Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe

Alvarez Cáccamo, Celso. 1991. "Language revival, code manipulation and social power in Galiza: off-record uses of Spanish in formal communicative events". In: Carol A. Klee & Luis A. Ramos-García, eds. *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking World: Iberia, Latin America, United States*. Tempe: Bilingual Press / Editorial Bilingüe, pp. 41-73.

Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking World:

Iberia, Latin America, United States

Carol A. Klee
Editor

Luis A. Ramos-García
Associate Editor

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Cover design by Kerry Curtis

Contents

III. Spanish in the United States

Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking World:

Iberia, Latin America, United States

LANGUAGE REVIVAL, CODE MANIPULATION AND SOCIAL POWER IN GALIZA: OFF-RECORD USES OF SPANISH IN FORMAL COMMUNICATIVE EVENTS

Celso Alvarez Cáccamo
University of California, Berkeley

Introduction[1]

Galician sociolinguistics has been primarily concerned with language conflict at the macro-social level as it manifests itself in changing status relationships between Spanish and Galician (Rojo 1981; Fernández 1983). However, such work has revealed little of the relationship between language usages, interactional control, and social power. Indeed work at the micro-level in interactional sociolinguistics, conversational analysis, and related disciplines in Galiza is practically non-existent.[2] But if we consider that sociolinguistic change is a composite, multidimensional process of changing language usages and attitudes intricately connected with cultural values and political ideology, it seems necessary to focus our analysis on those units of social interaction where the communicative, social, and symbolic meanings of the languages in conflict are generated, in order to document the current course of sociolinguistic change in Galiza.

1. The problem: Language revival and norms of language choice

There is no doubt that language contact in Galiza has so far fitted the description of what can be metaphorically called 'language domination'—or, as Hispanic sociolinguistics has presented it, 'diglossia' in a broad interpretation of Ferguson's (1959) notion. That is, the specific social behavior represented by speaking Spanish has enjoyed— and still enjoys—a higher social prestige. In more precise

words, it is *through* Spanish that the dominant classes have traditionally interacted, it is assimilation *to* Spanish that has primarily served as a tool for social advancement, and it is *in* Spanish that the vast majority of formal activities in public, institutional, educational and other superordinate domains has been conducted.

However, we are currently witnessing the social expansion of Galician in public life. The antecedents of this process of language shift are probably familiar to any student who follows the political and social life of post-Francoist Spain. The resurgence of national identity in the peripheral cultures of the Spanish State (primarily Galiza, Catalunya and Euskadi, or the Spanish provinces of the Basque Country) is manifested in the decentralization of political power with the establishment of the so-called *Estado de las Autonomías*, a state system of seventeen different autonomous communities. Language legislation has been passed, and partially implemented, in defense of the 'minoritized' (Cobarrubias 1986a,b) languages.[3] The languages of the non-mainstream ethnicities are now co-official with Spanish within their respective territories, and the teaching of Galician, Catalan, and Basque is prescribed at all pre-university educational levels, although implementation of this policy occurs in differing degrees in each of the autonomous territories. Language revival is not exclusive to the three historical nationalities; similar attitudes towards the revival of local speech are also observed in Asturies, Andalucía and, particularly, València. In public life the languages are extensively used in political activities, which symbolizes an ideological commitment towards the nations-without-a-state.

Nevertheless, we should not infer that the sociopolitical conditions under which this multipolar process is developing are similar in the various communities. The most obvious and significant difference in Galiza, one that sets it apart from Catalunya or Euskadi, is the historical absence of a local bourgeoisie interested in generating an important culture of prestige around the local language. Instead, the Galician economic bourgeoisies traditionally have been uncommitted 'mediating forces' (*'burguesias in-*

termediárias', Rodríguez 1976) between the interests of the dominant classes in Galiza and the Spanish State. The reshaping of political structures and legal framework in the State suggests that changes are taking place in the roles of these local bourgeoisies in Galiza's economic structures, as well as in their ideological positioning toward the question of Galiza's historical identity.

At the level of language usage, language revival is manifested in changes in the norms of code choice in bilingual encounters. A wide array of patterns obtains for choosing among speech varieties of either Spanish or Galician according to contextual conditions, including the speaker's and other participants' social and linguistic background.

An example of this is apparent in patterns of language choice among sectors of the middle-class intelligentsia, and the political class, whose linguistic repertoire may include both formal *and* colloquial Spanish, as well as urban Standard Galician, and occasional usage of dialectal Galician. That is, for sectors of these emerging elites of culture and power the prevalent code in family life continues to be colloquial Spanish, whereas Standard Galician tends to be used in superordinate, formal domains, where it channels a different type of group identification based on re-emerging feelings of Galicianhood.

At first glance we could consider these patterns of correspondence between situational constraints and language choice as a case of reverse language functions. Should we then refer to this phenomenon as a new form of 'language domination,' this one being the domination of Galician over Spanish? Or rather, should we consider it as a new type of sociofunctional specialization of speech varieties which responds, at least in part, to emerging symbolic values associated with the varieties in conflict?

In this paper I want to make a case for the latter formulation of the problem. Indeed, there are not unambiguous, one-to-one correlations between language status, on the one hand, and language functions on the other. Most likely this is not the case even in situations of well-documented diglossia, for the metaphorical use of 'high'

varieties in informal contexts and 'low' varieties in formal contexts does occur (see Blom and Gumperz 1972); in fact, these apparently unpredictable usages convey a great deal of social information and they make language or register specialization a much more dynamic phenomenon than the usual descriptions of diglossia suggest (Rojo 1981). To refute once and for all the previous rigid characterizations of Galician societal bilingualism, I will argue that 'diglossia' is not an accurate construct to describe the Galician case—and perhaps many others. If language conflict in Galiza were diglossic, then we should expect, among other things, to find Spanish consistently signaling formality and communicative distance. If we are witnessing instead a 'reverse diglossia,' we should expect Galician to take on the 'high' role as a code for formal communication exclusively. However, neither is the case. Rather, what is occurring is that *changing political ideology and sociocultural values are entering verbal interaction in such a way that the traditional, relatively stable norms of language choice are undergoing transformations of still difficult assessment.*

In sum, what we are observing is the redefinition of each language's ethoglossia (Cobarrubias 1986b), that is, a 'language's societal expressive power, its character and communicative force,' which 'is determined by . . . the language's sociolinguistic functions plus the respective degree of social rootedness of each of these functions' (189; all translations are mine).[4] The concept of ethoglossia may help us better understand the historical vicissitudes of language practices. Since a language's status is partially determined by the relative degree of structuration of its social functions, we may comprehend how certain formal functions are gradually installed in the community's sociolinguistic competence by accumulation of language choices in interactions socially perceived as formal or relatively ritualized. Thus, while Spanish expands its uses as the language of primary socialization in traditional domains of Galician (e.g. rural life) (Fernández 1983), it is also the case that Galician is being recovered in formal domains of urban life (Alvarez Cáccamo 1986, 1987).

