

5-14-2010

The New Voseo Culto: An Exploration of the Complexity of Familiar Address in Chilean Spanish

Patrick Roy Rouse
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Rouse, Patrick Roy, "The New Voseo Culto: An Exploration of the Complexity of Familiar Address in Chilean Spanish" (2010). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 1118.
<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1118>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

The New Voseo Culto: An Exploration of the Complexity of Familiar Address in Chilean Spanish

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Romance Languages

By

Patrick R. Rouse

B. A., The University of Southern Mississippi, 1999

May 2010

© 2010, Patrick R. Rouse

Acknowledgements

I have been constantly inspired to continue my studies of Spanish since first arriving in the Republic of Chile in the spring of 1994. For that constant inspiration I have the Chilean people to thank, first and foremost. I am reminded of their warmth and hospitality every time I speak Spanish. My sojourn in their country was truly life-changing. I would also like to thank James Hartman for much-needed encouragement and positivity. Most of all, I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Manuel García-Castellón, Dr. María Del Carmen Artigas, and especially my professor, Dr. Joke Mondada for their consistent support throughout this entire process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures	iv
Abstract and Key Words.....	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 – Definition and History	7
Chapter 2 – Voseo in Chile	20
Chapter 3 – Sociolinguistic Considerations	30
Chapter 4 – Investigation	35
Chapter 5 – Conclusions	44
References.....	49
Appendix A – Internal Review Board Exemption Memo	51
Appendix B – Questionnaire.....	52
Vita	54

List of Tables

- Table 1.1:* Second-person forms in later Latin
Table 1.2: Second-person forms in fifteenth century Peninsular Spanish
Table 1.3: Second-person forms in Contemporary Spanish
Table 1.4: A comparison of modern forms of address in both Peninsular and American Spanish
Table 1.5: Rona's voseo classification
Table 1.6: Voseo variants according to syntax
Table 1.7: Second-person variations of ser observed in the Chilean Spanish
Table 3.1: Representation of types of treatment used according to familiarity
Table 4.1: Occurrence of voseo in print, by type and by publication

Abstract

In Chilean Spanish, second-person address is non-uniform in that the *vos* competes with the conventional tuteo and a third, mixed form has emerged. To add to this complexity, the form speakers choose has been shown to correspond to socioeconomic strata. Upper classes use *tú*, lower classes use *vos*, and young, middle class speakers choose the mixed form in which the verb is conjugated according to the voseo and is used with the pronoun *tú*. The causes and effects of this second-person schism in Chile are explored here, as well as the resulting sociolinguistic issues and consequences. In a study of printed media, television and interviewed informants, an attempt is made to confirm and validate the complexity of address in Chilean Spanish and determine the degree of the mixed voseo's pervasion into the mainstream.

Keywords: Chilean Spanish, Chilean voseo, voseo culto, mixed voseo, voseo, tuteo, second-person singular address, second-person models, familiar address, familiar dialog, Andrés Bello, *Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana*, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, prescriptivism, language policy, sociolinguistic stratification, linguistic schism, solidarity, second-person formal, sociolinguistic stigma, stigmatized voseo, voseo morphology, voseo syntax, morpho-syntax, history of voseo

Introduction

First published in 1957, *Coronación* was Chilean novelist José Donoso's first successful full-length work. By the time of his death in 1996, *Coronación* had been followed by several other highly successful novels, and his reputation as one of the most successful Latin American authors of the twentieth century was indisputable. In this novel, which deals with themes such as inequality, insanity, absurdity, opulence, poverty and the obscene, the author presents vivid contrasts of class struggle in Chile.

Not only does Donoso paint a clear picture of the material differences that exist between the classes, but he also illustrates a difference in education, refinement and sophistication between the personages in the novel. He achieves this by making it clear to the reader how one group speaks to the other, and, more importantly, how these characters address each other within the same socioeconomic stratum:

- (1) a. '¿*Quieres** destruirlo todo, imbécil? ¿Ésa es tu protesta, porque una sirvienta no quiere acostarse *contigo*? *Te crees* un filósofo y no eres más que un histérico... Y *tú te burlas* porque los hombres buscan nombres hermosos y queridos con los cuales les sea posible engañar la desesperación.' (p. 244)
- b. '¡Mírame, te digo! --Aulló la mujer--. A ver, mierda. ¿Por quién estoy así, ah? ¿Por causa de quién estoy así para que me *vengái* a hacer callar vos, mocoso desgraciado, ah?... ¡Y yo qué voy a saber! A mí no me cuenta nada, vos *soi* testigo...' (p. 45)
- c. 'Oye. ¿*Tú roncái* de noche?' (p. 155)

'Oye --dijo Mario de pronto--, te apuesto que *tú* le *gustái* a ese
viejo...' (p. 188)

*Italics added for emphasis

In the first example, a speaker utilizes the conventional tuteo, addressing the listener familiarly using the pronoun *tú* as the subject with verbs conjugated as would be expected for the second person singular: *Quieres, contigo, te crees, eres, tú te burlas*. In the second utterance, the pronoun *vos* is being used familiarly and in a singular context with an expected verb conjugation: *vengái(s) vos, vos soi(s)*. The third and fourth examples would seem to be completely ungrammatical, since the conjugated verb corresponds to *vos*, yet its subject pronoun is *tú*. This example is indicative of a mixed second-person form in which the pronoun *tú* is used in conjunction with a verb conjugated according to *vos*: *tú roncái(s), tú gustái(s), etc.*

The preceding examples serve to demonstrate that a complex second-person model has emerged within the context of Chilean Spanish which sets this dialect apart from others within the broader continuum of American Spanish. The complexity surrounding familiar dialog (as opposed to formal speech) within this particular dialect – as in any dialect of a language – lies in how it is perceived, how it is intended, who uses which of the three familiar forms, and for what communicative purpose.

It is certain that the voseo form of familiar address is well-represented and well-documented among the various dialects of Latin American Spanish in which it is used on a day-to-day basis. However, in the Chilean context, the voseo has undergone a transformation and displays a set of characteristics and issues which differentiate it from the broader spectrum of voseo usage. This transformation is indeed multifaceted and

complex, for not only are the issues surrounding it morphological and syntactic, but they are also sociolinguistic in nature.

An evident competition between the voseo and tuteo has developed in Chilean Spanish, and as a consequence, a third, mixed form would seem to be moving toward mainstream use. These three levels of familiar dialog existing in Chile today have been attested for decades, and each corresponds to a particular social and/or economic stratum. Treatment of the pronoun *usted* will have little relevance in this discussion, since it is universally employed across all socioeconomic strata in Chile. The primary focus will be on familiar address in Chile and the issues surrounding it.

The object of the present work will be to describe the three forms of second-person familiar dialog as they are deployed within the environment of Chilean Spanish; however, special attention will be given to the unique situation of voseo within this dialect. This will be accomplished by defining the different varieties of voseo and providing a detailed overview of the historical antecedents which contributed to the voseo variants presently in use in Latin American Spanish. The intention is that an examination of these historical data, presented in Chapter 1, will provide depth and context – a ‘big picture,’ as it were – to a further exploration of questions which arise when describing the region-specific paradigm that exists in the Republic of Chile.

First, the Latin origins of the pronoun *vos* will be explored, morphological and syntactic changes will be tracked and followed over the course of Vulgar Latin’s evolution to Ibero-Romance and eventual development into Castilian and Modern Spanish. A discussion on the origin of voseo must first begin with the Latin *VOS*, which was the precursor to the *vos* used in Latin American Spanish in modern times. Other

contexts for the uses of *vos* are found throughout literature, such as the *voseo clásico*, or classic voseo which refers to voseo use in Spain prior to and during the Golden Age, *Voseo mayestático* is a term used to refer to *vos* used as a plural form of deference when referring to royalty or nobility; the corresponding second-person form for a royal referring to himself or herself as *we* or *us*. Use of voseo may also be described as dialectal, as not all varieties of Spanish employ this form of second-person address. For the purposes of this work, the voseo used in Chile is dialectal, as it is a variant of voseo specific to Chilean Spanish. The first chapter will carry through to the modern era and end with a detailed description of the second-person model deployed in Chile at present, with an emphasis on morphosyntax.

Historical factors unique to Chile will be explored in the second chapter. First, an examination of the state of second-person forms in Chile will be made from the very beginning of the region's settlement in the late sixteenth century. The first settlers of the region during that colonial period brought with them a second-person dynamic that was being used in Spain. In order to come to an understanding of how the present model came to be, it is necessary to determine from which regions of Spain those first settlers originated in order to determine the system being used in Chile at the time of its colonization.

While the use of *vos* and its corresponding verb conjugations is not unique to Chile, the apparent conflict between voseo and tuteo, the morpho-syntactic fusion of the two forms and the sociolinguistic complexity which surrounds them create a situation that is singular. The complication leading to this schism would appear to begin in the mid-nineteenth century, and may be attributable, in large part, to the writings and

teachings of Andrés Bello and his followers, as has been suggested by Alfredo Torrejón (1986) and John Lipski (1991).

