

SECTION I

Diachronic change and regional variation

Voseo and *Tuteo*, the countryside and the city

Voseo in Río de la Plata Spanish at the beginning of the 19th Century

Virginia Bertolotti

Universidad de la República, Uruguay

This study presents new evidence that supports the idea that at the beginning of the 19th century there were two distinct norms used by Spanish speakers in the Río de la Plata region as forms of address: an American/rural norm (*vos tenés/tenéis*) and a European/urban norm (*tú tienes*). That explains the use of *voseante* pronominal and verbal forms and *tuteante* pronominal and verbal as the forms used today and also explains the different attitudes toward one and the other. The data analyzed were taken from the play *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón* ('The Brave Braggart and the Sarcastic Creole'), a literary source that has been scarcely explored by the history of language in the Río de la Plata.

1. Introduction

The Spanish spoken across America is not uniform, with various dialects found in different regions and countries. **The description** of the processes of dialectal division in America is far from complete, at least with respect to forms of address. This study presents new evidence that supports the idea that at the beginning of the 19th century there were two clearly distinct norms used by Spanish speakers in the Río de la Plata region for forms of address: an American/rural norm and a European/urban norm (Bertolotti 2011a, p. 34). That reality explains the use of *vos* and *tú* today as forms of address and the different attitudes toward one and the other. Both forms of address, pronominal *voseo* and *tuteo*, coexist in Uruguay, while in Argentina *voseo* is used almost exclusively.

In America, there are three singular pronouns of address: *tú*, *vos*, and *usted*. As is known, only one plural pronoun is used: *ustedes*. The Uruguayan and Argentine systems of address share the *voseo* singular *vos cantás* ('you sing' singular informal), the use of *usted canta* ('id.' singular formal), and the plural expression *ustedes cantan* ('id.' plural). Uruguayan Spanish also has the form *tú cantás* ('id.' singular informal)

and a diatopically marked form, *tú cantas* ('id.' singular informal) This was not the case two centuries ago. This study analyzes the singular forms of address and discusses the social correlates of the diphthongized verbal *voseo* (*cantáis*) at the start of the 19th century, which was a subject of discussion in the seventies (Granda, 1978; Lapesa, 1970) and has not been taken up again since.

The text is structured as follows. It begins by reviewing the previous studies on the subject, justifying the type of text chosen for analysis – a literary work –, and describing the methodology employed. This is followed by an overview of the nominal, pronominal, and verbal singular forms of address used throughout the play analyzed. The nominal, pronominal, and verbal forms are then analyzed in depth, with special emphasis on the verbal *voseo* manifestations, which, as will be shown below, are predominantly diphthongized. Lastly, the data are interpreted, demonstrating the existence of two linguistic norms, an urban/Spanish norm and a rural/*criollo* norm (or a European/urban and an American/rural norm). These two norms differ from each other in three ways: the use of nominal forms of address; the distribution of forms that indicate closeness or distance; and the use of *tuteo* or *voseo*. This confirmation contributes new empirical evidence in support of the explanation given in Bertolotti (2011b, 2015) on *voseo* in America as a linguistic form that survived among the American indigenous populations that learned Spanish.

2. Previous studies, methodology, and corpus

The study of forms of address in Spanish, in the philological tradition, has been based predominantly on literary sources. The advent of historical sociolinguistics led to a diversification of sources (for example, Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1996, pp. 40–41). However, the accumulation of studies conducted exclusively with archive documents has shown that some linguistic characteristics are not present in such documents, be it because of the *genre* traditions that these documents contain, the social groups that are reflected in them, or the pragmatic situations that are excluded from them. Thus, it seems reasonable to seek to complement the data obtained from archive documents with other types of sources, including literary sources, as has been shown by Calderón Campos (2005), Medina Morales (2010), and Bertolotti (2011b). This last work, which focuses on the Río de la Plata region, analyzes data from an epistolary corpus made up of documents obtained from historical archives. The analysis of letters is complemented with an analysis of literary works, especially from the late 19th century.

Various reasons justify the use of literary texts to complement archive data. In the case of forms of address analyzed in plays, there are certain qualitative and quantitative advantages. Qualitatively, literary texts provide more information on

expressions that are used exclusively in colloquial speech, which is not available in epistolary corpuses. Plays also give access to a representation of the speech of a greater variety of characters. Quantitatively, the number of occurrences that can be accessed is greater than in an epistolary corpus of similar dimensions, as plays are structured based on dialogues.

Nonetheless, when interpreting the data it is necessary to bear in mind the possible exaggeration of the linguistic characterizations of the characters. Comedies of manners, in particular, often contain stereotypes, that is, socially marked features that are used deliberately and which the author resorts to regularly and unnaturally, reflecting his social views. However, there is an implicit understanding between audience and author whereby the former expects a reasonable degree of verisimilitude, so that the characters should not be considered as disconnected from reality.

Under both the philological tradition and the historical sociolinguistics tradition, there are past examples of analysis of literary texts for the study of Spanish in the Río de la Plata. Four of these studies are considered here as the most significant. First, the work by Tiscornia (1930) on the language of *Martín Fierro*, dates back almost a century. Second, the analyses by Fontanella de Weinberg (1989a, b and c, among others) focus on the forms of address in *El amor de la estanciera* and are a major antecedent to this work. Third, quantitative analyses by Moyna (1996) and Moyna and Vanni Ceballos (2008), based on Río de la Plata plays from the late 19th century and early twentieth century. Lastly, we have the extensive and well-documented work by Carricaburo, *El voseo en la literatura argentina* (1999), which encompasses Argentine literature as a whole.

