

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

CUNY Graduate Center

2000

Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: misinterpreted multilingualism in Modern Galicia

José del Valle
CUNY Graduate Center

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/80

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu



PERGAMON

Language & Communication 20 (2000) 105–132

LANGUAGE
&
COMMUNICATION

www.elsevier.com/locate/langcom

Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia

José del Valle

Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, Fordham University, Bronx, NY 10458, USA

Keywords: Language ideologies; Linguistic culture; Language policy; Galician sociolinguistics; Multilingualism

1. Introduction

The analysis I present in this article is based on the position that descriptions of all aspects of human experience are mediated by culturally determined categories and patterns of perception. Thus, the ways in which human beings conceptualize their linguistic behavior and that of others, and the ways in which they linguistically characterize the communities to which they belong are culture dependent. Even the most empirically rigorous studies of linguistic phenomena, carried out within the disciplinary boundaries of linguistics, are at least partially influenced by the broader contexts in which they emerge. As Tollefson puts it: “All theories are embedded in sociopolitical structure” (1991, p. 37).

The emerging field of language ideologies, that is, the study of “representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (Woolard, 1998, p. 3), provides a variety of valuable conceptual frameworks that allow us “to examine the cultural and historical specificity of construals of language” (Woolard, 1998, p. 4).¹ The present article represents an attempt to contribute to this field with an analysis of the ideological underpinnings of language policies in Galicia. Galicia is an autonomous community in north-western Spain in which Galician and Spanish enjoy co-official status. The current policy establishes the co-officiality of both languages, protects the right of all Galicians to use either language, and encourages the promotion of Galician. Opponents

¹ See Joseph and Taylor (1990) and Schieffelin et al. (1998) for an overview of the field of language ideologies.

of the official policy maintain that, under the present conditions, the co-existence of Galician and Spanish perpetuates the decline of the former; and therefore they demand affirmative actions that guarantee the dominance of Galician in all domains and the reversal of the on-going shift towards Spanish. In the present article, I will begin by (a) studying the texts and discourses that endorse hegemonic and counter-hegemonic language policies in the region in order to identify the cultural and linguistic assumptions in which these policies are grounded, (b) I will then demonstrate how those assumptions have produced inaccurate descriptions of Galicia's sociolinguistic configuration, and, finally, (c) I will propose a new conceptual framework for the sociolinguistic characterization of Galicia.

Harold F. Schiffman (1996) studied a number of cases in which language policies do not reflect the sociolinguistic situation of the communities for which they have been designed. I will argue that Galicia is one such case, as linguists and language policy makers have failed not only to properly describe people's linguistic behavior and language attitudes, but also to notice the existence of a popular linguistic culture that differs from the one that mediates the dominant views on language. Schiffman emphasizes the importance of distinguishing *linguistic culture* from *language policies* (which may be overt or covert) and *language planning*. For Schiffman, linguistic culture is a rather broad term that designates a "set of behaviors, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language" (1996, p. 5). Linguistic culture is the basis in which both covert and overt language policies are grounded. Covert policies are "implicit, informal, unstated, *de facto*, grass-roots, latent" beliefs about a community's linguistic configuration, whereas overt policies are "explicit, formalized, *de jure*, codified, [and] manifest" (1996, p. 13). Finally, language planning entails some type of action, that is, the implementation of an overt language policy, normally that of the dominant group within a community.

In the following pages, I will present an analysis of three types of discourse on language.² This analysis will contain a description (Sections 2–6) and critique (Sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.3) of the politically hegemonic (or official) and non-hegemonic (or nationalist) overt language policies in Galicia. I will make two claims: first, that despite the apparent conflict of views between hegemonic and non-hegemonic language policies, they share one important characteristic, the linguistic culture in which they are grounded: the culture of monoglossia (Section 7); and second, that, in addition to these, there is a popular covert language policy which is grounded in a linguistic culture different from the one in which overt policies are based: the culture of heteroglossia (Section 8).

² By discourse I mean a consistent way of using language in a series of texts; not the use of grammar, but the semantic echoes that each word or statement acquires precisely by dint of its insertion in that body of texts. Language is "seen from the point of view of the beliefs, values and categories which it embodies" (Roger Fowler, cited in Mills, 1997, p. 6).

2. The discourse on linguistic history

Typical descriptions of the linguistic history of Galicia (García, 1986; López Valcárcel, 1991; Rodríguez, 1991; Freixeiro Mato, 1997) tend to be consistent with the following outline.

Galician is the language which evolved from Latin in the northwestern corner of the Iberian Peninsula. In the early Middle Ages Galician was the main medium of oral expression in that region and subsequently, as a result of the southward expansion of Christian kingdoms, in what would eventually become Portugal. Until well into the Middle Ages, there were no significant differences between the language spoken north and south of the river Minho (which constitutes part of the present political border between Galicia and Portugal), and it was only the political independence of Portugal (in the middle of the twelfth century) that eventually led to the linguistic differentiation north and south of the border.³ The language of the vast majority of documents written in Galicia in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries was Galician. The linguistic situation in the Middle Ages has been described in the following terms:⁴

At the end of the Middle Ages, Galician was a language with the category of what we would call today the official language of a country. Galician served as the vehicle of oral expression for the powerful and the common people, the bourgeoisie and the peasantry, and it was considered the normal language used in legal and administrative, civil and ecclesiastical documents, and in the composition of literary works (García, 1986, p. 51).

The Galician language was at first, like all Romance languages of culture, a normalized language used by all social classes in the country (Rodríguez, 1991, p. 61).

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed the increasing use of Castilian among socially and politically privileged groups. Castilian noblemen and their acolytes took charge of Galician land and administrative jobs in growing number and the members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Galicia were more often than not

³ The significance of these structural differences is, supposedly, at the root of the current debate in Galicia between '*lusistas*' and *isolationists*. For *lusistas*, Galician dialects lie at the northern end of the dialectal continuum between southern Portugal and northern Galicia. They are therefore varieties of Portuguese. Thus, in this view, the goal of contemporary linguistic normalization should be the progressive adoption of Standard Portuguese as the sole standard language in Galicia. For *isolationists*, on the other hand, Galician is a language distinct from both Portuguese and Spanish. Thus, for this group, the goal of normalization is the development of Standard Galician and the expansion of its use to all linguistic domains. Among the many shortcomings that the reader will undoubtedly find in the present article, there is one that I myself have to confront: the absence of a discussion of the *lusista* position and its implications for identity development in Galicia. For practical reasons, I have decided to leave that discussion for another occasion and include the *lusista* position with respect to the language question within the discourse of nationalist sociolinguistics (cf. Section 4). I believe this exclusion to be partially justified since *lusismo* seems to me to be grounded in the culture of monoglossia (cf. Section 7).

⁴ All translations in this article are mine unless otherwise indicated.

speakers of some Castilian dialect: “A castilianizing wedge entered Galician society with the concession of land and vassals to the Castilian nobility” (Rodríguez, 1991, p. 62). The creation of the Spanish state and the consolidation of political unity by Ferdinand and Isabella in the second half of the fifteenth century augmented the subjugation of Galicia and the developing diglossic situation:⁵

Taming and castration of Galicia by the Catholic Monarchs. Culmination of a process of strangulation of an autoctonous ruling class and of the possibilities for the creation of a modern State (Rodríguez, 1991, p. 62).

Galician ceases to be the language used in the rooms of power and in the offices of civil and ecclesiastical administrators. Merchants, artisans, peasants, fishermen, etc., will continue to speak their language for centuries onward, but the upper classes of society remained definitely installed in Castilian from the sixteenth century (García, 1986, p. 54).

As a result of this prolonged diglossic situation, Galician dialects came to be associated with ignorance and poverty, an association which has lasted until the present day:

The process of devaluation of Galician is an old one. Its immediate causes are to be found in the historical events that began with the imposition of Castilian in Galicia after the fifteenth century; an imposition which, because it came from the political and administrative power, entailed the establishment of a correlation between social class and language that still exists today (López Valcárcel, 1991, p. 136).

In the second half of the nineteenth century, some sectors of the Galician intellectual elite, influenced by the Romantic outlook and the emergent nationalist ideology, attempted to elevate the prestige of Galician culture and language. With this goal in mind, they promoted and developed grammars and dictionaries, attempted to recreate a literary standard, and studied other natural and cultural phenomena (such as Galicia’s political history, geography, and folkloric traditions) that are integral to the collective identity of the region. These cultural developments were closely linked to the emergence of first a regionalist and then a nationalist political movement.

