

Societal change and language history in Cervantes' *entremeses*: The status of the Golden Age *vos*

JEREMY KING

I. INTRODUCTION

IT IS COMMONLY RECOGNIZED in modern scholarship that the period in which the Spanish language as a whole experienced the greatest amount of change and variation was the Golden Age.¹ It is in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that we see not only a grand and expansive literary blossoming in Spain, but also the geographical expansion of the Spanish language to a new continent, where it begins to grow and flourish in a fashion parallel to the evolution taking place in the Peninsula. Because of the drastic changes that are seen in the language during this period, it is also in the Golden Age that the issue of appropriate levels of formality and deference in speech come to the forefront of the sociolinguistic arena.

One of the most recognizable ways in which the Spanish language showed evidence of increased variation in the post-medieval period was in its system of pronominal address. Historical documents bear witness to the fact that, during Spain's Renaissance, its inhabitants arrived at the collective realization that the forms of pro-

¹ For example, see Spaulding (167), among others. Note that I use the term 'Golden Age' (as well as 'Renaissance') to refer to the period often discussed by modern scholars as the 'Early Modern Period' in Spain's literary history. This period spanned from approximately 1554 to 1680.

nominal address used since the times of the Roman Empire were no longer adequate to express the increasingly complex social relationships that had developed by this time. In particular, the strengthening of a significant middle class², in contrast with the relatively weak and diminutive middle class in medieval Spain (Johnson Primorac 89), necessitated an expansion of the linguistic means by which one could address an interlocutor. As will be seen in subsequent sections, both modern and Renaissance scholars disagree widely on the distribution and uses of the distinct forms of address used in the Golden Age, particularly regarding the pronominal form *vos*. The large amount of variation among scholarly opinions in the literature calls for an increased number of comprehensive sociohistorical studies on this topic.

In the present paper, I will lay out a detailed analysis of Cervantes' *entremeses* found in the (1615) collection *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos, nunca representados* with a threefold purpose: (i) to examine the use of different pronominal forms of address attested to in these works; (ii) to analyze the pragmatic and sociolinguistic motivations behind the employment of each address pronoun within the context of Golden Age society; and (iii) to discuss the results of this study in relation to other similar investigations and their implications for sociological studies dealing with Renaissance Spain.

2. THE EARLY STAGES OF SPANISH ADDRESS THROUGH THE GOLDEN AGE

2.1. ADDRESS IN MEDIEVAL SPANISH

The Spanish language, having inherited its first and second person pronominal forms directly from Latin with few phonetic changes,

² I use this term loosely, and it should not necessarily be understood in terms of its modern connotations. As Cooley notes (15-17), it is difficult to speak of specific classes or social statuses in Golden Age Spain, as these were constantly shifting based on Spaniards' negotiation of ancient customs of personal honor and blood purity during this time period. Thus, for the purposes of this study, what I refer to as the "middle class," Moreno refers to as the "urban middle classes" (22) and Habermas refers to as the "bourgeoisie" were, in fact, working class citizens (i.e., neither nobility nor servants).

initially displayed the same simplicity in its system of pronominal address which had been seen in its predecessor: *tú* was used to address a single person with whom one was familiar, while *vos* continued to be used whenever addressing more than one person, and also when addressing a single individual with deference (Bentivoglio 178-79; Penny 123).

The straightforward nature of the pronominal address system of medieval Spanish is exemplified in the *Cantar de Mio Cid*, the great Spanish epic poem of the twelfth century. In large part, the address system in the *Cantar* conforms to the societal norms already in place. In any case in which more than one person is addressed, the long-standing plural *vos* is used. Rodrigo also uses this form when individually addressing his *cavalleros* and other Christian nobles, including royalty. In fact, whenever a speaker directs him/herself toward a single interlocutor, *vos* appears to be the unmarked address form in the poem, being used most commonly as a form of respect between nobles and spouses. Ribas calls this the “reciprocal *vos* between Christian nobles” and explains that it is “an affirmation of shared power or class” (iv). For example, King Alfonse in the *Cantar* is always addressed as *vos*. Rodrigo, likewise, is nearly always addressed with the deferential *vos*, even by the king and other nobles, likely in respect of his stature. The relationship between Rodrigo and his wife, Ximena, is also marked by a mutual *vos*, which Brown and Gilman refer to as an address pattern indicating *solidarity*. Interestingly, the form *vos* in the *Cantar*, as in other medieval works, is not only a form that indicates respect and reverence, but affection and tenderness among spouses and loved ones as well.

On the other hand, the address pronoun *tú* is much more marked in the *Cantar* and in nearly all cases is used to address those considered inferior in some way. For example, Rodrigo always calls all of his family members *vos*, with one exception: he uses *tú* with his nephew, Féllez Muñoz. Both Rodrigo and the King use *tú* with Muñoz Gustioz, the Rodrigo’s *criado*. It is generally believed (Johnson Primorac 273) that the reason these two receive less formal treatment

is a result of their age; they appear to be considerably younger than Rodrigo, and this would result in their being seen as having lower status in society.³

Though the *Cantar de mio Cid* does show occasional irregularity in address forms, it is clear that the bipartite *tú-vos* system that existed in Old Spanish is strongly exhibited in the epic work. Thus, at the time of the *Cid*, the second person Spanish address system is the same as it had been in Late Latin, and the same as the system of modern French:

	NON-DEFERENTIAL	DEFERENTIAL
singular	<i>tú</i>	<i>vos</i>
plural	<i>vos</i>	<i>vos</i>

Over time, however, the social usage of these pronouns became more and more complex. The distinction between *tú* and *vos* ceased to be determined solely by social status; as Spain edged out of its medieval period and into its Renaissance, the choice of which address term to use with an interlocutor came to involve a variety of factors such as age, sex, the desire to display politeness and even the particular message one wished to convey. Penny notes that in later Old Spanish, the singular *vos* had widened its range of reference and was not used to express deference as often. By the fifteenth century, he posits, the reference intended by this form had become so close to the informal value of *tú* that Spaniards began to experiment with new deferential forms of address (124).

