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Abstract:
This article analyzes the representation of features of the Caipira rural dialect of Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese in the stories included in the book Leréias (“Yarns”), by regionalist writer Valdomiro Silveira.
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1. Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese as a literary dialect.
Writers have traditionally portrayed orality by means of literar dialect, a device defined by Ives (1971: 146) as “a stylized representation of speech by means of nonstandard, regional, social, or even individual features.” Following up on previous research, the present article analyzes the use of phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features in the literary representation of the rural variety of Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese (VBP) known as Caipira dialect, in the book Leréias (“Yarns”), a collection of twenty-four stories by Valdomiro Silveira (1975), one of the earliest regionalist writers in Brazil, who portrayed the dialect in stories gathered in four published books. This book is particularly interesting from the viewpoint of the representation of orality because, unlike his first three books, in which a narrator uses standard Portuguese, the twenty-four narratives included in Leréias are told by dialect-speaking homodiegetic narrators, whence the subtitle, “histórias contadas por eles mesmos” (“stories told by themselves”), which clearly alludes to the rural characters. Consistent use of literary

2 The present article is part of a project on the literary representation of Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese that includes Azevedo (1995, 2003, 2005b, and 2007).
dialect imparts uniformity to the narrative, evoking an illusion of orality enhanced by the fact that in every story a rural character spins his or her yarn while addressing a silent, unidentified interlocutor.

A word about VBP is in order. The occurrence of similar features in VBP and in Portuguese-based African creoles has led some scholars to suggest that VBP might descend from creoles spoken by African slaves taken to Brazil during the colonial period⁴. Others have proposed that VBP features might result instead from diachronic changes in the language of Portuguese settlers who started going to Brazil in the sixteenth century. According to a hypothesis submitted by Holm (2004), VBP might be the outcome of partial restructuring induced by contact between the varieties of Portuguese spoken by those settlers and the slaves’ languages, which might include Portuguese-based creoles developed in Africa. Linguistic leveling would then account for the formation of a vernacular which “probably played a key role in spreading a newly leveled variety of Portuguese” (Holm 2004: 56), from which VBP might have originated. Whatever its precise origin, and in spite of being spoken by a large proportion of Brazil’s population, VBP enjoys scant social recognition as a legitimate variety. Traditionally, if erroneously, dismissed as incorrectly spoken Portuguese (Praxedes 2008), it has long been used in literature, popular theater, radio, and television as a vehicle for portraying —often comically— the speech of illiterate country folk or lower-class urban dwellers. Silveira, however, was remarkable for his respectful treatment of his characters, depicted with a credible depth of feeling and always speaking the Caipira dialect, which at the time was widespread in the hinterland of the states of São Paulo and southern Minas Gerais. Although factors such as generalized schooling, the urbanization process, and the media have contributed to disseminate standard Portuguese throughout that region in the second half of the last century, both casual observation and systematic research show that Caipira features still occur regularly not only in rural areas but also in urban regions that have received an influx of dialect-speaking migrants.⁵

⁴ For an overview of the issue of the origin of VBP, see Azevedo (2005a: 250–253) and the bibliography therein.

⁵ According to Houaiss et al., the etymology of Caipira, though uncertain, may be related to caipora, from the Tupi language, ca’ipora<kaa ‘woods’+pora ‘dweller’. The Caipira individual is essentially a rural dweller, whose speech contrasts markedly with that of urban dwellers. The Caipira dialect was first described by Amaral (1920); other studies include Bortoni-Ricardo (1981, 1985), Head (1973), Istre (1971), Quicoli (1978), and Rodrigues (1974). Studies of Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese include Nascentes (1922), Marroquim (1934), and Guy (1981). Sociolinguistic aspects of standard versus nonstandard Portuguese are treated in Bagno (1999, 2000, 2002), Bortoni-Ricardo (1985), Perini (1997), and Praxedes (2008). About Caipira culture, see Brandão (1983).
2. A biographical sketch.