In the 1860s, Galician began to be used in literary works; in the early 1900s, Galician made its appearance in public events; finally, in 1936, legislation was drafted (a Statute of Autonomy) granting Galician and Spanish co-official status in the regional administration. This legislative initiative (which, of course, had political implications that went well beyond the linguistic realm) was truncated by the eruption of the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), at the end of which a strongly centralist and

⁵ As is well known, the term “diglossia” was introduced in mainstream sociolinguistics by Ferguson (1959) to refer to the relationship between varieties of the same language; but its use was later expanded to refer to the co-existence of different languages in a relationship of functional specialization (Fishman, 1980). It is in this latter sense that the term is used here.

patriotic military-type dictatorship was established in Spain with Francisco Franco as Chief of State. It was only after Franco's death in 1975 and the approval of the *Law for Political Reform of 1976* that a legal framework was established for the officialization, and, allegedly, the promotion and defense of Galician (as well as Catalan and Basque).

There is little public debate over the validity of this historico-linguistic outline. However, the potential of the post-Franco language policy to elevate the status of Galician and reverse the on-going shift is much more controversial. According to some, the new legal framework has successfully created a climate that favors balanced bilingualism—that is, the peaceful co-existence of Galician and Spanish. But for others, contemporary language policy has simply hidden, rather than resolved, the conflict; it has perpetuated the historical diglossic situation and accelerated the language shift initiated in modern times.

Let us now briefly review the legal texts that frame the dominant language policy (Section 3) and the opposition to this policy by nationalist sociolinguists (Section 4).

3. The legal discourse on language

The language policy promoted by both the Spanish central government and the regional governments (whose offices have never been held by a Galician nationalist party) through legislation, media campaigns and the educational system relies heavily on the notion of balanced bilingualism. In this framework, Galicia is conceived of as a community with two co-official languages in which individuals may freely use either language in any domain. This characterization can be seen in the cornerstones of language legislation in modern Galicia: Article 3 of the *Spanish Constitution of 1978*, Article 5 of the *Galician Statute of Autonomy of 1980*, and the *Law of Galician Normalization of 1983*. These documents recognize both Spanish and Galician as official languages and adopt balanced bilingualism as the stated goal.⁶

Article 3 of the Spanish Constitution reads as follows:

1. Castilian is the Spanish language official in the State. All Spaniards have the obligation to know it and the right to use it.
2. The rest of the Spanish languages will also be official in their respective Communities according to their Statutes.
3. The richness of the different linguistic varieties of Spain is a cultural patrimony and it will be the object of special respect and protection.

Point 1 establishes Spanish (here called Castilian) beyond any question as the language of Spain, and guarantees its perpetuation in every community within the territory of the State by establishing the obligation of all Spanish citizens to know Spanish. Point 2 opens the legal door for the establishment of official bilingualism in

⁶ García Negro, in her book *O Galego e as Leis* (1993), has analyzed this legal framework and unveiled what she perceives to be the essential contradictions of these texts regarding their treatment of linguistic conflicts in Spain. In the following discussion I greatly rely on her analysis.

the communities where ‘other Spanish languages’ are spoken, leaving the exact formulation of bilingual policies to the respective Statutes of Autonomy. However, these policies are limited by the language of this article, which clearly outlines a linguistic hierarchy: Point 2 grants the ‘other’ Spanish languages the privilege of ‘also’ being official, but it should be noted that no obligation to know any of these languages is mentioned.

Article 5 in the Galician Statute of Autonomy reads as follows:

The language proper to Galicia is Galician. 2. The Galician and Castilian languages are official in Galicia and everyone has the right to know them and use them. 3. The public powers of Galicia will guarantee the normal and official use of both languages and will promote the use of Galician in all levels of public and cultural life, and will provide all necessary means to facilitate its knowledge. 4. Nobody shall be discriminated by reason of language.

The Statute of Autonomy replicates the mandate of the Spanish Constitution, confirming the co-official nature of Spanish and Galician, and legally protects the right of everybody to use them. This article of the Statute of Autonomy emphasizes the co-officiality of both languages, the need to promote Galician ‘in all areas of public life’, and the individual rights of speakers.

The Law of Linguistic Normalization of 1983 (Article 1; point 2) attempted to establish the obligation for all Galicians to know Galician. The original version stated that “all Galicians have the obligation to know it and the right to use it”. The same year the Law was approved by the Galician Parliament, the Spanish government presented an appeal to the Constitutional Court in Madrid. This Court pronounced sentence in favor of the appeal, and the obligation for all Galicians to know Galician was declared unconstitutional.

This brief outline of the legal texts that frame the official language policy shows that Spanish laws, by stating the need to protect and promote the use of Galician, implicitly recognize it as an endangered language. The understood goal of these laws is to normalize the use of Galician—that is, to accomplish its total restoration in all linguistic domains through the appropriate corpus and status planning efforts. The result of these policies is supposed to yield a situation of balanced bilingualism in which both Galician and Spanish co-exist as official languages without detriment to either. For the architects of the official language policy in Galicia, linguistic normalization seems to require the restoration of Galician in all administrative and political institutions, in the media, and in schools, as well as the end of discrimination towards speakers of Galician.

4. The discourse of nationalist sociolinguistics

In the various texts representative of this type of discourse, the linguistic crisis of Galicia (the fact that Galician is being spoken by fewer and fewer people) is interpreted as a crisis of Galicia’s cultural identity:

The pseudo-galicianist academic and cultural ‘holding’ continues to legitimize the Regional Government on an issue as strategic and essential as the cultural–linguistic identity of the Galician people (Fernández-Velho and Henríquez Salido, 1991, p. 429).

The survival of the language, and therefore of Galicia, is being decided now to an extent that has no historic precedents (López Valcárcel, 1991, p. 135).

The research produced by these linguists focuses mainly on three themes. The first revolves around the fact that Galician continues to recede in spite of its presence in schools, the media and the regional administration:

We do not notice, now that there is media in ‘Galician’, a reversal of that process [the incorporation of new speakers to Castilian] (López Valcárcel, 1991, p. 140).

Where does this lead us? To the defense of Galician as a language which is **also** appropriate for official and educated uses, at a time when it is the daily use that is decreasing (Domínguez Seco, 1993, p. 147).

While acknowledging that the official language policy may have spread Galician to domains traditionally associated with the dominant language, they claim that this policy has not corrected diglossia nor the concomitant feeling of self-hatred among native speakers of Galician:

Their own language produces in them an inferiority complex caused by the self-hatred that they feel because of the inferior social position of those who speak Galician (Pellitero Ramilo, 1992, p. 36).

The second dominant theme in these texts is the rejection of balanced bilingualism as an achievable goal. The title of Pellitero Ramilo’s article speaks for itself: “Bilingüismo, horizonte imposible”. In general, the authors of these articles express their skepticism regarding the possibility, given the present political conditions (in which the regional power is constrained and controlled by the institutions of the centralist Spanish State), of altering the diglossic relationship between Galician and Spanish. They maintain that because the official language policy has not and cannot alter the associations of these languages with different levels of socio-economic status and cultural prestige, the co-existence of both languages is transitional:

If the minority language has a status of territorial co-officiality that makes it subordinated, in the case of Galician in the institutional Spanish framework, it is not possible to neutralize the assimilation by the dominant language (Fernández-Velho and Henríquez Salido, 1991, p. 423).

According to these authors, given the current policies, the best possible scenario for Galician is one in which it would be preserved only as a ceremonial language: “the language of the Gods” (López Valcárcel, 1991, p. 142).

The third theme in the discourse of nationalist sociolinguistics is the ideological character of the regional government's language policy. This policy is ideological in the sense that it contributes to creating a false consciousness, a false perception of the linguistic situation, among the population. It obscures the precarious situation of Galician and thus neutralizes the conflict:

An idea, no matter how aberrant it may be, becomes part of reality as soon as it is assumed to be true by a human community, especially when it becomes the ideology of the political power (Fernández-Velho and Henríquez Salido, 1991, p. 429).

Fernández-Velho and Henríquez Salido state that the existing language policy neutralizes the conflict by means of public displays of interest in the protection and cultivation of the language and with financial support for efforts that allegedly contribute to such ends:

The regional power and the cultural lobby that legitimizes it... simply improvise, with great display of financial resources, impressive 'Jogos Florais' in order to neutralize the social impact of groups and associations more committed with the cause of Galician (p. 425).

