

# Evidence of Colonial Lag in Post-Colonial Languages: The Case of Colombian Spanish

Aisling O'Donnell, University College Cork

## Abstract

The aim of the paper is to investigate evidence of colonial lag through the use of second person singular pronouns (SPSPs) in Colombian Spanish, a post-colonial language which developed as a result of language transplantation. The study uses Marckwardt's (1958) and Görlach's (1987) definitions of colonial lag, and Trudgill's (1999, 2004), Hundt's (2009) and Schreier's (2013) observations on language transplantation as a basis for the investigation. A secondary aim is to demonstrate evidence of linguistic formality within the post-colonial society which can be linked to its colonial history and post-colonial development. The study employs a diachronic approach in which data collection was carried out via three sources in Bogotá: historical documents from 1800 – 1900, novels published between 1999 and 2002, and in-person, face-to-face exchanges carried out in 2009. SPSPs found in the data were analysed firstly to establish the meaning conveyed in each exchange and to determine if and how the use of SPSPs has changed across time. The examples of pronoun use were then analysed using GOLDVARB to ascertain how personal characteristics such as gender, age and socio-economic status influence their use. The results of the study posit that colonial lag, one of three predicted outcomes in the evolution of post-colonial languages, can be observed in the use of SPSPs in Bogotá, Colombia. It likewise provides evidence of formality in linguistic behaviour within Bogotá society which is reminiscent of the post-colonial society.

**Keywords:** post-colonial languages, Colombian Spanish, colonial lag

## Introduction

Focusing on Colombian Spanish this paper discusses the evolution of transplanted languages in post-colonial societies in the Americas. It proposes that the development of transplanted languages in colonies was distinct to that in the then metropolis insofar as language transplantation results in three predicted outcomes: colonial lag, dialect mixing and language variation due to language contact (Marckwardt 1958, Trudgill 1986, Görlach 1987). This paper focuses specifically on the first of these outcomes, colonial lag.

The study is based on the hypothesis that linguistic features, namely second person singular pronouns (SPSPs), in the Spanish transplanted into Colombia in the early 1500s, which have since fallen out of use in Peninsular Spanish, can be observed in contemporary

Spanish spoken in Bogotá. Based on this hypothesis, the study explores two research questions:

- which features of SPSP use in the Spanish of Bogotá can be traced back to the transplanted language and therefore demonstrate evidence of colonial lag?
- what does the use of these SPSPs tell us about Bogotá society?

The study employs diachronic and variationist methodologies in which the use of singular pronominal terms of address in three data sources, historical correspondence, contemporary fiction and face-to-face exchanges, is analysed to provide insight into linguistic practices regarding the use of SPSPs and their development. This study contributes to existing research on the development of post-colonial languages in the Americas by demonstrating evidence of linguistic retention and conservatism in the contemporary society. The paper is divided into three sections. The first section provides an overview of the concept of colonial lag and previous research on post-colonial languages. The second section applies the theories discussed in the first to the Spanish of Bogotá which is presented as a case study of a post-colonial language. The third section of the paper presents the results and discussion of the data analysis.

### **Colonial Lag**

Colonial lag is the retention of linguistic features of a transplanted language in the emergent post-colonial language. Linguistic retention is mentioned by Ellis (1869-89, as cited in Krapp, 1927) who refers to a kind of arrest of development of language which occurred in the English of the British colonies at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Krapp (1927, p. 294) proposes that “the language of emigrants remains for a long time at a stage in which it was at when emigration took place, and alters more slowly than the mother tongue, and in a different

direction". Schele de Vere (1872, p. 427) also mentions linguistic retention in American English and maintains that:

the largest part of so-called Americanisms are nothing more than good old English words which for one reason or another have become obsolete or provincial in England, while they have retained their full power and citizenship in the United States.

Marckwardt (1958, p. 80) coined the term 'colonial lag' to describe "retention of earlier linguistic features" in American English and claims that when a language is transplanted certain features of the language remain static over time. Marckwardt maintains that earlier linguistic features and archaic elements found in American English are evidence of colonial lag. Furthermore, Marckwardt suggests that colonial lag is not unique to English and states that evidence of Continental French antedating the French revolution has been found in Canadian French and some varieties of Spanish in Latin American have retained elements of Peninsular Spanish. Moreover, Marckwardt (1958, p. 80) claims that the principles of colonial lag can be applied to people, language and culture, and refers to evidence of "post-colonial survival of earlier phases of mother-country culture" in North America which had disappeared in England. As a result, evidence of a lag may be found in the attitudes and customs of the post-colonial societies as well as in the languages.

