



1-1-1996

A Proposed Explanation of the Specific/ Nonspecific TU Constraint Ranking in SpanishA Proposed Explanation of the Specific/Nonspecific TU Constraint Ranking in Spanish

Richard Cameron

A Proposed Explanation of the Specific/Nonspecific TU Constraint
Ranking in SpanishA Proposed Explanation of the Specific/Nonspecific
TU Constraint Ranking in Spanish

A proposed explanation of the Specific/Nonspecific TÚ constraint ranking in Spanish

Richard Cameron
The University of Illinois at Chicago

The challenge of explaining variable constraint ranking increases when two dialects show different rankings. A case in point is the different ranking of Specific and Nonspecific reference for the category of second person TÚ in Latin American and Iberian dialects of Spanish. As in other null subject languages, finite verbs in Spanish permit the variable expression of pronominal and null subjects. Variation in second person TÚ subjects may be further analyzed per specificity of intended reference as Specific or Nonspecific. In studies of San Juan, Buenos Aires, and Santiago, Nonspecific TÚ favors personal pronominal expression relative to Specific TÚ. In studies of Madrid and Seville, the reverse pattern emerges with Specific TÚ favoring personal pronominal expression relative to Nonspecific TÚ. Two explanations are proposed for these rankings, one from Accessibility Theory, and one which relies on generative treatments of specificity and arbitrary reference (i.e., pro_{arb}). However, neither explanation alone accounts for the different rankings. Further close analysis of the resources for nonspecific reference in Spanish indicate that the Latin American dialects have reanalyzed the quantitative nature of Nonspecific TÚ by analogy to that of either Nonspecific UNO or Nonspecific USTED, both of which show high frequencies of personal pronominal expression in all dialects. Finally, review of the frequencies of second person TÚ pronominal expression in a number of dialects permits prediction of which dialects, as yet unanalyzed, will show which ranking of Specific and Nonspecific TÚ.

1 Introduction

The ranking of internal grammatical constraints on linguistic variation presents a considerable explanatory challenge. Such a challenge may be increased two-fold in cases where two regional dialects display different constraint rankings. A case in point is the different ranking in Latin American and Iberian dialects of Spanish of the Specific and Nonspecific reference constraints on the expression of pronominal subjects for second person TÚ. As in other null subject languages, finite verbs in Spanish permit the variable expression of pronominal and null subjects. This alternation of pronominal and null subjects in second person TÚ may be further analyzed per specificity of intended reference as Specific or Nonspecific. In studies of San Juan in Puerto Rico, Buenos Aires in Argentina, and Santiago in Chile, Nonspecific TÚ favors personal pronominal expression relative to Specific TÚ. In studies of Madrid and Seville in Spain, the reverse pattern emerges with Specific TÚ favoring personal pronominal expression relative to Nonspecific TÚ.

In the research presented here, I will propose an explanation for the reversed ranking of these variable constraints on subject pronoun expression which utilizes insights from Accessibility Theory, generative treatments of referential specificity, and, finally, historical work on analogy as paradigm leveling. When concluding, I will submit a

prediction of which dialects of Spanish, as yet unanalyzed with respect to this pair of constraints, will show which ranking of Specific and Nonspecific TÚ.

2 Speakers and data

The data come from the speech of ten speakers from San Juan, Puerto Rico and ten from Madrid, Spain. In each case, there are five males and five females, all adults, ranging in age from 20 to 70, who may be identified occupationally as belonging to the Professional, Technical and Sales, or Clerical Worker categories. The San Juan speakers come from a larger sociolinguistic study of 62 speakers whom I interviewed in October of 1989 (Cameron 1992, 1996). The ten speakers from Madrid are represented in the transcribed interviews found in the version of *El habla de la ciudad de Madrid* edited by Esgueva and Cantarero (1981). Those selected include Encuestas VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIV, XV, and XVII. In all cases, I analyze only the speech of the interviewee.

3 Second Person TÚ

Second person singular TÚ subjects may be classified into three categories:

- (1) Discourse Markers
- (2) Specific TÚ
- (3) Nonspecific TÚ

For our purposes here, I exclude Discourse Markers and focus only on Specific TÚ and Nonspecific TÚ.

Nonspecific second person TÚ subjects are equivalent to "indefinite" in Laberge and Sankoff (1986:275), "impersonal tú" in Suñer (1990:213), or "los singulares arbitrarios" (arbitrary singulares) in Hernanz (1990). Specific TÚ is equivalent to what is often identified as "definite" or "determinable" as in (Cifuentes 1980:746).

Cases of Specific TÚ occur strictly in two contexts:

- a. Direct address to another person who is conversationally present at the moment.
- b. In reported speech in which the speaker recreates an act of direct address between two speakers.

For instance, in one interview with a married couple Beatriz and Benjamín, we sat around eating dinner together and talking in their home. At one point, as Beatriz discussed how the neighborhood had changed, she quickly asked me if I wished to eat more. See line 4 in Example #1. Because these examples come from a larger variationist study of the interaction of subject expression and agreement deletion (Cameron 1992, 1996), I provide phonetic transcription of the second person marker of /s/ in the examples from Puerto Rico. Following this, I provide an additional example of Specific TÚ from Encuesta XVII of the Madrid texts (Esgueva and Cantarero 1981:298). Here, two male students begin discussion of a literary club.

Example #1 SPECIFIC TÚ > Direct Address

(Puerto Rico Interview: Beatriz; Age = 53)

(Phonetic Key for Second Person /s/: S = /s/; H = aspirate variant; Ø = absence of /s/)

Beatriz: (1) No existía Rio Piedras Heights.

