

# **Estudios de Sociolingüística**

*L i n g u a s , s o c i e d a d e s e c u l t u r a s*

**Volumes 3(2) 2002 & 4(1) 2003**

## **Separata**





# The Castilianist theory of the origin of the *gheada* revisited

Montserrat Recalde

*Universidade de Santiago de Compostela*

Departamento de Lingua Española, Facultade de Humanidades,  
Campus de Lugo, s/n. Universidade de Santiago de Compostela  
27002-Lugo (Galicia), Spain  
mrecalde@lugo.usc.es

## Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to offer a critical review of the sociolinguistic and ideological assumptions upon which the Castilianist theory of the origin of the Galician *gheada* is based. To this end, we will review the concepts of *diglossic bilingualism* and *prestige*, fundamental to this theory, to point out their limited applicability to the historical period to which they are applied (the 18th and 19th centuries), given the social structure and cultural situation of 18th- and 19th-century Galicia. Likewise, we will endeavour to demonstrate how this theory derives from a concept of linguistic interference characteristic of xenophobic purism, resorting to naturalisation tactics to present its doctrine as common-sense truths shared by everyone, and contributing to spreading the stigma of this social variety by identifying the causes of the language change with lack of education, ignorance, or incapacity of the lowest social classes to pronounce a particular sound, thus providing a theoretical basis to the existence of practices of discrimination and social exclusion based on language use.

**Key words:** linguistic ideology, linguistic purism, interference, bilingualism, *gheada*, Galician.

## Resumo

O propósito deste artigo é facer unha revisión crítica dos presupostos sociolingüísticos e ideolóxicos en que se basea a teoría castelanista sobre a orixe da *gheada* galega. Para iso revisaremos os conceptos de *bilingüismo diglósico* e *prestixio*, fundamentais nesta teoría, para dar conta do seu escaso grao de adecuación ó momento histórico ó que se aplican (séculos XVIII-XIX), debido á estruturación social e á situación cultural da Galicia do XVIII e o XIX. Así mesmo, intentaremos comprobar cómo esta teoría parte dunha concepción da interferencia lingüística propia do purismo xenofóbico (Thomas, 1991), recorre a tácticas de naturalización para presentar a súa doutrina como verdades de sentido común compartidas por todos, e contribúe a difundir o estigma desta variante sociolectal ó identificar as causas do cambio lingüístico coa incultura, a ignorancia ou a incapacidade das clases sociais máis baixas

para articular un determinado son, proporcionando así unha base argumental á existencia de prácticas de marxinação e exclusión social baseadas no uso da lingua.

**Palabras clave:** ideoloxía lingüística, purismo lingüístico, interferencia, bilingüismo, gheada, galego.

## 1. Introduction

The phonetic-phonological phenomenon known as *gheada* (or *geada*), characteristic of a large portion of the Galician territory, consists of the absence of the voiced velar phoneme /g/ characteristic of standard Galician. It is replaced by an aspirated phoneme /h/ of predominantly voiceless pharyngeal articulation, although it can also take the form of voiced pharyngeal, voiced or voiceless uvular or laryngeal, and the voiceless velar fricative [x], coinciding with the production of the phoneme /x/ of standard Spanish, which in this language is opposed to /g/ on account of its voiceless nature<sup>1</sup>. All of these variants are diatopic in nature (Fernández Rei, 1990).

Taking into account the geographic distribution and combination of the diatopic Galician varieties, Galician Dialectology has differentiated three major dialectal blocks that cross Galicia from North to South: the Western Block (almost the entire region of A Coruña and Pontevedra), the Central Block (northeast and inland of A Coruña, inland of Pontevedra and the provinces of Lugo and Ourense, excluding their eastern extremes), and the Eastern Block (formed by the foreign parts of Galician speech community and the extreme eastern region of Lugo and Ourense). The *gheada* extends throughout all of the Western Block and half of the Central Block, including the whole of the Atlantic provinces, the western half of Ourense, and a narrow zone in the west of Lugo adjacent to A Coruña and Pontevedra. It is possible to find, in the *gheada* zone, a strong production after nasal, consisting of a voiced or voiceless velar plosive (*domingo* = [do'mĩngo] / ([do'mĩŋko]), a feature which extends throughout the Atlantic coast from the south of Pontevedra to the north-western half of A Coruña<sup>2</sup>.

In Galician velar order we have, therefore, two phonological subsystems, which are reproduced in Table 1, along with the Spanish one:

In dialectal Galician [x]\* and [g]\* are allophones of /h/. The first one is

1 The researchers who defend the autochthonous origin of the *gheada*, tend to consider this last articulation to be the result of interference of Spanish [x] with the phonetic system of the bilingual individual who, using the same phonetic item in two different systems, economises efforts in learning and articulatory production (Santamarina, 1980: 245; Fernández Rei, 1981: 21). In my own recordings I have detected the same interference, but in reverse: speakers who articulate the Spanish /x/ the same as their native aspirated pharyngeal [h] (/h/).

2 For all of these matters, Fernández Rei (1990) may be consulted.

Table 1

	Velar			Pharyngeal
	voiceless		voiced	
	plosive	fricative		
Standard Spanish	/k/	/x/	/g/ [g] / [ʝ]	
Standard Galician	/k/		/g/ [g] / [ʝ] <sup>3</sup>	
Dialectal Galician	/k/	[x]*	[g]*	/h/

characteristic of speakers influenced by Spanish, while the second one appears after nasal in a small sub area of the *gheada* dialectal area. This allophone may even become voiceless in such position and be articulated as [k] (as in *domingo*, from the previous example)<sup>4</sup>.

Likewise, sufficient evidence exists to believe that in the geographical area of the *gheada* the units [g] and [h] constitute an equivalency set of an underlying sociolinguistic variable that can be designated as (gh), stratified at least according to age and cultural level and subject to stylistic variation<sup>5</sup>. This phenomenon is influenced by the fact that the *gheada* has been a form stigmatised and prohibited for centuries by local language authorities, philologists, and intellectuals, which have helped to convert a phonologically non-distinctive difference into a socially relevant factor, thus favouring the reinterpretation of a regional pronunciation as a *sociolinguistic marker*. In this manner, a tendency originated on the part of the *gheadophones* to use the standard [g] when they perceive the context of situation to be formal, relegating the use of their dialectal form [h] to colloquial exchanges.

There is no agreement about the approximate date of the appearance of this

3 In standard Galician, the velar voiced phoneme /g/ has two allophones, one approximant [ʝ], in almost all positions, and the other plosive [g], after a nasal or pause.

4 This phenomenon is produced in all the villages of the Atlantic coast between Panxón and Malpica and penetrates into the interior of the provinces of A Coruña and Pontevedra (cf. Santamarina, 1980).

5 Under [h] I cluster all of the possible phonetic productions for the *gheada* ([x], [h], [χ], etc.). Various dialectal studies have detected the existence of apparent social and stylistic variation among informants in the areas studied. In Recalde (1994) I attempt to conduct a presentation in a more strictly sociolinguistic vein, based on the assumption that [g] and [h] are variants of a single sociolinguistic variable (gh) that can be qualified as a *marker*. However, strictly speaking there is not any study of variation at the moment.

phenomenon, since this information is linked to the hypothesis concerning its origins. Zamora Vicente (1986: 23-24) considered the *gheada* a phenomenon of pre-Indo-European origin, basing this statement in the coincidence of *gheada* with *castreño* settlements<sup>6</sup>. However, José Luis Pensado (1983: 21-40) believes that it would have emerged between 1652 (date on which the first written testimonial of *gueada* appears<sup>7</sup>) and 1794 (the date closest to the first written testimonial of the existence of *gheada*). Santamarina (1980: 244, note 5) and Mariño Paz (1994: 210-11) adopt an intermediary position between these two, establishing the appearance of the *gheada* before 1652, the year in which the oldest document containing two examples of *gueada* (*higüelas* and *aguares*) was written; this document was interpreted by the authors as an indirect testimony of the existence of the *gheada*<sup>8</sup>.

The philological attention paid to the Galician *gheada* has been on the rise since the first grammatical and lexicographical treatises of the 19th century. The absence of a similar trait in the other Romance languages, especially notable in Portuguese, and its phonetical similarity to the Spanish voiceless velar fricative consonant has made research into its origin interesting and relevant. It is relevant because the consideration of the *gheada*'s origin has been systematically linked to the sociolinguistic function granted it, either as a standard variant (cf. ILGA/RAG, 1982; Álvarez, Regueira & Monteagudo, 1986) or mere dialectism, and it is interesting because quite frequently the two most widely accepted theories in the scientific community (that is, the structuralist and Castilianist) combine propositions of a scientific nature with ideological valuations. In fact, qualifying statements concerning the "authenticity" or "inauthenticity" of the phenomenon or references to its profoundly "Galician" and "popular" or rather "anti-Galician" or "rustic" nature can be found quite often in publications about this topic, highlighting the reality that supposedly objective linguistic theories sometimes serve the interests of purist ideologies about language, so that linguistic description appears tangled in prescriptive messages<sup>9</sup>.

We might think, following Thomas (1991), that the rejection of the introduction of

6 *Castreño* settlements are a kind of circular housing where inhabitants of the western Galicia before Roman's arrival lived. They are supposed to belong to the Celtic culture.

7 The articulation of the Spanish voiceless velar fricative consonant [x] as the plosive or approximant voiced velar ([g] / [ʝ]) is known as the *gueada*. For Pensado, this phenomenon is implicated in the origin of the subsequent *gheada*; the researchers who defend the internal origins of the *gheada* consider the *gueada* to be the result of Galician speakers' "hypercorrection" of their *gheada*.

8 The reference described is a legal document from the jurisdiction of Xallas deposited in the Historical Archive of the University of Santiago and reproduced by Barreiro Mallón (1978: 183).

