ADDRESS FORM SELECTION AMONGST URBAN SPANISH YOUTH:

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHELI SOCIOLECT

by

ANNE RUTTER SEKANINA

(Under the Direction of Chad Howe)

ABSTRACT

In Peninsular Spanish there has been a shift in choice of form of address toward increased frequency of solidary *tú* in comparison to other Spanish-speaking dialects. This shift was advanced largely by urban youth speakers during the latter half of the twentieth century. It occurred in tandem with the growth of a youth sociolect called *cheli*. The nature of this sociolect as a badge of youth linguistic identity links it to the expansion of the realm of solidarity among youth speakers. It is argued that the youth sociolect *cheli* acted as a conductor or growth medium for the expansion of the solidarity domain and subsequent increased frequency of use of *tú* throughout Peninsular Spanish. Using data from works of theater as diachronic evidence, the shift in form of address is documented and analyzed in terms of the role of youth speakers in this process.

INDEX WORDS: solidarity, form of address, *cheli*, youth language, youth sociolect, pronoun, address form, politeness, lenguaje juvenil, solidaridad, fórmula de tratamiento, sociolecto, cortesía

ADDRESS FORM SELECTION AMONGST URBAN SPANISH YOUTH:

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHELI SOCIOLECT

by

ANNE RUTTER SEKANINA

B.A., Berry College, 2004

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

ADDRESS FORM SELECTION AMONGST URBAN SPANISH YOUTH:

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHELI SOCIOLECT

by

ANNE RUTTER SEKANINA

Major Professor:	Chad Howe
Committee:	Sarah Blackwell
	Hildebrando Ruiz

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2007

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to beginnings and ends. There have been so many this year.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a great number of people to whom I would like to express my gratitude for their help in this endeavor. First, I would like to thank Dr. Chad Howe, my major professor, for his help, his interest, his enthusiasm, his flexibility, and for allowing this thesis to come together in the very organic way that it did. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with him on this project. I am also very grateful to my committee members, Drs. Blackwell and Ruíz for their flexibility during the elaboration of the thesis, and for the knowledge base that they provided me in the courses that I had the pleasure of taking with them. It has been a great privilege to learn from their expertise. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Stacey Casado for her guidance in selecting plays and for bringing up the topic of *cheli*. I appreciate her help and ideas.

There are many other people in the Department of Romance Languages to whom I am grateful for encouragement and support. I would specifically like to name Dr. Teresa Pérez Gamboa and Dr. Dana Bultman. Both of these women have helped me feel that I could succeed through their encouragement and kind words.

On the home front, I would like to thank my husband, Martin Sekanina, for his patience, heavy lifting at the library, eye for detail while editing (though, I'm sure, we'll have, missed, a few comma, splices,), for keeping me distracted, and for all the cups of tea. I am grateful to all of my family members, whose constant inquiries about my thesis were an excellent source of daily accountability, and whose interest was genuine and appreciated. I am thankful to everyone who, along the way, in direct and indirect ways, expressed interest in this project or offered kind

words, advice, or support, including my friends and colleagues in the Department of Romance

Languages and my students. Their encouragement and curiosity was invaluable to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Language, much like the aesthetic choices that one makes each day in preparing to go out into the world, is both an outward manifestation of identity and an influencing factor in the formation of identity. Whether a conscious or subconscious choice, the words that one chooses to express one's self, and the way in which those words are ordered and pronounced are indicative of belonging to a particular social group. This sense of belonging can occur on multiple levels. On the most basic level, the language that one speaks is an indicator of nationality. Upon further analysis, conclusions can be drawn from one's speech about one's geographical origin, level of education, socioeconomic background, and even, in some cases, the ideology which one accepts.

Numerous sociolinguistic studies have demonstrated the power of language to convey information about speakers' social status. Labov (1972) was able to correlate pronunciation of /r/ in English amongst department store employees with the prestige of the establishments in which they were employed. What can be garnered from such studies is the knowledge that linguistic behaviors do provide insight into the social situations of speakers, and that the manifestation of a certain set of linguistic traits can be a mark of identification with a particular social group.

The capacity of language as marker of identity can be seen quite clearly in the speech of the urban youth of Spain, especially those from Madrid. Their choice to adopt the markers of identity of Madrid's youth culture has led to the development of a typical speech pattern for

youth of that city, a pattern sometimes called *cheli,* which evolved as a result of the influence of marginalized language and the social circumstances of the end of the Franco era. Authors such as Delgado Ruiz (2002), Maffesoli (2002), Molina (2002), and Rodríguez González (2002) have described *cheli* in their investigations, all of which will be discussed in this paper.   These authors describe *cheli* as a youth sociolect, viewed as a type of slang, as a result of its origins in a linguistic register associated with drugs, crime, and indigence. Even so, the communication of Madrid's youth is often characterized by the manifestation of lexical, syntactic, and even phonetic features which are traits of the *cheli* sociolect.

One highly salient feature of c*heli*, or the Madrid youth speech or sociolect, is a heightened use of the address form pronoun *tú* (Molina 2002), often in contexts in which speakers from other nations or from a more rural background would use *usted.* The choice of pronoun of address conveys implicit sociocultural messages about the speaker, the interlocutor, as well as the relationship between the two. The heightened use of *tú* amongst Madrid's youth, often speakers of c*heli*, is the result of a host of political, economic, social, and individual factors (Molina 2002). It is the theory of this author that *cheli* and the substantial increase of solidary *tú*, both phenomena of the late twentieth century, supported each other in their respective processes of evolution. In fact, it will be argued that *cheli* acted as a conductor for the increase in usage of *tú*, contributing to the exceptional situation of the forms of address that is unique to Peninsular Spanish.

In this paper, the many interrelated factors involved in selection of form of address pronouns will be explored, and the status of address form selection in Spain will be analyzed in contrast with other Spanish-speaking contexts. The relationship between this linguistic choice and the concept of politeness will be established, which will lead to an understanding of the

conclusions that can be drawn about a speaker based on selection of form of address. The wide range of social factors involved in the lifestyles and choices of Spanish youth in the last thirty years will be documented so as to understand the motivations for their exceptionally increased use of *tú*. *Cheli* will be described in terms of its history and relation to form of address selection. Dialog from works of theater from twentieth century Spain will serve as linguistic data from which to extract examples of this phenomenon.

The final objective of this paper is to gain insight into the confluence of social and historical factors leading to the shift in pronoun usage unique to Spain, as well as to connect this shift to the increase in popularity of *cheli* during the late nineteen-seventies and early nineteen-eighties. This will be accomplished through careful analysis of dialog from theater from throughout the twentieth century. It will be shown that two parallel processes such as the popularization of *cheli* amongst Spanish youth and the expansion of solidary *tú* in the same group of speakers are in fact, not only related, but part of a cause and effect relationship.

CHAPTER 2

THE ADDRESS FORM SYSTEM

Alternation between multiple forms of address is a feature of the Romance Languages, including Spanish, as well as of many other world languages. The factors which influence the selection of form of address are multiple and multi-dimensional, including sociolinguistic, cultural, and situational factors. In this section, forms of address will be described in general terms, and the factors influencing their selection will be discussed.

Braun (1988) describes the concept of a system of address in terms of the types of intervening factors in address form selection. According to this author, systems of address may be closed "when there is a well-known and limited set of variants – forms of address – and homogeneous when all speakers select and use these variants in roughly the same way" (1988: 18). This concept of system implies that there are governing factors, i.e. a rigid, rule-based set of constraints, rather than guiding factors, i.e. variables that influence each individual speaker's selection of address form. A contrasting concept mentioned by Braun consists of guiding factors influencing selection of address form.

Braun characterizes the contrasting view as a truly "sociolinguistic one" which holds that "language varies – according to speakers' age, class, education, religion, ideology, sex, etc." (1988: 18). The author further asserts that the latter view, based on sociolinguistic principles, more accurately portrays the reality of speakers' selection of address form (18). Without a set of rules prescribing when each form of address must be used by each speaker of a language, variation in form of address becomes inherently sociolinguistic in nature and cannot be described

4

as a system of address at all if a system is understood to be dictated by linguistic constraints rather than extralinguistic ones. The sociolinguistic factors in action have been described by several authors and will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

When analyzing forms of address, the seminal work by Brown and Gilman (1960) often provides the theoretical framework from which to depart. Brown and Gilman examined address forms along two dimensions: those of power and solidarity. According to their diachronic investigation across several languages of the evolution of pronouns of address from their origins in Latin to the contemporary context, the distinction between the formal, socially distant pronouns (*V)* and the informal and solidary pronouns (*T)* first evolved along the power dimension. One of the early appearances of dual forms was in the nonreciprocal relationship of power between noble or ruler and commoner (1960: 254). This nonreciprocal usage would occur, for instance, in the treatment of servant to master, a relationship in which, inherently, one of the interlocutors is in a position of authority over the other. It would be unthinkable for the servant to use any other than the *V* pronoun to address the master, who would return address with the *T* pronoun. As Brown and Gilman observe, "[p]ower is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior" (1960: 255). Power relationships were said to be based on "physical strength, wealth, age, sex, institutionalized role in the church, state, the army, or within the family" (1960: 255).

In Spanish, the early pronoun of deference was *vos* (Penny 2002: 123). Early pronoun usage was similar to Latin in that *vos* was the pronoun of deference used in asymmetrical power relationships as well as the pronoun of plural address, regardless of power dynamic (Penny 2002: 123-24). Penny explains how, in Spanish, the use of *vos* changed over time as new deferential pronouns were introduced into the language. "By the fifteenth century, *vos* has become so close

5

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." (2002: 124). It was *vuestra*

merced and *vuestras mercedes*, however, which took hold. Therefore, the address pronouns at

the time were the non-deferential pronouns *tú/vos* and *vosotros* and the deferential *vuestra*

merced and *vuestras mercedes*. Penny then jumps forward to the eighteenth century, stating that,

at that time, *vos* had fallen into disuse in Spain (except for Western Andalusia) and in parts of

America more closely connected to Spain, with *tú* being the pronoun of choice (2002: 124).

During that same period, Penny mentions that *vuestra merced/vuestras mercedes* began to

undergo a "series of contractions" which eventually yielded the pronouns *usted* and *ustedes*

(2002: 124). Finally the modern address pronouns are in place. The non-deferential pronouns *tú*

and *vosotros* alternated with the deferential *usted* and *ustedes*. The process of evolution,

however, did not only involve the actual pronouns themselves, but their usage as well. Brown

and Gilman explain that the power dynamic also evolved into a mutual, that is, reciprocal

treatment between members of "roughly equivalent power" (1960: 257). Over time, this mutual

relationship evolved to include a distinction along the dimension of solidarity.

Brown and Gilman use the term "solidarity" to describe the selection of pronoun, based

not on power, but on common ground or shared traits. They use the term "like-mindedness" to

describe this type of relationship (1960: 259). The authors later suggest that the shift towards

choice based on solidarity has had lasting effects on usage of the pronouns. They state that "the

modern direction of change in pronoun usage expresses a will to extend the solidarity ethic to

everyone" (1960: 280). As a result, in many cultures, the pronoun of solidarity, in the case of

Spanish, *tú,* has become more prevalent in recent years. The authors state that:

> Perhaps it is because Europeans have seen that excluded persons or races or groups can
> become the target of extreme aggression from groups that are benevolent within

themselves. Perhaps Europeans would like to convince themselves that the solidary ethic will not be withdrawn, that there is security in the mutual *T* (1960: 280).

This statement, in referring to Europeans as a homogenous population, is perhaps a bit sweeping and fails to take into account the individual factors influencing the development of each culture and therefore language. Even so, the idea of a divergence between usage in Europe and usage in other areas of the world is central to this paper. It will be shown that the process of transition to predominant use of the *T* pronoun in Spanish is accelerated in Spain, especially amongst urban youth, as compared to the rest of the Spanish speaking world.

Brown and Gilman propose two possible hypotheses which explain the shift across languages away from *V* pronoun usage toward *T* pronoun usage. One hypothesis states that the power semantic, since the end of the 19th century, has been diminishing in importance while the dynamic of solidarity has been gaining. This shift has caused a reduction in asymmetric uses and a corresponding increase in symmetric forms. This change can be attributed to social changes and social values acquired during the 20th century as a consequence of more open and egalitarian societies (1960: 260-261). The second hypothesis maintains that, during that same historical period, the domain of informal solidarity has grown to include a larger number of relationships in which symmetric use of *tú* is viewed as acceptable (1960: 260-261). These two hypotheses together explain the overall shift to *tú* usage across the Spanish-speaking world, but do not account for Spain's more accelerated progress in this process of change. Factors contributing to Spain's unique situation will be discussed later in this paper. At this point it is important to mention another author's classification of the sociolinguistic factors affecting form of address selection.

Escandell-Vidal's (1996) analysis provides a general set of guidelines for examining the factors which lead speakers to select one form of address over the other. Escandell-Vidal describes the choice as occurring on two different levels, based on several properties of the person being addressed and the relationship between interlocutors:

I) Macro social properties:
    a. Characteristics such as: age, sex, familiar position…
    b. Acquired properties such as: rank, title, social status…
II) Individual action (1996: 137).

