Deliverable no: 2.1
Deliverable title: State of the art report on maintenance of regional languages

Lead beneficiary: CNRS - IKER

Work package: 2. Regional languages in multilingual Europe: Linguistics resources in need of resourceful policies

Project acronym: ATHEME
Project full title: Advancing the European Multilingual Experience
Grant agreement no: 613465
Introduction
Within the European Union there are many languages spoken. There are 23 officially recognised languages, more than 60 indigenous regional and minority languages, and many non-indigenous languages spoken by migrant communities. The EU, although it has limited influence because educational and language policies are the responsibility of individual Member States, is committed to safeguarding this linguistic diversity and promoting knowledge of languages. This is crucial for reasons of cultural identity and social integration and cohesion, and because multilingual citizens are better placed to take advantage of the economic, educational and professional opportunities created by an integrated Europe.

In this report on maintenance of regional languages, the reader will find information on some of these minority languages/varieties (Basque, Dutch varieties and Frisian, Fiuman dialect, Gallo, Sardinian, Primorska Slovenian and varieties spoken in Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol), including measures aimed at supporting initiatives carried out at local, regional and national levels designed to:

- extend the benefits of language learning to all citizens as a lifelong activity;
- improve the quality of language teaching at all levels;
- build an environment in Europe favourable to languages by embracing linguistic diversity, building language-friendly communities, and making language learning easier.

The current sociolinguistic situations of the languages/varieties included in this report are diverse, but they also share common aspects, and they provide a good sample of the linguistic diversity of Europe mentioned above. We include a brief description of the sociolinguistic situation of each of the languages/varieties, its (purported) relatives, geographical distribution, standard and dialects, and general data on language vitality of each of the languages/varieties.

This document was prepared by the researchers involved in the Regional Languages in Multilingual Europe work package (WP2). It results from the work of many people and has undergone many revisions.

A list of members who contributed to this report can be found here:

1. CNRS-IKER: Irantzu Epelde, Urtzi Etxeberria, Ricardo Etxepare (Basque)
2. UU: Myrthe Bergstra, Norbert Corver, Marjo van Koppen, Jacomine Nortier (Dutch varieties and Frisian)
3. FHSS/University of Rijeka: Branka Drljača Margić, Tihana Kraš, Siniša Smiljanić (Fiuman dialect)
4. UN: Nicolas Guilliot, Hamida Demirdache (Gallo)
5. UEDIN: Antonella Sorace, Caroline Heycock, Martin Pickering (Sardinian)
6. UNG: Lanko Marušič, Penka Stateva, Artur Stepanov, Rok Žaucer (Primorska Slovenian)
7. UNIT: Ermenegildo Bidese, Patrizia Cordin, Francesco Vespignani (Varieties spoken in Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol)
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Main goal:
To gather information about the maintenance of regional bilingualism by the different research groups and their language varieties of study:

1. Basque (p. 2)
2. Dutch varieties and Frisian (p. 9)
3. Fiuman dialect (p. 17)
4. Gallo (p. 24)
5. Sardinian (p. 30)
6. Primorska Slovenian (p. 35)
7. Varieties spoken in Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol (p. 44)
1. The Basque language and its name
The Basques call their language *euskara* (and dialectal variants: *euskera, eskuara, üskara*, etc.). The Royal Academy of the Basque language or Euskaltzaindia (1919) is the official body responsible for Basque. It has formulated the rules for the normalisation of the language. In 2000, the name *euskara* had been favoured by the Academy.

Basque speakers refer to the land where their language is spoken *Euskal Herria* (*euskal* = compositional form of *euskara* + *herri* ‘country’ + *-a* ‘singular determiner’) ‘country of the Basque language’ and to themselves as *euskaldunak* ‘those who have the Basque language’ (*euskal- + -dun ‘possessing’ + -ak ‘plural determiner’). In historical times, the Basque language is found occupying an area of variable extension on both sides of the Pyrenees and along the Bay of Biscay. It is conceivable, and even likely, that, prior to the first Indo-European invasions, Basque and its relatives were spread over a larger area of western Europe. The non-Indo-European Iberian language may also have replaced Basque in some areas.

In the Middle Ages, Basque was also spoken in areas of Castile, north of Burgos and in parts of La Rioja. It is fairly certain that the presence of the Basque language in Castilian territory was a consequence of medieval repopulation by Basque speakers.

2. (Purported) Relatives
Basque remains a language isolate without known linguistic relatives. A long tradition has seen in Basque the modern descendant of Iberian, a language which at the time of the Roman conquest is known to have been spoken over much of southern and eastern Spain and even north of the Pyrenees along the Mediterranean coast. This is known as the Basque-Iberian hypothesis.

Besides Iberian, genetic relationships have been proposed between Basque and numerous other languages and language families from Europe, Africa and elsewhere. In general, this comparative work has lacked rigor. An exception is the serious work on Basque-Caucasian connections carried out by several authors, which, nevertheless has also failed to convince most experts. It is probably the case that, even if Basque were indeed genetically related to some of the languages of the Caucasus, the separation has been so long that there is no real possibility of proving this relationship by usual standards (see Michelena 2011, Trask 1997).

3. Geographical distribution
Basque is spoken in the Basque Country, an area spanning part of northeast Spain and southwest France. It is currently an official language (together with Spanish) in the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country, which comprises the historical provinces of Bizkaia, Gipuzkoa and Araba. It also enjoys a more limited official status in the region of Navarre (Nafarroa in Basque). In both of these areas Basque was the majority language three or four centuries ago, but it has been steadily receding since then and until the last two decades. Most of the territorial loss has taken place in the southernmost provinces of Araba and Navarre. In these two provinces, the territory where Basque has remained in continuous use has been reduced to the northern corner of Araba and the northwestern part of Navarre. Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa remain more strongly Basque-speaking.

Basque is also spoken across the French border in the historical regions of Lapurdi, Low Navarre and Zuberoa, which together comprise the western half of the Département des Pyrénées-Atlantiques. In France, the Basque language, like other ‘regional languages’, does not have any official status. In this area the geographical extension of the language has remained more or less stable for the last few centuries, unlike in the south, and most of the area of the three historical Basque regions of France was until very recently strongly Basque-speaking, but the lack of official recognition appears to be leading to the rapid loss of the language in the whole area in just a few generations.
4. Standard Basque and Basque dialects

As can be expected for a language that is spoken in a mountainous area and that until very recently has lacked both official status and a standard form (since 1968), in the Basque-speaking area noticeable differences in phonology, morphology and lexicon are found, even though dialectal differentiation is not strong enough to mask the common origin or to preclude intercomprehensibility or mutual understanding. After some period of accommodation, whose length may depend on the abilities and experience of the speakers, communication is possible among speakers of distant Basque dialects.

According to the recent classification of the linguist Koldo Zuazo, there are six modern dialects in Basque (2010), from west to east: Western (= Bizkaian of other classifications, which includes not only the varieties spoken in Bizkaia but also those of Araba/Alava and western Gipuzkoa), Central (= Gipuzkoan), Lapurdian-Navarrese, High Navarrese, Zuberoan and Eastern Navarrese (including the obsolete or obsolescent dialects spoken in the two northeasternmost Navarrese valleys: Zaraitzu [Salazar] and Erronkari [Roncal]. Many important isoglosses coincide at present roughly with the Spanish/French border. Dialects spoken in France are sometimes referred to as ‘northern’, as opposed to ‘southern’ ones spoken in Spain. It is, however, geographically more appropriate to refer to these two poles as ‘eastern’ and ‘western’, respectively.

![Figure 1. Map of Basque Dialects (Zuazo 2010)](image)

The present dialectal differentiation in Basque is not ancient. Michelena (2011 [1981]) concludes that Basque dialects were much more like each other a few centuries ago than they are now, and that the present dialects are developments from a more-or-less unified form of speech or koiné formed at some point in the early Middle Ages. This position seems correct. Clear innovations such as the grammaticalization of demonstratives as articles are common to all Basque dialects.

The current sociolinguistic situation regarding Basque traditional dialect forms is a complex one. Simplifying greatly, several situations can be distinguished. In areas where Basque is extensively used in the social life of the town/village and where the local dialect is considerably different from the standard language, young speakers, most of whom have been educated in standard Basque, tend to be fluent in the local dialect (and also, to varying degrees, in standard Basque). But in areas where Basque is not used so much in everyday communication, the younger generations’ patterns of language use could signal dialect attrition. As mentioned above, there are two extinct dialects in the northeasternmost area of Navarre: the dialects of Zaraitzu and Erronkari, two pyrenean valleys (at present fully monolingual). In addition to local town and village dialects, we find written varieties that were developed at different historical points for wider communicative purposes, but always restricted to a certain geographical area. These are known as the four ‘literary dialects’ of Basque: Literary Bizkaian, Literary Gipuzkoan, Classical Lapuridian (of the 16th century) and its more recent offshoot Literary Navarro-Lapuridian, and Literary Zuberoan.
Taking the literary tradition into account, as well as the central position of two dialects (Gipuzkoan and Lapurdian, historically more prestigious than the rest of dialects), when the Basque Academy, under the leadership of Luis Michelena, undertook the job of developing a unified written standard for the whole Basque Country, it did so by a marriage of sorts between the Gipuzkoan and the Lapurdian literary traditions. The resulting standard language, \textit{euskara batua} or unified Basque, has been rather successful. Through its use in education, in the media (television, several radio stations, a daily newspaper and a number of magazines) and in the vast majority of all written production in Basque, \textit{euskara batua} has become a well-established variety with a large number of fluent speakers, including both native speakers of Basque and people for whom Basque is their second language.

5. Language vitality (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003\textsuperscript{1}):

5.1. Intergenerational Language Transmission

In the last sociolinguistic survey (Basque Government, 2013\textsuperscript{2}), in order to a better understanding of how language transmission takes place, those informants with children between 2 and 15 years of age were selected. At present, in almost all cases where both parents are bilingual, Basque is transmitted at home in the BAC and in the north of Navarre (the Basque-speaking area of the province), but less in France. The language competence of the parents totally conditions language transmission:

1. If the parents are bilingual, 97\% of children learn Basque at home in the BAC and 95\% in the north of Navarre. In France, even if the percentage is similarly high (87\%), it is still lower than the other territories.
2. If one of the parents does not speak Basque, however, 71\% of the children in the BAC learn Basque at home, 67\% in Navarre and 56\% in France\textsuperscript{3}.

We can observe that if one or both parents are non-native Basque speakers, the transmission percentage is lower, although most of them still transmit Basque to their children at home. It is significant that, unlike some years ago, most mixed-language-competence couples transmit Basque currently together with Spanish or French, although there are differences according to what the parents’ L1 is (whether they are native Basque speakers, simultaneous bilinguals or non-native Basque speakers). The fact of transmitting Basque together with Spanish or French is linked to the language competence of the couples. In fact, as a consequence of the process of language recovery during the last 25 years, there are at present increasingly more non-native Basque-speaking couples.

5.2. Absolute Number of Speakers\textsuperscript{4}

According to the last sociolinguistic survey (Basque Government, 2013), there are 714,136 Basque speakers in the whole Basque speaking area. With very rare exceptions, all Basque speakers are completely bilingual in Spanish or French, whereas their proficiency in Basque including factors such as richness of vocabulary and control over different registers varies substantially among speakers. It is difficult to know what percentage of Basque speakers are equally or more proficient in Basque than in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} «Language communities are complex and diverse; even assessing the number of actual speakers of a language is difficult. We identify six factors to evaluate a language’s vitality and state of the endangerment, two factors to assess language attitudes, and one factor to evaluate the urgency for documentation. Taken together, these nine factors are especially useful for characterizing a language’s overall sociolinguistic situation.» (2003: 7).
  \item \textsuperscript{2} The study is stratified by gender and age, and 7,800 people were interviewed in this fifth edition (2011; results published in 2013): 4,100 in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC), 2,000 in France (the Northern Basque Country) and 1,700 in Navarre.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Considering the Intergenerational Language Transmission as one of the major evaluative factors of language vitality, the following degree of endangerment should be considered for Basque in France: \textit{critically endangered} (degree 2, UNESCO 2003).
  \item \textsuperscript{4} For more information on language policy and sociolinguistics, the official webpage of the Basque Government may be consulted: \url{http://www.euskadi.net/euskara}.
\end{itemize}
Spanish or French, but surely it is not very high. However, things may be changing among youngest speakers in the Spanish Basque Country, who are being educated with Basque as the main medium of instruction.

5.3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population
According to the last sociolinguistic survey (Basque Government, 2013), there are 714,136 Basque speakers in the whole Basque speaking area, as mentioned in the preceding section. These speakers make up 27% of the population aged 16 and above. This sociolinguistic survey takes into consideration inhabitants aged sixteen or over throughout the whole Basque Country (cf. note 2). The age group left out of the survey is significant for the situation of Basque, given that, because of schooling, this is the most Basque-speaking of all age groups.