Görlach (1987) proposes that colonial lag is a predicted outcome of all transplanted languages claiming that although the historical conditions of the spread of languages diverge quite drastically, colonial lag is to be expected in post-colonial languages irrespective of language, settler type or new habitat. Trudgill (1999, p. 227) refers to colonial lag as "a lag or delay in the normal progression and development of linguistic change." Although, Trudgill agrees with Marckwardt's and Görlach's theories which claim that colonial lag is a feature of some post-colonial languages, he maintains that this lag only "lasts for about one generation

and arises solely as an automatic consequence of the fact that there is often no common peer-group dialect for children to acquire in the first-generation colonial situation involving dialect mixing” (p. 227). Furthermore, Trudgill proposes that young children speak like their peers rather than their elders and that up to a certain age in European-style communities “children accommodate rapidly and totally, or almost totally, to the speech of any new peer group of which they become long term members” (p. 228). Trudgill claims that when British English was first brought to New Zealand there was no “single, established peer dialect for children to acquire” and as a result children acquired the English, Scottish and Irish dialects of their parents. Trudgill suggests that this scenario is typical of all colonial situations which involve dialect mixing and new-dialect formation and hence, may be true for the formation of other varieties of post-colonial languages, such as Spanish.

Hundt (2009) claims that the concept of colonial lag and colonial innovation “implies a far too simplistic view of the much more complex patterns and processes of language change” (p. 14). In her analysis, she refers to previous studies (Kytö, 1991; Kytö & Romaine, 2000) to demonstrate how instances of change may show evidence of colonial lag and instances of colonial innovation in American English. Hundt concludes that the terms “‘colonial lag’ and ‘colonial innovation’ are useful for the synchronic description of the early stages of colonialization” (p. 34). Yet, cautions against the propensity highlighted by Bailey (2001, p. 472) “to assume that ‘lag’ exists rather than to test the idea as a hypothesis”. Schreier (2013) proposes that drawing on case studies facilitates an understanding of the forms of post-colonial languages which first emerged in the colonies. In the case of Tristan da Cunha English, a lesser known variety of English, Schreier states that “some features, brought to the island by the first generation of founders, were adopted and maintained; these then died out in the input varieties so that analysing the variety allows researchers to gain an understanding of how these features may have operated in the past” (p. 161). Schreier’s

(2013) observations are comparable to Mufwene's (2001) Founder Principle which maintains that the founder population has a greater influence on linguistic outcomes than settlers arriving later. This principle when applied to the evolution of post-colonial languages may account for the retention of linguistic features recognised in this paper as colonial lag. Furthermore, as new colonies developed, and administrative centres were established, the colonial society often took on a new hierarchical structure. As a result, prestige and social status became important features of the community and it was often the first-generation settlers who strived to maintain the colonial society's hierarchical structure. Evidence of retention of customs and attitudes by members of the post-colonial society in Bogotá will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

## **The Case of Colombian Spanish**

### **Colonization of Colombia**

The Spanish colonization of Colombia began in 1509 when Alonso De Ojeda, and his troops landed in La Guajira and travelled along the northern coast to Cartagena Bay in the department of Bolivar. Cartagena de Indias became a major point of access to South America for Spanish explorers and immigrants. Lipski (1994) states that in 1718 *Nueva Granada*, which took in the territories of what is now Colombia, Panama, Ecuador and Venezuela, was converted to a Viceroyalty and Santa Fé de Bogotá was elevated to administrative capital. This elevation brought with it a university and other cultural and religious centres, which resulted in the arrival of clerics, teachers and administrators. Many Spanish immigrants came from *Castilla la Nueva* and *Castilla la Vieja* to take up official positions in Santa Fé de Bogotá.

The Spanish Empire endeavoured to strengthen its authority over the viceroyalties and therefore strived to achieve social order. However, Safford and Palacios (2002) maintain that in *Nueva Granada* these efforts “helped sow the seeds of colonial rebellion” (p. 54). Spanish officials were given priority over *Criollos*, the second-generation Spanish, when positions of authority were allocated, and this created resentment towards the system. Nevertheless, even though *Criollos* were seldomly appointed to the highest positions of authority, it was something that they strived for and links were often created through marriage and many achieved posts as provincial administrators (*corregidor*), lieutenant governors or advisers to governors. However, the Spanish Empire intentionally limited the power accessible to the *Criollo* elite and established *encomiendas* (colonial forced labour institutions) which then became instrumental in the creation of the local state as they influenced the formation of the revolutionary government and the new federal government. (Faguet et al, 2024).

