

*¿De onde es?, ¿de quen es?*¹: Local identities, discursive circulation, and manipulation of traditional Galician naming patterns

Gabriela Prego-Vázquez

Universidade de Santiago de Compostela

Departamento de Literatura Española, Teoría da Literatura e Lingüística Xeral
Facultade de Filoloxía, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Avda. de Castelao s/n, Campus norte
15782 Santiago de Compostela (A Coruña), Spain
gabipv@usc.es

Abstract

In this paper I will analyse how traditional Galician naming patterns circulate from discourses produced in traditional networks to the institutional and political speech belonging to the networks that emerge in the process of urbanisation and establishment of a democratic political system in Galicia. Based on the Ethnography of Communication, Interactional Sociolinguistics, Conversational Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis, I will examine —from a broad interdisciplinary perspective— the social relevance of these discursive practices to the negotiation of local identities. I will observe how politicians, aside from using technical nomination and introduction procedures, characteristic of political jargon, strategically mobilise traditional naming patterns (Prego Vázquez, 2000). Along these lines, I will study how this type of discursive circulation concerns the process of conversationalisation of institutional discourse (Fairclough, 1997) in order to cover the asymmetric interactive relations between institutional representatives and individuals and, in this way, enhance the exercise of persuasion (Prego Vázquez, to appear). The analysis is based on a data corpus collected in Bergantiños (A Coruña): it is composed of haggling in rural markets, *regueifas*, sung or rhymed verbal challenges in which two individuals face off and, finally, public discourse (political and institutional).

Key words: naming patterns, local identity, ethnic identity, discursive circulation, conversationalisation, power.

Resumo

Neste traballo analízase cómo circulan as fórmulas de presentación tradicionais galegas dende discursos producidos nas redes tradicionais ata a fala institucional e política propia das

1 *¿De onde es?* ('what parish or village are you from?'), *¿de quen es?* ('what family do you belong to?').

redes que emerxen no proceso de urbanización e democratización en Galicia. Partindo da Etnografía da Comunicación, da Sociolingüística Interaccional e da Análise Crítica do Discurso, estudiarei —dende unha ampla perspectiva interdisciplinar— a relevancia social destas prácticas discursivas na negociación das identidades locais. Observarase como os políticos, ademais de utilizar procedementos de presentación técnicos característicos da xerga política, mobilizan estratexicamente as fórmulas tradicionais de presentación (Prego Vázquez, 2000). Así mesmo, estudarase cómo este tipo de circulación discursiva está relacionado co proceso de conversacionalización do discurso institucional (Fairclough, 1997), destinado a encubrir as relacións interactivas asimétricas entre representantes institucionais e individuos e, deste xeito, favorecer o exercicio da persuasión (Prego Vázquez, por aparecer). A análise baséase nun corpus de datos recollido en Bergantiños (A Coruña): está composto por regateos en mercados rurais, regueifas, desafíos verbais cantados e rimados nos que se enfrontan dous individuos e, finalmente, discurso público (político e institucional).

Palabras clave: fórmulas de presentación, identidade local, identidade étnica, circulación discursiva, conversacionalización, poder.

1. Introduction²

¿De onde es? (‘what parish or village are you from?’), *¿de quen es?* (‘what family do you belong to?’), *é o fillo de Roberto de Catoira* (‘he’s the son of Roberto from Catoira’) or *sodes dos Borralleiras da parroquia de Loureda* (‘you’re from the Borralleiras family of the parish of Loureda’), are communicative naming practices that respond to traditional identification patterns still customary in rural and rururban Galicia. Through these practices, the personal identity is reconstructed oriented to the social networks relevant to the rural space, that is, the family, the hamlet, and the parish. The use of this type of interactive pattern when initiating a relationship or social recognition aroused my curiosity exactly in the spring of 1977. The motive for this interest was not any type of investigation given that in May of 1977 I was only seven years old and, unfortunately or fortunately, I was not such a precocious discourse analyst.

This was the year that I moved with my family from Montevideo (Uruguay) to the parish of Loureda in Arteixo (A Coruña, Galicia) and, as this trip mean an important change of surroundings, I still remember that during the first months, despite the fact that I understood Galician and Spanish perfectly, I experienced a certain confusion when faced with certain socio-communicative situations. In particular, the communicative practices of introduction were especially perplexing since they directly affected my identity. Thus, because of this trip, I discovered that in the village of my

² I would like to express appreciation for the commentaries of Celso Álvarez Cáccamo and Milagros Fernández Pérez, the literature contributed by Francisco García Gondar from the database BILEGA and, of course, the work and detailed reading of the editors of this volume, Manuel Fernández-Ferreiro and Fernando Ramallo.

grandparents I ceased to be Gabriela Prego Vázquez and was mysteriously transformed into Gabriela of Borralleiras. I also discovered that my parents, who had always told me that their names were Roberto Prego and Amalia Vázquez, became Roberto of Catoira and Melucha of Borralleiras. And, further, my forbearers began to habitually use the questions *who are you from?* and *where are you from?* to identify those old friendships that had, with the passage of time, changed so much.

The fact that in the first seven years of my life I participated in different culture communities (Clark, 1996: 332-34, 352-53) made it impossible for me to acquire the socio-cultural background of those individuals who interacted within the traditional Galician social networks and in their *ethnic or traditional conversational style* —Tannen (1982) defines ethnic conversational style as the manner of expressing and interpreting the meaning of conversation that is characteristic of a particular culture. And, as a consequence, I did not have at my disposal sufficient keys to interpret the *contextualisation cues* (Gumperz, 1982) or any other type of discursive resource that would index the immediate social-cultural reality of my new community.

After a brief period of adaptation, participation in my new networks of interaction permitted me to acquire sufficient cultural-pragmatic skill to overcome those initial problems of *cross-talk* (Gumperz, 1982). In this way, I was able to adequately interpret these and other communicative practices —belonging to the Galician ethnic or cultural conversational style (Gumperz, 1982c; Tannen, 1982)— that began, in a natural way, to form part of my verbal repertoire. Surely this was the reason that these interactive patterns did not attract my attention again until, years later, I began my ethnographic data collection in the rural and rururban Galician social networks. Resulting from this fieldwork, I observed how these naming patterns appeared recurrently.

The motive of this interest was no longer, as it had been twenty-five years ago, the uncertainty in facing some unknown discursive practices. Nevertheless, my curiosity was not awakened simply by the presence and vitality of these naming patterns in the daily exchange of the traditional networks. Rather, what really captured my attention was the crucial role these naming patterns played in the negotiation of local identities and in the continual discursive reconstruction of socio-cultural meanings. Let's not forget that an understanding of the communicative traditions, of the principles of interpretation, and of the socio-cultural meanings is necessary to be able to adequately use and interpret these practices, meanings that are acquired through participation in the networks throughout the socialisation process. As John Gumperz (1996: 359) argues, social meanings are relative to context, and the context and the principles of interpretation are relative to the social networks in which they are situated; in this sense, the traditional forms of identification in my corpus manifest themselves as strategic elements for studying the relations between interaction, identities, and social networks.

