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Since the late 1800s, the Uruguayan Government has attempted to enforce cultural and linguistic norms along the border with Brazil through the prohibition of Portuguese, especially in schools, despite the fact that this is the heritage language of most border residents. This research focuses on the differential use of Spanish and Portuguese in Rivera, the largest city on the border. Using self-reported data and metalinguistic commentaries extracted from interviews with 63 Spanish–Portuguese bilinguals, the use of both languages in various domains (home, school, work spaces) and with diverse interlocutors (family, friends, co-workers, superiors) is analyzed. Quantitative and qualitative analysis reveals that Portuguese, which has been marginalized for decades, is more frequently used in the home with relatives and close friends. The use of Portuguese in more formal domains, including schools, is much less frequent. The results from this study corroborate a perception within the community that Portuguese lacks the prestige of Spanish and provide further evidence of its status as a primarily home language. The current research does not show a progressive shift toward Spanish in Rivera nor does it support claims by other researchers that this community is diglossic.
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1. Introduction

1.1. History of a border community

Due to hundreds of years of territorial dispute between the Spanish and Portuguese in what is now northeastern Uruguay, a situation of language contact exists along this national border. National sovereignty was not bestowed on Uruguay until 1828, when it was officially declared a ‘buffer zone’ between the warring nations of Brazil and Argentina. With this newly declared independence, Spanish became the country’s official language and an extensive campaign to eradicate Brazilian influence and the use of Portuguese along the border with Brazil began. In the mid-1800s, the government promoted the establishment of new settlements on the border, right next to already-existing Brazilian towns. The largest border city, Rivera, was founded in 1862 in conjunction with officially sanctioned attempts to delimit national borders with Brazil. Not coincidentally, its sister city, Santana do Livramento, Brazil was founded some 40 years prior. Evidently, Rivera was established alongside the already-existing town of Santana do Livramento as a
way to inhibit Brazilian encroachment into what had then become official Uruguayan territory. When asked why Rivera was founded so much later than Santana do Livramento, one of the consultants interviewed for the current investigation replied:

(1) [...] porque el gobierno uruguayo entendía, que si no creaba una ciudad, aquí, iba a haber, cada vez ... un avance, un, un avance mayor, y quizás, por un lado de la frontera no estuvieran allí. Podían estar más adentro. Pero, no es sólo eso, sino lo que tú me preguntas hoy. Y, lo cultur, eh, que era ... fue creada para frenar una cultura brasileña. [...] because the Uruguayan government understood, that if it didn't create a city, here, there was going to be, each time ... an advance, a, a greater advance, and maybe, on one side of the border they [Brazilians] wouldn't be there. They could be further in. But, it's not just that, but what you asked me today. The, the culture, uh, that used to be ... was created to stop [the spread of] Brazilian culture'. (10/A:497-507/10)

Due to these historical occurrences, researchers claim that the ethnic base of the entire northern zone of Uruguay is Portuguese, not Spanish (Behares 2007; Elizaincín 1979, 8; Rona 1965, 11). The clarification of this Luso-Brazilian ethnic base is extremely important to the study of this bilingual community. According to Rona (1965, 8), 'when one studies the origins of the actual border dialects, one should keep in mind that these do not deal with an influence from Portuguese on Spanish (since there was not a Hispanic population here before the arrival and settlement of Brazilians), but rather, an influence of Spanish on a Portuguese base' (translation mine). Although this assessment is valid with reference to the original ethnic base of northern Uruguay, it is far too simplistic to deny the influence of Spanish colonization in this region. Regardless of the complexity of the ethnic makeup of Rivera, however, the historical situation just elaborated will help determine the status that both languages currently enjoy on the border.

1.2. Aims of the current study

The analysis of language use in bilingual communities is a complex phenomenon that encompasses a wide range of variation based on multiple social, psychological, and pragmatic factors, as has been well demonstrated in the seminal works of Fishman (1965), Giles, Taylor, and Bourhis (1973), Gumperz (1982), LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985), and Sankoff (1972). The current study obviously cannot address all of these issues with respect to language use in Rivera, but it will address some of them, especially the more social aspects that relate to motivations for using one language over another and the social identities that language use inscribes. Rather than focusing on the more finely grained aspects of language use in the community, the overarching aim of the current study is to discover patterns of language use in Rivera with respect to different linguistic domains and the interlocutors who inhabit them.

Although the term 'domain' is often used to signify 'an abstraction which refers to a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific times, settings and role relationships' (Romaine 1995, 30), this term will be used in a more narrow sense in the current investigation to avoid ambiguity. Here, domains will be restricted simply to places of interaction (i.e. settings). Each domain, whether economic, academic, familiar, social, religious, or cultural in nature, is shaped by the relationships that interlocutors have with one another. These relations, together with prestige norms,
influence the choice of language use in a given domain. In other words, the social roles associated with each language determine which language a bilingual will choose in a particular domain. Fishman, Cooper, and Ma (1971), for example, found that Spanish–English bilinguals in New York preferred to use Spanish most often in the following domains (in decreasing order of frequency): familiar, social, religious, economic, and academic. This organization in the choice between two languages is necessary for bilinguals to achieve socio-communicative efficacy.

The determination of patterns of language use in Rivera according to different linguistic domains and their respective interlocutors will be achieved through a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. Quantitative analysis will be based on self-reported percentages of language use given by residents of Rivera via a questionnaire. The more qualitative assessments of language use in this bilingual community will be based on metalinguistic commentaries supplied by consultants during sociolinguistic interviews. In addition to general patterns of language use, this study will also address the social stratification of language use in Rivera, the perceived shift toward the greater use of Spanish in the community, and its previous classification as diglossic.

2. The linguistic prestige of Spanish in northern Uruguay

2.1. The historical prohibition of Portuguese in border schools

The linguistic situation along the Uruguayan–Brazilian border should be considered one of societal bilingualism. Both Spanish and Portuguese have co-existed (though perhaps not peaceably) in this region due to sustained cultural contact between Spanish and Portuguese colonizers dating back to the sixteenth century. As Rona (1965) makes clear, the formation of Portuguese and Spanish dialects in this part of South America is the result of ethnic contact. Although the Portuguese were the first to settle in northern Uruguay, Spanish influence has also been robust. Attempts to ‘Hispanicize’ the northern frontier of Uruguay, which began in earnest in the early 1800s, have greatly affected language use and attitudes in this area. According to Rona (1965, 11), the influence of Spanish is carried out largely by a ‘cultural, commercial, and administrative penetration represented by the State and embodied by teachers, professors, government employees, business people, soldiers, journalists, etc.’ (translation mine).

