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“Breizh atao” means “Brittany forever” in Breton and is often used by activists to reference the longevity of the region and its culture. Brittany’s history is not dissimilar to that of other regions whose linguistic heritage suffered under pressures to suppress regional languages as a result of emerging nationalist ideals. What is unique about Brittany, though, is that the region actually has two unrelated traditional languages (Breton and Gallo), which have developed a seemingly competitive relationship over limited resources for their preservation and promotion. This would suggest that despite centuries of coexistence, the region may no longer be able to sustain its two traditional languages.

The traditional view of language variation analysis is based on different ways of saying the same thing. In addition, using the same word to mean different things may also be telling when looking at the weight of particular words in a given society. My study looks at both. Using survey and interview data, I focus on a set of nuanced terms and expressions referring to Breton culture (‘Bretonness’) and language(s) in Brittany to examine the interrelation between lexical variation, language choice and people’s sense of Breton identity. Surveys were conducted via social media while interviews were conducted on site in Brittany.
My primary research questions include, what role, if any, do Bretons assign to their traditional languages within the context of being Breton? Do Bretons feel that one needs to know one of the languages to be able to be considered to be Breton? To what extent have today’s Bretons internalized the ‘one nation, one language’ philosophy that so many western ‘nations’ have come to espouse, and, if so, do they seek to apply this when conceptualizing a contemporary Breton identity, or even constructing a Breton nation, in the 21st century and beyond? Finally, must Breton identity be linked to only one of its two traditional languages, or can it be more inclusive, with members of both language communities having equal access to being Breton?
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CHAPTER 1 - MOTIVATION

France has the dubious honor of being perhaps the country that most fervently protects the interests of its national language, and Brittany has borne the brunt of this zeal. While this region in the northwestern corner of France is known for its strong Celtic heritage, its true linguistic history is much more complex. After centuries of repression, the Breton culture and Celtic language, as well as regional pride, have undergone a resurgence in popular media coverage and daily life, since the mid 1990s.

I first became aware of the polemic revolving around language in Brittany while on an undergraduate study abroad program in Rennes, the present-day capital of the region. When I decided to study in France during my sophomore year of college, there was little to ponder: I would go with my friends to our college’s exchange partner, the Université de Haute Bretagne (Rennes 2). As this was the sole approved program in France, I admit that I did not do much research on my future host city. All I knew was it was the capital of Brittany and this was a region that had a strong identity. Despite being placed in a bicultural Franco-German family whose ancestry was not linked to Brittany, thanks to a thorough on-site orientation program, I was able to appreciate the differences in regional and national cultures in France before courses at the university even began.

This regional culture had recently seen a surge in popular support, including the establishment of a bilingual education program, named Diwan, which quite appropriately means “seed” in the Breton language. Celtic in origin, Breton traditions are quite different from their French counterparts and, in addition to the orientation
session organized by the university’s language school for foreign students, whether it was picking chestnuts or mushrooms in the countryside, visiting a historic seaside fortress or discovering the traditional way of preparing and eating crêpes, or galettes as they are known in Upper Brittany, my host family was delighted to expose me to the region and its culture. It was at this same time that I was exposed to the French mentality regarding regional languages, which for all intents and purposes can be summed in one word, denial and in many cases, ignorance.

I have lived in Brittany on three separate occasions and throughout the first two I only ever heard reference to Breton as the traditional language of the region. It was not until my third stay, while teaching English in a local high school, that I first heard mention of Gallo, the traditional Romance language spoken in the region. I was sitting in the teachers’ lounge when a colleague began to complain about the mistakes students made in their assignments. She bemoaned the level of her students’ written French. The catalyst of this episode was what she called a “Gallo” expression se rendre used to mean “to go” (which, interestingly, is actually a nonstandard French variant of the standard aller). When a colleague asked what she meant, she stated that it was a usage that she often heard since she began teaching in Brittany (she was not a native of the region) and something that annoyed her immensely. She did not approve of the use of a local patois (her original word choice and emphasis) in academic writing.

Unfortunately, it has been my experience that my colleague’s condescending attitude towards what she perceived to be a way of speaking particular to Brittany is quite common in France, where people have been lectured for centuries on the
preeminence of so-called standard French. This has been internalized to the point of rejecting regional varieties and languages, particularly in regions on the periphery of the former Kingdom of France; a situation which is not improved when others criticize elements that may or may not be representative of the particular regional variety in question.

Another person who taught me about the linguistic traditions of Brittany was also a colleague at that school. Coincidentally, both colleagues taught English at the school. We had become close in planning a week-long study trip to England, and it was after one of our meetings that we began to talk about the place of Breton in Brittany. Knowing that this other colleague was a native of the département of Finistère in Lower, or western, Brittany, the one part of Brittany where some people still spoke Breton in everyday situations, I innocently mentioned that while wandering the streets of Rennes’ old quarter I had come across a couple street signs in Breton in Rennes. This harmless comment sparked a very interesting discussion about the use of French and Breton in Brittany.

He explained, as several of my professors at the university had before, that when education became compulsory in the 19th century (and the language of instruction in public schools was French), the citizens of the newly-founded republic were expected to sacrifice their separate individual or, in this case, regional identities in favor of adopting the then new national identity: an attitude that has served as the

---

1 Administrative division dating back to territorial reorganization following the French Revolution. There are 96 départements in mainland France. While France is not a federal republic, these could be likened to U.S. states, Canadian provinces or German Länder, only with less autonomy.
basis for modern French society and, despite increased visibility and improved status for regional languages in recent years, is still very prevalent today.

This second colleague was almost offended by the recent movement to popularize the Celtic heritage of Brittany. This movement included the Diwan bilingual education experiment that had gained renown across France for its effort to revive Breton by reintroducing the language to the younger generations through school; the group Manau, which had won acclaim for reinterpreting traditional Breton music into a hip hop style; and the beginnings of a movement to bring Breton back to Rennes. While he agreed that such attention would undoubtedly strengthen an argument for greater autonomy, he expressed his reservations about overextending the reach beyond the limits of reality, particularly regarding the idea that Breton should be brought back to Rennes, where it was never spoken by the population at large. In fact, the residents of Rennes have always been predominantly Gallo or, more recently, French speakers. It was then that I began to understand that this ‘Breton or Bust’ attitude was gaining momentum due to popular perceptions rather than historic accuracy, which meant that its very integrity could be questioned. This in turn could be explained partly by the general level of ignorance of and indifference toward the fact that there are actually two traditional regional languages of Brittany due to centuries of linguistic repression.

Years later, when I had returned to visit, I was finally able to piece together the puzzle of what I had learned about the linguistic traditions of Brittany. Traveling on the first line of Rennes’ then newly opened, fully automated metro, I was surprised to
find that all of the informational signs in the station for the train and bus stations (Gares) were in both French and Breton. While general information was presented equally in both languages, the signs were separate for each language. The following is one of these informational signs in Breton.

**Figure 1 – Rennes Metro Sign in Breton (Station Hours of Operation)**

![Image of Rennes Metro Sign in Breton](http://members.societe-jersiaise.org/sdllj/breton/)

I also noticed that there were many more French-Breton bilingual street signs through the city center. Furthermore, the automated audio message for arriving trains had been changed from the standard “Rennes. Ici, Rennes” to “Rennes. Ici, Rennes. Bienvenue en Bretagne”.

This mention of the region in the audio greeting, which is not customary, was another sign of the increased presence of regional identity in everyday life. Had it not been for a group distributing flyers, though, I probably would have never noticed that there was another stop that also had bilingual signage. It was

---

2 *Rennes. This is Rennes.*
3 *Rennes, This is Rennes. Welcome to Brittany.*
there that I discovered the political statement that had been made one stop further up the line toward the city center: bilingual signs in French and another language that looked to be of Romance origin, but was distinctly different from French. The same but equal format was used as in the other station for Breton. The following is one of these informational signs in Gallo.

**Figure 2 – Rennes Metro Sign in Gallo (Station Hours of Operation)**

![Rennes Metro Sign in Gallo](http://members.societe-jersiaise.org/sdllj/)

These flyers appealed to riders’ curiosity and explained that the mystery language was called Gallo, the traditional language of Rennes and the rest of Upper Brittany.

This experience piqued my interest to learn more about these two languages: where they were spoken, how many people speak them, their current status in France and what has been done to increase awareness in Brittany. Through this investigation, I learned that the linguistic history of Brittany is more complex than
most people realize. Indeed, there are two traditional languages, Breton and Gallo, yet these language communities share a common culture. This unique feature informed my research which seeks to understand how Bretons identify with the region and whether their allegiance to a particular traditional language has any impact on this definition.
CHAPTER 2 - INTRODUCTION

Variation analysis has served as the foundation of many sociolinguistic studies on community language use and community self perception, but the vast majority focus on phonological variation (differences in the production of certain sounds). There has been little research, however, conducted on semantic variation (differences in meaning). It is the latter which I propose to study in the context of regional identity in the two traditional language communities of Brittany, through community members' use and definition of 'Breton' and terms related to the traditional languages of the region along with the overall role of language in the conceptualization of contemporary Breton identity and nationhood.

The traditional view of variation is based on different ways of saying the same thing. I propose that using the same word to mean different things may also be telling when looking at the weight of particular words in a given society. My study looks at both. Through a series of surveys and interviews, I attempt to distill the essence of Breton culture as expressed through a selection of culturally anchored words and expressions. These words and expressions are realized in French, as this has over the course of the last century become the lingua franca in the region. As such, the differences and nuances among these different words and expressions that I have researched actually only exist in French, not in the traditional languages of Brittany, but nonetheless offer a window into Breton identity.

While many sociolinguistic studies on language attitudes and identity focus on the relationship between certain linguistic features and their perceptions within a
given community, I am interested in exploring the attitudes about and ideologies regarding entire languages, namely, within the context of Brittany, Breton and Gallo. Breton is a Celtic language which was brought to the region starting in the 6th century by settlers from Britain who had crossed the English Channel to flee the increasingly frequent invasions of Germanic tribes. The language is traditionally spoken in the western half of the region. In Breton, the Breton-speaking part of the region is called Brezhonegva, which in French has been traditionally called Pays Bretonnant. Some also consider the major cities like Rennes and Nantes to be Breton speaking due to presence of Breton speakers who have either emigrated from Lower Brittany or learned the language at school in one of the Breton bilingual education programs now present in these cities. In this case the term could be used in the plural, Brezhonegvaoù, because these cities are not contiguous with the rest of the region where the language is spoken. Gallo, on the hand, is a Romance language that evolved from the Latin brought to the region by Roman soldiers at the beginning of the Common Era. The language is traditionally spoken in the eastern half of the region and also the fringe of neighboring regions. This area is referred to as Pey Galo or, with the more common French spelling, Pays Gallo. The following map shows the current territorial division between Breton and Gallo, with major cities shown with French and Breton or Gallo names as appropriate, which corresponds to the divisions of Lower (blue) and Upper (orange) Brittany, respectively.

4 While the French term Pays Bretonnant is perhaps more common, I will use Brezhonegva throughout as this is the term in Breton to describe a notion related to the Breton language.
Through survey and interview data that yields insight into semantic variation in key words for the traditional languages, the regional culture and the Breton people, I hope to show what being Breton means to those who consider themselves Bretons, including the role of the two traditional regional languages in people’s sense of regional identity. Both surveys were conducted via social media and targeted those with affiliation to on-line special interest groups focusing on Brittany in general, and also more specifically the traditional languages of the region. The interviews were conducted on site in Brittany, and the protocol used was informed by the first survey. The data collected during the interviews later informed the revision of the questions used in the first survey, as well as the addition of new questions, resulting in a new survey. This second survey, while inspired by the first, sought to break through the
superficial matters such as whether respondents supported different initiatives to gain insight into participants’ understandings of the rationale behind their opinions on issues related to such matters as government involvement in language revitalization campaigns, the place of regional languages in modern society, and the evolution of contemporary Breton culture. I suspected that the Celtic language, Breton, would play a more central role for a greater number of people than its Romance counterpart, Gallo; however, whether these languages are adversarial or complementary in the regional identity will be discussed at length in a subsequent chapter.

Of course, the formation of Breton identity has not occurred in a vacuum. Indeed, hundreds of years of shared experiences have shaped the region and the people who live there. Brittany’s history is not dissimilar to that of other regions (of France, of Europe, of the world) whose linguistic heritage suffered under external pressures to suppress regional languages in favor of a national language often in relation to emerging nationalist ideals. What is unique about Brittany, though, is that the region actually has two unrelated traditional languages, which as France’s once stringent language policy has become more accommodating, have developed a seemingly competitive relationship with regard to the limited resources (e.g., financial, physical, human, intentional) available for the preservation and promotion of regional languages at national and regional levels. This recent development in the relationship between Breton and Gallo would suggest that despite centuries of coexistence, the region may no longer be able to sustain its two traditional languages.
UNESCO currently considers each language to be severely endangered and estimates they have similar numbers of speakers (roughly 200,000 for Gallo and 250,000 for Breton\(^5\)). With roughly four million inhabitants of the historic area of Brittany, these figures account for only slightly more than 10% of the overall population. Both languages also face the challenge of an ever-aging population of speakers with few opportunities for younger generations to receive the languages from their elders, but Breton has until recently received much more attention of the media and therefore has greater recognition by the public at large. This places it in a position of relatively higher prestige vis-à-vis Gallo, thus relegating Gallo to a position of a minority within a minority.

The identity of contemporary Brittany would seem most rooted in the Celtic episodes of its multi-millennial past, but I will explore the role the regional languages play, if any, in the way that Bretons conceptualize what it means to them to be Breton today. While one of the traditional languages of the region is of Celtic origin (Breton), I will also look at the traditional language of the region that is Romance in origin (Gallo) and investigate how those who consider themselves to be Breton identify with the region, including whether or not personal connections with the two languages or the areas where they are traditionally spoken has any impact on this relationship. To this end, I focus on a set of nuanced terms referring to Breton culture (‘Bretonness’) and language(s) in Brittany to see whether or not a person’s individual language heritage has any effect on how they define being Breton. The majority of the historical

and policy portions of this project will focus on Breton because aside from research on the different dialectics of Gallo, there is regrettably very little scholarly work on the social place of the language.

Indeed, it is fairly rare for there to be two traditional languages in one region, and even rarer for both to share a common cultural heritage that is centuries old. In contexts of language competition, whether national versus regional or, in this case, national versus regional versus regional, there is generally some sort of hierarchy of prestige, but does this need to be the case? And must the relationship between Breton identity and its two traditional languages be mutually exclusive? Or can it be truly inclusive, whereby both language communities have equal access to being Breton?

What role, if any, do Bretons assign to their traditional languages within the context of being Breton? Do they feel that one needs to speak Breton (and/or Gallo) to be able to call oneself Breton? How important is the future of these languages to the region and its culture? What are Bretons willing to do – both publicly and privately – to ensure that the languages are spoken by more Bretons in the years to come? Finally, to what extent have today’s Bretons internalized the ‘one nation, one language’ philosophy that so many western ‘nations’ have come to espouse and do they seek to apply this when conceptualizing a contemporary Breton identity, or even constructing a Breton nation, in the 21st century and beyond?

Before diving into the specifics of Breton and Gallo, however, it would be beneficial to explore the history of Brittany along with the attitudes in France that have led to the double diglossic state (French-Breton and French-Gallo) that exists in
the region. I thus present an overview of the situation of other regional languages in France as well as the regional languages in other Celtic countries. I then present an overview of the scholarly frameworks that served as the foundation for this project, namely, literature on language attitudes and language ideologies along with language revitalization and reversing language shift. These fields informed my research methods, which consisted of two on-line surveys and a series of personal interviews, in addition to historical research and ethnographic observations regarding the region and its sociolinguistics. I will review the processes by which I arrived at the questions asked in these surveys and interviews. I will then present results of the internet-based surveys conducted about Breton and Gallo and how these languages and related terminologies both fit into the concept of Bretonness. These results will also be contextualized with interview data collected in Brittany with participants from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds.
CHAPTER 3 - BRIEF HISTORY OF BRITTANY

The term Armorique has been used as a synonym for Brittany for centuries. The origin of this term in French can be traced back to the Romanization Armorica of the Gaulish are mori which means ‘by the sea’. This definition is attested in multiple modern Celtic languages: arvor in Breton, ar for in Welsh, er vooir in Manx, ar mhuir in Irish and air mhuir in Gaelic. Nevertheless, Armorica in the time of the Romans stretched much further than the administrative borders of the four départements (Ille-et-Vilaine (35), Côtes-d’Armor (22), Morbihan (56) and Finistère (29)) of Brittany under the Fifth Republic. It should be noted that the current composition of the region only goes back to the collaborator Vichy regime of the early 1940s (Piette 2008). Until then, the region had five départements (with Loire-Atlantique (44), formerly Loire-Inférieure).

The following map shows all five, known as ‘historic’ Brittany.

**Figure 4 – Five Départements of Historic Brittany**

When the Romans arrived in Brittany, the Gaulish peoples who were living in the region were loosely organized in five tribes, the names of which are still present in the names of some of the modern cities of Brittany today. The territory of the Namnetes was located in the northern half of what is today's Loire-Atlantique. They gave their name to the city of Nantes. The Redones occupied a small part of what is now Ille-et-Vilaine and left their name to two of its cities: Rennes and Redon. The Veneti lived in the southern part of the peninsula, in today's Morbihan. They gave their name to the city of Vannes and, according to some legends, also indirectly to far-off Venice. The Coriosolites lived in the northern part of the peninsula, mostly in today's Côtes-d'Armor, but also in parts of Ille-et-Villaine and Morbihan. The name of this tribe is only present in the small commune Corseul, near the coastal enclave of Saint Malo. The Osismii were the largest of the tribes present in the region when the Romans arrived and occupied an area which encompassed the whole of today's Finistère along with parts of Côtes-d'Armor and Morbihan. It is interesting to note that there is no trace of the Osismii in the modern toponomy of Brittany, but since it is the part of the region where Breton is, and has been, spoken the most, perhaps this lack of toponomical footprint is not that surprising after all.

Despite the seeming tribal organization, one must not confuse this with any sort of political unity that was any more than superficial in the time of war. These tribes were merely groupings of villages, which were little more than extended families living in a single dwelling. Even under the Romans, the notion of urban agglomeration remained very foreign to the Bretons. In fact, the region would have to
wait a millennium before it would see its first cities begin to take shape. It is perhaps this tradition that explains why Brittany did not have a fixed capital for centuries. The city of government would vary depending on the ruler at the time, and to this day, Brittany has a high concentration of small to medium-sized cities. Furthermore, many consider that Brittany actually has two capitals: Rennes and Nantes. The fact that both cities lie on the eastern frontier and are therefore closer to the rest of France may well have influenced how the region has evolved.

Even if the Roman period is known for its richly documented past, there is nothing known about the language that Bretons from that period spoke amongst themselves, especially in the far East of the region, in what is now Finistère. Some of today’s pro-Breton activists would like to think that the inhabitants of the region continued to speak Gaulish during the Roman occupation, but this is not attested anywhere. Given the large number of Roman troops who were sent off to campaigns in Britannia (modern-day Britain), it seems unlikely that the coming and going of so many Romans would not have had an influence on the use of Latin in the region. A Roman province called Gallia Transalpina stretched from the Rhine and the Alps to the Mediterranean and from the Pyrenees to the Atlantic (roughly the territory of modern-Day France and Belgium, with portions of the Netherlands, Germany and Switzerland). This name Gallia is more than likely from Gaulish, where Gall means foreigner or enemy. A likely hypothesis would be that the first Romans to encounter the Gauls would have asked the name of the area, to which the Gauls may have
responded using their word for outsider to describe these newcomers, which could have quickly spread as the name of this newly ‘discovered’ province.

All of Roman Gaul benefited from the *Pax romana*, but shortly after the decline of the Roman Empire, Germanic tribes began arriving on the shores of Great Britain. This invasion forced most Britons westward until they had nowhere else to go. At that point, towards the end of the 5th century, some left the British Isles and headed south to Brittany. These Britons brought with them their language, customs and also their name. With their arrival began the re-Celtization of the region, which would be known as Little Britain for centuries to come. After a period of internal conflicts, the boundaries of the Duchy were established more or less around the borders of the five present-day départements of Ille-et-Vilaine, Loire-Atlantique, Côtes-d’Armor, Morbihan and Finistère. The newcomers mainly stayed near their landing points in the western part of the region, which explains the extent of the use of the Breton language, which as seen in the map in Figure 3.2, has been estimated to have reached its zenith (in the 9th century) at the eastern boundary of Rennes. The language would eventually develop into four distinct dialects, three of which are mutually intelligible and often referred to as KLT (Kernevég, Leoneg, Tregerieg). The fourth (Gwenedeg) is considered to be the closest to the variety of the original Breton language as it was first spoken on the so-called Continent.
Figure 5 – Territorial Regression of Breton Use 9th-21st Centuries
(The area in color indicates the extent of Breton use at its zenith, in the 9th century. Pink lines indicate the diminishing range of Breton use over the centuries. The areas of darkest color represent the current boundary of the Breton-speaking area. Pink circles indicate atypical use of Breton in cities outside traditional areas, partially attributed to education efforts. Colored areas indicate dialectal divisions of Breton (Cornouaille-Kerneveg, Léon-Leoneg, Trégor-Tregerieg and Vannetais-Gwenedeg) and shading gradation indicates density of Breton place names.)


From that moment on, the language has seen a gradual regression in relation to the Romance language of the region (now called Gallo). This represents a loss of 80 kilometers westward over approximately 300 years, which could also be considered a gain for Gallo and, as its use began to decrease over time, for French.

A Celtic-Romance diglossic state existed for centuries, with customs and traditions that were shared between the two language communities. With ever better organized neighbors, who were constantly looking to acquire more territory through military conquest, the Bretons found themselves obliged to band together, something which was not an easy task. There were multiple attempts from the Franks to take
over the region before the Dukes of Brittany finally acquiesced and aligned themselves by treaty with the King of the Franks.

The integration of Brittany into the Kingdom of France was finalized in 1491 with the marriage of Duchess Anne of Brittany to King Charles VIII of France and after his death, later reinforced by her marriage with his successor Louis XII in 1499. Extremely proud of her native Brittany, Anne was sure to see that the Duchy maintain certain special rights, namely with regard to self-governance, but these would gradually be eliminated over the course of the next two hundred years. The change of sovereign did not have an immediate impact on the language spoken by the Bretons in their daily lives. The nobility continued to speak Breton (even in the Pays Gallo, or Upper Brittany), but slowly began to favor French as they sought to align themselves more and more with the rest of the aristocracy of the Kingdom. During this time, however, the peasants did not change their geo-linguistic tendencies; those in the eastern part of the region continued to speak their Romance patois while their western counterparts continued to speak Breton. One would have to wait more than a century and the creation of the Académie Française (French [Language] Academy) for the situation and attitudes towards these regional languages to begin to ‘evolve’ and for the traditional languages to be forced to take their now longstanding defensive stance. This opposition never ceased to intensify, at least until recently.

Shortly after the French Revolution, Revolutionary leader Abbott Henri Grégoire presented a report to the National Convention (the name of the newly-formed French legislative body). This report was entitled Rapport sur la Nécessité
d'anéantir les Patois et d'universaliser l'Usage de la Langue française whose mere title indicates the undeniably aggressive position he took with regard to the other languages that were spoken in France at that time. In this report, he wrote, “on peut uniformiser le langage d'une grande nation [...] Cette entreprise qui ne fut pleinement exécutée chez aucun peuple, est digne du peuple français, qui centralise toutes les branches de l'organisation sociale et qui doit être jaloux de consacrer au plus tôt, dans une République une et indivisible, l'usage unique et invariable de la langue de la liberté.”

The primary motivation behind this report was a survey that the Abbott conducted in the Province, which revealed that barely one out of every five people at the time were able to speak French. The others spoke what Jean Jaurès, the peace-loving leader of the Socialist movement in the late 19th and early 20 centuries, would later qualify as “la langue d'un peuple vaincu.”

The National Convention then voted to prohibit the use of any other language in government and education in order to create national linguistic unity. Thus began Robespierre’s Terreur linguistique, which despite draconian punishments was never fully able to eliminate the Babelesque linguistic diversity of the country. At this point, flyers were distributed calling for the deportation or even beheading of those who dared speak another language. The subsequent First Empire (1804-1815) saw little attention paid to the constituent languages of the Kingdom; however, the French

---

6 “Report on the Need and Means to Annihilate Dialects and to Standardize the French Language”

7 We can standardize the language of a great nation... This undertaking, which has not been fully realized by any other people, is worthy of the French people, who centralize all branches of society and who must now become intent on dedicating themselves to the singular and unvarying use of the language of liberty in this single and indivisible Republic.

8 The language of a conquered people.
defeat at the hands of the Germanic states during the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871) brought down the Second Empire, and the Republican leaders of France of the time believed that the loss of the Alsace-Lorraine region on the eastern frontier was largely due to the fact that its people were never intellectually, culturally or linguistically integrate into the French social fabric. It was thus decided to implement the prohibition of regional languages that had been passed earlier in the century, beginning with public schools, which would become mandatory and secular, and, thanks to the Ministry’s regional inspecteurs, or superintendents, the promoting tool par excellence of the French language outside of Paris.

It was under Jules Ferry, Minister of Public Instruction at the onset of the Third Republic in the late 19th century, that primary education became national, free, secular, and more importantly, French-taught. He expressed very strong racist feelings, stating that, “il y a pour les races supérieures un droit, parce qu’il y a un devoir pour elles. Elles ont le devoir de civiliser les races inférieures.” 9 This sentiment was widespread among the inspectors who were posted to the Province, especially in Brittany, who often referred to those they encountered in the region as people who were retarded and spoke a dead language. Anti-Breton sentiment was very common at this time, as can be seen by famed novelist Balzac, who said of Brtany, “entouré de

9 “The superior races have a right because there is a duty for them. They have the duty to civilize the inferior races.”
lumières dont la bienfaisante chaleur ne l’atteint pas, ce pays ressemble à un charbon glacé qui resterait obscur et noir au sein d’un brillant foyer.”  

The Third Republic ended with the Nazi Militärverwaltung in Frankreich (Military Administration in France) at the beginning of the Second World War. This ‘Administration’ –or Occupation– divided France in two. The German controlled area stretched from the Rhine to the Atlantic, including Brittany, and relegated the collaborator Vichy regime to the Southeast, along the Mediterranean coast. While many pro-Breton regionalists fervently opposed their German occupiers, notable leaders like Ropaz Hemon felt that siding with the Nazis would be beneficial for Brittany’s quest for autonomy. The coastal areas of the region served as home to the Nazi navy and therefore were devastated by the Allied forces as first-line targets. After Liberation, all things German quickly became viewed with a high level of suspicion and as such, so was any attempt to question the idea of a centralized French government. It was not until the 1950s that Breton and a handful of other regional languages would begin their slow and arduous journey towards recognition.

As we have seen, the history of Brittany has long been intertwined with that of France. Especially regarding Brittany’s (socio)linguistic situation, the relationship between the region and the French state has for centuries played a crucial role. As France has gone from a Paris-centered monarchy to an even more centralized republic, it increasingly sought to solidify its authority by perpetuating ideologies such as ‘one Nation, One Language’ that have little basis in the country’s genuine history. However,
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10 “Surrounded by lights whose warming heat does not reach, this country [Brittany] resembles a lump of frozen coal that remains obscure and black in the midst of a roaring fire.”
as I will discuss in the upcoming chapters, whether due to growing demands of regionalists or external pressure from Europe, the government in recent years has changed its posture in relation to the regional languages of France from one of aggression towards one of recognition and, most recently, support.
4 - LANGUAGE VITALITY

4.1 - LANGUAGES OF FRANCE

Despite France’s reputation for being a country with a strong national identity based on a shared common, single language, its linguistic fabric is not nearly as uniform as some of the Republic’s founders would have us believe. In fact, the reality would be best described as a patchwork, with some pieces held together only by a thin thread. While some leaders have seen this linguistic diversity as a threat, recently the political tone has changed and the government has sought to investigate the situation of many minority and regional languages in hopes of better understanding the overall landscape of languages in France.

In 1999, Bernard Cerquiglini, director of the Institut national de la langue française (National Institute of French Language) published his report on the Languages of France. He identified 14 languages spoken by French nationals in ‘Metropolitan’ (or mainland) France. These included four ‘immigrant’ heritage languages that are not historical to the mainland: Arabic, Armenian, Berber, Romani and Yiddish. The remaining territorial languages will be highlighted in this section in alphabetical order. Figure 6 will prove useful for visual reference of the traditional territories of these languages, particularly in relation to the original French-language core of the country, referred to as parlers centraux.

While this study focuses primarily on Brittany, in a country as nationally centralized yet linguistically diverse as France, it would be irresponsible not to highlight its other historic regional languages. Indeed, while the history of each has unique features, they nonetheless share elements, particularly in the post-Revolutionary period. The following vignettes are presented in alphabetical order and are meant to offer an opportunity to compare and contrast the sociolinguistic situation and vitality of these languages with those of Breton and Gallo. These vignettes will give a brief overview of the overall history, history of repression, current state of vitality, and revitalization.
efforts and debates concerning the status of these languages in the French context. Where appropriate, comparisons will be provided for the situation of the same languages in neighboring countries.

4.1.1 - Alsatian

In common parlance, Alsatian may be used to refer to any of the Germanic language varieties spoken in the eastern part of France. This generally extends beyond the territorial boundaries of the Alsace region into the neighboring region of Lorraine. While all Germanic in origin, these language varieties represent a broad continuum across the two prominent branches of the West Germanic languages: namely Upper German and Central German. For a point of reference, *Hochdeutsch* (standard High German) is a Central German variety. Strictly speaking, *Elsässerditsch* (Alsatian) belongs to the Alemannic branch of Upper German and is most closely related to the *Schwyzerdütsch* (Swiss German) dialects. The name applied to those varieties spoken in Lorraine and some isolated parts of Alsace is *Lottringer Plätt* (Lorraine Franconian) and is most closely related to *Lëtzebuergesch* (Luxembourghish). This is not to be confused with *Plattdeutsch* (Low German). Both varieties are commonly shortened to *Platt*, but the former is Franconian and, therefore, remotely related to *Hochdeutsch* while the latter constitutes its own subfamily.

While often referred to in conjunction with Lorraine because the two formed the *Reichsland Elsaß-Lothringen* (Imperial Territory of Alsace-Lorraine) from the foundation of the German Empire (1871) through the end of the First World War,
Alsace has otherwise been a separate entity for centuries. The Archduke Sigismund of Austria sold part of the region to the Duke of Burgundy in 1469 and the region has found itself periodically changing sides of the Franco-German political frontier ever since. The contemporary period has seen the most activity on this front with the region passing between France and Germany four times in the 20th century alone.

Under the newly formed German Empire, Hochdeutsch became official and the sole language of education. Consequently, the use of French nearly ceased, but use of Elsässerditsch persisted. This is easily explained because the population, still predominantly proficient in their local Germanic variety, were able to easily transition to Hochdeutsch in public and official spheres, all the while maintaining their use Elsässerditsch in private matters. This diglossic situation reflects the reality across most of the Empire at the time and, for that matter, is still commonplace today. When the region was ceded to France after World War I, French became the sole language of instruction. During the Nazi annexation of the region during World War II, Hochdeutsch was reinstated as the official language, but this was short-lived. When the region returned to France, the French government undertook a campaign of Gallicization, whereby French not only became the sole official language, but German was eliminated as a subject offered at the elementary school level.

The French Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques - INSEE (National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies) (2002) estimates the number of adult speakers of Alsatian (often defined as any Germanic dialect spoken in the region) at 545,000, making it the second most widely spoken regional language after
Occitan. Like other regional languages, there are few new young speakers. The bilingual education movement in Alsace did not take shape until the 1990s and both associative and public models focus on French-German (Hochdeutsch) balanced programs. Much like one finds on the other side of the Rhine, these programs use Hochdeutsch as the written medium, but both standard and local varieties are generally accepted for oral communication. The most recent figures (Morgan and Zimmer 2009) show some 309,173 children enrolled in some sort of bilingual education across the region, of which over 1,000 high school students have access to the binational AbiBac, a series of exit exams that integrate both the French Baccalauréat and the German Abitur and grant holders entrance to university in both countries. In addition to receiving German digital broadcast television and radio, the public channel France 3 Alsace produces several programs in Alsatian, including a daily news show Rund Um, which is subtitled in French, and two weekly news magazines A'gueter and GsunTheim.