Rico Ocampo (1989) claims that the emancipation of South America was a political revolution which replaced the dominance of the Spanish with that of *Criollo* aristocrats. Moreover, Thurner & Guerrero (2003, p. 224) propose that although the wars of independence had secured liberation from the Spanish Empire, the social situation had not improved for the lower levels of society. It was the “same mule, new rider”. From a linguistic point of view, Spanish became the official language, and the ruling classes disregarded the language and culture of the Indigenous peoples.

### **Development of SPSPs in Colombian Spanish**

From a linguistic perspective the elevation of Santa Fé de Bogota to administrative capital facilitated continued contact with the speech of the Castilian elite. Regular contact between the Peninsula and the administrative centres of the Spanish colonies meant that initially linguistic changes occurred simultaneously in the Peninsula and the Viceroyalties. One

example of this was seen in the pronoun system. Until the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Peninsular Spanish used the second person singular pronoun (SPSP), *tú*, informally to express closeness, and the SPSP, *vos*, formally to express respect and deference. Capdevila (1928, p. 124) maintains that by the 16<sup>th</sup> century *vos* began to lose its respectful status in the Peninsula, stating that: “*en España se tutearon los más cultos. El vos quedó para los inferiores.* [In Spain the most cultured use *tú*. *Vos* was left for the lower class]”. Rosenblat (1964) later claims that, in the Peninsula, *vuestra merced* ‘your grace’, which until the 16<sup>th</sup> century had been reserved for addressing those of superior status, became used as a singular term of respect and replaced *vos* as the formal SPSP. *Vuestra merced* ‘your grace’ was shortened to *usted*. By the seventeenth century, *tú* had replaced *vos* in Peninsular Spanish and was used as the informal SPSP and *usted* was used as the formal SPSP. Montes Giraldo (1967, p. 23) proposes that the retention of *vos* in Colombian Spanish is an example of colonial lag, as the innovation which replaced the use of *vos* with *tú* in the Peninsular did not occur to the same extent in all the Spanish colonies. Tiscornia (1930, cited in Montes Giraldo, 1967, p. 22) claims that in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century the Spanish colonies of America were introduced to a language whose linguistic rules were in flux, as innovations had not been fully established in the Peninsula.

Uber (1985) investigated the use of pronominal terms of address in Bogotá and found evidence of a dual function of *usted* to express solidarity and respect. Uber maintains that this aspect which is unique to the address system in Colombian Spanish developed from the dual use of *vuestra merced* ‘your grace’ and as such is an example of colonial lag. Uber’s reference to solidarity is based on Brown and Gilman’s (1967) concepts of power and solidarity. Brown and Gilman propose that within a dyad the relationship may be based on power, where one person has power over the other and the relationship is asymmetrical, or based on solidarity, whereby a shared experience exists, and the relationship is symmetrical. For the purposes of this study, solidarity refers an expression or acknowledgement of a shared

experience or a sense of common ground, while distance refers to an expression or acknowledgement of a difference in relation to personal characteristics, such as social status, age or gender. Quesada Pacheco (1988) investigated examples of correspondence between the colony and the peninsula from in the sixteenth century and found that *vos* and *vuestra merced* were used to express solidarity among friends and family as much as they were used to express distance and respect, while the pronoun *tú* was reserved for use with offspring to express solidarity. As a result, the dual use of *usted* observed by Uber (1985) can be considered an example of colonial lag. In light of the above, this study investigates contemporary usage of SPSPs in order to establish if patterns of usage observed by Quesada Pacheco (1988) and Uber (1985) can still be found in the Spanish of Bogotá.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

