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The standardization of Galician is traditionally one of the aspects of the language 'normalization' that has been most fervently discussed. Certainly the linguistic status of Galician in the framework of Romance varieties in general and Hispanic varieties in particular is very peculiar. It arose as a literary language in the Middle Ages as a variety closely related to Portuguese. However, the political and later the sociocultural division between Galicia and Portugal gave rise to a divergent evolution of the varieties of Galician and Portuguese.

Portuguese has enjoyed a lengthy and intense development which extended beyond Europe, while Galician fell into a situation of diglossia in which Castilian played the dominant role. The contemporary resurgence of Galician began in the nineteenth century in conditions where there was scarce knowledge of, and little attention paid to, the Portuguese standard.

Our account intends to offer a synthetic view of the historical process of standardization of Galician up to the present day.

At the end of the 1970s the Galician language was officially recognized together with Castilian in the recently constituted Galician autonomous community. At the same time Galician began to be studied in the official national curriculum. These were very new developments because since the Middle Ages the Galician language had not enjoyed official status nor had it normally been taught at school. These important modifications in the social status of Galician had immediate repercussions on its linguistic corpus.

At that time the language, which existed in a purely oral and literary state, did not have a consolidated and unified standard. Attempts at orthographic and morphological regulation, insufficiently socialized and without a unanimously accepted authority, had had little impact on the cultivated variety, both oral and written.

With official recognition, the opportunity for developing some basic norms for a Galician standard appeared for the first time to have the possibility of an effective socialization and an authoritative support. For this reason discussions about the possible orientations for the standard language were revived. These discussions resulted in two alternative views: the reintegrationalist, which seeks the approximation of Galician to Portuguese, and the independentalist, which follows the dominant line in the cultivation of contemporary Galician and tends to convert it into an independent language, although close to Portuguese.
The independentist position defeated the reintegrationalist one, drafted the Normas Ortográficas e Morfolóxicas do Idioma Galego (1982) and achieved their official recognition in 1983. Reintegrationalists maintained their positions, although several different normative proposals have since issued from this group. Some of them are more or less definitive models, others are normative proposals of transition or agreement.

Discussions about which one must be the normative model have been produced almost since the Galician language began to be written (A. Montero; R. Carballo; C. Hermida). The true novelty, which at the same time can explain the passion of the present-day debate, is that for the first time some power is involved. If we attend to their respective arguments, it seems as if the polemic reintegrationalism/independentism (or utilizing some of the terms used by the rival factions to attack each other, lusismo/isolacionismo) existed, and moreover in today's terms, almost since Galician started to be cultivated. This is a false impression. As we shall show, in the process of the constitution of standard Galician, Portuguese trends, as well as separatist and purist ones (enxebristas), among others, played an important role, but they were not so clearly defined as they are today (in fact, they co-exist in periods and authors) and they were not formulated in such clear terms as they currently appear.

In this article we shall examine the development of contemporary Galician towards the constitution of a standard language. As can be deduced from what we have said, we shall try to look beyond such present-day terms of such sour polemic, and analyse the 'question', we hope objectively, by using the theoretical instruments of sociolinguistics, and at the same time establish its importance in relation to the historical framework in which we placed it.

The Theoretical Instruments
We shall start from Haugen's well-known proposal in order to systematize the different facets of a process of linguistic normalization. In our opinion the study of standardization should focus on the formal aspect of corpus planning, that is, on the codification of the norm. However, this aspect is closely linked to the others: the selection process of a variety as a base of the standard language; the implementation of its sociocommunicative uses; and their corresponding cultivation in the terminological and stylistic domains. In fact, in this article we shall seek to show not a

restricted vision of standardization but an integral overview which will be contextualized in the four aspects of the above diagram.

