Vladislav Knoll[1]
(Prague, Czech Republic)

Types of non-dominant languages in Europe

1. Language by elaboration

The conservative division of diatopic lects[2] in Europe into languages or dialects has been – more so in the last decades – frequently challenged by numerous studies. The focus of these studies were those lects which do not fully fit the traditional concept of language or dialect. My contribution in this area is inspired by my recent reading of three collective volumes[3] discussing this issue from different perspectives and based on different philological approaches (notably, Slavic and Romance). In this article, I will compare different approaches taken by various scholars to define the non-dominant lects, and point to both the perspectives and the weak points of these respective approaches. The theories will be framed in a context of legal definitions of non-dominant lects. Prior to this discussion, I find it important to state that many among the lects mentioned here are – within the more traditional schemata – considered to be dialects

---

[1] https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5112-2903

[2] We use this term as it is possibly the most "neutral to whether the variety is a sociolect or a (geographical) dialect" (Trudgill 2003: 78) and may, in a very broad meaning, denote "language, dialect or variety" (Paddock 1988: 377). Some scholars consider lect and variety to be synonyms, others make clear the difference between these two terms (Felder 2017: 142). The problem inherent to the term *variety* is that it is predominantly comprehended as a 'subsystem' *(*cf. Berruto 2004: 190).

[3] Duličenko – Nomachi 2018, Stern – Nomachi – Belić 2018, Tamburelli – Tosco 2021.

of a dominant language. It is not my intention here to comment on these assumptions, whether they be correct or not.

First of all, it is worth discussing the criteria used to distinguish a language from a dialect.[4] As the most recent of the above mentioned collective volumes still bases its argumentation on the classical work authored by Heinz Kloss, the latter cannot be overlooked in the present article. Likewise, I will try to place this theory in a contemporary framework. According to Kloss' concept (1978: 24–25), there are two independent criteria ruling how a language is determined: elaboration (*Ausbau*) and linguistic distance (*Abstand*). These criteria are mutually independent (Brasca 2021: 62). The *Ausbau* criterion is linked with the socio-political emancipation of a lect, and according to Kloss (*ibidem*), such emancipation takes place through language planning, focused on the elaboration of its functions. Kloss (1978: 58), informed by the traditionally strong regionalism of the German-speaking countries, locates the border between dialect and language in the presence (or absence) of the non-fiction genre (*Sachprosa)* and translations of key texts (e.g. the Bible). Thus, the public presence of a *normal dialect* (*Normaldialekt*) is limited to fiction or belles-lettres (*Belletristik*)[5] and oral-only presentation in the media (e.g. radio plays).[6] This concept contradicts the traditional view prevalent in Slavic Studies where a dialect is supposed to be limited only to "spoken private spontaneous communication" (Kloferová 2017).

Simultaneously, Kloss also mentions the existence of an elaborate *dialect* (*Ausbaudialekt*), one which he previously called a half-language (*Halbsprache*, Kloss 1978: 57) patterned on Swiss German, Luxembourgish and

---

[4] For a discussion of the different criteria, see also Sinner 2014: 96–10, Wicherkiewicz 2014: 26–33.

[5] In the meantime, full Bible translations are mentioned in Kloss' *Normaldialekte*: in Bavarian (Hell 1998) and Swabian (Rudolf 2008). Both authors created specific rules for the language used in their Bible.

[6] Dialect stylization is present on the Czech radio; notably, in the fairy-tale radio plays recorded in stylized local dialects (especially those of Krkonoše, Chodsko, Haná). Currently, there is a regular programme on the Czech radio broadcast in the Haná dialect (Central Moravian), glossing current events (https://olomouc.rozhlas.cz/plk-na-nedelo-6370961 [21 XII 2021]). In the past, comedic broadcasts were realized in other dialects as well (the interdialect of Brno, various dialects of Moravia). In Germany, the presence of local lects in audio media is much more intensified (e.g. radio programs in Swabian, https://mundartradio.de/ [21 XII 2021]).

Scots. The *elaborate dialect* is functionally characterized by a more significant oral presence in the media and some penetration into the non-fiction genre (written media, books on local themes in the dialect, basic school primers) and elevated literature (novels). In my older work (Knoll 2017: 32), I also place on this level (i.e. *emancipated literary dialect*) translations of contemporary key texts of popular culture (*Astérix*[7], *The Little Prince*,[8] *Tintin*[9]), translation attempts of passages from the Bible, and the presence on Wikipedia.[10] In the virtual space, it is actually Wikipedia that is the workshop area in which the different lects are elaborated upon in non-fiction writing. On the other hand, let us mention Stern's warning (2018b) concerning the fallacy of evaluating the status of a language based on its presence on the Internet as this presence might only represent a sort of a *Second Life* phenomenon or experiment, which does not necessarily have to correspond with the *offline* status of the language.

In my article mentioned previously (Knoll 2017), I consider the difference between the stage of a *developed dialect* (Kloss' *Normaldialekt*, i.e. one with rich fiction/literature on local themes) and an emancipated one as the elaboration of vocabulary needed to encompass the spheres in which the dialect was not traditionally used. It seems that the description of Sicilian and Lombard functionality as described by Coluzzi et al. (2018;

---

[7] The translations include, among others, 36 continental Germanic lects (https://www.asterix-obelix.nl/ [21 XII 2018]). There are also numerous Finnish varieties.

[8] E.g. from Slavic non-dominant lects, translations have been produced to Banat Bulgarian, Burgenland Croatian, Čakavian (traditionally a dialect group of Croatian), Greater Polish, Kajkavian (traditionally a dialect group of Croatian), Kashubian (in a non-standard orthography at that), Lower and Upper Sorbian, Podhalian (linguistically a part of the Lesser Polish dialect group), Prekmurian (traditionally part of the Pannonian dialectal group of Slovene), Silesian (traditionally a dialect group of Polish) and Suržyk (a fused lect spoken in Ukraine comparable to *Missingsch* in the Germanic area). The versions in other lects comprise small local dialects (e.g. 21 varieties of Occitan). See https://petit-prince-collection.com/lang/traducteurs.php [21 XII 2021].

[9] E.g. in Walloon, Picard, Franco-Provençal, Provençal (Mistral's orthography), see https://www.casterman.com/Bande-dessinee/Collections-series/les-aventures-de-tintin/en-langues-regionales [21 XII 2018].

[10] Slavic Wikipedia in non-dominant lects only includes Kashubian, Low and Upper Sorbian, Carpathian Rusyn, and Silesian versions. The variety of non-dominant Romance and continental Germanic lects is, similarly to the case of pop-cultural texts, much higher. This might be another proof of a low level of modern linguistic regionalism among Slavic speakers.

2021: 176–178) would still fit this category. Duličenko's theory on literary microlanguages (e. g. 2014: 573) is less demanding and it covers Kloss' *Ausbaudialekt*, but, despite explicitly rejecting it, also *Normaldialect* (*developed dialect*).[11]

For Kloss (1978: 48–49, 59–60), the crowning of the elaboration of a language (full language, *Vollsprache*) is its regular use in non-fiction, science, and course books on different subjects (i.e. not just primers).[12] This is mostly impossible without the recognition of the lect as a language (cf. Knoll 2017: 35). This is why more types of recognition shall be distinguished. Of course, real recognition of a language is performed by local state authorities. We can distinguish two main types of recognition:

– functional recognition (the state guarantees the use of a language in administration and/or public schools)[13]
– symbolic recognition (the state acknowledges the existence of a language without taking any intensified action in its favor).

Apart from recognition on the part of local authorities, the language may be *recognized* by supranational bodies, such as UNESCO (i.e. the official list of endangered languages),[14]

---

[11] Based on Duličenko's characterization (2014: 600–601; 2018), Molise Croatian, Aegean Macedonian, Pomak, Lachian, and East Slovak could be considered to be closer to Kloss' concept of a *Normaldialekt.*

[12] Primers of *dialects* without a serious *Ausbau* ambition are not a rare phenomenon. Let us mention Skalička's detailed primer of the Opava dialect (2017, linguistically: West Lachian dialect of the Czech continuum) with an original orthography contrasting with the traditional spelling used in dialectal literature. According to his own commentary, interest and fun were important factors in composing the text. One other example is a primer of Kociewian (Möller – Oller 2013), linguistically a Great Polish dialect spoken in Pomeranian Voivodeship of Poland. In Germany and France, the production of such primers is organized by large publishing houses. For instance, on the website of Langenscheidt, dialect primers are placed under the category *Humor & fun* (https://www.langenscheidt.com/shop/deutsch/humor-unterhaltung/dialekte/langenscheidt-mundart-978-3-12-563059-8?c=695 [21 XII 2021]).