2. The case: Galician and Spanish in a council meeting

In this paper I will illustrate ethnoglossic change and its significance for the redistribution of power in the community through interpretive micro-analysis of metaphorical code alternation (Blom and Gumperz 1972) in a formal communicative event. With my analysis I want to unveil changing values of officialness, formality, and power on the one hand, and colloquialness, informality, and solidarity on the other, associated with Galician and Spanish respectively. Needless to say, their values of officialness and formality do not emerge directly from superstructural factors such as language legislation granting co-official status to Galician, but through *specific instances of language use* which convey a constellation of social and interactional meanings.

I start from two basic assumptions about the relationships between macro-social phenomena and face-to-face communication. The first one is that, as I suggested earlier, language practices reflect to a certain extent the status relationships of social groups at large (cf. Heller 1982; Woolard 1983, 1989).[5] The second assumption refers to the discursive meanings of code manipulation in bilingual interaction. If code-switching constitutes a powerful discursive device, it is because, in structuralist terms, the *syntagmatic* contrast established by the juxtaposition of utterances in code 1 and code 2 parallels a *paradigmatic* contrast between the social meanings of code 1 and code 2 as a whole.

I will argue that Galician is now emerging as a marker of distance (Brown and Levinson 1987), and as a code of authority, particularly in formal settings connected with local and autonomous institutions of political and cultural power. To be brief, a 'formal event' is defined here as a highly structured situation both in terms of rules for the organization of talk (including formulaic expressions to perform specific tasks, and rigid turn-taking organization), and in terms of participants' role structure (including the transparency and amplitude of the roles invoked and their hierarchical organization; for example, it is in formal occasions where 'positional and public, rather than personal,

identities' are invoked; Irvine 1984). 'Formality' is thus seen both as a property of the social situation, and as a property of a given linguistic code used in such a situation in accordance with the *primary* goals, frame, and organizational principles of the interaction.

My data, gathered from 1984 to 1987, come mostly from observation of formal events in settings linked to local power in the city of Vigo, in Southwestern Galiza (pop. appr. 300,000). Vigo is probably one of the leading forces in the urbanization of Galician both at institutional and grass-root levels. As an example, in 1984 the local government, run by the Spanish Socialist Party (PSOE), signed an agreement along with over 100 Galician towns and villages stating their commitment to the revival of the language through its officialization at all levels of institutional life by implementing a number of specific measures for Galicianization. The extent to which this theoretical commitment has been put into practice falls quite short, to put it mildly, of what grass-root language activists understand by full social normalization of Galician. But one of the aspects in which Galicianization is most evident is in public monthly council meetings. The meeting proceedings are written in Galician, and the Mayor conducts the ritualized turns of session-opening, turn-giving, voting, and session-closing in Galician as well. At the time of my research, the debates among most council members were predominantly carried out in Spanish, but the Mayor himself would use primarily Galician. In the Mayor's frequent interventions language choice would often co-occur with the interplay of several components of the activity in course, including attributes of the addressee, the activity type (debating an issue, calling for a vote, or admonishing other council members or the audience), and the tone of the exchange.

In this regard, I observed three basic discursive strategies in which contextual factors were related to language choice: (1) The Mayor usually employed Galician when he addressed the audience—sometimes to impose authority upon it—or when he intervened to cut short a bitter digression within a debate. (2) Other times convergence to

Spanish with other council members conveyed a sense of interactional cooperation on an issue to be quickly resolved through consensus; the message might include explicit references to this collective sense of agreement. And (3) Spanish was often used in off-record, informal comments.[6]

I have chosen just one case, taken from a council meeting in January, 1986, as paradigmatic of the new contrasting usages of Spanish for off-record, informal discourse tasks in a context where standard Galician represents what we could call the 'official code.' A brief description of the event follows:

The council members are discussing the demolition of an elevated off-ramp for the freeway, an off-ramp that has never been put into use due to its obvious inadequacy. The issue had generated intense controversy in the city ever since its construction, for obscure financial reasons, a few years ago. The meeting is being broadcast live by local radio stations due to the significance of the issue. This circumstance probably has a critical effect on the participants' monitoring of their own speech, including, obviously, language choice.

Earlier in the meeting, socialist Hermida had accused liberal Gudín (G) of inconsistencies in his voting record on the issue in previous years. The Socialist majority stands for the immediate demolition of the off-ramp, whereas opposition council members Gudín and Abade hold a different position. The socialist Mayor (M) announces in Galician that a new round of rebuttal turns will take place due to allusions to Gudín and Abade during Hermida's turn. The Mayor gives a turn first to Abade and then to Gudín. In the following episode, it is Gudín's turn to reply to Hermida's allusions. The Mayor's opening turn in line 1 is ambiguous regarding language used if isolated from the communicative context. However, since the Mayor's previous and subsequent official turns were in Galician, it is safe to assume that he is not switching to Spanish in his first turn.

The following conventions are used for transcription:

Transcription   notation

Galician
Spanish
switch to Spanish in Mayor's language choice

ac	accelerated	- relatively faster tempo
dc	decelerated	- relatively slower tempo
hi	high	- relatively higher pitch
lo	low	- relatively lower pitch
f	fortis	- relatively louder enunciation
p	piano	- relatively softer enunciation

↑	rising tone after last stressed vowel of intonation group
'	sustained tone after last stressed vowel
/	falling tone after last stressed vowel
//	extra falling tone after last stressed vowel

\<sec\>	pause in number of seconds
..	short pause (less than 0.5 sec. approximately)
...	long pause (more than 0.5 sec. approximately)
[ ]	beginning and end of voice overlapping
==	voice latching; no discernible pause between speakers' consecutive == ==utterances

*yes	Prominent phrase *accent
CAPS	extra STRESSED syllable
ʔ	glottal stop at ʔ onset of word
[ə]	neutral vowel schwa
:	lengthening of preceding so::und
-	sound interrup-
'	soun' elided
( )	reconstructed (s)ound or (word)
(xx)	unintelligible sylla(xx)
[ ]	non-linguistic turn or utterance (laughs = [ja JA])

