



10-1-2007

The Loss of the 'voseo' in Chilean Spanish: Evidence in Literature

Gregory Newall
Indiana University

The Loss of the 'voseo' in Chilean Spanish: Evidence in Literature

The loss of the *voseo* in Chilean Spanish: Evidence in literature*

Gregory Newall

1 Introduction

The *voseo* in Spanish is defined as “el uso de formas verbales derivadas de las de segunda persona plural, construidas con el pronombre arcaico *vos* en función de sujeto, para dirigirse a un solo interlocutor” (Torrejón 1986:677, my translation), “the use of verbal forms derived from the second-person plural, constructed with the archaic pronoun *vos* as the subject pronoun, in order to address a single interlocutor.” Although studies abound on the current use of the *voseo* and its interaction with the other second-person singular pronoun and verb form, the *tuteo*, studies of *voseo* usage in the past, and its eventual loss or diminished use in some regions in that time period, are somewhat limited to theories or historical accounts (Páez-Urdaneta 1981, Benavides 2003, Sweeney 2005, and others) and analyses of literature (Arizabalaga 2001, Ramírez-Luengo 2003). The theories offer historical explanations for why the *voseo* was lost in some regions but still is used in others. However, even with the contributions of the theories and the analyses of literature, there is a lack of explicit explanations of *voseo* use that offer social or linguistic reasons for the change in some regions. The present paper attempts to explain the diminished use of *voseo* in Chile in the 19th century by examining literature from this time period, and attempts to go beyond the theories by suggesting different social and linguistic variables that contributed to the change in the use of the *voseo* in Chile.

2 Previous literature

The *voseo*, as defined in the introduction, consists of a second-person singular verb form and a pronoun. In Spanish, there is another second-person singular pronoun and verb form, called the *tuteo*. The *tuteo* consists of another pronoun (*tú*) and verb form. The pronoun and the verb form, as indicated by Páez-Urdaneta (1981) and Torrejón (1986) may have different realizations,

*The researcher appreciates the comments and suggestions offered by Professors Manuel Díaz-Campos, Alejandro Mejías-López, and Norma Mendoza-Denton, as well as by colleagues in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Indiana University and attendees at the NWA V 2006 Conference.

according to the tense of the verb. A *vos* pronoun may occur with a *voseo* verb form, called the authentic *voseo*. A *vos* pronoun with a *tuteo* verb form is called the pronominal *voseo*. Finally, the *tú* pronoun with a *voseo* verb form is the verbal *voseo*. The different verbal realizations of the *voseo* are shown in Table 1 below. A conflict is presented with this information, which is that the first verb forms listed in rows 1, 2, and 4 (*comes*, *comiste*, *comerás*) are the same as the *tuteo* verb form. Thus, if the verb form does not appear with the pronoun in context, it could be ambiguous. Nevertheless, the other forms that are different from the *tú* seem to be accentuated on the ultimate syllable (present indicative), include a vowel change (present indicative, future indicative), an added vowel (imperfect indicative, present subjunctive) or a word-final *-s* (preterit indicative). Essentially, the *voseo* can have a morphology that is similar to or different from the other second-person singular verb form, the *tuteo*, but its grammatical function is to indicate second-person singular.

Verb form	Variant	English meaning
Present indicative	<i>comes/comés/comís/coméis</i>	'you eat'
Preterit indicative	<i>comiste/comistes / comites</i>	'you ate'
Imperfect indicative	<i>comíai</i>	'you were eating'
Future indicative	<i>comerás/comerés/comerís/ comeréis</i>	'you will eat'
Present subjunctive	<i>comái</i>	'that you eat' (modal)
Imperative	<i>comí/come</i>	'eat' (command)

Table 1: The *voseo* verbal paradigm

Studies have shown that currently the use of the *voseo* is in variation with the use of the *tuteo* in certain Spanish-speaking regions, and that this variation could be due to social variables, such as age, gender, and relationships between speakers (Rey 1995, Rey 1997, Torrejón 1991). According to some historical accounts (Páez-Urdaneta 1981, Benavides 2003, Sweeney 2005), the situation can be explained historically. The Spanish language was brought to the Americas by the conquistadors in roughly the 15th and 16th centuries. At least one account (Páez-Urdaneta 1981) indicates that the conquistadors and settlers who arrived from Spain brought the *voseo* with them. Kany (1969) indicates that during the 15th century and the first third of the 16th century the *voseo* and its morphology existed in Spain. However, there were social meanings associated with the *voseo* in Spain during this time period, ranging from an insult to a very close relationship. Examinations of

literature from this time period with characters from the lower classes suggest that the *voseo* and the *tuteo* were both used, and that the varied meanings of the *voseo* applied to all strata of society. However, Benavides (2003:613, my translation) claims that during this time period, the tendency was that the *voseo* “iba adquiriendo un valor de menosprecio y se estaba convirtiendo en una forma de tratamiento degradante,” or “was slowly adopting a value of contempt and was being converted into a treatment form of degradation.”