A brief look at Silveira's biography should help contextualize his work as a fiction writer, an activity he maintained while practicing law and participating in politics and public administration. Valdomiro Silveira (1873–1941) was born in today's Cachoeira Paulista, a small town in the eastern region of the State of São Paulo. When he was one year old, his family moved to the capital city of São Paulo, and when he was eight the family went to Casa Branca, another small town in the north of the same state. At age 17 he returned to São Paulo to study law, and after graduating he practiced law in the interior of the state until 1905, when he moved to the port city of Santos, where he lived until his death at age 67. It is thus apparent that Silveira was exposed to the Caipira dialect during most of his life, including the thirty-six years spent in Santos, the surroundings of which were part of that culture, locally known as Caícará (Istre 1971).

Like other regionalist authors, Silveira set his stories in the countryside (Almeida, 1999: 317), establishing a rural connection that enabled him to portray the ways and speech of country folk, who actually made up most of the population of pre-industrialized Brazil. Gonçalves (1975: xi) describes Silveira as a keen student of the dialect, suggesting an unusual seriousness of purpose at a time when dialectological studies were barely known in the country. However, rather than trying to reproduce the vernacular faithfully, Silveira, like other regionalist writers, used it as a foundation for representations designed to evoke country talk. Readers, who were likely to be primarily urban dwellers, could be expected to recognize the dialect, which they heard daily from servants and other working-class persons with country roots. In fact, some readers might have ambivalent feelings about the vernacular: funny, quaint, or picturesque as it might appear in fiction, it was also the speech of a social Other with whom they might not necessarily want to identify.

Some of Silveira's contemporary fictionists, such as Belmiro Braga (1935) or Cornélio Pires (1924, 1929) made ample use of the Caipira dialect as an element of humor (Azevedo 1995). Silveira, on the contrary, used its features selectively to fashion out a discrete contrast between his characters' speech and the standard language. Specifically, he eschewed two outstanding and socially stigmatized features of the dialect that were abundantly featured in the works other writers, namely lack of

---


7 Until the middle of the twentieth century, Brazil was mostly a rural country: in 1940, only about 30% of the population lived in urban areas, whereas in 2006 that percentage had grown to 81%. "Brasil - População" (http://www.portalbrasil.net/brasil_populacao.htm); (http://br.geocities.com/viniciashbr/historia/brasil/historiadapopulacaobrasileira.htm).

8 Ramos (1975: xxxi) comments on the development of Silveira's representation in different versions of one of his early stories.
subject-verb agreement in the verb phrase and lack of noun-qualifier number agreement in the noun phrase (Azevedo 2005: 226–228).

3. Analysis.

The following analysis is based on a corpus of data taken from the twenty-four stories in *Lerêias.* The examples cited have been chosen as sufficiently representative of the dialect to be recognized as such by readers of Brazilian Portuguese.

(1) Phonology. One of the contrasts between the vernacular and the standard variety consists in lexicalized forms that can be explained by phonological processes. Although stressed vowels are relatively stable in Brazilian Portuguese, a few instances of variation are found in the Caipira variety. Stressed vowels show variation in quality, as in the following examples.10

[1] stressed /e/ for /a/: réiva//raiva ‘anger’ (L/TQ, 73).
[2] stressed /u/ for /o/: tudo//todas ‘all’ (L/CA, 100), tudo// todos ‘all’ [L/ Vio, 106].

Unstressed vowels, on the other hand, show considerable variation, particularly in pretonic position, as shown in Figure 1. The following examples are representative:

[4] pretonic /e/ or /e/ for /a/: rezão [ e/e] //razão ‘reason’ (L/PC, 4).
[6] pretonic /a/ for /e/: antão//então ‘then’ (L/TQ, 75).
[7] pretonic /i/ for /e/: piquenina//pequenina ‘tiny’ (L/FL, 33); Ginerosa// Generosa ‘Generous’ (a woman’s name) (L/TQ, 73), similhante//semelhante ‘similar’ (L/PC, 6).

