

Vuk Vukotić^{*‡}

Research Institute of the Lithuanian Language
 Department of Sociolinguistics

**"A LANGUAGE EXPERT PROTECTS TRUE VALUES AND NATIONAL
 INTERESTS": A LOOK INTO THE CONSTRUCTION OF LINGUISTIC EXPERTISE
 IN THE METALINGUISTIC DISCOURSES IN LITHUANIA AND SERBIA**

Original scientific paper
 UDC 81'272::811.172
 81'272::811.163.41

<https://doi.org/10.18485/kkonline.2016.7.7.11>

Linguists, language teachers and all other types of language experts are of key importance in the dissemination of beliefs about language, today referred to in literature as *language ideologies* (Rumsey, 1990). In spite of the great deal of attention given to language experts in sociolinguistic literature, very little research has looked into how these experts and their expertise is perceived amongst non-experts. A study of the perception of experts would help answer the question of how language ideologies come about, how are they formed by non-experts and are there any competing language ideologies, that language users come up with themselves. The aim of this paper is, thus, to explore the discursive construction of language experts amongst lay language users. The data is drawn from online comment sections, and two communities are compared: Lithuania and Serbia. The research is qualitative, based on a relatively small number of comments, with the main goal to identify tendencies which could be examined in further research. The analytical tools build upon the notion of *interdiscursivity*. Following Bauman (2005) is assumed that every utterance (or here: a comment) is created ideologically, by relying on recognisable ways of speaking, voicing and answering to discourses circulating in society. Such an analysis of the possible connections of this discourse with other discourses could offer some explanation how language ideologies coming from language experts are perpetuated, negotiated or reconstructed.

Key words: linguistic expertise, authority, language ideologies, internet comments, virtual sphere

1. Introduction

One of the focuses of sociolinguistic research in the past two decades has been *ideologies about language / language ideologies* (Rumsey 1990), which uncovers how *language* is conceptualised by non-linguists. This type of research reveals important facts about the "political life of language", such as political exclusion (Woolard, 1989), linguistic discrimination (Lippi-Green, 1997) or stigmatisation of certain linguistic forms. One portion of such research is studies on the public discourse about language.

* Research Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Centre of Sociolinguistics, P. Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius, Lithuania; e-mail: vuk.vukotic@sociolingvistika.lt

‡ This article is a revised version of the paper presented at the Sociolinguistics Symposium 21 at the University of Murcia, June 18th 2016.

They have shown that the relationship between the notions of *a language* and *a people*, *a (nation-)state* tend to be idealised in public discourse. This ideology suggests that one people have ideally one language on a single territory (c.f. Blommaert, 2011; Berthele, 2008) and that *a language* somehow embodies the *spirit of the people* (Moschonas, 2004). These idealizations can be traced back to Herder's idea of the nation-state and Whorf's linguistic relativism, respectfully. Languages become "national treasures", objects that need to be protected against foreign influences (Spitzmüller, 2007). This provides some explanation to the questions of what language means to its users.

One aspect of the ideologies of language in the public space, namely the understanding of *language experts*,⁴ remains underresearched, in spite of the great attention given to it in seminal publications in sociolinguistics (Cameron 1995, Milroy & Milroy 2002). Linguists are especially interesting here, as they are the ones who were primarily engaged in the codification of standard languages, those same "national treasures", whose protection stirs up so much debate. Language experts have served as brokers of various linguistic ideologies, such as the *standard language ideology* (an ideology that suggests that standard language is the most superior form of language, see Milroy, 2001) and linguistic purism (Thomas, 1991). In the public spheres of Western societies today, many linguists often appear as those who criticise these "old" ideologies, the same ones that were promoted by the linguists a few generations back.⁵ This creates noise in the perception of language experts amongst non-linguists.

At this point, I will argue that in order to fully grasp the construction of language expertise in the late-modern world, in which authority is often challenged and contested, one would need to research the public perception of language experts. Yet, the discourse of non-linguists about language experts and their construction of linguistic expertise are underresearched. Thus, this paper will aim to explore how a *language expert* is constructed amongst *lay* language users. The data will be taken from two communities – Lithuania and Serbia – from the comment sections of online news portals, where language and language experts are discussed. With the comparative perspective, I aim to shed some light on the possible universal and community-specific notions of language expertise. The main research question is: how is linguistic expertise constructed in the discourse of online news comment sections in

⁴I use the term "expert" to cover any type of profession that has to do with language, including researchers, teachers, language editors etc.

⁵ Sociolinguists have been especially active in their ideological criticism, see Sally Johnson's 2001 article and James Milroy's (2001) answer, for an interesting debate on this topic

Lithuania and Serbia? To answer this question, the discourse data is approached from an interdiscursive angle: Following Bakhtin, it is assumed that all utterances are shaped *dialogically* (Bauman, 2005: 145), which means that a discourse (for example on language) can be connected to a variety of other discourses (for example, to discourse on morality or religion, nationality, history etc.) and the choice of this connection is based on *ideology*. Following Bauman (2005), I shall refer to these *dialogical* connections as *interdiscursive*. The analysis seeks to uncover these interdiscursive connections and explore the discursive construction of a language expert.

The paper continues in three sections. Section two will discuss the notions of language ideology, linguistic expertise and one possible way of analysing those notions – interdiscursivity. Then, section three will present the results of the discourses on language experts in news portal comment sections. Section four will present the conclusions.

2. Theoretical underpinnings and methodology

This section will overview the theoretical problems in the construction of “language experts” (and experts in general), present them in the light of language ideological research, and then continue to describe the present research.

2.1. Language ideologies

The field of study referred to as “language ideologies” today builds upon Michael Silverstein's notion of *linguistic ideologies* (1979). He used this notion to help answer traditional questions in linguistics: it was understood in terms of “...any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979: 194), meaning belief systems that influence language structure and change. Today, the field of “language ideologies” has largely moved from Silverstein's structuralist problematic, and is now a broad multidisciplinary field covering a range of topics. One study direction here comes from the anthropological tradition: relying on ethnographic data, the phenomena researched are ideologically shaped ways of speaking, e.g. gendered speech, honorific language and their social and pragmatic roles in communities (c.f. Schieffelin, Woolard & Kroskrity, 1998). Another, cognitive, study direction seeks to uncover how language and language phenomena are cognitively understood by the speakers (c.f. Geeraerts, 2003). A third direction within the field focuses on societal ideologies

(rather than linguistic, for example, capitalism, nationalism etc.) produced, sustained and challenged *through language* (c.f. Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002) Language ideologies are most broadly defined as "shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world." (Rumsey, 1990), or, from a more critical perspective "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests." (Irvine, 1989)

Recently, an important set of questions has been raised in sociolinguistics, namely how certain beliefs about language become so dominant that they are considered common-sense, and what their consequences are. These beliefs, called *language ideologies* are understood as those covert systems of attitudes, which have become subconscious, unnoticeable, "naturalized" (in terms of Silverstein, 2003). Many studies have looked historically through development of such ideologies, pointing out the historical origins of linguistic prescriptivism (linguistic correctness and incorrectness, c.f. Cameron 1995), terms such as *national languages* (c.f. Bauman & Biggs 2003), the ideology that standard language is the best language (c.f. Milroy 2001). Recently, the focus has turned public discussions about language, since the dominant ideologies are is most clearly visible in the public space. A central term in these studies, *language ideological debates* (Blommaert, 1999), provides a handy analytical tool: A debate, identifiable in space and time, followed by an analysis of its connection to other discourses and its historical origins, would allow for a nearer exploration of phenomena that are the key to understand the origins and sustainment of language ideologies.

