

The Loss of Final Dental in Spanish Voseo Imperatives

Ana María Díaz Collazos

Ph.D. in Hispanic Linguistics

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Durango Adult Education Center of Colorado

University of Florida

Florida, United States

adiazcoll@gmail.com

Abstract

In modern Spanish, singular imperatives the vocalic final stress assignment is the morphological marker of familiar *vos*. Historically, these imperatives are marked with a *-d*. The loss of *-d* has been regarded as a pure phonetic reduction (De Souza, Menéndez Pidal, Penny) which morphologizes in the singular (Rini 1999). This paper provide 95 examples of *vos* imperatives from 1555 to 1858 in Hispanic America to show that *morphological distinction* of informality plays a role in the maintenance of *-d* until the 19th century, while *inverse standardization* triggers the definite loss of *-d* in all Hispanic American dialects, since the more prestigious form (with *-d*) is eliminated from a less prestigious address such as *vos*.

Keywords: *Voseo*, Imperative, Standardization, Spanish, Morphologization, Grammaticalization

The goal of this paper is to examine historical data from Spanish (1555-1828) to explore the loss of final dental in the *voseo* imperatives. The term *voseo* refers to the vernacular usage of *vos*, the second person singular, and its related morphology. The Spanish language has three second person pronouns in the singular: the respectful *usted*, and the

familiar *tú* and *vos*. *Usted* and *vos* prevail in the most part of Argentina, while the three pronouns are equally dynamic in the speech of Central America from Chiapas to northern Panamá, Chile, Bolivia, Paraguay, Arequipa (Perú), the western highland of Colombia, Zulia (Venezuela) and the Ecuadorian highland, there is a three-part system containing *usted*, *tú* and *vos* (see Benavides 2003, Carricaburo 1997, Fontanella 1999, and Rona 1960 for general overviews). Studies in Central American Spanish show that the *tuteo* (usage of the pronoun *tú* and related morphology) works as a neutral address, or an intermediate between the formal *usted* and the familiar *tú* (Castro 2000, Quintanilla 2009).

Spanish speakers use the *voseo* to express *confianza*, a cultural value entailing social closeness, trust, and confidence in a relationship (Covarrubias 2002, Fitch 1989). Beyond the *confianza* usage, the *voseo* has historically been also used to express authority to a person of inferior status. This authoritarian *voseo* occurs in the colonial period since the 16th century (García Gallarín 2000, Enguita Utrilla 1986, Ferrecio Podestá 1993, Fontanella 1994, Lapesa 2000a [1970], Maldonado 1998, Pedroviejo Esteruelas 2003, Quesada Pacheco 1998, among others).

Authority and *confianza* often overlap in addressing inferior family members, which has been widely documented in letters from the 16th century (Bentivoglio 2003, AUTHOR 2014, King 2006, Fontanella 1994, among others). The difference between both types of *voseo* stems from reciprocity (Brown & Gilman 1960): in a relationship based on *confianza*, both interlocutors treat each other through *voseo* in a reciprocal manner; in an unequal situation of power, the person in power may address the inferior using *voseo*, but not the opposite. The *voseo*, thus, is a useful resource to express strong feelings of anger, to belittle the hearer even in an egalitarian relationship. This has been called *voseo de enojo* or “anger *voseo*” (Castro 2000), as has been widely documented since the 16th century until today (Bentivoglio 2003, Castro 2000, AUTHOR 2010).

The *voseo* involves the usage of verbal conjugations in agreement with the pronoun. Spanish is a noun-drop language and the *voseo* is expressed through verbal endings. In present-day Spanish, *voseo* imperatives are marked by assigning stress to the final syllable, as presented in (#1):

(1) Singular imperatives in modern Spanish, regular conjugation *-ar/-er*

<i>amar</i>	<i>ama</i>	<i>amá</i>
/am-ár/	/ám-a/	/am-á/
love-INF	love-2S.IMP.tú	love-2S.IMP.vos
<i>comer</i>	<i>come</i>	<i>comé</i>
/com-ér/	/cóm-e/	/com-é/
eat-INF	eat-2S.IMP.tú	eat-2S.IMP.vos ¹

Stress assignment is the only morphological marking of *voseo* in conjugations ending in infinitives *-ar* or *-er*, when the verb stem does not undergo paradigmatic changes. In stem changing verbs from *-ar/-er* conjugations, the *voseo* imperatives are characterized by maintaining the form of the stem, in contrast with the *tuteo* imperatives where the stem varies, as illustrated in (#2):

(2) Singular imperatives in modern Spanish, irregular conjugations

<i>volver</i>	<i>vuelve</i>	<i>volvé</i>
/volv-er/	/vuelv-e/	/volv-é/
return-INF	return-2SG.IMP.tú	return-2SG.IMP.

As for *-ir* conjugations, the *voseo* imperatives receive a different ending than *tuteo* imperatives, as illustrated in (#3):

¹ The morpheme-by-morpheme gloss shows the stress assignment in each example as in a phonetic transcription, even against spelling conventions in Spanish. I refrain from providing complete phonetic transcriptions which may complicate the presentation of examples with irrelevant information.

(3) Singular imperatives in modern Spanish, conjugation *-ir*

<i>abrir</i>	<i>abre</i>	<i>abrí</i>
/abr-ir/	/abr-e/	/abr-í/
open-INF	open-2S.IMP.tú	open-2S.IMP.vos

For some lexical entries, especially the monosyllabic infinitives, there may not be any morphological differentiator between *voseo* and *tuteo*. This is a phenomenon called homomorphism, as illustrated in (#4):

(4) Singular imperatives in modern Spanish, homomorphic verbs

<i>dar</i>	<i>da</i>
/d-ár/	/d-á/
give-INF	give-2S.IMP.tú/vos

Other homomorphic lexical entries are *estar* (“to be located”), *ver* (“to see”), *ser* (“to be”) and *ir* (“to go”) (Lapesa 2000b [1970]: 687). *Estar* is not monosyllabic, but becomes homomorphic in the second person singular. Homomorphism occurs due to coincidences in the position of stress assignment when the verb is composed of a single syllable.

Modern paradigm in *voseo* imperatives is the result of a complex process of evolution. At least from the 15th century, the traditional system of the person *vos* conjugates imperatives by attaching a voiced dental stop, /-d/, in addition to a final-syllable stress. Dental ending is also the modern conjugation of familiar plural imperatives in peninsular Spanish. (#5) shows the traditional *vos* imperatives which are the same as modern peninsular plurals:

(5) Traditional *vos* imperatives and modern peninsular plurals:

<i>amad</i>	<i>comed</i>	<i>abrid</i>	<i>dad</i>
/am-á/	/com-éd/	/abr-íd/	/d-ád/
love-INF	eat-2S.IMP.vos	open-2S.IMP.vos	give-2S.IMP.vos
<i>volvéd</i>			

/volv-é/

return-2s.IMP.vos

The traditional system contains no cases of *tú/vos* homomorphism since the *-d* is an unambiguous marker. The morphology with *-d* in today's peninsular Spanish is part of the *vosotros* familiar paradigm, while *ustedes* is the respectful address. *Vosotros* is totally absent from Hispanic America, where *ustedes* is the only plural address. Thus, *ustedes* is used for both formal and informal contexts in Hispanic America. Table in (#6) summarizes the whole picture of this complex situation.

(6) Summary of second person pronouns in Spanish.

Number	Area	Respectful	Familiar (imperative)
Singular	Spain	<i>usted</i>	<i>tú (ama)</i>
	Mexico, Perú, Caribbean, Colombia's Eastern Highland	<i>usted</i>	<i>tú (ama)</i>
	Argentine	<i>usted</i>	<i>vos (amá)</i>
	Central America, Chile, Colombia's Western Highland	<i>usted</i>	<i>tú (ama)</i> <i>vos (amá)</i>
	Plural	Spain	<i>ustedes</i>
	Hispanic America	<i>ustedes</i>	<i>ustedes</i>

This paper analyzes the process by which the final dental disappeared from *voseo* imperatives. Previous research has explained the loss of *-d* in the *voseo* imperatives as a result of phonetic weakening (Lapesa 2000b [1970b]:687 and Penny 2002 [1991]:163) or morphological leveling (Rini 1999:103). In this paper, I show evidence of other factors that play an important role in the evolution of *voseo* imperatives, such as *morphological distinction* and what may be called *inverse standardization* as I will explain later. I provide data from documents from 16th to 19th centuries, focusing on Colombia. The first section presents a review of previous research on the evolution of *vos* imperatives from Classic Latin to Modern Spanish. Second section discusses the methodology used to collect and analyze

data of *voseo* in Hispanic America. Third section provides an overview of the results as well as a discussion of the factors affecting the evolution of the morphology in the *voseo* imperatives. This leads the discussion to a reassessment of previous research on the matter to show a unified account of factors altogether.

Sound Change vs. Morphological Leveling

Modern *vos* derives from Classic Latin *vōs*, a second person plural with no pragmatic distinction. Singular uses of *vos* begin to be attested in 4th century's documents as a resource of showing respect to an authority figure (Müller, 1914; Páez Urdaneta, 1981; Primorac, 1996). During middle ages, *vos* becomes frequent in the expression of reciprocal respect among equals of high status (Menéndez Pidal 1908: 324, Lapesa 2000a [1970a]: 316 and Primorac 1996). The formation of the *voseo* is the result of three types of events starting from the 15th century: 1) the popularization of egalitarian *vos* leading to the incorporation of *confianza* into its pragmatic functions (Dworkin 1988, León 2011, Páez Urdaneta 1981 and Eberenz 2000); 2) the specialization in the singular of the form *vos* along with formation of the plural *vosotros* (Hanssen 1913: 75, Jonge & Nieuwenhuijsen 2009: 1598, Menéndez Pidal 1965 [1904]: 251, Lloyd 1993 [1987]: 563, Penny 2002 [1991]: 138, Rini 1999: 209); 3) the loss of the respectful uses of *vos* in the 16th century (Bentivoglio, 2002, and 2002-2004; AUTHOR, 2014; Fontanella 1994; García Mouton, 1999; King, 2006).

The genetic kinship between *voseo* and *vosotros*, thus, has an impact on the morphology. *Vōs* imperatives are conjugated with-TE, as in AMATE (“love_{imp.pl}”) in Classic Latin. The medial /t/ becomes /d/ due to the process of *lenition* of intervocalic stops in the Western Romance. Lenition is a type of consonantal weakening that affects a wide variety of sounds, voiceless stops among them. Due to lenition, voiceless stops become voiced as in the change from CATĒNA to *cadena* (“chain”) in the last centuries of the Roman Empire (Penny

1991 [2002]: 74-79). This process leads to the change from /amáte/ to /amáde/, realized [amáðe].

The subsequent change *amáde* > *amáð* > *amá* has been regarded as the result of straightforward chain of phonetic deletions (Menéndez Pidal 1965 [1904]: 279). In modern Spanish, there is strong evidence for the weakness of consonantal codas as a general tendency of the language, e.g. the aspiration and deletion of *-s* or the neutralization of *-r* in the Caribbean or Andalusia (see Lipski 1994). However, neutralization of voiced coda stops is more extensive phenomenon, affecting general Spanish. For example, *admirar* (“to admire”) is realized [admirar], [aðmirar] or [atmirar] in standard Spanish, or [agmirar], [aθmirar] and [amirar] in spontaneous speech. However, in onset positions /d/ keeps its phonemic distinctions as shown by the minimum pair /ada/ (“fairy”) and /ata/ (“s/he ties”). Dental codas are represented with the archiphoneme /D/ to capture the phenomenon of neutralization (Quilis, 1999:205, 209). The problem with this traditional account is that predicts the total loss of *-d* in all cases. In fact, the archiphoneme /D/ does still exist in Spanish in quite frequent words such as *verdad* (“truth”).