Due to its status as the official language of Uruguay, Spanish has gradually become the prestige language of border communities like Rivera. Of course, the variety of Spanish in question has only acquired local prestige. To be considered prestigious regionally, it would have to resemble that of nonmixed, monolingual varieties, such as those of Montevideo and Buenos Aires. By residents’ own admission, however, the Spanish spoken in Rivera does not usually conform to those standards.

Normative pressures to use Spanish in border communities have been exerted primarily by the public education system. From the passage of the Law of Common Education devised by José Pedro Varela in 1877 to the implementation of bilingual education programs along the border in 2003, the Uruguayan Government unsuccessfully attempted to enforce cultural and linguistic norms along the border through the prohibition of Portuguese in public schools, despite the fact that this is a heritage language for many border residents (Behares 2007; Broveto 2010; Carvalho
During this time, the use of Portuguese in the classroom and on school grounds was strictly prohibited in Rivera. In this environment, not only was the use of Portuguese disallowed but also the use of prestige forms associated with national, monolingual forms of Spanish which are characteristic of the rest of Uruguay, was consistently reinforced. Despite these pressures, structural influences from Portuguese, especially with respect to phonology and the lexicon, characterize Border Spanish (Waltermire 2006).

Most educators in public schools did not allow the use of Portuguese in the classroom due to its unofficial status and the misperception that it was somehow 'deforming' the variety of monolingual Spanish that they were attempting to preserve (Behares 2007; García Etchegoyhen de Lorenzo 1975; Elizaincín 1979; Elizaincín, Behares, and Barrios 1987; Hensey 1972). According to Hensey's data, 94% of all teachers in Rivera that he surveyed ($N = 46$) said that they try to prevent pupils' use of Portuguese even outside of the classroom (1972: Appendix D). The variety of Portuguese in question, of course, is a border variety of this language, commonly referred to by members of the community as portuñol. The Portuguese spoken in Rivera demonstrates significant differences with the more prestigious nonborder dialects of this language, which show little or no influence from Spanish and are not associated with rural varieties. Consequently, the use of nonmixed, nonborder forms of Portuguese is not stigmatized, unlike the use of portuñol (Waltermire 2010a).

The reason for disallowing the use of Portuguese in the academic setting is that teachers (as well as the rest of the community) see the presence of Portuguese as a negative influence on the proper learning of Spanish. According to Hensey (1972: Appendix D), only 17% of all teachers surveyed in Rivera public schools claimed that Portuguese did not present a problem to the learning of Spanish. Spanish-only policies were particularly prevalent during the military dictatorship in Uruguay (1973–1985), which effectively squashed initial attempts at reform proposed by Eloisa García Etchegoyhen de Lorenzo in 1967. During this time, according to Barrios and Pugliese (2004, 1), 'xenophobic and purist discourse worsened, accompanied by idiomatic campaigns aimed at defending Spanish against the “threat” of Portuguese and preserving its “purity” from the “contamination” of “incorrect” expression' (translation mine).

### 2.2. The sociolinguistic status of Border Portuguese in Rivera

Public schools do not represent the only domain in which the use of Portuguese is stigmatized in Uruguay. In most official/formal linguistic domains, the use of Portuguese is discouraged. The use of this language is reserved primarily for communicating with Brazilians who cross into Rivera along Sarandi Avenue, which is the main artery connecting the two cities. Considering that Portuguese is a language of heritage in northeastern Uruguay, with Rivera as its center, the use of this language is also extremely common in the home and for use with close friends and family members, many of whom live in Brazil. The transnational networks that exist on both sides of the border are also the result of intermarriages and frequent relocations from one side of the border to the other. These realities are reflected in many comments supplied by consultants for the current study, such as the following:
(2) I: ¿Naciste allá en Santana do Livramento?
'Were you born in Santana do Livramento [Brazil]?'
C: Sí.
'Yes.'
I: Entonces, ¿cuánto tiempo has vivido acá en este, en Rivera?
'So, how long have you lived here in um, in Rivera?'
'Here? In Rivera? When I was one I came here to Rivera. Seventeen years ago. My parents wanted to move because they are Uruguayan. My brothers and I are Brazilians.' (09/A:075-087/09)

Despite the strong transnational ties that bind the two border communities, there may be a shift toward the more frequent use of Spanish in Rivera by younger speakers because the majority of their time is spent at school. This possible shift may also be the result of the greater prestige afforded to this language. This seems likely, especially given the evidence of a shift toward the use of more prestigious phonological forms of monolingual varieties of Brazilian Portuguese by the youngest generation (Carvalho 1998, 2003). Young speakers, especially females of the middle socioeconomic class, tend to use prestigious forms of urbanized varieties of Brazilian Portuguese much more frequently than members of other social groups. The use of these forms by young speakers is reinforced by their constant exposure to the urbanized varieties of Brazilian Portuguese which are propagated through mass media and popular culture (Carvalho 2003, 21-29). A somewhat unfortunate consequence of the shift toward the greater use of prestige varieties among younger speakers is that the use of Border Portuguese, or portuñol, continues to be highly stigmatized.

2.3. Portuñol

The widespread use of the term portuñol, which is generally disdained by linguists, who prefer the term Dialectos Portugueses del Uruguay ‘Portuguese Dialects of Uruguay’ (or DPU), has led to many misperceptions with respect to language use in bilingual communities such as Rivera. Its mere classification has been plagued by misunderstandings for decades. For example, according to Rona (1965, 38), the use of this variety, which he referred to as fronterizo is characteristic of ‘those who do not use Portuguese or Spanish, but rather [a] mixed system’ (translation mine). Other researchers have erroneously classified portuñol as a tercera lengua ‘third language’ (Lipski 1994, 342, 2006, 7-8), a media lengua ‘middle language’ (Moreno Fernández 2004), and an interlanguage (Hensey 1980). Unsurprisingly, these classifications were not based on the extensive analysis of authentic speech data and, in some cases, were based purely on anecdotal evidence and casual observation. Unfortunately, these classifications have reinforced the persistent misperception in border communities that residents speak neither Spanish nor Portuguese, but rather aberrant amalgamations of both languages, or even a different language altogether.