Created in 1994, the Elsassisches Sprochàmt (Alsatian Language Office) has as its mission to promote the identity of the region, including both Alsatian culture and language. It is common practice in Strasbourg to find streets labeled both in French and Alsatian, although the names may not have the same meaning. It is worth noting that the name of one stop on Strasbourg’s tram network is bilingual - Langstross/Grand’Rue (Main Street) - and another is only in Alsatian - Winmärk (Wine Market). Alsatian is rarely found, however, on directional or informational signs.
4.1.2 - Basque

Basque is a language isolate spoken in the southwestern corner of France and northern Spain. Locally referred to as Euskera, which simply means “manner of speaking,” Basque is spoken to varying degrees on either side of the French-Spanish border. In the Middle Ages, Euskal Herri or Euskadi (Basque Country) was split between the crowns of Aquitaine and Navarre. The Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) established the current border between France and Spain, thus permanently splitting the area. Traditionally, the area is comprised of seven provinces: Lapurdi (Labourd), Naffaroa Beherea (Lower Navarre), Zuberoa (Soule), Naffaroa (Navarre), Araba (Alava), Gipuzkoa and Biskaia (Biscay). The first three make up the French Basque Country, also called Iparralde (Northern Side) and account for less than 10% of the population of the entire area and 15% of the land mass. Naffaroa and the remaining three make up Hegoalde (Southern Side). Recently the slogan “Zazpiak Bat” (The Seven are One) has surfaced, referring to a single Basque cultural entity - despite current political and administrative divisions- thereby evoking a sense of Trans- Pyrenees Pan-Basquism.

Administratively, Iparralde is part of the French département of Pyrénées-Atlantiques (Atlantic Pyrenees) and Hegoalde forms two separate Spanish autonomous regions: País Vasco (Basque Country) and Navarra (Navarre), the latter retaining the right, according to the Spanish constitution, to join the former should the population of Navarra decide they wish to do so. As yet, the residents of Navarre have been reluctant to align themselves politically with their cousins in the País Vasco due
to the fanaticism of the separatist group *Euskadi ta Askatasuna* (Basque Country and Freedom), more commonly known as ETA. While this group has operated on both sides of the border, it was founded in 1959 as a resistance group against the Franco dictatorship in Spain. As such, most of its campaigns have taken place in Spain and have included assassinations, explosions and kidnappings, all with the intent of gaining sovereignty from the central government. Not unlike the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and *Sinn Fein* in Northern Ireland, the public at large has seldom supported the excessive force of ETA’s actions, but they have served a purpose of keeping the debate for independence at the fore and with it, through the very name of the group, the importance of the Basque language to the Basque people.

With the death of Franco and the return of democracy to Spain, the País Vasco and Navarra have regained a great deal of political autonomy in regional matters and with this, the co-officiality of Basque alongside Spanish. This means that in the two autonomous regions, both Basque and Spanish, are official languages, and the population may use either to access services and communicate freely. This is a vast improvement over the repression of the Franco regime, where even speaking Basque was a punishable offense. While great strides have been made in Spain, unfortunately the same cannot be said for France. Although included in the initial text of the Deixonne law, Basque only has marginal ‘heritage’ status in the eyes of the French government.

Recent figures would place the number of speakers of Basque in Spain at over one million, while north of the border in France the figures (INSEE 2002) are much
less impressive at roughly 73,800. It is worth noting that there are an estimated 20,000 monolingual Basque speakers across Iparralde and Hegoalde. While the first Basque-medium school opened in Spain in 1914, the first *Ikastola* in France did not begin until 1969. This was the first program in contemporary France to use a regional language as the primary means of instruction. Both French and Spanish schools make use of a common written standard, *Euskera batúa*. The French associative programs are managed by a group called *Seaska* (Cradle), and there are now balanced bilingual programs in many French public schools of the region. Enrollment across both program models in France is 11,999 and has shown a steady increase over recent years (Sarraillet 2009).

Basque speakers in France can benefit greatly from Spanish digital broadcast channels produced by *Euskal Irrati Telebista* (Basque Radio and Television), also known as EITB. EITB offers three primary television channels, two of which are exclusively broadcast in Basque. They also control five radio stations, two of which offer programming exclusively in Basque and a third which is bilingual. There is another private digital television station, Hamaika, which operates solely in Basque. In addition to these options from Spain, France 3 Euskal Herri Pays Basque, a subsidiary of France 3 Aquitaine, also offers modest, non-subtitled programming in Basque: one minute in the daily regional news broadcast and one third of weekly local programs.

*Euskaltzaindia*, literally the “group of keepers of the Basque language,” though more commonly translated as the “Royal Academy of the Basque language,” in keeping

---

12 So-called associative schools are governed by a contract with the central government, much like charter schools in the American education system.
with the form of the *Real Academia Española* (Royal Spanish Academy), was founded in 1981 and is present both in France and Spain, even though it does not carry a royal warrant. The charge of the Academy is to defend and regulate the Basque language. Bilingual road signs are present, but are not systematically found everywhere. Given the multilingual heritage of parts of the region, signage in Bayonne is actually trilingual, French-Basque-Occitan.

4.1.3 - Catalan

Catalan, or *Català*, is a Romance language spoken in southeastern France, northeastern and mediterranean Spain, Andorra and Italy. The overall region is often called *Els Països Catalans* (The Catalan Countries), which is not a unanimously supported term. Even the more neutral *Els Països de llengua catalana* (The Countries of Catalan Language) is still contested, primarily by those in areas where speakers typically use a different name to refer to their local variety of the common language (Doppelbauer 2006). It is for this reason that some prefer the inclusive, albeit somewhat cumbersome, expression *català-valencià-balear* (Catalan- Valencian-Balearic); however, regional terms are preferred within the confines of their respective areas¹³. Controversy set aside, this conglomeration spans territory in four

---

¹³ (2005) *Dictamen de l'Acadèmia Valenciana de la llengua sobre els principis i criteris per a la defensa de la denominació i l'entitat del valencià*

"La llengua pròpia i històrica dels valencians, des del punt de vista de la filologia, és també la que compartixen les comunitats autònomes de Catalunya i de les Illes Balears i el Principat d'Andorra. Així mateix és la llengua històrica i pròpia d'altres territoris de l'antiga Corona d'Aragó. [...] Com és sabut, un sector de la societat valenciana considera que l'idioma propi dels valencians coincidix amb la llengua que es parla en altres territoris de l'antiga Corona d'Aragó, mentre que un altre sector considera que és una llengua diferent. Esta polèmica s'ha vinculat, sovint, al tema de la identitat nacional dels
countries and has an overall population of nearly 14 million, larger than several sovereign European states. This includes Andorra, where the language is official, the Spanish autonomous regions of Generalitat de Catalunya (Catalonia), Generalitat Valenciana (Valencian Community) and Les Illes Balears (Balearic Islands), where the language is co-official with Castillian Spanish. Additionally, it also includes parts of neighboring regions La Franja de Ponent (The Eastern Strip in Aragon) and El Carxe (Carche in Murcia) along with a small part of France often called Pays Catalan (Catalan Country) and the city of L’Alguer (Alghero) on the Italian island of Sardinia, where the language does not have an official status.

The part of France colloquially named Pays Catalan in French is more commonly referred to as Catalunya Nord (Northern Catalonia) in Catalan. This term was coined in 1930 by French politician, writer and Catalanist Alphonse Mias. Historically, however, this region is known as Rosselló (Roussillon) and was initially included on the ‘Spanish’ (then Aragonese) side of the border drawn by the Treaty of Corbeil in 1258. When Jaume I died in 1276, the territory was integrated with Les Illes Balears to form the Regne de Mallorca (Kingdom of Majorca), which would be retaken by Aragon a few decades later. This lasted until the Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659, which redrew the French-Spanish border, from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean, and ceded the five northernmost Comarques (Rosselló, Vallespir, Conflent, Capcir, and Alta Cerdanya) to France. After the French Revolution, the Occitan Fenolheda was added to
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valencians. Per això, en alguns sectors socials, ha tingut ressò la tesi segons la qual identificar l’idioma propi dels valencians amb el d’altres pobles (especialment Catalunya) contribuiria a la pèrdua de les senyes d’identitat del poble valencià i a una hipotètica submissió exterior.”
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these regions to form the département of Pyrénées-Orientales (Eastern Pyrenees), which has remained unchanged for over two centuries.

In France, the official use of Catalan was outlawed by royal decree in 1700 while it flourished south of the border. In addition, much like Basque, public use of Catalan was prohibited – and often attacked – under the Franco regime. This also changed when democracy was reinstated and the three aforementioned autonomous regions declared Catalan (including local varieties which sometimes went by other names) a co-official language. Again, like Basque, Catalan was one of the initial regional languages of the Deixonne law. While the departmental government of Pyrénées-Orientales declared that “la langue catalane, née il y a plus de mille ans, constitue un des piliers de notre identité, du patrimoine et de la richesse du département des Pyrénées-Orientales (Catalunya Nord)”\(^\text{14}\), it still merely has marginal 'heritage' status in the eyes of the French central government.

According to the Generalitat de Catalunya\(^\text{15}\) more than eleven million people understand Catalan across the whole of Els Països Catalans, while some nine million speak it. “Som 7 millions”\(^\text{16}\) (We are 7 million [people]) is a slogan heard in conjunction with claims for further recognition by central governments based on the claim that the population of Catalonia, where almost 98% can understand Catalan, is larger than several sovereign European countries, and across the area the language is
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\(^\text{14}\) The Catalan language, born over a thousand years ago, constitutes one of the pillars of our identity, of the heritage and the richness of the département of Pyrénées-Orientales (Northern Catalonia).

\(^\text{15}\) El català, llengua d’Europa. 2007.

\(^\text{16}\) The original slogan of the campaign launched in the 1980s by the Generalitat de Catalunya was “Som 6 millions”.
spoken by more people than many national European languages. While some 275,000 understand Catalan in Catalunya Nord, an impressive figure which represents over half of the population of the whole département of Pyrénées-Orientales, only 150,000 are able to speak it and very few use it regularly in their daily lives.

Aside from the four decades of Franco’s repressive regime, education in the Spanish autonomous regions where Catalan (or local variety) has co-official status, instruction of and/or in Catalan has been regularly available for well over a century. While most pupils now study at Catalan-medium schools, it is at very minimum a mandated subject for all pupils in Catalonia, including those who study in Spanish. In France, however, Catalan education has been more challenging to assure. While permission was granted for optional language courses by the Deixonne law, it was not until 1976 that the first Bressola (Cradle) school opened. This associative program which, like its equivalents in several other French regions, focuses on early immersion, inspired later public models, which opt for a balanced approach. Recent figures show 13,420 students enrolled in some sort of Catalan bilingual program in Roussillon (Sanchiz and Bonet 2009).

Again, like Basque, Catalan speakers in France can benefit greatly from Spanish digital broadcast channels, most notably those produced by Televisió de Catalunya (Catalonia Television). In total, there are currently 60 regional and local channels that broadcast Catalan-language programming. Of these, a bundle of six (all belonging to Televisió de Catalunya) are available to Catalan speakers in France. In addition to these channels from the South, France 3 Languedoc-Rousillon offers a subtitled daily
news show Pais Català along with a weekly new magazine Viure al País (Living in the Country/ Homeland) which alternates every other week with an Occitan edition – the title being the same in both Catalan and Occitan.

Founded in 1907, the Institut d’Estudis Catalans (IEC), or Institute of Catalan Studies, is charged with the standardization of the Catalan language. The Valencian equivalent, the Acadèmica Valenciana de la Llengua (AVL), or Valencian Language Academy, was founded in 1932. The AVL collaborates with the IEC, which operates across Els Països Catalans (including Catalunya Nord) but the AVL remains the point of reference particularly in matters of orthography and lexicon for its respective territory.

In 2008, Perpignan, the seat of the Pyrénées-Orientales, was named that year’s capital of Catalan culture. The city also has a Casa de la Catalanitat (House of Catalanness) along with official representation of the Catalan government at the Casa de la Generalitat. Signage for street and city names is regularly bilingual and there has been a push from the Conseil Général (département-level legislature) to include Catalan in informational and directional signs.

4.1.4 - Corsican

Corsican, or Corsu, is a Romance language spoken on the island of Corsica off the Southeastern coast of France. The island constitutes a collectivité territoriale (territorial collectivity), which is a unique legal status in French administration. In essence, this status equates to that of région, which places the island on par with the
country’s other 26 régions. Ruled by Genoa for nearly four centuries, Corsica declared independence in 1735, with Italian as its official language, but never managed to drive out the Genoese from the major cities. It was eventually sold to France in 1764, five mere years before the birth on the island of France’s most renowned post-Revolutionary leader, Napoléon Bonaparte. Corsica actually fell under British control/protection several times during the period from the outset of the French Revolution through the end of the Napoleonic Wars. When the monarchy was reinstated in 1814, however, the island was returned to the French crown.

Corsicans are generally proud of their insular origins and references to the rest of France as the ‘continent’ (mainland) abound. Many basic items, like gasoline and foodstuffs, need to be imported from the mainland, which makes the cost of living on the so-called Ile de la Beauté (Island of Beauty) significantly higher than one finds at the nearest French port of call (Marseille). While education and careers often push youth to leave the island, there is a tradition of sending money back home, a scenario not dissimilar to that of immigrants from impoverished lands to the East or to the South.

In 1982, the French legislature approved the transfer of some powers to the newly established Assemblée de Corse (Corsican Assembly), which were increased with the creation of the new collectivité territoriale status in 1991. The abbreviation CTC, for Collectivité Territoriale de Corse, is most commonly used. The 1990s began a period of considerable violence on the island; both against symbols of the French Republic as well as in-fighting between factions of the Front de libération nationale.
corse (National Front for Corsican Freedom) – FLNC. This reached a peak with the assassination of the regional préfet (regional governor) in 1998. In recent years, violence between militant groups vying for local power has seen an unfortunate upsurge.

When the island acquired its new status, there was a provision to foster education of and in Corsican. The language is visible on all road signs (a unique feature of the Corsican linguistic landscape). It is also now a regular subject in primary school, offered as an elective in high school and required for study at the Université de Corse. Given this unique status within French regional languages, there is not the same push for immersive bilingual programming in education as there is for other regional languages. According to the INSEE (2005), there are more than 31,000 pupils enrolled in some sort of Corsican language instruction. The most recent census figures show nearly 303,000 inhabitants on the island and it has been estimated that there are 165,000 speakers of Corsican on the island and elsewhere. While some question whether Corsican is actually a distinct language, since it is so close to the Tuscan standard of Italian, it clearly qualifies as a language according to Kloss’ (1967) Ausbau definition, whereby a language is ‘constructed’ for social or political reasons.

There has been a proposal put forth in the Assemblée de Corse for establishing criteria for Corsican ‘citizenship’, which would require residency on the island and command of the Corsican language. Provisions have already been made for this in a recent modification of the island’s property taxation laws, whereby ‘citizens’ would be treated more favorably than outsiders. Italian television is available via satellite and
France 3 Corse offers a non-subtitled nightly news broadcast in Corsican along with regular sports and news magazine shows. Finally, the CTC unveiled the following bilingual logo in December 2011.

**Figure 7 – New Logo for Corsica**

Along with Brittany, it is the only région to visibly display its name in a language other than French. It is worth noting, however, that French is still first in the visual hierarchy of the logo. The CTC has also charged itself with elevating the place of Corsican on the island. To this end, it has established a *Plan stratégique d'aménagement et de développement linguistique pour la langue corse* (Strategic Plan for the Planning and Development of the Corsican Language) which comes to term in 2013. Along these lines, it has also created a *Charte de la langue corse* (Charter for the Corsican Language), whereby, much like the *Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg’s* (Public Office of Breton Language) charter *Ya d’ar brezhoneg* (Yes to Breton), municipalities, organizations and companies agree to promote the use and visibility of the language in the public sphere and workplace. The Strategic Plan also makes provisions for
creating a Cunsiglia di a lingua è di a cultura corsa (Council of Corsican Language and Culture).

4.1.5 - Flemish

Flemish, or Vlaams, is a pluricentric Germanic language spoken in the Northwestern corner of France. This is much like the Catalan-Valencian-Balearic situation discussed above, with the addition of two national governments: Netherlands and Belgium. The variety spoken of Flemish spoken in France is generally called French Flemish, or (Fransch) Vlaemsch. The area of France where Vlaemsch is spoken is often called French Flanders, or Fransch-Vlaenderen. This region was part of the Zeventien Provinciën (Seventeen Provinces of the Netherlands) from the 15th to the 17th centuries. These Provinces belonged to the Habsburg Empire and, like the French parts of the Pays Basque and the Pays Catalan, several were ceded to France with the signing of the Treaty of the Pyrenees to form French Flanders, which make up most of today’s département of Nord.

Flemish, or Dutch as it is most commonly called –even by many Flemish speakers– is the official language of both the Kingdoms of Belgium and the Netherlands. While Belgium has two other official languages (French and German), Dutch is the sole national language of the Netherlands. Some 23 million people speak Dutch worldwide, but like so many other of France’s regional languages, the numbers of Vlaemsch speakers have been on a steady decline. Today, there are an estimated 60,000 speakers, of whom roughly one third use it on a regular basis. This is a
woefully low number, when one considers the 1.7 million inhabitants of the region. Although Vlaemsch appears on Cerquiglini’s list of Languages of France, it unfortunately does not have any official status or recognition, either at the national or regional level. *D’akademie voor Nuuze Vlaemsche Taele* (Academy for Our Flemish Language) was founded in 2004 and is generally called ANVT-ILRF, which also refers to its French title, *Institut de la Langue Régionale Flamande* (Institute for the Regional Flemish Language).

The ANVT-ILRF’s principal charge is the codification of Vlaemsch and has been crucial in the campaign to teach Dutch in the region’s schools. Dutch is taught in a few schools in the *Westhoek* (Western Corner) part of the region, to the tune of 1,300 pupils[^17] and there is currently a proposal to start bilingual education in 2013. Much like in Alsace, where primarily Hochdeutsch is used in schools, standard Dutch is the medium of instruction. While the Dutch-language continuum is similar to that of its sister language (German), the regional language heritage is unfortunately not as strong in French Flanders as it is in Alsace. Like the other border languages discussed above, Vlaemsch speakers can benefit from the resources of their Flemish-speaking neighbors on the other side of the Belgian border. Among these resources, digital broadcast television (*Vlaamse Radio en Televisieomroeporganisatie* –Flemish Radio and Television– VRT) and radio figure prominently. Regrettably, visible signs of Flemish in French Flanders, however, are nearly non-existent.

[^17]: [http://www.uoc.edu/euromosaic/web/document/neerlandes/fr/i1/i1.html#3.1](http://www.uoc.edu/euromosaic/web/document/neerlandes/fr/i1/i1.html#3.1)
4.1.6 - Francoprovençal

Francoprovençal, or *Francoprovençâl*, also known as *Arpitan* (primarily in France) and *Romand* (in Switzerland), is a Romance language once spoken in eastern parts of France, most of French-speaking Switzerland and a small part of northwestern Italy. The name Francoprovençal was coined by Italian linguist Ascoli in 1878: “Chiamo franco-provenzale un tipo idiomatico, il quale insieme riunisce, con alcuni caratteri specifici, più altri caratteri, che parte son comuni al francese, parte lo sono al provenzale, e non proviene già da una confluenza di elementi diversi, ma bensì attesta sua propria indipendenza istorica, non guari dissimili da quella per cui fra di loro si distinguono gli altri principali tipi neo-latini.” This name is often confused with *Provençal* and, as such, the name *Arpitan* –stemming from the word for highlander or mountain dweller– was coined by activists in the 1970s. While initially linked to a communist political movement, *Movement Harpitanya*, in recent years the name has grown in popularity among speakers. The name Romand (not to be confused with *Romansch*, the fourth national language of Switzerland) has been used in Switzerland since the 15th century, but was never adopted by those outside of modern-day French-speaking Switzerland, which is typically called *Suisse romande*. The area where *Arpitan* is traditionally spoken is now referred to as *Arpitania*. This includes the area

---

18 “I call *Franco-Provençal* a linguistic code that brings together, along with some unique characteristics, characteristics partly in common with French, and partly in common with Provençal, and which are not due to a late confluence of diverse elements, but on the contrary, attests to its own historical independence, not dissimilar from those by which the major Romance languages distinguish themselves from one another.”
in France between *Langues d'oïl* and *Langues d'oc*, the Val d'Aosta and part of the Piedmont in Italy and all but the canton of Jura in *Suisse romande*.

There are an estimated 140,000 speakers 19 of Arpitan across Arpitania, half of whom are in the Val d'Aosta. It is perhaps not surprising that that is the only place where the language is recognized and protected. Since it is now only spoken in a small mountain town in Switzerland, Swiss authorities consider the language extinct within their borders. Francoprovençal does appear on Cerquiglini's list of Languages of France, however, unlike most of the other regional languages discussed in this section, it is not present in the mass media, bilingual educational movements or other visible public signs.

4.1.7 - Langue(s) d'oc/ Occitan

Occitan, also referred to as *Langue d'oc* in the singular and *Langues d'oc* in the plural, is a language spoken in the southern half of France, Monaco, the *Valladas Occitanas* (Occitan Valleys) of northwestern Italy, the enclave of *La Gàrdia* in Italy's southern Calabria region as well as the enclave of *Val d'Aran* (Valley of Aran) in northern Spain. This area is often referred to as *Occitània* or *País d'òc* (Country of Oc). Charlemagne declared that his empire would be divided along linguistic lines (and nationalities), which would have produced a territory that reflects the contemporary limits of Occitània, but instead the area was divided into and amongst various counties,
duchies and kingdoms. Most of the area was slowly acquired by the French crown, to the point where today only a few pockets lie outside French borders in Spain and Italy.

Until recently, this language was also commonly known as Provençal, the language of the famed troubadours of the Middle Ages. Modern-day Occitan, or more aptly, Langue d'oc, is typically split into five main varieties, or Langues d'oc: Lengadocian, Provençau (now a subvariety), Gascon, Auvernhat-Lemosin and Vivaroaupenc. The name Langue d'oc was coined by Dante in his 13th century De vulgari eloquentia, where he commented on the different expressions that the major Romance literary languages of the time used to say “yes: “nam alii oc, alii si, alii vero dicunt oil,” whereby òc came from the Latin hoc (this), si from sic (thus) and oil from hoc illud (this [is] it). Linguistically speaking, the singular is used for historical comparison with Langue d'oïl, whereas the plural is used to capture the pluricentric nature of the language. Since both terms have the same pronunciation in French, Occitan (or even Provençal by outsiders) is often preferred in common parlance as a simpler term and one that has fewer connotations.

Occitan rivaled what would become modern-day French as a prominent literary language in the Middle Ages. It is closely related to Catalan and for centuries both were commonly referred to as lingua limosina. Some linguists, namely Pèire Bec, Domergue Sumien, Patric Sauzet, Xavier Lamuela and Carles Castellanos, still feel that Catalan and Occitan can be considered varieties of the same language, but others believe that Catalan and Occitan splintered off from their common ancestor in the

---

20 Some say òc, others say si; others, in truth, say oil
13th century. Nowadays, Occitan is co-official with Italian in several municipalities of
the Piedmont and Liguria is co-official with Spanish (and Catalan) in the Val d’Aran in
Catalonia. In France, all five varieties appear on Cerquiglini’s list of Languages of
France, but have very little legal status in France, being recognized as regional
languages, alongside Francoprovençal, only in the région of Rhône-Alpes.

The disparate nature of Occitan, most notably the numerous names of the
language, in addition to the various metrics used in data collection, make it difficult to
get an accurate sense of the current number of speakers. Estimates would place this
figure anywhere from 500,000 to over ten million. Recent French government
estimates are around 800,000 native speakers. While this figure may seem impressive,
when one considers that the population of the area numbers is the tens of millions, it
is far less so. The language is the primary medium of instruction in Spain’s Val d’Aran,
and is taught to some degree in French primary and secondary schools. There has also
been an associative bilingual education program, Calandreta (lark or learner), since
1979. Overall, there are nearly 79,000 pupils in France who are learning Occitan,
making it the most widely studied regional language in France (Verny 2009).

Occitan and Catalan language planners regularly work together to determine
new terminology. The vast majority of Catalan vocabulary can be applied to Occitan. In
2005, the Institut d’Estudis Catalans and the Institut d’Estudis Occitans (IEO), in
conjunction with the Consell General d’Aran (General Council of Aran) and Termcat
(the institution for terminology in Catalonia, established in 1985) published a series of
four lexical works in Biology, Ecology, Internet and Mobile Phone vocabulary. Since
then the government of Catalonia has also created an *Oficina Occitan en Catalohna* (Occitan Office in Catalonia). There are relatively few media available in Occitan, but France 3 Languedoc-Rousillon does produce a nightly news broadcast *Edicion Occitana* and a weekly news magazine *Viure al Pais*, which alternates every other week with a Catalan edition. Thanks to a new regional initiative to foster Occitan on the Atlantic side of the region, France 3 Aquitaine recently began broadcasting a weekly news magazine *Punt de Vista*. Many cities have put in place bilingual street/city signs, but directional and informational signs remain almost exclusively in French.

4.1.8 - Langue(s) d’oïl

As discussed above, in the singular *Langue d’oïl* is contrasted with Langue d’oc in French historical linguistics. In the plural, *Langues d’oïl* refers to a set of languages spoken in the northern part of France, among them Standard Modern French. Just as Occitan is often used as a simple (or simplistic) reference to the Langues d’oc, French is routinely used in common parlance to refer to the Langues d’oïl. In fact, it is widely believed by non-linguists that these languages are either (1) derivatives of French or (2) varieties of poorly spoken French. French linguist Gaston Paris coined the term *Francien* in the late 19th century to refer to the variety of French spoken in Île-de-France (the capital region surrounding –and including– Paris) that would become the preferred Oïl variety of the Royal Court.
According to the Académie Française, "la langue d'oïl regroupe l’ensemble des parlers pour lesquels oui se disait oïl". Based on this definition, which exemplifies the breadth of the continuum, it could be argued that there is no need to use the term in the plural. Whether used in the singular, with this definition, or in the plural, today there may be as many as 20 distinct Langue d’oïl varieties, which have been divided into five geographical zones: Frankish, Francien, Burgundian, Armorican and Poitevin-Saintongeais. The first mention of Français, once also interchangeable with François, (French) as such dates back to the 13th century. At this time, Picard (today more commonly called Chti) and Normand (both on the continent and in England) also had considerable literary presence and influence. In fact, Anglo-Norman was the language of choice at the English Royal Court for centuries after the Battle of Hastings (1066).

Standard Modern French has been the de facto official language of France since the 16th century Ordonnances de Villers-Cotterêts, but this was not codified until the constitution of the current Republic was amended in 1992. With this amendment, the second article declares that the (sole) language of the Republic shall be French. While eight Langue d’oïl varieties appear on Cerquiglini’s list of Languages of France, only one, Gallo, has achieved any regional recognition or benefits from formal language instruction programming. Other varieties are nevertheless recognized by neighboring countries. The Communauté Française (French Community) of Belgium recognizes

---

21 The Langue d’oïl encompasses the set of speech varieties* for which oil was used to say 'yes'.

*There really is no equivalent in English for parler. Stemming from the verb 'to speak', it is used as a neutral way of referring to a speech variety that is not considered by the speaker as a 'full' language. In other words, it could be considered the politically correct way of saying dialect (or patois).
Wallon, Picard, Lorrain and Champenois as regional languages within its borders. The United Kingdom (and the Republic of Ireland by virtue of the bilateral British-Irish Council) recognizes Normand as a regional language for the Channel Islands. Aside from a marginal presence on the Internet, these languages have long been excluded from the mass media. The major challenge facing these languages in France stems from the perception—especially among speakers themselves—that their patois is nothing more than poor French. After centuries of coexistence and given their linguistic proximity, another challenge is determining where the variety of regional French ends and where the variety of Langue d’oil begins. Visible signs of any Langue d’oil are very rare. On the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, there is some visibility for Normand, for example, in the form of limited signage; in addition, as discussed and illustrated in Chapter 1 above, there is an increasing presence of Gallo signage in Brittany. Aside from the signs in the Rennes metro, the majority of these signs are in response to the imposition of Breton signs to locations within the traditional Pays Gallo, whereby activists deface signs with the newly coined Breton place names and replace them with their tradition Gallo names. In most other cases these signs are more often than not relegated to a nostalgic or tourist register.

4.2 - REGIONAL LANGUAGES IN OTHER CELTIC COUNTRIES

While many on either side of the Channel would likely assert the many differences between France and England, one cannot deny the mutual impact they have had on one another’s culture and society for centuries. This would be, and has been, reason
enough to compare the situation of regional languages in France and the United Kingdom, and scholars have done just this (Mollà and Viana 1987, Fishman 1991, Ager 1996, Judge 2007). However, the rationale is made even stranger when one considers that Brittany belongs to a greater Celtic collective, which radiates out from Britain. Therefore, the following overview is intended to broaden the comparative and contrastive perspective in hopes of better situating the Breton (in the broadest sense of the term) reality. Of particular interest is the situation in Scotland, with its familiar dual-language (Gaelic and Scots) heritage, whereby Gaelic is a Celtic language spoken by an outlying people who resisted integration into the greater British realm and Scots is a sister language of English.

4.2.1 - Cornish

Cornish, or Kernewek, is a Celtic language that was once spoken in the Cornwall peninsula of southwestern England. It was a common community language through the 16th century, but its use waned, and it is generally accepted that the language died during the 17th century. Since the turn of the 20th century, there has been a small yet committed revival movement, based on surviving documents in Middle Cornish dating from the Middle Ages. Cornish is closely related to Breton and, to a lesser extent, Welsh. It is estimated that approximately 3,500 people currently speak Cornish. UNESCO has recently changed the status of Cornish from ‘extinct’ to ‘severely endangered’. The British government recognized it as a regional language in 2002, making it the only one in England, thus joining the ranks of Welsh, Gaelic, Irish and
Scots, which were already recognized in their respective constituencies of the United Kingdom. While the *Keskowethyans an Taves Kernewek* (Cornish Language Partnership) was created in 2005 as the public body charged with promoting and developing the use of Cornish in Cornwall, there has been much debate over the efforts to standardize the language for the purposes of facilitating further transmission and education. There is a parent organization, *Dal leth* (Beginning), which has been active in the Partnership, especially with regard to opening the first Cornish-medium nursery school in 2010. Cornish is not present on television, but BBC Radio Cornwall has produced a short (approximately five-minute) weekly news broadcast for over 20 years. *Radyo an Gernewegva* (Radio Cornwall), started as a weekly news podcast in 2007 and has since expanded to a more comprehensive format that includes music and discussion. Due to its newly renarescent nature, Cornish is not currently visible on road or street signs.

4.2.2 - Gaelic

(Scottish) Gaelic, or *Gàidhlig*, is a Celtic language currently spoken in the northern and western parts of Scotland, or *Alba*. The qualifier Scottish is often added to avoid the possibility of confusion with Irish Gaelic, which outsiders tend to mistakenly call Gaelic. Both Scottish and Irish Gaelic are closely related. Like the other Celtic languages spoken in the British Isles, the use of Gaelic has decreased as that of English has spread and increased in the area. Scotland was a sovereign state until the turn of the 18th century when it joined England and Wales to form the United Kingdom of
Great Britain. There were many centuries of battles between the two countries before the union. Despite the political union with England, Scotland maintained much of its pre-union legal and cultural distinctness. After a successful referendum in 1997, the Scottish Parliament was established in 1999. The Scottish National Party won a majority in the legislature in 2011 and has announced plans to hold a referendum on independence from the United Kingdom in 2014.

Gaelic is recognized by the UK government as a regional language. In late 2009, it became possible for Scottish government ministers to communicate with EU officials in Gaelic. The Scottish government agreed to pay any related translation or interpretation costs related to this agreement. While this does not accord official status to the language, it is nonetheless an important step forward in recognition both home and abroad.