De Souza (1964: 4-5) develops further the phonetic explanation for the *-d* deletion of *voseo* imperatives by considering two different paths of evolution leading to the same results. The first path is a deletion of final elements in *voseo* imperatives following the steps *-áde/-éde* > *-ád/-éd* > *-á/-é*, as in Menéndez Pidal (1965 [1904]: 279); the second path starts by the deletion of intervocalic dental and then the final vowel, following the steps *-áde/-éde* > **-áe/-ée* > *-á/-é*. According to De Souza (1964), both paths co-occurred in the history of Spanish to produce the dental-deleted imperative. In some communities of northern Spain imperative endings *-ái/-éi* are still in use. This is an alternative result from **-áe/-ée*, after diphthongization of *-e* due to its post-vocalic position. (#7) summarizes the paths of evolution proposed by this author:

(7) Paths in the evolution of imperative according to De Souza (1964: 4-5)

Path 1:

<i>amade</i>	>	<i>amad</i>	>	<i>amá</i>
/am-áde/		/am-ád/		/am-á/
love-2.IMP.vos ²		love-2.IMP.vos		love-2.IMP.vos
<i>comede</i>	>	<i>comed</i>	>	<i>comé</i>
/com-éde/		/com-éd/		/com-é/
eat-2.IMP.vos		eat-2.IMP.vos		eat-2.IMP.vos

Path 2:

2.1:

<i>amade</i>	>	* <i>amáe</i> ³	>	<i>amá</i>
/am-áde/		/am-áe/		/am-á/
love-2.IMP.vos		love-2.IMP.vos		love-2.IMP.vos
<i>comede</i>	>	* <i>comée</i>	>	<i>comé</i>
/com-éde/		/com-ée/		/com-é/
eat-2.IMP.vos		eat-2.IMP.vos		eat-2.IMP.vos

2.2

<i>amade</i>	>	* <i>amáe</i>	>	<i>amáí</i>
/am-áde/		/am-áe/	>	/am-ái/
love-2.IMP.vos		love-2.IMP.vos		love-2.IMP.vos
<i>coméde</i>	>	* <i>comée</i>	>	<i>coméí</i>
/com-éde/		/com-ée/	>	/com-éí/
eat-2.IMP.vos		eat-2.IMP.vos		eat-2.IMP.vos

² I do not specify whether it is plural or singular since this is an obscure issue in the history of vos imperatives to be discussed later.

³ Penny (1999 [2002]: 163) is the one who marks these forms as unattested.

Penny (1999 [2002]: 163) also accepts loss of $-d$ by the sole means of phonetic reduction. However, he reassesses Path 1 by considering that $-\acute{a}de/-\acute{e}de/-\acute{i}de > -\acute{a}d/-\acute{e}d/-\acute{i}d$ does not go further toward the deletion of $-d$. In this way, today's peninsular plural is the result of Path 1, whose reassessment is summarized in (#8):

(8) Path 1A (reassessed by Penny 1999 [2002]: 163):

amade > *amad*

/am-áde/ > /am-ád/

love-2.IMP.vos > love-2.IMP.vos/vosotros

The modern *voseo* imperatives would be the sole result of Path 2.1, the reduction $*-\acute{a}e/-\acute{e}e > -\acute{a}/-\acute{e}$, while Path 2.2 allows for an explanation of residual forms with falling diphthongs in northern Spain. Rini (1999: 105) identifies two problems in this account: one is the lack of textual evidence for the middle stages $*am\acute{a}e$ and $*comee$, other is the fact that Path 2.2 wrongly predicts other final dentals would evolve into falling diphthongs, such as $ed\acute{a}de > *ed\acute{a}e > *ed\acute{a}i$ ("age") and $verd\acute{a}de > *verd\acute{a}e > *verd\acute{a}i$ ("truth").

The discussion enriches further with the consideration of semantic factors in the evolution of *voseo* imperatives. Rini (1999) develops a brief suggestion in Lloyd (1993 [1987]) by taking into account grammatical number. The specialization of *vos* in the singular favors the production of a dental-deleted form during the 15th century, since the competing singular *tuteo* ends in a vowel. Rini (1999) returns to Menéndez Pidal (1965 [1904]) as in Path 1 and, contrary to De Souza (1964) or Penny (1999 [2002]), accepts a straightforward phonetic deletion of final sounds, $-\acute{a}de/-\acute{e}de > -\acute{a}d/-\acute{e}d > -\acute{a}/-\acute{e}$. However, in accepting Path 1, the retention of $-d$ in plural imperatives requires an explanation.

Rini (1999) adds the hypothesis of *morphologization*, a process by which a form acquires a new morphological meaning. According to him, $-d$ acquires the grammatical feature of [+plural], which blocks the process of deletion in cases of plural reference. This

phenomenon affects not only the plural imperatives, as *amad*, but also certain nouns such as *edad*. Neutralization yields the deletion of final dental in singular, [eɖá], but never in plural. The morpheme *-es* is added to nouns with final consonants, as in *edad* (singular) versus *edad-es* (plural). In plural, the final dental becomes an onset due to the addition of *-es*. The maintenance of the dental in plural nouns influences the perception of this sound as a plural marker.

Aside from the hypothesis of morphologization, Rini (1999) develops an alternative explanation for the origins of dental-deleted allomorphs. He analyzes *vos* imperatives in the *Cancionero general* (*General Compilation of Songs*, 1511), which includes poetry by authors from ca. 1395-1520. De Souza (1964) extracts all cases of verbal *vos* from the *Cancionero*, unfortunately without distinguishing plural from singular. Rini (1999) notes that the first attestations of *-d* deletion occur before the clitic *os*, as in *plegaos* (“submit_{imp} yourself”). The clitic *os* emerges as the declined form of *vos* in object positions during the late middle ages (Jonge & Nieuwenhuijsen 2009, Rini 1992). The clitic *os* works as a reflexive pronoun when attached to *vos* imperatives, meaning “yourself”. The case of *plegáos* is attributed to an author who presumably writes in the time period of 1394-1425 (De Souza 1964: 44), which is the earliest case of dental deletion in the corpus.

Rini (1999) interprets this finding as the possibility that the dental is deleted first in imperatives attached to *os*. The phonetic environment of the voiced dental is intervocalic, which is a context favoring lenition and deletion. Dental-deleted forms undergo reanalysis as full imperatives, and then extension to absolute final positions. However, Rini (1999: 107) rejects his own analysis because dental deletion before *-os* is current in today’s peninsular plurals, and morphologization in singular would not be sustainable as a result of reanalysis. (#9) summarizes the two hypotheses in Rini (1999) by labeling them as Path 1B and Path 3:

(9) Rini’s hypotheses in the evolution of *vos* imperatives

a. Path 1B (Path 1 reassessed by Rini 1999)

		Deletion of <i>-d</i>	
<i>amá</i> <i>d</i>	>	<i>amá</i>	
/am-ád/		/am-á/	
love-2PL/SG.IMP		love-2 SG .IMP	
		Retention of <i>-d</i>	
	>	amá <i>d</i>	
		/am-ád/	
		love-2 PL .IMP	

b. Path 3 (alternative provided by Rini 1999):

Deletion		Reanalysis	
<i>amad</i> <i>os</i>	>	<i>amá</i> <i>os</i>	> <i>am-á</i>
/am-ad=os/		/am-á=os/	/am-á/
love-2.IMP=2.REFL		love-2 PL ?.IMP=2.REFL	love-2 SG ?.IMP

In Path 1B, the form with the dental is used in both plural and singular. After this stage, the dental is deleted by phonetic lenition, and the deleted form becomes a singular imperative. This should have happened by the time when *vos* specializes in the singular reference, that is, by the 15th century. In Path 3, the dental is deleted before *os* and reanalyzed. However, if the result of deletion in the medial dental is modern peninsular plural, the evolution to a modern singular is a paradox that leads Rini (1999) to reject Path 3.

There is still a possibility to maintain Path 3 by considering that the results of all stages do not differentiate between plural and singular. If this is possible, Path 1B cannot be sustained since dental-deleted forms may be used in plural imperatives, or dental-retained forms as singular imperatives. In fact, there is evidence of a long existence of dental-deleted

imperatives in the plural. Anipa (2000) reports dental-deleted plurals in 1492, 1535 and 1625.

Nebrija (1492) describes a dental-deleted plural allomorph, as in (#10):

(10) Spain (Nebrija, 1492, in Anipa 2000: 390)⁴

Lassegundas	persona-s	de	plural	[del	imperativo]
/ Las	segundas	personas	de	plural	del.imperativo
the:second:	persosn:	of	plural	of.the.imperative/	
formanse	mudando	la	<i>r</i>	final	del
/formanse	mudando	la	<i>r</i>	final	del/
are.formed:	changing:	the:	<i>r</i>	final	of.the:
infinitivo en	<i>d</i> ,	como	de	amar,	<i>amad</i> ;
/infinitivo en	<i>d</i> ,	como	from	am-ár,	am-ád /
infinitive in	<i>d</i> ,	such.as of	love.INF,	love.2.IMP	
de	leer,	<i>leed</i> ;	de	oír,	<i>oíd</i> . Mas
/de	le-ér,	le-éd	de	o-ír	o-íd mas
from	read.INF	read.2.IMP	from	hera.INF	hear.2.IMP but
algunas	vezes	hazemos	cortamiento	de	aquella
/algunas	veces	hacemos	cortamiento	de	aquella
some:	times:	we.do:	cutting/deletion	of	that:
<i>d</i> ,	diciendo	<i>amá</i> ,	<i>leé</i> ,	<i>oí</i> .	
/d	diciendo	am.á	le.é	o.í /	
d	saying:love.2.IMP	read.2.IMP	hear.2.IMP		

“The plural second persons [of imperative] are formed by changing the final *-r* in the infinitive into *d*, as in *to love*, *love_{imp}* [with *-d*]; from *to read*, *read_{imp}* (with –

⁴ In all the examples, I have maintained the typographical marks in the authors taken as a source, such as the italics added by the researcher, ellipsis, etc. I modernize the spelling in the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss.

d); from *to hear*, *hear_{imp}* [with *-d*]. However, sometimes we do shortening of that *d*, saying *love_{imp}* [no *-d*], *read_{imp}* [no *-d*], *hear_{imp}* [no *-d*].”

As suggested in (#10), Nebrija presents the deleted allomorph in the plural as an exceptional case, probably a non-standard allomorph (Anipa 2000). However, further evidence suggests that dental-deleted plurals were far from exceptional. According to the Spanish grammarian Gonzalo Correas in 1625, the plural may be expressed with a dental-deleted allomorph, as in (#11):

(11) Spain (Correas, 1625, in Anipa 2000: 392)

- a. Amad, o amá vosotros; temed,
 /**am-ád** o **am-á** **vosotros** **tem-éd**/
 love-2PL.IMP or love-2PL.IMP NOM.PL fear-2PL.IMP
 o temé vosotros, consumid, o
 /o **tem-é** **vosotros** **consum-íd** o
 or fear-2PL.IMP NOM.PL consume-2PL.IMP or
 o consumí vosotros (Correas, quoted in Anipa 2000: 392).
 /o **consum-í** **vosotros**/
 or consume-2PL.IMP NOM.PL
 “Love [no *-d*] or love [with *-d*] you all; fear [no *-d*] or fear [with *-d*] you all; consume [no *-d*] or consume [with *-d*] you all.”
- b. la plural mas de ordinario se usa cortada
 /la: plural: mas de ordinario se.usa: cortada:
 the plural more of ordinary is.used: deleted/shortened
 la *d* final por eufonía, *amad*, *amá*,
 /la: d: final: por: eufonía: **am-ád** **am.á**
 the d final for good.sound love.2.IMP love.2.IMP

<i>temed,</i>	<i>temé,</i>	<i>consumid,</i>	<i>consumí</i>
/tem.éd	tem.é	consum.íd	consum-í
fear.2.IMP	fear.2.IMP	consume.2.IMP	consume.2.IMP

“in plural, the *d* is more commonly used deleted (“shortened?”) for a good sound: *you, love* [with *-d*]; *you, love* [no *-d*]; *you, fear* [with *-d*]; *you, fear* [no *-d*]; *you, consume* [with *-d*]; *you, consume* [no *-d*].”