9 We propose here the definition of purism offered by Thomas (1991: 12): "Purism is the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects and styles of the same language). It may be directed at all linguistic levels but primarily the lexicon. Above all, purism is an aspect of the codification, cultivation and planning of standard languages".

a dialectal/sociolectal form such as the *gheada*, especially in cultured Galician, does not constitute a case of purism because it deals with variation into the same diasystem. According to the cited author, this type of rejection is usually a tactic for protecting the standard and increasing the prestige by means of cultivating the language. In our case, nevertheless, the acceptance or rejection of the phoneme [h] for Galician as an alternative to /g/, and specifically in its standard functions, is intimately connected to the considerations concerning its etymological origins: those who believe that the phenomenon emerged as a result of the evolution of Galician [-g-] in weak position accept it as a standard variant, while those who believe that it was motivated by exogenous factors, such as interference of Spanish [x] in the Galician phonetic system, reject it. This is not a case of opposition of two contrasting language ideologies, one purist and the other non-purist, since in this case both tendencies demonstrate the same worry about genealogical authenticity and *pedigree* that characterises xenophobic purism (cf. Thomas, 1991). In the case which concerns us, the purification is directed against elements originating from a genetically related linguistic system (Spanish), which, furthermore, is the dominant language within the same political entity. The aim of this purification is to empower those characteristics that can function to provide separation from the superimposed language and cohesion among the Galician-speaking community. The divergent opinions toward the *gheada* are due to its rôle in the debate about the identity and autonomy that standard Galician should have: those who accept the *gheada* base their opinion on its endogenous origin, its popular nature, and its presence in the rural environment, where it is estimated that the most authentic Galician has been preserved. Those who reject the *gheada* usually point to its exogenous origin, its low prestige, and its absence in the literary tradition. For the former group, whose attitudes toward the standard may represent xenophobic ethnographic purism (following the work of Thomas, 1991), it is a trait that separates Galician from the dominant language and reinforces ethnolinguistic borders. For the latter group, who follows a line of argument closer to elitist and archaising xenophobic purism, the *gheada* is absolutely unacceptable, because its acceptance would bring standard Galician closer to Spanish, mitigating the possibility of the former to function as an element of intergroup distinction.

In this article I will conduct a critical review of the Castilianist theory of the origins of the *gheada*. There are two reasons why I choose this theory from among the three that deal with the origin of this phenomenon. In the first place, I agree that the social dimension of linguistic change must be taken into account, but I doubt that Galician-Spanish contact had played as crucial a role in the appearance of the *gheada* as the Castilianist theory suggests. Given that the contact between two linguistic systems is not more than the macrostructural abstraction from the contact among their speakers at the micro level, I believe that affirming that Spanish was imposed upon Galician as the language of power since the 15th century does not sufficiently justify the claim that the *gheada* is a product of the interference of the Spanish phonetic

system with that of Galician. It is necessary to keep in mind the nature of the social structure at the historical time in which the change took place and also the situations of use, in which social contexts and with what frequency the face to face interlinguistic contact necessary to facilitate its emergence might have taken place.

In the second place, it is in the Castilianist theory that the view of linguistic change as “deviation”, “error” or “violation” of the “ideal” language appears with special intensity, and where the concept of the standard language based on ideological attitudes about purity and authenticity is most clearly revealed. Nevertheless, this critical review does not imply my conviction that the theory that defends the autonomous emergence of the *gheada*, which has received wide acceptance within the scientific community along with the Castilianist one, and has frequently opposed it, reflects the true nature of things. In fact, its principal constraint, in my judgement, is that it strives to reconstruct the structural process of change without attending to the social dimension — although it is true that the causes of linguistic change can only be identified while the change is taking place, with the result that upon entering the field of Historical Sociolinguistics we are moving on the slippery terrain of more or less grounded speculations. In short, although I believe in the social nature of linguistic change, I am sceptical that in this case the contact of languages have played as relevant a role as ascribed by the Castilianist theory.

## 2. The origin of the *gheada* according to the Castilianist theory

Aside from the superstratum, or Castilianist theory, there are two others that endeavour to account for the existence of the *gheada* in Galician: that pointing to the substratum (Zamora Vicente, 1952; Rabanal Álvarez, 1958), and those attributing its appearance to systematic causes. The first defends the influence of the pre-Roman, or even pre-Celtic, substratum on the emergence of the *gheada*, based on its geographical coincidence with the area occupied by *castreño* settlements. The others seek its origins within the Galician phonetic-phonological system, from a structural (Santamarina, 1980) or generative (Schroten, 1980; Prieto Alonso, 1980) point of view.

The superstratum theories, defended by, among others, Pensado (1970), Pensado & Pensado Ruiz (1983), Fernández Laje (1987) and Freixeiro Mato (1998), explain the appearance of the *gheada* as the result of a process of interference of the phonological system of Spanish with that of Galician one in the velar system<sup>10</sup>.

The supporters of this explanation point to *diglossic bilingualism* as a direct cause of the *gheada*, which emerged as a result of the language contact and the specialisation of each language for different functions: Galician as the language of

10 We understand interference to be “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact [...]” (Weinreich, 1968[1953]: 1).



everyday oral use and Spanish for regional government and administration, education, and printed texts. In the words of Pensado (1983: 32):

Dentro de este marco de bilingüismo diglósico, y sólo dentro de él ha de ser tratado el problema de la *gheada* y de la *geada*; el no hacerlo implica necesariamente el olvido de la única realidad lingüística gallega. (Pensado, 1983: 32)

As Pensado (1970, 1983) expounds the facts, the process of interference had a double direction: first operating from the primary Galician system to the secondary Spanish one (L1 to L2), and then from the secondary Spanish system to the primary Galician one (L2 to L1).

The effect of the interference from Galician first language with the Spanish second one (L1 with L2) produced what Weinreich (1968[1953]: 18) called *under-differentiation of phonemes*, that is, two different phonological units in Spanish (/x/ and /g/) are identified by Galician-speakers as a single unique unit of their native system (/g/). Due to the lack of a phoneme /x/ with voiceless velar fricative articulation in Galician language, Galician-speakers identified the Spanish /x/ with the voiced velar /g/ of their first language, which had two articulation variants, plosive after nasal or in absolute initial position [g], and approximant in the other positions [ʁ]<sup>11</sup>. In this way, Spanish words such as *gente* ['xente] or *ajuares* [a'xwares] were subjected to the phonetic rules of the primary system, pronounced as ['gente] and [a' ʁ wares] by those who, having Galician as their L1, had not achieved complete fluency in Spanish as their L2, giving rise to the phenomenon of the *gheada*. Thus the phonological distinction between /x/ and /g/, relevant in L2, disappeared.

Nevertheless, this under-differentiation would have been perceived perfectly by

11 Concerning the adaptation of the Spanish /x/ with the Galician /k/, Pensado (1983: 43) maintains: "Por otra parte la /k/ tenía muy pocas posibilidades de ser aceptada en gall. ya que apenas puede encontrarse algún rasgo común con el sonido /x/ frente a la /g/ que por lo menos es fricativa". It seems evident that this appraisal is incorrect. In the first place, the approximant production of /g/ (which the author denotes as "fricative") is not a distinctive trait, but rather conditioned by the phonetic context (as Pensado himself admits elsewhere in his work): it is produced as a plosive in the absolute initial position and after nasal, and as an approximant in all other positions. Nevertheless, /k/ is, just as /x/, velar and voiceless in any context. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the Galician-speaker would have perceived the plosive or voiced approximant velars [g/ʁ] to be closer to the [x] than the voiceless velar plosive [k]. Therefore, if the difficulty in reproducing the Spanish velar fricative is implicated in the origin of the *gheada*, we might wonder why Galician did not transfer the Spanish [x] to [k], as for example Catalan did, or why it did not adapt [x] variably, sometimes as [k] and others as [g/ʁ], as also happened in Catalan, in which various dialectal differences were produced (Pensado rejects the notion that cases such as *dominko* are evidence of *gheada*). In my view, the explanation offered by the author about the greater phonetic similarity between [ʁ] and [x] is not very convincing: spectrographic analyses have demonstrated the considerable acoustic differences between approximant sounds like [ʁ] and fricatives like [x] (cf. Martínez Celdrán, 1983). Concerning the interferences in Catalan I mentioned, cf. Payrató (1985).

monolingual Spanish listeners, who, according to Pensado (1970, 1983), would have reacted on numerous occasions with mockery and scorn to the inexperienced bilingual speaker. To avoid the ridicule to which they were subjected, those bilinguals who were in better conditions to increase their Spanish proficiency managed to overcome this interference from L1 with L2, learning to articulate correctly the phoneme /x/. However, those who were not able to achieve full command of Spanish due to their insufficient exposure to the superimposed language —according to the cited authors, farmers and other illiterate people— although they learned to articulate the sound [x], remained unable to master the phonological opposition maintained by /x/ : /g/ in the Spanish velar system. As a result of that, after a period in which they exchanged these two phonemes arbitrarily (/ 'xeNte/: ['xeŋte] o ['geŋte]; / 'agua/: ['a ɣ wa] o ['axwa]), they replaced the voiced [g] with the voiceless [x], first in Spanish (['xeŋte] y ['axwa]), and later in Galician (/ 'auga/: ['auxa]). While in Spanish this just became an aspect of performance, since those who initiated the importation spoke the language as a secondary system and only used it on certain occasions, in Galician it became an aspect of the language system, since having [g] changed into [x] regularly, it began to be transmitted from one native speaker to another<sup>12</sup>. In this way the process of interference from the second language to the first one took place when Galician-speakers incorporated the phoneme /x/ into their system as a substitution for /g/, which produced the *gheada* phenomenon:

En consecuencia: la *geada* en Galicia nos parece un fenómeno reciente, debido a la presión del castellano, que se manifiesta primeramente por la sustitución de la /X/ por /G/ (fenómeno todavía vivo en los que no dominan bien el castellano) y, como resultado del ridículo que estas sustituciones producían, se operó una proscripción radical del fonema sustituyente /G/ hasta el propio sistema fonemático de la lengua oprimida: el gallego. Como eran las gentes rústicas las que más pecaban en este hecho, quedó el fenómeno motejado de rústico, exactamente igual que todavía queda la sustitución de /X/ por /G/ en quienes no dominan el castellano. Donde la presión castellana fue más fuerte, fue donde más se acusó el fenómeno de la *geada*; donde más ansia había de liberarse de esa connotación de rusticidad, donde más prestigioso era hablar castellano, y no hablar gallego, fue en donde más arraigó la sustitución. (Pensado, 1970: 42-43)

The Castilianist theory supports itself by means of several key points. First, the highly discussed absence of graphemic evidence in 16th and 17th century texts<sup>13</sup>. Second, the absence of such an articulation in Portuguese, which, as Pensado informs

<sup>12</sup> For a distinction between interference in speech and in language, see Weinreich (1968[1953]).