The same author states that the use of form of address is a linguistic expression of the structure recognized by society, and that breaking with the established norms has social consequences, both by being excessively informal or familiar or excessively formal and distant with the interlocutor (1996: 138). Braun maintains that this type of deviation from the norm in form of address selection does not generally lead to misinterpretations or conflicts, "in most cases, speakers tolerate each other's 'deviant' behavior" (1988: 30). Although the communicative value of the forms of address is low, the pragmatic value is high. Levinson (1983) explains this statement further in his discussion of conventional implicature, that is, "non-truth-conditional inferences that are (…) simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions" (1983: 127). In reference to *T/V* pronoun choice, Levinson asserts that what is conveyed "is not any difference in truth conditions but just a difference in the expressed social relationship between speaker and addressee" (1983: 129). Failure to recognize the social distance/proximity between speakers through inappropriate pronoun choice can have social consequences.

Levinson (1983) and Braun (1988), like Escandell-Vidal, affirm that deviations from the norm do often result in the interlocutor drawing certain conclusions about the speaker: "They will regard the instance of address in question as typically lower class, rural, old-fashioned, dialectal, etc., just as they obtain social information from other linguistic features in the other's

8

utterances" (Braun 1988: 30). In short, the use of *tú* by a 17 year old trainee to address an older, more experienced mentor on the job could be judged as inappropriate, and could lead to the older employee's perception of the young person as impolite, uneducated, or socially inept. The fact that address form selection reflects so strongly on the speaker leads to the conclusion that choice of address form is inevitably linked to the notion of politeness. The notion of politeness hinges on speakers' desire to portray themselves favorably to others, and to either ingratiate or assert themselves within an interaction (Brown and Levinson 1987). Therefore, the conclusions that can be drawn about a speaker based on their address pronoun choices are linked to politeness. This notion will be discussed in the following section.

2.1 POLITENESS IN RELATION TO ADDRESS FORM SELECTION

The notion of politeness is central to any study of linguistic interactions. Escandell-Vidal notes that language is, in fact, the strongest means of interpersonal relation, and that, as a result, it is used as a tool for pursuing certain goals, especially those that depend on the actions of other people (1996: 135). The same author mentions that the very act of addressing another person establishes a relationship, and that the type of relationship established is reflected by the language used (1996: 136). According to Escandell-Vidal, the goals of the relationships established by these interactions manifest themselves in two directions: in terms of attempts at maintaining the status quo or of modifying it by bettering the relationship or creating distance (1996: 143). Speakers' attempts at maintaining and fostering positive relationships are not the only factors involved in analyses of linguistic politeness. One important concept is that of *face*, as described by Brown and Levinson (1987), which refers to the public image that one fosters of

one's self and the means by which this image is preserved. Positive face involves the desire to

be appreciated by others while negative face involves the desire to be free of impositions from

others and to be in control of one's own territory (Escandell-Vidal 1996: 149). Achieving this

balance between preserving autonomy and ingratiating the interlocutor is a necessary part of all

interactions. Pedroviejo Esteruelas generalizes that use of *tú* falls into the category of positive

politeness while use of *usted* is considered negative politeness (2004: 246). Both pronouns can

be considered courteous, depending on situational factors. Since treating one's audience with

politeness is one means of fostering positive relations and interactions, displaying politeness is

one of the underlying factors involved in the selection of form of address. The choice of *T* or *V*

address determines not only the relationship between interlocutor and speaker, but the level of

politeness employed in the interaction as well.

Politeness can be manifested in varying degrees. A variety of situational as well as social

factors affect the level of politeness employed in any given circumstance. Escandell-Vidal states

that the level of politeness depends on three factors:

I)   the relative power relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor;

II)   the social distance established, which includes the level of familiarity and

        contact between interlocutors; and

III)   the degree of imposition implied by a given act with respect to public image

        (1996: 149).

These three factors, especially the first two, are crucial to analysis of selection of form of

address. Even so, what is polite or courteous is not always apparent when it comes to this

linguistic choice.

Indeed Braun argues that the very idea of politeness is ambiguous and subject to cultural determinants (1988: 46). It is not possible to accurately prescribe a polite or impolite selection of form of address due to the numerous factors in play when the choice is made and the fact that, as Braun states, the pronoun classified as polite "need not always be polite while the other pronoun, implying the feature '- polite', may be the really polite one in certain contexts (1988: 46). Marín's 1972 study provides examples of this vagueness. Although *usted*, Spanish's *V* pronoun, would be assumed to be polite, Marín provides examples from the Spanish-speaking world in which the use of *usted* is not motivated by politeness in any way, such as in the case of a parent scolding a child (902). A parent has the option of employing *usted* as a means of creating distance with the child, and as a tool for communicating their disappointment or annoyance at he child's actions via this distancing. The distancing allows the parent to fully exert his or her authority over the child. There is certainly no politeness intended. Braun points out "that a 'polite' pronoun can be aggressive, insulting, authoritative, or simply non-familiar in situations where a T pronoun is common" (1988: 51). As a result, when considering forms of address, politeness must be viewed in a different way.

The aforementioned concepts are important in analyzing each situation, because, as we are about to see, politeness is entirely situational with regard to the forms of address. According to Braun:

> Forms of address are called and considered polite when they are adequate for the situation. Thus, a form of address which is appropriate to the relationship of speaker and addressee, and which is in accord with the rules of the community, or at least those of the dyad, will always be regarded as adequately polite" (1988: 49).

Terms such as "adequate" and "appropriate" may seem vague or ambiguous at first. The choice of address form, guided by sociolinguistic variables, is one in which such terms are applied differently to each situation and each set of interlocutors.

It is worthy of note that, in the specific context of Spain, Albelda Marco (2004) concluded that, in cases of close interpersonal relationships, if a speaker acts very courteously with his or her interlocutor, the latter may feel offended or note a lack of confidence in the relationship (2004: 131). It would seem that, in Spain, where the domain of solidarity has expanded to include so many different types of situations and relationships, use of *usted* in many circumstances can even be perceived as overly formal or excessively distant, leading to the feelings of offense or lack of confidence mentioned my Albelda Marco. This could indicate that over usage of *usted* in Spain could imply graver social consequences than over usage of *tú*. Indeed, the very purpose of the present study is to explore the factors that lead to this unique Spanish mindset which, at least for the younger generation, has allowed *tú* to become the default or preferred pronoun of address. The general factors contributing to the adequacy of each form of address in each situation have already been discussed. They will be further examined in a later section, and those factors specific to Spain and its process of change will also be analyzed more in-depth.

2.2 ADDRESS FORM SELECTION IN THE SPANISH-SPEAKING WORLD

Many studies have sought to document the selection of address forms in the Spanish-speaking world, as well as explore the factors behind speakers' selections. Marín's 1972 article describes these factors. This author defines the double semantic function of *tú* as (a) equalizing,

expressing a mutual recognition of shared ties or affinity between two people and, in its asymmetric use, (b) as an expression of superiority, the residual effect of the power dynamic (1972: 905). *Usted* is described as being displaced by *tú,* especially amongst members of the younger generations (1972: 906). Marín states that *tú* is considered the norm amongst young people, without the need for other factors such as friendship, and with little distinction between the sexes. This tendency seems to have advanced more in Spain than in Spanish speaking America (1972: 907). In regards to *usted*, Marín again refers to the age factor in affirming that *usted* is still the preferred form amongst those over the age of 40 who do not share friendship or other ties (1972: 907). Besides age, Marín also describes several cultural factors believed to influence the selection of address form. The following statement is made to summarize these factors:

> el *tú* tiende a hacerse más frecuente entre amigos y conocidos de las clases 'altas,' mientras que el *Vd*. tradicional se mantiene mas firme entre las clases 'bajas' como tratamiento puramente social, es decir, no tratándose de compañeros de trabajo, de partido, etc. Pero cabe suponer que esta diversidad lingüística desaparecerá con el paso de las generaciones a favor del *tú* común hoy entre la juventud (1972:906).

This author speculates that the reciprocal *usted* still present amongst members of the "lower class" will eventually give way to the *tú* already employed by the "upper class." Whether or not this is true remains to be seen. The distinction between age and class, however, would seem to demonstrate that this is a phenomenon in process of change. The factors contributing to this change have already been touched upon. Marín provides a very broad view of the T/V distinction in Spanish, and hints at the change in progress throughout the Spanish-speaking world. Other authors' works have sought to document more specific contexts.

Jaramillo describes the process of change as manifested in Spanish-speakers in New Mexico in a 1995 article. After affirming that the choice of *tú/usted* is related to "such

demographic characteristics of the speaker as gender, age, social class or socioeconomic status, nationality, and ethnic group identification" (1995: 193), it is argued that the change or shift that is taking place is mostly attributable to one certain demographic, based on the results of her study.

> The consistent upswing in TÚ use displayed by the middle educational group suggests that change in the use of TÚ/USTED (…) originates in this group. Having attained a marketable level of education, this group of speakers, for the most part falling in the 30-50 age range, constitutes the first generation of post World War II socially-mobile speakers with greater access to employment opportunities and a greater variety of lifestyles. It is also these speakers who play a primary role in the production and consumption of goods and services (1995: 207).

Jaramillo's findings would seem to suggest that the shift toward increased frequency in solidary *tú* for the population described in her study originated amongst a group that falls in the middle of the social spectrum in several ways: in terms of education, age, and social class. Thus, the shift occurring amongst New Mexican speakers of Spanish is different in its progression than the shift observed in Spain, which is to be analyzed in the current study. Jaramillo documents the change in progress in choice of address form amongst speakers in the United States. The following paragraphs will discuss the situation in several Latin American countries.

In describing the geographical distribution of form of address preference in Latin America, there are several studies worthy of mention. Solé (1978) established factors influencing usage in Latin American settings versus the peninsular context. Whereas the basis of solidarity in the Peninsular contexts has been described in terms of shared common ground or ties, in the Latin American context, "the family group, nuclear and extended, subsists as the primary basis of solidarity," although other relationships have begun to achieve similar importance (1978: 948). The author provides a series of examples:

In San Juan, Santiago de Chile, Buenos Aires, and Mexico City, young adults may easily exchange a reciprocal *tú* at clubs, at college, and even at work. In Lima and Bogotá, on the other hand, the relationships arising within those spheres do not necessarily engender common solidarity feelings which warrant – in time – a mutual *tú* (1978: 948).

In conclusion, Solé states that "[t]he *tú* in most Spanish speaking countries, except among the very young, still remains more of a privilege than a convention, being tied to a familiarity and intimacy rather than to mere solidarity" (1978: 948). This statement from Solé would seem to be indicative of a generalized trend towards use of *tú* amongst young speakers throughout the Spanish-speaking world. While this may, indeed, be the case it will later be demonstrated that the sphere of solidarity in Spain is greater than that of the rest of the Spanish-speaking world.

Studies by Ringer Uber (1985) and Torrejón (1991) further demonstrate the fact that *tú* usage is less widespread in America than in Spain. Torrejón argues that, in Chile, *usted* would exist at either extreme of a spectrum of solidarity, indicating the complete absence of and the extreme of this factor, but that when an equal relationship is shared between participants, both normally will default to *tuteo*, that is, reciprocal use of *tú* as form of address in conversation. (1991: 1070). Ringer Uber found that in the Colombian context, *usted* is still very much the norm. In fact, the author states that "On first impression, a visitor to Bogotá might think that *usted* is the only form of address in the singular used there" (1985: 389). Colombia serves as an example of the variability of address in the Spanish language. This variability grows considerably, however, when factoring in dialects that include use of *vos*.

In some dialects of American Spanish, the pronoun *vos* exists as a third form of address. In those dialects, *vos* may occupy a separate rung on the ladder of hierarchy of form of address pronouns. Braun states that "there are speakers for whom the pronoun of address *tú* (second person singular) is more polite than *vos* (second person plural), but less polite than *usted*" (1988: 58). Braun states that this is the result of a process through which *vos* at some point in history

replaced *tú* as the normative pronoun of address. When, at a later point, *tú* was reintroduced into the language in these dialects, being the newer form, it acquired the polite connotation in contrast to *vos* which became regarded as less polite. Another possible reason for this seeming inversion of politeness in dialects with *voseo* offered by Braun (1988) is that, *tú*, belonging to the standard varieties of Spanish, acquires its prestige by virtue of its association with the broader spectrum of the language, meaning that the fact that speakers subconsciously linked *tú* to their perceived "norm" for the language led them to accept it as the preferred polite form.

The use of T/V address forms has been briefly discussed in this section. It is worth noting that many of the aforementioned authors have described American Spanish in contrast with Peninsular Spanish. This is due to the already alluded to fact that Spain represents a completely unique context which differs strongly from the rest of the Spanish-speaking world. The manifestations and causes of this difference will be discussed at length later in this thesis. In Spain, the realm of solidarity has grown much more than in any other Spanish-speaking country. The next section will document the present-day situation in Spain and will uncover the factors that have contributed to this accelerated growth of the solidarity sphere in Spain.