The data collection for this study was carried out across three sources i) 19<sup>th</sup> century correspondence; ii) novels based in Bogotá published between 1997 and 2002; and iii) live face to face conversations recorded in Bogotá in 2009. The data analysis was completed in two stages. In the first stage, examples of use of SPSPs were collected across the three data sources and these examples were analysed diachronically to determine if use of terms of address observed in Colombian Spanish in 1800s can still be seen in contemporary usage. In the second stage examples from each data source were analysed in terms of the relationship between addresser and addressee and their social status to establish the relative power between them with the aim of determining the meaning conveyed by the SPSPs. Using GOLDVARB each example was coded in relation to the data source, gender, age and social class of the addresser and addressee in the exchange. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century correspondence and novels, social status was determined by information available regarding characteristics of the addressee and addresser such as employment, profession or position. In each example the

social status of those involved in the correspondence or exchange was analysed in relation to one another. For instance, in example (4) Francisco de la Guerra, the author of the letter is an army captain and historian which indicates a level of education and high status. Manuel Martínez Mansilla, the addressee, is a lieutenant to the Governor, which also indicates education but in relation to status the addressee is lower in rank than the addresser. In face-to-face exchanges social status was determined by the strata in which the participant lived. The city of Bogotá is divided into six strata which are based on per capita income and quality of urban infrastructure; strata 1 is the lowest and strata 6 the best located and best served. A separate token file was then created for each source of data and each exchange. This token file facilitated analysis of the influence of each of the personal characteristics of addresser and addressee on the choice of SPSP in an exchange. GOLDVARB produced tables which show the number and percentage of exchanges which use each term of address.

### Correspondence from 1800-1900

In total 31 samples of correspondence were accessed via the *Archivo General de la Nación* ‘The National Archive of Colombia’. On analysis of these examples evidence of the use of *usted* and of *tú* was found (see examples (1) – (4)).

(1) A letter written in 1820 by Enrique Somoya to an America friend (Republica, Historia, Roll 4 p 685 l. 1-3).

*He leído, mi querido amigo, con mucho gusto las juiciosas observaciones del Señor A. en su artículo venvenido que **usted** me aconsejarías con el diario de Cádiz del 10 de corriente.*

*He leído, mi querido amigo con mucho gusto*

‘I have read, my dear friend with great enthusiasm

*las juiciosas observaciones de -l Señor A.*

the judicious observations of the **Mr. A.**

*en su artículo venvenido que usted*

in his article welcome that **you**

*me aconsejarías con el diario de Cádiz*

me would advise with the daily of Cadiz

*de 10 de -l corriente.*

the 10 of the current.'

'I have read, my dear friend, with great enthusiasm the wise observations of **Mr. A.** in his welcome article which **you** recommended to me with 'El Diario de Cadiz' on the 10th of the current (month).'

- (2) A letter written in Quito in 1807 by Felipe Fuentes Amar, nephew of the Virrey, to his uncle the Virrey Amar y Borbón (Colonia, Miscelánea, Roll 139 pp 1068 l. 6-7).

*En su visita no puedo menos a atributar á VD las debidas gracias.*

*En su vista no puedo menos a tributar*

'In your visit not I can least to pay

*á VD (usted) las debidas gracias*

to you the deserved thanks.'

'On **your** visit I can do no less than give **you** the deserved thanks.'

- (3) A letter written in Maracaibo, Venezuela in 1807 by Francisco de la Guerra, an

army captain and historian, to Manuel Martínez Mansilla, a lieutenant to the Governor (Colonia, Miscelánea, Roll 130 pp 1094 l. 7-10).

*Es regular que refrigerando V con estos días de la vida **continúa** gozando de la perfecta salud.*

*Es regular que refrigerado V (usted) con estos días*

‘It is normal that refreshed you with these days

*de la vida continúa gozando de la perfecta*

of the life you continue enjoying of the perfect

*salud.*

health.’

‘It is normal that refreshed by these days, **you** continue enjoying in **your** life perfect health.’

- (4) A letter written in 1805 by Juana Mansilla to her son (Colonia, Miscelánea, Roll 116 p 99 l. 20-21).

***Tú** mismo, **tú** conocerás toda la extensión de **tus** recursos, si a **ti** mismo te **dices** sin dilación.*

***Tú** mismo **tú** conocerás toda la extensión de*

‘You self you will know all the extent of

***tus** recursos, **sí** a **ti** mismo te **dices***

your resources if to your -self you you say

*sin dilación*

without delay.’

‘**You** yourself will know the full extent of **your** resources, if **you** tell yourself without delay.’

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century correspondence *usted* is used between friends (1), by a nephew to his uncle (2), and by a superior to a subordinate (3), and *tú* is used by a mother to her son (4).

