

Romance Orthographic Reintegrationism: Orthographic Guidelines for Romance Minority Languages

by Sicilanguageist

GLOSSARY, SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

TERM	MEANING
\$	Proposed spelling, example ROR spelling. Remember that the spelling introduced by this symbol are purely explanatory of a ROR rule or prescription and not an official proposal
§	Introduces the title of a section of this document
languages of reference	Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, Occitan, French and Romanian; the languages used as reference for the present proposal
orthographic reintegration	The implementation and adaptation of the spelling conventions of a language or language group by the orthography of another language
palatal <c>, palatal <g>	The reflexes of Latin c and g before e and i at the beginning of word-initial, stressed syllables
RML	Romance minority language
ROR	Romance Orthographic Reintegrationism

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The core rationale of Romance Orthographic Reintegrationism (ROR) is that Romance minority languages (RMLs) should be represented orthographically as part of the wider Romance linguistic continuum. Effectively, this means that the orthographies of RMLs should be grounded on the practices of the major Romance orthographies—namely Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Occitan, Catalan and, to a lesser extent, Romanian. This is achieved through etymological justifications for focused spelling choices that have been studied to achieve orthographic reintegration with the Romance language family. (For a definition of “reintegration”, see below.)

ROR does not seek to create a single orthography for all RMLs. Instead, it provides general guidelines for creating orthographies, leaving room for a diversity of outcomes.

The present proposal is potentially useful for all stakeholders involved in the study of Romance minority or regional languages, such as linguists and philologists (including orthography experts), language planners, policymakers, educators and community activists.

1.2 WHAT DOES “REINTEGRATION” MEAN?

In its only official and established sense, reintegrationism is a linguistic movement which postulates that Galician and Portuguese constitute a single language. As a result, Galician reintegrationism promotes orthographic unification with Portuguese through the implementation of Portuguese spelling conventions (see [this link](#) for more). The implementation and adaptation of the spelling conventions of a language or language group by the orthography of another language is here referred to as *orthographic reintegration*.

While Galician can look to Portuguese for reintegration on both historical and linguistic grounds, the aim of the present proposal is not necessarily to reintegrate a minority language into a dominant one—although ROR guidelines could be used toward that end if desired. In actuality, ROR advocates for orthographic similarity or convergence among minority languages belonging to the same subgroup; conversely, it advises against orthographic convergence with the majority language of the region or state, unless it is consistent with and does not contradict the objective of subgroup cohesion.

The kind of orthographic reintegration advocated for by ROR is that of RMLs towards the major Romance languages with an established and continuous orthographic tradition.

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Increasing mutual intelligibility with other Romance languages in writing is one of the primary reasons why a given RML should use a Romance reintegrationist orthography. This is achieved thanks to focused etymological considerations. With a more informed, limitedly historical spelling, the lexicon would be more recognisable for speakers of other Romance languages, all

the while the orthography maintains a degree of complexity in writing that is comfortable for native speakers with enough training.

Through the enhanced mutual intelligibility reintegrationist spellings would provide, ROR aims at breaking the linguistic isolation most minority languages face, creating interconnectedness between minority and majority languages of the Romance family.

Since the creation of these orthographies should require deep etymological and possibly philological understanding, ROR encourages and fosters etymological research and the creation of an active scholarly community.

2 GUIDELINES AND RULES

2.1 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In this section, I will explain the overarching principles behind ROR guidelines.

2.1.1 Attested Romance orthographic practices

The central idea behind ROR is to reintegrate the orthography of Romance minority languages through the implementation of orthographic conventions used in Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, Occitan, French, Italian and, to a lesser extent, Romanian.

This is achieved by acknowledging what these orthographic conventions are and by understanding what their *etymological* role is within the system they are borrowed from. A further recommendation is to avoid letters and multigraphs (di-, tri- and quadrigraphs) that are not used in the languages of reference. The use of <w> and <k> is especially discouraged, unless finding another solution is proven to be difficult.

This idea is also valid for diacritics. For example, the use of double dots above a character as a diacritic (<ä, ë, ï, ö, ü>) should be reserved for use as a diaeresis rather than an umlaut, i.e. it should not indicate a change in vowel quality, unless finding another option is difficult.

2.1.2 Etymological criterion

The details of the so-called *etymological criterion* are better explained in §[ROR prescriptions](#). The main idea is that the reflexes and evolution of certain Latin consonants and consonant clusters determines how some sounds are represented. These newly established spelling conventions can then be extended to non-etymological contexts. Therefore, a ROR orthography ought not to be exclusively historical: etymology is just the method used to *justify* spelling choices in certain contexts so that they can be used non-etymologically—according to the restrictions that will be explained below.

