

# The discourse of language in Galiza: Normalisation, diglossia, and conflict

Mário J. Herrero-Valeiro  
*Universidade da Coruña*

Proxecto “Comunicación e novas tecnoloxías”  
Departamento de Galego-Portugués, Francés e Lingüística  
Facultade de Filoloxía, Campus de Elviña s/n  
15071 A Coruña (Galiza), Spain  
mariojherrero@mundo-r.com

## Abstract

In this article we will conduct a review (influenced by critical historiography and critical discourse analysis) of the circulation of some terms characteristic of political-linguistic discourse and linguistic planning in the context of the discourse about language developed in Galiza throughout the last thirty years. We focus our attention especially on the terms “diglossia”, “linguistic normalisation” and “linguistic conflict”, which have come to occupy a central position in the Galician context, marked on the plane of identity politics by the confrontation between two conflicting nationalist ideologies —identification with a nation with State (Spanish nationalism) and identification with a nation without State (Galician nationalism)—, and on the plane of language planning by (a) the conflict generated by the process of standardisation of one normative model for the Galician-Portuguese of Galiza, and (b) the critique generated by Galician linguistic nationalism of the language planning measures implemented by the autonomous government of Galiza. All of this must be understood against a general background shaped by the advanced linguistic substitution suffered by the Galician-Portuguese varieties spoken in Galiza in favour of Spanish.

**Key words:** diglossia, linguistic conflict, linguistic normalisation, nationalism, bilingualism, monolingualism.

## Resumo

Neste artigo realizamos unha revisión (influenciada pola historiografía crítica e a análise crítica do discurso) da circulación dalgúns termos propios do discurso político-lingüístico e a planificación lingüística no contexto do discurso sobre a lingua elaborado en Galiza ó longo dos últimos trinta anos. En concreto, centramos a nosa atención especialmente nos termos “diglosia”, “normalización lingüística” e “conflicto lingüístico”, que viñeron a ocupar un lugar central no contexto galego, marcado no plano da política identitaria pola confrontación entre dúas ideoloxías nacionalistas en conflito —a identificada coa nación con Estado (nacionalismo español) e a identificada coa nación sen Estado (nacionalismo galego)—, e no

da planificación lingüística por (a) o conflito xerado polo proceso de estandarización dun modelo normativo para o galego-portugués de Galiza, e (b) a crítica ás medidas de planificación lingüística implementadas polo goberno autónomo de Galiza, xerada polo nacionalismo lingüístico galego. Todo isto debe ser comprendido no trasfondo xeral conformado pola substitución lingüística avanzada sufrida polas variedades galego-portuguesas faladas en Galiza en favor do castelán.

**Palabras clave:** diglosia, conflito lingüístico, normalización lingüística, nacionalismo, bilingüismo, monolingüismo.

### 1. Diglossia and its negation, ideological axes of the discourse about language in Galiza<sup>1</sup>

Few terms have proven to be as productive in sociolinguistic discourse, and in discourse about language in general, as diglossia (see Fernández, 1993a). Moreover, few terms have managed to achieve the degree of mystification that this term has demonstrated, and continues to demonstrate, in some discursive contexts. From its initial usage, now more than a century ago (Fernández, 1995), until the current time, by way of the frequently cited intervention of Ferguson (1959), the definition of diglossia and its application to different and at times very divergent contexts has produced genuine controversies, usually ideologically-based rather than incited by simple arguments between academic schools of thought. These arguments are

---

1 We will make reference here to the confrontation between nationalisms, dominating and dominated, existing in the Spanish State. In our case, we consider Spanish nationalist ideology, historically favoured by the State, to be the dominant nationalism, and Galician nationalist ideology, lacking State legitimisation (sub-nationalism for Anderson, 1983), to be the dominated nationalism. From the dominant nationalist perspective, which is presented as non-nationalistic, the only existing nationalisms would be the peripherals (principally Catalan, Basque, and Galician). From our perspective, we understand the concept of nation in the sense of Anderson (1983), that is, as a political community imagined to be implicitly limited and sovereign. Our understanding of the relation between language and nation basically coincides with that expressed by historians of nationalism such as Smith (1976), Anderson (1983) and Hobsbawm (1992), and those who study the relation between language and nation such as Crowley (1996) and Baggioni (1997), and that, in our opinion, has been precisely summarised by González Millán (1998) and Fernández (1998) in two works focusing —the first directly and the second indirectly— on the current Galician context. The first analyses the relation between linguistic nationalism and the construction of a national literature, and the second analyses the relation between language and social identity, especially national. At this point we will limit ourselves to pointing out a basic axiom in this respect: “with few exceptions, the identification of language and nation is a recent phenomenon” (Fernández, 1998: 32). We study this issue more extensively in Herrero Valeiro (2000: 132-45). A more detailed examination of the language-nation relation and its connection with nationalitarian conflict in the Galician context can be seen in Herrero Valeiro (2000: 188-222). We point out here that Galician as well as Spanish nationalism defends an essentialist concept of nation, whose appearance is set as far in the past as possible, and generally establishes, more or less explicitly, a rigid relation between the nation and the language that identifies it (Galician or Galician-Portuguese in one case, Spanish in the other).

especially prevalent in territories where some kind of (socio) linguistic conflict (generally an index of social confrontation) has been generated, nationalitarian in nature with its thick and opaque epidermis, a hegemony of some social groups over others in the deep levels of the society.

We should point out that we do not intend to argue here the global validity of the term linguistic conflict, that is, we do not intend to determine whether we should only speak of the existence of such a process when a given linguistic situation is assumed to be conflictive (that is, of necessary transformation) by broad segments of the population, or if we can also use this characterisation when the situation is considered conflictive by only more or less numerous groups of linguistic militants or conscious speakers—that is, by elite or proto-elite groups. We accept the existence of a (socio)linguistic conflict, or process of linguistic domination (of some social groups over others), when some segment of the population becomes conscious that one of the languages present in the society—although it may not even be that which this segment habitually uses in its daily non-institutional communication—is subordinated in the socio-political dimension, and sets out in some way to subvert or to simply modify this situation. Neither will we discuss here whether this social segment is necessarily destined to comprise some elite groups in a political-discursive process of national construction, although this process seems to have been the most habitual in modern vindication processes of languages like Galician. This conflict-consciousness is expressed, in a first phase, through discourses that interpret and discourses that propose actions, and in a second phase, through social implementation of the proposed actions—always and when this social segment, through the accumulation and adequate management of political capital, possesses the necessary institutional political power or the ability to influence the institutional political—: that is, through a program, broad in a sense, of linguistic policy and language planning. This entails, therefore, a glottopolitical practice, which produces first an analysis and then an intervention (Herrero Valeiro, 2000).

In Galiza, a territory in which a social conflict in the basic terms we have just defined exists, we can observe that different uses of the term *diglossia*, a word central in the Galician discourse about the language, have existed since the beginning of the 1970s: (a) with the objective of defending its validity in applying particular interpretations to a social situation characterised by the functional distribution (extreme or very marked) of two (or more) relatively structurally distant language varieties, and by the relative stability of such a situation; (b) on the contrary, with the intention of criticising or denying these interpretations; and (c) to present new conceptual appropriations of the term.

In our opinion, based on the use (or non-use) of diglossia we can locate the two ideologically central axes of the political linguistic discourse in Galiza:

- a) the confirmation of diglossia (high language Spanish vs. low language

- Galician or Galician-Portuguese), as the label which has served and which still serves to describe the current Galician situation and to indicate the necessity to overcome it, the discourse preferentially linked to Galician nationalism; and
- b) the denial (explicit or implicit) of Galician diglossia, which has been overcome in the two last decades —replaced by a *harmonic* or *balanced* bilingualism— thanks to the planning intervention of the autonomous government and the evolution of the Galician society itself. This discourse is linked, as one might assume, to those sectors that hold this institutional power, ideologically situated in Spanish nationalism.

At the same time, it is important to keep in mind that the refusal to characterise the Galician situation as diglossia or, at least, the criticism of this interpretation hegemonic in Galician nationalism, are positions defended as well by other sociolinguistic discourses, although certainly with arguments different from those used by the Galician administration.

We believe that this interpretive confrontation (diglossia vs. harmonic bilingualism or non-diglossia) can only be studied in ideological terms. Nevertheless, as we have pointed out on other occasions (Herrero Valeiro, 1993a, 1997), we come from an initial position that establishes that, from the point of view of a technical analysis of the Galician sociolinguistic situation, this confrontation about uses of diglossia can provide little productive application at the current time. Once the lines of interpretation of the term are fixed, there is little more that can be done besides choosing one or, perhaps, rejecting all of them (including the line postulating denial of the term based on the linguistic policy proposals of the autonomous government). Our position considers that, from a critical perspective, what should be of current interest is —together with the study of the ideological foundation of the different discursive lines— the analysis of the evolution of the social situation in recent years, and not so much the discussion of which descriptive label is most appropriate.

Thus, as we have already expressed on various occasions (Herrero Valeiro, 1993a, 1997, 2000), we think that the changes produced have been important enough to demand an update of the analysis and of the lines of argumentation. In this way, we open ourselves to the criticism of authors very influential in the discourse of Galician linguistic nationalism who maintain that the linguistic conflict has persisted in practically the same way as it was almost three decades (especially Rodríguez, 1991, originally published in 1976; Garcia Negro, 1991; Freixeiro Mato, 1997). This does not imply, in any case, denial of the existence of what we ourselves understand to be conflictive elements; that is, postulating the relevance of a change in the interpretation of the Galician conflict does not imply a denial of the persistence of legal and social subordination (with economic, political, and cultural repercussions) of certain social groups, resulting from issues for which “the linguistic” takes on a special relevance.

## 2. The institutionalisation of a model of the Galician language and the standard language conflict

### 2.1. The conflict over the standard language: The struggle for control of the linguistic market

We will attempt to define some of the sociolinguistic changes to which we referred in the previous section. In principle, and attending to the most evident aspects, we have experienced in this period of time the institutionalisation (Álvarez Cáceamo, 1990) of a normative code that receives the name of *Galician*, that is, the constitution of a particular codification of Galician-Portuguese as legitimate language (Bourdieu, 1982), with a legally co-official status —subordinated, if we attend to the founding legality of the State monarchy (the Constitution of 1978)— with Spanish, designated to be the only language of power little more than twenty years ago.

