

Language contact on the Spanish-Portuguese border: A contribution from the linguistic landscape perspective¹

Xosé A. Álvarez-Pérez

University of Alcalá (UAH)

Abstract

This paper studies the linguistic landscape of two distant border-crossing areas, located in the municipalities of Verín (Spain)-Chaves (Portugal) and Vilar Formoso (Portugal)-Fuentes de Oñoro (Spain). The research is based on a corpus of 306 texts promoted by public bodies and private entities or individuals. It examines the presence and weight of the languages in which they are written, as well as the linguistic accuracy of the collected texts, interference phenomena and mixed statements that combine both languages. The results obtained demonstrate the complexity of the linguistic landscape on the borderland, a place with intense interpersonal contact and, at the same time, an area where national identity is often vindicated. In this sense, convergence whereby linguistic systems of neighbouring languages become similar due to the borrowing of material from the neighbour's language or, on the contrary, non-convergence, i.e. the lack of such converging and thus the tendency to not use the neighbour's language in the texts placed into the public space, can serve as an indicator of language loyalty and, as such, of the strength of the national identity.

Keywords: Linguistic landscape, (non-)convergence, language contact, language policy, identity, Spanish-Portuguese border, Spanish, Portuguese.

1 Introduction

The linguistic landscape of a given territory can be defined as the set of written testimonies visible in the public space. It is not confined to those texts located in the streets, but also includes linguistic statements placed in the showcases window displays of commercial establishments, such as menus in a restaurant, and even in private homes (property rental adverts, protest banners displayed in a window, and the like), provided that such messages can be seen from a public space.

The choice of the linguistic code for a sign identifies explicit and implicit language policies, both at the private and the public level. Therefore, the theoretical framework provided by the research on the linguistic landscape, combining linguistic data and demographic, economic, political and social information, can provide an innovative methodology in contact analysis that links linguistic and cultural relationships. The analysis of the linguistic quality of the texts collected during the study is also important, since they may reveal cases of linguistic interference, as well as processes of convergence / divergence between varieties

¹ This contribution was funded by a *Ramón y Cajal* Fellowship granted by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (reference RYC-2013-12761). It was also developed in the framework of the research projects *Frontera hispano-portuguesa: documentación lingüística y bibliográfica* (FFI2014-52156-R, Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness of the Spanish Government, 2015-2017), for which I am responsible. I would like to thank the reviewers of this text for their interesting feedback.

that are in close contact. Observation of the linguistic landscape is a relatively new perspective within linguistics. Among the pioneers are Rodrigue Landry and Richard Y. Bourhis who, in a work published in 1997, called attention to the dual role of written texts on public roads, namely an informative function that delineates the territory in which a certain language is used, and a symbolic function that reveals the status of a linguistic variety in a given community. That is, the analysis of the distribution of texts can address many sociolinguistic issues that also have implications from the viewpoint of Sociology or Human Geography, such as the quantitative weight of each variety in a bilingual territory, the existence of spheres of use restricted to a particular language, the hierarchy of languages in multilingual texts (as determined by font size or position of the text), the balance of languages in official texts, the visibility of migrant communities' languages, the role of English as a *lingua franca* and its association with the commercial and tourist worlds, and so forth.

For more than a decade, several studies about the Spanish linguistic landscape from the perspective proposed by Landry and Bourhis (1997) have been produced.² Among them, some useful contributions can be mentioned, such as Castillo Lluch/Sáez Rivera (2011) on Madrid, Pons Rodríguez (2012) on Seville, and, finally, a monographic issue with contributions on various cities: Almería, Barcelona, Basque Country, Galicia and Madrid (with a focus on Arabic) (Castillo Lluch and Sáez Rivera, 2013). Studies on the linguistic landscapes in Portugal are far fewer. I will mention three contributions from different perspectives. There is a work by Clemente et al. (2013) that examines a neighbourhood in the city of Aveiro and touches on many theoretical and programmatic issues. Torkington (2016) examines the British lifestyle of migrants in the Algarve and, linked to this line of research, some works on the linguistic landscape of tourist areas in this region have appeared. Finally, Solonova et al. (2016) studied graffiti on the walls of Coimbra using an approach that combines semiology, sociology and more specific issues pertaining to linguistic landscape.

After having carried out this research, I became aware of the publication of the work “El paisaje lingüístico de la frontera luso española: multilingüismo e identidad” (Pons Rodríguez 2014). However, it must be noted that, despite the title of the work, it only examined the Portuguese side of the border; moreover, the studied area in each locality is quite limited in relation to their overall surface area.

This paper adopts a transnational perspective. It examines the contact of Spanish and Portuguese in the linguistic landscape of two border regions. More specifically, it analyses the degree of presence and spheres of use of Portuguese in written records visible from the public space in the Spanish borderland and the use of Spanish in public signs placed in Portugal. This specific geographical area was

² Various editorial events have delayed the publication of this work. In order to assess the validity of its results, please note that the field work was carried out in the summer of 2015 and that the data analysis and bibliographic review work was concluded in early 2017.

chosen for two reasons: the intense contact between the Spanish and Portuguese people and the identity issues that are intrinsically linked to border areas, as will be explained in the following lines.

Along the borderland, the dialogue between border identity and state identity has always been difficult and tense (Godinho 2009a). The state boundary has clear symbolic and identity values attached to it but, at the same time, there is a strong feeling of belonging to a supranational community because of the intense cross-border relationship. The Spanish-Portuguese border has been a meeting point of languages, occurring via the extensive population movements between the countries, both temporal and permanent, such as sales, smuggling, pilgrimages, tourism, intermarriage, work migration, etc. Throughout the centuries, strong solidarity between the two sides of the border has developed. In fact, border villages are often *mirror-localities*, a binomial distribution placed symmetrically on the borderline, the members of which have traditionally maintained a closer relationship with each other than with other villages and cities in the same country. Furthermore, the entry into force of the Schengen Agreement (1995) has led to the disappearance of border controls, a fact that has increased daily commerce and tourism between the two countries significantly.

Considering that situation, this paper aims to analyse the following questions:

- Is the intense cross-border mobility between Spain and Portugal reflected in the linguistic landscape of the borderlands?
- Which foreign language is predominant in the borderlands: Spanish / Portuguese, the languages of the neighbouring countries, or English, a language clearly identified with the tourist sector?
- Do Portuguese and Spanish have a similar presence in official and private texts? What is the attitude of public bodies regarding these languages?
- Are there differences in language choice depending on the geographic typology of the border? In particular, I will seek differences between cross-border conurbations and *Eurocities*, which are medium-sized populations that have signed a cross-border agreement to share infrastructures and activities.
- What is the degree of linguistic correctness of statements written in the border area? Are there linguistic interferences? If so, are they more likely to occur in certain text types?

2 Methodology and data

Most linguistic landscape studies include an extensive introduction to the emergence of this line of research, the establishment and consolidation of the theoretical frameworks and the diversification of methodological approaches. In fact, the reader may sometimes have the impression of reading the usual litany of

citations and references, considering that “On the whole the main discourses on LL methodology are in agreement and many researchers point out the same problems even if some discourses vary” (Clemente et al. 2013, 117). Because of space limitations, this section must be concise; therefore, I will focus on the discussion of my methodological choices in the delimitation and classification of the corpus, while I will refer to the studies mentioned above in §1 to provide more information about the development of the linguistic landscape and a thorough review of the existing literature. In this regard, special attention is paid to Gorter (2013), which combines the analysis of pioneering research and the examination of recent studies that opened the field to new perspectives and applications.

2.1 Corpus delimitation

Regarding the physical support on which the text is displayed, this research considers any type of static text visible from public areas. In other words, the corpus consists of both stable texts, written messages on rigid media that are intended to be permanent (such as a plaque that describes a monument), and ephemeral texts on walls, such as advertising posters that may be rapidly covered by others. Digital screen panels have been also included (see §3.1.3.1). Mobile texts (such as those found in newspapers, buses, private vehicles, etc.) have been excluded because of the technical complications linked to the study thereof.