<sup>13</sup> Santamarina (1980) and Mariño Paz (1994) believe that the first examples of the *gheada* date from the 17th century. They refer to the word *ergida*, present in a sonnet of Pedro Bazquez de Neyra of 1612. Similarly, they consider another case of *gheada* to be the word *prolojos*, that appears in a romance of Juan Correa Mendoza published in the *Fiestas Minervales* in 1697. However, Pensado believes that these spellings reflect the Galician voiceless prepalatal fricative /ɣ/. For this author, in the 17th century

us, adapts the Spanish /x/ to [g], would demonstrate that the *gheada* is beyond inherent systemic tendencies. Finally, and as it can be inferred from the previous quotation of professor Pensado, it was the extreme Castilianisation of Galician during the 18th century (especially institutional) that gave rise to diglossic bilingualism.

From my point of view, the extreme Castilianisation of Galician in this historical period (18th and 19th centuries) is supported by an overly vague and biased view of Galician sociolinguistic reality, due to the fact that it is based on the linguistic behaviour of certain classes (bourgeoisie and nobility) which are qualitatively relevant, but quantitatively a small minority, and by the importance, in my view exaggerated, which has been given to the sparsely populated and underdeveloped urban settings. The uncritical assumption of this view has led to the application of concepts not completely appropriate for this time, which should be subjected to review: the use of the concept of *diglossic bilingualism* to describe the sociolinguistic situation in the Galicia of the *Antiguo Régimen* (Ancient Order); the notion of *linguistic prestige* used by this theory; and even the social identity attributed to the group pointed to as responsible for the linguistic change.

## 2.1. The concept of diglossic bilingualism

As evident in the quotations from the preceding pages, the defenders of the Castilianist theory centre their argument on the Galician-Spanish language contact situation. Nevertheless, as noted by Weinreich (1968[1953]), the *locus* of linguistic contact is the bilingual individual, fundamental centre of any interference process, and this theory fails to clarify what is understood by the term “bilingual individual”.

As several definitions have been offered of the terms “bilingualism” and “bilingual individual”, the vagueness of these concepts can be perceived. Weinreich (1953: 1) and Mackey (1978) consider as bilingual anyone who alternatively uses two languages, without delving into the frequency of use or the fluency in each one of them. Other authors, nevertheless, take into account questions such as the difference between passive and active proficiency in L2, or the frequency of use of each language. Therefore, there is a broad concept of the bilingual speaker as one who is able to transmit valid communicative messages in a second language, regardless of their grammatical accuracy, as opposed to another, more restrictive, concept that uses the term to refer to one who masters perfectly and in equal conditions both languages; this speaker is known as “ambilingual”:

Such situations [language contact] are characterized by varying degrees of bilingualism. Bilingualism is recognized wherever a native speaker of one language makes use of a second

---

the only valid examples of *gheada*, such as *higüelas* or *aguares*, are found in a 1652 document belonging to the jurisdiction of Xallas —examples that Santamarina and Mariño Paz considered to be the result of *hypercorrection* and, as such, indirect testimonies of the existence of the *gheada* in this time period. However, for Pensado the *gheada* would have emerged after the 18th century.

language, however partially or imperfectly. It is thus a cline, ranging in terms of the individual speaker, from the completely monolingual person at one end, who never uses anything but his own native language or "L1", through bilingual speakers who make use at varying degree of mastery of two languages and makes use of both in all uses to which he puts either. Such a speaker is "ambilingual". (Halliday, McKintosh & Stevens, 1972[1968]: 141)

Siguan (2001: 29) considers to be bilingual any individual who knows and has a good mastery of two languages and who can use them in any social context with similar efficiency and facility. Within bilingualism understood in this sense different degrees are distinguished, depending on the speaker's greater identification with one or the other language and on the breadth of contexts in which he/she can use both of them with equal dexterity; therefore, the most basic manifestation of bilingualism would be a monolingual with ample knowledge of a second system. For Siguan, nevertheless, a speaker who possess so limited knowledge of one of the two languages that he or she can only use it in very particular and restricted situations cannot be considered bilingual, and neither can the speaker who only possesses passive L2 proficiency. We will adhere to this idea in this paper.

Following this concept and eliminating all of those Galicians who, more than two centuries ago, had only passive proficiency in Spanish or could just barely mumble it clumsily under exceptional circumstances, the group of bilinguals responsible for the phonetic interference which we are dealing with can be seen to diminish considerably. As Pensado recognises (1983: 23), in terms of the pressure exerted by Spanish as the superimposed language by means of seminaries and schools, by trade, the Church and governing institutions of a centralist nature "sólo podían dar testimonio no más de un 7% de la población; del resto de la gente, quizás en la mayor parte monolingües, no sabemos nada". In fact, it seems that some authors exaggerate the social consequences of the Castilianisation of the Galician ruling class during the 17th and 18th centuries in order to support that the *gheada* appeared as a result of Spanish interference (cf. Freixeiro Mato, 1998; Fernández Laje, 1987):

O galego malvive durante séculos co castelán, que se superpón como lingua do poder, como única lingua oficial, até no último recuncho da Galiza; e isto non se pode ignorar á hora de explicar certos cambios. (Freixeiro Mato, 1998: 152)

The fact that Spanish has been the legal and administrative language since the 16th century does not imply that it was equally implanted in oral communication, the real context of interference, nor that it could have served as an instrument for Castilianisation of Galician-speaking masses who couldn't read and scarcely ventured out of their home villages. The social stratification and organisation of the Galician population, the low level of urbanisation, and the illiteracy rate are inconsistent with a rapid social expansion of Spanish.

The extension of Spanish in Galicia was, certainly, a consequence of the

urbanization and industrialization of the region, but neither of these was achieved to any significant degree until the 1950's. In effect, it was the period between 1950 and 1995 that saw the greatest abandonment of the agrarian sector in the history of Galicia, which according to López Iglesias (1997) reduced by 80% the population engaged in agriculture. In the middle of the 18th century, only a scarce 5% of the Galician population could be considered urban, and these urban nuclei were not only lightly populated —Santiago had 4,500 residents, A Coruña 2,000 and Pontevedra 1,350, while the rest of the villages never reached 1,000 inhabitants—, but were also characterised by marked ruralism (cf. Saavedra, 1991, 1992; Eiras Roel, 1981; Pérez García, 1996)<sup>14</sup>.

For this reason, it does not seem advisable to make estimates concerning the Castilianisation of the Galician urban population based solely on quantitative factors, that is, considering that a city-dweller spoke Spanish for the mere fact of living in the city —as did occur after the integration of Galicia in the modern capitalist system<sup>15</sup>. It is advisable to take into account that the society of the *Antiguo Régimen* was strongly stratified and governed by a feudal value system already superseded in other parts of Europe. In my opinion, the language may have functioned then more as a symbol of distinction and refinement used by the notable members of the kingdom to differentiate themselves from the common people, even into the cities where the landed nobility and the Spanish-speaking upper middle class cohabitated, but hardly ever mixed with, humble artisans, small merchants who scarcely knew how to sign their names, beggars, peasants, or daily labourers. These latter social groups represented, in a city like Santiago, more than three-quarters of the population, had relational networks of an endogamous nature, and maintained strong connections with the rural world (Saavedra, 1991; Rey Castela, 1998). In such a rigidly hierarchical society, it would be unlikely that Spanish would have been used as a social mobility strategy by those who knew that they would never be able to achieve it. I also consider improbable that this language would have been used by the common people with the purpose of concealing clearly evident class differences.

In my opinion, this social configuration of the tiny Galician cities weakens one of the principal arguments used by the superstratum theory regarding the origin of the *gheada*, calling into question its basis in the strong Castilianisation suffered by Galicia in the 18th century as a consequence of urban development. At least, it

---

14 Furthermore, in 1900 the seven principal cities of Galicia did not have more than 9.1% of the total inhabitants (Villares Paz, 1996: 363).

15 According to Villares Paz (1996), this incorporation took place in two periods: the first stretches from 1900 to 1950/60 (in which the redemption of feudal taxes and the beginning of a market agriculture took place), and the second includes from the middle of the 20th century to the current time (industrial development and modernisation and integration into the EU).

would be advisable to justify this assertion quantitatively as well as qualitatively<sup>16</sup>:

O grau de espanholização lingüística nos finais do XVIII e no XIX nom pode ser tam baixo como muitos sustentam. A apariçom gradual, mas puxante, do Estado Moderno e da Economia Capitalista —representada na Galiza pola “burguesía foránea”— tivo que supor um forte incremento da espanholização, como alás demostra o léxico dos autores literários do XIX. (Fernández Laje, 1987: 611)

As far as we know, even at the start of the 20th century, 90% of the Galician population was rural, suggesting that, numerically speaking, the cultural hegemony in Galicia was that of its own rural population. It is advisable to take this data into account when considering the prevalent linguistic attitudes and values, which sociolinguists generally identify automatically with the dominant elite minority.

Another factor attributed to be decisive in the Castilianisation of the Galician population was primary schooling. However, such a Castilianising effect may have been mitigated by the mediocrity of the educational system and the scarcity of schooling centres. During the entire *Antiguo Régimen* there was no educational network broad and regular enough to effect widespread literacy among the Galician masses: in 1797 there existed at most 650 schools, which were attended by some 12,000 students, just 4% of the school-aged population of Spain —at a time when the Galician population represented 13% of the national total— and in the middle of the 19th century this number rose to 1,205, which represented 6% of the national total (cf. Barreiro Fernández, 1991). Private education centres also existed (called *escolas de ferrado*) which were very unequally distributed and of dubious quality, and which were financed by parents through payment in kind. In these centres the

---

16 A similar criticism can be made of the claims that relate the geographic distribution of the *gheada* to the indices of Castilianisation attributed to western Galicia (very high) in comparison with the eastern region (very low), based on the high levels of urban and commercial development of the west area as opposed to the underdevelopment of the east zone. Evidently, neither western nor eastern Galicia were compact and uniform in this respect: the level of commercial development and external contact of A Coruña, whose port engaged in commercial trade with European countries, was incomparably greater than that which small fishing enclaves like Muros, Noia or Baiona could have had in the 18th century. The port of Ribadeo, in eastern Galicia, had already been trading since the 16th century with the ports of Lisbon, Asturias, and the Basque Country (in the same way that Vigo traded with Carril), and their ships took on supplies in the market of Mondoñedo, which was frequented by traders from Castilla, Asturias, and other parts of Spain. It must be added that the eastern villages of Ourense had more commercial connections with Castilla and Leon than with the rest of Galicia; some of the nobility lineages in this province shared family relations or common economic interests with other Spaniards (for these topics cf. Saavedra, 1989, 1991). Therefore, it would be advisable to review the repeated discourse about the isolation of eastern Galicia to argue in favor of the low pressure that Spanish exerted there and the resulting absence of the *gheada*, since, following this theory, certain enclaves in the eastern part of the region shared the same conditions or more, that would have led to Spanish pressure in favour of its appearance, yet did not.

curriculum was delivered by uncertified teachers, individuals with dubious training who in this way supplemented the meagre earnings obtained through their real professions (artisans, farmers, sailors). As a result, the academic culture acquired by the majority of the students was reduced to knowledge of “the four rules” (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division) and rudimentary reading and writing skills. Children attended these private centres in a seasonal fashion, adapting to the agricultural cycles. In 1865 there were some 457 such centres in Galicia (De Gabriel, 1986).