However, with respect to this question is impossible to ignore the existence of a virulent confrontation of elites around the control of the graphic construction of Galician and its symbolic value as national or ethnic identitary marker (Herrero Valeiro, 1993b, 2000), which has to a large extent conditioned the discourse about the language in Galiza. Although its origins may be situated around the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and traced throughout the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this war of elites has fostered since the 1970s a confrontation between defenders of the glottopolitical independence of Galician with respect to Portuguese (autonomism or differentialism) and defenders of the glottopolitical unity of Galician-Portuguese (reintegrationism or lusism). The differentialist position has been legitimated since 1982–1983 by means of its legal sanction by the autonomous Galician government (*Alianza Popular*, currently *Partido Popular*, of conservative and Spanish nationalist ideology). In the powerful symbolic value represented by orthography, this conflict is expressed in the opposition between particular significant graphic characteristics: <ñ> as opposed to <nh>, <ll> as opposed to <lh>, presence or absence of <ç> or <ss>, *-ble* or *-bel* as opposed to *-vel* (*amable/amábel* vs. *amável*), assimilation or non-assimilation of the definite article to the verbal forms ending in *-r* or *-s*, different accentuations, etc. (see for example Herrero Valeiro, 1993b, or Álvarez Cáceamo & Herrero Valeiro, 1996).

Although differentialism is also defended and, which is fundamental, sustained by those sectors of Spanish nationalist ideology that occupy institutional power, these two tendencies can be included with more or less clarity in a heterogeneous Galician nationalism in the arena of linguistic ideology. The origins of this strong divergence can be found in the very different reading that each makes of the linguistic and sociolinguistic history of Galiza, in addition to very different interpretations of particular historical realities (Galiza-Spain relations, Galiza-Portugal relations), of Galiza's current situation in the Spanish State, and, finally, the future projection for Galiza. Although both linguistic ideologies present some of the basic characteristics of Galician nationalism (ethnocentrism and mono-identitarianism linked with social

monolingualism), they differ radically in that while reintegrationism maintains as an essential ideological aspect the non-recognition of linguistic-cultural —and at times not even political— borders with Portugal, the differentialism linked with Galician nationalism defends the linguistic-cultural individuation of Galiza in relation to Portugal as well as to Spain, while in terms of the administrative relation with both States the positions are very different. As might be expected, differentialism linked with Spanish nationalism considers Galiza (converted into an Autonomous Community after the end of the Franco period) to be an inseparable part of what this ideology recognises as the Spanish nation, and considers Galician to be a Spanish language, necessarily different from Portuguese, national language of the Portuguese State.

In the language-planning aspect, after a short period of debate between defenders of the two sides with the common objective of achieving standardisation of Galician, the autonomous government held by ideologically Spanish nationalist sectors tipped the balance toward the side of the technical-intellectual differentialist groups, legitimising their discourse and normative standard option. The government then went on to enact a policy combining disciplinary resources with democratic control over the defenders of the reintegrationist perspective, who remained outside the elite realm of legitimated power, and therefore, without control of the new linguistic market and the authorised intellectual camp. Composed of some anti-elites who postulate an alternative political-cultural model (with a greater draw in Portugal and among lusophony), the reintegrationists interpret the institutional support for the differentialist vision as an attempt by Spanish nationalism to control Galician linguistic planning in order to avoid an excessive political problematisation of the linguistic issue that might politically and socially endanger the State and its national language, Spanish. Included within this undesired problematisation is the fact that reintegrationism implies an evident approximation of Galiza to a State other than Spain (Portugal). After twenty years, the confrontation still continues, since both tendencies are necessarily irreconcilable in offering opposed, irreducible identity projects. A good demonstration of this is the progressive disappearance of alternative intermediate norms (within the *continuum* that we define in Álvarez Caccamo & Herrero Valeiro, 1996). Thus, in one of the latest episodes of the conflict, an attempt to unify the two existing differentialist tendencies (the legitimated norm and that known as “reintegration of minimums”<sup>2</sup>) was rejected by the *Real Academia Galega*, the institution that legally possesses the authority to effect modifications in the legitimate language model, despite the fact that, in practice, this unification represented the absorption of the second tendency by the

---

2 In our opinion, this normative proposal was the reintegrationist in name only, since formally it was much closer to the legitimated differentialist norm than to the reintegrationist proposals, which were very close to or even coinciding with contemporary written Portuguese.

first in exchange for concessions that, in our opinion, did not exceed a symbolic level, since at no time did they affect the fundamentals of the legitimated norm<sup>3</sup>.

The glottopolitical panorama becomes more complicated if we add that, although both linguistic ideologies appear to be well defined, within each coexist groups with divergent political ideologies. Reintegrationism appears to be the most homogeneous, the basic ideological weight corresponding to pro-independent nationalism, although there are also nationalist groups with other ideologies and libertarian groups. Differentialism, more heterogeneous, covers diverse ideologies from conservative or social-democratic Spanish nationalism to different sectors of Galician nationalism, from non pro-independence social-democratic to Marxist-Leninist pro-independence. It is necessary to avoid in this case a rigid identification among linguistic ideology, nationalist ideology, and political ideology.

Finally, it is necessary to note that this conflict, orthographic on the surface, is alive especially among the linguistic militancy and affects only tangentially the population as a whole—who for the most part continue to write in Spanish and who, generally, remain apart from the linguistic vindication movement. Communication media, which reproduce the dominant linguistic ideology, generally omit the existence of this conflict, and its socialisation remains restricted to the militant activity of the reintegrationist groups.

## 2.2. The institutional vs. the social: The process of linguistic substitution

However, beyond the problematic election of a legitimate Galician language model, which has resulted in a conflict with no discernible means of consensus, it is certain that the changes derived from the institutionalisation of the language have been quite significant. Along with the progressive advance of Spanish in the overall social space, to which we will attend shortly, we believe that the following sociolinguistic changes in particular should be highlighted:

- (i) first standard Galician legally sanctioned and implemented in the history of Galiza, although socially contested;
- (ii) constitution of certain techno-intellectual elites who design and/or assess language planning;
- (iii) constitution of certain technical elites (essentially bureaucrats and politicians but not specialists in linguistic planning) who manage this planning;
- (iv) expansion of Galician into arenas in which it had never before been present;
- (v) spectacular increase in the number of books published in Galician

---

<sup>3</sup> Almost all of the changes postulated were limited to proposing as preferred, in those cases where multiple forms existed, those forms which are now permitted although their use is “less recommended” (*amábel* vs. *amable*, or *conflito* vs. *conflicto*).

(especially in the legitimised standard, institutionally subsidised, but also in other varieties through private initiative) with the consequent constitution of a literary arena situated within the cultural property production space (artistic market) in which the new standard Galician occupies the position of hegemonic language in the production of cultural property (literary production) as well as the interactional rituals generated by the artistic market (presentation of expositions, catalogues, etc.).

In sum, we believe it is possible to speak of the constitution of a typically capitalist linguistic market —perhaps it would be more correct to speak of the reformulation of the previous linguistic market—, born with an apparently strong nationalitarian component, by conforming in its origins to the pressure exerted by the linguistic demands of Galician nationalism or, in a general form, of the sectors traditionally recognised as Galicianist, not all of which can be situated in the space of political nationalism.

We think that, overall, this process of the expansion of standard Galician can be qualified as a weak institutionalised Galicianist movement that essentially affects the literary arena, since the spread of the use of Galician is quite incomplete in some arenas (justice, state administration and municipal) in which Spanish (spoken or written) continues to be the hegemonic language and is precarious in others (autonomous administration, education) where Galician constitutes a greater presence, although habitually used only in written form or in public speech.

Compared with this institutional situation described minimally here, which is truly completely different from that of twenty-five years ago, the description of the sociolinguistic situation of colloquial daily Galician requires, in principle, more caution. Based on the macro sociolinguistic data provided by the *Mapa Sociolingüístico de Galicia* (Sociolinguistic Map of Galiza; Fernández & Rodríguez Neira, 1995) —from here on MSG—, an optimistic reader might be moved to infer the existence of a deceleration in the process of linguistic substitution (or, at least, that the process has come to a relative impasse). Nevertheless, the situation does not invite the unmeasured optimism that, for example, the autonomous government of Galiza tends to demonstrate<sup>4</sup>. This institutional reading is sustained not so much by the data about language use but by a particular interpretation of certain attitudes

---

4 We moderate here some of the observations made in Herrero Valeiro (1997) with respect to the state of the process of linguistic substitution, although not with respect to the basis which sustains it: the fact that, with greater or lesser force, the substitution continues, as can be deduced from the results of the MSG (Fernández & Rodríguez Neira, 1995: 361). Perhaps the reference by Fernández (1991) to the lack of primary material in the urban settings (that is, Galician-speakers of the younger generations) upon which the substitution can act explains the apparent moderation in the substitutory process. Possibly, along with the fact that the linguistic retention (Fernández & Rodríguez Neira, 1995: 361) of

toward Galician that seem to have shifted radically in the last two decades: from a majority consideration, even among Galician-speakers, that the language has no value for socio-economic progress or for prestigious functions to certain majority attitudes that recognise in Galician the same functionality traditionally recognised in Spanish. Nevertheless, the important point in terms of language maintenance is that this attitude modification does not seem to produce a modification of usage favouring Galician sufficiently important to assure its future maintenance at a time when, given the competence levels in Galician among Spanish monolinguals and Spanish-dominant Spanish-Galician bilinguals, the shift from Spanish to Galician is still very feasible (see Fernández & Rodríguez Neira, 1994). Perhaps this change in values should be placed in relation with the influence derived from the modification of state language policies, which have passed in the last few decades from enforcing a disciplinary system that repressed, prohibited, or strictly controlled prestigious public uses, of the peripheral languages to a formal defence and promotion of them, although somewhat vague upon a rigorous reading of the Spanish legislative texts related to linguistic concerns, or upon simply attending to a fundamental aspect of state linguistic policy: the need to learn Spanish and its place as the official language of the State.