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domains
As for language use, the results of the last sociolinguistic survey (Basque Government, 2013) show that 24.2% of the bilinguals report using Basque to a greater or lesser extent, though the level of use varies within the territories.

Taking into account all of the territories, 24.2% of inhabitants aged 16 or over use Basque to some extent:
1. 16.1% use Basque intensively, that is, they use Basque more than or to the same extent as Spanish or French in their everyday communication.
2. At the same time, 8.1% use Basque, although less than Spanish or French.

The results vary considerably depending on the area. Those speakers who use Basque more than or to the same extent as Spanish or French are the 20% in the BAC, 9.6% in France and 5.5% in Navarre.

Simplifying greatly, if we consider the development of language use in the last 20 years, the use of Basque has increased in the BAC, remained similarly in Navarre and declined considerably in France.

5.5. Response to New Domains and Media
Basque is currently used at schools, in the media (television, Internet, several radio stations, a daily newspaper and a number of magazines) and in the written production. The standard Basque or euskara batua has become a well-established variety with a large number of fluent speakers, including both native speakers of Basque and Basque L2 speakers. By any criterion that we may choose, the standardization of Basque in recent years has been a very successful project. Nowadays, standard Basque, which was not developed until the late 60s, is used in education at all levels, from elementary school to the university, on television and radio, and in the vast majority of all written production in Basque.

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy
The Royal Academy of the Basque Language, the official body responsible for Basque since 1919, established a unified orthography in 1968. Noun and verb morphology systems are also well established, but some syntactic and lexical aspects remain unfixed. It exists a rich literacy tradition with grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature and considerable presence in everyday media, at least in the BAC.

5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
Basque is, at present, co-official with Spanish in the BAC, which comprises the three provinces of Bizkaia, Gipuzkoa and Araba. It also has a more restricted official status in Navarre, which is a separate Autonomous region within Spain. It lacks official status in the three historical territories of France. There is no administration common to all territories where Basque is spoken (divided as they are between Spain and France and even, within Spain, into two separate administrative regions with different legislation regarding the Basque language).

---


6 The use of Basque is limited in France (around 11% use it at home and among friends). Its use is poor in formal contexts (for example, it consists of the 8.3% in local council services and 3.5% in health care). In general, the sociolinguistic situation of the language has declined at this point.
The Basque Government has a explicit language policy for supporting Basque in the BAC, the only area where Basque is official. In France, where it lacks official status, the Office Public de la Langue Basque (OPLB) was created recently (2004) based on public funding, with Basque-supporting and promoting specific policies. For example, they are currently working on a Basque teaching program for elementary and high school teachers and students.

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language
According to the last sociolinguistic survey (Basque Government, 2013), favourable attitudes towards Basque and the willingness to see it recover successfully have increased in the BAC (62.3 %), but not so much in Navarre (37.7 %) and in the French Basque Country (38.5 %). If we consider all the generations, this is the general tendency in Navarre and France, although favourable attitudes towards Basque have increased among younger speakers in the last five years.

5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation
Basque and Basque linguistics is present currently at university, with a rich scientific production: it exists a Department of Basque Linguistics at the University of the Basque Country in Vitoria-Gasteiz, which includes a Basque Studies Program. In France, it exists another Basque Studies Program at the Faculté Pluridisciplinaire in Bayonne, and a Centre for Research on Basque Texts and Language (CNRS, University of Bordeaux & University of Pau). The amount and quality of Basque grammars and dictionaries is good, and the flow of language materials is constant. It also exists an amount of annotated high-quality and video recordings.

5.10. International Presence of the Language
In the Basque Country of Spain, the Etxepare Basque Institute was created by the Basque Government in 2010 to spread the Basque language and culture throughout the world. The institute is at present an ambassador for our language and culture abroad, and encourages the international diffusion of the Basque language and Basque artists of all disciplines.

In the Basque Country of France, the Office Public de la Langue Basque (cf. 5.7) was created in Bayonne in 2004 as the first governmental language policy institution and initiative in France. Its main aim is to promote and support the Basque language and culture in the three traditional territories of France.

6. Basic bibliography


Dutch varieties and Frisian

1. Dutch and its name
Ethnologue (www.ethnologue.com) lists 15 current languages for the Netherlands, namely Dutch, Frisian, Limburgish, Achterhoeks, Drents, Gronings, Sallands, Stellingwerfs, Twents, Veluws, Zeeuws, Flemish, Romani:Sinte, Romani: Vlax, and Sign Language of the Netherlands. Most of these languages are regional dialects/varieties, except for Romani and the Sign language. In the Netherlands, a variety of Flemish is spoken on the most southern island of the province of Zeeland. Flemish is also spoken in Belgium.

Dutch is the official language of the Netherlands and also one of the official languages of Belgium. The official Dutch name of the language is Nederlands. Frisian (Dutch: Fries) is a co-official language which is spoken in the province of Friesland (north-east of the Netherlands). Limburgish (Dutch: Limburgs), spoken in the south-eastern province of Limburg, and Low Saxon (Dutch: Nedersaksisch), spoken in much of the north-east of the country, are acknowledged regional languages (see the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages). Low Saxon comprises several of the above mentioned Eastern dialects (Achterhoeks, Drents, Gronings, Stellingwerfs, Twents and Veluws) (http://taal.phileon.nl).

The word Dutch finds its origin in Middle Dutch Diets or Duuts, which is the name for the (low) German vernacular.

History (van der Wal & van Bree, 1992; Van den Toorn et al, 1997; van der Sijs, 2005):
Between 700 and 1150, The Netherlands was divided into three language areas: Frisian in the northern part, Saxon in the northeastern part (very closely connected to German), and Frankish dialects, (referred to as Old Dutch) in the rest of the country. A sound change in vowels lead to classification as Middle Dutch from 1150 onward, while Frisian was still called Old-Frisian.

While Latin was Europe's lingua franca in the Middle Ages, the Germanic languages were referred to as vernaculars. Middle Dutch was a collection of dialects rather than a uniform language, which can be divided into Flemish, Brabantish, Limburgish and Eastern Dutch (= Low Saxon). All of these were Frankish dialects, except for Eastern Dutch. Limburgish, spoken close to the (current) German border, showed influences of High German; Eastern Dutch showed influences of Low German.

From the 16th century onward vernaculars became more important and started to replace Latin in the public domain. The languages were now referred to as New Dutch and New Frisian. Because of the printing of books and the growing mobility of the people, the need for a more uniform, standard language grew. Grammars and spelling conventions were made; the 16th and 17th century were a period of construction and purification of Dutch. However, there was still dialectal diversity. Attempts for constructing a standard language were made in several parts of the Netherlands, but the dialect of the province of Holland was in the end the most influential for the standard language, mainly because of Holland’s strong political, economic and cultural role. Southern and eastern influences were also noticeable. Next to the emerging standard language, dialects continued to be used, especially in the countryside. Standard Dutch was spreading gradually across different groups of the population. In the beginning of 20th century, education improved and nowadays, almost everyone in The Netherlands is able to understand Dutch. Dialects/regiolects are still being used, but the speakers are all bilingual and their dialect/regiolect is sometimes substantially influenced by Dutch. In Friesland, the Frisian dialects are still very much in use, and the province tries to create a standard. In some Frisian cities, “Stadsfries” (Town Frisian) is spoken, which is a mixture between Frisian and Dutch (van Bree & Versloot, 2008).

2. (Purported) Relatives
Dutch, Frisian, Limburgish and Low Saxon are West Germanic languages (Indo-European – Germanic – West Germanic), closely related to English and German.
Because of colonial history, Dutch is also spoken in other places than western Europe. Afrikaans, the language spoken by part of the white and mixed-race population of the Republic of South Africa, is derived from Dutch dialects. It has developed into a daughter language of Dutch. (www.ethnologue.com)
3. Geographical distribution

Dutch is an official language in The Netherlands, Belgium, Aruba, Curaçao, Sint-Maarten and Suriname. It is also spoken in parts of Germany and France (Nederlandse Taalunie: www.taaluniversum.org).

Frisian (specifically, West-Frisian) is spoken in the province of Friesland, in the north-eastern part of the Netherlands. Frisian (specifically, Saterland Frisian and North Frisian) are spoken in Germany.

Limburgish is spoken in the province of Limburg, in the south-eastern part of the Netherlands, and adjacent to this in Belgian Limburg.

Low Saxon is spoken in the provinces of Groningen, Drenthe, Overijssel, a south-eastern part of Friesland, and the areas Achterhoek and Veluwe in the province of Gelderland. It is also spoken in the northern part of Germany.

4. Standard Dutch and Dutch dialects

Dutch is an official language, and the standard language in most of the Netherlands. Frisian is another official language, which can be used in the public domain. It can be divided into several Frisian dialects.

Limburgish and Low Saxon are official regional languages, recognized by the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Standard Dutch is mostly based on the dialect spoken in the provinces of Holland in the Middle Ages. Limburgish (a distinct Frankish dialect with influences of High German) and Low Saxon (a Saxon rather than Frankish dialect, and closely connected to Low German) did not really contribute to the standard language.

5. Language vitality (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003):

In what follows, our characterizations on the scales presented should be taken as very tentative and inconclusive in the sense that no policy decisions can and should be based on them. The data/studies that served as our basis for the given characterizations are generally too limited and/or insufficiently up-to-date to base any strong conclusions on them.

5.1. Intergenerational Language Transmission

Dutch: transmitted both via family and education (standard language in primary and secondary school). In higher education, the role of English is growing fast. Safe.

Frisian: transmitted via family, partly via education. Since 1980, Frisian is an obligatory part of the curriculum at primary school (although many schools have an exemption). It is optional at secondary school. There are some bilingual and even trilingual (Dutch, English, Frisian) primary schools (http://taal.phileon.nl, Nortier, 2009). Unsafe.

Limburgish: Transmitted via family. However, for all regional languages, parents are worried to reduce their children’s opportunities in life when using the regional language as L1 in raising their children. Therefore some of them decide to raise their children in Standard Dutch. Unsafe.

Low Saxon: Transmitted via family (but see the above mentioned worries of the parents.) Unsafe.

5.2. Absolute Number of Speakers:

Dutch: Approximately 15,700,000 in the Netherlands, 21,944,690 worldwide (www.ethnologue.com). Speaker here means native speaker.

Frisian: Approximately 480,000 inhabitants in Friesland speak and understand Frisian in 2011. (Fryske Taalatlas 2011: about 75% of the inhabitants, total 640,000). Approximately 332,800 native speakers (52% in 2011 (De Fryske Taalatlas 2011)).

Limburgish: 900,000 (approximation, Driessen, 2009)

Low Saxon: 1,800,000 (approximation, Driessen, 2009)

5.3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population

Dutch: Near to 100%, but not necessarily as a first language or at a high level. In big cities, over 50% of the school population has a non-Dutch background. Moreover, the role of English in daily life is growing (Nortier, pc). Safe?
Frisian: 75% of inhabitants of Friesland speak and understand Frisian (De Fryske Taalatlas 2011). Since it is the native languages for only 52%, many of the speakers are second language learners. The number of native Frisians is 3% of the entire population of the Netherlands (± 16.000.000). Unsafe. 
Limburgish: Approximately 75% of inhabitants of Limburg (Driessen, 2009). 6% of entire population of the Netherlands. Unsafe. 
Low Saxon: Approximately 60% of inhabitants of the relevant provinces (Driessen, 2009). 11% of the entire population of the Netherlands. Unsafe.

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domains
Dutch: Multilingual parity. Dutch is used in most domains, but the role of English is growing fast. English is used on a daily basis in many businesses, in higher education and in the media, for example in commercials.
Frisian: Limited domains. Frisian can be used in the public domain, although almost all official documents are in Dutch only. It is used in some Media. (http://taal.phileon.nl)
Limburgish: Limited domains. Limburgish is used a lot within everyday life, e.g. with family, friends and in shops (Belemans, 2002).
Low Saxon: Limited domains. Low Saxon can be used in public domain, but authorities rarely use it (http://taal.phileon.nl).

5.5. Response to New Domains and Media
Dutch: Used in most domains. Dutch is used a lot in everyday life, but English is used more and more in some domains, such as higher education, businesses and new media.
Frisian: Used in some new domains. It is used at some primary schools. There is a regional Frisian television and radio station “Omrp Fryslân” (broadcast Friesland). It is sometimes used at the internet.
Limburgish: Used in a few new domains. Local radio and newspapers. It is sometimes used on the internet (e.g. Wikipedia in Limburgish).
Low Saxon: Used in a few new domains. Local radio, television and newspapers. It is sometimes used on the internet (e.g. Wikipedia in Low Saxon).

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy
Dutch: Yes, used for everything, although English is also prominent in everyday media.
Frisian: There is an official grammar and orthography. There is some Frisian literature. There is a program designed for preschool children called “Tomke”, which makes use of illustrated books, cd’s, television and a website (Nortier, 2009, www.tomke.nl)
Limburgish: There is no established grammar and orthography, although written Limburgish is used on the internet sometimes and in some local newspapers.
Low Saxon: No established grammar or orthography, since it can be divided into several different dialects. However, in some of the dialects, there is quite some literature and music (http://taal.phileon.nl).