Eberenz, however, disagrees with this conclusion. The depreciation of *vos* to near semantic equality with *tú*, he maintains, did not occur until 1600; the address form continued to be received well throughout the sixteenth century (114-15). Based on a literary analysis of the period, the author asserts that, throughout fifteenth cen-

3 One interesting exception to this general rule occurs when medieval personages address deities and saints. In these cases, *tú* is used nearly invariably. In opposition to the cases cited above, it would seem that these are cases that point out the intimate nature of *tú*.

ture Spain, *tú* and *vos* are the two fundamental forms of address used by both the common people and the nobility (90-112). People of the *estado llano*, he argues, used *vos* as an almost exclusive singular vocative form; the only situations in which one consistently heard *tú* were in dialogues involving servants, when parents spoke to children, and when one addressed him/herself to an animal or an inanimate object (90-94). The nobility, on the other hand, used *tú* more often, as they frequently addressed those of inferior status; in most other circumstances, including with their spouses, nobles commonly continued to utilize *vos* as well (95-96).

Regardless of which version of these events we choose to accept, new forms of address that expressed deference began to be seen more and more in the language of the late Middle Ages. Eberenz propounds that various nominative expressions were used as vocatives in the late Middle Ages; among these we find *señor* (often in combination with other terms delineating office or profession, such as *cura*, *alcayde*, and *arzobispo*), *Vuestra Realeza*, *Vuestra Magestad* (both used to address royalty), *Vuestra Paternidad*, *Vuestra Reverencia*, and *Vuestra Señoría* (102-05). Less formal forms such as *Tu Merced* are found in extant historical and literary documents, Penny maintains, but the form that found favor to express a higher degree of respect and formality was *Vuestra Merced*⁴ (and its analogical plural, *Vuestras Mercedes*) (124). These address forms all required third person verb forms (in both singular and plural), as well as the possessive *su(s)* (Eberenz 86). The singular *vos*, then, became used primarily as a second person singular pronoun with a certain degree of courteous or deferential quality, but one that was clearly inferior to that implied by *V.M.* In the plural, *vos* passed through a different type of evolution: although this form continued to be used as the sole plural pronoun of address throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it had been all but replaced by *vosotros*, a result of the synthesis of the analytic *vos otros*, well before the end of the medieval period (Candau de Cevallos 139; Lapesa, 259; Rini 209). According to Eberenz, these 'readjustments' of the scope and refer-

4 Hereafter, *V.M.*

ence of *vos* represented the single most important circumstance that led to the complete overhaul of the address system in the Spanish of the Middle Ages (83).

By the beginning of the Golden Age, then, the second person pronominal forms of address had developed into the following:

	NON-DEFERENTIAL	DEFERENTIAL
singular	<i>tú</i>	<i>vos / V.M.</i>
plural	<i>vosotros/as</i>	<i>Vuestras Mercedes</i>

2.2. ADDRESS IN GOLDEN AGE SPAIN

Resnick remarks that, beginning in the fifteenth century and continuing through the Golden Age, there was much indecision and vacillation in the selection of address pronouns and their corresponding verb forms (90). Much of the confusion that seems to have taken place during this period resulted from sociolinguistic changes in the manners and contexts in which the different second person pronouns were used. As was discussed in the previous section, *vos* was used in medieval Spain as a singular address form implying a certain level of deference; according to Resnick, it continued being used mainly in rural areas among family members and those who were considered inferior following this period (90). *Tú*, on the other hand, continued being used in urban areas and in upper-class society among family members and in intimate relationships, and also with servants and the like (Lapesa, 392; Resnick 91). There is general agreement in the literature that *tú* continued to be used much as it had been in the Middle Ages, as a form of address used to speak with individuals with whom one shared intimacy or familiarity, as well as with social inferiors. The singular address term that had begun to evolve during the late Middle Ages, *V.M.*, emerged as a full-fledged address form around the beginning of the sixteenth century, and was adopted from the beginning of its existence as the standard form of deferential address.

Although an exact date is not agreed upon in the literature, most scholars concur that, during the Golden Age in Spain, *vos* continued

to be a more and more marked address form in the singular. Porto Dapena holds that in the sixteenth century, *vos* was largely displaced by the polite form *V.M.*, which was still in transition (24). Spaulding adds that this slow exclusion of *vos* from the standard address system is clearly exhibited in Cervantes' Golden Age masterpiece *Don Quixote*. According to this author, the work demonstrates that by this point, *vos* had come to sound like "a slap on the cheek" and was reserved for servants and others considered inferior (167-68). Likewise, Pla Cárceles argues that as early as the beginning of the Golden Age, addressing someone as *vos* implied either an insult, an intimate familiarity with one's interlocutor or a social standing superior to that of the listener (245).

Castillo Mathieu, in an article on the usage of the principal address forms in the Golden Age in America, maintains that, despite the near-insulting nature of *vos* in the sixteenth century to which he attests in his study, this form still held a somewhat more lofty position in the social address hierarchy than *tú*. The author holds that later, in the seventeenth century, *vos* descended even further to the "más baja sima del desprestigio" (604-05). Lapesa agrees with this estimation, adding that in the Golden Age, *vos* had been so gravely devalued by the other singular forms that it was impolite to address someone using the form unless the person was considered inferior (392).

If these appraisals of pronominal usage in the Golden Age were accurate, one would expect to find very few examples of *tú* and even fewer of *vos* in the literature of the time, unless an author wished to portray the specific social circumstances of power and/or superiority through non-standard pronoun usage. In light of these strongly conclusive statements regarding the status of the Golden Age *vos* in particular, it is appropriate to add to the existing philological literature a close examination of a largely ignored genre of literature, namely the Golden Age's *género menor par excellence*, the short farce. It is my intention to examine the claims of both Renaissance grammarians, as well as those of modern linguists and philologists, in relation to the Renaissance system of address in Spanish, as well

as the societal implications of the address patterns observed. I will begin the following section with a brief discussion of the rationale behind the selection of the present corpus and its place in the existing philological literature.

3. PRONOMINAL ADDRESS IN CERVANTES' *ENTREMESES*

3.1. CORPUS FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

Within the field of historical philology, much recent discussion and debate has taken place regarding the appropriateness of use of distinct types of primary sources in diachronic investigations of language. The conclusion of many, if not most, scholars working in this field of study has been the recommendation of the employment of literary sources, and dramatic texts in particular. Culpeper and Kytö argue, for example, that the language utilized in dramatic texts approximates spoken registers more closely than any other type of historical document. Salmon agrees with this estimation, remarking that dramatic works are the only reliable source of authentic historical varieties of language, as the dialogue included in them is composed with the express purpose of appearing spontaneous when it is performed before an audience (265)⁵. Although some authors, such as Fontanella de Weinberg, present the opposing viewpoint that collections of letters and other types of non-literary documents represent more accurate accounts of historical varieties of language resembling speech due to the fact that their prototypes are not "rec-reaciones literarias" (8), it is clear that dramatic texts remain the preferred source of information for diachronic studies of language.