On the other hand, the education of the popular classes did not have as its objective the exhaustive intellectual formation of the individual, but was of a more utilitarian and pragmatic nature, which explains why schools were concentrated in the most economically developed and most accessible areas, in which commercial trade required certain rudimentary accounting and reading and writing skills. As Barreiro Fernández (1991: 113) explains, “en la Galicia rural la educación no era un valor que se defendiese” (keep in mind that “rural Galicia” in this period represented practically the entire territory), which explains how as late as the beginning of the 20th century the illiteracy rate reached 74.5% of the population, including both genders (Barreiro Fernández, 1991).

As explained by De Gabriel (1988, 1992), the desire of 19th century centralist education policy to introduce Spanish as a pedagogical tool and subject of instruction came up against Galician social and cultural reality<sup>17</sup>. As we have seen, a good many of the non-professional teachers came from the popular classes, and did not have much more knowledge of Spanish than the students to whom they were supposed to teach it —this data might be anecdotal if at the height of the 19th century these teachers did not represent more than 50% of Galician public teaching. Further, De Gabriel (1992) has collected some parent complaints about the fact that Spanish was spoken to their children inside the classrooms, or that time was wasted with Spanish grammar classes for which, as future labourers, the children would have no need, which confirms the extraordinary pragmatism with which Galician farmers viewed education. Therefore, whether the school inspectors liked it or not, Galician was the usual language in Galician schools because their members could scarcely speak any other. The low levels of education, the precarious conditions under which schooling took place, and the irregular attendance of the students were obstacles to the process by which Galician schools could serve as effective instruments of Spanish linguistic policy.

The data presented concerning the scarce urban development of Galicia, the

---

17 In 1813, Manuel José Quintana wrote the *Informe de la Junta creada por la Regencia para proponer los medios de proceder al arreglo de los diversos ramos de Instrucción Pública*, where he argued the pedagogical necessity of using Spanish as the *native* language of instruction throughout the entire Spanish state [italics are mine].

extreme social stratification, and the precarious expansion of literacy confirms that the percentage of the Castilianised population, strictly speaking, hardly reached 10%. Therefore, the superstratum theory should explain how the phonetic interference managed to extend so quickly and generalize over half of Galicia, from a small group of bilinguals—who would eventually manage to overcome it—to the vast group of Galician monolinguals, to the point of slipping into their own phonological system and removing their native phoneme—given that the phonological system of a language is one of the most resistant to interference.

Undoubtedly, it could be accepted that the first of the interferences mentioned by the Castilianist theory, consisting of the under-differentiation of Spanish /g/ and /x/, would have been caused by bilingualism. But this bilingualism would have been rather that of those who acted as intermediaries between Spanish monolinguals and Galician monolinguals, predominantly the minor nobility, parochial priests, and the literate bourgeoisie—that is, those middle social strata that Labov (1972) identified as those responsible for linguistic change from above. Therefore, if such interference is admitted, those mainly responsible for it must be looked for in the middle social class, whose members later would reflect it in their written documents. Only deriving from a very lax conception of bilingualism could we attribute some responsibility for this interference to the Galician farmers. Furthermore, referring to *diglossic bilingualism*, it would be advisable to pinpoint what exactly is understood by this concept in applying it to the historical period in which the change is localised (18th century), and what are the domains where the rural Galicians made use of H and L languages, the type of functional relation established among the participants within these domains, and the frequency of farmers' exposure to each one of them<sup>18</sup>.

In characterising the situation of these languages in the 18th and 19th centuries as diglossic bilingualism, Pensado (1983) alludes to one of the four situations in which, according to Fishman (1995[1972]), the relation between bilingualism and diglossia is set up. However, diglossic bilingualism, in Fishman's original sense, is extended throughout almost all of the population—Fishman (1995[1972]: 121-22) offers as an example the situation in Paraguay—and the two languages, H and L, are functionally distributed in the manner characteristic of diglossia (H variety for the business of education, government, and high culture, etc., and L variety for intimacy or primary

---

18 *Domain*, as understood by Fishman (1965) is a construct that adapts to the specific sociocultural dynamics of different multilingual spaces in particular historical periods. For that reason domains must be fixed for each individual community after observing the recursive relationship established among the elements that constitute the communicative process (topic, time, communication scene and participants), and some of the typical activity spheres of that community. Domains, therefore, consist of a set of similar social situations, within which specific functional relationships among participants are established (teacher-student, husband-wife and employer-employee are some of those mentioned by Fishman). These relationships are understood as a set of rights and duties implicitly recognised by the members of the community.



group solidarity). As we have seen in the preceding pages, the sociolinguistic situation in Galicia in the *Antiguo Régimen* consisted rather of a great Galician monolingual majority (farmers, sailors, footmen, minor artisans and merchants, etc.), with precarious knowledge of Spanish, and two minor groups of speakers that made up the social elite: one Spanish monolingual (foreign upper nobility and upper urban bourgeoisie, in part also of foreign extraction) and another probably ambilingual (autochthonous nobility and the lettered bourgeoisie). Taking this into account, the only group that could demonstrate a functional division of the languages, as understood by Fishman, would be the latter. The former would conduct their entire functional repertoire in Spanish, and it is unlikely that the latter would have at their disposal enough knowledge of Spanish to use it in higher functions —due to which they cannot be considered bilingual— nor would they have easy access to these functions.

In effect, the data reviewed to this point leads us to consider that Galician farmers had little or no participation in domains that could be labelled institutional, which would require the use of H language. The life of Galician farmers would have taken place within the home village, from which they might venture out on certain occasions to attend some market or local festival, or to a nearby village or city to formalise some legal-administrative contract, always with the inevitable aid of intermediaries who were in charge of translating into written Spanish what the farmer declared in oral Galician (cf. Saavedra, 1991, 1992).

Another domain where the farmers might have used H language (Spanish) was the ecclesiastical one, especially after the 18th century, when receiving the sacraments began to require greater knowledge of Christian doctrine, and church attendance began to be more rigorously controlled. However, it must be taken into account that doctrine instruction, as well as the learning of prayers and liturgical acts, took the form of learning by heart, and the farmers frequently failed to attend these classes (cf. Saavedra, 1991, 1992; Carballo, 1995), for which reason these requirements may have contributed more to acquisition of passive knowledge than to oral fluency. In addition, at the end of the 18th century, 59% of rural priests were chaplains and Parish priests of rural extraction, with hardly any training, who shared the language and culture of the rural world (Saavedra, 1992). Due to the scarce social distance between themselves and the farmers, it is difficult to imagine farmers addressing them in Spanish.

To conclude, we have reviewed farmers' low school attendance, and which was the language used there on most occasions. Even including the manor houses in this type of domain<sup>19</sup>, the repercussions the use of Spanish might have had on farmers were minor, since their visits there were few. These visits took place only once a year

---

<sup>19</sup> The manor house may approach those domains most clearly institutional, since between the landed nobility, who was not part of the rural community, and their vassals power relations were established that probably favoured transactional exchanges, marked by the recognition of the rights and duties of those who occupied extreme positions in the scale of power and social status.

to pay taxes or to seek alms in times of famine (Saavedra, 1991).

Given all we have seen so far, I believe that the Castilianising repercussions of the institutions may have been more moderate than suggested by Freixeiro Mato (1998), and that the intensity of dominant-language exposure of the farmers, who were “almost completely monolingual” according to him, was not deep enough to provoke a phonological change of such a nature in their native language. For such a change, they would have spoken more than a vague and occasional “jabber” of Spanish:

Esa imposición do castelán como lingua do poder e lingua oficial en Galiza comprendeu uniformemente todo o territorio de fala galega, hoxe galego ou non, administrativamente español e, como tal lingua oficial, chegou a todas as vilas e aldeas, pois en todas elas o cura o utilizaba nas súas relacións polo menos formais cos fregueses, o mestre vehiculizaba o ensino, alí onde o houbese, en castelán e en castelán se facían os documentos e certificados (nacemento, bautismo, matrimonio, compra, venda, aluguer, etc.). (Freixeiro Mato, 1998: 156)

## 2.2. The notion of *linguistic prestige*

The superstratum theory relies on the concept of social overt prestige to explain the propagation of the second interference, that of L2 into L1 (/x/ → /g/) within the rural Galician-speaking community. If this is the case, we must suppose that Galician farmers, although they were not able to speak Spanish, knew and shared the linguistic value system and norms of the dominant elite, whom they attempted to imitate:

El prestigio ciudadano conlleva prestigio lingüístico y el campesino se admirará de la modalidad nueva del *nuevo gallego* [...] (Pensado, 1983: 78)

Por tanto, aínda que nas aldeas o monolingüismo en galego se mantivo case integramente, o castelán estaba tamén presente como modelo a imitar e como lingua do poder (e por conseguinte lingua superior) que todos nalgunha ocasión (escola ou catequese, confesións, rezos na Igrexa ou rezo do rosario na intimidade familiar, xustiza, etc., etc.) debían intentar aínda que só fose “chapurrear”, para o que precisaba aprender a pronuncia do /x/. (Freixeiro Mato, 1998: 156)

According to Pensado (1970, 1983), when Galician farmers, after enormous efforts, managed to learn how to pronounce the prestigious Spanish voiceless velar fricative sound, introduced it into their local speech in order to imbue it with greater prestige, eliminating the voiced velar consonant [g], which they considered of low prestige:

Ese temor a las /G/ que causan risa se extienden sobre la autóctona /G/ gallega, y el hablante gallego llegaría a adquirir miedo a articularla, y temiendo que se trate de una articulación viciosa, la corrige hasta en su lengua nativa, de ahí que cuando tenga que decir: *gato* > /xato/, *guerra* > /xerra/, *agua* > /axua/ [...]. (Pensado, 1970: 38)

A certain elitist ethnocentrism and an identical dose of anachronism may be

attributed to this view of the situation. It is anachronistic because the factors that elicit linguistic change in industrialized capitalist societies, which include the desire of the urban lower and lower-middle classes to emulate the linguistic behaviour of the upper and upper middle classes, perfectly valid for the Galicia of today, are not equally applicable to rural pre-capitalist societies, that is, to the Galicia of the 18th and 19th centuries. It is ethnocentric and elitist in that it makes the mistake of considering that the only existing language prestige is that associated with the varieties of the urban intellectual elite and that their dominant value system and their language attitudes are cultural frames accepted and shared by the other social strata<sup>20</sup>. The image of an illiterate farmer, who worked the land from sunup to sundown and lived in conditions almost as miserable as the livestock with which he shared his rooms, imitating Spanish pronunciation to give himself airs before other members of the ingroup, poses a certain tragic irony. Moreover, taking into account that social mobility was impossible in a society stratified in the feudal mode, the image turns out not only ironic but ridiculous—it is well known that the use of the prestige norm is characteristic of those persons who, having sufficient economic capital, use the language to reflect relevant sociocultural differences or of those who, lacking the economic capital, avail themselves of the language to increase their possibility of acquiring it.

