

Onomastics, flexible standards and spoken-mass media

Lluís de Yzagirre i Maura, Ester Pedreño Puertas

DOI: 10.2436/15.8040.01.244

Abstract

The pronunciation of proper names is a universal source of variation, which can generate tensions in languages subject to significant normalisation processes. This phenomenon becomes socially significant when the pronunciation of a place name by media professionals differs from the autochthonous pronunciation, and it may create problems for such professionals if a place name is used as a surname, changing the pronunciation.

In the case of Catalan, all of these factors exist in a social context with a young media (between 25 and 40 years old), generating intense social debate on the language model that the media should adopt and the spoken language model defined by the linguistic authority intended to incorporate a wide range of geodialectal characteristics.

To complete the picture, Catalan is subject both to centrifugal trends that many other languages also witness in dialect areas that feel less represented by the standard variety, as well as campaigns opposing standardisation processes present in some of the most stringently planned languages.

This paper is intended to analyse how all of these factors interact when conditioning the work of non-linguist spoken-word professionals (journalists, speakers, actors, etc.) and the strategies that could be implemented to support them in their work.

This paper is intended to analyse how phonetic variations in toponyms (prescribed or proscribed) can condition the work of non-linguist spoken-language professionals (such as journalists, speakers and actors) and the strategies that could be implemented to support them in their work.

1. Journalist lost in onomastic jungle

Although spoken-language professionals are often criticised for the way they convey aspects of standard language that are hardly conflictive, the pronunciation of proper names undoubtedly provides an abundance of unsolved or controversial issues waiting to trip them up, with journalists frequently stumbling over news items that include proper names that they have never seen, said or heard before. The following examples, taken from *Nomenclàtor de Catalunya*, could cause most of our non-linguist professionals to hesitate, at best:

Examples

- Riera de Santfrancisco (Ribera d'Ebre)
- Vall d'en Batle (Terra Alta)
- Llau del Caragol (el Pallars Jussà)
- Barranc de les Caragoles (Terra Alta)
- Can Francès (Sant Gregori - el Gironès)
- Mas de Martínez (Amposta - el Montsià)
- Masia Atanassio (Amposta - el Montsià)

2. Flexible standards under different political authorities

The media, especially publicly owned or subsidised media, is compartmentalised according to political criteria that do not always correspond to the geographical divisions of the Catalan language. Although the state-wide decree re-establishing the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*

identifies its Philology Department as the linguistic authority for all Catalan-speaking territories (see preface to said decree at <http://dlc.iec.cat/proleg.html>), the Statutes of Autonomy, as organic laws, introduce other normative agents that have an influence on public-owned media in their respective subterritories.

The flexible standard applied by the Philology Department of the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans* (SFIEC), on the other hand, does not admit such colloquial usage in all of the variants that it covers.

The issue of standards in the islands is a complex one, on account of its extreme fragmentation, in which not even division by island resolves the issue entirely. In the case of Western Catalan, the *Laboratori de Tecnologies Lingüístiques* (LATEL) was obliged to implement specific rules, or specifically configured rules, for territories in the old diocese of Tortosa, straddling the political border between Catalonia proper and the Valencian Community.

The LATEL, in creating an algorithmic model in the *Proposal for a spoken standard for the Catalan language* (PEOSFIEC) published by the SFIEC, was limited by the fact that the descriptions *valencià* and *baleàric* are more markedly political than linguistic, which is also the case with *lleidatà*, which works better as North Western Catalan. In both cases, the linguistic reality does not reflect the labels assigned.

In our contact with professionals in the old diocese of Tortosa, we have found that they feel poorly represented by the standard spoken variety. We believe that a remapping of the phonetic standard to include “Central Western Catalan” (essentially Terres de l’Ebre and Maestrat) would free linguistic research from the politicisation implied by the term *valencià*. This term would be replaced by “South Western Catalan” or “Central Western Catalan” for linguistic reasons.

It would also enable a clearer definition of the orthoepic model for the area in question. Furthermore, in a cautious alliance with centralism, it would necessarily put an end to the practice of identifying the (at least demographically) dominant dialect using the term “Central” as a simplification of “Central Eastern Catalan”.