Thus, based on the Ethnography of Communication (Gumperz, 1982a, 1982b, 1996), Conversational Analysis (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Drew & Heritage, 1992) and Critical Discourse Analysis (Van Dijk, 1988, 1995, 1997; Fairclough, 1989; Martín Rojo & Van Dijk, 1998; Martín Rojo & Whittaker, 1998) I will examine, from a broad interdisciplinary perspective, the social relevance of these discursive practices to the negotiation of local identities.

My intention is to analyse the discursive circulation of these patterns from the conversational exchanges produced in the traditional networks to the institutional and political discourse, characteristic of the superposed networks of the public domain, networks that emerge in the process of urbanisation and democratisation of Galicia (Álvarez Cáccamo & Prego Vázquez, 2001; Prego Vázquez, 2000). Discursive circulation consists of the shifting of discursive resources and texts across different types of contexts (Blommaert, 2001; Briggs & Bauman, 1992; Silverstein & Urban, 1996). Specifically, we will observe how local politicians, aside from using technical introduction procedures characteristic of political jargon, strategically mobilise traditional naming patterns (Prego Vázquez, 2000). Along these lines, I will study how this type of discursive circulation concerns the process of conversationalisation of institutional discourse (Fairclough, 1997) in order to cover the asymmetric interactive relations between institutional representatives and individuals and, in this way, enhance, on one hand, the exercise of persuasion (Prego Vázquez, in press), and, on the other hand, reinforce the power of the ruling classes. In this sense, as Foucault (1971) argues, the circulation of discourses, understood as “el fluir de los discursos” (‘the flow of discourses’; Martín Rojo, 1997: 7) is controlled by those groups that hold the power with the goal of reinforcing their position (Martín Rojo, 1997: 8).

The analysis is based on a data corpus collected in Bergantiños (A Coruña). It is composed of haggling (discursive activity, framed in traditional contexts of economic exchange such as fairs and markets, in which the price of the product is negotiated), *regueifas* (folkloric rituals produced in festival contexts that consist of sung or rhymed verbal challenges in which two individuals face off) and, finally, public discourse (political and institutional).

Bergantiños, a natural district and socio-cultural entity since ancient times, is situated in the northwest of Galicia, in the province of A Coruña. It is bounded to the north and west by the Atlantic Ocean and the rias of Laxe and Corme; to the south by the territories of Xallas; to the east by the mountains of Santa Leocadia and the steppes that separate the council of Laracha from the Valle de Barrañán (Arteixo). It has an area of 741.9 Km² (Precedo Ledo, 1997) and its spatial distribution is organised around Route C-552 A Coruña-Fisterra. According to the new district plan implemented by the Galician autonomous government (Xunta de Galicia), the district of Bergantiños covers seven councils (Cabana de Bergantiños, Carballo, Coristanco, Laracha, Malpica de Bergantiños, Ponteceso y Laxe) and includes

eighty-four parishes. In our study we will also include the municipality of Arteixo since it is transitional between this district and A Coruña.

Bergantiños has been a traditionally rural district that has experienced in recent decades a process of urbanisation and industrialisation representative of the process occurring in Galician in recent times. This process has resulted in a social, economic, and linguistic transformation. Along with the traditional farmers, new social groups have emerged such as salaried workers, civil servants, small business-owners, independent professionals and, in general, individuals who participate in the new networks of the urban space. A gradual transition has emerged in the rural, rururban, and urban social networks, which is reflected, to a certain extent, in the communicative repertoire. This communicative repertoire is comprised of the continuum of linguistic varieties ranging from Galician to Spanish. Of particular relevance are the different hybridised linguistic forms including Galician/Spanish code-switching, Galician/Spanish intermediate varieties like *castrapo* (a variety of Spanish with an abundant presence of Galicianisms at the different linguistic levels) and, on the discursive dimension, the strategic recycling of traditional discourse in the institutional realm (Prego Vázquez, 2000).

2. Naming patterns: An intercultural perspective

Naming patterns index the social relations among individuals and encapsulate socio-cultural meanings characteristic of each community. In general, the different naming forms may be specification or genericisation (Van Leeuwen, 1996). That is, people may introduce themselves individually (specification) or as a function of the different groups to which they may belong (genericisation). Normally, the social groups that are culturally relevant for each community are those that come into play in each of these introductions or nominations. For this reason, naming patterns are discursive markers of the distinctive ethnic traits of each culture community.

Thus, for example, in urban cultures with dynamic social networks in which the relations among the individuals are not dense, it might be useless to try to introduce ourselves relative to our families and our ancestors. In contrast, in rural cultures where everybody knows each other and dense networks are established with multiplex relations among their members, this type of introduction may be more effective. In this sense, the interaction patterns and socio-cultural values of a society are reflected in the different naming patterns, and this is what makes them interesting as an object of investigation, since they offer us guidelines for understanding the relations between language and society (Mehrotra, 1985).

Therefore, the majority of urban societies of Western Europe and the United States correspond to the naming patterns that Van Leeuwen (1997) observed for British society. This author indicates that the nominations are carried out fundamentally through individual given names that can also be utilised as vocatives.

In these cases there are three types of nomination: formalisation (surname with some type of honorific), semi-formalisation (given name-surname)³ and informalisation (given name).

Nevertheless, the nomination can take quite different forms, and different cultures and communication types use various procedures. Van Leeuwen points out that nomination can also be carried out by titulation, fundamentally consisting of two types: honorification and affiliation. Honorification makes reference to the responsibilities of the individual, while affiliation indicates personal and family relationships. Further, there is also a distinction between functionalisation and identification. Functionalisation takes place when the social actors introduce themselves in terms of the activity they are carrying out, while identification occurs in terms of what the individuals are on a permanent basis. This author distinguishes three identification procedures: classification (origin, age, social class, gender, ethnicity, etc.), relational identification (the social actors introduce themselves in terms of their personal and family relations) and physical identification.

The degree of relevance of these nomination formulas varies from community to community. Thus, for example, Van Leeuwen (1996: 56) notes: “The role of relational identification is, in our society, less important than that of classification and functionalisation, especially where personal and kinship relations are concerned”. The societies to which Van Leeuwen refers are urban and industrialised societies. Nevertheless, in the naming patterns analysed in this study, characteristic of traditional Galician networks, relational identification (*who are you from?*) and local classification (*where are you from?*) are more important than formalisation (given names and surnames) and functionalisation.

In this sense, the forms of identification of the traditional Galician networks are closer to the forms of identification of rural networks in other communities than they are to urban Galician nomination forms. Identification relative to family and place can be found in rural settings of Catalonia, the Basque Country, and other communities of the Iberian Peninsula. They can even be found in cultures more distant from Galicia, including for example that of the Australian Aborigines. Observe the similarity between case 1, an exchange deriving from a haggling episode in the data corpus analysed in Prego Vázquez (in press), and case 2, an exchange between Australian Aborigines collected from Von Sturmer (1981: 13) and analysed by Van Leeuwen (1997: 205):

³ In a large portion of languages surnames follow given names. Nevertheless, there are languages, as is the case with Hungarian and Chinese, in which the surname precedes the given name (Crystal, 1994: 112).