Several consultants interviewed for the current study referred to portuñol as a language distinct from either Spanish or Portuguese. For example, two consultants mentioned (outside of an interview session) that residents of Rivera speak three languages – Spanish, Portuguese, and portuñol. To demonstrate this, one of the
consultants explained that they use three variations for the word ‘spoon.’ These are cuchara (Spanish), colher (Portuguese [ku.lɛɾ], and culler [ku.yɛɾ], which is simply a reduced, nonurbanized pronunciation of the Portuguese form (see Carvalho 2003) for a discussion of this variation in the Portuguese of Rivera). No research provided to date can be used to substantiate claims that portuñol is an actual language that is distinct from Portuguese. For historical reasons, Elizaincin (1979, 15) properly classifies fronterizo (portuñol) as a dialect of Portuguese ‘showing strong influences from Spanish, as much in phonology as in morphosyntax, lexicon, and semantics’ (translation mine). This classification is also supported in the more recent, rigorous analysis provided by Lipski (2009, 38), who defines fronterizo as a ‘natively spoken hybrid language’ that is ‘grounded in the grammar of vernacular Brazilian Portuguese’ and ‘contains an admixture of Spanish elements.’

It is extremely important to recognize that this is a native language for many speakers of Rivera. Community members also view it this way. The following comments, extracted from an interview conducted with a husband and wife, reveal this sentiment:

(3) C1: El portuñol en muchos lugares por acá es la lengua materna. [A su esposo] Fue tu lengua materna el portuñol. Como, mira, el de [ ]. La madre de [ ] habla portuñol en casa y [ ], amigo nuestro, ¿no? Es interesante. [ ] en la casa con la madre, ellos hablan portuñol, portugués así, ese portuñol con la madre. [ ] también habla portuñol y sin embargo [ ] es una persona de lenguas y, pero es la lengua materna. De chiquito las madres hablan así y ellos siguen hablando. [A su esposo] Y [ ] tú también mi amor, con tus hermanas. ¡Verdad?

'Portuñol' in many places around here is the mother tongue. [To her husband] Portuñol was your mother tongue. Like, look, that of [ ]. [ ]'s mother speaks portuñol at home and [ ], our friend, right? It's interesting. [ ] at home with his mother, they speak portuñol, Portuguese that way, that portuñol with his mother. [ ] also speaks portuñol even though she is a language person and, but it's her mother tongue. From a young age, their mothers spoke that way and they still speak [it]. [To her husband] And [ ] you do too, my love, with your sisters. You speak Portuguese with your sisters. Right?

C2: Bueno, no es un portugués perfecto. Mi portugués no es perfecto porque no fui a la escuela.

'Well, it's not perfect Portuguese. My Portuguese isn't perfect because I didn't go to school.' (32/A:142-154/50-51)

Clearly, portuñol, which is acquired by many Uruguayans as a native language, is not an interlanguage, which Crystal (2003, 239) defines as 'the linguistic system created by someone in the course of learning a foreign language.' Imitations of this native language should not be confused with this variety of Portuguese either. Imitations of portuñol simply do not match the variety of Portuguese that is spoken as a native language by many Uruguayan speakers.

Perhaps, the classification of portuñol as a different language (i.e. not a bilingual dialect of Portuguese) is the result of salient linguistic influences from Spanish, which are characteristic outcomes of language contact situations (see Weinreich 1968). These influences can alter the base language to such an extent that it is no longer considered to be the same language, at least when compared to the standard, monolingual forms of Portuguese to which all speakers in Rivera have access (via television, newspapers, family members, etc.). A comment made by one of the
consultants interviewed for the current study, which appears in Example 4, reflects the general perceptions concerning portuñol shared by the residents of Rivera:

(4) *Los niños riverenses, en el patio, juegan hablando ... no, no es un, un idioma portugués sino que es un portuñol, pero más portugués, mucho más portugués que español.* ‘The children of Rivera, on the playground, play speaking a ... it's not, it's not Portuguese, but rather portuñol; but [there's] more Portuguese [in it], much more Portuguese [in it] than Spanish.’ (10/A:514-518/10)

Given the history of this border community, it is simply illogical to suppose that the residents of Rivera would speak a standard, urbanized, monolingual dialect of Portuguese (even though these speakers do exist given the robust transnationalism that characterizes the city). After all, the use of Portuguese in public domains was suppressed for decades and, consequently, was relegated to use in the home, which prohibited it from developing into a more standard variety. Despite this deviation from monolingual standards, however, portuñol is still a dialect of spoken Portuguese, not a language distinct from it. For these reasons, the term portuñol will not be used with reference to language use in the current study.

2.4. Diglossia

Since the use of Spanish and Portuguese varies according to social domain, it has been proposed in multiple studies that the language situation along the Brazilian–Uruguayan border is one of diglossia (Barrios et al. 1992; Behares 2007; Brovetto 2010, Elizaincin 1976, 130; Hensley 1972; Rona 1965). Unfortunately, these claims are merely impressionistic and have not been substantiated by quantitative data. This classification seems too rigid for this community if we are to use Ferguson’s original definition of the term (see Ferguson 1959). Although there seems to be a stratification of language use by domain to a certain extent, the exclusive use of either language according to social domain does not seem realistic. In this sense, the use of high and low varieties to describe the bilingual situation in Rivera is difficult to sustain. These concerns have led some researchers to temper this classification as ‘semi-diglossic’ in recent years (Carvalho 2010).