## Novels

Three novels were analysed: *Perder es cuestión de método* (Gamboa, 1997), *Su casa es mi casa* (García Ángel, 2001), *Satanás*, (Mendoza, 2002). The criteria for choosing the novels were that: i) the story contain dialogue, ii) the story be based in Bogotá, and ii) the author be a native of Bogotá. The expectation is that these dialogues represent natural use of terms of address which can be interpreted as deictic (directly referring to the addressee of the utterance) or generic (De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014). Therefore, analysis of the deictic examples in the novels based in Bogotá provides insight into the perceived norms of SPSP use across the sectors of Bogotá society represented within the novels.

Examples of exchanges between two interlocutors were extracted from the novels. The average length of exchange was one hundred and thirty-eight words. The use of *tú* (5) and *usted* (6, 7, 8, 9) found in the novels are exemplified below.

(5) A middle-aged priest addresses a young woman.

*Dime en qué [tú] has pecado, hija mía* (Mendoza 2002).

*Dime en qué has pecado, hija mía.*

‘Tell me in what **you** have sinned daughter my.’

‘Tell me how **you** have sinned, my child.’

(6) A newspaper seller addresses a young woman.

*Aquí tiene, SEÑORITA, una copia limpiecita. Normalmente estas cosas no se hacen, pero tratándose de alguien como usted.* (Gamboa 1997).

*Aquí **tiene**, señorita, una copia limpiecita. Normalmente estas*  
‘Here you have, miss, a copy a little clean. Normally these  
cosas no se hacen, pero tratándose de alguien  
things no one they do but being of someone  
como *usted*.  
like *you*.’

‘Here you go, miss, a nice clean copy. Normally, these things are not done, but as it is someone like **you**.’

(7) A mother addresses her son.

*Yo nunca lo he odiado, mijo.* (Mendoza 2002).

*Yo nunca **lo** he odiado, mijo*  
‘I never **you** have (I) hated, my son’  
‘I have never hated **you**, my son.’

(8) A female bank clerk addresses a middle-aged man.

*Señor, **entienda**, no tengo monedas de esa denominación.* (Mendoza 2002).

*Señor, **entienda**, no tengo monedas de esa*  
‘Sir, **you** understand no I have coins of that  
denominación  
denomination.’

‘Sir, understand (**you**), I do not have coins of that denomination.’

(9) A middle-aged man addresses a young man.

*No sé quién es **usted**, JOVEN, pero me lo imagino.* (Gamboa 1997).

*No sé quién es usted joven pero me lo imagino.*

‘No I know who is **you** youth but I it imagine.’

‘I do not know who **you** are, young man, but I can imagine.’

In the novels *usted* is used by a newspaper seller to a young woman (6) and between a mother and son (7), by a female bank teller to a male customer (8), and by a middle-aged man to a young man (9). *Tú* is used by a middle-aged priest to a young woman (5).

### Face-to-Face Exchanges

A total of 32 conversations were observed, recorded and transcribed. In each conversation there was a minimum of two turn takers. In total 42 participants (18 male and 24 female) took part in the study. The participants were all residents of Bogotá or had lived there for a minimum of 10 years. They were selected by age, according to three generations: 1) 16–35 years, 2) 36–55 years, 3) 56 years and above, level of education, according to three levels: i) primary, ii) secondary, iii) university and above, and socio-economic level according to three levels: i) lower ; strata 1-2, ii) middle; strata 3-4, iii) higher; strata 5-6.

(10) A mother addresses her son

*¿Usted está en cual está entonces?*

*Usted esta en cual está entonces?*

‘**You** are in which **you are** then?’

‘Which one are **you** in then?’

(11) A young woman addresses a male friend.

a. *Bueno, que voy a contar a usted?*

*Bueno, que voy a contar a usted?*

‘Well, what I am going to tell to **you**?’

‘Well, what am I going to tell **you**?’

b. *Ha visto, usted le gusta que le acompañe aquí.*

*Ha visto, usted le gusta que le acompañe aquí.*

‘You see you to you like that to you I accompany here

‘You see, you like that I keep you company here.’

(12) A female, middle aged office cleaner addresses a younger female administrator

*Como usted ya sabe que siempre a mitad de año siempre nos.....*

*Como usted ya sabe que siempre a mitad*

As you already know that always at middle

*de -l año siempre nos.....*

of the year always we ....

‘As you already know in the middle of the year, we always...’

In the analysis of face-to-face conversations examples of *usted* were observed in conversations between parents and offspring (10), and between friends (11a, 11b) and co-workers (12).