The data analyzed were taken primarily from the play *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón* ('The Brave Braggart and the Sarcastic Creole'), a literary source that has been scarcely explored in the analysis of Spanish in the Río de la Plata. The manuscript of the play, located in 1979 by Jacobo de Diego in the Archive of the National History Museum of Montevideo under the title *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón*, is part of a trilogy of plays with a common theme. Because of its content, it is considered by drama critics as the first part of *Las bodas de Chivico y Pancha* ('The Wedding of Chivico and Pancha'), a play that together with *El amor de la estanciera* ('The Love of the Rancher') was used as the basis of analysis in the founding studies on voseo in the Río de la Plata (Fontanella de Weinberg 1989a, b, c, among others; Carricaburo 1999). The text analyzed here is a *sainete*, a one-act theatrical piece meant for popular audiences and generally humorous. The manuscript of *El valiente fanfarrón y [el] criollo socarrón* was transcribed by Trigo (1991) from a version found in the National History Museum. The transcription chosen for the present study was done with philological rigor by López (2011). It included a comparison with the manuscript, thus allowing for a reliable linguistic analysis. It is a text composed of 17 folios, of which 16 are written on both sides (recto and verso),

with 25 to 30 lines per page, and some 4,700 words in total, including the names of the characters preceding their lines and the stage directions. The history and authorship of this *sainete* is discussed in detail in López (2012), who places the date of the play at around 1810, based on studies of the history of theater. Although a Catalan by the name of Rius has been identified as the most likely author, this tells us little about the accuracy of the linguistic representation of the characters, since little is known of Rius himself. López also notes that the play had several performances during its time; thus, it can reasonably be assumed that it was well received and, in turn, this probably means that the linguistic characterization was realistic enough to resonate with the public.

There are eight characters in the play. Four are members of a family that lives in the countryside: Juancho, the father; Jusepa, the mother; Pancha, the daughter; and Chingolo, the son. They are joined by Chivico, a friend of the family who lives nearby in the countryside, is courting Pancha, and is the *criollo socarrón*, or sarcastic creole, of the title; García, the captain and *valiente fanfarrón*, or brave braggart, of the title; and the Sacristan, García's friend and sidekick. García and the Sacristan live in town and they represent the ridiculed "foreigner" (also represented in *El amor de la estanciera*, as Marcos Figueiras, the Portuguese character). García and the Sacristan visit the rural family's ranch repeatedly while Juancho is away, to flirt with or make advances on his wife and daughter: García is courting Jusepa, while the Sacristan pursues Pancha. The fourth character, the Mayor, appears on scene near the end and comes to administer justice. He reestablishes the order expected by the audience: he determines that Chivico, the good *criollo*, will marry Pancha rather than the brave braggart who wants to flirt with herbut does not truly love her.

The clearly delineated social roles of the characters makes this a good source for a study that explores forms of address and social variables. The depiction of the characters makes it possible to analyze the power relations between them, in the framework of Brown and Gilman (1960).

The process of analysis was as follows. After extracting the relevant terms from the corpus, that is, after identifying all the forms of address present, their occurrences were categorized as either pronominal – nominative, objective, or possessive pronouns, or terms of preposition –, verbal, or nominal forms. Only forms in the singular were considered. Each of these forms was assigned to one of the six categories that emerge from considering two parameters. One of these parameters is power in the classic sense of Brown and Gilman (1960), with three values: more power (+P), less power (–P), and equal power (=P). The second parameter considered was social in nature. It is the setting of the relationship between the participants in the dyad, which can be either society or family. The intersection of these two parameters determines six categories (Bertolotti 2001b, pp. 130–131), as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Interaction dyads according to power and social setting in *El Amor de la Estanciera*

Setting of the Relationship		Family	Society
Power Relation (more, less, or equal)	+P	F+P	S+P
	-P	F-P	S-P
	=P	F=P	S=P

Each of the pronominal, verbal, or nominal occurrences necessarily falls under one of these dyadic categories, understanding as such an utterance by a speaker (singular or plural) directed at an addressee (singular or plural).

Whenever a character speaks, there are usually several occurrences, as shown in the following example:

- (1) *Animal! Ya empieza el bruto:*
no siá soso; tome y Calle
que más se quisiera uste
 ‘Animal! There he goes again, the brute:
 don’t be stupid; drink and Shut up
 what more could you want’ [f. 2r, l. 21–23]

In a case such as (1) above, each of the four verbal forms and the pronominal form of address, in bold, are considered. As in all the other cases, each of these was first analyzed in isolation and then syntagmatically, that is, considering the combination of verbs, pronouns, and nouns.

Here we need to recall the system of pronominal forms of address used in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, when European Spanish was brought to America. In the 16th century, the use of the pronoun *tú* was limited to situations of closeness in which there was no social need for either prescriptive or pragmatic courtesy to establish distance. *Tuteo* was used only by interlocutors who knew each other intimately or who were peers and knew each other from a very young age, particularly if they were of the same sex, preferably in a family context. If there were age differences, it was used only when the speaker was older than the person addressed. In extra-group situations, the only ones who could choose the *tú* form were speakers from a higher social class to address someone from a lower class, generally a servant. *Vuestra merced*¹ (> *usted*) had two basic uses. It was used in extra-group situations when addressing members of the upper classes, and intra-group it was used by members of the upper class among themselves. Thus, in the 16th century *vuestra merced* was used to address members of

1. Or some of the intermediate forms.

the nobility and among members of that group. All the situations not covered by *tú* or by *vuestra merced* > *usted* were covered by *vos*. *Vos* was used in contexts both of closeness and distance and in non-deferential as well as deferential contexts. Therefore, in the 16th century, *voseo* was the form that covered the vast majority of the communicational needs of speakers in terms of address.

In the European Spanish of the 18th century, the space that had been occupied by *vos* was divided between *usted* and *tú*, due to external linguistic factors (rise of the bourgeoisie, decline of the aristocracy, social and ideological changes) and internal linguistic factors (grammaticalization of *vuestra merced* > *usted*). As a consequence, the new generation of Spaniards who came to America in the 19th century had a repertoire with fewer pronominal and verbal forms than those of their 16th and 17th century predecessors, who brought to America a paradigm with three forms of address (Bertolotti, 2011 a, b, 2012). As for verb conjugation, particular attention was paid to the *voseante* forms. As is known, in the 13th century verbal *vos* forms ended in *-des*, with the exception of the preterite and the imperative. By the early 16th century, the exceptions also included the present indicative, the present subjunctive, and the future indicative, which went from *-ades*, *-edes*, *-ides* to *-áis/ás*, *-éis/és*, *-ís*, respectively. The *-ades*, *-edes*, *-ides* endings were retained in the proparoxytonic tenses: the imperfect indicative, the conditional, and the imperfect and future subjunctive, as can be seen in Table 2.²

Table 2. Verb conjugations for *vos* in the 16th century for the verbs *cantar* ‘to sing’, *temer* ‘to fear’, and *partir* ‘to leave’.