According to the figures released after the 2001 census\(^{22}\), there were 58,552 speakers among the Scottish population over three years of age. As with many other regional languages, the average age of Gaelic speakers is aging. A 2010 census of school-aged children\(^{23}\) showed that only 606 pupils in Scotland came from households where the primary language was Gaelic. The Gaelic Language Act of 2005 established the *Bòrd na Gàidhlig* or BnG (Gaelic Board), which has been charged with developing a national language plan for Gaelic as well as advising authorities for Gaelic-medium education. The *Sgoil Ghàidhlig Ghlaschu* (Glasgow Gaelic School) opened its doors in 2006 and was the first Gaelic-medium secondary school. There are dozens of partially

\(^{22}\) [http://www.cnag.org.uk/munghaidhlig/stats/gspeakcensus01.php](http://www.cnag.org.uk/munghaidhlig/stats/gspeakcensus01.php)

Gaelic-medium primary school around the country and there are now more than ten
other Gaelic-medium secondary schools. According to BnG, there were 2,089 primary
school pupils enrolled in Gaelic-medium education.

Gaelic is present –albeit marginally so– in print, audio and visual outlets of
local mass media. There are several local bilingual radio stations. And the BBC
operates both a radio station and a television channel. The television channel, BBC
Alba, not to be confused with the English-language channel BBC Scotland, is a
collaborative effort and is available throughout the United Kingdom and the rest of
Europe via satellite. There is an increasing push to make Gaelic more visible in the
Scottish linguistic landscape and to include it on directional and informational signs.

4.2.3 - Irish

Irish, or Gaelige, is a Celtic language spoken in western parts of the Republic of Ireland,
or Poblacht na hÉireann, as well as Northern Ireland, or Tuaisceart Éireann. The
language has often been mistakenly called 'Gaelic' because the English word is so close
to the Irish Gaelige, but speakers prefer 'Irish' for its name in English. It is also
sometimes called Irish Gaelic partially because it is so closely related to Scottish Gaelic.
The use of the language in both countries has been relegated to small pockets,
primarily on the western coast. These areas are known in Irish as the Gaeltacht, or
since these areas are not contiguous, more appropriately the Gaeltachtai.

Ireland was a sovereign state until the turn of the 19th century when it ‘joined’
England, Scotland and Wales to form the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.
Much as with Scotland, there had been centuries of tensions between the two countries and despite the political union, Ireland remained attached to its cultural and linguistic distinctness. These tensions intensified once Ireland became part of the United Kingdom and eventually led to the so-called Irish War of Independence. This war resulted in the foundation of the Irish Free State within the British Empire, with the exception of six counties that became Northern Ireland. In 1937, a sovereign state was created, and in 1949 a republic was declared and the newly found country left the British Commonwealth. Through all these changes, Northern Ireland has remained part of the United Kingdom.

Irish is the national and first official language of the Republic of Ireland (English is the second official language) and is recognized by the UK government as a regional language in Northern Ireland. Proficiency in Irish was required of all civil servants in Ireland through 1974. According to the constitution, all legislation and laws are required to be in recorded in both official languages, though this is seldom upheld. Irish became an official language of the European Union in 2005. In the Republic of Ireland, Irish language matters, particularly concerning language equity, are overseen by the Comisinéir Teanga (Irish Language Ombudsman). In 1999, the transnational, island-wide Foras na Gaelige (Irish Language Body) was founded. A survey conducted in 2007 showed that over 350,000 respondents in the Republic of Ireland judged their command of the language as fluent or nearly fluent, but it is
estimated\textsuperscript{24} that fewer than 80,000 truly are fluent and even fewer use it in their daily lives.

Despite the loosening of requirements for language proficiency for government officials, Irish remains a compulsory subject in primary and secondary schools. Applicants to the various institutes of the National University of Ireland are required to have either a leaving certificate or a qualifying exam in the language. The \textit{Fine Gael} party, which won power in the 2011 elections, champions removing the requirement to study Irish in English-medium schools to better invest in the future generation of Irish speakers as opposed to forcing everyone to learn the language. Enrollment in Irish-medium schools is on the rise and recent figures\textsuperscript{25} show nearly 38,000 pupils enrolled in \textit{Gaelscoileanna} (Irish-language primary schools) and more than 4,000 pupils enrolled in Irish-language middles schools. In the Gaeltachtaí there are an additional 9,000 pupils enrolled at the primary level and 3,000 at the secondary level. Finally, there are also nearly 3,400 pupils enrolled in Irish-language education in Northern Ireland.

Irish, either through monolingual or bilingual formats, is heavily present in all outlets of mass media. TG4 is an Irish-language television channel that is broadcast both in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland and draws on average 800,000 viewers daily in the Republic of Ireland. RTÉ International is a new satellite television channel with bilingual programming that broadcasts across Europe and North America. BBC Two Northern Ireland also produces a variety of Irish-language

\textsuperscript{24} http://census.cso.ie
\textsuperscript{25} http://www.gaelscoileanna.ie/?lang=en
programming. In addition to dozens of bilingual regional radio stations, there are six Irish monolingual radio stations broadcasting from both Ireland and Northern Ireland and several news magazines in print. Since 2009, Samsung includes Irish-language software as a standard feature on its mobile phones. Bilingual signage is very common, particularly in areas of high tourist activity.

4.2.4 - Welsh

Welsh, or Cymraeg, is a Celtic language spoken in Wales, or Cymru, on the western part of Great Britain. It is closely related to Cornish and Breton. While numbers of Welsh speakers were declining during the first part of the last century, there has been an increase over the past two decades. Now part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Wales was at one time a sovereign state. The English kings sought to control the country for a long time and built a series of fortresses and castles along the Welsh border to maintain their dominance in the area. Wales was finally annexed by England in the middle of the 16th century. Much like in Scotland, there was a referendum in 1997 which yielded favorable results for a devolved regional government. Consequently, the Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru, or National Assembly of Wales, was created in 1999. Welsh is recognized by the British central government as a regional language of the United Kingdom and, along with English and Gaelic, is one of the languages which applicants may use to satisfy the language proficiency requirement in order to gain British citizenship. The Welsh Language Measure of 2011 now gives the language official status in Wales.
The Welsh Language Board, or Bwrdd yr Iaith Gymraeg, was established as a result of the Welsh Language Act of 1993. Its charge is to “promote and facilitate” the use of Welsh. As such, it conducted surveys on the use of Welsh. In 2004, it released that 611,000 identify themselves as Welsh speakers\textsuperscript{26}, meaning that some 21% of the population of the country is able to speak Welsh. Of this, more than three quarters (78%) consider themselves fluent or fair speakers of the language and well over half (62%) claim to use Welsh on a daily basis. These figures confirm that Welsh is currently the most-widely spoken of the Celtic languages. It is possible to communicate in Welsh, through the Board, with certain European institutions. The aforementioned Welsh Language Measure, however, will soon abolish the Board.

English was generally the sole language of instruction in schools throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The first Welsh Primary School was opened in 1939 and the first Welsh secondary school opened in 1955. Starting in 1990, all pupils have been required to take Welsh language instruction through the age of 14. In 1999, the study of Welsh became required through the age of 16. Enrollment in Addysg Cyfrwng Cymraeg (Welsh Medium Education) continues to grow. Recent figures show that an impressive 20% of school-aged children are enrolled in Welsh-medium education. This translates to nearly 55,000 children enrolled in Welsh-medium primary schools in 2007-08 and more than 40,000 enrolled in Welsh-medium secondary schools the following year\textsuperscript{27}.

\textsuperscript{26} \url{http://www.byig-wlb.org.uk/English/publications/Publications/4068.pdf}
\textsuperscript{27} \url{http://wales.gov.uk/docs/statistics/2008/081127swgs2008ch7ency.xls}
The favorable position of Welsh in Wales, as opposed to the other Celtic languages, has been partially attributed to the creation in 1984 of *Sianel Pedwar Cymru* (Channel Four Wales) or S4C, a television channel initially broadcasting in both English and Welsh. Since the transition to digital television, however, it now broadcasts solely in Welsh. The channel commissions programs from *BBC Cyrmu* (BBC Wales), one of which, *Pobol y Cwm* (People of the Valley) is the longest running British soap opera and the most widely watched program on S4C. It, along with the other programs on S4C, is broadcast with English subtitles, thus making it accessible to those who do not speak Welsh. Funding for the channel currently comes from the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport, but will fall under the BBC starting in 2013. The financial impact has been estimated to an effective 25% cut in the annual budget of the channel. *BBC Radio Cymru* (BBC Radio Wales) is the sole radio station which broadcasts entirely in Welsh, but many others produce Welsh-language programming. There are not any Welsh-language daily print newspapers, but there are dozens of weekly and monthly specialized and local print publications. In 2006, the Welsh Language Board began offering a predictive program for writing text messages in Welsh. In 2009, Samsung released its first mobile phone with a built-in Welsh dictionary and interface. Much like the use of Navajo in World War II, during the European intervention in Bosnia, a Welsh regiment used the language to send sensitive emergency communication. Bilingual road signs, both informational and directional, are relatively present throughout the country.
4.2.5 - Scots

While not a Celtic language, it is also important to consider the situation of Scots, or *Braid Scots* (Broad Scots) or *Lallans* (Lowlands). This is a Germanic language spoken in Lowland Scotland and parts of the Irish province of Ulster (which occupies territory both Northern Ireland and the Republic), where it is called Ulster Scots. To avoid confusion with Scottish Gaelic or Scottish English, in Scotland, the language is also sometimes called Lowland Scots. The name for this language has been cause for confusion for hundreds of years. Scots is a shortened form of *Scottis*, which until the late 15th century was used in English to refer to the Celtic language of the Scottish Highlands. English was then called *Inglis*. Slowly Scottis began to represent the non-English Germanic language spoken in the Lowlands and *Erse* (or Irish) slowly became the name used for the Celtic language.

Before Scotland and England were joined by the Treaty of Union in 1707, Scots was widely used in every facet of Scottish life. Unlike many other regional languages discussed here, Scots has a considerable literary past, but like most regional languages has lost much of its prestige and domains of regular usage. This regression would give it in what Kloss (1967) would call *Ausbaudialekt* or *Halbsprache* (half language) status, whereby Moderns Scots’ *Dachsprache* (‘roofing’ or standard language) has over the centuries become English. Scots does not possess a standard literary form and a 2010 study conducted by the Scottish Government that nearly two-thirds (64%) of the adult population of the country “don’t really think of Scots as a language.”

---

28 http://www.scotslanguage.com/books/view/2/941
Estimates to ascertain how many people speak Scots are difficult to determine since the name 'Scots' can mean different things for different people. For some it has come to simply mean the variety of English spoken in Scotland, whereas for others it means the language of former literary fame. The challenge of this continuum is that since everyone who speaks Scots also speaks English, and code switching is very common, it is often difficult to define where English ends and where Scots begins. This is not dissimilar to the situation of French and Gallo. Nonetheless, the estimate of 100,000 speakers is generally accepted.

There is no system of Scots language education and the language is not present in the media, except in occasional theatrical performances. The language, however, has been recognized by the United Kingdom (and Ireland) as a regional language in both in Scotland and Northern Ireland. This dual recognition is the same as that of Irish for both countries. Scots is not highly visible in the linguistic landscape, but the government, particularly in Northern Ireland, has made an effort to include it – along with Irish and/or Gaelic – on official buildings.

Of all the regional languages discussed above, precious few are considered to be in a ‘safe’ position in relation to the national language, whether it be French or English. These would include Alsatian, Basque, Catalan and Welsh. With the notable exception of Corsican, which enjoys special legal status in France – but still would not be considered safe – all of the aforementioned languages spoken in France are endangered within its borders. They do benefit, however, from the more favorable positions found in neighboring countries, where some like Catalan and Welsh have
become so prominent that their place in society is now seldom questioned. Unfortunately, regional languages in France have a long way to go before the same can be said of them. The situation of the languages of Brittany is doubly precarious, since the region is home to not just one but two historically important but embattled languages.

4.3 - LANGUAGE POLICY IN FRANCE AND BRITTANY

French language policy, independent of Brittany, can be split into three distinct phases which I would label as (1) indifference, (2) defensive or protective nationalism and (3) reluctant regionalism. As it relates to Franco-Breton relations, most of the period following the foundation of the First French Republic would fall into the second category. Before reviewing French language policy, however, it is helpful to have a basic understanding of Brittany and its culture. As discussed above, Brittany has been bilingual since the Roman era. The modern confusion over Brittany’s linguistic heritage likely stems from the fact that Bretons (Celtic and Romance alike) share a common culture based in a predominantly Celtic tradition.

Unlike many of its neighbors, sovereign Brittany was not centralized and, in fact, never had a single fixed capital. This political disorganization fostered a Breton-Gallo diglossic state which continued well beyond the region’s integration into the Kingdom of France late in the 15th century. This, in fact, had little impact on the languages spoken by Bretons; nobles continued to speak Breton, though they began to favor a transition to French, while peasants maintained their customary language use.
Once Brittany joined the Kingdom of France, its languages were wrapped into the proverbial fold and would be treated like any other under French rule. Political interest in these languages, though, did not begin to surface until after the French Revolution. These interests have intensified, and aggressively so, with the passage of time and have only recently begun to change in favor of the traditional languages of the region by giving them constitutional legitimacy.

The first sign of these interests emerges in the 16th century when Francis I signed an edict\textsuperscript{29} changing the official language of the Court from Latin to French, which codified the centuries-old popular linguistic evolution in terms of royal communication and proclamation. The next sign was an attempt to standardize the language of the Court to enable more effective communication across the Kingdom\textsuperscript{30}. These measures were practical in their scope and constitute the first phase of French language policy of indifference toward regional languages referenced above. While neither targeted regional languages, they did place a newfound prestige on the mastery of French, particularly in regions where it was not widely spoken. Shortly

\textsuperscript{29} (1539) Ordonnance de Villers-Cotterêts art. 111. “De prononcer et expedier tous actes en langaige françoys: Et pour ce que telles choses sont souventesfoys advenues sur l’intelligence des motz latins contenus es dictz arretz. Nous voulons que doresenavant tous arretz ensemble toutes aultres procedeures, soient de nous cours souveraines ou aultres subalternes et inferieures, soient de registres, enquestes, contractz, commisions, sentences, testamens et aultres quelzconques actes et exploictz de justice ou qui en dependent, soient prononquez, enregistrez et delivrez aux parties en langage maternel francoys et non aultrement.”

Proclamation and expedition of all acts in French : With regard to those things which often rely on the knowledge of Latin words We wish that all edits along with other procedures, whether from Our sovereign courts or other lesser bodies, including registries, investigations, contracts, commissions, sentences, testimonies and any other acts and judicial decisions or any acts resulting from the aforementioned, shall be proclaimed, recorded and delivered in French and no other language.

\textsuperscript{30} (1635) Académie Française - “La mission qui lui fut assignée dès l’origine était de fixer la langue française, de lui donner des règles, de la rendre pure et compréhensible par tous.”
after the Revolution, the legislature of the new Republic began to look at the use of French by its citizens, only ten percent of whom were estimated to speak the so-called language of liberty. At the same time, the Académie Française began exercising its full force by also ‘purifying’ French of undesirable elements (e.g. expressions, orthographies, etc.) and protecting the language from foreign influence.

France's defeat in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) would bring an end to the French Second Empire and establish the Third Republic. The war also resulted in the foundation of the German Empire and permitted the newly formed Kingdom of Italy to integrate the Papal States (formerly controlled by France), thus achieving the physical extent of modern-day Italy. The Republican leaders of the time blamed the loss of the Alsace-Lorraine region to Germany (then Prussia) on the State's inability to intellectually, culturally and linguistically integrate the border regions into the proverbial national fabric. This is when primary education became national, free, secular, mandatory and above all dispensed in French. Thus began the aforementioned second phase of the language policy, that of defensive or protective nationalism.

Irénée Carré, who was the superintendant charged with Gallicizing the Breton speakers of the region wrote, “[les Basques] sont généralement plus propres et plus civilisés que les Bretons”31 and his superior declared that there would be “aucun inconvénient à qu'en France personne ne parlât le breton, tandis qu'il est utile que les

---

31 The Basques are generally cleaner and more civilized than the Bretons.
Basques puissent communiquer avec leurs congénères espagnols.” 32 (See Appendix 1 for signs about speaking regional languages in school.) While the official policies in place did not target any one regional language, anti-Breton sentiment was common during this time to the point where contemporary authors Balzac and Maupassant criticized and made fun of Brittany and Breton in their literary works. Nationalizing and secularizing primary education had a significant impact on the use of all regional languages in France. After the First World War, for example, it was estimated that as little as one-half of the population of the historically Breton-speaking part of the region still spoke the language, a trend of regression that continued throughout the 20th century.

Shortly after the Second World War, though, the legislative and educational landscape changed with regard to regional languages; the optional instruction of four such languages (Basque, Breton, Catalan and Occitan) was suddenly permitted 33. This selection was far from random; these four languages were minor and without foreign connotations and were not perceived to pose any threat to the Nation. Alsatian, Corsican and Flemish, however, were labeled foreign languages (German, Italian and Dutch, respectively), and thus initially excluded from the legislation.

The climate changed in the Fifth Republic (1958 – present), however, when legislation was passed in 1975 that required the use of French – and no other

---

32 ...nothing wrong with no one speaking Breton in France, while it is useful for the Basques to be able to communicate with their Spanish cousins.
33 (1951) Deixonne Act
language – in all public displays\textsuperscript{34}. Although the expressed intention of this legislation was to protect French from English, it nonetheless had a disastrous effect on the presence of regional languages across the country. Despite this, however, the first Breton-immersion Diwan ("sprout") school opened two years after this legislation was enacted. This secular, associative project quickly gave way to similar models in the Catholic (\textit{Dihun}, “awakening”) and public (\textit{Div Yezh}, “two languages”) school systems.

Unfortunately, the legislature decided to enact even stronger measures to protect French as the national language\textsuperscript{35}, which eventually led to the constitutional amendment that officially made French the sole language of the Republic. It was on this very amendment that the Constitutional Court based its ruling when it declared that the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages was unconstitutional. Therefore, even though France did sign the Charter, the current French Constitution, namely the then newly amended Article 2, prevented the country’s legislative bodies from ratifying it. This undoubtedly marked the peak of the anti-regionalist nationalism phase of French language policy.

In the summer of 2008, the third phase officially began with the national legislature approving another series of constitutional amendments that included recognition of regional languages, but only in the context of national heritage. Individual regions had already begun the process of recognizing their respective languages as part of their regional heritage; however this recognition carried little, if

\textsuperscript{34} (1975) Bas-Lauriol Act  
\textsuperscript{35} (1994) Toubon Act
any, clout in such a heavily centralized polity. Brittany did so in 2004 and now recognizes the presence of three languages in the region: French, Breton and Gallo. The Regional Council has committed itself to funding education in the two traditional languages as well as increasing their visibility in public spaces. The General Council of the Pyrénées-Orientales did the same for Catalan in 2007.

The *Institut National d’Études Démographiques* - INED (French National Institute of Demographic Studies) published a study in 2002 looking at languages in France throughout the 20th century, which reported that nine of ten Breton speakers will not transmit the language to their children (Héran, Filhoun & Deprez, 2002:3). Indeed, according to a study published that same year by the INSEE, only 3% of parents having children born between 1980 and 1990 spoke to their children in a regional language (Clanché, 2002:3). This means that virtually no children are exposed to the regional language in the home any longer. Additionally, only 37% of those who learned a regional language from their parents use it today (Clanché, 2002:3). A startling figure indeed when the same study shows that some 66% of those who learned a foreign language from their parents still use that language regularly.

Another problem facing the Breton-speaking population is its advanced age: 1999 census data shows that three fourths of the Breton-speaking population is over 50 and one-half is over 65 years old (Le Boëtté 2003:20). With this ever-aging demographic, the language has all but lost its position in the workplace, now finding itself relegated to purely social settings. According to three separate surveys on the
use of Breton, conducted in 1997 (Broudic 1999), 1999 (Le Boëtté 2003) and 2007 (Broudic 2009), the language is most commonly spoken with friends, neighbors and siblings ~75%, 63% and 52%, respectively (Broudic 1999:57). This is important, as barely 25% reported speaking the language with their children and only 13% with co-workers. The scope of the first study was slightly different from that of the latter two, since the former simply focused on numbers of speakers, while the latter two also looked at domains of use and interlocutors. Considering that Breton speakers account for only approximately five percent of the current population of Brittany and the majority are elderly, the survey results showing that Breton is in addition severely restricted in terms of domain (especially its use with children in the home) gives cause for serious concern about the viability of the language in the decades to come.

The three previous studies, with their focus on who speaks Breton, to whom, and in what settings, provides an invaluable backdrop for my study focused on the social value of Breton and Gallo in modern-day Breton society. The results of the previous studies offer important insight into the overall use of the language among Bretons, which helps contextualize some of the attitudes expressed by respondents to my surveys about the language and its role in today’s Brittany. Unfortunately, there has not been the same amount of academic research focusing on Gallo. The few studies that exist tend to focus more on surveying individual dialects and accents. The INSEE did mention Gallo in a recent study it conducted on Breton (Le Boëtté 2003). The average speaker of either language is well into their retirement years, but this study showed that when compared to Breton, Gallo seems to have suffered from a less
dramatic loss of speakers over the past century. All this despite the apparent lesser degree of recognition Gallo has with regard to its Celtic cousin (both in- and outside the region). While no explanation was offered for this phenomenon, one might attribute it to the linguistic proximity of Gallo to French, which may well raise issues of code-mixing in other discussions, but here may explain why speakers have not forsaken its use. This would be related to the idea that while long classified “poor French,” it is not foreign and therefore its use might be less stigmatized and certainly less ‘threatening’.

While Breton gradually disappeared from the public sphere over the last century, it remained prevalent in place names, including the names of administrative divisions. Indeed, the names of Brittany’s five traditional départements are products of a history rich in toponymic diversity. In France, the département is the smallest territorial division with administrative autonomy. Each département has a numerical reference to its position in an alphabetical listing of all départements by name. To make reference to each of the départements of Brittany more manageable, I will first refer to them by their numerical reference and then indicate their names along with any changes that may have taken place since the départements were introduced after the French Revolution. Département number 44 underwent a name change after it was detached from Brittany during World War II. Originally called Loire-Inférieure (Lower Loire – Loire being the name of the longest river in France, which empties into the Atlantic Ocean in the southern part of traditional Brittany), it has been called Loire-Atlantique (Atlantic Loire) since 1957. Département number 22 was called
Côtes-du-Nord (Coasts of the North) until 1990 when its name was changed to Côtes-d'Armor (Coasts of the ‘country’ by the sea). The decision to change the name was approved by the General Council of the département back in the 1960s based on the idea that the original name carried a negative connotation, but the change was not implemented for nearly 30 years. This change, applauded by the tourism industry, puts forward the département’s Breton identity, one it must be said is more of yore than the modern day since, as discussed above, in modern Breton armor is actually arvor. This notion of nostalgia is ubiquitous in the French national perception of Brittany, Bretons and Breton.

At the same time that the Côtes-du-Nord had its name changed, département number 35 made an official request to change its name as well. Its name was Ille-et-Vilaine, which refers the confluence of two rivers in the département’s and region’s capital, Rennes. The proposed changed would have named the département Marche-de-Bretagne, which could be translated as “Steps of Brittany” since the département is the historic buffer between the region and the rest of France. This requested name change was immediately rejected by the Direction départementale de l’Équipement (roughly equivalent to a State Highway Administration). No official reason was given for the rejection, but two hypotheses prevail: the government did not wish (1) to grant such a blatantly pro-regionalist name for fear it could incite further requests for pro-Brittany identifiers or similar requests in other regions; or (2) to undertake the renumbering of the then 60 départements that followed Ille-et-Vilaine in the alphabetical listing. Even if the government was working under a Republican mandate,
the second possible explanation for the rejection of the request carries a great deal of credibility due to the enormous costs that would have resulted from having to change the numbers of the 60 subsequent départements. These numbers are omnipresent in French daily life and changing them would have meant changing, among other things, the postal codes for thousands of municipalities in the affected départements (since these numbers are the first two digits in the postal code system), and until recently all the license plates for the same départements as well (since these same numbers were the last two digits on all license plates), thereby changing the addresses and vehicle registration numbers of literally millions across the country.

Département number 29 has the Gallicized version of the Latin finibus terrae, Finistère, which means the “end of the Earth.” This name is very fitting for the département since it is located on the Atlantic coast and is the westernmost point in France. It is certain that in times past, many looking out over the expanse of the ocean considered this to be the end of the world. Finally, département number 56 has the notoriety of being the only French département to have a non-French name. Morbihan, which means “little sea” in Breton, amazingly survived the post-revolutionary naming reforms. This far from small feat is nevertheless fitting since the it is located on the southern shores of the region, forming the northern boundary of the Bay of Biscay.

As discussed above, the visual presence of a language is also important to give it a place in the public sphere. In addition to the declaration of support made by the Breton Regional Council, the Region has also taken the unique step to make a Breton version on its latest logo. Unlike the Corsican logo highlighted above, there is no single
bilingual logo for Brittany; however, keeping the languages separate does avoid assigning any hierarchical value to one language over the other. According to the Region, the new logos (shown in Figures 8 below) were intentionally designed to reflect a populace that is ever prouder, and publicly so, of its Breton heritage. The color choice was meant to represent the traditional divide between the blue Arvor (sea or coast) and the green Argoat (land or forest) of the region.

**Figure 8 – New Logos for Brittany (French and Breton)**

![Logos](https://example.com/logos)

Source: Région Bretagne

The ermine (or weasel) form is a very traditional symbol of Brittany, which also figures prominently on the Region’s flag, the *Gwenn ha du* (black and white), since the ermine shape represents, in stylized form, the shape of the region. Both versions of the above logo are seen throughout the region, especially on the Region’s trains. Regrettably, the Gallo version of the logo (shown in Figure 9 below) is not present on the Region’s website. It is present, however, on many Gallo sites. The Region only provided the Gallo version of the logo upon request. Considering that the logos were designed the year following the Region’s recognition of Breton and Gallo as languages...
of the region and pledge of support to both, it is interesting that the Region did not openly include Gallo in its move to re-brand the image of Brittany.

**Figure 9 – Gallo Version of New Logo for Brittany**

![Gallo Version of New Logo for Brittany](image)

*Source: Région Bretagne*

In sum, while culturally speaking all of Brittany is unquestionably Celtic, the region is more linguistically diverse than most think. In fact, the current Celtic-Romantic cohabitation can be traced back to the beginning of Roman rule shortly before the dawn of the so-called Common Era. This slowly spread the use of Latin westward overtaking many of the local Gaulish dialects. This was reversed in the 5th century when the Britons began crossing the Channel to flee Germanic tribes who were invading the British Isles. The geographical contours of the use of Breton (and, by extension, Gallo) continued to fluctuate over the next millennium until settling along the oft-cited current dividing line that stretches from Plouha in the North to Vannes in the South (see Figure 3). Much like other regional languages in France who also suffered under the Republican French-taught school system, many pro-Breton activists see the school – in particular, bilingual education programs – as the means by which the declining Breton language can be stabilized and, in the long term, its
diminishment reversed. In the following chapter, these programs will be discussed in relation to the frameworks of reversing language shift, language attitude and language ideologies.
5 - LITERATURE REVIEW

It is outside scope of my project to delve into a complete discussion of identity as defined in fields like psychology and sociology. That said, seminal works in sociolinguistics have drawn connections between the social value of linguistic features and community identity, from Labov's pioneering sociolinguistic study of language and identity in the rural, historically isolated community of Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts (1963), to large-scale sociolinguistic studies of urban populations like New York City (Labov 1966) and Detroit, Michigan (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1968), to current studies focusing on how individual and community identities are revealed in and constructed through ongoing discourse (e.g. Schilling-Estes 2004; Podesva 2007). In addition, there is a long tradition in the study of language attitudes of investigating the interrelation of identity and entire languages, beginning with Lambert, et al.'s (1960) pioneering work in the field. (See, e.g., Campbell-Kibler 2010 and Preston 2013 for comprehensive overviews of language attitude studies. See also Bucholtz and Hall 2004 and Kiesling 2013 for overviews of sociolinguistic studies of language and identity.) My study follows the traditions of (variationist) sociolinguistics and language attitude studies in their focus on the close relation between language and identity, as well as language attitude studies in their focus on entire languages rather than individual linguistic features.
5.1 LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND IDEOLOGY

The sociolinguistic study of language attitudes presupposes two factors: an accepted norm—or standard—and some degree of variation. As noted above, variationist studies often lead researchers to investigate the attitudes that are connected to different sociolinguistic variables, oftentimes focused on phonological features; however, I am more interested in those studies conducted on attitudes towards entire languages. These studies tend to focus on a limited number of countries, languages or language families. Spain and its co-official regional languages—Catalan (Mollà and Viana 1987; Villaverde i Vidal 1998; DiGiacomo 1999; Strubell 2001; Ramón Solé i Durany 2004; Solé i Camardons 2004; Huguet 2007; Pujolar 2007; Marany 2008), Valencian (Martines et al. 2003; Doppelbauer 2006; Safont Jordà 2007), Galician (Loredo Guitérrez 2007; O’Rourke 2011) and Basque (Grin and Vaillancourt 1999; Azurmendi, Bachoc and Zabaleta 2001; Antxustegi 2004; Cenoz and Gorter 2006; Lagabaster 2007; Aiestaran, Cenoz and Gorter 2010)—figure prominently among recent studies. Similarly, the Celtic languages of the British Isles have also been consistently cited in the literature on language attitudes—Welsh (Sharp et al. 1973; Stubbs 1991; Grin and Vaillancourt 1999; Bradley 2002; Garrett, Coupland and Williams 2003; Laugharne 2007; Garrett 2010), Gaelic (MacKinnon 1981; McEwan-Fujita 2008) and Irish (Ó Riagáin 1991, 1997, 2001; Grin and Vaillancourt 1999; Ahlqvist 2002; Ó hIfearnáin 2004; Ó Laoire 2007; Kallen 2008; Kallen and Ní Dhommacha 2010; O’Rourke 2011). However, attitudes toward the Celtic language of France—namely, Breton—have
received little scholarly attention, other than tangentially, as part of the three surveys of Breton language use mentioned above (Broudic 1999, 2009; Le Boëtté 2003).

As Preston (2002) illustrates, attitudes toward languages very often stem from attitudes toward those who speak them. The investigation of transfer of social perceptions of or prejudices toward speakers to their language varieties was the impetus behind Lambert et al.'s (1960) language attitude studies grounded in the matched guise technique, whereby researchers had a number of Canadian French/English bilinguals each record texts in both languages and then asked participants to rate speakers on a variety of scalar variables, for example attractiveness, friendliness, social status and likability. The objective of the matched guise technique is to remove inter-speaker variance from potentially impacting participants’ ratings by having a single speaker produce speech samples in a variety of languages or ‘guises’. The results of Lambert et al.'s study indicated that French-speaking Quebeckers rated English speakers more favorably than French speakers (the opposite of the trend attested for English-speaking Quebeckers). Among other conclusions, this suggested surprisingly that French-speaking Quebeckers, a “minority” in their own province at this time in history (at least in terms of political and social power), held their language in lower regard than English. In fact, when this study was conducted, English was lingua franca in most metropolitan areas across Quebec.

Language attitudes have informed research related to language ideology. Language ideologies typically revolve around social beliefs about language (standards, origins, etc.) and the role language plays (or should play) in society. In their extensive
review of the field, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) identify three threads in the domain of language ideologies: language varieties, public discourse on language, and linguistic structures. All three of these enter into the discussion of languages in Brittany.

First, there are the questions related to Breton and Gallo and their respective dialects. Second, comes the collection of French and European laws enacted with regard to language and the debate that has often surrounded them. Third, there is the tendency of regional language supporters to adhere to historical purist movements seen in national language debates in relation to standardizing their own regional languages. Indeed the establishment of a national language, a standardized language, has been seen as a fundamental element of nation building over the past two centuries (Fasold 1984).

This then begs the question, what is a nation and what role does language play in nationhood? Anderson (1983:7) defines a nation as “an imagined political community that is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.” It is Herder who is most often credited with most resolutely supporting the idea of “one nation, one language,” which exemplifies the Romantic notion of Volksgeist (national spirit) put forth by Herder in mid-eighteenth century Prussia. He sought to create a sense of pride in German-language literature and German nationhood that would rival his contemporaries’ trend to emulate everything French. This ideological concept emerged right before the American and French revolutions, which Herder supported, and roughly a century before the unification of the German Empire. Since language is
the vehicle by which literature is transmitted, Herder saw a single national language as a crucial component to laying claim to nationhood.