Bello's role in the development of the contemporary model will also be considered in the second chapter. Bello's *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos* along with his *Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana_dedicadas a los padres de familia, profesores de los colegios y maestros de escuela*, are both important works that have had a significant impact which reverberates into the present. *Gramática*, first published in 1847 is still considered an important grammar of the Spanish Language that attempted to set linguistic standards not only for Chile, but for the rest of Latin America (Guimarães Barros 2000). *Advertencias* specifically approaches the systematic errata observed by Bello in nineteenth-century Chile, and does so in a tone that is undeniably reproachful.

Excerpts from both texts will be examined with a specific focus on their prescriptivist objectives, tracking the effects of these works into the present. To conclude the second chapter, attention will be given to the state of the authentic and mixed forms in modern times.

In the third chapter, the sociolinguistic factors associated with voseo usage in Chile will be addressed. The picture deepens when one considers that not only are there two forms of familiar address in competition and yet another mixed form has emerged, but the existence of four forms of personal address (an authentic voseo, a mixed voseo, traditional tuteo and *usted*) complicates the model of how formality and familiarity are expressed among speakers of Chilean Spanish. The levels of deference

presently in use in Chile will be explored and an attempt will be made to explain their dynamics.

The fourth chapter will be dedicated to presenting the methods and findings of a study carried out from June 20, 2009 to July 4, 2009. The study is composed of interviews and conversations with members of the Chilean speech community, as well as an examination of popular media in Chile. The objective of presenting and analyzing these data will be to validate and confirm the historical data and current research on forms of second-person treatment in Chilean Spanish, with an emphasis on the mixed verbal voseo of the growing Chilean middle class. It is supposed that this segment of second-person treatment is gaining ground and moving towards standardization in Chile as the middle class continues to grow.

The fifth chapter will present the conclusions of the study. It is hoped that the findings of this investigation will lead to a broadening of the reader's understanding not only of the second-person paradigm in Chilean Spanish, but to a greater awareness of the diversity that exists within the Spanish language in general.

1. Definition and History

1.1 Definition

In order to present a clear, concise explanation of the second-person forms of address and solidify the place the Chilean model occupies within those varieties, it is necessary to examine their origins. Those origins naturally begin with Latin, which eventually rendered the modern Romance languages.

For the uninitiated person who is just beginning to learn Spanish – perhaps in a high school setting – only one model of familiar address is generally taught. The form universally taught to beginners is the mode which uses the pronoun *tú* and its corresponding verb conjugations to express familiarity between the speaker and the person spoken to. This mode of familiar address which uses *tú* as the second person subject pronoun and its objective and possessive derivatives is referred to as *tuteo*: *tú caminas, tú sientes, tú dices*. In most of the Spanish-speaking world, *tuteo* is the preferred manner of familiar address.

It would seem reasonable that the *tuteo* is taught universally since it is the approved, agreed-upon standard. However, the reality for speech communities in large parts of Latin America is quite distinct, and ultimately more complex. Contemporary Latin American dialects of Spanish utilize two forms (*tuteo* and *voseo*) of familiar address in second person models that vary from region to region. In contrast with *tuteo*, *voseo* is the term used to describe the second form of familiar address used in some regions of Latin America. This form uses the historically second-person plural pronoun *vos* in a singular context with its corresponding plural verb conjugations.

Mireya Cisneros Estupiñán (1996) aptly defines the voseo as a phenomenon with pragmatic and morpho-syntactic variety, extensive in America and absent in Spain, having its roots in Latin and making its way through the Romance languages to arrive in the New World by way of the conquistadors and colonists. Voseo and tuteo can be defined as 'competing modes of second-person singular familiar address. Voseo indicates use of the tonic pronoun *Vos ...* for this purpose, although the associated object pronoun is always *te* and the related possessives are *tu* and *tuyo ...* By contrast, the term *tuteo* refers to the use of the tonic pronoun *Tú* in the same role' (Penny: 2000, 151-152).

1.2 Origins in Latin

The Spanish pronouns *tú* and *vos* are ancient pronouns that were retained from its parent tongue, Latin. In the context of Latin, TU and VOS form part of the pronoun system, taking into account that the nominative forms of the personal pronouns were EGO, TU, NOS and VOS. These originally Latin pronouns have survived into Modern Spanish with few significant modifications. The modern pronouns, *tú* and *vos*, except for minor orthographical changes, have remained largely the same since possibly before the time of the Republic, surviving the linguistic turmoil of the Middle Ages after the Empire ceased to be. Although Latin still undoubtedly survives in the present as a liturgical language and is ever present in legal and scientific terminology, the education and infrastructure void resulting from the fall of the Roman Empire dissolved the institutional glue that held Latin together and paved the way for a significant degree of rapid linguistic change at the vulgar level.

The fact that these pronouns remain easily recognizable in most of the modern Romance languages facilitates the illustration of relevant changes in morpho-syntax and semantics that have occurred over the millennia. Penny (1991) describes the distinction in Early Latin as being one of number. TU was used whenever a single individual was addressed, whatever his or her status in relation to the speaker, and VOS was used for addressing more than one person. In all dialects of present-day Spanish, the pronoun *tú* still retains its basic value of second-person singular familiar. *Vos* underwent various changes through the centuries, but its value as a true plural endures in modern times only in the context of Peninsular Spanish (i.e. *Vosotros*). In contemporary times, *vos* is undoubtedly used by more speakers as a singular than a plural.

The divergence of VOS from plural to singular took place late in the development of Latin. Penny (1991) affirms that the nature of this later distinction between TU and VOS was one of deference. In later Latin, VOS was used, in addition to second-person plural, for deferential address of a single person, apparently beginning with the Emperor, but then becoming extended to other circumstances where deference or formality of address was considered appropriate. Thus a representation of singular and plural forms with familiar and deferential values in the context of later Latin could be rendered as such:

	Familiar	Formal
Singular	TU	VOS
Plural	VOS	VOS

Table 1.1: Second-person forms in later Latin

The Latin pronoun VOS has maintained a presence in all of the major Romance languages in the second person in one form or another, although it has suffered morphological syntactic and even semantic changes. However, it is interesting to note that in contemporary times, the above table mirrors deployment of the pronoun *vous* in Modern French.

1.3 Second-Person Models in Spanish from the Middle Ages through the Renaissance

The later Latin system had survived more or less unchanged in Castilian until the fourteenth century. For reasons unknown, toward the fifteenth century, this model began to shift. The formal value of *vos* began to carry less and less weight and began to approximate the non-deferential value of *tú*. The decline in deference that *vos* suffered left a vacuum, and created the need for another form of deference in a social context that considered it necessary. Penny asserts that ‘by the fifteenth century, *vos* had become so close in value to informal *tú* that new deferential forms of address are experimented with, based on abstract nouns such as *merced* ‘grace’, *señoría* ‘lordship’, etc...Speakers of fifteenth century Castilian often remedied the situation by using two-word phrases consisting of an abstract noun preceded by the hitherto deferential possessive: *vuestra excelencia*, *vuestra señoría*, *vuestra merced*, etc.’ (2000: 52).

Around the same time, ‘the plural *vos* expands to *vosotros* and becomes regularized. The combination *vos* + *otros* had previously been available with contrastive value...but now becomes the unmarked plural form, in opposition to singular *vos*’ (Penny 1991: 138). With the dilution of *vos* as a second-person form of deference, the

emergence of *vosotros* as a disambiguation for familiar plural, and the institution of *vuestra merced/vuestras mercedes* as new third-person forms, the ‘deference void’ was filled, and a new model eventually emerged:

	Familiar	Formal
Singular	<i>tú/vos</i>	<i>vuestra merced</i>
Plural	<i>vosotros</i>	<i>vuestras mercedes</i>

Table 1.2: Second-person forms in fifteenth-century Peninsular Spanish

During the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, this is the system of second-person address that was commonly in use in Castilian, and was thus carried to the New World with the conquistadors and colonists. Documents surviving from this period in centers of colonial power testify to this (Weeks: 2005).

Vuestra merced, (literally *your mercy*), eventually rendered the modern deferential pronoun *usted* with its corresponding plural, *ustedes*. As recently as the twentieth century, the abbreviations used for *usted* and *ustedes* were *Vd.* and *Vds.*, respectively, and are still used in some circles.

Except for the trivial changes which affected the deferential mode of address (selection of *Vuestra merced* from among the competing expressions and gradual contraction of *Vuestra merced* to *Usted*, changes which are identical for American and Peninsular Spanish), this system was adjusted differently in different parts of colonial America (Penny 2000: 152).