Verb conjugation	IC cantar	IIC temer	IIIC partir
Present Indicative	cantáis/cantás	teméis/temés	partís
Perfect Indicative	cantasteis/cantastes	temisteis/temistes	partisteis/partistes
Future Indicative	cantaréis/cantarés	temeréis/temerés	partiréis/partirés
Present Subjunctive	cantéis/cantés	temáis/temás	partáis/partás
Imperfect Subjunctive	cantábades	temíades	partiades
Conditional Indicative	cantaríaades	temeríades	partiríades
Imperfect Subjunctive	cantássedes	temiéssedes	partiéssedes
	cantárades	temiérades	partiérades
Future Subjunctive	cantáredes	temiéredes	partiéredes

2. For a more detailed description of this evolution, see Cuervo (1893). For a discussion, see Lapesa (1970) and Rini (1996), in particular, the distinction in the latter between the phonic and morphological changes involved in this complex process.

The oxytonic forms acted as vanguard for the ensuing loss of the final *-d* in the proparoxytonic forms, which would lead to the *voseo* verbal forms becoming *cantabas, temías, partías; cantarías, temerías, partirías; cantases, temieses, partieses; cantaras, temieras, partieras; cantares, temieres, partieres*. These manifestations merged with the *tú* forms; thus, the *vos* and *tú* verbal forms were only distinguished in the present, preterite, and future indicative, in the present subjunctive, and in the imperative: *cantá(i)s, temé(i)s, partís* vs. *cantas, temes, partes; cantaste(i)s, temiste(i)s, partiste(i)s* vs. *cantaste, temiste, partiste; cantaré(i)s, temeré(i)s, partiré(i)s* vs. *cantarás, temerás, partirás; canté(i)s, temá(i)s, partá(i)s* vs. *cantes, temas, partas*; and *cantá(d), temé(d), partí(d)* vs. *canta, teme, parte*. As can be observed, the *tú* and *vos* forms are distinguished either by some phonematic difference, by some difference in stress, or by both.

In an early study, Pedro Henríquez Ureña (1976 [1921], pp. 380–381) examined the characteristics of the *vos* paradigm in the Río de la Plata region, noting the mixed nature of the conjugation, that is, the combination of *vos* in the subject position with three types of verbal forms: etymologically *tuteante* forms (*cantas*); etymologically *voseante* forms (*reís, cantastes*); and forms that are ambiguous due to the merger of the *voseante* conjugation and the *tuteante* conjugation (*cantabas*).

As has been noted already (Bertolotti 2011b, p. 65), it may be safely assumed that the monophthongized present forms (*cantás, temés*), the imperative forms without *-d* (*cantá, temé, partí*), and pronominal *vos* that characterize the Río de la Plata *voseo* cannot have come to the region with the Spanish settlers of the 18th century. This is because at that time the verbal *voseo* was almost non-existent in Spain. It must necessarily have come from the *criollo* population that acquired *voseo* at an earlier time, through intergenerational transmission from the region's first Spanish speakers.

There are other forms of verbal *voseo* documented for America besides those identified by Henríquez Ureña for the Río de la Plata. At present, the least variation occurs in the imperative. The regular form is stressed on the last syllable and lacks the original final *-d*.³ The present indicative has etymologically *voseante* manifestations, with few exceptions.⁴ As for the future, the morphological *voseo* (*comeréis, comerés, comerís*) has substantially fewer manifestations (eastern Cuba, in the Colla region of

3. Exceptions are found in Panama, Bolivia, and Chile, where *come* 'to eat' (from the *tú* form) is used and the Andean region of Venezuela where *coma* (from the *usted* form) is used with etymologically *tut* forms (Bertolotti 2011 b, pp. 65–67 drawing on Moyna (1996), Penny (2004), Hummel, Kluge & Vázquez Laslop (2010), and the author's own review of the bibliography – see Bertolotti 2011b, p. 66, Note 64).

4. *Comes* instead of *comés, coméi, coméis, comís* are found in the standard norm in Panama, urban dialects in the Colla region of Bolivia, and educated varieties in Ecuador (Bertolotti 2011 b, pp. 65–67 drawing on Moyna (1996), Penny (2004), Hummel, Kluge & Vázquez Laslop (2010), and the author's own review of the bibliography – see Bertolotti 2011b, p. 66, Note 64).

Bolivia, in the Arequipa region of Peru, and in Chile). In the rest of Spanish America it either alternates with the etymologically *tuteante* form (*comerás*) or the *tuteo* form is the only one used (Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Costa Rica). The preterite varies and presents several manifestations: *comiste*, which is etymologically *tuteante*; and *comites*, *comistes*, and *comisteis*, which are etymologically *voeante*. A possible interpretation for the form ending in *-s* could be that it is an analogical construction based on the forms of the second person singular of the rest of the Spanish conjugation, and not necessarily an etymologically typical conjugation of the *vos* form. In the present subjunctive, there is an even greater diversity. The oxytonic forms, which are etymologically *voeante*, alternate with etymologically *tuteante* forms in Panama, the mountainous region of Ecuador, Arequipa in Peru, the Bolivian Colla region, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Chile (Bertolotti 2011 b, pp. 65–67 drawing on Moyna (1996), Penny (2004), Hummel, Kluge and Vázquez Laslop (2010), and the author’s own review of the bibliography – see Bertolotti 2011b, p. 66, Note 64).