Other examples of using language as an integral part of nationhood, at least in the European context, would include Serbian and Croatian, and Slovak and Czech. In both cases, nationalists focused on and emphasized the linguistic features that distinguished the two varieties from one another to justify re-labeling them as two separate languages, as each political entity was transformed into its own separate nation and eventually separate state (McColl Millar 2005).

This notion of language, though, must be recognized as being very Western, something which European colonizers imported to their various colonies. Prior to the arrival of the Europeans in Africa, for instance, many indigenous peoples did not actually have a name for their language (Irvine and Gal, 2000; Brand, 2006). Along these same lines, it is curious to see that the names of most of the world’s languages are often the same as the adjective used for people belonging to that group.

At the very core of any language ideology is the discourse of legitimacy: what is true and right. This idea is reflected in Silverstein’s (1979:193) widely quoted definition of language ideology, namely the “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.” Language ideologies are highly, if not wholly, informed by the rhetoric of those in power. This concept is captured in Irvine’s (1989:255) definition of language ideology as “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests.” Indeed, we should bear in mind that
beliefs do not exist in a vacuum but rather reflect society, especially the views of the ruling classes.

Closely linked to this notion of legitimacy comes the matter of authority. Who in fact ‘controls’ the languages that we speak? In many societies there is an institution charged with overseeing the use of the language, establishing the standard and determining what is correct, particularly with regard to the lexicon. As discussed in Chapter 4, the Académie Française is perhaps the example *par excellence*, but many other languages have similar institutions. Spain has the Real Academia Española, Italy has the *Accademia della Crusca* (Academy of the Chaff), the German-speaking countries have the supranational *Rat für deutsche Rechtschreibung* (Council for German Orthography) for spelling norms, and Norway has its *Språkrådet* (Language Council). Many endangered languages have also established similar entities. Wales has the *Bwrdd yr Iaith Gymraeg* (Welsh Language Board), South Africa has *Die Taalkommissie* (the Afrikaans Language Commission), Brittany has its newly institutionalized *Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg* and Basque has the *Euskaltzaindia*.

Another institution known for putting forth language ideologies perhaps better than any governmental administration is the school. This is where children learn about what is acceptable in their society, oftentimes before they can question the validity of what they are being taught. In addition to imparting often implicit ideologies regarding linguistic capital (Bourdieu and Passeron 1970; Bourdieu 2001), a principle of Bourdieusian thought which highlights the value that society places on certain linguistic features, education often implicates another tenet of his canon,
‘symbolic violence’ (1982, 1994), that is, the constant inculcation and reproduction of social inequities within every society, to the point that neither those who ‘impose’ them nor those who ‘suffer’ under them are aware of their existence. According to Bourdieu, symbolic violence can manifest itself in a variety of venues, most notably in the realm of education via the social bias of exams (1968), the way honors are attributed (1989), or even the structure of the school system itself (1994). Examples of this may be seen in the rules of pre-war France, where it was “forbidden to speak Breton and to spit on the floor” and children in the south were told to “speak French and to be clean” (see Appendix 1). Such parallels lead children to hold their regional languages in very low regard and, of course, to exalt French.

5.1.1 - Terminology for the French Context

While a common term in linguistics literature, ‘minority language’ is one that perhaps should not be used in reference to the traditional languages of Brittany or France. It is true that the descriptor ‘minority’ is applicable to any language whose speakers are not in a position of power in a given society; however, it often carries a different connotation in France, where such terminology is reserved for cultural minorities, typically immigrants. In cases of traditional languages, the French practice is to call these languages, when they are considered languages, ‘regional’ languages. A similar distinction, albeit with different applications is made in the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. This treaty adopted in 1992 at the Council of Europe
(a supranational entity that predates and extends beyond the current membership of the European Union) clearly differentiates between regional and minority languages.

Initially drafted in terms of ‘less widespread languages’, politicians opted for ‘regional and minority languages’ for the final version. With regard to the treaty, regional “denotes languages spoken in a limited part of the territory of a state, within which, moreover, they may be spoken by the majority of citizens” and minority “refers to situations in which either the language is spoken by persons who are not concentrated on a specific part of the territory of a state or it is spoken by a group of persons, which, though concentrated on part of the territory or state, is numerically smaller than the population in this region which speaks the majority language of the state.” (Conseil de l’Europe 1992 §18) While the various traditional languages of France would be considered minority languages according to the aforementioned European treaty, due to the interpretation of the term ‘minority’ in France, they are almost exclusively called regional languages because they are historically bound to a particular region of the country. Therefore, for the purposes of this project and to avoid confusion when referencing segments of interview data, I will use the terminology of those I interviewed in Brittany and apply the French definition of regional language to the cases of Breton and Gallo.

5.2 REVERSING LANGUAGE SHIFT

In any discussion of languages that have become disenfranchised, whether as a result of explicit national policy or a gradual change in desirability and practice, the revival
of the language and its return to widespread use in society often finds itself at the fore. In order to determine the degree to which a particular language has seen its use and/or utility in social interactions diminish, a variety of scales have been developed. Here I will review two of the most prominent examples, ’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) and the UNESCO Ad-Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Language's criteria for language vitality and endangerment.

Fishman’s GIDS (1991) (See Appendix 2) is an eight-stage scale which describes current language use within a community, always referencing the degree to which the language is transmitted between generations. He also discusses strategies for reversing language shift in the community at hand with an inherent goal of moving up the scale to a more vital stage, indicated by a lower number. Fishman uses the term Xish to refer to the minority language and Yish for the majority language, whereby he refers to speakers of Xish as Xmen and speakers of Yish as Ymen. Since Fishman is an unabashed champion of language revitalization, it should not come as a surprise that his scale starts at the final stage (Stage 8) when a language is spoken by isolated elderly persons, with the least chance of being ‘saved’. He likens the GIDS to the Richter scale, whereby the higher numbers on the scale represent greater ‘danger’. The crucial point along the GIDS for Fishman is Stage 6 because it describes a situation where the minority language is being actively transmitted between generations, its speakers live in sufficient proximity to one another to create a physical language community, and the language has some degree of institutional support. The final two stages of the GIDS, Fishman admits represent a pipe dream for most minority
languages, whereby they are present in governmental, media, educational and professional spheres.

Fishman has written and edited many books on the subject of RLS and it is interesting that he qualifies three languages as RLS success stories, namely Catalan in Spain (see previous section), French in Quebec (Heller 1999; Bourhis 2001) and Hebrew in Israel (Dagut 1985; Spolsky and Shohamy 1999; Shohamy 2004). It is certain that they more than satisfy the Stage 1 criteria; however, what is intriguing is the means by which all three arrived at this point. Governments in all three territories have severely restricted the use of other languages (including, at times, the majority language of the State) to achieve their objective of revitalizing their language to the status of the everyday means of communication within the limits of the respective territory. When one champions the cause of recognizing and valuing languages that have been disregarded and/or marginalized in the past, it is only logical to want to see them take their ‘rightful’ place in modern society. However, in so doing, do speakers of these languages have the right to disparage the languages that once dominated in their communities? Such a scenario of the oppressed becoming the oppressor not only seems counterproductive in settings where multiple languages are present, but perhaps also hypocritical.

While their presence in their respective language communities varies quite a bit, both Breton and Gallo would likely be defined as Stage 7, since the average age of most of their speakers remains quite advanced, despite efforts to re-introduce the languages to children through immersion education programs. While not as dramatic
as Stage 8, which may be seen by some as a lost cause, there still is great cause for concern since languages in this situation have been cut off from the natural means of intergenerational transmission. Revitalization through education is a strategy that many minority languages have embraced, especially in the context of French regional languages. Activists caution, however, that simply sending children to school for an hour or two of regional language instruction cannot undo decades, or in some cases centuries, of discrimination.

Indeed, as the GIDS would suggest, the crucial factor in reviving any language in decline is assuring continued intergenerational transmission, without which good intentions, no matter how widespread, cannot hope to substitute for substantive social interaction in the language. While in addition to Breton language classes, immersion language programs, whereby at least half of the instruction takes place in Breton, do exist, the number of children enrolled in these programs cannot alone ensure the survival of the language and certainly cannot substitute for natural intergenerational transmission of the language. Unfortunately, there are only Gallo language classes; there are no immersion programs for the language.

In 2003, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) formed an Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages which submitted a document outlining how to determine language vitality and endangerment to the International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme Safeguarding of Endangered Languages in Paris. This extensive document presents a multi-dimensional assessment framework based on nine factors, each of which is then assigned a grade
(0-5) with regard to the degree of vitality for that particular factor. (See Appendix 4 for the full framework.) These grades range from Extinct (0) to Safe (5). The factors discussed in the UNESCO document encompass those that Fishman addresses in the GIDS with the explicit addition of attitudes (both external and internal) and documentation. The latter is a clear indication that UNESCO recognizes that some languages cannot be saved and instead efforts (and resources) should be used to document these languages while there are still speakers left.

Having to face the reality of little or no administrative recognition, many who wish to revive the traditional language of their region have turned to education as the primary means by which to do so. As discussed above, public education was one of the tools that French Republican leaders used to eliminate regional languages in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In fact, according to the 1997 survey of Breton usage mentioned above, three quarters of the Breton-speaking respondents did not know French before starting school (Broudic, 1999:57). Admittedly, this population is of advanced age, but this shows to what extent Breton was the lingua franca of much of Brittany in the last century. The situation now, however, is quite different, with a miniscule portion of today’s school-aged Breton speakers having learned the language at home. This illustrates a break in intergenerational transmission of the language, which is key to the survival of any language, whether endangered or not.

Dorian (1981) touches on all of the aforementioned UNESCO gauges of language vitality in her study involving the decline in use of the East Sutherland variant of Scottish Gaelic, but the most salient would undoubtedly be the transmission
of the language from one generation to the next. She uses the terms ‘semi-speaker’ and ‘near-passive bilingual’ to describe those who do not possess age-appropriate fluency in the language due to the loss of intergenerational transmission. Do Breton and Gallo face the same loss of fluency, as well as the domain shrinkage and relegation of the traditional languages to symbolic functions that Dorian also notes for Scottish Gaelic?

5.2.1 - Language Revival Efforts through Education

In 1969, with the founding of the first Ikastola in the Basque Country, the first immersion program in France for a regional language was established. Over the next eight years, programs in the other languages mentioned in the loi Deixonne followed suit: 1976 - Brassola (“cradle” in Catalan), 1977 - Diwan (“sprout” in Breton) and 1979 - Calendreta (“lark” or “learner” in Occitan). All of these programs would be classified as additive bilingual programs, where the regional language is being added to the students’ linguistic repertoire, which already includes an age-appropriate command of French. Aside from Gallo, which has a limited number of courses offered in Gallo, the others all make use of what could be called an inverted transitional model.

Tsunoda (2005) describes the standard transitional model as a model where instruction “is initially conducted in the minority language [which is] based on the view that ‘children learn better in their own language’” (pp. 204-5). The dominant language is then gradually introduced as the children progress through the system. While structurally this is certainly the situation of the bilingual-immersion programs
in France, I call them inverted because the motivation behind starting off in the minority language is to introduce the language as soon as possible to work on proficiency assuming that they will have sufficient exposure to French through their extracurricular activities (Diwan Breizh\textsuperscript{36}). Also, even in the best of situations, the number of children who speak the regional language as a first language is regrettably seldom more than a small minority.

Given the decline in the use of Breton by both population and domain, the Diwan ‘experiment’, as the program is often called, has purposely targeted introducing Breton to children at the earliest age possible. The promotional material for the program explains that children need to start at the age of two to permit acquisition of everyday language before being exposed to the more formal registers that are typically used in a classroom setting. To this end, the first four years of children’s participation in Diwan is conducted entirely in Breton. While structured slightly differently than other Breton-French bilingual programs, the consensus is to provide a solid foundation in Breton before re-introducing French in the academic realm. The promotional materials for Diwan include an explanation for the need of this Breton-exclusive beginning based on a tabulation of the number of hours of exposure to the language. With 168 hours in a seven-day week, the program’s designers assume 70 hours of sleep, leaving 98 hours of waking activity of which the 26 hours spent in the Breton-speaking environment at school constitutes roughly 25% (Diwan Breizh [online]). The association considers this exposure to be the minimum necessary to assure

\textsuperscript{36} http://www.diwanbreizh.org
functional independence in the language. While the program does tout excellent exam results, at the same time, they do recognize that the full acquisition of two languages will result in a slight delay for basic skills (e.g. reading, writing, math and reasoning) (Diwan Breizh [on-line]).

Applied linguist Jim Cummins (2003) explains that the distinction between his concepts of basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), which he initially presented in 1979, “was to draw attention to the very different time periods typically required for children to acquire conversational fluency in their second language as compared to grade-appropriate academic proficiency in that language” (p. 322). While conceptualized with immigrant children in mind, BICS and CALP would seem applicable to the Breton situation and behind the goal of the Diwan founders, namely upbringing and education (both covered by the French éducation) in the Breton language. Indeed the primary objective of this program model is to give children the linguistic repertoire in Breton that will allow them to use the language in all situations and registers from the playground to the classroom. As can be seen in Table 1, the three different Breton-language bilingual education programs distribute differently the various components of the curriculum among the language(s) used as means of instruction.
### Table 1 – Distribution of Hours of Instruction by Language by Bilingual Program

**Diwan (Sprout) – Independent (1977)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-6</th>
<th>Complete Breton Immersion</th>
<th>Breton 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Introduction to French</td>
<td>Breton 24, French 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Balancing of Skills in L1 &amp; L2</td>
<td>Breton 17, French 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to L3</td>
<td>English 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Content Courses in L1 &amp; L2</td>
<td>Breton 22.5, French 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Content Courses in L3 &amp; Introduction to L4</td>
<td>Breton 20, French 6.5, English 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Content Courses in L1, L2 &amp; L3</td>
<td>Breton 18.5, French 8, English 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence in L4</td>
<td>Spanish/German 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>50/50 L1 &amp; L2 with Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dihun (Awakening) – Catholic (1990)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>Complete Breton Immersion</th>
<th>Breton 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Introduction to L3</td>
<td>Breton 24, English 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Introduction to French</td>
<td>Breton 20, French 4, English 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Reading Skills in L1 &amp; L2</td>
<td>Breton 12, French 12, English 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Content Course in L3</td>
<td>Breton 12, French 11, English 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Content Courses in L1, L2 &amp; L3</td>
<td>Breton 12, French 12, English 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>Introduction to L4</td>
<td>Spanish/German/Italian 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Language Arts, History &amp; Elective in L1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining courses in L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Div Yezh (Two Languages) – Public (1979)**

- **Elementary** 50/50 French-Breton
- **MS & HS** Minimum 3h Breton language and 3h history in Breton
  Other courses in Breton, where available

Overall, the goal of all of these programs, particularly Diwan and Dihun, is to revitalize the language in all domains, and when students are schooled in the program throughout the length of their studies, it is presumed that any delay in mastering academic material and skills is quickly overcome. The programs’ coordinators estimate that by the time children reach the age of eight, having completed six years in
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37 [www.diwanbreizh.org](http://www.diwanbreizh.org)
38 [www.dihun.com](http://www.dihun.com)
39 [www.div-yezh.org](http://www.div-yezh.org)
the program, they have not only caught up to their French-only counterparts but have surpassed them. Indeed results on national standardized exams support these claims.

These programs gradually introduce French, first as a language and then as a medium of instruction. This method is used for subsequent languages as well. The only evident drawbacks of the program are related to its highly structured nature: students cannot come in midway, thus limiting the potential pupil pool, particularly in communities where Diwan schools have only recently opened or when families are geographically mobile. The concept of geographic mobility in France (and Brittany), particularly after the Second World War, has been used to explain some of the interruption of the natural intergenerational transmission of the country’s regional languages. Those communities that were most ‘cut off’ from the rest of the country were better suited to maintain their language use much later. This phenomenon is why so many Breton-language activists advocate for a widespread, region-wide Breton-language education initiative, which would address the issue of children being able to maintain their study and use of the language even if their family moves (within the region, of course). As Figure 10 shows, there are many Breton-medium schools across the region. In fact, there is now even a Diwan school in Paris. However, the reach of these different schools is still limited and there are thousands of families who do not have access to bilingual options in their local communities.
As discussed in the previous chapter, the same Breton-dominant immersive methodology is also used in the Catholic Dihun schools, while in the public Div Yezh schools teaching in Breton seldom surpasses 50% of the school day.

While certainly less developed than the programs offering instruction of and through Breton, Gallo is nevertheless in an enviable position when compared to its Oïl sisters. It is the only one of the Langues d’oïl to have an explicit language training program, which is also recognized by the Ministry of National Education. At this time, there are only Gallo language classes, but there is a movement to begin offering content courses taught in Gallo. It is worth noting that Gallo language instruction is
actually offered in several of the Catholic Dihun Breton bilingual schools. When compared with the numbers and locations of schools offering Breton-medium education programs, one sees just how limited Gallo instruction is (see Figure 11). In addition, one must also remember that these schools only offer classes in Gallo language, since there are as yet no Gallo-taught content courses.

**Figure 11 – Locations of Schools Teaching Gallo**  
(Blue indicates primary schools, red represents middle schools, green represents high schools and yellow represents universities)

Of course, education is one realm, but people have to be willing to change their habits and bring Breton back to the streets, shops and workplaces as well. The major question looming overhead is then, “Are bilingual classes, enough to save a language?” There does not seem to be a definitive answer, but with the Regional Council of Brittany’s 2004 decision to recognize Breton and Gallo as ‘official’ traditional
languages, there seems to be a change in tide at least with respect to public opinion about the language. However, if the efforts of these valiant few are to be fruitful, many more will have to join the cause to assure Breton and Gallo’s survival into the 22nd century.

Language attitudes and ideologies are crucial to any efforts seeking to effectively reverse language shift. Attitudes and ideologies are not only important for those in positions of authority, but also for those directly impacted by the decisions made by the ruling classes. In the French context, inhabitants of regions with strongly separate regional histories, regardless of whether or not they actually speak the traditional language of their regions, have often become the most fervent believers in the French Republican universalist ideals. My research seeks to determine the extent of this indoctrination in Breton society. The following chapter will review the questions of the second on-line survey conducted through Brittany-specific Facebook groups.
6 – METHODOLOGY

As is probably evident from the above discussion, this project does not fit neatly into the variationist tradition that has come to dominate sociolinguistic research. Instead, it fits best into the sociology of language branch of the field (Cameron 1990). This particular branch, which can also be called macrosociolinguistics, looks at the broadest social aspect of language, namely how language affects and is affected by broad social forces and dynamics, and is the backbone of my study.

The empirical basis of the present study are two Internet surveys, as well as a set of face-to-face interviews, designed to investigate people’s identification with various components of Bretonnitude (or Bretonness), as well as correlations between people’s senses of Breton identity and attitudes toward Breton, Gallo and French with such factors as linguistic background, birthplace, and current residence (e.g. on either side of the aforementioned Plouha-Vannes dividing line between Brezhonegva and Pays Gallo). Bretonnitude is a concept that, like its progenitor Négritude is based on a political and literary movement that rejects French supremacy in a struggle for external recognition and internal valorization. The interviews, which were conducted after the administration of the initial survey, revealed that some people prefer Bretonnité over Bretonnitude to describe the unique aspects of Breton culture. While both terms translate to “Bretonness” in English, there are subtle differences in French, most notably the link with ‘struggle’ that Bretonnitude evokes. Bretonnitude also
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40 This term was originally coined by poet and politician Aimé Césaire (Martinique) in 1935 in a student publication, l’Étudiant noir, he started along with Léopold Senghor (Senegal) and Léon Damas (French Guyana).
sounds more scholarly, again perhaps due to parallels with Négritude. These differences, along with other terminological preferences attested in the personal interviews informed the second survey.

The present study has three components of data collection which are meant to gauge the attitudes and ideologies of those who identify with the region and their relation to residential, ancestral, or other links to a particular side of the proverbial linguistic divide: two surveys and personal interviews. Responses to the first survey informed the interview protocol and the interviews informed the fine-tuning of questions or formulation of new questions for the second survey.

Questions for all components were formulated to see how respondents position themselves on supporting Breton and Gallo language movements. The first internet survey served as the base for the interview protocol with the addition of a question about “being a true Breton.” Interviews were conducted with persons from or living in Brittany to see whether or not their stated views on the topics of interest correlate with the survey responses. The two primary locations for interviews were Rennes in the East and Brest in the West. Rennes is the administrative capital of the region and, as a result, has been a center of ‘Frenchness’ for a long time, even before the Revolution. It is largest city in the historically Gallo-speaking part of the region and, with over 206,000 inhabitants, the largest city in the current administrative region overall. (Nantes, the capital of Loire-Atlantique, which is located in the traditionally Gallo-speaking part of the region but is now part of a separate administrative region, has over 283,000 inhabitants.) Brest is located on the Atlantic
coast, on the opposite side of the region. With its nearly 150,000 inhabitants, it is the largest city of the traditionally Breton-speaking part of the region. It has also been a major port city and the home to the French navy for over a century. As a result, it, too, was closely linked to the administration. Both cities have therefore been primarily French speaking for well over a hundred years.

Questions for the initial internet survey (see Appendix 7 for the entire questionnaire) were designed to gauge respondents' opinions about what counts as Breton, and demographic data was collected to ascertain whether the geographic location of their birthplace and current residence (on either side of the aforementioned Plouha-Vannes dividing line) are correlated with respondents' views regarding Breton culture and languages. The data were collected via the Google Docs survey tool, and open invitations were posted on the walls of four Brittany-focused Facebook groups: two general Brittany interest groups and one each for Breton and Gallo language interest. Due to technical difficulties, responses were only received from the group in favor of a Brittany-specific ".bzh" internet domain extension (one of the generic groups). The moderator for this group sent out a personal invitation for group members to respond to the survey and 400 responses (roughly half of the then membership) were subsequently received. This same group was the focal point of the second survey as well, but members of the group subsequently posted the invitation to participate to the walls of other Facebook groups that focus on Brittany and Breton cultural issues. Consequently, 535 people responded to the second survey. While the over 900 respondents to the two surveys come from various segments of Breton
society, most were younger (under 40 years old) and highly educated. The pool also had a large proportion of Breton speakers, the majority of whom had learned the language outside of the home, mostly at school.

The initial interviewee pool was made up of personal acquaintances, however, the sample was extended to include people who were previously unknown to me. This was accomplished by either contacting them directly or through referrals of other unknown participants. These strangers all had a vested interest in Breton identity: language associations, tourist offices, commercial organizations, etc. None of my personal acquaintances, however, have ever been more than passive observers of pro-regional identity movements. This sample is far from exhaustive (22 informants), but it represents a mix of ages (ranging from early 20s to mid-80s), professions, backgrounds and family histories with relation to the region and its languages, which broadens the applicability of the conclusions that are reached through the analysis of the collected data. The data from the internet-based surveys lends itself to be quantified, while the data collected through the interpersonal interviews is much more qualitative in nature. The two types of data are complimentary and, therefore, render the end result all the more definitive and reliable.

In the following sections, I discuss the various components of the surveys, including rationale for including each, as well as revisions made to the second survey based on initial survey results and interview discussions.
6.1 DEMOGRAPHICS

As stated above, the responses to the first on-line survey informed the personal interviews and then the second on-line survey. While the hope was to elicit a variety of standpoints on culture and language in Brittany, the majority of the questions of the first survey were found to yield positive attitudes toward the Breton culture and language, with little, if any, variance. While the second survey retained the same items regarding participant demographics as well as a few other questions considered to form a structural backbone for the study (e.g. asking respondents their first definition of the word ‘Breton’, why they feel Breton and what is the essence of Breton culture), most of the second survey was formulated with the intent of making respondents take a position on various language- and culture-related issues. I will discuss the rationale behind each of these questions and, if applicable, their evolution from the original survey. Since the nature (and order) of the questions in the two surveys is different, I will present the questions thematically. The first survey items elicited basic demographic information: gender, age and education level. I opted for age range over exact age as it could be coded with relative ease. Furthermore, broad ranges are more suitable for analysis when looking for trends. Also, education level is often used in France as a predictor of socio-economic background. Since the French education system is highly centralized and composed of multiple degrees, the following options were easily determined:
Niveau de formation atteint\textsuperscript{41}

- brevet des colleges
- bac
- bts/ bep
- bac+1 - bac+3
- bac+4 et plus

The next set of survey items was also demographic in nature and specifically related to the region of Brittany, namely place of birth and residence, length of residence and overall length of time spent in Brittany.

There was a small change in this section between the two surveys. Initially, respondents were asked to provide the number of their départements of birth and residence along with the name of the exact places of birth and residence. They were able to enter their answers for all four in any format and many chose to disregard the request to enter the numeric reference for the départements and instead typed their names, which meant that these had to be coded manually. In the second survey, respondents were instead asked to choose from a drop-down menu of a limited number of choices for both of these two categories: the five départements of historic Brittany (22, 29, 35, 44 and 56), a placeholder for elsewhere in France (99) and another for anywhere abroad (00). While this choice eliminated the possibility for respondents to respond in Breton, this was still an option when providing the name of their locations of birth of residence. It should be said, however, that this is not always

\textsuperscript{41} Level of Education

- Middle School
- High School
- Community College
- Undergraduate
- Graduate
as apparent as with the names of the départements because so many city names are the same in French and Breton.

The rationale for asking respondents' length of residence and overall length of time spent in Brittany is to gauge whether the amount of time they have been in a particular location in the region correlates with their attitudes and ideologies regarding language and culture in Brittany.

6.2 BRETON AND GALLO EXPOSURE

The final demographic information elicited of respondents was related to the exposure they have to Breton and/or Gallo. In the first survey, only respondents' ability to speak Breton and whether or not they had heard of Gallo was recorded. Given the goal of determining whether there is any substantive difference in conceptualization of Bretonness between the two language communities—which, given today's ever more mobile Breton society, are not necessarily not be mutually exclusive—it became clear that more detailed information would be useful in making this determination. Thus, in the second survey, respondents were asked to qualify their exposure to each language based on the following criteria, with the notable addition for Gallo of whether or not respondents knew what it was. Every effort was made to capture the nuances of different degrees of exposure, including where the language was learned for those who speak it, and, for those who do not speak it, but whose family did, how much of their time they would be willing to invest to language revitalization efforts by formally studying it or having their children study it.
Répertoire linguistique

- Je parle le breton/gallo et je l’ai appris à la maison
- Je parle le breton/gallo et je l’ai appris à l’école/ en cours du soir
- Je ne parle pas le breton/gallo, mais ma famille le parlait. J’aimerais l’apprendre
- Je ne parle pas le breton/gallo, mais ma famille le parlait. Même si je ne peux l’apprendre, j’aimerais que mes enfants l’apprennent.
- Je ne parle pas le breton/gallo, mais je l’ai entendu parler en ville et à la radio/télé
- Je ne parle pas le breton/gallo, mais je l’ai entendu uniquement à la radio/télé
- Je ne parle pas le breton/gallo, mais je l’ai entendu dans des comptes/chants traditionnels
- Je ne parle pas le breton/gallo et je ne l’ai jamais entendu parler
- Je ne sais pas ce que c’est le gallo
- Préfère ne pas répondre

6.3 REGIONAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION

The initial survey included questions about respondents’ attitudes towards regional languages in general, relating to their overall presence in public and government spheres, but yielded very little interesting data. Therefore, that thread of questions was abandoned for the follow-up survey in favor of more focused questions regarding

---

Language Background

- I speak Breton/Gallo and I learned it at home
- I speak Breton/Gallo and I learned it at school/ in night school
- I don’t speak Breton/Gallo, but my family spoke it. I’d like to learn it.
- I don’t speak Breton/Gallo, but my family spoke it. Even if I can’t learn it, I’d like my children to learn it.
- I don’t speak Breton/Gallo, but I have heard it in town and on the radio/TV.
- I don’t speak Breton/Gallo, but I have only heard it on the radio/TV.
- I don’t speak Breton/Gallo, but I have only heard it in traditional stories/songs.
- I don’t speak Breton/Gallo and I have never heard it spoken.
- (I don’t know what Gallo is.)
- I prefer to not respond.
the use of Breton and Gallo in Brittany’s schools. The initial survey focused its questions in this thematic on so-called bilingual classes, but this, too, yielded little useful information. As such, in the follow-up survey, these questions were replaced by questions that emerged from comments made during the personal interviews conducted in Brittany, namely questions regarding mandating regional language education and the standard that should be used in the classroom. Whether or not Breton should be a required subject in school came up in several interviews. While one might assume that pro-Breton activists would favor this type of policy, there were some who were hesitant, if not adamantly, against any such move, citing the example of Irish and the widespread belief that forcing pupils to study it has actually hurt the language's vitality (a mistaken notion that probably stems in part from the geographic fragmentation of the Gaeltachtai).

I purposely chose to include Gallo in the question about language education, although the issue of making it a required subject did not come up in any of the interviews. I did so out of equity, but also to allow for an answer that would overtly exclude it.

**QUESTION:** Croyez-vous que les langues traditionnelles devraient être une matière obligatoire à l’école? 43

---

43 Do you believe that traditional languages should be a required subject at school?

- Yes, all children in Brittany should learn Breton and Gallo.
- Yes, all children in Brittany should learn Breton or Gallo, depending on the linguistic heritage of the town where they live.
- Yes, all children in Brittany should learn Breton or Gallo, depending on their parents’ preference.
- Yes, all children in Brittany should learn Breton – Gallo is interesting, but not very important.
- No, bilingual education, like Diwan, exists for those who want their children to learn these languages.
- No opinion
• oui, tous les jeunes de la Bretagne devraient apprendre le breton et le gallo
• oui, tous les jeunes de la Bretagne devraient apprendre le breton ou le gallo, selon la tradition linguistique de la commune
• oui, tous les jeunes de la Bretagne devraient apprendre le breton ou le gallo, au choix des parents
• oui, tous les jeunes de la Bretagne devraient apprendre le breton - le gallo étant intéressant, mais pas très important
• non, il existe les classes bilingues, comme Diwan, pour les gens qui souhaitent que leurs enfants les apprennent
• sans opinion

It should be noted that the answer relating to parents choosing the language that their children learn in school came from a comment made by one of the very first survey respondents. As will be discussed in the data analysis section, this option proved to be a popular one with a certain number of respondents.

The matter of a Breton standard came up in many interviews. While opinions were divided, in the end, most agreed that learning some form of Breton, albeit one that might sound contrived or foreign to older native speakers, is still beneficial to the overall position of the Breton language in contemporary society. Indeed, the Breton learned in the various bilingual programs in schools is meant to be a pan-Breton variety that can be used in all facets of modern life. That said, some –primarily those who learned the language in the home– find that this ‘standardized’ form of Breton, while replete with new vocabulary for the 21st century, is nonetheless devoid of the ‘local color’ that they value so highly. It is important to note that the administrators of Diwan, Dihun and Div Yezh all encourage instructors to highlight locally relevant variation in their lessons, but this often proves difficult for those teachers who –like
many of their students have only learned the language in the classroom. In addition, new lexical items have had to be introduced to keep up with changing times and technologies, and some older generation Breton speakers may have trouble understanding graduates of the Breton language programs when it comes to discussing modern topics such as computers or mobile phones. There may also be confusion if the younger Breton speakers use so-called ‘new’ constructs which may have come into the school standard from other parts of the region and are not common practice in the specific area where the elders grew up. The proposed answers to this question were meant to gauge whether respondents supported standardization, merely tolerated it or possibly lamented it.

**QUESTION:** Que pensez-vous de l'émergence d'un breton “unifié” pour les classes bilingues qui ressemble peu au breton parlé par les plus âgés? 44

- je ne comprends pas la polémique autour du phénomène – toutes les langues évoluent et cela en est un parfait exemple
- je pense que c’est logique - la standardisation est souvent nécessaire à la survie des langues régionales
- je trouve que c’est regrettable, mais tout à fait compréhensible puisque la langue n’a pas été suffisamment transmise par le biais familial
- je crois que cela représente une triste perte linguistique qu’il faut remédier à ces dérives
- sans opinion

---

44 What do you think of the emergence of a “unified” Breton for bilingual programs that bears little resemblance to the Breton spoken by older generations?

