

[Rascunho do artigo publicado na revista *Written Language & Literacy* 18/2, 2015, pp. 275–286, entregue à John Benjamins Publishing Company em setembro de 2014]

The Portuguese Language Spelling Accord

Rita Marquilhas
Universidade de Lisboa

Abstract

The process of adopting an official orthography for the Portuguese language was completed very late in history, only in the twentieth century, and it was independently triggered by the Brazilian Letters Academy (in 1907) and the Portuguese sciences academy (in 1911). The diplomatic negotiations between the nations involved were countless ones along the following decades, and also included, in due time, other former Portuguese colonies. Since 2006, all countries are gradually ratifying a unified orthography decided in 1990, but the process is much debated in the public space. The root of the disagreement has to do with the fact that both the Portuguese and the Brazilian sets of graphematic norms, although aiming at phonological segments, include transcription rules for variant matter: different phonetic realizations that are triggered by phonological processes.

1. Introduction

The standard norm for written language in Portugal was formally established in 1911, one year after the instauration of the Republic. The pro-standard arguments were almost 200 years old, but before the twentieth century there had never been a favourable occasion for a proper academy commission to produce an orthography (Gonçalves 2003:779–786). Portugal finally approved a first written standard in the context of a hasty process, less than 12 months after the Republican revolution, but some of the decisions made then proved, in time, to have lacked vision. They were mainly two. Firstly, there was no attempt to include Brazilian representatives in the works of the commission of the Lisbon Sciences Academy, the institution put in charge by the Portuguese government for the design of the official orthography. Nevertheless, Brazil had been independent from Portugal since 1822 and the Brazilian Letters Academy had previously voted, in 1907, its own proposal for an orthographic reform (Silva 2014).

Secondly, the orthography decided by the Lisbon Sciences Academy commission, which was published in number 213 of the state official journal, *Diário do Governo*, in the 12th of September 1911 (Ministério do Interior 1911), included two graphematic rules that would become a source of disagreement between Brazilians and Portuguese reform negotiators: (i) representation of the difference between the mid-vowels and open vowels in the European Portuguese (EP) words that receive antepenult stress; (ii) maintenance of a minority of learned word spellings, representing the absence of raising in European Portuguese pre-stressed vowels. The relevant examples will be given below, in Section 2. A sort of mid-phonetic, mid-phonological orthography was thus designed, as some phonetic realizations peculiar to European Portuguese were being represented.

Along the slow process of unification of this first Portuguese orthography with the Brazilian one, many compromises were achieved between the academies of both countries, but the root problem was never fully solved. Since the compromises ended up eliminating more rules of phonetics representation for EP and fewer rules for Brazilian Portuguese (BP), the public perception of the 1990 Portuguese Language Spelling Accord, especially after 2008, when the Portuguese government ratified it, was that of national treason committed by the state.

2. The phonetic representations in the 1911 orthography

Portuguese has free lexical stress and in 1911 it was decided that stress should be signaled by the orthography when falling in the antepenultimate syllable. The model was that of Spanish orthography, which had adopted such a system. The intention was to highlight with diacritics those words obeying to the less frequent stress pattern. Indeed, at least in nowadays EP adult speech, monosyllables excluded, 76% of the lexicon has penult stress and 22% has final stress (Frota et al. 2012).

Although the Spanish standard was recognized in 1911 as a good reference for fixing Portuguese graphematic accentuation, it could not be scrupulously followed. As it happens, the system of contrastive vowels in both European and Brazilian Portuguese has a larger inventory than the Spanish vowel system: five contrastive vowels in Spanish against seven in Portuguese, alongside an inventory of only five Latin available letters <a, e, i, o, u> (Mateus & Andrade 2000:9, 33). So, in terms of diacritics, instead of just the acute accent, which was the only one in the Spanish graphematic accentuation, the Portuguese orthography was to use the acute, the circumflex, and the grave accents, alongside a justification that signaled, precisely, the existence of more contrastive (“differential”) vowels in Portuguese speech:

The natural conditions of the Portuguese language demand its graphic accentuation to be much more copious and differential than the Castilian one, which is a model in its simplicity. In fact, Castilian makes no difference between open e, o and closed [= “mid”] e, o, and this frees that language from the use of the circumflex accent.