Nevertheless, the conquistadors and settlers who came to the new world considered themselves an egalitarian group, and supposedly showed no socially-motivated variation between *tuteo* and *voseo* in their interpersonal communication; they nearly categorically used *voseo* (Páez-Urdaneta 1981). Furthermore, in the process of colonization, the conquistadors taught the indigenous peoples Spanish that included the *voseo*, and at the beginning, it was a symbol of, as Benavides (2001:616, my translation) states, “igualdad y camaradería,” or, “equality and camaraderie.” However, after a few generations, the young societies that were being established supposedly began to experience stratification. The same persons that settled the regions became masters and owners of the lands and of the people, and had positions of higher authority and greater wealth. The consistent communication with the Spanish government confounded this situation; the linguistic changes that occurred on the Peninsula came to occur in the colonies as well. The *voseo* was losing ground in Spain, and instead, the *tuteo* was gradually supplanted as the preferred second-person pronoun in interpersonal communication. The consistent communication with the Spanish Crown that some colonies received did include the language that was used in Spain at the time—as well as the prestige values attached to such forms. In the colonies where there was consistent communication with Peninsular Spanish, the rise in the use of *tuteo* co-occurred with lesser use of the *voseo*. However, the loss of the *voseo* by linguistic influence of colonization did not occur in a uniform manner across all Spanish colonies. Páez-Urdaneta (1981:66, my translation¹)

¹The original Spanish language versions of these descriptions, available in Páez-Urdaneta (1981) are shown below:

1. una región parcial o totalmente colonizada para la primera mitad del siglo XVI que fue zona de *voseo* general, pero que, por su avance socioeconómico y/o su contacto con la Península, asimiló rápidamente el sistema de tratamiento que allí se estaba poniendo (e.g.: México, Perú, Santo Domingo);
2. una región parcial o totalmente colonizada para la primera mitad del siglo XVI que fue zona de *voseo* general, pero que, por su estado socioeconómico y su no contacto con la Península, no asimiló el sistema de tratamiento que allí se impuso (Centroamérica);

suggests there are four types of areas in Latin America, according to the status of the *voseo*:

1. “a region partially or completely colonized by the first half of the 16th century that was a region of general *voseo* usage, but due to its advanced socioeconomic development and/or contact with the Peninsula, it assimilated rapidly to the treatment system that was being imposed there.” (Mexico, Perú, Santo Domingo, D.R.);
2. “a region partially or completely colonized by the first half of the 16th century that was a region of general *voseo* usage, but due to its lesser socioeconomic development and its lack of contact with the Peninsula, it did not assimilate to the treatment system that was imposed there.” (Central America);
3. “a region colonized in the second half of the 16th century that was not a region of general *voseo* usage because its settlers or colonizers had already assimilated to the imposed system.” (Eastern Venezuela);
4. “a region colonized in the second half of the 16th century by persons coming from zones of general *voseo* usage.” (Western Venezuela)

In short, in areas where communication and contact with Peninsular Spanish were less consistent, or where colonization (if by *voseo* users) began at a later date, *voseo* use became extensive, and the influence of the *tuteo* was not present until later. This is an explanation as to why the *voseo* still exists today in places such as Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Argentina.