Due to intense Luso-Hispanic contact along the border for over 150 years, and a consequent use of Spanish and Portuguese in both private and public domains (albeit with some language use receiving preference in certain domains), the linguistic situation in Rivera seems to be much more akin to ‘intense bilingualism’ (Silva-Corvalán 2001, 278). Intense bilingualism, or simply ‘the frequent use of two languages [in all social domains],’ is characterized by language mixing, rather than separation (Silva-Corvalán 2001, 278). Rather than choosing to use either language according strictly to social domain, as in diglossic communities, language choice in Rivera seems to be determined by social domains as well as by the interlocutors who inhabit them. To test these claims, the use of both Spanish and Portuguese in work and home domains will be further explored in Sections 4 and 5. If it can be reasonably demonstrated that consultants use both languages at variable rates in each of these environments, and that neither is exclusive to public nor private domains, then the proposal that Rivera is a diglossic community will be unsubstantiated.
3. Data collection

3.1. Levels of bilingualism among consultants for the current study

Field work for the current investigation was carried out in Rivera in the spring of 2003. A total of 63 speakers were interviewed in both individual and group formats for a total of approximately 45 hours of unguided casual conversation. Each interview session lasted anywhere from 30 minutes to 3 hours but the typical session lasted approximately one hour. There were 24 individual interviews and 20 group interviews. Groups usually consisted of two consultants who knew each other very well (such as husband and wife, mother and daughter, or longtime friends) or fairly well (such as more recent friends, colleagues, and co-workers). Several interviews, however, occurred with groups of three consultants. These larger groups consisted mainly of family members and colleagues. As each of these formats has advantages and disadvantages, a roughly equal use of these formats ensured the collection of consistent data types.

Consultants were selected according to sex, age, and profession to achieve a representative community sample. Each of the 63 speakers interviewed during the data collection process claimed at least some level of command of Portuguese, even though the use of this language by a handful of consultants is extremely limited. For this reason, each of the consultants should be considered bilingual. Although it could be argued that speakers who do not speak Portuguese regularly should not be considered bilinguals because they demonstrate low levels of bilingual ability, it should be stressed that these speakers still demonstrate some level of communicative competency in Portuguese. Furthermore, bilingualism is not defined easily by gauging acceptable levels of linguistic competency. The determination of ‘acceptable’ levels of competency would differ greatly from one researcher to another. For this reason, the mere ability to communicate in two languages seems a more reliable measure of bilingual status. Silva-Corvalán (2001, 270) refers to this more encompassing idea of bilingualism as a ‘bilingual continuum’ which includes all speakers showing at least some level of communicative ability in both languages. This continuum is represented graphically in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. The Spanish-Portuguese bilingual continuum.](image)

While the point at which an individual finds himself/herself on the continuum is at least partially determined by his/her ability to communicate in both languages, degrees of bilingual ability are perhaps best determined by a speaker’s frequency of use of both languages. Since the extent to which consultants use Spanish and Portuguese varies, the frequency of use of each language was assessed for each of the speakers individually by way of a written questionnaire, which appears in the appendix along with a translated version.

3.2. Questionnaire data

Consultants were asked to identify the overall percentage with which they use Spanish according to specific linguistic domains and the interlocutors with whom
they converse. The linguistic domains included in the questionnaire were: (1) home, (2) work/school, (3) church, (4) bank, (5) post office, and (6) restaurants/bars. The first two domains were chosen since they represent the places where people spend most of their time. Furthermore, it is likely that consultants have built close relationships in these domains as a result of frequent personal contact.

Although percentages of use of both languages in other linguistic domains (church, bank, post office, and restaurants/bars) were also obtained from consultants (as shown in the Appendix), language use in these environments will not be analyzed here for two reasons. First, the majority of consultants indicated that their choice of Spanish or Portuguese in these domains depends on which country they are in. If they are in a bank in Brazil, they will use Portuguese, whereas they will use Spanish in a Uruguayan bank. Considering that it was impossible to determine the frequencies with which each consultant spends time in either country for business or personal reasons, and for this reason are impossible to control, they will not be analyzed for the current study. Furthermore, and of equal importance, none of these domains should be considered particularly frequent, especially the bank and the post office, in which each consultant most likely spends less than a total of half an hour a week.

In addition to language use according to specific linguistic domains, the frequency with which consultants speak Spanish with different interlocutors was also solicited. Consultants indicated how often they speak Spanish with the following individuals: (1) spouse, (2) children, (3) parents, (4) relatives, (5) friends, and (6) boss/teachers. These groups were chosen as they represent the most probable interlocutors with whom the consultants speak on a daily basis. It should be noted that the density of personal connections that exist between a consultant and other interlocutors in each of these environments is essentially distinct. The relations between two coworkers or colleagues are undoubtedly less intimate than those established over long periods of shared experiences by members of the same family. For this reason, the linguistic domains of home and work/school, along with their respective interlocutors, will be analyzed separately.

Percentages included in the questionnaire range between 20 and 100% in intervals of 20% points. Some of the consultants altered these numbers slightly to better reflect their actual frequency of use of Spanish by including 0 and 50% for certain categories. It should be noted that only six speakers indicated that they never speak Spanish with at least one interlocutor group (typically parents) or in one of the domains specified on the questionnaire. One speaker indicated, for example, that he never speaks Spanish at church because he attends church in Santana do Livramento. It should also be noted that questionnaires were not given to consultants directly after interview sessions given the fact that they were not informed of the specific linguistic nature of the interviews, but only that language use would be analyzed as part of a larger analysis of the social norms and practices of this border community. Unfortunately, due to this method, six consultants were never relocated to complete the questionnaire. Although interlocutors can easily be grouped according to linguistic domain (e.g. parents, children, spouse, and relatives in home environments vs. teachers/boss in work environments), the interlocutor category of 'friends' extends across each of these domains. Although these interlocutors seem to more logically group with familiar interlocutors and domains, in which the use of language is seldom formal, language use with these interlocutors will be assessed separately without reference to specific linguistic domains.
3.3. Metalinguistic data

In addition to consultants’ self-reported frequencies of use of both languages, metalinguistic commentaries made by speakers during interviews were also used in the determination of general patterns of language use within the community. Considering that each interview for the Rivera database consists of approximately one hour of non-guided conversation, in which the discussion of language use consistently surfaced, a wealth of metalinguistic data concerning the situational aspects of language choice was supplied by each speaker. These comments have been analyzed extensively to more accurately determine patterns of language use in Rivera. Obviously, not all of these metalinguistic commentaries can be presented here. However, some of the more illuminating comments have been chosen to demonstrate certain patterns of language use in the community. These comments will appear according to their relevance to language use with respect to domain, interlocutors, or both. Given that these comments were produced spontaneously by consultants during interviews and were in no way solicited from them directly, they reflect actual patterns of language use in Rivera. The qualitative analysis of unmonitored metalinguistic commentaries will provide a more encompassing perspective on the distributional patterns of Spanish and Portuguese use in this bilingual community.

