

**The Galician language in Asturias:
a battle between linguistic facts and extralinguistic pressures.**



1. Introduction

Over 40000 people in the autonomous community of Asturias (Spain) have Galician as their native language¹. These people come from a stretch of land between two rivers: the river Eo, (nowadays the political border between Asturias and Galicia) and the river Navia. Galician is one of the languages of Asturias, along with Spanish (spoken in the whole territory) and Asturian (spoken in other parts of the region).



Figure 1: The Galician-speaking part of Asturias, in blue.

The singularity of the Eonavian territory is the result of a series of historical circumstances, with two dioceses (Lugo and Oviedo) continuously fighting for control over those territories around the river Eo. Even though the Eonavian land started to be part of the Oviedo bishopric officially by the end of the 12th century, Lugo continued to have a notable influence in practice: after all, this territory had belonged in Roman times to the so-called *Conventus Lucensis* within the *Gallaecia* province, whose Eastern frontier was precisely the Navia river. The Roman division followed ethnic criteria, since the Navia river separated the Gallaeci people from the Astures “pésicos” people. This ancestral fact combined with recurrent periods of geographical isolation seems to have played a decisive role in the maintenance of their own traditions and language, distinguished from the rest of Asturias.

The information is structured as follows: firstly, we summarize the scientific evidence collected so far, introducing a list of language-specific Galician properties that are intrinsic to the dialects of Eo-Navia (§2); secondly, we discuss the main extralinguistic issues that obstruct any attempt of institutional recognition and dignification of the linguistic reality of Eo-Navia. In doing so, we also analyse the consequences of 30 years of regional language policy, where subjective extralinguistic *opinions* override actual *facts* (§3); lastly, after considering the overall situation as it looks like now, as well as in the foreseeable future, we introduce our proposals for action.

¹ The recent project ETLEN from the University of Oviedo reports a total of 37000 speakers. This number, however, fails to include the Galician-speaking diaspora living outside the Eo-Navia homeland.

2.Linguistic facts

The linguistic evidence supporting the Galician-Portuguese nature of the dialects spoken in Eo-Navia can be traced back as far as to the early 12th century, thanks to a collection of texts from the Monastery of Santa María, in Villanueva de Oscos. The **philological significance** of these texts for our current understanding of Galician-Portuguese is worth mentioning (see in this respect Álvarez Castrillón 2011). However, for the sake of brevity, we will restrict our attention to typological, system-internal claims ², starting with Menéndez Pidal in 1906.

In his study about asturleonese, he states that:

“In Asturias, the Leonese dialect begins only to the East of Navia; on the left banks of the river a variety of Galician is spoken, as well as in a few villages to its immediate right.”

(Menéndez Pidal 1906: 130, our translation)

To substantiate this claim, Menéndez Pidal lists two distinctively Galician properties present in Eo-Navia: **1. absence of diphthongization of open-mid vowels** ě (IPA: /ɛ/) and ǔ (IPA: /ɔ/), such as that in *corpo* ‘body’ (Spa. *cuervo*, Ast. *cuervu*); **2. the loss of intervocalic -n-** in words like *lúa* ‘hand’ (Spa & Ast. *luna*).

Property 1 above is interesting for another reason as well, since it is basically telling us a further, essential property, which is that **3. the phonological inventory** of the Eo-Navia dialects contains the **7 distinctive vowels** of Galician, as opposed to both Spanish and Asturian which have only 5.

Three further properties of the Eo-Navia dialects are identified by Manuel Menéndez García (1951:278) as “rasgos fundamentales del gallego” [distinctive features of Galician]: **4. the use of *eu* as 1st person singular pronoun** (Spa. & Ast. *yo*); **5. the presence of a form *che* as the 2nd person singular dative pronoun** coming from the Latin *tibi* (e.g. *douche* ‘(I) give.1p.sg.pres-you.dat’; Spa. & Ast. *-te*), and a similar **6. form *che* coming from the latin *-sti* for 2nd person singular perfective forms** (e.g. *bebiche* ‘drink.past-you.sg’; Spa. & Ast. *-ste*); **7. the existence of pronominal contractions** of the form *mo* ‘to me-it’, *cho* ‘to you-it’, or *yo* ‘to him/her-it’ (e.g. *xa cho din* ‘(I) already to.you-it give.1p.sg.past; Spa. & Ast. *te lo*).