Scholars working within this framework have also denounced non-nationalist regional governments for appropriating the cultural discourse of nationalism. Domínguez Seco (1993), in a revealing study of Galician language textbooks for secondary education, concluded that there has been a process of de-semiotization of the discourse of nationalism. In her view, signifiers originally associated with nationalist political analysis have been appropriated by non-nationalist political groups and filled with new signifieds that better match the official policies of the regional government:

The institutions of power appropriate the semiotic system articulated around the Galician community, that is, they re-interpret in an officialist and scientistist fashion the concept of socio-cultural unit ('nation', 'people' or other terms), with which this concept loses its *political* content, becomes de-semiotized, loses the connotations that, in the discourse in which it originated, linked it to commitment and action (Domínguez Seco, 1993, p. 159).

In sum, for nationalists, as for the proponents of the official policy, the starting point is a situation of language shift and, therefore, of conflict: Spanish is replacing Galician, a language that carries the stigma of being traditionally associated with ignorance and poverty. In response to this situation and allegedly with the intention of correcting it, the laws grant Galician citizens the legal right to use their language and the institutional resources to learn its standard variety. However, at the same time, they impose on Galicians the obligation to know and use Spanish in their relations with non-Galician institutions and citizens of the Spanish state. Given the

sociolinguistic reality of Galicia, balanced bilingualism is thus an impossible goal. How can the true normalization of Galician (i.e. its total restoration in all linguistic domains) occur except at the expense of Spanish? How likely is Galician to spread in competition with an international language like Spanish, one that, in Galicia, is associated with education, upward social mobility, and economic success? Nationalists claim that institutional bilingualism and the official campaigns for the promotion of Galician have not corrected either the centuries-long diglossic situation or the progressive loss of Galician as the habitual language of Galicians. Self-hatred persists among speakers of Galician, who are doomed to either linguistic schizophrenia or acculturation (assimilation to the dominant language and culture), in either case to an irreparable loss of identity:

There is a displacement of the conscience of the authentic, essential SELF, towards the assimilated self (López Valcárcel, 1990, pp. 97–98).

[The dominant discourse] inculcates... a biased valuation of the cultural fact, causing in children a symbolic association which generates cultural schizophrenia, a division in their social self (Domínguez Seco, 1993, p. 149).

Could the nationalists' description of Galicia's sociolinguistic situation be the sole product of their political bias? Could it be that, intentionally or unintentionally, their descriptions have been tailored to serve their political agenda? I intend to argue that, in spite of their openly stated and unquestionable political involvement, their descriptions are consistent with empirical research conducted under the methodological constraints of standard sociolinguistic practice. As I will show in the next two sections, the existing sociolinguistic research (whether conducted by Galician or non-Galician sociolinguists) leads to conclusions similar to those on which nationalists base their arguments.

5. Data on language use in Galicia

Robert and Virginia Williamson (1984) conducted a sociolinguistic survey in Galicia in the early eighties: "Interviews with both open-ended and standardized items on usage of the ML [minority language] and OL [official language] as well as attitudes toward bilingualism, were largely carried out in the homes of 104 subjects in representative areas of Galicia" (p. 401). They found that "upper age, low social status, and rural residence were associated with ML code choice" (p. 401). Accordingly, their data indicate that there is a tendency for younger people, the middle class and the urban population to use Spanish more. In addition, they found that adolescents, young adults and the working class in general seem to be highly aware of the connection between speaking Spanish and upward social mobility. This picture corresponds quite well with a diglossic situation and with a shifting trend. Siguan (1992) reached a similar conclusion after reviewing the admittedly scarce data available to him in the late eighties: "All the available data point to a diglossic

situation with a progressive displacement of the L [low] language by the H [high] language” (p. 221).

The Sociolinguistics Seminar of the Galician Royal Academy has sponsored the elaboration of the sociolinguistic atlas of Galicia, which was coordinated by Mauro Fernández Rodríguez and Modesto Rodríguez Neira. So far, three volumes have been published entitled *Lingua inicial e competencia lingüística en Galicia* [Initial language and linguistic competence in Galicia (1994)], *Usos lingüísticos en Galicia* [Language use in Galicia (1995)], and *Actitudes lingüísticas en Galicia* [Language attitudes in Galicia (1996)]. In the following paragraphs, I will refer to these volumes as *MSGa* I, II and III, respectively.

At first sight, the data regarding Galicians’ initial language and people’s habitual language indicate a quantitative advantage for Galician (*MSGa* I, p. 39; *MSGa* II, p. 94):

Initial language	(%)	Habitual language	(%)
Galician	62.4	Galician	38.7
Both	11.4	More Galician	29.9
Spanish	25.6	More Spanish	20.8
Other	0.6	Spanish	10.6

However, the accurate sociolinguistic description of a multilingual community such as Galicia demands that these data be crossed with certain sociologically relevant factors such as age, social group, area of residence, and level of formal education of the informants. By taking into account these factors, we may be able to provide answers to some of the key questions posed by sociologists of language when analyzing a multilingual community: (a) What is the relative status of Galician and Spanish? (b) What are the patterns of intergenerational transmission of both languages? (c) What are the apparent patterns of maintenance or shift?

In order to determine the status of both languages, let us look at how data on initial language and habitual language correlate with some of the above-mentioned social factors: level of formal education, social class⁷ and area of residence. We notice the following significant correlation: First, the lower the level of formal education, the social class and the urban character of the area of residence, the higher the percentage of informants whose initial language is Galician. An opposite pattern is seen among those informants whose initial language is Spanish (*MSGa* I, p. 71, Table 3.1). Second, the percentage of people who speak only or predominantly Galician is higher among those with a lower level of formal education, with attributes assigned to the lower socio-economic class, and among those who live in rural areas (*MSGa* II, p. 94, Table 3.1.1.0). These correlations seem to indicate that there is a strong association of Galician with the lower class, rural life, and relative lack of formal education. In contrast, Spanish tends to be associated with socio-economically advantaged groups, urban life, and access to formal education.

⁷ For an explanation of the problems associated with the notion of social class and how they were handled by the researchers see *MSGa* I, p. 50.

In order to evaluate the patterns of intergenerational transmission, I will reproduce two sets of data from the *MSGa*:

a. Initial language by age groups (*MSGa* I, p. 71):

Age	Galician (%)	Spanish (%)	Both (%)	Other (%)
16–25	38.9	43.5	16.7	0.9
26–40	53.4	33.0	12.8	0.9
41–65	71.6	18.0	9.9	0.4
+ 65	81.8	11.3	6.6	0.3

b. Language used with different family members (*MSGa* II, p. 172, 208):⁸

Age	with grandparents	with parents	with siblings	with partner	with children
16–25	2.88	2.61	2.40	2.61	2.68
26–40	3.23	3.08	2.94	2.85	2.63
41–65	3.58	3.46	3.40	3.30	3.00
+ 65	3.74	3.65	3.61	3.55	3.39

We can see then that Spanish is increasingly the initial language of Galicians, and that Galician is used less frequently with their children than with any other family member. These two sets of data indicate that patterns of intergenerational transmission are unfavorable for the maintenance of Galician.

Finally, the patterns of maintenance or shift can be observed in apparent time—that is, by comparing the linguistic behavior of different age groups. As shown above, the younger the age group, the higher the percentage of informants whose initial language is Spanish. The same pattern is found with respect to habitual language:

Age	Spanish (%)	More Spanish (%)	More Galician (%)	Galician (%)
16–25	17.7	35.7	23.0	23.5
26–40	12.9	24.8	32.2	30.2
41–65	7.5	15.2	33.8	43.5
+ 65	5.8	9.5	25.8	58.9

Thus, in apparent time we see an increase in both Spanish monolingualism and predominance of Spanish.

The interpretation of the data just presented (which, I will remind the reader, is mediated by the three questions posed above) confirms the view of the linguistic situation in Galicia offered by nationalist sociolinguists: Galician and Spanish co-exist in a diglossic relation where the former is the L (low) language and the latter is the H (high). The fact that a larger percentage of people, in the younger groups,

⁸ In this measuring scale, 4 means ‘only Galician’ and 1 means ‘only Spanish’.

have Spanish as their initial and habitual language is evidence of an on-going shift that will eventually lead to monolingualism in Spanish. The writers of the *MSGa* frequently interpret the data they are presenting as a sign of an on-going process of de-galicianization or castilianization.