Contrary to that suggested by the superstratum theory, many indicators suggest that the rural Galician community had its own value system and an autonomous cultural universe of which its language formed a part. This language, as with other socialising and cultural elements, probably functioned as a symbol of group cohesion. It is quite probable that the overt prestige of the dominant cultural forms existed along with the covert prestige of the local culture. In effect, until the 20th century was well underway Galician rural communities were characterised by the scarcity of communication networks and infrequent contact between its members and members of other social groups and linguistic communities. These traits characterize Galician rural communities as *endocentric communities* (a definition of them can be found in Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985). Galician socio-economic structure corresponded to that of the *type 1* or *autonomous* way of life, prevalent in communities economically organised into simple family—or neighbourhood—based units of production (for this concept, cf. J. Milroy, 1992). In Galicia these units were identified with the *aldeas*, local parish-centred villages that formed the basic cells of shared life, social

---

20 It has been demonstrated that aside from overt prestige, that which is recognised by the social majority and considered to be a “normal” reflection of social values, corresponding to the linguistic varieties of the dominant groups (middle and upper-middle classes), there exists a form of covert prestige, which corresponds to the prestige that the linguistic varieties considered to be of low status have for their users, especially as symbols of group cohesion, loyalty and identity. Compared to overt prestige, which is made explicit through public declarations about “proper usage” or correction norms, covert prestige has a tacit nature and usually remains hidden in the most formal situations (cf. Labov, 1983[1972]; Trudgill, 1972).

organisation and agrarian production. These were strongly cohesive, through solid familiar relations and tight cooperation among its members. These communities were sustained by a broad base of shared culture and internal mechanisms of community control (O'Flanagan, 1996). These characteristics permit us to deduce that dense and multiple social networks were established among their inhabitants. As L. Milroy (1980) assures us, these kinds of social networks reinforce the non-legitimated local norms by means of language convergence among its members, for which reason they are usually considerably impermeable to influences of foreign languages<sup>21</sup>.

Existing data demonstrates that traditional Galician farming communities clung tightly to their cultural universe and demonstrated little interest in changing their forms of socialisation (Saavedra, 1991, 1992; Dubert, 1994). We have already noted the farmers' complaints against the teaching of Spanish grammar and Spanish use in their schools, practices to which they attributed no practical value (De Gabriel, 1992). It is probable that the vernacular language was a core-value within the rural communities and there are not sufficiently founded reasons to believe that in linguistic matters the farmers fully shared the value system and attitudes of the dominant group, and even less that they would introduce language forms of overt prestige into their ingroup relationships, giving prevalence to the status dimension over that of solidarity.

The Castilianist theory attributes the spread of the *gheada* in the 18th and 19th centuries to the linguistic convergence strategies of the Galician-speaking group toward the Spanish-speaking one, due to the explicit recognition of the prestige of the latter. This means analysing the language attitudes of the Galician farmer from the ideological bias of the dominant group, and taking into account neither the more than probable existence of covert prestige nor the role that Galician may have played as an element of community cohesion and as a symbol of group identity and solidarity. In Ryan (1979) we are presented with the results of various attitudinal studies showing that the members of the dominated group manifest solidarity with and adherence to their ingroup through language divergence from members of the dominant outgroup and language convergence toward members of their group, particularly clear in ingroup interactions and private spaces, where community pressure toward vernacular forms can be as strong as the official pressure toward prestigious varieties in intergroup interactions or in public spaces.

### 3. Some ideological implications of the Castilianist theory

---

21 It is precisely the processes of industrialisation and urbanisation, with the subsequent emergence of the Capitalist class system, that break the tightly-woven social networks of traditional societies and accelerate the spread of a supralocal linguistic norm (cf. L. Milroy, 1980). This development started in Galicia between 1900 and 1950, and it intensified after this date, what had negative repercussions on the transmission and conservation of the vernacular language. The second volume of the *Mapa Sociolingüístico de Galicia* (Sociolinguistic Map of Galicia) demonstrates that the greatest decrease of Galician monolingualism, by almost 40 points, happened in the second quarter of the 20th century (cf. Fernández Rodríguez & Rodríguez Neira, 1995).

In the following we will review some of the arguments supporting the Castilianist theory and discuss what we believe may be its ideological implications for the concept of linguistic varieties and their users.

We begin by quoting two discursive fragments in which we are presented with the Castilianist theory of the origin of the *gheada* as if it were socially hegemonic:

Es creencia “popular” que la *geada* es de origen castellano, pero en este caso, para algunos, el pueblo no ha acertado, y eso que hoy, para los sociolingüistas, es muy importante lo que el pueblo, no los lingüistas y los gramáticos, opina de su lengua. (Pensado, 1983: 55)

Mais convén precisar que tal tese [castelanista] non foi defendida en solitario por estas dúas persoas [Pensado 1970 e Pensado e Pensado Ruíz 1983], senón que foi a que viñeron sostendo a case totalidade dos estudiosos da nosa lingua até o período actual, como xa se viu, en concordancia co pensamento popular que a asociou a unha má pronuncia por interferencia do castelán, feito que explica o seu desprestixio e abandono que dela fixeron practicamente todos os escritores en galego, defensores da nosa lingua e por iso mesmo inimigos da *gheada*. (Freixeiro Mato, 1998: 152)

In the works cited, the authors do not offer any objective survey data in which a representative percentage of the above-mentioned “common people” expressed their opinion concerning the *gheada* phenomenon, which indicates that the authors are extending their own ideas about language to the speech community as a whole. This is a “naturalisation” strategy, by means of which the beliefs of one social group are presented as universal and are legitimised as a reflection of the natural state of things (Van Dijk, 1999[1998]; Fairclough, 1989). Further, what these authors seem to forget is that, behind the existence of such a generalised opinion like the one mentioned above, there is an underlying hidden process of production of that state of opinion by academic authorities and its expansion among the audience. It is difficult to assume that the community of speakers would have arrived at such a state of consciousness that a linguistic form is worthy of rejection for the cited reasons—that it originated from Spanish—, through personal independent reflection. The opinion of speakers is mediated by the dictates of linguists and affiliated groups (members of the Academy, writers, teachers) concerning the speakers’ language varieties, and this is something these same linguists seem to be aware of every time they use the press to communicate their analysis of language matters or to spread their criteria of correctness. In this way, the guardians of language intend to direct the speaker-reader on how or when he/she should use (or renounce) a particular linguistic variant and try to control something so functional for the speaker as the existence of semantic equivalency sets whose members have different communicative functions and serve to transmit the desired social and/or pragmatic contents for each occasion. Through mass-media and the school system, the dominant social groups are able to reproduce their linguistic ideology and build “consent” (Bourdieu & Boltanski, 1975; Bourdieu, 1985[1982]),

the process by which speakers of devalued language varieties accept the social elite's undervaluation of their speech productions in the same way that they accept the overvaluation of the standard legitimate forms which hold overt prestige<sup>22</sup>. By means of consent, the dominated language groups take part in the reproduction of the dominant ideology and become engaged in their own discrimination. The strategy is the following: first consent is built through the spread of particular ideas about language by means of discourse which represents these ideas as if they were common-sense truths, and then the existence of this consent built by linguists, writers, members of the Academy, or teachers is used to legitimise these ideologies relying on the argument of their hegemony or universality.

This use of discourse to spread a particular linguistic ideology through consent is not new for literate societies throughout the world, including the case concerning us. In fact, the same year in which Freixeiro Mato published *Gramática da lingua galega I. Fonética e fonoloxía*, where he expressed his adherence to the Castilianist theory of the origin of the *gheada*, he used the weekly *A Nosa Terra* to disseminate his scientific opinions in an article entitled "A *gheada*: sobre a súa orixe e má reputación" ("The *gheada*: on its origin and bad reputation") —a title by means of which the adept reader could infer the low social prestige attributed to the phenomenon without needing to continue reading<sup>23</sup>. In this article, the linguist poses claims identical to those which appear in his grammar (Freixeiro Mato, 1998: 158):

Mais non semella razoabel sacrificarmos esforzos por beneficiarmos unha característica fonética que naceu baixo o estigma da inautenticidade, a vulgaridade e a incultura e que en máis de douscentos anos non foi quen de superar. A súa orixe foi sancionada como castelanista pola conciencia popular —"o pobo é quen máis ordena"— e pola conciencia ilustrada dos nosos precursores.  
(*A Nosa Terra*, n. 819: February 26, 1998)

The following words seem equally illustrative:

22 The media and the education system form part, along with business corporations and the entertainment industry, of what Lippi-Green (1994, 1997) labelled as the dominant bloc. Their function is to build consent in the direction of the ideological standard, which the author defines as "a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed from above, and which takes as its model the written language. The most salient feature is the goal of suppression of variation of all kinds" (Lippi-Green, 1994: 166).