(2) Solamente estaba por aquí cerca Sagrado Corazón, San Geraldo

- y El Paraíso.
- (3) Eso era todo.
- (4) ¿**Richard, tú no vaH a comer más?**
- Richard: (5) Sí, voy a comer más. (laughter)
- Beatriz: (1) Rio Piedras Heights did not exist.
- (2) Around here there was only Sagrado Corazón, San Geraldo and El Paraíso.
- (3) That was all.
- (4) **Richard, aren't you going to eat more?**
- Richard: (5) Yes, I'm going to eat more. (laughter)

(Madrid Interview: Esgueva and Cantarero (1981:298))

- Inf. B:(1) ¿**Tú conoces** el... actual Círculo de L.?
- Inf. A:(2) Soy socio desde hace cinco años.
- Inf. B:(3) **(0) eres socio..**
- Inf. A:(4) Para mi desgracia ¿eh?
- Inf. B:(5) del C?
- Inf. A:(6) Sí, sí.
- Inf. B:(7) ¿Tú qué opinas de él?
- Inf. A:(8) Es fatal.
- Inf. B:(1) **Do you know** about the... current L. Circle?
- Inf. A:(2) I have been a member for five years.
- Inf. B:(3) **You are** a member...
- Inf. A:(4) Unfortunately, eh?
- Inf. B:(5) Of C?
- Inf. A:(6) Yes, yes.
- Inf. B:(7) And you, what do you think of it?
- Inf. A:(8) It's awful.

The second context of Specific TÚ, as illustrated in Example #2, involves reported speech. As a young girl, Cecilia, the speaker, had moved with her mother and brother to the home of her grandmother and aunt. In this recollection, she recreates brief conversational exchanges between her aunt and her mother wherein her aunt directly addresses her mother. In particular, see lines 5 through 10 in Example #2.

Example #2: (Puerto Rico Interview: Cecilia; Age = 61)

- (1) Mi mama quedó viuda a los veintiocho años.
- (2) Y entonces pues. vivíamos ahí en Santurce con., en casa de mi abuela, con ella porque este...
- (3) La hermana no la dejó trabajar fuera.
- (4) Ella era secretaria, pero no.
- (5) Le dijo, "No. No quiero que **(0) te vayaH a trabajar fuera**
- (6) porque **tú ereØ** una mujer joven."
- (7) Y. y pues. este "**(0)vaH** a descuidar tus hijos.
- (8) no que así pues. **tú trabajaH** en la casa,
- (9) y **(0) te ocupaH** de la casa,
- (10) y **(0) te ocupaH** de mamá".

- (11) Y entonces, nos pusieron en la escuela muy cerquita.
 (12) Se llamaba la escuela Padre Rufo.

- (1) My mother was widowed at the age of 28.
 (2) So then we lived there in Santurce with., in my grandmother's house, with her because um...
 (3) Her sister would not let her work outside the home.
 (4) She was a secretary, but no.
 (5) She told her, "No. I don't want **(you) to go** work outside
 (6) because **you are** a young woman.
 (7) And. and well. um. **(you) are going** to neglect your kids.
 (8) No so. **You work** at home,
 (9) and **(you) take care** of the house,
 (10) and **(you) take care** of mom."
 (11) And then, they put us in a school near by.
 (12) It was called the Padre Rufo School.

Nonspecific TÚ is used when a speaker reports a personal experience and generalizes it such that it becomes applicable to anyone given a similar set of circumstances. By way of illustration, consider lines 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 in Example #3 from Lucio who explains here why he had returned "pelao" with no money from his stint in the Army in South Korea.

Example #3: (Puerto Rico Interview: Lucio; Age = 36)

- (1) Sí, pero hubo gente que regresaron a los estados unidos,
 con diez mil, quince mil, y veinte mil dolares,
 (2) porque **tú no gastaH** nada.
 (3) O sea, si **tú te quedaH** en la barraca,
 (4) **tú no tieneØ** que pagar desayuno, ni almuerzo, ni comida.
 (5) **Tú no tieneH** que pagar ropa, ni laundry, nada, o sea.
 (6) Pero que sucede que yo no me podía quedar en la barraca.
 (7) Yo tenía que salir.
 (8) Y entonces yo por ejemplo iba, me iba pa' la capital
 (9) y allá **tú me veíaØ**.
 (10) Yo pedía la suite más bella, ciento cincuenta, dos cientos pesos por noche.
 (11) Yo me gastaba el dinero.
- (1) Yeah, but there were people who returned to the United States
 with ten thousand, fifteen thousand, and twenty thousand dollars
 (2) because **you spend** nothing.
 (3) In other words, if **you stay** in the barracks,
 (4) **you don't have** to pay for breakfast, lunch, food.
 (5) **You don't have** to pay for clothing, laundry, nothing.
 (6) But it happens that I could not stay in the barracks.
 (7) I had to get out.
 (8) And so I would for example, I would go to the capital
 (9) and there **you used to see** me.
 (10) I would ask for the most beautiful suite, one hundred fifty, two hundred dollars a
 night.
 (11) I would spend my money.

Note that in this sample from Lucio, the personal pronoun TÚ occurs in all five instances of Nonspecific TÚ subjects. Also, in the three cases of same or coreference, found in lines 3, 4, and 5, a context which favors null subject expression, we find a personal pronoun.

By way of contrast, consider the lengthy Example #4 taken from Encuesta VII in the transcripts of speakers from Madrid. Here a woman speaks of her wedding. Notice the absolute lack of pronominal subjects for Nonspecific TÚ in all 14 tokens. In other words, all of these subjects are phonetically null. Also, in the four cases of switch reference, found in lines 3, 7, 9 and 17, a context which favors subject pronoun expression, we find a null subject.

Example #4: (Madrid Interview: Esgueva & Cantarero (1981:113-114))