---

9 The stories from the second edition of *Lerêias* (Silveira 1975) are identified by the initials in parentheses: “Pedaço de cumbessa” (L/PC), 3–7; “Cobra mandada” (L/CM), 8–13; “Na ilha da Moela” (L/IM, 14–17); “A consulta do Lau” (L/CL), 18–23; “Do pala aberto” (L/PA), 24–27; “Visão” (L/V), 28–32; “Na folha larga” (L/FL), 33–36; “Cantador” (L/Ca), 37–42; “Sonharada” (L/So), 43–47; “No escuro da noite” (L/Es), 48–53; Mau costume (L/Mau), 54–57; “A pantasma” (L/Pan, 78–61), “Tal e qual” (L/TQ, 73–78); “Ciumada” (L/Ciu), 62–67; “Ué!” (L/Ué), 68–72; “Tal e qual” (L/Tal), 73–78; “Força escondida” (L/FE, 79–83); “Coração à larga” (L/Cor), 84–88; “Bruto canaleta” (L/BC, 89–97); “Ao correr das águas” (L/CA, 98–102); “Violento” (L/Vio, 103–108); “Com Deus e as almas” (L/Com), 113–118; “Resignado” (L/Res), 119–121; “Aquela tarde turva…” (L/Aqu), 122–129.

10 In the examples a double slash indicates a sequence of vernacular //standard.
[12] pretonic /e/ for /o/: *propósito*//*propósito* ‘purpose’ (L/CA, 100), *delorida*//*dolorida* ‘painful’ (L/CL, 23).
[14] pretonic /u/ for /o/: *jugar*//*jogar*  ‘to play’ (L/IM, 17), *sussegava*//*sossegava* ‘calmed down’ (L/CA, 100).

Other phonological processes affecting vowels include diphthongization, monophthongization, and denasalization:

[16] Diphthongization: [o:i] for [o]: *coiração*//*coração* ‘heart’ (L/CL, 20), [u:i] for [u]: *escutei*//*escutei* ‘I heard’ (L/BC, 90); diphthongization may be related to a shift in stress placement, as in for [u:i] for [u:i]: *ruim* // *riúm* ‘bad’ (L/CL, 20).
[17] Monophthongization: [o] for [a:u]: *osência*//*ausência* ‘absence’ (L/PC, 4); *sodade*//*saudade* ‘longing’ (L/CA, 102), *Aogustə*//*Augusta* (L/FE, 79).
[18] Denasalization and monophthongization reduces word-final [e:i] to a simple vowel [i]. This process is often interpreted in terms of spelling as the loss of final m, which Silveira, following a respelling tradition, indicated by means of an apostrophe: (18) *home*//*homem* ‘man’ (L/CL, 19); *camaradagem* ‘camaraderie’ (L/CL, 19); *ferrage*//*ferragem* ‘irons’ (L/CL, 21), *passage*//*passagem* ‘passage’ (L/CL, 22).

Processes affecting consonants include rhotacism, metathesis, palatalization, and segment loss and addition. The resulting forms, as in the following examples, are socially stigmatized, and consequently any one of them suffices for characterize a character as speaking the vernacular:

[1] Rhotacism involves primarily change of implosive /l/ into /ɾ/: *arguém*//*algum* ‘someone’ (L/FL, 34); *artos*//*altos* ‘tall’ (L/FL, 33); *carcou*//*calcou* ‘pressed’ (L/TQ, 77); *quarquer*//*qualquer* ‘any’ (L/FL, 34); *sortera*//*solteira*
'unmarried' (L/FL, 35), vortei//voltei 'I came back' (L/FE, 81). Also common is rhotacism of /r/ in consonant clusters: cabocrinha//caboclinha 'country girl' (L/PC, 3); crara // clara 'clear' (L/FL, 33); crarear//clarear 'to clear up' (L/PA, 24); semblante//semblante 'aspect' (L/BC, 93), fror//flor 'flower' (L/Ca, 38). Occasionally, rhotacism involves another implosive consonant, such as /s/, fôrfo//fôsforo 'match' (L/FE, 81).