[13] In France, there are some non-dominant lects tolerated in education, but not admitted for administrative purposes.

[14] http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php [21 Dec 2021]. The Slavic non-dominant lects are represented by Banat Bulgarian, Burgenland Croatian, Kashubian, Pannonian Rusyn, but also Torlak (linguistically speaking the Serbian-Bulgarian-Macedonian transitional zone with different ascription in the Serbian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian dialectology). Again, the lects of Germany, Italy, and France are richly represented.

ISO 639 codes[15] and Ethnologue.[16] These databases include many more *languages* than the ones recognized by single states (including the EU) and the value of such recognition is symbolic. Therefore, the inclusion of a diatopic lect into these lists has no real impact on its status, but can serve as "surrogate proof" for language activists (Stern 2018b: 96). Let us mention here that these lists, at least from the perspective of European languages, may seem in part to be a rather random selection.

A significant part of elaboration is the codification of a language, whose goal is to create a standard language. The first stage, which is included into the stage Kloss' *Ausbaudialect* (*emancipated literary dialect*), is the unification of orthography. The next stage is the standardization of the morphology system; this step is actually more ambitious. While the orthography may be able to cover more diatopic varieties (the graphemes corresponding to different phonemes in local circumstances or simply the unified orthography may be used to display different local forms), the standardized morphology[17] requests an existence of a supradialectal koiné. In case of a not fully standardized lect, the crucial aspect is not the existence of an orthography and grammar, but rather its level of its acceptance by users.[18] In case of a non-standard language, we cannot actually speak about its obligatoriness.[19] The controversy related to orthography may be caused by its reflecting just one of the local varieties (or a koiné), but also by a different approach to the relationship with a *reference language*.[20] The

---

[15] https://iso639-3.sil.org/ [21 Dec 2021]. It is worth mentioning that Kajkavian (kjv) is mentioned here only as *historical language*, while Čakavian (ckm) is considered a living language. Both are listed by Duličenko as current literary microlanguages.

[16] https://www.ethnologue.com/ [21 Dec 2021]. Only (Carpathian) Rusyn, Čakavian, Molise Croatian, Kashubian, Sorbian and Silesian from *Slavia Minor* are expressly mentioned by this database.

[17] A detailed elaboration of the syntax or even orthoepy would be the next stage.

[18] Duličenko (2018) *de facto* accepts the emergence of any grammatical work done for any purpose with any impact on the linguistic reality to represent language codification.

[19] The question of the obligatoriness was actually discussed in the polemics around the Kashubian Grammar published by H. Makùrôt-Snuzëk (Bańdur 2017).

[20] By reference language we understand the language(s) whose relationship to the lect in question is taken into consideration during the corpus planning. It may be the dominant and original roofing language, but also another culturally important language (e.g., Czech in the case of Upper Sorbian). This was also one of the core issues in the polemics around

non-acceptance of a koiné by the users may cause the preference of another koiné (often the dominant language).[21] Stern (2018a: 36) adds that a user of a not fully standardized dominated lect might be not willing to replace one authoritative language by another (new) one, as his reason for using a not fully standardized lect is actually to escape the authoritativeness of the dominant language. The biggest competitor to an elaborated orthography (and actually also the morphology) is a spontaneous one[22] gaining currently even more force with the impact of the virtual environment. The netspeak does not seem, at least in some channels (especially social media), to be as prescriptive as the offline world. Such writing is based on the language of the writer's education (i.e. usually the dominant language). Miola (2021) remarks that this writing is close to the kind of primitive writing typical for the beginnings of the written use of vernacular languages.

We are aware that the problem of the term *dialect* lies in its hierarchical character. Using it, we are mostly assuming that a diatopic lect is a subvariety of a concrete language (cf. Kloferová 2017). In practice, a *dialect* is (in the case of European languages) usually linked to an elaborated (standard) language. This means that the ascription is actually of a rather *Ausbau*-like (socio-political) character. From a sociolinguistic perspective, it is considered a type of a diatopic variety existing within a language diasystem. On the *dialect-standard* axis, it stands at the bottom (Felder 2016: 89, cf. Auer 2011: 491). In Kloss's concept (1978: 60), the language superordinate to a dialect is called a *roof language* (*Dachsprache*), which the author defines as a "linguistically ascribed cultural language" (*linguistisch zugeordnete Kultursprache*). Stern (2018: 14) points to the *Ausbau* criterion for determining a dialect, stating that it is a lect with an "unchallenged claim of affiliation".

Aragonese orthography concerning the relationship to the Castilian Spanish vs. Catalan modelled spelling. The conflict among several competing self-proclaimed codification bodies caused an intervention of the local government (see the Resolution of the 28th of June 2017, Gobierno de Aragón).

[21] See the results of the survey among the speakers of Carpathian East Slavic dialects in Slovakia conducted by Vašíček (2020: 284–295), who vacillate among Standard Slovak language, Standard Ukrainian, and Standard Rusyn (officially recognized in Slovakia), created by a small group of scholars based on one of the local East Slavic dialects.

[22] To refer again to the example of the modern Swabian Bible: its proposed orthography using unusual signs (such as *å*) is used neither by Wikipedia nor by popular language primers sold in Germany.

2. Language by linguistic distance

The different density of standard and non-standard written lects on the map of Europe consists in the difference in the sociolinguistic history of various areas. This causes a disproportionate number of standard languages contrasting with the linguistic diversity. The Slavic speaking area was affected by a step-by-step dissolution of great empires or larger states, national revival movements, and significant oppositions between confessions. All these aspects caused considerable ethnic diversification and fueled language planning activities, which resulted in a relatively dense net of standard languages. In contrast to this, the relatively small number of well-established and fully elaborated standard languages in Romance and continental Germanic areas is related to early state unifications or early koinéization processes (the Renaissance), which encompassed large territories. This causes a striking contrast between the attempts of linguistic or phylogenetic classifications of these territories and the traditional, politolect-based classifications (cf. Toporova 2000: 16; Koryakov 2001: 4).[23]

Kloss (1978: 67–68) calls the diatopic lects without any "linguistically ascribed cultural language" *near-dialectized languages*. Among them, he places Kashubian, Low Saxon/German, and Occitan. In his works, the same languages are also referred to as *Nur-Abstandsprachen* (language definable just by linguistic distance, Kloss 1978: 28). These contrast to *Nur-Ausbausprachen* (language defined only by elaboration), among which he orders Slovak and Macedonian, being, in his opinion, originally dialects of Czech and Bulgarian, respectively. He illustrates this by the presence of Slovak/Macedonian dialects on the territory of Czech Republic/Bulgaria, which he understood to be part of Czech/Bulgarian. U. Amon (2004: 280) distinguishes three types of linguistic distance:

  – major distance (according to cited examples belonging to two different language groups, e.g. Romance vs. Germanic),
  – medium (corresponding to Standard German vs. Swabian or Pomeranian/East Low German, but also Standard German vs. Stan-

---

[23] In Romance linguistics, the classical example of a politolect-oriented classification is the separation of Catalan and Occitan into different subgroups (Ibero-Romance vs. Gallo-Romance), in spite of their being objectively very close languages. The current polemics on the affiliation of Pannonian Rusyn is caused by the contrast between the linguistic and socio-cultural approaches (cf. Habijanec 2018).

      dard Dutch, thus belonging to the same language group),[24]
  – small (Standard German of Germany vs. Austrian Standard German, Low Franconian dialects on the Dutch-German border).[25]

In this model, only *major distance* assumes that both compared lects can be automatically considered different languages. In the case of *medium* and *small* distance, the status of the lect depends on the *Ausbau* criterion: the roofed lect would then be *a dialect*, the roofing one *a language*.[26]

These examples show that the definition of an *Abstandsprache*, i.e. a language defined just by a linguistic distance, is very complicated. It could be said that the criteria which Kloss uses for the definition of an *Abstandsprache* seems to be related with the elaboration and socio-political constellation (*Ausbau*). Kloss does not specify why exactly Kashubian should be an *Abstandsprache*[27] and Slovak an *Ausbausprache*.

