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ASPECTS OF CORPUS PLANNING IN GALICIAN

0. Introduction.

Regardless of the opinion one may have, it is undeniable that the Galician language has increased qualitatively in usage over recent years and has finally achieved the status of official language. In the present work, we shall be examining the demands that have been placed on the language itself in order for it to be used in new public and formal domains, due to the transformation of status, from non-official to official language, including the subsequent regulation of its usage in education, administration and in state-run mass media.¹

In the title of this paper we have used the phrase corpus planning because this term is of accepted usage in sociolinguistic writings and thus in order to place ourselves in a well-defined conceptual framework (see Haugen 1980). Within this conceptual framework we find the distinction made between aspects concerning language status (status planning) on the one hand and aspects concerning the language corpus (corpus planning) on the other hand to be of particular value. This distinction conforms to that of the catalan school of sociolinguistics (Vallverdú 1977) which distinguishes between language normalisation (ie. increased spread and usage) and language normativisation (ie. standardisation of grammar, spelling etc.). We wish however to point out that we are not wholly satisfied with the term planning, because it tends to convey an overly governmental and consciously organised idea regarding the process of language promotion. As we shall see, in the case of Galician the more or less

* Henrique Monteagudo, Facultade de Filoloxía, Universidade de Santiago; Burgo das Nacións, s/n; 15706 - Santiago de Compostela - Galicia - España. Teléfono: 34 81 575 040. Fax: 34 81 574 646

¹ The other side of this process which Galician is going through, the continual loss of native speakers (not fully compensated for by the increasing number of new speakers) falls outside the scope of this present work.
These are the issues which will be briefly addressed in this article. Due to lack of space we shall have to leave to one side the theoretical considerations and concentrate on giving a schematic presentation of the concrete problems and gains concerning the Galician language. The reader should be warned however that in addition to viewpoints based upon rigorous studies (cited in the accompanying bibliography), we have on occasion preferred to present ideas and evaluations based upon our own personal experiences and criteria rather than to go in silence due to lack of existing studies.


Prior to the last half of the seventies, the Galician language had at its disposal an empowered range of registers and styles, and a large rift was growing progressively between the current spoken language and literary Galician (Monteagudo & Santamarina, 1993; Monteagudo, forthcoming). Here follows a brief characterisation of the different levels of language in use at that time:

1) Colloquial popular Galician, spoken by the working and peasant classes especially in country areas. Given over to vulgarisation, this was the most common type of spoken Galician. It showed a visible, albeit superficial, degree of dialectal fragmentation and was heavily influenced by Castilian. The fact that the two languages, Galician and Castilian, are so close encourages a great deal of interference in their spoken varieties (García González, 1976; Álvarez Cañamo, 1993; Nolla Campos, 1984), and in this situation Castilian inevitably comes out as the donor language whilst Galician is the receiver language open to many interferences; less so in the grammatical structures but much more so in vocabulary (especially in the case of the more modern and learned terms).

2) Written literary Galician is a variety produced and used by small educated groups of lower middle-class town dwellers. It was a language lacking in well-defined criteria of correctness and which displayed a marked differentialism to Castilian, a trend which on occasions led to vulgar forms, hypercorrections and other deviations. These same intellectual circles also employed a learned spoken Galician, but this lacked the means for general social spread, and it is for this reason that popular Galician developed in parallel to this learned form. In any case, at that time, the main worry was not how Galician was spoken but rather the actual fact that Galician was used: the problem of linguistic correctness was considered of secondary importance to the more pressing question of avoiding the loss of prestige of the Galician language and the consequent language shift to Castillian.