[2] Two kinds of metatheses are found in the corpus. One involves breaking up a consonant cluster when a vowel shifts to a position between the stop and the liquid, following the general scheme stop + liquid + vowel > stop + vowel + liquid: /kr/ aquerditei [ker]/acreditei 'I believed' (L/CA, 99); /pt/ percipitado / precipitado 'hurried' (L/BC, 96); percurava//procurava (with change of /o/ > /e/) (L/TQ, 74); pertendia//pretendia (L/PC, 6). In the second type of metathesis a vowel originally situated between a stop and a liquid shifts to a position after the latter, originating a cluster according to the general scheme stop + V + liquid > stop + liquid + V. Thus we have /d/ V /ɛ/ > /dr/ V; drumia//dormia 'slept' (L/CL, 21), and /t/ V /ɛ/ > /tɛ/ V: atromentados//atromentados 'tormented' (L/CL, 23); desteminou//determinou 'determined' (L/TQ, 76); trocido//torcido 'twisted' (L/FL, 35), estróva//estorva 'embrasses' (L/Cor, 85).

[3] Palatalization involves change of /z/ to /ʒ/, often by assimilation to a nearby /ʒ/, as in ejagera//exagera 'exaggerates' (Le/PC, 4), ejigiu//exigiu 'demanded' (L/IM, 16). In items like inquiri//inquizir 'to annoy' (L/FE, 80) and quají//quase 'almost' (Le/PC, 4), palatalization may be conditioned by the front vowel /i/.

[4] Segment loss affects both vowels and consonants, and entails loss of syllables (often indicated by an apostrophe in Silveira’s spelling) in pretonic position, as in inda//ainda (L/PC, 4), tava//estava (Le/PC, 4), avinha//avezinha 'little bird' (L/Res, 119), or in post-tonic position, as in relamp’o//relâmpago (L/Ciu, 66), estâmo//estômago 'stomach' (L/Ué, 70), musga//música 'music' (L/Tal, 76), córgo//côrrego 'brook' (L/So, 45).

[5] Segment addition involves several processes, such as epenthesis of /e/ or /i/ to break up learned consonant sequences not admitted by the phonotactics of VBP, as in admirado//admirado ‘surprised’ (L/Com, 114), adimete//admite (L/Vio, 105) (adimete also shows change of /i/ to /ɛ/). In fact, nowadays this process is widespread in Brazil, even in colloquial educated speech (Câmara 1972: 48). Also prevalent is the insertion of prothetic /a/, as in adivirtam //divirtam ‘amuse’ (L/CA, 101), alembre//lembre ‘recall’ (L/CA,
amaguado//magoado ‘wounded’ (L/SO, 43), assossegue//sossegue ‘calm down’ (L/CIU, 63), asserene//serene ‘tranquilize’ (L/CIU, 63), arreparar//reparar ‘to notice’ (L/CIU, 63). Another pervasive process involves insertion of an epenthetic vowel in a consonant cluster of the type stop + liquid, as in emburrilho//embrullho ‘package’ (L/CL, 27), Quelemente//Clemente ‘Clement’ (L/Es, 49). Consonant insertion, in turn, is responsible for forms such as embonecrado//embronecado ‘dolled up’ (L/CA, 101). bonecra//bonca ‘doll’ (L/FE, 81), and satifação//satisfação ‘satisfaction’ (L/PA,26).

(2) Morphosyntactic processes.

In standard Portuguese a qualifier agrees with the head noun in number, a process describable by a rule that copies the [plural] feature of the head noun onto its modifiers. Thus a string such as Det + Adj + \*N.pl + Adj originates Det.pl + Adj.pl + \*N.pl + Adj.pl, and consequently an NP such as uma pobre mendiga[pl] triste ‘a poor sad beggar woman’ pluralizes as umas pobres mendigas tristes ‘some poor miserable beggar women’. In VBP, on the contrary, the pluralization marker occurs in the leftmost modifier, though not in the head noun, so that uma pobre mendiga[pl] triste pluralizes as umas pobre mendiga triste. Although this process is one of the most salient features of VBP and is well attested in the literature (Amaral 1920), it only appears every now and then in Silveira’s stories, as for instance in the semi-lexicalized construction às vez for às vezes ‘sometimes’ (L/Ca, 37). Examples of standard number agreement include, among others, as estradas ‘the roads’ (L/FL, 28–29), as duas tranças ‘the two braids’ (L/FL, 34), os pés ‘the feet’ (L/PC, 3), poucas semanas ‘a few weeks’ (L/CM, 12), algumas lágrimas ‘some tears’ (L/IM, 16). Occasionally one finds more elaborate constructions such as modas antigas e modas novas ‘the old songs and the new songs’ (L/Ca, 37) instead of as moda antiga e as moda nova, which one would normally expect from a VBP speaker.