The reasons behind this preference become even more evident when one delves into the case of Golden Age primary sources. Although there has been a relative lack of studies analyzing the language of Renaissance Spain⁶, scholars appear to be in agreement

⁵ Although it is commonly acknowledged that the short farces in the current corpus were not performed prior to Cervantes' death, this detail carries no relevance for the purposes of this study, as the language itself and not the actual on-stage performance is what is discussed here.

⁶ Two of the more remarkable studies of which I am aware are those by

that Golden Age literary texts provide a rich source of information for the evaluation of authentic language. In an article dealing with Cervantes' *entremeses*, Rozenblat notes, for example, that "los críticos se han detenido en el arte con que Cervantes hace vivir a tipos y personajes de su tiempo, la imitación tan precisa del lenguaje hablado, el humorismo..." (129). The Renaissance short farce, in fact, and those composed by Cervantes in particular, is often credited with being the literary genre of its day which was most concerned with the accurate display of everyday language used by the lower classes of the time (Moreno 21-22; Pedroviejo Esteruelas par. 3). It would seem that Cervantes' interludes would be of great interest to scholars considering the varieties of language employed in Golden Age Spain.

Thus, although this genre has been all but ignored in linguistics studies, it is my belief that the short farce represents the ideal starting point for a study on Golden Age pronominal address. In this section I will examine the forms of address attested to in the *entremeses* of Cervantes found in the 1615 collection *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos, nunca representados*. In the following discussion, the examples introduced will be discussed in their conversational context within the larger context of the work in which they are found; in particular, I focus on the presence or absence of symmetry in address forms between two interlocutors, as well as their personal characteristics and the nature of their relationship, as the social implications of the address form patterns witnessed in these works is of primary interest for the present study. Finally, I discuss the results of the present investigation in comparison to those of other scholars and make suggestions for future study on this topic.

3.2. USES OF *TÚ*

As is acknowledged in most studies on interpersonal address in sixteenth and seventeenth century Spain, the pronominal form *tú* appears in fairly predictable contexts in Golden Age primary sources. As was mentioned in the previous section, the Golden Age *tú* was

Larson ("Visible") and Moreno ("Address"), both of which involve commentary on different aspects of Cervantes' *entremeses*.

directed, in general, to those the speaker considered to be either clearly inferior or intimately tied to him/her. The most obvious case of a power differential between two characters found in the present collection is that between master and servant. This type of relationship is found in several works in the corpus, and in nearly 100% of these cases, masters speak to their servants using *tú*. Consider the following example from “La guarda cuidadosa”:⁷

(1) AMO. ¿*Tienes* desseo de casarte, *Cristinica*?

CRISTINA. Si tengo.

AMO. Pues, *escoge*, destes dos que se *te* ofrecen, el que mas *te* agradare.

CRISTINA. Tengo verguença.

ELLA. No la *tengas*; porque el comer y el casar ha de ser a gusto proprio, y no a voluntad agena.

CRISTINA. *Vuessas mercedes*, que me *han* criado, me *daran* marido como me conuenga; aunque todavia quisiera escoger.

In this dialogue, Cristina is speaking with her master and mistress (referred to as ‘ella’ in the original text) regarding the possibility of Cristina marrying one of the two suitors who have been pursuing her. This scene takes place in front of several onlookers, including the two suitors themselves, and thus it is clear that both the master and mistress considered it to be socially appropriate to address Cristina as *tú*. It is also evident, however, that no disrespect is intended by the use of this address form: in the first line, the master uses the diminutive form of his *criada*’s name, *Cristinica*, as a vocative, which would indicate to a modern audience that theirs was a relationship involving significant affection. From the context of the conversation, it would appear that this use of the diminutive carried the same social connotation in Cervantes’ time that it does in

7 All corpus citations are taken from the (1948) edition of the *entremeses* by Griswold Morley. Note that all italicized lexical items within these citations serve to highlight the address pronoun used by a speaker. As Spanish is a null-subject language, many lexical forms appear without an overt corresponding pronoun.

modern dialects of the language. This dialogue also shows the only instance in “La guarda cuidadosa” in which Cristina addresses either of her *amos* with a pronominal address form; it is seen in the last line that she uses the plural *Vuessas Mercedes*⁸ to demonstrate respect to both of her interlocutors simultaneously. Although she does not use individual pronouns of address when speaking with either her master or mistress at any point in the play, it can be conjectured on the basis of this example that the form she would use with both her master and mistress would be *V.M.*, the analogical singular variant of the form she actually does use here.

This hypothesis is confirmed when additional cases of address in the corpus are examined. For instance, in “El rufián viudo, llamado Trampagos,” the servant of the title character addresses his master in exactly this fashion:

(2) VADEMECUM. Ya está en el antesala el jarro.

TRAMPAGOS. *Trayle.*

VADEMECUM. No tengo taça.

TRAMPAGOS. Ni Dios *te* la depare. ¿El cuerno de orinar no está estrenado? *Traele.* ¡Que *te* maldiga el cielo santo! Que *eres* bastante a deshonnar vn duque.

8 The form *Vuessas Mercedes* used by Cristina in (1) is a variant of the standardized *Vuestra(s) Merced(es)* that came into widespread use during the Golden Age, as discussed in section 2. During the Golden Age, this compound address form passed through what Lathrop calls “una evolución desgastada” (155). Spaulding maintains that, because of frequency of use, *V.M.* went through some twenty transformations, which were all in existence during the Golden Age; most of these forms, often exhibiting only minor phonetic differences, spanned from the barely altered *vuesa erced* to the nearly unrecognizable *océ* (167). As is well known, the changes in this form eventually led through the intermediate stages *voacé*, *vucé*, *vuced*, and *vusted*, and, with the loss of the initial *v* (which is retained in the abbreviation *Vd.*), gave birth to the modern form *usted* around the beginning of the seventeenth century (Lapesa 392; Resnick 90). Spaulding observes that the modern *usted* was not seen in any text before 1620 and had its second appearance in 1635 (167). The modern plural form, *ustedes*, came into use in this period as well as an analogy of its singular counterpart (Lathrop 155).

VADEMECUM. *Sossieguese*, que no ha falta de faltar copa, y aun copas, aunque sean de sombreros.

The nonreciprocal *tú—V.M.* address pattern between master and servant seen above in *La guarda cuidadosa* is repeated here, and in the rest of the corpus; it appears that, for the purpose of interpersonal address form selection, the sex of a servant was irrelevant in Renaissance Spain, as this pattern was held to universally. There are a number of difficulties with this analysis, however. First, the present corpus itself provides data contrary to this conclusion. The short farce “La cueva de Salamanca” shows an address pattern that does not conform to this general rule:

(3) CRISTINA. ¡O espejo del matrimonio! A fe que si todas las casadas quisiessen tanto a sus maridos como mi señora Leonarda quiere al suyo, que otro gallo les cantasse.