- (1) Me puse.. me puse a recibir gente.
 - (2) Bueno, aquello fue la avalancha.
 - (3) O sea, de pronto **(0)**estás tan tranquilamente con tu marido,
 - (4) tomándote una copita de champán
 - (5) que te ofrece muy.. muy cortésmente el camarero y..
 - (6) Y de pronto, empieza a entrar la gente.
 - (7) Y entonces, ya **(0)**ves.. **(0)**no ves más que una masa de gente, como un río humano
 - (8) que se acerca a ti a darte la enhorabuena,
 - (9) Que no **(0)**sabes ni quién es,
 - (10) ni **(0)**te das cuenta de nada absolutamente, más que de que..
 - (11) De que **(0)**tienes allí esa masa,
 - (12) Y que no **(0)**sabes cómo obrar,
 - (13) ni qué hay que hacer, ni nada de esas cosas.
 - (14) Pero bueno, después de todo esto, ya luego, **(0)**vas viendo a tus amigos,
 - (15) **(0)**Hablas a cada uno.
 - (16) Y además, yo encuentro que ese sistema de bodas es muy
 - (17) agradable por.. por esto, porque **(0)**hablas con quien **(0)**quieres
 - (18) y no **(0)**estás como.. como envarada, sentada en un sitio.
 - (19) Que **(0)**eres el .. el centro de las miradas,
 - (20) Y **(0)**estás muy bien.
 - (21) Y luego, pues nada.. comí muchísimo.
-
- (1) I started.. I started to greet people.
 - (2) Well, that was an avalanche.
 - (3) It's like, suddenly **(you)** are very relaxed with your husband,
 - (4) drinking a glass of champagne
 - (5) that the waiter offers you very.. very politely and..
 - (6) And suddenly, people start to come in.
 - (7) And then, then **(you)** see.. **(you)** see nothing more than a mass of people, like a human river
 - (8) that approaches you to congratulate you.
 - (9) **(you)** don't know anyone,
 - (10) nor are **(you)** aware of anything except,
 - (11) That **(you)** have there this mass of people,
 - (12) And that **(you)** don't know how to act
 - (13) or what to do or any of those things.
 - (14) But well, after all of this, then, **(you)** start recognizing your friends,
 - (15) **(you)** speak with each one.
 - (16) And also, I find that this system of weddings is very
 - (17) agreeable because of that.. because **(you)** speak with whoever **(you)** want to

- (18) and **(you) are not** like.. like stuck in one place, seated in one place.
 (19) That **(you) are** the.. that all eyes are upon you.
 (20) And **(you) are** ok, quite ok.
 (21) And after that, well nothing.. I ate alot.

As these two individual examples of speech indicate, speakers from Puerto Rico favor a personal pronoun when the subject is Nonspecific TÚ. In contrast, those from Madrid, favor the null variant. In fact, if we look at the frequency of pronominal expression among the 10 speakers from each of the two dialects, we find that with respect to Specific TÚ, the two dialects do not significantly differ. But, with respect to Nonspecific TÚ, the differences are very significant.

<u>Second Person: TÚ = Specific</u>			
San Juan, P.R.		Madrid, Spain	
+Pronoun	TOTAL	+Pronoun	TOTAL
48%	145	40%	58
<u>Second Person: TÚ = Nonspecific</u>			
San Juan, P.R.		Madrid, Spain	
+Pronoun	TOTAL	+Pronoun	TOTAL
69%	188	19%	150
Chi-square for Specific TÚ = 1.240 (Not significant at .05)			
Chi-square for Nonspecific TÚ = 83.105 (p < .001)			

Table 1: Second person TÚ reanalyzed by specificity of reference in 10 (5 male/5 female) speakers: San Juan vs Madrid

Of further interest is how this effect appears in studies of other Spanish dialects. As Table 2 shows, Nonspecificity of reference in second person TÚ favors pronominal expression in San Juan, Buenos Aires in Argentina, and Santiago in Chile. It disfavors pronominal expression in Madrid and Seville.

Because post-verbal subjects do not permit variation between pronominal and null subjects, they were excluded from the analysis (Cameron 1992:80-83). However, if we include the few post-verbal subjects of UNO back into the data from Madrid, the frequency of UNO expression changes to 62% (8/13), which is more in line with tendencies found in other dialects.

In her study of Madrid, Enríquez (p. 350, Tabla 3), also found that although Nonspecific TÚ correlates with a decrease in pronominal expression relative to Specific TÚ, the reverse holds for Nonspecific and Specific uses of the second person deferential subject of USTED. As Table 3 reveals, a similar pattern is found in the data from Buenos Aires, though not in the study of Santiago.

	MD(1)	MD(2)	SV	PR	BA	SC
KEY:						
<u>MD(1)</u>	= Enríquez (1984:175-76, 350): Madrid, Spain					
<u>MD(2)</u>	= Cameron (1992): Madrid (based on Esgueva and Cantarero (1981))					
<u>SV</u>	= Cameron (1996): Seville, Spain (based on de Pineda (1982))					
<u>PR</u>	= Cameron (1992): San Juan, Puerto Rico					
<u>BA</u>	= Barrenechea and Alonso (1977:341): Buenos Aires, Argentina (See Cameron 1993:331, fn. 22 for explanation of figures of BA here.)					
<u>SC</u>	= Cifuentes (1980:748): Santiago, Chile					
+SPEC. TÚ/VOS:	33%	40%	42%	48%	31%	43%
-SPEC. TÚ/VOS:	9%	19%	18%	69%	55%	65%
-SPEC. UNO:	--	38%*	92%	85%	79%	60%

Table 2: Dialect comparison of +/-Specific TÚ and -Specific UNO

	MD(1)	BA	SC
KEY:			
<u>MD(1)</u>	= Enríquez (1984:175-76, 350): Madrid, Spain		
<u>BA</u>	= Barrenechea and Alonso (1977:341): Buenos Aires, Argentina		
<u>SC</u>	= Cifuentes (1980:748): Santiago, Chile		
+SPEC. USTED:	76%	47%	53%
-SPEC. USTED:	89%	89%	38%

Table 3: Dialect comparison of +/-Specific USTED

Tables 2 and 3 also indicate that for most dialects of Spanish, the frequency of pronominal expression associated with USTED or UNO is quite high. One may find explanation for this particular finding in the work of Gernsbacher (1989) on the two mechanisms of enhancement and suppression. Conceived of as general cognitive processes, enhancement and suppression work in different ways to facilitate the referential accessibility of anaphoric antecedents which, in turn, provide the basis for anaphoric identity. As the term indicates, enhancement of antecedent accessibility occurs when the antecedent itself, or the basis for inferring the antecedent, is somehow made more salient. Enhancement, then, "increases or boosts" (1989:102) the mental activation required to identify the antecedent. Suppression occurs when the antecedent's salience is secured by suppressing other potentially competing antecedents. Turning to USTED and UNO, these singular subjects not only share the same verbal morphology, but they share this with all third person singular

subjects also. For instance, the subject of the simple sentence of "(0) quiere trabajar" ((0) wants to work.) may be instantiated by USTED, UNO, ÉL (he), ELLA (she), or any number of other competing third person grammatically singular subjects as might occur within a particular context. Unlike second person singular TU where person is marked via a verb final [-s] (quieres), the verbal morphology which marks person in third person singular is quite impoverished and fails to distinguish subject identity within a potentially large number of subjects. Hence, the high frequency of pronominal expression associated with USTED and UNO may be understood as a form of enhancement which, by increasing the salience of subject identity, simultaneously suppresses other potentially competing antecedents.