5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
Dutch: Is the dominant language.
Frisian: Differentiated support? The language is acknowledged as an official language, but Dutch is more frequently used in the public domain in Friesland.
Limburgish: Differentiated support? The language is acknowledged as an official language, but Dutch is more frequently used in the public domain in Limburg.
Low Saxon: Differentiated support? The language is acknowledged as an official language, but Dutch is more frequently used in the public domain in the eastern provinces.

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language
Dutch: Most inhabitants of The Netherlands value the Dutch language.
Frisian: Many inhabitants of Friesland value their language.
5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation
Dutch: Very much documentation.
Frisian: Some documentation: grammars, dictionaries, old and new literary texts.
Limburgish: unknown.
Low Saxon: unknown.

5.10. International Presence of the Language
Dutch: Official language of the EU. Taught as foreign language at 175 universities in 40 countries to 400,000 students (Taalunie: www.taalunieversum.org).
Frisian: Not internationally present.
Limburgish: Spoken in parts of Belgium and Germany.
Low Saxon: Spoken in parts of Germany.

6. Basic bibliography

Some core references on Dutch grammar:

Some core references on Frisian grammar:
http://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/ (the digital language portal of Dutch and Frisian grammar)
**Limburgish:**

**Low Saxon:**
http://taal.phileon.nl/nds_boeken.php

References:

Internet references:
De Nederlandse Taalunie (www.taalunieversum.org)
Ethnologue. www.ethnologue.com
http://taal.phileon.nl
www.tomke.nl
Fiuman dialect

1. The Fiuman dialect and its name
The Fiuman dialect derives its name from the eponym *Fiuman*, historically a citizen of the Croatian city *Fiume* (a romanized version of *Rijeka*), and nowadays a member of a small community within the city that still uses the Fiuman dialect in everyday life. The local name of the dialect is *fiuamanski*, or its morphological variant *fiuanski*.

Although the history of the city of Rijeka can be traced back to Roman times, there is very little material written before the first half of the 15th century from which a reliable historical account of its social, political and linguistic development can be derived. Therefore, a lot of the research on the external history of the Fiuman dialect is based on fragmented and often counterfactual evidence, leaving room for researchers, as has often been the case, to base their conclusions on subjective or politically motivated preferences and poorly substantiated conjectures. However, there does seem to be an agreement in the scientific literature about some of the facts concerning the early historical influences on the development of the Fiuman dialect.

Although there is still an ongoing debate whether the Fiuman dialect originally developed from vernacular Latin spoken by romanized Illyric tribes or was gradually introduced from the 13th century on by merchants from Italy, its centuries long relationship with the Italian language, specifically northern Italian dialects, and the Croatian Chakavian dialect remains undisputed. The Fiuman and the Chakavian dialect coexisted for so long that it has become impossible to determine which was first, i.e. which is the autochthonous language of the city of Rijeka (Crnić Novosel & Spicijarić Paškvan 2014). Regardless of this, the influence seems to have been bidirectional. On the other hand, Rijeka's sea oriented geographical position and the proximity of Italian cities, most notably the city of Venice, instigated long-lasting commercial and political relations between them, which left its mark on the language spoken by Rijeka's citizens. Also, due to Rijeka's turbulent political history, the Fiuman dialect came into contact with many other languages such as German, Hungarian, French and Turkish, whose traces are evident in heavy lexical borrowing. Indeed, throughout the centuries the Fiuman dialect borrowed numerous words from all the languages it came into contact with, which can be explained by its domain specific use. Since the citizens of Rijeka were mainly uneducated artisans and fishermen, their language did not develop beyond everyday communicative needs suited to their simple lifestyle. It was with the arrival of outsiders such as Venetians and Germans that their vocabulary expanded by way of borrowing to enable communication in ever-changing social and political conditions.

Today's Fiuman dialect is considered to be a *koine* of Italian, Croatian and German created by the descendants of Rijeka’s 17th century bourgeoisie, whose social superiority was reflected in their preference of the, then prestigious, standard Italian language for mutual communication (Rošič 2002). The influence of standard Italian on the Fiuman dialect was even greater in the first half of the 20th century, when Rijeka was officially part of the Italian state (between 1923 and 1945), resulting in the Fiuman dialect losing much of its original form, the phenomenon Lukežić (1993: 36) refers to as “the agony of the dialect of Fiume”. However, after the Second World War a large number of speakers of the Fiuman dialect left the city for political reasons. Their exodus resulted in the existence of two Fiuman dialects – one spoken by the still remaining, but diminishing, population in Rijeka, and the other spoken by those who have left and their descendants (Blecich 2012). In this questionnaire, we focus on the former variant.

2. (Purported) Relatives
The Fiuman dialect is a member of the Venetan family of dialects (i.e. dialects primarily, but not exclusively, spoken in the Italian region of Veneto), and is historically most closely related to the Venetian dialect (It. *il veneziano*). Together with the dialect spoken in Trieste (It. *il triestino*) and the Italian dialects spoken in the Croatian regions of Istria (It. *l’istroveneto*) and Dalmatia (It. *il veneto dalmata*), it belongs to the Eastern branch of the Venetan family of dialects.
3. Geographical distribution
Since reliable sources on the stratification of speakers of the Fiuman dialect in the city of Rijeka are scarce, it is difficult to determine its exact geographical distribution in the past. The issue becomes even more complicated when one takes into account that it has always been in contact with other languages, especially the Chakavian dialect, that were also widely spoken in the city. However, most researchers agree that the original Fiuman dialect was primarily spoken in the area commonly known as Old Town (see Bató 1983). As its name suggests, it is the oldest part of today’s city of Rijeka, and it was built on the ruins of the ancient Roman settlement Tarsatica. This urban area is localized on the northern bank of the river Rječina, and while once it was synonymous with the city itself, now it represents just one small part of it.

Today the Fiuman dialect has lost much of its former presence in Rijeka. The change of ideological and political model, following the Second World War, resulted in the emigration of the majority of Fiuman speakers and marginalisation of those that stayed in Rijeka (Lukežić 1993). While once it was a speech of a relatively homogenous group, mainly concentrated in the city proper of Rijeka, now it is a personal language of the descendants of the indigenous Fiuman population dispersed throughout the city and its margins. Because of that, the speech of the population who still call themselves Fijumani is no longer considered to be a dialect, but rather a sociolect, i.e. a variety spoken within a particular socially and culturally, rather than geographically, connected group of people.

Some researchers have tried to place its speakers in a particular area, e.g. Lukežić (2008: 445) writes that today the Fiuman dialect is predominantly spoken in Rijeka’s neighbourhood Kozala. Our informants (n = 5) confirm this, adding the neighbourhood Belveder as well. According to our informants, the dialect is also spoken in neighbourhoods Turnić, Krnjevo, Kantrida, Zamet, Mlaka, Potok and Škurinje and (to some extent) Stari grad (Old Town), as well as in surrounding towns and villages (e.g. Viškovo, Matulji, Kastav, Čavli, Kostrena, Kraljevica).

Our informants report that the Italian dialect spoken in Opatija, Mošćenička Draga and Lovran, i.e. towns on the eastern Istrian coast very close to Rijeka, and on the islands of Krk, Cres, Veli Lošinj, Mali Lošinj and Susak, is very similar to the one spoken in Rijeka and its surroundings, however, this dialect is typically referred to as Istro-Venetan.

The Fiuman dialect is also spoken by those who have left Rijeka in the aftermath of the Second World War and their descendants, however, it is a variety significantly different than the one still spoken in Rijeka. The emigrants went to live in Canada, Australia, USA (primarily New York), Argentina and many Italian cities, including Trieste, Muggia, Padua, Bologna, Genova, Torino, Deruta, Rome, Latina, Ancona, Pescara and Bari.

4. Standard and dialects
To our knowledge, there is no established dialectal differentiation in the Fiuman dialect, rather different realisations of the same dialect, i.e. different vernaculars. Its speakers spot minor differences between different varieties, but these differences do not disguise the common origin nor do they impede mutual comprehension. The Fiuman dialect spoken by the elderly seems to be closer to its original form, i.e. containing more words of the Germanic origin and less influenced by the standard Italian language, than the language spoken by younger speakers.

5. Language vitality (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003):

5.1. Intergenerational Language Transmission
According to Lukežić (1993) and Rošić (2002), the Fiuman dialect will not survive the loss of its present speakers, who are in their eighties and above. Rošić (2002) reports that older members of the Fiuman community often complain that younger members lack interest in the Fiuman dialect. In contrast, according to Crnić Novosel and Spičiarić Paškvan (2014) and our informants, some children speak the language, primarily at home, in communication with their family members and are even inclined to
transmit it to their own children. In our opinion, the Fiuman dialect probably ranks a 4 (unsafe) with respect to Factor 1.

5.2. Absolute Number of Speakers
It is difficult to provide the absolute number of speakers of the Fiuman dialect as no recent study or census has attempted to determine it. Several pieces of information are relevant. According to the most recent Croatian census, from 2011, there are 2276 people with Italian as their native language and 2445 people of Italian nationality in the town of Rijeka. Also, there are 7200 fully-fledged members (those with voting rights) in the Italian Community of Rijeka (It. Comunità degli Italiani di Fiume). According to some of our informants, most members of the Italian Community of Rijeka speak the Fiuman dialect, and, in their opinion, 7200 should be considered as the approximate number of speakers of the Fiuman dialect (although they believe the actual number to be higher).

5.3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population
If, in this particular case, we define ‘community’ as the Italian Community of Rijeka, then the Fiuman dialect ranks between a 3 (definitively endangered) and a 4 (unsafe) as, according to some of our informants, the majority if not nearly all members of this community speak the language.

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domains
According to Lukežić (1993), Rošić (2002) and Crnić Novosel and Spicijarić Paškvan (2014), the Fiuman dialect is used in everyday, private and informal communication, primarily, but not exclusively, at home. Our informants report that it is also used in work environments, such as Italian-medium schools or the Italian university department, where staff members speak it outside the classroom; another example is the newsroom of the Italian daily newspaper “La voce del popolo”. The language is even used during the Assembly meetings of the Italian Community of Rijeka. According to our informants, the language can be used to talk about any topic and is used on every occasion, regardless of the location, when the interlocutors are all speakers of the language and are sufficiently familiar with each other. The exception is the younger speakers, who tend to use the dominant, Croatian language instead. However, the Fiuman dialect is not used as an official language in any context. We conclude that the Fiuman dialect most probably ranks a 4 (multilingual parity) regarding Factor 4.

5.5. Response to New Domains and Media
As stated in 5.4., the Fiuman dialect is used in private, informal communication at Italian-medium schools (among staff members) and in the work environments where the speakers of the language are concentrated. It is not used in broadcast media and on the Internet. However, speakers may use it in private e-mail correspondence among themselves. Also, they may use it to write comments on the Facebook page “Giovanni Fiumani”. In terms of Factor 5, we give the language a 1 (minimal).

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy
The Fiuman dialect is documented in dictionaries (e.g. Samani 2007, Pafundi 2011). Samani (2007) and Pafundi (2011) also contain very brief overviews of its grammar. Pafundi (2011) also lists and describes sounds of the language and provides some pronunciation and orthographic rules. More than few authors wrote about the language (e.g. Batè 1933, Berghoffer 1894, Bidwell 1967, Depoli, A. 1913, Depoli, G. 1928). One of the more recent works is a doctoral thesis “Linguistic Identity of the Dialect of Fiume”, which comprises a comprehensive overview of the Fiuman phonology, morphology and syntax, as well as examples of prose, poetry and proverbs written in the Fiuman dialect collected by the author (Rošić 2002). Gottardi (2007) contains a list of words of the foreign origin in the Fiuman dialect, as well as a collection of idioms, expressions, proverbs and poems in the language. Several authors wrote poetry and prose (primarily short stories) in the language; some of the publications include Antoni (1908), Schittar (1885) and Mazziere (2007). Their work is also included in an anthology of the Italian literature in Rijeka in the 19th and 20th century (Pužar 1999). The only periodical publication that contains written material, typically short literary pieces, in the Fiuman dialect is an annual review “La tore”, the official magazine of the Italian Community of Rijeka.
Writing in the Fiuman dialect is not used in administration and education. According to some of our informants, in a few elective school programmes devoted to the Fiuman dialect in Italian-medium primary schools, children also learn to write in the language. Regarding Factor 6, we give the Fiuman dialect a 3 because “written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form at school”, yet “literacy is not promoted through print media”.

5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
As for Factor 7, in our opinion, the Fiuman dialect ranks a 3 (passive assimilation), indicating that the Fiuman dialect is passively assimilated, i.e. there is no explicit policy for it, and the dominant language prevails in the public domain. The attitudes of average non-Italian speaking people towards the language are generally positive (cf. Crnić Novosel and Spicijarić Paškvan 2014), as they are towards the standard Italian language.