LEONARDA. *Entra*, Crisťinica, y *saca* mi manto, que quiero acompañar a *tu* señor hasta dexarle en el coche.

PANCRACIO. No, por mi amor; abraçadme, y quedaos, por vida mia. Crisťinica, *ten* cuenta de regalar a *tu* señora, que yo *te* mando vn calçado quando buelua, como *tu* le quisieres.

CRISTINA. *Vaya*, señor, y no *lleve* pena de mi señora, porque la pienso persuadir de manera a que nos holguemos, que no imagine en la falta que *vuessa merced* le ha de hazer.

LEONARDA. ¿Holgar yo? ¿Que bien *estàs* en la cuenta, niña! Porque, ausente de mi guŝto, no se hizieron los plazeres ni las glorias para mi; penas y dolores, si.

PANCRACIO. Ya no lo puedo sufrir. Quedad en paz, lumbre deŝtos ojos, los quales no veran cosa que les de plazer, hasta bolueros a ver.

[*Entrase Pancracio.*]

LEONARDA. ¡Allà daras, rayo, en casa de Ana Diaz! ¡Vayas y no bueluas! La yda del humo. ¡Por Dios, que esta vez no os han de valer vueŝtras valentias ni vueŝtros recatos!

CRISTINA. Mil veces temi que con *tus* estremos *auias* de estoruar su partida y nuestros contentos.

This lengthy dialogue shows a pattern distinct from that of the previous examples discussed here; although Cristina is always addressed as *tú* by both her master and mistress, she clearly speaks to her master, Pancracio, using *V.M.*, but returns a reciprocal *tú* to her mistress, Leonarda. These patterns continue throughout “La cueva de Salamanca” without variation. Upon an initial consideration of example (3), it might occur to the reader that Cristina feels free to address her mistress with a distinctly informal pronominal form due to the fact that her master has left the building, and that there is no longer any need for formality, as it is well-established in the play that the two women are confidantes. This pattern of the use of more formal variants of language in public situations than are normally witnessed in the private sphere is commonly seen in many situations of linguistic interaction in literary texts; King (*Formality*), for example, refers to this phenomenon as the *public façade*, and Habermas discusses at length the differences between the public and private spheres of life. In this case, however, this hypothesis is proven to be inaccurate when, later in the *entremés*, the reader finds Cristina and Leonarda together in their home not only with Pancracio, but also with an outsider, the student to whom Leonarda offers assistance, and Cristina continues to address her mistress as *tú* in a more public setting.

The possible distinction between public and private settings is not the only concern that arises as a result of the interaction in (3). The issue of class standing also comes to the forefront of the analysis of this example due to the fact that the address situations involving servants in the *entremeses* in the present corpus provide a different picture of Golden Age society than do other types of literary sources. For example, King (“Ceremonia”) demonstrates that the *comedias* of the time bear witness to the nearly universal mutual use of *tú* between upper class masters and their servants in Golden Age society. It can be postulated, then, that situations of address involving servants in this time period exhibit an example of what Labov

terms *linguistic insecurity*. In this case, it is clear that the upper-class citizens portrayed in the *comedias* are unconcerned with the forms of address their servants use with them, and thus allow intimate forms of address. This type of interactional situation would fall under the umbrella of Brown and Levinson's *positive politeness*, referring to a linguistic strategy designed to stimulate one's interlocutor to feel good by exhibiting areas of common ground and solidarity with him/her. On the other hand, the middle class masters portrayed in Cervantes' *entremeses* show their linguistic insecurity through their insistence on receiving deferential address forms. Although Cervantes clearly understood the distinction between social classes and what these differences implied for patterns of address in his time, it remains unclear why Cristina in example (3) is allowed to speak so informally with her mistress while the rest of the servants in the author's short farces use the standardized polite forms, even in cases such as (1) where there are clear indications of intimacy between these characters.

The second case in which a standardized use of *tú* is witnessed in the present corpus is in situations involving children. In the eight *entremeses* studied, only one example of a parent and child relationship is noted, that between Juan Castrado and Juana Castrada in "El retablo de las maravillas":

(4) JUAN. Señor autor, si puede, que no salgan figuras que nos alboroten. Y no lo digo por mi, sino por estas mochachas, que no les ha quedado gota de sangre en el cuerpo, de la ferocidad del toro.

CASTRADA. ¡Y como, padre! No pienso boluer en mi en tres dias. Ya me vi en sus cuernos, que los tiene agudos como vna lesna.

JUAN. No fueras tu mi hija, y no lo vieras. [...]

CASTRADA. ¿Oyes, amiga? Descubre el rostro, pues ves lo que te importa. ¡O, licor tan sabroso! *Cubrase*, padre; no *se moje*.

JUAN. Todos nos cubrimos, hija.

As is suggested by this example, the address situation between

these two personages is easily characterized: Juan always addresses his daughter as *tú*, and Juana always addresses her father as *V.M.* These results are at odds with those obtained by King (*Formality*) and Pedroviejo Eñteruelas (“Análisis”) in studies on Lope de Rueda’s *pasos*: these authors find that, although *V.M.* is used by children to address their parents in some cases, *vos* appears quite frequently in parent-child dialogues in the *pasos*. One possible reason for the discrepancy between the two authors’ depictions of this type of address pattern could be the ages of the different children involved: in Rueda’s “Las Aceitunas,” it is noted that Mencigüela is clearly an older child, of a sufficient age to help her parents with business matters, while Juana in “El retablo de las maravillas” appears to be a younger child from the dialogue she utters. Additionally, Lope de Rueda’s *pasos* were composed some five decades prior to Cervantes’ works discussed here, a significant enough lapse so as to allow for the evolution of this element of the language which had been in transition in this time period.

It must be kept in mind as well that the standard address pattern in each parent-child relationship is likely characterized by the level of intimacy the parent and child share. In “Las Aceitunas,” Mencigüela is addressed by her mother as *tú*, while her father uses *vos* to speak to her (King, *Formality* 168). In the present *entremés*, Juan Castrado clearly prefers using *tú* with his daughter. In either case, the address found between parents and children in the lower strata of society is generally nonreciprocal. Moreno concurs with this analysis, and states that the lack of mutual address in the parent-child relationship seen in “El retablo de las maravillas” has to do with the setting of the play (“the rural world”) as well as the social status of the characters involved (“Fathers in this play are rich countrymen and town authorities”) (28). While this may be true, it is potentially problematic to jump to such a conclusion, given that this is the only address situation between a parent and child in the collection of *entremeses* analyzed in the present study, as well as in Moreno’s, in addition to the fact that this pattern does not emerge in a sister genre from roughly the same time period, the *paso*.