2.3 ADDRESS FORM SELECTION IN PENINSULAR SPANISH

In describing the situation in Spain, Pedroviejo Esteruelas (2004) states that the process of expansion in use of *tú* that has been seen is a reflection of modern, democratic societies in which prejudices and hierarchies are continually wearing away. This has contributed to an increase in the type and number of situations in which use of *tú* is adequate or appropriate (2004: 247). Use of *usted*, according to the same author, implies deference and represents the

maintenance of the most conservative rules. For *usted*, the sphere of appropriate uses in Spain is shrinking. In fact, it is argued that *usted* now only has three values or functions in discourse in Spain, which are the respectful and polite, distancing, and stereotypical uses (2004: 248). In short, Pedroviejo Esteruelas confirms that a shift is taking place away from use of *usted*. This fact was further demonstrated by a preliminary look at data from the Spanish-speaking world.

The shift toward use of *tú* is widespread in the Spanish language, but is, without doubt, much further progressed in Spain. In a preliminary investigation, product ads featured in the most widely-circulated newspaper from Spain as well as the most widely-circulated Spanish-language newspaper published in the U.S. were studied (Rutter 2006). The following categories were used to classify the ads: (1) *Tú*, (2) *Usted*, (3) Other form of address, and (4) No form of address. The first two categories are relatively evident, though it is worth mentioning that explicit pronoun use was not the criterion for analysis, but rather, any reference to *tú* or *usted*, including verb morphology and possessives. The third category included examples in which infinitives, impersonal constructions such those with *se*, as well as other similar strategies were used to circumnavigate the need to select a form of address, while the fourth category encompassed all ads which contained no form of direct address to the reader.

The results of this preliminary investigation serve to demonstrate the strong preference for *tú* which does exist in Spain in contrast to the American context. In the newspapers from Spain, out of 117 total examples taken from ads, 53% used *tú*, 13% used *usted*, 33% used no form of address and only 1% used a form of address falling in the "other category. Some examples from the Spanish ads will now be described. One ad for electronics and appliances at a retail department store used *usted*, "Compre ahora y empiece a pagar el 28 de febrero del 2007" (*El País,* 11/10/06, pg.15)   Another ad, for mobile phone service, read: "¿Sabes qué se siente al

ser de Vodafone? Descubre el Programa de Puntos, conecta el mp3 de este móvil y te harás una idea," very clearly opting for use of *tú* (*El País*, 11/10/06, pg. 34). In the newspapers published in Miami, 107 ads were counted. Of these, 22% used *tú*, 52% used *usted*, 23% used no form of address, and 3% used one of the "other" forms of address mentioned earlier. This near complete inversion of the forms of address *tú* and *usted* substantiates the claim that the extended use of *tú* in Spain is different from the norm in American Spanish. At this point it is possible to begin examining why this difference exists.

Several authors have attributed this change to social factors and political circumstances unique to Spain in the twentieth century. As a means of very briefly summarizing the processes undergone by the forms of address in Spain, Hickey states that the evolution of the forms of address in Spain occurred

> "(generally away from formal, towards informal, alternatives) from 1931, when the Second Republic favoured 'brotherly' informality, through the 1936-39 Civil War and a 35 year dictatorship (which also promoted the 'comradely' alternatives), through a long post-1975 transition period (witnessing a fairly radical move, or perhaps return, from the informal to the formal alternatives)" (2005: 319).

This simplified view would seem to demonstrate the instability of the form of address system under changing social and political conditions. It does not, however, truly account for the changes in a meaningful way, especially for those which took place post-1975, after the end of Franco's regime. Hickey only refers to the political climate in this analysis, and does not take into account the changing social conditions of each era, or the very complex set of factors involved in address form selection (which certainly go beyond formal vs. informal). It is evident that since the shift mentioned by Hickey back *towards* the formal pronoun, another shift has occurred resulting in the amplified use of *tú* seen in Spain today.

Stewart (1999)echoes Hickey's statements concerning the 20th century evolution of form of address usage in Spain. In regards to the Second Republic, Stewart states that "the use of *tú* was once for a very short period, under the Second Republic, the prescribed form of address and its use by previously servile sectors of the population functioned, in a sense, as an emblem of Republican affiliation and a commitment to a major change in the power structures in Spanish society" (1999: 127). Stewart goes on to describe the post-Franco era: "[s]ince then *tú* has been associated (…) with the urban young and not-so-young of a progressive orientation, has become so widespread that the intimate connotations attaching to its use have been, in many instances, eroded" (1999: 128). Once again there is little analysis of the social factors leading up to the current state. It seems likely that, as Stewart (1999) and Hickey (2005) both mentioned, the fact that, during the Second Republic and early years of the Franco regime, *tú* was the prescribed usage, which in turn contributed to the swing in the opposite direction that is expected immediately at the end of the Franco era. The momentum of this swing, along with the already established instability of forms of address in Spain, contributed to the equally abrupt and swift swing back toward use of *tú* throughout the 1980s and 90s up until the present day. Relatively few studies have focused on the urban Spain of today and more specifically, on the dialect of Spain's youth and its adoption of *tú* in ever-increasing types of situations and relationships.

CHAPTER 3

A BRIEF SOCIAL HISTORY OF SPAIN

At this point a brief discussion of the history of Spain in the 20th century is necessary in order to pinpoint the political and social context to be examined. The period leading up to the end of Franco's regime are an appropriate point of departure in analyzing the social factors influencing youth culture in Spain during the past 30 years. In reality, there are several distinct generations in question for purposes of this analysis. This analysis will begin with the generation including those who were youths at the end of the Franco regime. Those who came of age slightly after them, at the beginning of the 1980s, had their own unique experience. A chronological discussion of youth culture in Spain from 1975 up to the present day will be presented in each of the following paragraphs, keeping in mind that there is no definite line between generations, and that the factors influencing one generation are inherited, whether directly or indirectly, by subsequent generations.

For those who were first-hand witnesses of the end of the Franco era, their youth was characterized by change. The young Spaniards of 1975, according to Robles Orozco (1986), had not suffered the hunger or the horrors of the Civil War, nor had they known an undeveloped Spain. Their childhood occurred within a growing consumer society (163). The time leading up to the death of Franco in 1975, however, marked the beginning of a period of transition that would last into the 1980s. According to Mangen (2001), the late years of the Franco regime brought about many changes, including a process of secularization brought about largely by socioeconomic factors:

"Importantly, social developments emanating from the 'miracle years' of the 1960s prepared the country for a secularizing '*apertura*' (opening up). The influx of foreign tourism and emigration (…) each played a part. Within Spain, rapid urbanization, matched by depopulation of the rural interior, disturbed social – and religious- practices, but they ensured high levels of employment and greater prosperity for many. Thus, by the later years of the General's regime, prosperity had fed materialism, and materialism had weakened the hold of religiosity" (128).

This weakening of the influence of religion in Spain will continue to be a strong influencing factor in the society's development for decades to come. This will be further discussed later in this analysis.

The secularization of Spain was just one of many changes surrounding the end of the Franco regime. Romaní Alfonso (2002) cites 1973 as the beginning point of the great contemporary social and political crises, including the death of Franco, the increase in ETA violence, political transitions that would last until 1982, and the surfacing of alternative groups such as feminists, homosexuals, antinuclear groups, etc. (52). All of these factors had a lasting effect on the attitudes of the generation in question. The restrictions imposed on society by Franco were lifted, and this generation was acutely aware of the pressures on it as principle players in the unfolding drama of their country's modernization. In 1975, according to Robles Orozco (1986), they did not face the difficulties of unemployment or delinquency that were soon to come (164). Their principal aspiration was the creation of a free society. Robles Orozco goes on to mention that this generation rejected "the system," which they found to be archaic and intolerant, in favor of a democratic system, representative of public sentiment (164).

The youth of the late 1970s to early 1980s experienced a fundamental shift in the values of their society as it transitioned towards democracy. The grip of Franco on Spanish society did not really begin to relax in a discernible way until around 1980. Woolard (1985) notes that "While the preliminary steps of restoring a constitutional, parliamentary democracy had been

taken, linguistic, cultural, and educational policies were still largely those inherited from the Franco years" (741). A society previously founded on the solidarity of the traditional working class, according to Romaní Alfonso (2002), slowly gave way to a society based on consumerism and individual competence (48). The 1982 socialist victory marked the beginning of a period of stabilization in Spain that has lasted through the present day. Mangen (2001) states that, "[c]ompared to the outgoing government of Calvo Sotelo, PSOE found it relatively easy to convey the image of a young, modernizing party, untainted by Francoism, with the capacity to accelerate social transformation" (71). Some evidence of these social transformations in action can be found in the evolution of youth cultures, subcultures and aesthetics, and in their attitudes and interests.

It was the 1982 PSOE victory that gave rise to a number of movements amongst Spanish youth. For the first time in almost a century, marginalized groups were able to become visible. In a study of countercultures in Spain since the end of the Franco era, Romaní Alfonso (2002) details the rise of groups such as hippies, skinheads, okupas (similar to the English term 'squatter') and "pijos" (similar to the concept of 'preppy') in Spain during this period. Though the individual stories of these youth countercultures are not of interest to us for the present study, Romaní Alfonso makes several more general observations that are very indicative of the mindset of Spanish youth of the time.

One of the first points that Romaní Alfonso makes is that, throughout history in Spain and even in Europe, youths have been responsible for calling attention to the contradictions of society (2002: 48). Romaní Alfonso (2002) attributes this fact to the necessary unstable sorting out and balancing act that is the transition from youth to adulthood (48). During this crucial period of identity formation, youths explore themselves in contrast to and in comparison to their

society, drawing conclusions about both. In the early post-Franco era (1973-1980), youth countercultures surged. Having participated in all of the celebrations of the supposed coming of a new era, many felt keen disappointment as their expectations for this new society were unfulfilled (Romaní Alfonso 2002: 53). After the 1982 elections, however, According to Romaní Alfonso (2002), youth movements were the result of a feeling of detachment that came with the establishment of a more individualistic society in which there was little civic participation on the part of citizens, a sense of detachment which was exacerbated by crises which isolated many marginalized groups during the 1980s, such as the AIDS virus (56-57). Romaní Alfonso goes on to explain the growth of this sense of detachment, explaining that in the postmodern era, we have gone from living in social systems that provide a basic set of goals and a sense of stability to living within a set of social conditions that lead to a segmentation or fragmentation of everyday life (62). This, according to the author, leads to a great deal of difficulty in constructing a personal sense of purpose in life, as well as in constructing our individual and group identities (2002: 62). Romaní Alfonso (2002) explains that these difficulties have led to the resurgence of ethnic and/or nationalistic feelings, feelings that allow us to feel a sense of belonging or involvement with our community, an involvement which offers a sense of security in the battle of our small tribe against the exterior world which is beyond our control (62-63). This attitude of detachment from society as a whole but of simultaneous belonging to a smaller group set the stage for the growth of the youth groups seen in Spain today.

The youth movements in present-day Spain, as observed by Delgado Ruiz (2002), are based on a shared aesthetic that is not, in most cases, associated with a philosophy or set of beliefs. Delgado Ruiz (2002) affirms that with the new "rocker," "punk," "neo-hippy," and "skin" groups, just to name a few, one does not speak of social movements with solid ideological

configurations or even shared global conceptions of life or society. Those who identify with

these groups wish to reveal an identity which has been reduced to a set of physical

manifestations having lost any and all relation to its original philosophical origin (122). Delgado

Ruiz (2002) sums this up well in stating that "Muchos jóvenes se han integrado en movimientos

alternativas y radicales, pero de una manera que da la impresión de estar mucho más preocupada

por *parecer* que por *ser*" (121). Those who adopt the aesthetic of one of these groups do so in

order to establish a sense of belonging, to portray that they are part of a group, a group which

only exists in its aesthetic contrast with society as a whole. They wish to be somehow different

or to stand out from society, yet also to be the same as others who choose their aesthetic.

Maffesoli (2002) speaks of escapism, of the desire of youth to distance themselves from

the institutions of modernity (145). Maffesoli further describes this phenomenon:

> "Esto se manifiesta en los diversos signos tribales de reconocimiento: aretes, vestimentas
> uniformes, modos de vida miméticos, hábitos lingüísticos, gustos musicales y prácticas
> corporales, todo ello trascendiendo las fronteras y dando testimonio de una participación
> común en un espíritu del tiempo hecho de hedonismo, de relativismo, de tiempo presente
> y de una sorprendente energía concreta cotidiana" (149).

This desire has led to solidarity amongst youths, even of very different aesthetic affiliations.

Maffesoli (2002) states that

> "Desde el 'mochilero' al 'juerguista', sin olvidar las diversas formas de indiferencia
> política, social o religiosa, hay un hilo rojo, tenso e infranqueable, el de la solidaridad de
> base y de los valores que le están ligados. Vagando o errando fuera de toda institución, o
> por lo menos no siendo esclavo de ninguna, unos y otros afirman la importancia de la
> experiencia vivida y el sentido concreto que ésta puede inducir" (146).

