

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

Spanish in contact with Galician

1. Introduction
2. Studies on language contact in Galicia
3. Spanish in contact with Galician
4. Conclusion

Abstract

This chapter deals with the effects of language contact in Galicia and focuses on the usage of speakers with Spanish as L1. In the light of recent empirically based work and of new insights based on corpus analysis, it critically examines the phonetic, grammatical and lexical phenomena that are generally considered to be characteristic of Galician Spanish. From this overview, a new picture of language contact in Galicia emerges, in which the internal variation of Galician Spanish converges with that of Galician, in a linguistic continuum that involves complex linguistic practices. This approach opens promising perspectives for future research into linguistic contact in Galicia.

1. Introduction

The contact between Spanish and Galician has a history of more than five centuries. Spanish began to enter Galicia at the end of the 15th century, but for several centuries it remained mainly the language of the nobility, while the vast majority of the population continued to speak Galician (Mariño 1998: 201–230; 2017). From the 18th century onwards, Spanish has become dominant in the cities (Ferrol, A Coruña, Vigo) and since 1960 it has spread rapidly in Galician society, which has undergone an accelerated process of urbanization and tertiarisation. Nowadays, Galicia is no longer a rural country (only 6.1% of the working population is dedicated to the primary sector, cf. IGE 2021) and in the new generations Spanish is already the majority language compared to Galician: in 2018, 49.5% of the population between 5 and 14 years claimed to have Spanish as their first language and 29.21% both Spanish and Galician (IGE 2018).

At the same time, in recent decades a process of linguistic normalization of Galician has taken place (Monteagudo & Bouzada 2002), which is now the official language of Galicia, together with Castilian, and occupies social and symbolic spaces that were previously exclusive to Spanish. Whereas before 1980 Galician and Castilian were defined through relatively clear-cut divisions such as rural/urban or lower

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

class/middle (and upper) class, now the divisions are more complex: Spanish extends to the urban lower classes, while Galician also appears in middle class groups (but cf. Recalde 2021 on anti-rural prejudices and indexicality in the process of standardization).

This situation gave impetus to sociolinguistic studies on bilingualism in Galicia and the effects of the contact of Spanish on Galician, but the influence of Galician on the linguistic characteristics of Galician Spanish hardly attracted the attention of researchers until recent times. The reasons for this neglect can be found both in the philological orientation of traditional dialectology and in the dominant linguistic ideology of much of the 20th century in Spain, which did not recognize the varieties of Spanish in territories with their own language as objects of research in their own right, as they were seen as “deformations” of the idealized Castilian model. These conditions also limited the research into authentic resources necessary for their linguistic description.

In the limited space of this chapter it is not possible to provide a general description of the contact phenomena in Galician Spanish in all types of sociolinguistic situations. As Rojo (2004: 1090–1091) pointed out, it is worth distinguishing between the language (or interlanguage) used by native Galician speakers, with the occasional individual interferences typical of the acquisition process, and the language spoken by the part of the population that has Spanish as L1 and which presents regular socially shared patterns. In this paper we will pay particular attention to the linguistic uses of speakers of Spanish as L1, which we conventionally call “Galician Spanish” (henceforth GS). Accordingly, our focus is not on the linguistic code, understood as an autonomous entity, but on the agency of the speakers (Parish & Hall 2020), who manage partially different linguistic repertoires in order to achieve their communicative (or other) goals in social interaction (Blommaert 2010; Pennycook, 2010). This view is consistent with the fact that the available data point to the existence of inter- and intra-speaker variation within GS. In the different sections, reference will be made to this variation where we have sufficient empirical support.

First of all, we will summarise the current state of work on GS and contact with Galician (Section 2), then we will focus on the description of the most important and interesting contact phenomena (Section 3) and we will end with a conclusion (Section 4).

2. Studies on language contact in Galicia

The first works on the contact of Spanish with Galician adopt a normative approach centred on the identification of “Galicianisms”, conceived as idiosyncratic features which deviate from the prestige (Castilian) norm and are fundamentally due to

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

“interferences” from Galician, and which, according to the prescriptivist view of usage, should be avoided.

As Recalde (2012: 668–669) points out, the variety of Spanish spoken in Galicia has historically been neglected by both Hispanic dialectology and sociolinguistics, as it is considered a non-authentic variety of Spanish, with interferences from Galician. The scarcity of studies on the contact phenomena identified in the GS has only begun to be alleviated in recent years. Another limitation has been the weak empirical basis of the descriptions offered by both the first publications on the subject in the 19th century, conceived as manuals of “linguistic urbanity” (Fernández Salgado 2007: 768), and the academic works in the field of Spanish dialectology (Cotarelo 1927; Rabanal 1967; Abuín 1971). In both cases, the main primary source of information was the author’s direct observation of usage, an intuitive procedure which is insufficient as a method of accessing the data.

During the last few decades, several studies based on actual language use have been carried out (cf. Álvarez Cáccamo 1983; Acín 1996), but it was not until the 21st century that the first systematic research using corpus data was published (cf. Pollán 2001). More recently, there has been a considerable increase in empirical work on GS. Studies on intonation (Pérez Castillejo 2012, 2014) and on the pronunciation of stressed and unstressed pretonic vowels (Fuente 2020, Fuente & Pérez Castillejo 2020; Regueira & Fernández Rei 2020) stand out. Attention has also been paid to the grammatical level, especially to the verb system (Rojo & Vázquez Rozas 2014; Vázquez Rozas 2020; Azpiazu 2021), but also to some other aspects (such as the epistemic expression *si cuadra*, in Rodríguez Espiñeira 2019, and clitic doubling, in Sanromán Vilas 2021). The perceptions and attitudes of speakers about some aspects of the GS were also studied (Loureiro Rodríguez et al. 2013; Azpiazu 2017; Anderson 2020). Recalde (2023) presents a recent evaluation of the studies on language contact in Galicia.

In general, the publications focusing on the sociolinguistic changes that have taken place in Galicia in recent times have identified varieties both within Galician and GS. Thus, Álvarez Cáccamo (1989) proposes a linguistic continuum from standard Galician to the “standard Spanish of Galicia”, and between these limits would be located non-standard varieties, as well as an “interfered Galician” and an *espanhol acastropado* (Spanish mixed with Galician) (1989: 284). Monteagudo & Santamarina (1993: 145) distinguish “Standard Castilian” from “Regional Castilian” (which would be parallel to “Standard Galician” and “Popular Galician”). As opposed to the Standard Castilian, a minority variety which is not very influenced by Galician, the “Regional Castilian” would be the most widespread variety and would present “interference from Galician, especially in phonetics and morphology” (1993: 146).

In an article on “Galician sociolects”, Dubert (2002: 25) defends the existence of two linguistic continua, one of Galician varieties and another one of Castilian varieties. The normative languages would act as roof varieties, and in which acrolects (of higher prestige) and basilects (of lower prestige) are distinguished. This proposal assumes that Galician and Spanish are clearly delimited in linguistic uses in Galicia. However, Regueira (2019) shows that, at least in phonetics, there is a remarkable continuity between different modalities of Galician and Spanish spoken in Galicia, without there being a clear divide between one variety and another; this phonetic continuum would have popular (rural) Galician and standard Castilian Spanish as opposite ends (cf. also Regueira & Fernández Rei 2020). Possibly this continuum can also be traced in other areas of grammar and lexicon.