23 The use of the press to create an opinion about the value of the *gheada* in Galician is not exclusive to this author. Francisco Fernández Rei and Rosario Álvarez Blanco, defenders of its autonomous origin, published earlier an article in the journal *Teima* (1977, n. 20), with the illustrative title "En defensa da 'geada'"; and even *A Mesa pola Normalización Lingüística* (Board for Linguistic Normalisation) responded in a Galician daily paper to a speaker who left a message on their answering machine expressing doubts about the quality of his Galician due to his use of *gheada*: "A *gheada* [...] é un deses rasgos dialectais que temos que conservar, precisamente por ser un xeito peculiar de falar o galego — máis da metade do noso territorio lingüístico fala con *gheada*— e por ser unha consecuencia da evolución natural da nosa lingua e non unha cópia do castelán" (*La Voz de Galicia*, June 3, 1993).

[...] se desde a súa orixe, como todos recoñecen, a *gheada* (e tamén antes e despois a gueada) é xeralmente desprezada e os que a usan son obxecto de burlas e ridiculación por a consideraren, polo menos desde o ámbito das persoas cultas, un signo de ignorancia e vulgaridade, ¿por qué será? [...]. Se a *gheada* fose xerada espontaneamente polo sistema galego a súa presenza na lingua sería sen dúbida asumida como algo natural [...].

(*A Nosa Terra*, n. 819: February 26, 1998)

The above quotations prompt several interesting ideological issues. In the first place, they reflect the negative connotations associated with an objective linguistic phenomenon occurring frequently in contact situations, that of interference, presented there as the result of the bastardisation of the language or as a disturbance or deterioration of his natural state. That is the attitude usually hidden behind purist ideologies that set themselves up as defenders or detractors of particular varieties for the sake of linguistic authenticity —as if it were possible to find a language that had no elements coming from any other, and as if Creole languages, the maximum instantiation of confluence of two linguistic systems, were therefore minor languages<sup>24</sup>. This search for authenticity, for the true Galician, is guided by another ideological aspect, the necessity to create a standard language that becomes a symbol of national identity, for which it is essential to purify it of foreign elements, especially of those which are believed to have originated in the superimposed language, although the antiquity and integration into the system of these elements are recognised. Given that to have a vernacular language is perhaps the main ethnolinguistic characteristic upon which a community supports its claims for national status, the differences between subordinate and dominant languages are consciously strengthened as strategies for reinforcing intergroup boundaries that, if weakened, would provoke the full linguistic and cultural assimilation of the Galician ingroup to the Spanish outgroup and the disappearance of one of the key elements for nation-building. As absurd as it might seem, a structural linguistic unit as arbitrary as a phoneme has been assigned a role in this conflict. Resistance to it symbolises, from the viewpoint of these analysts, resistance to the linguistic, cultural, and political invasion of the dominant group —in the same way that for those who believe the *gheada* to be of endogenous origin, its use is a symbol of differentiation and authenticity. Therefore, from this viewpoint, a logical cause-effect relationship is established (Freixeiro Mato, 1998: 152) between the defence of Galician and the censure of the *gheada*, for which, the defence of both Galician and

---

24 An interesting critique of this concept of interference can be found in Fishman (1968: 29): “It is particularly unfortunate that most linguists have come to refer to the language of bilinguals as revealing “interference” since this term has a pejorative (disruptive) connotation that a truly impartial science would have avoided [...]. The underlying model of pure, monolithic *langue* leads the linguist to assume that the interaction or fusion of two such is “interference”, that is, deleterious, harmful, noxious”.

the *gheada* is presented, by default, as a contradiction. The gheadophone reader of this journal article can infer, therefore, that if he/she feels committed to the survival and regeneration of the Galician language he/she must put an end to his “old friendship” with the *gheada*, just as Freixeiro Mato (1998: 152) assures us Galician writers did, those who in order to defend Galician language, declared themselves “enemies” of the *gheada*.

In the article from *A Nosa Terra* cited above, Freixeiro Mato speaks out against including this variant as an alternative for standard Galician:

Se fose preciso emitirmos unha opinión ao respecto, o ditame sería contrario a calquer intento por lle outorgar á gheada outro status diferente ao de unha variante dialectal máis, que non debe formar parte do modelo estándar que o galego necesita. E isto fundamentalmente pola carga pexorativa que historicamente foi acumulando como signo de vulgaridade e de incultura, proxectada á súa vez sobre o idioma galego no seu conxunto. [...] Razóns pragmáticas de carácter sociolóxico, cando menos, parecen aconsellar que deixemos a gheada como un trazo dialectal máis do galego, que como tal debe ser respectado, o mesmo que todos os seus usuarios espontáneos e aqueles que voluntariamente o queiran utilizar.

(*A Nosa Terra*, n. 819, February 26, 1998)

The gheadophone Galician-speaker who, besides his or her dialectal language variety, has learned standard Galician, is, in principle, free to decide whether or not to follow the prescriptive advice of the academic authorities who, like those cited above, recommend not using the *gheada* in those contexts of situation that require the standard variety, relegating it to informal situations and private spaces. However, it will be difficult for the gheadophone to distance himself from these prescriptions (using devalued linguistic varieties in formal situations) if he wishes to achieve professional and economic advancement, even though for him these varieties have an important identity value. Thus, as Bourdieu & Boltanski (1977) state, the objective laws of linguistic market, especially controlled by the education and labour markets, are there to remind him of the true value of his speech productions, and the use of *gheada* (“sign of vulgarity and lack of education”), as any other linguistic trait which has been illegitimated for whatever reason, may constitute an obstacle to a qualified individual’s entrance into certain sectors of the labour market<sup>25</sup>.

Only when the speakers belong to the social hierarchy or are recognised as

25 Among other linguistic traits, I am thinking of the Galician accent in labour markets that require Spanish. Perhaps the most clear example is the artistic market. It is known that if Galician artists want success in Spain the first thing they must do is to receive classes in phonetics in order to lose their vernacular accent —exception being made if they are typecasted in comic roles as “Galician”. Nevertheless, we Galician spectators witness the success in Madrid of artists whose marked Andalusian accent has not been an impediment to their success. This is probably because the Spanish market is more tolerant of the intrusions within the standard of its own geographical varieties than the phonetic and pitch patterns associated with another language of the state. Also, given that the Galician accent is



members of the intellectual elite and, as such, their fluency in the standard language and the high value of their speech productions are unquestionable, can they allow themselves to violate the norms of the linguistic market by using illegitimated dialectal forms, either as subversive or acquiescent strategies, with scarcely any risk —although, if the person and the circumstances are relevant enough at the social level, this fact will not pass unnoticed. I want to highlight the title of a Galician daily newspaper article announcing the reading of Francisco Fernández Rei's speech upon being admitted to the Real Academia Galega: “Primer discurso de la Real Academia con *seseo* y *gheada*” (‘First Real Academia speech with *seseo* and *gheada*’, *La Voz de Galicia*, September 25, 1999). The linguistic behaviour of the member of the Academy has various implications. First, the fact that the event celebrated was Fernández Rei's inauguration as a full member into the institution that has the highest authority in language matters confers upon his performance the value of a public transgression of the legitimate norms that constrain an institutional event of maximum formality by its main character, who, fluent in standard Galician, nevertheless decided to use his native dialect. This is a transgression that, while coherent with his position as defender of the *gheada* and of the *seseo* as genuinely Galician sounds, and consequently admissible within the standard Galician norm (cf. Álvarez Blanco & Fernández Rei, 1977; Fernández Rei, in press), is nevertheless not typical of his public speeches —as is the case with the majority of users of these sounds, who reserve them for informal or family situations. Due to the social relevance of this act, Fernández Rei must have been conscious of the repercussions his performance would have, that it would also have the symbolic meaning of vindicating phonic social variants systematically repressed in formal speeches. In this way, these variants become dignified before their community of users, who see them invested with the prestige conferred by a speaker with academic and intellectual authority. Through this subversion of the norm, this particular speaker symbolically denies or ignores the hierarchical relationship among legitimate and illegitimate language varieties and their respective users and situations of use, showing adherence to and solidarity with his group of origin —the speech was read in his native village—, knowing very well that nobody would interpret this fact as ignorance of the cultured norm or as incapacity to satisfy the formality required by strongly ritualised situations like that described above.

However, this leaves room to wonder how the gheadophone who only knows how to speak dialectal Galician, because his academic training has been short or completely lacking, and who finds it difficult to pronounce the voiced velar [g], can

---

not only a geographic indicator, but also a social and ethnic indicator, the discrimination can never be merely a linguistic issue. In this sense it is interesting to reproduce the ironic words with which Lippi-Green (1997: 50) parodies the assimilationist ideology of the Anglophone dominant group in the United States: “*Sound like us, and success will be yours*”. The problem here is that shedding a native accent is not something within everyone's reach.

accept prescriptive advice like that which Freixeiro Mato offers in *A Nosa Terra*. It is evident that fluency in the standard variety, either Galician or Spanish, is unequally distributed along the society, and that the groups with the lowest social status are those that lack this symbolic capital. Therefore, when a dialectal variety is illegitimated for use in formal contexts of situation, its users are indirectly illegitimated to participate in them or, as Bourdieu (1985[1982]) claims, they are condemned to silence —the *intermediaries* of societies with high illiteracy rates have become the *spokesmen* of the literate societies, a function carried out by, in principle, the persons most effective in public discourse and most fluent in the standard language. In this way the users of a stigmatised dialectal sound, such as the *gheada*, are just perceived as legitimate to participate in relatively low-level linguistic exchanges, within the popular linguistic market, to which the purist prescriptions about correctness are never directed, because they are usually more concerned in ensuring that the language of the elite does not become similar to that of the masses.