Prior to ground rules being laid down for Galician, everyone involved in language preservation used a more or less personalised form based on her/his own particular dialect, literary preferences, style and tastes (Monteagudo & Santamarina, 1993). Some enthusiasts had given some thought to describing the grammar of the variety which they saw as most appropriate for imitation or compiled lexicons of popular and literary vocabularies. Although most of the grammars fell into the temptation of drawing up preceptual recommendations, none of them attempted to establish a standard language model. The Institution which was made responsible for this work of standardisation, the Real Academia Galega (RAG), founded in 1906, only managed to produce a dictionary which barely covered the first three letters of the alphabet (Diccionario gallego-castellano, Cuenca 1913-1928). The Seminario de Estudios Galegos (SEG)5 was a para-university body whose drive and energy were instrumental in encouraging the use of Galician in scientific writings between the wars (1922-1936). The SEG managed to publish a set of Norms (SEG 1933; SEG 1936) upon which the future standard Galician would presumably have been based, once the

---

4 The most important modern galician grammars published before the Civil War are, in chronological order of publication: J. Cuéveic El Habla Galega (1868); J.A. Sacó Gramática Galega (1868); R. Lugis Gramática do Idioma Galego (1922; 2nd edition 1931); A. Couceiro El idioma Galego (1926, 1935). As far as dictionaries are concerned, the following are worthy of mention: J. Cuéveic Diccionario Galego (1873); M. Valladas Diccionario Galego-Castellano (1884); L. Carri Diccionario Galego-Castellán (1928-31, 1933; 4th ed. 1973). For the post Civil War period and prior to 1970 we should also mention the Diccionario Enciclopédico Gallego-Castellano by E. Rodríguez (3 volumes, 1958-61) and the Diccionario Galego-Castelán by Xosé L. Franco-Grandá (1968).

5 The most eminent personalities of the galician intelligentsia participated in the founding of the RAG, but as early as before the Civil War (1936-38) it had already ceased to function concerning the codification and elaboration of the galician corpus, and since the war its activity has declined still further. It is fair to say that although the RAG was initially designed with the vocation of becoming a true Galician Language Academy, it has not, at least up until very recently, seriously pursued this aim.

6 Founded in 1923, this group was disbanded de facto in 1936 by the Phalangists who had taken up arms against the 2nd Spanish Republic.

The five years between 1977 and 1982 are crucial if one is to understand the subsequent developments in so much as it was during that period that the first outlines for the advances and splits which were later to occur in the 1980's. With the onset of democracy in Spain (Franco died in 1975) it was felt that official recognition of Galician and its use in education were close at hand and work on drawing up reference norms for standard Galician was increased. It was with this in mind that several open conferences were held attended by writers, linguists and teachers who, between them, represented the various different tendencies. The *Bases prä unificación das normas lingüísticas do galego* (1977; 2nd ed. 1980) were the fruit of these meetings. Although dealing exclusively with spelling and morphology, the Bases are of wider scope, more systematic and well-reasoned than their forerunners. Furthermore, they were proposed as a synthesis of the various different positions (populist, academic and reintegrationist).

Nevertheless, and despite the support that the *Bases prä unificación* received, including endorsement from the ILG and the RAG, they did not manage to reach a general consensus. The dispute came from two areas: on the one hand, Carballo Calero (who at the time occupied the chair of Galician Language and Literature at the University of Santiago) had since evolved his position in defense of an "academic" Galician (viz. RAG norms) towards an ever more overtly reintegrationist one (Carballo Calero 1981, Carvalho Calero 1983). Furthermore, such ideas were gaining increasingly more followers. On the other hand, the leaders of the more radical wing of galician nationalism cut themselves off from the rest of galicianism by adopting a sectarian stance: by their attempts to usurp the legitimacy of any institutionalised initiative in the eyes of the public, they sought to profit from the arguments surrounding language standardisation and developed their own proposals, very similar to the official ones concerning the concrete solutions presented but at the same time underpinned by a philosophy much closer to that of the reintegrationists. Eventually, only the sector which gravitated around the ILG and the majority of those close to the RAG felt themselves bound by the *Bases prä unificación*. Notwithstanding, these *Bases* served as guidelines for many writers, for the larger publishing houses and editors and for the growing number of teachers.