3. Spanish in contact with Galician

As is well known, Romance varieties form a linguistic continuum across the north of the Iberian Peninsula, from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean, from which different languages (Galician, Portuguese, Asturleonese, Castilian, Aragonese and Catalan) emerged. In this context, it is problematic to determine which linguistic elements are due to language contact and which may be due to internal processes (Pat-El 2013). In GS studies, an educated formal variety of Castilian is usually taken as a benchmark, and from this comparison the most obvious conclusion to be drawn is that anything that deviates from this standard is due to some kind of interference. However, some of these grammatical or lexical elements are also present in other non-standard varieties of Spanish, and therefore it is debatable whether they can be attributed to language contact without further evidence.

3.1. Phonetics

Phonetics is undoubtedly one of the distinctive features of Galician Spanish, especially the intonation and the contrast between high and low mid vowels /ε/-/e/ and /ɔ/-/o/ (Cotarelo 1927: 84–85; Rabanal 1967: 20–21; Abuín 1971: 171–182; Rojo 2004: 1093). It is generally understood that the phonetics of GS basically matches that of Galician. However, Porto Dapena (2001: § 5) points out that this situation is changing, as the older generations distinguish and produce these vowel contrasts, but the younger generations ‘display serious difficulties in distinguishing between open and closed with regard to both *e* and *o*’.

Recent empirical work confirms Porto Dapena's impressions. We do not believe that the perceptions of the different authors were mistaken, but rather that changes in GS during the last couple of decades led to increasing phonetic variation. In Regueira & Fernández Rei (2020) six informants with different sociolinguistic profiles were observed, but none showed contrasts between the low and high mid vowels /ε/-/e/

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

and /ɔ/-/o/. This is in line with the results of research into Galician vowels, such as those of Amengual & Chamorro (2015), Tomé (2018) and Mayr et al. (2019), who find that Spanish dominant speakers failed to distinguish between the mid vowels /ɛ/-/e/ and /ɔ/-/o/ when speaking Galician. Although these studies refer to Galician speech, they allow for conclusions about the vocalism of Spanish spoken in Galician cities.

Moreover, the results of Mayr et al. (2019) show that not even Galician dominant speakers present contrasts between the medial vowels, so that “the Spanish vowels overlapped acoustically with their Galician counterparts” in both bilingual and monolingual productions in Spanish and Galician. The authors suggest that there is “assimilation of Galician vowels to Spanish categories, and hence cross-linguistic transfer, in line with models of bilingual speech development” (2019: 14), which is a mirror image of what is reflected in the works indicating a transfer of the phonological system from Galician to Spanish (e.g., Cotarelo 1927: 84). This allows us to infer GS has changed and that the transfer of the five-vowel system from Spanish to Galician is now attested in urban environments, which would explain the existence of a phonetic continuum between the different varieties of Galician and Spanish in Galicia.

However, we should be cautious in making generalisations. Mayr et al. (2019) work with speakers from the city of Vigo, Amengual & Chamorro (2015) from Vigo and Santiago, but Fuente (2020) shows a partially different situation in a medium-sized town (Noia, A Coruña). Fuente finds a variety of GS in which Galician mid vowels still occur in stressed position, but also a minority variety in which stressed contrasts have been neutralised (cf. also Fuente & Pérez Castillejo 2020). These two varieties are related to linguistic dominance of Galician or Spanish, level of education, and occupation.

Final unstressed vowels seem to behave differently, although only the studies by Tomé (2018) and Regueira & Fernández Rei (2020) take this variable into account. Some previous studies mentioned the more closed character of the final vowels, especially in the case of the back vowel (e.g., Rojo 2004: 1094). The results of Tomé (2018) show that “new speakers” (Spanish native speakers speaking Galician in urban environments) do not produce the seven stressed Galician vowels, but their final vowels resemble those of Galician dominant speakers. Regueira & Fernández Rei (2020) show that Spanish dominant speakers from medium-sized towns also have Galician-like final vowels and only one speaker from Vigo produces unstressed final vowels similar to those of standard Castilian Spanish.

As mentioned above, intonation is one of the most notorious features (e.g., Rojo 2004: 1093). Pérez Castillejo (2012, 2014) shows the presence of the most common intonational pattern in Galician yes/no questions (which could be described as H+ L* L%) in speakers with a high exposure to Galician, which the author interprets as ‘a

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

feature that originates from contact with Galician, but which is already integrated in the speech of those who have learned Galician Spanish as L1' (Pérez Castillejo 2014: 223). This pattern has even been found in urban speakers whose pronunciation is very close to standard Castilian Spanish (Regueira & Fernández Rei 2020: 345–346). Mixed intonations are also recorded in some cases, combining intonational contours typical of standard Castilian with Galician contours, as occurs in certain cases of *wh*-questions (Regueira & Fernández Rei 2020: 349). These cases of hybridisation could be understood as elements of Britain's (2010) 'interdialect'.

The use of distinctive phonetic features of Galician Spanish is generally associated with identity-related linguistic practices (Tomé 2018; Tomé & Evans 2018; de la Fuente 2020, Regueira & Fernández Rei 2020). As Recalde (2012) points out, this type of elements constitutes marks of local prestige, identity and belonging, and the conclusions of all the empirical studies corroborate and reinforce this idea.

3.2. Grammar

The delimitation between contact phenomena and endogenous phenomena in GS is no mean feat, especially due to the lack of systematic diachronic studies of the documentary sources of Spanish in the Galician territory. The identification and description of the syntactic features of the GS must therefore be based on a comparison of its current use with that of other varieties of Spanish. For this purpose, we have at our disposal the ESLORA corpus of oral Spanish (768,005 words), made up of interviews and conversations with Galician speakers recorded between 2007 and 2015 (Vázquez Rozas et al. 2020). Another useful resource to further the descriptions of some constructions is the information extracted from a subcorpus of esTenTen18 elaborated in Sketch Engine with the electronic editions of the newspapers *Faro de Vigo*, *La Voz de Galicia* and *El Correo Gallego* (23,783,478 words).

In order to broaden the basis for comparison of the description beyond the standard Castilian norm, we used CORPES XXI and COSER. These two corpora contain samples of geographical variation and oral materials which provide more spontaneous usage, less conditioned by the linguistic norm, as well as instances of non-standard variation which are considered dialectal or even vulgar from the prescriptive perspective.

The analysis of the corpus data allows us not only to determine the presence or absence of the constructions attributed to the GS in the different textual resources, but also to observe the differences in frequency and distribution indicative of different functional values of the elements. This section also includes references to the attested use in Galician of some of the constructions examined, particularly in the TILG and CORGA corpora.

The most characteristic grammatical phenomena are related to verbal constructions, particularly to the uses and values of some forms of the verbal paradigm (to be illustrated with the verb *cantar* ‘sing’) and to periphrases.