The delimitation of the *unit of analysis* is a key issue in research on the linguistic landscape but, as there is no consensus among scholars, several studies differ in the definition of this unit. I will explain in §2.1.1 below that my choice is justified because of the special nature of this research, which is not a description of a multilingual territory, but is an examination of Portuguese and Spanish in contact. This specific purpose also justifies the exclusion of some typologies of sign, such as so-called *shared texts* (see §2.1.2).

The corpus includes all texts written entirely or partly in a language other than the official language(s) of the country concerned. In other words, in a Portuguese village, all statements written in English, French, Spanish, German and so on will be collected. Even though this paper focuses on Portuguese and Spanish, an inventory of all signs composed in foreign languages is essential to shed light on the linguistic hierarchy in the territory and to determine whether the language of the neighbouring country enjoys the same vitality and belongs to the same spheres of use as do other varieties. In §2.1.3., I will discuss some issues concerning language identification.

2.1.1 Delimitation of textual units

There is no agreement regarding the delimitation of textual units of analysis inside commercial or official establishments. Several studies – including the

aforementioned research on the Portuguese border carried on by Pons Rodríguez (2014), who followed the proposal by Cenoz/Gorter (2006) – have grouped all texts from the same establishment into a single object of study. However, in this research, I have chosen to analyse each sign individually. In my view, the overall vision is useful for general studies of multilingual societies, where the priority is the identification of foreign languages. However, this particular research, focused on Spanish and Portuguese in contact, must examine the degree of presence, position within the sociolinguistic hierarchy and the spheres of use of each foreign language; thus, an individual examination of each text is essential for this purpose.

Image 1³ is enlightening in this respect. A restaurant in Vilar Formoso displays a menu (that is, a relatively stable list of dishes) in its shopfront, with versions in four languages (French, English, Portuguese and Spanish). However, the dishes of the day are written only in Portuguese, but are preceded by a trilingual header, from which Spanish has been excluded (it appears in Portuguese, French and English). Considering the showcase of the restaurant overall, one could say that it is a multilingual sign: English, French, Portuguese and Spanish. However, the individual examination of texts shows a tri-level hierarchy: first, Portuguese; second, English and French; and third, Spanish, despite being the language of the adjacent country.

2.1.2 Exclusion of shared texts

Franco-Rodríguez (2009) provided an interesting revision of the concept of the linguistic landscape's unit of analysis. A key aspect of his proposal is the concept of the *actor*, "the entity (business, institution, or individual) or joined entities that compose a text" (Franco-Rodríguez 2009, 2–4). He identified three types of texts that are composed by external actors, and not by the primary actor (the responsible for the place where the text appears):

- *Guest texts*: The statement has been produced by a third party and has no relationship with the commercial or service activities of the establishment in which it is placed. A few examples of this typology are event announcements, edicts, jobs or property rental adverts affixed to the showcase of a shop.

- *Borrowed texts*: The content is directly related to the services, items, or activities advertised by the primary actor. The primary author could have produced the texts, but he chose to borrow them from a third party, because of commercial reasons or purely for convenience. One example is the "open/close" sign displayed on a soft drink company's logo at a restaurant's main entrance

³ For editorial reasons, the images referred to in this paper have been placed in a gallery available at http://arcanaverba.org/artigos/lberoCon/images_landscape.html, where they may be downloaded and viewed at full size. They are offered under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0) license.

- *Shared texts*: The external actor usually has a commercial relationship with the primary actor or performs a supervisory activity. Some examples are stickers placed by security companies, ratings of hotels given by a tourist board or travel guide, smoking warnings issued by health authorities, etc.

Shared texts are foreign to the local linguistic communities, which have no opportunity to choose which languages would be used in the sign, the order thereof, specific formats associated with each idiom and the like. These issues are determined by private enterprises (*Le Routard*, *TripAdvisor*, *MasterCard*, amongst others) or by public legislation, common for the entire country. Image 2 is an excellent example. The picture shows a sign prohibiting smoking and a sign that announces the existence of a smoking area. The format of these Portuguese signs is dictated by Law 37/2007, which determines trilingual presentation (in Portuguese, English and French), regardless of whether such signs are placed at the door of a bar that is located 200 metres away from the Spanish border or in a Lisbon restaurant. Besides, shared texts are overrepresented, especially mandatory signs, such as the aforementioned non-smoking sticker, which must be affixed to the door of any bar, restaurant or public service.

Even if their small size and reiteration make them much less noticeable than other elements in the configuration of the linguistic landscape, each instance should be counted as an independent sign; thereof, their inclusion in the corpus may alter the overall results of the language distribution and the hierarchy to a significant degree. For all these reasons, they have been excluded from the corpus.

2.1.3 Linguistic adscription

The linguistic classification of signs has not been without problems. There have been two major issues.

First, Portuguese (and Spanish, to a much lesser extent) is very likely to incorporate foreign words without adaptation. That is, words that retain the spelling of the original language but which, because of their frequency of use, can also be considered as lexical elements in the target language. Thus, recurring appearances in the corpus, such as *outlet*, *design* or *stand* (on signs located in Portugal), are difficult to interpret with regard to their linguistic description. The applied criterion was the inclusion of the dubious elements in two reference dictionaries – *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* (RAE) and *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa* (Porto Editora) –, regardless of whether they appear indicated as anglicisms, because I am interested in their vitality, and not in the academic discussion on their relationship with the standard language. Accordingly, the aforementioned words were classified as Portuguese because they appeared in the second dictionary and were thus excluded from the corpus.

Second, as Portuguese and Spanish are extremely close linguistic varieties, it is often the case that a specific word is identical in both languages. When this

occurred, the text was assigned to the official language of the country in which it was located, based on the assumption that, if the composer/promoter of the sign had wished to write a statement in a foreign language, he/she would have opted for a clearly foreign form, or, more likely, by adding the local designation, as documented in (1). This criterion led to the classification of (2) as a bilingual Spanish-Portuguese sign, since; the text was collected in Portugal, and *bazar* can be used in both languages; however, *España* is clearly written in Spanish, since the grapheme <ñ> does not exist in Portuguese. The case in (2b) seems to confirm this decision, since it is clear that the Portuguese form was used as generic designation of the establishment, whereas the name of the store and a commercial slogan were presented in Spanish.

(1) *Ourivesaria — Joyería* ‘jewellery’ (Vilar Formoso), Image 3.

(2a) *Bazar España* ‘Bazaar Spain’ (Vilar Formoso).

(2b) *Comércio El Navarro || Todo para el hogar* ‘El Navarro’s retail || Homeware’ (Vilar Formoso), Image 4.

Two additional cases, which were excluded from the corpus, must be discussed. The sign for a candy store had a Brazilian flag and a puzzling statement that imitated Portuguese (2c) but was linguistically incorrect (it should read *doce baía*). In (2d), Portuguese is present in the proper name of this bakery, but only because it is the owner’s surname.

(2c) *Dolce Bahía* (Image 67).

(2d) *Pan Da Cunha* (Image 68).

2.2 Corpus classification

After conclusion of the fieldwork, each unit of analysis was classified using a *Filemaker* database with the following structure:

1. Nature of the text (*top-down* / *bottom-up*).
2. Multilingual (Y/N).
3. Languages.
4. Including linguistic errors. (Y/N).
5. Country.
6. Locality.
7. Support (fixed, semi-stable, graffiti).
8. Typology (road sign, tourist information, commercial advertisement, name of an establishment and so on).

The distinction between texts issued by an official body (*top-down*) and those produced by individuals or private entities (*bottom-up*) is particularly relevant for the purpose of determining the degree of the presence of Spanish and Portuguese and the factors involved in their contact.

The first category includes signs at official buildings, road signage, information campaigns, tourist information promoted by public entities, and prohibitions issued by any authority. The latter category includes the names of shops, publicity, posters announcing festivals or celebrations, graffiti on walls, etc. It is evident that top-down texts can be largely influenced by the official language policy since the legal framework may determine whether a certain linguistic variety may appear in official texts and under what conditions: as the only language, subordinate to the main language in position and size, or under identical conditions. On the other hand, code choice is usually freer in bottom-up texts, because there are not usually external restrictions on the motivations of the actor choosing the language and the content of a certain message. However, it should be noted that bottom-up texts are not exempt from legal interference either.