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language
According to Crnić Novosel and Spicijarić Paškvan (2014), the Fiuman dialect is seen as the most important symbol of national identity among the members of the Italian national minority. Older speakers claim the Fiuman dialect as their mother tongue to a somewhat larger extent than younger speakers, and they to a higher degree underscore the importance of the intergenerational transmission of the language. The majority of speakers lament the limited use of the Fiuman dialect and perceive their dialect to be as valuable as other dialects spoken in Rijeka. Many consider the activities undertaken with the aim of preserving and promoting the dialect to be insufficient.

Crnić Novosel and Spicijarić Paškvan (2014) also state that younger speakers are concerned about the future of the Fiuman dialect, have positive attitudes towards it, use it and identify with it (which contradicts the findings of Lukežič 1993 and Rošić 2002, according to which only the elderly speak the language and show interest in it). However, only a small number of younger speakers are active members of the Italian Community of Rijeka and have constructive suggestions regarding the popularisation of the Fiuman dialect.

In our opinion, the Fiuman dialect ranks a 4 with respect to Factor 8 as most community members support language maintenance.

5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation
There are several dictionaries of the Fiuman dialect; Samani (2007) is the most authoritative among them and Pafundi (2011) probably the most recent one. Early descriptions of the language include Bató (1933), Berghoffer (1894), Depoli, A. (1913) and Depoli, G. (1928). A recent comprehensive description is Rošić (2002), which also includes examples of prose, poetry and proverbs written in the Fiuman dialect. A collection of words and expressions typical of the Fiuman dialect has been compiled by Mario Valich in 1970s; only a part of this collection has been preserved. A recent collection of idioms, expressions, proverbs and poems in the Fiuman dialect, which also includes a list of words of the foreign origin is Gottardi (2007). Literary works in the Fiuman dialect include several collections of poetry (e.g. Antoni 1908, Schittar 1885) and a collection of short satirical pieces (Mazzieri 2007), among others.

In our opinion, the most appropriate ranking of the Fiuman dialect regarding Factor 9 would be 3 (fair), corresponding to a situation in which “there may be an adequate grammar or sufficient amount of grammars, dictionaries, and texts, but no everyday media; audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality or degree of annotation”.

5.10. International Presence of the Language
There are two associations devoted to the study, cultivation and preservation of the Fiuman cultural, literary and linguistic heritage abroad that we are aware of: the Società di Studi Fiumani in Rome and the Associazione Libero Comune di Fiume in Esilio in Padua. The former publishes a scientific journal
“Fiume: Rivista di studi adriatici” and the latter a monthly magazine “La voce di Fiume”. Both associations also publish books. The study and promotion of the Fiuman cultural, literary and linguistic heritage also falls within the scope of the Istituto regionale per la cultura istriano-fiumano-dalmata (IRCI) in Trieste.

6. Basic bibliography
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1. The Gallo language and its name
Although the Gallo language is a Romance language, the origin of the name Gallo is related to Celtic languages. It comes from the word *gall* in Breton (its geographic neighbor), meaning “French and/or stranger”. It can also be related to *gail* in Scottish Gaelic.
The history of Gallo is itself closely related to Breton. Until the 19th century, Gallo has spread over Brittany (from East to West) at the expense of Breton, only the former being an *oïl* language like French. This evolution gave rise to the actual situation where Breton is limited to Western Brittany (called Basse-Bretagne) whereas Gallo is found in the Eastern part (called Haute-Bretagne).

2. (Purported) Relatives
Gallo is a regional language spoken in Northern France. It is part of the Romance languages, developed from Latin. More precisely, it is an *oïl* language like Standard French, but also Picard, Normand, Poitevin-Saintongeais, and seems to share many linguistic properties with these other Regional languages. One other famous and interesting relative of Gallo is Canadian French (Québecois), for historical reasons, as most of the migrants came from Northern France.

3. Geographical distribution
Gallo is currently spoken in two Regions of France: Brittany for the most part (including Côtes d’Armor and Ille et Vilaine, and also Pays-de-la-Loire (including North Vendée and Loire-Atlantique). See the orange part on the following map, which also shows its local neighbor, the Breton language.

The geographic situation of the Gallo language is really interesting as it is in contact with a Celtic language, Breton, on the Western part, and with other endangered Romance varieties such as Poitevin-Saintongeais in the South-Eastern part.

4. Standard Gallo and Gallo dialects
Although some institutions (Brittany Region) and associations (*Chubri*, *Bertiègn Galèzz*) try to promote Gallo, there is no precise standardization of Gallo (but see *Chubri* website for the development of a new codification for orthography, [http://www.chubri.org/](http://www.chubri.org/)). As a result, many linguistic differences can be found within the regions where Gallo is spoken. However, it is really hard at this stage to distinguish precise dialects of Gallo. The choice of various linguistic criteria gives rise to different results. For example, on the basis of phonological differences, 3 dialects seem to roughly emerge:

- Northern dialect (Rennes, Saint-Malo, Saint-Brieuc)
- Central dialect (Morbihan gallo, Guérande, Pays de la Mée)
Southern dialect (Pays de Retz, East of Nantes), closer to Poitevin-Saintongeais

But on the basis of morphological differences (such as the shape of pronouns), more distinctions (hence, potentially more dialects) seem to appear:

- Ille-et-Vilaine
- Côtes-d'Armor
- Morbihan
- South of Loire-Atlantique (closer to Poitevin, again)

One of the aims of that project is thus to try to get a better view of the linguistic diversity within the region of Gallo.

5. Language vitality (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003):
Gallo is considered as a severely endangered language by the UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger.

5.1. Intergenerational Language Transmission
Very few sociolinguistic studies have been done on Gallo, especially with respect to the transmission of the language. However, one survey from 2004-2005 within the Provinces of Haute-Bretagne has shown that only 5% of the parents speaking Gallo tried to transmit it to their children, but that the transmission was a bit more effective between children and grand-parents. Also notice most (if not all) speakers of Gallo are bilingual, as they also speak standard French, a genetically related language. The relative proximity between the two languages is another source of danger for Gallo, with the potential influence of Standard French over Gallo.

5.2. Absolute Number of Speakers
Notice here that it is really hard to get a precise idea of the number of Gallo speakers. Most surveys rely on a (non-linguistic) personal judgment which might be biased by two factors. One is related to the fact that Gallo speakers were often (and are still) stigmatized (Gallo is still often considered as a “patois”, i.e. deviation of the “regular” standard French, and spoken by rural communities with low education). The other reason is that some people consider themselves as Gallo speakers although what they use is more a mixture of Standard French and Gallo (just familiar with some lexical and/or accentual peculiarities of Gallo).

According to Eurominority (2010), there would be around 24000 speakers of Gallo. One official survey by the INSEE was done in 1999: from 49626 inhabitants living in Brittany, 29060 defined themselves as Gallo speakers. By extrapolation, the number of Gallo speakers could then be estimated to more than 40000.

However, in 2013, the Association Bretagne Culture Diversité organized another survey which gave rise to different results, as more of 5% of the inhabitants of Historical Brittany considered themselves as Gallo speakers, which would amount to a number up to 200000 speakers. That result is also confirmed by another survey done by the CREVIDILF Laboratory, according to which at least 20000 are categorized as Gallo speakers.

5.3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population
Depending on the survey (INSEE or Association Bretagne Culture Diversité), the proportion of Gallo speakers can be estimated to 1,3 to 5% of the Total Population of Historical Brittany, which is one reason why Gallo is a severely endangered language. However, 8% of the population declares being able to understand the language (but does not consider himself as a speaker).

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domain
No precise survey can be found with respect to the precise use of the Gallo language by the speakers, but most studies agree that it is often restricted to vernacular use (family, rural communities,...) and sociocultural events (festivals, games,...).
5.5. Response to New Domains and Media

Gallo is not present at all in the two most famous newspapers of the region: Le Télégramme and Ouest France. Only L’Hebdomaire d’Armor publishes a regular chronicle in Gallo, written by André Le Coq and called Les caoseries à Matao.

As for other medias, some programs in Gallo tend to develop, but in local medias only: one radio station, Plum’FM, is proposing at least 10 hours per week in Gallo. Armor TV proposes few programs in Gallo. Two Editors publish books in Gallo: Rue des Scribes Editions (translation of famous comics such as Tintin or Astérix, the dictionary by Régis Auffray), and Les Éditions Label LN, who published one grammar and and dictionary, among other things.

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy

Although the French State agreed in the 1970s that Gallo could be taught at school, it has never promoted its development. No credit has ever been raised to develop presence of Gallo at school. It is only proposed as an option for the French Baccalauréat, and it is found only locally in secondary schools (1 or 2 hours per week in 15 schools. No bilingual teaching has ever been created. Only an introduction to Gallo can be found at the University of Rennes II.

Linguistic work on Gallo dates back to the 1850s with the publication of local dictionaries. Nowadays, we can find several references, with at least two dictionaries and two grammars:

Grammars:

Dictionaries

As for the orthography, two codifications have been developed from 1970 to 2013: the ABCD and the Moga developed by the Association Chubri. One project is to unify these two competing codifications. The Gallo language is not used in administration, and very few documents are translated in Gallo.

5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies

The official status of Gallo is fragile. The dominant language, standard French, is the only official language of France. Gallo belongs to the 23 minor and regional languages of France. France signed in 1999 the European Charter of the Minor or Regional Languages, but it was never ratified by the Conseil Constitutionnel.

In Brittany, Gallo is recognized as an official language: Regional Council adopted in December 2004 a linguistic policy plan that considers both Breton and Gallo as official languages together with French. However, in 2010, issues about Gallo represented only 1 or 2 % of the regional budget « Langues de Bretagne ».

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language

In 1983, the Association of the Teachers of Gallo (Association des enseignants de gallo) was created. It provides with useful map of the sites where Gallo can be learned. Gallo is also promoted by two other associations: the cultural association Bertègn Galèzz, which organizes events and gathers information about Gallo, and the association Chubri, which is devoted to the preservation of the linguistic heritage of Gallo and to the development of new trends for the use of Gallo.

But more generally, many speakers of Gallo really wish to see it promoted, and do it through the development of poetry, theatre and other arts in Gallo.

5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation

As already mentioned, several dictionaries and grammars on Gallo already exist. See the following exhaustive list:

However, there are still few language materials that can be used for linguistic purposes. The two Associations, Bertègn Galèzz, and Chubri, provide with a useful database in Gallo, and are also currently developing audio recordings and surveys that could be used for linguistic analysis. For example, researchers from the University of Nantes have developed a questionnaire related to the syntax of Gallo, which should be tested on Gallo speakers with the help of Chubri in the coming months.

5.10. International Presence of the Language
The Gallo language is just not present internationally.
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Sardinian

1. The Sardinian language and its name
Speakers of Sardinian call their language *sardu* (and dialectal variants such as *saldu*); in Italian the language is known as *sardo*. Traditional descriptions of Sardinian generally talk of four main dialects, *Campidanese* and *Logudorese* (which together cover most of the island of Sardinia except the far north; Logudorese is sometimes divided further into Logudorese and Nuorese) and *Sassarese* and *Gallurese* (in the far north of the island). However, it is now common to recognize Sassarese and Gallurese as distinct from what we might call “Sardinian proper”, and they are sometimes considered dialects of Italian and/or linked to Corsican dialects. Speakers of Gallurese reserve the term *sardu* for Logudorese/Nuorese and Campidanese and clearly consider their own language to be different.

Sardinia was incorporated into the Roman Empire in the third century BC and was occupied for long enough that Latin completely replaced the language(s) spoken by the original inhabitants. Virtually nothing is known about these earlier languages. After the Romans abandoned Sardinia, and after a period of invasions by various other would-be conquerors, there was a period of essentially indigenous rule, which lasted until the late Middle Ages. The earliest written records of Sardinian date from the 11th and 12th centuries. After the decline of the indigenous kingdoms (the so-called giudicati or judicados), various continental powers (especially from Iberia and Italy) ruled the island for varying periods of time, and Aragonese, Catalan, Genoese and Pisan influences made themselves felt on the language, especially in the Campidanese area in the southern part of the island. The presence of outside rulers also prevented the emergence of any standard form of Sardinian; the elites used Spanish, Catalan, or various forms of Italian. However, Sardinian continued to be used in most non-elite contexts in most parts of the island until well into the 20th century.

2. Relatives
Most scholars regard Sardinian as a separate Romance language, comparable to Italian, Spanish, French, etc. The long period of independent development following the fall of the Roman Empire distinguishes it clearly from other Romance languages, and it is not intelligible to speakers of Italian. However, the present-day sociolinguistic reality is such that most speakers of Standard Italian probably consider it to be a “dialect” of Italian comparable to Sicilian, Neapolitan, Genoese, Venetian, and so on.