3.2.1. *He cantado* vs. *canté*

In the descriptions of the GS, the tendency to use simple verb forms to the detriment of compound forms is generally attributed to contact with Galician. Different scholars – e.g. Rabanal 1967: 35–36, Rojo 2004: 1095, Veiga 2019: § 2.3 – draw attention to the scarce or even non-existent use of *he cantado* (present perfect) as opposed to the predominance of *canté* (preterite), which, in addition to the past tense values common to other varieties, expresses immediate anteriority and present relevance as well:

- (1) *aún no fuimos a mirar nada.* (ESLORA)
We haven't gone [lit. didn't go] to look at anything yet.'

The absence of functional opposition between *canté* and *he cantado* and the generalisation of *canté* corresponds to what Veiga (2019: § 2.3) calls the “B1 variety”, a classification that the GS shares with the Río de la Plata variety. The data collected in Table 1 show the differences in the distribution of the forms according to the area and the concomitances between Galicia and the Río de la Plata in the predominance of the simple form.

	<i>he cantado</i>		<i>canté</i>	
	Total frequency	Frequency /million words	Total frequency	Frequency /million words
ESLORA (Galicia)	626	916	15 830	23 155
CORPES (España)	30 740	8597	29 675	8299
CORPES (Mexico & Central America)	1080	4839	2999	13 438
CORPES (Río de la Plata)	290	2952	2307	23 490

Table 1. Total and mean frequencies per million words of *he cantado* and *canté*. Sources: ESLORA (informants only). CORPES: Oral.

On the other hand, Table 1 also shows that speakers of GS sometimes use the compound form, although the distribution of its use in ESLORA reveals a great deal of individual variation that needs further research that would have to consider the sociolinguistic biography of the informants.

In the references to the use of the perfect by Galician speakers, it is commonplace to underline its ‘improper’ use (by hypercorrection) in contexts which do not correspond to the values proper to Castilian (cf. Álvarez Giménez 1870: 56–59; Cotarelo 1928: 94; Rabanal 1967: 35–36; Acín 1996: 270; Rojo 2004: 1095; Klee & Lynch 2009: 72–73). However, the current usage data collected in ESLORA indicate that in most cases the compound form expresses present continuity or has an “experiential” meaning:

- (2) *sí sí / además a mí siempre me **ha gustado** mucho // eeh pues las el la / las plantas / los árboles / los animales.* (ESLORA)

‘Yes yes. Besides, I have always been very fond of plants, trees, animals.’

In this regard, Azpiazu (2021) conducts a detailed analysis of the ESLORA interview subcorpus and concludes that 95.3% of the occurrences of *he cantado* correspond to an “indeterminate” temporal context. On the other hand, her qualitative analysis of the functioning of the perfect versus the preterit confirms the similarities of the use of these forms in GS and Río de la Plata Spanish as type B1 varieties.

3.2.2. *Cantara / cantase / había cantado*

In standard Spanish *cantara / cantase* are synonymous forms of the past subjunctive. But in GS, like in Galician, the *-ra* form maintains its etymological pluperfect indicative value of the Latin *cantaveram* (cf. e.g. Álvarez Giménez 1870: 60–62; Rabanal 1967: 39–40; Rojo 2004: 1095–1096). Although the normative recommendation for Spanish is to avoid such usage, it occurs in both spoken and written GS:

- (3) *Se llegó a decir que **estuviera** de incógnito en Coruña practicando la pesca submarina.* (ESLORA)

‘It was even said that he had been incognito in Coruña, practising spearfishing.’

The standard Castilian form corresponding to *estuviera* in (3) is *había estado*. On the other hand, *viniera* in (4) does not correspond to the standard value of the analytic form, but it expresses a temporal relation of primary anteriority, i.e., it is equivalent here to *vino* ‘he came’, the preterite.

- (4) *mmm en ese viaje **viniera** [...] uno de los responsables de aquí de de de Turgalicia.* (ESLORA)

‘One of the people in charge of Turgalicia came on this trip.’

In GS there is sometimes a transfer of these values of *cantara* to *había cantado*: the analytic form has both the standard pluperfect use and a preterite value not found in other varieties:

- (5) [the interviewer asks about an excursion that the interviewee remembers from their school years]

I: *mmm bueno en / sí en octavo de EGB **habíamos ido** a / a Navarra a esquiar con los / con los compañeros de clase y los profesores.* (ESLORA)

‘mmm well in / yes in eighth grade we went [lit. had gone] to / to Navarra to ski with / with our classmates and teachers.’

Pollán (2001) presents a corpus analysis of the three forms that can express preterite in GS, i.e., *canté*, *cantara*, *había cantado*, and concludes that the choice of *cantara* and *había cantado*, as opposed to *canté*, marks a lower informative relevance of the events referred to. As for the ‘innovative’ use of *había cantado* as preterite or imperfect, he considers it to be a case of hypercorrection due to the prescriptive rejection of the form *cantara* with a non-standard value (Pollán 2001: 62). Rojo & Vázquez Rozas (2014) and Vázquez Rozas (2020), based on ESLORA data, analyse the function and sociolinguistic distribution of *había cantado* and *cantara*. The study finds that the (self-)censorship affecting the use of the indicative use of *cantara* among more educated speakers not only triggers an increasing use and semantic extension of *había cantado*, but also results in a preference for the subjunctive *cantase*, a form that speakers associate with linguistic correctness and prestige (cf. Anderson 2020).

3.2.3. Verbal periphrases

Some periphrastic verb structures show a different functioning from that described in other varieties of Spanish. In the literature, the peculiarities of certain constructions with formally similar constituents in both languages are attributed to the influence of Galician: *tener* ‘have’, *llevar* ‘take’ + participle, *haber de* ‘have to’, *estar a* ‘be to’, *andar a* ‘walk to’, *seguir a* ‘keep on’, *ir (a)* ‘go (to)’ + infinitive (cf. Álvarez Cáccamo 1983; Acín 1996: 273; Rojo 2004: 1096). In the first publications on the use of Spanish by Galician speakers, the comments on the periphrases are limited to pointing out the “incorrectness” of the use of *ir* + infinitive instead of the normative *ir a* + infinitive, and *estar*, *andar*, *seguir a* + infinitive instead of *estar*, *andar*, *seguir* + gerund (Álvarez Giménez 1870: 65, 69; Cotarelo 1928: 97, 99). However, in none of these initial contributions is there any reference to two other frequently used periphrases: *tener* and *dar* + participle.

Tener + participle (agreeing with the direct object) is identified in Spanish grammar as a periphrasis with a resultative or perfect meaning (*Lo tenemos controlado* ‘it’s all under control’ [lit. we have it controlled]) or of reiteration and insistence (*Te lo tengo dicho* ‘I told you that before’ [lit. I have it told to you]) (NGLE § 28.16 l-p). In contrast to more grammaticalized periphrases, this is a construction restricted to transitive verbs with agentive subjects, which is difficult to delimit from non-periphrastic readings (cf. Olbertz 1998: 305–314). The NGLÉ also reports a non-agreeing variant in Asturias and ‘other areas of western peninsular Spain’ and occasionally in popular Yucatecan Spanish (§ 28.16 l).

Corpus data confirm the scarce presence of the non-agreeing construction elsewhere in contrast to the vitality it shows in the GS:

- (6) *mi hermana / la tiene esperado mi madre [...]*. (ESLORA)
‘My sister, my mum has waited for her’).