6. Some predictions based on theory

It may be argued that it is too soon to tell whether the language policy implemented since the early eighties has changed the status of both languages, the patterns of intergenerational transmission and the patterns of shift found in Galicia. After all, the data presented above were collected in the late eighties and early nineties, only 10 years after the implementation of the new language policy. Ten years certainly is a short period of time as far as linguistic history is concerned. However, it is possible to interpret the existing data with models designed to predict the likelihood of maintenance of a minority language or the shift towards the standard.

Joshua Fishman (1980,1990) has insisted that the maintenance of a minority language and the possibility of reversing a language shift trend must be based on the creation of two conditions: the strict compartmentalization of the dominant and subordinate languages, and the preservation of the patterns of intergenerational transmission of the minority language. The compartmentalization of Galician and Spanish within Galicia, which has allowed the survival of the latter despite centuries of presence of Spanish as the H language in the region, has been broken. The disruption of this compartmentalization has been the result of modernization and the concomitant expansion of networks of interaction and social mobility, and of the officialization of Galician without the de-officialization of Spanish, which has led to competition between the two languages within certain domains in such a way that the speaker must choose which one to use. The disruption of the patterns of intergenerational transmission were briefly discussed above: there seems to be a tendency for parents whose habitual language is Galician to raise their children with Spanish as their initial language. In addition, the number of children who learn to speak Spanish first increases with every generation.

Christina Bratt Paulston (1994) provides another conceptual framework for the prediction of maintenance or loss of a minority language. In general, she claims that “ethnic groups within a modern nation-state, given opportunity and incentive, typically shift to the language of the dominant group” (Paulston, 1994, p. 9). There is certainly a high degree of variation regarding the speed of the shift, and of course, there are instances in which the minority language is maintained. According to Paulston, traditionally, studies in the sociology of language have identified three main factors that lead to the maintenance of a minority language: “Self-imposed boundary maintenance” (p. 20); geographic isolation and “externally imposed boundaries, usually in the form of denied access to goods and services, especially jobs” (p. 21); and finally, “a diglossic-like situation where the two languages exist in a situation of functional distribution” (p. 21). The second and third—lack of social mobility, the geographical isolation of rural areas, and the persistence of a relatively

stable diglossia (which correspond to Fishman's strict compartmentalization)—account for the maintenance of Galician throughout the previous four centuries. In contrast, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries brought to Galicia easier access to Spanish, and a higher degree of social mobility, and consequently an end to the stability of the diglossic situation.

Paulston proposes another model for the prediction of maintenance or loss of a minority language. She characterizes the different types of social mobilization adopted by minority groups as a continuum ranging from *ethnicity* to *ethnic nationalism*. The concept of social mobilization, as used by Paulston, encompasses the recognition by members of a minority group of certain defining cultural features and also the perception that the minority group has of its relation with the dominant group. Paulston defines three points in this continuum: The first point is *ethnicity*, which is a type of social mobilization based on learned behavior associated with a common past and common cultural values and beliefs (Paulston, 1994, pp. 30–31). Minority groups that adopt this type of social mobilization tend not to feel discriminated against or participating in a power struggle with another ethnic group. The second point in the continuum is *ethnic movement*, which is “ethnicity turned militant” (p. 32). Typically, members of these minority groups see themselves competing with the majority for scarce resources. The third point is *ethnic nationalism*, which incorporates access to territory by the ethnic group and the goal of independence. According to Paulston, there is still a fourth point in the continuum: *geographic nationalism*, that is, a nationalist movement which is territorially but not ethnically based.

In Paulston's framework, the closer a minority group's social mobilization comes to *ethnicity* the more likely they are to lose the minority language and to assimilate to the dominant group. The predominant type of social mobilization in Galicia seems to fall under the category of *ethnicity*, which explains the trend towards the substitution of Spanish for Galician. In contrast with the dominant *ethnicity*, a small though significant percentage of the Galician population approves of or participates in a type of social mobilization that falls somewhere between *ethnic movement* and *ethnic nationalism*. In this group I would include Galician nationalists. This group is well articulated around a political coalition of parties, the *Bloque Nacionalista Galego* (BNG), and other social organizations such as student and youth associations, neighborhood associations, and trade unions.

An indication of the relative prominence of both types of social mobilization in Galicia may be found in the percentage of votes obtained by different political parties in different elections in Galicia. The vast majority of Galician citizens who vote have supported not the BNG but the Galician branches of Spanish political parties in whose political agenda nationalist claims play a minor role or no role whatsoever (even though they may pay lip service to the rhetoric of cultural nationalism):⁹

⁹ The following are results for elections for the regional Galician parliament, and can only be taken as an indication of what types of social mobilization people adopt. An accurate description of this phenomenon would require in-depth sociological studies. In the last section, I will comment on the growing support for the BNG and possible shifts in the dominant linguistic culture.

	1985	1989	1993	1997
PP + (PSdeG) PSOE ¹⁰ (%)	69.6	76.6	75.8	70.9
BNG (%)	4.2	8.0	18.4	25.5

Thus far in this article, I have presented the terms in which the language question is discussed in Galicia. The texts that I have examined support either the official or the nationalist language policy. At this point, it may be appropriate to review the concept of language policy as it was presented in the introduction (see also Schiffman, 1996, p. 13). Language policy is a set of beliefs about a specific language or languages, about a specific speech community, and about the linguistic behavior of the members of that community. For the proponents of the official language policy, Galicia is now a bilingual community where speakers are free to choose which language to use. For the proponents of the counter-official policy, Galicia is a diglossic community in which Spanish is slowly but surely replacing Galician, a situation that requires language planning efforts that will place Galician in a position not of equality but of dominance over Spanish.

As Woolard has pointed out, “movements to save minority languages ironically are often structured, willy-nilly, around the same received notions of language that have led to their oppression and/or suppression” (1998, p. 17). In the following section, I will argue that this is the case in Galicia, that both official and counter-official language policies are grounded in the same assumptions—that is, in the same linguistic culture (cf. Section 1 and Schiffman, 1996, p. 5): the linguistic culture of monoglossia that at present dominates ideas about language in Western society. As Woolard states, it is rather common that “state policies as well as challenges to the state around the world are structured by this nationalist ideology of language and identity” (1998, p. 17).

7. The linguistic culture of monoglossia¹¹

The linguistic culture of monoglossia that I am describing is an elaboration of existing concepts previously proposed in sociolinguistics and language ideologies research. It is closely connected with what is commonly known as the Romantic or Herderian concept of language (cf. Coulmas, 1988 and Dorian, 1998) or with what Woolard calls the nationalist ideology of language and identity — that is, the equation of language, spirit of the people, and nation (see previous paragraph). My description of the culture of monoglossia is to some extent similar to James and

¹⁰ PP: Partido Popular, conservative. PSOE: Partido Socialista Obrero Español, social democrat.

¹¹ I use Mikhail Bakhtin’s terms ‘monoglossia’ and later ‘heteroglossia’ for their suggestive power, without committing to assigning to them the meanings they had in Bakhtin’s texts. In other words, they should be reinterpreted in my own discourse.

Lesley Milroy's notion of the ideology of standardization, "based on the idea of aiming, by any means possible, at uniformity" (Milroy and Milroy, 1991, p. 28). The culture of monoglossia in which the dominant discourse on language is grounded consists of two principles: the *principle of focused grammar* and the *principle of convergence*. The principle of focused grammar is the assumption that what linguistically characterizes an individual as well as a community is possession of a well defined and relatively stable grammar. The existential locus of such grammar is the mind, in the case of an individual, and abstract notions such as society or culture, in the case of a community. James and Lesley Milroy refer to this principle when they state that the ideology of standardization "inclines us all to view a language as a relatively fixed, invariant and unchanging entity" (1991, p. 26).

The conceptualization of an individual's linguistic knowledge as a grammar is not a modern phenomenon, and it pre-dates the birth of linguistics as an independent academic discipline. Similarly, the configuration of a community on the basis of its members sharing a grammar has existed throughout history. But as a result of two modernizing and closely related movements, Romanticism and Nationalism, the principle of focused grammar spread from a cultural and political elite to practically the whole population of Western societies, becoming one of the most deeply entrenched linguistic ideologies of modern times.

The principle of focused grammar that I am proposing is in reality the cultural counterpart of two principles that govern language science. The first is the principle of intersubjectivity, or the idea that human beings communicate successfully because they share a grammar. In Talbot Taylor's words:

The Principle of Intersubjectivity assumes both that mutual understanding, conceived as the product of 'telementation,' is a regular occurrence and that this regular occurrence is only possible because of specific characteristics of the language used in the communicative act (Taylor, 1997, p. 3).

