Recensións

Gugenberger, Eva / Henrique Monteagudo / Gabriel Rei-Doval (eds.) (2013): *Contacto de linguas, hibrididade, cambio: contextos, procesos e consecuencias*. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega, 326 pp.

This book, outcome of the Symposium "Contacto lingüístico, hibrididade, cambio: contextos, procesos e consecuencias", from which it draws its title, and edited by Eva Gugenberger, Henrique Monteagudo, and Gabriel Rei-Doval, contains eleven articles whose goal is to challenge traditional constructs in the field of language contact. From beginning to end this book, focused primarily though not exclusively on contact phenomena in and around Galicia, presents evidence of fuzzy boundaries between languages, thus calling into question monolingual ideologies that, while recognizing the existence of contact phenomena, have until now tended to consider languages as discrete entities, ignoring or considering as aberrations the less prototypical phenomena that can occur in contact situations. Whether through the lens of lexicon and syntax, questions of territorial and linguistic borders, or attitudes toward code mixing, this work puts such "aberrations" in the spotlight and reveals them to be neither more nor less than the real-life realizations of language varieties that, in addition to sharing common origins, have spent centuries in intimate, though not equality-inducing, contact.

After a brief introduction, Eva Gugenberger ("O cambio de paradigma nos estudos sobre contacto lingüístico: pode ser útil o concepto de hibrididade para a lingüística e a política de linguas en España?") opens the volume with a critical overview of the phases through which the field of language contact has passed, giving her own perspective on which construct proves most adequate in addressing linguistic realities, not only in Galicia, but also in other European and American spaces. She makes a strong and passionate argument that the concept of *hybridity*, apart from being descriptively valid, is useful from more than just a linguistic analysis perspective, and examines the compatibility of traditional theoretical constructs within her recommended hybridist paradigm. Hers is a perspective highly influenced by the recognition that linguistic boundaries, and languages themselves, are social constructs given meaning by speakers and that, from a historical perspective, the transition from Latin to various dialects of Romance into the categories today considered distinct languages was gradual and somewhat arbitrarily based on political boundaries. Thus, contact and language mixing are considered the basic phenomena of communication, and individual languages are secondary constructs. Additionally, speakers are taken into account as intentional social actors who may manipulate their various linguistic resources to meet discursive needs. After citing a variety of examples in favor of the hybrid consideration of language, the author closes by acknowledging that, at a societal level, monolingual ideologies still hold a great deal of power. While it is necessary to create and teach normative varieties of regional language, she argues, this should not come at the expense of rejecting the authentic creativity inherent in popular language use. If negative attitudes toward hybridization can be replaced, the author predicts that the use of regional languages, whether normative or hybrid forms, will be promoted.

In the article by Álvarez de la Granja and López Meirama ("A presenza do galego no léxico dispoñible do español de Galicia. Análise distribucional"), the authors demonstrate how hybridity can be seen in the available lexical repertoire of Galician youth. The authors examine patterns in which Galician lexical items are present in the Castilian spoken in Galicia, whether in the form of fully integrated borrowings or forms directly taken from Galician. Results indicate that, unsurprisingly, the highest concentrations of Galician lexical items occur in categories such as "The country", "Animals", and "The ocean", while categories such as "The city" contained far less frequent Galician entries. According to the authors, this is in part because many Galician words in the former categories do not have Castilian equivalents. The authors also found that, more than any other

variables, both habitual language of the informant and place of residence played important roles in the inclusion of Galician lexical entries in Castilian. While it is unsurprising that rural environments have more Galician influence, within rural and urban zones those speakers who habitually use Galician introduced more Galician words into their Castilian lexicon than did those who habitually use Castilian.

The following article, by Álvarez Pérez ("A fronteira entre galego e portugués. A perspectiva portuguesa"), opens with a brief overview of the historical formation of the border between Galicia and Portugal, then moves into discussing attitudes and behaviors in regions near said border. Despite the clear divide, at least in the minds of the people, between those on opposite sides of the border, the author reports a continuum of linguistic practices, ranging from practical monolingualism through full bilingualism, with "potential" and partial bilingualism constituting intermediate practices. Because of the hybridization near the border, the author argues, in many cases the deciding factor in whether a given variety is considered Galician or Portuguese is more social than purely linguistic. What follows in the second half of the article is a relatively neutral review of the positions taken by various Portuguese linguists with respect to the status of Galician as a variety of Portuguese or as a separate language. Though some do indeed consider it to be an independent language, the most common attitude appears to be that Galician is a dialect of Portuguese that has some distinctive traits due to contact with Castilian. The article closes with an overview of linguistic materials that can support studies of the Portuguese side of the border, and a review of studies in this line that have already been carried out. The author highlights the need for integration of sociolinguistic and identitary factors with linguistic considerations in future studies of the Galician-Portuguese border.