The advance in the grammaticalization of the periphrasis that accompanies the extension of the non-concordant construction is also manifested in the increase in the frequency of *tener* + participle (token frequency). In ESLORA its mean frequency is 306/million, whereas in the oral part of CORPES (Spain) it drops to 152/million (excluding tokens from ESLORA). Furthermore, the construction in GS occurs with a high number of different verbs (type frequency), i.e., 90, whereas in other regions there is a tendency to lexicalization or fixation with a very limited set of verbs of perception, intention and saying. Finally, the Galician variant of the periphrasis is not restricted to transitive verbs, but extends to intransitive verbs (7), impersonal constructions (8), and non-verbal predicates (9).

- (7) *yo me **tengo ido** a tomar cañas / con con mi ex por ahí.* (ESLORA)
'I've been out and about for a drink with my ex there.'
- (8) *incluso pues / eh ibas a coger el coche y ha habi- hu- **tiene habido** accidentes.* (ESLORA)
'Even though you were going to take the car and [stammering] there have been accidents.'
- (9) *y lleva trabajando desde los dieciséis // nunca cogió una baja [...] **tiene estado** enfermo pero iba igual.* (ESLORA)
'And he has been working since he was sixteen // he never took a sick leave [...] he has been sick but he went anyway.'

The comparison of the results of ESLORA with those of *ter* 'have' + participle in the oral part of CORGA shows a similarity between GS and Galician both in frequency (in CORGA: 276/million) and in the syntactic features of the construction, parallel to those exemplified in (7)-(9).

Llevar + participle, a resultative periphrasis with a component of reiteration or continuity, also shows features of a more advanced grammaticalization in the GS than in other dialects, in parallel with the Galician periphrasis *levar* + participle, which has a higher relative frequency than the Spanish one (with masculine singular participles there are 16/million tokens in the Galician CORGA corpus as opposed to 7.86/million in the Spanish CORPES). In line with these data, the Galician periphrasis presents syntactic possibilities and semantic values which are also documented in the GS corpora, but not included in the grammatical descriptions of Spanish (cf. NGLÉ § 28.16qr). The NGLÉ does not mention the construction with participles of intransitive verbs and recommends avoiding the non-agreeing variant with transitive verbs, but both are common in GS:

- (10) *Más de 1500 personas **llevan pasado** por esta nave desde el 18 de diciembre.* (esTenTen18, lavozdeg Galicia.es)
'More than 1,500 people have been through this hall since 18th December.'
- (11) *una de las clasificaciones que establezco respecto de los países que **llevo visitado** está hecha a partir de la calidad de sus mariscos.* (esTenTen18, elcorreogallego.es)
'One of the classifications I make of the countries I have visited is based on the quality of their seafood.'

Llevar + participle has, therefore, in GS a behaviour similar to *tener* + participle, in parallel with that of Galician *levar* + participle and *ter* + participle. Both periphrases show more features of grammaticalization in GS than in other dialects.

Like the previous ones, *dar* + participle is a periphrasis characteristic of GS, also used in Galician (Rojo 1974: 133; Álvarez Cáccamo 1983: 436). It is described as a perfect periphrasis which, in its prototypical use of negative polarity, expresses the inability of an agent to reach the culmination of the event despite her/his will to achieve it. The construction therefore also has a modal value related to the notions of ability and possibility. As Recalde (2012: 670, 674) demonstrates, the speakers themselves are aware of the particular communicative function of the periphrasis.

Dar + participle is documented in both spoken and written language. In the ESLORA corpus the relative frequency is 39/million, but the low absolute frequency (29 cases) does not allow us to identify any sociolinguistic trends. In the newspaper corpus the frequency is lower (1.6/million; 39 tokens), but its mere presence indicates the common use of the construction. The periphrasis is only attested with the non-agreeing participle, both in transitive (12), intransitive (13), impersonal (14) and reflexive passive (15) clauses.

- (12) *[yo] no **daba encontrado** la facultad.* (ESLORA)
'I couldn't find the faculty.'
- (13) *sí que vas a **dar aparcado** // fijo.* (ESLORA)
'I'm sure you'll manage to get parked.'
- (14) *no se **da circulado** por las carreteras porque están llenas de baches.*
(esTenTen18. farodevigo.es)
'You can't drive on the roads because they are full of potholes.'
- (15) *[...] porque nunca se **daba creado** la plaza esa.* (ESLORA)
'[...] because the post never comes about.'

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

The grammaticalization of the periphrasis is also evident in its use with non-agentive and non-animate subjects, as in (16), although it mostly appears in clauses that include a human agent, either explicit or implicit.

(16) *¡Quedan tres horas! 180 minutos que no **dan pasado**.* (esTenTen18, farodevigo.es)

‘Three hours left! 180 minutes that just won’t go by.’

The lexical diversity of the participles is further proof of the vitality and productivity of the periphrasis: the 29 occurrences of ESLORA correspond to 24 different verbs.

Moreover, although negative contexts are the most frequent, there are also affirmative uses, such as (13), which also indicate the generalisation of the construction.

References to this construction in GS highlight the absence of the periphrasis in other areas of Spanish (Rojo 2004: 1096; Porto Dapena 2001: § 6) and regard it as a semantic calque of the Galician construction (Álvarez Cáccamo 1983: 436). Contemporary corpora seem to confirm the “Galicianness” of the construction, since while in CORGA the combination *dar* + participle is quite common (33/million), in the CORPES materials from Spain, leaving aside the ESLORA records, only two cases are documented, both in texts related to Galicia. However, it is possible that the periphrasis is of relatively recent diffusion in Galician and that its use in GS also has its roots in the diachrony of Spanish itself. Unlike what we saw in GS corpus data, loss of agreement of the participle is not complete in CORGA, which includes some agreement cases. It should also be noted that there are no cases in TILG until the last third of the 19th century and that there is a limited progress over the following decades.

On the other hand, diachronic corpora of Spanish contain cases of *dar* + agreeing participle from the 14th century onward, which increase between the 15th and 16th centuries due to its recurrent use in contracts for the execution of works. The performative function of these texts favours expressions of obligation and commitment which may have contributed to the semantic configuration of the modern periphrasis:

(17) *Martín de Tapia **esta obligado a dar acabado** el dicho retablo y **puesto** en el dicho lugar de Xulve y para el dicho día de Sanc Mateo.* (CDH 1569).

‘Martín de Tapia is made to have the said altarpiece finished and put in the said place of Xulve and for the said day of Sanc Mateo.’

Finally, it should be noted that the construction *dar* + participle is not entirely unknown in Portuguese, although it is not part of the current standard language. In the Algarve, the construction with agreeing participles is found in transitive clauses (cf. Gonçalves 1996: 197).

To sum up, the data examined question the generally assumed hypothesis that the use of *dar* + participle in GS is necessarily and exclusively due to the influence of Galician. Considering the diachronic trajectory revealed by the Spanish corpora, it is conceivable that the construction was maintained in the use of the Spanish-speaking minority from its use in the contractual language and that over time it consolidated its periphrastic character until it reached its current state of total grammaticalization. Hopefully, future research into the Spanish documentation from Galicia will help to clear up the incognita outlined here.