Case 1. “Labradores galegos” (‘Galician farmers’).

[V: vendor; C1, C2 and C3 are buyers].

- | | |
|---|--|
| V: Nós somos moi antighuos, ¿verdad Melucha? | V: We are very old, right Melucha? |
| C1: ¿É de, é de Loureda? | C1: You’re from, you’re from Loureda? |
| C2: ... Este é bo, do Valle, deee | C2: ... That’s good, from the Valley, from... |
| V: Eu a ti conózote. | V: I know you. |
| C2: ¿Ti es do Foxo non? | C2: You’re from Foxo, no? |
| V: Ai do Foxo, ¿e logho ⁴ ti non es irmán de ...? | V: Oh, from Foxo, then aren’t you the sister of...? |
| C: De Chapelá. | C: Of Chapelá. |
| V: ¿Ti es irmán de da nai de Pablo? | V: You’re the sister of the mother of Pablo? |
| C: Sí. | C: Yes. |
| V: Pois Pablo | V: Well, Pablo |
| C: Que se casou agora. | C: Who just now got married |
| V: Pablo e mailo meu fillo máis novo mórrese un polo outro, muller , que Pablo estaba sempre na (...) | V: Pablo and my youngest son are dying for each other, lady, and Pablo was always in (...) |
| C: Ahora Pablo está lexos ⁵
[...] | C: Now Pablo is far away.
[...] |
| C: É do país noso [refírese á parroquia de orixe da vendedora] | C: She’s from our country [referring to the vendor’s parish of origin]. |
| V: Son todos da mesma parroquia. | V: They are all from the same parish. |
| C: Eu a señora conózoa. | C: I know the lady. |
| C3: E daquela... | C3: And so... |
| C2: Eu non creo que ela compre pienso pa darle. | C2: I don’t think that she buys feed to give it. |
| C3: Se é do país noso é imposible, aí hai (...) | C3: If she’s from our country it’s impossible, there there’s (...) |

Case 2. “Australian Aborigines” (Von Sturmer, 1981: 13).

- Mareeba man: Where you from?
Mickey: I’m Edward River man.
Mareeba man: I’m Lama Lama man ... do you know X?
Mickey: No. Do you know Y?
Mareeba man: No. Do you know Z?
Mickey: Yes, she’s my auntie.
Mareeba man: That old lady’s my granny. I must call you daddy.
Mickey: I must call you boy. You give me a cigarette.

In both cases they attempt to identify, in the first place, the origin of the speaker. Observe that “Mareeba man” and Mickey utilise the same question that appears on many occasions in our own data: *where are you from?* In the exchange

4 We use the grapheme <gh> to represent the production [h] of the phoneme /g/ in Galician (the standard is [g]), a dialectal variant of this zone known as *gheada*.

5 The term “lexos” (/leʃos/) is a Spanishism: the Galician form is “lonxe” (/lonʃe/).

among the Galicians, the three participants identify themselves by their place of origin. They introduce themselves as members of the same parish, that is, as residents of Loureda: they even use the term “country” as a synonym for “parish”. In fact, together, the three profile the local identity portrait of the buyer based on the traditional networks. They indicate the parish (Loureda) and the village (Foxo). Further, in both cases we can observe that the direct and indirect family relationships are activated. Thus, “Mareeba man” knows Mickey’s aunt and, in the case of the Galician haggling, the buyer introduces herself as the aunt of a friend of the son of the vendor. In both cases the participants of both cultures seek, in the first place, the relationships that they share and, based on these, establish their relationship.

This is not the case, for example, with the Sakavalas of Madagascar, who hide from strangers the name of their village as well as their own name (Crystal, 1994: 9), since they consider this information to be taboo and believe that, in this way, they can prevent this information from being used in a negative form. Personal information is also hidden in certain tribes of New Zealand and Australia. The individuals of these communities possess a public name and a private one that almost nobody knows, in order to prevent the manipulation of this information with evil intentions in magical rites and witchcraft (Crystal, 1994).

Ritual and magical meanings are also present in the nomination of other peoples, as in the case of some Hindu communities. As described by Raja Ram Mehrotra (1985), ten days after the birth of a child an astrologer would be consulted to find the appropriate name based on the delivery date. The selection of the name was fundamental, because it was believed that a person’s destiny is to a certain degree influenced by the name given. Thus, in this type of community it was impolite to ask *who are you?*, or it wasn’t as relevant to ask *who are you from?* (‘what family do you come from?’) as characteristic of the most traditional Galician communities. The habitual and correct form in these Hindu communities would be something like “what is your good/auspicious name?” (Mehrotra, 1985: 122). In any case, according to this author, this type of identification is currently being abandoned due to modernisation processes.

Mehrotra (1985) provides testimony of other nomination forms in other Indian communities. For example, in the south of India there are naming patterns more similar to those of our study, in that the name of the person includes the name of the father and of the mother, together with the village of birth. Nevertheless, not all of the nomination practices in Hindi indicate the parents’ names and the place of birth. On other occasions, names are accompanied by the caste to which the person belongs, by the profession, or by an account of physical or mental characteristics.

In this sense, Mehrotra (1985: 123) points out the importance of the study of “personal names and nicknames in Hindi in relation to their sociocultural matrix with special reference to the role they play in defining interpersonal relationship”. Obviously, it is not only Hindu names that comprise strategic resources for the study

of the relation between language and society, but rather that, in general, in all communities the nomination patterns offer these possibilities.

3. *Where are you from? Who are you from?: Local and ethnic identities in traditional Galician discourse*

Rural social groups and, to a lesser degree, rururban groups (formed by individuals who simultaneously interact in rural and urban networks) continue to practice traditional introduction techniques. As mentioned earlier, the public introductions relevant to those individuals who form part of the traditional networks are elicited as a response to questions of the type: *where are you from?* and *who are you from?* The prototypical social group traditionally participating in these social networks is that of farmers. In addition, we see the participation of individuals who, although they belong to urban networks, continue to participate periodically in the rural networks to which they are linked by family ties (the rururban social group). These questions not only reconstruct the local identity of the individual based on recognition of the family, the village, and the parish⁶ to which he or she belongs, but they also, through the use of these communicative practices that are characteristic of the ethnic conversational style to which we referred in the first section, invoke ethnic identity.

Ethnic identity consists of the membership that the social actors recognise in terms of race, nation, or ethnicity, a human group that shares a common culture—that is, traditions, values, beliefs, models of behaviour, etc. The most traditional definitions of ethnicity maintain, according to Pagliai (2000: 126-28), that the borders between ethnic groups are stable and fixed: “ethnic groups as stable and self-perpetuating social units to which the individual belongs by birth or primary socialisation, and which can be defined through sets of traits”. Nevertheless, Pagliai (2000) argues that these classic conceptions forget what Kroskrity (1993; cited in Pagliai, 2000: 126) considers the “space of free decisionality that identity offers to the person”. In this sense, the author maintains that ethnic identities are negotiated in face-to-face interactions, given that the cultural borders separating groups are not stable, but rather that “the focus on boundaries is in itself an ideological choice” (Pagliai, 2000: 127). Thus, in her work about the *contrasto* (verbal challenge very similar to the Galician *regueifa*)⁷, the author analyses how the participants reconstruct in their discourse their Tuscan ethnic identities, evoking their belonging to places, that is, to towns, villages, mountains, valleys, or legends of Tuscan Italy.