Some explanations have been suggested for the current diversity in the verbal *voseo* morphology in Spanish America. Germán de Granda (1978) discusses Lapesa’s thesis (1970), which broadly speaking holds that diphthongized forms were retained in aristocratic settings and monophthongized forms were retained in lower class settings, with the latter prospering in America. Granda observes that the forms with yod should not be interpreted as being exclusively European, as they are also found in America:

Now then, if this interpretation is taken to extremes, excessively polarizing the aristocratic and educated tendency that strengthens the morphemes with desinential yod in Spain, and the popular tendency in the monophthongized morphemes in America is dangerous, as it could result in a blurring of the historical and linguistic physiognomy of Spanish America, which is much more complex than what may be suggested by excessively simplified characterizations (...).
(Granda, 1978, p. 82, my translation)⁵

In Granda’s opinion (1978, p. 83), judging by the “remnants of these [monophthongized forms] that persist in present day Spanish America,” they must have been used at least until the 17th century in the social and cultural upper classes of colonial society. The educated tendency (with diphthongized verbal *voseo*), which was predominant in Spain, and the popular tendency (with monophthongized *voseo*), predominant in

5. “Ahora bien, si se lleva al extremo esta interpretación, el polarizar excesivamente la tendencia cortesana y culta afirmadora de los morfemas con yod desinencial en los territorios peninsulares, y la popular en los morfemas monoptongados de los americanos es peligroso; se puede desfigurar la fisonomía histórico-lingüística de la América española, mucho más compleja de lo que caracterizaciones excesivamente simplificadas podrían hacer suponer” (Granda 1978, p. 82).

America, “apparently coexisted in American territories during at least two centuries [the 17th and 18th centuries]” (Granda 1978, p. 83).

After presenting the case of San Juan de Micay (and explaining the diphthongized *voseo* found there as inherited from the ‘old aristocratic Popayan *voseo*’) Granda maintains that it is possible to “generalize the process and draw parallel conclusions for other areas of America, which have also maintained verbal *voseo* forms with desinential yod” (Granda, 1978, p. 87).

The populations that have this type of *voseo* are, according to Granda, linguistically isolated and geographically remote. They were historically formed “with groups of citizens who were identifiable, in colonial times, because of their aristocratic and noble extraction, within the particular characteristics of Spanish American society in the 16th through 19th centuries” (Granda 1978, p. 88). He argues that two types of *voseo* coexisted: an aristocratic and educated *voseo*, used by the “sociologically highest strata of Spanish American society”; and another, more popular and innovative *voseo*, which “was normally used by the lower strata of Spanish American society.” He attributes the following diatopic distribution to the settlement processes: urban centers of diphthongized *voseo*; and non-urban areas of monophthongized *voseo* resulting from the settlement of these areas “by human contingents identifiable with the lower social strata of Spanish society” (Granda 1978, p. 91).

3. Findings

A total of 361 occurrences were found, of which 80 were nominal forms of address, 144 verbal, and 137 pronominal. The analysis in the present study is qualitative and focuses on the pronominal, verbal, and nominal singular forms of address used in *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón*. Each of the forms of address in the play is analyzed in connection with the social characteristics of the **characters** (family or non-family setting, rural or urban origin, gender, age) and with relational characteristics (the *power* relationship between speaker and hearer). Data drawn from the plays *El amor de la estanciera* and *Las bodas de Chivico y Pancha* are also taken into account to complement the analysis.

This section partially summarizes the more comprehensive analysis in Bertolotti (2012) for each of the forms that fall under one of the six possible categories, and describes and interprets the verbal forms of *voseo*.

In the F+P dyads, that is, those in which, within the family setting, the speaker has more *power* than the addressee (parents speaking to the son or daughter, in this case), the manifestations are for the most part verbal. While there are few conjugations in which it is possible to distinguish *tuteo* from *voseo*, for historical reasons seen above, when this is possible, the forms of address are systematically *voseante*. The

verbs identified as *voseo* forms are the following: *andate* ‘go away,’ *mirá* ‘look,’ *venís* ‘you come,’ *cayate* [callate] ‘shut up,’ *corretraíme* [corré y traéme] ‘run and bring me,’ *parecís* ‘you seem,’ *pispastes* ‘you spotted,’ *vesá* [besá] ‘kiss,’ *decime* ‘tell me,’ *habéis de venir* ‘you must come,’ *alcanzále* ‘pass it to him,’ *verés* ‘you’ll see.’ While *pispastes* is included here, preterite forms ending in *-s* are not conclusively *voseante*. The *-s* ending in the past tense could be interpreted as an etymological mark of *voseo* (as in the ending *-steis*), but it could also be interpreted as having been formed by analogy with the rest of the second person singular of any other verb tense in Spanish.

The syntagmatic analysis reveals that the nominal forms that accompany the verbal forms are, as would be expected in a family setting in +P relations, first names, nouns describing kinship, or generational nouns.⁶ These are *Chingolo*, *Chingolito* (diminutive of *Chingolo*), *Jusepa*, *che Panchita*,⁷ *vieja* ‘old lady,’ *hija* ‘daughter,’ *muchacha* ‘young lady or girl,’ and *muchacho* ‘young man or boy.’

In the dyads where there is a difference in power between speaker and addressee (F-P) – in this case, son or daughter speaking to parents – there are no *voseo* forms. The pronoun used in these cases is *usted* (or *usté*) with corresponding verbs. The nominal forms present are *Seño* for ‘mister,’ *mi madre* ‘my mother,’ *mi padre* ‘my father.’

The dyads in which there is equal power between two interlocutors of the same family (F=P) are limited in this play to the brother and sister who address each other with verbal forms indicating closeness. *Chingolo* addresses his sister as *Pancha* or *Che Pancha* and uses verbs in *vos* form. On the only occasion where she addresses her brother, *Pancha* says to him, “*Desde que te juíste tu / que no viene por el rancho*” ‘Since you left / he hasn’t come by the ranch’ [fol. 11 v, lines 25 and 26], using the pronoun *tú* and a verb form that reflects her rural speech (*juíste* instead of *fuíste*). It should be noted that this exception to *voseo* comes from a speaker who is in contact with the only users of the *tuteo* norm, *García* and the *Sacristan*, as will be seen below.