1.4 Contemporary Second-Person Models

Eventually, *vos* was abandoned in Peninsular Spanish, and the contemporary model emerges which favors *tú* as the only familiar singular form. This same model, commonly accepted as standard, is taught to schoolchildren in the Spanish-speaking world and to learners of Spanish as a second language in modern times:

	Familiar	Formal
Singular	<i>tú</i>	<i>usted</i>
Plural	<i>vosotros</i>	<i>ustedes</i>

Table 1.3: Second-person forms in Contemporary Peninsular Spanish

Those colonies which were in more frequent contact with Spain adjusted more readily to the linguistic changes taking place on the Peninsula, specifically, the disappearance of *vos* from common usage and the dominance of *tú*. This eventual replacement of *vos* with *tú* is paralleled in centers of colonial commerce such as the Caribbean, and the seats of colonial power, such as Mexico City, Bogotá and Lima. In these regions, *tú* continues to prevail in modern times. Today, *vos* is practically nonexistent in Mexico and the Caribbean and used only regionally in most of Venezuela, Colombia and Peru.

According to Penny (1991), *vos* was abandoned in areas which were further removed from Peninsular Spanish developments during the colonial period and continue to use the older system. Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, and the Central American states, which were most culturally 'distant' from Spain, are the places where

vos came to dominate, while in other areas (Chile, Ecuador, Colombia), the two forms of address continue to compete in a complex sociolinguistic relationship.

The phenomenon of voseo in Latin American Spanish, while used only regionally in some countries, enjoys a virtually standard status in others. Its presence in places such as Argentina, Paraguay and virtually all of Central America is much too significant to be dismissed as a regionalism or diminished as local color. This significant presence of vos in Latin American Spanish produces an adjusted model as shown in the following comparison:

	Familiar		Formal	
	Peninsular	American	Peninsular	American
Singular	<i>Tú</i>	<i>tú/vos</i>	<i>usted</i>	<i>usted</i>
Plural	<i>vosotros</i>	<i>ustedes</i>	<i>ustedes</i>	<i>ustedes</i>

Table 1.4: A comparison of forms of address in both modern Peninsular Spanish and modern American Spanish

This representation accurately represents differences between Peninsular and American usages, but it must be reiterated that the preceding is a generalization and does not take into account variations within a regional system or the competition that can be seen between tuteo and voseo in several geographical regions.

Most texts for students of Spanish as a second language recognize vosotros, and some still give preference to the Peninsular model, only briefly noting that *vosotros* is not used in Latin America. The American Model differs significantly from the Peninsular model with respect to singular familiar forms (as shown in the preceding

table) and is more widely used, considering the varying models of second person singular familiar and the universality of *ustedes* for a plural familiar as well as a plural formal. Even so, there are relatively few texts that even mention the existence of *vos* or acknowledge the fact that it is used by tens of millions (if not hundreds) of millions of speakers of American Spanish daily.

1.5 Voseo Types According to Morphology

John Lipski (1991) quotes José Pedro Rona's 1964 study in which Rona proposes criteria for dividing Latin American Spanish into dialectal zones. One of the criteria he suggests is presence or absence of voseo. He further classifies voseo morphology into four distinct types according to the endings used in their verb conjugations.

	1st Conj. (-ar)	2nd Conj. (-er)	3rd Conj. (-ir)
Type A	-áis	-éis	-ís
Type B	-áis	-ís	-ís
Type C	-ás	-és	-ís
Type D	-as	-es	-is

Table 1.5: Voseo classification according to morphology (Rona: 1964)

According to Rona's system, the largest number of voseo users would be categorized in Type C. This is the type in widespread use throughout Central America and the majority of speakers in the Southern Cone (Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay).

Chile, however, is the exception in the Southern Cone region. According to Rona's system of classification, Chilean voseo is characteristic of Type B. This variant maintains the diphthongized first conjugation form *-áis* and fuses the endings of the second and third conjugations; effectively eliminating the *-éis* ending of the second conjugation in favor of the third-conjugation ending *-ís* (1991: 28). These endings remain consistent in all the simple tenses as demonstrated in Table 1.6.

	First conjugation	Second conjugation	Third Conjugation
Present indicative	<i>Juntái(s)</i>	<i>Vendí(s)</i>	<i>Escribí(s)</i>
Preterit	<i>Juntaste(s)</i>	<i>Vendiste(s)</i>	<i>Escribiste(s)</i>
Imperfect indicative	<i>Juntábai(s)</i>	<i>Vendíai(s)</i>	<i>Escribíai(s)</i>
Conditional	<i>Juntaríaí(s)</i>	<i>Venderíaí(s)</i>	<i>Escribiríaí(s)</i>
Present Subjunctive	<i>Juntí(s)</i>	<i>Vendái(s)</i>	<i>Escribái(s)</i>
Imperfect Subjunctive	<i>Juntárai(s)</i>	<i>Vendieraí(s)</i>	<i>Escribiérai(s)</i>

Table 1.6: Sample conjugation in Chilean Spanish

It must be mentioned that Rona's classification is a simplification of a system that is complex and dynamic. With respect to Rona's classification, Carricaburo (2003) comments that it is nothing more than a systemization, a systemization difficult to encapsulate into a pure state. The complexity surrounding the voseo comes from being taken for so long as an ungrammatical or incorrect form – or an archaism, at best. Given this difficulty of encapsulating these morphological voseo variants into a system or a definite description, they may be better described as a continuum.

1.6 Voseo Types According to Syntax

As with any linguistic characteristic or phenomenon, there exist variations within the panorama of the voseo. Not only are these variations exhibited in the morphology of the verb conjugations as dialect zones are crossed, as demonstrated in Rona's voseo classification, but the variations within the second person model can also be syntactic in nature. Syntactic variation can be observed in three possible forms:

	Authentic Voseo	Mixed Pronominal Voseo	Mixed Verbal Voseo
First Conjugation	<i>vos encontrás/encontráis</i>	<i>vos encuentras</i>	<i>tú encontráis</i>
Second Conjugation	<i>vos vendés/vendís</i>	<i>vos vendes</i>	<i>tú vendís</i>
Third Conjugation	<i>vos vivís</i>	<i>vos vives</i>	<i>tú vivís</i>

Table 1.7: Possible voseo variants according to syntax

The first variation is an SV model in which the subject pronoun is *vos* and the corresponding verb is conjugated according to expected, established second-person plural models: *vos encontrás/encontráis*, *vos vendés/vendís*, *vos vivís*. Torrejón (1986, 1991) refers to this form as a *voseo auténtico*, or authentic voseo, because the verb form accompanying the pronoun *vos* is conjugated in an expected manner consistent with historically second person plural forms.

The mixed voseo, may take two directions. A mixed pronominal form consists of assigning the pronoun *vos* with a verb conjugation corresponding to the tuteo in the second person singular, such as *vos hablas*, *vos dices*, *vos eres*, etc. Both Páez Urdaneta (1981) and Bello (1847) in his *Advertencias* noted and documented cases of mixed pronominal voseo, yet Torrejón (1986) maintains that he cannot affirm these observations. Indeed, this author has never observed the mixed pronominal form in Chile, and cannot confirm its existence in the present.

Conversely, there are instances of a mixed voseo form in which the subject pronoun used is *tú*, yet the accompanying verb form does not correspond to the second-person singular pronoun *tú*; rather, the verb is conjugated as if the subject were *vos*. Torrejón refers to this as *voseo mixto verbal* (mixed verbal voseo). It consists of the construction of verb forms derived from the second-person plural paired with the pronoun *tú*, in situations where a subject pronoun is called for (1986: 678). This mixed form, specifically as it pairs the subject pronoun *tú* with the diphthongized verb conjugation typical of Type B (see Table 1.5), is the form in widespread use in Chile, and is referred to by Torrejón as the ‘voseo culto,’ since it is employed principally among young, educated Chileans of the middle to upper classes.

1.7 Issues Involving Ser

In addition to the complexity surrounding familiar address, it would appear that the mixed second person form has forced changes in the conjugation of the verb *ser* in the speech community of Santiago. Within the mixed voseo, a new conjugation of the

verb *ser* has been documented. This new verb conjugation blends the second-person singular conjugation (*tú*) *eres* with the tonic verb ending *-ís* to form *eríh* (or *erís*).

Variations of Ser	
Authentic voseo	<i>Vos soi(s)</i>
Mixed voseo	<i>Tú soi(s)/Tú eríh</i>
Standard tuteo	<i>Tú eres</i>
Formal	<i>Usted es</i>

Table 1.8: Variations of the verb *ser* in Chilean Spanish for familiar and formal treatment.

As an explanation for the emergence of *eríh*, González quotes Félix Morales (1999), in which Morales proposed that the aspiration of the final /s/ typical of Chilean Spanish provoked the necessity for the creation of a distinction between first person singular (*yo*) *soy* and second person (*vos*) *sois*. Thus the form *eríh* emerged possibly as a disambiguation for *soy/sois*. The necessity for such a disambiguating form becomes clearer when taking into consideration the potential misinterpretation of such utterances as, *Sois tonto* or *Soy tonto*.