The second is the principle of historicity, or the idea that people do not simply speak, they must speak a language. In Eugenio Coseriu's words:

Language always presents itself as historically determined: as 'a language' (Spanish, Italian, French, German, etc.); there is no speaking that is not speaking 'a language' (1981, p. 269).

The consolidation of the principle of focused grammar (not only in linguistics but in many other discourses on language) was supported by nationalist ideology and by the prestige of the new science of linguistics. On one hand, nationalists view language (understood as a focused grammar) as the fundamental feature defining a people and their culture, entities whose existence legitimates any claim for the formation of a nation-state. On the other, the development of language science and its unquestionable success in explaining certain linguistic phenomena depended, to a great extent, on linguists' ability to define their object, language, in terms of regular patterns and internal systematicity:

Academic linguists' extension of the concept of grammar from the explicitly artifactual product of literate scholarly intervention to an underlying natural system only exacerbates the polemics (Woolard, 1998, p. 17).

The growing interest of linguistics in defining language as a stable and internally coherent system (together with the principles of intersubjectivity and historicity) contributed to the marginalization of actual speech, linguistic variation, and language change. One of the main characteristics of the ideology of standardization described by James and Lesley Milroy is precisely "intolerance of optional variability in language" (1985, p. 26).

The principle of focused grammar has a diachronic counterpart, the principle of convergence, or the assumption that people's linguistic behavior tends to become homogeneous over time through pressure from the dominant norm of the community. The principle of convergence must have been reinforced by several factors: the observation of the apparently natural tendency for people to accommodate their behavior to that of those around them (Giles and Coupland, 1991; Giles et al., 1991), by the greater mobility of modern society and the socio-economically based notion of best interest and, perhaps, by the metaphorical extension to linguistic history of the theory of evolution by natural selection. Obviously, the principle of convergence has had great impact on the configuration of historical linguistics. The history of a language tends to be described, as Roger Lass (1976, p. xi) and James Milroy (1992, p. 50) have signaled, as a single-minded march towards the modern standard. As Milroy stated, "for recent centuries models of language history are predominantly *convergent*" (p. 50). As a result of the wide acceptance of this principle, linguistic research has often assumed that dialectal variation is reduced (though not eliminated) through a process of focusing as we move forward in time and as we move upwards in the socio-economic scale: "The social and political pressure on persons in cities to give up speaking their own dialects. . . is considerable" (Milroy and Milroy, 1991, p. 110).

The principle of convergence has also influenced the perception of multilingual communities as somewhat unnatural and therefore transitional, going through a process of elimination of varieties and subsequent convergence in the dominant focused grammar. In fact, a significant part of the research carried out within the sociology of language has focused on the development of frameworks for the prediction of language maintenance, language shift or language death. The reader may recall that the research questions on which I based my interpretation of the *MSGa* data and my application of Fishman's and Paulston's models assumed the existence in Galicia of two focalized grammars and the possibility of convergence into one of them.

Let us look at how the linguistic culture of monoglossia is explicitly or implicitly present in the discourses on language in Galicia.

7.1. *Monoglossia in the discourse of linguistic history*

Histories are always based on a series of events organized in a chronological outline; but facts and dates do not speak for themselves, and, at most, they constitute chronicles that only become histories when they are inserted in a master narrative

(cf. White, 1973, 1978). The standard narrative of Galician linguistic history presented in Section 2 rests, at least in part, on the linguistic culture of monoglossia.

As I showed in Section 2, the birth of Galicia is associated with the emergence of Galician, and the development of socio-cultural unity is equated with the formation of a monolingual community based on a focused grammar. When Constantino García wrote that “Galician served as the vehicle of oral expression for the powerful and the common people, the bourgeoisie and the peasantry, and it was considered the normal language used in legal and administrative documents” (1986, p. 51), he assumed the existence of Galician (which would be conceptualized by his reader as a focused grammar) and of Galicia as a monolingual community. When Rodríguez wrote “Galician was at first, like all Romance languages of culture, a normalized language used by all social classes in the country” he also assumed the existence of Galicia both as a socio-cultural unit and as a monolingual community. As we saw in Section 2, this *normal* state of affairs (a monolingual community based on a shared grammar) was disrupted by the appearance of another language (a foreign language), spoken by those who held power in the region (hence the modern need for normalization). Thus, the main plot of the linguistic history of Galicia from the fifteenth century onwards is one of conflict between the two main characters of the story: a victim and an aggressor, Galician and Spanish.

A certain degree of presentism characterizes all histories, either because concepts of the present are projected onto the past or because the past is laid out as a justification of the present. Linguistic histories of Galicia are no exception. An example of the first type of presentism is the (often uncritical) application of familiar categories from the present such as ‘lingua normalizada’ or ‘lingua oficial’ to the description of past stages in which neither the words nor the reality they suggest to us existed. An example of the second type is precisely the choice of a plot of confrontation, which serves the purpose of historicizing (legitimizing with history) a view of the current linguistic situation as one of conflict, of politically and socially contested language shift.

The descriptions of the modern history of Galician are also grounded in the culture of monoglossia. In these descriptions, the most important event in the modern period is the re-birth of Galician in the form of a standard language for use in prestigious domains. The importance of this event is that it makes the normalization of the linguistic situation possible in two ways. First, it allows for the conceptualization of Galician as a focused grammar; and second, it offers a possible resolution of the linguistic conflict: the development of a standard will allow the linguistic behavior of Galicians to converge into their own language instead of into Spanish. This brings us to the question that controls not so much the discourse of the historian as that of the language planner and the sociolinguist: What direction or directions will the process of convergence follow?

7.2. *Monoglossia in the discourse of nationalist sociolinguistics*

The power of the linguistic culture of monoglossia is so prominent in nationalist discourse that the exposure of Galicians to more than one linguistic norm is said to potentially cause linguistic schizophrenia (cf. Section 4).

The description of the linguistic situation of Galicia given by these linguists is clearly mediated by the principle of convergence. It is taken for granted that people's linguistic behavior will converge into a norm; the nationalists' claim is that, given the present cultural, economic and political circumstances, the inevitable convergence will favor Spanish. Only a drastic transformation of those circumstances (an affirmative action that places Galician in a position of privilege) could re-direct the process of convergence towards Galician.

The principle of focused grammar also contributes to determining the shape of the discourse of nationalist sociolinguistics. As Woolard has pointed out, the "lack of a distinct language can cast doubt on the legitimacy of a group's claim to nationhood" (1998, p. 17). Therefore, the existence of a Galician focused grammar, a well-defined and stable standard language, is seen as a condition *sine qua non* for the survival of Galician identity and for the legitimacy of nationalist claims. People can then establish their true Galicianness through knowledge and use of the appropriate focused grammar; that is of pure, true Galician. In addition to the previously-mentioned criticism that nationalist sociolinguists directed to official status-planning strategies, much concern has been voiced by nationalists about the results of corpus-planning policies. The main defect of official corpus planning in Galicia, according to nationalist sociolinguists, has been the lack of concern with the impurification of the standard language, which López Valcárcel considers "artificial, alien and full of serious errors" and "spoiled by interference from Castilian" (1991, pp. 140–141).

7.3. *Monoglossia in the legal discourse on language*

The legal language on language, presented in Section 3, also reflects the culture of monoglossia. First, the legal discourse pivots around the equation of language and nation, as reflected in Article 3 of the Spanish Constitution ("Castilian is the Spanish language official in the State") and Article 5 of the Galician Statute of Autonomy ("The language proper to Galicia is Galician"). Second, under the legal texts lies the assumption that linguistic knowledge is knowledge of a focused grammar. The goal of language policies is to make both grammars available to Galicians giving them the option of choosing one or the other in all domains.

Bilingualism thus conceived does not significantly differ from monolingualism, since what characterizes linguistic knowledge and behavior is knowledge of one or two (or three, or four, ...) focused grammars. Thus understood, policies of both monolingualism and bilingualism are products of monoglossic culture.

The legal language does not directly address the question of convergence but, since the legal framework was designed to protect individual rights, the language planners' attitude towards convergence can be characterized as one of *laissez faire*: They assume that convergence will occur into two norms rather than one or, as was the case in nineteenth-century liberal nationalism (Hobsbawm, 1992, pp. 30–39), that nature will take its course and people will *freely* abandon what they perceive to be the less useful language converging into the dominant one.