From the multiplicity of the criteria for distinguishing a language by language distance (extant list Ammon 1987: 321–325), Berruto (2010: 182–183) regroups them into the following ones:
  – Genealogic distance.
  – Lexicostatistics (respectively, glottochronology).
  – Linguistic dissimilarity.
  – Mutual intelligibility.

It seems evident that these criteria are by no means objective and their application may provide even opposite results. Moreover, the decision (language or dialect) would depend on the setting of the importance of

---

[24] I believe that there is nothing shocking in placing e.g. the relationship between Slovak and Carpathian Rusyn (especially that from Slovakia) in the medium distance group, especially when the official texts in Rusyn largely use Slovak loanwords (e.g., https://rs.medzilaborce-urad.sk/ [21 Dec 2021]). In traditional dialectology, the Carpathian Rusyn dialects are considered to be a part of the Southwestern subgroup of Ukrainian (cf. Danylenko 2020).

[25] From within the Slavic world, Bosnian – Croatian – Montenegrin – Serbian would fit here perfectly.

[26] One must remark that Kloss's "linguistically ascribed cultural language" is a relative term. Applying Kloss's theory to a Low German dialect, the use of the Dutch standard language would be actually more appropriate from a linguistic perspective.

[27] Also Duličenko (2014: 578) considers Kashubian (and Sorbian) to be an *Abstandsprache* (autonomous literary microlanguage in his terminology).

the chosen criteria and the selection of diatopic lects included in the evaluation.[28]

The genealogical distance is, in traditional concepts, mostly evaluated according to historical phonology and few morphological features.[29] The oldest appearance of a specific trait may be considered a marker for a separation of a language.[30] The features of historical phonology, despite being of older date, could be assimilated by later changes, or do not need to have impact on the intelligibility. Thus, the Pskov-Novgorod lect had, according to the birchbark manuscripts and some dialectological evidence, features that could be interpreted as an early separation from the rest of the Slavic languages (cf. Zaliznjak 2004: 41–49).[31] Nevertheless, these specific features were mostly dissolved by contact with neighbouring lects and koinéization until the end of the Middle Ages. Similarly, the Kashubian archaic features, linking this language with Polabian, are regressive, and they remain only constricted to a part of territory or are lexicalized in few local dialects (cf. Breza – Treder 1981: 22–24). The dialectal base of standard Slovak (Central Slovak dialects), due to its increased amount of South Slavic features, might have been early opposed to the rest of West Slavic (cf. Holzer 1997: 88). These features, however, do not really impact the mutual intelligibility with Czech. The genetic affiliation can, however, be also blurred by an intensive contact with another related lect.[32]

---

[28] The majority of studies on the closeness of languages from a particular group take into account just the standard dominant languages.

[29] One can take actually any overview of diversification of Slavic (or other) languages, e.g., Sussex – Cubberley 2006: 42–59.

[30] From this perspective, considering Tsakonian a direct descendent of Doric and likewise a dialect of Modern Greek being descendent of Ionic-Attic, all languages of the Slavic (or Balto-Slavic), Romance, and Germanic groups should be just dialects. M. Kisilier (2017), without denying the very specific phonetic and morphologic structure of Tsakonian causing its non-intelligibility with Modern Greek, warns against such generalizations, showing that the vast majority of the vocabulary in Tsakonian and Modern Greek is shared, and the lects never completely lose the contact.

[31] In this context, can the reconstructed language of the early texts of the Pskov-Novgorod area be called a dialect (group)? And if so, of which language?

[32] See, e.g., the many-sided South Slavic impact in Russian, caused the specific circumstances of the creation of the modern standard in the 18th and early 19th centuries through synthesis of Church Slavonic and East Slavic elements (for details see Živov 2017: 954-1126). Compare also the large amount of unadapted Latinisms in Castilian Spanish.

The lexicostatistic method (recalibrated glottochronology) in the analysis conducted by Blažek – Novotná (2007: 200) shows a 100% identity of the Kashubian and Polish basic vocabulary, while the coincidence of Czech and Slovak is of 97%, and Bulgarian with Macedonian of 95%. For the sake of comparison, Burlak and Starostin (2001: 82–105) count the closeness between Swedish and Danish to be 98% and their agreement with Nynorsk as 94%. If we merged these two sets of results (which can hardly be considered objective), the lexicostatistic distance between Russian and Ukrainian would correspond to that of Standard German and Dutch (93%). However, a different methodology or selection of words applied can yield diametrically different results (Blažek – Novotná 2007: 196–197).

While the difference between local dialects on the lexical level is often represented by lexemes representing local specifics (e.g. nature, craft) and emotions, in the modern world, the intelligibility of communication depends much more on the repertoire of abstract words. Here, the approach changes among the languages of different groups. While the Romance languages mostly adapt these lexemes directly from Latin and even the language-planners do not intend to change them, the language-planners of the Slavic languages might tend to use neologisms. Among Germanic languages, the Northeastern Germanic and continental Germanic share an important amount of such words due to the impact of Low (and partly High) German in Scandinavia. The language planners dealing with the Northwestern Germanic have the tendency to avoid them.[33]

The criterion of linguistic dissimilarity may also be perceived from different perspectives and the same features may be given different importance. For example, the Timok-Prizren (or Torlak) dialects are counted together with Serbian due to common phonological features, but to Bulgarian-Macedonian based on the common morphosyntactic (actually typo-

---

[33] Cf. English 'reality' as Castilian *realidad* – Catalan/Occitan *realitat* – Aragonese *realidat* – Italian/Piedmontese *realtà* – Sardinian *realidade* etc. However, cf. Polish *rzeczywistość* – Belarusian *рэчаіснасць* vs. Kashubian *jawernota* vs. Russian *действительность* – Bulgarian *действителност* – Ukrainian *дійсність* vs. Serbian/Macedonian *стварност* – Pannonian Rusyn *стварносць/дїйсносць* vs. Rusyn in Slovakia *скуточность* – Slovak *skutočnosť*, etc., German *Wirklichkeit* – Luxembourgish *Wierklechkeet* – Norwegian Bokmål *virkelighet* vs. Nynorsk *røyndom*, etc. In most languages also a Latinism may be used (in specific situations).

logical) traits (cf. BDA I-III: 17 vs. Okuka 2008: 230–231).[34] The difference in assibilation is perceived as an important isogloss to mark the difference between Polish-Kashubian and Belarusian-Russian, while a large variety of assibilation reflexes "fits" into Slovak (cf. ASJ 1: 257).[35]

The mutual intelligibility, supported by Tamburelli (2021: 31) can cause problems with asymmetric intelligibility (typically Northeastern Germanic and Ibero-Romance languages *sensu stricto*).[36] The languages of these two language subgroups are characterized by a very similar grammar and vocabulary, which results in the fact that the differences of the written language seem to be of rather "orthographic" nature. However, these languages show important differences on the phonologic level, which historically is not necessarily old.[37] Such is also the case of Kashubian and Polish whose mutual intelligibility without previous knowledge is hardened by the striking changes in the Kashubian vocalism dating back to the 18th century (Topolińska 1974: 91–93). The mutual intelligibility of Czech and Slovak may also be caused by the closeness of standard (Central) Slovak phonology to the standard Czech one. This might not have been the case if the standard Slovak were based on East Slovak dialects (as the Pannonian Rusyn is).[38] In other cases, the most relevant differences between the languages may be lexical due to different language contact (e.g., between Belarusian and Russian, Macedonian vs. Bulgarian, Catalan, and Occitan in Spain vs. Catalan and Occitan in France and Italy). The obstacle to a mutual intelligibility of the written language can be caused by different spelling principles (e.g. Czech/Slovak vs. Polish, Belarusian vs. Russian, Dutch, respectively Low Saxon in the Netherlands, German, respectively Low Saxon in Germany) or script (East Slovak dialectal texts from Slovakia vs. Pannonian Rusyn).

---

[34] Some of these dialects may be considered to belong to Croatian as their speakers are Catholic (cf. Lisac 2009: 143).