1.8 Summary

In summation, models of second-person treatment from Latin to Romance, and from Romance to Spanish have undergone various changes over the course of the past two millennia. As shown in the preceding, some of these changes have been morpho-syntactic in nature, and some have been semantic.

The state of affairs in modern-day Chile with respect to forms of familiar treatment may be characterized as following a model in which tuteo and voseo are in apparent competition. Chile follows the authentic voseo in some instances, mixed verbal voseo in others, and the conventional tuteo in yet others. In all instances of voseo usage, the verb forms employ a diphthongized ending in the first conjugation, and the second and third conjugations use a fusion of *-éis* and *-ís* to favor the tonic ending *-ís*.

While voseo usage is usually homogenous in regions where it is deployed universally (Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Central America), this is not the case in Chile. In Chile, voseo coexists in two forms, authentic and mixed verbal, with the conventional tuteo. The form of second-person treatment a speaker uses to address another person (tuteo, authentic voseo or verbal voseo) varies along lines of socio-economic status and solidarity, and these dynamics will be examined with other sociolinguistic factors in chapter 3. However, the reasons for the variety and complexity of second person familiar treatment specific to Chile can be attributed to historical factors which will be explored in the following chapter.

2. Development of the Voseo in Chile

2.1 Historical Antecedents

When considering a model as complex as this one, certain questions inevitably arise. Why is the voseo situation so complex in modern Chile, and how did the pronominal voseo come to be stigmatized? How is it that certain socioeconomic sectors of Chilean society use the pronominal voseo and others do not? What prompted the emergence of the mixed verbal voseo, or ‘voseo culto?’ Why does the morphology differ from the tonic forms (see Table 1.5) so widely used in the rest of vos-speaking Latin America? These interrogatives can be satisfactorily answered by examining the deployment of vos in Spain prior to and during the colonization of Chile and an examination of certain historical factors through the mid-nineteenth century.

The history of Spanish in Chile begins with the arrival of Pedro de Valdivia in 1541. Valdivia and the explorers accompanying him brought with them a voseo which had not lost its formal value. As established in the first Chapter, voseo usage in Spain was already in decline at the time of the colonization. However, there were still pockets of voseo in Spain in the sixteenth century, although Benjamin and Butt affirm that vos survived in Spain as a polite form of address until the 1830s (2004: 132). In any case, its use was not so completely substandard at that time as to prevent Prince Felipe II from treating Pedro de Valdivia, his subordinate, as vos in letters addressed to him from the court of Castile. In her dissertation, Patricia Weeks (2005) points out that in these letters the prince uses the pronoun vos with the diphthongized second-person plural verb form such as *tengáis*, *hayáis*, etc.

Not only do these communications provide insight as to the type of voseo used, but also as to the level of personal treatment between royalty and nobility. Weeks further demonstrates that the same is true among nobles from northern and central Spain in the sixteenth century, and in correspondence between nobles in Chile and their families in Spain. She concludes that *vos* had been used in the formal sense in the first centuries of the colonization. *Vos* was a form of prestigious and formal treatment as much among Spanish nobles as the rest of the population coming from northern Spain and the Castilian plateau.

Apart from the aforementioned historical factors, Patricia Weeks (2005: 125) also suggests that Chile's distance from Spain and its relative geographic isolation is a factor in the country's remarkable linguistic homogeneity and the retention of the voseo. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that this same isolation was a contributing factor in impeding the integration of new forms of personal address in the region that were already in common use in Spain.

Weeks concludes that the voseo in Chile in colonial times was a form of second-person treatment typical of colonists from the northern and central areas of Spain, and its usage spread throughout the Chilean territory during the colonization. However, it eventually came to be seen in a negative light, as belonging to less-educated and less-refined sociolects (2005: 124). In order to determine why the authentic voseo has fallen from prestige in Chile when in colonial times its semantic value was respectful and dignified, it is necessary to examine the life, times and works of Andrés Bello.

2.2 Post-Independence: Andrés Bello

If any one person can be said to have influenced the course of development of Spanish in Chile, the name Andrés Bello immediately comes to mind. It is plainly evident, given the number of streets, monuments, schools, and even universities in Chile named after and/or dedicated to Andrés Bello, that he is a historical figure held in high esteem. An intellectual in every sense of the word, Bello's contributions span several disciplines, including law, literature, business and philology, as well as politics.

Bello's stature and esteem in Chile are as attributable to his patriotism and sense of nationalism as to his scholarly accomplishments. Guimarães Barros (2000) explores Bello's ideas and intentions behind the publication of his *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos*. She supports the idea that Bello was focused on nation building, and this was the primary motivation for all of his works and accomplishments. This is a reasonable, supportable assumption, given that he wrote the first Civil Code for the country and was the founder and first rector of the University of Chile. However, as she states, her study places Bello in proper perspective within the discourse of the foundation of independent Hispano-American nations by way of interpretations that mix politics with linguistics. (2000: 49).

Guimarães Barros likens Bello's motivations for writing his *Gramática* to those of Antonio de Nebrija, suggesting that an important prerogative of his intellectual and political endeavor is linguistic unification. Indeed, it is well-established that this was a motivating factor for Nebrija given the historical environment and the events which preceded the publication of his *Gramática de la lengua castellana* in Spain in 1492. Guimarães Barros suggests that Bello follows Nebrija's posture in that his motivations

for linguistic unification are not only intellectual, but political, and Bello draws the parallel between his time and Nebrija's. Guimaraes Barros suggests that 'the American linguistic panorama, formed in large part by a large number of indigenous language and dialectal differences in the Castilian spoken in various regions of the continent explain the empirical foundation that leads Bello to compare his own time to the period in which Latin fractured into the Romance languages' (2000: 49).

Even today, linguistic nationalism is evident within the autonomous regions of Spain, as with indigenous groups in all parts of the Western Hemisphere; and even in Chile, the Mapuche nation continues to strive for linguistic unity as well as political autonomy. The advancing of Bello's politico-linguistic agenda seems to have been a primary motivating factor in the writing of *Gramática* and *Advertencias*.

Certainly, before Bello's arrival in 1829, the voseo in Chile enjoyed widespread prestige and was used universally (Torrejón 1986, Guimarães Barros 2000). According to Torrejón, it is relatively clear when vos began to lose prestige in Chile. He states that Chile was 'voseante desde comienzos de la Conquista hasta ya establecida la República,' and goes on to assert that before Bello's arrival, the tuteo was completely absent (1986: 679).

It is evident that Bello was not completely successful in altogether vanquishing the voseo from Chilean Spanish, as examples from literature have attested and modern usages plainly demonstrate. It is reasonable, however, to attribute its decline during the latter half of the nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century to his efforts and the efforts of his followers. Torrejón attributes the voseo's decline in Chile in large part to the results of a campaign by Bello to better the Chilean norm of Spanish, but

principally due to the tireless effort of his disciples and the existence of what was, at the time, an efficient education system (1986: 680).

Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos, first published in 1847 was, arguably, Bello's most well-known contribution to American Spanish, and perhaps his most well-known work. As its title indicates, it was not intended for those speaking Castilian on the Peninsula, rather it was intended for an American audience. Undoubtedly a prescriptive work, the objective of *Gramática* was to improve the Spanish spoken in Chile by attempting to unify Chilean Spanish with what would have been considered the 'norm,' or the standard dialect, spoken on the Iberian Peninsula. *Gramática* was an attempt on Bello's part to bring Chilean Spanish into alignment with, or prevent its divergence from, the Peninsular norm which would have been established by the Real Academia.

As varieties of American Spanish had diverged over the course of nearly three hundred fifty years since the discovery of the New World until the time Bello wrote his *Gramática*, the work was to provide a guide for maintaining the purity, mutual intelligibility and linguistic integrity of Spanish in Latin America. In brief, *Gramática* attempted to impose the grammatical standards of nineteenth-century Peninsular Spanish on a population which had very limited exposure to it, if any.

Gramática prescribes against a plethora of errors Bello frequently heard, not only in the streets of Santiago, but in other areas of Latin America of which he had knowledge. However, as indicated by the following, voseo usage seems to be of particular concern to him: 'El vos de que se hace tanto uso en Chile en el diálogo familiar, es una vulgaridad que debe evitarse, y el construirlo con el singular de los

verbos una corrupción insoportable. Las formas del verbo que se han de construir con vos son precisamente las mismas que se construyen con *vosotros*' (2008: 417).

Although he devotes no more time to the issues surrounding the use of *vos* than he does any other point of grammar in his *Gramática*, his low opinion of this form of personal address is made plain as he labels it an 'intolerable corruption' and 'a vulgarity.'