(1a) *The council meeting.* The Mayor thanks Abade for her participation and gives a turn to Gudín:

```
1    M:      grácias senhora abade / hi senhor gudín/
2    <4.5 sec.>
3    G:      ...pues muy bien/... señor hermida, qué quiere usted que
4            le diga /.. pues solamente una cosa, (que u)sted miente //
5            ... lo así de sencillo //
6    (?):    (hos ⌐tiá⌐/
7    G:       f   [y::  ]/y sencillamente así ↑ porque:- e:h / .. yo soy
8            persona rigu*rosa , .. y sobre todo cuando[ə]  utilizo estas
9            hi palabras , ... y: , .. estoy seguro / hi absolutamente
10           seguro /
11   M:      .. senhor gudín , = =
12   G:      == porque: , ==
13   M:      == nom podia ʔutilizar ↑.. às argumentacións
             que queira/
14           .. sem: qualificativos[ə:] ↑
15           .. ⌐ᵈ⌐esqualificadores para n   ⌐ (aide)⌐ /
16   G:       s  [í ]/              [perfec⌐tamente / ac lo
17           que sucede , señor presidente es que el idioma castellano /
18           tiene las palabras / ..   r:igurosas y exactas ↑ y a mí me
19           gusta utilizarlas //
20           dc .. pero- , a partir de ahora no las utilizo ↑
21           p ⌐orque⌐ /      ya le he dich ⌐o-⌐ ,
22   M:        [(re:) ]/      f ac hi  [tie ]  ne muchas,
             algunas muy
23           FUERtes señor gudín / y vienen TOdas en el
24           di'cioNArio / ==
25   G:      ==  p  ⌐ues eso ⌐//
26   Oth:    [  P   [jA JA JA⌐Ja ja ]
27   G:      ... (pero) que sí quede recogid(o) en acta↑ porque: /
28           cuando lo digo (y)↑ (xx xx xx xx xx xx xx) (es)↑
29           ..asumiendo TOdas lo P sus responsabilidades //
             (...)
```

The following is an approximate translation of the episode. I have omitted the transcription of certain prosodic elements, for they may convey substantially different interactional meanings in English. Double parentheses (()) represent lexical items supplied in order to facilitate comprehension. Punctuation marks are used conventionally.

(1a) The council meeting. English version

1	M:	Thank you, Ms. Abade. Mr. Gudín.
2	<4.5 sec>	
3-5	G:	Well, alright ... Mr. Hermida, what do you expect me to say? .. Well, just one thing. (You a)re lying ... It's that simple.
6	(?):	(Je⌈sus!)⌉
7-10	G:	⌊Aaand⌋ it's as simple as that because uuhm .. I'm a precise person ... and specially when I uh use these words ... aand ... I am certain, absolutely certain
11	M:	.. Mr. Gudín ==
12	G:	== becausse ==
13-15	M:	== Couldn't you use .. the argumentations that you like .. ((but)) without ((using)) debasing ..
		⌈ad⌉jectives toward an ⌈(yone)⌉?
16-21	G:	⌊Yes⌋ ⌊Perfect⌋ly. The thing is, Mr. President, that the Castilian ((Spanish)) language has the .. precise and exact words, and I like using them. .. But-, from now on I will not use them
		b⌈ecause⌉I've already told⌈ you-⌉
22-24	M:	⌊ ([re:]) ⌋ ⌊It has⌋many ((words)), *some very STRONG, Mr. Gudín, and they are ALL in the dictionary ==*
25	G:	== E⌈xactly.⌉
26	Oth:	⌊[ha HA HA⌋HA ha]
27	G:	... (But) do keep this on record, because when I say these things, (and) (xx xx xx xx xx xx xx), ((I do so)) .. assuming ALL responsibility.
		(. . .)

After this, Gudín goes on to explain his position once again and to justify his voting record on the demolition of the off-ramp. No more interventions by the Mayor are registered for questions of order during Gudín's turn.

Overall, the segment reproduced constitutes an introduction to Gudín's further argumentations against Hermida's accusations of ideological inconsistency. But embedded in it we find a major sequence which starts with the Mayor's admonishment to Gudín, 'Couldn't you use the argumentations that you like, but without using debasing adjectives toward anyone?' (lines 13-15), and it ends with Gudín's appeal for his words to be registered on record in spite of their harshness (lines 27-29). In turn, I

will argue that the exchange between the Mayor, Gudín, and other (Oth.) participants (some council members and part of the audience) in lines 22 to 26 represents an embedded discrete discourse unit organized around a shift in tone, frame, and communicative goals.

The shift in communicative goals and in what Hymes (1972) would call the *tone* of the exchange in the Mayor's participation is accompanied by a shift from formal Galician (lines 13-15) to an informal register of Spanish (lines 22-24). In terms of conversational alignment, formal Galician signals officiality and authoritativeness as it is used by the Mayor for a procedural question—namely, the tone in which the debate should be conducted. In lines 13-15 he officially and politely admonishes Gudín about his word choice. By contrast, his switch to Spanish in lines 22-24 signals at the same time informality, off-recordness, solidarity, and irony. Let us examine why:

As indicated by timing, the other participants' laughs in line 26 respond to the Mayor's words. Although the entire exchange is loaded with indirectness, both timing and the prosodic contour of Gudín's utterance in line 25 ('*pues eso*', 'exactly'), suggest that Gudín's remark was not indispensable for the audience to produce such a response. In order to test this hypothesis, I will perpetrate an old structuralist trick of commutation by deleting Gudín's next-to-last turn in line 25:

(1b)

1	M	grácias senhora abade / ʰⁱsenhor gudín /
2		<4.5 sec.>
3	G:	... pues muy bien / ... señor hermida , qué quiere usted que
4		le diga /.. pues solamente una cosa , (que u)sted miente //
5		... ˡᵒ así de sencillo //
6	(?):	(hos ⌈ tiá)⌉
7	G:	ᶠ ⌊ y::⌋ / y sencillamente así↑ porque:) e:h / .. yo soy
8		persona rigu*rosa , .. y sobre todo cuando[ə] utilizo estas
9		ʰⁱ palabras, ... y: , .. estoy seguro / ʰⁱabsolutamente
10		seguro/
11	M:	.. senhor gudín , ==

```
12   G:    == porque: , ==
13   M:    == nom podia ʔutilizar↑ .. as argumentacións que queira /
14         .. sem: qualificativos[ə:]↑
15               ⌈d⌉esqualificadores para n ⌈(aide)⌉/
16   G:    s⌊�í⌋/                        ⌊perfec⌋tamente / ᵃᶜlo que
17         sucede , señor presidente es que el idioma castellano /
18         tiene las palabras / .. r:igurosas y exactas↑ y a mí me
19         gusta utilizarlas //
20         ᵈᶜ.. pero- , a partir de ahora no las utilizo↑
21         p⌈orque⌉/ ya le he dich ⌈o-⌉,
22   M:     ⌊(re:)⌋/    fachi  ⌊tie⌋ne muchas , algunas muy
23         FUERtes señor gudín / y vienen TOdas en el
24         di' cioNArio /==
26   Oth: [ja JA JA JA ja]
```

In unstructured interviews, I asked other Galician speakers to listen to the original recording and to comment on the conceivable reasons for the relaxed, humorous tone of the exchange. The judges' commentaries constitute additional evidence that the constructed discourse in (1b), without Gudín's remark 'Exactly' would be 'grammatical' as well—that is, acceptable according to native implicit knowledge about the organization of conversation.