Other periphrases mentioned in the literature as examples of the impact of Galician syntax in GS are the constructions of imperfective aspectual value *estar* ‘be’ / *andar* ‘walk’ / *seguir* ‘keep’ + *a* ‘to’ + infinitive, instead of the corresponding gerund periphrases in standard Spanish (Rabanal 1967: 46; Álvarez Cáccamo 1983: 437–438). However, GS corpora offer virtually no instances of such combinations (we found just a single token of *seguir* + *a* + infinitive in esTenTen18).

Likewise, neither in ESLORA nor in the journalistic corpus are there any cases of the preterite of *haber* (*de*) + infinitive with the sense of ‘to be about to’ + infinitive, cited among the most characteristic Galician idioms of GS in Rabanal (1967: 41–42), Rojo (1974: 100; 2004: 1096) and Klee & Lynch (2009: 75), although it should be noted that TILG does not document many cases in Galician either.

The prospective aspect and (near)future periphrasis *ir* + infinitive coincides with the most common form in Galician. In GS the combination is attested in ESLORA as a variant of the standard *ir a* + infinitive and with similar values. In ESLORA the distribution of uses is 106 non-prepositional (4.2%) as opposed to 2408 with the preposition, while in the oral CORGA there are 440 non-prepositional cases (76.2%) as opposed to 136 with preposition. Even recognising its possible origin in language contact, the absence of preposition is not an exclusive property of the Spanish spoken in Galicia. A search in COSER results in 177 cases of *ir* + infinitive (3.3%), spread over practically the whole of Spain, against 5112 tokens of *ir a* + infinitive.

From this section we can conclude that the verbal forms and periphrastic constructions constitute a touchstone for understanding the different conditions of the phenomena of contact between Galician and Spanish. The corpora allow us to identify differences and similarities in the frequency, distribution and functions of the forms and periphrases generally considered to be characteristic of GS. The data show that contrasts between languages and varieties, when they exist, are not categorical but gradual, and that gradualness and variation are also present in individual usage.

3.2.4. Verb syntax and argument structure

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

As for the influence that the syntactic constructions of Galician verbs have in GS, the use of the non-reflexive verb form instead of the inherently reflexive form, typical of the Castilian standard, stands out (cf. Acín 1996: 274; Rojo 2004: 1097). In ESLORA there are constructions with non-reflexive verbs such as *marchar* 'leave' (18), *casar* 'get married' (19), *romper* 'break', *secar* 'dry', which are not attested in other varieties, although the reflexive variants are dominant in GS' corpora.

(18) *tenía [...] tres cuatro años o así / y marché de Betanzos.* (ESLORA)

'I was [...] three four years old or so / and I left Betanzos.'

(19) *con la chica esa //[...] no iba a casar.* (ESLORA)

'With that girl //[...] I wasn't going to get married.'

On the other hand, non-reflexive constructions with a direct object referring to body parts are relatively frequent in ESLORA.

(20) *me caí / rompí la rodilla.* (ESLORA)

'I fell / I broke my knee.'

There are two other structures with pronominal clitics generally considered to be typical of GS: one that encodes as accusative the single argument of the intransitive verbs *estar* 'be' and *venir* 'come' (*ahí la viene* 'there she comes'; *aquí la está* 'here she is'), and the other is the construction of an agreeing clitic in predicative function with verbs such as *ser* 'be' and *parecer* 'seem', instead of neutral *lo* 'it'. None of them is attested in the corpus of Galician newspapers and only the second one occurs once in ESLORA, which indicates that, as an idiosyncratic construction of GS, it is disappearing.

Finally, with regard to pronominal constructions, the descriptions of GS mention the extensive use of the ethical dative, a tendency often linked to its frequency in Galician (Álvarez Giménez 1970: 71–72; Rabanal 1967: 46–47; Rojo 2004: 1097). Although the construction is not specific to GS, it is certainly more widely used in this variety than in other varieties of Spanish:

(21) *nosotros / lo teníamos todo montado lo monté yo <silencio/> y te llevábamos de aquí alquilado ya el coche.* (ESLORA)

'We / had it all set up I set it up myself <silence/> and we were taking from here already rented the car.' (ESLORA).

It has been claimed that some verbs in GS occur in constructions that are more similar to their Galician counterparts than to the Castilian norm: e.g., verbs that are transitive in the standard, are constructed with prepositional/oblique objects, such as *llamar por* 'call [someone]', *esperar por* 'wait [for someone]', *tirar con* 'throw [something]', which alternate with transitive forms, and the goal of movement verbs of displacement, especially *ir* 'go' is marked with *en* 'in' instead of standard *a* 'to'.

Ir en [destination] and *llamar por* [someone] are not attested in ESLORA, and there are just two tokens of *llamar por* in the newspaper corpus. However, the latter construction is also found in the dialect of the Canary Islands (COSER). Both *esperar por* and *tirar con* occur both in ESLORA and in the journalistic corpus, which indicates a more general use. When examining their use in other varieties of Spanish, remarkable differences can be observed: while *tirar con* is practically inexistent outside Galicia, *esperar por* is found in Asturias and the Canary Islands (COSER), and in CORPES it occurs in all varieties, both in Europe and in America, particularly in the Antilles.

3.2.5. A note on non-verbal categories

As for other word classes, reference should be made to the suffix *-iño* as a diminutive characteristic of Galician and GS, regarded even as a stereotypical mark of this variety by speakers from other areas. The ESLORA data confirm its widespread use, but, comparing *-iño* with *-ito*, the Galician form is less frequent: 92/million of *-iño* as opposed to 1807/million of *-ito*.

	women	men	1ary	2ary	3ary	19-34	35-54	>55	Interview	Conversation	T
<i>-ito</i>	1934	1610	2011	1991	1597	1623	2215	1631	1857	1522	1807
<i>-iño</i>	105	71	146	38	90	56	96	132	102	35	92

Table 2. Mean frequency (/million words) of *-ito* and *-iño* according to sex, level of education, age group and genre. Source: ESLORA.

The sociolinguistic distribution of the use of the two forms is also different. Both are more frequent in the speech of women than of men, and more frequent in interviews than in conversations. On the other hand, the distribution varies according to sociolect and age: *-iño* is preferred by speakers with primary education and by older speakers, while there are no marked trends in the use of *-ito*. There is also a notable contrast in the number of different lemmas with which both suffixes are combined: *-ito* is recorded in ESLORA with 353 different lemmas and *-iño* with only 31. In the corpus we have forms such as *bueniño* ‘good’, *gentiña* ‘people’, *hambriña* ‘hambre’, *hijiño* ‘son’, *maliño* ‘bad’ or ‘sick’, *mujeriña* ‘woman’, *listiña* ‘clever’, *puertiña* ‘door’. In some cases the same lemma is also found with *-ito* (*hijito* ‘son’, *malito* ‘sick’), but in others the change of suffix does not seem appropriate, even out of context: ?? *gentecita*, ?? *hambrecita*, ?? *listita*. These restrictions indicate a functional specialisation of the form *-iño*, which is preferably associated with interactive pragmatic values (affective or polite depending on the relationship between the interlocutors and the context).