The finding of different dialect responses to specificity of reference in the category of second person TÚ permits at least three important questions. First, why would the categories of Specific and Nonspecific second person singular TÚ subjects show differing frequencies of pronominal subject expression in the first place? Second, why does Nonspecificity favor pronominal expression in these Latin America dialects yet not in Madrid or Sevilla? Third, might there be a connection between the generally high frequencies of pronominal expression found for Nonspecific USTED and UNO and Nonspecific TÚ in such dialects as San Juan, Buenos Aires, and Santiago?

The Accessibility Theory of Ariel (1991, 1990) and Givón (1983), as well as generative treatments of referential specificity and arbitrary reference, may provide us with initial frameworks for investigating the first two questions above. However, it is unclear that either separately may explain this dialect difference.

Briefly, the object of Accessibility Theory is that of providing an explanation of how speakers select referring expressions which guide their listeners in the process of antecedent retrieval or anaphor resolution. The central idea is that different expressions, such as names versus pronouns, not only guide listeners but also indicate the speaker's estimation of how accessible in memory the antecedent is for the listener. Hence, different types of referring expressions indicate different degrees of presupposed accessibility.

Ariel further argues that the degree of accessibility indicated by a referring form is determined by three criteria (Ariel 1991:449-450): informativity, rigidity, and attenuation. Of these three, informativity proves germane to the issue of pronominal and null subject variation in the case of second person TÚ subjects.

Informativity is the amount of lexical information in a referring expression. Because a personal pronominal subject has phonetic form which minimally identifies person and number, it provides more lexical information than its counterpart, the phonetically null subject NP. Considering this in the context of specificity of reference, we may predict that when a second person singular subject is Specific in reference, it will require less lexical information because the addressee will either be physically present or may have been previously evoked in the act of reporting speech. These correspond to being, in Prince's terms (1981), "situationally evoked" or "textually evoked." Recall that Specific TÚ occurs only in cases of direct address to a conversationally present interlocutor or in recountings of past occasions of direct address which are recreated through reported speech. In short, one may argue, following on Chafe, that Specific Second Person reference "acquire(s) the given status naturally from the conversational context itself" (1987:26). And, given status should statistically favor null subject expression over that of pronominal expression.

By contrast, a Nonspecific second person singular subject may require more lexical information because, at least initially, it cannot be Situationally Evoked but must be inferred, via some sort of "pragmatic checking" of the information predicated of the subject (Marslen-Wilson, Levy, and Tyler 1983:361) which leads the addressee to the conclusion that the "you" of the utterance is not "you" the addressee, but could be anyone including "you." Subsequent mention of Nonspecific second person subjects are, of course,

"textually evoked" as the examples show which I have provided. However, at least initially, a change from Specific to Nonspecific reference also entails a switch of subject reference which, in turn, statistically favors a pronominal subject (Silva-Corvalán 1982, 1994:158, Cameron 1992, 1995). Therefore, following the implications of Accessibility Theory, one would expect that Specific second person singular TÚ subjects favor null subjects relative to Nonspecific second person TÚ subjects. This is true, as we have seen, of the Latin American dialects here represented, yet is not true of Madrid and Sevilla. However, the same line of reasoning may be applied to an explanation of the higher frequency of pronominal expression associated with Nonspecific USTED, relative to Specific USTED, which occurs in the data provided by Enríquez for Madrid as well as in the data on Buenos Aires. See Table 3.

Turning to generative treatments of referential specificity, we find in a few languages that the alternation of specific and nonspecific NP reference depends crucially on the actual presence or absence of morphological marking. In Turkish for instance, Enç (1991) reports that object NP's with case morphology are necessarily specific whereas those without case morphology are nonspecific. Mahajan (1991) argued for a similar pattern in Hindi. Moyne and Carden (1974:206) noted that in Persian specific direct objects are marked with a postposition *-r* whereas nonspecific object noun phrases are not. Sigler (1992) found that in Modern Western Armenian specific plural subjects invariably require agreement marking whereas nonspecific plural subjects only variably induce agreement marking on the verb. Therefore, a plural subject lacking agreement is read as nonspecific. In these cases, then, referential specificity either favors or requires morphological marking whereas referential nonspecificity disfavors such marking. This pattern maps neatly onto the ranking of Specific and Nonspecific TÚ in Madrid and Seville where Specific TÚ favors pronominal expression in contrast to Nonspecific TÚ.

Suñer (1990) and Hernanz (1990) have also argued that Nonspecific TÚ is another instance of arbitrary reference identified as *pro_{arb}*. Subject noun phrases which exhibit arbitrary reference typically occur as the subjects of tenseless clauses in which this subject is not controlled. For instance, in an utterance such as "I wish to go" [I want [pro to go]], the "pro" is controlled by the preceding subject "I" of the matrix clause. By being so controlled, "pro" obtains its referential identity. However, in sentences like "To play basketball like Michael Jordan is a common fantasy in Chicago" or "Eating ice cream is fun", the pro subjects of "To play" and "Eating" have no controllers and thereby are not limited in reference to any specific individual or set of individuals. As with Turkish, Hindi, Persian, and Armenian, these cases of *pro_{arb}* correlate to an empty or phonetically null category. However, not all cases of *pro_{arb}* need occur with nonfinite verbs.

In Spanish, a parallel pattern emerges in cases of impersonal SE as well as third person plural nonspecific subjects of finite verbs. Impersonal SE constructions, like Nonspecific TÚ, are singular in number yet implicate an "unspecified set of human referents" (Suñer 1990:212) who are indicated by the phonetically null subject. In fact no expressed lexical or pronominal subject is permitted. An example from Suñer is provided in Example #5 along with a naturally occurring example from the Madrid texts of Esgueva and Cantarero (1981:117)

Example #5: (Suñer 1990) IMPERSONAL SE:

Se come bien en las fiestas.
Se eats well during the holidays.