Within the lines of argument used by the supporters of the Castilianist theory it is common as well to resort to the stigma of ignorance, rusticity, and lack of education associated with the *gheada* to justify its rejection. Almost all Galician grammars, philological treatises or press articles that deal with the phenomenon in different times do so from markedly negative perspectives: “manera incivil de hablar solo disculpable en boca de gente zafia” (Valladares, 1970[1892]: 20), “tan grosero hábito sólo se usa entre el vulgo” (Cotarelo Valledor, 1927: 91), “ese sonido extraño y desapacible, signo de rusticidad e incultura” (Carré Alvarellos, 1956: 963), etc. In the fragments from *A Nosa Terra* quoted above, Freixeiro Mato considers that the systematic mockery and rejection of which Galician-speakers with this phoneme in their native system were victims is a substantial reason to consider it an interference from Spanish, since if not, those more highly-educated sectors of the population would not have reacted against it with such rage, nor would the writers of the 19th century have rejected it in literary Galician. However, the fact that a linguistic trait is stigmatised is not sufficient to demonstrate its exogenous origin —we know that some Galician grammars of the previous century have tried to stigmatise the conjugated infinitive, the verbal periphrasis of the infinitive without the preposition “a” and other genuinely Galician features (cf. Valladares, 1970[1892]). Further, the argument of stigma can turn against the theory that it attempts to support, given that if Spanish was the prestigious language when the phenomenon emerged (as it still is today), the fact that a Spanish sound entered into Galician should have been considered a prestigious trait, not the opposite. In my opinion, the stigmatisation of the Galician *gheada* and its rejection by members of the Academy and authors of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century can not be attributed simply to that it was considered an interference from Spanish, but more likely to the fact that it was considered to be an interference produced by a type of deficiency or cognitive

inferiority that, among other impediments, rendered the lowest strata of Galician society unable to differentiate /g/ ([g] / [ʝ]) and /x/ ([x]) when they tried to speak Spanish; that is why the phenomenon was repeatedly qualified as a “sign of vulgarity and lack of education”. In this way, we make a usual mistake in our society, what Joseph (1987: 41) calls the *cognitive fallacy*, which consists of considering that fluency in a standard variety of a language —by default the only “correct” variety— usually acquired after years of schooling and training in reading and writing, demonstrates the superiority of its users in logical-analytical thinking and, in turn, that the failure to learn this standard —remember that, in our case, this is the standard in the L2— demonstrates cognitive or intellectual inferiority —forgetting again that the success or failure in such matters are functions of time and money spent, and that time and money are also goods unequally distributed in our society. For this reason, I consider more likely that the *gheada*’s low prestige may be due to the reduced intellectual capacity attributed to the individuals identified to be responsible for the linguistic change than to the fact that it was considered an interference from Spanish (actually, other interferences from this language, very common in today’s spoken Galician, do not suffer such a low esteem):

Las *geadas* son inadmisibles, así en gallego, como en castellano, manera incivil de hablar; solo disculpable en boca de gente záfia, lo mismo que la de aquellos que, por no pronunciar la *j* como los castellanos, queriendo hablar en la lengua de estos, ni aún como los franceses y portugueses, cual debieran pronunciarla, hablando bien en gallego, emplean malamente la *g* y dicen *extranguería*, *extranguero*, *galéa*, *gamás* [...]. (Valladares, 1970[1892]: 20)

En gallego no existe el sonido de *j*, *y*, sin embargo, cuando las gentes incultas de la zona costera occidental hablan castellano, incurren en el vicio de pronunciar como gutural explosiva fortísima la *g* suave (*jato*, *Vijo*, *Lujo*, *jallo*, *jorra*, *joma*), y lo que es más raro todavía, como *g* suave la *j* (*garro*, *conego*, *Gosé*, *narango*) [...]. Claro que tan grosero hábito sólo se usa entre el vulgo, pero a veces induce a confusión a personas algo ilustradas. (Cotarelo Valledor, 1927: 90-91)

En este párrafo encontramos *gran*, *trégoa*, *gregos*, *enganadores*, *gorir*, *folgança*. Hoy puede oírse: *jrán*, *tréjoa*, *enjanadores*, *fuljanza*. Pero en Portugal, libre de la influencia de Castilla, continúan pronunciando como está escrito en la Crónica, que es como se decía antes en Galicia sin duda alguna, como decimos las personas de cierta cultura y como debemos procurar que se diga hoy, rechazando ese sonido extraño y desapacible, signo de rusticidad e incultura. (Carré Alvarellos, 1956: 963)<sup>26</sup>

It is evident that modern-day linguistics who have defended this theory have done so using much more scientific criteria than those used by the 19th century grammarians, who invested their work with openly discriminatory vocabulary and

26 These authors use the letter <j> to represent the phoneme /x/, and the letter <g> to represent the /g/. These two phonemes are also referred to as “strong guttural explosive” (/x/) and “soft g” (/g/).

with their own value judgements. Nevertheless, on some occasions the terminology used to present their arguments seems to reinforce the theory of cognitive incapacity implied by their predecessors. Expressions such as “las ciudades y villas profundamente castellanizadas se reirán de *los aldeanos y gentes pobres que intentan, y lo hacen muy mal, hablar castellano*” or “*el mal uso de la lengua superior*”, “*la mala imitación*”, “tampoco los gallegos se mataban por adquirirlo [el sonido [x]] y los más cómodos se limitaban a imitarlo” (italics are mine), used profusely in Pensado (1983), discredit this phenomenon in the eyes of the speaker who reads or hears such qualifications, since it is presented as the result of incompetence or almost pathological lack of interest in learning the correct version. It is quite possible that a Galician speaker who has the *gheada* in his dialect and knows that the academic authorities attribute its appearance to the ineptitude and neglect of his ancestors may end up participating in the stigmatisation to which he is subjected (more so if he is a supporter of the Galician language or a nationalist concerned with purifying his language of elements originating in the dominant language). In my understanding, these arguments serve to reproduce the linguistic ideology that links fluency in the standard variety with cognitive superiority<sup>27</sup> and interference with inferiority, and that presents these intellectual characteristics as a reflection of social status —note that the subjects of the above citations are peasants and poor people—, given that a very effective way to illegitimate a language variety in the eyes of its own users is to explain its origin as the result of clumsiness, lack of learning aptitude and illiteracy.

#### 4. Conclusions

In this paper we have attempted to demonstrate some of the objections limiting the acceptability of the current formulation of the Castilianist theory concerning the origin of the *gheada*, in terms of its sociological foundations as well as the linguistic ideology underlying it.

In the first place, we have referred to the inconsistencies encountered in accepting *diglossic bilingualism* and *overt prestige* of Spanish as instigating factors of the entire process of interference in the historical period in which this theory localises the change (the 18th century). Reviewing the social structure of Galician society, the level of economic development and urbanisation, and the scarce or nonexistent level of literacy among the majority of the population, we have concluded that the bilingual group, understanding as “bilingual” one who possesses similar or equal degrees of

---

27 With this I am referring to the particular manifestation of the cognitive fallacy of which Joseph (1987: 41) speaks, that is, the attribution of an unequal capacity for learning, for logical-analytical thinking, and for intellectual pursuits in general to speakers of some varieties in comparison with speakers of another variety.

active fluency in both languages, would have represented a minor percentage of the population and would have been identified with the literate classes (bourgeoisie and nobility). Therefore, the notion of *diglossic bilingualism* is not completely applicable to an interference that is considered to have affected the illiterate monolingual majority. I believe that the rudimentary knowledge of Spanish that this majority would have had do not let us consider them authentically bilingual, and would have made it difficult for a structural feature of a language that they did not know well to have penetrated their mother tongue to the point of altering its phonetic structure (interferences are more likely to occur the other way around). This reality, and the more than likely scarce exposure of Galician speakers to the domains which required Spanish use weaken this line of argument, especially when testimonies exist demonstrating the use of L language even in those institutional domains that theoretically demanded H language (such as schools). Perhaps the notion of *diglossic bilingualism* might have been able to explain the appearance of the *gheada* if the *gheada* had been produced as a result of the democratisation of education, the spread of media and the industrial and urban development of Galicia, that is, well into the 20th century, but I consider it anachronistic to use the notion of diglossic bilingualism to describe the social situation of the languages in the 18th century. Furthermore, the *overt prestige* that Spanish undoubtedly had could be used to explain Castilianisation for the sake of upward social mobility and the bilinguals' convergence toward the Spanish-speaking group, especially in formal situations, but is not suitable for explaining the introduction of the Spanish [x] into the native language of the monolinguals. First, the Galician-speaking monolinguals, given that they belonged to the rural farming class, had no possibilities to achieve such mobility. Second, in their interactions with the members of their own community, with whom they established ties of solidarity and group cohesion, the overt prestige of the dominant group and language did not operate, but what operated instead was the covert prestige of their language and their ingroup.

In the second place, concerning the linguistic ideology implicit in the Castilianist theory, the concept of *interference* is presented to us as an 'error' or 'disturbance' that infects the system and that, in the case concerning us, is mainly attributed to the ineptitude of the lowest social classes. This conception of interference can be identified with xenophobic and elitist purism, insofar as the ideal standard is based on genetic purity and the social elite (remember that the negative opinion of the *gheada* held by writers, 19th century grammarians and educated people in general has been repeatedly used as an authority argument to reject it). If we pay attention to how the laws of the linguistic market function (Bourdieu, 1985[1972]), characterising the *gheada* as Castilianisation and attributing its appearance to the "incapacity" and "ignorance" of the least-cultured Galician-speakers are two powerful arguments of illegitimation on the part of the language guardians: when they introduce them in their discourses as common-sense truths, those arguments can be used to discriminate

and socially exclude on a linguistic basis in some social situations (consider the predictable negative consequences that using the *gheada* in an academic examination or in an employment interview might have). We might wonder, by way of balance, if a linguistic form, whatever its origin, might not be legitimate for the simple reason that it is used and it is functional for speakers.

Within the studies of linguistic change provoked by interferences, there is considerable agreement that a language only accepts borrowings from other systems when these borrowings do not contradict their own evolutionary tendencies (cf. Vogt, 1954; Weinreich, 1953; Payrató, 1985). For Weinreich as well as for Vogt, contact plays the role of reinforcing the internal tendencies, which means that the interference will only affect the system to the degree that foreign elements correspond to one of the receptor system's own innovations. A similar case is made by Payrató (1985), for whom the influence of an L2, cause of the interferences, acts as a catalyst for the internal changes of a language. Taking this into account, it appears that the academic debate over the acceptance or rejection of the *gheada* as a standard variant will have to begin to use arguments different from those of genealogical purity and authenticity. Researching into the true attitude of the speakers toward the *gheada* and what sociolinguistic function they assign to it would be a good start.