In Chile, the situation was very specific. Benavides notes that Spanish was introduced to Chile by the Spanish settlers (2003). However, Chile was a marginal zone economically, culturally, and administratively. It did not have the same amount of communication with the Crown. Regarding the situation of the *voseo*, some explanations claim that the reason for the diminished use of the *voseo* and the use of the *tuteo* was the sweeping educational reforms of the grammarian Andrés Bello, which was in a manner of speaking, pro-*tuteo*. Andrés Bello’s *Advertencias*, which consisted of observations and opinions of language, indicated that the *voseo* was a “universally informal and familiar” form of treatment. He declared that using the pronoun *vos*

-
3. una región colonizada en la segunda mitad del siglo XVI que no fue zona de *voseo* general porque sus primeros pobladores peninsulares o americanos habían ya asimilado el sistema de tratamiento en cuestión (e.g.: Oriente de Venezuela);
 4. una región colonizada en la segunda mitad del siglo XVI por individuos procedentes de zonas de *voseo* general (e.g.: Occidente de Venezuela).

instead of *tú* meant “. . . *se peca contra el buen uso . . .*”, or “a sin against good use” (Bello 1884:469, as cited in Torrejón 1986:680, my translation). In theory, the Chilean society at this time was experiencing stratification. Not all people were exposed to this view of education and language use, nor did they experience the changes in education. The system of education allowed for this view to propagate, and (in theory as well), the higher class and more educated persons came to be more likely to speak the Spanish proposed by these reforms. Furthermore, as noted by Páez-Urdaneta (1981:108, my translation), there was also social ascension brought about by economic development (“. . . *el ascenso social promovido por cierto desarrollo económico*”). Thus, for the reasons of education, social stratification, and economic development, the *voseo* eventually adopted a social stigma similar to Spain—it came to be considered incorrect and vulgar. These are the explanations suggested for the gradual loss of the *voseo* in Chile.

While these explanations are logical, there is still a lack of real evidence. It seems that more information can be ascertained. First, linguistic change can be more complicated than the force of a prestige group, or a change from above. Also, when someone addresses his/her interlocutor in a specific way, several factors can come into account (Brown and Gilman 1964, as cited in Torrejón 1991), other than the socially correct way of speaking. Third, while the use of the *voseo* may have been diminished by the educational reforms and the stigmatization, there is lack of knowledge regarding other specific linguistic and social factors that may have affected such a change. Essentially, what is missing from current sociolinguistics research is an explanation and demonstration of the relative importance of the specific variables that led to the diminished use of the *voseo* in Chile, as well as a description of the diachronic change in the Spanish of Chile in the 19th century. Taking as inspiration the general statements made regarding the 19th century linguistic change in Chile, as well as the still-unknown characteristics of this change, the present paper will analyze the use of second-person address forms, the *tuteo* and the *voseo* in Chilean literature from the 19th century.

Corpora of spoken speech from the 19th century are non-existent, so literature serves as the most feasible medium for examinations and descriptions of language. Although spoken language may be more dynamic, written language may still provide notable results. Previous examinations of linguistic change of the *voseo* with the use of literature have been conducted. Arrizabalaga (2001) described the analysis of the *voseo/tuteo* use in *Matalache*, a Peruvian novel based in Piura, a rural Peruvian location. In this novel, it is noted that the *voseo* was purely a pronominal form, and that the only verbal form used was *sos* ‘you are.’ The analysis of this novel suggests that the *voseo* is limited to popular use, and co-exists with the *tuteo*. Furthermore, it

appears that the *tuteo* is used for treatment between a husband and his wife, treatment of inferiors, or treatment between close friends. The *voseo* is used only in relationships where a certain degree of respect is shared. Arrizabalaga suggests that since the use of the *voseo* was so limited in context, and since its usage was known to be widespread before, the *voseo* was experiencing decline in use, effectively being replaced by the *tuteo*.

Ramírez-Luengo (2003) examined the distribution of *voseo* and *tuteo* verb forms and pronouns in letters sent from a wife to a husband in 1811, or namely, the letters of María Guadalupe Cuenca de Moreno. The woman and her husband were from Bolivia, but the woman was temporarily in Buenos Aires. The intention of the analysis was to provide a description of the *Alto Peruano voseo-tuteo* verb paradigm, and to compare it to the paradigm of Buenos Aires Spanish described by Fontanella de Weinberg (1989). The focus of the study was the “unequivocal” forms, which means only those verb forms that could be undeniably classified as *voseo* or *tuteo*. Ramírez-Luengo (2003) explains that orthographic ambiguity was common in the letters, and because of the exclusion of ambiguous forms from the analysis, only 70 of 163 verb forms were analyzed. The pronouns were also ignored, for in these letters, it was found that pronoun use was categorical. However, the researcher noted that the verbal paradigms in these letters show variation in use of the *voseo* or the *tuteo* in several verb tenses. It appears that the present indicative favors the *tuteo*, but not all verb tenses show the same tendencies. These results suggest that if this writer’s linguistic production is representative of Bolivian Spanish in the early 19th century, then the verbal paradigm of *voseo-tuteo* was heterogeneous.