(22)-(24) illustrate the pragmatic function of *-iño*, not only with vocatives (22), but also in imperative (23) and exclamative (24) sentences. Note that the commutation by *-ito* would be odd:

- (22) *mira que subir todas esas escaleras filliña <risa/>* (ESLORA).
‘Look, climbing all those stairs, my dear <laugh/>.’
- (23) [the speaker addresses her granddaughter] *ciérrame la puertiña cuando salgas*. (ESLORA)
‘Close the door for me when you go out.’
- (24) *qué listiña eres <risa/>* (ESLORA)
‘What a smart girl you are <laugh/>’

In the list of possible Galician-Spanish contact phenomena, there is also the use of *mismo* as a focus particle with the sense of ‘even’, as in (25), not included in the NGLÉ description of its adverbial function (§ 13.11):

- (25) *yo me acuerdo // pff / mismo en vacaciones // salías de casa te venían a buscar los amigos o tal a lo mejor a las diez de la mañana* (ESLORA)
‘I remember // pff / even on holidays // you would leave the house and your friends would come and pick you up or something, maybe at ten o'clock in the morning.’

To conclude this brief review of some syntactic aspects of GS, let us consider the particular use of the adverb *luego* ‘then, afterward’. Together with the temporal value common to general Spanish, in GS *luego* has a connective value of a consecutive nature (26), similar to *entonces* ‘then’, and in interrogatives, such as (27), it is equivalent to *por qué*.

- (26) *vais en autobús / mira qué bien / y luego tú? / tú Elena / ¿tú no quieres?* (ESLORA)
you go by bus / look how nice / and then you / you Elena / don't you want to?
- (27) *me decía / una chica que tiene un ultramarinos ahí abajo que decía Rosa // yo no sé hasta qué punto / mmm debieras / sacar a tu madre / y le dije yo / ¿y luego? // y dijo la encuentro muy / muy gastadita // mmm / como / muy deteriorada / sí bueno es que tiene los años*. (ESLORA)
‘A girl who has a grocery store down there was telling me / a girl who said Rosa // I don't know to what extent / mmm you should / take your mother out / and I said to her why / and she said I find her very / very worn out // mmm / like / very deteriorated / yes well, she's getting on in years.’

This functional extension of the form is also reflected in its frequency of use in GS (parallel to the Galician word *logo*), which is much higher than in other varieties of Spanish: 1323/million in ESLORA, similar to 1219/million in CORGA, whereas in oral CORPES (excluding the ESLORA interviews) the mean is only 554/million.

3.3. Lexicon

The studies on the effects of language contact on the GS lexicon are scarce and are mainly situated in the “interference” paradigm (e.g., Noia 1982). As in the case of grammar, the decision whether a word is shared by Galician and GS or only belongs to one of them can only be made after studying the history of that word. This is a typical example of the problem of distinguishing between the results of inheritance and those of contact between related languages (cf. Epps, Huehnergaard & Pat-El 2013: 210). Thus, many lexical items claimed to be “Galician” in GS belong to the common Romance background (V. § 3, above) and are preserved with greater or lesser vitality in different parts of a wider territory.

Among the lexical elements used in Galician Spanish and attributed to Galician are words such as *reseso* (‘stale’), *trapalleiro* (‘sloppy’), *esmagar* (‘to smash’), *carballo* (‘oak’), *xouba* (‘small sardine’), *parvo* (‘foolish’), *pocillo* (‘cup’), *silva* (‘bramble’) (Noia 1982: 95). These would be forms that speakers do not consider borrowings from Galician, but that are fully integrated into GS. These words refer mainly to the natural world (plants, animals) and to objects and actions of everyday life (Rojo 2004: 1099; Porto Dapena 2008: 72; Álvarez de la Granja & López Meirama 2015: 71).

A further characteristic unduly attributed to GS is the “confusion” between the verbs *sacar* ‘take out’, and *quitar* ‘take off’ (e.g., García 1976: 336). In a corpus study, Mas (1996: 672) shows that in GS these two verbs are just used differently from standard Spanish: *quitar* in the place of *sacar* and vice versa.

The awareness of a different lexicon in GS is present in public interactions, especially in social networks. In a Twitter thread, for example, the journalist Xosé Castro mentions different words and expressions that would be characteristic of Galician, such as *coger en el colo* (Cast. *coger en brazos, en el regazo* ‘hold (a baby)’), *pota* (Cast. *olla* ‘pot’), *tener choio* (Cast. *tener trabajo, curro* ‘to have a job’), *choiar* (Cast. *trabajar, currar* ‘to work’), *vertedero* (Cast. *fregadero* ‘sink’), *pailán* (insult, ‘moron’), *zanco (de pollo)* (Cast. *muslo* ‘tight’), *fayado* (Cast. *desván* ‘loft’).

For many speakers, some of these words are not felt to be specific to GS. In other cases, they are aware of their different character, but they still use them in their daily life, such as *colo*, *parvo* or *trapallada* (these forms are attested, with different frequencies, in ESLORA). Some of these allegedly Galician words appear in the DLE labelled as obsolete (such as *zanco*), as regionalisms of Galicia (e.g. *fayado*) or some other place near Galicia (such as *silva*), or without any label (e.g. *carballo*). Other words, although not collected in the DLE, are present in wider areas of the northwest of the peninsula, such as *pota*, which is registered in the COSER in Asturias, León and in one place of Ávila.

On the other hand, the contact with standard Galician from the late 20th century onwards has facilitated the occurrence of loanwords in certain areas of use in which Galician is a common language, such as in universities and in certain public institutions. Thus, in university settings, expressions such as *bolsa* (Cast. *beca*) de *investigación* ‘research grant’ (however *bolsa* is also used elsewhere with this meaning) or *doutoramento* ‘doctorate’ (for *doctorado*; but *doctoramiento* is also included in the *DLE*) can be heard. In areas related to political activity terms such as *orçamento* (for *presupuesto* ‘budget’): “*El orçamento de actividad [...] ascendió a 1.102.055 €*” (<https://www.sergas.gal/>) ‘The activity budget amounted to 1,102,055 €’. A different case is the deliberate use of Galician lexicon or colloquial expressions in texts written in Spanish. To give just two examples, the newspaper *La Voz de Galicia* published a note entitled *Estorninos dibujando cogomelos* ‘Starlings drawing mushrooms’, using the Galician word *cogomelo*, while in the text appears the equivalent Spanish word *seta*. In a commentary on the Spanish elections, journalist Iago García writes: *la táctica empleada es virar el timón y volver ao rego* (Cast. *volver al redil*) ‘the tactic used is to turn the rudder and return to the fold’. A similar example is the Galician expression *poñerse como un pito* (lit. *become like a chicken*), equivalent to the Spanish *empaparse* or *calarse hasta los huesos* (‘get soaked’), found in a social networks text. These cases are obviously conscious uses of Galician forms within Spanish texts, and can be understood as practices related to identity constructions of community and belonging.