Anipa (2000) takes (#11) as evidence that the dental-deleted allomorph is commonly used in oral language, yet being depicted with final *d* as a spelling convention. Anipa (2000) reads “se usa cortada la *d*” (“the *d* is used deleted/cut”), according to his edition of 1954. I consulted a different edition in which the transcriber shows a different reading: “se usa corada la *a*” (“the *a* is used deleted/cut”, 1903). This disparity in the editions obscures any straightforward interpretation. Even if assuming that Correas intended to write “cortada la *d*,” the meaning of “cortada” may not be “deleted”, but “shortened” as in “[a]cortada.” Correas may be alluding to the neutralization of dental stops in coda and not to the deletion of *-d* in the plural as a common oral practice.

Despite this difficulty, imperatives with *-d* may have been just spelling conventions, as the grammarian Juan de Valdés (1535) had suggested almost one century before. When Marcio asks Valdés why Spanish speakers usually put a *d* after some words and not after others, Valdés responds as in example (#12):

(12) Spain (Valdés, Spain, 1535, in Anipa 2000: 391)

Pongola	por	dos	respetos:	el	uno	por
/póngola [the <i>-d</i>]	por	dos	respectos	el	uno	por/
I.put.it:	for	two	reasons:	the:	one:	to
henchirel	vocablo,	y	el	otro,	porque	
/henchir	el	vocablo	y	el	otro	porque/

inflate: the: word: and the: other: because
 aya diferencia entre el *toma*,
 /haya diferencia entre el **tóm-a**/
 there.is: difference between the: take-2SG.IMP.tú
 con el acento en la *o*, que es para
 /con el acento: en la *o* que es: para/
 with the stress/accent in the: *o* which is: for
 quandohablo con un muy inferior, a quien
 /cuando hablo con un muy inferiora quien/
 when I.speak: with a: very inferior to whom:
 digo *tú*, y *tomá*[d], con el acento
 /digo **tú**, y **tom-ád** con el acento/
 I.say: 2SG.NOM.tú and take-2SG.IMP.vos with the: stress/accent
 en la *a*, que es quandohablo con un
 /en la *a*, que es cuando hablo con un/
 on the: a which is: when I.speak with a:
 casi igual, a quien digo *vos*, lo
 /casi igual, a quien digo **vos**, lo
 almost equal: to whom I.say: 2SG.NOM.vos the:
 mesmo en *compra* y *comprad*, en
 /mismo en **cómpr-a** y **compr-ád**, en
 same: in buy-2SG.IMP.tú and buy-2SG.IMP.vos in
corre y *corred*, etc.
 /**córr-e** y **corr-éd** etc/
 run-2SG.IMP.tú and run-2SG.IMP.vos etc

“I put it [the final -d] for two reasons: the one to inflate more the word, and the other to signal the difference between *take*_{imp} [tú conjugation], with the stress on *o*, which is for when I talk to an inferior, to whom I say *tú* [2SG.NOM], and *take*_{imp.vos} [-d added by Anipa], with the accent in the *a*, which is when I talk to an almost equal, to whom I say *vos* [2SG.NOM]; the same is in *buy*_{imp.tú}, and *buy*_{imp.vos} [with -d], in *run*_{imp.tú}, and *run*_{imp.vos} [with -d], etc.”
 (Quoted in Anipa, 2000: 391).

Examples as in (#12) persuade Anipa (2000) that the dental-deleted allomorph is typical from speech, often perceived as popular, rural or non-standard. Thus, dental deletion is socially marked as non-standard while retention as standard. I find further evidence for this social distinctions in *El desierto prodigioso* (*The prodigious desert*), a baroque book of mystical verse and prose by Pedro Solís y Valenzuela, published in 1650 (Bogotá, the capital of today’s Colombia). The dental-deleted allomorph is used in the plural in an authoritarian tone, as illustrated by (#13):

(13) Bogotá, Colombia (Solís y Valenzuela, 1650: 586)

Marineros, embarcá;

/mariner-o-s **embarc-á**/

Sailor-M-PL, go.aboard-2PL.IMP

“Sailors, go aboard”

In (#13), the modern publisher adds an accent mark to “embarcá” (“go_{imp} aboard”) without explaining in a footnote whether this mark exists in the original. During the 17th century and most of the 18th the placement of accent marks is quite rare; the presence of one should have been a matter of comment. However, I agree that the stress should be in the final syllable since “embarcá” is more liketly to be a person-*vos* imperative of plural reference. The absence of a mark would imply a person-*tú* imperative *embárca*, which would not be

compatible with the plural vocative “marineros”. *Desierto*, the text where (#13) is located, also abounds in *-d* imperatives to address an entity of higher status, such as the Virgin Mary in (#14):

- (14) Bogotá, Colombia (Solís y Valenzuela 1994 [1650]: 97)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--------|--------|
| Ayudadme, | piadosa | Señora | mía |
| /ayud-ád=me | piados-a | señora | mí-a/ |
| help.2SG.IMP.vos=1SG.DAT | merciful.F | Lady | mine.F |
- “Help me, my Lady”

Example (#14) suggests a reminiscence of respectful *vos* or *vos reverencial*, which exists in religious speech even today (Almasov 1974). The dental-deleted imperative as in (#13) is a command, said by a captain to their subordinates, while the dental-retained imperative as in (#14) is a begging, said to a superior in the artificial style of *vos reverencial*. This contrast supports the social marking involved in dental imperatives as Anipa (2000) suggests.

Plural imperatives with dental deleted conjugations, thus, challenge the hypothesis of singular morphologization as in Path 1B (Rini 1999). Further evidence is found in the popular poetry collected by Restrepo (1929) in Antioquia, Colombia, as in examples (#15) and (#16):

- (15) Antioquia, Colombia (Restrepo, 1929: 137)
- | | | | |
|-----------|--------|----------|---------------------------------|
| Madreslas | que | tengáis | hijas |
| /madre-s | las | teng-áis | hij-a-s |
| mother-PL | those: | who | have.2PL.PRS.SBJV daughter-F-PL |
-
- | | | | |
|-------------|-----|-----|--------|
| Solteras | y | por | casar: |
| /solter-a-s | y | por | casar/ |
| single-F-PL | and | to | marry: |
- Hacé las paredes altas,
- | | | | |
|--------|-----|----------|----------|
| /hac-é | las | pared-es | alt-a-s/ |
|--------|-----|----------|----------|

do.2PL.IMP the: walls: tall:

Que yo soy el gavián

/que yo soy el gavián/

that I: am: the: sparrow.hawk.

“Mothers, those who have single or yet to marry daughters, make tall walls because I am the sparrow hawk.”

(16) Antioquia, Colombia (Restrepo 1929: 232)

Amigos y compañeros,

/amig-o-s y compañer-o-s/

friend-M-PL and fellow-M-PL

Tené lástima de mí,

/ten-é lástima de mí,

have-2PL.IMP pity of me:.,

Que se fue de la mano

/que se fu-e de la mano/

that 3.REFL went: from the: hand

La paloma que cogí

/la: paloma que cogí/

the pigeon that I.caught:

“Friends and fellows, feel pity for me because the pigeon I caught flew away.”

In (#15), the addressee is plural as the vocative *madres* (“mothers”) implies, and the imperative *hac-é* (“do”) does not end in *-d*. Also, in (#16), the addressee is signaled by the plural vocative *amigos y compañeros* (“friends and fellows”), whose imperative *ten-é* (“have”) lacks a *-d*.

The advantage of popular verse is that certainly represents the vernacular, with the disadvantage that it is impossible to date. There may be an indefinable gap between the date of production and compilation. Many popular verses contain archaic fossilized forms which are transmitted intact to next generations through oral tradition. In addition to that, poetry in general may allow a trope called *anacoluthon*, which consists of the deliberate production of a syntactic mismatch to create a poetic effect. In (#15) and (#16), the purpose may have been related to the need of emphasizing on the feeling of trust, familiarity or camaraderie by expressing a *voseo* imperative even with a plural interlocutor.

In any case, imperatives without *-d* are used during an unspecified period of time as a plural, certainly at least until the 17th century, and probably even after that. Factors other than grammatical number may be playing a role in the evolution of *voseo* imperatives. The study by Anipa (2000) reveals the need for the consideration of social and pragmatic factors that enrich traditional explanations for the loss of *-d* in *voseo* imperatives. He analyzes the factors affecting the variation between *-d* and no *-d* in 16th century works. The results in *La Lozana andaluza* (*The Lusty Andalusian Woman*, 1524), by Francisco Delicado, seem to the author closer to the linguistic reality due to the higher presence of dental-deleted imperatives. In fact, not only Delicado locates his plot in the world of prostitutes and scoundrels, but he expresses his intention of representing the social reality, as noted by León (2011). Delicado writes at the end of the novel that he has written: “una historia compuesta en retrato, el más natural que se pudo” (“a story composed in the form of a picture, the most natural possible”, quoted by Leon 2011: 155).

In his study, Anipa (2000) identifies two linguistic factors favoring the presence of *-d*: monosyllabic verbs and the presence of 3rd person clitics (*le, la, lo*). Recall that some lexical entries are prone to homomorphism when losing the *-d*. A monosyllabic verb such as *dar* (“to give”) would be *da* in both *voseo* and *tuteo* imperatives (see #4). Also, the

presence of clitics favors the process of metathesis, as in *tened-lo* (“have_{imp} it”) > *teneldo* (“have_{imp} it”). The metathesis produces a switch of the dental from coda to onset, which destroys the phonetic context of deletion. The metathetic form absorbs the semantic content of the clitic into the imperative, becoming a morphemic unit.

Anipa (2000) also finds that the loss of *-d* is favored by certain lexical entries, being the forms *mirar* (“to look”), *catar* (“to realize”) and *andar* (“to walk”) the main influencers. Both *mirar* and *catar* are verbs of perception, the former physical and the latter psychological; used as imperatives, they serve to demand attention from the interlocutor.

Example (#17) illustrates this situation:

(17) Spain (Delicado, 1524, in Anipa, 2000: 396)

Pasa	cada	día	por	casa	de	su	amo,	y
/Pasa	cada	día	por	casa	de	su	amo,	y/
He.passes:	each	day	through	home	of	his:	lord,	and
mirá		qué	regatear	que	tiene,		y	
/mir-á		qué	regatear	que	tiene,		y/	
look-2SG.IMP.vos	what	to.bargain:		that	he.has:	and		
porfía	que	no	la	conoce.				
/porfía	que	no	la	conoce.				
stiks.on:	that	NEG	her:	knows:				
Miralda				bien,	que	a	todos	da
/Mir-álda				bien	que	a	todos	da/
look-2SG.IMP.vos.3SG.M.ACC				well	that	to	all:	da:
remedio	de	cualquier	enfermedad	que	sea.			
/remedio	de	cualquier	enfermedad	que	sea/			
remedy:	of	any:	disease:	that	is:			

“He spends each day in the place of his lord, and look_{imp.vos} at (‘pay attention to’) his ability in bargaining, and sticks on saying that he doesn’t know her.

Look_{imp.vos} at her, carefully, because she remedies whatever disease.”

In (#17), the expression “mirá” (“look_{vos}”) does not work as a command for the interlocutor to physically look at the speaker. It is a strategy to emphasize on the ability of certain person in bargaining. Similarly, a verb of movement such as *andar* is often used as a discursive marker of farewell, as in (#18):

(18) Spain (*Lazarillo*, 1554, in Anipa, 2000: 397)

Caballeros	de	media	talla	también	me	ruegan;
/Caballeros	de	media	talla	también	me	ruegan/
gentlemen:	of	medium:	size:	also	me:	beg:
mas	server	con	éstos	es	gran	trabajo,
/mas	servir	con	éstos	es	gran	trabajo,
but	serve:	with	these:	is:	great:	work:
					because	of
hombre	os		habéis			de
/hombre	os		hab-éis			de
man		2SG.REFL.vos		have.2SG.PRS.IND.vos		of
convertir	en	malilla		y	si	no,
/convertir	en	malilla		y	si	no
turn:	into	wild.card/joker		and	if	no,
“andá		con	Dios”	os		dizen
/andá		con	Dios	os		dicen/
walk-2SG.IMP.vos	with	God		2SG.DAT.vos	they.say:	

“Medium-size gentlemen also beg me, but serving them is very difficult because, man, you would have to become a jack of all trades, otherwise they tell you ‘Good bye’.”