I will give an example. Old Spanish spelt [ʃ] as <x> and [ʒ] as <j> or <g>. Over the centuries, these sounds merged into the sound [x], and the distinction between them was lost. To reflect this merger, it was decided that <j> should be used for the sound [x] where <x> was used in the past (in contrast, the use of <g> remained the same, but that falls outside the scope of this example).

In this case, the use of <j> was extended to non-etymological contexts—an example of how a historically motivated choice can develop into a general spelling rule, within the limits of ROR.

2.1.3 Reader-oriented approach and orthographic depth

Depending on the language’s phonological history, a reintegrationist orthography may turn out to be historical to various degrees, and therefore more or less difficult to write in. For example, compare the Catalan words *cena* “dinner” (an archaic term) and *sena* “number six in a game of dice, sice”. Both words are pronounced the same, but their initial consonant is spelt differently according to etymology. This makes it more difficult for the writer to predict or remember the exact spelling of a word.

Romance reintegrationism promotes facilitating the reader rather than the writer. That is, while a single phoneme may be represented by multiple graphemes, each grapheme should ideally correspond to only one phoneme. It is possible that this principle cannot be implemented fully, and that mostly depends on how complex the phonemic inventory of the language is. Sacrificing this principle might be needed to make the orthography less crowded with diacritics (see §[Economy](#)) and less cumbersome for both the reader and the writer.

2.1.4 Economy

An important rule of ROR is the avoidance of double marking: a particular element or feature cannot be indicated more than once. As an example, Bolognese Emilian [mʌnd] “world” is written *mānnd*. The double <n> indicates that the previous vowel is short, but [ʌ] <ā> is always short, so there is no need for a double <n>.

ROR also discourages the extensive use of diacritics, unless they are well established in the reference languages mentioned above. This ties nicely with the principle of avoidance of double marking: stress is sometimes excessively marked in writing by RMLs. One way of preventing this is to establish rules for a default interpretation of stress placement in an accent-less word; those words which defy the established rules will be marked by an accent (acute or grave).

2.1.5 Other considerations

...

2.2 ROR PRESCRIPTIONS

Here, the word “prescription” is used to define guidelines that are not considered general principles behind ROR, and that are more practical and specific in nature. These prescriptions are rooted in Latin etymology, but—as already stated—etymology should not be overly dominant in a Romance reintegrationist orthography. Remember that these prescriptions are suggestive in nature and allow for flexibility. **I will use the symbol ‘\$’ to indicate proposed spellings. These are merely examples used to illustrate ROR prescriptions and should not be interpreted as formal orthographic proposals.**

Some of these ideas can contradict each other, so choosing one option over another is definitely acceptable. If a prescription is essential for creating a ROR orthography, it will be stated.

2.2.1 Palatal and palatalised sounds

2.2.1.1 Latin yod

“Yod” here refers to the phone [j].

The modern reflex of word-initial Latin yod at the beginning of a stressed syllable will determine the use of <j>. For example, since Latin *I_{OCAT} (“he/she plays”) evolved into Venetian [ˈzoga], that initial Venetian [z] can be written <j> (for example \$joga).

The Italian route. The evolution of yod in this context usually coincides with the evolution of the prevocalic Latin sequences -GI- and -DI-. Therefore, the resulting sound from this merger can be spelt the same as these sequences even in contexts where it comes from yod. This is what Italian does.

HODIĒ “today” > It. *oggi*
 IUNIUM “June” > It. *giugno*
 MEDIUM “middle” > Ven. [ˈmɛzo] \$megio, mejo, mexo, etc.
 *I_{OCAT} > Ven. [ˈzoga] \$gioga, joga, xoga, etc.

The Catalan route. The general rule for this in Catalan is different. I will explain it to the best of my abilities, but know that the following is an oversimplification. Catalan treats the [(d)ʒ] sound that came from Latin yod the same as Latin G before E and I. For most cases, [(d)ʒ] is written <g> before <e, i> and <j> before <a, o, u>. This means that, if Latin yod has the same reflex as G before E and I, then they can be treated the same as Catalan: said reflex—which is [(d)ʒ]—is written <g> before <e, i> and another choice has to be made before other vowel letters.