In order to make a sociolinguistic characterization of Galician, we shall make use of the conceptual apparatus designed by Heinz Kloss⁶ and refined by Žarco Muljačić.⁷ The basic concepts in which we are interested are, in the first place, the concepts of Abstand (distance or distancing) and Ausbau (development or elaboration). The first one is related to the linguistic component of historical varieties, to their internal features. The second one refers to the socio-cultural component of the varieties, to the features provided by the linguistic communities. A given language can be an abstand language (if it has a linguistic physiognomy that is clearly original) and at the same time can be an ausbau language (if a linguistic community manages to create a standard variety by developing its social and communicative functions to create a standard). Consequently, there can be varieties that exist as abstand languages but are not developed (for example Basque in the Middle Ages or many indigenous languages nowadays), and varieties that are developed but are not true ausbau languages because they do not have enough linguistic distancing. This is the most debated contribution of Žarco Muljačić and it is precisely our point of interest. According to him Galician should be a typical example of ausbau language, which is not an abstand language on its own. In fact present-day Galician should be part of a wider abstand language, Galician-Portuguese, developed in the Middle Ages. In Muljačić's scheme, Portuguese and Galician should be two different ausbau

languages that were developed independently at different historical times from the abstand language Galician-Portuguese, as shown in Diagram 2.

Diagram 2: Muljačić 1986 (Re-elaboration)

In the second place, we are interested in the concepts of covered idiom and linguistic roof. An idiom is covered when its speakers are obliged to learn a standard language at school that corresponds to a different abstand language and/or when numerous speakers perform a substantial percentage of their speech acts, volentes nolentes, in a variety of a foreign abstand language. In our case, historical circumstances imposed Castilian in Galicia as the only official and formal language. Galician from the fifteenth century up till now has been in the situation of a covered idiom in regard to the Castilian linguistic roof. In order to study the phenomena produced in cases of linguistic protection (or tutelage), it is quite important to take into account the degree of inter-linguistic proximity which exists between the roof variety and the covered idiom variety. If this proximity is very close it is quite probable that the protected community feel that both roof and covered idiom are varieties of the same language, specialized by the social functions they play. Thus, the community can think that the roof is the high variety (H in Fergusonian terms) of their covered idiom (the low variety, L). It is clear that in Galicia, during the centuries of exclusive dominion of Castilian, Galician came to be perceived socially as a simple low variety of Castilian (see Diagram 3a below).

This has important consequences firstly in the phenomena of linguistic interference, and secondly in the processes of promotion and standardization of the covered idiom, when and if these processes take place. As far as the first point is concerned, a high frequency and a relative depth of language interference between Galician and Castilian (mainly from the latter to the

former) can be observed. With regard to the second, it is also noteworthy that on starting the cultivation of Galician, a strong reaction appears against the attraction and assimilation of Castilian. This is the phenomenon named

**Diagram 3: Salgado & Monteagudo 1991**

[A] Sources of Neologisms in Popular Galician

Internal Roof (Castilian)

\[ \text{Castilian} \rightarrow \text{Galician} \]

Covered Idiom (Galician)

[B] Sources of Neologisms in Differentialist and Puristic Galician

\[ \text{Latin} \quad \text{other sources} \]

\[ \text{(Castilian} \rightarrow \text{) Galician} \quad \text{Portuguese} \]

\[ \text{Galician} \leftarrow \text{Portuguese} \]

in Galician sociolinguistics *differentialism*. At this point in the process, the *roof* is used as a negative reference, against which the language must be redefined and from which it is important to be as different as possible.

Here we come to the concepts of *purism* and *separation*, which were cleverly explored by Paul Wexler in his study about processes of standardization in varieties which we have characterized as *covered idioms* with *linguistic roof*.\(^{11}\) The tendency to *purism* (in Galician *enxebrismo*) tries to liberate the *covered idiom* from all impurity originating from the *roof*. The tendency to *differentialism* seeks therefore the largest distance between *covered idiom* and *roof* (see above: Diagram 3B).