Dubert Garcia ("As formas tipo *tivo* e o contacto lingüístico cos romances centrais") presents an historical analysis of the origins of verbs like *tivo* and, in doing so, complicates traditional explanations for the differences between this form and the Portuguese forms such as *teve*. After providing counterevidence against several such explanations, the author concludes that, while perhaps not unambiguously of Castilian origin, there is sufficient evidence to consider such forms as possible effects of Castilian on Galician, formed by creative processes on the part of Galician speakers. He closes by challenging the reader with the question of what should be done with such forms, should they prove to be of Castilian origin.

The study by Iglesias Álvarez ("«Eu falo castrapo» - Actitudes dos adolescentes ante a mestura de linguas en Galicia (estudo piloto)") examines the linguistic practices and attitudes of adolescents in a rural, Galician-speaking environment through a series of semi-directed group interviews. Many young Galicians in this study identified themselves as speakers of Castrapo, a hybrid variety mixing Galician and Castilian. One of the interesting results of this study is that, while Castrapo could legitimately be characterized as either a variety of Castilian or of Galician, or both, due to its mixing of both codes, speakers consistently consider it an incorrect variety of Galician opposed to the normative variety. When asked about different varieties of Castilian, however, they indicate not recognizing variation within the dominant language. As is often the case with popular language varieties, the youth in this study, while acknowledging that Castrapo is not overtly prestigious, associate it with solidarity and covert prestige. At the same time, they report being able to use both the normative variety as well as Castilian when the need arises, and indicate comfort in switching between varieties. Thus, the author ends with the idea that the concept of hybridity applies not only to a speaker's linguistic code, but also to his or her linguistic identity.

The next article, while falling within the hybrid theme, fits somewhat strangely in a volume that is otherwise focused exclusively on the Iberian Peninsula and, in nearly all cases, on Galicia in particular. Lucchesi ("O contato entre línguas e a origem do português brasileiro") describes Brazil as being sociolinguistically polarized, due historically to the system of slavery and to other forms of social inequality beginning in the colonial era. He then comments on two controversial explanations of the origins of popular Brazilian Portuguese. The first, the idea that the variety arose from a creole language that later de-creolized, he

considers problematic due to the social differences between Brazilian society and those of other areas, particularly the Carribbean, where creolization was common. He also cites the lack of evidence that a creole variety exists in Brazil, or that a pidgin ever persisted long enough to be transmitted to the next generation. According to the author this does not mean, however, that language contact did not play a central role in the development of Brazilian Portuguese. As equally problematic as the creolization explanation is the position that popular Brazilian Portuguese developed based on tendencies internal to the language, perhaps accelerated by contact with other languages. With no documentation of disassembly of agreement rules, among other phenomena, elsewhere in the Lusophone world, the author finds no evidence in support of this aspect of popular Brazilian Portuguese being an internal tendency of more mainstream Portuguese as a whole.

Instead of promoting either extreme, Lucchesi argues for what he terms *transmissão linguística irregular*. This theory differs from the creolization explanation in allowing for a "light" form of irregular transmission that occurs when contact between speakers and learners of the dominant variety is intense enough to prevent full pidginization, but not so intense as to lead to full acquisition. Thus the variety passed on to future generations is a modified version of the dominant language, rather than a new creole. That is, while some grammar forms such as agreement may not be learned or passed on, "light" irregular transmission does not lead to widespread modifications across other aspects of the grammatical system. It is precisely this type of system that exists in modern popular Brazilian speech.

In the following article, Negro Romero ("Contacto galego-castelán e cambio no léxico do corpo humano") uses data from the Atlas Lingüístico Galego to examine the incursion of Castilianisms into Galician vocabulary, specifically with reference to parts of the human body. She draws an important distinction between interference, the use of words from another language or dialect, and integration, the use of words that originated in another language or dialect, but have been fully incorporated as normal usage into speakers' realizations of their own language. Results indicate that Castilianization of body lexicon is more concentrated in the eastern half of Galicia, as well as in several important urban centers, notably those that have historical significance, such as Santiago de Compostela, Baiona, and Ferrol. There is also some indication that regions surrounding an old access route into Galicia have higher rates of Castilianization. Negro Romero calls for future studies to further investigate both of these trends.

In addition to the much discussed behaviors of native Galician speakers, this book also contains a discussion of those who, though not native speakers of Galician, have chosen to shift to the minority language as their primary means of communication. After briefly presenting the societal changes that made the existence of such speakers possible, Ramallo ("Neofalantismo") discusses the traits of such speakers, who number roughly 70,000 in Galicia. He argues that functional bilingualism, a trait of practically all of Galician society, is not enough for a speaker to become a *neofalante*; they must also make a commitment, whether for cultural, political, or social reasons, to set their first language aside. Thus these speakers tend to be active defenders of the minority language. Because their linguistic practices may come to be valued by the rest of society, they contribute cultural and social prestige to the language they use, calling into question the traditional dichotomy between minority and majority languages. Ramallo closes with a call to promote and value *neofalante* practices, often stigmatized for not being a "pure" Galician variety, in order to continue working toward a favorable outcome for the language.