The final case of the standardized use of *tú* noted in Cervantes' *entremeses* is that seen in conversations between female friends. There are a number of pairs of such friends found in the present corpus, all of which exhibit a reciprocal *tú-tú* address pattern. Cristina and Brígida in "El vizcaíno fingido," for example, exhibit a typical mutual *tú*:

(5) CRISTINA. ¡Jesus! ¿Que es lo que *traes*, amiga doña Brígida, que parece que *quieres* dar el alma a su Hazedor?

BRÍGIDA. ¡Doña Cristina amiga, *hazme ayre, rozíame* con vn poco de agua este rostro, que me muero, que me fino, que se me arranca el alma! ¡Dios sea conmigo! ¡Confession a toda priessa!

CRISTINA. ¿Que es esto? ¡Desdichada de mi! ¿No me *diras*, amiga, lo que *te* ha sucedido? ¿*Has* visto alguna mala vision? ¿*Hante* dado alguna mala nueua de que es muerta *tu* madre, o de que viene *tu* marido, ò *hante* robado *tus* joyas?

In addition to their standard use of *tú*, it should also be noted that Cristina and Brígida repeatedly use the nominal title *doña* when speaking to one another. This use of this title in such circumstances would seem strange in modern Spanish, as it appears to defeat the intimate purpose of the *tuteo*. On this issue, Moreno argues that "in the 16th century, the title {*don/doña*} was an attribute given by birth to a person from a particular social group, so it became part of the name whenever the interlocutors are interested in pointing out the social group to which the speaker belongs" (36). She later adds that Cristina and Brígida are prostitutes; if this is in fact the case, it seems quite odd that the two women address one another with the form *doña* + *first name*, as do the male characters in the play, if this title truly has to do with the womens' social standing and their place in the Court that Moreno posits (38).

The use of a mutual *tú* is also seen among pairs of younger female characters. Juana Castrada and Teresa Repolla in "El Retablo de las maravillas" exchange this familiar form as well:

(6) CASTRADA: Aquí *te puedes* sentar, Teresa Repolla amiga, que tendremos el retablo enfrente; y pues *sabes* las condiciones que han de tener los miradores del retablo, no *te descuydes*, que sería vna gran desgracia.

TERESA: Ya *sabes*, Iuana Castrada, que soy *tu* prima, y no digo mas. Tan cierto tuuiera yo el cielo como tengo cierto ver todo aquello que el retablo mostrare. Por el siglo de mi madre, que me sacasse los mismos ojos de mi cara si alguna desgracia me aconteciesse. ¡Bonita soy yo para esso!

CASTRADA: *Sossiegate*, prima, que toda la gente viene.

A reciprocal *tú-tú* pattern is also witnessed between the three women depicted in “El rufián viudo” (called La Repulida, La Pizpita and La Mostrenca in the play). Although these women appear in the short farce for the sole purpose of serving as possible love interests for the title character, Trampagos, the exact nature of the relationship between them is unclear. At one point in the play, Mostrenca calls Pizpita *amiga*, which leads the reader to believe that the women are more than casual acquaintances.

It is evident from the cases presented here that, in Golden Age society, it was more important for female friends to mutually express intimacy through their use of *tú* rather than to show deference through the use of more formal address formulas. In Brown and Levinson’s terms, the female characters’ standardized reciprocal use of *tú* in Cervantes’ interludes constitute a strategy of positive politeness. As will be seen in section 3.4, the same cannot be said of the relationships between the men of Renaissance Spain.

3.3. USES OF *V. M.*

In addition to the cases discussed in section 3.2 (those of servants addressing their masters and children addressing their parents), there are a small number of additional situations in which the form *V.M.* appears to be generalized in Cervantes’ *entremeses*. The first of these is seen in any dialogue in which a character speaks with an interlocutor of significantly higher power, normally by virtue of the

position that the interlocutor holds. In this type of situation, *V.M.* is used nearly without exception. The most obvious example of this type of address situation is seen in “El juez de los divorcios”; the judge who presides over divorce cases in this short farce holds power over his litigants, a fact his litigants recognize when addressing him:

(7) CIRUJANO. Por quatro causas bien bastantes vengo a pedir a *vue*ssa merced, señor juez, *haga* diuorcio entre mi y la señora Aldonça de Minjaca, mi muger, que està presente.

JUEZ. ¡Resoluto *venis!* *Dezid* las quatro causas.

In this dialogue, a man known only as ‘the surgeon’ explains to the judge that he is seeking a divorce from his wife, doña Minjaca. It is evident from this conversation that, even though the doctor, because of his level of education and experience in a professional field, would likely receive the respectful *V.M.* under most circumstances, in the courtroom he uses this form and receives *vos* from the judge in recognition of the judge’s status. This pattern is seen throughout “El juez de los divorcios:” all of the litigants in this play address the judge as *V.M.*, and regardless of their status, he returns the form *vos* to them.

A somewhat different scenario involving power relationships is presented in “El retablo de las maravillas,” however: in this short play, a number of characters of differing levels of power, including a governor, a mayor and a town alderman all take part in the dialogue. The governor in this *entremés* uses *V.M.* to speak to Juan Castrado, the alderman, which seems understandable, as Castrado holds a position of some power himself:

(8) GOBERNADOR. Señor regidor Iuan Castró, yo determino, debaxo de *su* buen parecer, que esta noche *se despose* la señora Juana Castrada, *su* hija, de quien yo soy padrino, y, en regozijo de la fiesta, quiero que el señor Montiel muestre en *vue*stra casa su retablo. JUAN. Eso tengo yo por seruir al señor gouernador, con cuyo parecer me conuengo, entablo y arrimo,

aunque aya otra cosa en contrario.