I will now proceed to deepen my analysis by isolating the specific features that function as markers of contextualization according to which the participants signal and interpret what is going on interactionally in the exchange between lines 22 and 26. For this purpose, I will employ a similar contrastive procedure. In order to determine specifically *what* renders the Mayor's turn communicatively efficient in terms of conveying irony in a broad sense (see Haverkate 1985) and colloquialness, I will again compare the actual exchange with contrived versions in which sets of cooccurrent linguistic features (prosodic patterns, on the one hand, and lexicon and syntax, on the other) have been replaced with other, paradigmatically contrasting structures.

First, as a test that the ironic effect of the Mayor's turn in lines 22-24 is partly due to prosody, let us consider the possibility that the Mayor had delivered the same message using the prosodic patterns characteristic of expository speech that he had used in previous turns.[8] For the sake of brevity I have omitted those turns which are not directly relevant to our analysis:

(1c)

```
11   M:    ..senhor gudín ,
13         nom podia ʔutilizar↑ .. as argumentacións que queira /
14         .. sem: qualificativos[ə:]↑
15         .. ⌈d⌉esqualificadores para n ⌈(aide)⌉/
6    G:    s⌊�í⌋/                        ⌊perfec⌋ tamente / ᵃᶜ lo que
17         sucede , señor presidente es que el idioma castellano /
18         tiene las palabras / .. r:igurosas y exactas↑ y a mí me
19         gusta utilizarlas //
20         ᵈᶜ .. pero- , a partir de ahora no las utilizo↑
21         p⌈orque⌉/ ya le he dich ⌈o-⌉,
22   M:     ⌊(re:)⌋       ᵈᶜ ⌊tie⌋ne muchas[ə:] ↑ ... algunas
23         muy fuertes↑ señor gudín / .. y: vienen todas , ᴾlo en el
24         diccionario //
*26  Oth: [ja JA JA JA ja]
```

In the above version the sequence in lines 22-26 makes little sense, and it should be regarded as highly artificial. Delivering the message in lines 22-24 in a slower rhythm, lower pitch, shorter intonation groups, with more pauses, etc. (a prosodic contour which in the same communicative situation is typically interpreted by participants as signalling officiality), would not trigger the audience's final response.

A final commutation test may be applied. In example (1d) I have replaced the sequence under analysis (lines 22-24) with an equivalent one, this time in Galician, in order to determine the specific effect of language choice for conveying irony:

(1d)

```
11    M:      .. senhor gudín ,
13            nom podia ʔutilizar↑ .. as argumentacións que queira/
14            .. sem: qualificativos[ǝ:]↑
15            ..⌈d⌉esqualificadores para n ⌈(aide) ⌉/
16    G:      s⌊í⌋/                       ⌊ perfec⌋tamente / ᵃᶜlo que
17            sucede , señor presidente es que el idioma castellano /
18            tiene las palabras / .. r:igurosas y exactas↑ y a mí me
19            gusta utilizarlas //
20            ᵈᶜ .. pero- , a partir de ahora no las utilizo↑
21            p⌈orque⌉/ ya le he dich⌈o-  ⌉,
22    M:       ⌊(re:)⌋        ᶠᵃᶜʰⁱ ⌊tem⌋muitas , algumhas
23            mui FORtes senhor gudín / e venhem TOdas no
24            dicioNArio /==
25    G:      ==p⌈ues eso ⌉//
26    Oth:      ⌊[ja JA JA⌋JA ja]
```

It seems that the bystanders' response would also be likely to occur in this version of the exchange. As a matter of fact, the historical contact between Galician and Spanish has resulted in ample convergence in phonetic and prosodic patterns in certain colloquial varieties (García 1976), to the extent that colloquial Galiza Spanish is marked by characteristic native Galician intonation as observed in the original version. However, as the judgement of a number of native speakers repeatedly confirms, the choice of Spanish in the original exchange *maximizes* the ironic effect of the Mayor's turn by establishing a sharper syntagmatic contrast with his previous turn in Galician, which revolved around the same topic of 'appropriateness of Gudín's words'.

3. The meanings: frame, social identity and language practices

As I pointed out earlier, a similar contrastive effect based on language and register choice is found in a number of cases from the same meeting, as well as from other institutional events. This points toward the existence of regularities in the communicative effects of code manipu-

lation in institutional domains. I will now discuss the intertwined dimensions of contrastive code manipulation in terms of (1) the signalling of frame through code choice, (2) the signalling of role relationships and social identity, and (3) the generation and reinforcement of specific practices of language use.

The signalling of frame

At the level of conversational inference, code choice functions as a contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982) which, in Goffman's sense (1974), *frames* the activity in course and generates new expectations about what is to be accomplished. In this order of things, Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz's work (1984) on ritualization in interaction and 'the politics of a conversation'—namely, a dissertation defense—is most revealing in suggesting how shared knowledge about contextualization conventions based on the participants' common sociocultural background acts as a constant 'reservoir' of information from which they draw for conversational inference. In this regard, what confers efficacy to the Mayor's turn in conveying humorous irony is shared knowledge about the contextualizing meaning of the *cooccurrence* and *interplay* of the following discursive phenomena:

(a) *Message content*. Firstly, the message content seems to violate the Gricean (1975) Maxim of Quantity—and perhaps Relation—for conversational cooperation. That is, by stating the obvious fact that the Spanish language 'has many words', that 'some of them are very strong', and that 'all of them can be found in a dictionary', the Mayor is breaking the implicit rule, 'be as informative as possible, but not more'. Consequently, if the Mayor is adhering to the Cooperative Principle, he must be trying to convey *something else* through conversational implicature. That 'something else', which Gudín and other participants are in a position to decipher on the basis of shared sociolinguistic knowledge, is that the Mayor's Spanish turn

represents a supportive strategy in his request for verbal restraint.