Example of Impersonal Se from Esgueva and Cantarero (1981:117)

- (1) Allí engordé mis, mis dos kilos,
- (2) porque se come muy bien, muy sano, una vida muy tranquila

- (1) There I gained my, my two kilos
- (2) because **se eats** very well, very healthy, a life very tranquil

Specific third person plural subjects permit variation between pronominal and null subjects. However, Nonspecific third person plural subjects are invariably null. This appears to be true of all dialects of Spanish (Suñer 1983, 1982; Bentivoglio 1983:264). These are comparable to the use of Nonspecific THEY in English. By way of illustration, consider Example #6 of a Nonspecific third person plural utterance, the null subject of which survives even in a context of contrast. Contrastive contexts elsewhere obligatorily require pronominal subjects.

Example #6: (Puerto Rico Interview: Lucía: Age = 10)

- (1) Mi mamá me iba a poner en kinder,
 - (2) pero (0) **me brincaron** para primero.
-
- (1) My mother was going to put me in kindergarten,
 - (2) but (they) **jumped me ahead** to first grade.

Therefore, given these previously cited patterns, in the case of Nonspecific TÚ, where variable pronominal expression is possible even though the subject is arbitrary in reference, we could expect Nonspecific TÚ, relative to Specific TÚ, to favor null subjects. This is the case, as noted, in Madrid and Seville, but not the case in San Juan, Buenos Aires, or Santiago. Moreover, it is not the case for the contrast of Nonspecific and Specific USTED in Madrid.

Where does this leave us with respect to explanation? It appears that Accessibility Theory provides a basis for explaining the Latin American constraint ranking of Specific and Nonspecific TÚ. In turn, the *pro_{arb}* treatment provides a basis for strongly expecting, if not explaining, the constraint ranking found in Madrid and Sevilla. But again, Accessibility appears to founder with respect to the Madrid type of dialect and the *pro_{arb}* treatment founders with respect to the San Juan type of dialect. Nonetheless, in the process of reviewing the resources for nonspecific reference in Spanish, we have established that such reference is expressed through a number of different subjects. If these subjects are conceived of as representing a paradigm for nonspecific reference, we find that within the set of singular subjects only, the paradigm includes impersonal SE, second person TÚ, second person USTED, and third person UNO. Moreover, we have established the relative frequencies of pronominal subject expression which correlate with each set member with this paradigm. These are depicted in Table 4.

When seen from this perspective, it appears that the Latin American dialects have reanalyzed the quantitative nature of singular Nonspecific TÚ by analogy to those of Nonspecific USTED and/or UNO both of which show relatively high frequencies of pronominal expression which we have already explained as a function, primarily, of the mechanism of enhancement (Gernsbacher 1989). Therefore, it appears reasonable to argue that the dialects of San Juan, Buenos Aires, and Santiago exhibit a paradigm leveling of the frequencies of pronominal expression in singular finite verbs used to express nonspecific reference.

	San Juan Type	Madrid Type
Nonspecific Impersonal SE	Null	Null
Specific TÚ	Low	High
Nonspecific TÚ	High	Low
Specific USTED	Low	Low
Nonspecific USTED	High	High
Nonspecific UNO	High	High

Table 4: Paradigm of relative frequencies for Specific and Nonspecific reference: Singular subjects only

Turning to the speakers from San Juan, the basis for analogy probably is Nonspecific UNO because the USTED variant occurred but four times and this only in the speech of one speaker. It is not uncommon, however, to find instances of Nonspecific TÚ and UNO occurring within a string of related utterances. Consider Example # 7. When recalling a dramatic moment in which her mother foresaw the death of her own father, Cecilia said:

Example #7: (Puerto Rico Interview: Cecilia; Age = 61)

- (1) Pero era una cosa que **tú. tú te quedaba**Ø..
 (2) porque **uno pensaba**, "Son cosas de mami", tú sabes

- (1) But it was a thing that **you. you were**..
 (2) because **one thought**, "These are things of my mom," you know.

A moment of similar drama, a bicycle accident, is recalled by Vicente. See lines (2) and (4) in Example #8.

Example #8: (Puerto Rico Interview: Vicente: Age = 38)

- (1) Cuando me caí en la carretera,
 (2) y **tú veH** que vienen los carros
 (3) y no vienen con cara de parar
 (4) y **uno tiene que salirse** de la carretera.

- (1) When I fell on the highway
 (2) and **you see** that cars are coming
 (3) and they're coming like they're not going to stop
 (4) and **one has to get off** the highway.

Finally, not all cases of anaphorically linked TÚ and UNO need be subject based. Nonspecific second person reference also finds expression through the second person

object pronoun of TE. The typical pattern is that of a second person TE object of one verb participating in an anaphoric chain (Chastain 1975:204-205, Donnellan 1978:51-52) with the UNO subject of another verb. See line (3) in the following Example #9.

Example #9: (Puerto Rico Interview: Diego; Age = 64)

- (1) Y era una escuela coeducacional, entre comillas.
- (2) Lo que había eramos cinco seis varones por por clase, ¿no?
- (3) Pues, ya **te** separaban cuando veían que **uno miraba** a una muchachita.

- (1) And it was a coeducational school, in quotation marks.
- (2) What there was was that there only five or six of us boys per per class, right?
- (3) Well, they took **you** aside when they saw that **one looked** at a girl.

These patterns of close interaction between Nonspecific UNO and TÚ indicate that not only may both occur in the same contexts, they may also, at points, be construed as coreferring elements within the same anaphoric chain. If this is the case, it becomes clear how the frequency of pronominal expression for Nonspecific TÚ may have increased by analogy to the frequency of pronominal expression for Nonspecific UNO.