Moreno makes note of the patterns of address between the town authorities in “El retablo de las maravillas” and comments that there appears to be a hierarchy among those in power. Her basis for this judgment is the fact that, after addressing the alderman Juan Castrado as *V.M.*, the governor then switches to *vos* in the dialogue seen above in example (8) (30). There are two difficulties with Moreno’s analysis, however: first, the governor’s switch from *V.M.* to *vos* in (8) does not take place “at some point,” as she puts it, but rather it takes place in the same sentence as two uses of *V.M.* Although her estimation that the governor changes the form with which he addresses the alderman mid-sentence is a feasible explanation for what we see in the above dialogue, it is also grammatically possible that when the governor speaks of *vuestra casa*, he is referring to the house which Juan and his daughter Juana share. In other words, it is possible that the governor here switches from *V.M.* to the plural *vosotros* and not to the singular *vos*, thus speaking by implication to both Juan and his daughter. This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the possessive *vuestra* is used directly after the governor mentions Juana. Of course, this explanation also has its difficulties; since it is seen in (8) that the governor normally addresses Juan as *V.M.*, we would expect him to use the respectful plural address form *Vuestras Mercedes* when speaking to a group of which Juan Castrado is a member instead of the more informal *vosotros*. Still, it seems more logical to conclude that, instead of changing address forms mid-sentence, the governor simply changes the grammatical person to whom he is referring, particularly since both Juan and Juana are directly or indirectly addressed in his utterance.

The second issue that arises with Moreno’s analysis is that the above quoted dialogue is the only instance in “El retablo de las maravillas” in which the governor directly addresses the alderman; the three examples of direct address in this citation constitute the only dialogue between the two men. We cannot know whether or not Moreno’s contention regarding a hierarchy of power is actually the

case strictly based on their address forms because, although the governor directly addresses Juan Castrado as well as some of the other authority figures in the *entremés*, none of the other power figures directly address him at any point. In fact, the only other character who does employ a form of direct address with the governor is the quartermaster (*el furrier de compañías*); in their very brief interaction, he and the governor exchange a mutual *V.M.*:

(9) FURRIER. ¿Quien es aqui el señor gouernador?

GOBERNADOR. Yo soy. ¿Que manda *vuessa merced*?

FURRIER. Que luego al punto *mande* hazer aloxamiento para treynta hombres de armas que llegaran aqui dentro de media hora, y aun antes, que ya suena la trompeta. Y a Dios.

This example serves to demonstrate that *V.M.* was not only used in Golden Age Spain to speak to those in positions of significant power, but was also used in many cases between those who were not previously acquainted. This type of address situation arises in several of the plays in the present collection, and *V.M.* is used in the majority of the cases studied. A typical case of two strangers addressing one another for the first time is seen in “La guarda cuidadosa”:

(10) AMO. Galan, ¿que *quiere* o que *busca* a esta puerta?

SOLDADO. Quiero mas de lo que seria bueno, y busco lo que no hallo.

Pero ¿quien es *vuessa merced* que me lo pregunta?

AMO. Soy el dueño desta casa.

SOLDADO. ¿El amo de Crístinica?

AMO. El mismo.

SOLDADO. Pues *lleguese vuessa merced* a esta parte, y *tome* este emboltorio de papeles, y *aduierta* que ay dentro van las informaciones de mis seruios, con veynte y dos fees de veynte y dos generales debaxo de cuyos estandartes he seruido, amen de otras treynta y quatro de otros tantos maestros de campo que se han dignado de honrarme con ellas.

From this dialogue, it is evident that these two men have never met prior to this moment, and it is also clear that both instinctually feel that it is appropriate, and possibly even required by societal obligations, for them to exchange a mutual *V.M.* This reasoning partially explains the mutual *V.M.* seen in (9) as well. This pattern of address is common in many modern dialects of Spanish as well; a mutual *usted* is often used between two interlocutors who have just met and know little about the other's social status. This is the case in (10) even though the *amo* addresses the soldier as *galán*, which might sound odd to modern speakers of the language, as it appears to negate the formality implied by *usted*. In Golden Age Spain, however, this was clearly an acceptable combination of pronominal and nominal address forms. In (10), it is also seen that, even after each interlocutor has identified himself, the employment of *V.M.* continues, which implies that this was not only an address form to use when meeting someone for the first time, but also in situations requiring increased levels of formality.

3.4. USES OF *vos*

As has been discussed in previous sections, the pronominal form of address from this time period which has received the most attention in the scholarly literature is *vos*. Given that so many studies have arrived at conflicting conclusions regarding this pronoun, an in-depth discussion of the contribution the current corpus can make to the determination of the status of the Golden Age *vos* is thus warranted.

Possibly the most notable use of *vos* in the present corpus is that between spouses. This form is used by wives when speaking to their husbands nearly without exception, and it is also the preferred form used by husbands as well. Consider the following example from “El juez de los divorcios”:

- (11) D.^a GUIOMAR. ¡Pues no! ¿Y por que no me *aveys vos* de guardar a mi decoro y respeto, siendo tan buena como soy?
SOLDADO. *Ojá*, señora doña Guiomar. Aquí, delante de estos se-

ñores, *os* quiero dezir esto: ¿porque me *hazeis* cargo de que *sois* buena, estando *vos* obligada a serlo, por ser de tan buenos padres nacida, por ser christiana, y por lo que *deueys* a *vos* misma?

In this interaction, Doña Guiomar and her husband (“the Soldier”) argue about their reasons for wanting a divorce. As is the case with the rest of the couples in this play, these two characters exchange a mutual *vos*. It was noted earlier that some scholars posit that public communication is often more formal than that which takes place behind closed doors; since the dialogue in (11) takes place in a courtroom in front of a judge and several other witnesses, it is thus possibly subject to the effects of the *public façade* noted in section 3.2. It is therefore prudent to seek additional examples to confirm this finding. In (12), a partial restatement of (3) above, a further example of dialogue between spouses is seen, this time from “La cueva de Salamanca”:

(12) PANCRACIO. Mi angel, si *gustas* que me quede, no me mouerè de aqui mas que vna estatua.

LEONARDA. No, no, descanso mio; que mi gusto està en el *vuestro*, y por agora mas que *os vays* que no *os quedeys*, pues es *vuestra* honra la mia. [...] Entra, Cristinica, y saca mi manto, que quiero acompañar a tu señor hasta dexarle en el coche.

PANCRACIO. No, por mi amor; *abraçadme*, y *quedaos*, por vida mia.

The address pattern seen here is slightly different than that noted in “El juez de los divorcios”: in (12), Pancracio addresses his wife as *tú* but subsequently switches to *vos*, while Leonarda consistently responds with *vos*. A number of authors (Blas Arroyo 239-40; Brown and Gilman 273-76; Moreno 38-41; Placencia 171) have noted that, in situations involving heightened emotion or irony, address patterns in many languages shift and forms that are not normally used with a given interlocutor come into play. As Pancracio is preparing to leave on a trip in (12) and is comforting his wife, whom he believes to be

distraught over his departure, it is possible that his use of *tú* in this conversation is justified on these grounds.