The dyads that take place in a social setting, that is, outside the family, and in which there is a difference in *power* between the interlocutors (S+P or S-P) present a greater variety of forms of address. There are no cases of *voseo* in the S+P forms of address. *Chivico* addresses *Chingolo*, his friend *Juancho*’s son who has left the paternal

6. Here *generational nouns* means all those that describe the generation the hearer belongs to: these are sometimes kinship terms even if they are not used in a family setting: *hijo* (son) for someone who is younger than the speaker but who is not his or her son, *abuelo* (grandpa) for someone older by more than one generation. They are generally included under general names (Rigatuso, 1994, p. 21), but they can be considered as a separate group, since they are defined by an age parameter: *muchacho*, *pibe*, *guri* (young man, boy, kid), to address someone who is younger than the speaker, *señor* (mister or sir) for someone older.

7. Not analyzed in this study is the co-presence of the interjection *che* (hey, you) with forms of *voseo* in this *sainete*, as well as other discursive traditions associated with popular speech.

home to go to town, with verbs of the *usted* paradigm, without ever using that pronoun and nominally addressing him as *amigo Chingolo* ‘my friend Chingolo.’ Captain García addresses Juancho as *señor Juancho* ‘mister Juancho’ with the explicit pronoun *usted* and conjugated verbs that correspond to that form. Jusepa is addressed as *usted* by García upon his arrival at the ranch, but thirty lines later, this character switches to *tuteo*, as can be seen below.

- (2) *García: Permítame que á sulado... [...]*
García: Pueda llegar este asiento
Sacrist.: Sea Cardenal á latere
y en esta monda y lironda
sea su vicario a Capíte (Arríma un cabeza y se sienta)
García: Doña Chepa esta V muda
Jusepa: Or! que quiere que le hable?
 ‘García: Allow me that by your side... [...]
- García: I may move this seat
 Sacrist.: Be a Cardinal *á latere*
 and plain and simple
 be your vicar *á Capite* (Moves his head closer and sits down)
 García: Doña Chepa, are you mute?
 Jusepa: Now! what do you want me to say?’ [fol. 5v, lines 1 to 7]
- García: Jusepa, monina, vaya*
a tu García confronte
no le dás una manopla
con que tanto incendio aplaque?
 García: Jusepa, my lovely, say
 with your García come face to face
 will you not give him a gauntlet
 with which to quench such a fire? [fol. 6r, lines 14 to 17]

Once Captain García has broken the ice, he uses increasingly diverse nominal forms of address to speak to Jusepa. He addresses her with creative nominal phrases: *Jusepa del alma mía* ‘Jusepa, my precious’, *mi Reyna* ‘my Queen’, *pico de pulida plata* ‘polished silver lips’, *mi amada Jusepa* ‘my beloved Jusepa’, *Chepita, encanto mío* ‘Chepita, my darling’, *hermosísima Jusepa* ‘most beautiful Jusepa.’

In the S-P setting, Pancha, the young woman who is being courted, is addressed by the Sacristan exclusively in *tuteo* forms, as can be seen **below** in (3). There is no conflict with respect to her identity, as could be the case with Jusepa, a married woman who is being courted. The nominal forms of address used by the Sacristan with Pancha vary in a gradation that goes from her first name with an affective possessive adjective (*Panchita mía* ‘my Panchita’, *Pancha de mi vida* ‘Panchita of my life’, *mi adorada Pancha* ‘my beloved Pancha’) to a macaronic Latin declension (*Pancha, Panchorum de panchis*).

- (3) *Sacristan. vaya pancha de mí vida
un caríñito no me haces?
dame á besar esa mano
con que hoy sín duda ordeñaste*

Sacristan: Come, Pancha of my life
won't you give me some love?
let me kiss that hand
with which you surely milked today

[fol. 6r, lines 6 to 9]

Also in the framework of an S-P dyad, the Sacristan uses *usted* to address Chingolo, Pancha's brother (*Amigo Chingolo, venga/de lo que ha visto cuente algo* 'My friend Chingolo, come here / tell us something of what you've seen,' fol. 12r, lines 7 and 8). What sets Pancha apart from Chingolo is the fact that she is a woman (courted/pursued). Between men, the use of *tuteo* is reserved for members of the same family. This suggests that for the Sacristan *tuteo* forms imply greater closeness to the addressee than the *usted* forms, be it because Pancha is a woman, or because she is being courted.

The parallel dyad to the Sacristan-Pancha dyad is the one formed by Chivico and Pancha. Chivico, Pancha's other suitor, addresses her with verbs from the *usted* paradigm, with the pronominal form *usté* and the form of address used to show respect *ña* [doña] 'ma'am,' using at the same time a diminutive of her name, *Panchita*. As noted above, unlike the Sacristan, Chivico is a rural character.

The use of forms of address as a dramatic device to develop the characters is strengthened in explicit references to the differences in the way they talk, as can be seen below in (4).

- (4) *Chivico: es que habla ese lenguaje
ese Dotor San cristán
quien jamás lo entíende naidés*

Chivico: it's because he speaks that language
that Doctor San cristán
that no one ever understands

[fol. 7v, lines 26 to 28]

The remaining dyad (S+P) is that of the Mayor/Judge and Chivico. The Mayor is a character who comes from town to administer justice; he addresses Chivico only once and does so using *tú*.

There are eight social dyads in which someone with less *power* addresses someone with more *power* (S-P): Chivico speaking to the Mayor; Juancho to the Mayor; Jusepa to the Mayor; the Sacristan to the Mayor; Chingolo to the Sacristan; Chingolo to García; Jusepa to García; and Pancha to the Sacristan). Two factors are combined here to promote a more distant form of address – namely, the social (non-family) setting, and the distance (the difference in power due to authority, role, or age); the verbal form of address in all of these dyads always corresponds to *usted* or *usté*.

The form with the dropped *-d* is used by the rural characters (Chingolo, Juancho, and Jusepa), while *usted* is used by the urban characters (García, the Sacristan, and the Mayor).