In (#18), the speaker is mocking the speech of the gentlemen who abuse of their servants by firing them if they refuse to perform a multiplicity of duties. The way he mocks the firing is by saying a conventionalized expression meaning *good bye*, which is “*andá con Dios*” (“go with God”). Grammaticalization of verbs of movement is also identified by Company Company (2008: 207) in the case of *vaya* (“*go_{imp.usted}*”), used to express admiration. Grammaticalization is defined as the process by which a form loses its semantic content due to a high frequency of usage, to become a grammatical marker, e.g., a discursive marker. High frequency also yields a reduction of phonetic elements (Bybee 1994 & 2001). Grammaticalized lexical entries in the *voseo* imperative favor the loss of the traditional dental.

These ideas posit a network of intertwining factors in the evolution of *voseo* imperatives when looking at historical data. Not only grammatical number, but sociopragmatic factors may be playing a role in the evolution of *voseo* imperatives. In the next section, I will briefly introduce the theories of sociopragmatics that could enrich the traditional explanations. Also, I will provide details of the methodology used for data collection and analysis.

Methodology

Any methodological step to study the loss of *-d* in *voseo* imperatives should pay close attention to Hispanic American colonial data. The *voseo* itself only survives in Hispanic America, and this is the area where the evolution takes place. In Spain, the *voseo* undergoes a process of stigmatization since the second half of the 16th century to the first of the 17th century; afterwards, the *voseo* becomes quite rare in the literature until disappearing (Lapesa

2000a [1970]: 323). Evidence of stigmatization is found in the usage of *vos* to belittle an interlocutor starting the second half of the 16th century (Páez Urdaneta 1981: 50), and to depict the speech of peasants and low class speakers during the first half of the 17th century (García Gallarín 2002, King 2009: 189, Lapesa 2000 [1970]: 317, Salvador 1996: 195). In certain regions of Hispanic America, stigmatization does not lead to the extinction of *voseo*, but to the relative absence of *voseo* in literary sources during the most part of the colonial period. The absence of literary sources creates a gap in the documentation of *voseo* or its *latency period*. Thus, the study of *voseo* imperatives should fill in this gap to better account for its evolution. In some regions, such as central México, coastal Perú or the entire Caribbean, which have closer contact with Spain, the *voseo* becomes extinct at some point in history, yet the conditions and dates of this process are yet to be established (see discussion in Benavides 2003, Montes 1967 and Sánchez Méndez 2003).

The *voseo* is widely attested in an epistolary collection from the 16th century published by Otte (1993). Many researchers have taken advantage of this invaluable material since these are private letters of invitation from Spanish immigrants to Indies for their family members in Spain. The private nature of these letters makes them a unique source of linguistic material to attest a variety of language very close or *immediate*, in terms of Oesterreicher (2005), to the vernacular. In the case of Colombia, there is a presumably close representation of the vernacular in *El Carnero (The Ram)*, a chronicle that gathers anecdotes of political and social life in Santa Fé (today's Santafé de Bogotá), written in 1638. Juan Rodríguez Freyle, the author, is a first-generation Creole, and he narrates stories related to fights, intrigues, complots and love affairs of prominent political figures from Santa Fe. The characters exchange all kinds of pronouns, including *voseo*. Literature written after *El Carnero* comprises only mystical poetry, in which the frequent interaction of the Christian deity creates an archaic tone, very *distant* from the vernacular. In this type of poetry, the old

meanings of respectful *vos* or *vos reverencial* appear very frequently. Thus, mystical poetry is excluded from consideration in our study.

Chronologically, the next literary work in Hispanic America with a relevant depiction of *voseo* is the Argentine *sainete* (“comic sketch”) *El amor de la estanciera* (*The Love of the Female Rancher*), written in ca. 1787. It is an anonymous play that portrays the private affairs of a family of peasants in the Argentinean *pampa* (“plains”) in Río de la Plata. In Colombia, the next literary work with some cases of *voseo* is a *sainete* entitled *Las Convulsiones* (*The Convulsions*), written by Luis Vargas Tejada in Santa Fe. Paradoxically, the *voseo* underwent a process of gradual loss in the region where Bogotá is located, the Eastern Highland, after the 19th century (AUTHOR, 2010, 2012, 2014, Montes 1967).

As part of a larger project, I collected almost 9000 tokens of pronominal terms of address in Colombian Spanish, and also 4000 examples from all other Spanish speaking regions provided by other researchers. To reach documentation of the *voseo* in the latency period, I visited five Colombian archives and found 22 court cases in which the *voseo* is used as part of the reported speech in the trials (see AUTHOR, 2014). However, for this paper I am focusing only on the cases of *voseo* imperatives.

The first step to the inclusion of examples for analysis is to perform a textual critique. It is not a common practice during the colonial period the use of accent marks. This creates the problem of *homography*, or the ambiguous writing of *voseo/tuteo* imperatives. Since some *voseo* imperatives only differ in stress assignment with respect to the *tuteo*, as illustrated in (#1), it is not advisable to assume any form is *tuteo* or *voseo* before looking at the immediate linguistic context. Some publishers or transcribers make this assumption and place accent marks without this consideration, thus it is crucial to proceed with caution at accepting any textual evidence from secondary sources.

To solve this problem without excluding homographic examples, I registered for each homographic example the closest unambiguous second person form in the same utterance depicted. I assume that *voseo* imperatives are those forms preceded or followed by an unambiguous form of *voseo*. If preceded by *voseo* and followed by *tuteo* or vice-versa, the example was excluded from consideration. For example, I extracted an occurrence from 1578 transcribed by Otte (1993), with the homographic form <trae> (“bring_{imp.tú/vos}”). It comes from a letter written by a Spaniard immigrant to Indies to his wife in Spain. The form is preceded and followed by *vuestro* (possessive *vos*), as illustrated in example (#19):

(19) Eastern Highland, Colombia (1578, in Otte 1993: 316)

Así	os	ruego,	señora	mía,	que			
/Así	os	ruego	señora	mía	que/			
so	2SG.DAT.vos	I.beg:	madam/wife	mine:	that			
pongáis		por	la	obra	de	venires	con	
/pong-áis		por	la	obra	de	venires	con	
put-2SG.PRS.SBJV.vos	for	the:	work:	of	coming:	with		
mi	hermano,	si	él	quisiere,	o	si	no,	con
/mi	hermano	si	él	quisiere	o	si	no	con/
my:	brother:	if	he:	wanted:	or	if	no	with
un sobrino	vuestro	de	los	hijos	de	Alonso		
/un sobrino	vuestro	de	los	hijos	de	Alonso/		
a: nephew:	2SG.POSS.M.vos	of	the:	sons:	of	Alonso		
Bartolomé,y	trae	a	vuestra					
/Bartoloméy	tra-é	a	vuestra					
Bartolomé and	bring-2SG.IMP.vos	to	2SG.POSS.F.vos					

hijaporque en fin acá se remediará mejor
 /hija porque en fin acá se remediará mejor/
 daughter: because in end here herself:will.remedy: better
 queallá.
 /que allá/
 than there

“So I beg you, my lady, to put all your efforts on the travel, with my brother if he wanted, or if not, with a nephew of yours among the sons of Alonso Bartolomé, and bring your daughter because in the final account here she will have a better life than there.”

The letter is plenty of unambiguous *voseo* forms such as the object *os*, the verbal form “pongáis” (“put_{imp}”) and the possessives “vuestro” and “vuestra.” These possessives are the closest unambiguous forms. Since they are *voseo* forms, I reconstruct the token *trae* as *tra-é* (“bring_{imp.vos}”). The appendix contains the original examples with its respective reference, but in the body of this paper I will refer only to the quoted examples.

The time period for the collection of examples starts in the earliest documentation of *voseo* imperatives in each of the regions included, and finalizes in the last attestation of the final *-d* in each of the regions: Colombia (1555-1828), Argentina (1653-1817), Costa Rica (1774-1858). Some regions with fewer cases have shorter time periods such as Ecuador (1626-1646), Perú (1605) and Dominican Republic (1662). This search yielded 61 examples of *voseo* imperatives in Colombia, and 34 in the rest of Hispanic America.

One important methodological caution was to exclude all possible cases of *vos reverencial*. Since this is an archaic and artificial form of *vos*, the presence of final *-d* in these examples may lead to a great confusion of the results. In fact, Almasov (1974) notes that in Argentina he heard a group of children in a school praying to the Virgin Mary; they

were using a hypercorrect *-d* to emphasize the majestic tone of the pray. This type of artificial reinforcement of final dental as also registered in the baroque poetry should be put aside. To avoid any mistaken form of *vos reverencial* as *voseo*, I have only taken into account cases where the interlocutor is a person of equal or inferior status. To avoid this confusion, I selected only those examples in which the addressee was equal or inferior. However, during the discussion of examples I will address other contextual nuances of examples leading to the consideration of the cases as types of *voseo* and not *vos reverencial*.

The method for analysis of examples gathers elements of variationist sociolinguistics. One important concept involves the *variation*. Both types of imperatives serve to the expression of *voseo* imperatives, but they may be expressed with *-d* or without it. The function undergoing variation is the second person singular imperative, in order to test which factors beyond grammatical number favor one or another allomorph. Penny (2000) explains that the process of change involves a stage of variation. A traditional form co-exists with an innovative form during a certain amount of time until the traditional disappears. He defines *standardization* as the elimination of variants in favor of one considered more prestigious. However, in analyzing the *voseo* imperatives, it is possible to find that the opposite is also true: speakers may eliminate the more prestigious variants in order to standardize their vernacular and differentiate it clearly from what they perceive as more prestigious. I use the term *inverse standardization* to refer to this phenomenon. Classification of factors in the analysis of *voseo* imperatives (*-d* versus *no -d*) are grouped per centuries (16th and 17th centuries versus 18th and 19th centuries), and classify lexical entries into homomorphic and not homomorphic. Lexical entries such as *mirar* (“to look”), *andar* (“to walk”) are classified separately.

Results and Discussion

After reconstructing examples, I organized them into tables with accent marks signaling stress while ignoring other types of phonetic features, which are irrelevant for this analysis. Table in (#21) shows the reconstructed forms in the Colombian corpus. Data of 1577-1587 comes from the epistolary compilation in Otte (1993), while all cases of 1638 come from *El carnero (The Ram)* by Rodríguez Freyle and the case of 1828 from *Las convulsiones (The Convulsions)*. Other researchers provide cases found in court cases from 1599 (Castillo Mathieu 1982), 1694, 1692 (Gutiérrez Maté 2013) and 1674 (Sánchez Méndez 1997). The rest of the Colombian data come from my own search in the court cases. The difference between the court cases and the letters is that court cases are written by a different person from whom the utterance is attributed, transcribing words orally pronounced. Letters, on other hand, contain cases originally produced in written by the authors. Literary works reproduce imaginary dialogs of a given author.

(21) *Voseo* imperatives in the Colombian corpus.