Once again, political circumstances (the imminent approval of the Galician Autonomous Statute of 1980 and the subsequent creation of the autonomous institutions) forced the different currents of thought to seek a compromise. The formula adopted at this juncture was the creation of a Language Commission with the backing of the *Xunta de Galicia* (Autonomous Government) and with representatives from the RAG, the ILG and the Department of Galician Studies at the University of Santiago. The results of this commission were the *Normas ortográficas do idioma galego* (Comisión de Lingüística 1980; see also Fábade Castañeiras 1980). Nonetheless, these *Normas ortográficas* did not represent a step forward with respect to the previous *Bases prä unificación* but rather a proof of failure in that they are in effect merely a codification running parallel to the various different proposals and offering optional solutions at every step. It was for this reason that the *Xunta de Galicia* decided to simplify them for use in teaching by removing the reintegrationist options. From this moment on, the unreconcilable stances each party adopted made the practical possibility of reaching an agreement between the autonomists and the reintegrationists unfeasible.

---

9 The most important reintegrationist group is the *Asociación Galega da Língua* (AGAL), founded in 1981.

10 The organisation which proposes this particular option is the *Asociación Socio-Pedagógica Galega* (ASPG) which is centered around the Xornadas do Ensino (Teaching Days) held annually since 1978. The ASPG published its own language norms in 1980 (ASPG 1980) which were in turn later reformed more in line with reintegrationist thinking (ASPG 1992). However, in the opinion of the dominant sector of the ASPG this later version had gone too far down the road of reintegrationism and the subsequent tensions led to the break-away group the *Asociación Socio-Pedagógica Galego-Portuguesa* (ASPG-P) in 1983. This latter group is unreservedly pro-reintegrationist. The Norms of the ASPG-1980 are those followed, with some minor alterations, by A Nosa Terra, the only weekly to appear in Galician and which is run by the radical nationalists.

11 This schizophrenic split between pro-portuguese linguistic theory and autonomist practice has been a long standing part of galicianism for at least as long as since the period between the wars (Monteagudo, 1991, Monteagudo, 1992).

12 The Autonomous Statute allowed for the election by referendum of a Galician Parliament (the first elections were held in 1982), from which derived the Autonomous Government, entitled Xunta de Galicia. Previous to the statutory plebiscite there had been a provisional Xunta in existence.
schools and in official documents. It is unfeasible to use a non-standard variety in decrees laws nor could it be used in teaching (to any degree beyond simple basic education) nor could it be used formally in the public domain. Galician aspires to be used in all these and other fields and the legal framework recognises the right to pursue these aims and includes measures to be taken in order to do so. But for this to be so, the existence of a fully functioning standard is imperative. Whomsoever denies this necessity whilst at the same time stating the need for the language to become normalised is either deluding her/himself or is naive (Monteagudo 1990). In conclusion, a responsible position clearly rooted in the first instance upon the order of priorities for language promotion would necessarily clear away the differences and discussions concerning the normative model outside of the areas where these debates prove sterile and even counter-productive (especially in the area of education).

4. The new sociolinguistic conditions for the standard language.

In the early eighties the reduction in the number of native speakers of Galician was clear. However, the institutionalisation of the language had created sociolinguistic conditions significantly different to those described for the period prior to 1980: the necessity to attend to the spread of the language (ie. increase the number of adult speakers and so the teaching of Galician to adults)¹⁴, the regulation of the teaching of Galician within the education system, the increase in public and large-scale diffusion (especially by the means of television and radio) and the acceptance of Galician in the official domain brought to the fore the necessity of having a standard language. At the same time, conditions were created for large-scale social diffusion of standard Galician in such a way that it is in the reach of the whole linguistic community and can be taken as a guide of correctness.

The impact that the teaching of Galician has had on the pupils remains to be proven¹⁵. Normally, castilian-speaking pupils only become competent in the standard language whereas in general, the galician-speaking pupils add reading and writing ability in the standard language to their already acquired oral competence in their own native variety of Galician. It is also the case that on the whole, the castilian-speaking pupils learn the standard language with more ease by dint of the fact that they are not previously conditioned by another variety of Galician, whereas the galician-speaking pupils are hindered by their own native variety.

The one medium which definitely should have a regulatory effect upon the popular usage of Galician is radio and television. Generally speaking, the standardisation of the language used on radio is of an acceptable level. Television shows rather less satisfactory results however, due to the fact that the setting up of the autonomous TV channel TVG in 1986 and the choice of personnel was done under pressure from sectors barely or wholly unaware of such questions as language normalisation and standardisation. Attitudes towards the Galician used on television may take one of two forms: the grass-roots speaker of Galician accepts the language used as a learned form of her/his own language variety although s/he may be confused by certain words chosen and by the peculiar pronunciation of many of the television speakers; the language specialists, on the other hand, complain about the lack of preparation and the scanty linguistic rigour on the part of the television professionals.