In the conditions described it is very easy for these tendencies to be exaggerated and lead to two phenomena: *hyperdifferentialism*, that is, the rejection of words and forms which are the same in the roof and in the covered idiom by a cultivator who can interpret them as real interferences; and *hyperpurism* or, in our case, *hypergalicianism*, the phonic or morphological reformation of words shared by both varieties.

*Hyperdifferentialism* affects above all the popular lexicon. The tendency to exclude words shared with Castilian leads many writers to the promotion

---


of differential words in their place. Words like bágoa ‘tear’, belvozo ‘lip’, lembrar ‘to remember’, esque(n)cer ‘to forget’ were systematically preferred in literary Galician to synonyms which were common to Castilian (lágrima, labio, recordar, olvidar). The first set of examples continue to be largely employed in both the literary and the spoken language. In some other cases the differential words had a more restricted semantic field and were not completely synonymous (like originally acabar ‘to take up’ with regard to Galician and Castilian alcanzar ‘to reach’). Finally, words in popular use like mencina ‘medicament’ and creto ‘personal reputation’ — although having a much more specific use — were preferred for differentialist reasons to the learned words medicina ‘medical science’ and crédito ‘credit, loan’.

On the other hand, hyperpurism affects particularly, but not exclusively, learned words of Latin origin because one of the main sources of lexical renewal for Galician and Castilian, as Romance languages, is Latin. Cultivation of Galician demanded the introduction en masse of erudite vocabulary of Greek and Latin origin common to Castilian, but this conflicted with the differentialist inclination of cultivators of Galician. In fact, this was the eventual reason for a hyperpuristic reformation of these words. By applying historical rules of evolution from Latin to Galician, learned words like catedrático ‘professor’, secretario ‘secretary’, ámbito ‘ambit, domain’, destino ‘destiny, fate’, sombra ‘shadow’, excepción ‘exception’, became in some writers cadeirado, segredado, aneto, destiño, sona, excepción.

It seems also very fruitful to our purpose to combine the key concepts of Muliačić’s formulation with the concepts of opening and closure elaborated by Punya S. Ray.12 They refer to the potential sources of enrichment of a given linguistic variety. When a language is covered, its roof tends to be its only source of lexical innovation. In other words, the covered language is open only to the influence of its roof and it is closed to any other source for potential enrichment. In our case, Castilian closed any other potential source of Galician and imposed itself not only as its only direct source of ever more numerous linguistic interferences but as the effective filter of other influences. For instance, the introduction of Latin learned words into Galician from the sixteenth century onwards took place almost exclusively through Castilian (for example the huge number of words with suffix -ción/-ción like admiración, composición, disolución, división). In contrast, cultivators of Galician tried to open their language to other sources of neologism, namely opening doors to old Galician (with the consequent introduction of archaisms and the adaptation of medieval words like ren ‘nothing’, às vegadas ‘sometimes’, conquistar ‘to conquer’ or castelán ‘Castilian’), to Portuguese (from where we have numerous Lusitanisms in literary Galician and even in

the present-day standard: xornal 'newspaper', estrada 'road', ensino 'schooling, education') and to other influences.

Within the development of literary and standard Galician, together with the process of linguistic borrowing, we must point out the importance acquired by the process of internal renewal during this century. We refer to the creation of new words by composition (many times by calque like raiñacesos 'skyscraper', cumpreános 'birthday'), derivation and parasyntesis (aplausar 'to clap, to applaud', alonxar 'to distance, to separate', gotexar 'to drip', adicanza 'dedication, devotion', pescudación 'investigation', adoutri-namento 'indoctrination') and especially by metaphorization and reutilization of popular words in cultivated texts with the resulting amplification of their semantic field (verba 'fluency' has taken the meaning of 'word'; peirao, originally 'dam' nowadays means 'wharf, quay', antergo initially 'adult' became 'ancestor', conquerir 'to conquer' became 'to achieve, to obtain' and so on.