⁶ The municipality is understood not as a cultural entity, but rather as an administrative entity.

⁷ Pagliai defines the *contrasto* (2000: 125) as a “humorous representation of a verbal duel among entities, people or ideas. Structurally, it is formed by a series of chained Octets, in hendecasyllables”.

For this reason, in the cases analysed by Pagliai (2000), the reconstruction of ethnic identity is directly connected to the negotiation of local identities in the discourse.

In the same way, the connection between ethnic identities and local identities can be observed in the discourse of the traditional Galician networks. Thus, people are not usually known by their neighbours in terms of the given names and surnames that they carry in their identity card. Rather, in the village it is customary to name people, first, by their name or nickname, followed by the preposition *de* ('of') and followed by the family name or nickname. For example, "Roberto de Catoira", "Melucha de Vázquez", "Jacinto de Valiño", etc. Finally, the individuals can be assigned the name of the village and/or parish to which they belong.

The name of the family to which the individual belongs does not necessarily correspond to his or her surname. Normally, the families are known by the name by which the house is identified, a symbol of lineage. Thus, in my fieldwork I observed that participants constantly referred to the families in terms of nominations in which the term *casa* ('house') appeared, for example, "Casa de Xan Naia", "Casa da Pachona", or with shortened forms like "Cas Xan Naia", "Cas Farruqueiro", etc. The house is that which carries the name, and the daughters-in-law and sons-in-law that come to live in the house normally adopt the name of the new lineage to which they will belong.

According to Mariño Ferro (2000: 360), on some occasions the name of the house indicates that the denomination of the house may proceed from the given name or surname of the proprietor, with the possibility of maintaining the name of a past proprietor. On other occasions the house carries the name of the office or profession of the proprietor or, it is clear, that of some ancestor. For example, in the "Casa de Canteiro" ('quarryman's house') there is nobody who currently holds this office. However, according to what the current inhabitants told me, a quarryman from Pontevedra, great-grandfather of the current residents of the house, founded this new lineage in the parish of Loureda in Arteixo three generations ago. Nominations such as "Casa do Portugués" ('house of the Portuguese') or "Casa do Cubano" ('house of the Cuban') can also be used to refer to the origin of the proprietors that come from other places or that were emigrants in other countries. I have also confirmed that on many occasions a house can have two names: an official name and a nickname; for example, "os de Vázquez" ('those of Vázquez') have as a nickname "os de Borralleiras" ('those of Borralleiras').

The family-house constitutes the minimum social structure of cohabitation. The house brings together, as Lisón Tolosana (1990: 377) explains, the ancestors as well as the current inhabitants, and "es proyección del pasado y del futuro" ('is a projection of the past and of the future'). At the same time, the family is the fundamental economic unit in the Galician rural space. It represents a small business in the farming world, with the tasks perfectly distributed among the members. For this reason, the number of inhabitants occupying the same house in the rural setting

is greater than that in the city. Several generations usually cohabit — grandparents, parents, and children— forming a dynamic work structure. In any case, in many houses there currently exists some member of the family who simultaneously conducts farm work and holds a salaried job, due to the precarious state of the small holding in the area studied in this investigation. The distinctive element of this network is that its members, aside from establishing social ties, also possess blood ties. It is necessary to distinguish between those who live together — under the authority of their elders— and *os parentes de fóra* ('the relatives from outside', that is, those members of the family who do not live at home) who belong to the same lineage but not to the family-house.

For example, the following fragment comes from a haggling case analysed in Prego Vázquez (1998). It illustrates the mitigation phase, as it follows a hard negotiation of the price of the product (Prego Vázquez, 1994, 1998). As can be observed in this example, this last phase of the haggling is not only designed to establish a certain continuity in economic relations, but is also intended to reinforce social relations. Specifically, the vendor introduces herself as a member of the same lineage/family as the buyer:

Case 3. "A nosa xente" ('Our people/our folks').

[V: vendor; C: buyer].

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>V: É que mira muller túa nai aínda é da nosa xente [risa]. Inda é, oíches, o abuelo de mi padre.</p> <p>C: Si somos algo da familia.</p> <p>V: O abuelo do meu pai e mailo de túa nai eran irmáns.</p> <p>C: Eran irmáns.</p> <p>V: Así que mira.</p> <p>C: Hasta somos seghundas primas (...)</p> | <p>V: It's that, look, woman, your mother is still of our folk [smile]. The grandfather of my father, listen, still is.</p> <p>C: Yes, we're sort of family.</p> <p>V: The grandfathers of my father and of your mother were brothers.</p> <p>C: They were brothers.</p> <p>V: So look.</p> <p>C: So then we're second cousins (...)</p> |
|---|--|

The vendor evokes the parentage links between the participants. The uniting links between these participants are not limited to their frequent interactions of buying and selling. These two participants belong to the same *xente* ('family, folks'), in the sense of the Latin *gens*, the same family origin, the same lineage, as their grandfathers were brothers. The participants orient to the traditional family network. In this way, they make relevant (Schegloff, 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Wilson, 1991) their membership (Sacks, 1992[1972]) in the traditional social group and reconstruct their traditional local identities.

As we have seen, the rural family entails a large group, always projecting onto the exterior shared life. This social network is basically oriented with respect to the parish and the village. In this sense, these formulas of nomination can be accompanied by the name of the village and of the parish, since they are social

networks institutionalised in the rural Galician setting, recognised by the members of the community due to their cultural relevance and their survival over time (Lisón Tolosana, 1990[1979]). We can see naming like “os de Borralleiras do Ighlesario de Loureda” (‘those of the Borralleiras family of Ighlesario of Loureda’), “os do Pirinete de Candame de Arteixo” (‘those of the Pirinete family of Candame of Arteixo’), etc. For example, observe how Calviño and Costa, two *regueifeiros* (those who argue in a *regueifa*) from Bergantiños, introduce themselves in their couplets — collected from a *regueifa* celebrated in the year 1997 on the Day of the Muiñeira in Arteixo (A Coruña)— to other *regueifeiros* by means of their nicknames and their village and/or parish of origin:

Case 4. “Os regueifeiros” (‘The *regueifeiros*’).
[R1 and R2: *regueifeiros* participants].

R1:	Cantei con ben cantadores nunca fun home de orgullo e co Churrero de Caión co Ribeiro do Soutullo.	R1:	I sang with many <i>regueifeiros</i> I never was a proud man and with the Churrero of Caión with Ribeiro of Soutullo.
R2:	Eses señores non os nombres fala con entendemento co [= que o] Churrero e máis Soutullo morreron xa fai tempo.	R2:	These gentlemen, don’t mention them speak carefully as the Churrero and Soutullo died a while ago.