8. Galicia and the linguistic culture of heteroglossia

Although in the history of European nationalism religion, ethnicity or civic values have been claimed as pillars of a community, nationalist ideology has more often than not defined the nation on the basis of language. As a result of the dominance of the culture of monoglossia, a language-based cultural community is always assumed to share a focused grammar, and the linguistic behavior of members of a community is assumed to tend to converge into that grammar.

As shown in the previous sections, all public discourses on language in Galicia are grounded in these assumptions. But given the present political situation in the region, there are two relevant questions that linguists, anthropologists, sociologists and the like must address (and that, for the most part, we have failed to address): First, are the language attitudes and linguistic behaviors of all Galicians consistent with the linguistic culture of monoglossia? And second, is it possible (maybe even necessary) for language planners to contribute to the development of a linguistically-based Galician identity that is not mediated by the culture of monoglossia?

Mauro Fernández (1998) has offered a very lucid analysis of identity in Galicia that opens the door for a more revealing treatment of these issues. In his recent article ‘Lengua e identidade en el tercer milenio’ [Language and identity in the third millennium], he questions the universal validity of the equation of ethnic identity and language. Fernández adopts a constructivist (as opposed to an essentialist) conception of identity, and he defines it as “a dimension of the social or individual existence that may be emphasized or de-emphasized according to the situation; which means that identity is a superficial, not a deep, element; mutable and not stable and permanent”. Then, following Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), he argues that any act of speaking constitutes an act of identity in which people shape their linguistic behavior to match or differ from that which they associate with a given group. The act of speaking, he insists, must not be confused with using a specific language:

Languages. . . are but the crystallization of certain models, the result of a process of focalization of multiple acts of identity, from which many processes of institutionalization (standardization, among them) emerge, which reinforce that crystallization (Fernández, 1998).

He then shows the historical specificity of the identification of language with group identity, which was a product of the emergence of nationalist ideology and the nation-state as the main form of political organization in Western societies. In sum, he illustrates and emphasizes the complex nature of social identities and argues that one social identity does not have to be associated with a single language: If social identity is complex and speaking is performing acts of identity, then speech must reflect that same complexity.

With respect to Galicia, he claims that the majority of Galicians display linguistic practices and attitudes that do not match the dominant discourse that identifies language (Galician) and social identity, that is, the discourse that I have analyzed in this article as the linguistic culture of monoglossia:

Galicians who speak Spanish do not feel less Galician or cease to be perceived as such by those who speak it; at the same time, these do not cease to feel Spanish (Fernández, 1998).

8.1. *The non-universality of monoglossia*

Fernández's approach is consistent with that of many sociolinguists who have shown that the ideas associated with the culture of monoglossia are not universally valid. On one hand, as some linguists have indicated [for example, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) for Creole-type communities, or Romaine, 1994, pp. 2–12 for Papua New Guinea], linguistic models designed to describe monoglossic communities are inappropriate for the description of the linguistic behavior of members of linguistically complex communities. On the other hand, the assumptions about language, speech community and linguistic behavior implied in the culture of monoglossia are not held by every single person in every community. For example, Romaine states that the pressures towards linguistic convergence were not present in Melanesia until the imposition of Western models of society, and, more importantly, that "diversity is cultivated in Melanesia as a badge of identification and is largely a conscious reaction" (Romaine, 1994, p. 11). In addition, sociolinguists have often shown that, even in Western societies, there are cultural and social forces that prevent convergence and may actually favor divergence. According to James and Lesley Milroy, "the capacity for long-term survival which stigmatized language varieties demonstrate is quite contrary to the popular view that modern mass education and mass communication will have a standardizing effect on language" (1991, p. 115). Along the same lines, Giles and Coupland (1991, pp. 105–108) report the widespread existence of processes of psycholinguistic differentiation, even in situations of apparent linguistic convergence. For example, they report how French Canadians learning English introduce "phonological markers into the second language they are learning (Lambert and Tucker, 1972), restoring psycholinguistic distinctiveness" (p. 108).

In the following paragraphs, I will try to further develop Fernández's thesis by describing the linguistic culture in which the linguistic behavior of Galicians (their covert language policy) is grounded: the culture of heteroglossia.

8.2. *Ethnicity and language*

Before proceeding, however, it is necessary to make some remarks about the relationship between language and ethnic identity—that is, about the fact that language is a possible attribute of ethnic-group membership and an instrument for generating a sense of common ethnicity. The literature on this topic is so vast that a detailed review of previous treatments would fall outside the scope of the present article.¹² I will try, however, to be as explicit as possible with respect to my use of the concept. Let me begin by reproducing John Edwards' definition, from which I elaborate my own:

¹² See, for example, Edwards, 1994 (Chapter 5) and the references provided there.

Ethnic identity is allegiance to a group—large or small, socially dominant or subordinate—with which one has ancestral links. There is no necessity for a continuation, over generations, of the same socialization or cultural patterns, but some sense of a group boundary must persist. This can be sustained by shared characteristics (language, religion, etc.), or by more subjective contributions to a sense of ‘groupness’, or by some combination of both. Symbolic or subjective attachments must relate, at however distant a remove, to an observable real past (Edwards, 1994, p. 128).

I take ethnic identity to be a conscious sense of belonging to an abstract social unit made up of individuals that are in some way alike because they share certain patterns of behavior. Ethnic identity is formed and reinforced through participation in and/or explicit association with specific cultural and political institutions and through acts of loyalty towards the symbols fabricated to represent the social unit in question. *Cultural institutions* tend to develop from bottom to top, when people become aware of common patterns of behavior (often linked to the way they interact with their environment) and institutionalize them. Cultural institutions include patterns of linguistic behavior; patterns of family life, friendship and economic cooperation; gastronomic, musical and other entertainment traditions; and representations of the national space (images of the land institutionalized by painters, photographers or cinematographers). *Political institutions* are created by society to coordinate group action, and tend to develop identity from the top down—that is, their existence, besides articulating the life of the community, generates common behaviors that create or reinforce a sense of identity. They include administrative offices, political parties, schools, and neighborhood organizations. *Fabricated symbols*, the third component of ethnic identity, have no direct link with patterns of behavior associated with survival, entertainment, interaction with the environment, or political action; they serve the sole purpose of identifying the community. They typically include flags and national anthems.

8.3. Language attitudes and linguistic behavior in Galicia

The *Mapa Sociolingüístico de Galicia*, in particular volume III, entitled *Actitudes lingüísticas en Galicia*, offers information that may allow us to describe how Galicians view the relation between their linguistic behavior and their ethnic identity. The authors of the *MSGa* included three questions designed to explore this issue. The questions and the total percentages for Galicia are the following:

a. The language of Galicians is (*MSGa* III, p. 362; Table 3.5.1.1.0)

Spanish	1.8%
Both	39.9%
Galician	58.4%

b. If Galician ceased to be spoken, Galician culture and identity would be (*MSGa* III, p. 390; Table 3.5.3.1.0)

Lost	76.8%
Maintained	23.2%

c. Who is more Galician? (MSGa III, p. 376; Table 3.5.2.1.0)

Someone who lives and works in Galicia	21.4%
Someone who was born in Galicia	62.3%
Someone who speaks Galician	16.3%

My interpretation of these data is the following: Responses to questions (a) and (b) indicate that Galicians clearly recognize the symbolic value of Galician and therefore express their Galicianness through acts of loyalty towards *the* language. They publicly support the existence, institutional use and protection of an exclusively Galician standard language. In fact, answering as they did to questions (a) and (b) above may be in and of itself an act of loyalty to Standard Galician. But Galicians seem to distinguish between their loyalty to the language that functions as a symbol of their ethnic identity and their own linguistic behavior. They know that their linguistic production often differs from standard Galician, but they do not cease to be Galicians for that; and that is the reason why they are not inclined to say that one who speaks Galician is more Galician than one who does not [hence the response to question (c)].

But how do we describe the linguistic behavior of Galicians when they are not speaking Standard Galician? We might be tempted to answer that they speak either Spanish or *bad* Galician (or even *bad* Spanish). These are in fact the only answers available to the proponents of both the hegemonic and non-hegemonic language policies. Both groups agree that Galicia is a community in which two languages (understood as focused grammars) co-exist, and they only differ in their views as to whether the linguistic behavior of Galicians will converge into the two norms or into a single norm. In other words, when Galicians speak, they speak either Galician (good or bad) or Spanish (good or bad). But there is evidence—evidence that has been either ignored or misinterpreted by sociolinguists—that these language policies are based on partial misrepresentations of the linguistic behavior of Galicians.