(3) Verb morphology.

Whereas in Standard Brazilian Portuguese the verb paradigm has four forms (corresponding to the persons P1sg eu, P1pl nós, P2/3sg você/ele/ela, P2/3pl vocês/eles/elas), in VBP verb paradigms have, according to the tense, three, two, or even only one form (Figure 2). Further, the vernacular systematically employs specific forms that depart considerably from the standard, such as the following forms for the first person plural (nós), with apocope of final /s/ indicated by an apostrophe (‘):

[1] Present: andemo’//andamos ‘we walk’ (L/CM, 13); só sabia as que serve’ for só sabia as que servem ‘only knew the ones that serve’ (L/CL, 20).
[2] Preterite: combinemo//combinamos ‘we agreed’ (L/IM, 15); fronteemo’ // fronteamos ‘we faced’ (L/IM, 15), entremo’//entramos ‘we entered’ (L/IM, 16); troquemo’//trocamos ‘we exchanged’ (L/BC, 91), marquemo’//marcamos ‘we marked’ (L/IM, 16).

[3] Imperfect: nós levava’ for nós levávamos ‘we took’ (L/BC, 90); nós escolhia’ for nós escolhíamos (L/IM, 15; nós nem sabia’ for nós nem sabíamos (L/CL, 20).

Another aspect of vernacular verb morphology is the occurrence of socially stigmatized radicals that contrast vividly with their standard equivalents. For example, the infinitive of the high-frequency verb pôr ‘to put’ alternates with vernacular ponhar (based on the radical of the first person singular of the present indicative, ponho), hence se ponhou//se pôs ‘[he] placed himself’ (L/FL, 35), ela se ponhou . . . de cacun-da ‘she lay down on her back’ (L/FE, 81). Other salient vernacular forms include: imo//fomos ‘we went’ (L/Ca, 38, truxe//trouxe ‘[I] brought’ (L/Mau 54), pida//peça ‘ask’ (L/FL, 35), seje//seja ‘let it be’ (L/BC, 89), (eu) sube//soube ‘[I] knew’ (L/BC, 90), vêve//vive ‘[he] lives’ (L/BC, 90), inséste//existe ‘[he] exists’ (L/TQ, 75). There are a few forms that are archaic in standard Portuguese, such as hai//há ‘there is/are’ (L/PA, 24), cognate to Sp. hay, and havéra//haveria (L/PA, 25), parallel to Sp. hubiera ‘might/would be’.

(4) Double negative construction.

Double negatives have been used in Portuguese since medieval times (Bueno 1955: 225). In constructions like the following examples they have an emphatic function that seems to be a feature of the popular language:¹¹

[1] eu também não deixava de não querer casar co’ela // Eu também não deixava de querer casar com ela ‘I also wanted to marry her’ (L/CL, 19); ninguém não viu quando o Carrinho chegou // ninguém viu quando o Carrinho chegou ‘nobody saw when Carrinho arrived’ (L/TQ, 76); ninguém não se alembrá // ninguém se lembra ‘nobody remembers’ (L/PA, 24); nunca não ‘vi dizer // nunca ouvi dizer ‘I never heard it said’ (L/V, 28)

(5) Pronouns and forms of address.

Portuguese inherited two second person forms from Latin, namely tu (< Lat. tu)