[35] E.g. Polish *cicho* vs. Kashubian *cëchò*, Belarusian *ціха* vs. Russian *тихо*, Slovak "dialects": *ticho, tycho, cicho, čicho*.

[36] Tamburelli actually considers such cases to be explainable by previous knowledge.

[37] Thus, the most striking differences between Danish and Swedish phonology (not reflected in the spelling) can be dated to the 16th – 17th centuries (Riad 2005: 1105; Larsson 2005: 1273).

[38] Cf. Czech *na světě* – Slovak *na svete* – East Slovak *na śvece/švece* – Polish *na świecie* – Kashubian *na swiece* 'in the world'.

Another important aspect of the difference between diatopic lects are their borders. Their linguistic definition[39] is dependent on the criteria chosen. Such criteria may be in conflict with self-identification caused mainly by political, or possibly, socio-cultural features. Within the language continua, sometimes the political borders determine the traditional borders between the languages.[40] On the other hand, the political borders had, without doubt, an important levelling impact,[41] which has been accelerated by the dominant position of modern standard languages.

In the case where an important bundle of isoglosses or a language of a different language group overlaps the border, Duličenko (2014: 578–579) may call the cross-border lect *peripheral-insular microlanguage*. The case of a language island with its own literature, i.e. a diatopic lect surrounded by less or unrelated lect Duličenko calls *insular microlanguage.* Both terms roughly correspond to Kloss' *roofless external dialects* (*dachlose Außenmundarten*),[42] which can be illustrated by the fact that both scholars cite the same examples: Carpathian Rusyn and Prekmurian as *peripheral-insu-*

---

[39] Franco-Provençal is considered to be a fully linguistically defined language. The currently used fashionable name *Arpitan* added an ethnic notion to this originally "linguistic construct" (for details, see Bichurina 2016).

[40] E.g. Low Franconian speaking area (the dialectal base of Dutch) in Germany, the near-to Belarusian dialects in Russia, the border between Macedonian and Bulgarian, the Belarusian identity of the speakers of West Polessian dialects (traditionally ascribed to Ukrainian, Maksymiuk 2018) in Poland, speakers of the Scanian dialects in Sweden. The Swiss German is defined primarily by the borders of Switzerland, the dialectologically corresponding dialects (High and Highest German) in Austria (Vorarlberg), Liechtenstein and Italy are usually not considered to be part of it.

[41] E.g., in a stabilization of the linguistic border between Czech/Slovak, Danish/Swedish, Galician/Portuguese.

[42] In this connection, a remarkable case are the Mosel Franconian dialects. These are recognized as national and official language in Luxembourg (Luxembourgish), roofed (i.e. using the standard language) by German in Germany, Belgium, Romania (Transylvanian Saxon possessing a dialectal literature), rather roofless in France, but dominated by different standard languages (German, French, Romanian). A comparable case in Slavia are the Carpathian East Slavic dialects recognized in Poland (Lemko), Slovakia, Hungary, and Romania (Rusyn). In Poland and Slovakia, the local standards are taught at school, while the dialects may be alternatively roofed by Ukrainian (as in the Ukrainian Transcarpathia). Under the same name (Pannonian Rusyn), a West Slavic language is recognized in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Hercegovina (Reference).

lar[43] and Burgenland Croatian as *insular* lect. Also Kloss acknowledges the increasing tendency of elaboration of such lects. The insular type of a diatopic lect can be further subdivided into one which is definable by natural limits (typical a valley or an island)[44] and those which are not, and may be the product of a colonization activity of different periods.[45] The insular character of some of the previously mentioned lects may be supported by confessional characteristics of the speakers.[46]

Some of the diatopic lects are non-territorial, but they are linked to a clearly culturally definable ethnics (typically Romani and Jewish lects, Yenish). The most complicated may be the definition of diatopic lects, which are called peripheral or regional by Duličenko and which are, generally speaking, the lects traditionally considered to be dialects of a dominant standard language of the same state. There are three types of definition of such a diatopic lect: linguistic (ideally defined by a dialectological atlas, dialectometry), geographical (using historical or current administra-

---

[43] Masurian (linguistically a part of Masovian, one of the main dialectal groups of Polish) mentioned by Kloss is not mentioned by Duličenko. Kloss's mention is informed by the tradition in the pre-1918 German Empire to consider the Masurs as a separate ethnic group (cf. Tetzner 1902: 181–211).

[44] Valleys: e.g. Ladin/Rumansh valleys, Germanic enclaves on the Italian side of the Alps (e.g. Mòcheno, Cimbrian, Wallis enclaves), mountain zones: Megleno-Romanian, islands: Northfrisian dialects, the Romance lects of the Channel Islands. An example of a naturally delimited lects of an overlapping continuum are Mirandese (linguistically considered to be a part of the Asturian-Leonese continuum), Aranese (linguistically part of the Gascon/Occitan continuum), the Occitan Valleys in Piedmont, the Aosta Valley (Franco-Provençal continuum), Resian (overlapping the Slovenian continuum), Gorani (lect of the Macedonian continuum using "nominal" Bosnian or Turkish as standard language, dominated mostly by Albanian, respectively Macedonian, cf. Nomachi 2018) and currently the Catalan-speaking Andorra.

[45] In Europe and the Americas, such is the case of the Germanic enclaves, e.g. Wilamowice, the Transylvanian enclaves, in the Americas Pomeranian, Mennonite Low German, Hunsrik, Pennsylvania Dutch, etc. Among Slavic ones the recognized ones are (Banat) Bulgarian, (Pannonian) Rusyn, Bunjevac on the former Military frontier (Council of Europe 2020).

[46] Protestantism in the case of Germanic enclaves in Catholic South America or in predominantly Orthodox Romania may contribute to the preservation of the language (similarly to Catholicism in some Upper Sorbian speakers). These are, however, more relevant in cases when the language difference is minimal (as in the case of Croatian vs. Serbian vs. Bosnian, possibly vs. Bunjevac in the predominantly Orthodox Vojvodina).

tive borders, geolect),[47] and by the awareness of its speakers (Berruto 2010: 183). Wicherkiewicz (2014: 33) considers the criterion of the conscience of one's own language to be the primary one. In some cases, the lects defined geographically or by the conscience factor may be simply former the cross-border ones (as Prekmurian, Silesian). They may keep different language contact traits from those in the neighbouring areas. It seems to be the norm that a diatopic lect is primarily defined as belonging to a certain (historical) region, and its borders are consecutively specified by linguists.[48]

3. Dominant and non-dominant languages

Presently let us focus on delimitation of dominant and non-dominant languages. Today, in the time of ubiquitous media and globalized businesses, the question of a dominant language may not always be unambiguous. In the Post-Soviet countries, Russian was predominant, which has been changing step-by-step, except for Belarus. English (or another working language) may be dominant for people working for international corporations in different countries even if English holds no official status there. In most states, the dominant language corresponds to the official language, similar to the notion of a *state language* in the Post-Soviet states. In Belarus, although both Belarusian and Russian are declared state languages, Russian is actually the dominant one. An attentive reading of the Belarusian Law On languages in the Republic of Belarus shows that the official use of Belarusian is not obligatory, but actually optional in most situations.[49] Similarly, this term is used also to denote the local vernacular, even if non-dominant, used in autonomous republics of Russia. Curiously enough, the Constitution of Dagestan (Art. 11) says that "the state languages of the Republic of Dagestan are Russian and the languages of the nations of Dagestan" without providing a list thereof.

---

[47] The *Moravian language* declared in the Czech census and likely also the *Silesian language* in the Polish census is definable this way. Similarly, Cornips (2018) defines the Limburgish linguistic identity as well, although linguistics would define the lect area otherwise. This actually corresponds to the definition presented to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (Council of Europe 2020: 8).

[48] Thus, e.g., the diatopic lects in Germany (including Austria) and Italy or bordering between Corsican and Sardinian.

[49] http://agrocollege.by/ru/pravovye-akty-po-temam/152-ab-movakh-u-respublitsy-belarus/769-ab-movakh-u-respublitsy-belarus.html [21 Dec 2018].