However, it is seen that Pancraccio continues to switch between *tú* and *vos* when speaking to Leonarda throughout “La cueva de Salamanca,” while Leonarda uses *vos* with her husband without exception. This pattern is repeated in the *entremés* “El viejo celoso”: the elderly Cañizares switches between *tú* and *vos* with his wife Lorenza throughout this play, while the latter uses *vos* nearly exclusively with her husband. King (*Formality* 192) and Moreno (26-27) have previously argued that social status and/or socioeconomic class are of particular importance when considering the forms of address used between spouses in the Golden Age, as different social classes have different semantic rules for their usage. These authors conclude that a reciprocal *tú-tú* address pattern is common among the nobility, while middle-class couples tend to prefer a mutual *vos*, again demonstrating their linguistic insecurity. Notwithstanding these findings, it has been seen that the current corpus manifests a strong tendency for middle-class husbands to waver between these two address forms, even though middle-class wives appear to be resolute in their use of *vos*. As Cervantes’ husbands do not appear to have any specific pragmatic motivation behind their employment of one pronoun or the other, it can be concluded that the patterns witnessed in the *entremeses* are the result of the author’s awareness of a shifting paradigm in his time, to which the husband-wife relationship was particularly vulnerable.

A second widespread use of *vos* in the *entremeses* is that seen between male friends. This type of situation is perhaps best exemplified in the dialogues between Solórzano and his friend Quiñones in “El vizcaíno fingido”:

(13) QUIÑONES. Alto. Pues *vos* lo *quereys*, sea assi. Digo que yo *os* ayudare en todo quanto me *auveys* dicho, y sabre fingir también como *vos*, que no lo puedo mas encarecer. ¿Adonde *vays* agora?

SOLÓRZANO. Derecho en casa de la ninfa; y *vos* no *salgays* de casa,

que yo *os* llamarè a su tiempo.
 QUIÑONES. Alli estarè clauado esperando.

The reciprocal *vos* seen in (13) continues throughout the entire play; these male characters, although they make use of both *tú* and *V.M.* with other interlocutors, address one another exclusively with *vos*. Neither Cervantes nor his contemporaries vary from this pattern in many cases; a mutual *vos* between male friends has been witnessed in several different genres of Golden Age literature (King, “Ceremonia”).

It is evident from the *entremeses*, however, that the reciprocal *vos* was not only the standard form of address for use between two male friends in Golden Age society, but also between two men in general. In the short play “La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo,” the town authorities and candidates for alderman address one another as *vos* nearly exclusively, even in the midst of business dealings:

(14) PANDURO. Mil setencias ha dicho censorinas.

ALGARROBA. De Caton Censorino: bien ha dicho el regidor Panduro.

PANDURO. *Reprochadme.*

ALGARROBA. Su tiempo se vendra.

ESTORNUDO. Nunca acà venga. ¡Terrible inclinacion es, Algarroua, la *vuestra* en reprochar!

The only character in “La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo” that makes use of *V.M.* in business situations is the nitpicking mayor Algarroba. Speaking strictly of issues of characterization, it would be logical for Algarroba, who constantly reproaches and corrects the improper speech of others, to use ultra-polite forms of address in business situations. The address norm for the rest of the businessmen is a reciprocal *vos*.

The dialogue in examples (11)-(14), as well as the situation discussed in section 3.3 above in relation to “El retablo de las maravillas,” serve to highlight the multifaceted nature of *vos* in the Golden

Age. It is evident that this address pronoun served multiple purposes and was used in a wide variety of social and private situations, a number of which are witnessed in Cervantes' short farces.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The direct address system of the Spanish Golden Age, far from being straightforward, was a complicated sociological system involving multiple levels of complexity. By the beginning of this period, the appropriate determination of which address form to use in a given situation had become an increasingly complex task due to the existence of numerous confounding factors involving social change and development.

It can be deduced from the present corpus that, in some cases, the reasoning behind the choice of certain pronouns was nearly automatic. *Tú*, for instance, continued to be used much as it had been throughout the nation's medieval period, namely, with inferiors. The use of this form with children and servants in Cervantes' *entremeses*, then, should be no surprise to any scholar of Peninsular history. On the flip side, servants' employment of *V.M.* with their masters and children's use of this form with their parents are expected as well, given that this form came into being just prior to the Golden Age to express a sense of formality and deference that the previously existing forms had lost.

The Golden Age *vos* clearly presents us with the most sociologically intriguing case of pronominal address in the present corpus. Spouses' mutual employment of this form has inspired some confusion on the part of modern philologists, particularly considering the widespread view regarding the denigrating value of this pronoun in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁹ However, this confusion is easily resolved if we take into consideration that this form had been used between spouses for centuries in Spain and implied not only mutual respect but also affection for one's partner.¹⁰ It is tempting,

9 See section 2 for a detailed discussion of these scholarly opinions.

10 See section 2.1 regarding the use of this pronoun in medieval Spanish literature.

from a modern point of view, to associate the occasional use of *tú* on the part of husbands in the present corpus with increased levels of affection for their wives; among the working classes, however, this practice was not common, especially when we keep in mind that *vos* was the address form chosen to fulfill this function, not *tú*. It is more likely that this use of *tú*, as has been seen in its use with children, was intended to communicate a specific social structure to middle-class wives. This interpretation is much more in line with historians' view of Golden Age Spain as a male-dominated society in which women were significantly constrained and constantly reminded that their salvation depended upon their obedience and performance in the home (Barnes-Karol and Spadaccini 234-35).

In addition to the nearly exclusive use of *vos* between spouses, the reciprocal use of this form between men in business dealings during this period has been alternatively ignored or denied in modern criticism. Nevertheless, the present corpus bears witness to its standard employment in this type of social situation. As has been seen, Cervantes' *entremeses* also testify to a mutual use of this form in informal conversations between male friends in the Renaissance period. The distinction between the pronominal forms used by men and women with same-sex friends reflects an important theoretical point discussed in the pioneering study of Brown and Levinson on linguistic politeness: from these data, it is clear that in Golden Age Spain, it was more important for female friends to mutually express intimacy through their use of *tú*, whereas male friends used *vos* to show respect for one another as equals. In Brown and Levinson's terms, women's mutual use of *tú* in Cervantes' interludes was a strategy of positive politeness, while men's use of *vos* shows more attention to the negative face of their interlocutors. Once again, the factor of the sex of both speaker and interlocutor shows itself to be a significant determiner of the linguistic form that is employed.