In the Galician case, we are faced with a process of construction and institutionalisation of a language that, in reality, does not intend to provoke the substitution of another language but rather what we may call “sharing” of institutional and social spaces. Nevertheless, the Galician language planning seemed at the beginning to be destined, as a fundamental objective, to intervene in the linguistic conduct of the Galician society with the intention of solving the problem (pointed out by militant Galicianism) of the legal and social inequality between the languages and, further, given the sociolinguistic dynamic of the last few decades, to deter or reverse the process of linguistic substitution. At least these are the reasons that we are able to uncover as fundamental to the process. If the process does not accomplish these functions—as in fact seems to be the case, since Galician (that is, its conscious speakers) is not in a full position of legal or social equality with Spanish, and the process of substitution has not reversed but rather has increased—we believe that we will have to define those functions that truly are taking place, although now in the context of a new sociolinguistic reality. In fact, the linguistic policy of the Galician autonomous government, which appeared to begin with directive intentions, has turned out to be so openly liberal as to be almost nonexistent beyond aesthetic issues (publicity campaigns, institutional declarations

---

the Galician-speaking sectors continues to be high, the moderation of the substitutory process might also be explained by the developing consciousness within the Galician-speaking sectors in favour of language conservation and normalisation. Finally, the language change in the direction opposite to the traditional, that is, from Spanish to Galician, continues to be a marginal process of little importance.

and liturgical acts, subsidization of investigations, incomplete Galicianisation of the autonomous administration), doubtless important for the social prestige of the language. Nevertheless, in the eyes of Galician linguistic nationalism such issues may seem to be of little use if they are not accompanied by other, more interventionist, methods (effective intervention in the educational media, the communication media, massive publicity, the employment arena, etc). It is quite certain that to object to criticism of this type it will be necessary that the interests of the current Galician administration genuinely revolve around the principal axis of impeding the possible disappearance of Galician-Portuguese as a dynamic language of use<sup>5</sup>, and not simply around its ideological instrumentalisation, which produces at least two types of symbolic benefits for Spanish nationalism:

- a) the symbolic theft of one of Galician nationalism's favourite and most productive weapons in the political perspective, linguistic vindication; but also,
- b) a more intimate connection with the Galician-speaking sectors which seem to still constitute their largest group of voters. In this way, Galician gains a political value of local, regional, or ethnic proximity, but loses all potential to become a symbol of national construction.

In the beginning of 1990s the autonomous government began to defend *bilingüismo equilibrado, armónico y limpio* ('a balanced bilingualism, harmonious and clean'; see Regueiro Tenreiro, 1999), the object of all sorts of criticism on the part of Galician linguistic nationalism. In our opinion, the discourse of harmonious bilingualism seems to attempt to conceal, fundamentally, two facts:

- a) the persistent consideration, on the part of certain nationalistic sectors that are continuously increasing in social, electoral, and institutional force, that the situation is conflictive, confirming that *de jure* and *de facto* linguistic subordination still exists; and
- b) the dynamic of undeniable linguistic substitution, whether more or less rapid or massive.

### 3. Some notes about diglossia, a conflictive term

In this section we will limit ourselves to pointing out certain aspects of the use of diglossia in the sociolinguistic discourse which have an impact on the Galician discursive context: the ideological part of the term, its value as an all-purpose

---

<sup>5</sup> Although it is true that if, as the Galician autonomous Administration declares, the social health of Galician is optimal and its future maintenance does not present any problem, why act?

concept, its path of entry into the Galician discourse, and particularly its circulation in this context. Thus, as highlighted by Fernández (1995: 165) in the first of his contributions to the knowledge of the very productive pre-Fergusonian era (see also Fernández, 1999), which even continued apart from the intervention of Ferguson during other decades, diglossia originated around 1885 with the Greek defence of the popular language and referred to the fact that Greece saw the use of two linguistic forms, “a written form of the language very different from the language that everybody spoke”. Therefore, the term’s field of use can be seen to have been quite restricted, only applicable to situations comparable with that of Greece. There don’t seem to be many of these, even broadening the term written language to encompass all ideologically imbued educated language, oral language included. We would like to observe how this use came about in an ideologically charged context, that of the confrontation between defenders of maintaining the traditional spelling system and defenders of modifying it to give pre-eminence to the language actually spoken.

Thus, *diglossia* was born with an ideological charge that it seems to have lost when Ferguson (1959) took it up —and never took it up again— and broadened its field of meaning to apply it in varying degrees to other different Greek situations. For Ferguson, diglossia is fundamentally a label designating a particular type of linguistic situation, even though these situations might be too different from each other to be defined by the same label (Fernández, 1995: 187-88). As Fernández states (1999: 309), the ideological content of Ferguson would be restricted, in any case, to the social focus within which we find his discourse (the functionalist sociology of Parsons), but this ideology does not extend to the use of the term. We have, therefore, an identifying label whose initial ideological value seems to have been completely blurred (although actually it is increasing to a large extent in the way in which it is used in particular discourses) with the later broadening of meaning effected by Fishman (for example 1967, 1972, etc.), that, as has already been mentioned on various occasions (for example López Morales, 1983: 209) have made *diglossia* into all-purpose term valid for referring to practically any situation of communicative interaction in which there exists a formal and functional differentiation, from an individual’s use of different registers depending on the type of interaction established to the use of different languages for different functions in a multilingual society.

#### **4. Sociolinguistics and nationalism: Diglossia, conflict, and normalisation**

The attempts to clarify the use of diglossia to refer to quite different sociolinguistic situations —like, for example, those of Fasold (1984) and Britto (1986), see Herrero Valeiro (1997)—, creating new labels or sub-labels, continued in a basically descriptivist tradition to search for the best label to designate situations that were being encountered or that were being revealed as more complex than had been recognised at first.

If diglossia is to take up again a very explicit ideological charge, it will have to be within certain contexts where a conflict is generated from the existence in a single community of languages with different socio-political status and with larger or smaller groups of speakers (the required condition is the existence of certain proto-elites who can create a discourse, not legitimate but susceptible to legitimisation, which may define the existence of a conflict) of the minoritised language who have developed critical consciousness of the subordination and rebel against it. Those shouldered with such a task will be analysts belonging to the group that Calvet (1996: 20) has called “native sociolinguist” (or what even earlier Prudent, 1980a, 1980b, recognised as “native linguist”), that is, Catalans and Valencians, Occitanians, Galicians or those coming from colonial creole language situations (especially the French-speaking areas), immersed in the reality of their own countries and speakers of the dominated language, although necessarily bilinguals<sup>6</sup>. The analyst who only describes and interprets (the theoretically non-militant sociolinguist) makes way for the analyst who is going to intervene consciously as well; in this way a new glottopolitical analyst emerges (the militant sociolinguist or *engagée*). These new analysts establish themselves as representatives of certain particular social groups, normally elites or proto-elites of a dominated nationalism, who, based on the refusal to accept the current reality that minoritises their language (taken as a basic element of the national consciousness) carry out a particular socio-political function from their structural position as dominated elites with the intention to intervene in their own society, attempting to subvert the state of things and to create a new sociolinguistic reality as a part of a new socio-political reality. In this way an ideological reading is born, one of sociolinguistics as “national science” (Bañeres & Romani, 1994: 38) in the service of a national construction process characterising the discourse about language, the theoretical political discourse, and, in those cases that have been able to put these processes into practice (Catalonia, the Basque Country, Québec), linguistic planning generated by nationalist ideologies dominated in the State as a whole, but which come to occupy a dominant space in their own communities.

In the Spanish State, this fact has not so far generated an especially significant or systematic response on the part of ideologically Spanish nationalist or centralist linguists. Only a few isolated examples, of more or less public impact, attempt to generate a technical discourse opposed to the peripheral nationalistic ideologies, in which Spanish (necessarily united with the concept of the Spanish nation) is considered the current victim in the substitution process (or at least of effective discrimination) as a consequence of linguistic normalisation<sup>7</sup>. It is not difficult to

6 Authors of these origins are also referred to as “peripheral sociolinguists” (see, for example, Fernández, 1998).

7 See, for example, Salvador (1987, 1992) and Jardón (1993) for the Galician case; and, finally, the recent publicity afforded to the propagandistic discourse of Lodaes (2000), a work seriously lacking in technical rigor. For a critical review of this type of discourse, see Branchadell (1997) and Moreno Cabrera (2000).

conclude from these discourses that the hypothetical inverse linguistic substitution never fails to be seen as one of the most visible faces of a national substitution, of the destruction of the Spanish nation: linguistic immersion in Catalonia would therefore be a strategy of national immersion. Nevertheless, Spanish nationalist sociolinguistics is still a scarce phenomenon, since the opposition to the linguistic policy of peripheral nationalisms comes not so much from technical experts or intellectuals as from certain political and journalistic elites, who express State nationalism (in this case, Spanish nationalism) with the greatest clarity.

Nevertheless, in the last few years these peripheral nations of Spain have begun to generate from within this same reflection about language an ideological criticism of these readings in terms of a sociolinguistics that assumes a particular patriotic compromise, very different from the social compromise of the sociolinguistic discourses, certainly heterogeneous, of Labov, Bourdieu, Bernstein and Gumperz.

From the viewpoint of this criticism (see especially Bañeres, 1992, 1993; Bañeres & Romaní, 1994, for the Catalan case; for the Galician case, Rodríguez Yáñez, 1993, and for certain specific elements, Cabrera, 1992)<sup>8</sup>, “national sociolinguistics”, characterised by its “linguistically-based ethnocentrism” (Rodríguez Yáñez, 1993: 227) or “linguocentrism” (Bañeres, 1993: 20), was born “pervertie *ab origine*” as a science at the service of “a patriotic cause” (Bañeres & Romaní, 1994: 38). This generates, in other respects, an ideological discourse lacking deep understanding of the social management of bilingualism, of the attitudes, beliefs, and social linguistic ideologies (as, in one form of the other, as has already been noticed by Álvarez Cáccamo, 1987), a discourse serving a predetermined policy based on a national ideology sustained by a mono-identity and monolingual definition of the nation (Rodríguez Yáñez, 1993).