This points to a shared ideal that rejects "the system," as well as a shared hedonism that unites all

of the different social/aesthetic youth movements. This hedonism and, once again, detachment

from society, is not only present in the youth countercultures of modern Spain. Romaní Alfonso

(2002) describes the "pijos" as conservative youths from "comfortable" classes who do not

contemplate any alternative to the society in which they live and whose primary goal is to prepare themselves to replace their elders in the running of society and, at the same time, enjoy themselves as much as possible (58). "Pijos" are the mainstream youth, those who do not reject society yet do not embrace it, but simply follow along with what they believe to be expected of them, propelled by an inertia passed down through generations. They are neither breakers of nor makers of rules. Yet even they seem to have been affected by the overriding sense of apathy toward the system and desire for pleasure that appears to characterize modern Spanish youth.

In addition to these changes in attitude, the post-Franco years also brought about demographic changes. Mangen (2001) mentions that "within the space of 30 years Spain moved from a comparatively youthful population to one broadly mirroring the age distribution of the EU average" (128). This demographic change had long-lasting effects on the lifestyles and attitudes of Spanish youth. This demographic shift, combined with high rates of unemployment, fundamentally changed the process of transition from youth into adulthood for Spaniards. Mangen asserts that, "[i]n an era of high youth unemployment, the cultural value of independence and socialization through work among the young excluded from the labour market has, perforce, been surrendered by many young Spanish adults who remain long in the parental home" (128). The delayed age of independence for most Spaniards has also changed the family dynamic. Robles Orozco (1986) explains that, although it would seem that adult children remaining at home well into their twenties would breed family conflict, this has not been the case. He states that a noticeable decline in authoritarianism has occurred within families, and that tolerance and understanding amongst family members has grown in importance (168). This extension of youth into what, for most Americans, would be considered adulthood, is a

continuing phenomenon, and has itself caused a variety of changes in attitude amongst Spanish youth.

The problem of unemployment is an ongoing one, even in the new millenium. Freire (2006) cites data from Spain's 2001 census, which found that 22.4% of the population of Spain fell between the ages of 15 and 29 (13). She goes on to mention that a 2004 study found that, of the 3,500,248 Spaniards between the ages of 25 and 29, 75% had not achieved economic independence. Also, those that had achieved independence did not have confidence that that independence would be lasting as financial and relationship changes could land them once again in the homes of their parents (Freire 2006: 13). The reliance on parents until late in life has, perhaps, affected the values and priorities of Spanish youth.

Family loyalty seems to be predominant amongst Spanish youth. A study published in 1997 by Calvo Buezas compared survey responses across Spanish-speaking cultures all over the world, attempting to gauge the values of Spanish-speaking youth. One of the surveys published asked the young respondents what they would do if they won the lottery. 42.9% of Spanish youth's first response was that they would help their family, a higher rate than the average across cultures for the study (181). Another survey question asked the respondents to rank the entities which were most important for orienting one's self in life. 72.8% of Spanish respondents chose the family, which was once again higher than the cross-cultural average. This demonstrates the fact that Spanish youth, though impeded by unemployment in the process of achieving independence, continue to be strongly tied to their families. Freire (2006) concludes that Spanish youth are "limitados pero contentos" and that, in many cases, they seemed to be prepared to reside at home with parents not only until they have achieved employment, but until they

achieved the employment they desired, at times passing up opportunities (15). It would seem

that Spanish youth are, as Freire stated, "limited but content" with their situations.

CHAPTER 4

THE YOUTH SOCIOLECT OF MADRID: *CHELI*

All of the social, political, demographic, and economic factors mentioned in the previous

section had an effect not only on the outward appearance of Spanish youth through their

belonging to the aesthetic groups discussed, but also changed their use of the Spanish language.

The speech variety common to the young people of Madrid, often referred to as *cheli*, *pasota*, or

lenguaje del rollo, evolved in the mouths of urban Spanish youth during the end of the Franco

regime and in the years of transition following his death, and continues its evolution in the

present day. Rodríguez González (2002) states that the unprecedented protagonism of youth

during the sixties, followed by the end of the Franco era and the beginning of economic crises

during the seventies contributed to the development of the youth sociolect still developing today

(19). Freire (2006) speaks of Madrid as the cultural center of Spain in the early eighties, and of

the energy felt in the large cities of the country:

> La Movida madrileña, un movimiento contracultural de enorme éxito, surgió como
> consecuencia de unas coincidencias favorables que no se han repetido de nuevo. Por un
> lado, los jóvenes estaban ansiosos por salir, divertirse y experimentar los límites que se
> había disuelto tras la muerte de Franco. La noche madrileña rebosaba de actividad, y la
> de otras ciudades no se quedaba atrás (22).

Another important factor in the explosion of the youth sociolect was the presence for the first

time in history of mass communications, which, in the words of Rodríguez González (2002),

acted as "verdaderas canteras de construcción de palabras y como rampas de lanzamiento de

nuevas expresiones de moda" (21). Rodríguez González (2002) further points out that the

popularization of radio, television, and film leads to

un proceso de osmosis continua, pues por un lado, estos medios audiovisuales hacen de espejo donde se refleja la vida y el lenguaje especial de un pequeño grupo social y, por otro, bajo sus poderosos efectos, la jerga sale de su gueto marginal, difundiéndose amplia y rápidamente (21).

The years leading up to and directly following the Franco era were years of change, as much in the development of mass communications as in youth life in Spain, which entered a transition the effects of which are still being felt.

Freire describes the spirit of urban youth of the era: "Pocas veces hubo una euforia mayor, una sensación de solidaridad entre generaciones similares" (2006: 23). It was this energy, the energy felt by Spanish youth living in the country's urban centers, but especially Madrid, that allowed for the emergence of the youth sociolect. Speaking of *cheli*, which is the specific sociolect most relevant to this paper, Rodríguez González (2002) states that:

> [e]l término *cheli*, en sus orígenes un tratamiento afectivo utilizado en los ambientes marginales de Madrid, pasó a designar al pasota madrileño y a su jerga, y, finalmente, a la de todos los pasotas, sin que haya faltado quien lo considere sinónimo de lengua coloquial, una prueba irrefutable del arrastre de este argot (20).

Rodríguez González (2002) also makes reference to the influence of marginalized culture on the birth of *cheli*, but explains the expansion of this sociolect to include the better part of a generation:

> La material prima de este lenguaje fue de procedencia muy variada. El *cheli* bebió del argot del hampa y del mundo de la droga, castellanizó palabras procedentes del inglés y del caló y resucitó acepciones olvidadas del castellano antiguo. Aunque constituido básicamente a partir de elementos castizos y marginales (y en esto no se diferencia del lenguaje popular), el pasota nació con una voluntad contracultural que lo convirtió en seña de identidad y expresión de toda una generación, trabajadora o estudiantil, marcada por la crisis y el desencanto (20).

Interestingly, though *cheli* began as a youth sociolect, it has grown upward to include adult speakers. Since the sixties, according to Rodríguez González (2002), "son los adultos en

29

realidad los que imitan a los jóvenes en sus maneras y en su lenguaje, invirtiendo unas pautas de

comportamiento que habían venido transmitiéndose por generaciones" (19). Although the

resultant explosion of *cheli* occurred at the end of and following the Franco regime, the roots of

this sociolect can be traced to theater from more than fifty years earlier.

The first evidence of *cheli* or *pasota* can be found in Spanish theater of the end of the

nineteenth century (Seco Reymundo 1970). The works of Carlos Arniches, Spanish playwright,

feature the inhabitants of Madrid at the end of the nineteenth century, and captures them in

faithful detail to be reproduced on the stage. Arniches has been credited with having not only

carefully reproduced the speech of Madrid's inhabitants of the era, but with having influenced

that speech as well. Ramos (1966) speaks of the "*arnichesización* de Madrid, proceso mucho

más fuerte que su contrario, es decir, la *madrileñización* de Arniches" (151). This refers to the

contributions made by Arniches' theater to the "habla de Madrid" at the end of the nineteenth

century. Seco (1970) observes the following:

> Si en un principio la labor del autor fue recoger estos modismos del público y ofrecerlos
> en la escena con el prestigio que este lugar posee, hubo también inmediatamente el
> instinto creador del dramaturgo que, ya en la corriente de un gusto, improvisó nuevas
> fórmulas, que fueron incorporadas por el público a su sistema expresivo (13).

In short, Arniches was able to document the language of Madrid at the time through his theater,

while at the same time manipulating the direction of development of Madrid's colloquial speech.

The lexical items that Arniches invented, the terms he coined in his works, became so

popular that they left the stage to roam the streets. Membrez (1994) states that Arniches and his

contemporaries "eran conscientes de utilizar ortografía idiosincrásica y giros no bendecidos por

la R.A.E. para aproximar el habla popular madrileña" (81). Membrez (1994) later adds that

"Como resultado de la simbiosis de la calle y el teatro, y a pesar de la controversia que gira a su

alrededor, mucho argot de la década de los noventa ha pasado al diccionario de la R.A.E." (87).

Arniches and his cohorts influenced the colloquial language of Madrid by introducing new lexical items and by popularizing terms that belonged to marginalized groups. Hurtado Calvo (1994) mentions that, in analyzing the language of the works of Arniches, it is necessary to take into account "las hablas marginales, en particular la de germanía" (156), and adds that "Un rastreo por el léxico de Arniches, como por el de otros saineteros, nos indica que son numerosos los términos procedentes del léxico marginal" (156). The works of Arniches represented and amplified the colloquial language of Madrid and, by doing so, helped to popularize elements of "las hablas marginales" so that they entered the consciousness of mainstream Peninsular speakers. This marks the beginning of the process of change through which a sociolect such as *cheli* became the growth medium of linguistic change.

In the twentieth century, the language that Arniches and his unique vocabulary had brought to the mainstream public eye began to evolve in Sevilla. Rodríguez González (2002) points out an important document in the history of *cheli*: "el 'Manifiesto del borde' firmado en 1969 por Gonzalo & Smash" in which there is a lexicon containing "aportes del mundo del hampa, del habla de barrio y del mundo flamenco y gitano" (33). Rodríguez González (2002) also states that *cheli*, while born "a caballo entre Barcelona y Sevilla" (20) would have to pass through Madrid "el principal foco de difusión" (33) "para consagrarse como fenómeno social" (20). It was from this point that *cheli*, on its way thru Madrid also travelled through social strata such that, finally, "[e]l uso del lenguaje del rollo o pastos no quedó relegado a un sector rockero o barriobajero, sino que pasó a formar parte de los hábitos expresivos de buena parte de la juventud" (Rodríguez González 2002: 34). This helps to explain how a characteristic (such as the increased use of solidary *tú*) related to a variety that was, in its beginnings, a youth sociolect, have become generalized in Peninsular Spanish. The specific traits of the set of linguistic habits

associated with the youth sociolect discussed in this section will be explored in the following section in which the characteristics of *cheli* are addressed.

4.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF *CHELI*

It can be inferred, based on the earlier discussion of lexical items, that the youth sociolect of Madrid is a speech variety defined primarily by lexical features. *Cheli* is also identified with a number of other linguistic features, which will be discussed in this section. However, it is important to first identify some basic traits of *cheli* or *pasota*. After those have been identified, more specific phonetic, syntactic, morphological, and lexical aspects of this sociolect will be explored.

Referring to youth sociolects such as *cheli*, Rodríguez González (2002) mentions that one defining characteristic of these varieties is the "acepción de ciertas formas subestándar como medio de distinguirse de la lengua estándar hablada por la gente 'normal'" (34). Linguistic varieties such as *cheli* are a means through which members of a speech community or social network identify themselves. The notion of social network is defined by Milroy (2001) as "the aggregate of relationships contracted with others" (549), or as "a boundless web of ties which reaches out through a whole society, linking people to one another, however remotely" (550). Social networks are classified based on the type of relationship shared by the members of the network. Milroy (2001) distinguishes "between 'strong' and 'weak' ties of everyday life – roughly ties which connect friends or kin as opposed to those which connect acquaintances" (550). Loosely knit social networks with weak ties between individuals have historically, according to Milroy (2001) been a vector for linguistic change (562). Milroy (2002) states that,

"if a close knit network structure supports localized linguistic norms and resists change originating from outside the network, the corollary, that communities composed of weak ties will be susceptible to change is also likely to hold" (562). Milroy supports the previous statement by arguing that "'weak' and apparently insignificant interpersonal ties (of 'acquaintance' as opposed to 'friend', for example) are important channels through which innovations and influence flow from one close-knit group to another" (562-63). The macro social network of Madrid's youth, responsible for the explosion of varieties such as *cheli*, is such a social network, comprised of the countless smaller social networks made up of young madrileños and their immediate close-knit social networks. Linguistic change occurs when linguistic innovators, described by Milroy (2001) as "likely to be individuals who are in a position to contract many weak ties," (563) adopt changes which then spread through the multiple social networks of which they are a part. In this way, *cheli* rose to achieve a near normative status amongst the youth of Madrid, and later, much of urban Spain.

