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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 Carricaburro, 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; Carricaburro 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 author-
ship 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 admin-
ister 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 her but 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 charac-
ters 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 occur-
rences were categorized as either pronominal – nominative, objective, or possess-
ive 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 param-
eters 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 20011b, pp. 130–131), as
shown in Table 1.
Table 1. Interaction dyads according to power and social setting in
El Amor de la Estanciera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting of the Relationship</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Relation (more, less, or equal)</td>
<td>+P</td>
<td>F+P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-P</td>
<td>F-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=P</td>
<td>F=P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb conjugation</th>
<th>IIC cantar</th>
<th>IIC temer</th>
<th>IIC partir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Indicative</td>
<td>cantáis/cantás</td>
<td>teméis/temés</td>
<td>partís</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Indicative</td>
<td>cantasteis/cantastes</td>
<td>temisteis/temistes</td>
<td>partisteis/partistes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Indicative</td>
<td>cantaréis/cantarés</td>
<td>temeréis/temerés</td>
<td>partiréis/partirés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Subjunctive</td>
<td>cantéis/cantés</td>
<td>temáis/temás</td>
<td>partáis/partás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect Subjunctive</td>
<td>cantábades</td>
<td>temiádes</td>
<td>partiádes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Indicative</td>
<td>cantariades</td>
<td>temeriades</td>
<td>partiriades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect Subjunctive</td>
<td>cantássedes</td>
<td>temiéssedes</td>
<td>partiéssedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Subjunctive</td>
<td>cantárades</td>
<td>temiéredes</td>
<td>partiérades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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; cantarias, temerías, partirías; cantases, temieses, partíeses; 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), parti(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, parti*), 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 2011b, 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, comés, comís* are found in the standard norm in Panama, urban dialects in the Colla region of Bolivia, and educated varieties in Ecuador (Bertolotti 2011b, 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 voseante. 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 voseante, 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 diphthonged 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 diphthon-gized 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 desinental 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,’ parecés ‘you seem,’ pispastes ‘you spotted,’ vesá [besá] ‘kiss,’ decirme ‘tell me,’ habéis de venir ‘you must come,’ alcanzále ‘pass it to him,’ verés ‘you will 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 juiste 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 (juiste instead of fuiste). 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, gurí (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: Permitame que á sulado… […]
   García: Pueda llegar este asiento
   Sacrist.: Sea Cardenal á latere
   y en esta monda y lironda
   sea su vicario a Capite (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 mio ‘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 mi vida
un cariño no me haces?
dame à besar esa mano
con que hoy sin 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

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 [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 Sancristán
quien jamás lo entiende naides
Chivico: it's because he speaks that language
that Doctor Sancristán
that no one ever understands

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/merce [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 tí 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 tí. 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 tí.

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. 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’, parecéis ‘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’” (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 (‘attiene’ ‘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 (*veréis* ‘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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Present Indicative</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>El valiente</em></td>
<td>alcanzá 'reach'</td>
<td>habéis 'de venir'</td>
<td>llevéis 'you carry,'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anda(te) 'leave'</td>
<td>'you must have come,'</td>
<td>seáis 'you be'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caya(te) 'shut up'</td>
<td>parecéis 'you seem,'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decí(me) 'tell me'</td>
<td>venís 'you come'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mirá 'look'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vesá 'kiss'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>El amor</em></td>
<td>andá 'go,'</td>
<td>conoceis 'you know'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comé 'eat'</td>
<td>decís 'you say'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decid 'say'</td>
<td>despreciáis 'you spurn'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mirá 'look'</td>
<td>habéis 'you have'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reñi 'fight'</td>
<td>hacéis 'you do'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vení 'come'</td>
<td>habláis 'you talk'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>podéis 'you can'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pretendéis 'you intend'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>soís 'you are'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tenéis/ténéis 'you have'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>veís 'you see'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Las bodas</em></td>
<td>acostate 'lie down'</td>
<td>aparecés 'you appear'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anda(te) 'leave'</td>
<td>decís/decís 'you say'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avisá 'let us know'</td>
<td>estáis 'you are'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>calla(te) 'shut up'</td>
<td>Hais/ma vis/ habéis/heis 'you have'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decí/díci 'tell'</td>
<td>pegásteis 'you hit'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dejá 'leave it'</td>
<td>rigañais 'you scold'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doblá 'turn'</td>
<td>soís 'you are'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>echá(te) 'lie down'</td>
<td>venís 'you come'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>escuchá 'listen'</td>
<td>veréis 'you see'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>esperá(te) 'wait'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>larga(te/me) 'get out'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mete(le) 'sink it in'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mirá(te) 'look at yourself'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quitá(te) 'get out of the way'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sacá 'take out'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>salí(te) 'get out'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tomá 'take'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>templá (calm down),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>veni 'come'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 diastratic correlation (diphthongization in educated strata), as it is present in characters who belong to popular rural strata and never in educated speakers.
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