A clear example is a peninsular territory frequently studied within the linguistic landscape approach, to wit the Raval neighbourhood (Barcelona). This is a multi-ethnic area with a strong presence of Pakistani, Filipino and Moroccan immigrants who are highly active in commercial life. The linguistic analysis of the labels placed in their establishments reveals that Catalan has a strong weight, as opposed to its more reduced oral use in this trade context. This apparent contradiction is explained because of regional government (*Generalitat de Catalunya*) legislation, which obliges local businesses to write all their public information (such as opening hours and descriptions of products) in at least the Catalan language.

This is not an exceptional regulation. In fact, regarding this study, there is at least one similar restrictive rule, but it has never been strictly enforced. More specifically, Article 7 of the Portuguese *Código da Publicidade* 'Publicity Code' stipulates that:

3 - the use of languages from other countries in the advertisement is only permitted, even in conjunction with the Portuguese language, when it has foreigners as the exclusive or main recipients, without prejudice to the following paragraph. || 4 - the exceptional use of words or expressions in languages of other countries is permitted when necessary to obtain the intended effect of the message design (available at http://www.wipo.int/wipolex/es/text.jsp?file_id=179261; last access: 17/03/2019. Author's translation).

2.3 Timeframe of the fieldwork. Synchrony and diachrony in the linguistic landscape

The fieldwork was conducted on different days in July 2015. All the signs were photographed in situ using a digital camera (Canon EOS 700), although it was sometimes necessary to use a camera integrated into a mobile phone.

Research into the linguistic landscape is intrinsically synchronic. The corpus used in this study corresponds to a particular historical moment and would have been different had it been compiled a year earlier or a year later. The geographical

reality mutates, and the process of change is more dramatic along the Spanish-Portuguese borderland because it has been subject to on-going alterations in recent years, such as the opening of high-capacity cross-border roads. These divert traffic away from towns and villages, with the resulting decline in economic activity and closure of commercial establishments (with their concomitant signs and texts).

A distinction should be made between the synchrony of the corpus and the chronology of the collected elements. The corpus captures the linguistic landscape at a certain moment. However, each individual element has its own chronology. There may be texts that were created on the same day of the corpus collection (for example, a menu written in chalk at the front door of a restaurant) and other elements with varying degrees of age, such as a poster for a concert given in the previous summer, a plaque that commemorates the inauguration of a monument, or even a sticker of an airline that closed twenty years ago, as occurred in the corpus collected for this research – see (14).

However, future research into the linguistic landscape may take other time frames into account. Just as digital photography and audio recordings were a breakthrough for fieldwork linguists, more recent technological innovations may lead to significant changes in the procedure of data collection. This is clarified by providing an example. Image 5 is a screenshot taken from *Google Street View*, dated 2009, located in the Galician town of Feces de Abaixo. It shows the bar *Portugalicia*, which no longer exists. This establishment had an iconic name—it is no surprise that it was mentioned in anthropological works, such as Godinho (2009b, 2013)—but it is also very interesting because there are many Portuguese elements on the main awning, such as *sandes*, *bifanas*, *tostas mistas* and *presuntos* (‘sandwiches, fillets, toasted cheese and ham sandwich, ham’).

2.4 Geographical area

This paper examines two different sections of the Spanish-Portuguese border, approximately 150 km away from each other in a straight line. Therefore, three different typologies of border will be analysed:

- a) Chaves and Verín, two cities with over 10,000 inhabitants that are the economic centres of their area of influence. They are about 22 km apart;
- b) A 2,500-metre-long section of the cross-border road that connects the rural villages of Feces de Abaixo and Vila Verde da Raia;
- c) The cross-border conurbation of Fuentes de Oñoro and Vilar Formoso, which is the focus of much of the road and rail traffic between Spain and Portugal. Images 6 to 8 show the areas studied in each of these zones.

Chaves (Portugal) is the capital of a large municipality with 18,500 inhabitants in its urban area (2011 data). On the Spanish side, Verín has 10,600 inhabitants in the town centre (2014). These localities were chosen because of the existence of the *Eurocity Chaves-Verín* (<http://www.eurocidadechavesverin.eu>), a

pioneering initiative that started in 2007 (Trillo/Lois/Paül 2015). It is an agreement between historically related cities but belonging to different EU states in order to share resources and to establish joint policies in economic and sociocultural fields. Therefore, the question arises what the linguistic reflection of this experience of cross-border cooperation, which has received several European awards for joint development strategies, would be. In both cities, the main arteries of the city centres have been examined.

Feces de Abaixo has 420 inhabitants (2011). It belongs to the municipality of Verín and it is crossed by the national road N-525. Its Portuguese counterpart, Vila Verde da Raia (municipality of Chaves), has 993 inhabitants and is also situated on the same road axis, which is called the N-103 in Portugal. This crossing point traditionally had intense interstate circulation (7,524 per day in 2008), however, the opening of highways A-24 (Portugal) and A-75 (Spain) has greatly altered the dynamics of the area, limiting national roads to local traffic. The studied area was the stretch of road along which major commercial establishments in the area are located. The route starts at Feces de Abaixo, continues past the old Spanish customs building—which has been restored and serves as the headquarters of the Eurocity— goes through the abandoned Portuguese customs area, and crosses the shopping area of Vila Verde da Raia until it reaches the junction of the new highway.

Area c) is composed of two neighbourhoods of the municipality of Fuentes de Oñoro (Salamanca, Spain) —*Colonia de la Estación* and *Pueblo Nuevo*, built around railway and customs facilities— and the shopping and service area of Vilar Formoso (municipality of Almeida, district of Guarda, Portugal), which is located between the railway and the national road N-332. These municipalities have a combined population of 3,500 inhabitants. It should be noted that Fuentes de Oñoro is the smaller of the two (1,070 inhabitants), and that more than a third of its census has Portuguese nationality, mainly consisting of people who have emigrated for economic, social or labour reasons. This conurbation is one of the more important border passes, with daily traffic of 10,615 vehicles (of which one-third is trucks). The border is still crossed by the national road, but it is planned that highways A-25 and A-62 will be connected in 2020, which will transform the reality of this nucleus radically. Finally, it is also one of the three operational railway links between Spain and Portugal.

3 Discussion of materials

After having analysed the materials collected during the fieldwork and having expunged the texts that did not conform to the criteria explained in §2.2, the corpus consisted of 306 elements, which were texts written entirely or partly in one or more languages other than the official language of the country in which the sign was located.

The corpus is quite balanced between the countries, with 143 entries from Spain and 163 from Portugal. It is also well proportioned with regard to the actors' natures, namely public bodies (top-down signs) and private individuals or entities (bottom-up signs), as shown in Figure 1.

	Portugal	Spain
Top-down (public)	22 texts (13.5%)	18 texts (12.5%)
Bottom-up (private)	141 texts (86.5%)	125 texts (87.5%)

Figure 1. Typology of texts by country and nature of the issuer.

However, the national sub-corpora showed discrepancies in the number of languages involved in the creation of a sign (Figure 2). In Spain, monolingual and multilingual texts were virtually matched, whereas Portugal preferred multilingual statements.

	Portugal	Spain
Monolingual	60 texts (36.8%)	71 texts (49.6%)
Multilingual	103 texts (63.2%)	72 texts (50.4%)

Figure 2. Distribution of texts according to the number of languages.

3.1 The linguistic landscape in the Portuguese border area

3.1.1 Idiomatic distribution⁴

The 163 texts collected in Portugal were distributed across 47 different language combinations; the more dominant choices are shown in Figure 3.

Portuguese – English	50 texts (30.5%)
English	30 texts (18.5%)

⁴ To facilitate comprehension and clarity, the classification considers only the languages that were used in the production of the signs; it does not take into account the order of appearance of languages in the text, the extension occupied by each linguistic code, typographic hierarchy, or the like. Thus, for the purposes of this paper, a Spanish-Portuguese sign is merely a text in which both Spanish and Portuguese (and they alone) have been used, regardless of which language came first.

Spanish	19 texts (11.5%)
Portuguese – Spanish	13 texts (8%)
Portuguese – French – English	10 texts (6%)
Other combinations	41 texts (25%)

Figure 3. Dominant linguistic choices used in the signs collected in Portugal.