Two further morphological properties which Menéndez García fails to mention are: **8. the so-called *dativos de solidaridade* *che*** (singular) and *vos* (plural) as in *sonvos as 8 e teño*

² That is, claims about the phonological and morphosyntactic configuration of the dialects as they are at the time of the investigation, not claims about their historical development.

as pitas sen pechar ‘it is-dative2pl eight and I still have not taken care of the chickens’; **9. form -ín** for first person singular of simple past tensed forms in the second and third conjugations (Spa. & Ast. -í).

If we look at the verb system, we find more properties that are exclusive to the Galician linguistic domain and they are found in Eo-Navia: for instance, **10. the existence of the construction [dar + participle]**, which roughly translates as ‘manage to’, e.g. *Salín tarde e case nun dou chegado* ‘It was late when I left and I barely managed to get there’; also, **11. the construction [ter + participle]** which necessarily denotes actions that happened more than once, e.g. *eu teño parado muito na súa casa* ‘I have stayed over at theirs many times’³; **12. The use of a synthetic (simple) pluperfect form** ending in -ra, e.g. *Condo aquilo él xa anduvera por muitos sitios* ‘Back then, he had already been to many places’.⁴ The properties are summarized in Table 1, grouped by domain:

Table 1: language-specific Galician properties found in Eo-Navia

Phonological
1. Vowel inventory of 7 items
2. Lack of diphthongization of open-mid vowels
3. Loss of intervocalic -n-
Morphological
4. <i>Eu</i> as 1 st person singular pronoun
5. Form <i>che</i> (<lat. <i>tibi</i>) as 2 nd person singular dative pronoun
6. Form <i>che</i> (<lat. <i>-sti</i>) as 2 nd person singular perfective forms
7. Pronominal contractions of the form <i>mo</i> , <i>cho</i> , or <i>yo</i>
8. <i>Dativo de solidaridade che/vos</i>
9. First person singular past -ín
Syntactic-Semantic
10. Light verb construction [<i>dar</i> + participle]
11. Pluractional construction [<i>ter</i> + participle]
12. Synthetic pluperfect -ra

It must be noted that the list in Table 1 is not exhaustive: we could mention other phonetic facts, such as the evolution of the groups PL-, KL-, FL- or the vowelization of the group -CT-, and other morphosyntactic facts, such as the use of the inflected infinitive, and the list can easily grow bigger if further research is undertaken. We are particularly interested in reporting syntactic facts that have received very little attention in

³ A similar construction is reported in Asturian, but crucially the action is not required to have happened more than once, as opposed to the whole Galician speaking domain, including Eo-Navia.

⁴ This construction is reported to exist in Asturian as well, according to the descriptive grammars, but there is no information about speakers origins/background on the sentence reported, so it is very likely that the speaker was actually from Eo-Navia. Upon being asked about this construction, we found that people from the Asturian speaking part of Asturias do not recognize it as natural.

dialectological studies, compared to morphophonological ones (in this respect, see Adger & Trousdale 2007).

Also, we have excluded the parts related to vocabulary and phrasal expressions, on the grounds that those domains are subject to change in ways in which the phonological and morphosyntactic components of the language are not. A simple way to put it is to say that, if language was a cherry, morphosyntax would be its stone.