4. Conclusion

The results outlined in this chapter offer a different picture from that presented in previous work on GS. First, GS does not behave uniformly, but shows considerable internal variation in different aspects. Secondly, we find that some of the characteristics traditionally considered idiosyncratic of GS are (or were) also present in other Spanish-speaking areas, which forces us to question the exclusively Galician origin of some phenomena. This has been shown mainly for verb-related constructions, such as the prevalence of the simple past *canté* (vs. *he cantado*), the verbal periphrases *tener / llevar / dar* + participle, *ir (a)* + infinitive, the ethical dative, and the patterns of verb + preposition (*llamar / esperar por*).

Moreover, the spread of Spanish through middle classes and urban workers means that social differences are no longer manifested by the language spoken, but by the “accent” (see RAG 2003), since, as Recalde (2012: 672) points out, “la legitimación social ya no solo depende de qué lengua se hable (entendida como diátesis simbólica), sino también de cómo se hable esa lengua (entendida como práctica social contextualizada)” ‘social legitimization depends not only on what language is spoken

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

(understood as the symbolic diasystem), but also on how that language is spoken (understood as the contextualised social practice)'. Contact with different varieties of Spanish, especially with standard Castilian, has dramatically increased in the last 60 years, due to the mass media and, more recently, social networks and increased mobility.

In addition, the process of social “normalisation” of Galician has also produced a social diversification of this language, bringing it into social spheres shared with Spanish. The linguistic repertoires of speakers have expanded in an unprecedented manner, so that many elements of both languages are available for use in linguistic practices related to the construction of identities in complex ways, without these repertoires necessarily being separated into “languages”, understood as discrete autonomous systems (cf. Regueira & Fernández Rei 2020: 356).

Furthermore, linguistic repertoires are not exactly the same for all speakers in a community, since they are dynamically shaped throughout the sociolinguistic biography of each speaker, so that, as Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 35) state, this biography “is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact”. This perspective, which focuses on the agency of the speaker, makes it possible to explain the existence of linguistic continua between varieties, as well as the marked inter-speaker variation observed.

The studies undertaken in recent years, from linguistic conceptions less conditioned by *standard language ideology* and more focused on the agency of the speakers, are paving the way for a better understanding of the complex sociolinguistic reality of Galicia. In this chapter we have tried to advance some ideas and hypotheses which will have to be explored in more detail in future works.

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to Hella Olbertz and two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper. Part of this work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (Ref. PID2019-110352GB-I00 and PID2020118133GB-I00-P/AEI/10.13039/501100011033).

References

- Abuín Soto, Manuel. 1971. El castellano hablado en las Rías Bajas Gallegas. *Archivum* 21. 171–206.
- Acín Villa, Esperanza. 1996. Galleguismos en la prensa gallega escrita en castellano. In Manuel Casado Velarde, Antonio Freire Lamas, José Eduardo López Pereira &

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

José Ignacio Pérez Pascual (eds.), *Scripta philologica in memoriam Manuel Taboada Cid*, vol. 1, 167–177. A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña.

Álvarez Cáccamo, Celso. 1983. A influencia do galego sobre o sistema verbal e no uso de certas perífrases verbais do castelán de Galiza. *Grial* 82. 423–442.

Álvarez Cáccamo, Celso. 1989. Variação lingüística e o factor social na Galiza. *Hispanic Linguistics* 2(2). 253–298.

Álvarez de la Granja, María & Belén López Meirama. 2013. A presenza do galego no léxico dispoñible do español de Galicia: análise distribucional. In Eva Gugenberger, Henrique Monteagudo & Gabriel Rei-Doval (eds.), *Contacto de linguas, hibrididade, cambio: contextos, procesos e consecuencias*, 49–96. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega.

Álvarez Giménez, Emilio. 1870. *Estudio sobre las faltas del lenguaje que se cometen en Galicia*. Pontevedra: Imp. José Antúnez y Comp.

Amengual, Mark & Pilar Chamorro. 2015. The effects of language dominance in the perception and production of the Galician mid-vowel contrast. *Phonetica* 72. 207–236.

Anderson, Ana Maria. 2020. Percepción frente a produción de la forma *cantase* inducida por contacto en el español de Galicia. *Verba* 47. 137–162.

Azpiazu Torres, Susana. 2017. Actitudes lingüísticas de los hablantes gallegos de español frente a la oposición Pretérito Perfecto Compuesto (PPC) / Pretérito Perfecto Simple (PPS). *Lingüística en la red* 15. 1–34.
https://linred.web.uah.es/articulos_pdf/LR-articulo-15092017.pdf.

Azpiazu Torres, Susana. 2021. Mitos y realidades acerca del sistema de oposición *canté / he cantado* en Galicia. In Carmen Quijada van den Berghe & José J. Gómez Asencio (eds.), *Los pretéritos perfecto simple y compuesto en español peninsular y en otras lenguas románicas*, 71–100. Madrid: Arco.

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Britain, David. 2010. Contact and dialectology. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The handbook of language contact*, 208–229. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

CDH = *Corpus del Diccionario histórico de la lengua española*
<https://apps.rae.es/CNDHE>. (October 2021.)

CORGA = *Corpus de Referencia do Galego Actual*. <http://corpus.cirp.gal/corga/>. (September 2021.)

CORPES XXI = *Corpus del Español del siglo XXI*. <http://www.rae.es>. (September - October 2021.)

COSER = *Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural*. www.corpusrural.es. (September 2021.)

Cotarelo y Valledor, Armando. 1927. El castellano en Galicia. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 14. 82–136.

De la Fuente Iglesias, Mónica. 2020. *Contacto de lenguas e identidade regional: la variación de las vocales medias en el castellano de Galicia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. (Doctoral dissertation.)

de la Fuente Iglesias, Mónica & Susana Pérez Castillejo. 2020. Spanish mid vowels as sociolinguistic variables in Galicia. *Spanish in Context* 17(3). 464–487.

DLE = *Diccionario de la lengua española*. <https://dle.rae.es>. (September 2021.)