Year	Region	Reconstructed	Speaker	Hearer
1555	East	decídle “say him”	female master	servant
1565	East	andá “walk out”	captain	soldier
1565	East	id “go”	soldier	soldier
1565	East	mirá “look”	soldier	soldier
1565	East	andá “go”	captain	not captain
1577	East	traspasádle “transfer him”	immigrant	wife
1577	East	vended “sell”	immigrant	wife
1577	East	vended “sell”	immigrant	wife
1577	East	vended “sell”	immigrant	wife
1577	East	entendéd “understand”	immigrant	wife
1577	East	rogád “beg”	immigrant	wife
1578	East	traé “bring”	immigrant	wife
1578	East	tened “have”	immigrant	wife

1578	East	traedla “bring it”	immigrant	wife
1578	East	ponéd “put”	immigrant	wife
1578	East	tenéd “have”	immigrant	wife
1583	East	mirá “look”	immigrant	son-in-law
1584	East	decídle “say him”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	mirá “look”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	decí “say”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	entendéd “understand”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	mirá “look”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	avisámelo “inform me it”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	mirá “look”	immigrant	son-in-law
1587	East	mirá “look”	immigrant	son-in-law
1587	East	veníos “come (yourself)”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	animád “encourage”	immigrant	wife
1587	East	ponéd “put”	immigrant	wife
1599	Carib.	llegáos “arrive (yourself)”	priest	nun
1599	Carib.	besáme “kiss me”	priest	nun
1599	Carib.	mostrádme “show me”	priest	nun
1638	East	esperá “wait”	African, co-mother	rich, co-mother
1638	East	metédlo “put it in”	African, co-mother	rich, co-mother
1638	East	tomá “take”	African, co-mother	rich, co-mother
1638	East	veníd “come”	rich lady	husband
1638	East	dádle “give him”	rich lady	husband
1638	East	dádme “give me”	brother	Brother
1638	East	dádle “give him”	host	church clerck
1638	East	dádlos “give them”	supreme judge	Wife
1638	East	favorecéd “support”	court officer	court officer
1638	East	descalzáos “take off your shoes”	court officer	court officer
1638	East	mirá “look”	supreme judge	court officer
1638	East	subí “go up”	supreme judge	court officer
1638	East	goberná “govern”	court clerk	court clerk
1638	East	vení “come”	policeman	Policeman

1638	East	ídos “go (yourself)”	regal auditor	former judge
1638	East	lleváldo “take it”	soldier	Policeman
1669	East	vení “come”	male mayor	male indigenous
1674	South	andá “walk out”	Indigenous leader	Indigenous subord.
1674	South	decíldes “tell them”	Indigenous leader	Indigenous subord.
1694	Carib.	mirád “look”	button fixer, mulatto	barber, mulatto
1750	South	traéme “bring me”	slave	slave
1754	East	calla “shut up”	female master	female slave
1762	Carib.	vení “come”	soldier	soldier
1783	West	entrá “enter”	male friend	male friend
1793	East	hacéme “do me”	male accused	Policeman
1797	South	andá “walk out”	mother-in-law	daughter-in- law
1797	South	dale “give him”	mother-in-law	daughter-in- law
1811	West	corré “run”	father-in-law	son-in-law
1818	West	andá “walk out”	friend	male friend
1828	East	dádme “give me”	rich rancher	daughter

All speakers all male otherwise specified. East: Eastern Highland, including provinces of Cundinamarca (Bogotá main city) and Boyacá. South: Southern Highland, provinces of Valle (Cali main city) and Cauca (Popayán main city). West: Western Highland, including province of Antioquia (Medellín main city). Carib.: Caribbean

Table (#22) shows all cases of reconstructed examples in the rest of Hispanic America, according to examples extracted from Carricaburo (1999), Castillo Mathieu (1982), Fontanella (1971), Gutiérrez Maté (2013), Predevello (1987), Quesada Pacheco (1998), Rojas (1985) and Sánchez Méndez (1997).

(22) *Voseo* imperatives in the Hispanic American corpus (excluding Colombia)

Year	Region	Reconstructed	Status speaker	Status hearer
1527	Méx.	agradecé “thank”	Indigenous	former master

1527	Méx.	andad “walk out”	Indigenous	former master
1527	Méx.	íos “go (yourself)”	Indigenous	former master
1527	Méx.	guardáos “take care (yourself)”	Indigenous	former master
1568	Méx.	íos vos “go (yourself)”	Jerónimo de Aguilar	Guerrero
1605	Cuzco	tomáos “take (yourself)”	soldier	soldier
1605	Cuzco	lleváos “bring (yourself)”	soldier	soldier
1626	Quito	quitáos “take off (yourself)”	auditor	indigenous
1646	Quito	mirád “look”	supreme judge	subordinate
1646	Quito	andád “walk out”	supreme judge	subordinate
1653	Tuc.	andá “walk out”	Spaniard	fem. indigenous
1653	Tuc.	ídos “go (yourself)”	Spaniard	fem. indigenous
1655	Tuc.	perdonádmme “forgive me”	daughter, indigenous	mother
1662	SD	veníd “come”	soldier	soldier
1662	SD	mirád “look”	soldier	soldier
1662	SD	veníd “come”	soldier	soldier
1662	SD	virád “turn”	soldier	soldier
1669	BA	abrí “open”	captain	soldier
1669	BA	vení “come”	captain	soldier
1774	CR	andá “walk out”	female woman	female neighbor
1774	CR	vete “go out”	female woman	female neighbor
1774	CR	quitáte “take off (yourself)”	female woman	female neighbor
1782	CR	estád “remain”	priest	brother
1787	Arg.rur	mirá “look”	peasant	wife
1787	Arg.rur	mirá “look”	peasant	husband
1787	Arg.rur	vení “come”	mother-in-law, peasant	son-in-law
1809	Cór.	procurá “try”	older	younger
1813	BA	compráme “buy (for) me”	brother ⁵	brother
1816	BA	dádle “give him”	brother	brother
1817	BA	creédme “believe me”	brother	brother

⁵ From the epistolary compilation in a prestigious family from Buenos Aires, the Anchorenas.

1817	BA	led “read”	brother	brother
1858	CA	traeldo “bring him”	NA ⁶	na
1858	CA	llevaldo “take him”	NA	na
1858	CA	llevaldo “take him”	NA	na

Méx.: México; Cuzco: Cuzco (Perú); Quito: Quito (Ecuador); Tuc.: Tucumán (Argentina); Cór.: Córdoba (Argentina); BA.: Buenos Aires (Argentina); SD.: Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic); CR.: Costa Rica; Arg.rur: Undefined rural zone of Argentina; CA: Central America. All speakers all male otherwise specified.

(#23) shows a decay in imperative D towards the 18th century, and a preference of D in for homomorphic forms. Its presence also prevail before the clitic *la*, *lo* or *le*.

(23) Dental-retained *voseo* imperatives in Hispanic America

Factor	%	Cases with D	Total
Century			
16 th /17 th	54.3	38	70
18 th /19 th	28	7	25
Clitic			
<i>la</i> (F.ACC), <i>lo</i> (M.ACC), <i>le</i> (DAT)	100	14	14
<i>me</i> (1SG)	50	5	10
No presence of clitic	41.7	25	60
<i>os</i> (2SG)	18.2	2	11
Lexical entry			
Homomorphic	73.3	11	15
Non-homomorphic	48.3	28	58
<i>mirar/andar</i>	27.3	6	22

⁶ From a grammarian who prohibits this form as an error.

Total

45

94

The presence of *-d* occurs all the 14 times when a clitic with liquid initial is attached to the imperative, 4 of which undergo methathesis: *lleváldo* (“take_{imp.vos} it”), 1638, Colombia; *decíldes* (“say_{imp.vos} them”), 1674, Colombia; *traéldo* (“bring_{vos.imp} it”); and *llevaldo*, 1858, Nicaragua. The latest case of a dental-retained *voseo* imperative comes from a methathetic conjugation. It appears in a text of grammatical correction in which an interviewer asks the grammarian Juan Eligio de la Rocha about the most common mistakes made by Central Americans when speaking, as in (#24):

(24) Nicaragua, 1828 (Rocha 2000 [1858]: 39)

- a. ¿Cuáles son los errores de propiedad gramatical?
 /cuáles son los errores de propiedad grammatical/
 which: are: the: errors: of: appropriateness: grammatical:
- b. (. . .) decir *quer*, *traéldo*,
 /(. . .) decir quer **tra-éldo**
 saying: to.fall: bring-2SG.IMP.vos.3SG.M.ACC
llevaldo, (. . .) equivocaciones corrientes
 /**llev-áldo** equivocaciones corrientes
 take-2SG.IMP.vos.3SG.M.ACC errors current
 de los pueblos de Honduras, Guatemala y Costa
 /delos pueblos de Honduras, Guatemala y Costa
 of the: peoples: from: Honduras Guatemala and Costa
 Rica.
 /Rica/
 Rica.

In (#24), the grammarian includes “traeldo” (“bring_{imp.vos} it”) and “llevaldo” (“take_{imp.vos}) among the most common mistakes made by Central Americans, which means that they are still in use. The presence of a 3rd person clitic yields a 100% of dentals, and GoldVarb does not allow the regression with 100% or 0% results since this implies a lack of variation. Anipa (2000) also notes that since the 16th century 3rd person clitics favor the presence of a dental. The strength of this factor seems to last until the 19th century by retaining the latest cases of dentals in *voseo* imperatives.

The attachment of clitic *os* (second person *voseo* object) disfavors the presence of *-d* in one out of the 11 cases provided (18.2%). This is not surprising since this context is the most traditional in the history of imperative dental deletion. In other words, among the *voseo* imperatives with *os* 8 are dental-deleted variants, and only 2 retain the dental: in 1638, Colombia, and 1653, Tucumán, Argentina. Both are cases of “idos” (/i-d=os/go.2SG.IMP.vos=2SG.REFL.vos). The presence of *-d* is favored by the fact that they are monosyllabic and potentially homomorphic. Thus, with regards to clitics, the patterns of variation seem to continue the traditional factors of variation introduced by Spaniards during the 16th century.

The verbs *mirar* (“to look”) and *andar* (“to walk”) disprefer dentals with D in only 6 out of the 22 cases. This happens probably due to the fixation of these forms as discursive markers. A close look at the examples shows that in many cases these verbs maintain their lexical meanings, not always functioning as discursive markers. An example as in (#25) illustrates the usage of *andar* as a verb of movement:

(25) Indigenous leader to subordinate. Southwest, Colombia, 1674 (Sánchez Méndez 1997: 185)

hermano	<i>anda</i>	a	lo	de	jioro	y
/hermano	and-á	a	lo	de	Jioro	y/

brother: walk-2SG.IMP.vos to the.place of Jioro and
dec-ildes pues *sab-eis* la
/dec-ildes pues sab-eis la
 say-2SG.IMP.vos.2PL.DAT since know.2SG.PRS.vos the
 lengua
 /lengua/
 language
 “Brother, go to the place called Jioro, and tell them, since you know the
 language (. . .)”

In (#25) the verb *andar* maintains its lexical meaning, yet the speaker deletes the dental. In (#26a), however, *andar* works as a discursive marker, while (#27b) implies an intermediate stage between the lexical meaning and the discursive marker:

(26) Eastern Highland, Colombia, 1565 (AGN: f. 3v)

a. Captain to soldier:

anda que soys vn majadero
/and-á que **sois** un majadero/
 walk-2SG.IMP.vos that be-2SG.PRS.vos a stupid
 “Come on! You are a stupid guy!”

b. Soldier to soldier:

mallo aveys hecho anda
 /mal lo **habéis** hecho **and-á**
 bad: it: have-2SG.PRS.vos done: walk-2SG.IMP.vos
 yd con Dios
/i-d con Dios/
 go-2SG.IMP.vos with God

“you have done it badly, get off the way, good bye!”

In (#26a), *andá* is an emphatic expression to intensify the insult, while in (#24), the speaker utters *andá* to both suggest his friend to go away and announce the farewell. *Mirá* also retains a lexical meaning, which has been extended to the metaphoric senses of *pay attention* or *have into account*, is in examples (#27) and (#28):

(27) Eastern Highland, Colombia, 1565 (Otte 1993: letter 373)

mira,	hijo,	que,	vista	ésta,	vendáis
/mir-á	hijo	que	vista	ésta	vend-áis/
look-2SG.IMP.vos	son:	that	seen:	this:	sell-2SG.PRS.SBJV.vos
toda	mi	hacienda	y	os	
/toda	mi	hacienda	y	os/	
all:	my:	belongings:	and	2SG.REFL.vos	
vengáis		acá	con	vuestra	señora
/veng-áis		acá	con	vuestra	señora
come-2SG.PRS.SBJV.vos	here	with	2SG.POSS.F.vos	wife	

“Son, have into account that, as soon as you see this letter, you should sell all my belongings and come here with your wife.”

(28) Argentina, 1787 (Fontanella 1989: 524)

Mira,	Cancho,	lo	que	hacéis
/mir-a	Cancho	lo.que		hac-éis
look-2SG.IMP.vos	Cancho	what:		do.2SG.PRS.vos
porque	sois	un	gran	salvaje.
/porque	s-ois	un	gran	salvaje/
because	be-2SG.PRS.vos	a	great	savage

“Be careful, Cancho, with what you do, because you are a violent person.”