3.Extralinguistic pressures

We start this section with an important reminder: **The linguistic facts in §2 have not been contested.**

During the late 80s there was a robust and promising movement towards recognizing the language rights of the Galician speaking population of Asturias, after 4 decades of dictatorship where Galician was marginalized in the public sphere, in favour of Spanish. The movement was initiated and nurtured by intellectuals and other members of the public, and it culminated with the publication in 1990 of the *Orthography of the Galician language of Asturias* (MdGa, 1990). The work was coordinated by a group of distinguished university professors, all of them linguists: Prof. Xosé Carlos Álvarez Blanco, Prof. Xoa Babarro González, Prof. Francisco Fernández Rei, Prof. Celso Martínez Fernández, Prof. Antonio Meilán García, and Prof. Antón Santamarina Fernández. This *Orthography* was the result of high-level, methodical work that aimed to provide speakers with a sensible written standard. This orthography respected the idiosyncrasy of Eo-Navia, introducing forms that were not included in the orthography for standard Galician, while still reflecting the fundamental conventions of Galician linguistics.

The *Orthography* was not at all well-received in the circles of power, both political and academic, of Asturias. It is difficult to venture why, but the trigger for this hatred might have different sources: firstly, a certain prejudice towards these Galician dialects, whose historical and philological legacy as members of the Galician-Portuguese family turns out to be part of a much bigger linguistic domain than that of Asturleonese, both in extension and number of speakers. Instead, in Asturias the language is presented as a local one, spoken only by a handful of speakers in a limited territory, disconnected from its roots. Nothing in comparison with Asturian, the “language of the Principality” as it is defined in their latest report to the Council of Europe in 2021. Secondly, it could have been a case of aporophobia, associating anything “Galician” to poverty or backwardness. Thirdly, political ideology might have played a role too, because these events happened mostly in the 80s, right after a transitional period between dictatorship and democracy: at that time, the influence of the left-wing mining communities in Asturias fuelled a social feeling of resentment towards Galicia as accomplice of a regime that was coming to an end. All these factors might be behind the irrational aversion towards the Galician language and culture exercised by the Asturian authorities and members of the Asturian Language Academy.

This feeling of repudiation deepened with the exodus of Galician-speaking people from their original Eo-Navia land to central Asturias, due to a process of industrialization that began in the 50s. This resulted in people's alienation to adapt to a reality where their language is scorned as a symbol of poor, ignorant lands.

In sum, the historical and social circumstances of the last century hindered the survival and dignification of Galician, the native language of tens of thousands of people in Asturias; and when the basis language policy finally began to flourish in accordance with scientific, philologically sound arguments in the 80s and early 90s, the Asturian authorities decide to abandon this path and determine that Galician simply does not exist in Asturias. Since then, all institutional actions in Eo-Navia follow that false premise.

Right after the publication of the 1990 *Orthography* by the aforementioned group of prestigious academics, an alternative working group was created, conformed by school teachers and ordinary citizens who defined themselves as *antigaleguistas*, i.e. people who stand against those who accept Galician traits. A kind of Asturian "patriotic league" if you will. These members of the public, supervised by the *Servicio de Política Lingüística* (the regional body for language policies), were given the task of designing a new orthography to replace the one done by the linguists. This orthography was published three years later (Vv.Aa. 1993) by the Regional Directory of Education.⁵ Unsurprisingly, the spelling choices in this new version were made so that they will resemble the Orthography of the Asturian language, **alienating the Galician spoken in Eo-Navia from its philological roots**: for example, instead of preserving the Galician convention to use the etymological *-ll-* in words like *muller* 'woman', they changed it to *-y-*, following the convention for Asturian. In 2006, the Asturian Language Academy (ALLA) agreed to declare this 1993 orthography the "official" one, declaration which has no legal status because the language is not official.

In 1995, the Asturian Language Academy (ALLA) was appointed to hold custody of the Galician speaking part of Asturias, thanks to a modification in its statutes performed in the Acuerdo de Consejo de Gobierno on April 12, 1995. This modification was made without obeying the normative hierarchy, because the institution created by Real Decreto 33/1980 on December 15 had its statutes approved by Decreto 9/1981 on April 6, thus it is shocking that such modification was made by Acuerdo (resolution) and not by a new Decreto (decree). After that date, the ALLA has the power to decide on any aspect related to the Galician language in Asturias. In other words, the academy of one language watches over a different language.