This was, in part a reaction to the linguistic hegemony imposed by Franco and Spanish society at large. Woolard (1985) addresses a similar process in regards to use of Catalan amongst Spanish youth in the post-Franco era. Woolard describes what seems to be a conscious linguistic choice:

> An oppositional process that sees through and repudiates the legitimate language ('yes, it is the language of authority, but that is not the authority of my life'), the inversion of the dominant value hierarchy produces what is at best an alternative and at worst a collaborative product – an adherence to a 'substandard' form of speech (1985: 745).

This applies to *cheli* in that *cheli* speakers adopt a set of, especially lexical, linguistic traits that, for many speakers of other dialects, would seem 'substandard,' and that they do so, at least initially, as part of a process of identity formation through language. Rodriguez González (2002)

33

seems to recognize the intentionality of the individual's choice to identify with a linguistic

variety such as *cheli*:

> Si los pasotas, o cualquier grupo contracultural configuran, a pequeña escala, una contrasociedad o antisociedad, está claro que les será necesario poseer un medio de expresión acorde, un antilenguaje que connote sus propios valores, el cual les sirve de mecanismo de defensa y al mismo tiempo de señal de identidad" (34).

Regarding the longevity of such varieties, Woolard goes on to add that their perpetuation is, in

itself, a continued opposition to the same authority that led to their creation rather than

conformity to a new linguistic standard:

> It is nonetheless critical to understand that these vernacular practices are productive, not merely reproductive, that they arise not from a mere bending to the weight of authority, but are paradoxically a creative response to that authority, mediated by the oppositional value of solidarity (745).

In much the same way, the explosion in popularity of *cheli* can be characterized as another

manifestation of the anti-institutional sentiment of the youth of the era, a further expression of

their desire to collectively differentiate themselves from the past.

Thus, *cheli* may be classified as a linguistic variety promoted by the types of ties shared

by its speakers, and characterized by a lexicon of marginal origins. As well, the marginalized

origins of a large part of the *cheli* lexicon were described. This elevated presence of marginality

in the *cheli* lexicon is explained by Rodríguez González (2002), who notes that speakers resort to

"palabras y expresiones ya existentes, procedentes de sociolectos con un código distinto al suyo,

lo que le proporcionan un cierto aire exótico" (43). Some examples of lexical items originating

in marginalized language or that of delinquency, according to Rodríguez González, are terms

such as "*pringao*" (victim of a crime), "*molar*" (an equivalent to *gustar*), and "*tía*" (girl,

woman), just to name a few (44). Another feature resulting from this linguistic "exoticness"

mentioned by Rodríguez González (2002) is the inclusion of lexical items from other languages,

such as the use of words like "*tripi*" (a drug induced state) or "*yoin*" (from the English word

'joint') (45). Other lexical items undergo a change of register, losing a pejorative connotation in

certain contexts, as in the examples of the appellatives common amongst young men: "*cabrón,*

maricón, gilipollas" (Rodríguez González 2002: 48). These are all examples of terms from the

language of marginalized cultures that, through use amongst speakers of *cheli* have become part

of mainstream youth speech.

Another basic observation to be made about *cheli* is that, until changes that have occurred

recently, it was only oral in nature. Rodríguez González (2002) affirms, however, that the

publication of magazines, especially for young women, beginning in the nineties (titles such as

Ragazza, You or *Vale*) have allowed *cheli* to develop a written register. The popularity of text

messaging and online chatting amongst youth has contributed to this phenomenon, as Rodríguez

González (2002) points out, there has been a prevalence of "escritura fonética que recuerda

algunas manifestaciones del argot en su modalidad escrita" (22). Countless examples can be

found online in blogs, forums, critiques, and chatrooms.   In the first example, a young female

comments on the physical appearance of a favorite male celebrity and asks for the consensus of

the other readers of the forum:

(1)   Q guapo es mi Dani es q no se puede mas ya. Weno y el video ya es para la muerte
        suprema. Y como ha confesado q tiooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo. weno dazme
        westra opinión[1]

One person responds to the above post and to difficulties with a posted photo of the male

celebrity in question:

(2)   ala, q tio mas weno a ese si me lo comia ara mismo.....q no, q veo na en la foto[2]

In both of these examples lexical items found in *cheli* are found, as well as phonetic

[1] From http://foros.cuatro.com/index.php?showtopic=10621.
[2] From http://foros.cuatro.com/index.php?showtopic=10621.

representations like those mentioned before by González (2002). In the next example it is

worthy of note that multiple borrowings from English are present, another frequent feature of

cheli. Here, the writer responds to a video viewed on the internet. He/she comments:

(3)   "UN POCO friki ? jajajaja UN BASTANTE diria yo omg ! mola mazo"[3]

The term "friki" is a borrowing of the English Word "freaky," and the abbreviation "omg" stands

for "Oh my God" in English. All of these examples demonstrate the fact that *cheli* continues to

evolve as modes of communication evolve, and has now become part of the language of the

internet for Peninsular youth. Another trait to note is that *cheli* is not only oral in nature, but also

pertains to an informal or colloquial register and to a limited set of topics occurring in the daily

lives of its speakers. Herrero (2002) states that "[e]l lenguaje juvenil en definitiva, aparece

totalmente vinculado a las situaciones comunicativas en las que se manifiesta, situaciones

informales orales, propias del registro coloquial" (70). The fact that *cheli* belongs to this register

is manifested by the type of lexical items that comprise the *cheli* lexicon, and also by

morphological characteristics of *cheli* that are about to be described.

Having discussed the origins of the *cheli* lexicon, there are some notable morphological

and syntactic characteristics of the *cheli* sociolect. In terms of morphological elements of *cheli*,

several stand out. Casado Velarde (2002) mentions the prevalence of shortened words in youth

speech, specifying that these shortened words go beyond the 'traditional' ones such as "*auto,*

bici, cine, foto, mili, moto, tele, zoo, etc." to include uses such as "*depre*" (depression, depressed

– i.e. *estoy depre*), "*mani*" (*manifestación*), etc. (59). Other shortened words undergo a more

complex process in their formation which Casado Velarde (2002) attributes, once again, to the

influence of the language of delinquency on sociolects such as *cheli* (60). Some examples of

---

[3] From http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NISv4pWxrFo.

36

these terms include: "*gasofa*" (gasoline), "*sudaca*" (sudamericano), or "*munipa*" (guardia municipal) (60). Another morphological trait of *cheli* consists of the use of affixes, especially the suffixes *–ata, -ota,* and *–eta* (Casado Velarde 2002: 58). Examples of words to which these suffixes are often affixed include: "*bocata*" (bocadillo), "*drogata*" (drogadicto), "*pasota*" ("persona que permanece indiferente o inactiva"), etc. (58). One blogger, in an attempt to describe *cheli* for outsiders in "Guía cheli para el personal", provides instructions on how to navigate the *cheli* lifestyle. Part of the instructions state:

> Que sales por la noche de baretos. El sufijo –et@ para todo, véanse los ejemplos pafeto o buseto. A saco tus colegas y tú. La peña, tu basca. Le privas a saco y te pones de birra, o séase, cerveza, hasta las orejas.

> Loose Translation: Que sales por la noche de bares. El sufijo –et@ para todo, véanse los ejemplos "pafeto" (bar, pub) o "buseto" (autobús). A tope tus amigos y tú. La peña, tu gente. Bebes sin límites y te pones de cerveza hasta las orejas.

This quote demonstrates the speaker's consciousness of the rules of *cheli* and of the linguistic resources involved in speaking it. Speakers of *cheli* seem to be aware of the lexical and morphological characteristics of their variety in contrast to the norm. Speakers may not, however, be as aware of the syntactic characteristics.

In terms of syntax, Herrero's (2002) study, using as a corpus the language of graphic novels with youth protagonists speaking colloquially, uncovers several salient syntactic traits. First, Herrero (2002) notes the prevalence of interjectional utterances as a

> vehículo de la subjetividad o estado emocional del hablante, ligados a la función expresiva (*¡Coño!, ¡Joder!, ¡Mecagüen la puta!, ¡La hostia!, ¡A tomar por culo!, ¡No te jode!...)* o, en menor medida, como claros exponentes de función apelativa (*¡Venga!, ¡Vamos!, ¡Anda!...)* o fática (el abuso de ciertos tacos como meros apoyos comunicativos o reflejos espontáneos: *¡Joder!, ¡La hostia!*) (73).

Herrero (2002) later notes that, in less informal situations, these words are often replaced with euphemisms "para atenuar sus connotaciones" (74). This reflects the consciousness that young

speakers have of their use of a non-standard variety, and of their ability to adapt their speech to match the register of each given situation.

Among the various verb-related syntactic characteristics of *cheli,* Herrero (2002) notes the heightened presence of direct appellative utterances, as in the case of unmitigated imperatives "sin formas de cortesía que atenúen la imposición" such as "¡*Cállate* de una puta vez!" or "¡Joer! ¡*Párate* ya y espérame!" (76). Herrero (2002) also refers to differences in the structure of verb phrases, which are characterized by changes in the ways in which verbs are used (77). Herrero (2002) makes several observations about changes to verb phrases in the youth sociolect. One of the first observations is the presence of verbs that in standard language are intransitive, but that in the youth sociolect are transitive, such as *currar*: "Ese se *curra el bar* a tope", or "Será como sea, pero se *ha currao lo de los permisos* mogollón" (Herrero 2002: 77). In these examples, the verb *currar* takes a direct object, acting as a transitive verb. This usage of currar is not normally found in the speech of non-*cheli* speakers, who would use the verb in statements such as "Ella *curra* doce horas al día en el bar" without transitivization. Another of Herrero's (2002) observations involves verbs that, in the standard variety, are transitive but acquire intransitivity in the youth sociolect. Some examples of such verbs follow: *abrirse* (in this sense, meaning *to leave*), for example, "¿Qué te pasó anoche, que *te abriste* sin decir ni adios?", *pillar* (in this sense, meaning *to acquire drugs*), for example, "¡Tú es que siempre vas de gorrón! Oye, si no *has pillado*, no es mi problema, pero a mí no me pidas" (78). Herrero (2002) adds that it is also important to note the inclusion of the reflexive morpheme *se* to many verbs which leads to a change of meaning but also contributes to the intransitivization of the structure (79). According to Herrero, this occurs with verbs such as *apalancarse* (to stand still or quiet)*, atacarse* (to get nervous or to worry)*, cocerse* (to get drunk)*, colgarse* (to become intoxicated with drugs or

alcohol)*, engancharse* (to become addicted to drugs)*,* and *enrollarse* (to have sexual or romantic relations with someone) (79). Herrero (2002) mentions other syntactic features of *cheli,* such as the loss of the preposition *de* in utterances such as "¿Que te lo ha preguntado *el cara pavo* ese?" (86), which would be 'cara de pavo' for non-*cheli* speakers, or the commonality of fragments in the case of utterances such as "*¡Siete talegos un concierto de una hora!*" (75). This brief description of some of the syntactic traits associated with the youth sociolect in urban Spain is by no means all-encompassing. For purposes of this study, however, it is far more important to focus on the marked difference in the use of pronouns of address between *cheli* speakers and speaker of the standard variety. This key difference will be discussed in depth in the next chapter, and the methodology of the current study will be described.

CHAPTER 5

THE ROLE OF CHELI IN THE EXPANSION OF SOLIDARY *TÚ*

Multiple studies have shown a considerable difference between peninsular use of these pronouns, and use in the rest of the Spanish-speaking world (Braun 1988), (Jaramillo 1995), (Marín 1972), (Ringer Uber 1985), (Sole 1978). In chapter 3, which discussed the social history of Spain, the social factors concerning urban Spanish youth since the end of the Franco era that contribute to this difference were explored. In this chapter, address form usage in the sociolect of Spain's youth will be discussed exhaustively, with a focus on identifying the social factors motivating what has already been identified by numerous studies as a definite shift still in progress. In addition, I will describe the current study, the methods used, and the type of data to be analyzed.

As was demonstrated earlier in this study, the expansion of the solidarity domain amongst Spanish youth and consequent increased frequency of use of *tú* has been documented extensively. Since *cheli* has been inexorably linked to youth culture, and, in Madrid, has become one of the very badges of youth identity, it can be concluded that the shift in address form choice will occur amongst speakers of *cheli*. However, in this section it will be argued that *cheli* itself contributed to this expansion of the realm of solidarity, since its explosion in the post-Franco years occurred at the same time as a host of social circumstances in Spain both contributed to the adoption of *cheli* by young speakers and to the expansion of the solidarity domain, as well as to the influence of youth culture on society as a whole. This argument will be explained, along

with several theories as to the motivation behind the shift to almost exclusive use of *tú* by urban

cheli-speaking Spanish youth.

Past studies have demonstrated that usage of the familiar pronoun *tú* is far more prevalent

in peninsular Spanish than in any other area of the Spanish-speaking world (Molina 2002),

(Braun 1988), (Hickey 2005). This does not preclude the fact that there is a shift in progress

throughout the language. In fact, in reference to the shift known to be taking place in the context

of the Spanish language in general, Molina (2002) states that:

> se elaboran dos hipótesis, ampliamente corroboradas para el español general, según las
> cuales (a) se está produciendo un desplazamiento de ejes en beneficio de la solidaridad o
> simetría y en detrimento del poder o asimetría; al mismo tiempo (b) se detecta en el eje
> de la solidaridad un avance del uso recíproco del pronombre de intimidad (*tú*) superior al
> del pronombre recíproco de formalidad (*usted*) (98).