GENTEM “people” > Cat. [(d)ʒen(t)] gent
 IUNIUM “June” > Cat. [(d)ʒun] juny
 MEDIUM “middle” > Ven. [ˈmɛzo] \$megio, mejo
 *I_{OCAT} > Ven. [ˈzoga] \$gioga, joga
 GENERUM “son-in-law” > Ven. [ˈzɛnero] \$gènero

2.2.1.2 Modern yod: the use of <j> vs <y> vs <i>

Different Romance languages have different traditions for writing the sound [j].

Some do not distinguish it from [i] at all in writing, such as modern Italian, Catalan, Portuguese and Romanian; so that is certainly an option for a ROR orthography, if no or little ambiguity arises from such a choice. Other languages, however, do differentiate [j] in writing. Older Italian and many Romance minority languages in Italy traditionally use <j> for [j], while French and Spanish use <y>. The preference for <i>, <j> or <y> relies mainly on the interconnected strategies adopted for handling Latin yod (see §[Latin yod](#)) and the treatment of Latin <c> and <g> before front vowels (see §[Latin c and g before front vowels and the use of <c> and <g>](#)).

2.2.1.3 Latin c and g before front vowels

Probably the most important choice to make when creating a reintegrationist orthography is how the letters <c> and <g> are handled. The following suggestions are especially recommended.

Before <a, o, u>, the sound [k] should always be written with the letter <c>, and the sound [g] should always be written with the letter <g>. [k, g] should be written <c, g> also at the end of a word—unless some kind of liaison is present, **in which case it is advisable to use a system inspired by French**.

The use of the sequences <ce, ci> depends on the evolution of Latin C and G before E and I at the beginning of word-initial, stressed syllables. These will be referred to as *palatal <c>* and *palatal <g>*, regardless of whether their realisations in modern languages have a palatal place of articulation. Take for example French *cent* and *sent*. Much like the Catalan examples *cena* and *sena* above, they are pronounced the same, but the initial [s] is represented according to its origin in Latin. A ROR orthography should reflect this: palatal <c> and palatal <g> before <e, i> cannot be represented with letters other than <c> and <g>.

Many RMLs do not represent this faithfully, since their orthography is based on the way sounds are represented in the majority language of the state or nation where they are spoken. See the following examples.

CURRENT RML ORTHOGRAPHY	PROPOSED SPELLING	LATIN WORD OF ORIGIN
Jèrriais Norman <i>ch^eent</i> [ʃɑ̃] “hundred”	\$ <i>cent</i>	CENTUM
Walloon <i>djⁱins</i> [dʒɛ̃] “person”	\$ <i>gens</i>	GENTĒS
Genoese Ligurian <i>Z^ena</i> [ˈzeːna] “Genoa”	\$ <i>Gena</i>	GENU
Rumantsch <i>tschⁱintg</i> [ˈtʃinc] “five”	\$ <i>cintg</i>	CINQUE < QUINQUE

Table 1 - Spellings of RMLs for palatal <c> and <g>

2.2.1.4 The <s> rule

It is recommended that a sound derived from Latin S be written with <s> or <ss>, especially when the sound is [s] or [z]. However, this is a flexible guideline that may be disregarded in cases where following it would result in an orthographic form that makes it difficult for the reader to predict the pronunciation of a word.

2.2.1.5 The *velar table*

A way to write [k] and [g] before front vowels must be found. Strategies must also be developed to represent the sounds written with palatal <c> and <g> when they occur before back vowels.

I devised the following table that helps with creating said conventions, and which should be valid for all languages of reference and ROR orthographies. To illustrate how the table works, I will take Catalan as an example.

	NON-PALATAL ([k, g])		PALATAL ([s, (d)ʒ])	
	before <e, i>	before <a, o, u> and word- finally	before <e, i>	before <a, o, u> and word- finally
Latin c	<qu>	<c>	<c>	<ç/ss>
Latin g	<gu>	<g>	<g>	<j>

2.2.1.6 [ɲ] and [ʎ]

2.2.1.7 Palatalising clusters with L

2.2.1.8 sc before front vowels, sc and yod, st and yod

2.2.1.9 ct, cs, sc and the use of <x>

2.2.2 Vowels

2.2.2.1 Nasal vowels

2.2.2.2 Rounded Front vowels

2.2.2.3 Unstressed and reduced vowels

2.2.3 Diacritics

3 CASE STUDIES

3.1 STANDARD ROMANSCH

3.2 BOLOGNESE EMILIAN

3.3 RIFONDOU WALON (UNIFIED WALLOON)

4 IMPLEMENTATION AND FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5 CONCLUSIONS