It has been suggested to me that the frequency differences we find here between the speakers of Spanish from San Juan and Madrid may actually result from different communicative styles or different pragmatic values that are assigned to subject expression. Or it may be the case that speakers from Madrid show greater sensitivity to prescriptive norms of pronominal use than do speakers from San Juan. These differences, then, could perhaps then be used to explain why the analogical leveling which I propose took place. Work relevant to such suggestions may include Villaume (1988) on the concepts of high and low involvement speakers with Puerto Rican speakers representing the style of "high involvement" and those from Madrid representing that of "low involvement". The findings of Kroch and Small (1979) may also be of interest where they provide evidence for the influence of "grammatical ideology" on variable patterns of article placement and **that** deletion in speakers of English. Therefore, one could pursue the notion that San Juan and Madrid represent either different discourse communities or discourse dialects. Given the data available to me, however, I am unable to pursue these valuable suggestions with the ethnographic or psycholinguistic rigor they require.

Nonetheless, were these two communities to be distinct discourse dialects, one could expect them to differ in their responses to other pragmatic constraints on pronominal subject expression such as Switch Reference. However, as shown in Cameron (1995, 1993, and 1992:224-275), the speakers from San Juan and Madrid show virtually identical values associated with Switch Reference as well as with the scalar expansions of Switch Reference identified as Reference Chains, which extend to both plural and singular subjects, and Set-to-Element Saliency, which affects plural subjects only. Likewise, when Switch Reference is analyzed within the intersecting factor groups of Verb Class and Priming (Cameron 1994), both dialects again show remarkably parallel behaviors. These similarities indicate, then, similar pragmatic values of subject expression for the two dialects despite the clear differences in frequency of pronominal expression.

In addition, where differences of variable constraint ranking have been noted in other variationist studies, the differences are identified as a consequence either of incomplete language acquisition by language learners or of differences in the underlying dialect grammars which constrain variation (Labov 1989, Guy and Boyd 1990, Adamson and Regan 1991). One well known example is Guy's (1980) finding of different dialect responses, from New Yorkers and Philadelphians, to the category of "pause" for /d

deletion. Of further interest is his observation that, despite the generally uniform response of different dialect speakers to the major constraints, different responses may occur "in precisely those areas where a linguistic analysis would be ambivalent" (p. 34). Nonspecific reference may also be "ambivalent" in Guy's sense because, depending on the context, the intended referent set may range from the singular "'yo' encubierto", or "covert 'I'" as Hernanz (1990:160) and Suñer (1990:213) write, to a set interpretable as including anyone alive, past or present, real or imagined.

Moreover, not all cases of second person TÚ are transparently Specific or Nonspecific. In the hands of a gifted speaker, the distinction may blur. Consider Example #10, at times a very funny discussion by Vicente, a graphic artist from San Juan. In particular, notice lines (6) through (9) in the following Example #10.

Example #10: (Puerto Rico Interview: Vicente: Age = 38)

- (1) Como **uno no cambia** mucho.
- (2) Ya no **te** sale un diente nuevo ni un ojo ni nada de eso, tú sabes, pues..
- (3) **Uno no cambia** mucho
- (4) y lo único de repente es que (0) **te queda**Ø calvo en un año,
- (5) "¡Ea rayos! ¡Tengo cuarenta años!"
- (6) Pero antes especialmente cuando le daba a **uno** el espich de cambio de edad,
- (7) "El mes que viene (0) **vaS** a tener veintiyun años.
- (8) ¡Ya (0) **ereS** un hombre grande!"
- (9) Y **uno esperaba** la noche de cumplir,
- (10) "O se me va a aparecer la virgen y me va a dar un pergamino con los. los derechos y deberes de la persona mayor" y ese tipo de cosa,
- (11) "o con una cajetilla de cigarrillos porque ya puedo comprar cigarrillos."

- (1) Like **one doesn't change** much.
- (2) Now **you** don't get a new tooth or eye or anything like that, you know, so..
- (3) **One** doesn't change much
- (4) and the only thing all of sudden is that **you get** bald in a year,
- (5) "Oh wow! I am forty years old!"
- (6) But before that especially when they gave **one** the speech about change of age.
- (7) "Next month (**you**) **are going to be** twenty-one years old.
- (8) Now (**you**) **are a grown-up!**"
- (7) And **one expected** that on the birthday night,
- (8) "Either the virgin is going to appear to me and give me a scroll with all the. the rights and obligations of a grown-up" and that sort of thing
- (9) "or with a pack of cigarettes because now I can buy cigarettes."

As in the previous examples of interaction between UNO and TÚ, we find an anaphoric chain linking the Nonspecific object UNO in line (6) and the null second person TÚ subjects in lines (7) and (8). However, these second person subjects occur in reported speech in which direct address is recreated. Recall that such a context is characteristic of Specific TÚ. Should these second person TÚ subjects, then, in lines (7) and (8) be considered Specific or Nonspecific? They are Nonspecific in that they are coreferential with the preceding Nonspecific UNO. Hence, they inherit their lack of referential specificity from the preceding NP. Indeed, all first person and second person singular subjects in this discourse may be interpreted as Nonspecific because they participate in the anaphoric chain headed by the Nonspecific UNO in line (1). In essence, in lines (7) and (8) we find direct and thereby specific address to a nonspecific referent.

I chose to analyze these particular second person subjects as Nonspecific by virtue of their anaphoric link with the preceding Nonspecific UNO. However, my analysis may not be identical to that within the mind of Vicente as he spoke. His recreation of direct address in these lines (7) and (8) may have been based directly on a particular personal experience in which either his father or a priest tried to shake him into maturity by saying directly to him, "Now you are a grown-up!" Because these examples present features of both Specific and Nonspecific TÚ, they present us with a case of ambivalence in Guy's sense of the word.

Consequently, Guy's observation on the ambivalence of "pause" for the variable phonological process of t/d deletion may also extend to the variable syntactic process of pronominal and null subject alternation in San Juan and Madrid. Overall, the speakers from both dialects show remarkably similar behavior for the major constraints. However, with respect to Nonspecificity of reference for second person TÚ, an inherently "ambivalent" category, the dialects diverge.

Despite the ambivalence or ambiguity of this aspect of the grammar of Spanish, given what we now know we are able to make a specific and testable prediction about which dialects, as yet unanalyzed with respect to referential specificity, will show a constraint ranking similar to that of San Juan and which will show a ranking akin to that of Madrid. Such a prediction is based on the observation that dialects which are characterized by a relatively high rate of pronominal expression rank the Specific and Nonspecific TÚ constraints as in San Juan. Those dialects which show a lower rate of pronominal expression rank these constraints as in Madrid.