3. Geographical distribution
In principle, the entire island is the area where the language is spoken. However, this must be qualified in three ways. First, as noted above, speakers of Gallurese (and perhaps also Sassarese) do not regard what they speak as “Sardinian”. Second, there are two small non-Sardinian enclaves, the Catalan enclave of Alghero in the northwest, and the Ligurian enclave of Carloforte on the island of San Pietro off the southwest coast. Third, there are now significant areas of Sardinia, particularly in the cities, where the language has largely lost out to Italian.
4. Standard Sardinian and Sardinian dialects

As noted above, foreign domination from the Middle Ages onward put a stop to any natural development toward a standard form of the language. Dialect variation is now considerable. The main division within Sardinian proper, between Campidanese in the south and Logudorese in much of the northern half of the island, is marked by a variety of phonological, grammatical and lexical differences. There is a long-standing disagreement over whether there should be a single compromise standard form or two distinct standards, one based on Campidanese and one based on Logudorese, with passionately held views on both sides. The phonological differences mean that a compromise orthography would have to be rather “deep”, with spellings often reflecting underlying similarities between dialects rather than surface pronunciations. In 1999 the Italian government officially recognized Sardinian as a distinct language eligible for the legal protection due other minority languages in Italy. This recognition has led to two official proposals for single-standard orthographies, first Limba Sarda Unificada (LSU) in 2001 and then (in response to many criticisms) Limba Sarda Comuna (LSC) in 2006. Neither has commanded universal acceptance, though LSC is used in some official contexts in provinces where bilingual signs and documentation are official policy.

Sociolinguistically, as noted above, Sardinian functions rather like other Italian dialects relative to Standard Italian. That is, despite its clearly separate history, it tends to be used in local and/or informal settings in very much the same way that Sicilian or Venetian is used, while Standard Italian is the expected language in official contexts, in cities, in church and in school.

5. Language vitality (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003):

5.1. Intergenerational Language Transmission

There are parts of the island where children routinely learn Sardinian in the family before learning Italian, but there are also many children who learn Italian in the family and never acquire Sardinian. There are proposals to allow some use of Sardinian in schools which enjoy reasonably wide support among the population but seem unlikely to overcome a variety of practical obstacles, the most obvious of which is
the lack of agreement on a standard orthography. There are probably no monolingual speakers of Sardinian anywhere on the island, though there are certainly elderly speakers who are more at ease in Sardinian than in Italian. The degree of endangerment is probably best described as either unsafe or definitely endangered. Similar observations apply to Gallurese and Sassarese.

5.2. Absolute Number of Speakers
The regional administration commissioned a substantial study of language use in the early part of the 21st century, published in 2007 and based on a sample of approximately 2400 respondents aged 15 and above from all over the island, which found that almost 70% of the respondents reported speaking a “local language”. If we take the population of the island to be 1.5 million, that would lead to an estimate of about a million speakers. Additional qualitative information is given under the next heading.

5.3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population
According to the regional administration’s study from 2007, nearly 70% of respondents reported that they speak a “local language” and nearly 30% said they understood one but did not speak it; only 2.7% claimed no knowledge of a local language. Across all ages more males reported speaking a local language than females; use of local languages declines with level of formal education, and declines – but less sharply – with higher social class. The study also confirmed that there are substantially fewer speakers of local languages in towns and cities (localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants) than in villages and rural areas.

The study briefly reports the results of a similar survey of approximately 270 children under 14. The proportions are markedly different from the adult figures: just over 40% reported speaking a local language; just over 35% said they understood but did not speak a local language; and more than 20% claimed no knowledge of a local language. The substantially smaller proportion of children than adults who report using a local language clearly points to a judgement of “definitely endangered” for Sardinian as a whole.

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domain
The most suitable choice on this scale is “dwindling domains”. There are, as noted above, many Sardinians who do not speak or never spoke Sardinian. Among those who do, however, it is widely used in local and informal situations. But there is no “multilingual parity” with Italian; Sardinian speakers expect to use Italian to communicate with strangers, and regularly switch between languages depending on the interlocutor. All of these statements (which can be based on informal observation throughout the island) are confirmed in quantitative detail by the regional administration’s 2007 report.

5.5. Response to New Domains and Media
There is no Sardinian medium education anywhere in the island. The Regional Government has been working on proposal to introduce Sardinian as a subject in (some) schools. Sardinian is well represented on the internet (Facebook/discussion boards, Sardinian Wikipedia with nearly 5000 articles, etc.) and on some local TV channels. At best we could say that it is used in some new domains.

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy
As noted above, the lack of agreement about a standard language is above all a lack of agreement about an established orthography. There is a limited amount of printed literature in various forms of Sardinian, but all newspapers on the island are in Italian with the exception of occasional letters, columns, etc. There are a number of grammars (written in Italian or other continental languages) and Sardinian-Italian dictionaries but most are quite old (e.g. Spano, see references below). Since the beginning of the 21st century the regional Sardinian language office has produced some material aimed at administration and education (e.g. Pro una Limba Ufitziale, an extensive compendium of proposed legal and administrative terms for use in Sardinian translations of Italian laws and other official documents), and some provincial governments produce some documents in Sardinian. A small but increasing number of road signs are bilingual; these are sometimes vandalized or defaced in part because of disagreements about the orthography.
5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
Government attitude might be described charitably as one of “differentiated support”, but “passive assimilation” is probably more accurate overall. As noted above, some provincial administrations on the island have official bilingual policies and produce some documents and signs in both languages. However, the attitude of the island’s regional government varies from election to election, and it seems fair to say that the national government in Rome does not approach language rights in Sardinia with the same diligence as it does the rights of speakers of Greek and Albanian in the south of the peninsula, or of French and German dialects in the north.

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language
Attitudes are broadly positive in many areas, but there is also general awareness of the language’s subordinate status, and some younger people seem ashamed to use Sardinian outside familiar informal contexts. There is wide support for the introduction of Sardinian in school, and somewhat less for the use of Sardinian in official contexts. Again, these impressionistic statements are backed up by the regional administration’s 2007 report. The most accurate choice on the scale is probably either “many” or “some”.

5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation, including comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.

6. Basic bibliography
Primorska Slovenian

1. Primorska (Littoral) Slovenian
What we refer to as Primorska Slovenian (also Littoral Slovenian) comprises a group of Slovenian dialects spoken in the western part of the territory on which Slovenian is spoken, both in Slovenia and in Italy. As such, Primorska Slovenian is a group of varieties of the Slovenian language, or as it is called in the language itself, slovenščina or slovenski jezik. Slovenian is an official language on the entire territory of Slovenia, an official language of the European Union, and a recognized minority language in small parts of Italy, Austria and Hungary. Standard orthography and vocabulary aspects of modern Slovenian have been, in recent past, regulated by a language board under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences and Arts, which was established in 1938. The status of modern Slovenian is currently regulated through a number of legal documents (constitution, laws, regulations) (http://www.mk.gov.si/si/zakonodaja_in_dokumenti/veljavni_predpisi/slovenski_jezik/), and directions for its future are stipulated in parliamentary national resolutions on Slovenia’s language policy (http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministrstvo/slovenski_jezik/Resolution_2014-18_Slovenia_jan_2015.pdf).

In roughly the same extent as today, Primorska Slovenian has been recognized as one of 7 dialect groups by dialectologists since the early 20th century (Ramovš 1935, Logar & Rigler 1983, Smole & Škofc 2011). There is no single standard for Primorska Slovenian dialects as a group, although there are several local community newsletters or sections of newspapers published in individual Primorska Slovenian dialects, as well as some standardizing manuals for certain dialects spoken in Italy. The parliamentary national resolutions on Slovenia’s language policy typically also make explicit mention of aspects of the future of and preservation and description goals for Slovenian dialects.

2. (Purported) Relatives
As a group of dialects of the Slovenian language, Primorska Slovenian has close genetic ties to the rest of Slovenian dialects, as well as to other languages and their dialects which are members of the Slavic language family.

Given its geographic position and historical sociolinguistic situation, Primorska Slovenian exhibits certain linguistic features that are often attributed to its contact with its neighboring, though not immediately related Romance languages (Friulian, Italian) (Skubic 1997, Volk 2007).

3. Geographical distribution
Primorska Slovenian is spoken as one of the languages or as the only language in the western part of Slovenia and a smaller part of the extreme east of Italy (eastern parts of Friuli-Venezia Giulia). Specifically, as delineated in Smole & Škofc’s (2011) map of Slovenian dialects, the borders of the Primorska dialect group run for about 100km along the Slovenian-Italian state border in a north-west–south-east direction roughly from the area around Mount Mangart in the north to the area east of the bay of Piran in the south, in a belt that varies in its east-west extension from about 20km in its central part to about 60km at its north and south extremities (see Figure 1, with Primorska dialect group in blue in the left fringe of the map; the broken red line represents Slovenia’s national borders).
Even though Primorska Slovenian dialects are very vital in some parts of the dialect group’s area in Italy, if grouping them geopolitically on the basis of being on one or the other side of the state border, Primorska Slovenian dialects can nevertheless be said to be most vital on the Slovenian side of the Slovenia-Italy border, where most of their area comprise officially and de facto monolingual Slovenian areas. Extrapolating from a study on an unrelated dialect in eastern Slovenia (Lundberg 2013), it could be assumed that there is ongoing dialect leveling inside the Primorska Slovenian group, although not necessarily towards the standard but possibly towards a leveled Primorska Slovenian variety (or varieties); this is not to deny obvious pressure from deregionalized varieties and Standard Slovenian through the education system, the media, crossregional interaction and migration. Other than through this dialect leveling, there has been no territorial loss proper for the Primorska Slovenian dialects of today’s territory of Slovenia in the past century. Primorska Slovenian dialects on the Italian side of the border have seen considerably less influence from Standard Slovenian in the past century, but they are under considerably more influence from the majority state language, and at least some of them, in particular its northern-most varieties, are threatened by domain loss and general use decrease triggered by a shift towards the majority language of the area. The Slovenian-speaking population in Italy has been reported to decrease by 40% in the past century (http://www.uoc.edu/euromosaic/web/document/eslove/an/11/i1.html). The rate of native Slovenian speakers per municipality in Italy is shown in Figure 2, with all except the three municipalities at the top of the map belonging to the region of the Primorska Slovenian dialect group.
4. Primorska Slovenian dialects

Modern Slovenian dialectology typically posits close to 50 Slovenian dialects (e.g. Ramovš 1935, Logar & Rigler 1983, Smole & Škofic 2011). The individual dialects are usually further classified into 7 larger dialect groups, including the Primorska Slovenian group. The Primorska Slovenian group comprises 12 dialects: the Rezija/Resia dialect, the Soča dialect, the Ter/Torre dialect, the Nadiža/Natisone dialect, the Brda/Collio dialect, the Kras/Carso/Karst dialect, the Banšice dialect, the Istria dialect, the Rižana dialect, the Savrini dialect, the Notranjsko/Inner Carniola dialect, the Čičarija dialect (see Figure 2, with Primorska group dialects in orange shades in the left fringe of the map).
The grouping of dialects into dialect groups uses a mix of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Non-linguistic factors include geographical features (although these typically also determined isoglosses) and historical partitioning of territory with Slovenian speakers and the ensuing determination of regional administrative and political centers. In the context of the Primorska Slovenian dialects, this grouping roughly reflects historical geopolitical situations, such as an area’s inclusion in Italy/predecessors of Italy or the Austrian Empire’s land ‘the Littoral’ before World War I, and the partitioning of the territory between the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Italy between World War I and World War II. The linguistic factors typically include phonology and morphology, typically in relation to older forms of Slovenian/common development paths, and sometimes also vocabulary (cf. Rigler 1986, Toporišč 1987). For example, a typical phonological feature of Primorska Slovenian is taken to be the diphtongization in the historical development of Common Slavic yat into [ie] and [o] into [uo]. Classifications tend not to take syntactic characteristics into consideration.

Whereas differences between most of the dialects of the Primorska Slovenian group do not represent significant intelligibility obstacles, differences between the southern Primorska Slovenian dialects in both Slovenia or Italy and the northermost dialects of Primorska Slovenian in Italy, in particular the northermost dialect in Italy, that of the Rezija/Resia Valley, are significant. The Rezija/Resia dialect is spoken by a very small community in a closed mountain valley and has long been on an independent development course. It also has features of Carinthian dialects, so is often considered a transitional Primorska-Carinthia dialect. Spoken Rezija/Resia dialect can present significant intelligibility obstacles for speakers of southern Primorska Slovenian dialects. However, several aspects of the dialect have been studied in some detail (e.g. work by Han Steenwijk).