As can be gathered from the above explanation, most of the social settings and even the family settings are frameworks for the use of distance forms of address such as *usted*. That explains why the nuances in the differences in power within these must be expressed through complementary devices: one of these devices is the explicit use of the pronoun *usted* (in contrast to the significantly fewer occurrences of the explicit pronouns *tú* or *vos*) Another device is the use of nominal expressions. For example, to address the Mayor, the rural characters Chivico, Juancho, and Jusepa deploy a number of honorific titles, many of them inappropriate for the prescribed courtesies of the time: *su ecelencia* [su excelencia] 'your excellency,' *su paternidá* [su paternidad] 'father,' *seño* [señor] 'sir,' *seño Alcalde* [señor Alcalde] 'mister Mayor,' *su merced/mercé* [su merced] 'your Mercy,' *su mercé Seño* [su merced Señor] 'your Mercy, sir,' *su Señoría* 'your Lordship,' *su ecelencia Señor Juez* 'your excellence Mr. Judge.' We can assume that what is sought with these exaggerated forms of address is a comical effect typical of a play of such characteristics.

The dyads where the participants have equal power in social settings (S=P) are Chivico and Juancho, Chivico and Jusepa, and García and the Sacristan. In all of these cases the relationship between the participants is one of friendship. In the case of the rural characters the form used to address both Juancho and Jusepa is *usté* (and the corresponding verb forms). The nominal forms are *amigo* 'friend,' *amigo Chivico* 'my friend Chivico,' *Chivico amigo* 'Chivico, my friend,' *ño Juancho* 'mista Juancho,' *ña Jusepa* 'Jusepa, ma'am,' *ño Chivico* 'mista Chivico,' *seño* 'sir, mister.' For their part, the urban characters who are in the same S=P situation, the Sacristan and García, use *tú* to address each other. The Sacristan addresses García simply as *García* or with the expressions *amigo García* 'my friend García,' *García amigo malorum* 'García, malorum friend,' *García amigo* 'García, my friend,' and García addresses the Sacristan as *compañero* 'pal,' *Dotor* 'Doctor,' *mi Dotor* 'my Doctor,' *amigo* 'friend.'

A comparison of parallel situations is again relevant here. As noted, both Chivico and the Sacristan are courting Pancha. While Chivico, the *criollo*, uses *usted* to address her, the urban Sacristan uses *tú*. Similarly, there are two pairs of friends: Chivico and Juancho; and the Sacristan and García. While the first two, the rural pair, use *usted* to address each other, the other two, the urban and more cultured pair, use *tú*.

These data suggest the existence of two competing norms: a rural and an urban norm. The rural norm presents two forms of address: *voseo* used by characters with equal or greater power within the family setting, and *usted* for social forms of address or used by characters with less power within the family setting. The urban norm uses

tú in the case of interlocutors of equal power in a social setting, and *usted* in social situations with differences in power. This has been analyzed in Bertolotti (2011 b, 2012), which explains the origin of the retention of *voseo* through American indigenous or *criollo* speakers who adopted Spanish as their language of communication. The dramatic choice of *voseo* forms associated with rural characters strengthens this interpretation, as country dwellers are the continuation of the native populations, at least in the Río de la Plata region, where there was nothing comparable to cities before the arrival of Europeans.

The indigenous population of the region, in contrast to other American native peoples, had no forms of settlement similar to what we know as cities. These only begin to emerge with European colonization, which was late and only intensified after the establishment of the Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata (1776). Before that, there was a weak settlement process with a strong local and rural base, a continuation of preexisting indigenous societies with some European cultural features such as the increasing adoption of the Spanish language.⁸ At the time the play analyzed here was written, only two urban centers could be said to exist, Montevideo and Maldonado, with a predominantly European population and architecture influenced by Europe in the use of materials such as brick. The cities contrasted with the straw and hide constructions typical of rural dwellers with an indigenous cultural base, which characterized almost all of the existing settlements (Barrios Pintos 2000, pp. 10–15).

As for the data on the verbal *voseo* in the *sainete*, they do not reveal a positive correlation between educated Spanish speakers and *voseo* in the Río de la Plata, in contrast to what Granda (1978). The educated (and urban) characters in the play do not even use *voseo*. This is to be expected, as these characters represent speakers from the beginning of the 19th century who use the European Spanish norm for forms of address. By contrast, the characters who represent rural speakers of the early 19th century present verbal *voseo* and use both diphthongized and monophthongized forms. As shown above, some of the verbal manifestations include: *andate* ‘go away,’ *mirá* ‘look,’ *venís* ‘you come,’ *cayate* ‘shut up,’ *corretraíme* ‘run and bring it to me,’ *parecís* ‘you seem,’ *pispastes* ‘you spotted him,’ *vesá* ‘kiss,’ *decime* ‘tell me,’ *habéis de venir* ‘you must have come,’ *alcanzále* ‘pass it to him,’ *verés* ‘you’ll see.’

Fontanella de Weinberg (1989c, p. 521) had already pointed out the error in the observation made by Granda (and also by Menéndez Pidal 1962, p. 157) according to which diphthongized *voseo* was associated with educated speakers. The data emerging

8. For more details on the process of substituting Spanish for indigenous languages, see Bertolotti & Coll (2013).

from *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón* corroborate this. Because these data could be considered insufficient, they were complemented with the other two plays mentioned (*El amor de la estanciera* and *Las bodas de Chivico y Pancha*), both with respect to the social distribution of tuteo and voseo and with respect to the type of verbal voseo.

Following Carricaburo's analysis (1999, pp. 82–88), we find pronominal and verbal tuteo and voseo in *El amor de la estanciera*, which is a text from the late 18th century and thus earlier than *El valiente*. The presence of tuteo forms appears in “the consummation of the marriage of Chepa and Juancho [although] in the latter there is a certain stereotypical portrayal of the speech (...) in the exchanging of ‘sonsonetes’”⁹ (Carricaburo 1999, pp. 86–87). The forms of address in the rest of the play (for example, between Chepa's parents, two rural characters) are systematically voseante, with the exception of one occurrence (*atiende* ‘pay attention’).

As for the morphology of *vos* verbs, it is predominantly diphthongized (see Table 3). As in *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón*, there is monophthongized and diphthongized voseo, although in *El amor* the proportion of diphthongized forms is greater than in *El valiente*. If the texts are accurately dated, between *El amor de la estanciera* and *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón* there is a difference of almost a quarter of a century, that is, a generation.