### Findings and Discussion

The data samples were analysed in terms of the relationship between addresser and addressee, and their social status relative to one another. Based on this analysis, evidence of dual use of *usted* observed by Uber (1985) and Quesada Pacheco (1988) was found in all data sources. In the correspondence *usted* is used to express solidarity between friends (1), respect by a nephew to his uncle (2), and respect by a superior and to minimise social distance between him and a subordinate (3), and *tú* is used by a mother to express solidarity with her son (4).

This demonstrates that address patterns observed in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries were still evident in Colombian Spanish in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In the novels *tú* and *usted* are both used to express solidarity (5 (*tú*), 6,7 (*usted*)) and *usted* is used to express deference (8) and to create distance (9). *Usted* is used to express solidarity by a newspaper seller to a young woman (6) and between a mother and son (7), to express respect by a female bank teller to a male customer (8), and to express dominance and create distance by a middle-aged man to a young man (9). *Tú* is used to express solidarity by a middle-aged priest to a young woman (5). In the face-to-face examples of *usted* used to express solidarity and respect were observed. *Usted* was used to express solidarity by a mother to her son (10) to express solidarity between female - male friends (11a, 11b) by an office cleaner to express deference to an administrator and by the administrator to express respect for the cleaner and what she does for the company, and to therefore raise the status of the cleaner and minimise authoritative and social distance (12). The results on the second stage of data analysis reveal that *usted* is used by all genders and ages, and across all levels of society to express solidarity, respect or deference. The examples from the novels and face-to-face exchanges demonstrated that the dual use of *usted* observed by Uber (1985) which was observed in the examples taken 19<sup>th</sup> century correspondence can still be observed in the address patterns used in Bogotá and can therefore be considered an example of colonial lag.

The examples were coded using Goldvarb, the series of programs designed to implement variable rule analysis, and samples were analysed for expression of solidarity, dominance, formality and distance. Goldvarb is used to analyse these linguistic practices and ascertain how personal characteristics such as gender, age and socio-economic status influence the use of terms of address. Tagliamonte (2006, p.137) maintains that Goldvarb is the program best suited to variationist analysis as “in real language data this uneven distribution of categories is typical [and] standard statistical procedures such as Anova, which

assume even distribution, are not ideal for language in use.” The results of the variable rule analysis are displayed in tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1**

***Binominal Analysis of Usted***

<b>(1) Analysis of the contribution of the external variables of speaker and addressee selected as significant to the probability of speaker using usted [U].</b>			
<b>(2) Corrected mean</b>			.48
<b>(3) Log likelihood</b>			-49.546
<b>(4) Total</b>			208
<b>Variables (8)</b>	<b>Factor weight (5)</b>	<b>% (6)</b>	<b>N (7)</b>
<b>Message conveyed by term of address</b>			
Dominance	.93	75.0	6
Solidarity	.46	42.2	57
Formality	.00	100	63
Distance	.00	100	2
<i>Range</i>	47		
<b>Gender of speaker and addressee</b>			
Male – male	.76	67.9	57
Female – female	.44	58.3	14
Male – female	.40	67.3	35
Female – male	.19	45.8	22
<i>Range</i>	57		
<b>Age of speaker and addressee<sup>1</sup></b>			
G2 – G2	.74	77.4	41
G1 – G1	.51	65.1	28
G2 – G1	.68	67.6	25
G1 – G2	.53	61.9	13
G1 – G3	.38	28.6	2
G3 – G2	.15	46.7	7
G2 – G3	.14	56.2	9
G3 – G1	.08	33.3	2
G3 – G3	.05	20	2
<i>Range</i>	69		
<b>Class of speaker and addressee</b>			
Low – Low	.90	64.6	22
Mid – Low	.79	87.0	20
Low – Mid	.78	76.2	16

<sup>1</sup> G1 = generation 1 (16– 35 years, 2), G2 = generation 2 (36 – 55 years, 3), G3= generation 3 (56 years +)

Up – Low	.37	92.3	12
Mid – Mid	.37	47.5	19
Up – Mid	.34	80	4
Mid – Up	.33	71.4	5
Up – Up	.12	26.7	12
Low – Up	.00	100	15
<i>Range</i>	78		

Table 1 shows that across the data samples *usted* is used most often to express dominance and also to express solidarity. Moreover, *usted* is used most often to express dominance in exchanges between male addressers and addressees, G2 addressers and addressees and addressers and addressees from lower socio-economic levels.