“Central Eastern Catalan—or simply Central Catalan, as there is no Central Western—is the most widely spoken eastern dialect ...”
(http://ca.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catal%C3%A0_central).

The linguistic debate is so tainted by politics that we often encounter inconsistencies such as the one identified in this article, which includes a map that contradicts the statement made in its first paragraph. The first thing we have to do to help non-linguist professionals is clarify the matter for ourselves and give them usable information.

Several years ago, our laboratory developed ALEF, a specialist system used to model all of the pronunciation variants admitted in the flexible standard of the Philology Department of the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*. This task required us to define a geographical scope for each phonetic rule. On completion of the process to define all of the rules and related dialectal parameters, it became clear that rules are more frequently shared between the dialects of the south than between the dialects of the west or east. Although this does not cast any doubt on the significance of the phonetic phenomena upon which the west/east division is based, the fact that these phenomena require few rules in our specialist system, whereas there are many rules common to the dialects of the south and other rules common to the dialects of the north, gives us further grounds for considering the benefit of rethinking and depoliticising the dialect map.

3. Blaverism or localism

The exaggeration of localism is part of the linguistic debate in most languages, and is a sign of health and a source of concern for spoken-media professionals.

Blaverism is the most prominent example of this, but the Spanish Popular Party has used it as a political weapon in our islands and, as rightly noted by notable Valencians living in Barcelona, localism is alive and well throughout the country.

Such exaggerated localism has been used by people for more than a century to defend “the Catalan that we speak *where I live*” or “the Catalan spoken on *my street*” in a variety of different ways (our italics).

It is also the basis for Eastern Blaverism, which involves rejecting western Catalan phonetics in favour of an approximation to Spanish (Muntsa, Xevi, Carma/Karma, Tresa), forcing western Catalan speakers to use non-velarized variants.

Spoken-media professionals are often attracted by the siren calls of single-minded exponents of local varieties, in part because of the insecurity that most of us feel on account of our ignorance of the variants themselves, and in part because we look for simple formulas or crutches. With proper names, the simplest formula appears to be declaring the autochthonous pronunciation to be the only acceptable pronunciation.

4. Written-spoken gap

The simplistic thinking that finds fault with linguistic diversity (reflected in the metaphoric curse of Babel) tends to idealise pseudo-phonetic spelling (under the influence of Spanish), without realising that spelling can only be approximated to phonetics if it has been fixed in the image of just one of the variance of the language, trivialising all others. The wider the phonetic variety of a language, the more beneficial it is to have a universal orthography.

If we accept that Catalan is like most languages, not just because there is a gap between the spoken and written word, but also because the relationship between the two is not biunivocal, then a variety of different realisations become possible. In the case of proper names, it is of little importance to journalists whether a proper name comes from a common word (*sénia*) or not (*Dénia*), but rather whether its pronunciation is going to cause them problems.

Simplistic thinking seeks *crutches* to reduce the distance between the written and spoken word:

- If the forms of written words match, then pronunciation should be subordinated to it (Dènia la Sènia),
- If there is no match, there is a tendency to favour the written form considered, from a point of view heavily influenced by Spanish, to be closer to the pronunciation (el Figaró), in one instance resulting in the highly unusual step of calling a local referendum.

But any journalist looking into the matter would find the following:

Fon.: **dénia** (en la pronúncia local) DCVB

Fon.: **sénia** (Gir., Pineda); **sénia** (Tortosa, Guardamar); **sénia** (Riba-roja, Calasseit, Benassal, Morella, Cast., Val., Pego, Sanet); **seniɛ** (Sueca, Alcoi); **sénia** (Vila d'Eivissa); **séni** (Ross., pagesia d'Eivissa); **sínia** (Cardona, Solsona, Igualada, Pla del Llobregat, Penedès, Camp de Tarr., Ciutadella); **síniɛ** (Ll., Maó); **seja** (Vinaròs, Benicarló).