In (27) the form *mirá* has the discursive function of emphasizing on the instructions addressed to his son-in-law. The author is in the Indies and instructs his son to begin his arrangements to travel to Indies as soon as finishes reading the letter. This focus on the urgency of action is signaled by *mirá*, extending the meaning of physical perception to cognitive perception to request attention and promptness of action. In (28), *mirá* also works as a call for attention, since the wife is warning his husband to refrain himself from releasing his violent passion against her. The wife demands a cognitive perception of his passions by using a verb of looking.

The highest rate of $-d$ maintenance occurs in homomorphic or monosyllabic verbs, with where 11 cases were written with $-d$ out of 15 voseo imperatives. In the case of Colombia, from the 18th century on, there is only cases of dental-deleted variants, but there is a remaining case with $-d$ in 1828 in *dar*, exhibiting the form *dadme* (“give_{imp.vos} me”). It comes from a *sainete* or short humorous play called *Las convulsiones* (*The Convulsions*), written by the Bogota’s playwright Luis Vargas Tejada.

This imperative with $-d$ is attributed to Gualberto, a rich rancher who has a daughter called Crispina. He moves to the great city, Bogotá, to find a treatment for her daughter since she suffers frequent convulsions. The reality is far more different than he believes: she mocks convulsions to achieve her own whims. Once settled in Bogotá, they meet Cirilo, a social climber who pretends to be a doctor to win the love of Crispina and achieve her family’s fortune. In complicity with Cirilo, Crispina mocks convulsions even more frequently, to be secretly pleased by his flirtatious remarks. Gualberto’s concern in her daughter’s health increases at the same time as daughter and doctor make fun of him. One day, he is able to notice an exchange of a piece of paper between Cirilo and Crispina. Suspicious of this trickery, Gualberto asks Cirilo about the content of the piece of paper, and Cirilo lies by

saying that it is the prescription. Gualberto has already a hint about the machination and, infuriated against both of them, says the words I reproduce in example (#29):

(29) Eastern Highland, Colombia (Vargas Tejada [1828]: 39)

Quiere	apostar	señor	moderno		
/Quiere	apostar	señor	moderno/		
Do.you.want:	to.bet:	mister:	modern:		
Que	se	va	con	su	física al
/Que	se.va	con	su		física al
that	you.go:	with	2SG.POSS.usted		physics to.the:
					infierno
					/infierno/
					hell:
(a	Crispina)	–Dadme			el papel
/a	Crispina)	d-ad=me			el papel/
to	Crispina	give.2SG.IMP.vos=1SG.DAT			the: paper

“Do you want to bet, mister modern, that you go with your physics to the hell?

(To Crispina) Give me the piece of paper.”

In (#29), after sarcastically calling Cirilo “señor moderno” (“mister modern”) and sending his science to the hell, Cirilo turns to his daughter and claims the piece of paper using the *voseo* imperative “dadme.” Before this episode, during the whole play, Gualberto had addressed his daughter using *tuteo* forms.

The form *dadme* (“give_{imp.vos} me”) would become *dame* (“give_{imp.vos/tú} me”) if losing –*d*. The imperative would become homomorphic if pronounced without the final dental. Gualberto is emphatic at shifting from *tú* to *vos* at expressing anger and the playwright adds a final dental to intensify the emotional quality of Gualberto’s words, as a reaction to his

discovering of the truth in the penultimate scene. Potentially homomorphic verbs, then, favor the preservation of *-d* during a time of decay. Similarly, in the rest of Hispanic America, the last examples of *-d* occur in potentially homomorphic lexical entries such as *estar* (“to be,” Costa Rica, 1782), *dar* (“to give,” Argentina 1816), *creer* (“to believe”) and *leer* (“to read,” Argentina 1817). Among the 25 cases of *voseo* imperatives during the 18th and 19th centuries, 5 are potentially homomorphic and 2 are cases of *-ldo*. These are clear factors preventing the extinction of *-d* during a period of decay. It is necessary to explain why *creer* and *leer* are potentially homomorphic lexical entries.

In 1817, the verb *leer* is written with a single vowel in the imperative, “led,” which may be symbolizing a monosyllabic pronunciation as in [led]. If the author perceives *led* as a monosyllabic word, the loss of *-d* would have been perceived as homomorphic as well. The same could be said of *creed*, which was transcribed by Fontanella with <ee>, but the pronunciation may have been [cred] with a single syllable. In this way, the addition of *-d* served to make clear the *voseo* conjugation in a potentially homomorphic form. The sketch in (#30) illustrates this phenomenon:

(30) Verb *leer* (“to read”)

a. disyllabic:

[leer]	[lée]	[leé]
/le-er/	/lé-e/	/le-é/
read-INF	read-2SG.IMP.tú	read-2SG.IMP.vos

b. monosyllabic:

[ler]	[lé]
/l-er/	/lé/
read-INF	read-2SG.IMP.tú/vos

c. distinction:

[l-é]

[l-éd]

/cr-é/

/cr-éd/

believe-2SG.IMP.tú

believe-2SG.IMP.vos

The presence of final *-d* serves to fill an utterance with the pragmatic content of the *voseo* in the period of decay (18th to 19th centuries). However, the main question persists: why the *-d* disappeared in *voseo* imperatives even in the potentially homomorphic forms?

In the 19th century, (#25) is evidence that the methatetic dentals (*-ldo*) have undergone reallocation, since it is considered incorrect by an educated speaker. In contrast, the last attestations of final *-d* in either Colombia or Argentine occur in upper classes: *dadme* (Colombia, 1828) is used by an author to represent the speech of a rich rancher, while *led*, *cred* or *dadme* (Argentina, 1816-1817) are part of the private letters from a recognized rich family in Buenos Aires, reported by Fontanella (1971: 504). The Colombian case supports a hypothesis of reallocation since, despite the speaker being upper class, is a rural character being portrayed as angry at producing the *-d*. However, Argentinian examples do not support reallocation. Fontanella's data have the advantage of coming from private letters and not the stereotyped language of the theater as my last documentation in Colombia. Then, the standardization towards dental-deletion is a process that should be understood within the context of the linguistic ideology circulating among educated classes in the 19th century.

Sánchez Méndez (2003) explains that after the independence of the Hispanic American republics, by the mid 19th century, there occurred a strong purist reaction against the threat that Spanish could become fragmented into national languages, undergoing the same fate as Classic Latin. Intellectuals proposed a peninsular model of language to maintain the linguistic unit. Guitarte (1983) shows evidence that some educated speakers strove for the recovery of the inter-dental distinction of sibilants in formal speeches. The Chilean grammarian Andrés Bello (1940 [1834]), in his *Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua*

castellana (*Warning about the Use of the Castilian Language*), proscribes the use of *vos* as a familiar form, accepting the *vos reverencial* when he refers to the poetic style, as in example (#31):

(31) Chile, 1834 (Bello: 1940 [1834]: 54). Grammarian Andres Bello.

No	debe	usarse	en	la	pronunciación	el
/no	debe	usarse	en	la	pronunciación	el/
NEG	must:	be.used:	in	the:	pronunciation:	the:
pronombre	<i>vos</i> ;	porque	si	se	habla	con una
/pronombre	vos	porque	si	se	habla	con una/
pronoun:	<i>vos</i> :	because	if	is.spoken:	with	a:
sola	persona,	se	debe	decir	<i>usted</i>	o
/sola	persona,	se	debe	decir	usted	o/
single:	person:	must.be:	said:	2SG.NOM.	usted	or
<i>tú</i> ,	según	el	grado	de	familiaridad	que
/ tú	según	el	grado	de	familiaridad	que/
2SG.NOM.	<i>tú</i>	according.to:	the:	degree:of	familiarity	that
tengamos	con	ella,	y	si	son	muchas personas,
/tengamos	con	ella	y	si	son	muchas personas:/
we.have:	with	her:	and	if	are:	many: people:
<i>ustedes</i>	o	<i>vosotros</i> .		Solo	es	permitido
/ ustedes	o	vosotros		solo	es	permitido
2PL.NOM.	ustedes	or	2PL.NOM.	vosotros	only	is: allowed:
usar	el	pronombre	<i>vos</i>	en	el	estilo oratorio o
/usar	el	pronombre	vos	en	el	estilo oratorio o/
use:	the:	pronoun:	<i>vos</i>	in	the:	style: oratory: or:

poético

/poético/

poetic:

“In the pronunciation, *vos* must not be used; because to talk to a single person, *usted* or *tú* must be said, according to the degree of familiarity we may have with that person; and of talking to many people, *ustedes* or *vosotros*. It is only allowed to use the pronoun *vos* in the poetic or rhetorical style.”

The only “allowed” form of *vos* according to (#31) is in the rhetorical or poetic style, possibly referring to the *vos reverencial*. In this type of *vos*, a highly artificial and formal pronominal address, where the presence of *-d* is deemed correct. The *vos reverencial* should be conjugated with *-d* in the imperative, as stated by Bello in (#33):

(32) Chile, 1834 (Bello: 1940 [1834]: 52). Grammarian Andres Bello.

Si la tratamos de vos (. . .), debe decirse

/si la tratamos de vos (. . .), debe decirse/

if her: we.treat: of vos must: be.said:

mir-ad, andad,

/mir-ad and-ad/

look-2SG.IMP.vos go-2SG.IMP.vos

levantáos,

/levant-á=os/

get.up-2SG.IMP.vos=2SG.REFL.vos

sentáos,

/sent-á=os/

sit.down-2SG.IMP.vos=2SG.REFL.vos

sosegáos.

/soseg-á=os/

calm.down-2SG.IMP.vos=2SG.REFL.vos

“If we treat a person using *vos*, it must be said [with *-d*] *look, go*, [without *-d* before *os*] *get up, sit down, calm down*.”

In example (#32), Bello (1940 [1834]) had suggested that the *vos reverencial* is correct. It is possible to interpret that, for this author, imperatives with final dental are conceived as correct forms. The clitic *os* is by the 19th century an archaic form (AUTHOR 2014), being used to represent formal uses of *vos*.

Conclusions

Path 1B in Rini (1999, see #9) suggests that the formation of the dental-deleted imperative is the result of a straightforward phonetic process. The retention of the dental in some contexts derives from a process of morphologization of *-d* as a plural marker versus the dental-deleted form as a singular marker. However, the long standing usage of the *-d* in the *voseo* imperatives until the 19th century and the plural uses of the dental-deleted imperatives cast a doubt on this hypothesis. Path 3 in Rini (1999) is an alternative explanation that better adjust to the evidence. This hypothesis states that dental-deleted imperatives first occur upon clitic as in *plegá[d]os* (“submit_{imp.vos} yourself”), the first attestation of a dental deletion at the end of the 14th century. Then, the dental-deleted form is reanalyzed as an allomorph and then spreads to other contexts. Since the dental-deleted imperative may be used in plural at least until the 17th century –or even later, today’s usage of plural *os* in Spain does not contradict Path 3.

The remaining question is why intervocalic *d* as in *plegá[d]os* does not undergo deletion in lexical items other than the *vos* imperatives; Spanish is plenty of examples of words with intervocalic /d/ as in /dado/ (“dice”), where /d/ remains part of the phonological system. It is possible to hypothesize that deletion in *plegá[d]os* is not due to a straightforward

phonetic process. The reason I adduce is that the homomorphism of *plegados* with the past participle creates the need to delete /d/ as a disambiguator. This is a pure phonological deletion that affects only the *vos* imperatives, and reanalysis affects gradually the lexical inventory. A close look at the corpus in De Souza (1964) shows that the first lexical entry affected by the deletion is *decir* (“to say”) or *decí* (“say_{imp.vos}”) with two cases occurring the first half of the 15th century (De Souza 1964: 42, 74), and 11 cases the second half of the century, more than any other lexical entry. The second in usage frequency is *mirá*, with 4 cases during the 15th century. This is, in fact, the form higher rates of dental-deletion in the 16th to 19th centuries.