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

- Dubert, Francisco. 2002. Os sociolectos galegos. *Cadernos de Lingua* 24. 5–27.
- Epps, Patience, John Huehnergard & Na'ama Pat-El. 2013. Contact among genetically related languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6. 209–219.
- ESLORA = *Corpus para el estudio del español oral*. <http://eslora.usc.es>. (August – October 2021.)
- esTenTen18 = *Spanish Web corpus 2018*. <https://www.sketchengine.eu/estenten-spanish-corpus/>. (August – October 2021.)
- Fernández Salgado, Benigno. 2007. Como falar bo castelán en Galicia: a corrección lingüística nos manuais de bo uso publicados no século XIX. In Helena González & M. Xesús Lama (eds.), *Actas do VII Congreso Internacional de Estudos Galegos*, 765–789. Sada: O Castro.
- García, Constantino. 1976. Interferencias lingüísticas entre gallego y castellano. *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* 6(2). 327–343.
- Gonçalves, Eduardo Brazão. 1996. *Dicionário do falar algarvio*. 2nd edn. Faro: Algarve em Foco.
- IGE 2018 = Instituto Galego de Estatística. 2018. *Enquisa estrutural a fogares. Coñecemento e uso do galego*. https://www.ige.eu/web/mostrar_actividade_estadistica.jsp?idioma=gl&codigo=0206004. (17 October 2021.)
- IGE 2021 = Instituto Galego de Estatística. 2021. *Enquisa de poboación activa*. http://www.ige.gal/web/mostrar_actividade_estadistica.jsp?idioma=gl&codigo=0204031014. (17 October 2021.)
- Klee, Carol A. & Andrew Lynch. 2009. *El español en contacto con otras lenguas*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Loureiro Rodríguez, Verónica, May M. Boggess & Anne Goldsmith. 2013. Language attitudes in Galicia: using the matched-guise test among high school students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(2). 136–153.
- Mariño Paz, Ramón. 1998. *Historia da lingua galega*. Santiago de Compostela: Sotelo Blanco.
- Mas, Inmaculada (1996). El intercambio de los verbos *sacar* y *quitar* en el castellano de Galicia. In Rosario Álvarez & Dolores Vilavedra (eds.), *Cinguidos por unha arela común: homenaxe ó prof. Xesús Alonso Montero*, vol. 1, 655–675. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Mayr, Robert, Laura López-Bueno, Martín Vázquez Fernández & Gisela Tomé Lourido. 2019. The role of early experience and continued language use in bilingual speech production: A study of Galician and Spanish mid vowels by Galician-Spanish bilinguals. *Journal of Phonetics* 72. 1–16.
- Monteagudo, Henrique & Antón Santamarina. 1993. Galician and Castilian in contact: historical, social, and linguistic aspects. In Rebecca Posner & John N. Green (eds.), *Trends in Romance linguistics and philology*, vol. 5. *Bilingualism and linguistic conflict in Romance*, 113–173. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Monteagudo, Henrique & Xan Bouzada. 2002. *O proceso de normalización do idioma galego*. 3 vols. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega.
- NGLE = Real Academia Española. 2009. *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. 2 vols. Madrid: Espasa.

Draft

- Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter
- Noia Campos, María Camino (1982). Interferencias léxicas entre as linguas galega e castelá. *Grial* 75. 91–99.
- Olbertz, Hella. 1998. *Verbal Periphrases in a Functional Grammar of Spanish*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Parish, Ayden & Kira Hall. 2020. Agency. In J. M. Stanlaw (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*. Wiley Blackwell. Online publ. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0008>.
- Pat-El, Na'ama. 2013. Contact or inheritance? Criteria for distinguishing internal and external change in genetically related languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6. 313–328.
- Pennycook, Alistair. 2010. *Language as a local practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Perez Castillejo, Susana. 2012. Estudio sociofonético de los tonemas de las interrogativas absolutas en el castellano de Galicia. *Estudios de Lingüística* 26. 235–268.
- Perez Castillejo, Susana. 2014. *La entonación del español de Galicia desde una perspectiva sociofonética*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Pollán, Celia. 2001. The expression of pragmatic values by means of verbal morphology: A variationist study. *Language Variation and Change* 13. 59–89.
- Porto Dapena, Álvaro. 2001. El español en contacto con el gallego. *II Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española*. Valladolid. <https://congresosdelalengua.es/valladolid/paneles-ponencias/unidad-diversidad/porto-a.htm>. (17 October 2021.)
- Rabanal, Manuel. 1967. Gramática breve del castellano hablado en Galicia. In Manuel Rabanal (ed.), *Hablas hispánicas: temas gallegos y leoneses*, 11–69. Madrid: Alcalá.
- RAG = Real Academia Galega. 2003. *O galego segundo a mocidade*. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega.
- Recalde, Montserrat. 2012. Aproximación a las representaciones sociales sobre el español de Galicia. In Tomás Jimenez Juliá, Belén Lopez Meirama, Victoria Vázquez Rozas & Alexandre Veiga (eds.), *Cum corde et in nova grammatica. Estudios ofrecidos a Guillermo Rojo*, 667–680. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Recalde, Montserrat. 2021. Indexicalidad, gentrificación lingüística y desigualdad social en el proceso de estandarización del gallego. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 271. 167–194.
- Recalde, Montserrat. 2023. Historia de los contactos entre el español y otras lenguas de la Península Ibérica en la Edad Moderna. Contactos entre el español y el gallego. In Steven N. Dworkin, Gloria Clavería & Álvaro Octavio de Toledo (eds.), *Lingüística histórica del español. The Routledge handbook of Spanish historical linguistics*, 493-500. London: Routledge.
- Regueira, Xosé Luís & Elisa Fernández Rei. 2020. The Spanish sound system and intonation in contact with Galician. In Rajiv Rao (ed.), *Spanish phonetics and phonology in contact*, 325–362. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Regueira, Xosé Luís. 2019. Variación fonética, a lingua da esfera pública e estándar oral: entre a lingüística e a política. *Revista Galega de Filoloxía* 20. 119–147.

Draft

Xosé Luís Regueira & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. In press. L. Cerno, H.-J. Döhla, M. Gutiérrez Maté, R. Hesselbach, J. Steffen (eds.), *Contact varieties of Spanish and Spanish-lexified contact varieties*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

- Rodríguez Espiñeira, María José. 2019. La expresión epistémica *si cuadra* en español de Galicia. *Estudos de Lingüística Galega* 11. 197–231.
- Rojo, Guillermo. 1974. *Perífrasis verbales en el gallego actual*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- Rojo, Guillermo. 2004. El español de Galicia. In Rafael Cano (ed.), *Historia de la lengua española*, 1087–1101. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Rojo, Guillermo & Victoria Vázquez Rozas. 2014. Sobre las formas en *-ra* en el español de Galicia. In Andrés Enrique-Arias, Manuel J. Gutiérrez, Alazne Landa & Francisco Ocampo (eds.), *Perspectives in the study of Spanish language variation. Papers in honor of Carmen Silva-Corvalán*, 237–270. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Sanromán Vilas, Begoña. 2021. La discordancia de número en el doblado de objeto indirecto: nuevos datos del español de Galicia. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 137(2). 477–513.
- Thomason, Sara Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- TILG = *Tesouro Informatizado da Lingua Galega*. <https://ilg.usc.es/TILG/>. (September 2021.)
- Tome Lourido, Gisela. 2018. *The role of social factors in bilingual speech processing: The case of Galician new speakers*. London: University College London. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Tomé Lourido, Gisela & Bronwen G. Evans. 2018. The effects of language dominance switch in bilinguals: Galician new speakers' speech production and perception. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 22(3). 637–654.
- Vázquez Rozas, Victoria. 2020. *Había + participio no español falado en Galicia: un estudo de corpus*. In Francisco Dubert-García, Vitor Míguez & Xulio Sousa (eds.), *Variedades lingüísticas en contacto na Península Ibérica*, 195–219. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega.
- Vázquez Rozas, Victoria, Mario Barcala, Eva Domínguez Noya, Alba Fernández Sanmartín, Guillermo Rojo & Paula Santalla. 2020. Codificación y anotación del habla en un contexto bilingüe: el corpus ESLORA de español de Galicia. In Ángel Gallego & Francesc Roca (eds.), *Dialectología digital del español*, 189–224. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Veiga, Alexandre. 2019. *El pretérito perfecto español: variación gramatical y estructura de sistema*. Lugo: Axac.