As stated above, certain theoretical developments within sociolinguistics allow us to interpret linguistic situations such as this one in non-monoglossic terms. In general, recent reformulations of the concept of speech community reveal the limitations of the Labovian model which is based on a shared grammar including sociolinguistic information (Romaine, 1982; Mougeon and Nadasdi, 1998; Santa Anna and Parodi, 1998). But there is one study that is particularly useful for describing the linguistic behavior of Galicians: Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) previously-mentioned work on Creole communities. These authors proposed the terms *focused* versus *diffused* speech communities to address the fact that some language-based groups exhibit a more variable linguistic behavior than others. This, of course, has always been known, but the most valuable contribution of these authors is their description of diffused (linguistically highly variable) communities. This variability cannot be satisfactorily accounted for by simply stating that their grammar has many variable rules. The reality is more complex because these communities are

characterized by the presence of multiple norms. The linguistic behavior of individuals cannot be represented by a point or a range of points on a continuum that links the standard (or careful styles) with colloquial varieties (or informal styles). Instead, the linguistic behavior of the members of these communities is more accurately represented as a series of vectors that point in the multiple directions of the multiple norms available to each speaker. There is evidence in the *MSGa* that Galicia is not slowly becoming a monolingual community and that the linguistic repertoire of Galicians is in fact expanding. It is worth noting that initial bilingualism (people who claim to acquire both languages simultaneously) increases for younger age groups (*MSGa* I, p. 41); or that two thirds of those who have Spanish as their initial language incorporate Galician into their repertoire in the course of their lives (*MSGa* I, p. 45); or that 61.3% of the people who live in peripheral urban areas claim to have Galician as their initial language (*MSGa* I, p. 43), a fact that may reveal the presence of an important wedge for the penetration of Galician norms in the cities, traditional strongholds for Spanish monolingualism.

However, the *MSGa* assumes the existence of two norms (Galician and Spanish)—that is, it seems to consider that bilingualism is the only alternative to monolingualism. But, as I claimed in Section 7, the notion of bilingualism, like that of monolingualism, is grounded in the culture of monoglossia, and there is abundant evidence that characterizing Galicia as a bilingual community constitutes a partial misrepresentation of its complex sociolinguistic configuration. For example, Alvarez-Cáccamo (1989) carefully described the multiplicity of norms that, to a greater or lesser extent, condition the linguistic behavior of Galicians: the *lusista* (Portuguese-like) Standard, official Standard Galician, Standard Spanish, Galician Spanish, Galician varieties influenced by Spanish, and local varieties, including Eastern dialects adjacent to the Leonese dialectal area and Southern dialects adjacent to Northern Portugal.

Sociolinguists' and language planners' dismissal of the sociocultural value of the non-standard norms in Galicia is not surprising:

Language mixing, codeswitching, and creolization thus make speech varieties particularly vulnerable to folk and prescriptivist evaluation as grammarless and/or decadent and therefore as less than fully formed (Woolard, 1998, p. 17).

However, Argente Giralt and Lorenzo Suárez (1991) have studied the code-switching norm in Galicia and have shown that it is not a linguistic abnormality but, as in most contact situations, a socially productive and meaningful norm:

Code-switching may represent a particular type of discourse, articulated through the argumentative and/or metalinguistic value that each hybrid style contains in order to accomplish a discrete communicative effect (p. 107).

In light of this evidence, I would like to propose the following hypothesis: Galicia is a diffused speech community in which the availability of several norms of linguistic behavior constitutes a source of ethnic identity. Multiplicity of norms and resistance

to convergence are the principles on which the popular linguistic culture is based, a linguistic culture that, for the sake of consistency, I will term *the popular culture of heteroglossia*. In this context, the function of Standard Galician is twofold: On one hand, it functions as one of the multiple norms that determine people's linguistic behavior; and on the other, it functions as a symbol of the ethnic group. The advantage of this description of Galicia's sociolinguistic configuration is that it is consistent with the results of the language attitudes survey and with the variable linguistic behavior of Galicians.

For geographic, historical and political reasons, Galicia has developed an identity that makes it somewhat different from other communities in the Iberian Peninsula.¹³ The natural characteristics of the physical environment, the centuries-long economic and political dependence on a non-Galician center of power, the geographic proximity to Portugal, and the modern migration of large numbers of Galicians to Europe and the Americas, must have had great impact on the development of that identity. Modernity brought about apparently contradictory trends (quite typical, by the way, of post-colonial societies): on one hand, the articulation of a nationalist political movement, and on the other, a growing social mobility that brought Galicians in closer contact with other identities both internal and external to the Spanish State. Therefore, the present configuration of Galician identity is the result of a growing self-awareness and an unprecedented expansion of the networks of interaction within which Galicians function.

The expansion of networks of interaction has obviously transformed the linguistic behavior of Galicians. This transformation, as a result of the dominance of the culture of monoglossia, has been interpreted as a necessary convergence, either towards Galician or Spanish (as reflected in the linguistic and political discourses discussed above). Following Mauro Fernández, I maintain that Galicians do not want to choose between identity A and B and their associated linguistic reflexes. But I would go further and claim that not only do they not want to choose between Galician and Spanish, but that they want to maintain the multiple norms available to them: Standard Galician, local Galician norms, code-mixing and code-switching norms, the diglossic norm, Galician Spanish and Standard Spanish. Modernity has not caused the convergence of linguistic behavior, it has in fact broadened the linguistic repertoire of Galicians. It is precisely this broadness, this linguistic hybridity that has raised to the level of awareness and become one of the cultural institutions that make up Galician identity and that may feed the Galician-identity movement of the twenty-first century.

The existence of a linguistically-based identity that does not rely solely on the existence of a clearly differentiated focused grammar is not new to sociolinguists. De Vos has pointed out that "group identity can even be maintained by minor differ-

¹³ The failure to properly describe the sociolinguistic configuration of Galicia and the resulting inadequacy of the existing language policies may be due to the political convenience of treating equally the different multilingual communities in Spain in the late seventies during the delicate transition from Franco's regime to a parliamentary democracy. While these policies *may* be adequate for a monoglossic community such as Catalonia (regardless of whether it is defined as monolingual or bilingual), they may not be for a non-monoglossic community such as Galicia.

ences in linguistic patterns and by style of gesture” (1975, p. 16). Similarly, Giles and Coupland show that “ethnic minorities would accentuate their ingroup communicative markers in an interethnic encounter where they felt their linguistic boundaries were soft” (1991, p. 97)—that is, when the differences in the linguistic behavior of the ingroup and the outgroup are minor, as is the case between varieties of Galician or Galician Spanish and varieties of Spanish.

It may now be relevant to return to my definition of ethnic identity and the role played by language and linguistic behavior in the process of identity formation. Language may be a *cultural institution*, when speakers become aware of shared patterns of linguistic behavior and use them as markers of their own ethnic identity. Official standard languages (their grammar, lexicon and orthography) may also be associated with *political institutions* when they become the agreed-upon medium for oral and written communication within those institutions (cf. Fasold, 1988). But official standard languages often become *symbols* of the ethnic group, performing the same functions as flags and anthems (cf. Fasold, 1988). One can, for example, perform an act of aggression against a community or the identity of that community by burning their flag, booing during the performance of their national anthem, or by showing some kind of disrespect towards its language. The culture of monoglossia has tended to confuse language as a cultural institution and language as a symbol of the ethnic group, and therefore to assume the natural existence of (or tendency towards) a formal similarity between the symbol (the standard language) and the cultural institution (language use). In contrast with the assumptions of the culture of monoglossia, what characterizes Galicia linguistically is that Galicians accept the standard language as an important symbol of Galicianness, but, at the same time, they institutionalize (i.e. adopt and accept as Galician) a diffused linguistic behavior.

The use of ethnic identity as a resource for social mobilization in the last quarter of the twentieth century has attracted the attention of social scientists in general and sociolinguists in particular (e.g. Fishman, 1989, 1994; Paulston, 1994). Manuel Castells, in his recent book *The Power of Identity* (1997), describes the end of the millennium as a time in which the globalization of economic activity has distanced the centers of power and decision-making from people’s daily experience. It is, in Castells’ opinion, this distancing that has triggered the appearance of movements of resistance based on identities of various kinds. Following Castell’s views, I recognize that identity is an important resource for the articulation of movements of resistance that attempt to counter the socio-economic inequalities and the dehumanization of culture that an unchecked globalization may cause.