Studies like this have examined the above-mentioned ideologies in public debates, such as linguistic nationalism (Meeuwis, 1999), "pure" (Homer, 2005), and "impure" (Stroud, 2004) language and speech or linguistic expertise (Milani, 2007). The last study requires more attention, as it is related to the research question of this article. Milani has examined the presentation of a language expert in Swedish newspaper-mediated debates on discriminatory language. His study shows that the main factor that contributed to the construction of a language expert was the media outlet itself; it provided a prominent amount of discursive space to one participant, while denying access to another (Milani, 2007: 117).

It is therefore interesting to see if readers-commentators adopt the interpretation offered (directly or indirectly) by the media, or whether there is any counter-discourse to be found comment sections. In comment sections, there is much less filtering and surveillance of the content than in traditional media, due to the need

of the market to show that the portal has readership and participation. This allows for an examination of more varied notions of linguistic expertise. This article will focus only on the discursive construction of a language expert in the comments, while a comparison (in-)between article texts and comment sections below the text shall be left for future research.

2.2. Expertise in the era of the internet. Cases of Lithuania and Serbia.

Two social constructivist thinkers, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann define the problem of experts in the following way: "I require not only the advice of experts, but the prior advice of experts on experts" (1991: 60). The quote illustrates one of the central themes discussed in post-modernist thought, namely that authority of those who were traditionally considered experts has declined greatly. Their role has changed from those who are the holders of knowledge, to only a single actor in the creation of knowledge amongst a multitude of voices. The creation of knowledge in the postmodern world is explained by Jean-François Lyotard in the following way: "Postmodern knowledge is not simply a tool of the authorities; it refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable. Its principle is not the expert's homology, but the inventor's paralogy." (Lyotard, 1984: xxv)

Here, I find the ideas of knowledge being a product of "paralogy" especially worthy to empirically revisit in the era of the internet for two reasons.

First, the "virtual sphere" has provided a platform for multitude of voices, new types of participants and brought about great hopes for a new, virtual democracy, and, later on, disappointments in the hoped democratising effects (see Papacharissi, 2009 and Goldberg, 2010). The online space provides almost direct access to debates (for those who have access to the internet), the amount of user-created content on forums, news portals and discussion boards greatly exceeds the original content, and the level of censorship is also often very low, much because of market requirements, but also simply because of the inability of administrators and moderators to review all the user-created content. Some websites such as "4chan" promote the idea of null censorship, while others like "Reddit" support the idea of very low control.

Second, this could also apply to the expertise in language. In such a multitude of voices, is the authority of those language experts, which have usually been considered figures of authority (such as linguists, translators, teachers etc.), deconstructed, reconstructed or sustained through discourse? And how?

It is surprising that the question of a linguist's (and other authorities) right to decide over what is and what is (and what is not) language has been addressed in sociolinguistic literature, but not examined amongst language users. Moreover, sociolinguists are known as those who take up stances on language issues, and often publicly criticise linguistic normativism and prescriptivism. This is due to the fact that the terms that have long been used by sociolinguists, such as linguistic *variation*, *competence* or *repertoires*, have challenged the traditional ways of thinking about what is *correct* and *good* language. The authority of dictionaries, grammar books and normative linguists has been addressed in many critique-oriented studies on ideologies of purism, standardness, normative linguistics, monolingualism (c.f. Blackedge, 2001; Heller 2003). The question of the historical origin of these language ideologies has been returning to sociolinguistics with growing interest. A 1995 special edition of *Pragmatics* features a series of articles on "Constructing languages and publics" (edited by Susan Gal and Kathryn Woolard), which was focusing on precisely those questions. This publication was re-issued twice in 2001 and 2014, which shows that the academic interest is still present. As mentioned in the introduction, Cameron (1995) and Milroy and Milroy (2002) have also addressed this issue from a historical and top-down perspective (analysing institutional and expert discourses on language).

Given the attention of sociolinguistics to the *language expert – lay user* problematic, it is surprising that it the discourse 'from below' has been in research until today. While preparing this paper, I came across a recently published study by Antonio Reyes and Juan Eduardo Bonnin (2016), that has taken up a related question of how language authority is constructed among the users of the online *WorldReference* forum – an interactive forum for languages and cultures, featuring a multitude of semi-anonymous voices. Their results show that those voices that want to be recognised as experts shape their discourse using several techniques, including correct consequent use of punctuation, complex syntax, categorical ways of answering questions and an invocation of an authoritative voice (Reyes & Bonnin, 2016: 21), in other words – imitating the traditional linguistic authority of a teacher, grammar book or a school textbook. Since this article was published in "Current issues on language planning", it focused more on the construction of the internet platform as an authoritative space that decides on the language norm. Apart from this article, the notion of the language expert is missing from the grassroots research on language ideologies.

2.3. Approaching the data, cases of Lithuania and Serbia, interdiscursivity

The present article will focus solely on the techniques of the construction of 'a language expert' in metalinguistic discourse. I will take the case of Lithuania and Serbia, to compare the results in-between these two "second world" (Wallerstein, 2004) countries. Research on language ideologies in these two countries has shown that language experts found themselves making choices that are hard to explain linguistically, but rather politically. The two countries are a prime example of language being locus of many other societal and political debates.

Language is the central symbol of Lithuanian identity and anything that is perceived as a threat to it initiates huge debates. Research has shown that the reason for this is a long history of idealisation of Lithuanian language, starting from the boasting early 20th century linguists about the ancient features of Lithuanian language, and its importance for Indo-European studies (Tamaševičius, 2011: 146). Later, the idea of a *language culture* (caring for correct language and the ideal speech, which is seen as a strictly controlled monologue, for example, the language of the TV-anchor) was strengthened through new media and state institutions during the area of Soviet modernism (Vaicekausienė, 2010: 166). Although the first systems of control were established in the Soviet period it was after the regaining of independence that this country established one of the most extensive systems of language control and surveillance in Europe. The State Language Commission has legal right to decide upon all questions of the language norm, and the State Language Inspectorate has the authority to penalise incorrect language use with a fine ranging from 87 to 434 euros (these include TV and radio stations, municipalities, private companies etc.). The institutions and their authority have been instituted in the period of the regained independence (mostly between the years 1993-1995), in order to protect language from foreign influence and continue work on the purification of the language from foreign words (for more on this topic in English see Vaicekauskiene, 2011; 2016). Clearly, the state is the main and the most powerful broker of language ideology in Lithuania. It is also very paradoxical that the Soviet-style system of absolute control extended in the case of language, while the other spheres of life in Lithuania went through a period of democratization.

History of language ideologies in Serbia are somewhat more difficult to grasp. The current standard of the language (i.e. the first grammarbook and dictionary) were called "Serbian grammar" and "Serbian dictionary" in the first half of the 19th century.