(b) *Prosody*. Secondly, the prosodic pattern of each intonational group includes: relatively faster tempo, no pauses or hesitations, a comparatively higher pitch at the onset of the turn, and an intonational contour characterized by its noticeably high pitch and, particularly, by its distinctive final tone sequence. In this 'ironic' prosodic pattern, identified in a number of cases,[9] the pitch rises gradually until it reaches its main peak at the fourth or fifth syllable from the end of the intonation group. This highest-pitch syllable usually coincides with a primary word accent, but it may not; for example, in our case the intonation peak goes over /di-/ in *di'cionario*, which carries a secondary word stress.[10] Then the pitch descends, and it rises again to a secondary peak over the last stressed syllable of the intonation group.

The importance of prosody for an understanding of communicative intent and activity framing needs to be emphasized at this juncture. A number of works (Besnier 1989, Irvine 1982; cf. also Mitchell-Kernan 1972) highlight the role of prosody in communicating affective meanings. Vološinov (1929 [1973]) suggests that, while 'meaning' refers to the signification of words, it is intonation that confers on an utterance its 'thematicity'—that is, it is through intonation that potential meanings are actualized in an interactionally relevant unit of signification. Thus, prosody, like other aspects of speech, is subject to 'manipulative exploitation' (Brown and Levinson 1979). Most significantly, Blakar (1979) points out, in his discussion of the instrumentality of language for social control through the structuring of information and ideology, that the effectiveness of prosody ('tone of voice') lies in its irretrievability, for, while 'the tone of voice is lost forever, . . . it has had its effects' (:133). This is particularly so in formal encounters where written records of the proceedings are kept, 'because no one can assert, for example in a court of law, that you said ". . .," and then repeat anything but the words' (:ibidem; emphasis in the original). In actuality, whether the written record contained the Mayor's turn in

contained the Mayor's turn in Spanish or whether it omitted it altogether as redundant, the exchange that concerns us nevertheless played a crucial role in the framing of the activity as an informal exchange.

(c) *Language choice*. Finally, language choice, as defined by the cooccurrence of Spanish syntactic structures and lexicon, maximizes both the off-recordness, the solidarity dimension, and the ironic communicative effect of the Mayor's turn by establishing a syntagmatic contrast with the tone and language of his previous, on-record turn in Standard Galician. Interestingly enough, the metalinguistic, manipulative use of Spanish to refer to a topic revolving around the supposedly intrinsic qualities of the very code used as a 'precise' language renders this exchange extremely rich in metaphorical connotations. By switching to Spanish, the Mayor is also displaying his mastery of this language, and signalling that he might make perfect use of it; however, the implication becomes transparent that he has instead *chosen* to use Galician publicly and officially. To be sure, the Mayor is alluding to the accessibility of the Spanish language, both by his very strategic choice of the language and by his remark to the effect that 'anyone can look up "strong" words in a Spanish dictionary, there is no special merit to it; I could do it too, and I could use such words with you too if I chose to.' To this Gudín polysemically replies *'pues eso'* ('Exactly,' or 'That's the point'), which constitutes both a counter-attack to the Mayor's innuendo, and a veiled invitation for the Mayor to indeed speak Spanish as well: 'it is true that the Spanish language has many words (not only strong ones), perhaps you should use them too.'

In sum, the cooccurrence of these contextualization cues generates *a new set of communicative expectations* about the interpretation of the Mayor's utterance and about the activity frame and goals. Such cues are processed by participants in the event as markers of an off-record exchange. Whereas the Mayor's turn in Galician may be accurately registered in the meeting proceedings as a call for order, it is unlikely that any ulterior account of the exchange would register the Mayor's Spanish turn in a fash-

ion such as 'The Mayor stated that the Spanish language has many words, that some of them are very strong, and that all of them can be looked up in the dictionary'. In other words, the Mayor's turn in Spanish has an ironic effect—at least for some of the listeners—in that his words are not interpreted literally, but as a strategy to engage Gudín and others in a process of inference of the underlying meanings and illocutionary force. In fact, such a strategy triggers *informal laughs* rather than other types of back-channel signals or utterances expressing agreement or disagreement over the message content itself. The informality of the exchange is reinforced by its humorous effect, for, as Lakoff (1982: 38) reminds us, 'humor, in ordinary conversation, can often be viewed as a permissible Manner violation.' In other words, the permissibleness of an apparent violation of formal discourse—represented by the audience's affiliative response (Atkinson 1984)—can only be understood in terms of a redefinition of the situation of talk, one by which the introduction of ironic humor metaphorically *evokes* attributes of ordinary conversation.

The signalling of social identity and role relationships

But the transfer of content and the signalling of communicative intent are only some of the dimensions of verbal interaction. An analysis based merely on the relationships between propositional content and illocutionary force would fail to account for the differences between our exchange and, say, spontaneous ironic uses of Spanish inserted in a Galician discourse between two native Galician conversationalists at the family dinner table. Transferring information, or pretending to transfer certain information in order to do something else, are not the only, nor necessarily the primary functions of speaking. Importantly enough, speaking is the acting out of social relationships— almost like the dramatization of social attributes through the speaker's situated 'performed social identity' (Erickson

and Shultz 1982)—as well as the establishment of locally defined role relationships.

On this dimension of interpersonal relationships, the manipulative use of each code by the Mayor invokes different 'social personae' and brings into play different interactional roles which establish specific, context-bound relationships with other participants' roles. I argued earlier that, in order for interlocutors to inferentially process the meaning and intentionality of each of the Mayor's turns, they need to retrieve various types of linguistic and sociocultural information about the contextualizing meaning of the codes used. Now, in order for participants to interpret the situated role being played out by the speaker, they need to rely on their knowledge of what Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz (1984: 4) call

> the interactional history of the participants, which creates a substratum of relationships, the knowledge of which constantly obtrudes into the on-going interaction.

On the basis of this knowledge, code alternation in discourse often functions for participants as a marker that reconfigures situated relationships by symbolically invoking types of social identities that were previously nonsignificant for interaction in preceding discourse units (Blom and Gumperz 1972; Brown and Fraser 1979; Brown and Levinson 1979; Gumperz 1982). As Irvine (1984: 215) points out:

> by code inconsistency the speaker can detach himself from the social persona implied by one type of usage and suggest that that persona is not to be taken quite 'for real'; the speaker has another social persona as well.

In our example of code-switching, what is being exploited is the public/private contrast. At the public level the Mayor visibly symbolizes his commitment to the nationalistic ideology by presenting the official use of Galician as a prestigious practice, one to be expected from a Galician leader. This symbolic meaning can be documented in factual evidence from council meetings and

other institutional events observed. For example, critical references to the Mayor's use of Galician by council members from the non-nationalist conservative opposition may take the form of ironic metalinguistic mimicking of the Mayor's language choice.[11] On the other hand, the concurrence of the Mayor and Gudín in colloquially addressing each other in Spanish signals an understanding, albeit conflictive, of the terms of their locally situated relationship. In contrast to the official allocution in Galician, the Mayor's use of Spanish suggests a social relationship between him and Gudín which is based not on their mutual roles and duties as president of the council and council member respectively, but on their co-membership in a network of politicians who in their unofficial linguistic behavior do not show signs of a particularly strong commitment to language revival as a part of the broader issue of social transformation.