Bello gives his reasons for condemning its use by harkening back to a point in the linguistic history of Spanish in which *vos* was an exclusively plural form. He advises that using *vos* in place of *tú* implies a fictitious plurality; since *vos* originates from a plural form of the second person, it should not be used in a singular sense (2008: 78).

There are, however, instances in which Bello approves of the use of *vos*. In the following excerpt, he gives examples of when the use of *vos* is indicated:

...[P]ero ahora no se usa este *vos* sino cuando se habla á Dios ó á los Santos, ó en composiciones dramáticas, ó en ciertas piezas oficiales, donde lo pide la ley ó la costumbre...El uso de *vos*, cuando significa pluralidad ficticia, no es semejante al de *nós*, pues no solo se ponen en singular los sustantivos, sino los adjetivos, que le sirven de predicados.

(2008: 78)

He clearly communicates that *vos* is an antiquated form and should not be employed in everyday speech; it should be limited to personal dialog with deity or used in works of drama or in legal documents where it is customary and called for.

Although his aversion to voseo use in everyday speech is evident in the preceding, Bello makes his position even more plain in a series of articles which were

published in the newspaper *El Araucano* between 1833 and 1834. *Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana dirigidas a los padres de familia, profesores de los colegios y maestros de escuela*. In these *advertencias*, or admonishments, he advises against a myriad of grammatical errors which were commonplace in Santiago at the time. In *Advertencias*, Bello not only offers a scorching appraisal of Chileans' widespread preference for the use of the pronoun *vos*, but he provides a valuable insight as to the state of Spanish in nineteenth-century Chile shortly after its independence from Spain. Using a say-this-but-not-that approach, the article, in its prescriptive capacity, can be likened to a nineteenth-century *Apendix Probi* of sorts.

The majority of Bello's observations and recommendations in *Advertencias* has relevance and can be applied even today (Jaksic: 2001), as many of the same errors continue to pervade spoken Spanish in Chile: 'Es necesario,' he warns, 'hacer sentir la *d* final de las palabras que la tienen, como *usted, virtud, vanidad*.' In the same vein, he warns against the omission of *d* in the intervocalic position of the past participle endings *-ado* and *-ido*, thus avoiding mispronounced utterances such as *sentá'o* or *dormi'o* (1956: 18). Bello also advises against such erroneous verb conjugations as *haiga*, *haigas*, and *haigan* in place of *haya*, *hayas*, *hayan*; the confusion between *cocer* and *coser*, or *yo forzo*, *tú forzas* in place of *yo fuerzo*, *tú fuerzas*, etc. (1956: 19).

However, as Bello approaches the subject of voseo in the article, the descriptors he chooses make clear his disdain for its use and proliferation in Chile. In his twelfth admonishment, he states:

No debe usarse en la conversación el pronombre *vos*, porque si se habla con una sola persona se debe decir *usted* o *tú*, según el grado de

familiaridad que tengamos con ella; y si con muchas personas, *ustedes* o *vosotras*. Sólo es permitido usar el pronombre *vos* en el estilo oratorio y poético ... Pero no sólo se peca contra el buen uso usando a *vos* en lugar de *tú*, sino (lo que aún es todavía más repugnante y vulgar) concertándole con la segunda persona de singular de los verbos. *Vos* se ha de considerar siempre como plural, sin embargo de que designemos con él una sola persona. [E]s un barbarismo grosero decir, como dicen muchos, *vos eres*, en lugar de *vos sois* o *tú eres* ... no sólo a gentes de poca instrucción, sino a predicadores de alguna literatura, hemos oído quebrantar a menudo esta regla.

Es lícito sin duda en las composiciones literarias pasar del *tú* al *vos* y del *vos* al *tú*, como se pasa en la música de un tono a otro, pero no debe nunca hacerse un revoltillo de singular y plural en una misma sentencia, aunque conste de varias cláusulas... [E]s necesario en todos casos hacerla con suavidad y sin ofensa del oído. Como el vicio de que hablamos, al paso que grave y grosero, se ha hecho excesivamente común en este país (1956: 20-21).

In a related point, Bello's fourteenth admonishment warns against *-éis/-ís* substitution, in support of Rona's voseo classification (see table 1.5), lamenting that in Chile 'la ínfima plebe muda siempre en *-ís* la terminación *-éis* de los verbos, diciendo *vís, comís, juntís*, en lugar de *veis, coméis, juntéis* ... No hay más verbos castellanos que tengan terminación en *-ís* que los de la tercera conjugación, cuyo infinitivo es en *-ir*,

y eso en un solo tiempo, que es el presente de indicativo: *partís, salís, sentís*' (1956: 23).

As shown in the previous excerpt, the derogatory tone Bello uses in order to persuade against the voseo in his *Gramática* is overshadowed by even stronger language in his *Advertencias*. The final line of the 14th admonishment is undoubtedly instructive, proclaiming that 'educated people' simply do not speak in such a manner (1956: 23).

2.3 Modern Times

Bello's scathing repudiation of widespread voseo usage in Chile and his campaign against it undoubtedly had a detrimental effect on the voseo, but Bello certainly could not control social circumstances in Chile to the degree that tuteo could be carried to all speakers of Spanish in Chile. In modern Chile, the dividing line between users of voseo and tuteo has been shown to be one of socioeconomic class.

The lower economic classes tend toward the authentic voseo construction, whereas the privileged, more educated classes favor the tuteo. Lipski (1991) affirms that *vos* was relegated to the poor, lower socioeconomic classes within the capital and in other rural areas within the country. Carricaburo (2005) supports this, pointing out that Chile was a *vos*-speaking country until Bello arrived and exerted a strong normative pressure in favor of the tuteo. However *vos* continued to be a rural, substandard usage. She affirms that the 1970s saw a definite incursion of the voseo into the middle and upper classes.

Simply put, those who were in a position to receive a conventional education in Bello's time and thereafter – usually members of the oligarchy and the sparse middle class – were able to adhere to the new norms as set forth in *Gramática*. Those who did not have the opportunity to pursue an education simply continued to speak as they had always spoken, and their children did the same. Consequently, the voseo was perpetuated in rural areas and among Santiago's working poor.

In large part due to the campaign of Bello to better the Chilean norm, but principally thanks to the tireless efforts of those who adhered to his language doctrine, Bello's principles were imposed on a large part of the population. Torrejón (1986) suggests that the triumph of Bello's campaign is evidenced by the fact that the voseo was discredited to such a degree as to the point of becoming a symptom of vulgarity, ignorance and rusticity.

Thus, the work of Bello to unify the country under the linguistic umbrella of a grammatical norm based on Peninsular Castilian (Torrejón 1989) had an effect which would have been difficult for him to foresee. First, he and his disciples enjoyed limited success in replacing voseo with tuteo in a significant portion of the population of Chile. Second, the portion of the population to benefit from his *Gramática* and *Advertencias* was primarily the oligarchy. Third, voseo continued to be used in rural areas and in lower socioeconomic classes which did not have access to the same educational opportunities. Furthermore, given the preceding three points, the ensuing second-person schism exacerbated an already-present sociopolitical divide.

3. Sociolinguistic Considerations

3.2 Solidarity

In Chilean Spanish, as with any other dialect of Spanish, the manner in which one person addresses another can be based on the level of familiarity or solidarity that exists between individuals or within a group. Torrejón affirms that among learned Chilean youth the mixed verbal voseo expresses solidarity inasmuch as it identifies its users as members of a circle of friends or members of a generational group and makes evident the informality and the fluid character of dialog between friends and relatives (1986: 682).

Fernández Rodríguez (2004) represents solidarity and formality on a simple, graphic scale. On the extreme left of the scale, solidarity and closeness are expressed, and at the extreme right, formality and distance. *Vos* falls to the left end of the scale, indicating a high level of solidarity, intimacy and closeness, whereas *usted* falls at the other end of the spectrum indicating formality, courtesy and distance. In the Chilean model, *tú* falls between these two extremes. The position of *vos* on the following table can be descriptive of the authentic or mixed form within the Chilean context:

	Solidarity/Familiarity/ Intimacy/Closeness	Formality/Courtesy/Power/ Social Distance
Singular	<i>vos</i>	<i>Tú</i> <i>Usted</i>
Plural		<i>Ustedes</i>

Table 3.1: Representation of types of treatment used according to solidarity (Fernández Rodríguez 2004)

In most areas where *vos* is prevalent, it does not share influence with *tú*. Rather, one form is favored over another within the speech community. The fact that the two forms are in competition within the same dialect continuum adds a level of level of complexity to the model, as shown in the previous table. The model itself becomes a continuum of situations in which one of three forms may be chosen to indicate the closeness of the speaker to the hearer.

3.2 Stratification

To further add to the complexity of the situation, a correlation can be observed between the socioeconomic stratum of the speaker and second-person form the speaker chooses among members of the same stratum. The authentic voseo in Chile has been associated with less-educated speakers, speakers of a lower socioeconomic class, or those speakers who were considered uncultured by members of higher socioeconomic strata.