The “aldeas” (‘villages’ or ‘hamlets’) constitute population groupings of approximately forty to sixty houses. They are situated, according to Risco (1979), in the places where the terrain is most fruitful, such as the mountainsides, protected from the wind, small valleys, and areas around rivers and streams. The villages have their own limits and terms based on uses and customs. Life in the village is, as Lisón Tolosana (1990) described in his study, a life in common. There are various formulas of community organisation that demonstrate interdependence. Members of the village are united by cooperation in the agricultural cycle, by domestic chores, by the rites associated with death, birth and marriage, and by holiday cycles. The villages constitute social networks that belong to the parishes.

The “parroquias” (‘parishes’) are social cells of cohabitation, based simply on uses and customs. The rural Galician world is distributed throughout small and disperse communities that constitute dense social networks of multiple relations among members. The parish is, although it hasn’t had much of a judicial nature for quite a long time, of fundamental importance in the organisation of the rural space. (Lisón Tolosana, 1990; Mariño Ferro, 2000; Risco, 1979). The individuals who belong to the same village are *veciños de cerca* (‘close neighbours’) and those of a single parish consider themselves to be *veciños* (‘neighbours’). But *veciño* is not simply one who inhabits a parish. These individuals are integrated within networks of dense relationships, very frequent and multiplex, since they can simultaneously be

friends, family members, and co-workers of the fields. Thus, for example, it would be unthinkable that someone who lives in Madrid would tell us: “When you get to Madrid, ask for me”. In contrast, Calviño is sure that any of his neighbours from Boghalleira (his village) will know him and know where his house is; for this reason he says in his couplet:

Case 5. “Da Boghalleira” (‘Of Boghalleira’).

[R: *regueifeiro*].

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| R: | Meterme un telefonazo
xa poño os pes ó camiño
nos barrios da Boghalleira
preguntades por Calviño. | R: | If you call me on the telephone
I’ll come out right away
in the neighbourhoods of
Boghalleira
ask for Calviño. |
|----|--|----|--|

In the exchanges from our corpus we do not only encounter the question *where are you from?* (‘what parish or village are you from?’); or the response *I/he/she am/is a neighbour of* (‘be a neighbour of’, with the sense of ‘live in’) to identify the village and the parish. For example, observe these two cases corresponding to the mitigation phase of two haggling episodes:

Case 6. “¿De onde é?” (‘Where are you from?’, ‘What village and/or parish are you from?’).

[C: buyer; V: vendor].

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| C: | ¿E logho usted de donde é? | C: | And so you, where are you from? |
| V: | De Baldaio. Eu a usted conózoa. | V: | From Baldaio. I know you. |
| C: | ¿De Baldaio? En Baldaio tamén hai unha, unha veciña nosa que se chama Amparo. | C: | From Baldaio? In Baldaio there is also a, a neighbour of ours who is named Amparo. |

Case 7. “¿Sodes de cerca?” (‘Are you all from around here?’).

[V: vendor; C: buyer].

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| V: | ¿Sodes de aquí cerca vós? | V: | Are you all from around here? |
| C: | Non, de Arteixo. | C: | No, from Arteixo. |
| V: | ¡Ai de Arteixo! Pois mira que vendín hoxe mel para Arteixo. Non dighas que cho vendín así, que, que os vendín todos a mil pesetas. | V: | Ah, from Arteixo! Well, look, today I sold honey for Arteixo. Don’t say that I sold it like that, that I sold it all for a thousand pesetas. |
| C: | Si. | C: | Yes. |
| V: | De verdad. | V: | Really. |
| C: | Non llo digho a nadie. | C: | I won’t tell anybody. |
| V: | Ti cala a boca. Si non, outro día non ma levan. | V: | You keep that quiet. If not, they won’t buy it another day. |
| C: | Claro. | C: | Of course. |
| V: | Porque son clientes que mo levan sempre. | V: | Because they’re clients that always buy from me. |

The vendors in case 6 and case 7 introduce the first part of a question-answer adjacency pair, in order to localise the village and parish to which the other participant belongs. Questions such as *where are you from?* (what parish and/or village are you from?) and *are you all from around here?*, frequently recurring in the mitigation phase, are intended to establish relations with the other participants according to the social networks to which they belong. As can be observed in these two examples, for the individuals of the rural world it is important to know to which village and parish their conversational partner belongs, in order to be able to activate the ties uniting them by means of family references or common neighbours. The importance of these networks —village and parish— as vital units is reactivated day after day by the frequent interaction of the participants in their various types of relations. The social life, neighbour relations, and the community of religious worship are cantered within the structure of the parish, and even the living and dead live together (Risco, 1979), since all of the parishes have a cemetery.

In the nomination formulas that we have just presented, a certain subordination of “the personal” to “the group” can be detected. In this sense, these practices symbolise the diffuse borders separating public and private space in traditional Galician social networks. Generally, public life constitutes an extension of family life in the most traditional communities. This extension of the private into the public is not only found in rural settings but also, as demonstrated in the works of Frankenberg (1969) and Fried (1973), can be found in the urban working-class neighbourhoods in which everyone knows each other and relate habitually among themselves. These communities are comprised of dense and multiplex networks in which the members are directly or indirectly linked in a great variety of ways, due to a high degree of integration of the individual into the community and a great homogeneity of values and norms (Milroy, 1987; Gal, 1978, 1979).

In this sense, the social-interactional study of these practices is relevant for the analysis of identities as strategic points (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) of connection between discursive practices and social networks. The identities that are activated by communicative introduction practices constitute strategic instruments and sources (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) for the study of the relationships between social processes and discursive processes. Traditional introduction practices are socio-discursive practices through which individuals ascribe —in the sense of Sacks (1992)— to categories that are socio-culturally relevant in their world. Following Antaki & Widdicombe (1998), the different categories to which they ascribe function as inferential sources, since upon introducing ourselves as members of a category, we are attributed certain values, beliefs, understandings, etc. It is precisely through communicative practices such as nomination that local identities are made relevant as those evoking ethnic identities.

4. Legitimation and mobilisation of traditional introduction practices in political discourse

The first person plural as a formula of self-reference (Wilson, 1990) and self-designation using the name of the office one holds (mayor, minister...) constitute technical introduction procedures, characteristic of political jargon. These mechanisms are included within what Levinson (1989) calls *absolute social deixis*, given that they are only utilised by authorised speakers, and that through their use the speakers make relevant their role as institutional agents. The speakers present himself through these formulas as the authorised person. The speaker makes relevant his role as representative of a group or his institutional function to legitimise his declarations and himself (Thompson, 1990; Martín Rojo & Van Dijk, 1998).

Nevertheless, although the institutional participants habitually utilise these technical introduction forms, I have observed in my data corpus that they strategically filtered the naming patterns typical of the traditional world into their discourses.