Half of the results reveal Portuguese-English bilingual texts (30.5% of the corpus) and monolingual English signs (18.5%). However, there are other combinations in which English is also present. In all, 108 of the collected signs (66.26%) contained English forms, either entirely or in part. With regard to the nature of promoters, 93 of these texts with English elements came from the private sector (bottom-up) and 15 from public bodies (top-down).

Spanish is the second language used in the corpus, but at a great distance from English, since it only appears in 44 of the collected statements (27%); it is very close to French (19%). Regarding the promoters of the texts, the proportion is quite similar to the one described in the previous paragraph, with 35 private statements (79.5%) and nine public signs (20.5%). However, as will be explained in §3.1.3., these figures must be considered with caution.

What is most striking is the reversal of the ratio between monolingual and bilingual texts. In the case of texts written in Spanish, these are mostly monolingual signs (19 items), whereas there were only 13 Spanish-Portuguese bilingual statements. Some important notes about these texts will be provided in the next section.

3.1.2 Monolingual statements in Spanish

A typological analysis explains the striking vitality of the monolingual texts. More than half of these signs were graffiti or paintings on walls. They are particularly common in the underground passage connecting the two neighbourhoods of Vilar Formoso separated by the railway line. Texts (3), (6) and (7) below were sourced here.

Because of their semantic content, lexical selection and use of colloquialisms, it follows that the authors of (3), (4) and (5) are Spaniards. However, the signature of text (6) is crucial for identifying the provenance of the author: the proper name is Portuguese, as is the header of the signature, *Ass.* (*assinado* ‘signed’).

(3) *Viva españa | lo mejor de la | tierra* ‘hurrah for Spain | the best in the world’.

(4) *Ricotetos*⁵ *de Verin* | *guapos* ‘Flics from Verín | cute’ (Vila Verde da Raia, older customs buildings) (Image 9).

(5) *De puta madre* ‘fucking great’ (Chaves).

(6) *Te Quiero* || *Ass. Filipa P.* ‘I love you | sign[ed] Filipa P’ (Image 10).

There is discursive unity, judging by the handwriting and spelling, in the three examples of graffiti found in the abovementioned underground passage. These inscriptions were written in Spanish by a feminine collective, as deduced from the pronoun *nosotras* in (7a). They contained accusations targeted at another group, possibly Portuguese, because of the conscious insertion of the Portuguese term *cuecas* (‘panties, underpants’) in (7c).

(7a) *Solo teneis envidia de nosotras* ‘you just have envy of us’.

(7b) *No habeis venido* || 25-5-07 ‘you have not come || 25-5-07’.

(7c) *Teneis kaka en las* | *cuecas* ‘you have poop in your underpants’ (Image 11).

Excluding the graffiti, the corpus contained only seven monolingual Spanish statements. They were produced by private actors (bottom-up) and were advertising and publicity texts clearly aimed at Spanish people. It must be taken into account that coffee, furniture and household textiles are typical products imported from Portugal. Text (8) was a billboard in Vila Verde da Raia, with a Spanish contact phone number, and (9) was a sign in front of a shop in the same village. Examples (10) to (12) were placed in commercial establishments in Vilar Formoso. Finally, (13) was a billboard placed at a road junction in Vilar Formoso used by many Spaniards to enter Portuguese highways.

(8) *Espacio disponible* ‘space available’.

(9) *Muebles* | *Armarios* | *Cocinas* | *Aqui* ‘furniture | wardrobes | kitchens | here’.

(10) *Café-Monte|negro* | *a* | *precio* | “*especial*” || *El auténtico* ‘coffee Monte|negro | “special” prize | the authentic one’ (Image 12).

(11) *6 toallas* | *19.50 €* ‘6 towels | 19.50 €’.

(12) *El Navarro*.⁶

(13) *2º encuentro ibérico de rehalas* || *Prueba de trabajo de perros conejeros* || *Carrera de galgos* || *Prueba de San Huberto* || *Exposición de*

⁵ *Picoletos* was originally a colloquial term for the civil guard. The painting has since been overwritten. The resulting word, *ricotetos*, is unknown to the author.

⁶ This is the name of a business establishment. The current owner explained that *El Navarro* (‘The Navarre’) was the nickname of her father, the establishment’s founder, because they had lived in Tafalla (Navarre, Spain) for a long time; when the family returned to Portugal, their car still had Spanish number plates with the provincial sign (NA).

rehalas de caza mayor || Demonstración de cetrería. ‘Second Iberian meeting of packs of hounds || test of dogs bred to hunt rabbits || greyhound race | competition of San Huberto | exhibition of packs of hounds for big game hunting | falconry spectacle’ (Image 13).

(14) *Viasa. La línea aérea de Venezuela* ‘Viasa. The airline of Venezuela’ (Image 71).⁷

3.1.3 Signs in which Spanish was present

3.1.3.1 Top-down texts

In §3.1.1, it was noted that nine bilingual texts from the corpus collected in Portugal were top-down texts. However, this affirmation must be qualified. I have counted two signs with a minimal presence of Spanish as bilingual, namely a plaque located at the main entrance of the *Centro de Documentação da Rede Ibérica de Entidades Transfronteiriças* (Image 14) and an announcement of works in Vilar Formoso (Image 15). In these cases, the corporate logo of the cross-border cooperation programme is bilingual, but the variable text, the information provided by the plaque, is only available in Portuguese. Similarly, the map *Uma fronteira que nos une* (‘a boundary that binds us together’) has also been categorised as being bilingual. In fact, this map of the municipality of Almeida is written in Portuguese, but the legend headers are bilingual (Spanish appears in Italics, with a smaller font type) – see Images 16 and 16b.

Finally, another element could be better defined as “potentially multilingual” because it is a touch screen panel with information about Chaves that can be accessed in several languages (English, Spanish, Portuguese and French), although it is shown initially in Portuguese by default.

Therefore, there were only five texts promoted by public actors in which Spanish maintained a certain balance with Portuguese. Even so, the presence of Spanish is not always remarkable, as in (15), where the sequence is fixed, with some repetitions, to the door of the tourist office in Vilar Formoso.

(15) *agro-raia · agro-raya* ‘agro-[border]line’.

Two of the bilingual signs were maps. The map reproduced in Image 17a occupied the other side of the panel on which the map in Image 16 was fixed. However, linguistic distribution and weight of each language are different. The map is divided into eight columns with the same structure: a title (only in Portuguese), a bilingual description of the main territories (Spanish appears in italics and has a smaller font and is in a clearer colour) and a list of places of interest (in Portuguese, with a bilingual header). Image 17b shows an enlarged cross-section in order to reveal the aforementioned distribution. The Spanish translation sometimes differs

⁷ Sticker in the shopfront of a travel agency in Chaves. This sign proved to be an excellent example of anachronisms in linguistic landscape research, since this airline disappeared in 1997.

from the original Portuguese text, and it is linguistically poor, as will be shown in §3.1.4. The other map is located in Chaves; in the urban centre, there are bilingual tourist maps in Portuguese-Spanish (Image 18a) and in French-English (Image 18b).

Of particular interest in terms of linguistic hierarchy are two signs placed very close to each other, almost on the borderline. Image 19 shows a notice board that provides information regarding where foreign vehicles can pay the electronic tolls on Portuguese highways. The official sign is trilingual: Spanish-French-English (16). However, an anonymous hand, perhaps offended by the absence of the national language on a board created by a public entity, added a Portuguese word (*portagens*), expanded the abbreviation *km* and pinpointed the exact location of the toll station (*Alto de Leomil*).

(16) *Telepeaje | Télépéage | Electronic Toll | 11 km.*

Image 20a depicts a bilingual plaque (17) fixed to the building that housed the former joint Spanish-Portuguese police station. Symmetrically, a few metres away, on the Spanish side of the border, there is another plaque (Image 20b), with an inversion of the languages (18) and the same spelling error (missing accent) in *comisaría*.

(17) *Posto misto de fronteira luso-espanhol | Vilar Formoso / Fuentes de Oñoro || Comisaria común de frontera luso-española | Vilar Formoso / Fuentes de Oñoro* (Image 20a).