The conceptual machinery which we have just described is useful to analyse the processes named in Diagram 1 as codification and cultivation. In order to measure the degree of expansion (or implementation) we shall observe two aspects of linguistic cultivation: literary, and non literary.

In the first aspect we shall examine the progressive use of Galician in the different literary genres, from those which are closer to pure orality (lyric poetry, dialogues in prose) passing through an intermediate stage (theatre, epic and short narrative) to the most distant (novel and essay).

In the second aspect we shall deal with the proposal of Kloss and Haarmann, which is based on the types of written texts of non-literary prose and is represented by a network of two axes as shown below in Diagram 4.

Diagram 4: Kloss 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TEXT

E (elementary)
D (divulgative)
O (original)

TOPIC

N (national)
H (humanistic)
T (technico-scientific)

14 H. Haarmann, Elemente einer Soziologie der kleinen Sprachen Europas, 2 vols (Hamburg: Buske, 1979) II.
On the vertical axis, three kinds of text are distinguished according to their aims, format and potential audience: elementary (E), divulgative (D) and highly original (O). On the horizontal axis we find another three kinds of text differentiated according to subject: in the first level we find the writings on national subjects (N), in the second level there appear texts on humanistic subjects and of supranational character (H) and, in the third, texts on technical and scientific subjects (T). This gives us a box of nine squares with Arabic numbers from 1 (elementary level and national subjects) to 9 (university level and non-humanistic subjects: natural sciences and technology), listed according to the level of linguistic and socio-cultural development.

**The Development of a Contemporary Galician**

After having examined a series of sample texts, and in order to simplify our exposition, we propose the following pre-theoretical division of literary Galician into periods with reference to its linguistic evolution:

1. **Popular Galician** (*galego popular*, approximately until the end of the nineteenth century).
2. **Puristic Galician** (*galego enxebrizante*, from approximately the end of the nineteenth century to 1936).
4. **Standard Galician** (*galego estándar*, from the 1970s to the present day).

We shall characterize each period under the following headings (see Diagram 5):

(a) Progress in the culture of language (corresponding to expansion or implementation).
(b) Orthographic solutions (corresponding to graphization).
(c) Degree of (supra-/inter-) dialectalism (corresponding to selection and morphological codification).
(d) Influence of purist and differentialist attitudes with respect to the treatment of Castilianisms and vulgarisms; creation of hyperpurisms; introduction of archaisms, Lusitanisms and foreign words (corresponding to lexical codification and terminological cultivation).

In order to understand our proposal, the following should be taken into account:

(a) Passing from one period to another does not happen suddenly; there is a continuity between them and so there are transitional periods and works.
(b) The development of contemporary literary Galician is a cumulative process: in each period we find traces of the previous one and signs which anticipate the next step.
### Diagram 5: Salgado & Monteagudo 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castelanism</th>
<th>Dialectalism</th>
<th>Differentialism</th>
<th>Purism</th>
<th>Neologism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popular</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proto-st.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Lux = ‘Castelanismo de luxo’ Castilianism being superfluous; Adap. = Castilianism which was adapted; Dial. = Dialectalism; Inter = Interdialectalism; Supr. = Supradialectalism; Vulg. = Vulgarism; Hyper = Hyperpurism; Arc. = Archaisms; Lus. = Lusitanism; For. = Foreign word; Met. = Metaphorical use; Der. = Derived word

(c) Advance is very far from being linear: some works plainly anticipate tendencies which will only be developed later and there were periods of retrogression (for example immediately after the Spanish Civil War).

In what follows we will attempt to describe the different stages of the development of the standardization process of contemporary Galician.

### Popular Galician

This period extends from the first writings of the nineteenth century to 1880. As literary works we have chosen *Proezas de Galicia* by J. F. Neira, a book written as dialogues between two peasants, and the poetry collection *Cantares Gallegos*, which is of a folkloric character, and *Follas Novas*, which is more intimate and personal. Both of these were written by Rosalía de Castro, the most important modern Galician poet.