The social construction of language practices

Finally, at the level of socially constructed language usages, the use of each code in the context described contributes, consequently, to generate and structure new communicative functions and social values for the languages in conflict, by establishing associations between code use, social setting, degree of formality and publicity of the exchange, activity type, interactional goals, and participants' role relationships. In turn, the accumulation of these uses progressively shapes each language's ethoglossic character—it contributes to *root* the languages' socio-communicative functions as new language usages become incorporated into the community's sociolinguistic competence. By exposure to contextualized language choices, the speech community thus acquires a sense of the new discursive functions and symbolic meanings given to the various registers of Galician and Spanish, and they construct new expectations about the significance of similar strategies of code choice in future events of a comparable nature.

4. The implications: Language and social power

As we have observed, at stake in code choice and manipulation is what I will call *interactional control*, that is, the interactant's potential to actively affect interaction and to influence the figurative relationships between the components of the speech situation in terms of: signalling and imposing local role relationships, delimiting the range of permissible discursive alternatives (e.g. style, tone, and lexicon to use), and regulating information flow (e.g. its direction, length, and content relevance). Whereas the neutral notion of 'conversational management' suggests the administration of discursive resources so that the resulting exchange adheres to communicative expectations arisen in the course of supposedly cooperative action, the notions of interactional control and its outcome—i.e. the construction and display of *interactional power*—emphasize the intrinsic inequalities in social encounters, where differential command and exploitation of discursive devices (some of which are based on differentially acquired sociocultural knowledge) act as a valuable asset for the accomplishment of personal goals in interaction.

The construction of a common language of authority

We might consequently ask, what is the social significance of this strategic deployment of code choices for interactional control? Why is it that the use of Spanish now proves to be an efficient device to signal informality—that is, a relaxation in the rigidity constraints that govern discourse organization and role relationships in ritualized encounters? Conversely, why is it that now the use of Standard Galician may convey meanings of officialness, formality, communicative distance and authoritativeness which were traditionally signalled through the use of Standard Spanish?

I would like to look at the ideological landscape in politically autonomous Galiza today in order to shed some light on the new meanings associated with the public use of the languages in conflict. To state it explicitly, the public

use of Galician alludes to a *new ideological frame of reference for the situated interpretation of the symbolic and social meanings of linguistic behavior*. This new frame of reference is a reemerging discourse on language and nationhood activated by grass-root movements, and supported, for historically opportunistic reasons, by the spheres of local and autonomous power. This discourse, of Romantic undertones, places language at the core of national identity. In the words of the politically conservative President of the autonomous government when addressing the Galician nation on the occasion of the Day of Galician Letters (*Dia das Letras Galegas*) on May 17, 1987:

> 'A nossa língua é ... o mais importante componente do caudal comum e universal da sociedade galega' ('Our language is . . . the most important component of the common and universal patrimony of Galician society').[12]

Public figures now seek a symbolic channelling for the *selfness* of the Galician people not only through their theoretical identification with Galician values, but also actively through language practices in their public behavior. In a context where an increasing sharedness of urban cultural values and behaviors tends to dissolve the visible boundaries between Galician-speaking rural immigrants to the city and long-time Spanish-speaking urban populations, only the use of Galician (presented as *'our* language' and not 'one of our languages') can confer on Galicians their sense of selfness and identity versus the Spanish Other. And only by speaking a regulated, common and unified Standard form of the language can Galicians gain a sense of commonality and cultural unification.

By thus manipulating the form and the uses of the languages in conflict, politically or culturally influential members of society are significantly contributing to constructing *a new social sense of speaking*. The symbolically official use of Standard Galician now invokes a common political goal: that of leading the destiny of Galician society from within itself, not through the mediation of Spanish values, ('being Galician is a manifestation of being

Spanish'), but through symbolic opposition to the Spanish (i.e. non-Galician) identity ('being Galician is something different from being Spanish'). Thus, ethnic identity becomes political, and linguistic behavior (the use of Galician) becomes rationalized, objectified, and internalized through the mediation of ideology.[13]

Importantly and paradoxically, in the construction of the Standard Galician that would theoretically represent a variety exempt from any group symbolisms (that is, a common ground for speakers of differing but entirely interintelligible varieties), the reduction of linguistic variants is leading to the (perhaps coincidental, perhaps deliberate) *desymbolization* of the social meanings of speaking Galician, through the systematic exclusion of socially significant markers of class and ethnicity in Standard speech. Quantitatively important but socially stigmatized dialectal phenomena which are markers of lower class and rural background like *gheada* (the fricativization and unvoicing of /g/ —> [ɣ̊, h, x]) and *sesseo* (the reduction of /θ: s/ —> /s/), or prosodic and phonetic patterns that are considered as constitutive of a 'strong accent' (literally, a 'closed accent' or *acento cerrado*), are all absent from the spoken Standard which is spread through the educational system, the mass media, etc. (cf. Alvarez Cáccamo 1989b).[14]

The implications that these emerging patterns of language use and social values carry for social control and group stratification are far-reaching. Members of society who are able to display a wider linguistic repertoire which includes Standard Galician—from which they draw according to the implicit needs of interaction and the ways in which they want to present themselves publicly—may be in a more advantageous position for the control of social interactions and decision-making processes than speakers of limited repertoires mostly consisting of colloquial, socially stigmatized varieties (Alvarez Cáccamo 1987, 1989b). This select speech micro-community thus constitutes the privileged carrier of social prestige and the privileged agent in its construction. Thus, bilingual competence—or, rather, multidialectal competence, communicative competence and code manipulation—becomes an

invaluable social tool, and the question of *which* social groups generate and maintain, can gain access to and control over the speech varieties in conflict becomes a key aspect in the exercise of social power.

The educational system continues to be one of the main mechanisms for social selection based, among other things, on the differential access to and mastery of linguistic resources available in the community—that is, a mechanism based on the unequal distribution of knowledge. And now knowledge of Standard Galician is also becoming a tool for social advancement (Alvarez Cáccamo 1987). Evidence that the conflict between dialectal Galician and the Standard is entering the realm of family life and increasing the distance between educated youngsters and illiterate or semi-literate parents in Galician-speaking households also comes from my fieldwork observations. Native speakers often report that the type of Galician taught in school or used on Galician television *nom é galego* ('it is not Galician'). Conversely, high-school students exposed to the Standard through formal instruction, often censure their own parents' speech as 'not proper Galician.' Among the same speakers, alternation between dialect forms to address family members and standard forms to address an educated outsider in the same communicative context is also observable, and such public display of multidialectal competence has profound implications for the speaker's impression management and interactional control.