(18) *Comisaria común de frontera luso-española | Vilar Formoso / Fuentes de Oñoro || Posto misto de fronteira luso-espanhol | Vilar Formoso / Fuentes de Oñoro* ‘joint Spanish-Portuguese border police station Vilar Formoso / Fuentes de Oñoro’ (Image 20b).

3.1.3.2 Bottom-up texts

As regards private texts, the largest sphere of use of Spanish is in the hospitality and catering sectors. There are bilingual or multilingual texts on two restaurant menus (Chaves and Vilar Formoso) and on five signs placed at hotels and guesthouses (Vilar Formoso). Image 21 shows a Portuguese-Spanish-English-French warning about the payment of tolls that is fixed to the door of a restaurant and souvenir shop in Vilar Formoso. Curiously, this private notice had a Portuguese version, whereas the official sign issued by a public entity (16) lacked one.

The other five texts containing Spanish were from the commercial sector. There were two signs at a custom agent’s office in Vilar Formoso, two labels in establishments in the same locality and a notice asking customers to ring a bell to enter a shop in Vila Verde da Raia.

Text (19) is particularly interesting. The intended use of a bilingual label clearly solves a communication problem. Although Portuguese and Spanish are

closely related Romance languages, some terms are completely different; thus, a foreigner without linguistic skills may not be able to understand their meaning. Obviously, this has unfortunate consequences when the opaque word designates the type of a certain establishment. Therefore, there is need for clarification, and bilingual signs are a good tool to ensure that Spanish visitors will understand that an *ourivesaria* is the same as a *joyería* ('jewellery shop'). On the Spanish side of the border, this phenomenon can be repeatedly observed at butchers' shops, since the Spanish and Portuguese designations —*carnicería* and *talho*, respectively— are very different (see §3.2.3).

(19) *Ourivesaria – Joyería* (Vilar Formoso) 'jewellery shop' (Image 22).

3.1.4 Linguistic errors

Overall, the Spanish texts in the corpus that were collected in Portugal are quite correct, except for the aforementioned tourist map of the municipality of Almeida (Image 16), which provides many of the examples below: (25) to (29) and (31) to (33).

First, I will present the orthographic errors. Examples (20) to (24) are completely void of accents. This does not seem to be a product of interference, since the content of (21) has direct correspondence with the Portuguese *autêntico*, with an accent mark, and texts (21) to (24) are apparently graffiti produced in Vilar Formoso by Spaniards. The following two examples show the incorrect use of accent marks. Text 25 confuses the relative pronoun *cual* with the interrogative one *cuál*, which should have an accent; the Portuguese correspondent is *qual* for both forms, always without a mark. Image (26) is clearly a transposition of Portuguese rules of accentuation. Phrases (27) to (29) have incorrect capital letters in the Spanish version of the text. Finally, (30) shows interferences in the writing of consonant groups (see the Portuguese *demonstração*).

(20) *El autentico* 'the authentic one'.

(21) *Solo teneis envidia* 'you just feel envy'.

(22) *No habeis venido* 'you have not come'.

(23) *Alvaro y Jeni...* 'Alvaro and Jeni'.

(24) *Teneis kaka en las cuecas* 'you have poop in your underpants'.

(25) *de la cual se extrae* 'from which is extracted'.

(26) *eje viario internacional* 'international road axis'.

(27) *los Monolitos* 'monoliths'.

(28) *La Arquitectura es típica de los...* 'the architecture is typical of...'

(29) *Desde la Boda de D. Dinis* 'since D. Dinis' wedding'.

(30) *Demonstración de cetrería* ‘spectacle of falconry’.

There are other types of interferences. In (31), the Spanish noun *paisaje* is feminine because of the influence of the Portuguese *paisagem*. In (32), the composers borrow the Portuguese *florir* instead of using the correct Spanish verb, *florecer*, while (33) presents an interesting case of semantic interference. The Portuguese term *freguesia* designates an administrative entity into which municipalities are divided. However, there is no equivalent in the Spanish organisation of territories; the Spanish cognate would be *feligresía* (‘members of a parish’, without the administrative sense), and not the inexistent *fregesía* (perhaps a typo of *freguesía*?). Finally, the sign reproduced in Image 23 uses the form *hostal* as a synonym for ‘rooms’. A literal translation, coherent with the versions in other languages, should be *habitaciones*.

(31) *Las maravillosas paisajes* ‘the wonderful landscapes’.

(32) *florir los almendros* ‘the almond trees blossom’.

(33) *Fregesías* ‘parishes’.

3.2 The linguistic landscape in the Spanish border area

3.2.1 Idiomatic distribution

The 143 texts included in the corpus collected in Spain present 28 different language combinations; the main combinations are represented in Figure 4. It should be noted that there is less internal diversity than there is in the corpus collected in Portugal, which contained up to 47 language combinations.

Portuguese	30 texts (21%)
Spanish – English	27 texts (19%)
English	25 texts (17.5%)
Spanish – Portuguese	19 texts (13%)
Mixed Spanish – Portuguese	5 texts (3.5%)
Other combinations	37 texts (26%)

Figure 4. Main linguistic choices used in the signs collected in Spain.

The linguistic hierarchy is also quite different, since English and Portuguese are relatively balanced in this corpus, while the statements collected in Portugal showed a predominance of English, present in more than 66% of texts, while Spanish barely attained 27%.

Specifically, 61 of the 143 records (42.66% of the corpus) contained some English forms. These were divided between 25 monolingual statements, 27 bilingual Spanish-English texts, and 9 multilingual texts. Regarding the producer, only seven texts were promoted by an official body. Portuguese was present in 55 of the records that constituted the corpus (38.46%). Thirty are monolingual statements and nineteen are bilingual Spanish-Portuguese signs. As regards the promoter, 47 were private and eight public. The third language in the collection is French, which had a much lower incidence, with just 11 texts (18.03% of the corpus).

It was necessary to introduce an additional linguistic classification, namely mixed Spanish-Portuguese signs. Bilingual texts show either a functional distribution of languages—in (2a) and (2b), the category of the establishment is coded in one language, while the proper name uses another linguistic variety—or a complete or partial repetition of information, as in (16). However, mixed statements such as (34) and (35) combine Spanish and Portuguese without an apparent criterion on a list of products that are available in these shops in Feces de Abaixo and Fuentes de Oñoro, respectively.

(34) *Calzados* | *Perfumeria* | *Limpieza* [...] | *Ferragens* | *Bolachas* | *Caramelos* [...] ‘shoes | perfumery | cleaning [...] | hardware | biscuits | candies’ (Image 24).

(35) *2º andar* | *Perfumaria* | *Presentes* | *Brinquedos* | *Lingerie* | *W.C.* | *3º andar* | *Decoracion*⁸ | *Lar Textil P. Electrodomestico* ‘2nd floor | perfumery | presents | toys | lingerie | W.C. | 3rd floor | decorations | home textile small electrical appliances (Image 25).

3.2.2 Monolingual statements in Portuguese

The corpus includes 30 monolingual statements in Portuguese, a significant number that is even higher than the amount of monolingual English texts collected in this territory.

The biggest novelty is one top-down Portuguese monolingual text. There was no equivalent in the linguistic landscape examined in Portugal. This sign is an advertising poster for a thermal tourism programme (*termalismo saudável* ‘healthy hydrotherapy’) funded by a provincial public body, the Deputación de Ourense. It was fixed to the door of the premises of the *Eurocity Chaves-Verín*, based in the old Spanish customs building in Feces de Abaixo (Image 26).

Another striking difference from the corpus collected in Portugal was the large quantity of guest texts placed in shop windows and on the doors of establishments to announce various activities such as religious festivals, bullfights,

⁸ The possibility of a mistake cannot be excluded, since the rest of the statement was written in Portuguese, with the exception of this single word, which may be a form that was left untranslated.

rallies and concerts. These events were going to be held in different Portuguese towns and villages, and they were announced in Spain via a monolingual Portuguese poster (presumably, the same one that was used in Portugal). There are nine cases in the corpus; Images 27 and 28 represent two examples from Fuentes de Oñoro.