¹¹ This use of double negatives is not to be confused with the Brazilian standard use of reiterative/emphatic não ‘no’ in sentences like Eu não fui lá não ‘I didn’t go there.’
for a single addressee and vós (< Lat. vos) for either a plural addressee or a single addressee entitled to deferential treatment. In medieval Portuguese the choice of an address pronoun hinged on the social relationship between interlocutors: a social superior addressed an inferior as tu and was called vós, while upper-class equals used reciprocal vós and lower-class individuals used reciprocal tu. Beginning in the sixteenth century, increasingly fine-graded social stratification caused variation in deference to be indicated by constructions combining the possessive vossa with an abstract noun referring to some exalted quality supposedly possessed by higher-placed individuals, as in vossa alteza ‘your highness,’ vossa majestade ‘your majesty,’ or vossa mercê ‘your mercy’ (Lindley Cintra, 1967). This latter form, originally reserved to monarchs, was eventually extended to persons of quality in general. As this happened, phonological processes eroded vossa mercê, originating a variety of forms such as vassuncê, suncê, vosmecê, mecê, vancê, vacê, você (the latter one reduced today, in casual pronunciation, to ocê [oÊse] or cê [se]). While there are regions in Brazil where tu is preferred among friends, by the end of the nineteenth century você contrasted, in rural usage, with its more deferential cousins, vosmecê, mecê, vassuncê, and vacê, as in the following examples:

[1] criado de vassuncê ‘your servant’ (L/IM, 14), vancê ‘tâ meio novato aqui ‘you’re a newcomer here’ (L/CL, 18), vacê não tá lembrado ‘you don’t remember’ (L/V, 29), suncê já matou mesmo a mãe ‘you have already killed (my) mother’ (L/FE, 82).

Other phonological processes reduced senhor to sinhô, nhô, seu, seo, sô and senhora to sinhá, nhá, sa. Combinations of these deferential forms include:

[1] with men’s names: nho Tônho ‘Mr. Tônho’ (L/Pan, 59) seu Fernando ‘Mr. Fernando’ (L/PC, 7), seo Chico ‘Mr. Chico’ (L/CM, 8).

(6) Clitics.

There is in Brazilian Portuguese a general trend to avoid clitics, particularly third-person ones (Cyrino 1993, Nunes 1993). One development of this tendency affects in-
trinsically reflexive verbs, that is, verbs that require a reflexive pronoun even though no reflexive action or process is implied. A typical such verb is ir-se embora ‘to go away’ which in the vernacular occurs with a lexicalized third person singular pronoun se, regardless of the person indicated by the subject, as in eu ia s’embora//eu ia-me embora ‘I was going away’ (L/FL, 33). fui s’embora ‘I went away’//fui-me embora (L/FL, 36).

(7) The lexicon.

Like other regionalist authors, Silveira included a glossary at the end of his books, thus making it possible for readers to understand a number of terms which, at a time when there were no dictionaries reflecting Brazilian usage,\(^\text{12}\) were an exotic feature that contributed to define regionalist literature. From today’s perspective, it is apparent that regional lexicon includes archaism, morphological variants classifiable as popular forms, and, as one might expect, many nouns referring to the environment, flora, fauna, and customs prevailing in the hinterland. Although these dialectal forms do not influence the structure of the language, they are of interest to lexicographers and require a separate study,\(^\text{13}\) and a brief sample will suffice as illustration.

[1] Flora: cipó-cambira ‘a kind of vine,’ guacá, guaiuvira, guarandi, monjoleiro ‘kinds of trees’
[6] Popular forms include morphological variants such as inte//até ‘until’ (L/PC, 3), mais pequena//menor ‘smaller’ (L/Es, 48), causo//caso ‘story’ (L/Diu, 62), as well as archaism, such as depois//depois ‘after’ (Le/PC, 4). perguntai//perguntai ‘I asked’ (Le/PC, 4), alembrria//lembra ‘3Psg remembers’ (Le/PC, 4), ansim//assim ‘thus’ (L/FE, 80).

\(^\text{12}\) The first dictionary to specifically reflect Brazilian usage, Pequeno Dicionário Brasileiro da Língua Portuguesa, by Gustavo Barroso and Hildebrando Lima (Companhia Editora Nacional) was published in 1938. See Nunes (2008).