Moreover, the following variants could be added to the list above, demonstrating that any attempt to unify pronunciation is doomed to failure:

Fon.: **dénja** (en la pronúncia local) DCVB

Fon.: **sénja** (Gir., Pineda); **sénja** (Tortosa, Guardamar); **sénja** (Riba-roja, Calasseit, Benassal, Morella, Cast., Val., Pego, Sanet); **senjɛ** (Sueca, Alcoi); **sénja** (Vila d'Eivissa); **sinja** (Cardona, Solsona, Igualada, Pla del Llobregat, Penedès, Camp de Tarr., Ciutadella); **sinjɛ** (Ll., Maó).

In the case of “sénia”, the DCVB entry includes both the toponym and the common word under SÈNIA or SÍNIA f. Not being a word of Latin origin, it does not fall into the category of “cadena” type words, and it can be assumed, in this case and in the case of “Dènia”, that the similarity was decisive for Eastern Catalan speakers. It seems clear to us that, rather than fighting against these evolutionary and polyphonic trends, we should be raising awareness of diversity so that people from such places abandon the simplistic notion of the primacy of the autochthophone.

5. Maximum flexibility in onomastics

If there is a general inclination to maximise flexibility in proper names with an explicit written form, this is especially true when the written form is ambiguous, which is the case of Berga. This does not mean that we should cease to raise awareness amongst urban populations who pronounce Matadepera as if they believed that pears (*pera*) come from bushes (*mata*), but the “r” at the end of Sóller should not cause as much distaste as failing to neutralise the vowel at the end of this name when spoken in Eastern Catalan.

Before remarking on certain professional models in the spoken-word media, we should further emphasise the flexibility in the naturalisation of foreign proper names. If the language of origin has a preferred pronunciation that includes phones (sounds) that are alien to Catalan, but another variant of the same language uses an allophone to provide a variant compatible with Catalan, this latter should be used systematically (as a defective variant).

Thus, the Spanish spoken in Castile uses the allophone [θ] where the Spanish spoken elsewhere in Europe and in all American dialects use variants of [s] (approximately 90% of native Spanish speakers). Defending at all costs the notion that Catalan speakers should pronounce foreign names using foreign sounds may appear to be a cultural standard, but when different criteria are applied depending on whether the names come from French or Spanish, it is evidently a strategy designed to produce submission.

Example

The [θ] sound is untouchable in foreign names, while the [ʎ] sound has to be replaced with [r] or [r̄] (standard applicable in Spanish-administered Catalonia).

The [ʎ] sound is untouchable in foreign names, while the [θ] sound has to be replaced with [s] (standard applicable in French-administered Catalonia).

This is clearly not linguistics but politics, used to justify interference, submission and language death. If a southern Catalan announcer pronounced Spanish names properly naturalising the [θ], there would be uproar, even when it is the majority pronunciation: if you listen to the name Rodríguez Zapatero spoken by his first minister of justice in the Spanish of the Canary Islands, you will hear no interdental

(see http://latel.upf.edu/traductica/cav/RZ/lnad20060608_zapatero1.wav). And it is common to hear on *Ràdio Arrels* what you hear throughout French television and radio: [θ] → [s].

The same southern Catalan speaker could avoid alien sounds when pronouncing the “r” in Paris [paʁi(s)] or Mitterrand [miteʁɑ̃]—it would seem pedantic to say it the French way—but it turns out that the allophones we use to naturalise these names are perfectly French:

“Depending on the speaker, [ʎ] may be replaced by [χ], [ʀ], [x], [ʁ], [r] or [r̄]. This phenomenon is known as allophonic variation.”

(http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prononciation_du_fran%C3%A7ais).

When the Right Honourable José Montilla made an official visit to Portugal, no one was outraged by the pronunciation [ʒu'ze mun'tiʎə] used exclusively throughout the Portuguese media when referring to him. If the Catalan media had used this same pronunciation, it would have been construed as a jibe.

6. BBC model vs. No-Do model

The flexibility we are proposing for a single toponym or anthroponym has so far related to the admissibility of different speakers using different pronunciations, on the understanding that individual speakers are required to be consistent and to always employ the same solution. Now we are going to go further by justifying how a single speaker can use different pronunciations for the same name in different circumstances.