4. Language use in work and school environments

4.1. The frequent use of Spanish in public domains

Although the official, national language of Uruguay, and consequently that of business and academic endeavors, is Spanish, Portuguese is also used in these activities. It is expected that the use of Spanish in work and school environments, which at least partially coincides with the use of this language with teachers and occupational superiors, will be considerably more frequent than the use of Portuguese due to the historical situation detailed in Section 2. Table 1 shows the average of percentages of language use claimed by consultants for these linguistic domains with their respective interlocutors.

As expected, the use of Spanish is much more frequent in these formal linguistic domains. The social and political pressure to use Spanish in these domains, which has resulted from years of repression of Portuguese, is clear. There is a general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/work</td>
<td>4290/5200</td>
<td>910/5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82.5%)</td>
<td>(17.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/bosses</td>
<td>4250/5000</td>
<td>750/5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85.0%)</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals are based on 100 possible percentage points for each category per speaker (see the appendix). Since six consultants did not complete a questionnaire, a total of only 5700 percentage points is possible for any given category. For many categories, this total is lower than 5700 due to speaker differences. For example, a total of only 5200 points for language use in school and work domains is available for all speakers since five speakers are retired. Similarly, only 5000 percentage points are available for language use with teachers and bosses considering that, in addition to the five retired speakers, two additional speakers did not indicate any percentages for this category since they are the boss in their place of work.
perception among the residents of Rivera that Spanish should be used in these official, formal domains. Many comments from consultants, such as the following, reflect this perception:

(5) I: ¿Qué uso tú has del español?
   'When do you use Spanish?'
   C: Yo, para vender sólo.
      'I only use it for business.'
   I: ¿Sólo para vender...
      'Only for business...'?
   C: Sólo para vender. Cuando voy [?], cuando, cuando voy por allí, porque acá hablo más en brasilero.
      'Only for business. When I go [?], when, when I go over there, because here I speak more in Portuguese.'
   I: Claro.
      'Of course.'
   C: Hablo más en brasilero que en español. Y soy uruguayo.
      'I speak more in Portuguese than in Spanish. And I am Uruguayan.' (25/B:252-256/40)

(6) Mi aprendizaje del, del, de español es una necesidad social [e] institucional. Voy a la escuela donde se habla español y tengo que aprender el español. Si no hubiera asistido a la escuela, seguiría hablando el portugués. 'My learning of, of, of, of Spanish is a social [and] institutional necessity. I go to school where Spanish is spoken and I have to learn Spanish. If I hadn't attended school, I would continue speaking Portuguese.' (23/B:033-035/33)

Although the consultants for the current study are bilingual and can use Portuguese when the situation demands the use of this language, they still feel overt pressures to use Spanish in these environments, as indicated by the previous examples. A multitude of social and pragmatic factors (such as their knowledge of the other interlocutors and their language preferences, a perceived lack of inability for the other interlocutors to communicate in Spanish, and notions of sociocultural solidarity, to name a few) would influence a switch to Portuguese. While these factors are of great importance, they do not fall within the scope of the current study, which seeks to find more general distributional patterns of language use in Rivera.

The self-reported percentages of Spanish use by consultants with their superiors in formal domains are even greater. This finding further underscores the social pressure to use Spanish with authority figures in Rivera. Since the use of Spanish is slightly more frequent with superiors (at 85.0%) than in the linguistic domains of work and school in general (at 82.5%), it can be reasonably assumed that co-workers and classmates sometimes use Portuguese with one another while working. Hensey (1972, Appendix D) found this to be true when he analyzed the comments given by grade school teachers with regard to their students; that students would speak Spanish almost exclusively during class sessions and around teachers, but Portuguese during recess and away from teachers. This reality was also echoed in the comments of one of the older consultants for the current study who claimed that ...

(7) ... la verdad es que los niños, los chicos, hasta los maestros, posiblemente, salen a la calle y entran ese idioma medio entreverado. '... the truth is that children, young people, and possibly even teachers, go out in the streets and start using that mixed language.' (03/A:164-166/02)
Although this may be the case, it could be that percentages of Spanish use are lower in school/work domains in general than with superiors due to the necessity among many workers, especially those in nonprofessional occupations, to use Portuguese in business transactions. To further explore this possibility, we will need to examine self-reported percentages of language use in these domains by occupational type, rather than simply by general domain alone. The percentages with which students, nonprofessionals, and professionals reported using Spanish and Portuguese in their respective domains of school and work are shown in Table 2.3

The results displayed in Table 2 show that speakers’ language choices are based primarily on the requirements for language use demanded by their work environments. As expected, students use Spanish almost exclusively in school (at an average of 90.0%). It can be assumed that their use of Portuguese in this linguistic domain coincides with times spent outside of the actual classroom, in which the use of this language is less easily monitored. More interesting, however, is the fact that speakers with nonprofessional occupations use Portuguese to a much greater extent in the workplace than do professionals (28.6% compared to 11.1%). This is most likely due to the perception within the community that Spanish should be used in professional endeavors in which language use is expected to be formal. These results support findings in Hensel (1972) and Carvalho (1998) which show that members of the lower socioeconomic class tend to use Portuguese more frequently than members of the upper socioeconomic class.

4.2. The social conditioning of language use in Rivera

The social stratification of language use in Rivera is most likely due to the lingering stigma that Border Portuguese is spoken most frequently by members of a lower socioeconomic standing. If, in the current investigation, it can be proven that the more frequent use of Portuguese is characteristic of a certain social class, then the proposal that bilingualism is stratified socially will be substantiated. According to Lebov (2001, 60), ‘it is generally agreed that among objective indicators, occupation is the most highly correlated with other conceptions of social class.’ By examining the general use of Spanish and Portuguese irrespective of linguistic domain by members of like occupation, an even more accurate depiction of language choice in Rivera will be achieved. The examination of language use according to occupation alone is important since neither the social pressures to use Spanish are present in home environments nor are the necessities to use Portuguese with monolingual speakers of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1080/1200</td>
<td>120/1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90.0%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1690/1900</td>
<td>210/1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88.9%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional</td>
<td>1500/2100</td>
<td>600/2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71.4%)</td>
<td>(28.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Self-reported percentages of language use by consultants in all linguistic domains according to occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2140/2400</td>
<td>260/2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(89.2%)</td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3330/4300</td>
<td>970/4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77.4%)</td>
<td>(22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional</td>
<td>3140/4200</td>
<td>1060/4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74.8%)</td>
<td>(25.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To show rates of language use in both home and work/school domains, percentages of use in both domains were added for each consultant, thereby doubling the total possible percentage points for each occupational group. For example, since 12 students completed a questionnaire, the total possible percentage points for this group is 2400. This method was decided upon in order to plainly show percentages of use for each group. This makes it easier to understand why the possible percentage points for the professional occupation group are not double that of the number of consultants in this group. Thus, though there are a total of 28 speakers in this group, the total percentage points is not 5600 since five speakers are retired (which reduces the total to 5100 points since no information on language use in the workplace is available for them) and questionnaires were not filled out by four speakers (for whom there is no information on percentage language use in either domain), resulting in a total of 4300 possible percentage points.