In addition to the aforementioned guest texts, another phenomenon was commonly observed in the frontier culture, which could be termed *rendered objects*. The material support on which the signs appeared was bought in Portugal but was used in Spain. Therefore, in a street in Fuentes de Oñoro, I observed a mailbox engraved in Portuguese (36), and in the road that traverses Feces de Abaixo, there is a rental advert with a Spanish phone number, but with the predefined text in Portuguese (37).

(36) *Correio* ‘post’ (Image 29).

(37) *Aluga-se* ‘for rental’ (Image 30).

As mentioned in §3.1.2., a significant number of signs were placed at commercial establishments to advertise certain products. Nine cases were found during the fieldwork, none of them in the *Eurocity Chaves-Verín*. Examples (38) and (39) were located in Feces de Abaixo, in a general store that sold food and hunting items. In Fuentes de Oñoro, there were signs such as (40) at a roadside restaurant that advertised the sale of roasted chickens. Most of these texts contained linguistic errors, usually spelling mistakes –see also §3.2.4., and texts (55), (59) and (64).

(38) *Polvo | Vitela || Bacalhau | Noruega* ‘octopus | veal | cod | Norway’ (Image 31).

(39) *Mais de 30 modelos | de carabinas (chumbos) | calibres 4.5 5.5 y 6.35* ‘more than 30 models of carbines (bullets) | calibre 4.5 5.5. and 6.35’ (Image 32).

(40) *Frangos asados* ‘roast chicken’.

There were also two external texts that advertised deep-frozen cod (Image 33) and advertised the services of a generator rental company (Image 34). These adverts were also written in Portuguese, but they originated in Portugal, unlike the signs described above.

It is no surprise that, in border villages, the neighbours’ language may be used in the names of establishments, both for the generic designations and for proper names. Example (41) is placed at the awning of an establishment in Feces de Abaixo; while the second word has the same form in Spanish and Portuguese, the first is unmistakably Portuguese: *Mercearia congelados* (Image 35). Example (42) is particularly interesting. It is a sticker that publicises a hairdresser in Vilar Formoso. The entire text is written in Portuguese. As the designation *cabeleireiro de homens* ‘men hairdresser’ was opaque, somebody (the advertisers themselves?)

wrote the Spanish translation *peluquero de hombres* by hand, in order to cancel out the linguistic distance (Image 36).

In the same way that there is a top-down statement related to the tourist sector, there was also a bottom-up sign, which was a notice board for the bus company Anpian (Ourense), placed at the bus station in Verín and which provides information about international connections. Nonetheless, above the printed Portuguese poster, there is a handwritten text in Spanish: *Confianza, Seguridad y Confort* ('trust, security and comfort') (Image 37).

Finally, with respect to graffiti, while there were many examples in Portugal, only one was found in Spain, in Fuentes de Oñoro, which was a declaration of love written on a lamppost (43).

(43) *Amo-te, Joel* 'I love you, Joel' (Image 38).

3.2.3 Signs with the presence of Portuguese

3.2.3.1 Top-down texts

Only seven records have public promoters. In fact, it should be noted that presence of Portuguese in some of these texts is minimal; thus, the real weight of Portuguese in this sphere of use is even lower.

Image 39 is a parallel case to that of Image 15 – (see §3.1.3.1). It is an informative panel about construction works, which is written entirely in Spanish, except for the bilingual logo of the cross-border cooperation programme. However, it seems that there was no coherent information policy, because some metres away there was another informative panel about the same project (Image 40); in this case, the headers and predefined sections were in Portuguese, whereas the description of the works was written in Spanish. Verín, the municipal capital, has an informative panel about the Chaves-Verín stretch of the Way of St. James (Image 41a). It was classified as bilingual because there was a Portuguese logo in a corner of the poster (44), but the poster itself was in monolingual Spanish, despite its geographical scope and the large number of Portuguese pilgrims who walk that route (see <http://www.cpisantiago.pt>).

(44) *Caminho | Português | Interior de | Santiago* 'Interior Portuguese Road of St. James' (Image 41b).

Therefore, only five official texts showed a clear presence of Portuguese, and two of them have already been commented upon: the plaque at the former joint police station (§3.1.3.1) and the information panel mentioned in the previous paragraph (Image 40).

In Feces de Abaixo, next to the old Spanish customs building, there was a hapax, that is the only text in this corpus that combined Portuguese and Galician⁹. The sign was a poster advertising a “eurocitizen identity card” allowing access to certain infrastructures and services (45). The alternation of languages was chromatically indicated in red and blue: on the left side, Portuguese was in red and Galician in blue; on the right side, the opposite was the case. The poster contained the logo of the Eurocity using the form *eurocidade*, which is common to Galician and Portuguese; the same logo is also attached to the former customs building, now the administrative premises of the Eurocity.

(45) *Compartimos servizos | Compartilhamos serviços || Descubra todas as vantagens | do novo cartão do eurocidadão | Descubra todas as vantaxes | da nova tarxeta do eurocidadán* ‘we share services | discover all the advantages of the new euro citizen card’ (Image 42).

Another interesting text can be defined as being top-down, since it is fixed to the door of the Spanish police station in Fuentes de Oñoro. However, it has no official status (no signature, no seal and no letterhead). Thus, it seems more like an informal brief written by somebody to escape from recurrent questions.

(46) *No tenemos | ningún tipo de | información | sobre los peajes | de la A-25 || Nao dispomos de | qualquer tipo de | informaçao | sobre portagens | da A-25* ‘We have not any of information about the tolls of A-25’ (Image 43).

3.2.3.2 Bottom-up texts

The cases included in the corpus of bottom-up texts were all sourced in the municipality of Fuentes de Oñoro; Verín shunned any presence of Portuguese, as explained in further detail in the conclusion, and Feces de Abaixo opted for monolingual Portuguese statements.

I have identified three typologies of bilingual or multilingual statements. The first, the clarification of opaque designations, was already commented upon when analysing the corpus collected in Portugal. When linguistic distance obscures the identification of a certain establishment, bilingual labels are created (47). On occasion, there is no direct correspondence, as in (48). The Spanish term is a generic designation (‘supermarket’), whereas the Portuguese word (‘butcher’) provides information about the availability of certain products that are in high demand by Portuguese shoppers. Example (49) is a curious case of bilingualism. The generic designation of the establishment is given only in Portuguese (*rebuçados* ‘candies’), even though the store is located in Spain and the Spanish form is quite different

⁹ There were, however, other examples some years ago. For example, Lois (2013, 318) reproduced a Galician-Portuguese poster that publicised a food collection campaign carried out around Christmas 2010.

(*caramelo*); the proper name *La Cabra* ('the goat') refers to a prestigious brand of candies from Logroño.

(47) *Carnicería – Talho* 'butchery' (Images 44 and 45).

(48) *Supermercado – Talho* 'supermarket – butchery' (Images 46 and 47).

(49) *Rebuçados La Cabra* 'candies La Cabra' (Image 48).

On other occasions, Portuguese is used to advertise a certain product or service. The door of the pharmacy in Fuentes de Oñoro (Image 49) is remarkable for its internationality. It has a welcome sign written in eight languages (in addition to Spanish and Portuguese, the languages are English, Arabic, French, German, Russian and Chinese). However, for the purpose of research into the linguistic landscape, its shopfront (Image 50) is far more interesting. The main services provided by the pharmacy are described on bilingual lists that clearly indicate hierarchies: Spanish has a bigger font size, while the Portuguese version is a poor translation and sometimes lacks information included in the Spanish version.

By contrast, the advertisements for the booking offices of the bus company *Eurolines* (Image 51) demonstrate full equivalence between Portuguese and Spanish, both in the position and size of the forms and in terms of content, with the exception of a small mistake in the second line of the Portuguese text (cf. section 3.2.4., example 58).

The last type refers to information about opening hours and access to commercial establishments. Spanish and Portuguese follow different procedures to create the names of the days. The former adopts pagan references, such as *martes* 'day of Mars', for Tuesday, whereas the other uses the Christian calendar — Tuesday is *Terça-feira*, the 'third fair', because the count begins on Sunday, the holy day. As a result, the designations for weekdays (but not for Saturday and Sunday) are completely different. Furthermore, Spain and Portugal are located in different time zones and have a one-hour difference. Because of this, it is common for establishments with a high flow of cross-border clients to display two different notices about service hours in order to minimise the risk of confusion (50). Similarly, linguistic distance may complicate even simple acts such as entering a shop, since the action of pulling a door is *puxar* in Portuguese and *tirar* in Spanish. This explains bilingual statements such as (51). Linguistic errors in both texts, highlighted in boldface, will be discussed in §3.2.4.