In the work of Barrenechea and Alonso on Buenos Aires (1977:342) and that of Cifuentes on Santiago de Chile (1980:747), we find overall that the most frequently occurring cases of second person TÚ subjects are Specific in reference. Apart from these studies, no other study that I am aware of reports a similar ratio. In Enríquez (1984:350), we find that of the total of 1,374 second person TÚ subjects, 983 or 72% of the total are Nonspecific. In the research I have done into the Spanish of San Juan and the texts from Madrid and Sevilla a similar pattern emerges with Nonspecific TÚ subjects accounting for the majority. In the 10 speakers from Madrid here reported, 150 or 72% of the total of 208 are Nonspecifics. Of the total of 1013 second person TÚ subjects from the San Juan speakers, 671 or 66% of the total are Nonspecifics. In Sevilla, out of 131 second person TÚ subjects, 78 or 60% are Nonspecifics. Therefore, the overall frequency of second person TÚ subjects is most directly a reflection of the Nonspecific category.

In addition, we find that for Sevilla and Madrid, the average rate overall of pronominal expression for second person TÚ is less than 35%. In fact, the rates are less than 30% with the Sevilla texts showing a rate of 27% and the Madrid texts a rate of 25%. In the dialects of San Juan, Buenos Aires, and Santiago, we find average rates above 35%. The numbers provided by Barrenechea and Alonso on Buenos Aires (1977:342) and that of Cifuentes on Santiago de Chile (1980:747) indicate average rates of 36% and 45% respectively. Therefore, given these facts, the following testable prediction may be made.

I submit that for any dialect of Spanish, if the speech data has been gathered via the interview format, and if the overall rate of pronominal expression for second person TÚ is between 0% to 35%, then Specific TÚ, relative to Nonspecific TÚ, will favor pronominal expression. If the rate of pronominal expression for second person TÚ is higher than 35%, then the reverse pattern of constraint ranking will obtain such that Nonspecific TÚ, relative to Specific TÚ, will favor pronominal expression. The only caveats here are:

- (1) That the rate of second person TÚ pronominal subjects be based on the Specific and Nonspecific subjects where variation is possible.
- (2) That discourse markers be excluded.

(3) That the minimum number of second person TÚ subjects be 100 for purposes of comparison and reliability.

In keeping with this prediction, the data reported by Ranson (1991:139) on Andalusian Puente Genil Spanish and that reported by Silva-Corvalán (1994:163) on Mexican-American Spanish spoken in Los Angeles should reveal constraint rankings similar to those found in Madrid and Sevilla. I say this because Ranson reports a frequency of pronominal expression for second person TÚ of 21%. The data provided by Silva-Corvalán indicates an average frequency of pronominal expression for second person singular subjects of 20% across the three groups which she studied.

Because a relatively high rate of pronominal expression for Nonspecific TÚ appears in dialects which also show relatively high rates of pronominal expression for other persons, the data from Bentivoglio (1987:36) on Caracas indicates that this dialect will show a constraint ranking for second person TÚ similar to that of San Juan. Bentivoglio reports rates of 46% for first person singular and 16% for first person plural which are very close to the rates for the San Juan speakers of 50% and 15%. Therefore, Caracas should reveal constraint rankings similar to those found in San Juan, Buenos Aires, and Santiago.

4 Conclusion

One characteristic of some, though not all, scientific explanations has been noted by Hempel (1966:83) where he observed that such "explanations effect a reduction of a puzzling and often unfamiliar, phenomenon to facts and principles with which we are already quite familiar."

It is puzzling that in different dialects of Spanish Specific and Nonspecific reference show different influences on speakers' varying expression of pronominal or null subjects in second person TÚ. And, until recently, these patterns of language use were unfamiliar. Initially, the different rankings of Specific and Nonspecific TÚ were of interest in that they provided a basis for arguing against the Functional Compensation interpretation of the high frequency of pronominal expression in Puerto Rican Spanish (Hochberg 1986a,b; Cameron 1993, 1996). However, in attempting to explain these divergent rankings we are pushed beyond the analysis of variation *per se* into an analysis which initially considers issues of referential accessibility, arbitrary reference, and the presence or absence of morphological marking as a means of indicating a speaker's intention to refer to a specific entity or not. Eventually, the analysis turns to concepts which are quite familiar to researchers in linguistic change; analogy and paradigm leveling. In short, I have argued that speakers from San Juan, like those in Santiago and Buenos Aires, have reanalyzed the quantitative nature of Nonspecific TÚ by analogy to that of Nonspecific UNO or Nonspecific USTED. Moreover, because analogical change is not phonetically motivated, such analysis further permits us to explain why, *contra* the Functional Compensation Hypothesis, some variable */s/* dialects show a relatively high rate of pronominal expression whereas others, such as Seville, show a relatively low rate. Finally, review of the frequencies of second person TÚ pronominal expression across a number of dialects permits a testable prediction of which Spanish dialects, as yet unanalyzed, will show which ranking of Specific and Nonspecific TÚ. Such a prediction, whether it holds up or not, further permits us to use what we know in order to find out more.