this language. In other words, not only does the analysis of language use in both domains provide a broader perspective of the speaker’s language choices, it includes the environment in which speakers can freely choose either language without the imposition of work restrictions. The rates of Spanish and Portuguese use by members of different occupational groups are shown in Table 3.

As Table 3 clearly shows, members of distinct occupational classes use Spanish at approximately equal rates when all domains are taken into account. Speakers with professional occupations use this language only slightly more often than those with nonprofessional occupations (77.4% as opposed to 74.8%). Of course, students use this language considerably more often (at 89.2%). When these results are compared with those shown in Table 2, an important pattern of language use in the community is revealed. Students, who use Spanish in all domains at a rate of 89.2%, use this language 90.0% of the time at school. This means that these speakers use Spanish frequently even in familiar domains. Similarly, the overall rate of Spanish use by speakers with nonprofessional occupations in all domains (74.8%) is comparable to their use of this language in the workplace (71.4%). The rates of Spanish use by speakers with professional occupations, however, depend greatly on domain. These speakers use Spanish at a rate of 88.9% when in the workplace, but use this language less overall (at a rate of 77.4%). This suggests that older speakers tend to use Portuguese often in the home, but alter their language use when professional concerns demand that they do so. It is clear from these results that there are rigid community norms concerning the use of Spanish in professional domains, but not in private domains.

5. Language use in the home

5.1. The frequent use of both languages in the home

To further examine the language choices of speakers in home environments, in which the use of Portuguese is expected to be more frequent than in work environments for all
Table 4. Self-reported percentages of language use in the home with interlocutors pertaining to this domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4460/5700</td>
<td>1240/5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(78.2%)</td>
<td>(21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2700/3200</td>
<td>500/3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(84.4%)</td>
<td>(15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>2900/3300</td>
<td>400/3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.9%)</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3460/5000</td>
<td>1540/5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69.2%)</td>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>3940/5700</td>
<td>1760/5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69.1%)</td>
<td>(30.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

speakers, it is necessary to study the rates of language use by speakers in this environment alone. As with the examination of language use in work environments, the use of Spanish and Portuguese in the home will be compared to the use of these languages with the interlocutors that coincide with this informal domain. These are: (1) spouse, (2) children, (3) parents, and (4) relatives. Percentages of language use with each of these interlocutors were solicited directly from consultants by way of the questionnaire. Although all consultants indicated the percentage with which they use each language in the home (except for the six consultants who did not complete the questionnaire), percentages of language use with certain interlocutors were not indicated by many consultants due to the fact that they do not have children, are not married, or their parents are deceased. For this reason, totals do not equal 5700 in any of the interlocutor categories, with the exception of relatives. The rates at which consultants use Spanish and Portuguese in the home with these interlocutors appear in Table 4.

These results reveal interesting patterns about language use in the home. Although it is true that the use of Spanish is less frequent in this domain than it is in the workplace or school, these rates do not differ greatly (78.2% compared to 82.5%). This is particularly important given the fact that speakers do not have the same social pressures to speak Spanish in this familiar domain as they do in professional domains. When we look at speakers' rates of Spanish use with familiar interlocutors, however, it becomes apparent that speakers use this language according to the interlocutors with whom they interact. The use of Spanish is much more prevalent with spouses and children (at 84.4 and 87.9%, respectively) than it is with parents and relatives (at just under 70% each). This suggests that Spanish is spoken among these interlocutors as a way to foster the use of this language while discouraging the use of Portuguese, unless the use of this language is necessary for communicating with Portuguese-dominant or monolingual family members. This tendency, which is illustrated in the following example, was revealed in many interactions that I had with community members:

(8) I: ¿En qué sentido ha afectado la cultura brasileña al uruguayo?
    "In what sense has Brazilian culture affected Uruguayans?"
C: Nosotros que somos de Rivera, ella ha afectado mucho, mucho, porque normalmente tenemos matrimonios de brasileños, eh, con uruguayos y viceversa.
Entonces, hay esto ya de por sí; o la madre brasileña tira para un lado o el padre, eh, que sepa yo, tira para el otro. Yo soy casado con una brasileña. Y de niño, a ser obligado en la escuela, yo hablaba español; pero si no, hablaba el portugués en mi casa. Y todos somos españoles. Mi esposa es brasileña y, sin embargo, ella habla el español. Nuestros habitamos el español en nuestra casa. Nuestros hijos hablan español, pero también saben hablar el portugués perfectamente. Si tienen que hablarlo, hablan, pero normalmente, diariamente, es el español, pero conmigo no fue lo mismo, ¿viste?

"For" those of us who are from Rivera, it has affected [us] a lot, a lot, because normally we have marriages of Brazilians, uh, with Uruguayan and vice versa. So, there's that in and of itself; or Brazilian mothers move to one side [of the border] or fathers, uh, as far as I know, move to the other side. I'm married to a Brazilian. And as a child, since I was forced to in school, I spoke Spanish; but if not, I spoke Portuguese at home. And we're all Spanish. My wife is Brazilian and, even so, she speaks Spanish. We speak Spanish in our home. Our children speak Spanish, but they also know how to speak Portuguese perfectly. If they have to speak it, they speak, but normally, from day to day, it's Spanish, but it wasn't the same way with me, you know?" (39/A:127-159/61)