The individual's use of these traditional techniques allows him to present himself as a member situated within the community, that is, as a member with "pedigree", one who understands the local customs. This traditional self-presentation constitutes, as such, a formula of self-legitimation, as the speaker presents himself as a member with roots in the community in order to demonstrate that he is a person who represents this community and to seek, in this way, the sympathy of the audience. He does not present himself as a distant politician, who uses discursive mechanisms that are difficult to understand, with a discourse filled with technical expressions that separate him from his public. He uses the local traditional tactics to discursively construct his credibility. For example:

Case 8. "O fillo de Serra de Arixón" ('The son of Serra of Arixón').

[EA: interviewer; ES: candidate interviewed].

EA:	dez e vinte e dous minutos da mañá eleccións con voz propia continuamos coas entrevistas aos candidatos e hoxe temos con nós no estudio de Radio Voz Bergantiños a Enrique Xosé Serra Covas que encabeza a lista do Bloque Nacionalista Galego en Coristanco Enrique Xosé Serra moi bos días	EA:	ten twenty-two in the morning "Elecciones con Voz Propia" we continue with the interviews with the candidates and today we have with us in the studio of Radio Voz Bergantiños Enrique Xosé Serra Covas who heads the list of the Bloque Nacionalista Galego in Coristanco Enrique Xosé Serra very good morning
ES:	bos días Cristina	ES:	Good morning Cristina

- EA: é a primeira vez
que o BNG
presenta candidatura
en Coristanco
e tamén é a primeira vez
e
por así decilo
o seu debut
en política
mm
quizais os veciños de Coristanco
aínda que a estas alturas da campaña
seguro que xa todos coñecen
a Enrique Xosé Serra Covas
descoñezan
algúns datos da súa vida
que poderíamos decir de vostede
como poderíamos presentalo
- ES: pois poderíamos empezar
que **moitos dos veciños da parroquia
do Concello**
pois
ó millor conócenme máis
por
Pepe Serra
ou
o fillo de Serra de Arixón
son unha persona
de vinte e sete anos
polo tanto xa non me considero un
rapaz
aunque teño cara de moi xoven
que rematei os estudos
de química
na Coruña
hai ano e medio
agora estou dando clases particulares
na Rabadeira
e
metínme en política
porque me parecía
que todo o que se está facendo no
Concello
non é o que merecemos
e decidimos dar o salto á política
unha xente máis eu
con uns intereses non personales
senón polo pobo
pra que Coristanco
- EA: It's the first time
that the BNG
has presented a candidate
in Coristanco
and it's also the first time
and
in other words
his debut
in politics
hmm
maybe the neighbours of Coristanco
although this late in the campaign
everybody surely is already familiar
with Enrique Xosé Serra Covas
they aren't familiar with
some facts about his life
what could we say about you
how could we introduce you?
- ES: Well, we could begin
That many of the neighbours of the parish
of the town
well
maybe they know me best
by
Pepe Serra
or
the son of Serra of Arixón
I am a person
twenty-seven years old
therefore I don't consider myself a
child any more
although I have a very young face
that I finished my studies
in Chemistry
in A Coruña
a year and a half ago
now I am giving private classes
in Rabadeira
and
I got into politics
because it seemed to me
that all that is going on in the City
Council
is not what we deserve
and we decided to take a leap into politics
some people and me
with some interests that weren't personal
but rather for the people
so that Coristanco

vaia avanzando
e teña o millor
o millor para todos

would advance
and have the best
the best for everyone

This episode comes from “Elecciones con Voz Propia” (‘The Voice of the Elections’) of Radio Voz Bergantiños. In this episode, the announcer (EA), Cristina Abelleira, interviews Enrique Xosé Serra Covas (ES), the Bloque Nacionalista Galego’s candidate for mayor of Coristanco. The interviewer introduces Enrique Xosé Serra Covas as the representative of the Bloque Nacionalista Galego in Coristanco and informs the audience that this is the first time that this party has presented a candidate in this municipality. Following this, Cristina Abelleira invites Enrique Xosé to present himself, and he presents himself utilising traditional introduction practices (observe especially the paragraphs in bold).

In the first place, he identifies himself as a member of a parish of the town—that is, as an individual recognised within one of the traditional networks of the community—, as he says “que moitos dos veciños da parroquia, do concello pois, ó millor conócenme máis por (...)” [‘that many of the neighbours of the parish, of the town, well, maybe they know me best by (...)’]. And, later, he presents himself using the name by which he is known in his parish, utilising the traditional introduction techniques, that is, his informalisation name and the family or lineage to which he subscribes. Xosé Serra Covas introduces himself as “Pepe Serra or the son of Serra de Arixón”.

This traditional introduction technique can be identified as that which Van Leeuwen (1997) calls *nomination by affiliation*, in this case self-nomination in which he identifies himself in terms of the family to which he belongs. Demonstrating his skill in the utilisation of the traditional introduction techniques, he evokes his belonging to the rural networks.

In this way, he constructs his credibility as a candidate through his discourse. On one hand, he is a member known by everyone and whose ancestors have always belonged to the community, issues that offer confidence. On the other hand, he is a young person and university graduate. He presents himself as the perfect symbiosis where the traditional and the modern converge.

In other episodes of the interview, this participant introduces the same traditional nomination and introduction techniques to refer to other people. He continues to demonstrate his skill in traditional conversation strategies, and, therefore, demonstrates how close he is to his neighbours. In the example we will present next he refers to the town bosses by their local nicknames (observe the terms in bold):

Case 9. “Os caciques” (‘The *caciques*’, ‘The local bosses’).
[ES: candidate interviewed].

<p>ES: Nós decimos que nestes momentos o Concello está gobernado xa non por Antonio non está ben falar mal dunha xente nin de outra pero a verdade tamén a hai que decir non está gobernado por Antonio está gobernado por os dous señores que están detrás que serían Rodríguez tamén conocido por Pepe da Coua e Jesús o das gasolineras tamén conocido por Chucho de Porteiro.</p>	<p>ES: We say that at this time the City Hall is governed not by Antonio any more it's not nice to speak badly of one person or another but the truth also has to be told it's not governed by Antonio it's governed by those men that are behind that would be Rodríguez also known as Pepe of Coua and Jesús of the petrol stations also known as Chucho of Porteiro.</p>
--	--

These data demonstrate how traditional conversational strategies enter into the political discursive domain. The discursive process described above corresponds to that which Fairclough (1997) calls *conversationalisation*. This author considers that once of the characteristics of the order of contemporary social discourse is the colonisation exercised from within the institutional domain upon the types of discourse proceeding from the everyday domain.

This integration of conversational practices in institutional discourse constitutes a strategy of covert control, as the conversationalisation implies a greater informality that serves to conceal the asymmetrical interactive relations that are designed between the institutional representatives and the individuals.