Especially in small European countries, there is an institution of a *national language*.[50] These languages are local vernaculars, which are co-official with another international language. The status of a *national language* is given to Luxembourgish in Luxembourg (co-official with French and German), Maltese in Malta (co-official with English), but also Irish (co-official with English). Luxembourgish and Maltese are dominant rather in the oral sphere, while Irish is actually treated as a heritage language (or sometimes a minority language). In Andorra, the local vernacular (Catalan) is the only official language. The vernacular of Monaco has no official status, but is obligatorily taught in schools as a heritage language (Passet 2019).[51] The notion of a *national language* is similar to that of *lengua propia* 'own language' used in the autonomous communities in Spain (eventually Andorra). Such a term is used to denominate the local vernacular, which is mostly a non-dominant language. The use of this term does not depend on the language actual status.[52]

The non-dominant lects may be evaluated via different criteria. Some terms may be used for various purposes. The first criterion is the relative size. According to this criterion, the lesser used languages (Nic Craith 2006: 57), minor languages (cf. Miola 2021: 152), and microlanguages may be distinguished. The relative size (small number of speakers) may also be

---

[50] https://docs.cntd.ru/document/802018919 [21 Dec 2018]. Such is also the constitutional status of Urdu in Pakistan (Art. 251), where English is also officially used (http://www.pakistani.org/pakistan/constitution/part12.ch4.html [21 Dec 2018]).

[51] Linguistically belonging to Ligurian of the Gallo-Italian continuum. Neither Liechtenstein (a dialect close to Swiss German), nor San Marino (linguistically belonging to Romagnol of the Gallo-Italian continuum) have not given any status to their vernacular. On the San Marino TV, the vernacular is regularly used just for sport news (https://www.sanmarinortv.sm/risultato-ricerca?type=shows&term=dialetto [21 Dec 2021]). This corresponds to the usual *entertaining* presence of a dialect on air. In the case of Liechtenstein, similarly as is in the case of the German-speaking community, this may be caused by the dialect variability and the traditional position of the koiné (German).

[52] Cf. Catalan and Aranese Occitan are both *llengues pròpies* and official (Catalan being even the "normal and preferable") according to the Autonomous Statute of Catalonia (Estatut, Art. 6). The Autonomous Statute of Aragón (Art. 7) discusses the rights of the *lenguas propias* without mentioning them (currently Aragonese and Catalan), promising the option of their use in communication with authorities (https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2007-8444 [21 Dec 2021]). The corresponding law (3/2013 of the 9th of May) calls them *Aragonese languages with their linguistic modifications* (Art. 2.2) (https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2013-6103 [21 Dec 2021]).

related to its reduced functionality. It is actually the elaboration of the written language, which is a criterion for Duličenko's term of *literary microlanguage* (by Rabus 2015: *Mikrostandardsprache*). According to Duličenko's definition from 2014 (Duličenko 2014: 573), it is a form of existence of a language (or a dialect – *sic*) that possesses some literature and which can be characterized by normalization tendencies. In Duličenko's words, such a lect should be part of a more or less organized literary-linguistic process. The theory was originally formulated based on the status of Pannonian Rusyn.

The criterion of recognition and respect resulted in the coining of a term of *contested languages*, proposed by Nic Craith and evidently inspired by the situation of Scots. Nic Craith (2006: 107) characterizes such languages rather vaguely as "frequently an unfortunate consequence of the establishment of national boundaries". This formula is based on the criterion of conscience of the speakers, as Nic Craith comments (*ibidem*): "Speakers of contested languages are generally unhappy with the lack of status for their speech form". Among such languages, the author mentions the languages currently recognized as regional languages (Kashubian, Low German, Friulian), but mainly those that are recognized either just symbolically or not at all. In some contexts, this notion may be opposed to the legal meaning of the term *regional language* (cf. Dołowy-Rybińska – Soria 2021: 125).

The term *collateral language* as defined by Jean-Michel Eloy is most evidently backgrounded on the status of Picard (traditionally a group of French dialects). The main criterion to use this term is the relationship with the dominant language. According to Eloy (2007: 18), the term is applicable to "varieties which are near each another – objectively and subjectively – at the linguistic, sociolinguistic and historical or glottopolitical level, and those varieties which tend to contrast one another are historically linked because of the modalities of their development". Eloy also specifies that this concept is not applicable to not closely related languages (his example being French and Breton), for which he uses the term of roof language (thus in other meaning than Kloss). Eloy (*ibidem*) also accepts the use of term for lects separated by a political border that have never been roofed by the closest standard language (Kloss' *dachlose Außenmundarten*), giving the example of Csángó (a Hungarian dialect in Romanian Moldavia)

and West Flemish in France. This concept was updated by Wicherkiewicz (2014) under the name of *regional collateral languages*. In his detailed concept, he points to the genetic closeness of the languages and the *Ausbau* aspect (ongoing standardization) as well as the lack or minimal conscience of belonging to another ethnic group that the *titular* nation of the state.

Now we have come to the concepts of minority and regional languages. Both terms have two meanings, the legal and the scholarly or commonly used. In the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML), both terms are legally not distinguished, being defined as "languages traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals of that state who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state's population; they are different from the official language(s) of that state, and they include neither dialects of the official language(s) of the state nor the languages of migrants".[53]

The opposition between the notion of a regional vs. a minority language can be seen in two different ways. In a more traditional concept, any non-dominant language of a country may be called a minority language.[54] According to Tröster-Mutz (2011: 455), the term *minority language* is superordinate to the term of regional languages (corresponding, in his opinion, to *lesser spoken language, Kleinsprache*, cf. Rehder 2002) that are "languages with a small number of speakers which do not have the status of a majority language anywhere". As examples of regional languages, he cites *Scots Gaelic, Ladin, Saterlandic, Galician* and *Friulan*. The same understanding is applied in France. There, this term is used for any diatopic lect as opposed to standard French (cf. Cerquiglini 2003), independently of their closeness to the standard (Basque, Occitan or Gallo). It includes both the lects admitted as well as those not admitted in school education. In case of the Germanic lects in France, the Regional charter of regional or minority languages applied in Alsace defines the regional language as "the German language in its dialectal forms (Alemannic or Franconian spoken in Alsace and in Moselle)" and its standard form (Hochdeutsch)".[55]

---

[53] https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/languages-covered [21 Dec 2021].

54 Thus Trudgill (2000: 122) places on the list of the minority languages both Sorbian and Kashubian.

[55] https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/

Radatz (2012: 118–120) proposes an understanding of *Western European Regional Language* (WERS) the same way. He specifies that a *WERS* is an externally non-dominant unroofed lect that is more or less standardized and whose language planning affects a relevant part of the population. He distinguishes two types of such languages: the ones that have been developed from a spoken language dominated by another one to a standardized one (citing e.g. Mirandese, Sorbian, and Basque) and the other ones that had their peak in the Pre-Modern Age, but later lost its status and survived as oral languages (he cites e.g. Catalan, Occitan, Irish).[56]

It must be added that especially in Europe there are some diatopic lects whose written history cannot be traced to the Middle Ages. This is often a question of interpretation. Thus, a significant portion of the Old French literature was actually written in northern varieties such as Old Normand and Old Picard (cf. Šigarevskaja 1974: 64). The same is valid for Old High German which had various written regional varieties as well. Oldest law portions in some parts of Europe (Pyrenean Peninsula, Scandinavia, Slavia Orthodoxa) were composed in local vernaculars (including each of the medieval states of Hispania). At least until the 16th century, local chancelleries throughout Europe were using a language based on local vernacular that was adopting the shapes of the most prestigious variety step-by-step. On the other hand, many of the medieval and early Modern Period texts were not written in the pure vernacular, but represented a hybrid language with characteristics of different regions.[57] In Southwestern Slavia, many different literary traditions were rising and disappearing during the Pre-Modern age with various dialectal bases and different graphic systems that are not simply linkable with current standard languages, which are products mainly of the 19th and 20th century. The politically fragmented Slavic East also had a complicated history of written (in this case mainly chancellery) lects and in the case of a different political history, a different number of East Slavic languages could exist.

---

promoting-ratification-in-france [21 Dec 2021].

[56] This reminds us of the possible switching in the direction of the literary-written development as described in Knoll 2017: 13–14.

[57] Huld (1994: 27-28, 36–39) remarks that most versions of the novel *The Knight of the Lion* by Chrétien de Troyes have been preserved in Picard or with Picard traits, which served as *lingua franca* of Northern France in the 13th century. Only few versions have been preserved in Champenois which was the original lect of the author.