The relevance of the above studies to the present study is that they serve as an example of analysis of literature with the intention of suggesting the linguistic situation of the *voseo*. The methodology of extracting examples of tokens of *voseo* and *tuteo* from literature inspires the present study. The study of *Matalache*, which comes from the 20th century, shows that the rural Peruvian community that was the setting for the novel was experiencing the linguistic change that took place in other parts of Spanish-speaking America. The variation in the verbal paradigms of the letters of María Guadalupe suggests the same for Bolivia.

All works analyzed in the present study, despite being texts, which could be subject to editing changes, appear to maintain vocabulary and morphology are maintained. Furthermore, a variety of works was examined: a short play, a novel, and a short story. These characteristics follow the suggestions made by Schneider (2004:71) regarding texts that “lend themselves to a variation analysis.”

3 Methodology

The present analysis will consist of an examination of *voseo* and *tuteo* usage in 19th century Chilean literature. This time period, as stated before, is supposedly when the *voseo-tuteo* shift occurred. The reforms of Andrés Bello began roughly in 1830, one year after his arrival, and *Advertencias* was originally published in 1834. Taking into account this information, the present analysis examines works from the mid-19th century, or roughly one generation after the institution of the reforms, and from the early 20th century, or roughly three generations after the institution of the reforms. This time frame was established to allow for examination of the effects of the reforms, which supposedly promoted *tuteo* and demoted *voseo*. The following works from each time period are examined:

Mid-19 th Century	Early 20 th Century
<i>Chañarcillo</i> , A. A. Hernández	<i>Juana Lucero</i> , A. D'Halmar
<i>Martín Rivas</i> , A. B. Gana	<i>Casa Grande</i> , L. Orrego Luco
<i>El pirata de Huayas</i> , M. Bilbao	<i>Sub-Terra</i> , B. Lillo

Table 2: Chilean literature examined in the present study

The dependent variable of the present study was the use of the *tuteo* or the *voseo*. In order to collect a random sample of language from the works, the researcher extracted all tokens from every other page of each text. As was done in previous studies, the present study did not include ambiguous verb forms, such as the preterit indicative without word-final *-s*. In order for a token to be extracted, it had to include a non-ambiguous (clearly *voseo* or *tuteo*) verb form, with or without the *vos/tú* pronoun, or it had to include a pronoun that represents a core or peripheral argument, and is in a morpho-syntactic context that allows for use of either *tuteo* or *voseo*. Regarding the concept of core arguments, Foley and Van Valin (1984) explain that core arguments can be considered primary participants, and the peripheral arguments are secondary participants. An example of each of these is shown below, in (1)–(3):

- (1) Core argument: *Y sabís que la gente se comporte bien*
'And you know that people here conduct themselves well.'
- (2) Core argument: *Te llamo a vos*
'I call you.'
- (3) Peripheral argument: *Es una situación difícil para vos*
'It is a difficult situation for you.'

The distinction made between core arguments and peripheral arguments is semantic. As stated by Foley and Van Valin (1984) the subject and direct object are considered core arguments, and all other arguments are peripheral. In a case of a subject argument, exemplified by (1) above, there is no pronoun, but the verbal morphology provides sufficient information to consider this a use of the *voseo*. In the direct object case, exemplified by the core argument in (2) above, the pronoun is used. The recipient of the call is a necessary, primary argument, and the morpho-syntactic context allows for variation; it could have been *Te llamo a ti*, 'I call you'. The peripheral argument, exemplified by (3) above, can be considered an adjunct. It does include the pronoun, which is also in a morpho-syntactic context that allows for variation, for it could also say "*Es una situación difícil para ti.*"

The linguistic variables included in the present study were presence/absence of a pronoun, core/periphery arguments, and verb tense and mood. Verb tense was classified into one of six categories: present, imperfect, conditional, future, perfect, and not applicable. In order to avoid empty cells, all perfect tenses were combined. Not applicable refers to a token with no verbal components. The verbal mood was coded as indicative, subjunctive, or imperative, or not applicable. As explained by Torrejón (1991:1069), the pronoun *vos* may appear with *tuteo* forms or *voseo* forms, and the pronoun *tú* may appear with *tuteo* forms or *voseo* forms. In the classification of verbs, the present analysis considered only the verb forms themselves. If a pronoun appeared with a verb, the pronouns were only coded for presence or absence. If a verb was clearly *voseo* or *tuteo*, it was coded as such despite the pronoun.