(Ministério do Interior 1911:3846)

As it happens, the open or mid quality of the Portuguese stressed vowels, along being contrastive in some cases (*poço* [ˈposu] ‘well’ *noun*, *posso* [ˈpɔsu] ‘I can’; *selo* [ˈselu] ‘stamp’, *selo* [ˈselu] ‘I seal’), is also allophonic. It depends on whether the EP speaker speaks a Northern variety (*ramo* [ˈramu] ‘twig’) or a Southern one (*ramo* [ˈrɐmu]/[ˈRɐmu] ‘twig’). This assimilation process of stressed vowels, which can rise in some varieties before nasal consonants, became a major source of variation between EP and BP because BP always has the raised result. The spelling rule and the graphematic variation it creates when the stress is on the antepenultimate syllable survived until today and even phonology handbooks refer to it:

[W]ords stressed on the antepenultimate syllable whenever the penultimate syllable begins with a nasal consonant have the diacritic (˘) in EP and (^) in BP, corresponding to two different pronunciations of the vowel (e.g. *cómodo* [ˈkɔmudu]/*cômodo* [ˈkomudu] ‘comfortable’).

(Mateus & Andrade 2000:9)

On the other hand, and although the 1911 spelling system had been announced as a simplified orthography, in contrast with more fashionable customs, some learned spellings were kept. They were recognized as helpful by the Lisbon Sciences Academy commission because they were spellings that, in a complementary distribution with the grave accent, had a supporting role at the phonetic level: their unpronounced consonants occurred immediately after the letter for non-raised pre-stressed vowels. The given examples were *direção*, *directo*, *acção*, *activo*, *acto*, *tracção*, *tracto*, *excepção*, *excepto*, *exceptuar*, *adoptar*, *adpto*, *adopção*, all words with unpronounced <c> or <p> in EP, but with a pre-stressed vowel that doesn’t raise, being thus an exception to the phonological process of unstressed vowels in this language variety. Nevertheless, the behavior of pre-stressed vowels in BP is completely different and does not obey the raising rule (Mateus & Andrade 2000:34). So the orthography of Brazilian Portuguese, also a simplified one, has eventually arrived to the parallel spellings *direção*, *direto*, *ação*, *ativo*, *ato*, *tração*, *trato*, *exceção*, *exceto*, *excetuar*, *adotar*, *adoto*, *adoção*.

3. The concept of a “simplified” orthography and its consequences

None of the two measures presented in the section above seems to have been motivated, at the time, by the conscious will of the Lisbon Sciences Academy commission to use orthography as pretext for neo-imperialistic or aristocratic claims. The intention was, explicitly, to perfect a tool that could rapidly improve literacy rates in Portuguese society. The choice of a simplified orthography seen from the view point of the prototypical erudite, which had learned Greek and Latin, was a discarded option. As was explained in the report by the members of the 1911 Portuguese commission, they felt inspired by the will of working for “all the individuals that could read and write in [the] nation,” not “for the scholar.” They wanted to formulate “simple,” “rational,” “logical,” “learnable” rules, rules that would “conform to the

natural and even literary evolution” of Portuguese. The commission was clearly following the nationalism and the Enlightenment received views of the time.

The nationalism discourse was adopted, for instance, in the way fashions originating in France were condemned. They were identified as spellings in a “servile and etymologically inconsequent way, by the influence of French writing”. The commission members had an alternative to the French model in a “simple and coherent” orthography made 400 years earlier, in 1576, by the Portuguese grammarian Duarte Nunes de Leão. It had been dismissed and had not triumphed, in spite of its merits – they argued – because Portuguese culture kneeled too promptly before the prestige of French authors:

In truth, if the reading of foreign authors, in Portugal, was more that of the Spanish and the Italian, no orthographic complications [such as *assignar, Ignacio, augmentar, Magdalena*] would have gained roots in the literary writing of our mother tongue, which is contrary to such coquetries and to which it is convenient to restore the simplicity and the coherence of ancient orthography.