Therefore, in Spain, the generalized shift seems to occur towards solidarity and away from the

asymmetrical power dynamic, and simultaneously, within the realm of solidarity, *tú* is

increasingly becoming the pronoun of choice. In short, non-reciprocal uses of *usted* are

becoming scarce while use of mutual *tú* is, for some social groups and especially for urban

youth, becoming the norm. That this is a current phenomenon throughout the Spanish-speaking

world seems undeniable. What is remarkable about Peninsular Spanish with respect to the rest of

the Spanish-speaking world is the already established increased comparative frequency of use of

tú. With the goal of exploring the reasons for the acceleration of the shift amongst peninsular

Spanish speakers, especially amongst Spain's youth, the social factors affecting the protagonist

generations of this shift have been explored in this paper. In the following paragraphs those

factors will be analyzed and a theory constructed as to how they influenced the shift toward use

of solidary *tú* amongst young peninsular speakers.

It was previously stated that economic conditions and high rates of unemployment have led to a protracted period of transition from youth to adulthood. Many young people in Spain do not achieve financial independence or leave the parental home until their late twenties or even the age of thirty. This fact, in sheer demographic terms, increases the number of people in Spain's population who would be considered youth (in turn increasing the significance of youth culture and language within Spanish society). It also gives these young speakers a longer period of opportunity in which to absorb and propagate linguistic change through individual social networks up through the larger youth community of use, resulting in the diffusion of change to society at large.

Evidence exists to support the claim that the shift toward solidary *tú* originated in the youth community of Madrid. Molina (2002) cites a survey-based study by Fox (1969) which concluded that "el empleo de *tú* se ve favorecido por los estudiantes más jóvenes, las mujeres, las clases sociales más altas y los nacidos en Madrid" (102). Molina (2002) carried out a later study, mimicking Fox's survey-based model, and comparing data from 1988 and 2000. Taking into account three of the above factors (born in Madrid, young student, and high social class), the author justifies the use of a sample consisting of university students on the following grounds:

> Se ha visto que la mayor permanencia de los jóvenes en la universidad está asociada con la tendencia al empleo del *tuteo*: la universidad actúa como irradiadora de la ideología igualitaria y, por ello, es verosímil que haya una mayor influencia de esta ideología en alumnos que han permanecido en ella. Este trabajo se apoya en la premisa de que la generación más joven con nivel cultural alto es uno de los grupos sociales que en la actualidad difunde este cambio lingüístico (100).

The surveys taken in 1988 and 2000 by Molina (2002) asked participants about their use of pronouns when addressing different family members and in a variety of contexts. The author concluded that there were appreciable differences between attitudes towards the pronouns of address over that 12-year span. Relationships with friends and family members increased

slightly in solidarity between 1988 and 2000, demonstrating that "la solidaridad en el uso pronominal ha continuado avanzando hasta consolidar el tuteo con los tíos y los abuelos" (105). Solidarity was also the normative criteria in relations between students and professors. Molina (2002) states that in 1988 "el 85% afirmaba vacilar en el uso pronominal hasta saber el trato que el profesor les iba a dar a ellos, con el fin de establecer una relación simétrica" (107), meaning that, despite the seeming power dynamic between professor and students, Spanish youth opt to use the symmetrical and solidary form of address whenever possible, and base their decision on the treatment given to them by the "authority figure." This is further evidence of the role of an egalitarian philosophy in the evolution of the selection of form of address.

Molina (2002) also mentions that the shift in pronoun use appears to be propelled by two different processes occurring simultaneously: "un 'tú popular', que se extiende desde los niveles sociales bajo o medio-bajo y convive con un 'tú aristocrático y de buen tono', difundido por la clase media alta o alta" (114). Solidary *tú* is permeating colloquial language from both ends of the social spectrum (i.e. through the university students mentioned in the previous paragraphs as well as through the urban working-class youth of Madrid), groups that both, to varying degrees are speakers of the youth sociolect, in this case, *cheli*. *Cheli*'s influence on the speech of Madrid (and subsequently other urban areas) has already been established in the previous chapter. It is no surprise then, that Molina (2002) confirms that the shift toward use of *tú* is urban in nature, and even more specifically, "Los datos muestran cómo en la comparación de Madrid capital con otros lugares de procedencia, la ciudad siempre presenta el sello de innovador" (114). This further demonstrates the relationship between "el habla de Madrid," which, in the case of the youth who Molina (2002) views as the "grupo difusor del tuteo y de las otras formas nominales

innovadoras que se extienden al resto de los niveles generacionales" (114), and the influence of *cheli* on that sociolect and, as a result, on pronoun use throughout the peninsula.

Thus, as young people in Spain's relationships with their family members and with society became more egalitarian, and as Spaniards remained members of the youth population for a longer period of time, the realms of solidary and reciprocity began to expand, and *tú* became the default pronoun of address, with *usted* reserved for relationships of great social distance (distance created by differences in age or in status as in the relationship between employee and superior, for example). *Usted* also gained other discourse functions which will be discussed later in this thesis, but which include an ability on the part of the speaker to alter the tone of an interaction through pronoun alternation, reflecting hostility, distance, apathy, etc. by shifting from *tú* to *usted* with the same interlocutor in a single interaction. The shift began in the most intimate relationships, and, through social networks and a ripple-type effect, expanded outward to encompass all but, as was mentioned before, the most socially distant interactions. Molina's (2002) assertions support this claim, as this author states:

> El cambio comienza por los dominios de mayor cercanía afectiva, como son las relaciones en el entorno familiar y de los amigos de la escuela: desde éstas ya progresivamente extendiéndose a otras de mayor distancia social, como el trato con desconocidos en la calle (115).

This statement is further supported by a quote cited by Molina (2002) from Alonso (1962), who wrote of personal experiences amongst Madrid university students during the 1920s. Alonso (take note that this writer is male) describes the panorama of pronoun usage of that era in the following way:

> Durante aquellos años de convivencia, jamás apeamos a nuestras pocas compañeras el respetuoso *usted*. Y así tratábamos también a algunos compañeros algo más viejos que nosotros. Y recuerdo otros amigos muy queridos de aquellas horas. Bastaba una pequeña diferencia – edad, categoría social, para mantener frenado el *tú* muchos años. A veces la amistad se hizo entrañable, y, sin embargo, no pasamos nunca del *usted*. Era que nos

encontrábamos en él agradablemente, que no sentíamos necesidad de cambio; más aún, que temíamos el cambio. Es verdad; ha habido amistades a las que las ha asesinado el primer *tú* (101).

This citation from Alonso provides evidence of the recentness of the shift, and of the fact that, less than one hundred years ago, a young Spaniard could use *usted* to address a person regarded as a friend, which today would be nearly unthinkable. This proves that the change has been radical and swift, and has resulted from the unique set of social factors that occurred during the latter half of the twentieth century. As was discussed earlier in this study, pronouns are an important manifestation of social identity, which Molina (2002) asserts in the following way: "se trata de una parte de la lengua estrechamente ligada al tipo de organización social propio de cada comunidad de habla, y, por lo tanto, dependiente de las modificaciones que impone el desarrollo histórico y social" (97). It can thus be concluded that the shift toward solidary and reciprocal *tú* is the result of the social and historical factors explained earlier in this study, including the expansion of *cheli*.

The surge of speakers of an inherently informal and colloquial sociolect as is *cheli*, the roots of which can be found in marginalized language, acted as a connection between the two separate yet connected processes identified by Molina (2002), that is the "*tú* popular" and the "*tú* aristocrático y de buen tono" mentioned before (114). *Cheli* and its young speakers acted as a connector of two parallel yet connected processes of linguistic change, as well as a link between disparate social classes, creating the unique set of circumstances that were so favorable to this change's acceleration. Both *cheli* and reciprocal *tú* pertain to the latter half of the twentieth century and the youth of that time period. Both phenomena are intricately related through the social circumstances that have been analyzed in this study and by their links to social identity and group solidarity. *Cheli*, with its inherent informality and the shared group mentality or

identity of its speakers was the ideal growth medium for the shift toward solidary and reciprocal *tú*. As a youth sociolect generalized throughout Madrid and eventually the urban areas of the peninsula, *cheli*'s influence in this, as well as other, linguistic changes is evident.

5.1 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

Having posited the above theory as to the role of *cheli* in the pronoun shift, the present study will be described in this section, beginning with its methodology. A precedent for use of theater as a source of linguistic data will be established using other studies as a point of reference. Finally, the results of our theater analysis will be discussed, providing examples which evidence the process of change as well as statistical analysis of the presence of pronouns within the works of theater selected.

The current study will use dialog from works of Spanish theater as a source of diachronic data to support the notion that *cheli* and the shift to solidary *tú* are related phenomena. As was explained earlier, theater is an important part of the history of *cheli*, so the study of the language of works of theater depicting *cheli* speakers is a fitting method of analysis of this sociolect. The use of dialog from theater as linguistic data has a precedent in the field and, most importantly, in studies concerning pronoun use and politeness. Navarro Gala (2004) benefits from the many different social classes portrayed in the work *Segunda Celestina* in her study of the use of *tú* and *vos* pronouns. She states that the playwright "se sirve de la cortesía ya no sólo para establecer jerarquías, expresar enfado o ironizar, sino para matizar el carácter moral o depravado de sus personajes e incluso para la más despiadada sátira" (213). By exploring the social and historical

context of the work and analyzing the characters' use of pronouns, Navarro Gala (2004) is able to use the language of the theater as an effective source of data.

Another similar study of pronouns using theater as linguistic data is Pedroviejo Esteruelas' (2004) study of address forms in two twentieth century Spanish plays. Pedroviejo Esteruelas uses the two works of theater, separated by fifty years, as diachronic data to document the change that occurred late in the twentieth century, not only in the use of pronouns, but in forms of address in general, such as nicknames, terms of endearment, etc. Though the author studies nominal forms of address, such as *mamá*, *hija mía*, *señora*, etc., what is of interest in his research design for purposes of the present study is the method of quantifying pronoun use in the plays.

Pedroviejo Esteruelas' (2004) study has a statistical component, as well as analysis of specific examples. Statistical analysis is divided by the act of the plays in which the pronouns occur, and pronoun use is classified according to dyad. Percentages are calculated for each different type of relationship. For example, Pedroviejo Esteruelas found that in Act I of Buero Vallejo's 1949 drama *Historia de una escalera*, 83.33% of parents addressed their children using *tú*, while 16.66% did so using *usted* (252). The relationship categories measured are: parent to child and child to parent, adult to adult, youth to youth, adult to youth, and youth to adult, with results for each of these dyads divided by the acts in the plays. This form of analysis is relevant because, in part, it will be adapted for use in the present study.

In this study, pronouns will be broken down into similar categories, based on relationship dyads, and percentages of use for *tú* and *usted* will be calculated. However, there will be no further subcategorization based on the acts of the plays, since the nature of the works of theater to be studied precludes this. For purposes of this study, all manifestations of address form choice

47

will be taken into account. In short, any way in which form of address is encoded will be

quantified, including instances of explicit pronouns *tú* and *usted* (in all grammatical functions,

i.e. as subject, object, etc.), verb morphology (i.e. *dígame* vs. *dime*), and possessive adjectives

(i.e. *su* coche vs. *tu* coche). This means that in a sentence such as *Vete a hablar con tu hermana*,

there are three tokens of *tú*, found in the verb *ve*, in the reflexive pronoun *te*, and in the

possessive *tu*.   By counting examples in this way, it is possible to quantify all personal deictic

references, regardless of explicit pronoun expression, thereby giving a more complete analysis of

the use of the forms of address. This method also helps to account for differences in writing

style between the playwrights, as some may tend to express more pronouns explicitly than

others. Since all second person singular deictic references are taken into account, these types of

stylistic differences do not affect the data. Like Pedroviejo Esteruelas (2004), the results were

categorized based on relationship dyads, using the following categories: Adult addressing Adult,

Youth addressing Youth, Adult addressing Youth, and Youth addressing Adult. In order to

establish the relative ages of the characters, the authors' descriptions were very useful, as some

even provided an approximate age for each character. When this was not provided, it was

possible to infer from the types of relationships (i.e. in a mother – son relationship, it is possible

to infer the youth of the son based on the age of the mother), and titles used (Don, Doña, or

Señor) indicate mature age, whereas a nickname such as *El chulillo* indicates youth. In general,

however, these inferences were not necessary, as the settings and descriptions provided in the

plays were highly indicative of the ages of the characters.