\(^\text{13}\) For an appraisal of Silveira’s regional lexicon, see Nunes (1975).
We can appreciate the way Silveira’s literary dialect shapes the text by comparing a passage chosen at random with a version in standard Portuguese:

Aquí na prisão os outros já tenham medo de mim, e vêvem pedindo mudança tudo o dia: afiançam que eu não paro na cama, e ando a noite inteira, e falo sem parada, e faço gesto em desmasia. Eu não sei de mim quaji nada, dés que houve o acontecido: e só o que lhe posso dizer é o que eu já disse p’r’o tal meu ‘devogado, est’ro dia: é que eu sou um marvado, não presto p’ra coisa arguma, e quero acabar a minha triste vida aqui mesmo...  （L/FE, 83）

Aqui na prisão os outros já tem medo de mim, e vivem pedindo mudança todos o dias: afiançam que eu não paro na cama, e ando a noite inteira, e falo sem parada, e faço gesto em demasia. Eu não sei de mim quase nada, desde que houve o acontecido: e só o que lhe posso dizer é o que eu já disse para o tal meu advogado, este outro dia: é que eu sou um malvado, não presto para coisa alguma, e quero acabar a minha triste vida aqui mesmo... （M.M.A.）

Of eighty-nine lexical items, only eleven can be considered nonstandard, and at least two of these (namely p’r’o [prou] < para o and p’ra [pra] < para ) occur regularly in the informal speech of educated speakers. Their representation may be considered as an instance of eye dialect, that is a stylistic respelling intended to evoke or highlight certain pronunciation features (Bowdre 1971). The truly nonstandard items include the use of subjunctive tenham for indicative tem ‘(they) have’, and the nonstandard present indicative vévem for standard vivem ‘they live’. The forms quaji (st. quase ‘almost’), with palatalization of the fricative ([z] > [z]), apocopated dés (st. desde ‘since’) and syncopated est’ro (st. este outro ‘this other one’) are clearly nonstandard, as is the rhotacism process responsible for marvado (st. malvado ‘evil’). As to adevogado, it may have been considered more nonstandard in Silveira’s time than nowadays, given the aforementioned prevalence of epenthesis of /e/ or /i/ in learned consonantal sequences, even in colloquial educated pronunciation.

For the literary linguist, Silveira’s representation of rural speech holds interest as an artifact put together through careful selection of phonological, morphological, and lexical elements. In view of the near total absence of constructions without nominal or verbal agreement, which are a key element of VBP, that representation is clearly partial. Whatever the author’s motivation to omit those crucial morphosyntactic features, the result is a tame representation which nonetheless accomplishes the aesthetic goal of establishing a contrast between the homodiegetic narrators’ speech and the standard language, sufficient to flesh out an ample roster of types endowed with individual voices. These voices, cast both in direct and reported speech, create a heteroglossic effect (Bakhtin 2004: 331 ff.) that operates in a self-referential linguistic environment, marked at every step by nonstandard features that map out the space of the Caipira culture,
contrasting it with the urban culture with which most readers would associate. Given
the diglossic relationship between the vernacular and the standard in Brazilian Portu-
guese, which parallels the social chasm between the uneducated and the educated, the
literary representation of that subaltern dialect provides a socially suitable —if neces-
sarily unidirectional— means to bridge the gap, making it possible for educated readers
to access a domesticated version of the Caipira universe.
Figure 1. Variation in quality of a pretonic vowel (standard form shown in column 1)

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>reião//reção 'reason' (L/PC, 4)</td>
<td>reião//reção 'reason'</td>
<td>minhã//manhã 'morning'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>antão//então 'then' (L/TQ, 75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>simelhante// semilhante 'similar' (L/PC, 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>deferença//diferença 'difference' (L/FL, 34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>saluçando//sobrando 'sobbing' (L/CA, 98)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pissuir//possuir 'possess' (L/CA, 101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sojeito//sujeito 'an individual' (L/CL, 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Simplified verb paradigm in Brazilian Portuguese. Vernacular forms in bold; others are shared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eu</td>
<td>falo</td>
<td>bebi</td>
<td>parti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu*</td>
<td>falas</td>
<td>bebes</td>
<td>parto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>você/ele/ela</td>
<td>fala</td>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>parte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>falamos</td>
<td>bebemos</td>
<td>partimos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nós</td>
<td>falemos</td>
<td>bebemos</td>
<td>partimos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocês/eles/ela</td>
<td>falam</td>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>parte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>falam</td>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>parte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tu occurs in a few regions of Brazil only.

Works cited


Azevedo, Milton M. “Considerations on Literary Dialect in Spanish and Portuguese.” *Hispania* 85: 3


(2008. 12. 9 受理)