(Ministério do Interior 1911:3846)

This is the reasoning that normally accompanies the discourse in defense of shallow orthographies, the ones of the above identified virtuous models, the Italian and the Spanish ones. On the opposite side, the deep orthography would be that of the French model, regarded as inadequate for the writing of Portuguese. The terms shallow and deep orthography were not used at the time. But the way in which they started being employed later seem to correspond to the pair simplified vs erudite of the 1911 commission’s terminology. According to Leonard Katz and Laurie B. Feldman, who studied, in experimental psychology, the processes responsible for recognition and pronunciation of English and Serbo-Croatian printed words, a deep orthography, like the English one, principally references the “morphophonemic level of the language.” On the other hand, a shallow orthography, like the Serbo-Croatian spelling system of the 1980s, the spelling-to-sound correspondence is consistently simple (Katz & Feldman 1983:157–158).

Bearing these definitions in mind, we can say now that the first official written standard instituted in Portugal in 1911 was meant to stay distant from a deep orthography fashion because this latter was considered to be variable, and was qualified as “erudite,” “etymological” and “Frenchie”. A shallower system was preferred.

Amongst the 1911 commission’s members was an expert who was very well prepared to formulate the rules for the shallow “spelling-to-sound” correspondences. He was Aniceto dos Reis Gonçalves Viana, the first Portuguese phonetician, the author of several studies in the domain of acoustic and articulatory phonetics. Since 1885 he also fought, in a series of publications, for his proposal of a simplified spelling reform. The orthography of 1911 is, in general, the adoption of Gonçalves Viana’s ideas (Castro, Duarte & Leiria 1987:208).

When we examine the reasoning of Gonçalves Viana, one conclusion seems clear: he had the purpose of designing an orthography that mirrored the systematic correspondence between letters and abstract sounds in disregard of their surface phonetic realization. Had he lived today, he would have explained it with the difference between orthography and graphematics and with the benefits of graphematic transparency within a writing system. As Martin Neef puts it today in order to justify his Recoding Model of Graphematics (Neef 2005), the distinction between orthography and graphematics is relevant for the analysis of all writing systems because orthography is word-oriented, and graphematics is phonology-oriented. In Neef’s words, the distinction meets also a parallel in the contrast between writing and reading:

A fundamental property of the Recoding Model is a distinction between graphematics and orthography as two different modules of a writing system. As a first approximation, orthography is connected to writing while graphematics is related to reading. More precisely: Orthography is the part of a writing system that determines how a specific word has to be spelled. Graphematics, in contrast, asks how a written representation is translated into a phonological representation.

(Neef & Balestra 2011:112)

As for graphematic transparency, it has to do with the “reliability with which the pronunciation of a word can be gained from its spelling” (Neef & Balestra 2011:113).

When these concepts are taken as a reference measure, we can say that Gonçalves Viana’s idea was that the readers of the pages written in his orthography would all of them arrive at the same ideal representation, in a reliable way, independently of their language variety. They would arrive at what we call today the same phonological representation. In his first work on the matter, a work he co-signed with the Sanskrit expert Guilherme Vasconcelos Abreu in 1885, a distinction was drawn between enunciation (ideal) and pronunciation (physical):

The orthography cannot be special for a single way of speaking, be that the way of an individual, a province or a language dialect. [...] It cannot represent the pronunciation because surely this one is never unified. The orthography should represent the enunciation, which is common to the people, the nation who speak one single language as their own and exclusive idiom.

(Viana & Abreu 1885: 5)

Those were the times of a Romantic conception of languages, closely knitted to the way national histories were themselves perceived. Wilhelm von Humboldt had described such conception, following the Herdean philosophical tradition, a conception that distinguished successive phases in the deterministic historical processes of languages and nations: the one of formation, the golden age and the one of decline:

Two periods which must be definitely distinguished arise of course in this process: the one in which the sound-creating force of the language is still in growth and living activity; the other in which an apparent standstill takes place after complete formation of at least the external form of language and then a visible decline of that creative, sensual force follows.

(von Humboldt [1836], apud Lehmann 1967: chap. 6)

The very same theory was visibly present in the Gonçalves Viana and Vasconcelos Abreu orthographic proposal of 1885. The complete formation of the Portuguese language had been attained, they argued, in the fifteenth century, a period when that particular Romance language was established as a “fundamental, or mother tongue” for the subsequent dialects (Viana & Abreu 1885:6). The enunciation (or abstract representation) of that golden age was the target they aimed at in the formalization of their orthographic proposal.

In the context of such mentality, it becomes understandable why, in 1911, the Brazilian colleagues were not judged as an essential presence in the works of the Lisbon Sciences Academy commission. The commission was in a hurry and the Brazilians, after all, would have the same to say on the “mother tongue” of them all, conceived by then as a common ideal to both Brazilian and Portuguese speakers.