- I don’t understand the debate around this issue – all languages evolve and this is a perfect example.
- I think that it is logical – standardization is often necessary for regional languages to survive.
- I find that this it’s sad, but totally understandable since the language hasn’t sufficiently been transmitted through the family.
- I believe that this is a sad linguistic loss that needs to be remedied at all costs.
- No opinion
There was no mention of a similar issue in Gallo teaching and, therefore, little rationale for replicating the question for Gallo.

6.4 - WORD CHOICE

De Wolf (1996) investigates the expression of identity through lexical choice in his study of the use of Americanisms and Canadianisms in two prominent Canadian cities and how word choice (‘American’ vs. ‘Canadian’ lexical items) may reflect the degree of participants’ Canadianness. While such a study, and indeed the study of lexical variation more broadly, has not traditionally been a central part of traditional sociolinguistic variation analysis, I propose that variation in these contexts can also inform the role and value of language in society.

One of the aims of the initial survey was to determine how Bretons define the word ‘Breton.’ In French, the word can be a noun or an adjective. As a noun, it can mean either a person from Brittany (or of Breton heritage) or the Celtic language spoken in Brittany. Technically, when using the word to denote a person, it should be capitalized, but this convention is not always respected. As an adjective, the word can be used to denote anything that has some sort of linkage to the region. My objective, then, was to see what the word evokes when heard without any particular context. While the follow-up survey looks at other elements of word choice, this implied thematic of this question is still important and therefore was retained in the second survey.
QUESTION: Pour vous quelle est la première définition du mot 'breton'?  
- la langue d’origine celtique que l’on parle en Bretagne
- un résident quelconque d’un des départements de la Bretagne
- une personne née en Bretagne, malgré son ascendance familiale
- une personne avec une ascendance familiale en Bretagne, malgré son lieu de naissance ou résidence
- une personne qui sait parler le breton, malgré son lieu de naissance ou résidence
- toute chose appartenant à la Bretagne
- toute personne ayant un lien personnel, géographique, linguistique ou affectif à la Bretagne
- sans opinion

The idea of trying to ascertain what ‘Breton’ is lies at the very heart of determining the role that the region’s traditional languages play in the conceptualization of a contemporary identity for those who wish to claim it. As such, exploring preferences for word choice figured prominently in the follow-up survey. Not only did I want to know what respondents’ preferences were, but I also wanted to get them to think about why they feel the way they do. That was the goal behind the question on Bretonnitude.

As discussed above, the concept of Négritude informed the use of the word Bretonnitude; however, this term is not embraced by all Bretons to describe that which is unique about Breton culture, namely Bretonness. During the course of the
personal interviews, many said that they preferred Bretonnité. These comments inspired the questions on which term respondents preferred.

**QUESTION:** Quelle expression préférez-vous pour décrire la spécificité de la culture bretonne? 46
- la bretonnitude
- la bretonnité
- indifférent

Having discussed this with several people who participated in the personal interviews, I decided it was not enough to simply ask which term respondents preferred, but also why they preferred one over the other. Given the multiple-choice nature of the survey, I had to provide enough options to cover the primary possible attitudes. I found that during the interviews, participants were not initially able to explain why they preferred one term over the other, but when pressed, they were able to better express their feelings. For example, the following interview excerpt was extremely informative when formulating the various answers to be used in the multiple-choice question on Bretonnitude and Bretonnité.

“Je préfère, j’ai une petite préférence pour bretonnité, mais là encore on parle du sexe des anges. Pour moi, la bretonnitude est calquée évidemment sur le mot négritude. Euh, je pense que le mot bretonnité est plus neutre. Euh, il n’a pas cette connotation militante car bretonnitude, et en plus bretonnitude a fini par prendre des connotations négatives, je crois, parce que, euh, il est, il est devenu, il est un peu comme le mot bretonnant maintenant. Ça fait un peu bout à [?], vous voyez, bretonnitude. La bretonnité c’est, c’est, c’est tout simplement, désigne simplement la, le fait d’être Breton et non pas le fait de se réclamer

---

46 What expression do you prefer to describe the particular nature of Breton culture?
- la bretonnitude
- la bretonnité
- indifferent
Breton, et voilà. Donc, évidemment il y a une différence de sens entre les deux mots, d'une part. Et d'autre part, il y a des connotations différentes."  

The different aspects of the meanings of the two words that surfaced in discussions such as this one served as the basis for the proposed options in the final question below.

**QUESTION:** Pourquoi préférez-vous cette expression à l'autre?  
- je préfère 'bretonnitude' parce que c'est le terme d'usage courant  
- je préfère 'bretonnitude' parce que cela fait référence à une tradition militante  
- je préfère 'bretonnité' parce que c'est neutre  
- je préfère 'bretonnité' parce que cela ne relève pas d'une notion basée sur l'inégalité (à savoir, la négritude)  
- je n'ai pas de préférence

There were also differences in terms used to refer to Breton speakers in the personal interviews, and so I decided to directly ask participants in the second survey which term they preferred: *Bretonnant* or *Brittophone*. This was usually triggered by the use of one of the two terms while addressing another topic. The addition of *Breton* as a possible response was added to allow for a somewhat radical answer in the follow-up question, namely that only those who speak Breton are truly Breton.

---

47 I prefer, I have a slight preference for Bretonnité, but there it’s like talking about the gender of angels. To me, Bretonnitude is obviously connected to the word Négritude. Um, I think that the word Bretonnité is more neutral. Um, there isn’t that activist connotation because Bretonitude, and besides Bretonnitude has wound up taking on a negative connotation, I think, because, um, it has become, it’s a little like the word Bretonnant now. Bretonnitude, it’s like [?], you see. Bretonnité is, is simply, simply designates the state of being Breton and not the act of claiming to be Breton. So, obviously there is a difference of meaning between the two words on one hand. And on the other hand, there are different connotations.

48 Why do you prefer this expression over the other one?  
- I prefer ‘Bretonnitude’ because it’s the term that’s commonly used.  
- I prefer ‘Bretonnitude’ because it references a tradition of activism.  
- I prefer ‘Bretonnité’ because it’s neutral.  
- I prefer ‘Bretonnité’ because it doesn’t stem from an idea based on inequality (like Négritude).  
- I don’t have a preference.
QUESTION: Comment appelez-vous quelqu’un qui parle le breton? 49

- un bretonnant
- un brittophone
- un breton
- indifférent

Unlike their seeming lack of strong preference for either Bretonnitude or Bretonnité, interview participants seemed to have strongly feelings regarding this lexical choice. Again, though, I wanted to go beyond the mere preference to see why respondents have particular preferences. The options in the second survey were all offered by interview participants, like the one below, as an explanation for their personal preference.

“Moi, pour vous dire très clairement, on m’a interdit d’utiliser le mot depuis que la nouvelle élue est arrivée. Je vous le dis assez ouvertement parce que ça m’a complètement choquée. On m’a interdit d’utiliser le mot ‘bretonnant’ et on m’a ordonnée à utiliser le mot ‘brittophone’. Donc moi, c’est quelque chose qui me dépasse complètement. […] Moi, j’utilise le mot ‘bretonnant’ parce que, j’en sais rien, c’est le mot qui a été utilisé depuis toujours, quoi. On l’a toujours dit comme ça. ‘Brittophone’ là vient d’être, c’est un mot qui vient d’être créé ces dernières années.” 50

As noted above, the option of ‘Breton’ as a response to the previous question was added intentionally to allow for a potentially controversial position, which some

49 What do you call someone who speaks Breton?
- Bretonnant
- Brittophone
- Breton
- Indifferent

50 Personally, to be very clear with you, I have been forbidden from using the word [Bretonnant] since the new elected official arrived. I say this to you fairly openly because this completely shocked me. I have been forbidden from using the word ‘Bretonnant’ and I have been ordered to use the word ‘Brittophone’. So, personally, this is something that completely escapes me. […] Personally, I use the word ‘Bretonnant’ because, I don’t know, it’s the word that has always been used, you know. We’ve always said it like that. ‘Brittophone’ just came into being, it’s a word that was just created recently.
interviewees alluded to, that would reserve Breton identity only to those who speak Breton.

**QUESTION:** Pourquoi préférez-vous cette expression aux autres?  
- je préfère 'bretonnant' parce que c'est le terme d'usage courant  
- je préfère 'bretonnant' parce que cela ne sonne pas artificiel  
- je préfère 'brittophone' parce que cela ne relève pas d'une référence péjorative de bretonner  
- je préfère 'brittophone' parce que cela rentre dans le standard – francophone, anglophone, bascophone, etc.  
- je préfère 'breton' parce que seuls les gens qui parlent le breton sont de vrais Bretons  
- je n'ai pas de préférence

The two primary terms reflect the time periods in which they were coined. Bretonnant is a derivation of the verb *bretonner*, which originally meant “to speak Breton,” no more, no less. However, over the years use of this verb changed and now denotes a derogatory connotation, namely that of “babbling.” This reflects an anti-Breton sentiment, whereby the Breton language was held in very low esteem. The literary quotes highlighted in Chapters 3 and 4 show the degree to which this sentiment was widespread in French society. The neologism Brittophone has been seen by some as a neutral alternative; however, others feel that it is too artificial and even those who claimed in their interviews to prefer it over Bretonnant sometimes slipped in natural conversation and used Bretonnant instead. Finally, the fact that the

---

51 Why do you prefer this expression over the others?  
- I prefer 'Bretonnant' because it's the term that's commonly used.  
- I prefer 'Bretonnant' because it doesn't sound artificial.  
- I prefer 'Brittophone' because it doesn’t come from a pejorative reference to babbling (bretonner).  
- I prefer 'Brittophone' because it follows the standard – Francophone, Anglophone, Bascophone, etc.  
- I prefer 'Breton' because only people who speak Breton are real Bretons.  
- I don't have a preference.
Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg has adopted Brittophone as the sole term it uses in French to designate someone who speaks the Breton language may have an influence on the opinion of some. This influence may not always be positive, however, as I discovered during the course of the personal interviews that some regret the politicization of this terminology. These people would prefer to transcend such debates, which in their eyes are useless and a waste of time, and use the time and resources that are used to prepare for them to instead make the language more visible in the public sphere. It is perhaps of interest to note that in Breton there is only one word for Breton speaker: *Brezhoneger*.

There was also another question for Gallo and how respondents describe it in relation to Breton and other (regional) languages. This question openly asks whether or not respondents consider Gallo to be a language, which was an issue that came up several times during the personal interviews. Since there were Breton speakers who were interviewed who felt that it was language like any other while others did not feel that it was worthy of being called a language, the objective of this question was to see whether there was any demographic pattern to respondents’ opinions about Gallo.

**QUESTION:** Comment qualifiez-vous le gallo?  
- une langue égale au breton

---

52 How would you describe Gallo?  
- A language that is equal to Breton.  
- A language that is less important than Breton, but equal to other Langues d’Oïl (Normand, Picard, etc.).  
- A language that is less important than Breton, but equal to other regional languages (Alsatian, Basque, Corsican, etc.).  
- A simple dialect.  
- I have never heard of Gallo before.
• une langue moins importante que le breton, mais égale aux autres langues d’oïl (normand, picard, etc.)
• une langue moins importante que le breton, mais égale aux autres langues régionales (alsacien, basque, corse, etc.)
• un simple patois
• je n’ai jamais entendu parler du gallo

6.5 LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE

The concept of linguistic landscape as it relates to language vitality and reversing language shift rests on the premise that if a language is present in its written form in the public sphere, it has reached a certain level of recognition. The nature of this presence is the object of multiple studies of the language(s) present on signage in multilingual societies around the world (Cenoz and Gorter 2006; Coulmas 2008; Pavlenko 2010). While initially interested in whether or not certain languages were visible in public, typically on signs, the field quickly began looking at the different elements of this written presence. These elements can include fonts, language order, size of characters, colors, text orientation, and many other factors. Nevertheless the basis of all linguistic landscape studies is the nature of the opposition between a minority language or languages with a majority or national language, in particular, does the ‘other’ language receive the same treatment as the dominant language? In the case of public signage, it becomes a matter of language policy, whether explicit or implicit, on how (or even whether) to represent the ‘other’ language.

I included questions on people’s attitudes toward the linguistic landscape of Brittany in the initial survey as well as the personal interviews, but it became clear during the interviews that perhaps the wording of at least one of the questions was
not clear. In the context of the bilingual signage (Franco-Breton and Franco-Gallo) in the Rennes metro, the question sought to determine whether respondents supported the effort in the metro and whether they supported extending it to other public spaces. The question made reference to bi-lingual signage and attempted to refer to Breton and Gallo as “both languages”. During the course of the personal interviews, several participants either asked or indicated that they presumed the two languages were French and Breton. To eliminate the possibility of further confusion, the languages were clearly listed in the second survey, while the term bi-lingual was maintained, even in contexts of trilingualism, since that is common parlance in French.

**QUESTION:** Soutiendriez-vous la généralisation d’une signalétique bilingue à l’ensemble d’espaces publics bretons (bâtiments, transports, rues, etc. – les commerces n’étant pas obligatoirement concernés)?

- oui, le français, le breton et le gallo partout
- oui, le français et le breton partout
- oui, le français partout et le breton ou le gallo selon la tradition linguistique de la commune
- non, je ne vois pas l’intérêt d’afficher ces langues quand tout le monde parle le français
- sans opinion

One of the options for the original question offered the possibility for Breton to appear more prominently that the other language(s). For the follow up to the newly phrased

---

53 *Would you support the widespread use of bilingual signage in all public spaces in Brittany (buildings, transportation, streets, etc. – businesses would not necessarily be obliged to follow suit)?*

- Yes, French, Breton and Gallo everywhere
- Yes, French and Breton everywhere
- Yes, French everywhere and Breton or Gallo in accordance with the linguistic heritage of the town
- No, I don’t see the use of displaying these languages when everyone speaks French
- No opinion
question, I thought it would be interesting to look more closely into the concept the linguistic hierarchy of bilingual or multilingual signage.

QUESTION: Si vous soutenez une telle généralisation, quelle langue devrait être privilégiée? 54

- le français parce que c’est la lingua franca
- le breton et/ou le gallo selon la tradition linguistique de la commune pour sensibiliser le public au patrimoine linguistique de la commune
- le breton pour sensibiliser le public au patrimoine linguistique de la région
- ne soutiendrais pas une telle généralisation
- sans opinion

Of course, speaking in theoretical terms, everyone can support measures to increase the visibility of an endangered language. To suddenly add another language to all public signs, however, would be very costly, so the so-called acid test is what respondents would be personally willing to sacrifice in order to finance such a project. As some discussed in the personal interviews, though, the added cost need not be prohibitive, or even excessive, if the region were to have a policy to add Breton and/or Gallo to signs when they are replaced. This would not create an instantly cohesive visual presence of the languages, but their presence would progressively become part of the linguistic landscape, and this gradual approach could have a benefit in terms of acceptance by the public at large.

54 If you would support such widespread signage, what language should be given priority?
- French because it’s lingua franca
- Breton and/or Gallo in accordance with the linguistic heritage of the town to raise awareness for the linguistic heritage of the town
- Breton to raise awareness for the linguistic heritage of the region
- I wouldn’t support such widespread signage
- No opinion
QUESTION: Quel sacrifice (aux échelles locale et régionale) seriez-vous prêt à faire pour financer des projets comme celui-ci qui visent à renforcer la présence audio-visuelle du breton et du gallo (à savoir des classes bilingues, la signalétique bilingue, etc.)? 55
- une hausse d’impôts
- report de rénovations de bâtiments publics
- report de réparations routières
- réduction de manifestations culturelles
- réduction de personnel en mairie et autres services publics
- réduction d’horaires d’ouverture au public des services publics
- aucun

Choosing the “none of the above” option, therefore, does not necessarily mean that those who are in favor of bilingual signage are not in favor of financing it. Throughout the personal interviews, there were multiple participants who expressed a lack of trust in the government's claimed financial status vs. its covert spending priorities. On several occasions interviewees stated they believed that if legislators really wanted to fund widespread bilingual signage, they could do so without any negative impact to the other municipal projects or the proverbial bottom line for taxpayers. The ultimate goal of increased visibility is of course greater awareness for regional languages and, for those who speak them, a sense that their language has been accepted as part of the community. Overt recognition is perhaps not necessarily tantamount to acceptance,

55 What sacrifice (at local and regional levels) would you be willing to make in order to finance projects like this that aim to reinforce the audio-visual presence of Breton and Gallo (for instance, bilingual education, bilingual signage, etc.)?
- increased taxes
- delayed renovation of public buildings
- delayed repairs of roads
- cuts in cultural events
- staff cuts at town hall and other public services
- shorter hours of public services
- none
but acknowledging the existence of regional languages is part and parcel of any process that aspires to promote widespread acceptance of their role in modern society.

6.6 REGIONAL LANGUAGE RECOGNITION

As discussed above, the Regional Council of Brittany made a non-binding declaration in 2004, whereby it ‘officially’ recognized the place of Breton and Gallo, alongside French, as languages of the region. While this declaration may not have carried much weight in terms of the legal status of the two languages, it nonetheless sent a message to both pro-Breton and pro-Gallo activists that the Region was positioning itself to protect and promote the diverse linguistic heritage of Brittany. In the initial survey, I wanted to gauge the opinion of respondents regarding this declaration, but the results showed little variation. The overwhelming majority were in support of the declaration.

**QUESTION:** Que pensez-vous de la décision du Conseil régional de “reconnaître officiellement aux côtés de la langue française, l’existence du breton et du gallo comme langues de la Bretagne”? 56

- fortement favorable
- plutôt favorable
- plutôt opposé
- fortement opposé
- sans opinion

56 What do you think about the decision of the Regional Council to “recognize officially alongside French, the existence of Breton and Gallo as language of Brittany”?

- strongly agree
- somewhat agree
- somewhat disagree
- strongly disagree
- no opinion
This question did lead into another asking whether or not one should say 'Breton languages' in the plural instead of the customary singular 'Breton language' since at the most basic level Breton denotes anything that belongs to the Region. And in its 2004 declaration, the Regional Council clearly indicated that both Breton and Gallo indeed belonged to the Region. However, during the course of the personal interviews, I began to wonder whether the respondents understood the objective of the question as it was intended. Some, particularly Breton speakers, interpreted the plural to indicate the different varieties of Breton. Among this population, it is well known that there are four main varieties of the language spoken today: three of which are mutually intelligible – Kerneveg, Leoneg and Tregerieg (which are commonly referred to by the KLT acronym)– and a fourth, so-called archaic variety Gwenedeg. Since some interview participants suggested 'languages of Brittany' to avoid confusion (and debate), I therefore decided this additional word choice preference would be interesting to explore further. Of course, this follow-up question clearly indicates that 'languages' means Breton and Gallo.

**QUESTION:** Quelle expression préférez-vous pour l’ensemble des langues traditionnelles que l’on parle en Bretagne (à savoir, le breton et le gallo)?

- les langues bretonnes
- les langues de Bretagne
- indifférent

---

57 What expression do you prefer for the group of traditional languages spoken in Brittany (i.e. Breton and Gallo)?

- Breton languages
- Languages of Brittany
- Indifferent
As with the previous questions on word choice, I also wanted to see why respondents preferred one term over the other. The proposed options in the second survey were a mix of the intent of the question in the initial survey as well as comments made during the personal interviews. Also as with previous questions of this nature, I purposely added an option to appeal to the segment of the Breton-speaking population who believe that only the Celtic Breton language is worth recognition.

**QUESTION:** Pourquoi préférez-vous cette expression à l’autre? 58
- je préfère 'langues bretonnes' parce qu'elles sont les langues régionales de la Bretagne
- je préfère 'langues bretonnes' parce que tout ce qui appartient à la région est breton
- je préfère 'langues de Bretagne' parce que c'est moins ambigu
- je préfère 'langues de Bretagne' parce qu'il n'y a qu'une seule langue bretonne, le breton
- je n'ai pas de préférence

During the personal interviews, it came to light that it was recently announced that the Ofis ar Brezhoneg would become a public institution, thereby becoming the Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg. I quickly learned that this was not necessarily a welcome move to all. Those who were against it resented government involvement, and possible manipulation, when it came to deciding Breton language matters. Instead of focusing on why respondents might not approve of this change in status, I decided to focus more on the implications such a decision could, or should, have with regard to other

---

58 Why do you prefer this expression over the other one?
- I prefer ‘Breton languages’ because they are the regional languages of Brittany.
- I prefer ‘Breton languages’ because everything that belongs to the region is Breton.
- I prefer ‘Languages of Brittany’ because it’s less ambiguous.
- I prefer ‘Languages of Brittany’ because there’s only one Breton language, Breton.
- I don’t have a preference.
regional languages. As I have a keen interest in the juxtaposition of Breton and Gallo, I was interested to see whether or not respondents thought they should be treated equally in this context, particularly in light of the Region’s 2004 declaration.

**QUESTION:** Soutenez-vous la récente décision des conseils généraux des 5 départements bretons traditionnels à transformer l’Office de la langue bretonne (association de loi 1901 dont la mission est de “promouvoir l’usage du breton dans tous les secteurs de la société bretonne”) en établissement public? 59

- oui complètement
- oui, mais si l’office est maintenant public, en vue de la décision du conseil régional de soutenir le breton et le gallo, je crois qu’il devrait s’appeler “Office des langues bretonnes/ des langues de la Bretagne” et que sa mission devrait être élargie pour inclure le gallo
- oui et je souhaiterais que le gallo puisse bénéficier d’une structure semblable mais séparée
- oui et je souhaiterais que les autres langues régionales de France (y compris le gallo) puissent bénéficier de structures semblables
- non, je ne crois pas que l’office soit d’une grande utilité publique
- sans opinion

---

59 Do you support the recent decision of the General Councils of the five historic départements of Brittany to transform the Office of Breton Language (a registered association whose mission is to “promote the use of Breton in all sectors of Breton society”) into a public entity?

- Yes, totally.
- Yes, but if the Office is now a public entity, in light of the Regional Council’s decision to support Breton and Gallo, I think that it should be called the “Office of Breton languages/ Languages of Brittany” and that its mission should be extended to cover Gallo.
- Yes and I would like Gallo to have a similar, but separate structure.
- Yes and I would like the other regional languages of French (including Gallo) to have a similar structure.
- No, I don’t think that the Office serves the public interest.
- No opinion
6.7 BRETON CULTURE

The backbone of this study is to determine how those who identify as Breton define their culture and what connection, if any, exists between that conceptualization and the traditional languages of the region. An explicit question was posed in the initial survey and I decided to keep it for the follow up to see what exactly respondents think is the most salient feature of Breton culture.

**QUESTION:** Pour vous, quel est le plus emblématique de la culture bretonne?  
- sa/ses langue(s)  
- sa gastronomie  
- ses traditions (fest noz, coiffe, foi chrétienne, etc.)  
- son folklore (légendes, relation avec les éléments, etc.)  
- sa résistance, son acharnement  
- ne sais pas

In addition to gauging what respondents think, I also wanted to see how they think outsiders perceive their culture. While it is true that such a question does not necessarily reflect how non-Bretons view Breton culture, the perception can be all the more telling, particularly when trying to ascertain what exactly Bretons consider Breton. And by Breton, I do not only mean the word itself, but the identity or, as some may argue, the nationality.

**QUESTION:** Et vu de l’extérieur, à votre avis, quel est le plus emblématique de la culture bretonne?  

---

60 For you, what is the most emblematic element of Breton culture?  
- Its language(s)  
- Its cuisine  
- Its traditions (festivals, dress, Christian faith, etc.)  
- Its folklore (legends, relation with the elements, etc.)  
- Its resistance, its determination  
- I don’t know

61 And seen from outside the region, in your opinion, what emblematic element of Breton culture?
I also wanted to know whether or not respondents felt that the Breton culture could survive without one or both of its traditional languages. Of course, merely saying that you support the languages is one thing, but actively working to assure their place in society is another. In fact, this was the intent of the question about learning Breton and Gallo in the demographic section of the interview questionnaire – to see whether those who do not speak them, but whose family spoke them, are willing to invest the time to learn.

**QUESTION:** La culture bretonne dépend-elle de la survie de ses langues traditionnelles? 62
- oui, la survie du breton et du gallo est indispensable à l’avenir de la culture bretonne
- oui, la survie du breton est indispensable à l’avenir de la culture bretonne, mais celle du gallo n’a pas d’importance
- non, la culture bretonne a été divorcée de ses langues traditionnelles il y a très longtemps

---

- Its language(s)
- Its cuisine
- Its traditions (festivals, dress, Christian faith, etc.)
- Its folklore (legends, relation with the elements, etc.)
- Its resistance, its determination
- I don’t know

62 *Is Breton culture dependent on the survival of its traditional languages?*
- Yes, the survival of Breton and Gallo is essential for the future of Breton culture.
- Yes, the survival of Breton is essential for the future of Breton culture, but the survival of Gallo isn’t important.
- No, Breton culture was separated from its traditional languages a long time ago.
- No opinion
sans opinion

The idea of a Breton nation is also increasingly interesting, especially when one considers the actions of activists over the years. One might argue that the mere existence of an *Armée Révolutionnaire Bretonne* (ARB), or Breton Revolutionary Army, indicates that some fervently believe in notion of Breton nationhood. However, the ARB is significantly less active and as a result less known on a national level than the IRA and ETA; in addition, public opinion can be quite different from that of a relatively small handful of radical militants. Therefore, I wanted to see whether or not this is something that respondents found appealing. Of course, I also wanted to know why respondents think that there is a Breton nation.

**QUESTION:** Croyez-vous à la notion d’une nation bretonne?

- oui, le peuple breton est millénaire
- oui, les Bretons ont su résister à des affrontements culturels extérieurs pendant des siècles
- oui, la nation bretonne s’est montrée plus forte que la française
- non, je ne crois pas que cette terminologie s’applique à la réalité bretonne
- sans opinion

Walking through the neighborhood where Paris’ 5th, 14th and 15th arrondissements intersect, one cannot help but notice a high density of crêperies, Celtic bookstores and other artifacts of Breton culture. This location is not coincidental as it surrounds the Montparnasse train station, which has connected the

---

63 *Do you believe in the notion of a Breton nation?*

- Yes, the Breton people are over a thousand years old.
- Yes, Bretons have been able to resist external cultural confrontations for centuries.
- Yes, the Breton nation has shown that it is stronger than France.
- No, I don’t believe that this term applies to the Breton situation.
- No opinion
capital to Brittany since the railroad first ventured westward. It stands to reason that
if respondents believe in the concept of a Breton nation, they might also believe that
the displacement of its people constitute a diaspora. The key to me was whether or
not living elsewhere in France, around Montparnasse for instance, would constitute a
departure from the ancestral homeland.

QUESTION: Si oui, soutenez-vous l'idée d'une diaspora bretonne?64
   - oui, pour ceux qui résident à l'extérieur des 4 départements de la
     Bretagne actuelle (22, 29, 35, 56)
   - oui, pour ceux qui résident à l'extérieur des 5 départements de la
     Bretagne traditionnelle (22, 29, 35, 44, 56)
   - oui, pour ceux qui résident à l'étranger
   - non, je ne crois pas qu'il y ait une nation bretonne
   - sans opinion

Of course, along those lines, I also thought it would interesting to include different
geographic definitions of the region (e.g. modern-day 4-département Brittany vs.
historic 5-département Brittany) to see whether respondents were sensitive to this
issue with regard to the idea of a Breton nation. This nuance also helped partially fill a
void addressed in the initial survey about whether or not respondents recognized and
supported the idea of reunifying the département of Loire-Atlantique with the four
others of the current administrative definition of Brittany to reconstitute the 5-
département historical composition of the region.

---

64 If so, do you support the idea of a Breton diaspora?
   - Yes, for those living outside the four current départements of Brittany
   - Yes, for those living outside the five historic départements of Brittany
   - Yes, for those living abroad
   - No, I don’t believe there is a Breton nation
   - No opinion
6.8 REGIONAL IDENTITY

When looking at identity, it is important to ascertain why respondents may claim a certain identity. In other words, why they feel that they belong to a particular group or groups. In the initial survey, there were two separate questions: one asking whether respondents considered themselves to be Breton and another asking, if so, why they considered themselves to be Breton. Given that only a handful responded that they did not consider themselves to be Breton, I decided it would be easiest to combine the questions in the follow-up survey.

**QUESTION:** Vous considérez-vous Breton? 65

- oui, à cause de mon lieu de naissance
- oui, à cause de mon ascendance familiale
- oui, à cause de mon lieu de résidence
- oui, à cause de mon affinité celtique
- oui, à cause de ma capacité linguistique
- non, je ne me considère pas Breton

I still provided an option for those who do not consider themselves to be Breton, but combining the questions allowed for further questions about identity without dwelling on the topic and potentially putting respondents ill at ease. (Another question later in the survey asks respondents to rank their Breton, French and European identities, all of which were discussed at length by interviewees.)

65 Do you consider yourself to be Breton?
- Yes, because of my place of birth
- Yes, because of my ancestry
- Yes, because of my place of residence
- Yes, because of my Celtic affinity
- Yes, because of my linguistic ability
- No, I don’t consider myself to be Breton
Throughout my time living and visiting in Brittany, I have heard countless references to a so-called Celtic connection. Oftentimes, these references would be made in conversations about how Bretons do not particularly feel French. This anecdotal impression touched on another component of identity that I wanted to explore further, namely relation to the Other and who one considers to be their cultural kin. That served as the impetus for the following question, which was also present in the initial survey. I did add a couple options (other French regions and Europe) based on comments made during several on-site interviews, but as I will discuss in Section 7.8 below, the trend in responses remained fairly consistent between the two surveys.

**QUESTION:** Si vous vous considérez Breton, de quel(s) pays vous sentez-vous plus proche? 66

- des pays celtés
- des pays des autres langues régionales de France
- de la France
- de l’Europe
- ne me considère pas Breton
- indifférent

Since a majority of respondents to the question in the initial survey stated that they felt closest to other Celtic countries (Ireland, Scotland and Wales), I was interested in learning why they felt that way. As with previous questions that were new additions

---

66 If you consider yourself to be Breton, to which country(ies) do you feel closer?

- Celtic countries
- the “countries” (regions) of France’s other regional languages
- France
- Europe
- I don’t consider myself to be Breton
- Indifferent
to the follow-up survey, the proposed options came from discussions on the topic that took place during the personal interviews.

**QUESTION:** Si vous avez choisi les pays Celtes, pourquoi? 67

- pour les traditions culturelles
- pour le patrimoine linguistique
- pour l'histoire commune de résistance
- ne sais pas
- me sens plus proche de la France ou suis indifférent

I expected that some respondents would feel closer to other Celtic countries, but would not have thought about it previously and/or would not be able to specify why they felt this way, so I included the ubiquitous “I don't know” option as well. It might be interesting to note that even this option was an answer/explanation that I heard during several of the personal interviews. In fact, even after probing, some participants were still unable to verbalize exactly why they felt closer to the Celtic countries.

In considering identity from a sociolinguistic perspective, it is important to highlight that it is not static, nor is it singular. In fact, during several personal interviews, participants who fervently identified themselves as Breton mentioned feeling more European than French. This prompted me to wonder how those who identify as Breton would rank their identities.

**QUESTION:** Si vous vous considérez Breton, comment vous identifiez-vous? 68

---

67 *If you chose the Celtic countries, why?*
- For the cultural traditions
- For the linguistic heritage
- For the shared history of resistance
- I don't know.
- I feel closer to France or am indifferent
Overall, the objective of this particular question is to determine whether respondents assign any sort of hierarchy to their various identities, especially when considering the different demographic groups (e.g. age, gender, education level, etc.) that make up the respondent pool.

The final question of the follow-up survey does not stem from any direct comments made by respondents to the initial survey or direct comments by interview participants. There was a question about being a ‘true’ Breton that was part of the interview protocol, which overwhelmingly yielded a very inclusive definition of Breton identity. While everyone said they felt that anyone who felt Breton should be considered to be Breton, when reviewing the interview data, there nevertheless did seem to be a notion of different degrees of Bretonness, expressed rather indirectly through comments such as the following:

---

68 If you consider yourself to be Breton, how do you identify yourself?
- First Breton, then French and finally European.
- First Breton, then European and finally French.
- First French, then Breton and finally European.
- First French, then European and finally Breton.
- First European, then Breton and finally French.
- First European, then French and finally Breton.
- I don’t consider myself to be Breton.
- Prefer to not respond.
"Il y a beaucoup de gens qui sont, qui sont aujourd’hui très Bretons, des militants bretons, mais justement pour des raisons historiques, ne parlent pas le breton. Bon, ce serait, bien sûr ce serait plus logique s’ils le parlaient, mais on ne peut pas leur reprocher. Ben, s’ils ont déjà un sentiment breton, qu’ils soient Bretons ou pas, je trouve ça très bien. [...] Dans un siècle, je pense que si les choses évoluent favorablement on pourra pas être Bretons sans parler breton. Aujourd’hui c’est normal, c’est une conséquence."