However, under the guidance of the Austro-Hungarian bureaucracy, these became standards for languages which are today Bosnian, Croatian and Montenegrin. For a long period of time, the official name of the language was Serbo-Croatian, and sustaining this language standard was one of the important goals of the government of that time (Greenberg, 2004: 16). Some researchers (Bašić, 2001; Greenberg, 2004) have indicated that language planning in the Socialist Federative Republic Yugoslavia was government controlled, and linguists in Serbia had a task of sustaining a common language and to work with other (especially Croatian) linguists, in order to sustain linguistic unity. To my knowledge, there is no research on the connections between the language policies to the political goals, but analysis of decisions and discourse of linguists indicate that linguists in Belgrade, being near the centre of political power, indeed probably had a task of sustaining the status common language. What becomes difficult to explain then is the decision of a group of academics working at the main Serbian language planning institution within Yugoslavia (the Serbia Academy of Arts) to publish a long text on the status of Serbs and the Serbian language in 1986, alerting to the dangers that the Serbs are facing in the other Yugoslavian republics. It is considered one of the main documents of modern Serbian nationalism (Budding, 1998 :53) The first linguistic ideological movement was made here by a linguist and member of the Academy, Pavle Ivić, who wrote about the endangerment of Serbian Cyrillic script. In the 1990s, the name changed from Serbo-Croatian to Serbian officially. The second big ideological decision was made, not to re-standardise the Serbo-Croatian standard as it was done in Croatia and Bosnia, but to build upon it (Bugarski, 2004; Radovanović, 2004). Many discussions were started, about how the new language should be managed, how it should be called, and even what is "our", "Serbian" language.

Clearly, the discussions on language can nominally be about language, but essentially about education, politics, geopolitics and even war. A language expert engaging in a debate about language (on any topic) might find him-/herself inevitably engaging in debates about much broader issues than just language. This brings me to the notion of interdiscursivity, which might help clarify the relationships between discourse on language and other discourses.

A comment on a news portal, as a genre, offers a very limited range of semiotic resources in comparison with other online discussion outlets. No pictures, gif-images or gif-emoticons can be used; the character limit is usually low (the limits vary from platform to platform, but commentators themselves limit it to a) and hyperlinking is

not always allowed (all of these are possible on, for example forums social media such as Facebook). Thus, the participants of the discussion must rely on their rhetorical skills, strategically choose topics and arguments, use spelling, syntax and text structure, in order for their messages to gain attention (also shown in a previous study (Reyes & Bonnin, 2016), see section 2.3.). Here, I begin from two suppositions – first, that language users have to relate their comment to a broader, easily recognisable discourse in order to gain prominence in the debate; second, that public discussions about language are not discussions about language alone. This is based on the findings of Jan Blommaert's (2011) research on language debates in Belgium, which has shown that:

...language never occurred alone as a factor and argument in conflicts, but always operated as part, initially, of a larger democratization process and, later, as part of a power struggle due to momentous demographic and socio-economic transformations. Language was, in short, an emblematic argument that became shorthand for a larger set of issues.
 (Blommaert, 2011: 1)

It is expected that the discourse on language experts will also not be solely about "what an expert is", but about the political, historical, societal roles they are connected to. This brings me to the notion of *interdiscursivity*. The following paragraphs will present interdiscursivity as a tool that can be useful for the investigation of ideologies that are constructed (or deconstructed) through discourse.

Interdiscursivity is a concept often connected to Kristeva's notion of intertextuality, which explains the relationship of texts to other texts, as well as the construction of meaning through these relationships. Intertextuality on the most basic level is copying of one text into another context (for example, using a Hamlet quote in a modern novel). On a more abstract level shows and explains the relationship of utterances to each other, as they circulate in society through practices of talking, writing and reading. To explain this, one can refer to Bazerman (2004), who lists six levels of intertextuality, the first three of which will be considered intertextual, and the latter three interdiscursive. They are: "1) Direct quotation 2) Indirect quotation 3) Mentioning of a person, document or statement 4) Comment or evaluation on a statement, text or otherwise invoked voice 5) Using recognisable phrasing, terminology, associated with specific people or groups 6) Using language and forms that seem to echo certain ways of communicating, discussions among other people, types of documents" (Bazerman, 2004: 88-89). Interdiscursivity will be understood as

a much less recognisable type of intertextuality – it concerns the use certain forms of speech that resemble certain social groups or identities. Interdiscursivity is expected to be found in these comments because it can be used effectively in spite of the mentioned lack of other semiotic resources, and because it presents a powerful persuasive device (Bhatia 2010).

While intertextual researches focus on a direct comparison of texts, many works in the field of interdiscursivity have oriented their analysis to the dialogical nature of the connections between the discourses. Instead of comparing texts / possible texts, as it is common in intertextual studies, Bauman (2005) suggests an orientation to the very connections of utterances (interdiscursivity) that transcend text bound in time and space (in the case of this article – a comment), because this focus “gives us a way of comprehending more extended temporal relations-history-in discourse-based terms.” (Bauman, 2005: 146). Lastly, as mentioned in the introduction, studying interdiscursive connections can also reveal ideological workings behind productions of discourse, because “...interdiscursivity keeps us aware that all utterances are ideologically informed; Bakhtinian perspectives alert us necessarily to language ideologies—and to the sites where they are enacted, voiced, and respond to.” (Bauman 2005: 146).

The goal of the analysis is not necessarily to investigate the discourses which are connected to comments themselves (the possible discourses would be endless in number), but rather recognise potential sources, which the commentators on language expert borrow from or respond to. Open coding was used and repeating features were noted and analysed for potential tendencies in the discourse. The results could be confirmed in a larger, quantitative research. The results will be discussed relating to the field of language ideologies, or simply put – what can the notion of a language expert tell us about dominant language ideologies?

The data for this research consists of comments under the articles on news portals in Serbia and Lithuania. The articles for the research were chosen the following criterion: that they talk about a language issue. These include articles or interviews with language experts on topics such as literacy, internet language, influence of foreign languages, language policy questions. I have searched the biggest (in terms of comments) news portals in both countries, trying to gather as many comments on language experts or expertise. I started from the newest and slowly looked for older in order to find patterns of dominant discourses. The results I have found eight articles from Lithuania and nine from Serbia. The research is qualitative, and the accent is on

discovering tendencies in interdiscursive connections between comments and other discourses, which potentially form a new type of discourse.

3. Construction of the language expert in online news portal comment sections in Serbia and Lithuania

The first, and most important finding is that the analysis yielded very similar results in both countries. Two dominant discourses have emerged through interdiscursive connections between comments and other discourses: one will here be called the *discourse of nostalgia*; the other one will be called the *discourse of nation-building*. Also, two counter-discourses emerged (ones that appear as reactions to the dominant discourses), which will for the time being be referred to as the *counter-discourse of nostalgia*, and the *counter-discourse of nation-building*. These two will be described in detail in the following two undersections. The third undersection presents the results in a comparative light and discusses them.