To recapiltulate, is this the beginning of a new form of language domination in which the use of 'Galician' as a tool for social control is acquiring a superordinated role over the use of 'Spanish?', each language being conceived as an internally undifferentiated whole? Not at all: let us bear in mind that mastery of Standard Spanish still is— and it will predictably continue to be—essential to access power, and in fact Spanish continues to be quantitatively dominant in many realms of institutional life. Rather, what we are observing in language revival in Galiza is the redefinition of each language's ethoglossic values and status in the direction described. Finally, in this process, the

emergence of new language practices like the ones examined in this work may also reflect the establishment of new patterns of group domination—that is, the establishment of new social barriers, group boundaries, and forms of social stratification partly based on the unequal access to, control, mastery, public display and manipulation of the speech varieties in conflict.

Notes

[1] Fieldwork for this research was in part supported, by a grant from the Program for Cultural Cooperation between Spain's Ministry of Culture and United States' Universities and by a U.C. Berkeley Special Research Award. I am thankful to John Gumperz, Werner Nothdurft, Marco Jacquemet, and Jackie Urla for their comments on earlier version of this paper. I am especially grateful to Werner for his detailed, healthily destructive criticism. The present work has also benefited from discussions with participants at the first conference on Sociolinguistic Research on Spanish in Europe, Latin America and the United States (Minneapolis, March 4-5, 1988). To all of them, many thanks.

[2] González Pérez (1978) and Vázquez Cuesta (1976) represent two attempts to incorporate the micro-analysis of verbal interaction and language alternation into the description of language contact in Galiza. However, each author frames the issue in quite different terms, and neither work analyses data from actual speech samples, but from written literature. González Pérez sees a reflection of 'diglossia' in the language that fictitious characters are presented as using in traditional oral literature (e.g. 'the devil' usually speaks Spanish, while peasants employ Galician). Vázquez Cuesta looks for code-switching and Spanish 'interferences' in the speech of a character from a 19th century novel, who was a Galician emigrant recently returned from Andalucía.

3 The distinction 'minority / minoritized' language (*língua minoritária / minorizada*) gives account of cases such as Galiza or Catalunya, where the speakers of the subordinated languages do not constitute a minority (in Galiza approximately 80% of the population is more or less competent in Galician; in Catalunya the comparable figure is around 65%; for more detailed data see Rojo 1981). According to Cobarrubias (1986a: 190), 'una lengua resulta minorizada como consecuencia de restricciones de sus funciones institucionalizadas o carencia de funciones que requerirían institucionalización.'

4 '[La etoglosia es el] poder societario de una lengua, [el] carácter y fuerza comunicativa de la misma ... La etoglosia está dada por la combinación de funciones sociolingüísticas de una lengua y el arraigo correspondiente a cada función.' The validity of the ethoglossia notion *vis à vis* other notions with less explanatory power such as 'diglossia' is justified in the following terms: 'El concepto de etoglosia permite generar una serie de hipótesis que le dan un carácter explicativo del cual carecen el concepto de status y otros conceptos relacionados, como la diglosia ... La etoglosia permite, por ejemplo, explicar que una lengua oprimida, es decir, una lengua carente de funciones institucionalizadas, pueda mantenerse con pocas funciones no-institucionalizadas de arraigo sólido, como nuestra propia experiencia [del euskara] bien nos lo demuestra' (Cobarrubias 1986b: 189f).

5 In her work on language revival in Catalonia, Woolard (1983, 1989) discusses the existence of a new 'Bilingual Norm' of unreciprocal language choice in encounters between a Catalan and a Spanish speaker, as feelings of ethnic identification are revived in Catalan society. Similarly, Heller (1982) describes processes of negotiation of language choice in bilingual encounters in Quebec as a function of the signalling of ethnicity in a context of resurgence of the French Canadian identity.

6 In 1987 local elections took place in all of the Spanish State. In Vigo the Socialist Party lost its absolute majority, and the nationalist Galician Socialist Party-Galician Left (Partido Socialista Galego-Esquerda Galega) increased its presence in the local government by obtaining three representatives. The PSOE Mayor continues to hold office. As I could observe in 1989, the process of Galicianization in local power structures continues, fueled by pressure from the nationalist minority. The effective presence of Galician in council debates is now more noticeable than ever, if only because the language choices of Galician-speaking nationalists frequently have an effect upon other bilinguals' choices.

7 I thank Cathryn Teasley for her help with the translation, so that the original tone of the exchange would be maintained.

8 One might be tempted to adduce that the procedure of contrasting the prosodic pattern of a presumably ironic stretch of discourse with that characteristic of an allegedly expository turn presents methodological circularity. On what grounds can we determine whether a turn is expository in a discourse sequence? I have done so by looking at the interactants' responses to a given turn in order to ascertain their figurative position or alignment with regard to the message content and the speaker. In this way we can see whether the message content of a supposedly expository turn was indeed interpreted in its meaning of 'talking about facts with the communicative intent of transferring information about those facts, and with the immediate interactional goal of eliciting responses signalling the listeners' recognition that the speaker is primarily intending to transfer information about those facts.'

9 Needless to say, I am not suggesting that this is the only or the most genuine prosodic pattern which may signal irony in conversation.

[10] It is this phenomenon that Carballo Calero (1979) refers to when he argues that the 'secondary accent' in Galician words may carry a higher pitch than the 'main lexical accent' (:147, n.39). Rather than a secondary lexical accent, I believe that the higher pitch in these cases is an intonational stress, which coincides with the peak of the intonation group.

[11] On metalanguage and other phenomena of language choice in Galiza, see Alvarez Cáccamo 1989a.

[12] Galician ex-president Gerardo Fernández Albor in *Faro de Vigo*, 5-17-87, p. 1. Fernández Albor was elected from *Alianza Popular*, a state-wide right-wing party with strong influence in the Galician countryside. *AP* ideologically represents the civilized continuation of the Franco regime. In fact, in other parts of the country *AP* is the incarnation of Spanish centralism. Galiza is, again, peculiar in terms of political life.

[13] As Bourdieu (1982: 31) points out, in reference to the standardization of French and the appropriation of its symbolic value by the Parisian bourgeoisie, 'the issue is not only to communicate, but to make a new discourse of authority be recognized,' together with a new 'representation of the social world . . .—a world which because it is linked to the new interests of new groups, cannot be expressed through local speeches shaped by usages linked to the specific interests of peasant groups.'