(50) (*Hora española*) | *De lunes a sábado* | *Mañanas: 9:00 horas – 14:00 h*
| *Tardes 15:30 horas – 20 h* || (*Hora portuguesa*) | *De Segunda a Sabado* |
Manha 8.00 horas – 13 H | *Tardes 14.30 Horas – 19.00 H* '(Spanish time) |
(Spanish hour) | From Monday to Saturday | Mornings: 9 – 14 | Afternoons:
15.30 – 20 || (Portuguese hour)) | From Monday to Saturday | Mornings: 8
– 13 | Afternoons: 14.30 – 19 (Image 52).

(51) *Por favor* | *llame al* | *timbre* || *Toque* | *a* | *campainha* || *Tirar* | *Puxe*
'please, ring the bell || pull' (Image 53).

Finally, I would like to draw attention to a circumstance that is highly interesting from the perspective of the linguistic landscape. On the 21st of May 2015, the group Gildo—founded by Hermenegildo Bravo, who was born in Fuentes de Oñoro—inaugurated the refurbishment of its supermarket placed in this locality, 650 meters from the borderline. This establishment, now associated with the brand Carrefour, is essentially bilingual in all external labelling (Images 54 and 55) and in most of the internal signage—see Images 56 and 57.¹⁰ Moreover, the catalogue of products is published in both languages. Therefore, this marketplace is a true point of contact between two communities, beyond the political frontier and on an equal footing from a linguistic point of view.

3.2.4 Linguistic errors

The linguistic errors in the Portuguese texts produced in Spain are far more frequent on the orthographic level.

The first group—(52) to (56)—is characterised by the absence of accent marks and tildes. The causes are diverse. The lack of tildes (~) may be a consequence of technical problems in most cases, since they are absent from Spanish keyboards. In addition, (56) could be explained as an interference from the Spanish accentuation system, but it could also be a simple mistake or misprint. Finally, other mistakes are hard to explain, since the Spanish cognate of the word would also require an accent, as in *sábado* (53).

Another group of texts revealed insufficient knowledge of Portuguese orthography. It is possible to distinguish between three different types.

Firstly, there are clear interferences from the Spanish graphic system; (57) and (58) present a very common interference between Spanish and Portuguese orthographic systems, as the Portuguese conjunction *e* (pronounced [i]) is transcribed as *y*, the Spanish one, which sounds the same. Example (62) can be also explained by processes of interference, since regional Spanish has only one unvoiced alveolar fricative [s], written <s>, whereas Portuguese makes a distinction between voiced and unvoiced fricatives: <s> ([z]) and <ss> [s], as in *assados*. Finally, the second part of (64) can be also explained by interference from the Spanish system, since the author has used the digraph <ll> instead of <lh>.

A second group consists of texts overtly influenced by pronunciation; the correct written forms in (59) to (61) would be *binóculos*, *cassetes*, *infravermelho* and *análises*.

Finally, a third section groups other spelling errors that arose because the composers were unaware of certain peculiarities of Portuguese orthography; the correct forms would be (63) *presunto*, (64) *melancias* and (65) *pequeno-almoço*.

¹⁰ Clearly, these indoor texts and other similar cases have not been taken into consideration in the quantitative study, since they are not visible from the public space.

- (52) *Não* [...] *informação* [...] ‘no [...] information’ (Image 43).
- (53) [...] *Sábado* | *Manhã* [...] ‘Saturday | Morning’ (Image 52).
- (54) *melão*; *almondegas*; *leitão* ‘melon; meatballs; roast suckling pig’ (Image 58).
- (55) *armazem*; *meloês* ‘warehouse; melons’ (Image 59).
- (56) *relogios* ‘watches’ (Image 61).
- (57) *calibres 4.5 5.5 y 6.35* ‘calibres 4.5 5.5 and 6.35’, (Image 32).
- (58) *reserva y venda* ‘reservation and sale’ (Image 51).
- (59) *binoclos*; *R. cassetes* ‘binoculars radio-cassette’
- (60) *infrabermelho* ‘infrared’ (Image 61).
- (61) *análeses* ‘analyses’ (Image 50).
- (62) *asados* ‘roasts’.
- (63) *presunto* ‘ham’ (Image 58).
- (64) *melancias*; *maravilla* ‘watermelon; wonderful’ (Image 59).
- (65) *pequeno almoço* ‘breakfast’ (Image 60).

Text (66) is very curious: maybe it is a morphological interference (use of Spanish article *el*, instead of *o*) or, more likely, an oversight when writing the translation over the original text. Text (67) contains incorrect translations: it retains the Spanish word *embutidos*, instead of *enchidos*, and ignores the existence of the Portuguese form *esparguete*. Finally, (68) is an incomplete translation, since the original Spanish text, shown in another part of the showcase, is *Dermofarmacia Infantil* ‘children’s dermopharmacy’.

- (66) *prato del dia* (Image 60).
- (67) *embutidos variados*; *spaguetti* ‘mixed cold meat’ (Image 58).
- (68) *crianças* ‘children’ (Image 50).

4 Conclusions

The quantitative and qualitative analysis of a large corpus of material collected during the fieldwork allowed me to reach conclusions about the cross-border vitality of Portuguese and Spanish, their spheres of use, their linguistic accuracy and phenomena of interference.

One of the initial hypotheses I intend to verify is whether the existence of the *Eurocity Chaves-Verín* —a cross-border entity established to strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion via joint initiatives and the joint use of infrastructure and services— leads to a better appreciation of the neighbour’s

language, more vitality and, obviously, a greater presence in the public landscape. The answer is strongly negative. Moreover, it would be more realistic to affirm that what exists is a complete ignorance of the neighbour's language; in fact, some cases even suggest the existence of a "making invisible" strategy. Images (62a) and (62b) show information plaques placed at tourist sites. The format and layout are similar on both sides of the border, but the languages are different. Signs located in Chaves are written in Portuguese and English; in Verín, they are written in Spanish and English. Therefore, Spanish is absent from Chaves and Portuguese is absent from Verín. Meanwhile, Galician was absent from both towns, although a logo showed that the Galician regional government sponsored this publicity campaign. The common language of the *Eurocity* seems to be English.

No top-down text that used Portuguese was found in Verín, with the exception of the inclusion of a tiny logo, as discussed above in (44). However, English is present in several tourist texts (Images 63,¹¹ 64 and 65).

Regarding bottom-up texts, the situation is even worse, at least from a quantitative perspective. The corpus is composed of 55 signs written in languages other than Galician and Spanish, mainly in English, but there are also French, German, Romanian and Chinese texts, among others. However, only three examples that contained Portuguese were collected: two guest texts —the advertisement for a party in Chaves (Image 66) and the extremely degraded billboard for a bullfight celebrated in Portugal some months previously— and the aforementioned notice board at the bus station (Image 37).

Its counterpart, Chaves, has a similar linguistic landscape, if not worse, particularly in the private sector. Apart from the small bilingual logo of the cross-border cooperation programme, Spanish was only present in two of the nine top-down texts containing foreign languages. With regard to bottom-up signs reflecting the presence of Spanish, Chaves was a linguistic wasteland. Of the 79 signs with foreign forms collected in our corpus, only three contained Spanish forms: the graffiti (69), presumably produced by Spaniards, a restaurant menu (also available in English and French – see Image 70) and the sticker for a Venezuelan airline that disappeared 19 years ago (Image 71).

(69) *De puta madre* 'fucking great' (Image 69).