The social variables coded for in the present study are gender and education of the characters, age of character relative to interlocutor, authority of character over interlocutor, relationship between the characters, and the text. For the purposes of this analysis, education will be coded as "serviceperson" or "non-serviceperson." This is the most objective way of classifying the speakers, without having to consider social class or income, which tends to be treated differently across texts. These variables are included based on an analysis of *voseo* usage in Chile (Torrejón 1991), which shows differences in use based on certain social characteristics.

The present analysis will code each token extracted from the literature mentioned in Table 2, for the variables mentioned in Table 3. Two separate analyses will be conducted, one for the texts from each time period. This is to allow for a clear, separate analysis of the variables that promoted *voseo* and *tuteo* use during each time period. All tokens will be entered into GoldVarb 2.1 (Robinson, Lawrence, and Tagliamonte 2001), a computer program that examines the probabilistic contribution of different independent vari-

ables to the realization of one specific dependent variable. Ideally, the analysis conducted by GoldVarb will suggest the individual variables that were most significant in the production of the *voseo*. With these analyses, it is hoped that the following research question will be answered:

What were the specific social and linguistic factors that led to the diminished use of the *voseo* in 19th-century Chilean Spanish literature?

Variable	Variants
1. form produced	<i>voseo</i> / <i>tuteo</i>
2. presence of pronoun	yes / no
3. core v. periphery	core / periphery
4. verb tense	present / imperfect / perfect / future / conditional / not applicable
5. verb mood	indicative / subjunctive / imperative / not applicable
6. gender of speaker	male / female
7. gender of addressee	male / female
8. education of speaker	non-serviceperson / serviceperson
9. education of addressee	non-serviceperson / serviceperson
10. age of speaker	younger than addressee / same age as addressee / older than addressee
11. authority over addressee	yes / no
12. speaker-hearer relationship	married couple / non-married couple / friends-strangers / parent-child / siblings other family members / boss-employee / server-client (in a bar)
13. text	<i>Chañarcillo</i> (only in 1st analysis) <i>El pirata de Huayas</i> (only in 1st analysis) <i>Martín Rivas</i> (only in 1st analysis) <i>Juana Lucero</i> (only in 2nd analysis) <i>Casa Grande</i> (only in 2nd analysis) <i>Sub-Terra</i> (only in 2nd analysis)

Table 3: Variables of the current study

4 Results

A preliminary analysis of results showed no variation in the texts from the later time period. All tokens were *tuteo*. The researcher attempted to start on a different page and continue with the every-other-page method, and still, no tokens of *voseo* use were found. Due to this categorical result, there was no analysis run on the results for the later texts. However, variation was found

in the earlier texts. 659 tokens were extracted from the mid-19th century texts. Table 4 shows the percentages of total cases of *tuteo* and *voseo* in these texts.

Text	<i>Voseo</i> # / % of total	<i>Tuteo</i> # / % of total	Total
<i>Chañarcillo</i>	164 / 70%	68 / 29%	232 / 100%
<i>El pirata de Huayas</i>	17 / 4%	340 / 95%	357 / 100%
<i>Martín Rivas</i>	9 / 12%	61 / 87%	70 / 100%
Total	190 / 28.8%	469 / 71.2%	659 / 100%

Table 4: *Voseo* and *tuteo* use in 19th century texts

Based on these purely quantitative results, it appears that *Chañarcillo* shows the greatest percentage and number of uses of the *voseo*, and that *Martín Rivas* shows the fewest number of cases and the lowest percentage of use. About 29 percent of all tokens were *voseo* and 71 percent were *tuteo*.

Factor group	Factor	Weight	%	No.
Presence of pronoun	Presence	.726	47	36/76
	Absence	.467	24	136/552
Verb mood	Subjunctive	.678	29	25/84
	Indicative	.630	31	131/412
	Imperative	.070	7	8/109
Gender of interlocutor	Female	.679	30	63/207
	Male	.409	25	109/421
Authority over interlocutor	Authority	.806	33	35/106
	No Authority	.428	26	137/522
Text	<i>Chañarcillo</i>	.967	72	164/232
	<i>El pirata de Huayas</i>	.390	12	9/70
	<i>Martín Rivas</i>	.139	5	18/357

Table 5: Results of GoldVarb analysis for 19th century texts; $p < 0.05$

The results of the analysis in GoldVarb are shown in Table 5. The analysis found that presence of pronoun, verb mood, gender of interlocutor, authority over interlocutor, and text were significant variables.