3.1. Discourse of nostalgia

The main feature of the comments that were categorised into this discourse, is that they are connected to narratives about *an ideal past, a lost time* or a *golden age*. It was noticed that they also represent a discussion of societal values on a temporal axis. As a rule, the past is presented as better, characterised by values such as order, professionalism, hierarchy and quality. The following comment illustrates that:

(Ex. 1) Lithuanian, 1st Apr 2013

*Pradinių ir pagrindinių mokyklų mokytojų darbo niekas netikrina. Ten dažnai vyksta žaidimai. (...) Ateina į gimnaziją mokiniai neturėdami darbo įgūdžių. Dabar mokyklose keli jauni vyr. mokytojai, o vyresnio amžiaus visi metodininkai ir ekspertai. O rezultatai prastėja. Tarybiniais laikais visame rajone būdavo arba ne 1-2 ekspertai, mokykloje, kurioje apie 100 mokytojų, 3-5 mokytojai metodininkai ir 5-10 vyr. mokytojų, bet jie buvo verti šitų vardų. 'The work of elementary school teachers is not controlled by anyone. It's just games and fun there (...) Pupils come to high school without working skills. In schools now there are a few young *senior teachers* and all the older ones are *methodicians* and *experts*. And the results are getting worse. In Soviet times, a whole region would have 1 or 2 *experts* in a school, where there*

would be 100 teachers, 3-5 *teachers-methodicians* and 5-10 *senior teachers*, but they were worthy of those titles.⁶ (emphasis by me)

Here we see a narrative about a better past time. While there is no data about the commentator, the interdiscursive perspective supposes that he is voicing someone who knows a lot about the old schooling system – this type of discourse can be found amongst older members of society, usually with high education and jobs in the public sector, most likely school. This is indicated by the comment author's use of the old (Soviet period) names of qualificational categories, which are often subject to ridicule today, because they belong to an outdated system of titles. The commentator finds value in a stricter order of professions and presents the changes in hierarchy as the reason for low language skills. This is found in many comments in Lithuania, in spite of the fact that many other commentators point to the Soviet period as an era of russification. The discourse of nostalgia dictates that values are placed on the temporal axis so that anything in the past is always presented as better than the present, a tendency present in all of the comments labelled "discourse of nostalgia":

(Ex. 2) Lithuanian, 2nd Apr 2013

Ankčiau Dobrovolskio ar Kuzavinienės-Kadžytės vadovėliai buvo puikūs, išmokdavo puikiai visi rašyti, net sovietų sistema nesugebėjo sustabdyti raštingumo. O dabar patys nusiseilinome. Gėda ponioms iš pedagoginio universiteto Lituanistikos fakulteto - ten vadovėlių autorė, kuriai visai neįdomus raštingumas... (...) Po to mokytojais dirbs su tais vadovėliais, kur kalbos nebeliko - ti visokie teksto supratimai ir visokios stilistinės priemonės. Stilistines priemonės, brangiosios vadovėlių autorės, reikia dėstyti tada, kai žmogus jau moka taisyklingai rašyti. Ko daugiau norėti - chaosas, sumišęs su bizniu... `Before, textbooks by Dobrovolskis or Kuzavinienė-Kadžytė were excellent, everyone learned how to write perfectly, not even the Soviet system managed to stop literacy. And we have disqualified ourselves. Shame on the ladies from the Pedagogical university's Lithuanian faculty - there we have a textbook author, who does not care about literacy... (...) Then teachers will work with those textbooks, where there is no language - just some understanding of text and stylistic tools. Stylistic tools, my dear textbook authors, need to be thought then, when a

⁶ All the translations of the comments from Serbian and Lithuanian are my own. Some comments are spelled with very few punctuation marks and with non standard spacing between words and characters. I have mostly tried to transfer that punctuation and spacing into English.

person already can write correctly. What more do you want - chaos, mixed up with business...'

The hint of business at the end of the comment would be difficult to analyse, because it does not seem to refer to any of the content in the rest of the comment. However, it can be looked at *interdiscursively*, this discourse is voicing an older, wise teacher, which is concerned with education and culture, and *business* comes in as a new (to those citizens of Lithuania that grew up in the Soviet Union, business is a relatively new), bad, uncultured and savage phenomenon that prioritizes money over education.

In the Serbian discourse, the same concerns over the lack of order and professionalism are present, as well as fear of new phenomena that appear in language, such as political correctness, and gender-sensitive language:

(Ex. 3) Serbian, 25th Dec 2015

Gospođa lektorka je upravo obesmislila svoj poziv, ne znam da li je uopšte svesna toga. Praktično je rekla da može da piše kako ko hoće, bitno je da se razume šta je hteo da kaže. Još veći biser je nasilno uvođenje političke korektnosti i u lingvistiku - ne možeš reći nekome da nepravilno govori da ga ne bi uvredio... 'Madame lektor⁷ has just rendered her profession meaningless, I don't know if she is even aware of that. She practically said that anyone can write as they like, it is important to understand what he wanted to say. An even bigger nonsense is the violent introduction of political correctness into linguistics – you cannot tell someone that they are speaking incorrectly, just so you wouldn't offend them...' (Com-SR-1, my italics, 15 dec 2015)

(Ex. 4) Serbian, 11th Sep 2011

Takođe i nakaradno nametanje ženskog roda za zanimanja apsolutno ne smatram pozitivnim pomakom - psihološkinja i ostale nebuloze (naročito forsirane na b92) zvuče više nego smešno. 'I also don't consider the grotesque imposition of female genus for profession to be a positive move – psihološkinja and similar tomfoolery (especially forced at b92⁸) sound more than ridiculous.'

⁷Lektor refers to a profession of language editors/correctors/advisors. It was common for media and publishing companies in Yugoslav times to hire language editors and advisors that would prepare texts for both spoken and written media. They are much less present in commercial media today.

⁸ B92: Name of a radio and television station in Serbia

The word *psihološkinja*, meaning "female psychologist" is relatively new in the public sphere, because male-genus profession names were used as neutral for both genders for a long time. The female suffixes, introduced recently by a group of linguists, is a subject to much debate. In the discourse of nostalgia, this phenomenon are a part of the "new" and the "present", which is evaluated negatively in relation to the past. The verbs used to refer to the appearance of new phenomena are "imposition" and "violent introduction", as noticeable above.

A number of comments appear in the debates as an answer to those featuring the discourse of nostalgia, hence they will be classified as counter-discourse. Counter-discourse is build by breaking the interdiscursive connections featured in the dominant discourse, and introducing new ones. On the level of text, it means that they introduce new topics, re-formulate the problems, and inverse the values on the time axis. The old becomes bad, and the new becomes treated as good, for example the English language:

(Ex. 5) Lithuanian, 13th Apr 2013

Ta "meilė" kalbai yra tiesiog nesąmonė. Kalba tik įrankis komunikacijai ir tikslui pasiekti, nereikia jos sudievinėti. Man angliu kalba praktiškai dar geriau, nei Lietuvių, nes kalbininkai iš neturėjimo ką veikti jau visai į laukus nuvažiavė su naujom absurdiškom taisyklėm ir naujadarais... 'That «love» for language is just nonsense. Language is only a instrument of communication and to achieve a goal, no need to idolise it. For me, English is practically even better than Lithuanian, because the linguists went crazy with new absurd rules and neologisms from not having what to do...'

or youth language:

(Ex. 6) Serbian, 8th Apr 2015

Bolje bi bilo da jezicki strucnjaci pokusaju da cuju kako obicni ljudi govore i da to sto cuju pokusaju da pretvore u nesto sto je u duhu postojeceg (vrlo zastarelog) jezika, nego da ukazuju na greske. Ne znam kako je moguće da su svi zabiravili Vuka Karadzica i to kako je on postavio temelje danasnjeg modernog pisanog jezika. Slusajte mlade i ucite od njih. 'It would be better if language experts would try to hear how common people speak and to turn what they hear into something in the spirit of the current (very outdated) language, then point to mistakes. I don't know how it is

possible that everyone forgot Vuk Karadzic and how he set the grounds of the modern written language of today. Listen to the young ones and learn from them’.