If understood as an opposition, the difference between a minority language and a regional language would be the speaker's conscience (cf. Wicherkiewicz 2014: 76). The minority language could be defined as a language with its own ethnic identity within a state with another dominant language (national language in the Russian tradition). This notion includes both the languages whose speakers inherited or accepted roofing of a dominant language of another country[58] and the languages whose speakers have a separate ethnic conscience (e.g. Sorbs). Curiously enough, Slovak *Law on the use of minority languages*[59] defines a minority language as a *codified or standardized* one, traditionally used on the territory of the state. If we accept such a definition of a *minority language*, the term *regional language* would correspond to Wicherkiewicz's regional collateral languages applicable for lects whose speakers identify (or are supposed to identify) with the dominant ethnic group. Currently, the term *regional language* is used both for expressively recognized regional languages (such as Low German/ Saxon, Kashub, Limburgs) as well as for lects without official recognition that can be defined as collateral languages with strong regionalism (e.g. Lombard, Sicilian).

Sometimes, the term *regional language* is used as equivalent for a *regiolect* (Wicherkiewicz 2003: 76) in the meaning discussed above or simply for any regionally limited diatopic lect independently on the basis of the *Ausbau* criterion. In such a broad comprehension of the notion *regional language*, the majority of a territory or a state may be theoretically covered by plenty regional languages and there might be minimum or no area for the *dominant languages* (especially German, Italian, French[60]). In such cases, the *dominant language* seems to be rather considered a *macro-language* and the "map of languages" actually corresponds to a *traditional* dialectological map. Such cases are theoretically possible in situations where the standard language has no clear language base and/or it is a product of a long literary tradition which did not follow the evolution of the local

---

[58] E.g. Czech and Slovak (descendants of 18th-century colonists) dominated by South Slavic languages and Romanian.

[59] https://www.zakonypreludi.sk/zz/1999-184 [21 Dec 2018].

[60] In the model brought by Cerquilini 2003: 138, brought to the French Ministry of Culture and Communication, the space French language is reduced to the very centre of Northern France.

uneducated spoken lects (as Polish, German). In other concepts, the regio-lect (Felder 2016: 88–89) is not based on the *local dialects*, but it denotes a regional variant of a standard language (a regional substandard). In such a notion, the *collateral language* would correspond to a *regional dialect.* In a broader meaning, *regiolect* would denote any variety standing "between standard and dialect" (Auer 2011: 487).

The French Community of Belgium[61] uses the term *regional indige-nous language* denoting a symbolically recognized local variety of French/langue ďoïl (Walloon, Picard, and others). The term was introduced in 1990, when it replaced the term of *dialect*. A specific distinction can be found in the Italian law (no. 482 of the 15th of December 1999),[62] which recognized *Albanian, Catalan, Germanic, Greek, Slovene, and Croatian lin-guistic communities*, which may assume the dialectalized character of the lects spoken by the members of these ethnic groups on the Italian territory. This vague formulation is opposed to well-definable languages (French, Franco-Provençal, Friulan, Ladin, Occitan, and Sardinian). The autono-mous statute of Castilla-León[63] as well as some regional Italian laws use the term of *linguistic patrimony*, perhaps in the case where the term *language* seemed not to be appropriate to the legislators.[64] In the Latvian law on the State language, Latgalian is recognized as a variety (*paveida*)[65] of the Lat-vian language.

4. Final reflections

Can linguists redefine what language is and what it is not, based only on structural and communication criteria as Tamburelli (2021: 8) requests? Theoretically, it would be possible to redraw the borders between the European languages ignoring extra-linguistic aspects. Without doubt, it

---

[61] http://www.languesregionales.cfwb.be/index.php?id=1220 [21 Dec 2018].

[62] https://www.miur.gov.it/lingue-di-minoranza [21 Dec 2018].

[63] https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2007-20635&tn=1&p=20071201 [21 Dec 2018].

[64] The local laws may be more specific. Moreover, on the region level, Venetan (Re-gional law of the 13th of April 2007, no. 8) and Piemontese (25th of October 2016, no. 20) have been recognized as languages thus replacing the term of *linguistic patrimony*. This term is used by the Sicilian regional law promoting the teaching of Sicilian from the 31th May 2011.

[65] https://likumi.lv/ta/id/14740-valsts-valodas-likums [21 Dec 2018].

would radically change the map of Europe. However, who would accept such redivision? The current constellation of language differences, especially those in Europe, is, to a large extent, a product of the socio-political and language contact processes that led to the spread of prestigious koinés (politically or culturally), distribution of new vocabulary, and impacted the spread or stopping of certain phonologic and morphosyntactic traits.

In today's Europe, there are (almost) no people who would not be fluent in a dominant, fully standardized, *polyfunctional language*. Moreover, this polyfunctionality, so unusual in Europe's history, is being corroded by the spread of English, penetrating into different spheres of our lives as a written language or even as an everyday spoken language. Besides the polyfunctional languages, we undoubtedly do see here some *oligofunctional languages*, i.e. those which are still able to efficiently share the space in the modern world with the polyfunctional languages (e.g. Luxembourgish, Catalan). However, in most cases, the traditional vernacular is no more regularly used by the youngest generation. If such a language is not able to serve as a medium language in school education and it is taught just as a subject, it is clear it is already not a normally functioning language, but rather plays a role of a *heritage language*.

The current revival of interest in non-dominant languages is a product of the modern, liberal, globalized, and often even Internet-based civilization. We are witnessing attempts to redefine the role of vernaculars traditionally considered dialects, which have for a long period had a well-defined function (oral or even written) in coexistence with a dominant language. For centuries, their spatial definition was not exact but rather associated with concrete toponyms (the language of a town,[66] small regions without clear borders, or linked to the current administrative borders) or communities with certain characteristics (lifestyle, speech) opposed to the neighbours.[67] The existence of such lects was linked to the agricultural or small town societies with different expression needs than those of a (post-)

---

[66] Still, you can hear that an inhabitant of a town say that they speak e.g. a Rtyně-way (*po rtyňsku*) or a Hronov-way (*po hronousku*), although this corresponds to the same dialect, linguistically defined as Náchod stretch of the East Bohemian dialect area.

[67] Thus self-denomination *po našymu* 'our way', linguistically the Polish-Czech mixed strip (Czech perspective) or Cieszyn and Jabłonków subdialects of the Silesian dialectal area of Polish (Polish perspective) or part of the Silesian ethnolect (Silesian movement perspective).

modern person. It was often the modern linguistics, sometimes *corrected* by the actual political constellation, which made clear the spatial and linguistic definition of the language areas.[68] The spatial-linguistic redefinition and the activity of the users gaining some success in the field of recognition[69] may be considered to be the main traits of the *modern* regional languages.

Bibliography

Ammon, U. (1987). Language – Variety/Standard Variety – Dialect. In: Ammon, U. et al. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Vol.1*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 316–334.

Ammon, U. (2004). 30. Standard Variety / Standardvarietät. In: Ammon, U. et al. (eds.). *Soziolinguistik. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Volume 1. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 274–283.

ASJ 1: Štolc, J. (eds.) (1968). *Atlas slovenského jazyka 1, Vokalizmus a konsonantizmus. Časť prvá, Mapy*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Auer, P. (2011). Dialect vs. standard: a typology of scenarios in Europe. In: Kortmann, B.; van der Auwera, J. (eds) *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe. A comprehensive guide.* Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 485–500.

Bańdur, M. (2017). Czy "Gramatika kaszëbscégò jãzëka" jest gramatyką kaszubskiego języka? In: *Skra – pjismjono wo kùlturze*; https://pismiono.com/recenzja-czy-gramatika-kaszebsczego-jazeka-jest-gramatyka-kaszubskiego-jezyka/ [21 Dec 2021]

BDA I–III (2001): *Български диалектен атлас. Обобщаващ том. I–III.* Фонетика. Акцентология. Лексика. София: Труд.

Berruto, G. (2004). Sprachvarietät – Sprache. In: Ammon, U. et al. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Berruto, G. (2010). *Fondamenti di sociolinguistica*. Roma – Bari: Editori Laterza.