The results so far prove several very important points about language use in the community of Rivera. First, this is not a diglossic community as other researchers have claimed, at least not according to the original definition given in Ferguson (1959). The use of Spanish and Portuguese is variable in all domains and seems to be determined more by individual speaker preference, speaker relations, and perceptions of acceptability of language use according to domain. While it is true that speakers use Portuguese more often in the home (at a rate of 21.8%) than in professional environments (at a rate of 17.5%), the use of Spanish is still very common in homes throughout Rivera. Therefore, the division of languages into high and low varieties does not seem to apply to this community. Second, speakers seem to be maintaining cross-cultural bonds with relatives who live in Brazil, which is evidenced by the high rates with which speakers use Portuguese with their relatives. This linguistic manifestation of co-existence and cultural unity provides strong evidence in support of speakers' claims that the cities of Rivera and Santana do Livramento function as one, despite consistent attempts by the Uruguayan government to dismantle these historical, cultural, and ethnic ties. Finally, language use in the home seems to be related to age and the transmission of language across different generations. This seems to be the case given the fact that speakers use Spanish with their children much more frequently than Portuguese (87.9% compared to 12.1%) while using Portuguese often with their parents (30.8% of the time). Furthermore, spouses use Spanish with one another 84.4% of the time since they are normally in the presence of their children.

5.2. Generational transmission of both languages

Many spouses reported using Portuguese together when their children were not present, but then switching to Spanish around their children to reinforce the use of this official, national language. This pattern of language use was related to me by many older speakers, especially middle-aged speakers, who tend to use Spanish with their children even though they may have used primarily Portuguese with their parents when they were younger (as shown in Example 8). The following exchange between two mothers further exemplifies this pattern:
(9) C1: En mi casa siempre se adquirió la modalidad de hablar el portugués. Siempre con mi madre, con mis abuelos siempre se habló el portugués. En cambio, a veces estoy hablando con mi esposo y sale un portugués entre nosotros. Ellas [refiriéndose a sus hijas] nos miran como ‘¿De qué están hablando?’. Mi esposo, en su casa también, él adquiere; y él con su madre [?]. Si no, hablan en portugués. [ ] y [ ] hablan en portugués siempre, siempre. Ya es como una costumbre. [?] La madre y sus hijos lo hablan, pero con las hijas es diferente. [ ] sólo les habla por teléfono en español, pero con los gurucitos, incluso con el mayor que vive en Montevideo, ella por teléfono, ella está hablando portugués.

In my house, we always learned how to speak portugués. Always with my mother, with my grandparents, we always spoke portugués. However, sometimes I'm talking with my husband and we start to speak portugués. They [referring to her daughters] look at us like 'What are you talking about?'. My husband also learned it at home; and with his mother [?]. If not, they speak portugués. [ ] and [ ] always, always speak portugués. It's like a custom. Mothers speak it with their sons, but with their daughters it's different. [ ] only speaks Spanish with her daughters on the phone, but with her boys, even with her eldest who lives in Montevideo, on the phone, she speaks portugués.'

C2: Es costumbre, es costumbre de familia.

'It's a custom, a family custom.'

C1: Es costumbre de familia.

'It's a family custom.'

I: ¿Y entre los amigos también o no?

'And also among friends or not?'

C1: Sí, sí.

'Yes, yes.'

C2: Claro.

'Of course.' (17/A:360-381/23,25)

The motivation for parents to speak primarily Spanish around their children is that they feel that their children will learn to speak Spanish 'correctly' (i.e. without incorporating elements of Portuguese into their speech) as a result. This is particularly important with females, as indicated in the preceding example, given the more stringent social expectations that are traditionally placed on women.

To test whether this pattern of language use exists for the community as a whole, percentages of language use by older speakers with their children were calculated for both possible generational transmissions (that is, the third generation with their children and the second generation with their children). These results are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. Self-reported percentages of language use for older generations when addressing younger generations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation &gt; 2nd generation</td>
<td>1460/1600 (91.3%)</td>
<td>140/1600 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation &gt; 1st generation</td>
<td>1440/1700 (84.7%)</td>
<td>260/1700 (15.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Though 18 speakers from the oldest generation were interviewed for the Rivera database, only 1600 possible percentage points are available for this generation since speaker 14 does not have children and speaker 15 never completed the questionnaire. Similarly, only 17 out of the total of 27 speakers from the second generation were included in this calculation since five speakers do not have children and five speakers did not complete a written questionnaire.
Surprisingly, the oldest generation uses Spanish with their children more often than do parents of the second generation with their children (at a rate of 91.3% compared to 84.7%), indicating that there actually may be a steady trend in Rivera away from the more frequent use of Spanish with children. This could be the result of a growing acceptance in this community of Portuguese as not only a heritage language but also as a language which poses economic benefits to their children’s futures given its usefulness in Latin American economic affairs. The greater use of Portuguese by this generation with their children, however, may simply reflect the individual language preferences of consultants of this generation as sampled. That is, given the random selection of the consultants for the database and the resulting lack of control for factors such as language preference and actual use by these consultants, their higher rates of use of Portuguese with their children may simply reflect the greater tendencies of these speakers to use Portuguese overall. To see whether this is the case or not, percentages of language use overall for all three generational groups must be examined. These are displayed in Table 6.

There does not seem to be a shift toward the greater use of Spanish in Rivera, at least not over the course of three generations. It is true that young speakers use Spanish more often than their middle-aged parents, but this may be due primarily to the social pressures placed upon these speakers to speak Spanish more often (e.g. in school and when entering the marketplace). Somewhat surprisingly, since it has often been thought that Portuguese use in Rivera was more prevalent among the oldest generation, this generation uses Spanish to the greatest degree. In fact, several speakers (#s 16, 26, 29, and 43) use only Spanish in their daily lives. Each of these speakers attested to their abilities to understand and speak Portuguese, as they have lived on the border with Brazil for their entire lives (except speaker 26, who moved to Rivera in her early teens). Despite these abilities, however, they have chosen to speak only Spanish. Such a categorical use of this language, naturally, is very rare in this bilingual community. Only one other speaker (# 56), who is 18 years of age, claimed 100% use of Spanish. Since four members of the third generation represent an aberration from the typically bilingual nature of consultants, their categorical use of Spanish skews the rates of language use for the rest of the group toward Spanish. If they are removed from this calculation in Table 6, however, a more accurate representation of language use can be achieved (now 944.6/1300 or 72.7%). Even so, percentages of use of Portuguese are highest for the second generation. These results suggest that the greater use of Portuguese by members of the second generation with their children than that of members of the third generation with their children is probably not due to any societal or cultural need to encourage the use of Portuguese.