4. Towards a greater graphematic transparency in the 1990 Spelling Accord

Time proved Gonçalves Viana wrong when he thought that he was staying totally out of the representation of the “pronunciation” level of the Portuguese speech. Some idiosyncrasies of European Portuguese phonetic realizations were depicted – the ones concerning pre-stressed non-raised vowels, e.g. EP *acção* instead of BP *ação* – and some rules concerning the connection between graphematic accentuation and word stress were not sufficiently reliable in order to serve both Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese readers of standardly spelled words (e.g. EP *cómodo* versus BP *cômado*).

In order to correct this flaw, the 1990 Portuguese Language Spelling Accord made a move towards greater graphematic transparency by the suppression of all unpronounced consonant letters in Latinisms and Hellenisms, although some of them co-occur with non-raised pre-stressed vowels in EP. Examples can be found in *ação*, *acionar*, *afetivo*, *coleção*, *coletivo*, *direção*, *diretor*, *objecção*, *adoção*, *adotar*, *batizar*. The convention before the 1990 Spelling Accord, in all Portuguese speaking countries with the exception of Brazil, was to write *acção*, *accionar*, *afectivo*, *colecção*, *colectivo*, *directão*, *director*, *objecção*, *adopção*, *adoptar*, *baptizar*. So, in practical terms, the Brazilian 1907 convention was indeed generalized here.

But the 1990 Spelling Accord, fully exemplified in Appendix A, did not manage to attain all possible graphematic transparency. Indeed, the graphematic accentuation of stressed antepenultimate syllables was kept. Here, the Accord admits a variable with two values, against the previous situation, which had two orthographies with no intrinsic variability: EP spelling values (*académico, anatômico, cênico, cómodo, fenómeno, género, topónimo; Amazónia, António, blasfémia, fêmea, gémeo, génio, ténue*) and BP spelling values (*acadêmico, anatômico, cênico, etc.*). The phonology of other varieties of Portuguese, the African and the East Timorese Portuguese varieties, is still not sufficiently studied, but the corresponding societies have a closer connection to Portugal's educational system, hence a greater tendency to prefer the graphematic variants of the EP standard, the ones with the acute accent.

The only way of avoiding variables within the new written standard and of attaining more graphematic transparency would have been to banish altogether the graphematic accentuation in words with antepenult stress (*academico, anatomico, cenico, etc.*). But then a too drastic change would have been at stake, because the use of the diacritic for antepenult stress had had decades to become itself a reliable, steady rule, at the graphematic level of written Portuguese, both the EP and the BP.

5. Note on the public opposition to the Spelling Accord in Portugal, at the turn of the twentieth century

After 1911, several decades of negotiations would follow. They began in 1912 and aimed at a harmonization of the 1907 Brazilian spelling standard with the 1911 Portuguese one. Until 1986, forty successive public events occurred, some of agreement between the academies, some of split-up, and small reforms did take place (the counting is based on the list gathered by Castro, Duarte & Leiria 1987:208–218). Between 1986 and 1990, with African representatives already on board because the former Portuguese African colonies had been themselves independent since 1975, the process arrived at a final phase. A set of bases had been agreed upon for an international treaty, the Analytic bases of the simplified orthography of Portuguese language of 1945, renegotiated in 1975 and consolidated in 1986 (Castro, Duarte & Leiria 1987:232). In 1990, the Portuguese Language Spelling Accord was finally agreed upon. In 2009, Portugal and Brazil started its implementation after having it ratified the previous year. In 2014, only Angola and Mozambique did not ratify all the documents that are needed for the reform to be fully accomplished. All other former Portuguese colonies, including Timor-Leste, have already done so.