From a linguistic point of view, **this kind of attribution that the Academy of the Asturian language feels entitled to on decisions that affect Galician dialects is**

⁵ The full list of contributors can be found here:
https://alladixital.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/normas_gallego_asturiano.pdf.pdf

completely unwarranted. Still, we could in principle contemplate the possibility that the Academy took over this task with the honourability that is expected from these kinds of institutions. However, what did the Academy do in the last 30 years? The short answer is this: a language genocide.

The year 1993 was the start of three decades of **criminal language policies** driven by Academy of the Asturian language, with the connivance of the regional government. The main tenets were these:

First, the **adoption of new terms to refer to the language spoken in Eo-Navia**, combined with a constant campaign to spread curse on the word *Galician*. The language appears for the first time in the *Estatuto de Autonomía* in *Ley 1/1998* of use and promotion of the *bable* (Asturian), where it is mentioned that in Asturias there is also a third language called *gallego-asturiano*. The term was first used by the renowned linguist Dámaso Alonso, who defines it as “Galician spoken in Asturias” (1972: 391). In *Tomo I* of his *Obras Completas*, in the essay *Testimonio del gallego* ‘Galician testimony’, Alonso states “in areas that I call *exterior*, Galician dialects spoken outside the administrative limits of Galicia, such as: the western part of Asturias (*gallego-asturiano*); and in the province of León (*gallego-leonés*)”. It is clear from the original works of Alonso that he means Galician spoken in Asturias and León. What Alonso did not entertain at that time was the possibility of interpreting his terms as a mix of two languages, due to the presence of the hyphen. Out of context, the hyphenated version *gallego-asturiano* allows for an interpretation of Asturian as language, and not as a name of place. The members of the ALLA were perfectly aware of such a potential ambiguity: García Arias (1997) defines the dialects of Eo-Navia as a *continuum*, and the *Atlas* (ETLEN 2017) directed by the University of Oviedo talks about *transición lingüística*. In the *Ley 1/1998*, they choose the term *gallego-asturiano* instead of others used by Alonso such as *gallego exterior*. What else could motivate such decision, if not the will to prompt confusion?

In the proposal submitted by the party in power in the regional government, the PSOE, on December 30 2021, a proposal to modify the *Ley Orgánica 7/1981*, the legal name *gallego-asturiano* is replaced by *eonaviego* ‘Eonavian’. The proposed new name has been adopted and implemented by the regional Administration and the media (RTPA), on the grounds that it makes sense to give it a name based on geography: if these dialects are spoken between the Eo and the Navia, then they should be called Eonavian. However, to be fully consistent with this naming policy, the language call “Asturian” should also be renamed, because geographically it is not native to all Asturias. We doubt that the Academy will come up with a new name for Asturian any time soon. Here again it does not look like consistency or logic are the guiding principles.

The invention of names, as we said earlier, is complemented by **a merciless discredit of the word *gallego*** ‘Galician’. This is manifested in the recurrent questionnaires that are

distributed among speakers of Eo-Navia. All enquiries (1991, 2002, 2021) have been directed by José Llera Ramo, Professor of Political Science and member of the ALLA.

In these forms, participants see questions on identity first, such as “How Asturian do you feel?” before asking them how they would call the dialect/language they speak. The first section of the study is always *I-Asturian identity in the Navia-Eo*; and it is followed by *II-Linguistic identity in the Navia-Eo*. Thus, **participants access judgements on their language only after they have given identity judgements**. This kind of manipulation only contributes to create tension between feelings of identity and language. Instead of accepting the reality of a diverse Asturias in which many people have as their native language a variety of Eastern Galician, and instead of normalizing this fact as something valuable for the person and the community, something which is indeed part of Asturias’ immaterial heritage, the Asturian authorities (both political and academic) encourage a situation of conflict that condemns Eonavian society to live in permanent contradiction. A state of **social schizophrenia** that nobody takes responsibility for.