As discussed in Chapter 2, this was not always the case in Chile; authentic voseo was universal before the mid-nineteenth century as affirmed by Torrejón (1986). Only after the arrival of Andrés Bello and the publication of his two prescriptive works did the voseo come to be perceived as anything less than acceptable for speakers of Chilean Spanish at the time.

The socioeconomic dividing line between the authentic voseo and the standard tuteo in Chile is well-attested. Linguists who have treated this topic within the environment of Chilean Spanish, such as Rona (1964), Oroz (1966), Torrejón (1986, 1991) and Lipski (1996), have concurred for the most part. Oroz (1966) noted two

parallel uses in Chile between the voseo and tuteo, the first being predominant in the urban working class, and among miners and rural dwellers, whereas the conventional tuteo was the standard in the middle to upper classes.

This dividing line, or sociolinguistic schism, may be attributed principally to Bello and his followers as Torrejón (1986) suggests. When Bello wrote his prescriptive works, he was focused on nation building and the important task of retaining a common, unified language with the rest of Spanish-speaking America and Spain. Given the universal scope of voseo usage in pre-Bello Chile, Bello could not have predicted the consequences of attempting to eliminate a characteristic as ingrained in the psyche as the manner in which one person speaks to another. He could not have foreseen the effect that his vehement prohibition of *vos* would have on second-person models in Chile in the decades that followed.

Indeed, the effects of *Gramática* and *Advertencias* had far-reaching consequences. In the years following their publication, and given Bello's distinguished position in the country, his recommendations in these works were taken seriously by the educational establishment (Torrejón 1986, Guimarães 2000). As is so often the case in developing regions, not all segments of the population had access to education. As the privileged class began incorporating Bello's recommendations, those with fewer educational opportunities would have continued to speak as they always had. Thus, speech would begin to polarize according to socioeconomic criteria.

In Chile, voseo deployment and distinction can be divided into sociolects. Authentic voseo can be said to belong to one sociolect, the conventional tuteo to another. Competition between voseo and tuteo mirrors a socioeconomic struggle

between rich and poor. Torrejón (1991) divides linguistic stratification in Chile into three nuclei, or three sociolects. The learned, well-speaking members of the higher socio-economic strata occupy one end of the spectrum. These speakers' level of instruction goes beyond secondary, or high school education, and they can be said to speak 'correctly.' The other extreme is composed of less-educated speakers, which comprises the grand majority of the urban and rural working class, whose level of scholarly instruction is low to nil. Between these two extremes exists the semi-educated middle class composed of mainly younger people who aspire to a place within the ranks of the higher class. Through their contact with members of that class, they acquire partial command of usages typical of that group.

3.3 Stigmatization

To assert that the authentic form is held in relatively low esteem is not a stretch, considering its relegation to the lower social classes and the harsh prescription against it. Torrejón (1986) notes that it was still possible, even in the 1950s, to hear such denigrating remarks as 'vos dicen los chanchos,' or 'vos say the pigs.' Yet it may also be said that the stigma applies not only to the authentic form and those who use it, but to the pronoun *vos* itself, independently of its corresponding verb forms.

The fact that a large segment of the Chilean speech community belonging to the middle (and increasingly the upper) class uses the historically plural verb forms on a daily basis would seem to indicate that the negative connotation is not necessarily associated with the verb conjugations that correspond to the voseo. Rather, the stigma would seem to be attached to the pronoun *vos* itself.

This stigma is most notable in the instances in which the pronoun is used. Speakers of the mixed verbal voseo typically use the subject pronoun *tú* when a subject pronoun is called for, yet when angered frequently switch pronouns. In such situations the pronoun *vos* then acquires the connotation of an insult. Torrejón confirms this observation, commenting that ‘when ire is intense, or when a speaker of any age has lost his temper, he employs the authentic voseo, assigning an insulting character to the pronoun *vos* ... [T]he authentic voseo, when in the mouth of a learned speaker reveals ire, scorn; the purpose being to insult the hearer’ (1986: 681-682).

4. Observations

4.1 Objectives

The primary objective of this work was to undertake a thorough examination of the forms of second-person singular address in common usage in the Republic of Chile and determine what factors (historical or otherwise) led to the complex model of personal address that presently exists within the dialect. The secondary objective was to attempt to determine the extent to which the mixed verbal voseo, or ‘voseo culto’ had permeated the mainstream of Chilean Spanish. In order to accomplish this objective, various media outlets were examined, such as popular television, periodicals (both online and in print), and members of the speech community were interviewed in order to confirm and validate what has already been written.

4.2 Television

During the two-week period between June 20 and July 4, 2009, a brief survey was conducted of popular programming on two channels during prime time (6:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.). The channels surveyed were *Televisión Nacional de Chile* and *Universidad Católica de Chile Televisión*, or *Canal 13*, as it is popularly referred to. An attempt was made to identify programming on these two channels within the indicated time slot which employed the mixed pronominal voseo in congruence with the sociolect previously identified in Chapter 3 as employing it. It was observed that *telenovelas*, variety shows and talk shows in informal settings – especially those specifically targeted at a younger viewership – were more likely to use the mixed voseo.

Additionally, an attempt was made to identify instances in which the two voseo variants were contrasted with standard tuteo. The attempt was met with some success. One specific series, *Los exitosos Pells* (2009), which aired on *Televisión Nacional* from 7:00-8:00 p.m. weeknights, portrayed personages representing all three sociolects of Chilean Spanish, and all of these characters used the second-person form corresponding to the social stratum the personage was intended to belong to. Personages being portrayed as poor or of little educational formation unerringly used authentic voseo in their dialogs. Conversely, young, up-and-coming middle class personages consistently used the mixed verbal voseo. Those characters within the plot that were in a position of power or belonging to a higher socioeconomic class used conventional tuteo, in exclusivity, to address each other and those below them.

Ample use of the mixed verbal voseo, and, to a lesser extent, authentic voseo were observed. The state-run *Televisión Nacional* proved a contrast to the more conservative, Catholic-run *Canal 13* in which two television programs were observed to use the mixed form even sparingly, and only in a situation where a person was being interviewed.

Televisión Nacional demonstrated more of a tendency toward the two voseo forms. It should be noted that the same programs were examined over the entire two-week period. The use of the mixed verbal form on this channel was limited to telenovelas and variety shows, and the authentic form only to telenovelas. Use of voseo within these television programs (authentic or mixed verbal) was ample, but not extensive.

4.3 Printed media and Internet

A survey of three daily publications was made within a three-day period from June 25 through June 27, 2009 in Santiago. Every page of all three publications was examined thoroughly. The publications examined were three daily newspapers circulated in the Santiago Metropolitan region, *El Mercurio*, *La Tercera* and *La Cuarta*.

El Mercurio is, by far, the largest and most disseminated daily newspaper, with local editions throughout the country. Of the three periodicals examined, it is undoubtedly the most conservative and the most thorough, and can be, at times, rather voluminous. Indeed, the Sunday edition consisted of more than fifty pages, not including the magazine inserts.

This particular publication demonstrated a great degree of flexibility in that it publishes weekly magazines as inserts to its daily editions targeted to a particular readership or interest group. In spite of its flexibility, only one instance of voseo was observed during the three-day period.

In spite of the conservative appearance and content of its printed editions, *El Mercurio Online* (www.emol.com) contains a subsidiary pop-culture themed website targeted to young university-aged users. This site, www.zona.cl contains a variety of blogs, articles and interviews in which the mixed verbal voseo is used. These data, although worth mentioning, are not included in the study.

La Tercera is generally considered slightly more modern and liberal than *El Mercurio*, with a younger more up-and-coming readership. Surprisingly, the three-day survey encountered no examples of voseo, authentic or mixed verbal.

La Cuarta is the most liberal of the three publications, with a focus on sports and entertainment. The three-day survey encountered 5 examples of mixed verbal voseo and one example of the authentic form, all appearing in interviews with a question and answer format, or used in a comedic context.

The following table outlines the frequency of mixed verbal voseo encountered in the three publications between the dates indicated, drawing a comparison to the authentic voseo form.

Occurrence of Voseo in Print						
	June 25		June 26		June 27	
	Authentic	Mixed	Authentic	Mixed	Authentic	Mixed
<i>El Mercurio</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>La Tercera</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>La Cuarta</i>	0	2	0	1	1	1

Table 4.1: Occurrence of mixed and authentic voseo forms by publication

Over the three-day period, *La Cuarta* proved to be the most likely to use voseo mixto verbal and the authentic voseo form, with five instances being observed.