In the next article, Rei-Doval ("Purismo e control normativo na lingua galega: análise crítica dunha proposta actual") examines the just-mentioned notion of what constitutes a "pure" variety of the Galician languages. The author provides historical and modern bases for understanding the purism debate between various sub-sections of Galician society, then goes on to address the specific linguistic ideologies of the "Grupo da Coruña". This group is highly purist in the sense that they would like to see Galician be re-integrated into the Portuguese language, a position which the author critiques scathingly for being more concerned with political goals than with the desires of the mainstream Galician public. He argues

through an analysis of a variety of statements and positions of members of the group that their aim is not to reach society as a whole and promote the spread of the Galician language, but rather to establish an authoritative, purist group of elite speakers who hope to bring about radical political and societal changes.

The following article by Silva Valdivia ("Galego e castelán: entre o contacto e a converxencia") examines evidence of possible convergence between Galician and Castilian. While Galician has become established in public spaces formerly reserved for Castilian, it is also steadily losing ground as the first language learned in the home. The principle focus of this article, however, is the linguistic changes that are being introduced as a result of the social changes just described. The introduction of normative Galician, though met with some controvery, has according to this author been a relative success. However, the movement toward Castilianisms, especially at the phonetic and morphosyntactic levels, is more complex. In part because many of the most public speakers of Galician are *neofalantes*, the model of correct speech often observed in the media is strongly influenced by Castilian. The problem thus becomes not "*un problema de aprendizaxe incompleta ou incorrecta da lingua, senón de apredizaxe dunha lingua «incorrecta»*" (p. 298).

This is shown in a series of reported activities from a previous study by the author in which participants failed at high rates to correctly identify errors in Galician. Additionally, when asked to decide whether a given structure was correct or incorrect, those forms which converged with Castilian were strongly judged as correct, while those that diverged from Castilian patterns were most often judged as incorrect, even though both forms are valid options in standard Galician. These results, combined with a widespread tendency of code-switching, lead the author to reject excessive purism or insistence on normative behavior, on the one hand, and complete acceptance of the influence of the dominant language, on the other, as viable options. Instead, he calls for an understanding that influence of one language on another is normal, especially in the speech of *neofalantes*, and that both this speech and these speakers can be valuable. He also calls for both an acceptance of variation in spoken language and of the need for a unifying norm, both of which, in his view, can be allowed to contain lexical Castilianisms if they are affectively or functionally valuable. He makes an argument, however, against permissiveness toward grammatical Castilianisms, which he claims arise primarily due to the influence of new speakers. To these speakers he presents the challenge of considering developmental limitations in their Galician as acceptable only in the short term, exhorting them to continue progressing toward ever more faithful and native-like speech patterns.

The final article in this volume is a short piece by Venâncio ("Atitudes portuguesas face ao castelhano") about the existence and the negation of Castilian as a social actor in Portugal. The author cites several Portuguese authors from the 16th and 17th centuries, including Camões, all praising the beauty and desirability of the Castilian language. In the 18th century, attitudes toward the language began to change, but not before a wide range of Castilianisms were incorporated into common Portuguese. The author presents three possible explanations of these borrowings. The first is that the perception of languages at that time was that they were unchanging, and therefore slowly introduced modifications would have gone unnoticed. The second is the attitude that Castilian and Portuguese were so similar that elements of one were not considered foreign to the other. However, the explanation that the author most supports is that Portugal, seeking to expand its influence, subconsciously imitated the more prestigious Castilian language. He concludes with the idea that, given that Spain continues to play an influential role in Portuguese society, Portugal has not ceased to pursue what he calls the "sonho ibérico" (p. 326), the desire to gain dominion over the Iberian Peninsula.

The variety of studies and of arguments present in this volume creates a fascinating basis for dialogue and for future investigations. The one weakness is the lack of internal logic to the ordering of the articles, with articles sharing similar themes found at different points throughout the book, but this is negligible when compared to the consistency with which the phenomena described throughout point to the theoretical basis provided in the

first chapter. As evidenced by each of these articles, the concept of *hybridity* promoted by Gugenberger is a promising lens through which to analyze not linguistic ideals, but rather linguistic realities. Hybridity permits examining phenomena such as lexical borrowings, code-switching and code-mixing, and even the boundaries between languages from a perspective in which speakers are considered as key actors whose attitudes and practices are essential in determining the ultimate outcome of language policies.

Ana Maria Anderson