In this sense, Fairclough considers that the appropriation of conversational resources by institutional discourse is an intrinsic element of what he calls the technologisation of discourse, that is, “the embodiment in institutional forms and practices of circuits or networks which systematically chain together three domains of practice: research into the discursual practices of workplaces and institutions, design of discursual practices in accordance with institutional strategies and objectives, and training of personnel in such designed discursual practices” (Fairclough, 1996: 71). This technologisation of discourse includes what the author calls technologies of discourse, that is, those discursive practices utilised on the part of the institutions to control cultural and social changes. Fairclough’s conception of technology (1996) is directly connected to the studies of Foucault (1981) on “the alliance between social sciences and structures of power which constitutes modern ‘bio-power’, which has ‘brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge/power an agent of transformation of human life’ (Foucault, 1981)” (Fairclough, 1996: 72).

In principle, there are certain technical discursive practices characteristic of institutional groups and professions. For example, professionals and institutional agents possess their own linguistic jargons, and in the communicative exchanges that they establish with the civil population, this population suffers discursive restrictions in the question-response distribution or in the turn-taking system (town council meetings, legal arena). These and other linguistic and discursive mechanisms contribute to the asymmetric interactive relationship produced between institutional agents and individuals, constituting *prototypical discursive methods* by which the institutions discursively control the interaction. They constitute, in my opinion, the constituent elements typical of the process of technologisation.

Moreover, due to the social and cultural changes produced in modern societies, Fairclough considers that these methods of control—that is, the discursive technologisation—have had to be reformulated. This means that the practices and discursive strategies have had to change. For this reason, discursive technologisation also includes the process of conversationalisation of institutional discourse, given that, as mentioned earlier, this process encompasses the new covert strategies of modern societies.

Fairclough (1997) has studied the institutional medical setting in British society. According to his observations, medical consultations may follow a formal method where the questions are produced in a pre-established order and the patients respond. In this type of encounter the tone is impersonal, and can even, according to this researcher, be brusque. In contrast, another current type of medical encounter studied by this author has a more informal tone. This latter type is characterised by a conversationalisation of institutional discourse. These new models, according to Fairclough, are related to the modifications and restructuring of the existent hegemony. They imply, therefore, a transformation of the social relations, since these relations are in consonance with the reformulations of the discursive practices. In this way, in the second type of encounter the “medical” institutional identity is invoked through other processes, and the projection of this identity has different connotations.

The findings of Duranti (1994: 113) also demonstrate that it is not possible to maintain a rigid and absolute distinction between formal language and conversation. This author observes how personal identities are invoked in discourses produced by political orators in Samoa. Duranti (1994) observes that Samoans, in their political discourses in the *fono* (place of political discussion in Samoa), in general mix the ceremonial genre of *lauga* with other genres, reflecting what Bakhtin (1981: 219) has called *heteroglossia*. Duranti (1994: 107-8) considers that one of the characteristics of the heteroglossia of the political language of the *fono* is the invocation of personal identities: “Invocation of personal identities. In the talanoaga, personal names may be used next to titles. Although this is something that happens only when there is possible ambiguity between two or more parties sharing the same title—as in the case of the Savea title, which was split between Savelio and Sione—

it demonstrates a concern for individuals that violates the epic vision of ancestral powers remaining unchanged and unaffected by individuals' actions or (mis)deeds".

In the same way, in case 8 the personal identity is invoked in the institutional discourse through the appropriation of conversational resources. Specifically, Xosé Serra reconstructs his private identity in terms of traditional socio-cultural values to project a "credible" image that justifies "his representativity". In this way, he invokes his local public identity.

This case is an illustrative example of the different cases analysed in Prego Vázquez (2000), that demonstrate how the process of conversationalisation of the institutional discourse acts with the purpose of manipulation, as through this conversationalisation the speaker intends to cover up the asymmetrical interactive relations characteristic of the relation between the individual and institutions. This amounts to one of the latent processes through which institutional public identities can be made relevant in the discourse. Therefore, it constitutes a covert process of discursive control by means of which the individual legitimises his discourse and indirectly self-legitimises his representativity (Prego Vázquez, 2000; Álvarez Cáccamo & Prego Vázquez, 2001).

5. Conclusions

In this analysis we have observed that the use in interactions of forms such as "be from the X family" and "be from X village or X parish" demonstrates that, in the rural and rururban Galician context, what Wilson (1991) calls relevant points of the biography and the identity of the individuals exists in terms of the social networks of parish, village, and family, and that, through these *footings* (Goffman, 1987), the individuals reconstruct their traditional local identities using the discursive action.

Further, we have also observed how these types of communicative patterns are learned through socialisation in the traditional networks. As Tannen (1982) explains, the way of expressing and interpreting the meaning of a conversation—that is, what constitutes the ethnic conversational style—is learned through the communicative experience, with the communicative behaviours that we acquire in primary socialisation networks being especially important. In this sense, we have indicated that the traditional nomination forms as well as the questions *¿de onde es?* ('where are you from?') and *¿de quen es?* ('who are you from?') utilised with the aim of localising the networks to which the conversational partner subscribes, form part of the ethnic or cultural conversational style (Gumperz, 1982c; Tannen, 1982) characteristic of traditional Galician communities.

Therefore, based on the notion that discursive strategies play a relevant role in the negotiation of identities (Gumperz, 1982) and, specifically, as indicated by Tannen (1982) and Gumperz (1982c), based on the importance of ethnic patterns of communication in the negotiation of identities, we consider that the communicative

practices analysed in this study constitute not only markers of local identity, but also ethnic and cultural identity markers. As we have seen in section 3, the data analysed in this study illustrate, in our opinion, how ethnic identities are constructed in terms of local identities and vice versa, an issue that has also been investigated by Pagliai (1998). As we have already indicated, this author explores how in the Tuscan *contrasto*, poetic debates very similar to the *regueifas* that we analysed, the poets negotiate their ethnic identities by means of the context. Thus, in her analysis she observes how, within the repertoire of identities that may represent a person, the ethnic identity in the *contrasto* is reconstructed in terms of the possible places to which the individual might belong, that is, local identities.

What happens when these traditional forms of introduction or nomination circulate (Silverstein & Urban, 1996) from the civil discourse to the political discourse? What socio-discursive and identity meanings are involved in this circulation process?

In cases 8 and 9 we observed that it is necessary to meticulously analyse the discourse in order to ascertain the socio-discursive meanings encapsulated in the discourse. Thus, in this example, it can be seen that there is not always a transparent relationship between the discourse and its meaning, that is, between the apparently said and the really said. Nevertheless, the individuals usually correctly interpret what is communicated, as the context, the implications, the presumptions and the shared understanding are always present so that the communicative process is successfully realised. This explains that the solidarity that seems to be evoked in the traditional practices in case 8 really constitutes a practice of discursive control, symbolic of power. Further, in the same way, the evocation of local identities through the traditional introduction patterns that are produced in this case constitutes a strategic mechanism of covert control.

The technologies of discourse (Fairclough, 1997) of the political and institutional arena are disguised as the communicative patterns characteristic of traditional discourse and conversation (Prego Vázquez, 2000; Prego Vázquez, to appear; Álvarez Cáccamo & Prego Vázquez, 2001). In this sense, the local/ethnic identities, invoked through traditional naming patterns in haggling, *regueifas* and informal exchanges, are transformed into resources or weapons of power when they are strategically recycled in the political or institutional arena, as is the case with the analysed radio interviews with politicians.