Let us resume what has been said so far: despite the problems which have arisen from it and the numerous doubts surrounding the end results, the presence of Galician in schools and on the radio and television has had a largely beneficial effect upon the galician-speaking community. For the first time ever, this community has been able to compare its own native with other language varieties, and more

¹⁴ In addition to the political, cultural and ideological motivations which caused an increase in the number of new speakers since the late seventies, the preliminary requirement to know the galician language in order to obtain a job in the public sector or in order to gain professional promotion was also instrumental. This latter factor caused a sudden up burst in demand for this language precisely in those professional sectors which recruit primarily in the most castilianised sectors of society. Language learning based solely upon the desire for professional advancement or social prestige rarely leads to a true galicianisation of social practice (Alonso Montero 1991).

¹⁵ An evaluation of the results obtained concerning the use of the language following the introduction of Galician into teaching is a subject which falls outside the scope of this study.
spoken Galician has been a question rarely addressed. Apart from the main dialectal features of colloquial Galician, which do not play a part in learned Galician, being the "seseo" and the "gheada" (see the map)\(^{18}\), there is very little diversity between the various spoken forms of Galician. However, the creation of the galician television and radio network and the setting up of a Galician Drama Centre placed the question of a spoken standard in the foreground of current preoccupations. The question did not arise from the necessity to choose one particular variety from amongst the various dialectal varieties but rather from the fact that a large number of television and radio professionals have learned Galician as a second language and tend to apply the pronunciation habits of their native Castilian to Galician (Regueira Fernández, unpublished).

5.2. Graphization

The setting down of spelling norms has been the one issue which has given rise to arguments between the different currents of thought in favour of the standardisation of Galician (Arribe Dopeño et al, 1984; Ferro Ruibal, 1984). The question can be resumed as follows: the writers who first began to use a literary Galician in modern times were ignorant of the historical written form of medieval Galician (i.e. Galician-Portuguese) and Portuguese and created a spelling system based upon the castilian one in which they had been taught to read and write. The castilian spelling system was easy to adjust to the phonetic system of Galician as, besides their common neo-latin origin, the phonology of Galician and Castilian had developed together in certain respects\(^{19}\). In the areas where the castilian spelling system was ill-suited to galician phonology, it was adjusted in a more or less ad hoc fashion in order to fit it. It was in this way that the letter \(x\) came to be used to represent the voiceless palatal fricative /ʃ/ and that the digraph nh was used to represent the intervocalic velar nasal /n/ in words such as the indefinite feminine article unha\(^{20}\). These solutions held good in the later development of written Galician, with the result that the usual spelling of Galician accentuated the markedly phonetic nature of the castillian spelling system (Monteagudo & Santamarina 1993; Fernández Salgado & Monteagudo 1993).

That notwithstanding, alongside this tradition followed by the majority of writers, there grew up other minority currents who were less worried about the adequacy of the spelling system in respect to the phonology of Galician: the divergences of opinion were based primarily upon etymological criteria in the defence of the latinate letters g, j and x for the phoneme /ʤ/\(^{21}\). Later, when medieval Galician was discovered, the archaists rallied to the cause of those in favour of these etymological criteria. Finally, due to the contact with the portuguese language and literature, the use of the portuguese system as a model for written Galician was called for. Although this line of reasoning evolved along fairly coherent lines, it must be pointed out that the emphasis changed substantially between the etymologically and archeologically minded precursors and the champions of reintegrationism: the former wished to adapt the latin and medieval systems to that of modern Galician whilst the latter wished to see the galician writing system distanced from the castillian one in favour of the portuguese one.

The Official Norms of 1982 are the continuation of the first tradition, limiting their scope to the regularisation of that earlier

dowards the voiceless interdental /ʃ/). Similarly, Galician and Castillian had the same evolution of Latin /β/ and /vl/ to /β/. Furthermore, modern Galician denasalises the nasal vowels which have remained nasalised in Portuguese (although which a development peculiar to Portuguese).