It is likely that at least at a supraregional dialectal level, the past 70 years (since World War II) have seen a gradual split between the Primorska Slovenian dialects spoken in Slovenia and in Italy. While the former have been part of a political entity in which Slovenian has been the main national language, the latter have represented dialects of a minority language in Italy. However, possible divergence between the Primorska Slovenian dialects on the two sides of the border has not been systematically investigated. Size of the Slovenian-speaking communities, contact of Slovenian dialects with other/dominant languages, social and political political supression of Slovenian, natural contact with other dialects of Slovenian,
access to education in Slovenian and/or Standard Slovenian, and access to Slovenian-language media has differed across the areas with Slovenian speakers (cf. Šekli 2004). Possible differences in the extent of recent contact-induced changes between the Primorska Slovenian dialects of Italy have also not been systematically investigated. Recent investigations of syntactic characteristics of Primorska Slovenian and of possible syntactic contact phenomena have usually not paid attention to possible differences between Slovenian dialects in Italy and dialects in Slovenia (e.g. Skubic 1997, Volk 2007, Marušič & Žaucer 2009, Bizjak 2012). When there exist studies of specific phenomena in or dictionaries and grammars of individual dialects (e.g. the dialect of Rezija/Resia Valley, the dialects of Nadiža/Natisone Valley), these tend to describe the oldest/most conservative forms of the dialects and may thus be of somewhat limited use for assessing potential differences in recent contact influence across individual dialects.

5. **Language vitality** (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003):

5.1. **Intergenerational Language Transmission**
There has been no study on Primorska Slovenian dialects’ transmission from parents to children. However, based on a survey conducted among students at the largest two universities in Slovenia, the attitudes towards dialects in Slovenia, including transmitting them to future generations, are generally favorable for the preservation of dialects (Lundberg 2007).

The transmission situation with Primorska Slovenian dialects in Italy, which are members of a minority language, is different. With Slovenia’s integration into the European Union (2004) and the Schengen area (2007), interaction between the Slovenian-speaking communities in Italy and in Slovenia has been facilitated, strengthening the position of Slovenian in Italy, but at the same time the previously often emphatic ethnic and linguistic Slovenian identification is often reported to have decreased among the younger generations, suggesting a looming decrease in the transmission of Slovenian to future generations. The existence of Slovenian-language primary and secondary schools facilitates transmission; at the same time, Slovenian is not an obligatory subject in majority/Italian-language schools, thus still keeping the knowledge of Slovenian largely restricted to minority members.

5.2. **Absolute Number of Speakers**
There is no official or unofficial data about the number of speakers of Primorska Slovenian. However, in the statistical region population counts of Slovenia’s Statistical Office, the areas of Slovenia where dialects of the Primorska Slovenian group are spoken are reported to have around 260,000 residents. Since Primorska Slovenian dialects are not written, competence in a dialect would mean strictly spoken-language competence. As there has been some dialect leveling, younger speakers, even though perfectly competent in their contemporary local variety, could be judged as less competent in the dialect if compared to older speakers.

The Slovenian-speaking population in Italy has been reported to decrease by 40% in the past century. Current estimates about the number of Slovenian speakers in Italy vary widely, from 50,000 to considerably over 100,000. Some estimates put the figure at around 80,000 (http://www.uoc.edu/euromosaic/web/document/eslove/an/i1/i1.html), of which virtually all are bilingual with Italian. Proficiency in Slovenian varies among speakers, in particular in written Slovenian; it tends to be greatest in the local dialect, i.e. a dialect of Primorska Slovenian. The total, combined Slovenia+Italy number of speakers of Primorska Slovenian dialects can thus be assumed to be over 300,000.

5.3. **Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population**
The proportion of Primorska Slovenian dialect speakers in the areas traditionally belonging to the Primorska Slovenian dialect group in Slovenia is unknown. Assuming that all residents of these areas are speakers of a Primorska Slovenian dialect, the figure would be around 260,000. Whereas this is clearly an overestimation, the figure nevertheless cannot be significantly lower, and the proportion of Primorska Slovenian dialect speakers with respect to the total population probably cannot be below 90%.

The proportion of Primorska Slovenian dialect speakers in the areas traditionally belonging to the Primorska Slovenian dialect group in Italy is around 20% in the Province of Trieste/Trst, around 15% in the Province of Gorizia/Gorica, and around 5% in the Province of Udine/Videm (cf.
http://www.uoc.edu/evroman/web/document/eslove/an/i1/i1.html). For proportions in individual municipalities of these provinces, see Figure 2 above.

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domains
There is no study on the use of Primorska Slovenian dialects in Slovenia. They are mostly not used in formal situations, they are not used in education, and they are standardly not written (although there are individual newsletters and an occasional book, and there is some use on the internet); other than in these domains, they are used widely. Primorska Slovenian dialects in Italy have a considerably narrower use. They are typically restricted to communication among minority members. Administrative use thus tends to be rare. The dialects have some access to minority media (there is possibly less influence from Standard Slovenian in spoken Slovenian-language media in Italy). They are mostly not written – for writing, Standard Slovenian is used – although some dialects are written in local minority media and some are used in school instruction.

5.5. Response to New Domains and Media
Slovenian is fully included in schools, new domains and media. Primorska Slovenian dialects are, particularly in formal contexts, not used in writing at all (with rare exceptions), hence also not in the written domains of the new domains and media. There is limited use in informal contexts on the internet (e.g. forums). There is some use of the spoken varieties in culture (certain shows in local theaters, certain shows on local TV and radio stations, pop music). Not being used in writing, Primorska Slovenian dialects mostly also have a limited use in schools in Italy.

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy
Slovenian is a language with a fully established orthography, literacy tradition, grammars, dictionaries, literature, media, etc., and is used in administration and education. Primorska Slovenian dialects are mostly not used for writing, do not (with exceptions) have grammars dedicated to them, mostly do not have dictionaries (though smaller-scale glossaries are not uncommon), and are generally not used in administration and (with exceptions) education.

5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
Slovenian is an official language throughout Slovenia. In a small area it is co-official with Italian and in another with Hungarian. There is a small government office at the Ministry of Culture coordinating the many stakeholders involved in decisions affecting Slovenian language. Public funding is provided for several aspects of modern infrastructure for the Slovenian language. Slovenian is a recognized minority language in many of the municipalities in Italy that have historically had Slovenian speakers. The rights of the linguistic minority are regulated most directly by the state Law on the protection of the Slovenian linguistic minority in Friuli Venezia Giulia (2001) and the provincial Law on the protection of the Slovenian linguistic minority (2007). Earlier, minority rights had been regulated by other legal provisions, such as the Treaty of Rapallo (1920), The London Memorandum (1954) and Treaty of Osimo (1975). Several aspects of earlier regulations and of the state law from 2001 have still not been fully implemented. Primorska Slovenian dialects as such enjoy no special legal rights. Parliamentary national resolutions on Slovenian’s language policy (for the most recent one, see http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministrstvo/slovenski_jezik/Resolution_2014-18_Slovenia_jan_2015.pdf) seek to find balance between support for and continued promotion of Standard Slovenian and between preservation and description of dialects. Efforts directed specifically at the preservation and study of dialects is mostly limited to competitive public research funding (e.g. projects such as the preparation of an atlas of Slovenian dialects).

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language
There has not been studies on the attitudes of Primorska Slovenian speakers in Slovenia to their own language. However, based on a survey conducted among students at the largest two universities in Slovenia, attitudes towards dialects and the possibility of transmitting it to one’s children are generally favorable in Slovenia (Lundberg 2007).
In Italy, attitudes of Slovenian speakers to Slovenian as a whole depend considerably on the age of the individual, and on the particular setting/location of the community. Older speakers generally hold more positive attitudes to their own language. For a community in Triest, Kaučič-Baša (1997) reports rather negative attitudes among the younger generation, although less negative attitudes seem to be recognized in Pertot & Kosic (2014).

5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation
Slovenian is represented at four Slovenian departments at universities in Slovenia and also some abroad. It is a well-documented language (grammars, dictionaries, annotated corpora, etc). Specifically Primorska Slovenian dialects are not represented at universities. There are aspects of these dialects which are reasonably well-documented (phonology, morphology, partly also vocabulary). Syntactic differences with respect to Standard Slovenian are underdocumented and underresearched. As most Primorska Slovenian dialects are generally not written, there are no written corpora. There is currently also little systematic video material. Certain Primorska Slovenian dialects, however, have dictionaries and grammars (e.g. Nadiža/Natisone dialect), and some have also been the subject of a nonnegligible amount of other work (Rezija/Resia dialect).

5.10. International Presence of the Language
Slovenian is an official language in an EU member state and an official language of the EU. Its teaching is promoted outside of Slovenian borders through the Center for Slovenian as a Second/Foreign Language of the University of Ljubljana which organizes and coordinates university courses of Slovenian at over 50 international universities. Slovenian culture is promoted abroad by various government and nongovernment organizations, as well as by many emigrant associations. Specifically Primorska Slovenian dialects have no international presence of this type.

6. Basic bibliography
Varieties spoken in Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol

0. General Introduction

The region Trentino - Alto Adige/South Tyrol is made up of the two provinces of Trento, in the South, and Bolzano/Bozen, in the North. The official language is Italian, and in the province of Bolzano/Bozen also German and Ladin (but the latter with important restrictions, see infra, § 5.7). Besides these languages, in the region there are five varieties which are traditionally spoken: (i) the so-called “Trentino” which is (quite mistakenly) shorthand for the Italian varieties spoken in the Province of Trento and that can be subsumed under the Lombardo-Venetian linguistic area (see Pellegrini 1977), (ii) the German dialects belonging to the South Bavarian group, that are sometimes referred to as Südtirolerisch, and (iii) the minority languages Ladin, Cimbrian and Mòcheno. The administrative border between the provinces of Trento and Bolzano/Bozen coincides with the historical linguistic border between the Italian/Trentino and the German/South Tyrolean community, although nowadays there is a consistent minority of italophones in the province of Bolzano/Bozen (about 23.3% of the population indicated that they belong to the Italian group in the 2011 General Census). In the East, various administrative borders (province of Bolzano/Bozen, province of Trento, province of Belluno) cut the area where Ladin is spoken.

The areas of this region are part of a single administrative unit since the Napoleonic wars: before this period (i.e. from the XI century until 1801), they were divided into three domains: the county of Tyrol, which included also the current Austrian Bundesland Tyrol, and the prince-bishoprics of Trento and of Bressanone/Brixen, which were independent, but subordinated de facto to the Tyrolean count. In the period 1801-1803 the temporal power of the two bishops was abolished, and their domains became part of Tyrol. Since then, the whole area was part of the Austrian Empire until 1919, when it passed over to Italy and became the new region Trentino-Alto Adige/South Tyrol.

Figure 1: Detail of Pellegrini’s (1977) map of the dialects of Italy
Figure 2: Germanic minority languages
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Figure 3: Ladin valleys (NB: 'Bulsan' = Bolzano; 'Trênt' = Trento; 'Belun' = Belluno)

![Figure 3: Ladin valleys](image)

A. Trentino

1. The Trentino dialects

Trentino is a group of Italian dialects which does not constitute an autonomous or homogeneous group of dialects within Pellegrini's (1977) map (figure 1): the Western area is usually considered part of the Gallo-Italic group (IIF and IIe in the map), the Eastern and Southern areas as part of Venetian (Vf). The
central area, which includes the capital city of the province, Trento, is taken to be a transitional area between these two groups. Moreover, the North-Western varieties (noneso, solandro: IIIF) are described in Ascoli (1873) as transitional areas between the Italian and the Rhaeto-Romance group. All Trentino dialects are direct continuations of the Vulgar Latin spoken in this area after the Roman conquest (between the I century B.C. and the I century AD). The speakers call these varieties dialetto trentino and all of them consider it as an Italian dialect.

2. (Purported) relatives
Trentino dialects are part of Italo-Romance; the Western varieties have the Lombard, Piedmontese, Aemilian, Ligurian and Romagnolo varieties as their relatives (Gallo-Italic group), the Southern and Eastern varieties are related to the Venetian dialects, specifically to the varieties spoken in the province of Verona (for Southern Trentino) and those of Vicenza, Bassano, Feltre and Belluno (for the Eastern part).

3. Geographical distribution
The dialects of Trentino are spoken in the whole province of Trento (also in the areas of the three minority languages) and in some villages of the Southern part of the province of Bolzano/Bozen. Moreover, migrant communities keep up Trentino in Southern Brazil, Argentina, USA, Australia, Canada, Switzerland and Bosnia (in a village called Štivor), cf. http://www.trentininelmondo.it/i-circoli/circoli-nel-mondo.html.

4. “Standard Trentino” and dialects
Although various local properties distinguish the dialects spoken in different Trentino subareas, (cfr. Bertoluzza 1992), the intercomprehension between speakers coming from different places in the province is always possible; the intercomprehension with speakers of Venetian varieties spoken in the neighboring provinces is usually fair as well.