Another tenet has been **the policy of invisibilization of Galician in the institutional and public sphere**. The Junta General (the Parliament) is a blatant example of this: a place which is supposed to represent all Asturians, but where one can only find information in two languages, Spanish and Asturian. The only official answer in this respect has been: “well, you cannot pretend that we have posters and signs in three languages”. In other words, in Asturias, depending on your place of birth and your mother tongue, you are going to have more or less rights. The case for “language rights” ceases as soon as the person is not a speaker of Asturian. This policy of invisibilization extends to the institutional website of the Principality, accessible only in Spanish and Asturian, as well as in the laws published on the *Boletín Oficial del Principado de Asturias* (BOPA), where even those laws that affect Galician are not translated (for instance, see: Decretu 23/2022, April 22, on the birth and regulation of the *Red de Normalización Lingüística*). In the most indecent cases, we find informative posters written in Asturian at public health centres within Eo-Navia. **Language colonization**, that is the accurate term for what is happening to the Galician-speaking part of Asturias. Similar concerns apply when we consider the public media in Asturias, also known as **RTPA**. In contrast with the increasing use of Asturian, the Galician language is utterly unrepresented. And not only that: take any program about traditions, places, or folklore, and you’ll find the presenter talking in Asturian or *amestáu* (Spanish-Asturian mix) when they film in Eo-Navia and when they interview people there. This is not only a sign of **complete disregard for the cultural and linguistic heritage of one part of Asturias**, but also an instance of language colonization that always goes in one and the same direction: to slowly exterminate Galician and force everybody to identify with the Asturian language.

The Principality exercise its power at the subregional level by financing **instrumental bodies of local power** such as *Fundación Parque Histórico del Navia*, created in 2006.

Officially, the main purpose of this foundation is to engage civil society in different activities, as well as providing information for tourists in areas surrounding the Navia river. But in practice, the foundation promotes cultural confusion, language depreciation and a constant distortion/concealment of historical facts. As an example, in the tours organized to the municipality of Eilao (Spa. Illano), we can observe how they choose not to mention the existence of important medieval text written in Galician-Portuguese upon visiting Xio, a place which is historically famous precisely because of those documents. In that way, they also contribute to the segregation of the Galician dialects in Asturias with respect to the rest of Galician varieties. The exercise of power is felt also through the Federación de Municipios de Asturias, which has recently organized courses of “eonaviago” as they call it, using the 1993 antigaleguista orthography that they take as official even if it is not. Their rules are imposed in practice, **forcing individuals to comply with their false premises about the nature of the language and the norm in order to be eligible for grants and literary prizes.** And those who dare to use the 1990 orthography, despite its philological soundness, are dismissed.

One last tenet, perhaps the most fundamental as it is reflected in all the previous ones, is what we call **substitution**. It is lethal in the sense that it presents itself as positive and inclusive, recognizing that in Eo-Navia people speak a different language indeed. But in the words of the Academy of the Asturian Language, “we should not fall in the inaccurate, unjustified belief that this language is Galician” (ALLA 2006: 11). Instead, they propose that the *fala eonaviega* ‘eonavian speech’, as they call it, is either its own thing, or a mix between being its own thing and Asturian (García Arias 1997). These theories, if we can call them that, basically assume that **eonavian was like a mushroom which suddenly popped up in eonavian soil** and began to interact and receive influence from Asturian. Interestingly, they do not provide any argument for this statement, apart from citing examples for which there is always a simpler, more plausible explanation in the context of a longstanding situation of contact between Galician and Spanish in Eo-Navia.