Traditionally, the linguistic services of the BBC represent one of the most prestigious models available:

“Give readers and presenters all the help you can with the proper names of people, places and organisations. People in all parts of the UK get annoyed and exasperated when they hear a name they know well mispronounced by the BBC. Welsh names offer non-Welsh speakers particular challenges, but the Ll sound at the beginning of many place names is not

unpronounceable and should not be spoken as if it were a single letter L. Be aware that places such as Leominster are not pronounced as they look, any more than Worcester or Leicester are.

Help is at hand if you are not sure how to pronounce a name. Go to BBC Gateway and in the search box type *speakeasy*. You will be offered a comprehensive list of pronunciations. If that fails, you can call the Pronunciation Unit on Bush House 73062 or 73084 (Email: pronunciation@bbc.co.uk). Even more help can be obtained...”

The BBC News Style Guide

It is worth noting, as demonstrated in this style guide, that the BBC is also aware of the distaste that certain pronunciations cause in audiences that are sensitive to multilingualism, and in particular that they offer their professionals several different ways to clear up any doubts. The internal procedure normally followed by the BBC Pronunciation Research Unit is as follows:

- Ask the person (call in advance, if you can),
- Ask their agent,
- Consult the archives to hear how they said it themselves in a previous interview,
- Ask our correspondent in the country of origin,
- Try the same for toponyms related to the interviewee, or contact a university specialist.

A similar process is used by the team working on Joaquim Maria Puyal’s show, which uses [θ] or [s] to identify different players called Garci/ía, and it would perhaps lead us to adopt different solutions for names such as Montilla, depending on whether we are referring to the surname, the place name from which it is derived, or the wine that is produced there (see forthcoming reSOLC bulletin no. 1).

Equally, the name *Boi* may require different solutions depending on whether we are talking about Sant Boi de Llobregat, de Lluçanès or the regional health minister Boi Ruiz. Other place names used as surnames further challenge us to remain flexible and admit a plurality of solutions. For example, the place name Berga is a very well-known instance of a majority pronunciation that is different to the autochthonous pronunciation, that is complicated by the fact that it is the paternal surname of 597 Catalans and the maternal surname of 592 (2010 data). If we recognise the subjective right of the people of Berga to consider any pronunciation other than the autochthonous pronunciation (with a close e) to be incorrect, then we cannot deny the subjective right of everyone having Berga as a surname to require others to stress the “e” with the degree of openness usually used by their families. We asked university lecturer Miquel Berga—also a renowned columnist, talk-show guest and author—about the vicissitudes of the stressed vowel in his surname:

“I normally hear it pronounced with an open ‘e’, which is obviously how I pronounce it myself. Just like in Girona, where I was born. Curiously, my father was from Guimerà (Urgell) and in Terres de Lleida and the Plana de Vic and also in Berguedà, the ‘e’ is not pronounced open. So, my father’s itinerancy must have changed the pronunciation of his surname, and I must be a ‘B(é)rga’ transformed into a ‘B(è)rga’.”

So, a model that encourages the primacy of the autochthonous pronunciation of place names could create a conflict of legitimacy with people who use the same name as their surname, further complicating the task of professional speakers in exactly the same way as a model that

tolerates diversity.

The alternative to the BBC model is naturalisation at all costs, which we will call *No-Do*, as this Francoist news reel not only represented an ideological monolith, but used it to exterminate phonetic variation and multilingualism: current examples include [ru'ðriɣə səpə'tɛru] or Mariano ‘Fortuni’, used in the Prado Museum audio guide to refer to our Marià Fortuny.

For people of limited resources, it is easier to ignore both internal diversity and the diversity of languages that bring us neologisms and place names, and to treat any innovation or proper name as if it were a word in their own language and their own variant. But we will be better served once audiences tolerate a plurality of solutions and professionals are able to convey them.

7. Revising specific polymorphisms

At this point, it seems logical to assume that a flexible standard model involves a variety of pronunciations for a single written form. In the first decades of the 20th century, at a time when Catalan society was profoundly divided over the issue of a standard written model for the language, it seemed opportune to admit certain polymorphisms that, at the time, served to mitigate the tensions related to localisms that were not felt to be covered by the common standard. We are not talking here about vocabulary (pastanaga, safanòria, carlota, etc.) or morphology (cantés, cantàs, cantara, etc.) but phonetic variants, such as those introduced by the *Normes de Castelló* or by duplicating entries in the standard dictionary as a way of legitimising two different pronunciations.