The imperatives first affected by the deletion before *os* are reflexives. Then, the lexical diffusion of the deletion affects in early stages those verb types not used as reflexives in singular. For example, in *plegaos* (“submit_{imp.vos} yourself_{vos}”, in De Souza 1964: 44), *quexáos* (“complain_{imp.vos} [yourself_{vos}],” in De Souza 1964: 84) or *cagaos* (“poop_{imp.vos} [yourself_{vos}]” De Souza 1964: 84), occurring during the first half of the 15th century, the reflexive may be idiomatically used in singular. However, *miraos* (“look_{imp.vos} yourself_{vos}”) would be limited to a context in which a speaker commands the hearer to look into a mirror. The same phenomenon affects *decíos* (“say_{imp.vos} to yourself_{vos}”), in which the reflexive usage occurs in an odd situation of a speaker suggesting the hearer to speak to him/herself to control own’s thoughts. Thus, the first lexical entries affected by the reanalysis of deleted forms are verbal forms in which a reflexive may be odd. Future research should return to the 15th century data to examine the role of reanalysis and also of frequency. If *mirar* is a higher frequency imperative verb than others, grammatization would play also a role in the extension of dental-deleted variants.

This research has not confirmed that levels of intrinsic informality in the *voseo* imperative may yield one or another allomorph. However, if higher frequency yields higher

possibility of dental deletion, this may be due to a higher use in the vernacular, which may be associated with a spontaneous, casual or informal speech. A better explanation for the preference for *mirá* and *andá* over *mirad* and *andad* is related to the process of lexical diffusion of the dental-deleted allomorph from reflexives to non-reflexives. I summarize the development of *voseo* imperatives in Path 3A, (33):

(33) Path 3A (Path 3 reassessed in this paper):

Morphemic Distinction		Reanalysis		
<i>quejados</i>	>	<i>quejáos</i>	>	<i>quej-á</i>
/quej-ád=os/		/quej-á=os/		/quej-á/
complain-2.IMP=2.REFL complain-PST.PTCP		complain-2.IMP=2.REFL		complain-2.IMP
Lexical Diffusion				
<i>decí</i>		<i>mirá</i>		
/dec-í/		/mir-á/		
say-2.IMP		look-2.IMP		

In any case, the dental cannot be considered a pure convention of the spelling to signal *voseo* imperatives with final stress. Homomorphism and homographism are two types of phenomena that discard this possibility. If a homomorphic imperative were pronounced without *-d*, the writer would not have a reason to consider this form as a case of *voseo* but of *tuteo*. The only reason for which a writer would place a *-d* in a potentially homomorphic imperative is because that *-d* exists in pronunciation. In addition to that, lexical entries such as *andar* and *mirar* written without *-d* or an accent mark show that the writers are not interested in representing graphically the *voseo* imperative with a silent *-d*. In three of the documents I revised there are accent marks in *andá* (1797 and 1818) and *corré* (1811).

The lexical diffusion of *voseo* imperatives without *-d* goes further during the 18th century affecting almost all lexical entries; exceptions are those potentially homomorphic and those being attached a 3rd person clitic. During the 19th century, the lexical diffusion of dental-deleted allomorphs succeeds at affecting those potentially homomorphic lexical entries, and in the final stage, imperatives with 3rd person clitics. The final deletion of *-d* in these two contexts is due to the standardization of informal variants of inverse standardization. The perception of final *-d* as a highly formal variant in the *vos reverencial* style may have played a role in the preference for dental-deleted forms among educated speakers. There is more direct evidence of this process during the 19th century, which may be called inverse standardization, but may have started longer before that. Some literary works from the 16th and 17th centuries with abundance of *vos reverencial* show few cases of dental-deleted allomorphs, in plural, to distinguish an informal imperative. Thus, further research should take advantage of *vos* imperatives attested in 15th and 16th centuries, which certainly abound, to better the effects of frequency, levels of formality, morphemic distinction and homomorphism in this case of morphological variation.

Conflict of Interest: The corresponding author, on behalf of second author, confirms that there are no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Copyright: © 2025 by Ana María Díaz Collazos Author(s) retain the copyright of their original work while granting publication rights to the journal.

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, allowing others to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon it, even for commercial purposes, with proper attribution. Author(s) are also permitted to post their work in institutional repositories, social media, or other platforms.

Funded: This research was funded by the Summer Research Awards at the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Florida. I must acknowledge the feedback and

proofreading of Cindie Moore, who has worked intensively to support my endeavors, and my professor David Pharies (University of Florida), who showed me the path to Colonial documentation for this research. Also, the audience of the Kentucky Foreign Language Conference (2013).

Appendix

Voseo imperatives attested in Colombia as in their original source.

Year	Region	Original example	Corpus	Homograph.? (Closer form)	Reconstr.
1555	Eastern Highland	dezidle	AGN: f. 696r	No	decídle
1565	Eastern Highland	anda	AGN: f. 3v	Yes (yd)	andá
1565	Eastern Highland	yd	AGN: f. 3v	No	id
1565	Eastern Highland	myra	AGN: f. 3v	Yes (estareys)	mirá
1565	Eastern Highland	anda	AGN: f. 3v	Yes (soys)	andá
1577	Eastern Highland	traspasadle	Otte: lett. 319	No	traspasádle
1577	Eastern Highland	vended	Otte: lett. 319	No	vendéd
1577	Eastern Highland	vended	Otte: lett. 319	No	vendéd
1577	Eastern Highland	vended	Otte: lett. 319	No	vendéd
1577	Eastern Highland	entended	Otte: lett. 319	No	entendéd
1577	Eastern Highland	rogad	Otte: lett. 319	No	rogád
1578	Eastern Highland	trae	Otte: lett. 362	Yes (veniros, vuestra)	traé
1578	Eastern Highland	tened	Otte: lett. 362	No	tened
1578	Eastern Highland	traedla	Otte: lett. 362	No	traedla
1578	Eastern Highland	poned	Otte: lett. 362	No	ponéd
1578	Eastern Highland	tened	Otte: lett. 362	No	tenéd
1583	Eastern Highland	mira	Otte: lett. 371	Yes (escribís, halléis)	mirá
1584	Eastern Highland	decidle	Otte: lett. 374	No	decídle
1587	Eastern Highland	mira	Otte: lett. 372	Yes (vuestros, hagáis)	mirá
1587	Eastern Highland	decí	Otte: lett. 372	No	decí
1587	Eastern Highland	entended	Otte: lett. 372	No	entendéd
1587	Eastern Highland	mira	Otte: lett. 372	Yes (vuestros, hacéis)	mirá
1587	Eastern Highland	avísamelo	Otte: lett. 372	Yes (queréis, os)	avisámelo
1587	Eastern Highland	veníos	Otte: lett. 372	No	veníos
1587	Eastern Highland	mira	Otte: lett. 373	Yes (os, vendáis)	mirá
1587	Eastern Highland	mira	Otte: lett. 373	Yes (avéys, os)	mirá
1587	Eastern Highland	animad	Otte: lett. 374	No	animád
1587	Eastern Highland	poned	Otte: lett. 374	No	ponéd
1599	Caribbean	llegaos	Castillo: 628	No	llegáos
1599	Caribbean	besame	Castillo: 628	Yes (llegáos, mostradme)	besáme
1599	Caribbean	mostradme	Castillo: 628	No	mostradme
1638	Eastern Highland	esperá	Rodr.: 85	Yes (vuestro)	esperá
1638	Eastern Highland	metedlo	Rodr.: 86	No	metédlo
1638	Eastern Highland	tomá	Rodr.: 86	Yes	tomá

1638	Eastern Highland	decidme	Rodr.: 88	No	vení
1638	Eastern Highland	venid	Rodr.: 89	No	dádle
1638	Eastern Highland	dadle	Rodr.: 100	No	dádme
1638	Eastern Highland	dadme	Rodr.: 131	No	dádle
1638	Eastern Highland	dadle	Rodr.: 126	No	dádlos
1638	Eastern Highland	dadlos	Rodr.: 141	No	favorecéd
1638	Eastern Highland	descalzáos	Rodr.: 128	Yes (os)	descalzáos
1638	Eastern Highland	favorecedme	Rodr.: 142	No	mirá
1638	Eastern Highland	mirá	Rodr.: 154	Yes (estays, vos)	subí
1638	Eastern Highland	subí	Rodr.: 185	No	goberná
1638	Eastern Highland	goberná	Rodr.: 196	No	vení
1638	Eastern Highland	vení	Rodr.: 196	No	ídos
1638	Eastern Highland	idos	Rodr.: 198	No	lleváldo
1669	Eastern Highland	lleváldo	AGN: f. 980r	No	vení
1674	Southwest	anda	Sánchez: 185	Yes (decildes)	andá
1674	Southwest	decildes	Sánchez: 185	No	decildes
1694	Caribbean	mirad	Gutiérrez: 234	No	mirad
1750	Southwest	traeme	AHA: f. 16v	Yes (teneis)	traéme
1754	Eastern Highland	calla	AGN: f. 430v	Yes (tenes)	callá
1762	Caribbean	veni	Gutiérrez: 234	No	vení
1783	Antioquia	entra	AHJM: f. 5r	Yes (teneis)	entrá
1793	Eastern Highland	aseme	AGN: f. 399v	No	hacéme
1797	Southwest	andá	AHC: f. 23v	No (accent mark)	andá
1797	Southwest	dale	AHC: f. 23v	Yes	dále
1811	Antioquia	corré	AHA: f. 949r	No (accent mark)	corré
1818	Antioquia	andá	AGN: no f.	No (accent mark)	andá
1828	Eastern Highland	dadme	Vargas: 39	No	dádme

Corpus: AGN, Archivo General de la Nación; AHA, Archivo Histórico de Antioquia; AHJM, Archivo Histórico

Judicial de Medellín; AHC, Archivo Histórico de Cali (all correspond to direct discourse in court cases);

Gutiérrez Maté (2013); Otte (1993); Rodr.: Rodríguez Freyle (1997 [1638]); Vargas Tejada (n. y. [1828]);

Castillo Mathieu (1982); Sánchez Méndez (1997).

Voseo imperatives attested in other places of Hispanic America as in its original source.

Year	Region	Example	Corpus	Homographic? (Closer form)	Reconstructed
1527	México	agradecé	Castillo: 607	Yes (os)	agradecé

1527	México	andad	Castillo: 607	no	andad
1527	México	ios	Castillo: 607	no	íos
1527	México	guardaos	Castillo: 607	no	guardáos
1568	México	ios vos	Castillo: 607	no	íos vos
1605	Perú (Cuzco)	tomáos	Castillo: 626	no	tomáos
1605	Perú (Cuzco)	lleváos	Castillo: 626	no	lleváos
1626	Ecuador (Quito)	quitaos	Sánchez: 184	no	quitáos
1646	Ecuador (Quito)	mirad	Sánchez: 184	no	mirád
1646	Ecuador (Quito)	andad	Sánchez: 184	no	andád
1653	Argentina (Tuc)	anda	Rojas: 159	Yes (idos)	andá
1653	Argentina (Tuc)	idos	Rojas: 159	no	ídos
1655	Argentina (Tuc)	perdonadme	Rojas: 160	no	perdonádmme
1662	Rep. Dom (SD)	venid	Gutiérrez: 234	no	veníd
1662	Rep. Dom (SD)	venid	Gutiérrez: 234	no	mirád
1662	Rep. Dom (SD)	mirad	Gutiérrez: 234	no	veníd
1662	Rep. Dom (SD)	mirad	Gutiérrez: 234	no	mirád
1693	Argentina (BA)	abrí	Carricaburo: 52	no	abrí
1693	Argentina (BA)	vení	Carricaburo: 52	no	vení
1774	Costa Rica	handá	Quesada: 10	Yes (vos oigás)	andá
1774	Costa Rica	vete	Quesada: 10	Yes (vos oigás)	vete
1774	Costa Rica	quitate	Quesada: 10	Yes (vos oigás)	quitate
1782	Costa Rica	estad	Quesada: 8	no	estad
1787	Argentina	mira	Fontanella: 524	Yes (habéis)	mirá
1787	Argentina	mira	Fontanella: 524	Yes (hacéis)	mirá
1787	Argentina	vení	Carricaburo: 54	No	vení
1809	Argentina (Córd)	procura	Fontanella: 505	Yes (vos)	procurá
1813	Argentina (BA)	comprame	Fontanella: 504	Yes	compráme
1816	Argentina (BA)	dadle	Fontanella: 504	no	dádle
1817	Argentina (BA)	creedme	Fontanella: 504	no	creédme
1817	Argentina (BA)	led	Fontanella: 504	no	led
1858	Central America	traeldo	Rocha: 39	no	traeldo
1858	Central America	llevaldo	Rocha: 39	no	llevaldo
1858	Central America	cogéyo	Rocha: 39	no	llevaldo

Corpus: Carricaburo (1999); Castillo Mathieu (1982); Fontanella de Weinberg (1971 and 1989); Gutiérrez Maté (2013); Predevello (1987), Quesada Pacheco (1998); Rojas (1985); Sánchez Méndez (1997); Rocha (2002 [1858]). Region: Tuc., Tucumán; Córd., Córdoba; BA, Buenos Aires.