This clearly demonstrates that, despite the language contact setting, no convergence between Spanish and Portuguese appears to be taking place in the linguistic landscapes of Chaves and Verín. On the contrary, one could state that we are dealing with a non-convergence case (cf. Kaufmann 2010) as the presence of the neighbour's language is quite limited. In fact, the border between these places may be characterised as "distant", a boundary that points out the differences and settles national identities by rendering the neighbour invisible by concealing his or

¹¹ Note that, even though the thermal path is designated by its Portuguese name, *Rota termal e da água*, this language is entirely neglected in the tourist information.

her language, among other procedures. This situation becomes even more paradoxical given the existence of a *Eurocity*. It is possible to adopt, in this sense, the conclusions of Pons Rodríguez (2014, pp. 88-89, my translation):

The differences between the two localities we have studied are relevant [...] but it is even more striking a coincidence: marginalisation of Spanish [...]. It seems that there is an ongoing self-definition of being Portuguese from the linguistic landscape which, far from be driven by the values granted to borders by new policies, consolidates the idea of separation and difference. While the boundary is something political, it is social when an opaque or porous value is assigned. With respect to linguistic landscape, this border scenario is a non-hybridisation place. Physical and linguistic proximities are broken in the linguistic landscape, where there is a limitation of the other.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to extend this limiting vision to the entire Spanish-Portuguese border. Pons Rodríguez explored a geographical framework in which there was no close relationship on either side of the border. While the cities of Chaves and Verín are located 22 km from each other, Castro Marim and Vila Real de Santo António, studied by Pons Rodríguez, are closer to their Spanish counterparts in a straight line but, as the borderline follows the course of the river Guadiana, cross-border mobility requires using the ferry or taking a detour on the highway that was inaugurated in 1991.

However, there is a closer, more intimate border there where daily contact has existed for decades, instance when crossing the border only entails a short walk to the grocery store. For this part of the research, two different zones were studied, Feces de Abaixo / Vila Verde da Raia and Vilar Formoso / Fuentes de Oñoro. On the Spanish side of this “close border”, nine top-down texts were collected, and Portuguese was present in seven of these statements. It is missing only in two signs in Fuentes de Oñoro, namely the instructions for a phone booth (Image 72) and a plaque commemorating the inauguration of the new customs facilities (Image 73); interestingly, as this plaque was placed on the borderline, Latin was chosen as a neutral language because it is valid for both states. On the Portuguese side, Spanish has a lower presence, although it is more visible than in Chaves. I would like to point out, as a curiosity, that Portuguese cabin booths also neglect the language of the neighbouring country (Image 74). It is also significant that the information available at the railway station about connections to Spain (and France) was written only in Portuguese and English (Image 75).

As regards bottom-up texts, 70 statements were collected on the Spanish side, and Portuguese was present in 53 of them. In Portugal, our corpus collected 62 signs, and roughly half (32) included Spanish forms. The latter is not a particularly high percentage, but it must be said that Spanish was the main foreign language in the area, since English appeared in 30 statements and French in only

14; in any event, this linguistic landscape clearly differs from the reality encountered in Chaves.

Therefore, it can be stated that close cross-border contact is a direct reflection of the linguistic landscape in the border area, particularly with regard to bottom-up texts. There is a greater presence of Portuguese in Spain than there is of Spanish in Portugal, possibly because the Spanish side of the border concentrates on commercial activities. As one moves further away from this “close border” into municipal capitals or major towns, this situation fades, and the languages of the neighbouring country vanish, replaced by tourism’s major languages (English and French), as well as via a process of the affirmation of national identity.

5 Bibliographic references

- Castillo Lluch, Mónica/ Sáez Rivera, Daniel Moisés, *Introducción al paisaje lingüístico de Madrid*, *Lengua y migración* 3:1 (2011), 73–88.
- Castillo Lluch, Mónica/Sáez Rivera, Daniel Moisés (edd.), *Paisajes lingüísticos en el mundo hispánico*, Madrid/Frankfurt, Iberoamericana, 2013 [= *Revista internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 21].
- Cenoz, Jasone/Gorter, Durk, *Linguistic landscape and minority languages*, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3:1 (2006), 67–80, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668386> [last access: 03.07.2020].
- Clemente, Mariana Ribeiro et al., *Linguistic diversity in Aveiro, Portugal: Exploring linguistic landscape methodologies in the «Beira Mar» neighborhood*, *Internet Latent Corpus Journal* 3:1 (2013), 116–133.
- DRAE = Real Academia Española, *Diccionario de la lengua española*, ²³2014, <http://www.rae.es/rae.html> [last access: 03.07.2020].
- Franco-Rodríguez, José Manuel, *Interpreting the linguistic traits of Linguistic Landscape as Ethnolinguistic Vitality: Methodological approach*. *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada* 8 (2009), 1–15.
- Godinho, Paula, *Discursos palacianos*, in: Cairo Carou, Heriberto/Godinho, Paula/Pereiro, Xerardo (edd.), *Portugal e Espanha. Entre discursos de centro e práticas de fronteira*, Lisboa, Colibri, 2009, 73-91 (=2009a).
- Godinho, Paula, *Entre Chaves e Verín: mediadores, fronteira útil e fronteira fútil*, in: Medina, Eusebio (edd.), *Fronteras, Patrimonio y Etnicidad en Iberoamérica*, Málaga: Signatura, 2009, 137–152 (=2009b).
- Godinho, Paula, *Re-signification of the past in the northern Portugal/Galicia border: amenity, heritage and emblem*, in: K. Stokłosa, Katarzyna/Besier, Gerhard (edd.), *European Border Regions in Comparison*, New York/London, Routledge, 2013, 149–168.

- Gorter, Durk, *Introduction: The Study of the Linguistic Landscape as a New Approach to Multilingualism*, in: D. Gorter, Durk (ed.), *Linguistic Landscape: New Approach to Multilingualism* (pp.), Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2006, 1–6, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710608668382>.
- Gorter, Durk, *Linguistic Landscapes in a Multilingual World*, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33 (2013), 190–212, <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190513000020>.
- Kaufmann, Göz, *Non-convergence despite Language Contact*, in: Auer, Peter/Schmidt, Jürgen Erich, *Language and Space: Theories and Methods*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 2010, 478–493, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110220278.478>.
- Landry, Rodrigue/Bourhis, Richard Y., *Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study*, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16:1 (1997), 23–49, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x970161002>.
- Lois, María, *Re-significando la frontera: el caso de la eurociudad Chaves-Verín*, *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* 61 (2013), 309–327.
- Pons Rodríguez, Lola, *El paisaje lingüístico de Sevilla. Lenguas y variedades en el escenario urbano hispalense*, Sevilla, Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 2012.
- Pons Rodríguez, Lola, *El paisaje lingüístico de la frontera luso española: multilingüismo e identidad*, in: Bravo-García, Eva et al. (edd.), *Investigaciones sobre la enseñanza del español y su cultura en contextos de inmigración*, Sevilla/Helsinki, Universidad de Helsinki/Grupo de Investigación Estudios lingüístico-culturales y Enseñanza del Español como Lengua Extranjera (HUM 927) de la Universidad de Sevilla, 2014, 69–89 (CD-ROM).
- Porto Editora = *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*, Porto, Porto Editora, 2003–2019, <https://www.infopedia.pt> [last access: 03.07.2020].
- Solovova, Olga/Matos, Ana Raquel/Nolasco, Carlos, *E se as paredes falassem? Análise discursiva de inscrições no espaço público urbano de Coimbra*, in: Nolasco, Carlos/Matos, Ana Raquel/Solovova, Olga (edd.), *Ways of seeing, ways of making seen Visual representations in urban landscapes*, Coimbra, Centro de Estudos Sociais, 2016, 43–61. (= number 15 of *Debates*), <http://hdl.handle.net/10316/81065> [last access: 03.07.2020].
- Torkington, Kate, *Os impactos das mobilidades turísticas e migratórias na paisagem semiótica do Algarve*, in: Nolasco, Carlos/Matos, Ana Raquel/Solovova, Olga (edd.), *Ways of seeing, ways of making seen Visual representations in urban landscapes*, Coimbra, Centro de Estudos Sociais, 2016, 26–42. (= number 15 of *Debates*), <http://hdl.handle.net/10316/81065> [last access: 03.07.2020].

Trillo Santamaría, Juan Manuel/Lois González, Rubén Camilo/Paül Carril, Valerià,
Ciudades que cruzan la frontera, Cuadernos Geográficos 54:1 (2015), 160–
185.