As for the third play, *Las bodas de Chivico y Pancha*, it is a later play than *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón*, and Carricaburo highlights an increase in tuteo over voseo as compared to *El amor de la estanciera*. There is a preference for monophthongized verbal forms of voseo over diphthongized forms, as compared to *El amor* (Carricaburo 1999, pp. 91–92).

Voseante forms abound and can alternate between monophthongization and diphthongization even in the same verb. The greatest alternation is in the auxiliary verb *haber* ‘to have’: *hais visto* ‘you’ve seen,’ *hais de venir* ‘you’ll come,’ *mavis* [me habéis/habís] *hecho* ‘you’ve made me,’ *habeis, haveis* ‘you have.’ Table 3 systematizes the occurrences of voseante forms according to verb tense and play. The future and the preterite indicative are not included in the table because there are only a few examples (*verés* ‘you’ll see’ and *pispastes* ‘you spotted him,’ in the play *El valiente*; and *pensaréis* ‘you’ll think,’ *engañastes* ‘you deceived,’ *enllenastes* ‘you were full,’ and *sacastes* ‘you took’ in *Las bodas*). Each column includes the verbal voseante occurrences in the other three tenses where tuteo can be distinguished from voseo, that is imperative, present indicative, and present subjunctive.

9. *Sonsonetes* are simple, improvised verses that are exchanged between two individuals.

Table 3. Verbal *voseante* forms present in *El valiente*, *El amor*, and *Las bodas*

Play	Imperative	Present Indicative	Present Subjunctive
<i>El valiente</i>	<i>alcanzá</i> 'reach' <i>anda(te)</i> 'leave' <i>caya(te)</i> 'shut up' <i>decí(me)</i> 'tell me' <i>mirá</i> 'look' <i>vesá</i> 'kiss'	<i>habéis</i> 'de venir' 'you must have come', <i>parecéis</i> 'you seem', <i>venís</i> 'you come'	
<i>El amor</i>	<i>andá</i> 'go', <i>comé</i> 'eat' <i>decid</i> 'say' <i>mirá</i> 'look' <i>reñi</i> 'fight' <i>vení</i> 'come'	<i>conoceis</i> 'you know' <i>decís</i> 'you say' <i>despreciáis</i> 'you spurn' <i>habéis</i> 'you have' <i>hacéis</i> 'you do' <i>habláis</i> 'you talk' <i>podéis</i> 'you can' <i>pretendéis</i> 'you intend' <i>sois</i> 'you are' <i>tenés/tenéis</i> 'you have' <i>veis</i> 'you see'	<i>llevéis</i> 'you carry', <i>seáis</i> 'you be'
<i>Las bodas</i>	<i>acostate</i> 'lie down' <i>anda(te)</i> 'leave' <i>avisá</i> 'let us know' <i>calla(te)</i> 'shut up' <i>decí/dicí</i> 'tell' <i>dejá</i> 'leave it' <i>doblá</i> 'turn' <i>echa(te)</i> 'lie down' <i>escuchá</i> 'listen' <i>espera(te)</i> 'wait' <i>larga(te/me)</i> 'get out' <i>mete(le)</i> 'sink it in' <i>mirá(te)</i> 'look at yourself' <i>quitá(te)</i> 'get out of the way' <i>sacá</i> 'take out' <i>sali(te)</i> 'get out' <i>tomá</i> 'take' <i>templá</i> (calm down), <i>vení</i> 'come'	<i>aparecés</i> 'you appear' <i>decís/deicís</i> 'you say' <i>estáis</i> 'you are' <i>Hais/ma vis/ habéis/heis</i> 'you have' <i>pegásteis</i> 'you hit' <i>rigañais</i> 'you scold' <i>sois</i> 'you are' <i>venís</i> 'you come' <i>veréis</i> 'you see'	<i>Enojés</i> 'you be angry' <i>hablés</i> 'you speak' <i>seais/siais</i> 'you be'

4. Conclusions

The data from *El valiente fanfarrón y el criollo socarrón* interpreted in this study reveal the existence of two linguistic norms: an urban-Spanish norm, and a rural-*criollo* norm. These are distinguished in three dimensions: the nominal forms of address used; the distribution of the forms used to indicate closeness or distance; and the use of *tuteo* or *voseo*.

The norm of the rural **characters** is characterized by a limited use of nominal forms of address: kinship, generational, or friendship forms. These have a simple composition

and are generally common nouns or first names that can be accompanied by *ño* or by a first person possessive. For forms of address in S-P dyads, evidenced primarily in the forms in which the Mayor is addressed, characters use honorific titles in the canonic third-person possessive + abstract noun form, and, in some cases, in apposition. The use is mixed and varied: characters have to use honorific titles but do not know exactly which to use, so they fall into hypercorrection, most certainly to a comedic effect.

As for the forms indicating closeness, these can only be found in F+P situations (parents speaking to a son or daughter) or F=P (forms of address between siblings). The forms of address between the husband and wife Juancho and Chepa merit special mention. He addresses her using *vos*, which may be interpreted as being due to the fact that he considers her an interlocutor with equal or less power. This interpretation is enabled by the fact that Chepa sometimes addresses him using *vos* (interpretation of equal *power*) but she sometimes addresses him using *usted* (interpretation of difference in *power*). The alternation could be pragmatic; but this cannot be corroborated from the information in the play.

The forms of address employed by rural characters to indicate closeness are predominantly *voseante*. The verbal morphology presents occurrences of both diphthongized and monophthongized *voseo*. The urban characters, Captain García and the Sacristan, present a norm that defines the settings of the forms of address differently from the current norm. They are the only characters who use forms indicating closeness outside the family: in fact, they use these forms with the women and among themselves. Moreover, the forms of address that they use to indicate closeness are regularly *tuteante*.

The analysis of verbal *voseo* forms, complemented with two other plays with similar characteristics, makes it possible to assert that the verbal *voseo* that was used two centuries ago did not yet have the form it has today: it alternated diphthongized and monophthongized forms, it still presented forms ending in *-d* in the imperative with stressed vowel forms, and there were occurrences of typical *voseo* forms for the future, as well as diphthongized tonic forms for the present subjunctive.