This comment (Ex. 6), uses an intertextual strategy by mentioning the name of the language standardiser, Vuk Karadžić, who is famous for popularising the phrase “Write as you speak”.

The next commentator (Ex. 7) takes up criticism of language experts by introducing a new topic – economics:

(Ex. 7) Lithuanian, 1st Apr 2013

nematau problemos keiciasi visuomene, keiciasi kalba, keiciasi ir rastingumo samata. Cia straipsni rase verkšlenanti dinozaute, kuri susirupinusi del savo darbo vietos ir ateities pajamu. Nes jos specialybe darosi neberekalinga. ‘I don’t see a problem, society changes, language changes, the notion of literacy changes. This article was written by a crying dinosaur, worried about her workplace and future income. Cause her profession is becoming unneeded.’

(Ex. 8) Lithuanian, 2nd Oct 2013

As manau geriau jau tokie kalbininkai isnyktu kurie skleidžia erezijas ir bando vaidinti jog kazka daro o realiai tik pinigis is biudzeto siurbia. ‘I think it’s better that such linguists would disappear which are spreading misconceptions just to try to show that they are doing something and actually they are just pumping the money out of the budget.’

The introduction of new topics and the inversion of values are interpreted as an introduction of a new interdiscursive links. Even though it is difficult to set a name to discourses that are connected here, it is clear that these comments use a voice of a more politically-and-economically concerned, who is less concerned with literacy than economy, finances, future of the country, young people’s future etc.

It is visible from the past eight examples that the dominant discourse is characterised by use of complex sentence structure, longer narratives, correct punctuation, diacritics and spelling. This is largely not the case in the counter-discourse, where alternative spellings are used, texts are shorter and more on-point and punctuation is used sporadically. Even though this more of a tendency than a rule, it is in line with the results of Reyes and Bonnin’s research (2016) – those who

perpetuate the dominant discourse will make their language as correct as possible and demonstrate their expertise by use of language. The counter-discourse is structured so that it deconstructs the traditional notion of expertise in writing.

When compared, the exchanges between the dominant and the counter-discourse seem to call upon voices of an authoritative teacher and a disinterested pupil, and the discussion starts to look like a classroom exchange between the two. The dominant discourse presents categorical claims / ways of commenting and requires more order and respect. The counter-discourse either changes, reformulates the topic, shows clear disinterest or presents the issue as a non-issue. One example (ex. 6) does not voice a pupil, but perhaps a parent criticising the strict short-mindedness of the linguist that put the blame on children. Although not too many comments are like this, it is clear that this discourse transfers the discussion into a classical school situation – teachers demand that knowledge (of language and rules) is good for itself, while the pupils and their parents ask what is the economical gain of that knowledge, how much does that cost, and what good is that for their future.

The comparison of the discourses shows that the inversion of values on the time axis is accompanied by introduction of new topicality. It should be noticed that topics such as money and business are censored out of the dominant discourse, youth language is not mentioned as a neutral phenomenon, but rather as 'illiteracy'.

3.2. Discourse of nation-building

The discourse of nation-building is connected to the discourse that arose after the end of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia respectively, which gave rise to questions of the future of Lithuania and Serbia. The linguists were heavily involved in the construction of the new cultural identities in this period (c.f. Vaicekauskiene 2011 for Lithuania, Greenberg 2004 for Serbia). This discourse borrows greatly from the language of political parties, in terms of raising moral panics, urging for immediate action or pointing out threats to national interests. For example, the following comment (ex. 9) discusses the suggested change of law that would allow Polish names to be written in the original spelling (there is no such as possibility in Lithuania):

(Ex. 9) Lithuanian, gender unknown, 31st May 2012

Mes turime savo kalbą, savo kultūrą savo žemėje. Kiti visa tai turi pas save - mes nenurodinėjame, kaip jiems gyventi. (...) Jėiu kalbos kaita būtų natūrali- kalbininkai gali ją norminti, bet šokti pagal lenkelių dūda- tai nepagarba nei sau, nei

savo tautai nei savo indetitetui. 'We have our own language, our culture on our soil. Others have the same – we don't tell them how to live their lives. If the language change would be natural - the linguists could norm it, but to dance to the Polish tune is not honouring your nation or your identity.'

Apart from the clearly identifiable Herderian one-nation-one-language discourse in the first sentence, the language problem is presented in the geopolitical light. The issue with Polish language in Lithuania is a re-occurring subject, this discourse builds on the discussions about the problematic political history between Lithuania and Poland.

Historical subjects that are alive in the collective memory get quickly involved into the discourse on language in both countries:

(Ex. 10) Serbian, 26th Sept 2012

Prvo neka se naša gospoda filolozi i ostali stručnjaci za srpski jezik usaglase i standardizuju naš pravopis, jer trenutno ih ih ima dva - tri u opticaju, pa da znamo šta branimo! Više niko ne zna da kaže kako se nešto pravilno piše, ogruženi smo nepismenošću, počev od državne televizije (...) do dece koja koriste SMS poruke koje je tragikomično čitati ... Hajde akademici, stvorite neki "Memorandum srpskog jezika"! (ako ste sposobni da se dogovorite!) 'First, let our gentlemen philologists and other Serbian language experts agree upon our orthography and standardise it, because there are currently two - three of them in circulation, so we know what to defend! Nobody is able to tell us how to write something correctly, we are surrounded by illiteracy, starting from state television (...) to children whose SMS messages are tragicomical to read ... Go on, academics, create some kind of "Memorandum of Serbian language" (if you are capable to answer!)