In the late 20th century, the linguistic authority amended the spoken standard to incorporate both dual pronunciations for single written forms and the mandatory use of certain pronunciations that deviate from orthographic models (such as dropping the first “r” in “arbre”). This normative assumption that phonetic distance or dual pronunciation is compatible with a single written form could be used to revise some of the dualities introduced by *Normes de Castelló* and other similar cases, reducing the graphical polymorphism in dualities such as “caragol/cargol”. Moreover, if the consonant group -nx- admits two pronunciations without the need to duplicate dictionary entries, the -tll-/tl- group could be revised to receive the same treatment.

Accordingly, as it already includes dual pronunciations of the stressed vowel in classical loan words such as “docte” and “projecte”, or the optional “l” in “altres/nosaltres”, the PEOSFIEC should also admit the optionality of the pretonic vowel in “caragol” on the basis of a single written form.

As the PEOSFIEC includes the mandatory dropping of the first “r” in “arbre” and the optionality of the first “r” in “perdre”, it should also provide for the optionality of the second “r” in “cartró” and derivatives.

Indeed, if we look up words such as “cargol” and “cartó” on Wikipedia in Catalan, it shows us the pages for “caragol” and “cartró” respectively, informing us that we have been redirected. Searching for the same terms in the on-line version of the standard dictionary of the Catalan Academy (DIEC), we are redirected in the same direction for “cargol”, but in the opposite direction for “cartró”, creating universal confusion.

In addition to the foregoing, the -tl-/-tll- duality in “batle” or “ametla” and the double graphical accentuation of “cadena” type words such as “francè/és” could be included in this proposed reduction of graphical variants, while maintaining the phonetic variants. If formal unification is not deemed to be viable, conserving polyphony in cases such as “feina/faena”, it would be useful to admit the replacement of one with the other in radio broadcasts: “The coach of the Catalan national team Pitxi Alonso said: ‘Anem per faena’”, pronounced “Anem per feina”.

And, when the time comes to revise the standard, the double graphical accentuation of “cadena” type words could be conveyed using a circumflex, such as in “francês”, providing a single highly efficient written form and avoiding any confusion between these cases and others such as “desprès/després” and “marquès/marqués”, in that it would make it possible to show—if the linguistic authorities saw fit—that the adverb “després” does not admit double pronunciation, whereas the participle of “desprendre” does. Indeed, the electronic version of the DIEC already allows us to search for “francés” and “francês”, redirecting us in both cases to “francès”.

By way of summary of sections 5, 6 and 7, it may seem contradictory that we put ourselves up as advocates of non-linguist professionals, demanding maximum flexibility in the plurality of pronunciation of toponyms and anthroponyms, whilst simultaneously proposing a reduction in graphical polymorphism, which numerous professionals must consider to be a valuable aid. Our position is based on consistency (if the spoken standard is flexible enough to admit this plurality of pronunciations on the basis of a single written form such as “jo” or “altre”, it ought to be able to permit the same variation for a written form such as “caragol”), and the availability of an instrument that enables the needs of any professional in relation to this issue to be resolved easily and efficiently, as will be shown below.

8. Tools

Assuming that any spoken-word professional has access to the Internet, we believe that any pronunciation queries that any such professionals may have could be resolved at *reSOLC-mitjans.CAT*, which is an online search platform for spoken-language professionals (journalists, dubbing actors, multimedia producers and linguistic advisers in the spoken-word media) covering the correct and suitable pronunciation of the lexicon in its broadest sense (common lexicon, toponymy, proper names, abbreviations, etc.) based on the combination of the following variables: dialect, propriety, context and formality. These are the variables used to determine the flexibility of the *Proposal for a spoken standard for the Catalan language* of the Philology Department of the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*.

This platform was created by LATEL and promoted by the Media Secretary of the Regional Department of Culture and the Media of the Regional Government of Catalonia. With adequate funding, this platform could be extended to cover professionals in the remainder of the field in accordance with the corresponding style guides and applicable standards.