4.4 Observations through Conversations and Interviews

A pool of eight individuals from the lower to upper middle class, ranging in ages from 25 to 80, was surveyed. All interviews were conducted in Santiago between June 20 and July 2, 2009. Participants were asked seven questions about how they used

familiar and formal address. All seven of these questions were multiple-choice and required a definitive response. Five of the questions allowed participants to choose more than one response. One question required a yes or no answer, and another, which asked the participants' perceived socioeconomic status, required a definite answer – participants were not allowed to choose more than one answer.

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (3) | Acceptability of <i>Vos</i> | |
| | a. Among friends: | 6 |
| | b. When angered: | 5 |
| | c. When joking: | 8 |
| | d. Never: | 1 |
| (4) | Mode of Address Chosen When Greeting a Friend | |
| | a. Standard tuteo: | 2 |
| | b. Mixed verbal voseo: | 6 |
| | c. Authentic voseo: | 0 |
| | d. Usted | 0 |
| (5) | Acceptability of <i>Vos</i> When Angered | |
| | a. Yes: | 6 |
| | b. No: | 2 |

- (6) Form of *Ser* Used
- | | | |
|----|-----------|---|
| a. | Tú eres: | 2 |
| b. | Tú eríh: | 5 |
| c. | Tú sois: | 1 |
| d. | Vos sois: | 0 |
| e. | Usted es: | 0 |
- (7) When is conventional tuteo used?
- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| a. | Among friends or family: | 2 |
| b. | With an acquaintance (not a friend): | 5 |
| c. | To express distance without formality: | 6 |
- (8) When is *usted* used?
- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---|
| a. | To address elders | 8 |
| b. | To address persons in authority | 8 |
| c. | When wishing to express distance | 0 |

All of the participants, with the exception of one, indicated that they used the pronoun *vos* in one form or another; however the circumstances in which they indicated they used it varied. Sixty- three percent of participants indicated that it was acceptable to use *vos* when angered, 75% agreed it was acceptable to use with friends, and all participants were in agreement that it was acceptable to use *vos* jokingly. One

participant responded that it was not acceptable to use this pronoun under any circumstances.

Among the participants, mixed verbal voseo was the mode of choice when greeting a friend. Seventy-five percent of participants preferred this form of address when greeting close personal friends, the other 25% chose standard tuteo.

Results were identical when the participants were asked about a specific situation in which *vos* might be acceptable. Although given as one of the choices in three3, when asked as a yes or no question, one of the participants recanted his answer posed in and responded yes. Seventy-five percent indicated that it was acceptable in such circumstances while twenty five replied that it was not.

When asked which form of *ser* the participants used when addressing a friend, 63% indicated a preference for the modified form *eríh*, while 25% chose the conventional tuteo. One participant, representing 12%, favored *soi(s)*. It is interesting to note, that in contrast to the more detailed study described in González (2002), more participants chose the form *eríh* in the present study. Gonzalez's study indicated a propensity for *eríh* in females; however the present study found no indication that one sex favored one form over another.

When asked to indicate which uses of *tú* they considered valid, a significant percentage indicated that they would choose *tú* to create distance in a conversation. Seventy-five percent chose this as an acceptable use of *tú*, while 63% would use *tú* with a non-friendly acquaintance. Twenty five percent would use *tú* with friends and family. This result was not entirely unexpected, and confirms earlier observations.

All participants indicated a preference for *usted* when addressing someone significantly older or in a position of authority.

The purpose of the final question was to gain an insight as to the speakers' perceptions about how they addressed one another. The question was general; when asked for their thoughts and opinions on the matter, several replies were of particular interest.

- (8) a. 'O sea, todo el mundo – diría yo – se da cuenta de que esa forma de hablar viene del vos, pero acá en Chile la ocupamos a nuestra manera.'
- b. 'El voh es algo únicamente chileno. Son los argentinos que hablan de vos, porque dicen tenés en vez de tení, o hacés en vez de hací, o hablás en vez de hablái. ¿Cachái, o no?'
- c. 'Son los lolitos que hablan así, poh. Cuando yo era niña mis padres no nos permitían hablar así. Que alguien dijera vos era como decir un garabato. En serio, me hubieran mandado un palmazo.'

One participant's response confirmed the generational limitation of the mixed verbal voseo. At the age of 80, this participant was the eldest of the group. Her reply in 8c illustrates the stigma attached to the pronoun. She explains that as a small child, her parents did not permit her not to use the *vos*. The reply given in 8b indicates that the speaker recognizes the difference between voseo deployment in Argentina and the forms used in Chile, yet declares that *vos* is for the Argentines and *el voh*, is uniquely

Chilean. In contrast, the speaker in 8a recognizes that the mixed form comes from the voseo, but states that 'we just use it our way.'

5. Conclusions

5.1 Competition

The examination of the second-person dynamic in Chile undertaken in this study has led to several conclusions, some of which are already established and affirmed by the academic community. It is evident after an examination of the available research and years of experiencing the dialect personally, that the voseo and tuteo continue to compete. All three second-person forms in use can be observed in literature, heard daily in conversation and frequently in television programming.

Yet as Lipski (1991) asserts, the apparent competition between voseo and tuteo in Chile mirrors a socioeconomic struggle between rich and poor. The stigma associated with the authentic form and the growing prestige of the mixed form mirror the political and economic triumphs of Chile in recent decades. Poverty is stigmatized, and is something to overcome, whereas the middle class is something to which those living in poverty aspire. Poverty continues to decline while the middle class continues to grow.

5.2 Perpetuation of the Stigma

It is safe to conclude that the authentic voseo, while not necessarily endangered, is continuing to decline after more than a century of competition with the tuteo. This decline can be observed diachronically from the time of Andrés Bello, as an indirect result of his prescription of voseo as outlined in *Gramática* and *Advertencias*, and

subsequent indoctrination of his recommendations by the Chilean educational establishment.

Nevertheless, even a superficial observation of Chilean Spanish inevitably leads to the conclusion that stigmatization of the authentic voseo continues unabated. The perception that the pronoun *vos* is somehow vulgar, tacky and crude has been a contributing factor leading to the decline of the authentic form. Indeed, the idea that the substitution of a single pronoun can bring about a complete change in social perception is significant, from a sociolinguistic perspective.

However, the stigmatization of authentic voseo can be seen as a misperception. The stigma would appear to be specific to the pronoun *vos* itself. Two points support this argument. First, authentic voseo is almost universally shunned by the middle and upper classes, yet speakers use its corresponding verb conjugation as a way to express solidarity, relationships of intimacy and/or closeness. Although this verb conjugation belongs historically to the second-person plural *vos*, the singular pronoun *tú* is used with it when a pronoun is called for.

It would also appear that one pronoun is more prestigious than the other, or rather; one pronoun is assigned a certain level of prestige and therefore favored, whereas the other is avoided because of the stigma associated with its use. In any case, it stands to reason that the middle class would not prefer to use the verb conjugations normally associated with the pronoun *vos* if those were stigmatized as well. In place of using the pronoun that would normally correspond to the conjugated verb, the negative connotations associated with *vos* are avoided, and a more prestigious pronoun, *tú*, is preferred.

The pronoun *vos* also carries the value of an epithet, when used by members of the middle and higher classes. As affirmed by Torrejón (1986, 1991) and experienced by this author on a variety of occasions, users of tuteo and voseo culto switch pronouns in an instant when moved to anger or indignation, the intention being to convey an insulting and derogatory tone. This 'insulting' use of the pronoun *vos* by members of higher socio-economic classes would appear to also strengthen the argument that the pronoun *vos* itself is the specific element to which the stigma is attached, and not necessarily the pronoun in combination with the verb.

5.3 Expansion of the Mixed Verbal Voseo

At present, there appears to be very little in the way of the mixed form's progress. Torrejón (1986) sees the younger generation in Chile as having the most influence in this respect, perceiving the mixed verbal voseo as a form of treatment that reveals a great degree of spontaneity and considering it a generational creation that reflects a binding solidarity which predominates within the group. Torrejón's view, though somewhat idyllic, seems credible, and may account, to a large degree, for the expansion of the mixed form in recent decades.

Contrarily, asserts Torrejón, that same group sees the tuteo as an uncomfortable social imposition, a bookish element outside of their system (1986: 682). Nevertheless, these same young speakers can often effortlessly switch from verbal voseo to standard tuteo when the need arises. If, for example, the person with whom the speaker is interacting is a foreigner inexperienced with the voseo, or if the speaker perceives that

he or she has not been well-understood, the speaker will, more than likely switch to conventional tuteo for clarity and deploy it flawlessly.

Torrejón's explanation, however, is somewhat dated, and does not account for additional factors which have come to influence the paradigm of second-person address in Chile within the last two decades. The advent of the internet and Chile's high degree of connectivity has only served to broaden the mixed voseo's sphere of influence.