The mentioned "Memorandum of Serbian language" is an intertextual twist on the "Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts", where the academics asked for the Serbian people to be protected within Yugoslavia (see section 2.3. and Budding, 1998). The commentator seems to be asking for the same type of protection of the Serbian language. Furthermore, the traumatising events that took place during the wars of the 1990s are a frequent leitmotif in the comments about the activities of linguists. The following commentator (Ex. 11) is answering to a news piece about a new book on frequent grammatical errors, published by one of the main normative

linguists in Serbia, Ivan Klajn, but introduces the topic of the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the Serbo-Croatian language:

(Ex. 11) Serbian, 7th June 2012

O profesoru Klajnu vrlo malo znam ali to nije razlog da mu ne posaljemo iskrene želje i da mu uputim sve najbolje u njegovim naporima (...) Nas jezik je usao u " politicki haos' koga se vrlo tesko osloboditi. Jedan integralni naziv je ,apsolutno, neophodan da bi se sacuvale cari i ljepota jezika. (...) Tako integralan jezik bi se razvijao prirodnim koridorima i bio manje osjetljiv za strane izraze. U situaciji, u kojoj se danas nalazimo, kroz par godina pocemo upotrebljavati Albanski. 'I do not know much about professor Klajn but that is not a reason not to send him my most honest wishing and all the best in his efforts (...) Our language has entered a " political chaos', and it is difficult to liberate oneself from it. One integral name⁹ is , absolutely, necessary in order to preserve that charms and the beauty of the language. (...) Such an integral language would develop in natural ways and be less sensitive to foreign expressions. In a situation, which we find ourselves in today, will be using Albanian in a couple of years.'

This text builds upon circulating political discourses about the future of Serbia in relationship to the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the separation of Kosovo. The mention of the Albanian language relies on the discourse about the dangers of Albanian expansion and separatism in Kosovo, one of the most controversial topics in Serbia today.

It should be noticed that, even though the same issue is discussed as in the discourse of nostalgia (illiteracy), the historical events mentioned give the commentator the tool to present the language issue as a national priority. Discursive cues to be noticed in example 9 mentions "the nation", "identity" and example 10 mentions "gentlemen, philologists", "academics" and "state" television, example 11 names the linguist "professor". It would seem that the discourse of nation-building requires the "language expert" also to be presented on the highest national level.

The same connections exist in Lithuania; the topics are different, but they are all connected to the sudden political changes that took place in the 1990-s, including emigration, globalisation, relationship to the East and the West. In the next comment

⁹ He/she means: A common name for the language, rather than the current names: Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian.

(Ex. 12), which exemplifies the counter-discourse of nation-building, the user has used the name "emigrant"¹⁰ as his temporary nickname:

(Ex. 12) Lithuanian, 7th August 2011

*Emigrantas "Šavokos "rašosi" nėra" Gal kalbajobai lituanistai galetu apsiriboti kalba, o ne **uzhsimti filosofija, ir aishkinimu koks yra gyvenimas. TOTALUS BUKUMAS IR ATSILIKIMAS. 17 amzhius. O jus norti kad lietuviu kalba ishliktu Savaimė RASHOSI, jei tas veiksma atribojamas nuo subjekto. Zhodis "rashomas" reishkia akcenta i subjekta ir objekta, o rashosi jau lieka tik subjektas. Zhodis yra rashomas ivairiai, bet rashosi taip kaip turi. Zhidzhiai rashomi ir su klaidomis, ber rashosi be klaidu. nes rashymasis yra zhodzhio savybe o ne rashytojo (...). 'There is no concept of "is written"¹¹ Maybe the kalbajobai¹² Lithuanianists could limited themselves to language, and not to engage in the philosophy and teach us how to live. TOTAL STUPIDITY AND BACKWARDNESS. 17th century. And you want the Lithuanian language to survive Of course TO WRITE is the act separated from the subject. The word "to be written" mean a focus on both the subject and object, and "is written" keeps only the object. The word is written in different ways, but is always written as it should be. Wrods are written and misspelled, ber spelled without errors. rašymasis is because the word feature rather than the writer (...).' (emphasis by me)***

Instead of historical and political arguments, the commentator in example 12 uses complex philosophical arguments against prescriptivist linguists. The arguments are quite difficult to understand, but the commentator uses additional resources to make his message come through. Firstly, the title of his post includes the word "rašosi" (in italics), which is a form considered to be a incorrect by the language institutions (see footnote 7). Second, the commentator presents the historicity (which, as we saw, was one of the main features of the dominant discourse) as a negative thing. Third, he employs an additional semantic tool – non-traditional spelling (in emphasis) and intentional misspellings. The writing of the letters "ž" and "š" as "zh" and "sh", as well

¹⁰ I have used original names of commentators for two reasons. First, it is not a breach of anonymity, because no registration is needed to comment, and the same person can use different names to comment on the same topic. Second, sometimes users do not want to create a name, so they use this field for the first couple of words of their sentence.

¹¹ The commentator uses the "incorrect" form of "rašosi" [is written] intentionally, and contrasts it with the "correct" form "rašoma" [to be written]. The translations are not precise at all, I have translated them differently to English, just to point out that he is using two different forms – these are semiotic tools in the hands of the commentator, as they (especially the incorrect one) attract attention.

¹² The word consists of two words, *kalba*, meaning 'language' in Lithuanian, and *job*, meaning 'fuck' Russian.

as the strategic use of typing errors (words "word" and "but") points to the reactionary nature of the counter-discourse. The dominant discourse comes back through the writing of the next commentator (ex. 13) that picks up the pseudonym and re-introduces the dominant discourse:

(Ex. 13) Lithuanian, 7th August 2011

Tau isvis kalbos nereikia! uztenak grizti i bezdziones lygmeni, sokineti ir bliauti, kada "uzsinoresi" banano! kam ta unikali lietuviu kalbos gramatika, rastas, kalba, sutartines, legendos, galu gale - pati Lietuva, jei mes tik "rab-sila" (vergu jega) valyti WC ir skinti agrastus. Tauta atsisakiusi saves pacios paskui save palieka isdeginta dykuma! Pirmyn i meslo smarve, emigrante!;;; 'You don't need language at all! it is enough to go back to monkey level, jump and howl, when you want a banana! who needs this unique grammar of Lithuanian, its orthography, language, folk songs, legends, in the end – Lithuania itself, if we are just "rab-sila" (slave force) to clean toilets and pick berries. A nation renouncing itself is left as a dry desert. Go forth into the stench of the manure, emigrant!'

Historicity comes back as the main argument in two forms – mentions of the ancient language and folk tales, and also in forms of a recent historical event, namely emigration. Many Lithuanians have emigrated to Western Europe from poverty after the fall of the Soviet Union, and this one of the burning topics in Lithuanian politics. Although there is not clear mention of a language expert, language expertise that the previous commentator was criticising is reinforced as an attribute of a proper Lithuanian, contrasted with the "improper" Lithuanian who left the country to do low-class jobs.

3.3. Comparison and discussion

The comparison of the two discourses reveals an interesting trend: the discourse of nostalgia seems to be evoked by the mention of school, teachers, language-supervisors and editors in the media (examples 1-3), visible in the fact that the discourse builds upon school and classroom discourse between teachers and pupils. Experts evoked by the discourse of nation-building are of higher status – professors, academics, institutional representatives (examples 9-11), also probably due to the fact that the discourse borrows from political discourse between position and opposition, between an established and rebellious debater. This comes to no surprise in terms of

a general hierarchy of experts – higher level experts have responsibility for more important state level questions, lower-level ones for upbringing and education.

In the counter-discourses, this is not the case. Labels such as "linguists", "teachers", "professors" etc. are used in various way (as it can be seen in examples 6, 7, 8, 12). This can be explained in the following way – the hierarchy of linguistic professions is not important in the conceptualisation of a "language expert", but rather how much their services burden the public budget (examples 7-8), how they bother speakers unnecessarily (ex. 12).