Like all spelling reforms, the 1990 Portuguese Language Spelling Accord has been passionately debated (Coulmas 1989/2003; Sebba 2007:132–256).¹ In order to get a sketchy idea of the main facets of this debate, it would be useful to read the most emblematic claims made along the process, exemplified with the statements in Appendix B. The most shocking fact for the Accord opponents in Portugal was that the spellings exclusively suitable for EP readers were the ones to be banished (*acção, colecção, espectador, etc.*), whereas the comfort of BP readers seemed to have been safeguarded by the consecration of the variation *académico/acadêmico, anatômico/anatômico, cênico/cênico, etc.*

Although the technical reason for the double standard in the 1990 Accord lies in the struggle for the best possible balance between different ways of attaining graphematic transparency, as seen above, it was too tempting, especially because the technicalities of Portuguese phonology are not generally understood, to jump into the conclusion that there was a complot going on between the Accord negotiators and the Portuguese government. This one was accused of selling the national pride in exchange for crumbs of the economic growth that was happening in two former colonies, namely Brazil and Angola.²

References

Castro, Ivo, Inês Duarte & Isabel Leiria (eds.) (1987). *A demanda da ortografia portuguesa*. Lisboa: Edições João Sá da Costa.

Coulmas, Florian (1989/2003). Writing reform: Conditions and implications. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *The writing systems of the world: An introduction to their linguistic analysis*, 241–263. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. DOI: 10.1017/cbo9781139164597.013

Frota, Sónia, Joseph Butler, Susana Correia, Cátia Severino & Marina Vigário (2012). Pitch first, stress next? Prosodic effects on word learning in an intonation language. In *Proceedings of the 36th annual Boston University conference on language development* 1: 190–201. Boston: Cascadilla Press.

Gonçalves, Maria Filomena (2003). *As ideias ortográficas em Portugal: de Madureira Feijó a Gonçalves Viana (1734–1911)*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1836). *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Berlin: F. Dümmler.

Katz, Leonards & Laurie B. Feldman (1983). Relation between pronunciation and recognition of printed words in Deep and Shallow orthographies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 9.1: 157–166. DOI: 10.1037/0278–7393.9.1.157

Lehman, Winfred (ed.) (1967). *A reader in nineteenth century historical Indo-European linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0022226700002541

Mateus, Maria Helena Mira & Ernesto Andrade (2000). *The phonology of Portuguese*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0952675701004109

Ministério do Interior (1911). Relatório da Comissão nomeada, por Portaria de 15 de Fevereiro de 1911, para fixar as bases da ortografia que deve ser adoptada nas Escolas e nos Documentos oficiais e outras publicações feitas por conta do Estado. *Diário do Governo* 213: 3845–3851.

Neef, Martin (2005). *Die Graphematik des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. DOI: 10.1515/9783110914856

Neef, Martin & Miriam Balestra (2011). Measuring graphematic transparency. German and Italian compared. *Written Language & Literacy* 14.1: 109–142. DOI: 10.1075/wll.14.1.06nee

Sebba, Mark (2007). *Spelling and society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0047404509990352

Silva, Maurício (2014). Superando a ‘anarquia ortográfica’: a Academia Brasileira de Letras e a reforma ortográfica da língua portuguesa (1907). *Web-Revista Sociodialeto* 4.12: 541–554.

Viana, Aniceto dos Reis Gonçalves & Guilherme de Vasconcelos Abreu (1885). *Bases da ortografia portuguesa*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional.

Appendix A

List of spelling changes brought by the 1990 Portuguese Spelling Accord (adaptation of the Accord’s official website, Portal da Língua Portuguesa
(www.portaldalinguaportuguesa.org))

Before the 1990 Spelling Accord	After the 1990 Spelling Accord	Spelling rule
anti-revolucionário, anti-sistema ‘anti-revolutionary, anti-system’	antirrevolucionário, antissistema	Most compounds lose their hyphen, even at the cost of gaining a double spelling, <i>-rr-</i> or <i>-ss-</i>
fim-de-semana ‘weekend’	fim de semana	Locutions lose their hyphens
anti- / incendiário <i>or</i> anti- / - incendiário ‘fire proof’	anti- / - incendiário	Hyphen in trans-lineation becomes obligatory
há-de ‘(he/she) will’	há de	Hyphen before prep. <i>de</i> in the sequence <i>v. haver+de+v. infinitive</i>