Therefore, I wondered which factors respondents would find to be the most influential when assessing the level of someone’s Bretonness.

**QUESTION:** Selon vous, qui est le plus Breton? 70

- une personne née à l’extérieur de la Bretagne (ailleurs en France ou à l’étranger) dont la famille est d’origine bretonne, mais qui ne parle plus le breton
- une personne née en Bretagne dont la famille est d’origine corse qui ne parle que le français
- une personne d’origine maghrébine qui a appris le breton à l’école
- une personne née en Bretagne dont la famille est d’origine bretonne qui parle le gallo
- toutes ces personnes ont le même droit à s’appeler Breton
- sans opinion

When formulating the options for responses, I initially focused exclusively on language, but I was quickly reminded of some of the conversations I had about

69 There are a lot of people who are, who are very Breton today, Breton activists, but precisely due to historical reasons, don’t speak it Breton. Well, it would be, of course, it would be more logical if they spoke it, but we cannot reproach them for that. So, if they already have a Breton feeling, whether they are Breton or not, I think that’s really good. [...] In a hundred years, if everything progresses favorably, you won’t be able to be Breton without speaking Breton. Today, it’s [not speaking Breton] normal, it’s a consequence.

70 In your opinion, who is more Breton?
- A person born outside Brittany (elsewhere in France or abroad) whose family is Breton, but who doesn’t speak Breton.
- A person born in Brittany whose family is Corsican who only speaks French.
- A person from Northern Africa who has learned Breton at school.
- A person born in Brittany whose family is from Brittany and who speaks Gallo.
- All of these people have the same right to call themselves Breton.
- No opinion.
modern Breton society. There was one in particular that repeatedly came to mind, wherein the participant raised the notion of the evolution or diversification of the demographics of the region and the tendency of these so-called new Bretons to quickly adopt the region and its culture as their own. I did not wish this question to devolve into a laundry list of nuanced differences, but nonetheless I did want to capture the salient elements of language, family heritage, birthright and otherness. Given the fact that all of those I interviewed openly said that they believed anyone who wanted to claim a Breton identity should be allowed to do so, I decided that I should include an “All of the above” option. I intentionally did not include, however, an option for someone who was born in Brittany and spoke Breton. This seemed too straightforward and, in my opinion, would not yield anything that I would consider interesting. I instead opted to draw very clear lines around each proposed response. The underlying respective themes of the four specific responses can be summed up as follows: ancestry, place of birth, Breton language proficiency and Gallo language proficiency.

I decided that each element should be isolated from others that could have an influence on respondents’ opinions. This is why for the matter of ancestry, I decided the hypothetical person should live outside the region and not speak Breton. For place of birth, I thought it necessary to specify that the hypothetical person’s family heritage was not simply a vague non-Breton and, therefore, assigned another noteworthy regional heritage (Corsican) also known for its struggle for recognition. As discussed above, Corsican identity has a double-edged reputation. On one hand, the island is
known on the mainland for its homegrown mafia-like organized crime that also seeks greater autonomy from Paris, but on the other hand, the island has gained important concessions when it comes to the place of the Corsican language in Corsican society—most notably, in the island’s schools— and the authority of the island’s legislature to debate and decide a series of matters normally reserved for the central government. In other words, some regionalists are cautious or fearful of the more militant components of the pro-Corsican movement, while others admire the benefits that have been achieved perhaps in part because of these same often violent acts. When trying to determine the importance of the ability to speak the Breton language to access Breton identity, I wanted to take a rather radical position, namely I wanted those who would normally say that one needs to speak Breton to be Breton to take a step back and examine their own position in this debate. The hypothetical person in this proposed response not only learned Breton through so-called ‘artificial’ means, their family heritage is from a former colony, therefore not French, which some purists might think precludes any possible claim to Breton identity. Finally, since one of the primary goals of this project is to ascertain what differences, if any, exist between Breton and Gallo perceptions of Bretonness as well as the perceptions Bretons have in relation to the two languages, whether or not they personally belong to one of these traditional language communities, I decided that the Gallo language response should also be rather provocative. Again, I wanted those who might think that only those people who speak Breton can be Breton to re-examine their opinions with regard to the language situation in Brittany. Hence, I wanted to know whether
someone whose heritage is unequivocally linked to the region and who speaks Gallo could be considered more Breton than the others. In other words, does that fact that someone whose claim to Bretonness is perhaps more ‘genuine’ or complete mean that they in turn are more Breton than others who also avowedly identify with the region.
7 - DATA ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION

The following section details the data collected through each question of the follow-up survey. In many cases, analyzing separately the responses to the initial survey would have proven tiresome and repetitive. Therefore, when the same question, or part of a question, also appeared in the initial survey, the aggregate data for both surveys will be presented below. The distribution of responses across demographic categories for some questions is quite straightforward, whereas for others it will require further analysis to ascertain any discernible patterns that may be present in the data, particularly with regard to demographic distribution.

The first survey collected responses from 402 persons and the follow-up survey 535. Twenty-four additional people participated in the on-site interviews in France, which as I discussed earlier informed the modifications and additions to the initial survey that would lead to the drafting of the follow-up survey. There were also others who spoke with me during my field research, but did not wish to be recorded and also some 22 friends and colleagues who shared their experiences and opinions, as well as provided their invaluable feedback in the planning stages of what would later become the initial survey. Overall, there were 985 participants of various sorts throughout the different stages of this project.

Of these nearly 1,000 participants, however, only those attitudes and ideologies of 934 will be directly discussed below. This reduction is due to a variety of factors. First, I did not consider those persons (2) who answered negatively the first question regarding being over 18 years of age and participating in the study of their
own free will. I also eliminated responses from those persons (27) who responded that they did not consider themselves Breton. While the opinions and feedback shared by friends and colleagues at the very beginning of the planning stage of the initial was undoubtedly helpful in the formulation of survey questions, it was not collected in an easily analyzable format, therefore, it was not taken directly into account in this analysis, though does of course inform the analysis and interpretations in invaluable ways. Finally, I decided to not consider the responses that did not show signs of a thoughtful opinion or an established position with regard to the issue in question. This means that answers such as “I don’t know” and “No opinion” were excluded from the analysis. “No preference” has also been excluded from the analysis of those two-part questions formulated to assess respondents’ preferences and reasons for particular word choices.

It is also worth noting that there is a great variance in response rate for different questions. As I mentioned above, only the first question regarding age and motivation was required in order to submit either survey. All of the others, however, were optional based on the volition of individual respondents, which was overtly discussed in the introduction to each survey. In the subsections that follow, we will see that some questions garnered up to 100 fewer responses than the full participant pool of 535 responses. Except for one notable exception which I will discuss further on, on average, there were approximately 500 responses to questions that were specific to the follow-up survey and roughly 900 responses to those questions that were shared between the initial and follow-up surveys.
The demographic data will be compared to that collected through the French national census by the French National Institute of Statistics (INSEE) as well as other sources like the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and M@rsouin. M@rsouin is a unique entity in France. It stands for Môle Amoricain de Recherche sur la Société de l’information et des Usages d’INternet (Amorican Breakwater on Society, Information at Internet Usage), which ironically evokes two historical elements of Breton identity (the Roman and the maritime) in relation to communication of the 21st century. An initiative of the Regional Council of Brittany that was founded in 2002, it brings together 12 centers of research in the fields of social and human sciences from the region’s four universities and three discipline-specific schools of political science, communication and statistics.

In the following two sections, I present the demographic make-up of the respondent pool for both the initial and follow-up survey. This is solely intended to provide the background of those who responded to these two surveys. For those questions that require further analysis, particularly at the demographic level, I have reduced the subdivisions of the several categories to the fewest number of variables as makes sense in the French and Breton contexts. Finally, I will contextualize the raw data and present the results of the extensive probability tests of statistical significance of the distribution of the individual response choices to each question by the seven demographic variables – namely, Gender, Age, Level of Education, Place of Birth, Place of Residence, Time Spent in Brittany, Breton Exposure and Gallo Exposure.
7.1 GENERAL DEMOGRAPHICS

In Chart 1, it is interesting to see that there was such a dramatic gender division of respondents. According to the INSEE estimates for 2012 (INSEE 2013), Brittany’s population is slightly more female (51.4%) than male (48.6%) and yet the overall respondent pool for both surveys was overwhelmingly, nearly two thirds, male.

![Chart 1. Gender (n=939)](image)

One might think that perhaps there is a gender difference in regular internet usage that could explain this; however, the UNECE only shows a marginal difference. According to its statistical database (UNECE 2012), 72% and 76% of respective female and male populations of France use the internet on a weekly basis. I would attribute this significant gender divide of the respondent pool to the nature of the venue where they were invited to participate in the surveys. While there is no statistical data to prove it, my anecdotal experience in Brittany has been that the activist movements,
whether they be regional or linguistic in nature, are rather male dominant. Considering that the Facebook groups that were originally targeted could all be classified as promoting some sort of pro-Brittany activist agenda, even through the means of tourism, this could well contextualize the gender imbalance among those who responded to the two surveys.

Contrary to the perhaps surprising significant male bias to the data collected through the surveys, as seen in Chart 2, the age distribution of the respondent pool was relatively predictable and fully expected. Over one half of all respondents were 30 years old or younger. In fact, seven out of every ten respondents was aged 40 years or younger. This represents an approximate median respondent age of 35.2 years old. This figure is well below the equivalent national (49.33 years old) and regional (49.94 years old) levels.
This disparity can be explained by the virtual nature of the data collection method for the surveys. Membership information indicates that the average of age of adult (18+) Facebook users is 34.1 years old (Graphs and Go 2011) or roughly one year younger than the average of the respondents to my survey. Aside from taking into consideration that the general figure is for all users worldwide, I would also attribute this difference to the subject matter of the survey, which elicits opinions on topics that tend to be fairly personal in nature and have been the focal point of recent debates, both on the regional and national levels, with regard to individual rights, regional identity and the central government. It has been my experience that “older” Bretons are passionate about these topics and delighted to discuss them. As discussed above, some demographic divisions are reduced to fewer categories in the analysis of different survey questions. The first such category is Age. Instead of six subdivisions,
subsequent analysis will be reduced to three: Younger (40 years old and under), Middle (42-60 years old) and Older (61 years old and above). This is more in line with the four divisions (20-39; 40-59; 60-74 and 75+) that the INSEE uses for its reporting purposes related to the French adult population. It will also facilitate the data analysis by grouping together those age groups that share similar response profiles to the questions that follow.

The respondent pool to my surveys was very highly educated with nearly seven out of every ten respondents (69.5%) having attended university and nearly half holding an advanced degree. I purposely did not calibrate the categories of Chart 3 to university diploma levels, however, which start at two years of university study, because the first-year failure rate in France is well over half (Mouloud 2010). I simply sought to see who had attended university, working under the premise that even one year of university study without a degree could expose young people to perspectives that those with no university study would not experience.
Unfortunately, census data is not available for the subset of the university student population that fails to complete their degrees, but the INSEE (2009) has released such data for 25-34 year olds. For Brittany, 43.56% of this age range have a university degree, which when adjusted for those students who would not have gone into second year (52.5%), equals 70.38%. While this age range is admittedly limited, it does represent a cross-section of the two largest age groups in the respondent pool and yields a result similar to that seen in my dataset. In subsequent analyses, Level of Education will be reduced to the binary University (Bac+1 - Bac+3 and Bac+4 & Above) and Non-University (Brevet des collèges, Baccalauréat and BTS/ BEP). In sum, the respondent pool is predominantly male, young (under 40) and highly educated.
7.1.1 - BRITTANY-SPECIFIC DEMOGRAPHICS

The following three graphs address respondents’ connection to Brittany through birth and/or residence. The places where they were born and currently lived are important insofar as these administrative (artificial) divisions have evolved into socially significant entities. This is especially true for the départements of Finistère (29) and Ille-et-Vilaine (35) that are positioned on the geographic extremes of the region.

As far as where respondents were born is concerned, the data in Chart 4 shows that the distribution is not even across the five départements (22-Côtes-d’Armor, 29-Finistère, 35-Ille-et-Vilaine, 44-Loire-Atlantique and 56-Morbihan), with the deviation being well over 10% for the lowest and highest values. There was little expectation, however, of the two additional responses of elsewhere in France (99) and abroad (00). In the initial survey, one hypothesis was that respondents’ origins, or birthplace, in relation to the Breton-Gallo linguistic dividing line might have an impact on how they define and perform Bretonness.
While French and, by extension, Breton society is not as mobile as the United States, moving within the region is not uncommon. Considering that the historic region is slightly larger than the state of Maryland, such moves can easily take a person to the proverbial other side and thus have an impact on their perceptions of intraregional language issues. Unlike census registries, there is no data for the number of people living worldwide who were born in Brittany and, even if there were, this data would not likely yield much insight into the distribution pattern of respondents’ place of birth. Thankfully, this is not the case for their place of residence.

As seen in Chart 5, the distribution of the respondents’ residences is more even than where they were born, however, there is still a western bias. That is to say, that more respondents living in Finistère (29) responded to the survey than those living in Ille-et-Vilaine (35) or Loire-Atlantique (44), when those two départements have
significantly larger adult populations. The result is perhaps to be expected given that the western part of the region is where the highest concentration of Breton speakers live. Whether or not this difference in response rates can be directly to one's ability to speak Breton, the presence of the language is greater in Finistère and, therefore, it is not unreasonable to presume that inhabitants of this part of the region are more aware and/or sensitive to issues revolving around regional language and, as an extension, Breton identity. While the social media venues used to advertise the surveys were not specifically targeted to those who speak Breton or live in areas with large numbers of Breton speakers, exposure to such an environment could well have an impact of one's opinions on related matters and willingness to share them. The nearly 30% of respondents living outside of the boundaries of the region should also be noted and will be analyzed further when place of current residence proves significant in shaping respondents' opinions on certain matters.
Where respondents resided when they completed the surveys can also be seen as important, particularly when this data is compared with birthplace data. In fact, the INSEE (2008) has determined that there is a strong correlation between place of birth and place of residence throughout France. Unfortunately, this data is not available on the intraregional level, but it is nevertheless interesting to note that of the 3,149,701 people who lived in Brittany in 2008, 74.1% were born in the region. Similarly, of the 3,014,138 people living in France who were born in Brittany, 77.4% currently live in the region. This means that there are 2,333,319 people living in Brittany who were born there as well. Unlike other demographic variables, Place of Birth and Place of Residence cannot be reduced below the département level. These administrative divisions have existed for centuries, but do not correspond to anything more
substantive, particularly in light of the blurred, ever changing territorial line between today’s Breton- and Gallo-speaking communities.

Finally, in addition to where respondents currently live, it is important to know how long they have lived in Brittany. Logically, the longer respondents live in the region, the more they will identify with it and perhaps with the struggles of maintaining its traditional languages. The largest single response category in Chart 6 – by over 10% – was that of those who have lived their entire lives in Brittany (29.4%). In fact, nearly six out of every ten respondents (59.2%) have lived in Brittany for at least half of their lives, while 32.4% have lived in the region less than half of their lives and 8.4% have never lived there at all. This last category is rather interesting. I initially contemplated eliminating it from the data analysis, but later realized that whether or not someone has actually lived in the region should not have any impact on their ability to identify with the region, nor does it mean they will not have strong opinions about the status of the region’s traditional languages and the role they play in its contemporary culture.
In discussion of subsequent survey questions, like previously discussed demographic variables, Time Spent in Brittany will also be reduced to a binary division: Less than half one’s life and Half of one’s life and more. In sum, the respondent pool is more likely to have been born or currently lives in Finistère and has lived in Brittany for more than half of their life.

7.2 - TRADITIONAL LANGUAGE EXPOSURE

The final demographic is one that is particular to this survey: respondents’ exposure to the traditional languages of the region. It is amazing to see that nearly one half (49.6%) are Breton speakers. These results are not representative of the population of Brittany at large, however, where roughly 5% speak Breton. It is important to highlight that of those respondents who speak Breton, 28.2% learned to speak the
language in the home, that is, through intergenerational transmission. As discussed previously, this method is crucial to the long-term survival of any language, whether it currently be endangered or not. The two categories in Chart 7 regarding wanting to learn the language are composed of respondents whose families speak, or once spoke, Breton. These subcategories show that this break in this ‘natural’ way of passing along this important cultural artifact has not deterred some from wanting to right this wrong.

This uncharacteristically high proportion of Breton speakers can again be explained by the nature of the Facebook groups that were used to recruit participants, which included a group whose primary objective was to petition Facebook to release a Breton-language version of the social medium platform. As the communication on this
The group’s page was almost exclusively in Breton, it is logical to assume that the majority of its members had at least a functional knowledge of the language.

The data for a similarly-themed question in the initial survey yielded quite different results, whereby only 27% said that they spoke Breton. Taking into consideration that the invitation to that survey had not been posted to any Breton-language groups, it is perhaps more in tune with the linguistic abilities of the broader regional pro-Brittany activist movement or at least that portion of this population that would be interested in answering a survey about the role of regional languages in modern Breton society.

As stated previously, the present survey was informed heavily by the personal interviews that I conducted in Brittany. These interviews taught me that language in terms of the regional heritage is not singular and that Gallo was still spoken by a relatively significant segment of the population. Estimates would place the size of the Gallo-speaking population on similar standing to that of its Celtic cousin, roughly 5% of the overall population of the region. Chart 8 shows that the respondents demonstrate a higher degree of proficiency in Gallo (10.2%) than the regional average, albeit considerably lower than that of Breton. It should be noted that nearly double that amount of respondents (19.4%) did not know what Gallo was. This could be related to the difficulty the modern pro-Gallo movement has encountered with the name Gallo. Unfortunately, until recently, it has not had the same extent of coverage in the mainstream media, nor do those who speak it necessarily associate themselves
with this name; many opt for the ubiquitous *patois*. A similar number of respondents (17%) to the initial survey did not know what Gallo was.

In sum, nearly half of the respondent pool speaks Breton, the majority of whom learned it at school; very few respondents speak Gallo. That said, an overwhelming majority have heard Breton and Gallo spoken in some sort of social setting. Finally, the Breton and Gallo Language Exposures were also reduced to binary divisions of Speak Breton/Gallo and Do Not Speak Breton/Gallo. Contrary to my initial thoughts, those whose families once spoke one of the languages were more likely to respond like those who had merely heard the language spoken as opposed to those who speak it themselves. This simplification permits useful further analysis, namely tests of statistical significance for all demographic responses to each question (see Appendix 7).
7.3 - REGIONAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Since the vast majority of new Breton speakers are learning the language in formal language programs at school, and there are now limited options in school for Gallo as well, the next logical step is to gauge respondents' opinions about making either language, or both, a required subject. During the interviews I was surprised to find that many opposed the idea of mandating that children study something, whether it be the culture or language(s) of the region. This position, even held by some Breton language professors, was often justified in the context of Irish in the Republic of Ireland. In Celtic language circles, Irish is often considered the perplexing failure, whereby the language has a high status among and is supported by the population at large, but numbers of speakers have remained steady or decreased since it became a required subject. During several interviews, participants cautioned against making anything mandatory because that almost certainly turns students off to the subject matter in question and would in the long run be more detrimental than beneficial. One must remember that the oft cited Celtic success story, Welsh, also involves requiring that children study the language in school. One notable difference between the situations of the two languages is the support they have received from their national governments. While today Welsh does enjoy full recognition and support from the British government, one cannot help but wonder whether initial opposition to such measures in the education system may have had some positive effect, no matter how minor, on the underlying sense of necessity to support the language in the schools.
In terms of Brittany, and in the case of the respondents to the follow-up survey, it is very interesting to see in Chart 9 that the single response that most often selected, with nearly three out of every ten respondents (29.5%), was the one that stated that current so-called bilingual education programs are enough. This likely stems from a position of reluctance to widely oblige children to study the language for fear that it could backfire and result in fewer life-long speakers like highlighted above for Irish. That said, if one considers the remaining responses, an overwhelming majority (58.3%) do support requiring at least one of the two languages. Using traditional language heritage of the location as a guide, more than one quarter of the respondents (27.4%) felt that Breton or Gallo should be studied, however 12.2% felt that only Breton was important.
The segment that could well be the most telling is the one that was added at the suggestion of one of the first respondents, namely allowing the parents to choose which language their child learned in school. While relatively harmless at first consideration, upon further reflection, one needs to wonder which language they would choose and why. Perhaps the family's background may be in one language, but they have moved to the other side of the region and, therefore, wish to maintain their own heritage language, which an option for studying the heritage language of the family would have potentially addressed. This seems to be a reasonably justifiable explanation, however, this begs the question of how many parents would choose the other language simply because they prefer it to the one that is traditionally spoken where they live. Or perhaps they would do so because the other language has more caché, or cultural capital, presumably in this case Breton. Finally, while based purely
on conjecture, one cannot ignore the possibility that some may have chosen this response because they did not feel that Gallo was particularly important, at least for their family, but felt more comfortable choosing a response that was less overtly provocative, but nevertheless allowed for the same end result. The most statistically significant demographic factors when considering whether or not to require school-aged children to learn the region's traditional language and which one(s) include gender, level of education, Breton speaking ability and place of birth. Female respondents are more likely (p=0.0019) to think that Diwan and other bilingual programs are sufficient, while males respondents more often (p=0.0012) that only Breton should be learned. This gender divide is interesting, but the male point of view shows that men are more likely to take a radical stand with regard to pro-Breton activism. Place of birth, namely in the outlying Loire-Atlantique or elsewhere in France, also proved significant (p=0.0135) for those who feel bilingual education should only be required in Breton. It is perhaps surprising that Breton speakers are more apt to support education in both Breton and Gallo (p=0.0035) or either language (p=0.0030).

The next logical discussion point would therefore be what should be taught in the bilingual education programs in schools. The focus of this question is Breton since there are very few programs for Gallo and those who accept its status as a language seem to be fairly supportive of any and all movements to improve its viability and vitality. This question on Breton and the form that is taught at school was informed primarily by comments made by Breton speakers during the personal interviews,
many of whom expressed regret over what they perceived to be the sterilization of the language in the service of some sort of standard that could be taught regionwide.

These participants explained that many instructors in the bilingual programs underwent very short but intensive language training to become functional in the language, and the result was a language that was devoid of much of the local color that has come to mark the pluricentric aspect of Breton. Indeed, until very recently there has not been a widespread push for standardization, which some activists feel is key to maintaining the language's relevance in the 21st century. The aim of this question was therefore to gauge respondents' opinion not necessarily on the idea of standardization per se, but rather on the primary impact that Breton speakers see with regard to linguistic continuity and the possibility of communication with those older generations who have not been exposed to so-called Diwaneg (i.e. 'school Breton', with the suffix "-eg" indicating in Breton a variety of a language, as in the rough English translation 'Diwan-ish'). If older speakers do not necessarily recognize (or understand) this variety of the language, is it serving its purpose of boosting the vitality of the language as a whole? Standardization is often part of a greater discussion on how to assure that regional language can be extended to beyond the vestiges of traditional society. This concept of normalització in the context of post-Franco Catalan revival has been exalted as one of the means by which the language has become preeminent in all sectors of Catalonia’s modern, forward-moving society.
The term *Diwaneg* was used by several participants in their personal interviews, as was *Roazhoneg*, which literally means the variety of Breton spoken in Rennes. In common parlance, however, Roazhoneg can be used with a pejorative connotation to indicate a non-native variety of the language spoken outside the Breton-speaking heartland. Interview participants explained that this term is used to denote Breton when it is spoken with the intonation and rhythm from French. In their opinion, the tonic stress (i.e. stress on the penultimate syllables of words) is what gives the language its charm (as opposed to the final-syllable stress pattern that characterizes French). Diwaneg was initially used in this question, but after a couple comments indicating that respondents also felt that it expressed a negative connotation, the question was slightly reformulated to embody the notion of a 'new' school-based Breton and respondents’ opinions on how it relates to more traditional varieties. Chart 10 illustrates that over half (57.6%) of those who responded feel that this is
natural or normal, whereas fewer than one in ten (7.3%) feel that this schism between school learners and heritage speakers needs to be addressed. The remainder, which represents over one third (35.8%) of respondents have accepted the situation as an understandable – albeit regrettable – outcome of events and societal pressure that led Breton speakers to actively decide to not teach their children to speak Breton. In sum, the majority of the respondent pool feels that regional language education should be mandatory for the region's youth and most support or at least tolerate the implicit standardization that accompanies such an effort. With regard to statistical significance, gender, Breton speaking ability and place of residence are important to consider. While female respondents more likely feel that a unified Breton is regrettable, but understandable due to dwindling family transmission (p=0.0392), male respondents seem to be more strictly pragmatic and are more likely feel that standardization is necessary for regional language survival (p=0.0136). Those living in Loire-Atlantique and elsewhere in France are also slightly more likely to think that standardization is necessary (p=0.0725). It is interesting to note that those who speak Breton more often feel that a unified standard is an example of evolution, which is a natural component of language (p=0.0218).

7.4 - WORD CHOICE

Questions that look at respondents' preferences for certain words form the backbone of this study. This first question was present in both surveys and aims to understand the difference meanings that Bretons assign to the word 'Breton'. As discussed
previously, this word can mean many things, which are dependent on context. When the word is used on its own, however, the notion that it prompts in respondents' minds is very likely indicative of the importance they place on the various elements of Bretonness.

As seen in Chart 11, the overwhelming majority (67.6%) of respondents to both surveys indicate that the first definition of 'Breton' for them is a person, of whom over half opted for the “all of the above” option. This is not at all surprising. First, when presented with a catch-all option, respondents can certainly imagine their 'true' response included in the so-called mix. Furthermore, throughout the course of the personal interviews, participants stated that anyone who claimed they were Breton had the right to do so.
It is indeed interesting that to most people who identify as Breton, the word 'Breton' evokes more of a sense of being than it does an object, whether tangible or intangible (like the Celtic language). Indeed, relatively few respondents (16.2%) indicate that the word makes them first think of the Breton language and even fewer yet (barely 1%) first think of a person who speaks Breton. These results would seem to clearly demonstrate that for Bretons, the word 'Breton' is first and foremost a sense of being and that among persons who feel this sense, family ancestry in the region counts more (12.3% vs. 8.6%) than someone's place of residence. The language is therefore not at the forefront of people's minds when they hear the word 'Breton' without a specific context. In terms of statistical significance, two variables have proven salient: Breton language ability and gender. For Breton language ability, both speaking and not speaking the language yielded a rather predictable result. Not speaking Breton is extremely significant (p < 0.0001) in that those who do not are much more likely to associate the word 'Breton' with a person, whereas speaking is also very significant (p=0.0038) for those who associate the word with the language. The interesting, unexpected result is gender, whereby being female was very significant (p=0.0013) in considering 'Breton' to be a language before all else (perhaps due to women's traditional role as primary transmitters of culture and language to children, as suggested in some early sociolinguistic studies that included gender as a social factor of interest; see, e.g. Labov 1990). Place of residence could also be viewed as being significant for preferring language over a person or object (p=0.512), specifically living in Côtes-d'Armor, Finistère or Ille-et-Vilaine.
The next term of interest is that which respondents prefer to embody the specific nature of Breton culture. A simple Google search for the two terms in question (Bretonnitude and Bretonnité) shows an overwhelming majority (75.1%) for the use of Bretonnitude in online fora. This preference, however, is not reflected in the data collected from my respondent pool, of whom nearly half (43.6%) do not have a strong preference for either term. Of those who did express a preference, the following chart shows that nearly six out of ten (59.8%) prefer Bretonnité over Bretonnitude.

The differences in results can potentially be explained by several factors. First the Google search yielded over 60,000 hits compared to a pool of 525 respondents for this survey. Also, when discussing such a topic online, one cannot claim indifference. Indeed, one must choose a term. One cannot help wonder which term those who chose 'Indifferent' would have chosen had they been forced to do so. Finally, a cursory
review of the results of the Google search would seem to indicate that many of the hits for Bretonnitude were in fact related to academic or published media. Given the similarities with the Négritude movement, it is not surprising that discussion in these venues would be more biased towards Bretonnitude.

As seen above, of those respondents who expressed a preference for which term they prefer to indicate the specific nature of Breton culture, the majority (56.7%) chose Bretonnité. Of these respondents, most (60.5%) prefer it because the term is neutral. Ironically, of those who chose Bretonnitude, the majority (58.5%) did so because the term makes reference to a tradition of activism. These results present a rather interesting divide, whereby each subset of the respondent pool prefers its chosen term for a reason that is the categorical opposite of the other. Level of education, Breton language ability and age proved to be statistically significant in the analysis of
these two questions. Not attending university was very significant for preferring Bretonnitude ($p=0.0024$) because it is the word that is commonly used ($p=0.0010$), which is surprising since it is the more academic term. A similar trend appeared for speakers of Breton who also preferred this term for the same reason ($p=0.0260$ and $0.0111$, respectively). On the other hand, those over 61 years old preferred Bretonnité ($p=0.0054$), but for no discernible reason in particular.

The next question related to word choice looks at preferences for the word used to designate someone who speaks Breton. An undeniable majority prefer the traditional term Bretonnant over the recently coined Brittophone. The predominant preference for Bretonnant shown in the chart below is also reflected in a Google search of the two terms (80.7%). This search yielded nearly 58,000 hits, which would seem to indicate that the shared result with my survey would seem to lend a high level of reliability of this data subset. Contrary to the previous pair of terms, this set shows that the choice is clearly in favor of Bretonnant and that very few people (1.7%) are indifferent about the matter.
Chart 15 shows that well over half (62.8%) prefer Bretonnant over Brittophone because it is the word that is used in common parlance. Of those who prefer Brittophone do so because it fits into the -phone (Francophone, Anglophone) standard for speakers of various languages. This only accounts, however, for 14.8% of respondents, which is still less (16.8%) than the next popular reason for preferring Bretonnant, namely that it does not sound artificial. As a neologism, particularly one embraced by the Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg, there is bound to be some resistance to a new term –albeit coined with good intentions– that has not been used for very long or by many people.
It is interesting to note that while 16.8% of respondents feel that Brittophone sounds artificial, a mere 2.6% feel that Bretonnant is pejorative (owing to the evolution of the use of the root verb bretonner from “to speak Breton” to “to babble”). Finally, one must not forget that there is no such nuanced distinction for this in Breton itself, where there is only a single term to designate a Breton speaker, Brezhoneger. In sum, respondents feel that first and foremost Breton refers to a person, that Bretonnité should be used to refer to the specific nature of Breton culture because it is a neutral term, and when making reference to those who speak Breton, one should use Bretonnant because it is the word that is most commonly used. Language ability, level of education, gender, length of time spent in Brittany as well as place of residence all proved to be statistically significant. Of those variables, however, the most interesting trends were related to the so-called radical response of calling a Breton-speaker
Breton. Being born \( (p=0.0166) \) or living outside \( (p =0.0234) \) the administrative confines of the region --whether that be elsewhere in France, abroad or in Loire-Atlantique-- was a significant contributor to selecting this response, as was not speaking Breton \( (p=0.0173) \). This means that those who are not physically or linguistically connected to the region more often associate the language with Bretonness. Gender was also a significant variable in this discussion with women preferring Bretonnant because it does not sound artificial \( (p=0.0221) \) and men preferring Brittophone because it follows the -phone standard for language speakers \( (p=0.0205) \) and it is not pejorative \( (p=0.0282) \). Male respondents’ preference for Brittophone may well reflect the male prevalence in pro-Brittany activism discussed previously.