From the perspective that privileges predetermined ideologies, it is the society that must accommodate a predefined linguistic policy based on evident aspects, such as legislative linguistic subordination, as well as programmatic or *a priori* aspects based on the desire for what *should be* (normality), and not the reverse: thus, for example, the incontestable role of the language as primary and unrenounceable identifying symbol in demonstrating the homogenous being of the nation and national identity (which does nothing but reproduce some of the key elements of the nationalist ideologies of numerous nationalist movements, among them the Spanish nationalist movement).

On the other hand, we can also see within the peripheral nationalisms, and in clear form in the Galician, an evident drift towards a belief in the fundamental value of linguistic legislation as a way to modify social conduct —which in our opinion expresses an evident directive tendency. In this way, Galician linguistic militancy is

---

<sup>8</sup> As we can see, some of the discursive production of Álvarez Cáccamo (especially Álvarez Cáccamo, 1987, 1997), also enters into this terrain, although from a different perspective.

habitually related to the issue of linguistic legality (and the judicial inequality between the languages), perhaps based on the thought that if knowing Galician were required by law, this would have positive repercussions on the social health of the language. In this sense, we believe that the discourse of Galician linguistic nationalism possesses an evident vocation of intervention, or even imposition, since it generally links the Law (and its strict compliance) to the possibility of slowing down the massive process of substitution or to the achievement of a higher social status for Galician (see Herrero Valeiro, 2000: 278-79).

In the discursive context minimally sketched out above, we must recognise the fundamental Catalanian discursive contribution, originally centring around the concepts of ‘diglossia’ and ‘linguistic conflict’ to define the condition —negative— that explains the current reality that should be modified, and ‘linguistic normalisation’ (Aracil, 1965), to designate the process that will bring about the desired reality, linguistic normality<sup>9</sup>. The concept of “normality” (linguistic or not) constructed by the sociolinguistic discourses of the dominated nations’ elites, self-appointed authorised representatives of the popular will, can be read as the necessity to disrupt a reality considered to be repressive or anti-natural (abnormal) in order to install a new reality that is considered to be democratic or natural (normal). The process of linguistic normalisation should therefore be understood as the change from a normality defined by the power-elites of the dominating nation in the State to a normality defined by the power-elites of the dominated nation in the State, or to another normality defined by the power-elites of the particular nation without State, more or less sustained by an ill-definable popular will can represent greater (Catalonia) as well as lesser (Galiza) segments of the population actively meddling in the nationalisation process.

We do not believe that this change of normalities will necessarily result in the improvement of social, cultural, and political conditions of the civil society. In reality, we understand processes of this type to be a renewal of power-elites implying the appearance of a new code that acts as legitimate language, attempting to replace or merely wishing to accompany the original dominant code. Recalling Cooper (1998: 83), the benefits, real or apparent, that the planning offers other segments of

---

<sup>9</sup> There exists an internal critique (to which can be added a certain external component, such as the critique of Calvet, 1993, 1996, of the militant drift of the concept ‘normalisation’) of the sociolinguistic discourse generated by Catalanian sociolinguistics and transferred to the Basque and Galician discourse, and also an external critique that has praised the contribution of the Catalanian authors and that can be seen, for example, in Kremnitz (1980) and Goebel (1994). For Goebel, the Catalanian thought is a well balanced example “entre la réflexion théorique, la démarche empirique et la revendication glottopolitique” (Goebel, 1994: 126). Calvet himself (1996: 23) recognises the contribution of Catalanian sociolinguistics and other native discourses as a necessary recognition of the fundamental political content of the syntagma *linguistic policy* in contrast with the North American sociolinguistics, which has centered upon purely technical aspects.

the population must be understood as an inevitable effect of the process: if “the cooperation of the masses is a prerequisite for the maintenance of elites”, and if “benefits to the masses encourage cooperation with elites”, then it is advisable that these elites channel or at least appear to channel benefits (these are usually assumed to be material, but can also be symbolic) to the masses.

That is, we believe that the construction and legitimisation of nations (and their corresponding national languages) does not necessarily imply a radical transformation of class relations but rather a restructuring of the elite sectors, with (a) the conversion of regional elites into national elites and the addition of new elite sectors (the standard-bearers of the national cause) in successful cases, or with (b) the division of the regional elites into pro-nationalist sectors (in favour of the dominated nationalism) and anti-nationalists (in favour of the dominant nationalism) and the emergence of new sectors of pro-nationalist elites, in the cases where the nationalitarian process has not been completely successful. With this formulation, we are simply following the line of interpretation of nationalism that we adopted in this text (see footnote 1). In the Galician case, the small elite sectors that ideologically subscribe to Galician nationalism and that have existed for scarcely two decades (or seventy years earlier) are increasingly swelling in number due to the new elites emerging from the heat of the electoral ascent and social expansion of the new nationalism represented by the *Bloque Nacionalista Galego* (Galician Nationalist Block).

As highlighted by Rodríguez Yáñez (1993), since the end of the Franco era there has been talk within the Spanish State of the concept of democratic normalisation and a corresponding reference to a necessary linguistic normalisation that would repair the “historic injustice” inflicted by the direct repression or strict control of the peripheral languages during the Dictatorship as an ultimate expression of the traditional Spanish policy with respect to these languages. Deriving from the interest of Aracil (1982, originally published in 1966), in unmasking the mythification of bilingualism as a useful tool in obscuring the processes of linguistic substitution, we are experiencing a process that will lead to a demonisation (Rodríguez Yáñez, 1993: 239) of bilingualism that will not only affect governmental policies, and that under the cover of an interested bilingual positivism that obscures different aspects of linguistic substitution will continue to privilege a language (the national language of the State) over the other (the national language of the nation without State), but will also have an effect on everyday bilingual conduct.

The objective of linguistic normalisation is to change this reality. It sets out to replace social bilingualism (that from this perspective will always lead to diglossia and linguistic conflict, because social bilingualism is understood as an expression of the transitory process of linguistic substitution) as a condition of abnormality or conflict, with social monolingualism, as a condition of normality necessarily united with a process of mono-identitarian national construction. Bañeres & Romaní (1994: 38-40) define four concentric phases that may be expected in this normalisation process: (1)

cancellation of diglossia; (2) reversal of linguistic substitution; (3) bilingualisation of the allophones (that is, those who belong to a different speaking community, as in the special situations in Catalonia and Montreal, for example); and (4) a linguistic substitution that we can qualify as inverse. The bases are clearly defined in Aracil (1965: 10): “Par définition (sans parler de l’étymologie), la normalisation consiste surtout dans l’élaboration et la mise en vigueur de systèmes de normes d’usage linguistique”. A normative system is constructed to replace another normative system: the definition of normality is to be found, without a doubt, in those interests occupying hegemonic positions of power at the moment, who are appointed to represent the popular interest.

The production of the Galician linguistic discourse of nationalism has come to offer a mythification of monolingualism projected onto a glorious past (a good example of this, for example, is Freixeiro, 1997) that, inevitably, obscures the fact that monolingual situations give rise to similar or at least comparable schemas of linguistic uniformisation and social domination (hegemony) by means of language control, typical of capitalist society, although disguised in Modernity through massive literacy campaigns and other mechanisms for rendering social inequalities invisible. It might be advisable to recall, with Bourdieu (1982: 28, note 8), that nationalisms (dominated) “sont condamnés à reproduire, une fois triomphantes, le processus d’unification dont ils dénonçaient les effets”. Thus, in our opinion, “bilingualism as myth” gives way to “monolingualism as myth” without having very much effect along the way on the mechanisms of social control or the basic structure of domination of the capitalist linguistic market: the processes of inequality and social domination that are hidden behind the construction and control of the legitimate language are not questioned, but rather are viewed as a necessary step in the process of national construction (the construction of the National Language and its most perfect expression, the standard).

The modern linguistic discourse of Galician nationalism has been constructed under the strong influence of the Valencian-Catalonian discourse (Ninyoles, Aracil) and, to a lesser degree, by the Basque discourse (Sánchez Carrión), which in turn has been greatly influenced by Catalonia. However, the sociolinguistic, socio-political, and socio-economic histories of the three nations are very different, and, in consequence, the situations twenty years ago as well as that of today are quite different as well. Beyond the divergence of the three sociolinguistic situations, we have seen an emphasis on the basic idea of the “common enemy” (Rodríguez Yáñez, 1993: 227) uniting the three very different peripheral nationalistic ideologies: the State itself, its nationalitarian ideology and its national language, Spanish<sup>10</sup>.

---

10 There are also less weighty nationalist movements in other zones of the State, at times also linked with linguistic vindications (Asturias and Asturian, Aragón and Aragonese), an index of the scarce success that the construction of the Spanish Nation-State has had. Thus, the Spanish case can be described as a case of

However, problems arise from the implementation of a linguistic policy based on a discourse adapted from a very different sociolinguistic reality, privileging a confluence of socio-political interests over an individualised reading of the Galician situation and ignoring or de-emphasising the real functioning (uses, attitudes, ideologies; communicative, sociocultural, and socio-economic interests, etc.) of the particular sociolinguistic population in favour of predetermined evaluative factors: normality equal to monolingualism and mono-identitarianism<sup>11</sup>. Nevertheless, it is certain that the nationalist language discourse of Galiza has not even had the opportunity to implement its language policy for the simple reason that, in contrast with the Catalanian and Basque cases, it is a Spanish nationalist party that governs the Galician Autonomous Community, while Galician nationalism, despite a continuous electoral rise represented by the coalition *Bloque Nacionalista Galego*, whose independent and Marxist discourse has been modified to the rhythm of the electoral advances and the penetration of the nationalist messages into the broadest sectors of the population (including Spanish-speakers), has never possessed the institutional power to generate a linguistic plan developed from its ideological perspective<sup>12</sup>.