The analysis of the choice of forms of address and of the verbal morphology support the idea that two competing norms existed. The morphological analysis completely rules out the idea of a diastatic correlation (diphthongization in educated strata), as it is present in characters who belong to popular rural strata and never in educated speakers.

References

- Barrios Pintos, A. (2000). *Historia de los pueblos orientales*, Vol. I. Montevideo: Libros de la Academia.
- Bertolotti, V. (2010). La gramaticalización de *usted*: un cambio lingüístico en proceso. Evidencias en el Uruguay del siglo XIX. *Filología e Lingüística Portuguesa*, 12(1), 149–177. doi:10.11606/issn.2176-9419.v12i1p149-177

- Bertolotti, V. (2011a). La peculiaridad del sistema alocutivo singular en Uruguay. In Á. Di Tullio & R. Kailuweit (Eds.), *El español rioplatense: lengua, literatura, expresiones culturales* (pp. 23–47). Madrid/ Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Bertolotti, V. (2011b). *Los cambios en la segunda persona del singular en el siglo XIX en el español del Uruguay*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Rosario, Rosario. Available at (http://www.historiadelaslenguasenuruguay.edu.uy/?page_id=1123)
- Bertolotti, V. (2012). Claves para la historia del español en el Río de la Plata: Avances y rectificaciones sobre el tuteo y el voseo. *RASAL Lingüística* 2012, 7–26.
- Bertolotti, V. (2015). *A mí de vos no me trata ni usted ni nadie. Sistemas e historia de las formas de tratamiento en la lengua española en América*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Universidad de la República.
- Bertolotti, V., & Coll, M. (2013). Contacto y pérdida: el español y las lenguas indígenas en el Río de la Plata. *Boletín de Filología*, 48(2), 11–30. doi:10.4067/S0718-93032013000200001
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Calderón Campos, M. (2005). Fuentes para el estudio diacrónico de las fórmulas de tratamiento en español. In *Comunicación presentada en el congreso internacional Retos del Humanismo en la Europa Central y del Este*. Krakow.
- Caravedo, R. (2005). La realidad subjetiva en el estudio del español de América. In V. Noll, K. Zimmermann, & I. Neumann-Holzschuh (Eds.), *El español en América. Aspectos teóricos, particularidades, contactos* (pp. 17–31). Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Carricaburo, N. (1999). *El voseo en la literatura Argentina*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Elizaíncin, A. (2011). Motivación y origen de los cambios lingüísticos. In M. J. González & C. Píppolo (Eds.), *Español al sur* (pp. 257–289). Montevideo: Consejo de Formación en Educación.
- Fontanella de Weinberg, M. B. (1989a). Los usos de la segunda persona del singular en el período colonial. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica*, 5, 109–124.
- Fontanella de Weinberg, M. B. (1989b). *El voseo bonaerense. Visión diacrónica*. Bahía Blanca: Universidad Nacional del Sur.
- Fontanella de Weinberg, M. B. (1989c). Avances y rectificaciones en el estudio del voseo americano. *Thesaurus*, 44(3), 521–533.
- Granda, G. de (1978). Las formas verbales diptongadas en el voseo hispanoamericano. Una interpretación sociohistórica de datos dialectales. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 27, 80–92.
- Henríquez Ureña, P., & Ghiano, J.C. (1976). *Observaciones sobre el español de América y otros estudios filológicos, Vol. 1*. Buenos Aires: Academia Argentina de Letras.
- Lapesa, R. (1970). Las formas verbales de segunda persona y los orígenes del voseo. In *Actas del Tercer Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas* (pp. 519–531). Mexico City: El Colegio de México.
- López Fernández, C. (2011). *El español de principios del siglo XIX a través del sainete “El valiente fanfarrón y criollo socarrón.”* Available at (http://www.historiadelaslenguasenuruguay.edu.uy/?page_id=527)
- López Fernández, C. (2012). El sainete “El valiente fanfarrón y criollo socarrón”: Grafemática histórica del español del siglo XIX. In G. Cánepa Álvarez, M. J. González, & C. Píppolo (Eds.), *Español al sur* (pp. 427–440). Montevideo: Consejo de Formación en Educación.

- Medina Morales, F. (2010). La metodología en los estudios sobre formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en español. In M. Hummel, B. Kluge, & M. E. Vázquez Laslop (Eds.), *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico* (pp. 21–56). Mexico City/Graz: El Colegio de México/Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz.
- Menéndez Pidal, R. (1962). Sevilla frente a Madrid: Algunas precisiones sobre el español de América. In D. Catalán (Ed.), *Miscelánea homenaje a André Martinet* (pp. 99–165). Tenerife: Universidad de La Laguna.
- Moyna, M. I. (1996). *The evolution of verbal voseo in Río de la Plata Spanish: Evidence from plays and popular songs between 1880 and 1930*. (Unpublished MA thesis). University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- Moyna, M. I., & Vanni Ceballos, B. (2008). Representaciones dramáticas de una variable lingüística: Tuteo y voseo en obras de teatro del Río de la Plata (1886–1911). *Spanish in Context*, 5(1), 41–80. doi:10.1075/sic.5.1.05moy
- Nevalainen, T., & Raumolin-Brunberg, H. (1996). The corpus of early English correspondence. In T. Nevalainen & H. Raumolin-Brunberg (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language history: Studies on the corpus of Early English correspondence* (pp. 39–56). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Rigatuso, E. (1994). *Fórmulas de tratamientos y familia en el español bonaerense actual*. Buenos Aires: Departamento de Humanidades, Universidad Nacional del Sur.
- Rini, J. (1996). The vocalic formation of the Spanish verbal suffixes -ais/-as, -eis/es, -is. A case of phonological or morphological change? *Iberorromania*, 44, 1–16.
- Seibel, B. (2007). *Antología de obras de teatro argentino desde sus orígenes a la actualidad*. Buenos Aires: Inteatro.
- Tiscornia, E. (1930). *La lengua del Martín Fierro*. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Trigo, A. (1983). Antonio Rius y El Valiente Fanfarron y Criollo Socarron. Saynete. Texto y acotaciones histórico-críticas. *Prisma/Cabral*, 9/10, 149–165.