\(^{19}\) Here we have in mind such Galician and Castillian doubts as the silent subsystem of consonants /ls/→ls, /ʃʃ/→ʃʃ and /ts/→dz, where the distinctive pairs are neutralised in favour of the voiceless phoneme. The later evolution of /ts/ derived from /ts/ and /dz/ was

\(^{20}\) In Castillian the letter \(x\) represents the cluster /ks/ in learned words such as sexo and lexico, whereas the consonant /ʃ/ does not exist. Nor do we find in Castillian the digraph nh nor the nasal velar consonant nh.

\(^{21}\) So, instead of the more usual spellings xente, xunco and madeiko we find the following proposals: gente (< Latin gente), xonco (< juncu) and madeixo (< mataxe>)}
between verbs and enclitic pronouns and between various clitics.

It must be said that in respect to the spelling per se the general consensus is in favour of the official lines and that even those who are more open to reintegrationism regarding morphology, vocabulary and ideology also use a spelling system essentially similar to that of the Norms of 1982 with small alterations concerning for example the use of written accents (ASPG, 1980) and the use of the hyphen with enclitics. On the other hand, as far as the reintegrationists are concerned we simplify the actual situation leaving to one side the description of the great differences that in practice exist between the moderate and extremist tendencies: the line adopted by AGAL is wholly reintegrationist as far as spelling is concerned but maintains in its standard some of the morphological and lexical features characteristic of Galician, whereas the break-away hard liners centered around the "Irmandades da Fala" (Language Brotherhood) represent the extremist reintegrationist stance and support the wholesale adoption of written Portuguese as a standard model for Galician.

However, as a detailed debate surrounding this question would be very lengthy and infinitely complicated, we shall not take up more space discussing it. Let us recapitulate on what has been said so far concerning the criteria employed in choosing one spelling system rather than any other: simplicity, phonological adequacy, the contemporary literary tradition, the differentiation of Galician as opposed to Castillian, Latin etymology, the medieval tradition and Portuguese. In the literature dealing with this issue it is common practice to classify these criteria into two sets which are considered internally coherent and mutually opposed: in the view of those who favour a purely phonologically based spelling system, phonological adequacy is synonymous with ease of spelling (Mauro, 1991), whilst the reintegrationists hold that the Portuguese system is the only way of preserving the distinction between Galician and Castillian and that it is faithful to Latin etymology and the medieval tradition.

We should like to raise some objections to these common places at this point: 1) a phonologically based spelling system is not always the least complex and thus it is fairly senseless to use the argument of simplicity as the main defence against the officially approved Norms; 2) the modern Portuguese writing system does not always coincide with that of medieval Galician and the medieval galician and Portuguese spelling conventions do not always accurately reflect Latin etymology (as in the case of b/v). Thus, although there does exist a certain degree of coherency between the Portuguese orientated, medieval and Latin based criteria on the one hand and between the simplist, phonological and Castillian based criteria on the other, it is equally true that some of the elements pertaining to the former group are at times mutually conflictual whilst compatible with other elements pertaining to the latter group and vice versa. It is also all the more paradoxical that some of the solutions which are phonologically motivated in Portuguese (g/l as opposed to x, ss- l c l ç as opposed to -s/-z) are put forward to be used in Galician in the name of supposedly solid etymological grounds.

By way of conclusion, those responsible for the standardisation of Galician had to choose between an approach based upon philological criteria (the revival of the medieval galician writing system) and historical criteria (the possible integration of the galician language into the sphere of Portuguese and Castillian by means of the written language) on the one side or on the other an approach based upon

---

30 Form of the preposition a and the feminine definite article a (à, às) and also uses the circumflex accent to denote the tonal quality of the half-closed vowels /o/ and /o/ and of the closed /a/, e.g: câmera, portugues, olávo.