**Table 2**

***Binominal Analysis of Tú***

<b><i>Analysis of the contribution of the external variables of speaker and addressee selected as significant to the probability of speaker using usted [T].</i></b>			
<b>Corrected mean</b>		.52	
<b>Log likelihood</b>		-46.561	
<b>Total</b>		208	
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Factor weight</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Age of speaker and addressee<sup>2</sup></b>			
G3 – G1	.99	66.7	4
G3 – G2	.83	53.3	8
G1 – G3	.79	71.4	5
G1 – G1	.72	34.9	15
G1 – G2	.54	33.3	7
G2 – G1	.52	32.4	12
G2 – G3	.39	37.5	6
G2 - G2	.16	17	9
G3 – G3	.07	40	2
<i>Range</i>	92		

<sup>2</sup> G1 = generation 1 (16– 35 years, 2), G2 = generation 2 (36 – 55 years, 3), G3= generation 3 (56 years +)

<b>Class of speaker and addressee</b>			
Up – Up	.96	73.3	33
Mid – Up	.82	28.6	2
Mid – Mid	.76	47.5	19
Mid – Low	.18	13	3
Low – Mid	.14	19	4
Up – Mid	.13	20	1
Low – Low	.08	23.5	8
Up – Low	.02	7.7	1
Low – Up	.00	0	0
<i>Range</i>	<i>94</i>		
<b>Message conveyed by term of address</b>			
Solidarity	.54	52.6	71
Dominance	.05	25	2
Formality	.00	0	0
Distance	.00	0	0
<i>Range</i>	<i>49</i>		
<b>Gender of speaker and addressee</b>			
Female – male	.76	45.8	22
Female – female	.69	41.7	10
Male – female	.50	28.8	15
Male – male	.29	31.0	26
<i>Range</i>	<i>47</i>		

In table 2 the factors indicate the use of *tú* as an expression of solidarity is most common across all data by a female addresser to a male addressee, by a G3 addresser to someone younger and between addressers and addressees of higher socio-economic level.

Further analysis of the preference for *usted* shown by lower socio-economic levels when addressing someone with an equal status may stem from a desire to demonstrate respect and elevate status. This in turn may point back to period of transition from a colonial to post-colonial society when the lower levels of society were dominated by the Spanish colonisers and post-colonial elite from higher levels of society, respectively. Equally, the reciprocal use of *tú* by higher socio-economic levels is used, rather than *usted* of solidarity, as described by Uber (1985), to express a close yet not intimate relationship with the addressee. Therefore, an element of social distance is maintained which satisfies a desire for social distance and again

points back to a colonial period when Montes Giraldo (1982, p. 33) claims that conservatism was inherent in the language of the colonial administrators.

In the early stages of the new republic, *Criollos*, who were part of the elite in the colonial society alongside the Spanish immigrants and administrators, strived to maintain the prestigious speech of the Spanish elite which included the dual use of *usted* and use of *tú* in the place of *vos*. When independence was achieved, *Criollos* retained the linguistic practices of the Spanish to retain the hierarchal structure of the colonial society and their position as elites in post-colonial Colombia. As a result, a level of formality can be found in the contemporary speech of the department of Cundinamarca, where Bogotá is based, as well as in the attitudes to politeness and social boundaries. This may be considered a type of cultural colonial lag. In Bogotá formality and social boundaries are valued greatly and older generations consider addressing a stranger or someone with whom the speaker is not well acquainted using *tú* as impolite if this person has not invited the speaker to do so. These results show that a dual function of *usted* which influences the use of *tú* in intimate relationships is still present in the contemporary usage in Bogotá.

### **Conclusion**

This paper presents an investigation of colonial lag in the pronoun system of the Spanish and the post-colonial society in Bogotá. Examples of colonial lag in the pronoun system have been highlighted in the form of the dual use of *usted* observed in the data which has since fallen out of use in Peninsular Spanish. It is posited that the use of *usted* by a speaker from a higher socioeconomic level of society towards a member of a low socioeconomic group is an effort to minimize the social distance between the interlocutors and raise the status of the addressee and therefore demonstrate a desire to express respect for that person and their contribution to society.