Only very recently, with the publication of the three volumes of the MSG concerning competence and initial language, uses, and attitudes (Fernández & Rodríguez Neira, 1994, 1995, 1996) are we in possession of a complete (socio)linguistic database obtained by means of quantitative sociolinguistic methods. Using these data, in case at any moment there exists a real interest on the part of the Galician autonomous administration to foster the social and institutional expansion of the Galician language, it would be possible to articulate a linguistic plan—in the sense of a State-sponsored interventionist plan, a regulator of uses and conducts— acting

---

double failure (Linz, 1992; see also Linz, 1973): neither the peripheral nationalisms nor the state nationalism has obtained a sufficient level of legitimisation to achieve an environment of local national sovereignty, in the first case, or of homogeneity, in the second. In this sense, Touraine (1997: 404) maintains that, in an historical context, Spain is “en partie un empire unissant des régions plutôt qu’un État national intégré”. In the end, if we apply a language-nation typology such as that of Kloss (1968), we may conclude that Spain does not correspond to a genuine Nation-State, but an endoglossic multinational State (Linz, 1975).

11 Certainly a critique of the ideologies that, with various interests, exalt the values of multilingualism and multi-identitarianism, of cultural mixing, would have to be generated in the same manner, whether or not they come from the dominant elites in whichever State.

12 It is here that the critique of Rodríguez Yáñez (1993) weakens. Rodríguez Yáñez, in centering his analysis around an anti-power perspective, tends to forget the perspective of power, that is, the actual power that has been developing in Galiza in the last few decades under the direction of an Autonomous Government linked with Spanish nationalism. Rodríguez Yáñez, appropriately reproducing the false assumptions that convert Galician discourse into an inoperative adaptation of Catalanian discourse, seems to allow himself to fall into the same dynamic that he criticises as he makes a correlation between Catalanian national sociolinguistics, which represents the perspective of power in its territory, and non-legitimated Galician national sociolinguistics, which lacks institutional power.

effectively on the maintenance of Galician in a way that goes beyond the institutional level. Similarly, we have only recently seen the beginning of an analysis of the actual management of the uses of different linguistic varieties, of the negotiation of group and linguistic identities and of the understanding of the linguistic ideologies expressed in every day speech from perspectives that combine, among others, elements of ethnomethodology and interactional analysis along the lines of Gumperz.

Finally, in a never-forgotten ethnocentrism, while constantly directing its gaze toward the Basque, the Catalanian, and the Occitanian situations, the discourse on language in Galiza continues to pay scarce attention to examples proceeding from sociolinguistically multilingual situations that, due to their geographic distance, the distant genetic relation between the co-present languages, and different socio-economic or socio-political problems, seem to us to be essentially different. They are different if we emphasise the divergences, but they seem more similar if we observe closely certain sociolinguistic problems and discourses on the language generated in societies structurally different from our own. In the same way that an examination of the glottopolitical foundation of the orthographic conflict around Haitian Creole, other creoles, and Ugandan Luganda can provide interesting elements of comparison with the Galician conflict, the failure of the planned intervention in linguistic identity in Martinique might serve as an example to avoid similar mistakes in any future language policy directed, perhaps, by Galician nationalism. As Prudent, a participant in these events, describes (1993), the failure (which he labels as “glottopolitical illusion”) of this intervention can be explained in terms of their foundation in the ideological will of the militant groups who, despite being able to achieve that the attitudes of respect toward the creole by its own speakers increased considerably, ignored the basic aspect that would assure the success of a democratic linguistic plan: the real linguistic practices and the communicative interests or necessities of the majority of the population who, among other aspects, were not prepared to renounce French as a communicative vehicle and identity symbol.

### **5. Galician diglossia: Discourses in conflict**

The meaning of diglossia most common to the Galician language discourse is that which belongs to (although with divergent shades of meaning) the field of meaning represented by the superimposed bilingualism of Fasold (1984), the colonial bilingualism of Memmi (Rodríguez, 1991[1976]), the diglossic bilingualism of Kloss (1967) and, especially, the structural bilingualism of Ninyoles (1977), re-labelled by Galician nationalism as colonial diglossia (López Suevos & Rodríguez, 1978; Garcia Negro, 1991), varied labels that serve to designate in a more or less complete form what López Morales (1989: 82-83) defines simply as “cases of bilingualism in which a particular language has been superimposed by cultural, social, or political pressures”, or that which Joseph (1987) would define as

a case of superimposition, that is, situations in which two or more languages coexist in the same community with “unequal distribution of prestige”.

For Ninyoles (1977: 218) diglossic situations are “those situations in which a linguistic superimposition is produced between a ‘high’ variety or language (A) that is used in formal written communication (...) and a ‘low’ variety or language (B), often relatively uncultivated, that is used in conversations of an informal or family nature”. However, Ninyoles attempts with the qualification of structural to separate the concept from the use of the linguists, highlighting its relation and interdependence with the set of structural traits (economic, cultural, and political) of a society. In a great portion of the Galician nationalist discourse, diglossia acts, because of its habitual public use, as a substitute for linguistic conflict, being in any case a condition of linguistic conflict. Therefore, the general application of the concept has been for the most part uniform in the direction of analysis proceeding from some of the results of Fishman and his particular adaptation to Catalanian sociolinguistics and, fundamentally, Ninyoles (1969, 1971, 1977), despite the fact that the term was introduced to the Iberian Peninsula by Vallverdú (1968: 33) and Aracil (1968: 20-21). Such an adaptation manifests itself concretely in some authors in the exclusive opposition of bilingualism/diglossia in the sense of Ninyoles, although maintaining the ambiguity—present in Fishman—between its individual and social poles of bilingualism, and between the domains of varieties of the same language and different languages.

In general, a reading based on Fishman, established within a lack of familiarity with the initial phases of the history of the concept, or, more generally, established without reading Ferguson, and influenced or not by the particular interpretation of Ninyoles, can be seen in numerous examples proceeding from the Galician discourse about language, from the first appearance of the concept in Alonso Montero (1973)<sup>13</sup> and by means of the contributions of Rojo (1974, 1981), Rodríguez (1991[1976]), López Suevos & Rodríguez (1978), Fernández (1978), Chacón (1978), Álvarez Cáccamo (1983, 1987), Portas (1991), García Negro (1991), Freixeiro Mato (1997) and Mariño (1998). Overall, taking into account the postures in favour of characterising modern-day Galiza as a community still basically diglossic in the sense of Ninyoles (almost all of the Galician national discourse), centred, as we have seen, in the demystification of the concept of bilingualism along the lines of Aracil and a consequent mythification of monolingualism, we are more interested in the works that put into perspective, explain, or disqualify this common

---

13 Before the concept appeared in the peninsular area, Alonso Montero had proposed in 1963 the use of *dilingualism* and *dilingual*, applied to the Galician literary context, to refer to the “person who, knowing two languages, has one for certain motivations and the other for others” (Alonso Montero, 1968: 49). Nevertheless, the analysis of Alonso Montero terminates within the individual parameter without delving into the causes that determine the functional differentiation of the languages (García Negro, 1991: 88).

space in the nationalist Galician discourse, which has become, to use the formula of López Morales (1989), an authentic “article of faith”.

To characterise more basically this last discursive line, we turn to the defence conducted by Garcia Negro (1991) against some of the disqualifications or relativisations of the applicability of the concept to Galiza. Garcia Negro, after examining one part of the origins of the term and reproducing the Fergusonian definition, seems to feel obligated to forget from the beginning Ferguson’s text, as may be deduced from the definition of the first trait to characterize the Galician situation: the existence of diglossia assumes the co-presence in the same linguistic community of “two” varieties or differentiable languages (Garcia Negro, 1991: 77; Portas, 1991: 32-33). Therefore, it seems useless to identify Ferguson as the origin since, in reality, this interpretation derives from Ninyoles’ particular reading of Fishman, which in turn derives from the complete modification that Fishman makes of Ferguson, which itself stems from an already very particular interpretation of Ferguson. However, it is certain that the diglossia of Ferguson only exists within a glottopolitical unity known as a language, although, as described by Garcia Negro, the varieties within this language may be so different that a novice in linguistic analysis might consider them to be different languages.

Subsequently, Garcia Negro (1991: 81), with respect to Fishman’s classification of linguistic communities and based on this characterization of the phenomena of bilingualism and diglossia, sees it possible to reduce the possible linguistic communities to two: (a) monolingual societies, with independence from those linguistic markers that act as sociolectal border and from individual bilingualism (*normal* situation); and (b) diglossic societies, in which there is a language A that possesses formal and public functions and a language B of colloquial use (*conflictive* and unstable situation). In this second type of society, the fact that language A invades the space of language B, or that this language continues unadulterated, would be no more than a question of degree expressed in a transitional time that would derive, inevitably, from the social extension of the dominant language or from the recuperation of the dominated language, that is, from a linguistic conflict. The Galician case could be situated, therefore, in some place along this continuum whose absolute limits would be the definitive substitution of Spanish for Galician and the complete normalisation of Galician with the disappearance of Spanish.

This reading represents the sociolinguistic expression of the anti-colonial discourse characteristic of Galician nationalism, expressed with a variety of nuances in recent years, since the relation between Galiza and the State have come to be seen traditionally as a type of internal colonialism. In this ideological context linguistic repression, which seeks linguistic substitution or assimilation, is an essential part of a globally oppressive policy that affects all social areas, especially the economic aspects. This perspective, which reproduces the interpretation assumed by a large

part of Galician nationalism with respect to the Galician linguistic situation, was expressed by Alonso Montero (1973), from a superficial and idealistic perspective but with the inclusion of certain basic concepts that would determine future discourses, and was immediately redirected toward linguistic nationalism by Rodríguez (1991[1976]). This is a text fundamental to understanding this reading—constructed around a negative conception of the ideology, and strongly influenced by the glottophagia described by Calvet in *Linguistique et colonialisme* (Calvet, 1974)—since here we find its first systematisation and that which, in fact, would determine subsequent nationalist discourse due to its undisputed acceptance. This discourse is principally directed against other discourses that the author qualifies as “bilingualist theses”, that is, those discourses that defend a “bilingual status” for Galiza, corresponding to “the bidding of the petty-bourgeoisie”. For Rodríguez, linguistic subordination or domination appears unavoidably united with political and economic subordination and domination: “Galician society is in the process of assimilation, because it does not have a self-generated development. Some external signals of enormous importance for our consciousness as a people are at stake” (Rodríguez, 1991[1976]). Language as “external signal of enormous importance”. Self-determination as “self-generated development”. Monolingualism as “total normalisation”. These three tenets can be understood as basic *positive* arguments of Galician nationalist discourse.