[14] The question of language corpus and status planning in Galiza is highly intricate, as it carries serious political implications that ultimately touch upon the issue of the linguistic, historical, cultural, and political relationships between Galiza, Portugal, and the Spanish State. To summarize, the two main positions for language standardization are the official norms (approved by the Galician government on 11/17/82), which represent institutionally dominant *isolacionismo*, ('isolationism'); and the dissident, marginalized 'reintegrationist' approach, or *rein-*

tegracionismo. Isolationists aim, whether explicitly or not, at the development of an *ausbau* language by elaboration (Kloss 1967)—that is, a standardized version of the northern variety of modern Galician-Portuguese. On the contrary, reintegrationists propose standard norms which reflect the close structural relationships between Galician and its natural southern co-dialect, Portuguese. The official isolationist approach may be contributing to the interests of the Spanish state by presenting Galician as a 'small language.' As Knappert (1968: 64) points out, '[I]t is easier to control a community of a small language area if they have no other language that connects them with the outer world.' The isolationist model rules out the possibility that Portuguese be the language to connect speakers of Galician with the international community.

A great deal of literature has been produced about the issue. The isolationist position is contained in the official orthographic *Normas . . .* elaborated by ILG-RAG (1982). A comprehensive, thorough, and sharp critique of these norms, from both linguistic and sociolinguistic viewpoints, can be seen in AGAL (1983).

References

AGAL [Associacom Galega da Língua]. 1983. Estudio crítico das 'Normas ortográficas e morfolóxicas do idioma galego (ILG-RAG. 1982'). A Corunha: AGAL.

Alvarez Cáccamo, Celso. 1987. Fala, bilingüismo, poder social. Agália. Revista da Associacom Galega da Língua 10.127-50.

—. 1989a. Metapragmatic awareness in language choice: The public use of standard Galician. Paper read at the 1989 AATSP Meetings. San Antonio, Texas.

—. 1989b. Variaçom lingüística e o factor social na Galiza. Hispanic Linguistics 2.253-98.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell. 1984. Public speaking and audience responses: Some techniques for inviting applause. Structures of social action. Studies in conversational analysis, ed. by John Heritage and J. Maxwell Atkinson, 370-409. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Besnier, Niko. 1989. Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae. Reponsibility and evidence in oral discourse, ed. by Jane H. Hill and Judith Irvine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blakar, Rolv M. 1979. Language as a means of social power. Studies of language, thought and verbal communication, ed. by Ragnar Rommetveit and Rolv M. Blakar, 109-45. London: Academic Press.

Blom, Jan-Petter, and John J. Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. Directions in sociolinguistics, ed. by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 407-34. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. Ce que Parler veux dire. Paris: Fayard.

Brown, Penelope, and Colin Fraser. 1979. Speech as a marker of situation. Social markers in speech, ed. by Klaus Scherer and Howard Giles, 33-62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Penelope; and Stephen Levinson. 1979. Social structure, groups and interaction. Social markers in speech, ed. by Klaus Scherer and Howard Giles, 291-341. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1987. Politeness. Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carballo Calero, Ricardo. 1979. Gramática elemental del gallego común. Vigo: Galaxia, 7th ed.

Cobarrubias, Juan G. 1986a. La glotopolítica y el euskara. Sociología de las lenguas minorizadas, ed. by José Ignacio Ruiz Olabuenaga and José Agustín Ozamiz, 191-97. Martutate (Euskadi): Ttarttalo S.A.

—.1986b. Status de las lenguas minorizadas. Sociología de las lenguas minorizadas, ed. by José Ignacio Ruiz Olabuenaga and José Agustín Ozamiz, 185-90. Martutate (Euskadi): Ttarttalo S.A.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, and John J. Gumperz. 1984. The politics of a conversation: Conversational inference in discussion. Berkeley: Berkeley cognitive science report series, Institute of Cognitive Studies, University of California.

Erickson, Frederick and Jeffrey Shultz. 1982. The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews. New York: Academic Press.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia. Word 15.325-40.

Fernández, Mauro. 1983. Mantenimiento y cambio de lengua en Galicia: el ritmo de la desgalleguización en los últimos cincuenta años. Verba 10.79-129.

García, Constantino. 1976. Interferencias lingüísticas entre gallego y castellano. Revista Española de Lingüística 6.327-43.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. Frame analysis. An essay on the organization of experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

González Pérez, Claudio. 1978. A diglosia na nosa etnografia. Grial 60.181-88.

Grice, Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. Syntax and semantics, vol. 3, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haverkate, Henk. 1985. La ironía verbal: un análisis pragmalingüístico. Revista Española de Lingüística 15.343-91.

Heller, Monica S. 1982. Negotiations of language choice in Montreal. Language and social identity, ed. by John J. Gumperz, 108-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. Directions in sociolinguistics, ed. by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 35-71. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

ILG-RAG [Instituto da Lingua Galega-Real Academia Galega]. 1982. Normas ortográficas e morfolóxicas do idioma galego. Vigo: RAG-ILG.

Irvine, Judith T. 1982. Language and affect: Some cross-cultural issues. Contemporary perceptions of language: Interdisciplinary dimensions. GURT 1982, ed. by Heidi Byrnes, 31-47. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

—. 1984. Formality and informality in communicative events. Language in use. Readings in sociolinguistics, ed. by John Baugh and Joel Sherzer, 221-228. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Kloss, Heinz. 1967. 'Abstand languages' and 'ausbaus languages'. Anthropological Linguistics 9.29-41.

Knappert, Jan. 1968. The function of language in a political situation. Linguistics 39.59-67.

Lakoff, Robin T. 1982. Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising.

Analyzing discourse: Text and talk. GURT 1981, ed. by Deborah Tannen. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia. 1972. Signifying and marking: Two Afro-American speech acts. Directions in sociolinguistics, ed. by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 161-79. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rodríguez, Francisco. 1976. Conflicto lingüístico e ideoloxía en Galicia. Pontevedra: Xistral.

Rojo, Guillermo. 1981. Conductas y actitudes lingüísticas en Galicia. Revista Española de Lingüística 11.269-310.

Vázquez Cuesta, Pilar. 1976. Interferencias lingüísticas entre gallego y castellano. Actes du XIIIe congrès international de linguistique et philologie romaniques [ténue à l'université Laval (Québec, Canada) du 29 août au 5 septembre 1971] vol. II., ed. by Marcel Boudreault and Frankwalt Möhren, 443-55. Québec: Les Presses de L'université Laval.

Vološinov, Valentin N. 1929 [1973]. Marxism and the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. English translation by Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1983. The politics of language and ethnicity in Barcelona, Spain. University of California at Berkley dissertation.

—. 1989. Double talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia. Stanford: Stanford University Press.