5 Analysis

5.1 Linguistic Variables

The two significant linguistic variables are presence of pronoun and verb mood. First, the variable of presence of pronoun shows a strong factor weight (.726), which suggests that the use of the *voseo* was frequently used with the pronoun to refer to the interlocutor. The presence of the *vos* pronoun suggests that the authentic *voseo* was common among these characters. The variable verb mood shows the subjunctive and the indicative both favor use of the *voseo*, but the imperative disfavors it. (4)–(5) below show this situation.

(4) *Vos lo'stai ofendiendo*

'You are offending him.' (*Chañarcillo*)

(5) . . . *ve a Santiago y estudia con empeño*

'Go to Santiago and study hard' (*Martín Rivas*)

This mood distinction suggests the use of a command did not favor the use of the *voseo*, and the possibility exists that if a change in *voseo* use was occurring, perhaps the imperative mood was being affected before the other moods. The lack of significance for verbal tense suggests that the *voseo* was used equally across all tenses.

5.2 Social Variables

The gender of the interlocutor as a significant variable suggests that when the characters were addressing women, it is more likely that the *voseo* was used. If the suggestion that the *voseo* was considered a 'contemptuous' form is true, then it could be the case that women and men were not equal in 19th century Chilean society. Perhaps the *voseo* was used for women to signal them out as different from men. This result merits further research. Example (6) below is of a male character speaking to a woman, and includes use of the *voseo*.

- (6) *No te vendís*
 ‘Don’t sell yourself’ (*Chañarcillo*, male character, female interlocutor)

The results also suggest that if the speaker has authority over the interlocutor, then the *voseo* is favored. This result, along with that of gender of interlocutor, could also mean the *voseo* was in the process of adopting a stigmatized meaning. In this case, the use of the *voseo* is a linguistic sign of authority over an interlocutor. Brown and Gilman (1964) discuss the reasons for the distinction between T/V forms in European languages, and note the use of T forms could be used in relationships of authority. Further analysis is necessary, but it could be the case that in these texts, the *tuteo* would be used by an inferior addressing his/her superior, and the *voseo* would be used to address an inferior. Given the considerable amount of variation present in these texts, this distinction was not necessarily stable and shows signs of being a change in progress.

Finally, the result of text as significant variable allows for some suggestions to be made. First, *Chanarcillo* appears to be nearly categorically *voseo* (.967), and Martín Rivas appears to be categorically *tuteo* (.139). The first text takes place in a rural setting, whereas the second takes place in an urban setting. This result suggests the idea that the *voseo* could have been change that started in the urban setting and slowly spread to the rural. Without oral data, this suggestion is tentative at best, but in other studies, linguistic change has been noted to start in the urban setting and move to the rural setting. The Northern Cities Shift is one such example, in which vowel changes such as raising and fronting began in the cities, and as Ito (1999, as cited in Thomas 2004:173) claims, “. . . spread on a more local scale, in small towns in Michigan.” One example of linguistic change in Spanish that began in the city is the change of /tʃ/ to /ʃ/ in Panamá. Cedergren (1987) noted that this change began in Panama City, and spread to the less-populated cities and other areas of the country.

6 Conclusions and Future Studies

If these results represent Chilean society and linguistic production in the mid-19th century, then the linguistic factors that promote the use of the *voseo* seem to be presence of a pronoun and either the subjunctive or indicative verb mood. Furthermore, if the addressee is a woman or is in a position of inferior authority, the *voseo* is favored. What seems to be the case is that these characters would use the *voseo* in many verbal moods (subjunctive and

indicative) to address the interlocutor, and the presence of the pronoun helps indicate the relationship as including authority or to address a woman.

The greater use of the *voseo* in *Chañarcillo*, a rural setting, and the lesser use in *Martín Rivas*, an urban setting, suggests a change in progress from urban to rural. If the educational reforms of Andres Bello truly had influence, then it could be the case that this was a change from above, of the national educational system. The *voseo* acquired a new meaning—that of ‘bad use,’ and it was gradually used less and less by people who were exposed to and aware of this new evaluation. If the literature is a reflection of the society, given the lack of variation in the later texts, then this change seems to have neared completion by the beginning of the 20th century.