31 Thus, Portuguese writes via (I saw imperfect of ver) as opposed to vi-a (perfect of ver + non-accentuated third person feminine accusative pronoun: I saw her). In the same way: quero-o, dou-te, levas-me, levas-vois, trasem-nos, dá-no-lo etc. In Galician there is not need of such a use of the hyphen as a discritic, since the 1st. person of the perfect of the verbs in the second conjugation ends in -v. This being so, Galician distinguishes via (imperfect) from vina (perfect + pronoun).

32 Those who support a purely phonologically based system for written Galician tend to concentrate only on those aspects where such a system would simplify spelling (e.g. the exclusive use of b where today b and v are used; eg: bibrir for vivir, similar to beber) and tend to forget other aspects which would render the system more complicated as a whole (e.g. the use of different letter to represent closed /h/ and open /h/ and to represent closed /o/ and open /o/).

33 For example, lh and nh are innovations based purely upon the portuguese model and were digraphs unknown to medieval Galician.
5.4. Lexication

The process of standardising the vocabulary encompasses two aspects: the listing of the vocabulary of the language and the fixing of the word forms to be used. The tasks concerning the compilation of vocabulary consist of the collection of popular and literary Galician, the identification and elimination of Castillian based forms and other impure forms and also of modernising the vocabulary by means of adapting the lexical heritage, introducing loan-forms, producing calques and creating new words (generated by derivation and composition amongst other means). The fixing of word forms presupposes a choice between different variants whenever possible, fixing the criteria for the adaptation of learned forms and of loan-words and in taking decisions concerning spelling.

In principle, opinion differs very little between the various normative currents where vocabulary is concerned due to the widely-held consensus concerning the need for in-depth reform and up-dating of the galician lexicon. This being said, there do exist several controversial flash-points. Let us take as an example the case of forms influenced by or derived from Castillian which form a part of the vocabulary used by the average speaker and thus also form a part of every-day spoken Galician. We can distinguish between two types of Castillian based forms: "luxury" loans which are introduced into Galician at the risk of replacing already existing galician forms and "convenience" loans which are introduced in order to fill a gap in the Galician lexicon. The reintegrationalist approach is to eliminate both types of Castillian based forms and to re-establish the traditional galician form in the case of the former type and to adopt the portuguese form in the case of the latter type. The autonomist approach is to eliminate the "luxury" loans and to re-establish the equivalent autochthonous forms (in some cases it may be necessary to...
(Boulon Agrelo et al. 1989; 2nd edition 1992). Monolingual dictionaries aimed at use in schools have also been published containing approximately 10,000 entries and including illustrations (Boulon Agrelo et al. 1989; 4th edition 1992) and produced by applying the most advanced methods of lexicography (RAG & ILG 1990). Alphabetical lists with explanatory commentaries of doubtful points have also been published; one selectiva, of a purist bent (Fernández Salgado et al., 1991) and another with an eclecticism approach (Chacón Calvar & Rodríguez 1992, 2nd ed. 1993); both follow the line of the official Norm. Finally, a three volume encyclopaedic dictionary has been produced with a reintegrationist leaning (Alonso Estravis et al., 1988).

5.5. Onomastics

It would be inappropriate to draw this overview to a close before mentioning the steps that have been taken concerning the (re-)galicianisation of people's names and place names. Due to pressure on the part of the Church, the State and fashion trends, galician anthroponomastics had fallen into disuse. Furthermore, during the franquist dictatorship, the legal registration of galician proper names was prohibited, whilst place names were castellanised on public signs (Santamarina, 1988). In recent years a movement has grown up calling for the use of galician names which has crystallised into civil and public campaigns resulting in the drawing up and dissemination of lists of galician proper names. It is becoming increasingly more popular to galicianise one's own name in the Civil Register (legal devices exist in order to do so) and to give specifically galician names to new-born children (in fact, it has become fashionable to do so).

As far as place names are concerned, the Law Concerning Language Normalisation of 1983 states that: 'the only legally recognised form of galician place names is the galician form' (Parlamento de Galicia 1983:12). Since that date, it has become common practice to use the galician forms on public signs, although exceptions do exist (bilingual signs, local opposition to the revival of the galician name etc.). Since 1982 a Comisión de Toponima (Commission for Place Names) has been operating under the auspices of the Galician Xunta and has played a fundamental role in the collecting and the setting down of correct forms of galician place names.45
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