Ample dissemination of the mixed voseo through the avenue of television also contributes to its growth. As the middle class continues to expand in Chile due to a vibrant, inclusive economy, television will remain an important vehicle for popular forms of expression. If television can be seen as an indicator or mirror for popular forms of expression, it can reasonably be relied upon as a valuable tool in determining the vitality or decline of these forms of personal address. The fact that tuteo continues to dominate familiar address in television broadcasts is a testament to its prestige status. However, the general feeling is that the mixed verbal voseo will continue to gain prestige in coming years as it continues to be encouraged and validated through popular media.

5.4 For the Future

Lipski comments that the Chilean voseo seems to be in a state of rebirth in the last decades, signaling a beginning, if this tendency continues, of something that could result in a unique situation within the context of American Spanish (1991: 226). That this complex dynamic in Chile deserves a more detailed quantitative study as it develops is obvious, but because of its dynamic nature, a detailed study would be an arduous, continuous task of a diachronic nature.

As Torrejón (1986) asserts, the voseo behaves differently in each Spanish-speaking community that employs it. In spite of the extension and profundity with which dialectologists have studied it, they have not been able to reach an end point, due to its ever-changing nature (1986: 682).

As the economic power of the Chilean middle class continues to grow, the speakers of the authentic voseo that achieve an entrance into the Chilean middle class in coming years will surely adopt this mixed form. Since the mixed form is less distanced from the authentic form – a form of personal treatment which is likely already known to them – it is unlikely they will find difficulty in replacing one pronoun for another. For now, nothing seems to be in the way of the mixed form's continued growth, not even institutionalized tuteo.

As explained in Chapter 1, the present complication of second-person forms observable in Chile is not new to the Spanish language. Although it is impossible to predict with certainty how the present situation in Chile will resolve, it is reasonable to assume – even to predict – that it will resolve. Given the vibrant growth of the mixed verbal voseo, Chilean Spanish may see, in decades to come, a resolution in favor of the new 'voseo culto' as it moves ever closer to standardization.

References

- BELLO, ANDRÉS. 1956 [1833-1834]. Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana dedicadas a los padres de familia, profesores de los colegios y maestros de escuela. *Revista de educación de la Provincia de Buenos Aires*. Suplemento número II,17-40.
- BELLO, ANDRÉS. 2008 [1847]. *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos*. Barcelona: Linkgua.
- BUTT, JOHN & CARMEN BENJAMIN. 2004. *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*, 4th edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- CARRICABURO, NORMA BEATRIZ. 2003. *El voseo en la historia y en la lengua de hoy*
Las fórmulas de tratamiento en el español actual.
<http://www.elcastellano.org/ns/edicion/2004/julio/voseo.html>. (4 October 2009.)
- CISNEROS ESTUPIÑÁN, MIREYA. 1996. Aspectos histórico-pragmáticos del voseo. *Thesaurus* LI.1. 27-43.
http://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/thesaurus/pdf/51/TH_51_001_035_0.pdf. (9 Oct 2009.)
- DEL VALLE, JOSÉ & LUÍS GABRIEL-STHEEMAN. 2002. *The Battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: Language Ideologies and Hispanic Intellectuals*. New York: Routledge.
- Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*. 1st edn. 2005. Madrid: Real Academia Española.
- DONOSO, JOSÉ. 2006 [1957]. *Coronación*. 4th edn. Buenos Aires: Punto de lectura.
- FERNÁNDEZ RODRÍGUEZ, MAURO. 2004. Constitución del orden social y desasosiego: Los pronombres de segunda persona en español. *Franco-British Studies*, vols. 33-34. 79-89.
- GONZÁLEZ, CARLOS EDUARDO. 2002. La variación 'eríh' / 'soi' en el voseo verbal de Santiago de Chile. *Onomázein* 7, 213-230.
- GUIMARÃES BARROS, LUIZETE. 2000. Lengua y nación en la *Gramática* de Bello. *Anuario brasileño de estudios hispánicos*, vol. 10, 47-56.
- JAKSIC, IVAN. 2001. *Andrés Bello: Scholarship and Nation Building in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*. New York: Cambridge U. Press.

- LIPSKI, JOHN M. 1994. *El español de América*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- MORALES PETTORINO, FÉLIX. 1998. La conjugación en el español de Chile. *Literatura y lingüística*.
http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0716-58111998001100008&lng=es&nrm=iso. 16 Feb. 2009.
- PENNY, RALPH. 1991. *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- PENNY, RALPH. 2000. *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- RONA, JOSÉ PEDRO. 1964. El problema de la división del español americano en zonas dialectales. *Presente y futuro de la lengua española*. Tome I. Madrid: OFINES, 215-226.
- TORREJÓN, ALFREDO. 1986. Acerca del Voseo Culto de Chile. *Hispania* 69(3). 677-683.
- TORREJÓN, ALFREDO. 1989. Andrés Bello, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento y el castellano culto de Chile. *Thesaurus* XLVI. 534-58.
- TORREJÓN, ALFREDO. 1991. Formulas de tratamiento de segunda persona singular en el español de Chile. *Hispania* 74(4). 1068-1076.
- WEEKS, PATRICIA C. 2005. *El voseo en Chile: Factores histórico-morfológicos que explican su aparición y mantenimiento*. Albany. NY: State University of New York at Albany dissertation.

**University Committee for the Protection
of Human Subjects in Research
University of New Orleans**

Campus Correspondence

Principal Investigator: Joke Mondada
Co-Investigator: Patrick Rouse
Date: April 16, 2010
Protocol Title: How people use a certain point of grammar in Chilean Spanish
IRB#: 10Apr10

Federal guidelines prohibit IRBs from providing retroactive approval. However, IRBs can confirm that previous research was exempt from IRB regulations. The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures described in this protocol application are exempt from federal regulations under 45 CFR 46.101 category 2. Although information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research wouldn't reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Exempt protocols do not have an expiration date; however, if there are any changes made to this protocol that may cause it to be no longer exempt from CFR 46, the IRB requires another standard application from the investigator(s) which should provide the same information that is in this application with changes that may have changed the exempt status.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event. Please note that had your project not been exempt, approval could not have been granted. Keep this in mind as you plan future projects and obtain IRB approval before beginning the study.

Best wishes on your project!

Sincerely,

Robert D. Laird, Chair
UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

FORMULARIO DE ENTREVISTA

Fecha _____

Sexo: M F

1. ¿Cuántos años tienes? _____
2. Según tu propia percepción, ¿a qué nivel socioeconómico perteneces?
 - a. Alta
 - b. Media alta
 - c. Media
 - d. Media baja
 - e. Baja
 - f. De escasos recursos
3. Si te encuentras con un amigo en la calle, ¿cómo saludas a tu amigo? De los siguientes ejemplos, ¿cuál es el más probable?
 - a. ¿Cómo estás, tú?
 - b. ¡Hola! ¿Qué contái? ¿Cómo hai estado?
 - c. ¡Quihubo! ¿Y voh qué contái?
 - d. Buenos días. ¿Cómo está usted?
4. Si típicamente tratas a tus amigos y conocidos de tú, ¿les dices vos cuando te enojas? Por ejemplo, “¡Y voh, que te metí!”
 - a. Sí
 - b. No, o no trato a la gente de tú.
5. ¿Cuándo le dices tú a la gente (tú eres, tú vives, tú hablas, etc.?)
 - a. Cuando son mis amigos o familiares
 - b. Cuando conozco a la persona, pero no existe una relación de amistad
 - c. Cuando quiero expresar distancia.
6. Completa la siguiente oración: Tratar a alguien de vos...
 - a. es aceptable cuando son amigos.
 - b. es aceptable cuando uno se enoja.
 - c. es aceptable en broma.
 - d. no es aceptable bajo ninguna circunstancia.
7. ¿Cuál de las siguientes oraciones ocuparías tú, si estuvieras conversando con un amigo?
 - a. Tú eres el más guapo entre nosotros.
 - b. Tú eríh el más guapo entre nosotros.
 - c. Tú soi el más guap entre nosotros.
 - d. Voh soi el más guapo entre nosotros.
 - e. Usted es el más guapo entre nosotros.

8. Se nota hoy en día que la gente – en especial la gente joven – está hablando de una forma distinta al tuteo convencional (tú eres, tú vienes, tú sientes, tú hablas). En vez de decir ‘tú hablas’ dicen ‘tú hablái’, o en vez de decir ‘tú nunca vienes a la hora’ dicen ‘tú nunca vení a la hora.’ ¿Cuál es tu opinión de esta forma de hablar?

Vita

Patrick Roy Rouse was born July 20, 1973 in Gulfport, Mississippi. Having grown up in a family where French was spoken frequently, he was awakened to an interest in languages at a very young age. In 1994, he travelled to the Republic of Chile where he lived and worked for more than two years. This experience engendered an interest in the Spanish language which has endured to the present. In 1999, Patrick received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Spanish with a minor in French from the University of Southern Mississippi. He relocated to New Orleans in 2002 and began pursuing a Master of Arts degree shortly thereafter. For the future, he hopes to continue his studies at the PhD level.