Works cited

- AGN. 1555. Archivo General de la Nación, Sección Colonia, Fondo Caciques e Indios, leg. 11, doc. 10
- AGN. 1565. Archivo General de la Nación, Sección Colonia, Fondo Criminales Juicios, leg. 95
- AGN. 1754. Archivo General de la Nación, leg. 38, doc. 4
- AGN. 1793. Archivo General de la Nación, leg. 1, doc. 9
- AGN. 1818. Archivo General de la Nación, leg. 86, doc. 25
- AHC. 1797. Archivo Histórico de Cali, Fondo Judicial, Caja 54, doc. 20
- AHJM. 1783. Archivo Histórico Judicial de Medellín, doc. 706
- AHM. 1811. Archivo Histórico de Medellín, doc. 0443
- Anipa, Kormi. 2000. "Tomad and tomá, etc.: Change and continuity in a morphological feature". *Modern Language Review* 95.389-398.
- Bello, Andrés. 1940 [1834]. "Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana". *El español de Chile* ed. by Amado Alonso, 49-77. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Bañón Hernández, Antonio Miguel. 2001. "Apuntes sobre el tratamiento apelativo en el siglo de oro español". *Revista electrónica de estudios filológicos*. 1. Available in: www.um.es/tonosdigital/znum1/estudios/ab0.htm
- Benavides, Carlos. 2003. "La distribución del voseo en Hispanoamérica". *Hispania* 86(3):612-623.
- Bentivoglio, Paola. 2002-2004. "Formas de tratamiento en cartas de la segunda mitad del siglo XVI: una aproximación pragmática". *Archivo de filología aragonesa* 59-60.229-248.

- Bentivoglio, Paola. 2003. "Spanish forms of address in the sixteenth century". *Diachronic perspectives on address term systems* ed. by Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas H. Jucker, 177-191. Amsterdam & Filadelfia: John Benjamins.
- Brown, Roger, & Albert Gilman. 1960. "The pronouns of power and solidarity". *Style in Language* ed. by Thomas A. Sbeock, 253-276. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Bybee, Joan. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- Bybee, Joan. 2001. *Phonology and language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carricaburo, Norma. 1999. *El voseo en la literatura argentina*. Madrid: Arco.
- Castillo Mathieu, Nicolás del. 1982. "Testimonios del uso de 'vuestra merced', 'vos' y 'tú' en América (1500-1650)". *Thesaurus* 37(3).602-644.
- Castro, Amanda. (2000). *Los pronombres de tratamiento en el español de Honduras*. Munchen: Lincom.
- Company Company, Concepción. 2008. "The directionality of grammaticalization in Spanish". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 9(2).200–224.
- Correas, Gonzalo. 1903 [1626]. *Arte grande de la lengua castellana*. Madrid: Real Academia Española. Available in:
<http://books.google.com/books?id=VFATAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Covarrubias, Patricia Olivia 2002. *Communication, culture and cooperation: Interpersonal relations and pronominal address in a Mexican Organization*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Cuervo, Rufino José. 1955. Pronombres y artículos. *Apuntaciones críticas al lenguaje bogotano*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo. 335-397.
- AUTHOR. 2010

AUTHOR. 2012.

AUTHOR. 2014.

Dworkin, Steven. 1988. "The interaction of phonological and morphological processes: The evolution of the Old Spanish second person plural endings". *Romance Philology* 42.144-145.

Enguita Utrilla, J. M. (1986). "Fórmulas de tratamiento en 'El Criticón'". *Gracián y su época. Actas de la I Reunión de Filólogos Aragoneses: ponencias y comunicaciones*, 295-316. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico. Available in:
<http://ifc.dpz.es/recursos/publicaciones/28/59/17enguita.pdf>

Ferrecio Podestá, Mario. 1993. "El vos del maestro Correas". *Thesaurus* 48(2).410-411

Fitch, Kristine Louise. 1989. *Communicative enactment of interpersonal ideology: Personal address in urban Colombian society*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, D.C.

Fontanella de Weinberg, Maria Beatriz. 1971. "El voseo en Buenos Aires en las primeras décadas del siglo XIX". *Thesaurus* 26(3).495-514.

Fontanella de Weinberg, Maria Beatriz. 1994. "Fórmulas de tratamiento en el español americano: Siglos XVI y XVII". *El español en el Nuevo Mundo: Estudios sobre historia lingüística hispanoamericana*, 73-96. Washington, DC: OEA. Available in
<http://www.educoas.org/Portal/bdigital/contenido/interamer/interamer30/formulas/index.aspx?culture=pt>

Fontanella de Weinberg, Maria Beatriz. 1999. "Sistemas pronominales de tratamiento usados en el mundo hispano". *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte, 1399-1426. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Frago Gracia, Juan Antonio. 1999. "Notas sobre el español antillano del siglo XVI en cartas de emigrados andaluces". *Estudios de Lingüística Hispánica* ed. by Amparo Morales,

- Julia Cardona, Humberto López Morales & Eduardo Forastieri, 250-262. San Juan: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- García Gallarín, Consuelo. 2000. "Fórmulas de tratamiento en *El Quijote*". *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española. Valencia, 31 de enero – 4 de febrero de 2000* ed. by Maria Teresa Echenique Elizondo & Juan Sánchez Méndez, 633-644. Madrid: Gredos.
- García Mouton, Pilar. 1999. "Tratamientos en las cartas de Indias". *Estudios de Lingüística Hispánica* ed. by Amparo Morales, Julia Cardona, Humberto López Morales & Eduardo Forastieri, 263-276. San Juan: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Guitarte, Guillermo. 1983. "Seseo y distinción s-z en América durante el siglo XIX", 107-125. *Siete estudios sobre el español de América*. México: Universidad Autónoma Nacional de México.
- Gutiérrez Maté, Miguel. 2013. *Pronombres personales sujeto en el español del Caribe. Variación e historia*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Universidad de Valladolid.
- Hanssen, Friedrich. 1913. *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Jonge, Bob de, & Nieuwenhuijsen, Dorien. 2009. "Formación del paradigma pronominal de las formas de tratamiento". *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española: La frase nominal* ed. by Concepción Company Company, 1593-1672. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- King, Jeremy. 2006. *Formality and Politeness in the Golden Age: A Study of Direct Address Patterns in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Spain*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California-Santa Barbara.
- Lapesa, Rafael. 2000a [1970]. "Personas gramaticales y tratamientos en español". *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*, 311-345. Madrid: Gredos.

- Lapesa, Rafael. 2000b [1970]. "Las formas verbales de segunda persona y los orígenes del 'voseo'". *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*, 682-697. Madrid: Gredos.
- León, Ana Emilia. 2011. *Extinción de 'vos' en el español peninsular*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Lipski, John. 1994. *El español de América*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Lloyd, Paul M. 1993 [1987]. *Del latín al español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Maldonado, Silvia. 1998. "Acercas de los deicticos personales en los documentos coloniales de Tucumán". *Estudios sobre la historia del español de América* ed. by Elena Rojas Mayer, 77-90. San Miguel de Tucumán: Universidad Nacional de Tucumán.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. 1966 [1904]. *Manual de gramática histórica española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Montes Giraldo, José Joaquín. 1967. "Sobre el voseo en Colombia". *Thesaurus* 22(1).21-44.
- Müller, Henri François. 1914. The usage of plural of reference in the letters of Pope Gregorio I. (590-604). *Romanic Review* 5.68-89.
- Oesterreicher, Wulf. 2005. "Textos entre inmediatez y distancia comunicativas. El problema de lo hablado escrito en el siglo de oro". *Historia de la lengua española* ed. by Rafael Cano, 729-769. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Otte, Enrique. 1993. *Cartas privadas de emigrantes a Indias: 1540-1616*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Páez Urdaneta, Iraset. 1981. *Historia y geografía hispanoamericana del voseo*. Caracas: La Casa de Bello.
- Pedroviejo Esteruelas, Juan Manuel. 2003. "Análisis de las formas de tratamiento en los pasos de Lope de Rueda". *Artifara* 3. Available in: <http://www.cisi.unito.it/artifara/rivista3/testi/lopederueda.asp>
- Penny, Ralph. 2000. *Variation and change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Penny, Ralph. 2002 [1991]. *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Predevello, Nora Lili. 1989. "El voseo en Córdoba. Perspectiva diacrónica". *Actas del II Congreso Nacional de Lingüística Universidad de San Juan, 13–16 de septiembre de 1981*, 43-51. San Juan Argentina: Universidad de San Juan.
- Primorac, Karen Johnson. 1996. *'Tu', 'vos', and 'vuestra Merced': Social and stylistic variation in Medieval Spanish*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Quesada Pacheco, Miguel Ángel. 1998. "Formas de tratamiento en Costa Rica durante la colonia". *Comunicación 1*. Available in:
http://www.tec.cr/sitios/Docencia/ciencias_lenguaje/revista_comunicacion/Volumen%203N%BA1%201988/pdf%27s/mquesada.pdf
- Quilis, Antonio. 1999. *Tratado de fonología y fonética españolas*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Quintanilla, José Roberto Alexander. 2009. "Actitudes de los hablantes de San Salvador hacia el tuteo y el voseo". *Hispania* 92(2).361-373.
- Rini, J. 1992. *Motives for linguistic change in the formation of Spanish object pronouns*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta.
- Rini, Joel. 1999. *Exploring the role of morphology in the evolution of Spanish*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Restrepo, Antonio José. 1955 [1929]. *El cancionero de Antioquia*. Medellín: Teresa Uribe Restrepo y B. A. Gutiérrez.
- Rocha, Juan Eligio de la. 2002 [1858]. "Equivocaciones de los centroamericanos al hablar castellano". *El español de Nicaragua y Palabras y modismos de la lengua castellana, según se habla en Nicaragua [1874] de C. H. Berendt*, ed. by E. Arellano, 85-88. Managua: Instituto Nicaragüense de Cultura Hispánica & Academia Nicaragüense de la Lengua.

- Rodríguez Freyle, Juan. 1997 [1638]. *El carnero según el otro manuscrito de Yerbabuena*, ed. by Mario Germán Romero. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Rojas Mayer, Elena M. 1985. *Evolución histórica del español en Tucumán entre los siglos XVI y XIX*. Tucumán: Universidad de Tucumán.
- Rona, José Pedro. 1960. *Geografía y morfología del voseo*. Pôrto Alegre: Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul.
- Salvador Plans, Antonio. 1996. "Las fórmulas de tratamiento en la teoría gramatical de los siglos XVI y XVII". *Scripta Philologica in memoriam Manuel Taboada Cid* ed. by Manuel Casado et al, vol. 1, 185-207. A Coruña: Universidad de A Coruña.
- Sánchez Méndez, Juan. 2003. *Historia de la lengua española en América*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanc.
- Sánchez Méndez, Juan. 1997. *Aproximación histórica al español de Venezuela y Ecuador durante los siglos XVII y XVIII*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch.
- Sankoff, David; Tagliamonte, Sali; and Smith, Eric. 2011. *GoldVarb Lion: A multivariate analysis application*. Available in:
<http://individual.utoronto.ca/tagliamonte/goldvarb.htm>
- Solís y Valenzuela, Pedro de. 1984 [1650]. *El desierto prodigioso y prodigio del desierto* ed. by Héctor H. Orjuela. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Souza, Roberto de. 1964. "Desinencias verbales correspondientes a la persona vos/vosotros en el cancionero español Valencia 1511". *Filología* 10.1-95.
- Vargas Tejada, Luis. No Date [1828]. *Las convulsiones*. Bogotá: Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango. Available in:
<http://banrepcultural.org/blaavirtual/literatura/convuls/indiceconvuls.htm>