The last element dealing with respondents’ word choice is related to Gallo and how respondents describe it. The single-most chosen response in Chart 16 indicates that four out of ten respondents \( (40.7\%) \) consider Gallo to be equally important as Breton. However, the remaining respondents \( (59.3\%) \) do not feel that Gallo is as important as Breton. Of these respondents, a small albeit important minority \( (12.3\%) \) do not believe that Gallo should be called a language; they consider it a patois (or dialect).
While the initial aim of this question was to see how respondents perceive Gallo in relation to Breton, at the heart of the matter is also whether respondents consider Gallo to be a language. Whether they feel that Gallo is as important as Breton, the vast majority of respondents (87.7%) still feel that it is appropriate to call it a language. The most significant element to consider when gauging respondents' attitudes towards Gallo is their place of residence. Indeed, those living in Côtes-d'Armor and Morbihan were much more likely (p=0.0008) to consider Gallo and Breton to be equal in status. This is easily explained by the fact that these two départements are split by the same Plouha-Vannes line that separates the areas where Gallo and Breton are traditionally spoken. It is also interesting to note that those who have not heard of Gallo before do not speak Breton (p < 0.0001), have not attended university (p=0.0017), have lived less than half of their lives in Brittany (p=0.0013) or reside in Finistère, elsewhere in France or abroad (p=0.0175). This would seem to indicate that
it is those who have had less contact with the region who are more likely to not be aware of the existence of Gallo in the overall Breton (regional) context.

7.5 - LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE

As discussed above, the visual presence of regional languages in the public sphere is important in any movement aimed at improving their position in society. The data in Chart 17 shows that nearly half (49.8%) of all respondents feel that there should be widespread bilingual signage in Breton and that it should be in French and Breton or Gallo depending on the linguistic heritage of the municipality. This does leave a possible challenge in terms of Rennes, the current capital, and also, to a lesser extent, Nantes. Both of these cities, which are the region's two most populous, lie in the so-called Pays Gallo, but for many in Brittany they have taken on symbolic character that transcends traditional divisions of Breton- and Gallo-speaking areas. If the current decisions of Rennes Métropole as to what should be bilingual and where are any indication of wider trends, it is clear that municipal leaders, including those in tourism, wish to emphasize the Breton (cultural) heritage of the city in the Breton language. As yet very little has been done to increase the visibility of Gallo in Rennes and Nantes, but presumably this would be addressed should a general bilingual signage policy be adopted according to the preferences expressed in my survey. That said, it should be noted that more than a quarter of respondents (26.5%) feel that bilingual signage should only be in French and Breton, thereby excluding Gallo all together.
Of course, when producing informational signs in multiple languages, one must take a variety of factors into account, not least of which would be the order in which the different languages appear on said signs. There is a clear vertical and horizontal visual hierarchy and, as such, it is important to consider the implications of placing any language in the dominant (upper or left) position.
More than half (52.7%) of respondents feel that the regional language should be in this position to increase awareness of the municipality’s linguistic heritage. And more than one in five (20.3%) feel that French should come first because it is the lingua franca across the entire country. There were relatively few respondents who do not support widespread bilingual signage (4.1%) and among these respondents place of residence would seem to be a significant factor, particularly for those who live abroad (p=0.0012). Respondents’ ability to speak Breton also plays a significant role, albeit in a somewhat surprising manner: Breton speakers were more likely (p=0.0284) to support displaying all three languages (French, Breton and Gallo) on signs (when one might expect them to favor Breton-French or even Breton-only signs). Gender and place of birth are also significant: male respondents (p=0.0187) and those born in
Loire-Atlantique or elsewhere in France (0.0559) feel that Breton should be more prominent than other languages.

As discussed in the previous section, much like exploring the reasons behind respondents' preferences, in the case of bilingual --or multilingual-- signage, it is also important to ascertain the lengths to which respondents are willing to go to see such projects come to light. In practical terms, this means what they are willing to forgo in order to fund the widespread visual presence of the traditional languages of the region. The data in Chart 19 shows that roughly half (50.9%) of all respondents are willing to accept fewer services or delays in public works projects so that the traditional languages of Brittany may take a more prominent place in the region's linguistic landscape. Nearly three out of ten (29.2%) respondents would be willing to pay higher taxes to pay for new signs in Breton and/or Gallo, while nearly one out of five (19.9%) are not willing to make any financial or material sacrifice to do so.
As noted previously, those who chose this latter category are not necessarily against putting Breton and/or Gallo on public signs, only that they do not want to have to pay more or receive fewer services for this to happen. In the personal interviews, many believed that the government could easily cover the added costs if there were enough support from the electorate. Others did not see a need to replace all signs at once and instead opted for a gradual approach whereby the traditional languages would be added when signs were replaced. They argued that the added costs in this case would be minimal and that this would allow people to become used to the additional visual stimuli. In sum, the majority of respondents feel that signage in the region should be bilingual based on the linguistic heritage of the municipality, that the regional language should take the dominant position (over French) on signs and it would be
reasonable to fund the commission of these new signs by increasing taxes and delaying or reducing public services.

7.6 - REGIONAL LANGUAGE RECOGNITION

In addition to assessing respondents’ preferences for word choice as a gauge of how they perceive the role of language in their view of contemporary Breton society, I also wanted to assess how strongly they believe that Breton culture is linked to the region’s traditional languages. When asked directly, Chart 20 shows that an overwhelming majority (76.5%) of respondents feel that Breton culture is tied to the survival of both Breton and Gallo. However, a very low percentage of respondents feel that Breton culture is dependent solely on the survival of the Breton language (12.5%) or that the culture is no longer attached to its traditional languages (11%).

Chart 20. Dependance of Culture on Survival of Traditional Languages (n=502)
In a society where the State is the single-most present player in all sectors, it is interesting to see, in Chart 21, respondents’ opinions with regard to the recent decision to transform the *Ofis ar Brezhoneg* (Office of the Breton Language) into a public institution, which represents the first regional language entity to achieve such a legal status. Nearly four out of ten respondents (39.2%) support this move without any modification, while more than one quarter of respondents (27.4%) feel that, if the Regional Council has declared its support of Breton and Gallo, this new public office should include both languages, presumably with the Breton name *Ofis Publik Yezhou Breizh* (Public Office of the Languages of Brittany). Conversely, though, this means that more than seven out of ten respondents (71.2%) who support the public Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg do not think that its mission of the Ofis should include the preservation and revitalization of Gallo.
Nevertheless, of those respondents, nearly three out of ten (29.7%) believe that Gallo should have a similar, but separate institution. This means that overall, over half of respondents do support Gallo having some sort of public entity charged with promoting the language in modern society. The only point of contention among them is whether or not it should be the same --now public-- institution meant to promote and protect the interests of the Breton language in today's Brittany. Of those who do not necessary think that Gallo needs any institutional support, respondents' gender is statistically significant. In fact, male respondents (p=0.0023) again prove their penchant toward pro-Breton activist positions and lack of support for Gallo. As far as those who support Gallo being included in the new Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg's mission language ability are concerned, the most significant demographic is language ability (both Breton and Gallo). Those who do not speak Breton (p=0.0182) along with those
who speak Gallo (p < 0.0001) agree that the newly public institution should also work to strengthen Gallo’s place in Breton society of today. The position of Gallo speakers is an interesting one because while the institution could most certainly lend a great amount of social and political capital to the pro-Gallo cause, this may come at a cost. Given that some Breton speakers do not support the political stance of the Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg or the direction it is taking language policy, one must wonder what might happen if this same entity had authority over Gallo as well.

It is clear that the strong preference among respondents is to refer to the two traditional languages of the region jointly as 'Languages of Brittany' as opposed to 'Breton languages'. While etymologically speaking these expressions both mean the same thing, obviously that is not the case when considering what each means to respondents.

![Chart 22. Expression for Languages Spoken in Brittany (n=526)](image-url)
Indeed, the above chart demonstrates that to over four out of ten respondents (42.5%), 'Breton Languages' is a vague or confusing expression, whereas one in five (20.5%) feel that the 'Breton Languages' does not apply when including Gallo because there is only one Breton language, the one of Celtic origin. This is why well over half of the respondent pool (63%) prefers 'Languages of Brittany'. Statistically speaking, respondents’ level of education and Breton speaking ability were very significant in determining their preference for this expression over 'Breton languages'. Both those who have attended university \((p=0.0042)\) and those who speak Breton \((p=0.0002)\) feel that 'Languages of Brittany' is the clearer of the two expressions. The preference of the latter subset could be explained by the Breton language itself, whereby the only way to include the two languages spoken in the region, one of which is of Romance in origin, would be \textit{Yezhou Breizh}, which means “Languages (of) Brittany.” There are two equivalents of 'Breton languages' in Breton: \textit{Yezhou breizhat}, which is not used at all, and \textit{Brezhonegou} which means “Breton (Celtic) languages.”
The remainder, which accounts for slightly more than one third of overall respondents (37%), agrees that the qualifier 'Breton' suffices to indicate regional relation. In sum, the above graph illustrates that most respondents feel that there is a strong connection between Breton culture and both of the region's traditional languages, which should be called 'Languages of Brittany', upon which the culture is dependent, and that Gallo should be afforded the same institutionalized support mechanism as Breton enjoys through the Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg.

7.7 - BRETON CULTURE

One of the pivotal components of both surveys was the following question on what respondents feel is the most emblematic element of Breton culture. Given the results of the previous question on whether or not Breton culture was dependent on the
survival of its traditional languages, one might expect to find an overwhelming majority of respondents who feel that it is indeed its language(s). While language was the single-most selected response for which component of Breton culture respondents perceive to be the most emblematic, it was by far not a majority. In fact, Chart 24 shows that it did not even garner one third (31.1%) of the responses. This is nonetheless significantly higher than what respondents think outsiders see as being integral to Breton culture, where language was selected roughly the same amount of times as food (7.3%).

It is perhaps not very surprising that respondents feel that outsiders identify the region mostly (56.3%) with its traditions (e.g., Festoù Noz 'festivals', garb, Christian Faith) since it is known for being so steeped in tradition. From their own perspective, respondents chose tradition almost as often (29.6%) as language and when combined with folklore (e.g., legends, relationship with the elements, etc.), it would account for
the single-most selected category for both self-reporting and perceived outsider populations (46.7% and 76.7%, respectively). The most significant factors when considering which respondents feel that language is the most emblematic component of Breton culture include place of residence and age (p < 0.0001 for both) as well as length of time spent living in Brittany (p=0.0007) and level of education (p=0.0102), whereby those living in Côtes-d’Armor, Finistère and Ille-et-Vilaine for more than half of their lives, those who are 41 and older and those who have attended university feel that language forms the basis of Breton culture. Males (p=0.0163) and residents of Loire-Atlantique and other parts of France (p=0.0137) were more likely to consider resistance to be the defining element of Breton culture. This would seem to confirm that male respondents more often take on the activist role in the pro-Breton movement as do those living in Loire-Atlantique, whose outsider status – at least in current administrative definitions – may have an impact on their need to establish their claim to Bretonness.

During the course of the personal interviews, there was an undeniable sense of belonging expressed by nearly all participants. This group affiliation could be described as a sense of nationhood, albeit a stateless nation in today’s terminology. Chart 25 shows that the survey respondents overwhelmingly (75.5%) feel that there is indeed a Breton nation. Among those respondents who feel that there is a Breton nation (n=372), opinions are relatively evenly split as to why they feel this way; the millennial nature of the people (49.7%) and their ability to resist external cultural dominance (46.5%) account for all but a negligible few (1.1%) who believe that
Breton culture has proven itself to be stronger than its French counterpart. It should be noted, however, that nearly one fourth (24.5%) of respondents – all of whom identify as Breton – do not feel that the term ‘nation’ is applicable in the case of Brittany and the Breton people.

When considering those who do not feel that there is a Breton nation, age and Breton language ability are rather significant. Those who are 41 and older (p=0.0465) and those who do not speak Breton were much more likely to feel that the notion of nationhood was not applicable to Brittany and the Breton people.

Of course, any discussion of nationhood brings with it other related themes and, in the case of those who are or have been displaced, the notion of diaspora is nearly automatic. Since this term has been used in the press to describe various subsets of the Breton population, the objective of this question was to ascertain how those who
identify with the region understand this term’s application to the Breton context. The overwhelming majority (74%) feels that the Breton diaspora includes anyone who lives outside the region, whether that be the traditional 5-département or current 4-département administrative division. This means that Bretons living elsewhere in France, in the same country, are in their view living in the diaspora.

It is also interesting to note that fewer than half (11%) of those who do not feel that there is a Breton nation do not believe in a Breton diaspora. To invert that means that more than half of those respondents do believe in a Breton diaspora despite thinking that the idea of a Breton nation is not applicable (see Chart 26 above). This apparent contradiction in terminology is intriguing and would seem to indicate that to this group of respondents the idea of a displaced people somehow need not be linked to a sense of belonging to a separate group. Or perhaps it is the connotation of the
contemporary label of nationhood, that is so often used synonymously with statehood, that these respondents find does not apply to the Brittany. In sum, there is little consensus among those who consider themselves Breton as to what makes their culture unique; however, they agree overwhelmingly that others perceive their traditions to be most unique. There is not any consensus either on the basis of Breton nationhood, nevertheless a very large majority believe in the notion of a Breton diaspora outside the region.

7.8 - REGIONAL IDENTITY

Besides inquiring as to what is particular about Breton culture, in order to understand the role traditional languages play in Bretons’ conception of regional identity, it is important to understand what part of their personal and family histories contribute to their feelings of Bretonness. Chart 27 shows that more than four in ten respondents (43.1%) feel that their Bretonness is linked to their family ancestry, followed by over one fourth (27.2%) who feel that is more related to their place of birth (presumably in Brittany). It is worth noting that fewer than one in twenty respondents (4.1%) feel that their linguistic skills (either in Breton or Gallo) are the primary reason that they feel Breton. It is perhaps not surprising that place of birth is a very significant element for those who were born in any of the five départements of historic Brittany (p < 0.0001), but it is interesting to consider that it is also a significant factor for those under 40 years old (p=0.0337) and for those whole speak Gallo (p=0.0127).
While a relatively small portion (17.7%) of the respondent pool cite their Celtic affinity (or affection) for their sense of feeling Breton, the majority (61.8%) state that they feel closest to other Celtic countries as opposed to other nations or states, as shown in Chart 28. That said, nearly one quarter of respondents (24%) feel closer to France, the next most popular response. One might consider grouping those who feel closer to France with the marginal (7.2%) group who feel closer to other regions of France; however, the likelihood is that the latter respondents chose ‘Other regions’ based on these regions’ minority status with respect to the central government and so-called ‘national’ culture.
Despite some interview participants saying that they feel more European than French, this feeling does not overcome the underlying Celtic nature of Breton culture and Bretons' related allegiances. Indeed, Chart 28 above shows fewer respondents (6.9%) report feeling closer to Europe than other entities. Others may well feel more European than French, or even Breton, but conceptualizing Europe as a single polity may still be a challenge for those who were born before the creation of the European Union. For those who do feel closer to Europe, respondents' Gallo speaking ability, level of education, age, place of residence and time spent in Brittany were statistically significant. Those who speak Gallo (p < 0.0001), have attended university (p=0.0043), are 41 years old or older (p=0.0004), live in Finistère, Ille-et-Vilaine or abroad (p=0.0101) or have spent more than half of their lives identify more with Europe than France or other Celtic countries. That said, this remains the least selected response,
which may be explained by the recent debates by national leaders regarding maintaining sovereignty when faced with ever further-reaching E.U. treaties that transfer authority from Paris and other national capitals to Brussels.

The follow-up survey also included the question above which asks respondents to qualify the connection they feel to other Celtic countries, which partially explains the smaller respondent pool. As shown in Chart 29, of the proposed options (culture, language and history), cultural traditions garnered over half of the responses (55.3%), while fewer than one in five respondents (17.4%) chose linguistic skills, the least selected option. More respondents (22.8%) feel that their perceived connection to other Celtic countries is best explained by the history of resistance to outside forces that they all share. While in the aggregate respondents feel that the Breton connection is intrinsically linked to its traditional languages, when presented with specific
alternative markers of identity and affiliation, they do not choose language as an important motivator as often as one might expect.

When speaking about identity, it is important to bear in mind that it is seldom singular. Therefore, respondents were asked to rank their personal identities, in recognition of each individual’s multiplicity of identities as well as the fact that some elements may take precedence over others. And while it may seem that respondents are divided when it comes to how they rank their various identities, if one considers that the two most selected responses – identity as Breton, French, and European vs. identity as Breton, European, French – both place Breton in the primary position, this does show some level of consensus. Indeed, Chart 30 shows that these two responses account for more than eight out of ten respondents (82.5%). This absolute majority would indicate that an overwhelming percentage of people who claim Breton identity also place it in front of all others. The fact that so many respondents feel first and foremost Breton is perhaps not that surprising since they have already stated that they identify themselves as Breton, especially given the subject of this survey. That said, all of the responses did include Breton, so one may well have expected that some respondents could feel more French or European than Breton. In fact, the only non-Breton headed set of identities to garner more than 2% of responses collected was French, Breton, European, with one in ten respondents (10.6%) choosing this hierarchy over any other. It is interesting to note that if these results are compared to those of Chart 28, this group accounts for less than one third (31.1%) of those respondents who say they feel closer to France than another nation or state.
It is also interesting to consider that the remaining three choices (French, European, Breton; European, Breton, French; and European, French, Breton), which favor European identity over Breton, are by far the least popular with a combined representation of slightly more than one in twenty respondents (6.2%). As discussed earlier, a unified European identity is an elusive concept for many, and while some interview participants may well have claimed that for them it figured prominently, they are part of a rather small minority. Not dissimilar to those who prefer France, those who rank European identity first account for slightly more than one third (41.1%) of the relatively small number of respondents who feel closer to Europe.

The final component of the survey was to ask who respondents think is Breton, in fact who is the most Breton. As discussed in the methodology section, the response options were carefully crafted so that each would capture one element of what could
constitute a person’s claim to being Breton. These include ancestry, place of birth, linguistic skills and purposeful differentiation between Breton and Gallo. As shown in Chart 7.8.5, not surprisingly, a significant majority (72.6%) of respondents feel that all the proposed people should have the right to call themselves Breton. Again, this parallels the sentiment of most interview participants who said that anyone can be Breton as long as they care about the region.

If one looks at the other responses in Chart 31 above, however, it is interesting that the next most chosen response is the person who was born in Brittany and who speaks Gallo. The same option for someone who speaks Breton was not provided as it was assumed that respondents would choose it as the default. The objective was to see how Gallo would fare on its own and while perhaps not a large portion (16.8%) of the respondent pool, it is still the most widely chosen response for a single-person
category. This is interesting since most respondents stated feeling Breton because of their ancestry, but in this case ancestry alone was seemingly trumped by ancestry with a traditional language (even the less dominant of the two). For those who chose the Gallo speaker, the most significant demographic variable was education. Those who have not attended university were much more likely (p=0.0008) to consider a Gallo speaker born in Brittany to a Breton family to be most Breton. In sum, most respondents place their Breton ancestry ahead of any other factor, and they feel Breton primarily because their family is Breton or they were born in the region. They also confirm the Celtic connection in Brittany due to shared cultural traditions and the sense that anyone who claims the Breton identity is welcome to do so.

7.9 - SUMMARY

Taking into consideration that the respondent pool was predominantly male, young, well educated, and has spent half their lives in the region –and that a sizeable proportion also speaks Breton– the results of my research cannot necessarily be said to represent the population of Brittany at large. Nevertheless, they do represent the opinions of an important subset of Breton society, in particular, the region’s future leaders –be they political, business or academic– and those who will pass down at least one of the region’s traditional languages to the generations to come.

The preceding sections of this chapter have looked at various elements of Breton culture as they relate to the viability and vitality of the traditional languages of Brittany and have shown that while survey respondents feel that the languages are
intrinsically linked to the regional culture and that the survival of both languages is essential for the survival of the culture of Brittany, their opinions on the nuances of the relationship between language and culture are divided. The following is a discussion of some of the more salient results concerning mixed opinions over the current sociolinguistic situation of Breton and Gallo in Brittany today.

While male respondents, who outnumber female respondents nearly two to one, were more apt to position themselves in favor of Breton language and related social movements, female respondents were nevertheless more likely to associate the word 'Breton' with the Breton language, again suggesting women’s traditional primary role in passing down language and culture to future generations. A Breton university faculty member shared his feelings related to the potential role of women in reversing language shift in Brittany.

"C'est une chance pour la langue. C'est une opportunité pour le breton que ce soit fémini. Justement parce qu'il a l'image de la femme et l'image maternelle en même temps qui font que ces gens-là peuvent justement réinsciter la transmission familiale."\(^{71}\)

In this interviewee's opinion, if the language takes on a feminine image, and if women in the region regard the language as a useful social tool, they will be pivotal in reintroducing the language into the family unit and the home, thereby reestablishing the possibility of intergenerational transmission and thus a more viable means of regional language revitalization than simply relying on immersive schooling.

\(^{71}\) This is a chance for the [Breton] language. This is an opportunity for the language to be feminine. Precisely because it has a feminine image, a maternal image at the same time will allow these people to reinstate familial transmission [of the language].
With regard to the expression respondents prefer for referring to the specific nature of Breton culture, most were indifferent; however, the reasons for those who had a stated preference were found to be in direct opposition. Those who preferred Bretonnitude did so because it references the activist nature of Négritude, while those who preferred Bretonnité did so precisely because it is neutral and does not evoke the history of inequality of Bretonnitude.

There was no such divide in relation to the term respondents preferred to refer to speakers of Breton. Their choice was clear: Bretonnant was their term of choice because it is the term that has always been used. The terminology policies of the Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg for Brittophone are not sufficient, or have not yet been sufficient, for opinions on this matter to change. That said, the younger generation, particularly those who have participated in immersive schooling in Breton, do seem to embrace the new term. In addition, the fact that the Ofis has recently become a public institution may soon give it additional force. However, there are those –including Breton speakers– who do not agree with the position of the Ofis in relation to its terminology policy.

Finally, as far as Gallo is concerned, opinions are divided. Overall, however, those who most support the Gallo cause, from its status as a language to its visibility in the Breton regional linguistic landscape to its inclusion in regional political institutions, are, surprisingly, those who speak Breton. This quantitative finding was even more surprising to me because over the years, I have qualitatively observed a number of dismissive and disparaging comments about Gallo from Breton speakers.
In addition to the traditional regional languages, other important aspects of Breton identity were found to be its centuries old history and its history of cultural resistance – a history which many respondents feel links Brittany to other Celtic peoples, more closely than most feel linked to France. And whereas ancestry and place of birth were found to be important in identifying individuals as Breton, in the final analysis survey respondents felt that anyone who feels Breton ‘counts’ as Breton, an inclusive attitude that bodes well for the survival of Breton culture and traditions, though, again, it remains to be seen if the traditional languages can survive if intergenerational transmission is not regained.
8– CONCLUSION

8.1– BRETON, GALLO AND REGIONAL IDENTITY, IN SPEAKERS’ OWN WORDS

As discussed at the outset, it is relatively uncommon for there to be two unrelated traditional languages in one region, and even more so for there to be a single culture across the two language communities. In contexts of language competition and revitalization efforts, there is generally some sort of hierarchy of prestige, but this need not be the case. Hence, my project sought to understand whether Breton identity must be tied exclusively to one of its traditional languages, or whether it might be truly inclusive, with members of both language communities having equal access to being Breton. What role, if any, do Bretons assign to their traditional languages within the context of being Breton? Do they feel that one needs to speak Breton (and/or Gallo) to be able to call oneself Breton? How important is the survival of these languages to the region and its culture? What are Bretons willing to do to ensure that the languages are still spoken in the future? Finally, do today’s Bretons seek to apply the ‘one nation, one language’ philosophy that so many western so-called ‘nations’ (or states) have maintained for so long when conceptualizing a contemporary Breton identity and possibly constructing a Breton nation?

My initial hypotheses were obviously informed by my previous experiences in Brittany, in which I learned not only of efforts to maintain the Breton language but also of the existence of a second traditional language that seemingly was much less visible, Gallo. The previous chapter addressed some of the more interesting results of my study, especially in terms of the relationship between Breton identity and the
Breton language. Here, though, I wish to go into a deeper analysis of Gallo (e.g., participants’ overt opinions about the two languages of Brittany, the perceived position of Gallo vis-à-vis Breton, the Ofis’ position on Gallo, etc.), since learning more about Gallo and its relationship to Breton was the impetus of this project. The lack of a widespread awareness of Gallo, to me, spoke volumes. I wondered what this lack of visibility for Gallo meant for the shared culture between the two language communities and presumed that regional identity would be more strongly tied to the Celtic language, for a number of reasons, including the fact that Breton regional culture is more Celtic in nature than Romance, and the name for the Celtic language is synonymous with the term for belonging to the region. The surveys I conducted provide a broad overview of respondents’ opinions of Gallo. The interpersonal interviews, however, offer depth of insight into individual participants’ views and those they believe to have observed in others.

In terms of individual attitudes, there were certainly those whose opinions reflected the oversimplified view that the Breton language is the only language of Breton identity. Others, like the following interviewee, also question the genesis of Gallo as a language and even suspect that it has been ‘created’ to hold Breton back from assuming a greater position in Breton regional and French national society.

“Pour nous, ça [le gallo] reste toujours dans le mystère. [...] Le gallo est devenu un argument pour les politiques pour opposer ça aux bretonnants. [...] Il se passe exactement la même chose en Irlande du Nord, l’Ulster Scot qui est mis en confrontation à l’irlandais. Il y a eu une montée en puissance de l’irlandais. Qu’est-ce qu’on crée ? On crée l’Ulster Scot qui, qui [soupire] tant qu’ici on va
chercher du gallo. [...] On a créé le gallo comme on a créé la langue corse. [...] C’est une création pure et simple.”

However, when asked about how they define the word ‘Breton’ when there is no apparent context, the vast majority of survey respondents (68%) opted for a person instead of the Celtic language. In addition, and quite interestingly, non-Breton speakers were much more likely to consider Gallo a lesser language than Breton (p=0.0192) than were those who speak Breton. Those who speak Breton, therefore, are not necessarily anti-Gallo, including not only those who live in Lower (Eastern) Brittany, the traditional Gallo-speaking area, but even those in Upper (Western) Brittany. The following quote comes from an interview with a pro-Gallo activist:

“Les bretonnants de Haute Bretagne sont assez raides quand même. En Basse Bretagne, ils disent pas la même chose. Les bretonnants de Basse Bretagne sont plus proches de nous [les gallésants] que les bretonnants de Haute Bretagne. [...] Parce que le Chinois est plus fort, il faut que petit Tibétain disparaisse? C’est une dôle de philosophie.”

Interestingly, a similar stance was taken by someone doing the same type of activist work for Breton, in the Brezhonegva, or area where Breton is traditionally spoken:

“Ce qu’on constate aujourd’hui quand même c’est qu’il y a une force d’action, de mobilisation qui est beaucoup plus importante dans le, chez les locuteurs bretons, les bretonnants. C’est vrai en Basse Bretagne de manière plus soft, j’ai

---

72 For us, it [Gallo] remains a mystery. [...] Gallo has become an argument for politicians to oppose it to Bretonnants. [...] The same thing happens in Northern Ireland, Ulster Scots is put into a competition with Irish. There was a surge in power of Irish. And what do they create? They create Ulster Scots which, which [sigh] and here we go and look for Gallo. [...] Gallo was created just like Corsican was created. [...] It’s a creation pure and simple.

73 Breton speakers in Upper (Western) Brittany are pretty rigid overall. In Lower (Eastern) Brittany, they don’t say the same thing. Breton speakers in Lower Brittany are closer to us (Gallo speakers) than the Breton speakers of Upper Brittany. [...] Because Chinese is stronger, does that mean that little Tibetan has to disappear? That’s a strange philosophy.
envie de dire. C'est vrai aussi ici en Haute Bretagne de manière beaucoup plus revendicative.”

An important difference to highlight, though, as illustrated in the two quotes above, is that those Breton speakers who are not in the Brezhonegva are viewed as assuming a more militant position with regard to Gallo. This polarization was also observed in those respondents who lived outside the current administrative boundaries of the region, including Loire-Atlantique (44). The respondents in this département were seen to take a much more stringent attitude toward activism on several questions (e.g. equating Breton regional culture with the Celtic Breton language), which could be explained by the fact that they have long been politically cut off from the region and, therefore, feel that they must go to greater lengths to claim Breton identity than those who still live and conduct their daily lives in Brittany proper.

It is interesting to note that the Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg does not seem to have a unanimously positive following in pro-Brittany circles. There are those who think that by becoming a public institution, the Ofis will have to limit further activism, but there are also those, like the following interviewee, who think that in becoming public, the Ofis may be overstepping its mission and imposing the Breton language where it historically and culturally does not belong. Interestingly, the person quoted is a speaker of Breton, not Gallo, living in Lower Brittany.

“What we seen today though is that there is a strength of action, or activism that is much bigger in, with Breton speakers, Bretonnants. It's true in Lower Brittany, it's less intense, I want to say. It's also true that in Upper Brittany it's much more militant.
pas d’aller jusqu’à, jusqu’à plus on grimpe à l’est, mieux c’est. Même si on a jamais parlé breton dans ces régions-là. Ça me paraît fou. [...] Le gallo me paraît justifié si l’on va s’emporter à Rennes capitale d’une région, enfin, voilà, comme capitale j’entends centre important d’une région, c’est de la région gallèse, oui, bien sûr. Ça me, le breton n’a rien à faire, enfin, rien à faire à Rennes. On a jamais parlé breton à Rennes. Jamais. C’est une reconquête mythique—complètement mythifiée.”

Interviewees also spoke negatively of the strict terminology policies of the Ofis Public ar Brezhoneg, adding to the less than flattering picture their words have painted of the newly created institution.

In contrast to the perceived rigid policies of the official Ofis, overwhelmingly, Bretons seem to feel that there should not be a rigid definition of what constitutes a true Breton. As I discussed previously, there are obviously those who think that Breton identity should be tied to linguistic capacity (in the Celtic language), but even these people acknowledge that there are limitations to the application of such a strict understanding of being Breton. Furthermore, there are others who, like the following interview participant, have observed that Breton speakers who do not wish to recognize the existence of Gallo or its belonging to the region could in fact be accused of doing the same thing to Gallo that French Republicans did to Breton for centuries.

“Au département de Breton, demandez-leur s’ils, j’sais pas si vous les avez déjà rencontrés, s’ils sont favorables à ce qu’on mette en place un enseignement de gallo. Je suis pas certain d’une réponse positive. [...] On est vraiment dans une approche monolingue transférée aux langues régionales. Tant qu’il y a ça, ça ne

75 What the Ofis is doing, in my opinion, is territorial invasion, it’s scraping off symbolic territory based on a mythic history. There you go. But it wouldn’t bother them to go all the way to, to, the further East they go, the better it is. Even if Breton was never spoken in these regions. This seems foolish to me. [...] Gallo seems justified to me, if we’re going to make Rennes the capital of a region, there you go, by capital I mean an important center of a region, it’s in the Gallo region, of course. That, to me, Breton has nothing to do in Breton. Breton was never spoken in Rennes. Never. It’s a myth, completely mythical reconquest.
marchera pas. Donc le gallo est en concurrence même à Rennes 2 où à priori il existe, il reste toléré. [...] Pourquoi les bretonnants ne veulent pas du gallo? C’est parce qu’ils récupèrent le discours-idéologie monolingue français, appliqué à leur propre langue. Ils récusent les autres usages. C’est ça ce qui me choque scientifiquement le plus. En gros on a été victimes d’une oppression donc devenons à notre tour des oppresseurs.”

Most interview participants seem to reject the notion of being Breton de souche77 (‘of stem’ – that is, by ancestry), though, and instead support the idea that anyone can be Breton de coeur (of heart). One interview participant captured this sentiment very succinctly when asked what truly being Breton was to her, in saying, “être Breton, c’est un état d’esprit.”78

8.2 – MAINTAINING AND REVIVING THE ENDANGERED LANGUAGES

Despite widespread positive attitudes toward both traditional languages of Brittany, with 250,000 speakers of Breton and 200,000 speakers of Gallo accounting for only about ten percent of the current population of the region, both languages are in desperate need of support in every facet of modern Breton society. Since the average age of speakers of both languages is above 70 and both are spoken primarily in rural areas, the languages have been essentially relegated to an inactive part of today’s

76 In the Breton Department, ask them if, I don’t know if you’ve already met them, if they support putting in place Gallo classes. I’m not sure you’d get an affirmative response. [...] We’re really in a monolingual approach that has been transferred to regional languages. As long as that exists, it won’t work. So, Gallo is in competition, even here at Rennes 2 [a university] where normally it exists, it’s tolerated. [...] Why do Bretonnants not want Gallo? It’s because they’re taking on a monolingual French discourse-ideology applied to their own language. They reject other uses. That’s what most shocks me academically. In other words, we were victims of oppression, so it’s our turn to become the oppressors.