### Bibliographical references

- Alén Garabato, M.C. (2001). "La *gheada*: un phénomène de variation phonétique, géolinguistique et socioculturelle du galicien". *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique* 34/35, 219-32.
- Álvarez Blanco, Ch. & F. Fernández Rei (1977). "En defensa da 'geada'". *Teima* 20 (abril-maio), 8.
- Álvarez, R., J.L. Regueira & H. Monteagudo (1986). *Gramática Galega*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Barreiro Fernández, X.R. (1991). *Historia contemporánea. Ensino e cultura*. In M.M. Pérez Negreira (dir.), *Galicia. Historia. Obra completa*, tomo VI. A Coruña: Hércules de Ediciones.
- Barreiro Mallón, B. (1978). *La jurisdicción de Xallas en el siglo XVIII*. Santiago de Compostela: Secretariado de Publicacións da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Blommaert, J. (ed.) (1999). *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bochmann, K. (1992). "Valeurs e fonctions pragmatiques des premiers textes modernes en galicien issus de la Guerre d'Indépendance de l'Espagne (1808-1814)". In R. Lorenzo (ed.), *Actas do XIX Congreso Internacional de Lingüística e Filoloxía Románicas (Santiago, 4-9 de setembro, 1989)*, vol. 3. A Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de La Maza, 73-79.
- Bourdieu, P. & L. Boltanski (1975). "Le fétichisme de la langue". *Actes de la*

- recherche en sciences sociales* 4, 2-32.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985[1982]). *¿Qué significa hablar? Economía de los intercambios lingüísticos*. Madrid: Akal.
- Carré Alvarellos, L. (1967). *Gramática gallega*. A Coruña: Moret.
- Cotarelo Valledor, A. (1927). "El castellano en Galicia". *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* XIV, 82-136.
- De Gabriel, N. (1986). "As escolas de ferrado en Galicia no século XIX". In J. de Juana & J. Castro (eds.), *III Xornadas de Historia de Galicia*. Ourense: Servicio de Publicacións da Diputación Provincial de Ourense, 131-59.
- De Gabriel, N. (1988). "Escolarizaçom e práctica lingüística na Galiza rural do século XIX". *Agália. Revista da Associaçom Galega da Lingua* 13, 35-55.
- De Gabriel, N. (1992). "Lengua y escuela en Galicia". In A. Escolano (dir.), *Leer y escribir en España: doscientos años de alfabetización*. Madrid: Fundación Germán Sánchez Ruipérez & Pirámide, 165-86.
- Dubert, I. (1994). "A cultura popular na Galicia rural do Antigo Réxime, 1500-1830. Ofensivas e resistencias". *Grial* 122, 235-54.
- Eiras Roel, A. (1981). "La burguesía mercantil compostelana a mediados del siglo XVIII: mentalidad tradicional e inmovilismo económico". In A. Eiras Roel & cols., *La historia social de Galicia en sus fuentes de protocolos*. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 521-64.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fernández Laje, A.R. (1987). "A 'gheada', um fenómeno de modificaçom fonético-fonológica no quadro diglósico galego-espanhol". In *II Congresso Internacional da língua galego-portuguesa na Galiza*. Santiago de Compostela & Ourense: AGAL, 611-19.
- Fernández Rei, F. (1990). *Dialectoloxía da lingua galega*. Vigo: Xerais.
- Fernández Rei, F. (in press). "Gheada e seseo no galego coloquial e no galego estándar dos anos 90. Notas sobre a súa presenza nos media e nos textos musicais". In *Actas do I Congreso Internacional da Lingua Galega. Historia e actualidade, 1996*. [ms.]
- Fernández Rodríguez, M. (1997). "Las primeras propuestas de 'selección de norma' para el gallego: del Padre Sarmiento a fines del siglo XIX". *Historiographia Linguística* XXIV(1/2), 139-57.
- Fernández Rodríguez, M. & M. Rodríguez Neira (coords.) (1995). *Usos lingüísticos en Galicia*. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega.
- Fernández Salgado, B. & H. Monteagudo Romero (1995). "Do galego literario ó galego común: o proceso de estandarización na época contemporánea". In H. Monteagudo Romero (ed.), *Estudios de sociolingüística galega. Sobre a norma do galego culto*. Vigo: Galaxia, 99-176.
- Fishman, J.A. (1965). "Who speaks what language whom and when?". *La*

- linguistique* 2, 67-88.
- Fishman, J.A. (1968). "Sociolinguistic perspective on the study of bilingualism". *Linguistics* 39, 21-49.
- Freixeiro Mato, X.R. (1998). *Gramática de lingua galega I. Fonética e fonoloxía*. Vigo: A Nosa Terra.
- González Seoane, E. (1994). "Concepción do galego estándar nos gramáticos galegos do XIX". In R. Lorenzo (ed.), *Actas do XIX Congreso Internacional de Lingüística e Filoloxía Románicas*, vol. 6. A Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 75-88.
- González Seoane, E. (1998). "Avances na estandarización do galego no século XIX". In D. Kremer (ed.), *Homenaxe a Ramón Lorenzo*, vol. 2. Vigo: Galaxia, 555-67.
- Halliday, M.A.K., A. McIntosh & P. Strevens (1972[1968]). "The users and uses of language". In J.A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Paris: Mouton, 139-69.
- Hermida Gulías, C. (1992). *Os precursores da normalización. Defensa e reivindicación da lingua galega no Rexurdimento (1840-1891)*. Vigo: Xerais.
- ILGA/RAG [Instituto da Lingua Galega & Real Academia Galega] (1995). *Normas ortográficas e morfolóxicas do idioma galego* (12<sup>th</sup> edition). Vigo: Instituto da Lingua Galega & Real Academia Galega.
- Joseph, J.E. (1987). *Eloquence and Power. The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*. London: Frances Printer Publishers.
- Labov, W. (1963). "The social motivation of sound change". *Word* 19, 273-307.
- Labov, W. (1983[1972]). *Modelos sociolingüísticos*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Le Page, R.B. & A. Tabouret-Keller (1985). *Acts of Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1994). "Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts". *Language in Society* 23, 163-98.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an Accent. Language Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.
- López Iglesias, E. (1997). "Crise da agricultura tradicional e formación do agricultor. As mudanzas experimentadas polo agro galego na segunda metade do século XX". In G. Pereira-Menaut (coord.), *Galicia fai 2000 anos. O feito diferencial galego*, vol. 2. Santiago de Compostela: Museo do Pobo Galego, 219-33.
- Mackey, W.F. (1978): "The description of bilingualism". In *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*. Paris: Mouton, 554-84.
- Mariño Paz, R. (1994). "Testemuños de *gheada* nos primeiros textos galegos do século XIX". In R. Lorenzo (ed.), *Actas do XIX Congreso Internacional de Lingüística e Filoloxía Románicas*, vol. 6. A Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 207-21.
- Mariño Paz, R. (1998). *Historia da lingua galega*. Santiago de Compostela: Sotelo



Blanco.

- Martínez Celdrán, E. (1984). *Fonética*. Barcelona: Teide.
- Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, L. & J. Milroy (1991[1985]). *Authority in Language*. London: Routledge.
- Milroy, J. (1992). *Linguistic Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- O'Flanagan, P. (1996). *Xeografía histórica de Galicia*. Vigo: Xerais.
- Payrató, Ll. (1985). *La interferència lingüística. Comentaris i exemples català-castellà*, Barcelona: Curial Edicions Catalanes & Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- Pensado, J.L. (1970). "Interferencias estructurales castellano-gallegas: el problema de la geadá y sus causas". *Revista de Filología Española* 53, 27-44.
- Pensado, J.L. & C. Pensado Ruiz (1983). "Gueada" y "geada" gallegas (= *Verba*, *Anuario Galego de Filoloxía*. Anexo 21). Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Pérez García, J.M. (1996). "Idade Moderna". In X.M. Vázquez Varela et alii, *Nova Historia de Galicia*. A Coruña: Tambre, 237-352.
- Prieto Alonso, D. (1980). "Algunhas hipóteses sobre a geadá". *Verba* 7, 223-42.
- Rabanal Álvarez, M. (1958). "Rasgos de sustrato de la lengua gallega". In *Homaxe a Ramón Otero Pedrayo. No LXX Aniversario do seu nacemento*. Vigo: Galaxia, 199-217.
- Recalde Fernández, M. (1994). "Gheada e situación". *Verba* 21, 339-67.
- Recalde, M. (1995). "Unha aproximación ás actitudes e prexuízos cara á *gheada* (dos alumnos de 2º de BUP de catro centros galegos)". *Cadernos de Lingua* 12, 5-31.
- Rey Castelao, O. (1998). *A Galicia clásica e barroca*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Ryan, E.B. (1979). "Why do low-prestige language varieties persist?". In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (eds.), *Language and Social Psychology*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press, 145-57.
- Saavedra, P. (1989). "Industria textil rural e cambios demográficos na Galicia cantábrica". *Grial* 102, 237-57.
- Saavedra, P. (1991). *A Galicia do Antigo Réxime. Economía e sociedade*. In M.M. Pérez Negreira (dir.), *Galicia. Historia. Obra completa*, tomo III. A Coruña: Hércules de Ediciones.
- Saavedra, P. (1992). *A vida cotiá en Galicia de 1550 a 1850*. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Santamarina, A. (1980). "Novas consideracións arredor das orixes da *gheada*". *Verba* 7, 243-49.
- Santamarina, A. (1982). "Dialectoloxía galega: historia e resultados". In D. Kremer & R. Lorenzo (eds.), *Tradición, actualidade e futuro do galego. Actas do coloquio de Tréveris*. Santiago de Compostela: Consellería de Cultura, Xunta

- de Galicia, 153-87.
- Schroten, J. (1980). "Interpretación de la geadá gallega". *Verba* 7, 209-22.
- Siguan, M. (2001). *Bilingüismo y lenguas en contacto*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic Purism*. London: Longman.
- Tollefson, J.W. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality. Language Policy in the Community*. New York: Longman.
- Trudgill, P. (1972). "Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich". *Language in Society* 1, 179-95.
- Valladares, M. (1970[1892]). *Elementos de Gramática Gallega*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Villares Paz, R. (1996). "Idade Contemporánea". In X.M. Vázquez Varela et al., *Nova historia de Galicia*. A Coruña: Tambre, 355-447.
- Vogt, H. (1954). "Language contacts". *Word* 10(1), 365-74.
- Weinreich, U. (1968[1953]). *Language in Contact. Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Woolard, K. & B. Schieffelin (1994). "Language Ideology". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55-82.
- Zamora Vicente, A. (1986[1952]). "La frontera de la geadá". In *Estudios de dialectología hispánica* (= *Verba, Anuario Galego de Filoloxía*. Anexo 25). Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 11-26.