Fernández (1978) soon came to situate himself in opposition to this initial appropriation of diglossia—and the global discourse concerning language of which it is part—that was to become hegemonic and constitute the essential axiom orthodox sociolinguistic discourse for Galician nationalism. Fernández focused on the apparent contradiction between Fishman’s discourse and the application of Ninyoles and Alonso Montero, and demonstrated the futility involved in arguing whether Galician was bilingual or diglossic since, within the line of reasoning followed by this author in that time and that derived from Fishman, these terms were not mutually exclusive. At the same time, he notes that the fundamental characteristic of Fergusonian diglossia is that it can only appear in communities with two strongly differentiated varieties of the same language. Shortly before, Moralejo (1977: 85), without even citing Ferguson, had already called into question the validity of this usage, since the use of diglossia alluded to “deadlock between two languages”. Along these lines, Aracil (1985) questioned the hypothetical diglossic nature of the Galician situation based on the existence of population groups, not even allophones but natives, whose colloquial vernacular language is Spanish. Therefore, the diglossic scheme simply cannot be applied.

Little by little, the use of the term began to generalize and eventually exceeded the limits of technical discourse that affected a meagre intellectual minority, first reaching nationalistic sectors and later achieving a broad diffusion with its inclusion in school text books (basic elements for ideological reproduction) and its appearance

in communication media: its discursive productivity progressively increased. Nevertheless, we consider that after the initial arguments of Fernández and Aracil, no new point of inflection was reached until the intervention of Álvarez Cáccamo (1987). In fact, this intervention comprised the first systematic questioning of an important part of the foundations (and arguments) of the hegemonic line in the Galician nationalistic discourse on language, which revolved around the centralization of the concept ‘diglossia’ in the terms that we briefly reviewed above.

For Álvarez Cáccamo (1987), “the nationalist discourse is used to employing the argument that there are close reciprocal relations between the forms of uniformisation and political control and the linguistic policy of the centralist states”. However, Álvarez Cáccamo considers that, in reality, what is sought in Galician is not “linguistic uniformity”, as the nationalist position maintains, but rather the opposite: “the stability of diverse ethnolinguistic groups”. For this author, in “diglossic” situations, the preservation of the “functional specialisation of varieties” acts as a very useful instrument for maintaining particular strata of the population in a subordinate position across centuries. In this way, it is not a complete linguistic assimilation that would be sought, but rather “by means of the educational apparatus the minoritised ethnolinguistic group is educated in the dominant language to a necessary and sufficient degree in order to not obstruct the development of the social life”. This would not have to do with “exterminating a language”, as maintained by the Galician nationalist discourse, but rather with maintaining the reduction of its use to local, colloquial, and familiar use, linguistically marking “the social barriers between the subordinate and super-ordinate classes”. Thus, Álvarez Cáccamo considers that the “total assimilation” of the Galician dominant population has never been the objective of the Spanish-speaking elites who exercise administrative power; on the contrary, according to Álvarez-Cáccamo (1987: 135-36), the “linguistic subordination” produced as a result a “hierarchy of ethnolinguistic groups”:

- a) a Spanish-speaking minority, controllers of the economic resources and of the political-administrative apparatus;
- b) a minority monolingual in Galician, or with passive understanding of Spanish, in the rural areas;
- c) a bilingual Galician-dominant majority, with various levels of competence in Spanish, immigrants to the city or inhabitants of suburban nuclei; and
- d) a bilingual minority of Galician-speaking origin but progressively assimilated to Spanish, who find in Spanish the greater source of social progress, and who preferentially constitute the urban petty bourgeoisie.

However, Álvarez-Cáccamo comments that it is still strongly reductionistic to limit ourselves to speaking of “social classes, of elites that hold the power, and of

linguistic domination”, and calls for a micro-sociolinguistic analysis to investigate the social units where the communicative functions and the values of the linguistic codes are actually generated. For this author, the descriptions of language contact in Galiza have grown accustomed to certain established rigid correlations among the language utilised, context or domain, and social values. According to what he calls the “paradigm of diglossia”, Galician would be the colloquial language, while Spanish would be the formal language. However, such a static model cannot explain the sociolinguistic transformations that exist in modern-day Galiza. Álvarez Cáccamo understands that a type of sociolinguistics that conceives of diglossia as the social domination of one language over another without considering the utility of the language for socio-economic advancement, without taking into account the evaluations of the inhabitants themselves of this functional hierarchicalisation of languages, and without analysing how and for what purpose the two languages (or their hybrid varieties) are used in the different communication networks, will never explain Galician sociolinguistic history and will produce useless generalisations.

According to Álvarez Cáccamo, in more or less stable “diglossic” situations there exists “a close relation between the low social status of the speaker and the use of the minoritised variety in the closed social networks” in which they interact socially. In Galician “diglossia”, relatively stable for a few decades, Galician has been maintained as the “code of interpersonal relation, of group cohesion in the closed interactional networks in the family, in the village, and at work in the fields or at sea”. In this way, we would have to interpret that the survival of Galician does not constitute a serious threat for the expansion of Spanish, “as long as Galician-dominant speakers have a minimum level of competence in Spanish to interact with the sources of social power” of the State. From this emerges, at least in part, the apparently contradictory reality of “linguistic attitudes in which some Spanish-dominant sectors maintain a condescending posture towards Galician conservation and even an active defence of its use”, while broad segments of the population consider their own language in a negative light as it has not offered, at least not in the recent past, any prospect for social progress (Álvarez Cáccamo, 1987: 140).

Finally, Álvarez-Cáccamo points out that considerable socio-economic transformations like those suffered by Galiza in the 1960s and 1970s (industrialisation and urbanisation, strong migratory movements to the urban areas) create “new forms of interactional networks” in which the social values of languages are generated, and it is in this way that large-scale linguistic assimilation begins. Thus, while Galician “is maintained with relative vitality in the family life, Spanish is construed as the basic code of social relations in the open interactional networks of the world of work and in the circumstantial public domain”. It is in this sense that the partial assimilation of Spanish can be understood: “not necessarily as a rejection of an identity, but rather as an identification with new values, often understood by assimilated speakers as values of ‘progress’” (Álvarez Cáccamo, 1987: 140).

The interpretation of Álvarez Caccamo must be understood in its context of a line of study that focuses on real speaking behaviours and their basic value for interpreting the global sociolinguistic situation of a given group of more or less structural complexity. This perspective does not limit itself to a simple description of the pragmatic-linguistic or interactional mechanisms of conversation, but rather attempts to contextualize them in the socio-political sphere (for example, national) in which they are generated. That is, the process attempts to go from micro to macro and emphasizes the investigation of the linguistic ideologies expressed in speech. However, the perspective of Álvarez Caccamo can also be interpreted as a critical response to the lack of diversification that has existed for a decade in Galician sociolinguistics. Thus, as Fernández (1991: 248) points out, the preferred method of sociolinguistic analysis used in Galiza has been the macro perspective or that of the sociology of language, both in practical (quantitative sociolinguistics) and theoretical (essentially speculative, descriptive or interpretative studies) contributions. However, the other two perspectives listed by Fernández (1991) as components of a complete analysis of a linguistic community, micro-sociolinguistic and variational, did not have the same good fortune in our context. While the second perspective is almost nonexistent, the first has begun in recent years, following the work of Álvarez Caccamo (for example 1991, 1993, 1996), to be productive and to offer investigations that can help provide a better understanding of the management of Galician bilingualism. Fernández (1991: 248) offers, in part, an appropriate explanation for the lack of cultivation of these lines of analysis when he explains that the absence of sociolinguistics from the Galician university and research field until just a few years ago, along with the Spanish linguistic tradition itself, have made the development of those avenues of investigation that require long observational periods and the formation of a broad corpus of speech data considerably more difficult. However, perhaps the reason for the lack of cultivation of these different perspectives on sociolinguistic investigation must also be sought in aspects with a more clearly declared ideological basis. We must take into account that during the last twenty years and even still today for a large part of the nationalist discourse, sociolinguistics has been confused with the discourse about language generated only by those who previously confirm a profession of militant faith in the particular authorised discourse. Those who step out of this line and, for example, criticise the generalised use of the term *diglossia*, or defend the advisability of bringing up to date particular viewpoints or the necessity of introducing into new global readings the data provided by other perspectives in investigation, seem to be observed with suspicion (as guilty of “pro-Spanish sentiment”, declares Rodríguez Yáñez (1993: 245), although the opposite option also must be considered, that is, as guilty of “pro-Portuguese sentiment”) and relegated to those authorised arenas of knowing controlled by the majority nationalist discourse.

If we situate ourselves for a moment in the place of the “discourse of good will” to which Aracil (1986) refers in such an attractive manner, we will have to recognise

that such ideological prejudices have been counterproductive to the development of a Galician sociolinguistics that needs to combine different but complementary analytic perspectives with the objective of offering a systematic reading of Galician bilingualism indispensable for, if there exists a real interest, being able to articulate by means of this reading a linguistic policy constructed not around predeterminations and ideological interests, but rather socially verifiable empirical knowledge, and which take into account the interests, ideologies, necessities, habits, etc. of the population that is said to be defended or represented. In short, a linguistic policy that really takes into account the popular will —if such an idea might ever enter into the ideology of those groups that define and set out to implement it—, a will to which all the discourses allude in one form or another but that few seem to take into account, imbued with the different and complex levels of a war of elites that is not only limited to a discussion of orthographic aspects, but rather involves a global struggle for control of the linguistic market and the cultural arena —identity-definer— of Galiza. War of subjectivities, in the end, that impedes a set of criteria that perhaps might encourage the maintenance and expansion of Galician: that is, the normalisation of its use in all possible functions, the goal that everyone claims to defend, except those sectors who have declared open hostility to the symbolic expansion of Galician and who are represented by small but very noisy groups of urban bourgeoisie.