B. Cimbrian (ISO 639-3, cim)

1. The Cimbrian language and its name
Cimbrian is a minority language spoken in the area between the Regions Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol and Veneto. The provinces where Cimbrian speakers are found are Trento, Vicenza and Verona (see figure 2). Cimbrian belongs to the group of Southern Bavarian-Austrian dialects. According to the traditional view, the first settlements of Southern German people in this area of Northern Italy occurred during the 11th Century (cf. Bidese 2004): Cimbrian has been isolated ever since from the Southern Bavarian-Austrian varieties but has preserved morpho(no)logical features in common with its medieval cognates (cf. among others Bidese (ed.) 2010, Kranzmayer [1923] 1981–1985; Panieri 2006, Schweizer 2008 [1951/1952], Schweizer 2012 [1954]). Nowadays, the three major varieties of Cimbrian are spoken in Luserna/Lusérn in the Province of Trento; in the so-called area of the Tredici Comuni (lit. “Thirteen Municipalities”) in the Province of Verona (where Cimbrian is spoken in the village of Giazza/Ljetzan only); in the so-called area of the Sette Comuni (lit. “Seven Municipalities”) close to Asiago/Schlege in the Province of Vicenza (where only few speakers of Cimbrian are found in the village of Roana/Robaan. However, the only variety with a certain degree of competence also encountered among younger speakers is the one spoken in Luserna.

The current demonym ‘Cimbrian’ is not to be confused either with the Germanic tribe (namely the Cimbri) that inhabited Denmark in the 2nd Century or with the Cimbri defeated by the Roman Consul Gaius Marius at the Raudine Plain, near Vercelli in 101 BC, although some scholars - especially in the past centuries - insisted on tracing modern Cimbrian back to an ancient Scandinavian origin (cf. M. Pezzo or S. Maffei, whose grammatical description of the Germanic variety spoken in the Northern province of Verona was the first grammar of a dialect in the 18th Century). Even if ‘Cimbrian’ is quite common nowadays, people in Luserna prefer to use the phrase az be biar ‘like us/the way we speak’ to refer to their own language.

2. (Purported) Relatives
Currently, Cimbrian has no close relatives, even though the Môcheno variety spoken in the Fersina
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Valley (Province of Trento) shares some common features with Cimbrian which can be ascribed to the common Old/Middle High German origin.

3. Geographical distribution
Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol Region: southern Province of Trento; Veneto Region: northern Province of Vicenza and northern Province of Verona.

4. Standard Cimbrian and Cimbrian dialects
Non applicable

C. Mòcheno (ISO 639-3, mhn)

1. The mòcheno language and its name
Mòcheno represents another historical German language island of the Region. It can be described as a Southern Bavarian variety spoken in three small villages of the eponymous Valley which is also called Fersental in German and Valle del Fersina in Italian (Rowley 1986, Bidesi & Cognola [ed.] 2013, Schweizer 2012 [1954]) in Trentino (figure 2). Along with Cimbrian, it has been spoken by the local community since the Middle Ages (ca. 11th-12th Century) when Southern-Bavarian groups moved to this territory and settled down there. The denominations of this language is Mòcheno (used by Italians and the mòcheni themselves when speaking Italian), Fersentalerisch (in the German literature), ‘de inger sproch’ (our language) by the Mòcheni.

2. Purported relatives
As is the situation with Cimbrian, Mòcheno has no close relatives except for Cimbrian itself with which it shares some common features ascribed to the common Old/Middle High German origin.

3. Geographical distribution
There are currently 3 municipalities in the Valley where Mòcheno is alive, spoken on everyday basis, namely Fierozzo/Florutz, Frassilongo/Gereut and Palù/Palai. The Mòcheno language is used orally by almost all of the families of Roveda and Palù, by a large part of the families of Fierozzo, and by very few families in Frassilongo.

4. Mòcheno and its dialects
The varieties spoken in the four municipalities of the Valley of Fersina show a certain degree of variation both from a phonological viewpoint and, to a certain extent, a syntactic and lexical viewpoint.

D. South Tyrolean

1. South Tyrolean (i.e. the Tyrolean spoken in South Tyrol) and its name
The German dialects spoken in the Northern Province of Bolzano/Bozen are rather homogeneous and belong all to the Tyrolean group, which is also spoken in the Austrian region Tyrol and is part of the South Bavarian group. There are some minor differences among the various areas, regarding especially lexicon and phonology, but also syntax (see figure 1). These dialects, were introduced in the area during the Migration Period, when members of the Germanic tribe Baiuvarii started migrating into the region. In the province of Bolzano their varieties superseded the pristine Vulgar Latin/Early Romance varieties in most areas. This process went on from the V century, and by the end of the Medieval Age Tyrolean was spoken almost in the same areas as now. In the Modern Age, it replaced the Rhaeto-Romance varieties spoken in the West (Venosta valley), and in some smaller areas which were formerly part of the Ladin community. Nowadays, it is expanding in the Ladin Gardena valley. The speakers themselves call this variety Südtirolerisch and all of them consider it a German dialect. It is also important to draw a line between the dialects spoken in the Val Venosta, where Alemannic influences seem to be a little stronger than in other areas, and the ones of the Isarco Valley which are definitely closer to South-Bavarian.

2. (Purported) relatives
The Tyrolean dialects of South Tyrol are part of the Bavarian dialectal group, and are hence related to the
3. Geographical distribution

South Bavarian dialects in South Tyrol are spoken in the whole province of Bolzano/Bozen (see TSA) by the German speaking and the Ladin communities; Italophone speakers, on the contrary, rarely speak South Tyrolean. In the past centuries, Tyrolean was spoken also in some parts of the current province of Trento, i.e. in various non-connected villages of the Eastern valleys and in the valley of the Adige river until Trento; historians report that the town of Trento was bilingual from the XV to the XVIII-XIX century, and one of the nine districts of the town was called 'German district' (Contrada todesca); anyway, in Trento the German population never constituted more than 10% of the total. Nowadays Tyrolean is spoken also in some immigrant countries like the USA (Hutterisch - Canada and USA, Tyrolean base with influences from other dialects); there are also German speaking communities in Brazil (Dreizehnlinden), originally Tyrolean immigrants.

4. Standard South Tyrolean

There is no standard variety or a koinè, but speakers coming from different areas of the province understand each other perfectly well.

E. Dolomitic Ladin (ISO 639-3, lld)

1. The Ladin language and its name

Dolomitic Ladin is spoken in five valleys in the Dolomites and stems directly from the Vulgar Latin spoken in the area, although it is unclear if the valleys were inhabited during the Roman Empire, or if they were populated afterwards by people fleeing from the Germanic invasions. Since the Middle Ages, the valleys have never been part of the same administrative unit, although they became part of the same country during the Napoleonic wars (first the Austrian Empire and then Italy). However, during the Middle and Modern Ages they were part of the same bishopric (the Prince-bishopric of Bressanone/Brixen) with the exception of Cortina d'Ampezzo, but this ecclesiastical unity was split during the Napoleonic wars, and this division has lasted ever since.

Starting from the late 19th century and until some decades ago, the status of Ladin was strongly debated. The so called Questione ladina originated with Ascoli’s (1873) and Gartner’s (1879 and subsequent work) analyses: some scholars thought that there was an unità ladina, a Rhaeto-Romance unity, which included the Romansh varieties spoken in Switzerland, the Dolomitic Ladin language and the Friulian varieties. On the other hand, other linguists considered these three groups either as part of the Italian system, or at least as independent from one another. This debate was also influenced by the opposite (German vs. Italian) nationalistic tendencies. Nowadays, Ladin is generally considered a language and not a dialectal group. The denomination ladin (< LATINUM) was originally used only by the speakers of two varieties, one in the Dolomites (Badia valley) and the other in Swiss Romansh (Engadin). It was then adopted by Ascoli for the whole Rhaeto-Romance group (which he considered as a unit). On the other hand, the definition ‘Rhaeto-Romance’ was popularised by Theodor Gartner at the end of the XIX century. It stems from the former use of referring to Swiss Romansh as “Raetic”. The speakers themselves call their variety ladin or use the name of the valley (e.g., they say that they speak Badiot, or Fassan, etc.).

2. (Purported) relatives

A consistent group of scholars regard Dolomitic Ladin as a part of Rhaeto-romance, which also includes Swiss Romansh and Friulian. According to others, it is a language of its own. Finally, there are linguists who analyse it as a dialectal group within the Italo-Romania.

3. Geographical distribution

Ladin is spoken in five valleys of the Dolomites (see ALD): Gardena/Gherdëina and Badia (which belong to the province of Bolzano/Bozen), Fassa/Fascia (which is part of the province of Trento), Livinallongo/Fodom and Ampezzo/Ampesko (which belong to the province of Belluno in the Veneto region). There are some disputes about other possible members of Dolomitic Ladin: the Trentino dialect noneso has some feature in common with Ladin, but is generally regarded as part of Trentino (see supra)

dialects spoken in Austria and Old Bavaria (the Eastern and Southern part of the Bundesland Bavaria).
by the scientific community. The status of the Northern varieties of the province of Belluno, which border on Fodom and Ampezzo, is pretty unclear: according to some linguists (e.g. Pellegrini 1977), they should be considered as a part of Ladin; this subgroup is usually called ladino cadorino. On the other hand, some scholars argue that not even the variety of Cortina d’Ampezzo should be grouped with the other four Ladin valleys. In fact, nowadays the definition of Ladin takes into account not only linguistic, but also extra-linguistic factors (as the culture, the folklore, the common history, the sense of belonging to the same linguistic and cultural community). For this reason, the terms “ladin/ladino”, “Dolomitic Ladin” or “Ladinia Brixinenis” (referring to the common belonging of Gardena, Badia, Fassa and Fodom to the bishopric of Bressanone/Brixen from the Early Middle Ages to the Napoleonic wars) are usually used just for these five varieties (cfr. Dell’Aquila & Iannàccaro 2006).

4. Standard Ladin and its dialects

As stated supra, Ladin is spoken in five valleys, and each valley has a different variety. In three of them (Gardena, Fodom and Ampezzo) there is no significant variation from village to village. On the other hand, both in Badia and in Fassa there is internal variation: in Badia there are (at least) three different varieties: badiot (in the upper valley), badiot de mesaval (in the lower valley) and mareo (in the lateral valley of Mareo/Marebbe). Also Fassan is divided into three varieties: cazét (in the upper valley), brach (in the middle part of the valley) and moenat (in the lowest village of Moena). In these two valleys, there is a Standard Fassan and a Standard Badiot variety, which are widely accepted by the community.

There is no standard language or koinè of Dolomitic Ladin, and speakers of the different varieties tend to use Italian or German to communicate together (although the intercomprehension seems to improve thanks to an increasing amount of TV programs where all varieties are used). The question of a standard written language is being urged, since Ladin has got more attention by the official institutions in the last decades. At the beginning, the different varieties were used alternately in the official acts and denominations. In the 1990s, several cultural institutions of the Ladin valleys decided to imitate the Swiss experiment of Rumantsch Grischun (i.e. the creation of a common written language for all varieties of Swiss Rumantsch). The team of experts which was in charge of this issue was headed by Prof. Heinrich Schmid of the University of Zurich; they worked on this project for some years and published a grammar and a dictionary of the so-called Ladin Dolomitan. However, a part of the speaker community misinterpreted this project and contested it strongly, so that in 1999 a part of the political institutions which supported it economically decided to stop it. Since then, the institutions stepped back to the former alternate use of the different varieties, although this has caused conflicts and recriminations on some recent occasions.

5. Language vitality (based on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment document, 2003):

5.1. Intergenerational Language Transmission

Trentino dialects: The picture is quite complex and depends on the geographical and social context of the families: those who live in the main urban centres and are more educated will be less likely to transmit the dialect to the children. In any case, the dialects of Trentino are only spoken in informal situations; thus, they are transmitted by the family and often also by the social context, while they are excluded from school. In general, they can be considered as unsafe.

Cimbrian: As of today, the situation in Luserna, i.e. the last village where Cimbrian preserves its vitality, is quite complex since language transmission is non consistent in the population: there is a sort of continuum, from an optimal set of circumstances in which there are households where both parents speak Cimbrian with their children to an almost totally Italian-speaking environment where Cimbrian ends up being used just in the naming of certain objects or in frozen phrases. Considerable variation is found in between: either parent speaks Cimbrian and children tend to grow up as passive bilinguals (some of them find Cimbrian again after puberty). Having said this, Cimbrian can be considered definitively endangered.

Mòcheno: Being a minority language, Mòcheno is currently exposed to the same danger Cimbrian is facing, therefore it belongs to the definitely endangered languages. However, the fact that the absolute number of speakers is higher if compared with Cimbrian and that the different varieties of Mocheno
create a sort of “inner tension” contribute to render Mòcheno a little safer with respect to Cimbrian. The context of language transmission is very similar to Luserna’s. There are households where both parents address children in Mòcheno while in other ones children are passive bilinguals being able to produce two-word utterances and short phrases. School: limited exposure in the form of pedagogical projects where mòcheno is taught for very few hours at elementary school.

**Tyrolean as spoken in South Tyrol:** This dialect is spoken by all generations and there are no signs of a passage from South Tyrolean to (regional) High German. The only context where the transmission is excluded is at school. It should be definitely considered as safe.