The works of theater selected for this study are of particular importance, since a large

component of the analysis stems from the sociolect spoken by the characters in the drama. It was

important to choose works that included young urban characters in a naturalistic environment,

and to choose authors known for their ability to capture colloquial language in literary dialog. The plays had to be realistic and urban in nature in order to capture the linguistic register of interest to the study. Part of the decision to include two of the three plays was based on the support of literary commentary that indicated that the language of those playwrights was known to be highly representative of the vernacular of their respective eras. For example, Ramos (1966) cites the commentary of Díez-Canedo who affirmed about Arniches, the author of the earliest play included in this study, that the playwright "sabía oír y amplificar. Un autor dramático, atento a la palabra del pueblo, es algo así como un altavoz que devuelve, agrandando, lo que recoge" (152). The talent of Alonso de Santos, the autor of the most recent play in the study, in representing the speech of Madrid in his works, has also been the subject of literary commentary. Medina Vicario (1994) states that, "Alonso de Santos se limita a reproducir el lenguaje de la calle (el que todavía no ha sido admitido por la Academia), el argot propio de la marginación" (56).

It was also important to choose works which were representative of different time periods, with the intention of capturing data from different phases or periods within the shift. As a result, one play was chosen from 1917, one from 1977, and one from 2002. It was expected that the two plays from the latter half of the century would yield similar results whereas the earlier play's results would differ significantly from the other two. The prediction was that *tú* would be most used in the latest play, with *usted* only occurring rarely. It was believed that the proportion of tokens of *tú* as compared to use of *usted* would be greatest in the later plays and lowest in the earliest play. In the next section, the results of the study will be presented and analyzed, along with some examples of particular interest in displaying the address form shift.

5.2 RESULTS

In this section, the data for each individual play will be presented and discussed briefly. Then, the trends in address form choice will be analyzed by comparing the data in a diachronic manner. Finally, the results will be analyzed as a whole, and some especially interesting examples will be presented.

Following chronological order, the first play to be discussed is *Del Madrid Castizo* (1917) by Arniches. Table 1 shows the quantitative results from this play. In *Del Madrid Castizo*, *tú* was used more frequently than was initially predicted. This is due, in part, to the fact that the majority of the relationships depicted in the play seem to be longstanding friendships or relationships with a strong basis in solidarity, such as the relationship between coworkers or frequent visitors to a certain bar or game room. One difficulty concerning resulting from the data analysis is the relatively low number of tokens for interactions between youth and adults. There were not as many cases of the two groups addressing each other directly as would have been desired. Even so, the results of the recorded interactions are of interest. The most notable result from this particular play can be found in the Adult-Youth and Youth-Adult dyads, in which adults addressed youth using *tú* 100% of the time, and youths addressed adults with *usted* 100% of the time. It is predicted that this will not be the case with the later plays, and that youths will address adults with *tú* with some frequency in the 1977 and 2001 works.

Table 1 - *Del Madrid Castizo* 1917

RELATIONSHIP DYAD	Form of address TÚ (%)	Form of address USTED (%)	Number of tokens
Adult to Adult	72.13	27.87	445
Youth to Youth	97.64	2.36	254
Adult to Youth	100	0	29
Youth to Adult	0	100	40

The second play chronologically is *Delirio del amor hostil o El barrio de Doña Benita* (1977) by Francisco Nieva. The results for this play (found in Table 2) were as expected. *Tú* was the most frequent form of address, but *usted* was still strongly represented in the youth addressing adult dyad. In this case, there was a smaller number of tokens for the adult addressing adult dyad than would have been expected. It is worthy of reiteration that *tú* was the form of address chosen in 100% of the youth to youth interactions from this play. This is the predicted result, however, *tú* should increase in frequency again in all dyads in the next play. It is also important to address the tokens of *usted* in the adult to youth dyad. All of those examples occurred in interactions in which an adult addressed a waiter, bartender, or store clerk. This type of relationship with a person in their professional capacity as member of a service industry is not considered one of solidarity, and the use of *usted* is not an aberration here. Most importantly, it should be taken into account when considering those tokens that these were not solidary or familiar interactions in which an adult addressed a youth using *usted*, which would not fit into the established pattern of form of address selection.

Table 2 - *Delirio del amor hostil* 1977

RELATIONSHIP DYAD	Form of address TÚ (%)	Form of address USTED (%)	Number of tokens
Adult to Adult	82.76	17.24	29
Youth to Youth	100	0	285
Adult to Youth	94.58	5.42	314
Youth to Adult	62.96	37.04	81

The results from the third play, *Cuadros de amor y humor, al fresco* (2001) by Alonso de Santos, are presented in Table 3. Here, once again there are tokens of adults addressing youth with *usted*, which, as in the previous play, are all examples of interactions between client and service employee. Once again, 100% of youth to youth interactions occurred using the solidary *tú* form of address. These results follow the predicted pattern of use for this time period. This

play was the only one in which there was a consistent number of tokens for each dyad. Interactions between youths and adults were well represented, as were interactions between members of each age subgroup.

Table 3 - *Cuadros de amor y humor, al fresco* **2001**

RELATIONSHIP DYAD	Form of address TÚ (%)	Form of address USTED (%)	Number of tokens
Adult to Adult	89.53	10.46	478
Youth to Youth	100	0	470
Adult to Youth	96.06	3.94	127
Youth to Adult	74.24	25.76	132

Tables 4 and 5 (on the following page) show the change over time in use of each form of address. The diachronic data for *tú* reflects exactly what was expected. Usage of *tú* increased constantly across all four dyads, taking into account the fact that the examples of interactions in which adults addressed young service employees using *usted* affected the results. Were it not for those tokens, the Adult to Youth dyad would have manifested 100% usage of *tú* in both the 1977 and 2001 data. Aside from that, a steady increase in usage of tú can be inferred from this data in all relationships. As expected, however, frequency of *tú* is highest in the Youth-Youth dyad, which supports the claim that this shift began and took place amongst young urban speakers, eventually affecting older speakers, as evidenced by this data.

Table 4 - Combined Results for TÚ (%)

RELATIONSHIP DYAD	1917	1977	2001
Adult to Adult	72.13	82.76	89.53
Youth to Youth	97.64	100	100
Adult to Youth	100	94.58	96.06
Youth to Adult	0	62.96	74.24

Table 5 - Combined Results for USTED (%)

RELATIONSHIP DYAD	1917	1977	2001
Adult to Adult	27.87	17.24	10.46
Youth to Youth	2.36	0	0
Adult to Youth	0	5.42	3.94
Youth to Adult	100	37.04	25.76

Naturally, as usage of *tú* steadily increased in all dyads, the frequency of *usted* decreased. As was expected, in the earliest play, *usted* was still frequently chosen amongst adult speakers, and was the only choice for youths when addressing adults. The data shows that, by 1977, youth were already addressing adults using *tú* much more frequently, and this frequency increased again between 1977 and 2001. The change was far less pronounced in the adult to youth dyad, which was also expected, since even in the earliest data, adults were already using *tú* to address youths, though this was not a solidary *tú*, but rather, an asymmetrical *tú*, not always reciprocated by the young speaker, an argument that, again, is supported by the data. It is likely, however, that even the nature of this *tú* has become more solidary over time, especially since the 1977 and 2001 data show that some adults do reserve use of *usted* for situations in which they address a non-solidary youth such as a waiter or store clerk.

The results of this study point to an evolution not only of the types of relationships encompassed by the solidarity dynamic, but of the pragmatic function of the address forms as well. In a retrospective study of address forms in Portugal, Oliveira (2005) argues that address form choice occurs on two planes. The first plane is established by "social convention" and the second plane is "negotiated" by speakers (317). Based on Oliveira's analysis, interactions between speakers are initially established (at first meeting) based on the norms dictated by social convention, in predetermined patterns (reciprocal or non-reciprocal use of *V* pronouns based on the social statuses of the interlocutors). Later, according to Oliveira (2005), "[e]ach

interpersonal contact is a moment of negotiation in which speakers decide to maintain the pattern previously established or negotiate other forms reflecting the relationships that they feel they have or that one of the other wished to establish" (317). In this second stage, "the address form(s) selected express the will of the informants and not simply conventions which are socially determined" (317).

The two stages of interaction observed by Oliveira (2005) are highly relevant to the results of the present study. Whereas Oliveira's (2005) analysis applies to individual relationships and interactions, for purposes of this study, a similar idea can be used as a framework for analysis of the overall situation of address form choice in Spain. Before the present day, as discussed by Brown and Gilman (1960), address form choice was based on a rigid system determined primarily by factors pertaining to power and social status. In this initial stage, the pronouns of address have no pragmatic function and are like Oliveira's (2005) social conventions. As change began to take place and the solidarity dynamic began to expand, the pronouns of address gained a pragmatic function in that they could be manipulated by speakers to convey meaning. The possibility of alternation as a result of discourse effects can be interpreted as a new linguistic ability of speakers to convey a new kind of meaning through their pronoun choices. This type of manipulation is illustrated in the examples which will now be described.

In the first example, from the 2001 play by Alonso de Santos, an old man angrily demands that a waiter prepare him a drink, when the bartender is in fact attempting to close the establishment for the night. The old man, at first rude and demanding, addresses the young man using *tú*:

(1)   VIEJO: (Al camarero, que está barriendo en un lateral) ¡<u>Oye</u>, <u>tú</u>, <u>pon</u>nos otra copa!" (61).

Later, when his friend has left him and the old man has become lonely and depressed, he begs

the same waiter for the time:

(2)   VIEJO: <u>Oiga</u>, camarero, por favor ¿<u>Tendría</u> la amabilidad de decirme la hora que
             es? (66).

When the old man is in need of assistance, he manipulates his choice of form of address in order

to gain the sympathy of the waiter, whom he had previously treated so rudely. This is achieved

by displaying deference through use of *usted.*

The Alonso de Santos (2001) play contains another such example of speaker ability to

manipulate address form choice and the subsequent effect on social interactions. Two

uncomfortably pregnant women argue in the doctor's waiting room as to which of them is to see

the doctor first. One is slightly older than the other, and the younger woman begins the

conversation by using a polite and distant *usted*, which the older woman does not reciprocate.

As the argument becomes heated, however, the younger woman (maintaining use of *usted*)

threatens that her male companion will arrive to settle the issue, and the older woman (who had

previously been addressing the younger with *tú* as they commiserated about the difficulties of

pregnancy) responds using *usted* as a way of creating distance, since the conversation has

become hostile. The use of *usted* in this case is in an almost aggressive manner:

(3)   Morena – Pero ¿quién es ese Tano que lo va a arreglar todo, si puede saberse? ¿<u>Su</u>
             marido? (136).

These examples demonstrate the speaker's power to consciously manipulate their choices of

address form in order to create or minimize distance, convey emotion such as aggression, and

alter the tone of an interaction.

It appears, however, that amongst youth in Spain, pronoun usage has reached a third stage. Although the pragmatic function gained in the second stage is maintained for most interactions and most speakers, it seems to have once again been lost in youth-youth interactions. Adults can continue to manipulate pronoun choice, as can youth with members of other age groups. Between youth speakers, however, the pragmatic function or "negotiated" function has given way to social convention. Youth speakers in Spain would not employ *usted* to create distance with another youth speaker – social convention dictates that *tú* is the only option in such interactions. For youth to youth interactions, rigid social convention does not allow for manipulation of pronoun usage based on discourse factors. This is evidenced by yet another example from the Alonso de Santos (2001) play in which youth speakers, unlike those in the previous examples from the same play, do not manipulate form of address during a conflictual interaction. This example will be explained in the following paragraph.

In this interaction, three young women described by the author as "punkis" discuss the rules of life in the building they inhabit, which is a community of Okupas (most akin to the term 'squatters' in English). Juanita, who is new to life in the Okupa community, has reservations about sharing her husband with La Rizos, who, accompanied by her friend, Pili, argues with Juanita. Juanita is also disgusted by the idea of having to share intimate space with a man other than her husband. She approaches the other two girls, at first, appealing for them to help her avoid these unpleasant situations. The conversation becomes an argument, however, as the other two young women become belligerent towards Juanita. Even as the argument escalates, *usted* is never used to create distance or to show deference as it was in the two previous examples cited from the same play. Since the interlocutors are all young, the manipulation of address form is not a linguistic resource that is available to them, despite the severity of the argument. The

following excerpt shows the tone of their interaction, and the fact that use of *tú* is maintained throughout:

(4)   JUANITA – Ya, pero es que…verás, no sé cómo decír<u>te</u>lo. A mí, Ángel, además de ser
                el que más me gusta es que es…mi marido.
        PILI - ¿El marido de quién?
        JUANITA – Mío. Que estamos casados. Nos vinimos aquí de okupas porque nos echaron
                del piso por no pagar la hipoteca, pero yo no sabía que le iba a tener que sortear.
        PILI - ¡Ah!, pues <u>te</u> <u>aguantas</u>. No haber venido. No te jode la pringada esta con la que me
                salta ahora. ¡Casados! ¿Y tenéis papeles y todo?
        JUANITA – Claro. ¿No <u>te</u> he dicho que es mi marido? Yo trabajaba en una oficina. Y él
                en una fábrica. Pero nos quedamos los dos en el paro.
        PILI - ¿Nos <u>vas</u> a contar ahora <u>tu</u> vida, guapa? Para eso me compro una televisión, como
                mi madre, que le encantan las horteradas (126-27).