The orthography of this period is hesitant. Castilian orthography is taken as a model and is modified wherever Galician differs from that language. Castilian spelling was learnt at school and it was to a great extent suitable for Galician because of the convergent phonetic evolution in some aspects since the Middle Ages (see Diagram 6 for the evolution of sibilant and affricate consonants).

---

15 See footnote 10.
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Diagram 6: Salgado & Monteagudo 1991

Sibilants and affricates

A) Initial situation of Galician, Portuguese and Castilian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purism</th>
<th>Neologism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) Evolutions towards the respective modern languages

**GALICIAN**

**PHONETICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voiced/voiceless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>s₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ć</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORTHOGRAPHY**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coser</td>
<td>pasar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cozer</td>
<td>cazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gente</td>
<td>coxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASTILIAN**

**PHONETICS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>s₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ć</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORTHOGRAPHY**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coser</td>
<td>pasar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cozer</td>
<td>cazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gente</td>
<td>cojo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PORTUGUESE**

**PHONETICS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>dz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ć</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORTHOGRAPHY**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coser</td>
<td>passar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cozer</td>
<td>cazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancho</td>
<td>coxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cases in which Galician phonemics differed from Castilian were the points where there were the greatest vacillations in the written representation. This is the case with the consonants /ʃ/ (voiceless, fricative palatal) and /ʒ/ (velar nasal). The former corresponds *grosso modo* with Castilian /ʃ/ (velar, fricative) and the latter always appears in word-final position, in the article *unha* and in a series of indefinites (*algunha, ningunha*, etc.).

Two types of representation were tried for the first phoneme:

(a) A phonemic representation. The proposed graphemes were, among others, *xs, x* and *-x*. The letter *x* succeeded in being the most used up till now (*xente, boxe, deixar*) and this was the solution sanctioned by the official *Normas* (1982).

See footnote 10.
(b) An etymological representation. In this case the proposed spelling was motivated from Latin and medieval Galician points of view (and also Portuguese: gente, hoje, deixar), and coincides in part with Castilian (gente, hoy, dejar). The first proponents of this spelling adduced in its favour the historical relationship with Latin; later, the tradition of medieval Galician was propounded; then, the Portuguese spelling and finally the Castilian one. This tendency had supporters in every period of Galician but they were always in a minority. Nowadays, the etymological spelling is defended only by reintegrationist proposals, but not by proponents of transition.

Typical of this period is the generalization of the use of hyphens, apostrophes and written accents to stress some phonotactical features. The profusion of these diacritical marks gives the spelling of this period a very peculiar aspect, which at the same time distinguishes it from Castilian spelling.

As far as the morphological aspect of the written language is concerned, hesitancy is also dominant. From the first analysed works authors sought a mixture of different dialectal solutions, mainly from central Galician and western Galician. This combination was produced in an unsystematic way. Dialectally, there are three different ways in Galician of forming the plural of nouns ending in -n: (1) add -s; (2) -n change to -s; (3) -n change to -is (e.g. can 'dog' > cans/cas/cais). In Proeza alternation of different plurals, even in the same word, is quite common: cañons/cañois, leons/leos.

Lexically, purist and differentialist attitudes show little vigour in this period. The character of the works did not favour the appearance of numerous learned words, and authors limited themselves to representing the spoken Galician of their time with notable fidelity. They accepted without any hesitation plentiful Castilianisms. In Rosalía de Castro's works, Castilian words like suelo, nudo, cuna are used instead of chan 'floor', nó 'knot' and berce 'cot'. Forms with metathesis (like pirmeiro 'first', freheiro 'February'), with apocope (like mocídá 'youth', caridá 'charity') and with simplification of Latin -CC- and -CT- (like satisfacción 'satisfaction', dotor 'doctor', obxeto 'object') which today are considered vulgarisms are very numerous. Contrasting with other stages, the writers from this period include markedly few hyperpurisms and practically no archaisms and no Lusitanisms.