Despite its complete lack of scientific accuracy, all the current linguistic policies for Eo-Navia follow what we can call “the mushroom premise”. As an example, in the last decade changes were made in the toponymy, leaning towards Asturianised, unnatural solutions that violate the writing conventions for Galician vowels, trying to fit a phonological inventory of 7 into one of 5. Hence, we find names like Boal or Coaña changed into Bual and Cuaña. In other cases, the old Castilianized forms are maintained: Serandinas (Gal. Serandías), Jarrío (Gal. Xarrío), Ortiguera (Gal. Ortigueira).

Then there is another example whose relevance cannot be undermined: it is a recent statement by the highest institutional representative of Asturias, the president Adrián Barbón, in the social network X. Without arguments, he dares to say the following: “entre el Navia y el Eo no se habla gallego. Se habla fala eonaviega.” (Galician is not spoken in between the rivers Navia and Eo. Instead, “fala eonaviega” is spoken). Note the seriousness of a situation in which the person who holds **the highest institutional**

responsibility for Asturias makes a public statement **supporting the policy of hatred** and denial of the language facts, and he does so from a **position of power**. Along the same lines, the president of the Federación de Municipios de Asturias (FACC) and mayor of the Galician-speaking municipality of El Franco, Cecilia Pérez, speaks of “eonaviego” in the first newspaper of Asturias, La Nueva España, on November 19, 2023, and saying how in her youth talking in this “language” was frowned upon and how some people thought she was Galician for doing so. She pronounced these words, full of prejudice and negativity towards Galician, in the company of Antón García, the general director for cultural action and language policy. It is usual to hear Mrs. Pérez refer to our language as “this that we speak here” or “our speech (fala)”. Both terms deny the status of Galician as a native language in Asturias.

Summing up, **the last 30 years of language policy in Asturias** have been (and continue to be) **extremely harmful for the Galician-speaking community**. There is overwhelming evidence that **neither the regional government nor the Academy of the Asturian Language have done a good job for the survival and dignification of the language**; on the contrary, all the policies seem to go in the direction of total extermination/substitution.

Confronted with the constant arbitrariness of judgement and the **Principality’s despotic abuse of power on our language**, we appeal to the European institutions and ask them to observe the **defencelessness** of the Galician-speaking community in Asturias. We request a formal investigation of the facts reported here. **Aware of the historical commitment of the European Union with minority rights, we reiterate our alarm against policies that go against basic rights** such as the no discrimination for reasons of language or place of birth. We furthermore want to send a message of hope against despotism and falsity, because we, citizens of Eo-Navia, are ready to defend what is fair and true: we have the *forza da razón* (force of reason) against all *razón da forza* (reason of force).

4.Proposals from Axuntar.

Axuntar is an Association from Eo-Navia, born to normalize and care for the language of this territory: a variety of Galician, belonging to the Bloque Oriental, Área asturiana. The Galician-speaking area consists of 18 municipalities that belong to the Principality of Asturias, and one municipality in the Comunidad de Galicia, Negueira de Muñiz.

The **proposals** for our language are as follows:

1. Creation of an **Academy of the Galician Language in Asturias**, with headquarters in Eo-Navia. This institution has to be independent of the Asturian Language Academy, and it has to have the same institutional power and status as the latter.

We believe that **the jurisdiction of any scientific academy is established according to its object of study and not according to administrative borders**. Hence, the study of our language should depend on a new academy located in our territory (Eo-Navia), founded on rigorous scientific principles, with experts on Galician as it is spoken in Asturias, and in coordination with the Real Academia Galega, in the same way that the different language academies in Hispanoamérica are in coordination with the Real Academia Española. The case of Asturias now, where the academy of one language watches over another language, is unheard of to the rest of the world. In Asturias, there is an inexplicable confusion between administrative competences on Eo-Navia, which depend on the Asturian government, and the scientific work that should be done on our Galician in coordination with the Galician Language Academy in Galicia, by virtue of it being part of one and the same linguistic domain.