The conversation continues to escalate until finally, enraged by Juanita's outrageous suggestion that she be allowed to stay with her husband, Pili and La Rizos depart angrily saying:

(5)   LA RIZOS - ¿No me he aguantado yo cuando me ha tocado el Gordo o el Manteca? Si
                <u>vas</u> a salir con mío, tuyo, o rollos de esos, a mí ni me <u>hables</u>.
        PILI – Nosotras sólo nos enrollamos con gente legal, no con gente mierda como mis
                padres. "¡Mi marido, mi marido…!" Será gilipollas…(128).

In other such conflictive interactions between members of different dyads, the same author showed characters manipulating form of address to convey pragmatic meaning. In this case, however, since all the interlocutors are youth speakers, that linguistic resource is not ever used for the interaction, supporting the assertion that interactions between youth have lost the pragmatic functions previously gained. It seems that youths reserve *usted* for a very limited type of conversational situation and is usually determined by social convention, such as with persons of very advanced age or with non-solidary superiors in the workplace. The circumstances that would permit usage of *usted* between youth speakers are very rare if they exist at all. The advancement of solidary *tú* amongst youth speakers has greatly reduced their usage of *usted* when interacting with members of older dyads, and has essentially eliminated it within the

youth-youth dyad, as was demonstrated with the preceding examples from the Alonso de Santos play.

There are several interesting examples from the texts which illustrate not only the shift in address form choice through minimal pair type comparisons. The minimal pair examples occur in such similar circumstances in terms of the characters present and the setting that it is possible to analyze the differences between the interactions at each time period. For example, in the 1917 Arniches play, two elderly female neighbors address each other using *usted*:

(6)   Señá Librada – Hija, <u>paece</u> <u>usté</u> tonta. Esa que pide de luto, con manto largo, que lleva
                la cara tapá, que paece que la sale la voz de una cisterna.
        Señá Justa - ¡Ah, sí!...¿Y ésa <u>dice</u> <u>usté</u> que saca? (55).

In a similar interaction in the 2001 play by Alonso de Santos, two elderly female neighbors address each other using *tú*:

(7)   CARMINA: ¡Y <u>tú</u> más! <u>Tienes</u> noventa años, así que me <u>llevas</u> uno, que lo vi en <u>tus</u>
                papeles.
        ISA: Están equivocados. Nací en 1910, para que <u>te</u> <u>enteres</u>. Así que ahora tengo…(165).

This example shows the change in behavior in form of address selection amongst elderly female neighbors between 1917 and 2001. It is interesting to note that the topics of both of these conversations, as well as the tone, seem to indicate a high degree of solidarity between the characters. Even so, in the 1917 play, despite the playful insults and banter that passes between them, the neighbors address each other using *usted*.

There were very few cases of asymmetrical address form usage, and nearly all of them occurred in contexts in which a person in a professional capacity offered a service to a client or in which there was a difference in age between interlocutors. Since there was no evidence of interaction between members of distinct social classes, no conclusions can be drawn as to the effect that this factor would have had on form of address selection, though it is expected that it

would be only a minimal factor in only the earliest play, and not at all in later works. This

question, and others that surfaced as a result of this study, will be discussed along with the

conclusions in the next section.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In this paper the notion of form of address system and the importance of speakers'

choices in form of address have been discussed in depth. This notion was also related to

politeness, as form of address choice can affect the positive and negative face of interlocutors, as

well as set the tone for their interactions and even their relationships. Previous studies showed

that the current situation in Spain is different in the rest of the Spanish-speaking context in that

the realm of solidarity, that is, the types of relationships and/or situations in which it is

appropriate to use a solidary *tú* form of address, has expanded greatly, especially during the latter

half of the twentieth century. Though this expansion seems to be a generalized phenomenon

throughout the language, the process of shifting toward usage of solidary *tú* is much more

advanced in Spain than anywhere else, as was discussed in Chapter 2 and supported by studies

such as Solé (1978), Ringer Uber (1985), Torrejón (1991), and Pedroviejo Esteruelas (2004).

The motivations for this difference were discussed, including an analysis of the social,

political, and economic conditions that were favorable to this change, and that were unique to

Spain. The advent of mass communications such as television and film allowed *cheli* to

proliferate amongst the youth community in ways not previously observed. The nature of *cheli*

as a colloquial and informal youth sociolect with roots in the language of marginalized cultures

along with its adoption by young urban speakers made it the ideal conductor for linguistic

solidarity in the form of *tú* to swiftly become the norm amongst Spanish youth. This broadened

solidarity domain was then extended via the media once again and via social networks to

60

speakers of other generations. Social factors such as a high unemployment rate caused youth to remain members of the youth population for a longer period of time, and therefore to have greater opportunity to affect and be effected by linguistic change. As a result, a relationship was established between *cheli* and the overall extension of the solidarity ethic amongst Spanish speakers, leading to the conclusions that not only are the two phenomena related, but they are also interdependent.

The current investigation opened the door for a large number of other future topics for investigation. It would be interesting to investigate similar processes of language change in other Spanish-speaking contexts, with particular emphasis on the process of normalization of marginalized sociolects such as *cheli*. Also of interest is the role of mass communications in the propagation of these sociolects, a phenomenon that can be observed across modern cultures. Another investigation would involve the role of pronouns specifically in the construction of social identity, and the power of choice in address form to shape relationships and interactions between interlocutors. These are just a few possible future areas of research that came up as a result of this study. There are certainly countless others, especially since *cheli* is relatively underinvestigated. It is almost necessary that linguists further document this sociolect as it continues to evolve, as the state of a language is highly indicative of the state of a people.

There were some limitations to the methodology of this study, all of which could be overcome with some modifications for purposes of future investigations. In using plays, it is difficult to find works that combine the desired setting and type of characters, while also providing sufficient examples of the usage in question. Theater, though a useful source of linguistic data, has the natural limitation of being an author's representation of speech. A diachronic study of a spoken corpus of *cheli* would be ideal, but a diachronic corpus of *cheli*

would be difficult, if not impossible to obtain. Over the course of this study, it was most difficult

to consistently isolate examples for each dyad, as the works were not always uniform in the

number of characters from each age group, importance of those characters (i.e. number of lines

in the dialog), or types of situations. In some plays it was difficult to find interactions between

the different age groups, because it seemed that the youths only interacted with each other, and

the adults the same way. This could be overcome by using a larger sample of plays, and perhaps

only counting tokens from scenes relevant to the usage being observed. Furthermore, since not

all speakers in the works were speakers of *cheli*, not all of the results can be clearly attributed to

use of that sociolect. This could be remedied, once again, through use of a spoken corpus of

cheli, or of interviews with a sample of speakers of *cheli* from a range of age groups.

Another possibility for modifying the investigation would be to use film instead of

theater. By using film, *cheli* could be focused on more directly. Playwrights are not truly able to

convey the intricacies of a type of speech due to the limitations of text as a medium. Other

features of *cheli* such as body language and phonetic traits could be more easily explored using

film, though the ideal method of investigation would be interviews and observations of human

subjects, preferably in Madrid or another urban area of Spain.

This study has merged the fields of sociolinguistics and sociology by focusing on historic

events and social factors as a means of analyzing linguistic change. Since language is indelibly

linked to its speakers and their circumstances, it is important to take these kinds of factors into

account when analyzing language, especially changes such as that of the expansion of the

solidarity dynamic in Spain and its links to the popularization of *cheli*. It has been shown that

extralinguistic factors are relevant to linguistic studies, and never more so than when analyzing

such strongly socially constructed variables as are the forms of address and the notion of

solidarity.

REFERENCES

Albelda Marco, Marta. (2004). Cortesía en diferentes situaciones comunicativas. La conversación colloquial y la entrevista sociológica semiformal, in Bravo, Diana and Briz, Antonio (eds.) Pragmática Sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español. Barcelona: Ariel.

Braun, Friederike. (1988). Terms of Address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, P. and Stephen Levinson. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity, in T.A. Sebeok (ed.), Style in Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 253-76

Calvo Buezas, Tomás. (1997). Valores en los jóvenes españoles, portugueses y latinoaméricanos: Problemas y esperanzas de los protagonistas del siglo XXI. Madrid: Ediciones Libertarias.

Casado Velarde, Manuel. (2002). Apectos morfológico y semánticos del lenguaje juvenil, in Rodríguez González, Félix (coord.) El lenguaje de los jóvenes. Barcelona: Ariel.

Delgado Ruiz, Manuel. (2002). Estética e infamia de la distinción al estigma en los marcajes culturales de los jóvenes urbanos, in Feixa, Carles, et al (eds.) Movimientos juveniles en la península ibérica: Graffitis, grifotas, okupas. Barcelona: Ariel.

Escandell-Vidal, Victoria. (1996). Introducción a la pragmática. Barcelona: Ariel.

Fox, Jeremy Donald. (1969). The Pronouns of Address in Spanish, in Actes du Xe Congrès Internacional des Linguistes (Bucharest, August 28th-September 2nd, 1967). Bucharest: Académie de République Socialiste de Roumanie, vol. 1, 685-693.

Freire, Espido. (2006). Mileuristas: Retrato de la generación de los mil euros. Barcelona: Ariel.

Herrero, Gemma. (2002) Aspectos sintácticos del lenguaje juvenil, in Rodríguez González, Félix (coord.) El lenguaje de los jóvenes. Barcelona: Ariel.

Hickey, Leo. (2005). Politeness in Spain: Thanks But No 'Thanks', in Hickey, Leo and Miranda Stewart (eds.) Politeness in Europe. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hurtado Calvo, Javier. (2004). En la prehistoria del Madrid castizo, in Ríos Carratalá, Juan A. (ed.) Estudios sobre Carlos Arniches. Alicante: Instituto de Cultura "Juan Gil-Albert".

Jaramillo, June A. (1995). Social variation in personal address etiquette. Hispanic Linguistics 6/7, 191-224.

Levinson, Stephen. (2003). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Maffesoli, Michel. (2002). Nomadismos juveniles, in Feixa, Carles, et al (eds.) Movimientos juveniles en la península ibérica: Graffitis, grifotas, okupas. Barcelona: Ariel.

Mangen, S.P. (2001). Spanish society after Franco. New York: Palgrave.

Marín, Diego. (1972). El uso de "tú" y "usted" en el español actual. Hispania 55(4), 904-908.

Medina Vicario, Miguel. (1994). Los géneros dramáticos en la obra teatral de José Luis Alonso de Santos. Madrid: Ediciones Libertarias, S.L.

Membrez, Nancy J. (1994). La (re)invención de Madrid en el teatro por horas: tipomanía y lenguaje, in Ríos Carratalá, Juan A. (ed.) Estudios sobre Carlos Arniches. Alicante: Instituto de Cultura "Juan Gil-Albert".

Milroy, L. (2001). Social networks, in Chambers, J., Trudgill, P. and Schilling-Estes, N. (eds) *Handbook of Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Molina, Isabel. (2002). Evolución de las fórmulas de tratamiento en la juventud, in Rodríguez González, Félix (coord.) El lenguaje de los jóvenes. Barcelona: Ariel.

Navarro Gala, Rosario. (2004). Formas de cortesía en la *Segunda Celestina*, in Bravo, Diana and Briz, Antonio (eds.) Pragmática Sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español. Barcelona: Ariel.

Oliveira, Sandi Michele. (2005). A Restrospective on address in Portugal (1982-2002): Rethinking power and solidarity. Journal of Historical Pragmatics 6(2), 307-323.

Pedroviejo Esteruelas, Juan Manuel. (2004). Formas de tratamiento en dos obras de teatro del siglo XX: *Historia de una escalera y Bajarse al moro*, in Bravo, Diana and Briz, Antonio (eds.) Pragmática Sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español. Barcelona: Ariel.

Penny, Ralph. (2002). A History of the Spanish Language, 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press.

Ramos Pérez, Vicente. (1966). Vida y teatro de Carlos Arniches. Madrid: Alfaguara.

Ringer Uber, Diane. (1985). The Dual Function of usted: Forms of address in Bogotá, Colombia.

Hispania 68(2), 388-392.

Robles Orozco, Gonzalo. (1986). La juventud de España, in España diez años después de Franco (1975-1985). Barcelona: Editorial Planeta.

Rodríguez González, Félix (coord.). (2002). Introducción, Lenguaje y contracultura juvenil, in El lenguaje de los jóvenes. Barcelona: Ariel.

Romaní Alfonso, Oriol. (2002). Grifotas, contraculturales, pastilleros, juventud, drogas y cambio social en España, in Feixa, Carles, et al (eds.) Movimientos juveniles en la península ibérica: Graffitis, grifotas, okupas. Barcelona: Ariel.

Rutter, Anne. (2006). The Selection of Forms of Address in Advertising.

Seco Reymundo, Manuel. (1970). Arniches y el habla de Madrid. Madrid: Ediciones Alfaguara.

Sole, Yolanda R. (1978). Sociocultural determinants of symmetrical and asymmetrical address forms in Spanish. Hispania 61(4), 940-949.

Stewart, Miranda. (1999). The Spanish language today. London: Routledge.

Torrejon, Alfredo. (1991). Formulas de tratamiento de segunda persona singular en el español de Chile. Hispania 74(4), 1068-1076.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1985). Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: Toward an Integration of Sociolinguistic and Social Theory. American Ethnologist 12/4. 738-748.