References

- Adamson, H.D. and Vera Regan (1991). "The acquisition of community speech norms by Asian immigrants learning English as a second language: a preliminary study." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13:1-22.
- Ariel, Mira (1990). *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. (London:Routledge).
- Ariel, Mira (1991). "The function of accessibility in a theory of grammar." *Journal of Pragmatics*. 16:443-463.
- Barrenechea, Ana María and Alicia Alonso (1977). "Los pronombres personales sujetos en el español hablado en Buenos Aires." in Juan Lope Blanch, ed., *Estudios sobre el español hablado en las principales ciudades de América*. (Ciudad Universitaria, México 20, D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México). 333-349.
- Bentivoglio, Paula (1983). "Topic continuity and discontinuity in discourse: a study of spoken Latin-American Spanish." in Talmy Givón, ed., *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*. (Philadelphia: John Benjamins). 255-311.
- Bentivoglio, Paula (1987). *Los sujetos pronominales de primera persona en el habla de Caracas*. (Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela, Consejo de Desarrollo Científico y Humanístico).
- Cameron, Richard (1992). *Pronominal and null subject variation in Spanish: Constraints, dialects, and functional compensation*. University of Pennsylvania dissertation. [Distributed as IRCS Report 92-22 by The Institute for Research in Cognitive Science, 4301 Walnut St. Suite 400C, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.]
- Cameron, Richard (1993). "Ambiguous agreement, functional compensation, and nonspecific tú in the Spanish of San Juan, Puerto Rico and Madrid, Spain." *Language Variation and Change*. 5:305-334.
- Cameron, Richard (1994). "Switch reference, verb class, and priming in a variable syntax." in Katherine Beals et al., eds., *CLS 30: Papers from the 30th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: Volume 2: The parasession on variation and linguistic theory*. (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society). 27-45.
- Cameron, Richard (1995). "The scope and limits of switch reference as a constraint on pronominal subject expression." *Hispanic Linguistics* (forthcoming)
- Cameron, Richard (1996). "A community-based test of a linguistic hypothesis." *Language in Society* (forthcoming)
- Chafe, Wallace (1987). "Cognitive constraints on information flow." in Russell Tomlin, ed., *Coherence and grounding in discourse*. (Philadelphia: John Benjamins). 21-51.
- Chastain, Charles (1975). "Reference and context." in Keith Gunderson, ed., *Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science: Volume VII: Language, mind, and knowledge*. (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press). 194-269.
- Cifuentes, Hugo (1980). "Presencia y ausencia del pronombre personal sujeto en el habla culta de Santiago de Chile." *Homenaje a Ambrosio Rabanales: Boletín de filología de la Universidad de Chile* 31:743-752.
- de Pineda, Miguel Angel, ed., (1982). *Sociolingüística Andaluza 2: Materia de encuestas para el estudio del habla urbana culta de Sevilla*. (Sevilla: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla).
- Donnellan, Keith (1978). "Speaker reference, descriptions, and anaphora." in Peter Cole, ed., *Syntax and semantics: Volume 9: Pragmatics*. (New York: Academic Press). 47-68.
- Enç, Mürvet (1991). "The semantics of specificity." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 22:1-25.

- Enríquez, Emilia V. (1984). *El pronombre personal sujeto en la lengua española hablada en Madrid*. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Miguel de Cervantes).
- Esgueva, M. and M. Cantarero, eds., (1981). *El habla de la ciudad de Madrid: Materiales para su estudio*. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Miguel de Cervantes).
- Gernsbacher, Morton Ann (1989). "Mechanisms that improve referential access." *Cognition*. 32:99-156.
- Givón, Talmy (1983). "Topic continuity in discourse: an introduction." in Talmy Givón, ed., *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*. (Philadelphia: John Benjamins). 1-41.
- Guy, Gregory (1980). "Variation in the group and the individual: the case of final stop deletion." in William Labov, ed., *Locating language in time and space*. (New York: Academic Press). 1-36.
- Guy, Gregory and Sally Boyd (1990). "The development of a morphological class." *Language Variation and Change*. 2:1-18.
- Hempel, Carl G. (1966). *Philosophy of natural science*. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.).
- Hernanz, Ma. Lluïsa (1990). "En torno a los sujetos arbitrarios: La 2a persona del singular." in Violeta Demonte and Beatriz Garza Cuarón, eds., *Estudios de lingüística de España y México*. (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México: El Colegio de México, A.C.). 151-178.
- Hochberg, Judith (1986a). "/-s/ deletion and pronoun usage in Puerto Rican Spanish." in David Sankoff, ed., *Diversity and diachrony*. (Philadelphia: John Benjamins). 199-210.
- Hochberg, Judith (1986b). "Functional compensation for /-s/ deletion in Puerto Rican Spanish." *Language*. 62(3):609-621.
- Kroch, Anthony and Cathy Small (1978). "Grammatical ideology and its effect on speech." in David Sankoff, ed., *Linguistic variation: models and methods*. (New York: Academic Press). 45-55.
- Laberge, Suzanne and Gillian Sankoff (1986). "Anything **You** can do." in Gillian Sankoff, ed., *The social life of language*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press). 271-293.
- Labov, William (1989). "The child as linguistic historian." *Language Variation and Change*. 1:85-97.
- Mahajan, Anoop (1991). "Operator movement, agreement, and referentiality." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*. 15:77-96.
- Marslen-Wilson, William, Elena Levy, and Lorraine Komisarjevsky Tyler (1982). "Producing interpretable discourse: The establishment and maintenance of reference." in Robert Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein, eds., *Speech, place, and action: studies in deixis and related topics*. (New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd). 339-378.
- Moyne, John and Guy Carden (1974). "Subject reduplication in Persian." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2:205-249.
- Prince, Ellen (1981). "Toward a taxonomy of given-new information." in Peter Cole, ed., *Radical pragmatics*. (New York: Academic Press). 223-255.
- Ranson, Diana (1991). "Person marking in the wake of /s/ deletion in Andalusian Spanish." *Language Variation and Change*. 3:133-152.
- Sigler, Michele (1992). "Number agreement and specificity in Armenian." in C.P. Canakis; G.P. Chan; and J.M. Denton, eds., *CLS 28: Papers from the 28th regional meeting*

- of the Chicago Linguistic Society: Volume 1: The main session.* (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society). 499-514.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen (1982). "Subject expression and placement in Mexican-American Spanish." in Jon Amastae and Lucía Elías-Olivares, eds., *Spanish in the United States: sociolinguistic aspects.* (New York: Cambridge University Press). 93-120.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen (1994). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Suñer, Margarita (1982). "On null subjects." *Linguistic Analysis.* 9:55-78.
- Suñer, Margarita (1983). "pro_{art}." *Linguistic Inquiry.* 14:188-191.
- Suñer, Margarita (1990). "Impersonal se passives and the licensing of empty categories." *Probus.* 2:209-231.
- Villaume, William (1988). "Interaction involvement and the use of referential and formal anaphora in conversation." *Language and Speech.* 31(4): 357-374.