77 While originally coined to simply indicate someone’s origin or descent, the expression de souche (whether applied to Breton or another ancestry) has taken on a negative connotation in recent years.

78 Being Breton is a mindset.
Brittany. While its rural isolation may have been helpful at one point in preserving the language from outside influences, if the languages are to survive into the next century, they will need to be brought to the city, and preferably in the proverbial ‘mouths of babes’. Breton speakers and their supporters have made great strides in including the language across the spectrum of educational systems in the region, but if the children enrolled in these programs do not have opportunities to regularly speak the language outside of the classroom, all their parents’ and teachers’ efforts will have been made in vain. Of course, the same holds for Gallo; however, Gallo does not yet even enjoy the same support in the educational system as Breton, and there is a real need for implementing a public immersive education program along the lines of the Breton model, whereby teaching in the target language would account for half of overall classroom time. Without this important step, Gallo’s future will undoubtedly be very bleak.

Setting up bilingual education programs can be a protracted process that requires investment from the community as well as authorities. In the meantime, the simplest way to increase the position of both languages is to increase their visibility in the public sphere via bi- or tri-lingual signage. While slightly fewer than one in five respondents (19.6%) think that signs should be in French, Breton and Gallo across the region, one might argue that in Rennes and Nantes, or perhaps in the prefectural seats (capitals) of all five départements (22-Saint-Brieuc, 29-Brest, 35-Rennes, 44-Nantes, 56-Vannes), signs should be trilingual. The same solution could be envisaged in case where cities that were once in the Breton-speaking area now find themselves in the
Gallo-speaking area. Regardless of whether Breton on Gallo is in the most prominent position on signs (either on top or on the left), it is important that policies regarding positioning are applied consistently and, in order to avert any further questions as to the status of the traditional languages, that all languages be displayed in the same fonts and receive the same bold and/or italic treatments. This gesture, even if only applied through gradual replacement of old signs, would not only acknowledge the place of Breton and Gallo to their respective speakers, but would also send the greater population an undeniable message that these languages belong in today’s Breton regional linguistic landscape and, as such, are worthy of everyone’s attention. This would certainly elevate the level of awareness across the region and could well inspire some Bretons, whether young or old, to study one or both.

My project has shown that while there are differences in how different components of today’s society of Brittany may define their culture and the role that they think the region’s traditional languages play in that definition, all of those who identify with Brittany nonetheless still share many similarities.

8.3 – FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The current study has sought to provide a broad overview of the interrelation between language and culture in Brittany, via survey methodology, coupled with in-depth insights on these interrelations and accompanying attitudes, through open-ended interpersonal interviews. However, it must be admitted that given its bias toward young, highly educated males with active interests in Breton languages and
culture, we cannot presume that the sample is indeed representative of the Breton population as a whole or its findings representative of the opinions of Breton society in general. Ideally, future research would involve a broader, non-internet-based survey of a genuinely random sample of the Breton populace. In addition, more interpersonal interviews would add an even richer qualitative component, as would discussion with focus groups targeting key populations and key questions.

In addition to broader sampling, I see as the logical projection of my research an in-depth focus on what being Breton means to those who are from and/or live in Loire-Atlantique (44), the département that was, until 1941, a part of Brittany but now no longer politically belongs to the region. As we have seen, respondents from this département are still very attached to their Breton identity. Indeed, certain elements of this identity may be exaggerated when compared to the four départements of today’s administrative region of Brittany. It would be interesting to conduct studies of language and identity among current residents of Loire-Atlantique and compare these results with those from the residents of Brittany proper who took part in the current study, as well as with those originally from Loire-Atlantique who have either moved to Brittany or have left the area all together. Finally, it would be exciting to replicate the field component of my project to investigate language and identity in the capital of the Loire-Atlantique département, Nantes. Indeed, the city, once a capital of Brittany, is entirely within the Pays Gallo, but at the same time a Diwan school has recently opened there. Will this be merely symbolic, as seems to be the case of the opening of a Diwan school in Paris, or will it prove to confirm the place
of the Celtic language as a sign of an ever-present desire to reintegrate the
département into the traditional region?

Given its near-unique status as a minority region with two traditional minority languages, both present-day and historic Brittany (i.e. including Loire-Atlantique) are rich sites for continued sociolinguistic study, from a variety of perspectives, quantitative and qualitative, variationist and attitudinal, and, finally, from the perspective of the study of language endangerment, including its causes and, hopefully, its reversal.
AUX ÉLÈVES DES ÉCOLES

IL EST DÉFENDU

1° DE PARLER BRETON ET DE CRACHER À TERRE;

2° DE MOUILLER SES DOIGTS DANS SA BOUCHE pour tourner les pages des livres et des cahiers;

3° D'INTRODUIRE DANS SON OREILLE le bout d’un porte-plume ou d’un crayon;

4° D'ESSUYER LES ARDOISES EN CRACHANT DESSUS ou en y portant directement la langue;

5° DE TENIR DANS SA BOUCHE les portes-plumes, les crayons, les pièces de monnaies, etc.;

Voulez-vous savoir maintenant pourquoi ces défenses vous sont faites? Demandez-le à vos maîtres qui vous donneront les explications nécessaires.

Souvenez-vous enfin que vous ne devez pas seulement obéir vous-mêmes à ces prescriptions, mais que vous avez encore le devoir de les faire connaître à tout le monde.
Source: www.flickr.com/photos/xarxes/2240993571/
Appendix 2 - Fishman’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS)

**Stage 8** – Most vestigial users of Xish are socially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be-assembled from their mouths and memories and taught to demographically unconcentrated adults.

**Stage 7** – Most users of Xish are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age.

**Stage 6** – The attainment of intergenerational informal oralcy and its demographic concentration and institutional reinforcement.

**Stage 5** – Xish literacy in home, school and community, but without taking on extra-communal reinforcement of such literacy.

**Stage 4** – Xish in lower education that meets the requirement of compulsory education laws.

**Stage 3** – Use of Xish in the lower work sphere (outside of the Xish neighborhood/community) involving interaction between Xmen and Ymen.

**Stage 2** – Xish is lower governmental services and mass media but not in the higher spheres of either.

**Stage 1** – Some use of Xish in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts (but without the additional safety provided by political independence).

Appendix 3 - UNESCO Language Vitality Assessment

Factor 1: Intergenerational Language Transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Speaker Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used by all ages, from children up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is used by some children in all domains; it is used by all children in limited domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by the parental generation and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by the grandparental generation and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by very few speakers, of great-grandparental generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There exists no speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Absolute Number of Speakers

Factor 3: Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Proportion of Speakers Within the Total Reference Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nearly all speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A majority speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A minority speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very few speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None speak the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 4: Trends in Existing Language Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Domains and Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>universal use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used in all domains and for all functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multilingual parity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwindling domains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is in home domains and for many functions, but the dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Endangerment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grade</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Domains and Media Accepted by the Endangered Language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dynamic</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used in all new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>robust/active</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is used in most new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>receptive</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used in many domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>coping</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used in some new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>minimal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used only in a few new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inactive</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The language is not used in any new domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 6: Materials for Language Education and Literacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grade</strong></th>
<th><strong>Accessibility of Written Materials</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is an established orthography, literacy tradition with grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and everyday media. Writing in the language is used in administration and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Written materials exist, and at school, children are developing literacy in the language. Writing in the language is not used in administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form at school. Literacy is not promoted through print media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Written materials exist, but they may only be useful for some members of the community; and for others, they may have a symbolic significance. Literacy education in the language is not a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
part of the school curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>A practical orthography is known to the community and some material is being written.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No orthography available to the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 7: Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Support</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Official Attitudes toward Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>equal support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All languages are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiated support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minority languages are protected primarily as the language of the private domains. The use of the language is prestigious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive assimilation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active assimilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government encourages assimilation to the dominant language. There is no protection for minority languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced assimilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The dominant language is the sole official language, while non-dominant languages are neither recognized nor protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prohibition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minority languages are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 8: Community Members’ Attitudes toward their Own Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Community Members’ Attitudes toward Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All members value their language and wish to see it promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most members support language maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Many members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only a few members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No one cares if the language is lost; all prefer to use a dominant language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Factor 9: Amount and Quality of Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Documentation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Language Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>superlative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high-quality audio and video recordings exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are one good grammar and a number of adequate grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and occasionally updated everyday media; adequate annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are some grammatical sketches, word-lists, and texts useful for limited linguistic research but with inadequate coverage. Audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality, with or without any annotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only a few grammatical sketches, short word-lists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality, or are completely un-annotated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 5 – Interview Protocol & Translation

**ENQUÊTE: La bretonnitude vue et vécue par les Bretons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEXE</th>
<th>HOMME</th>
<th>FEMME</th>
<th>CRENEAU D’AGE</th>
<th>18-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>61-70</th>
<th>70 ET PLUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIVEAU DE FORMATION</td>
<td>BREVET DES COLLEGES</td>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>BTS/REP</td>
<td>BAC+1-BAC+3</td>
<td>BAC+4 ET PLUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT DE NAISSANCE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>AUTRE</td>
<td>ETRANGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNE</td>
<td>TEMPS VECU EN BRETAGNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT DE RESIDENCE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>AUTRE</td>
<td>ETRANGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNE</td>
<td>DUREE DE RESIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **AVEZ-VOUS JAMAIS ENTENDU PARLER LE BRETON?**
   - OUI
   - OUI, JE LE PARLE
   - NON
   - NE SAIS PAS

2. **PENSEZ-VOUS QUE LES LANGUES REGIONALES DEVRAIENT OCCUPER UNE PLACE DANS L’ESPACE PUBLIC?**
   - OUI
   - NON
   - NE SAIS PAS

3. **ESTIMEZ-VOUS QUE L’ETAT DEVRAIT INTERVENIR POUR PROTEGER LES LANGUES REGIONALES?**
   - OUI
   - NON
   - SANS OPINION

4. **SI OUI, DEVRA-T-IL LES PROTEGER TOUJOURS?**
   - OUI
   - NON
   - SANS OPINION

5. **SI NON, LESQUELLES?**

6. **SEREZ-VOUS FAVORABLE A UNE OPTION EN PRIMAIRE SUR L’HISTOIRE ET L’IDENTITE REGIONALES?**
   - FORTEMENT FAVORABLE
   - PLUTOT FAVORABLE
   - PLUTOT OPPOSE
   - FORTEMENT OPPOSE
   - SANS OPINION

7. **ET SI C’ETAIT UNE MATIERE OBLIGATOIRE?**
   - FORTEMENT FAVORABLE
   - PLUTOT FAVORABLE
   - PLUTOT OPPOSE
   - FORTEMENT OPPOSE
   - SANS OPINION

8. **QUELLE OPINION AVEZ-VOUS SUR LES CLASSES BILINGUES (E.G., DIWAN, BRESSOLA, IKASTOLA, ETC.)?**
   - FORTEMENT FAVORABLE
   - PLUTOT FAVORABLE
   - PLUTOT OPPOSE
   - FORTEMENT OPPOSE
   - SANS OPINION

9. **PENSEZ-VOUS QUE L’ETAT DEVRAIT SUBVENTIONNER CELLES-CI?**
   - OUI
   - NON
   - SANS OPINION

10. **PENSEZ-VOUS QUE L’ON DEVRAIT INTEGRER CES CLASSES DANS L’EDUCATION NATIONALE?**
    - OUI
    - NON
    - SANS OPINION

11. **INSCRIBIREZ-VOUS VOS PROPRES ENFANTS DANS UNE CLASSE BILINGUE?**
    - OUI
    - NON
    - SANS OPINION

12. **SI OUI, POURQUOI?**
    - AFFINITE REGIONALE
    - ASCENDANCE FAMILIALE
    - AVANTAGES DU BILINGUISME
    - NE SAIS PAS

13. **ET DANS QUELLE LANGUE?**
    - BRETON
    - GALLOW
    - AUTRE REGIONALE
    - AUTRE EUROPÉENNE
    - AUTRE
    - INDIFFERENT

14. **ACCETPEZ-VOUS QUE LA CLASSE SOIT PLUS NOMBREUSE QU’UNE CLASSE “NORMALE” POUR QUE VOTRE ENFANT AIT CETTE OCCASION?**
    - OUI
    - NON
    - SANS OPINION

15. **POUR VOUS QUELLE EST LA PREMIERE DEFINITION DU MOT “BRETON”?**
    - LANGUE D’ORIGINE CELLE QUE L’ON PARLE EN BRETAGNE
    - UN RESIDENT QUELCONQUE D’UN DES DEPARTEMENTS DE BRETAGNE
    - UNE PERSONNE AVEC UNE ASCENDANCE FAMILIALE DANS LA REGION
    - UN RESIDENT QUELCONQUE DE BRETAGNE QUI SACHE PARLER BRETON
    - TOUTE CHOSE APPARTENANT A LA REGION
    - TOUTE PERSONNE AVANT UN LIEN PERSONNEL, GEOGRAPHIQUE OU AFFECTIF A LA BRETAGNE
    - SANS OPINION

---
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(11) QUE PENSEZ-VOUS DE LA SIGNALETIQUE BILINGUE DES STATIONS 'GARES' (FRANCO-BRETONNE) ET 'CHARLES DE GAULLE' (FRANCO-GALLES) DU METRO RENNAIS?
○ FORTEMENT FAVORABLE ○ PLUTOT FAVORABLE ○ PLUTOT OPPOSE ○ FORTEMENT OPPOSE ○ SANS OPINION

(12) SOUTENDEZ-VOUS LA GENERALISATION DE CELLE-CI?
○ OUI, LES DEUX LANGUES PARTOUT ○ OUI, MAIS LE BRETON PRIVILEGIE ○ OUI, MAIS LE BRETON SEULEMENT ○ NON ○ SANS OPINION

(12A) OU Voudriez-vous trouver la signaletique bilingue?
○ BATIMENTS/SERVICES PUBLICS ○ TRANSPORTS ○ ROUTES ○ COMMERCE ○ PARTOUT

(12B) QUEL SACRIFICE SEREZ-VOUS PRET(ES) A FAIRE POUR FINANCER UN TEL PROJET?
○ RENOVATIONS DE BATIMENTS PUBLICS ○ REPARATIONS ROUTIERS ○ HORAIES D'OEUVERTURE DE MAIRIE ○ HAUSSE D'IMPOTS ○ AUCUN

(13) SAVIEZ-VOUS QUE LA LANGUE TRADITIONNELLE DE HAUTE BRETAGNE EST UNE LANGUE D'ORIGINE ROMANE QUI S'APPELLE 'GALLO'?
○ OUI ○ OUI, JE LE PARLE ○ NON ○ NE SAIS PAS

(13A) AVEZ-VOUS UNE PREFERENCE POUR LE NOM DE CETTE LANGUE?
○ GALLO ○ HAUT BRETON ○ BRITTO-ROMAN ○ SANS OPINION

(14) QUE PENSEZ-VOUS DE LA DECISION DU CONSEIL REGIONAL DE "RECONNAITRE OFFICIELLEMENT AUX COTES DE LA LANGUE FRANCAISE, L'EXISTENCE DU BRETON ET DU GALLO COMME LANGUES DE LA BRETAGNE"?
○ FORTEMENT FAVORABLE ○ PLUTOT FAVORABLE ○ PLUTOT OPPOSE ○ FORTEMENT OPPOSE ○ SANS OPINION

(15) DEVIENDRONT-ON AINSI PARLER DE 'LANGUES BRETONNES' AU LIEU DE 'LANGUE BRETONNE'?
○ OUI ○ NON ○ SANS OPINION

(16) QUELLE OPINION AVEZ-VOUS SUR UN EVENTUEL RATTACHEMENT DU 44 AUX 4 DEPARTEMENTS DE LA BRETAGNE ACTUELLE?
○ FORTEMENT FAVORABLE ○ PLUTOT FAVORABLE ○ PLUTOT OPPOSE ○ FORTEMENT OPPOSE ○ SANS OPINION

(17) SOUTENDEZ-VOUS LA DECISION DU PARLEMENT D'INSCRIRE LES LANGUES REGIONALES DANS LA CONSTITUTION EN TANT QUE "PATRIMOINE DE LA FRANCE"?
○ OUI, TOTALEMENT ○ OUI, MAIS DANS UN CONTEXTE PLUS Egalitaire AVEC LE FRANCAIS ○ PLUTOT OPPOSE ○ NON ○ SANS OPINION

(18) VOUS CONSIDEREZ-VOUS BRETON?
○ OUI ○ NON ○ PREFERE NE PAS REPONDE

(18A) SI OUI, POURQUOI?
○ LIEU DE NAISSANCE ○ ASCENDANCE FAMILIALE ○ LIEU DE RESIDENCE ○ AFFINITE CELTIQUE ○ CAPACITE LINGUISTIQUE ○ PREFERE NE PAS REP.

(18B) SI VOUS VOUS CONSIDEREZ BRETON, DE QUEL(S) PAYS VOUS CONSIDEREZ-VOUS PLUS PROCHE?
○ DES PAYS CELTES ○ DE LA FRANCE ○ INDIFFERENT

(19) POUR VOUS, QUEL EST LE PLUS EMBLEMATIQUE DE LA CULTURE BRETONNE?
○ LANGUE(s) ○ GASTRONOMIE ○ TRADITION (FESTOIZ, COFFE, POI CRETHIENNE, ETC.) ○ HISTORIQUE (LEGENDES, RELATION AVEZ LES ELEMENTS, ETC.) ○ RESISTANCE, AICHARNEMENT ○ NE SAIS PAS

(19A) ET DU L'EXTERIEUR, A VOTRE AVIS QUEL EST LE PLUS EMBLEMATIQUE DE LA CULTURE BRETONNE?
○ LANGUE(s) ○ GASTRONOMIE ○ TRADITION (FESTOIZ, COFFE, POI CRETHIENNE, ETC.) ○ HISTORIQUE (LEGENDES, RELATION AVEZ LES ELEMENTS, ETC.) ○ RESISTANCE, AICHARNEMENT ○ NE SAIS PAS

(20) A VOTRE AVIS, POUR ETRE UN 'VRAI' BRETON, ON...
○ DOIT PARLER BRETON ○ DOIT PARLER GALLO ○ DOIT PARLER BRETON/GALLO ○ PEUT PARLER SEULMENT FRANCAIS ○ DOIT APPRECIER LA TRADITION CELTIQUE
SURVEY: Bretonness as Seen and Lived by Bretons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>○ MALE ○ FEMALE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>○ 18-30 ○ 31-40 ○ 41-50 ○ 51-60 ○ 61-70 ○ 70 ET PLUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>○ MIDDLE SCHOOL ○ HIGH SCHOOL ○ COMMUNITY COLLEGE ○ UNDERGRADUATE ○ GRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRTH DEPT</td>
<td>○ 22 ○ 29 ○ 35 ○ 44 ○ 56 ○ OTHER ___ ○ ABROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN ___ TIME IN BRITTANY ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT DEPT</td>
<td>○ 22 ○ 29 ○ 35 ○ 44 ○ 56 ○ OTHER ___ ○ ABROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN ___ LENGTH OF RES. ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) HAVE YOU EVER HEARD BRETON SPoken? ○ YES ○ YES, I SPEAK IT ○ NO ○ DON'T KNOW
(2) DO YOU THINK THAT REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHOULD BE PRESENT IN THE PUBLIC SPACE? ○ YES ○ NO ○ DON'T KNOW
(3) DO YOU FEEL THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD INTERVENE TO PROTECT REGIONAL LANGUAGES? ○ YES ○ NO ○ NO OPINION
(3A) IF YES, SHOULD ALL REGIONAL LANGUAGES BE PROTECTED? ○ YES ○ NO ○ NO OPINION
(3B) IF NOT, WHICH ONES SHOULD BE PROTECTED? ____________________________________________

(4) WOULD YOU BE IN FAVOR OF AN ELECTIVE CLASS IN ELEMENTARY ON REGIONAL HISTORY AND IDENTITY? ○ STRONGLY IN FAVOR ○ SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR ○ SLIGHTLY AGAINST ○ STRONGLY AGAINST ○ NO OPINION
(5) WHAT IF THIS WAS A REQUIRED CLASS? ○ STRONGLY IN FAVOR ○ SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR ○ SLIGHTLY AGAINST ○ STRONGLY AGAINST ○ NO OPINION
(6) WHAT OPINION DO YOU HAVE ABOUT BILINGUAL EDUCATION (E.G., DIWAN, BRESSOLA, IKASTOLA, ETC.)? ○ STRONGLY IN FAVOR ○ SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR ○ SLIGHTLY AGAINST ○ STRONGLY AGAINST ○ NO OPINION
(7) DO YOU THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUBSIDIZE THESE PROGRAMS? ○ YES ○ NO ○ NO OPINION
(8) DO YOU THINK THAT THESE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE INTEGRATED INTO THE PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM? ○ YES ○ NO ○ NO OPINION
(9) WOULD YOU REGISTER YOUR OWN CHILDREN FOR A BILINGUAL PROGRAM? ○ YES ○ NO ○ NO OPINION
(9A) IF YES, WHY? ○ REGIONAL AFFINITY ○ FAMILY TIES ○ ADVANTAGES OF BILINGUALISM ○ DON'T KNOW
(9B) WHAT LANGUAGE? ○ BRETON ○ GALLO ○ OTHER REG. LANG. ___ ○ OTHER EURO. LANG. ___ ○ OTHER ___ ○ INDIFF.
(9C) WOULD YOU ACCEPT A LARGER THAN AVERAGE CLASS SIZE IN ORDER FOR YOUR CHILDREN TO HAVE THIS OPPORTUNITY? ○ YES ○ NO ○ NO OPINION

(10) FOR YOU WHAT IS THE FIRST DEFINITION OF 'BRETON' THAT COMES TO MIND? ○ CELTIC LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN BRITTANY ○ ANY RESIDENT OF BRITTANY ○ SOMEONE WITH FAMILY TIES TO THE REGION ○ ANY RESIDENT OF BRITTANY WHO SPEAKS BRETON ○ ANYTHING THAT BELONGS TO THE REGION ○ ANYONE WITH A PERSONAL, GEOGRAPHIC OR AFFECTIVE LINK TO BRITTANY ○ NO OPINION

(11) WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE BILINGUAL SIGNAGE OF THE RENNES METRO STATIONS 'GARES' (FRANCO-BRETON) AND 'CHARLES DE GAULLE' (FRANCO-GALLO)?
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**STRONGLY IN FAVOR**  **SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR**  **SLIGHTLY AGAINST**  **STRONGLY AGAINST**  **NO OPINION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12</strong></th>
<th><strong>WOULD YOU SUPPORT THIS BEING EXTENDED ELSEWHERE?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ YES, BOTH LANGUAGES EVERYWHERE  ○ YES, BUT WITH PRIORITY GIVEN TO BRETON  ○ YES, BUT ONLY BRETON  ○ NO  ○ NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12A</strong></th>
<th><strong>WHERE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE BILINGUAL SIGNS?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ PUBLIC BUILDINGS  ○ TRANSPORT  ○ ROADS  ○ BUSINESSES  ○ EVERYWHERE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12B</strong></th>
<th><strong>WHAT SACRIFICE WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO MAKE TO FINANCE SUCH A PROJECT?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ PUBLIC BUILDING RENOVATIONS  ○ ROAD REPAIRS  ○ TOWN HALL OPENING HOURS  ○ TAX INCREASE  ○ NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13</strong></th>
<th><strong>DID YOU KNOW THAT THE TRADITIONAL LANGUAGE OF UPPER BRITTANY IS A ROMANCE LANGUAGE CALLED ‘GALLO’?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ YES  ○ YES, I SPEAK IT  ○ NO  ○ DON’T KNOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13A</strong></th>
<th><strong>DO YOU HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR THE NAME OF THIS LANGUAGE?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ GALLO  ○ HAUT BRETON  ○ BRITTO-ROMAN  ○ NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>14</strong></th>
<th><strong>WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE RÉGIONAL COUNCIL’S DECISION TO “OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZE ALONGSIDE FRENCH THE EXISTENCE OF BRETON GALLO AS LANGUAGES OF BRITTANY”?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ STRONGLY IN FAVOR  ○ SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR  ○ SLIGHTLY AGAINST  ○ STRONGLY AGAINST  ○ NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>15</strong></th>
<th><strong>SHOULD WE THEN SAY ‘BRETON LANGUAGES’ INSTEAD OF ‘BRETON LANGUAGE’?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ YES  ○ NO  ○ NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>16</strong></th>
<th><strong>WHAT OPINION DO YOU HAVE ON THE POTENTIAL REJOINING OF 44 TO THE CURRENT 4 DÉPARTEMENTS OF BRITTANY?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ STRONGLY IN FAVOR  ○ SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR  ○ SLIGHTLY AGAINST  ○ STRONGLY AGAINST  ○ NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>17</strong></th>
<th><strong>DO YOU SUPPORT THE DECISION OF PARLIAMENT TO INTRODUCE REGIONAL LANGUAGES IN THE CONSTITUTIONS AS “HERITAGE OF FRANCE”?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ YES, TOTALLY  ○ YES, BUT IN A MORE EQUAL FOOTING WITH FRENCH  ○ SLIGHTLY AGAINST  ○ NO  ○ NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>18</strong></th>
<th><strong>DO CONSIDÈRE YOURSELF?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ YES  ○ NO  ○ PREFER NOT TO RESPOND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>18A</strong></th>
<th><strong>IF YES, WHY?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ PLACE OF BIRTH  ○ FAMILY TIES  ○ PLACE OF RESIDENCE  ○ CELTIC AFFINITY  ○ LINGUISTIC SKILLS  ○ PREFER TO NOT RESPOND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>18B</strong></th>
<th><strong>IF YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF BRETON, TO WHICH COUNTRY(IES) DO YOU FEEL CLOSER?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ CELTIC COUNTRIES  ○ FRANCE  ○ INDIFFERENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>19</strong></th>
<th><strong>FOR YOU, WHAT IS THE MOST EMBLEMATIC ELEMENT OF BRETON CULTURE?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ LANGUAGE(S)  ○ GASTRONOMY  ○ TRADITION (FESTNOZ, COIFFE, CHRISTIAN FAITH, ETC.)  ○ FOLKLORE (LEGENDS, RELATION WITH THE ELEMENTS, ETC.)  ○ RESISTANCE, DETERMINATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>19A</strong></th>
<th><strong>AND SEEN FROM OUTSIDE, WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST EMBLEMATIC ELEMENT OF BRETON CULTURE?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ LANGUAGE(S)  ○ GASTRONOMY  ○ TRADITION (FESTNOZ, COIFFE, CHRISTIAN FAITH, ETC.)  ○ FOLKLORE (LEGENDS, RELATION WITH THE ELEMENTS, ETC.)  ○ RESISTANCE, DETERMINATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>20</strong></th>
<th><strong>IN YOUR OPINION, TO BE ‘REALLY’ BRETON, YOU...</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ MUST SPEAK BRETON  ○ MUST SPEAK GALLO  ○ MUST SPEAK BRETON/GALLO  ○ MAY SPEAK ONLY FRENCH  ○ MUST APPRECIATE CELTIC TRADITION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – Results of Tests for Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Demographic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Breton - Person</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Education - Breton</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Breton - Brittophone</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Breton - Brittophone standard</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Breton - Never</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Breton - LB</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Breton - LdB</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Breton - LB Regional Langs</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Breton - No, cut off</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Breton - Diwan is enough</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gallo - Include Gallo</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Residence - Language</td>
<td>22, 29, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Age - Language</td>
<td>middle, older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Breton - Language</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Breton - Tradition</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Breton - Folklore</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Age - Language</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Breton - Language</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Breton - French</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Birth - Birth place</td>
<td>22, 29, 35, 44, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Breton - Linguistic skills</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>Breton - France</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>Gallo - Europe</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10D</td>
<td>Breton - Language</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXTREMELY SIGNIFICANT: p < 0.0001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>Gender - Language</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>Breton - Language</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>Education - Bretonnitude</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>Education - Bretonnitude Usage</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>Gender - Brittophone</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>Time - Breton</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>Education - Never</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>Residence - Equal</td>
<td>22, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>Time - Never</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>Gallo - Equal</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>Education - LdB - Less Ambiguous</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>Breton - LdB Less Ambiguous</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>Breton - Breton One</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>Gender - Breton Only</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>Gender - Diwan is enough</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>Education - Breton &amp; Gallo</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>Breton - Breton &amp; Gallo</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>Breton - Either lang</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>Gender - Completely support</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>Breton - Completely support</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>Education - Tradition</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>Time - Language</td>
<td>&gt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>Age - Gastronomy</td>
<td>younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>Breton - Gastronomy</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>Gender - Language</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>Breton - Gastronomy</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>Breton - Centuries Old</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>Birth - Abroad</td>
<td>0, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>Residence - Don't support</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>Breton - Breton</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>Age - Birth place</td>
<td>younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>Education - Celtic</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>Education - Europe</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>Age - Europe</td>
<td>Middle, older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>Education - Gallo</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>Breton - African Breton</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>Breton - Gallo</td>
<td>Don't Speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERY SIGNIFICANT: p = 0.0001-0.005
RATHER SIGNIFICANT:  \( p = 0.005-0.001 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>Age - Bretonnité</td>
<td>Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>Time - True Bretons</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td>Education - LB</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>Residence - LB Regional Langs</td>
<td>35, 56, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>Birth - Tradition</td>
<td>0, 35, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>Time - Resistance</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>Gender - Centuries Old</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>Birth - Centuries Old</td>
<td>22, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>Breton - French Only</td>
<td>Don't speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>Breton - Celtic</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>Variable(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>0.0260</td>
<td>Breton - Bretonnitude</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>Breton - Bretonnitude Usage</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0.0166</td>
<td>Birth - Breton</td>
<td>0, 44, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0.0234</td>
<td>Residence - Breton</td>
<td>0, 44, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>Breton - Bretonnant</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>Residence - Breton</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0.0221</td>
<td>Gender - Bretonnant not artificial</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0.0282</td>
<td>Gender - Brittophone not pejorative</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0.0205</td>
<td>Gender - Brittophone standard</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>Residence - Bretonnant not pejorative</td>
<td>22, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
<td>Residence - Never</td>
<td>0, 29, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>Gallo - Less</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>Education - LdB</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.0151</td>
<td>Education - LB Regional Langs</td>
<td>Non-uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>Breton - LB Regional Langs</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0272</td>
<td>Education - Either lang</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>Birth - Breton Only</td>
<td>44, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0.0161</td>
<td>Residence - Diwan is enough</td>
<td>0, 29, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>Gender - Breton &amp; Gallo</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>Gender - Lack of transmission</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0492</td>
<td>Age - Standardization</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
<td>Breton - Langs evolve</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0405</td>
<td>Breton - Lack of transmission</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0463</td>
<td>Gallo - Lang loss</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>Breton - Include Gallo</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>Gender - Tradition</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>Gender - Resistance</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>Education - Language</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>Birth - Resistance</td>
<td>44, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0268</td>
<td>Residence - Tradition</td>
<td>56, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>Time - Folklore</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>Age - Folklore</td>
<td>younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>0.0434</td>
<td>Time - Language</td>
<td>&gt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>0.0328</td>
<td>Age - Gastronomy</td>
<td>younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>Age - Resistance</td>
<td>younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>Variable(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>Breton - Not applicable</td>
<td>Don’t speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>Breton - All 3 langs</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>0.0187</td>
<td>Gender - Breton</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>0.0389</td>
<td>Time - French</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>Birth - Residence place</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>Gallo - Birth place</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
<td>Age - EFB</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>0.0398</td>
<td>Gallo - BFE</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>Gender - France</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>Residence - Europe</td>
<td>0, 22, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
<td>Time - Europe</td>
<td>&gt;1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10D</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>Residence - Culture</td>
<td>44, 56, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>0.0358</td>
<td>Residence - Diaspora</td>
<td>0, 44, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>Time - Diaspora</td>
<td>&lt;1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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