		disappears
tônico (Brazil) <i>and</i> tónico (Portugal and former colonies) 'tonic'	tônico <i>or</i> tónico	Letters <i>a, e, o</i> for stressed vowels in proparoxitone words receive qualitative accent (<i>á, ó, é</i> for low vowels and <i>â, ê, ô</i> for middle vowels); before nasal / <i>m, n</i> /, Brazilian speakers have no low vowels
<i>n. pêlo, n. pêra, v. para</i> 'hair, pear, (he/she) stops'	<i>n. pelo, n. pera, v. para</i> (= <i>prep.+n. pelo, prep. pera, prep. para</i>)	Letters for vowels in paroxitone words never receive an accent, even if this creates homography
idéia (Brazil), jóia 'idea, jewel'	joia, ideia	Letters for vowels in paroxitone words never receive an accent
baiúca (Brazil), desagúe 'tavern, <i>v. subj. pres</i> flow'	baiuca, desague (Brazil)	Letters for vowels in paroxitone words never receive an accent
acção, colecionador, actual, óptimo (Portugal and former colonies) 'action, collector, <i>adj.</i> present, great'	ação, colecionador, atual, ótimo	Learned consonants cease to be written if unpronounced
carácter (Portugal and former colonies), caráter (Brazil) 'character'	carácter <i>or</i> caráter	Learned consonants can be written if pronounced
lingüística, seqüência (Brazil) 'linguistics, sequence'	linguística, sequência	The umlaut is banned from the diacritics' system
Janeiro (Portugal and former colonies) <i>and</i> janeiro (Brazil) 'January'	janeiro	Words for months and year seasons have a lower case initial
húmido (Portugal and former colonies) <i>and</i> úmido (Brazil) 'wet'	húmido <i>or</i> úmido	Equivocated learned spellings are preserved when traditional

Appendix B

Statements sample before and after the 1990 Portuguese Spelling Accord's adoption by the Portuguese state (2009) and the Portuguese media (2010)

Standard Statements	Voice identification
Ruth Marlene, 2005, Lyrics in the song <i>Show de Bola</i> I have always learned to say / in the tongue of old Camões / [European Portuguese] "how beautiful", "how nice", / when something pleases us. / Now I have to learn / the new Spelling Accord; / to understand the new tides, / Oh, what time does to us! / Instead of [European Portuguese] "how good", we now say / [Brazilian Portuguese] "what a football show!" / And this phrase is here to stay.	Pop singer
António Emiliano, 2008, <i>Revista Autor</i> 'The problem was that some Portuguese souls (lexicographers, academics and political rulers from this side of the Atlantic, with little knowledge of language and cultural issues and little sense of the national interest) thought they could catch the	Linguist, language historian, promoter of the Anti-

<p>Brazilian train by means of an ‘unified orthography’, a kind of symbolic rendition to the emerging Portuguese speaking leviathan.’</p>	<p>Spelling Accord petition</p>
<p>Rui Tavares, 2008, <i>Público</i></p> <p>‘Nationalism is short-sighted. One of the petitions against the Accord says that this situation «irremediably harms our multi-secular identity». Is it possible to exaggerate more?’</p>	<p>Historian, columnist of a reference newspaper</p>
<p>Vasco Graça Moura, 2009, <i>Diário de Notícias</i></p> <p>‘These last days, the rhythm of signatures under it [the petition against the New Spelling Accord] has been speeding up, which makes it supposable that the civil society is very sensitive to the alarming risk of the application of such enormity in ours and those countries where the Portuguese language is written by the same spelling norms (all of them, after all, except for Brazil).’</p>	<p>Writer, poet, literary translator, editor, promoter of the Anti-Spelling Accord petition</p>
<p>Clara Ferreira Alves, 2009, <i>Expresso</i></p> <p>‘The spelling standardization can only benefit the language and promote its prestige and dissemination, making it easier for the relations between our common language and other tongues, those more widely used and spoken. I am in favour of the Accord. Nevertheless, I understand the initial violence of going from <i>ótimo</i> to <i>ótimo</i> and from <i>baptista</i> to <i>batista</i>, putting Portugal’s Portuguese a bit under Brazilian Portuguese jurisdiction.’</p>	<p>Journalist, columnist in a reference newspaper</p>
<p>Henrique Monteiro, 2012, <i>Expresso</i></p> <p>‘The war around the Accord is useless, anachronistic and, above all, has nothing to do with a mythical pureness of the language, which never existed’</p>	<p>Journalist, head of a reference newspaper</p>

ⁱ The debate can be followed on two webpages: Ciberdúvidas da Língua Portuguesa (www.ciberduvidas.com/) and Em Defesa da Língua Portuguesa Contra o Acordo Ortográfico (<http://emdefesadalinguaportuguesa.blogspot.com/>).