**Ladin:** The transmission process depends on the valley, and even on the village: the areas where the familiar transmission is working best is Badia valley, the lower Fassan valley and the higher Gardena valley. In the lower Gardena valley the tendency of speaking Tyrolean with the own children (a tendency which has lasted for at least the last 100 years) is increasing, and the social context of the children is slowly switching to Southern Tyrolean, too. In Fodom, Ampezzo, and in the other parts of the Fassan valley the familiar transmission is more and more restricted, because the parents very often decide to speak Italian to their children. An important reason for this fact concerns the mixed marriages, with one of the two partners (usually the wife) coming from a non-Ladin area. In Gardena, Badia and Fassa Ladin is taught at school and used as a vehicular language in the first year of primary school. In most Fassan elementary schools there is a bilingual curriculum, where some of the school subjects are taught in Fassan. On the contrary, in Fodom and Ampezzo (which belong to the Veneto region), Ladin is not considered at all at school. Thus, these varieties can be considered from **stable yet threatened** (Badiot) to **definitively endangered** (Ampezzo).

5.2. **Absolute Number of Speakers**

**Trentino dialects:** There are no official data about the number of speakers. The Italian official institute for statistics (ISTAT 2014, http://www.istat.it) reports that in the whole North-Eastern part of Italy, the people who speak only or also their dialect are about 50% of the population. Considering that in the province of Trento the dialect is spoken more than in some other regions of North-Eastern Italy, we can hypothesise that from 250.000 to 300.000 people, mainly over 40 years, speak a Trentino dialect in addition to Italian.

In Luserna (Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol) the inhabitants are 300: they are all taken to be speakers of Cimbrian *(de facto* about ¾ of them, so ca. 230). As already pointed out, their fluency is not homogeneous since fluent-speakerness and semi-speakerness are intermingled (“semi-speaker” in Dorian’s 1981 sense). The other villages in the Veneto Region have less than 10 speakers each.

**Mòcheno:** According to Ethnologue there are ca 1.900 speakers so distributed: about 400 in Fierozzo; more or less a thousand in Palù, and 460 in Frassilongo. On the other hand, the linguistic census carried out by the Autonomous Province of Trento in 2001 reports that 2.278 people declared their affiliation to the Mòcheno minority: however, these numbers appear to be a little inflated w.r.t the actual number of speakers. In fact, Alber (2010) basing on Rowley's 1986 observations points out that “[t]he high percentages resulting in the census could reflect at most the number of speakers in the villages of Palai/Palù del Fersina and Oachlait/Roveda, in which, according to Rowley (1986), most families still speak Mòcheno. If we assume a percentage of 50% speakers in Garait [Frassilongo]- Oachlait [Roveda] [...] and Vlarotz [Fierozzo] and 95,4% speakers for Palai [Palù], we arrive at the hypothetical number of 583 Mòcheno speakers”.

**Südtirolerisch:** Since the overwhelming majority of the German or Ladin speaking population in the province of Bolzano speaks Südtirolerisch (as well as the Italian-German bilinguals and some Italian speaking people), we can estimate that the absolute number of speakers amounts to more than 300.000.

**Ladin:** the total number of Ladin speakers can be estimated as about 35.000-40.000: more than 20.000 in the province of Bolzano, about 10.000 in the province of Trento and about 5-6.000 in Veneto (Dell’Aquila-Iannaccàro 2006).
5.3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population

All varieties: If we take the population of the whole region as point of comparison (amounting to 1 million people), Cimbrian is spoken by 0.025% of the population (0.05% of the province of Trento), Mòcheno by 0.05-0.19% of the population (0.1-0.38% of the province of Trento), Trentino dialects by 30-35% (60-70% of the province of Trento, and probably less than 2-3% of the province of Bolzano), Südtirolerisch by at least 30% of the population (more than 60% of the province of Bolzano), Ladin by 3% of the population (4% of the province of Bolzano and 2% of the province of Trento).

As regards the speakers of the minority languages with respect to the total population of their territory, Cimbrian is spoken by some 75% of the village of Luserna, Mòcheno by more or less the 50-90% of the population in all municipalities, Ladin by more than 90% in the valleys of Gardena and Badia, more than 80% in the Fassa valley and by more than 70% in Veneto (about 80%-90% in Fodom and about 75% in Cortina d’Ampezzo), cf. Dell’Aquila-Iannàccaro (2006). Thus, Cimbrian and Mòcheno are definitively endangered, while Ladin is unsafe, except for the Venetian valleys of Fodom and Ampezzo, which are respectively definitively endangered and severely endangered.

5.4. Trends in Existing Language Domains

All varieties. Trentino is used in multilingual parity with Italian: some speakers use it in all contexts, and seldomly alternate with Italian. Others use it only in familiar contexts, or when they speak with elderly people. South Tyrolean has a universal use and is used in all domains. There is diglossia, but Standard German is used only in written texts and in some highly restricted official contexts. The Ladin situation is more differentiated. In the areas where it is best preserved (first of all Badia), we can describe it as a multilingual parity: Ladin is used in most contexts, also in written texts, but German, Italian and South Tyrolean are also used in some contexts (especially at school and in the church). In the valleys where it is spoken less (Veneto region), it is used in dwindling domains. Although current linguistic policies at regional level are trying to widen its range of usage, Cimbrian and Mocheno are not likely to be affected in a significant way. Thus, they are used used in dwindling domains

5.5. Response to New Domains and Media

All varieties: Regional broadcasting networks devote up to an hour per day to Cimbrian, Mocheno and Ladin: local news as well as short TV shows and animated films for kids are broadcast in the minority languages in the private channel TML (channel 642). Ladin varieties are used in the public channel RAI3 ("TRAIL") and in the radio, too: there is at least one private network which alternates Gardenese Ladin and German ("Radio Gherdëina"), and the public radio network of the region RAI transmits an hour daily (news and discussion forums). Moreover, there is a weekly page for each minority language on the local newspaper of Trento ("L’Adige"); in the German newspaper of the province of Bolzano ("Dolomiten") several articles about the Ladin area in the province of Bolzano are written in a Ladin variety (mainly those about Badia). Furthermore, there is a weekly journal completely written in the different varieties of Ladin, called "La Usc di Ladins" ("The Voice of the Ladins"). The Ladin and the Mòcheno Cultural Institutes have also developed some tools for writing in Ladin, as e.g. an automatic spelling correction software and online dictionaries. At school, Ladin is used up to two hours per week in the Ladin valleys of Trentino-Alto Adige/South Tyrol (is is not used at all in Veneto until few years ago); in most elementary schools of the Fassa valley (province of Trento), Ladin is used as vehicular language, i.e. some subjects are taught in Ladin (up to 7 hours per week). Thus, we can say that Cimbrian and Mocheno are coping, Ladin is receptive (except for the varieties spoken in the province of Belluno). Trentino and South Tyrolean, instead, are not used in any media or school. There is only a spontaneous use of these dialects, e.g. in sms, e-mails or in the social media. In this respect, these dialects can be considered inactive.

5.6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy

All varieties: All the minority languages under investigation here have an established orthography, which was introduced either some decades ago for all varieties of Ladin (with some subsequent modifications) or just some years ago for Cimbrian (variety of Luserna only) and Mocheno (cf. Rowley 2003). There are also descriptive grammars of the minority languages and dictionaries (both printed and online) which keep being updated especially to catch up with the needs of the administration: all reports of the
municipal assemblies have to be both in Italian and in the minority language spoken in the village (except for the Ladin villages of Veneto, where only Italian is used), thus neologisms and adapted borrowings are constantly called for. Moreover, Ladin is used in some official acts of the two Autonomous Provinces and of the Region. As for Trentino, there is an official orthography which is mainly used for the toponymy and there are several descriptive dictionaries and grammars. Furthermore, Trentino is not used in official written texts. Lastly, there are reference books for Italian-speaking willing to learn South Tyrolean such as Schian isch’s gwesn, Hoi Hanni, Alpha&Beta.

5.7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
All varieties: The Region’s and Provinces’ governments protect the minority languages with specific laws and measures. However, these are based mainly on a territorial principle: the use of the minority languages - besides Italian and German (in the province of Bolzano) - is obligatory only at local level (i.e. in the municipalities where the minority language is located). On the other hand, all the supralocal activities (e.g. acts of the Provinces or of the Region, high schools attended by pupils of a minority but that are located outside their territory, even church ceremonies) only exceptionally include the minority language. Thus, there is a differentiated support. As for the Ladin varieties spoken in Veneto, a National Law promulgated in 1999 (Law 482 of the 15th December 1999) requires that all minority languages of the country should be protected and supported at a local level. However, the lack of funding and the indifference of the institutions of the Veneto region and of the province of Belluno prevent the law from fully applying. Thus, there is a situation of passive assimilation. As for trentino and South Tyrolean, there is no support at all, but neither there is prohibition.

5.8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward their own language
Even if Cimbrian usage is shrinking and some community members may not be active speakers, the whole community maintains such a caring attitude toward this minority language that almost all members value their language and wish to see it promoted. As for Ladin and Mòcheno, many members support language maintenance, while some members are indifferent or consider the knowledge of Italian or German as mother tongue as more useful. Trentino and South Tyrolean are considered by the speakers as dialects: thus, they do not think that they should be promoted. However, these dialects are seen as a key symbol of group identity by many speakers, and are thus preserved without the need of institutional promotion.

5.9. Amount and Quality of Documentation
As for Cimbrian, there is a good reference grammar published less that ten years ago which meets good descriptive adequacy. The Cultural Institute of Luserna also takes care of both websites providing comprehensive source of linguistic, cultural and historical data and an online dictionary. One should also recall the oldest documents written in Cimbrian, namely (i) the translation into Cimbrian of Bishop Bellarmine’s Catechism in 1602, during the Counter-Rformation and (ii) a short grammatical description of the Cimbrian language written in the 18th Century by a doctor living in Bassano del Grappa, Gerardo Slaviero (La grammatica dei sette comuni vicentini), who was an amateur grammarian. Last but not least, in recent years, Storia di Tönle an Italian novel on by Mario Rigoni Stern, has been translated into modern Luserna Cimbrian.

The documentation of the Ladin varieties is very good: Ladin is represented in 6 points of the AIS, and there is an extensive linguistic atlas (ALD) documenting the Romance varieties spoken in Trentino-Alto Adige, in the province of Belluno and in the neighboring areas. All varieties have at least one quite good grammar, and the varieties of the province of Bolzano have an additional, comprehensive grammar which contrast Gardenese and Badiot with Standard Italian and German (in more volumes). There is a rich online database of written texts, which was built up for the Standard Ladin project (http://corpuslad.ladintal.it/applications/textanalysis/search.jsp), and there are several authors who write in Ladin; some novels and many short stories and poems have been published up to now, as well as various translations of foreign works (e.g., the Little Prince). Moreover, there are also some music bands singing songs in Ladin. On the other hand, an audio database is missing, although it is possible to download some podcasts of the official radio programs in Ladin.
As for the dialects of Trentino, 15 varieties are documented in the AIS and many more in the ALD; there are also several dictionaries and some descriptive grammars which focus on a single variety of this group (cf. Cordin 1997 and Cordin 2005). The documentation is fair. The overall documentation of the South Bavarian dialects in Tyrol is good (see, e.g., the Tyrolean linguistic atlas (TSA) and the dictionary of Schatz 1993 [1955/1956] which explicitly specifies local variants).

5.10. International Presence of the Language
Non applicable.
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Conclusion

Language diversity is essential to the human heritage. Each and every language embodies the unique cultural wisdom of a people. Though approximately six thousand languages still exist, many are under threat; it is the case of some of the languages/varieties described in this report. Even languages with many thousands of speakers are no longer being acquired by children; at least 50% of the world’s more than six thousand languages are losing speakers.

Intergenerational language transmission is, following the different sociolinguistic situations described in this report, the principal matter of concern for these language communities. Language endangerment may be the result of external forces such as military, economic, religious, cultural, or educational subjugation, or it may be caused by internal forces, such as a community’s negative attitude towards its own language. Internal pressures often have their source in external ones, and both halt the intergenerational transmission of linguistic and cultural traditions. Many indigenous peoples, associating their disadvantaged social position with their culture, have come to believe that their languages are not worth retaining. They abandon their languages and cultures in hopes of overcoming discrimination, to secure a livelihood, and enhance social mobility, or to assimilate to the global marketplace.

Considering this concern, there is an imperative need for language documentation, new policy initiatives, and new materials to enhance the vitality of these languages/varieties. The cooperative efforts of language communities, language professionals, NGOs and governments will be indispensable in countering this threat. There is a pressing need to build support for language communities in their efforts to establish meaningful new roles for their endangered languages/varieties.

This report aims to make a contribution to state the field on regional bilingualism in Europe, adding qualitative information to the existing sources(descriptions). It will be the premise for all future work on the subject, to be referred to in future papers and reports.