Bibliographical references

- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1996a). "Building alliances in political discourse: Language, institutional authority, and resistance". *Folia Linguistica* XXX(3/4), 245-70.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1996b). "The power of reflexive language(s): Code displacement in reported speech". *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(1), 33-59.

- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1998). "From 'switching code' to 'codeswitching': Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes". In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 29-48.
- Álvarez Cáccamo, C. & G. Prego Vázquez (2001). "Political cross-discourse in Galiza". Paper presented at the *Jornades d'anàlisi crítica del discurs (ACD)*, Barcelona, 23-24 November 2001, Spain.
- Antaki, Ch. & S. Widdicombe (eds.) (1998). *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage Publications.
- Atkinson, J.M. & J. Heritage (eds.) (1984). *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2001). "Context is/as critique". *Critique of Anthropology* 21(1), 13-32.
- Briggs, Ch. & R. Bauman (1992). "Genre, intertextuality, and social power". *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2(2), 131-72.
- Clark, H.B. (1996). "Communities, commonalities, and communication". In J.J. Gumperz & S.C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 324-55.
- Crystal, D. (1994). *Enciclopedia del lenguaje*. Madrid: Taurus. [Original edition: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.]
- Drew, P. & J. Heritage (1992). *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A. (1994). *From Grammar to Politics: Linguistic Anthropology in a Western Samoan Village*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). "Technologisation of discourse". In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (eds.), *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 71-83.
- Fairclough, N. (1997). "Discurso, mudança e hegemonia". In E. Ribeiro Pedro (ed.), *Análise Crítica do Discurso. Uma perspectiva sociopolítica e funcional*. Lisboa: Caminho, 75-103.
- Frankenberg, R. (1969). *Communities in Britain*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Fried, M. (1973). *The World of the Urban Working Class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1981). *A History of Sexuality, vol. 1*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gal, S. (1978). "Peasant men can't get wives: Language change and sex roles in a bilingual community". *Language in Society* 7, 1-16.

- Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift. Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982a). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982b). "Ethnic style and political rhetoric". In J.J. Gumperz (ed.), *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 187-203.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982c). "Interethnic communication". In J.J. Gumperz (ed.), *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 172-86.
- Gumperz, J.J. (ed.) (1982d). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1996). "Introduction to part IV". In J.J. Gumperz & S.C. Levinson (ed.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 359-73.
- Gumperz, J.J. & D. Hymes (eds.) (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Levinson, S.C. (1989). *Pragmática*. Madrid: Teide.
- Lisón Tolosana, Carmelo (1990 [1979]). *Antropología cultural de Galicia*. Madrid: Akal.
- Mariño Ferro, X.R. (2000). *Antropoloxía de Galicia*. Vigo: Xerais.
- Martín Rojo, L. (1995). "Division and rejection: From the personification of the Gulf conflict to the demonization of Saddam Hussein". *Discourse and Society* 6(1), 49-80.
- Martín Rojo, L. (1997). "El orden social de los discursos". *Discurso* 21/22, 1-38.
- Martín Rojo, L. & T.A. Van Dijk (1998). "'Había un problema y se ha solucionado'. La legitimación de la expulsión de inmigrantes 'ilegales' en el discurso parlamentario español". In L. Martín Rojo & R. Whittaker (eds.), *Poder-decir o el poder de los discursos*. Madrid: Arrecife & Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 169-234.
- Martín Rojo, L. & R. Whittaker (eds.) (1998). *Poder-decir o el poder de los discursos*. Madrid: Arrecife & Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Mehrotra, R. R. (1985). "Hindi personal names and nicknames". In R.R. Mehrotra, *Sociolinguistics in Hindi Contexts*. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, 123-52.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Nogueira Esmoris, G. (1998). *A comarca de Bergantiños. Estudio demográfico (1887-1996)*. A Coruña: Deputación Provincial de A Coruña.
- Otero Pedrayo, R. (1980). *Guía de Galicia*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Pagliai, V. (2000). "Lands I came to sing: Negotiating identities and places in the tuscan 'contrasto'". *Pragmatics* 10(1): 125-46.
- Precedo Ledo, A. (1997). *Comarca de Bergantiños. Plan de Desenvolvemento Comarcal*. Santiago de Compostela: Xunta de Galicia.
- Prego Vázquez, G. (1994). *Estrategias discursivas de regateos recogidos en las*

- ferias rurales de Carballo y Paiosaco. Desde la microestructura discursiva de los regateos hacia la estructura del espacio rural gallego.* Master dissertation, Departamento de Linguística Xeral e Teoría da Literatura, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.
- Prego Vázquez, G. (1998). *Una aproximación socio-interaccional al género discursivo del regateo. Negociando precio e identidades en los mercados gallegos (= LynX. Documentos de trabajo 17).* València: Departament de Teoria dels Llenguatges, Universitat de València.
- Prego Vázquez, G. (2000). *Prácticas discursivas, redes sociales e identidades en Bergantiños (Galicia): La interacción comunicativa en una situación de cambio sociolingüístico.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Departamento de Galego-Portugués, Francés e Lingüística, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.
- Prego Vázquez, G. (in press). “Unha aproximación microsociolingüística ó xénero discursivo dos regateos”. Paper presented at the *I Congreso Internacional: A lingua galega: Historia e actualidade*, Santiago de Compostela, 15-20 September 1996, Spain.
- Prego Vázquez, G. (to appear). “Recycling of local discourses in the institutional talk of Bergantiños: Naturalization strategies, interactional control, and public local identities”. [ms.]
- Risco, Vicente (1979 [1952]). “Etnografía. Cultura espiritual”. In R. Otero Pedrayo (ed.), *Historia de Galicia*. Madrid: Akal, 255-763.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1991). “Reflections on talk and social structure”. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and Social Structure. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 44-70.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1992a). “In another context”. In A. Duranti & Ch. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 191-227.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1992b). “On talk and its institutional occasions”. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 101-34.
- Silverstein, M. & G. Urban (eds.) (1996a). *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tannen, D. (1982). “Ethnic style in male-female conversation”. In J.J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 217-31.
- Thompson, J.B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). "Principles of critical discourse analysis". *Discourse and Society* 4(2), 249-83.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1995). "Discourse analysis as ideology analysis". In L. Schaffner & A.L. Wenden (ed.), *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth: Aldershot, 17-33.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1997). "The study of discourse". In Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: Sage, 1-34.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). "The representation of social actors". In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (eds.), *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 32-70.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1997). "A representação dos actores sociais". In E. Ribeiro Pedro (ed.), *Análise Crítica do Discurso. Uma perspectiva sociopolítica e funcional*. Lisboa: Caminho, 169-222.
- Von Sturmer, J. (1981) "Talking with Aborigines". *Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies Newsletter* 15, 13-30.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Wilson, T.P. (1991). "Social structure and the sequential organization of interaction". In D. Boden & D.H. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and Social Structure. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 22-43.