The image below is a screenshot of the *reSOLC* interface as seen by a speaker of Central Eastern Catalan:

« anterior **matadepera N4** següent »

Transcripció fonètica	Dialecte	Àmbit	Propietat	Formalitat	Estat	Valoracions
mataðapéra	[?] Central	General	Propi	Formal	Pendent (tots)	<input type="text"/> Visualitza
mataðapéra	[?] Central	Restringit	Admissible	Informal	Pendent (tots)	<input type="text"/> Visualitza

Consulta d'altres mots Visualitza totes les transcripcions Consulta al suport humà

No hem trobat la transcripció del mot *matadepera* al [DCVB](#)

Comentaris

Escriviu un comentari sobre aquest mot

The *reSOLC*-mitjans.CAT platform currently essentially includes the words appearing in the *Gran Diccionari de la Llengua Catalana* and the first edition of the *Nomenclàtor de Catalunya*. In the short term, it needs to be expanded to include toponymy from outside the Principality and Catalan anthroponymy, as well as new DIEC entries, and in the longer term, foreign proper names, depending on the resources invested. A revision of the existing entries is also pending, given that the second edition of the *Nomenclàtor* includes the autochthophone transcriptions of some names.

In relation to Catalan proper names, the linguistic authority needs to determine whether or not the pronunciation of common words appearing in a given toponym are restricted by the orthoepic dictates for the geographical area in question. It also needs to determine whether the pronunciation of toponyms should be applied unchanged to surnames derived from them.

For foreign proper names, naturalisation guidelines need to be set up for each language.

The example of [mətəðapérə] in the screenshot above shows the current state of the tool: red indicates that the word is pending revision for Central Catalan. The second edition of the *Nomenclàtor* proposes [mátəðapérə] as the autochthophone, but precisely one of the issues to be further developed in the *Proposal for a spoken standard for the Catalan language* is the handling of the double accent, and specifically the optionality or otherwise of the secondary accent. What we believe to be fundamental in the case of [mətəðapérə/mátəðapérə] is the mistake most commonly committed by some speakers, and most exasperating for local speakers, namely pronouncing it as if it were “Mata de Pera” [mətəðapérə/mátəðapérə]. Most listeners are not irritated by the neutral in the first syllable if the main accent is closed.

One of the strong points of *reSOLC* is that it has been designed as a web 2.0 tool, i.e. a tool that exploits the potential for interaction with users, especially qualified users. This facilitates user-based validation, enabling something—even if it takes years—that otherwise would not be viable, even for languages that are much more lucrative than Catalan: validating millions of automatically generated phonetic transcriptions, which would be less viable if not transcribed automatically.

9. Conclusions

In conclusion, we believe that any effort intended to influence professional speakers to pronounce the lexicon of proper names in a unified manner on the basis of the primacy of the autochthonous pronunciation would be sterile, especially in the extremely common case of toponyms that are also used as anthroponyms. We believe, and accordingly intend to promote within our sphere of influence, that it would be more effective to raise awareness of diversity amongst audiences such that they are neither irritated nor exasperated when outsiders pronounce words differently to them, a noteworthy example of this being the inhabitants of Tàrraga (autochthophone: [tárgɛ]). We hope that *reSOLC* will help to ensure that raising awareness about diversity does not turn into “every man for himself”.

10. Abbreviations used in the article

ALEF: Linguistic algorithm for the flexible standard
 BBC: British Broadcasting Corporation
 DCVB: Catalan Valencian Balearic Dictionary
 DIEC: Dictionary of the Catalan Language of the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans* (Institute of Catalan Studies)
 IULA: University Institute of Applied Linguistics
 LATEL: Laboratory of Linguistic Technology
 MCO: Spoken-word media
 No-Do: NOTiciarios y DOcumentales (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/No-Do>)
 PEOSFIEC: *Proposal for a spoken standard for the Catalan language. 1 Phonology*
 SFIEC: Philology Department of the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*
 UPF: Pompeu Fabra University