The understanding of language experts is founded on principles of hierarchy (higher level experts take care of national issues, lower level experts of sustaining the value system), temporality and historicity (the changes in language, values and society are observed and discussed on a temporal axis and through the prism of historical events that are kept in the collective memory). Temporality in language ideologies has appeared in earlier linguistic anthropological research, and is described as a way of comparing possible worlds: "...temporalities must often-always?-come in pairs, as ways in which one compares and assesses possible worlds, whether these worlds are different aspects of one's own experience or different hypothetical realms." (Irvine 2005: 107). This is true of both the discourses of nostalgia and nation-building. Both are essentially about comparisons of worlds located in the – either real or idealised – past, present or future.

The values attached to the discourse of nostalgia are order, professionalism and, most importantly, hierarchy as a value in itself. This could be true for any *standard language culture* (Milroy 2001), as shown by studies of how both expert (Cameron 1995) and lay (Daives & Langer 2006) language users are quick to explain any language change as a deterioration in values. However, the fact that discourse of nation-building is evoked by mention of higher-positioned language expert is a trait of post-authoritarian regimes. This could be the result of the very high authority experts enjoyed in the period of state socialism. Also, these experts have engaged in language-political work by their own will. In Lithuania, two linguists who later worked at the State Commission for the Lithuanian Language, Rita Miliūnaite and Danguolė Mikulėnienė published an article entitled "In help of the state language" (1993), where they presented a list of "Great language errors", which later became the main recognised document in the work of the State Language Inspectorate when penalising language use. In Serbia, some linguists participated in the work on the controversial the "Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts" mentioned in ex. 10

(see section 3.2.), most prominently Pavle Ivić, who later became the head of the only regulatory body for the Serbian language at the same Academy. Due to the immense power that the state system had in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, it is not irrational for a language user to accept the expert and their wishes. This is in line with the findings Vaicekauskienė's (forthcoming) research, which has categorised the discourses of linguists in post-1990s Lithuania into two groups: the danger of the English language (connected to the idea of the nation-state) and the deterioration of language (clearly connected to *nostalgia). This study then suggests that linguists could have been the main ideological brokers of this type of discourse, which could be confirmed in further studies.

The comparison of topicality between the dominant and the counter-discourse shows gives a hint of the political discourses that the commentator enacts. On one hand, there is talk of national interest in terms of independence from larger state formations and foreign powers, national identity, emigration, birth-rate (nation-building) and past/traditional values (nostalgia). On the other hand, we have concerns for the financial aspect, discrimination and too much power of experts. This confirms that the discourses borrow directly from politics and the participants take sides according to what they feel the main political problem is. Thus the comments that belong to the dominant discourse are concerned with issues traditionally connected to right-wing ideologies, and the counter-discourse with left-wing (discrimination) and liberal (economical) issues. Language issues in the two countries are clearly a primary concern of the political right, as they are the ones that problematize the issue and set the tone of the discussion. Centre-left views come only as a response or a denial that language is an issue at all (compare ex. 2 and 7).

Some differences in the discourses in Serbia and Lithuania concern two possibly connected discourses: on gender roles and on economics.

As in many other places, gender-sensitive language is a prominent topic of debate in both Lithuania and Serbia. In Lithuania, female last names were an object of language-ideological debates in the past decades, as some women have opposed to traditional suffixes that mark married/unmarried status, and also requested a possibility to take a male suffix. The latter request is categorically dismissed by language institutions (Jakstienė 2004), because of exclusively linguistic, rather than societal reasons. In Serbia, as initiative by a feminist linguist to create a system of derivative suffixes that could give any profession a female version (Savić, Čanak, Mitro & Štasni 2009: 13-32) caused a great language ideological debate. It is surprising that

this topic is quite often mentioned in the discourse of nostalgia in Serbia, but not in Lithuania (at least my data has not shown any mentions). There can be several reasons for such results: first, I have not taken any news portal articles that were concerned with the subject of gender (neither in Serbia nor in Lithuania), under the assumption that all discussions on language related subject usually evoke connected discourses, as I have myself seen in my previous studies on metalinguistic internet comments (Vukotić 2014), and somewhat in this research too. It can be clearly seen from many comments that they have not read the whole article, but rather just joined the debate in the comment sections, introducing new topics and points of view. However, I was not expecting a disconnection from the discourse on gender and language. In spite of that, it is clearly important to notice the difference – gender became a topic of debate in any discussion on language in Serbia, but for some reason not in Lithuania. As there are no previous studies on the dynamics of these debates, one can only freely hypothesise – it could be due to the role played by the language institutions or court decisions in the debate, or there could have been a larger consensus in Lithuania than and in Serbia. Still, this shows that not only the connection, but also the disconnections between discourses are an interesting object for future studies.

Further research could look for: (1) the sources of these discourses, not just historically, but also at the actors in the public sphere that perpetuate them, and those who challenge them; (2) explanations on how connections between discourses in the public sphere are established, and when not (in order to explain why, for example, discourse on language and gender is prominent in Serbian comment sections, but not in Lithuanian); (3) more comparative studies are needed in order to see if hierarchy in language ideology is (and its connection to values such as order and discipline) a universal trait of language ideologies in standard language cultures (much like temporality), or is this just the case in post-authoritarian societies; (4) Interdiscursivity can be applied in the research on public discourse in order to look for how politicians and political ideologies have might have shaped it.

4. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to explore the construction of linguistic expertise in the comment sections of news portals. The main theoretical concept employed was interdiscursivity, with the goal to present all the discourses entangled with the discourse on language experts. Comments that talk about different language experts were firstly analysed in search for more stable discursive patterns using open coding,

then, relying on the notion of interdiscursivity, each feature was compared to a possible similar discourse. Finally, the comments were categorised into discourses. The conclusions are as follows:

1) Two dominant types of discourses have been identified. They are called the *discourse of nostalgia* and the *discourse of nation-building*. The two discourses that emerge as a reaction to those discourses were called simply the *counter-discourse of nostalgia* and the *counter-discourse of nation-building*. It is assumed that the *discourse of nostalgia* borrows from school/classroom discourses between the voice of the teachers (dominant discourse), who are concerned with culture, value, order, valuing traditional values; and the voice of the protesting student or parent (counter-discourse), that look into the future and talk about money, career, life perspectives and question the value of language for itself. Likewise, the *discourse of nation-building* borrows greatly from political discourse: the voice of the established politician (dominant discourse), who is concerned with national identity, education in the proper spirit etc., while the other one (counter-discourse) gives a voice to the rebel, breaking rules and delegitimising the commentator who is voicing the "establishment".

2) Hierarchy in language ideology. Further analysis of the re-occurring patterns in the two discourses has shown that there is a tendency for the discourse of nostalgia to be evoked by mention of lower-level language experts (and also use of their voice), such as teachers, language-advisors and editors, while mentions of higher-level language experts evokes the discourse of nation-building. In counter-discourses, this hierarchical difference is less present.