**Puristic Galician**

From our perspective the first stage of popular Galician is followed by a new stage of enxebrista Galician (purist and differentialist). This stage lasts roughly from 1880 to 1936. The culture of language moves forward spectacularly. Galician is used more and more in public speech and in the
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writers from this period

cally no archaisms and no

Galician is followed by a new

rentalist). This stage lasts

language moves forward

public speech and in the

theatre, and at the same time reaches a wider range of literary genres (short

fiction, novel, essay and journalism). It begins to be used with more freedom

and frequently even in non-literary writings (until level 5 in the Kloss

diagram). The kind of texts in which Galician is used makes it necessary to

adopt many erudite terms. However, the introduction of a new terminology

was felt to constitute a risk of lexical Castilization and occasioned a

strongly purist and differentialist attitude.

The chosen texts for this period are three novels by A. López Ferreiro (A

Tecedeira de Bonaval, O Castelo de Pambre and O Niño de Pombas) and

three by R. Otero Pedrayo (Arredor de Si, A Romería de Gelmez and O

Mesón dos Ermos).

Graphical solutions adopted in the earlier stage are now consolidated, but

alternative proposals are still prevalent. We still have a profusion of
diacritical marks used in a confused manner. The morphological trials of the

former stage continue with a predominance of interdialectical solutions

existing alongside authors who use their own dialect more.

In the lexical field, as we have already said, purist tendencies are in their

apogee. Galician becomes more resistant to Castilian influences and more

receptive to its own medieval literature, Portuguese, Latin and other closely

related languages. Popular words shared with Castilian are systematically

avoided or deformed. Otero Pedrayo, for example, prefers ledo ‘happy’,

lembrar ‘to remember’ and intre ‘moment’ (instead of contento, recordar,

momento); and, instead of ver, he adopts a variety of different forms (a)fitar,

ollar, mirar and ollecer. A huge mass of learned (and also popular) words are

now anachronistically altered and adapted to the patrimonial Galician

(esceo ‘scene’, biblioteca ‘library’, oitimista ‘optimistic’, attivo ‘active’,

estrano ‘strange’), so that we can say that both vulgarism and hyperpurism

are one and the same in this period. The discovery of medieval literature

enthuses the cultivated elite so that medieval Galician is taken as the measure

for the purification of Castilizations and as a mine for the literary lexicon.

Dead words like pobo ‘people’, deus ‘god’, eirexalígrena ‘church’ and

ci(b)dade ‘city’ are definitively reintroduced into the literary language. The

study of medieval literature and knowledge of contemporary and classical

Portuguese literature make the kinship and closeness of Galician and

Portuguese evident. This latter language, which had developed in conditions

of absolute normality, was one of the models for cultivators of Galician.

Integral to this enthusiasm for differentiation from Castilian is Otero

19 'A Tecedeira de Bonaval' (1894): initially published by the newspaper El Pensamiento Gallego

and later edited by Andrés Martínez Salazar (A Coruña: 1895); 'O Castelo de Pambre', in El

Pensamiento Gallego (1895); O Niño de Pombas (Santiago: Tipografía Galega, 1905). The three

novels have been published together in: López Ferreiro, Novelas (Santiago: Bibliófilos Gallegos,

1952). This is the edition we have used.

20 Arredor de Si (Santiago: Nós, 1930); A Romería de Gelmez (Santiago: Nós, 1934); O Mesón

dos Ermos (Ourense: Alauda, 1936).
Pedrayo’s use of aldeia, sul, camponés and cónego (instead of the commonest aldea, sur, labrego and lit. cãoego). In addition to this resource there was also a remarkable lexical creation through derivation, and in particular a semantic enlargement of innumerable terms relating to rural life. This lexical enrichment, which was used more and more, can be properly understood only in the light of the intellectualization of the language which took place during this period. Traditional verbs like xurdir and asoballar used only popularly to refer to natural actions, were often given many abstract meanings different from their original sense.