From the preceding discussion, it is evident that the popularly expressed opinion that *vos* was an address form that, during the Golden Age, descended to "la más baja sima del desprestigio" (Castillo Mathieu 605), is not confirmed by Cervantes' *entremeses*.

Far from being a form that was used to insult, this pronoun was clearly well-received by a variety of interlocutors in nearly all social situations until at least the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Considering the specific and situationally required uses of *tú* and *V.M.* evidenced by this corpus, it is my contention that *vos* was the standard, unmarked form of pronominal address in Golden Age Spain and was appropriate for use whenever a significant power differential between two interlocutors was not at play. Moreover, *vos* appears to be a sort of neutral form of address between men during this time period, both in personal and professional relationships. The conclusion of Brown and Gilman that what they term the “power semantic” which required the use of nonreciprocal patterns of address was predominant in all of Europe until “well into the nineteenth century” (259) is therefore also shown to be inaccurate on the basis of these data. It is possible that the inapplicability of Brown and Gilman’s generalizations to Golden Age Spanish is related to the tripartite system of pronominal address that existed in Spain at this time (i.e., *tú-vos-V.M.*), rather than a bipartite system used by other European languages (*tu-vous* in French, for instance), although a discussion of this issue falls outside the scope of this paper.

Although the results of the present study must be confirmed by further research into the language of Golden Age Spain, particularly from the vantage point of distinct literary and non-literary corpora, it has been seen that Cervantes’ entremeses provide a rich source of naturalistic dialogue for use in studies on Renaissance Spanish. As a master of his art, Cervantes provided us with a unique view of the language used in his time. Although his short farces have been neglected in philological studies of language,

Cervantes’ diligence and attention to the minute details of interpersonal communication hold particular significance for modern theories of linguistics.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
jking@lsu.edu

Works Cited

- Barnes-Karol, Gwendolyn and Nicholas Spadaccini. "Sexuality, Marriage, and Power in Medieval and Early Modern Iberia." *Marriage and Sexuality in Medieval and Early Modern Iberia*. Ed. Eukene Lacarra Lanz. New York: Routledge, 2002. 233-45.
- Bentivoglio, Paola. "Spanish forms of address in the sixteenth century." *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 107. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2003.
- Blas Arroyo, José Luis. "Un ejercicio de sociolingüística interaccional: el caso de los pronombres de tratamiento en el español actual." *Verba: Anuario Galego de Filología* 22 (1995): 229-52.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- Brown, Roger W. and Albert Gilman. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." *Style in Language*. Ed. Thomas A. Sebok. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. 253-77.
- Candau de Cevallos, María del C. *Historia de la Lengua Española*. Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanística, 1985.
- Castillo Mathieu, Nicolás. "Testimonios del uso de 'Vuestra Merced', 'Vos', y 'Tú' en América (1500-1650)." *Thesaurus* 37 (1982): 602-44.
- Cooley, Jennifer. *Courtiers, Courtesans, Pícaros and Prostitutes: The Art and Artifice of Selling One's Self in Golden Age Spain*. New Orleans: UP of the South, 2002.
- Culpeper, Jonathan, and Merja Kytö. "Data in historical pragmatics: Spoken interaction (re)cast as writing." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1.2 (2000): 175-199.
- Eberenz, Rolf. *El español en el otoño de la edad media: sobre el artículo y los pronombres*. Madrid: Gredos, 2000.
- Fontanella de Weinberg, María Beatriz. "Fórmulas de tratamiento en el español americano (siglos XVI y XVII)." *El español en el Nuevo Mundo: estudios sobre historia lingüística hispanoamericana*. Washington: OEA, 1994.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger. 11th ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 2000.
- Johnson Primorac, Karen. "Tu, vos and vuestra merced: Social and Stylistic Variation in Medieval Spanish." Diss. U of Michigan, 1996.
- King, Jeremy. "Ceremonia y cortesía en la literatura del Siglo de Oro: un estudio de las formas de tratamiento en español." *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico*. Ed. Martin Hummel, Bettina Kluge and María Eugenia Vázquez Laslop. Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2008.
- . "Formality and Politeness in the Golden Age: A Study of Direct Address Patterns in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Spain." Diss. UC Santa Barbara, 2006.
- Labov, William. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 1972.

- Lapesa, Rafael. *Historia de la lengua española*. 9th ed. Madrid: Gredos, 1981.
- Larson, Catherine. "The Visible and the Hidden: Speech Act Theory and Cervantes's *El retablo de las maravillas*." *El arte nuevo de estudiar comedias: Literary Theory and Spanish Golden Age Drama*. Ed. Barbara Simerka. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1996. 52-65.
- Lathrop, Thomas A. *Curso de gramática histórica española*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1992.
- Moreno, María Cristobalina. "The address system in the Spanish of the Golden Age." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (2002): 15-47.
- Morley, S. Griswold. *The Interludes of Cervantes*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1948.
- Pla Cárceles, José. "La evolución del tratamiento 'Vuestra Merced'." *Revista de Filología Española* 10 (1923): 245-80.
- Pedroviejo Eñeruelas, Juan Manuel. "Análisis de las fórmulas de tratamiento en los pasos de Lope de Rueda." *Artifara* 3 (2003). 3 March 2006 <http://www.artifara.com/rivista3/tefti/lopederueda.asp>.
- Penny, Ralph. *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Placencia, María. "Address forms in Ecuadorian Spanish." *Hispanic Linguistics* 9.1 (1997): 165-202.
- Porto Dapena, José Álvaro. *Los pronombres*. Madrid: EDI-6, 1986.
- Resnick, Melvyn C. *Introducción a la historia de la lengua española*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP, 1981.
- Ribas, Marie Sheppard. "El sistema de tratamiento directo en el Poema de Mio Cid: usos generales y alternancia paradigmática." Diss. UC Santa Barbara, 1981.
- Rini, Joel. "The Rise and Fall of Old Spanish 'y'all': *vos todos* vs. *vos otros*." *Essays in Hispanic Linguistics Dedicated to Paul M. Lloyd*. Ed. Robert J. Blake, Diana L. Ranson and Roger Wright. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1999.
- Rozenblat, William. "¿Por qué escribió Cervantes 'El juez de los divorcios'?" *Anales Cervantinos* 12 (1973): 129-35.
- Salmon, Vivian. "Sentence structures in colloquial Shakespearian English." *A reader in the language of Shakespearian drama*. Ed. Vivian Salmon and Edwina Burness. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1987. 265-300.
- Spaulding, Robert K. *How Spanish Grew*. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1943.