One further step along this path following the time-worn phase of *diglossia* will bring us precisely to the intersection of the use of diglossia and the orthographic conflict, to consider what may be the only completely endogenous reading carried out on the Galician discourse about language, and which must necessarily be understood from within the linguistic ideology of its authors. In reality, this new appropriation of diglossia will offer a new term with the same signifier but with a very different meaning. Gil Hernández & Rabunhal (1989) assert that this term can be applied to the Galician context in a very different form from that which has been habitual up until now<sup>14</sup>. Their starting point is the contrast between the defining traits of Fergusonian diglossia with those that, in their opinion, define the Galician situation:

- a) unity vs. duality: they place the notion of a unique language in a given territory for a linguistic community in opposition with the duality of

---

14 Previously, Gil Hernández (1986: 155-56) alluded to the habitual conceptualisation of diglossia in response to Ferro Ruibal (1984), who had accused him of reintegrationism for wishing to impose a diglossic situation upon Galiza. In his response, Gil points to his subsequent formulation when he writes: “(...) his accusation seems to obscure the real and clear diglossic situation in effect in Galiza, i.e. that in reality and by right the Galician language remains submerged with dignity in the whole of Spain. Further, it would be necessary to find out if in a socially and politically normalised Galiza, the lusist Galician language would foster the same type of diglossia that today causes the dysfunctional uses of Spanish, official language, and Galician, ‘autonomous’ language”.

languages in Galiza, where two communities intertwine and interpose themselves, that identified with the Nation-State and that categorised as regional, that doesn't even coincide with the complete Galician-speaking community existing in the Spanish State (Galician-speaking zones in León, Asturias and Zamora);

- b) functional differentiation vs. functional inequality: they place Fergusonian functional diversification in opposition with the functional inequality between Spanish and Galician, since while the uses of Spanish are normalised in the set of institutionalised and non-institutionalised spheres, the uses of Galician develop under subsidiary conditions within the institutional spheres and in an increasingly precarious situation in the non-institutional situations;
- c) normality vs. linguistic conflict: in the way that both concepts are understood by the Galician nationalist discourse;
- d) stable distribution and irregular distribution of idiomatic uses: they place the stability of Fergusonian diglossia in opposition with the irregularity of uses in Spanish and Galician throughout various historical eras.

The central point of the analysis of Gil Hernández & Rabunhal maintains that diglossia is adapted better to the connections between standard (Galician) Portuguese (superior variety) and that used in Galiza (inferior varieties) but that, in referring to disparate instantiations since the linguistic territory is administered by different States, Galician diglossia can be terms “dislocated” or “transferred” by the interposition of the Spanish linguistic community, a language accepted as its own by the State. It is evident that the starting point is the basic foundation of a reintegrationism that argues that the Galician linguistic community is composed not only of the Spanish administrative region of Galiza and other Galician-speaking areas of the State, but also includes the entire set of Portuguese-speakers.

Finally, one of the last uses documented in technical texts takes us back in part to the origins of the word, in the sense that diglossia is again considered to be a situation produced in the interior of one unique language. Thus, Mariño (1998: 445-46) claims that, at the current time, there seems to be an emergence of a “certain internal diglossia” in Galician derived from the diffusion of the legitimised standard by means of communication media and the school system, which places the use of the new standard in confrontation with the traditional uses (with their particularities that are not included within the norm, with their numerous Spanish borrowings).

## 6. Some conclusions

We have presented, in brief summary, some basic aspects of the use of the term *diglossia* in the discursive intervention into the language situation in Galiza, and we have attempted to contextualize these aspects in the arena of the nationalistic

discourse on the language. In our opinion, beyond whatever terminological discussion concerning how to label the Galician situation, the central issue must centre around questions such as the following: why is the process of the institutionalisation of Galician not accompanied by its recuperation in areas where the languages continue to be alive, being spoken? What is the interest of linguistic planning in Galiza: the recuperation and extension of uses or simple liturgical institutionalisation? Expansion or control?<sup>15</sup>

The term *diglossia* in its Fergusonian or post-Fergusonian definitions is today useless for the Galician context, if indeed it even had any real value for the contemporary age. In fact, as Vallverdú maintains (1994: 13) for the case of Catalan during the 1980s, there are indicators that the use of *diglossia* is also in regression in the Galician nationalist discourse. In our opinion, the current situation can be defined as an advanced phase of a process of linguistic substitution (Fernández, 1991, 1993b), even taking into account the data from the MSG and a dubious more positive reading for the maintenance of Galician-Portuguese. Large segments of the urban and semi-urban populations of young people are monolingual in the substitutive language. In a society like the Galician society, in a constant process of urbanisation and de-ruralisation, the future of the language no longer lies in the rural, but rather in the urban or semi-urban (Fernández, 1993b).

At the same time and in apparent paradox, a particular codification of the substituted language is in an advanced phase of the process of legitimisation and institutionalisation that, at least from a perspective that approaches a long range view, does not seem headed for a liturgicalisation in the sense of the current situation in Ireland due to the degree of ethno-linguistic vitality of Galician (see Recalde, 1997). Nevertheless, we think that there is actually a liturgical use of Galician on the part of the institutions that should be helping to make Galician a language of normalised usage, useful for any context of daily life, colloquial or formal, but who are rather simply effecting a precarious institutionalisation of the language. Further, Galician language normalisation has only served to reproduce the scheme of a typical capitalistic linguistic market. In this way, what is supposed to be a process of linguistic restitution ends up being confused with an institutionalisation of a liturgical nature, perhaps materially benefiting those elites who exploit the institutionalisation process and their particular linguistic market and cultural sphere, but not benefiting the active speakers of the language still formally subordinated. Fifteen years ago, Álvarez Cáccamo (1987) wondered if the normalisation or

---

15 The institutional intervention into the Galician linguistic situation might fall within the context defined by Dion (1981: 27): even though it is better for central governments to avoid entering into linguistic problems due to the difficulty in controlling them, “si, malgré tout l’on persuade de recourir à la planification linguistique c’est que l’on estime que les risques de subversion nationale sont encore plus grands en s’abstenant qu’en agissant”.

renewal of Galician would constitute a collective benefit for Galiza or if the standard varieties that were beginning to emerge and spread at that time would act as new instruments for social control. For Álvarez Cáccamo, the situation generated by linguistic normalisation (that in Galiza was mostly associated with the appearance of standard varieties and the institutionalisation of one of these) was being defined by the restructuring of the strata and the emergence of new sectors of the cultural elite. In this way, the standard variety's domain acted as a source of socio-economic advancement even for groups of individuals for whom the linguistic issue had never held relevance for their social lives. As opposed to the work of certain conscience-oriented groups, overall based in the social realm (*Mesa pola Normalización Lingüística*, *Movimento de Defensa da Língua* and others), for broad sectors of neo-Galician-speakers and bilinguals (civil servants, translators, journalists, teachers) the ideological issue was secondary or nonexistent. Once more, with the construction (or reformulation) of a new linguistic market, the same process of social control is reproduced based on control over the language. In modern times political orchestration has acquired forms very different from those of forty, thirty, or only twenty years ago, since, among other aspects, the power is now also exercised in *Galician*. In this way *diglossia*, as a label that makes possible the definition of a form of group definition and social control by means of the language, is acquiring very different connotations.

### Bibliographical references

- Alonso Montero, X. (1968). "Tres incisiones en la problemática del gallego". In *Realismo y conciencia crítica en la literatura gallega*. Madrid: Ciencia Nueva, 47-55.
- Alonso Montero, X. (1973). *Informe —dramático— sobre la lengua gallega*. Madrid: Akal.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1983). "Cara unha caracterización da diglósia galega: historia e presente dunha dominación lingüística". *Grial* 79, 23-42.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1987). "Fala, bilingüismo, poder social". *Agália. Revista da Associação Galega da Língua* 10, 127-50.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1990). *The Institutionalization of Galician: Linguistic Practices, Power, and Ideology in Public Discourse*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1991). "Language revival, code manipulation and social power in Galiza: Off-records uses of Spanish in formal communicative events". In C.A. Klee (ed.), *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-speaking World: Iberia, Latin America, United States*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press / Editorial Bilingüe, 41-73.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1993). "The pigeon house, the octopus, and the people: The ideologization of linguistic practices in Galiza". *Plurilinguismes* 6, 1-26.

- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1996). "The power of reflexive language(s): Code displacement in reported speech". *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(1), 33-59.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. & M.J. Herrero Valeiro (1996). "O continuum da escrita na Galiza: entre o espanhol e o portugués". *Agália. Revista da Associação Galega da Língua* 46, 143-56.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Aracil, L.I.V. (1965). *Conflit linguistique et normalisation linguistique dans l'Europe nouvelle*. Nancy: Centre Européen Universitaire.
- Aracil, L.I.V. (1968). "Introducció". In E. Escalante, *Les xiques de l'entresuelo. Tres forasters de Madrid*. València: Garbí.
- Aracil, L.I.V. (1982[1966]). "Bilingüisme com a mite". In *Papers de Sociolingüística*. Barcelona: La Malgrana, 39-57.
- Aracil, L.I.V. (1985). "A sócio-lingüística da experiéncia e da acción: O modelo galego". *Temas do Ensino* 4/5, 127-38.
- Baggioni, D. (1997). *Langues et nations en Europe*. Paris: Payot & Rivages.
- Bañeres, J. (1992). "La tensió i el conflicte lingüístics. Els elements socials condicionants (1ª part)". *Noves S.L.* 17, 17-30.
- Bañeres, J. (1993). "La tensió i el conflicte lingüístics. Els elements socials condicionants (2ª part)". *Noves S.L.* 18, 18-30.
- Bañeres, J. & J.-M. Romani (1994). "L'exhortation à la 'normalisation' ou Ho volem tot en català (*Nous voulons tout en catalan*)". *Lengas* 35, 27-44.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire*. Paris: Fayard.
- Branchadell, A. (1997). *Liberalisme i normalització lingüística*. Barcelona: Empúries.
- Britto, F. (1986). *Diglossia: A Study of the Theory with Application to Tamil*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cabrera, J. (1992). *La nación como discurso. El caso gallego*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Calvet, L.-J. (1974). *Linguistique et colonialisme. Petit traité de glottologie*. Paris: Payot.
- Calvet, L.-J. (1993). *L'Europe et ses langues*. Paris: Librairie Plon.
- Calvet, L.-J. (1996). *La Politique Linguistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Chacón, R. (1978). "Diglosia e historia". *Grial* 66, 442-52.
- Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crowley, T. (1996). *Language in History: Theory and Texts*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Dion, L. (1981). "L'État, la planification linguistique et le développement national". In A. Martin (dir.), *L'État et la planification linguistique. Tome I: Principes généraux*. Québec: Office de la Langue Française, 13-35.
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society (Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Vol. I)*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Ferguson, Ch.A. (1959). "Diglossia". *Word* 15, 325-40.
- Fernández, M.A. (1978). "Bilingüismo y diglosia". *Verba* 5, 377-91.
- Fernández, M.A. (1991). "Coordenadas sociais e dinámica do bilingüismo galego". *Grial* 110, 239-62.
- Fernández, M.A. (1993a). *Diglossia: A Comprehensive Bibliography 1960-1990 (and Supplements)*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fernández, M.A. (1993b). "La lengua materna en los espacios urbanos gallegos". *Plurilinguismes* 6, 27-53.
- Fernández, M.A. (1995). "Los orígenes del término *diglosia*. Historia de una historia mal contada". *Historiographia Linguistica* XXII(1/2), 163-95.
- Fernández, M.A. (1998). "Lengua e identidade en el tercer milenio". In B. Gallardo Paúls (ed.), *Temas de Lingüística y Gramática*. València: Universitat de València, 23-37.
- Fernández, M.A. (1999). "La *diglossie* en el *Mercure de France*". In M. Fernández Rodríguez, F. García Gondar & Nancy Vázquez Veiga (eds.), *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Historiografía Lingüística (A Coruña, 18-21 de febrero de 1997)*. Madrid: Arco Libros, 301-10.
- Fernández, M.A. & M.A. Rodríguez Neira (coords.) (1994). *Lingua inicial e competencia lingüística en Galicia*. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega.
- Fernández, M.A. & M.A. Rodríguez Neira (coords.) (1995). *Usos lingüísticos en Galicia*. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega.
- Fernández, M.A. & M.A. Rodríguez Neira (coords.) (1996). *Actitudes lingüísticas en Galicia*. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega.
- Ferro Ruibal, X. (1984). "O acordo ortográfico e morfolóxico de 1982. Entre a utopía foneticista e as heterografías lusistas". In A. Barca Lozano et al., *I Encontros Labaca. Ponencias*. Sada: Ediciós do Castro, 177-307.
- Fishman, J.A. (1967). "Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism". *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2), 29-38.
- Fishman, J.A. (1968). "Nationality-Nationalism and Nation-Nationism". In J.A. Fishman, Ch.A. Ferguson & J. Das Gupta (eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley, 39-51.
- Fishman, J.A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Freixeiro Mato, X.R. (1997). *Lingua galega: normalidade e conflito*. Santiago de Compostela: Laiovento.
- García Negro, M.P. (1991). *O galego e as leis. Unha aproximación sociolingüística*. A Coruña: Edicións do Cumio.
- Gil Hernández, A.P. (1986). "Humildade e cortesia intelectual. Resposta aberta a X. F. R.". *Agália. Revista da Associação Galega da Língua* 6, 127-60.
- Gil Hernández, A.P. & H. Rabunhal (1989). "O concepto de diglossia segundo Ch.A. Ferguson, e a súa pertinencia para a Comunidade Lusofona da Galiza. Um caso de diglossia por deslocação". *Nós* 13-18, 361-88.

- Goebel, H. (1994). "Bref examen des concepts de 'langue standard', 'langue commune', 'sociolecte', 'dialecte', 'patois', etc. du point de vue du romaniste germanophone". In C. Truchot (ed.), *Le plurilinguisme européen. Théories et pratiques en politique linguistique*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 117-35.
- González Millán, X. (1998). "O criterio filolóxico e a configuración dunha literatura nacional: achegas a un novo marco de reflexión". *Cadernos de Lingua* 17, 5-24.
- Herrero Valeiro, M.J. (1993a). *Aproximación à análise do discurso sociolinguístico sobre o caso galego*. Unpublished Master dissertation, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.
- Herrero Valeiro, M.J. (1993b). "Guerre de graphies et conflit glottopolitique. Lignes de discours dans la sociolinguistique galicienne". *Plurilinguismes* 6, 181-209.
- Herrero Valeiro, M.J. (1997). *A centralización do concepto diglosia na intervención discursiva sobre a lingua na Galiza (apontamentos para una sistematización)* (= *LynX. Documentos de trabajo* 10). València: Centro de Estudios sobre Comunicación Interlingüística e Intercultural.
- Herrero Valeiro, M.J. (2000). *Glotopolítica y genealogía del poder: El proceso de institucionalización del gallego desde la perspectiva de una (macro)política de la lengua*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade da Coruña.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1992). *Naciones y nacionalismo desde 1780*. Barcelona: Grijalbo Mondadori.
- Jardón, M. (1993). *La normalización lingüística, una anomalía democrática. El caso gallego*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Joseph, J.E. (1987). *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Language*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Kloss, H. (1967). "Bilingualism and nationalism". *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2), 39-47.
- Kloss, H. (1968). "Notes concerning a language-nation typology". In J.A. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson & J. Das Gupta (eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley, 69-85.
- Kremnitz, G. (1980). "Demarche et particularités de la sociolinguistique catalane". In B. Gardin & J.-B. Marcellesi (eds.), *Sociolinguistique. Approches, Théories, Pratiques*. Vol. I. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 21-31.
- Linz, J.J. (1973). "Early state-building and late peripheral nationalisms against the state: the case of Spain". In S.N. Eisenstadt & S. Rokkan (eds.), *Building States and Nations*. Vol. II. Beverly Hills, CA & London: Sage, 32-116.
- Linz, J.J. (1975). "Politics in a multi-lingual society with a dominant world language: The case of Spain". In J.-G. Savard & R. Vigneault (pres.), *Les États multilingues. Problèmes et solutions*. Québec: CIRB & Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 367-444.
- Linz, J.J. (1992). "Los nacionalismos en España: una perspectiva comparada". *Historia y fuente oral* 7, 127-35.

- Lodares, J.R. (2000). *El paraíso políglota*. Madrid: Taurus.
- López Morales, H. (1989). *Sociolingüística*. Madrid: Gredos.
- López Suevos, R. & F. Rodríguez (1978). *Problemática nacional e colonialismo. O caso galego*. Santiago de Compostela: Xistral.
- Mariño, R. (1998). *Historia da lingua galega*. Santiago de Compostela: Sotelo Blanco.
- Moralejo, J.J. (1977). *A lingua galega hoxe*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Moreno Cabrera, J.C. (2000). *La dignidad e igualdade de las lenguas: crítica de la discriminación lingüística*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Ninyoles, R. (1969). *Conflicte lingüístic valencià*. València: Tres i Quatre.
- Ninyoles, R. (1971). *Idioma i prejudici*. Palma de Mallorca: Moll.
- Ninyoles, R. (1977). *Cuatro idiomas para un estado (el castellano y los conflictos lingüísticos en la España periférica)*. Madrid: Cambio 16.
- Portas, M. (1991). *Língua e sociedade na Galiza*. A Coruña: Bahía.
- Prudent, L.-F. (1980a). *Des baragouins à la langue antillaise*. Paris: Caribéennes.
- Prudent, L.-F. (1980b). “Diglossie ou continuum? Quelques concepts problematiques de la creolistique moderne appliqués á l’archipel caraibe”. In B. Gardin & J.B. Marcellesi (eds.), *Sociolinguistique. Approches, Théories, Practiques*. Tome I. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 197-210.
- Prudent, L.-F. (1993). “Political illusions of an intervention in the linguistic domain in Martinique”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 102, 135-48.
- Recalde, M. (1997). *La vitalidad etnolingüística gallega (= LynX. Documentos de traballo 9)*. València: Centro de Estudios sobre Comunicación Interlingüística e Intercultural.
- Regueiro Tenreiro, M. (1999). *Modelo harmónico de relación lingüística. Estudio en Galicia*. Madrid: 3catorceuro Ediciones.
- Rodríguez, F. (1991[1976]). *Conflicto lingüístico e ideoloxía en Galiza*. Santiago de Compostela: Laiovento.
- Rodríguez Yáñez, X.P. (1993). “Quelques réflexions à propos de la sociolinguistique galicienne”. *Plurilinguismes* 6, 225-58.
- Royo, G. (1974). “Reseña a Informe —dramático— sobre la lengua gallega de Alonso Montero”. *Verba* 1, 243-49.
- Royo, G. (1981). “Conductas y actitudes lingüísticas en Galicia”. *Revista Española de Lingüística* II(2), 269-310.
- Salvador, G. (1987). *Lengua española y lenguas de España*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Salvador, G. (1992). *Política lingüística y sentido común*. Madrid: Istmo.
- Smith, A. (1976). *Las teorías del nacionalismo*. Barcelona: Península.
- Touraine, A. (1997). “Le nationalisme contre la nation”. In P. Birnbaum (dir.), *Sociologie des nationalismes*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 401-23.
- Vallverdú, F. (1968). *L’escriptor català i el problema de la llengua*. Barcelona: 62.
- Vallverdu, F. (1994). “La sociolinguistique en Catalogne dans les années 80”. *Lengas* 35, 11-26.