In relation to evidence of colonial lag observed within the post-colonial society of Bogotá, retention of linguistic features which were stigmatized in the Peninsula once independence had been achieved may have been a conscious effort to distance the Spanish of the Bogotá from the speech of Toledo, which was the capital of the Spanish Empire until 1561. Furthermore, preservation of features used in the colonial society also served to maintain the superiority of *Criollos* as the elite in the new post-colonial society. Therefore, reasons for this type of colonial lag within the society may have been an effort by the second-generation Spanish to maintain a domination over those in the lower socioeconomic levels of society. Furthermore, as claimed by Montes Giraldo (1982), it may have been an acknowledgement of the social distance which existed between the members of the different socioeconomic levels of society and a retention of the conservatism of the colonial society. The implications for further research from this study indicate that an analysis focusing more directly on the influence of characteristics such as gender and age would reveal variation in patterns of SPSPs usage across these categories.

### References

- Bailey, R. W. (2001). American English abroad. In J. Algeo (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, (pp. 456–496). Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cho19780521264792.015>
- Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960) The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed) *Style and Language*, 253-76. MIT Press
- Capdevila, A. (1928) *Babel y el Castellano*. Compañía Iberoamericana de Publicaciones.
- de Hoop, H. & Hogeweg, L. (2014). The use of second person pronouns in a literary work. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 43(2), 109-125. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jls-2014-0008>

- Faguet, J.-P., C. Matajira, and F. Sánchez Torres. 2024. "Encomienda, the Colonial State, and Long-Run Development in Colombia." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 8–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4761098>.
- Görlach, M. (1987) Colonial lag? The alleged conservative character of American English and other colonial varieties. *English World-Wide* 8(1), 41-60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.8.1.05gor>
- Hundt, M. (2009). Colonial lag, colonial innovation or simply language change? In G. Rohdenburg & J. Schlüter (Eds.), *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English* (pp. 13–37). Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511551970.002>
- Krapp, G. P. (1927). Is American English archaic? *Southwest Review*, 12(4), 292-303.
- Kytö, M. (1991). *Variation and diachrony, with early American English in focus: studies on CAN/MAY and SHALL/WILL*. Peter Lang.
- Kytö, M. & Romaine, S. (2000). Adjective comparison and standardisation processes in American and British English from 1620 to the present. In L. Wright (Ed.), *The Development of Standard English, 1300–1800: Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts. Studies in English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 171–94).  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511551758.011>
- Lipski, J. (1994) *Latin American Spanish*. Longman.
- Marckwardt, A. (1958) *American English*. Oxford University Press.
- Montes Giraldo, J. J. (1967) Sobre el Voseo en Colombia *Thesaurus*, 22, 21-44.

Montes Giraldo, J. J. (1982) El Español de Colombia: propuesta de clasificación dialectal.

*Thesaurus* 37. 23-92.

Montes Giraldo, J. J. (2000) *Otros estudios sobre el español de Colombia*. Instituto Caro y

Cuervo.

Mufwene, S. (2001). *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge Approaches to

Language Contact. Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404503234059>

Rico Ocampo, A. (1989) Problemas Sociolingüísticos de la Sociedad Colombiana. Relación

Español/lenguas indígenas. In J.J. Montes Giraldo, J.J. (Ed) *Estudios sobre el español de América y lingüística afroamericana.*: Instituto Caro y Cuervo (pp. 144-166).

Rosenblat, Á. (1964) La base del español de América: nivel social y cultural de los

conquistadores y pobladores, *Boletín de filología*, (16), 171-230.

Safford, F., & Palacios, M. (2002). *Colombia: Fragmented land, divided society*. Oxford

University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.39-3557>

Schele de Vere, M. (1872) *Americanisms: The English of the New World*. Scribner.

Schreier, D., & Hundt, M. (Eds.). (2013). *English as a contact language*. Cambridge

University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511740060>

Tagliamonte, S. (2006) *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511801624>

Turner, M., and Guerrero, A. (2003) *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial predicaments of the*

*Americas*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11cw0q1>

- Triana y Antorveza, H. (1987) *Las Lenguas Indígenas en la historia social de Nuevo Reino De Granada*. Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Trudgill, P. (1986). Social identity and linguistic sex differentiation. In H. B. Allen & M. D. Linn (Eds.), *Dialect and language variation* (pp. 395–402). Elsevier.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-051130-3.50034-3>
- Trudgill, P. (1999). A Window on the Past: “Colonial Lag” and New Zealand Evidence for the Phonology of Nineteenth Century English. *American Speech*, 74(3), 227–239.  
[https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-supplement\\_91-1-99](https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-supplement_91-1-99)
- Trudgill, P. (2004) *New-Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748626410>
- Uber, D. (1985) ‘The Dual function of usted: Forms of address in Bogotá, Colombia’  
*Hispania* 68, 388-392. <https://doi.org/10.2307/342216>