Bichurina, N. (2016). *Trans-border communities in Europe and the emergence of*

---

[68] It is interesting that several *dialectal/contested* language versions of Wikipedia are actually defined linguistically. E.g. the Neapolitan Wikipedia invites to participate all speakers of the dialects linguistically defined as *Middle-Southern Italian* (not using this name, but showing a dialectal map instead), although traditionally the *dialects* in Italy are associated with administrative regions. The *Alemannic* and *Ripuarian* Wikipedia use even the linguistic names of the corresponding *dialect areas*. This contrasts with the Tarantino Wikipedia which is not defined linguistically (it would otherwise fit into the Neapolitan Wikipedia), but traditionally linked to a concrete place.

[69] I consider the recognition as the only sure criterion to assess the „participation of the relevant part of the speech community", even if this is not necessarily universal.

"new" languages: From "Francoprovençal patois" to "Arpitan" and "Arpitania". Perpignan: Université de Perpignan – Bergamo: Università degli studi.

Blažek, V.; Novotná, P. (2007). Glottochronology and its application to the Balto-Slavic languages. In: *Baltistica* 42 (2), 185–210.

Brasca, L. (2021). Mixing methods in linguistic classification: A hidden agenda against multilingualism? The contestedness of Gallo-"Italic" languages within the Romance family. In: Tamburelli, M.; Tosco, M. (eds.). *Contested Languages. The hidden multilingualism of Europe.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins 2021.

Breza, E.; Treder, J. (1981). *Gramatyka kaszubska. Zarys popularny.* Gdańsk: Zrzeszenie Kaszubsko-Pomorskie, 22–24.

Cerquiglini, B. (2003). *Les langues de France.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Coluzzi, P. et al. (2018). Language planning for Italian regional languages: the case of Lombard and Sicilian. In: Stern, D.; Nomachi, M.; Belić, B. (eds.): *Linguistic Regionalism in Eastern Europe and Beyond. Minority, Regional and Literary Microlanguages.* Berlin: Peter Lang 2018, 274–298.

Coluzzi, P. et al. (2021). Revitalising contested languages: The case of Lombard. In: Tamburelli, M.; Tosco, M. (eds.). *Contested Languages. The hidden multilingualism of Europe.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins 2021, 163–183.

Consiglio regionale del Piemonte: *Legge regionale n. 20 il 25 ottobre 2016. "Modifiche alla legge regionale 7 aprile 2009, n. 11".* Tutela, valorizzazione e promozione del patrimonio linguistico del Piemonte; http://arianna.consiglioregionale.piemonte.it/ariaint/TESTO?LAYOUT=PRESENTAZIONE&TIPODOC=LEGGI&LEGGE=20&LEGGEANNO=2016 [21 Dec 2021].

Consiglio regionale del Veneto: *Legge regionale 13 aprile 2007, n. 8 (BUR n. 37/2007). Tutela, valorizzazione e promozione del patrimonio linguistico e culturale veneto.*

Cornips. L. (2018). Local identity construction in Dutch Limburg through dialect forms, use and popular culture. In: Stern, D.; Nomachi, M.; Belić, B. (eds.): *Linguistic Regionalism in Eastern Europe and Beyond. Minority, Regional and Literary Microlanguages.* Berlin: Peter Lang, 299–319.

Corpus-Based Perspectives in Linguistics. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 115–130.

Council of Europe (2020). *States Parties to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and their regional or minority languages*; https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/languages-covered [21 Dec 2021].

Council of Europe: *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*; https://

www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages [21 XII 2021].

Council of Europe: *Promoting ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in France*; https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/promoting-ratification-in-france [21 Dec 2021].

Danylenko. A. (2020). Carpatho-Rusyn. In: Greenberg, M. L. (ed.). E*ncyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*; http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_031960 [06 Nov 2021].

Dołowy–Rybińska, N.; Soria, C. (2021). Surveying the ethnolinguistic vitality of two contested languages: The case of Kashubian and Piedmontese. In: Tamburelli, M., Tosco, M. (eds.). *Contested Languages. The hidden multilingualism of Europe*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 125–142.

ECRML: Council of Europe. *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*; https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/text-of-the-charter [06 Nov 2021].

Eloy, J.-M. (2007). Collateral Languages and Digital Corpus. In: Kawaguchi, Y. et al. (eds.).

Estatut d'autonomia de Catalunya (2016). Barcelona: Parlament de Catalunya.

Fédération Wallonie–Bruxelles: *Langues régionales endogènes: Textes des loi*; http://www.languesregionales.cfwb.be/index.php?id=1220 [21 Dec 2021].

Felder, E. (2016). *Einführung in die Varietätenlinguistik*. Darmstadt: WBG.

Gobierno de Aragón: *Ley 3/2013, de 9 de mayo, de uso, protección y promoción de las lenguas y modalidades lingüísticas propias de Aragón*. Boletín Oficial de Aragón.

Gobierno de Aragón: *Resolución de 16 de mayo de 2017, del Director General de Política Lingüística, por la que se da publicidad a algunos aspectos básicos de la representación gráfica de la lengua aragonesa*. Boletín Oficial de Aragón.

Habijanec, S. (2018). Východoslovanské prvky v báčskej rusínčine. In: Ремнёва, Н. Л. et al. (eds.). *Славянский мир: язык, литература, культура*. Москва: Макс Пресс, 326–330.

Hell, S. (1998). *De Bibl auf bairisch*. [Trostberg: private print]; https://bibeltext.com/bairisch/genesis/1.htm [21 Dec 2021]

Holzer, G. (1997). Zum gemeinslavischen Dialektkontinuum. In: *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 43, 87–102.

Huld, David, F. (ed.) (1994). Chrétien de Troyes: *Le Chevalier au lion*. Paris: Librairie Générale Française.

Kloferová, S. (2017): Dialekt. In: Karlík, P.; Nekula, M.; Pleskalová, J. (eds.). *Czech-Ency – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*; https://www.czechency.org/slovnik/DIALEKT [21 Dec 2021].

Kloss, H. (1978). *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800*. Düsseldorf: Schwann.

Knoll, V. (2017). От литературных идиолектов к региональным литературным языкам (не только) в славянском мире. In: Скорвид, С. С. (eds.). *Миноритарные и региональные языки и культуры Славии*. (отв. ред.). Москва: Российская академия наук. Институт славяноведения – МИК, 11–43.

Koryakov, Y. B. (2001). *Atlas of the Languages of the World*. Romance languages. Moscow: Institute of linguistics.

Larsson, K. (2005) The development of Swedish from the mid-16th century. In: Bandle, O. et al. *The Nordic languages: an international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages*, 1270–1282.

Legge regionale Sicilia 31 maggio 2011, n. 9. Norme sulla promozione, valorizzazione ed insegnamento della storia, della letteratura e del patrimonio linguistico siciliano nelle scuole

Ley Orgánica 14/2007, de 30 de noviembre, de reforma del Estatuto de Autonomía de Castilla y León; https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2007/11/30/14/con [21 Dec 2021].

Ley Orgánica 5/2007, de 20 de abril, de reforma del Estatuto de Autonomía de Aragón; https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2007/04/20/5/con [21 Dec 2021].

Lingue di minoranza. Ministero dell'Istruzione. Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca; https://www.miur.gov.it/lingue-di-minoranza [21 Dec 2021].

Lisac, J. (2009). *Hrvatska dijalektologija 2. Čakavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Golden marketing — Tehnička knjiga.

Maksymiuk, J. (2018). The development of a Latin spelling system for Podlachian. In: Stern, D.; Nomachi, M.; Belić, B. (eds.): *Linguistic Regionalism in Eastern Europe and Beyond. Minority, Regional and Literary Microlanguages*. Berlin 2018: Peter Lang, 335–347.

Möller, M.; Oller, G. (2013). *Elementarz gwary kociewskiej. Gadómy po naszamó*. Starogard Gdański: Kociewskie Stowarzyszenie Edukacji i Kultury „Ognisko".

Nic Craith, M. (2006). *Europe and the Politics of Language*. Houndmills – New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Nomachi, M. (2018). The Gorani People in Search of Identity: The Current Sociolinguistic Situation Among the Gorani Community of the Former Yugoslavia. In: Дуличенко, А. Д.; Номати, М. (eds.): *Славянская микрофилология*. Sapporo: Hokkaido University – Tartu: Tartu Ülikool 2018, 375–414.