Thus, as an addition to the previous literature on the status of the *voseo* in Chile, the present study adds sociolinguistic quantitative and qualitative evidence to the historical accounts of the diminished use of the *voseo*. This seeming change from above developed along with the stratification of the society.

There are a number of ways that future analyses could augment the research on the *voseo* in Chile. First, analyses of a more pragmatic nature could examine the conversations in these texts. The results from these analyses could shed light on the contextual and discursive meaning of the *voseo*. Another contribution would be to examine works from throughout the 19th century, instead of groups of works separated by three generations. This analysis could provide a more specific view of the linguistic change. Another worthwhile study would be an analysis of the status of women in Chile in the 19th century. If women were truly considered inferior to men, and if the *voseo* was adopting a stigma of contempt, then the use of the *voseo* with women would be clearly explicable.

In conclusion, future research should continue to investigate the *voseo* and to collect qualitative and quantitative evidence that elucidates the historical changes that have taken place and continue to occur.

References

- Acevedo Hernández, Antonio. 1932. *Chañarcillo*. Santiago: Ercilla.
- Arrizabalaga, Carlos. 2001. Noticias de la desaparición del voseo en la costa norte del Perú. *Lingüística Española Actual* 23(2):257–74.
- Benavides, Carlos. 2003. La distribución del voseo en Hispanoamérica. *Hispania* 86(3):612–23.
- Bello, Andrés. 1884. Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana dirigidas a los padres de familia, profesores de colegios y maestros de escuelas. In *Obras Completas*, ed. A. Bello, 468–86. Santiago de Chile: Imprenta de Pedro G. Ramírez.

- Bilbao, Manuel. 1871. *El pirata de Huayas*. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes.
- Blest Gana, Alberto. 1862. *Martin Rivas*. Madrid: Catedra.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. 1964. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." In *Style in Language*, ed. T.A. Sebeok, 253–76. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Cedergren, Henrietta. 1987. The Spread of Language Change: Verifying Inferences of Linguistic Diffusion. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 45–60.
- D'Halmar, Augusto. 1902. *Juana Lucero*. Santiago: Nascimento.
- Foley, William and Robert Van Valin. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fontanella de Weinberg, María Beatriz. 1989. Avances y rectificaciones en el estudio del voseo americano. *Thesaurus* 44:521–33.
- Kany, Charles. 1969. *Sintaxis hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Lillo, Baldomero. 1904. *Sub Terra*. Santiago: Nascimento.
- Orrego Luco, Luis. 1908. *Casa Grande*. Santiago: ZigZag.
- Páez Urdaneta, Iraset. 1981. *Historia y geografía hispanoamericana del voseo*. Caracas: Fundación La Casa de Bello.
- Ramírez-Luengo, José Luis. 2003. Contribución a la historia del "voseo". El paradigma altoperuano a inicios del siglo XIX. *Estudios filológicos* 38:179–88.
- Rey, Alberto. 1995. Social correlates of the *voseo* of Managua, Nicaragua: Family and Neighborhood Domains. *Hispanic Journal* 16(1): 39-53.
- Rey, Alberto. 1997. Social correlates of the *voseo* of Managua, Nicaragua: Workplace, Street, and Party Domains. *Hispanic Journal* 18(1):109–26.
- Robinson, John, Helen Lawrence, and Sali Tagliamonte. 2001. GOLDVARB 2001: A multivariate analysis application for Windows.
- Schneider, Edgar. 2004. "Investigating Variation and Change in Written Documents." In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, ed. J.K. Chambers, et al., 67–96. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sweeney, Patricia. 2005. El Voseo en Chile: Factores histórico-morfológicos que explican su aparición y mantenimiento. Doctoral dissertation, Albany State University.
- Thomas, Erik. 2004. "Instrumental Phonetics." In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, ed. J.K. Chambers, et al., 168–200. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Torrejón, Alfredo. 1986. Acerca del voseo culto en Chile. *Hispania* 69(3):677–83.
- Torrejón, Alfredo. 1991. Fórmulas de tratamiento de segunda persona en el español de Chile. *Hispania* (74)4:1068–76.

Department of Spanish and Portuguese
 Indiana University-Bloomington
 Bloomington, IN 47405-7103
 gnewall@indiana.edu