If we accept as a goal the preservation of Galician identity, we must carefully define the terms of that identity. The survival of an ethnic group depends more on the preservation of ethnic boundaries than on the maintenance at all costs of certain essential features. In fact, this may be linked to that group’s ability to evolve and simultaneously maintain those boundaries (Barth, 1969; Edwards, 1994, pp. 126–27).

The linguistic behavior of Galicians will inevitably evolve, probably conditioned by the factors identified by sociolinguists: prospects for socio-economic development, networks of interaction, and sense of ethnic loyalty. In the present situation, Galicians seem to feel that knowledge of both Standard Galician and Spanish (and

probably English!) are valuable resources for their socio-economic mobility. As the *MSGa's* language attitudes survey shows [responses to questions (a) and (b) above], they clearly think of Galician as a symbol of ethnic identity. But they also participate in multiple strong and weak networks of interaction (Milroy, 1987) within Galicia, within Spain and, perhaps, if a cultural and economic space is successfully created between Galicia and northern Portugal, within the Iberian Peninsula as a whole. Finally, there is a strong and growing sense of identity and ethnic loyalty among Galicians, which is largely due to the cultural and political efforts of the Galician nationalist political coalition BNG (in fact the percentage of votes obtained by the BNG has steadily increased through the eighties and nineties, as I presented in Section 6). It is in this context that the popular linguistic culture of heteroglossia has emerged in Galicia. Any identity-based political movement that fails to understand this linguistic culture, and the identity of which it is a component, is doomed to fail.

In the last Galician parliamentary elections, held on October 19, 1997, the nationalist coalition Bloque Nacionalista Galego obtained an unprecedented 25.5% of the vote, with which it became the second largest parliamentary group in the region. Their campaign slogan was 'Porque nos interesa este País' [Because we care about this nation], a sentence that is grammatically and orthographically identical in Galician and Spanish. Could this mean that Galician nationalism is quietly assuming the linguistic culture of heteroglossia, and the ambiguity, hybridity and open-endedness of which Galicians are so fond as a source of identity?

9. Conclusion

In this article, I have attempted to show that both the hegemonic and non-hegemonic language policies in Galicia are based on similar descriptions of the sociolinguistic configuration of the region. Both types of policies are grounded in the linguistic culture of monoglossia. I have also claimed that these descriptions are at least partially inaccurate because they fail to relate the co-existence of not two but multiple norms of linguistic behavior (and their manifestation in actual speech) to the language attitudes displayed by Galicians. The language attitudes and linguistic behavior of Galicians are grounded in the linguistic culture of heteroglossia: acceptance of multiple norms and resistance to convergence. In conclusion, this analysis of the sociolinguistic configuration of Galicia shows that, like in the cases discussed in Schiffman (1996), there is a mismatch between the existing language policies and the language culture or cultures of the community.

References

- Alvarez-Caccamo, C., 1989. Variação lingüística e o factor social na Galiza. *Hispanic linguistics* 2 (2), 253–298.
- Argente Giralt, J.A., Lorenzo Suárez, A.M., 1991. A relevancia social da alternancia lingüística. *Cadernos de Lingua* 3, 91–109.

- Barth, F., 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
- Castells, M., 1997. *The Power of Identity*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Coulmas, F., 1988. What are national languages good for? In: Coulmas, F. (Ed.), *With Forked Tongues: What are National Languages Good for?* Karoma, Singapore, pp. 1–24.
- Domínguez Seco, L., 1993. Na construción do galego como língua legítima: Uma análise dos textos de língua do bachelato. *Agália* 34, 147–166.
- Dorian, N.C., 1998. Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In: Grenoble, L.A., Whaley, L.J. (Eds.), *Endangered Languages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 3–21.
- Edwards, J., 1994. *Multilingualism*. Routledge, London/New York.
- Fasold, R., 1988. What national languages are good for. In: Coulmas, F. (Ed.), *With Forked Tongues: What are National Languages Good for?* Karoma, Singapore, pp. 180–185.
- Ferguson, C.A., 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15, 325–340.
- Fernández, M., 1998. Lengua e identidade en el tercer milenio. In: Gallardo, B. (Ed.), *Temas de Lingüística y Gramática*. Universitat de València, Departament de Teoria dels Llenguatges, Valencia, Spain, pp. 23–37.
- Fernández Rodríguez, M.A., Rodríguez Neira, M.(Coords.), 1994. *Lingua inicial e competencia lingüística en Galicia*. Real Academia Galega, Vigo, Spain (*MSGa I*).
- Fernández Rodríguez, M.A., Rodríguez Neira, M.(Coords.), 1995. *Usos lingüísticos en Galicia*. Real Academia Galega, Vigo, Spain (*MSGa II*).
- Fernández Rodríguez, M.A., Rodríguez Neira, M.(Coords.), 1996. *Actitudes lingüísticas en Galicia*. Real Academia Galega, Vigo, Spain (*MSGa III*).
- Fernández-Velho, P., Henriques Salido, M.do C., 1991. Poder e contra planificación lingüística na Galiza. *Agália* 28, 423–433.
- Fishman, J., 1980. Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and societal phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1, 3–17.
- Fishman, J., 1989. Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon.
- Fishman, J., 1990. What is reversing language shift (RLS) and how can it succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11 (1–2), 5–36.
- Fishman, J., 1994. Critiques of language planning. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 15 (1–2), 91–99.
- Freixeiro Mato, X.R., 1997. *Lingua Galega: Normalidade e Conflito*. Lairovento, Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- García, C., 1986. El castellano en Galicia. In: Alvar, M., Echevarría, M., García, C., Marsá, F. (Eds.), *El Castellano Actual en las Comunidades Bilingües de España*. Junta de Castilla y León, Consejería de educación y cultura, Salamanca, Spain, pp. 49–64.
- García Negro, M.P., 1993. *O Galego e as Leis*. O Cumio, Pontevedra, Spain.
- Giles, H., Coupland, N., 1991. *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Giles, H., Coupland, J., Coupland, N. (Eds.), 1991. *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hobsbawm, E.J., 1992. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Joseph, J.E., Taylor, T.J. (Eds.), 1990. *Ideologies of Language*. Routledge, London/New York.
- Lambert, W.E., Tucker, G.R., 1972. *Bilingual Education of Children: The St Lambert Experiment*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA.
- Lass, R., 1976. *English Phonology and Phonological Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Le Page, R., Tabouret-Keller, A., 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- López Valcárcel, X.M., 1990. Normalización afectiva. *Cadernos de lingua* 2, 93–104.
- López Valcárcel, X.M., 1991. Normalización: Agora ou nunca. *Cadernos de lingua* 3, 135–146.
- Mills, S., 1997. *Discourse*. Routledge, London.
- Milroy, J., 1992. *Linguistic Variation and Change*. Blackwell, Oxford.

- Milroy, L., 1987. *Language and Social Networks*, 2nd ed. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Milroy, J., Milroy, L., 1991. *Authority in Language*, 2nd ed. Routledge, London/New York.
- Mougeon, R., Nadasdi, T., 1998. Sociolinguistic discontinuity in minority language communities. *Language* 74, 40–55.
- Paulston, C.B., 1994. *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings: Implications for Language Policies*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Pellitero Ramilo, L., 1992. Bilingüismo: horizonte imposible. *Cadernos de Lingua* 5, 27–34.
- Rodríguez, F., 1991. *Conflicto Lingüístico e Ideoloxía na Galiza*. Liaovento, Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- Romaine, S., 1982. *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities*. Arnold, London.
- Romaine, S., 1994. *Language in Society*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Santa Anna, O., Parodi, C., 1998. Modeling the speech community: configuration and variable types in the Mexican Spanish setting. *Language in society* 27, 23–51.
- Schieffelin, B.B., Woolard, K.A., Kroskrity, P.V. (Eds.), 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Schiffman, H.F., 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. Routledge, London.
- Siguan, M., 1992. *España Plurilingüe*. Alianza Editorial, Madrid.
- Taylor, T.J., 1997. *Theorizing Language*. Pergamon, Amsterdam.
- Tollefson, J.W., 1991. *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. Longman, London/New York.
- White, H., 1973. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- White, H., 1973. *Tropics of Discourse*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Williamson, R.C., Williamson, V.L., 1984. Selected factors in bilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 5 (5), 401–413.
- Woolard, K.A., 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In: Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, pp. 3–47.