Okuka, M. (2008). *Srpski dijalekti*. Zagreb: Prosvjeta.

Paddock, H. (1988). The actuation problem for gender change in Wessex versus Newfoundland. In: Fisiak J. (ed.). *Historical Dialectology. Regional and So-*

cial. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 377–396.

Passet, C. (2019). *Statut de la langue monégasque dans l'enseignement scolaire et universitaire*. Monaco: Académie des Langues Dialectales; http://www.ald-monaco.org/langues-monegasque/statut-de-la-langue-monegasque-dans-l-enseignement-scolaire-et-universitaire-18 [21 Dec 2021].

Rabus, A. (2015): Slavische Minderheitensprachen – Mikrostandardsprachen? In: *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 71 (1), 147–174.

Radatz, H.-I. (2012). Der Typus WERS (WestEuropäische RegionalSPrache): ein Plädoyer für eine soziolinguistische Arealtypologie. In: Herlingh, S.; Patzelt, C. (eds.). *Sprachkontakt, Sprachausbau und Verschriftungsproblematik. Aspekte der Normalisierung von Regionalsprachenm in der Romania*. München: Martin Meidenbauer, 97–128.

Rehder, P. (2002). Slavische Kleinsprachen. In: Kanich, N.; Greule, A. (eds.). *Sprachkulturen in Europa*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Riad, T. (2005): Phonological development from Old Nordic to Early Modern Nordic III: Swedish. In: Bandle, O. et al. *The Nordic languages: an international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages*, 1102–1116.

Rudolf, P. (2008), *Bibel für Schwoba*. Balingen: Verlag des Schwäbischen Albvereins.

Saeima: *Valsts valodas likums*. Rīgā 1999.gada 21.decembrī; https://likumi.lv/ta/id/14740-valsts-valodas-likums [21 Dec 2021].

SIL International: *Ethnologue. Languages of the World*; https://www.ethnologue.com/ [21 Dec 2021].

SIL International: *ISO 639–3*; https://iso639-3.sil.org/ [21 Dec 2021].

Sinner, C. (2014). *Varietätenlinguistik. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Narr.

Šipková, M. (2017): INTERDIALEKT. In: Karlík, P.; Nekula, M.; Pleskalová, J. (eds.). *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*; https://www.czechency.org/slovnik/INTERDIALEKT [21 Dec 2021]

Skalička, V. (2017). *Opavština pro samouky*. Stěbořice: Matice slezská.

Stern, D. (2018a). Languages without an army: minority, regional and literary microlanguages. In: Stern, D.; Nomachi, M.; Belić, B. (eds.): *Linguistic Regionalism in Eastern Europe and Beyond. Minority, Regional and Literary Microlanguages*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 14–39.

Stern, D. (2018b). The privacy of having a language of one's own: Slavic regional standard projects and minority agendas online. In: Stern, D.; Nomachi, M.; Belić, B. (eds.). *Linguistic Regionalism in Eastern Europe and Beyond. Minority, Regional and Literary Microlanguages*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 85–123.

Stern, D.; Nomachi, M.; Belić, B. (eds.) (2018). *Linguistic Regionalism in Eastern Europe and Beyond. Minority, Regional and Literary Microlanguages*. Berlin: Peter Lang 2018.

Sussex, R; Cubberley, P. (2006). *The Slavic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tamburelli, M. Contested languages and the denial of linguistic rights in the 21ˢᵗ century. In: Tamburelli, M., Tosco, M. (eds.). *Contested Languages. The hidden multilingualism of Europe*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins 2021, 21–40.

Tamburelli, M.; Tosco, M. (eds.) (2021). *Contested Languages. The hidden multilingualism of Europe*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tetzner, F. (1902). *Die Slawen in Deutschland*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn.

The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Part XII: Miscellaneous; http://www.pakistani.org/pakistan/constitution/part12.ch4.html [21 Dec 2021].

Topolińska, Z. (1974). *A Historical Phonology of the Kashubian Dialects of Polish*. The Hague: Mouton.

Toporova, T. V. (2000). Германские языки. In: Семенюк, Н. Н.; Калыгин, В. П.; Романова, О. И. (eds.). *Языки мира. Германские языки. Кельтские языки*. Москва: Academia 2000, 13–42.

Tröster–Mutz, S. (2011). The old minority languages of Europe. In: Kortmann, B., van der Auwera, J. (eds), *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe. A comprehensive guide*. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 455–466.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society*. London: Penguin Books.

Trudgill, P. (2003). *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Vašíček, M. (2020). *Dynamika jihokarpatských nářečí*. Praha: Slovanský ústav AV ČR.

Vikør, L. (2006). Scandinavia / Skandinavien. In: Ammon, U. et al. (eds.), *Soziolinguistik An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Volume 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1747–1753.

Wicherkiewicz, T. (2003). Języki mniejszościowe i regionalne w Europie – problemy typologii. In: Wrocławska, E.; Zieniukowa, J. (eds.) *Języki mniejszości i języki regionalne*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, 73–78.

Wicherkiewicz, T. (2014). *Regionalne języki kolateralne Europy – porównawcze studia przypadku z polityki językowej*. Poznań: Wydawn. Rys.

Zákon č. 184/1999 Z. z. Zákon o používaní jazykov národnostných menšín; https://www.zakonypreludi.sk/zz/1999-184 [21 Dec 2021].

Бурлак, С. А.; Старостин С. А. (2001). *Введение в лингвистическую компаративистику*. Москва: УРСС.

Вярхоўны савет Рэспублікі Беларусь: *Аб мовах у Рэспубліцы Беларусь. Закон Рэспублікі Беларусь 26 студзеня 1990 г. № 3094–XI*; http://agrocollege.by/

ru/pravovye-akty-po-temam/152-ab-movakh-u-respublitsy-belarus/769-ab-movakh-u-respublitsy-belarus.html [21 Dec 2021].

Дуличенко, А. Д. (2014). *Введение в славянскую филологию*. Москва: Флинта.

Дуличенко, А. Д. (2018). Славянская микрофилология. In: Дуличенко, А. Д., Номати, М. (eds.): *Славянская микрофилология*. Sapporo: Hokkaido University – Tartu: Tartui Ülikool 2018, 3–18.

Дуличенко, А. Д.; Номати, М. (eds.) (2018). *Славянская микрофилология*. Sapporo: Hokkaido University – Tartu: Tartu Ülikool.

Живов, В. В. (2017). *История языка русской письменности. Том II.* Москва: Университет Дмитрия Пожарского.

Зализняк, А. А. (2004). *Древненовгородский диалект*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.

Кисилиер, М. Л. (2017). Лексические особенности цаконского диалекта новогреческого языка: предварительные наблюдения и перспективы исследования. In: *Вопросы языкознания* 1, 105–136.

Конституция Республики Дагестан от 10 июля 2003 года (с изменениями на 26 июня 2021 года). In: Электронный фонд правовых и нормативно-технических документов; https://docs.cntd.ru/document/802018919 [21 Dec 2021].

Шигаревская, Н. А. (1974). История французского языка (на французском языке). Ленинград: Провсвещение. UNESCO: *UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*; http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php [21 Dec 2021].

Summary

The main aim of the paper is to discuss different concepts of the classification of non-dominant diatopic lects. The study treats and compares different definitions proposed both by scholars and local legislative bodies. The author confronts the definitions of Normaldialect and Ausbaudialekt developed by H. Kloss with Duličenko's concept of literary microlanguages, the notions of contested and collateral languages with different understandings of minority and regional languages, including variants thereof. The text is enriched with numerous examples both from the present and the past of non-dominant diatopic lects of Europe.

Vladislav Knoll studied Greek and Latin Philologies, but gained his PhD in Slavic Philology. Currently, he works at the Institute of Slavonic Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences and teaches the history of East Slavic Languages at

the Charles University in Prague. He has authored the following books: *Kašubšti-na v jazykovém kontaktu* ("Kashubian in Language Contact") (2012), *Církevní slovanština v pozdním středověku* ("Church Slavonic in the Late Middle Ages") (2019), and co-authored *Sintaxi contrastiva del català amb les llengües eslaves* ("Contrastive syntax of Catalan with Slavic languages") (2011).

e-mail: vladislav.knoll@centrum.cz