11. Bibliography

- Aragonés, A.; Duran, J.; Ingla, M. 2004. *El català per a periodistes de les Terres de l'Ebre* [*Catalan for journalists in Terres de l'Ebre*]. Valls: Cossetània Edicions (Col·lecció Antines, 8).
- Camps, O.; de Yzaguirre, Ll.; Salvà, F. 2004. Diagnòstic ortològic assistit [Assisted orthoepic diagnosis]. In: Martí, Sadurní; Cabré, Miriam; Feliu, Francesc; Iglesias, Narcís i Prats, David (ed.), *Actes del 13è Col·loqui de l'AILLC*. Barcelona: PAM.
- Castellanos, J. A. 1993. *Manual de pronunciació* [*Pronunciation guide*]. Vic: Eumo Editorial.
- Castellanos, J. A. 2004. *Manual de pronunciació: criteris i exercicis d'elocució* [*Pronunciation guide: criteria and elocution exercises*]. Vic: Eumo Editorial.
- Comissió de Toponímia de Catalunya. 2009. *Nomenclàtor oficial de toponímia de Catalunya* [*Official toponymy of Catalonia*]. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans i Generalitat de Catalunya.
- D. D. A. A. 1933. *Normes d'ortografia valenciana* [*Valencian spelling rules*]. València: Editorial Miguel Juan.
- De Yzaguirre i Maura, Lluís. 1990. *L'estructura sil·làbica del català central (Tesi Lluís de Yzaguirre i Maura dirigida per Joaquim Rafel i Fontanals)* [*The syllable structure of Central Catalan (from Lluís de Yzaguirre i Maura's thesis, directed by Joaquim Rafael y Fontanals)*]. Barcelona.
- Lacreu, J. 1987. *Manual d'ús de l'estàndard oral* [*Usage guide for standard speech*]. València: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat de València.

- Paloma, D.; Puigròs, M. A.; Rico, A.; Torrent, A. M. 2009. *Guia fonètica per a les televisions locals* [*Phonetic guide for local TV stations*]. Bellaterra: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Salvà, F.; de Yzaguirre, Ll.; Cabré, M. T. 2004. Un diccionari ortològic català [Orthoepic Catalan dictionary]. In: Martí, Sadurní; Cabré, Miriam; Feliu, Francesc; Iglesias, Narcís i Prats, David (ed.), *Actes del 13è Col·loqui de l'AILLC*. Barcelona: PAM.
- Secció Filològica. 1999. *Proposta per a un estàndard oral de la llengua catalana I, Fonètica*. [*Proposal for a spoken standard for the Catalan language I*]. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- Televisió de Catalunya. 1995. *El català a TV3. Llibre d'estil* [*Catalan on TV3. Style guide*]. Barcelona: Edicions 62.
- Vallverdú, F. 1986. *Elocució i ortologia catalanes* [*Catalan elocution and orthoepy*]. Barcelona: Editorial Jonc.

Online resources

- BBC Phonetics guide (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/languages/other/quickfix/catalan.shtml>).
- DCVB (<http://dcvb.iec.cat/>).
- Diccionari de dubtes del català oral* [*Dictionary of queries concerning spoken Catalan*].
Josep À. Mas, Mònica Montserrat, David Paloma
(<http://www.lecturanda.cat/www/lecturanda/ca/recursos/ddcor.html>)
- DIEC (<http://dlc.iec.cat/index.html>).
- ésAdir: llibre d'estil de la Corporació Catalana de Mitjans Audiovisuals [Catalan Broadcasting Corporation style guide] (<http://esadir.cat/>).
- "Fortuni" al Prado ["Fortuni" at the Prado] (<http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/5-cultura/19-cultura/294905-fortuni-al-prado.html>)
- AVL guide to phonetics (<http://www.avl.gva.es/inici.html>)
- reSOLC- mitjans.CAT (<http://www.iula.upf.edu/rec/resolc/que-es-solc.php>)
- SOLC onomàstic, SOLC (<http://latel.upf.edu/cgi-bin/editaTopon.cgi>)
- Wikipedia (<http://www.wikipedia.org/>)

Lluís de Yzaguirre i Maura and Ester Pedreño Puertas
Laboratori de Tecnologies Lingüístiques. IULA -UPF
Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
C/ Roc Boronat, 138 (despatx 53.216)
08018 Barcelona
iulalatel@upf.edu