2. Creation of a **Galician Seminar in the University of Oviedo**, to act as a consulting body.
3. Creation of **teams for Language Policy**, coordinated by experts in Galician-Portuguese linguistics and philology. The members of the team need to have a suitable academic background and knowledge of the language.
4. Admission of **experts on Galician in the Junta Asesora de la Toponimia** of the Principality, the official body for the toponymy.
5. Establishment of a **university campus in Eo-Navia**, and a Escuela Oficial de Idiomas where both Galician and Portuguese are among the languages offered. **Galician language and literature should also be offered as a subject** at all levels of education in Asturias (Infantil, Primaria and Secundaria- the university level is addressed next).
6. Regulation towards **equivalence with the CELGA** exams in Galicia (a system for the certification of the Galician language adapted to the European Common Framework for languages). The Principality is currently pushing towards a certificate for gallego-asturiano or eonaviego in the terms discussed earlier in this report, with the 1993 orthography and treating it as a Romance language outside Galician. If they manage to do so, it would make impossible to homologate it with the CELGA and it would be a further step in their immoral aspiration of alienating our Galician varieties from their roots.
7. Establishment of an **official academic itinerary for Galician** in the University of Oviedo. At the moment, only Asturian language and literature is offered: it is offered in the department of teaching, and in the department of philology. Therefore, all future teachers have the option to take that subject about the Asturian language, but not a subject about the Galician language, even though part of the region is Galician-speaking. There is no subject on Galician language whatsoever. The Asturian authorities want to introduce (under)graduate degrees on Asturian language and literature, but they ignore the possibility of doing the same for Galician. Galician is also not offered in the network of language academies (Escuelas de Idiomas) in Asturias. The absence of Galician-Portuguese studies in

the University of Oviedo is shocking, considering that Asturias -part of it- belongs to that linguistic domain, and what is more, the Council of Europe also pointed out that Galician had to be offered in Asturias (Point 4). **Asturias is not complying with the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages.**

8. Application of the Estatuto de Autonomía and the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, in coordination with the Comunidad de Galicia, Castilla y León and Extremadura, to **share and foster the valuable ties of a community of speakers of a same language, Galician, that transcends administrative borders.**
9. **Recycling of the current teachers**, with deadlines for the achievement of indicative knowledge levels, without which they would not be able to continue teaching. Professionals over 45 years old will be given further guidance.

Bibliografía

- Adger, David & Græme Trousdale. 2007. Variation in English syntax: theoretical implications. In *English Language and Linguistics* 11.2, 261-278. Cambridge University Press.
- Vv.Aa. 1993. *Proposta de normas ortográficas y morfológicas del gal(l)ego-asturiano*. Uviéu, Serviciu de Publicaciones del Principáu d'Asturies.
- Academia de la Llingua Asturiana. 2006. *Informe sobre la fala o gallego-asturiano: una perspeutiva histórica, social y llingüística*.
- Alonso, Dámaso. 1972. Del Occidente Peninsular. *Obras Completas*, Tomo I, 291-533. Madrid: Ed. Gredos
- Álvarez Castrillón, José A. 2011. *Colección diplomática del Monasterio de Santa María de Villanueva de Oscos (1193-1300)*. Oviedo: Real Instituto de Estudios Asturianos.
- García Arias, Xosé Ll. 1997. El continuum llingüístico ente'l gallegu y l'asturianu. *Lletres asturianas: Boletín Oficial de l'Academia de la Llingua Asturiana* 62. 43-50.
- Vv. Aa. 1990 *Normas ortográficas e morfológicas del galego de Asturias*. Mesa prá Defensa del Galego de Asturias. ISBN 84-404-7594-2.
- Menéndez García, Manuel. 1951. Algunos límites dialectales en el occidente de Asturias. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Asturianos*, Año 5, n.14. 277-299.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. 1906. El dialecto Leonés. *Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos*. Año X, febrero-marzo. Números 2 y 3.
- Vv. Aa. 2017. *Estudiu de la transición llingüística na zona Eo-Navia, Asturias (ETLEN)*. Universidad de Oviedo.