3) Temporality and historicity. The discourses and counter-discourse are structured around a temporally linear view of language change, in which the past is focused on and evaluated positively (the future and the present – negatively) in the dominant discourse. In the counter-discourse, the present and the future are not seen as problematic, the past is not seen as better than the present. The discourse of nation-building is constructed firstly by introducing or mentioning a historically important event or a big recent national issue (such as the Kosovo war, break up of Yugoslavia in Serbia or mass emigration in Lithuania) into the discourse. The discourse borrows from political discourse, taking strong historical moments that are engraved in the collective memory to make their arguments stand out.

4) Political orientation. The dominant discourses seem to be often connected to conservative, right-wing ideologies, such as preservation of old values, national independency, birth rate and emigration. The counter-discourses present a liberal and

left-wing style of criticism, bringing subjects such as discrimination, equality, economy and development into the debate. This is by no way saying that these commentators hold similar positions on other subjects, but rather that there is a clear tendency in the selection of argument that looks like a political debate.

5) To answer to the main research question – how is linguistic expertise constructed in the comment sections of online news portals, I stress: The expert knowledge of language experts is perceived to be valuable in the political life and the protection of national interests, as well as in the promotion of a certain type of civic culture.

The claims that are put out here are a result of a largely inductive, qualitative research. In future research, it could be extended to a larger sample of comments and quantitatively investigated.

References

- Bauman, R. (2005). Commentary: Indirect indexicality, identity, performance: Dialogic observations. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15 (1), 145-150.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge* (No. 10). London: Penguin UK.
- Berthele, R. (2008). A nation is a territory with one culture and one language: The role of metaphorical folk models in language policy debates. In G. Kristiansen, R. Dirven (Eds.), *Cognitive sociolinguistics: Language variation, cultural models, social systems* (pp. 301-332). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2010). Interdiscursivity in professional communication. *Discourse & communication*, 4 (1), 32-50.
- Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Estudios de sociolingüística: Linguas, sociedades e culturas*, 1 (2), 25-46.
- Blommaert, J. (2011). The long language-ideological debate in Belgium. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 6 (3), 241-256.
- Blommaert, J. (ed.). (1999). *Language ideological debates* (Vol. 2). Walter de Gruyter.
- Budding, A. H. (1998). Systemic Crisis and National Mobilization: The Case of the "Memorandum of the Serbian Academy". *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 22, 49-69.

- Bugarski, R. (2004). Language policies in the successor states of former Yugoslavia. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3 (2), 189-207.
- Cameron, D. (2005). *Verbal hygiene*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse & society*, 13 (2), 185-208.
- Davies, W. V., & Langer, N. (2006). The making of bad language: lay linguistic stigmatisations in German, past and present (Vol. 28). Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang.
- Gal, S., & Woolard, K. (eds.). (2014). *Languages and publics: The making of authority*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Geeraerts, D. (2003). Cultural models of linguistic standardization. In R. Dirven, R. Frank, M. Pütz. (Eds.). *Cognitive models in language and thought: Ideology, metaphors and meanings* (Vol. 24). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Goldberg, G. (2010). Rethinking the public/virtual sphere: The problem with participation. *New Media & Society*, 13 (5), 739-754.
- Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 7 (4), 473-492.
- Homer, K. (2005). Reimagining the nation: discourses of language purism in Luxembourg. In N. Langer and W. V. Davies. *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages* (pp. 166-185). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Irvine, J. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* 16 (2):248-67.
- Irvine, J. T. (2004). Say when: temporalities in language ideology. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 14 (1), 99-109.
- Johnson, S. (2001). Who's misunderstanding whom? Sociolinguistics, public debate and the media. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5 (4), 591-610.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. Psychology Press.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1999). The postmodern condition. *Modernity: Critical Concepts*, 4, 161-177.
- Meeuwis, M., 1999. Flemish nationalism in Belgian Congo versus Zairian anti-imperialism: continuity and discontinuity in language ideological debates. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 381-423). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.-

- Mikulėnienė D & Miliūnaitė R. (1993). Į pagalbą valstybinei kalbai. *Gimtoji kalba* 1:19-25.
- Milani, T. M. (2007). Voices of authority in conflict: The making of the expert in a language debate in Sweden. *Linguistics and Education*, 18 (2), 99-120.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Response to Sally Johnson: Misunderstanding language? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5 (4), 620-625.
- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2012). Authority in language. Investigating Standard English. 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Moschonas, S. A. (2004). Relativism in Language Ideology: Greece's Latest Language Issue. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 22 (2), 173-206.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2009). The virtual sphere 2.0: The Internet, the public sphere, and beyond. In P. N. Howard (ed.) *Routledge handbook of internet politics* (pp. 230-245). Taylor & Francis.
- Radovanović, M. (2004). Planiranje jezika i drugi spisi (Vol. 56). Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića: Novi Sad.
- Reyes, A., & Bonnin, J. E. (2016). Negotiating use, norm and authority in online language forums. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, pre-published online: 11 Aug 2016, doi:14664208.2016.1220280. Last accessed 9 Oct 2016: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14664208.2016.1220280>
- Rumsey, Alan (1990). Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92 (2): 346-361.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Clyne, P. R., Hanks, W. F., & Hofbauer, C. L. (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3), 193-229.
- Spitzmüller, J. (2007). Staking the claims of identity: Purism, linguistics and the media in post-1990 Germany¹. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11 (2), 261-285.
- Stroud, C. (2004). Rinkeby Swedish and semilingualism in language ideological debates: A Bourdieuean perspective. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8 (2), 196-214.
- Tamaševičius, G. (2011). Tauta, gimusi iš filologijos, ir lingvistinio nacionalizmo fenomenas. *Darbai ir dienos* 56, 143-152.
- Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic purism*. Longman Publishing Group.

- Vaicekauskienė, L. (2010). Lietuvių kalbos norminimo šimtmetis. *Naujasis židinys-Aidai*, 5-6.
- Vaicekauskienė, L. (2011). Language 'nationalization': One hundred years of Standard Lithuanian. In T. Kristiansen & N. Coupland (eds.) *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe* (pp. 105–112). Oslo: Novus.
- Vaicekauskienė, L. (2016). Language Regimentation as Soviet Inheritance: Joining Scholarship and State Ideology, In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade & C. Percy (eds.) *Prescription and Tradition in Language. Establishing Standards across Time and Space* (pp. 303–317). Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters,.
- Vaicekauskienė, L. (forthcoming). Lietuvių kalbos inžinerijos karkasas po 1990, In N. Šepetys & L. Vaicekauskienė (eds.) *Lietuvių kalbos idealai: standartizavimo idėjų ir institucijų istorija*. Vilnius: Naujasis Židinys-Aidai.
- Vukotić, V. Conflicting notions of language in metalinguistic discourses in Lithuania, Norway and Serbia. *Taikomoji kalbotyra* 5, 1-32. Available at: <http://mif.vu.lt/ojs/index.php/taikomoji-kalbotyra/article/view/38/37>
- Wallerstein, I. M. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.
- Wolfram, W. (1998). Scrutinizing linguistic gratuity: Issues from the field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2 (2), 271-279.
- Woolard, K. A. (1989). Sentences in the language prison: The rhetorical structuring of an American language policy debate. *American Ethnologist*, 16 (2), 268-278.