Proto-standard Galician

The proto-standard Galician stage extended from the end of the Civil War to the 1970s. The hiatus produced inside Galicia, because of the repression between 1936 and 1950, was covered by literary production in exile, namely in Buenos Aires. When critical post-war difficulties were over Galician reasserted its line of literary development in conditions of extreme precariousness. In two decades, thanks to its use in works of philosophical, historical and economic character, the non-literary language reaches level 5 and 7 of the Kloss diagram (without square 6 yet).

As control-works of this stage we have chosen the emblematic Sempre en Galiza by Alfonso Daniel R. Castelao,21 which is a sort of transitional work, mostly written in exile; the narrative work of Alvaro Cunqueiro (which appeared from 1955 to 1979);22 and the important treatise of political economy O Atraso Económico de Galicia by X. Manuel Beiras.23

With regard to graphic development, the most remarkable feature in this stage is the notable simplification of spelling, thanks above all to a drastic reduction of the use of written accents and hyphens.

Morphologically there is a clear trend (especially in Beiras’ work) towards the adoption of supradialectal solutions, that is, forms from different dialects are not mixed at random but are integrated and structured in a superior system. In Cunqueiro and Beiras the results of Latin endings -ANU/-ANA are preferably -ani-á (as in present-day Galician standard) in traditional words like verán ‘summer’, irmán ‘brother’, gran ‘grain’, cotián ‘daily’ (masculines) and mazá ‘apple’, irmá ‘sister’, curmá ‘cousin’, cortesá ‘courtly’ (feminines).

In the lexical aspect, purist vigilance against Castilianisms is still operating, but there is at the same time a certain purge of vulgarisms, hyperpurisms and Lusitanisms. In general, the achievements of the former period are reinstated and definitely consolidated; some excesses are reduced and the
process of enriching Galician goes on, due principally to the importation of foreign words and in part due to internal creation. What is remarkable in this respect and very characteristic of this stage is the great increase in derived words (asoballador ‘overwhelming’, rexurdimanto ‘revival, renaissance’, desarranxo ‘disorder’, feixismo ‘fascism’, eleitoreiro ‘electioneering’, aillar ‘to isolate’, etc.) and the intellectualization of the Galician traditional lexicon (internal lexical renewal) in phrases and sentences like aparello caciquil, escoller un texto, tronzar os vencellos, etc. In fact, it was at this time that a Galician essayistic register with its own stylistic traits was consolidated.

**Standard Galician**

We arrive at more recent times. Sociologically this is a period marked by the introduction of Galician into the educational system and into the university, by its acquisition of official status and its consequent use in the bureaucratic sphere and political institutions, and by its diffusion through the mass media.

There is a proliferation of learning courses for Galician and this develops an awareness of the necessity of norms which provide a standard model. Paradoxically, however, dissensions amongst scholars and writers do not favour a wide consensus in this matter, and a reintegrationist movement which advocates a greater affinity with standard Portuguese has arisen during this period.

In spite of present-day confusion and a proliferation of normative proposals during the last twenty years, the most characteristic feature of this stage is the consciousness of the necessity of a norm for the standard language. Although the proposals are diverse, nobody seriously denies such a necessity today. In this sense, the 1982 official norms, which consolidate the majority tradition of contemporary Galician by purifying it, fill in a gap which was essential for further progress along the path of ‘normalization’.

**University of Oxford**

**University of Santiago**

---

24 RAG-ILG, Normas Ortográficas e Morfolóxicas do Idioma Galego (Vigo: Real Academia Galega/Instituto da Língua Galega, 1982).

---

Notes: As Burgos, 1961.

Por Hámlet, Príncipe de Dinamarca (Galaxia, 1961).