Galician dialects constitute a good source of evidence for the Exemplar Model of Morphology developed by Joan Bybee (1985, 1988, 2001 and 2010). This model defends that:

a) The representations stored in the knowledge of the speakers are highly redundant.
b) The stored representations make up a network that gives them an internal structure.
c) Morphological rules, restrictions or well-formedness conditions do not exist out of the stored items.
d) Frequent regular forms are stored exactly in the same way with irregular forms.
e) Storing and frequency of use have an impact in the structure of the grammar.
f) Linguistic variation and change are good sources to discover the structure of a synchronic state of the language.

Galician, a Romance language spoken in the North West of the Iberian Peninsula, is part of a dialect continuum stretching along the northern strip of the peninsula which was not occupied by the Moors. These dialects were carried Southward following political developments connected to the Christian Reconquest. The dialects of the northern strip contain more internal variety than the southern dialects, which were subject to levelling processes.

This richness evidenced by the northern dialects merits attention because it illustrates the different evolutionary paths that a linguistic item can take.

In this presentation, I would like to demonstrate how the rich data taken from Galician dialects can serve as illustrations of that linguistic model. I propose to analyse the evolution of the stems of irregular verbs in Galician varieties, such as those of the preterits of *facer* 'to do', *querer* 'to want', *dicir* 'to say', known as *perfectum stems*. I will also pay special attention to the development of *poñer ~ pór* 'to put', whose changes throw light on the way speakers construct linguistic structures from stored, unanalyzed, materials. These *perfectum stems* appear in a morphomic distribution (Maiden 2001); their forms are so idiosyncratic that could hardly be derived from a basic root shared by the *infectum stems* and they have to be stored into the lexicon. In (3) we see that in the *infectum stems* of *poñer ~ pór* 'to put' where two paradigms are competing in the dialects, one conservative and other innovative; the innovative one was created by taking the root [poɲ] of the 1SG.IND.PRS to almost all the forms of the *infectum*. The conservative *perfectum stem* [puʃ] in (4) is the outcome of an analogical change that reduced polymorphism by spreading the old root of the 1SG.IND.PST.PRF to the rest of the forms of the *perfectum* creating in so doing a *morphome*.

3) *Infectum* of *poñer ~ pór*

	conservative stems	innovative stems
a) 1SG.IND.PRS	[ˈpoɲ-o]	[ˈpoɲ-o]
b) 2SG.IND.PRS	[ˈpɔ-s]	[ˈpɔ-s]
c) 3SG.IND.PRS	[ˈpɔŋ]	[ˈpɔŋ]
d) 1PL.IND.PRS	[ˈpo-mos]	[poˈɲe-mos]
e) INF	[ˈpo-ɾ]	[poˈɲe-ɾ]
f) FUT	[po-ˈɾej]	[poɲe-ˈɾej]

4) *Perfectum* of *poñer ~ pór*

	conservative stems	innovative stems
a) 1SG.PST.PRF	[ˈpuʃe-ŋ]	[ˈpuʃe-ŋ]
b) 3SG.PST.PRF	[ˈpuʃ-o]	[ˈpuʃ-o]
c) 2SG.PST.PRF	[puˈʃɛ-tʃes]	[puˈɲɛ-tʃes]
c) 1PL.PST.PRF	[puˈʃɛ-mos]	[puˈɲɛ-mos]
d) 2SG.PLUPRF	[puˈʃɛ-ɾas]	[puˈɲɛ-ɾas]
e) 2SG.SBJV.PST	[puˈʃɛ-ses]	[puˈɲɛ-ses]

However, a new analogical process affected the *perfectum*. In the innovative paradigm of (4) <1SG/3SG>.IND.PST.PRF retain the old root. Besides, speakers do not spread out the root [poɲ] of the

infectum, but a new root [puɲ]: no speaker uses forms like PLUPRF *[poɲ-ˈɛras], SBJV.PST *[poɲ-ˈɛses]; even if they use IND.PRS [poˈɲe-mos], INF [poˈɲe-ɾ], FUT [poɲe-ˈras] instead of [ˈpo-mos], [ˈpo-ɾ] or [po-ˈras]. The high vowel [u] is retained, but the last consonant is changed: [ʃ] > [ɲ].

To explain these facts, the model of Exemplar Morphology uses notions like *token frequency*, *type frequency*, *autonomy, lexical strength, grammatical schemata*, *network relations* etc. E.g., on the grounds of their high token frequency, the forms of <1SG/3SG>.IND.PST.PRF are autonomous inside their paradigm; so, they are not affected by the change [puʃ] > [puɲ] that affect elsewhere in the *perfectum*. As a consequence, the morphomic behavior of the *perfectum* of POÑER is broken, thus increasing the paradigmatic complexity of the verb: [ˈpuʃ] in <1SG/3SG>.IND.PST.PRF vs. [puɲ] elsewhere in the *perfectum*.

The change [puʃ] > [puɲ] can only be explained by increasing the structure of the root, because we need to admit that the root has two internal constituents that operate independently, the root vowel (RV) [u] and the root consonant (RC) [ɲ]:

[RV RC]root
[p u ʃ] > [ˈpuʃ-eŋ], [ˈpuʃ-o]
[p u ɲ] > [puˈɲ-ɛtʃes], [puˈɲ-ɛmos], [puˈɲ-ɛras]
[p o ɲ] > [ˈpoɲ-o], [poˈɲ-emos], [poɲ-eˈras]
[p ɔ] > [ˈpɔ-s]

So, we can represent the change [puʃ] > [puɲ] by delinking the RC of [puˈʃɛstes] of the RC of [ˈpuʃeŋ] ~ [ˈpuʃo], and linking the position of RC with the RC of [poɲo]:

[	RV	RC]root		> [	RV	RC]root	
[p	u	ʃ]: [ˈpuʃeŋ]		> [p	u	ʃ]: [ˈpuʃeŋ]	
[p	u	ʃ]: [puˈʃɛstes]		> [p	u	ɲ]: [puˈɲɛstes]	
[p	o	ɲ]: [ˈpoɲo]		> [p	o	ɲ]: [ˈpoɲo]	

As we can see, structure emerges from the relations that each stored items establishes with the other stored items. In other dialectal forms of *poñer ~ pór* and in the verb *vir* ‘to come’ we see that 1SG.IND.PST.PRF, and, above all, 3SG.IND.PST.PRF, behave autonomously with respect to their *perfectum* stem. The same evidence comes from Portuguese verbs.

[ɲ] is spread in the perfectum because the lexical strength of this consonant in the network of this verb; [u] is maintained by the lexical strength of the connection of high vowels with the morphosyntactic properties of the *perfectum* stems:

infectum stem	perfectum stem
facer ‘to do’	fixen
querer ‘to want’	quixen
ter ‘to have’	tuven, tiven
dicir ‘to say’	dixen
traer ‘to bring’	truxen, truien, trúen (dial.)

References

Bybee, J. 1985: *Morphology*, Amsterdam.

Bybee, J. 1988: «Morphology as lexical organization», in: M. Hammond/M. Noonan (eds.), *Theoretical morphology,* San Diego: 119-41.

Bybee, J. 2001: *Phonology and language use*, Cambridge.

Bybee, J. 2010: *Language, usage and cogntion,* Cambridge.

Maiden, Martin (2001): “A strange affinity: perfecto y tiempos afines, *Bulletin of Hispanic Linguistics* 58: 441-64.