Table 6. Self-reported percentages of language use overall for all three generations of speakers in Rivera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>1363.4/1800</td>
<td>436.6/1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75.7%)</td>
<td>(24.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>1501.9/2200</td>
<td>698.1/2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(68.3%)</td>
<td>(31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td>1344.6/1700</td>
<td>355.4/1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79.1%)</td>
<td>(20.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but rather is a reflection of their general language preferences. Since this generation tends to use Portuguese more often than the third generation (whose use of this language never exceeds 30%), the fact that they use Portuguese more often with their children is only to be expected.

Results from the analysis of language use in home environments in Rivera show that the use of Portuguese varies according to different interlocutors. The use of Portuguese is more common with relatives and parents whereas the use of this language is relatively infrequent with children and spouses. The use of Spanish with these interlocutors serves the purpose of fostering the use of this language while simultaneously discouraging possibilities of language mixing and phonological borrowing. The general idea held by many parents is that children will acquire the minority language naturally by communicating with family members who speak this language. This enables children, most of whom are dominant in the majority language, to maintain the language of their heritage. This situation demonstrates many parallels with other situations of language contact such as English–Spanish contact in the southwestern USA and English–French contact along the border between Maine and Canada. In each of these situations, the majority language has overtaken the minority language among younger speakers in general, though the minority language is still maintained as a heritage language, to a lesser or greater extent, among certain individuals (Bills 1997; Bills and Vigil 1999; Guerrette 1979; Hudson, Hernández-Chávez, and Bills 1995; Price 2007; Richard 1998). One major difference, however, is that, given the facility of crossing the Uruguayan–Brazilian border, as opposed to US borders, there is a greater likelihood that Portuguese will be maintained among future generations and may become increasingly more standard. Results from the current study, especially those displayed in Table 6, as well as research from Carvalho (2003) support this claim.

6. Language use with friends

Friends are a group of interlocutors that encompass both formal/professional and informal/personal linguistic domains. Due to the dense personal relationships and equal social status that they have, friends are more akin to familiar interlocutors than to bosses or teachers. Since they do not typify any particular linguistic domain, however, the analysis of language use with these interlocutors must be conducted separately, without reference to domain. This will serve as an indication of language preferences within the community in much the same way that language use in familiar domains reflects preferences. Language use with friends most accurately reflects individuals’ true language preferences and choices since there is little or no pressure for them to speak Spanish. To clearly depict language choice within Rivera as an overall community norm, percentages of use of both Spanish and Portuguese with friends were averaged for all speakers. These percentages of language choice appear in Table 7.

Consultants use Portuguese with friends much more frequently than they do with any other group of interlocutors. They choose to use this language not only because they have more linguistic freedom to do so, but also as a means to communicate with Brazilian friends and Portuguese-dominant Uruguayan friends. Many consultants indicated on the questionnaire that they choose to use either Spanish or Portuguese depending on the language preferences of the other speaker. In the case of most Brazilians living in Santana do Livramento, who, in general, do not speak Spanish
Table 7. Self-reported percentages of language use/choice with friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>3490/5700</td>
<td>2210/5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61.2%)</td>
<td>(38.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

often, this preference tends to be Portuguese (Waltermire 2010b). When conversing with these speakers, consultants choose to use Portuguese as an act of accommodation. Among Uruguayans, close, intimate friends who have known one another for many years are aware of these preferences and use this language accordingly. One of the consultants for the current study said the following with respect to this situation:

(10) *En mi cuadra, hay dos personas que hablan portugués conmigo porque nos conocemos de niño pero a su vez con su mujer había español.* ‘On my block, there are two people who speak Portuguese with me because we’ve known one another since we were children, but at the same time they speak Spanish with their wives.’

(23/F:021-023/33)

This linguistic situation parallels the general social situation of Uruguayans living on the border. Due to the dual cultural, ethnic, and socio-political history of this region of Uruguay, these speakers have had to adapt to Brazilian influence, both amongst themselves and with Brazilians living on the other side of the border. This influence has been reinforced in recent decades as a result of Brazil’s economic growth, the power of its media, and the diffusion of Brazilian popular culture to other parts of Latin America. Although the historic repression of Portuguese in public domains has succeeded to a certain extent, the influence of this language and Brazilian culture runs very deep in Rivera and is tied inextricably to the heritage of Uruguayan families living along the border.

7. Conclusion

In the bilingual community of Rivera, the use of Portuguese coincides with interlocutors of equal familiar and social status (such as family members of the same age and friends) in private domains (i.e., home environments). The use of this language in homes, however, depends largely on the relationship that exists between interlocutors. Parents and children tend to use Spanish with one another, but parents use Portuguese more often when their children are not present. As a heritage language in northeastern Uruguay, Portuguese is also used frequently with relatives and friends, many of whom live and work in Brazil. Past attempts to delimit Brazilian influence along the border, which now seem to be subsiding a bit, have not been completely successful since residents continue to speak Portuguese often in intimate situations. While it is true that Portuguese is spoken with the greatest frequency in home environments, the use of Spanish is still much more frequent. This situation resembles other contact situations along national borders where two major world languages are spoken, such as in the southwestern USA and along the border between Maine and Canada. The maintenance of Portuguese in Rivera may be more likely than Spanish in the southwestern USA or French in Maine, however, due to the fluid transnationalism that has developed in Rivera, where no physical boundaries exist between Uruguay and Brazil.
Furthermore, Portuguese is not merely a home language in Rivera, and is used often in the workplace by community members with nonprofessional occupations. If societal pressures for the use of Spanish in professional work environments did not exist, it is very likely that residents of a higher socioeconomic standing would also use Portuguese to a much greater extent, as evinced by the more or less equal use of this language by professionals and nonprofessionals irrespective of domain. For these reasons, this community should not be categorized as diglossic. The use of Spanish and Portuguese is variable in all domains and is contingent upon the relationships that exist between interlocutors in specific domains. Despite historical attempts to suppress the use of Portuguese along the Uruguayan–Brazilian border, the use of this language is still vibrant in Rivera. Unfortunately, the variety of Portuguese along the border is perceived negatively by the community, as are border varieties of Spanish, both of which are seen as ‘impure’ since neither are monolingual varieties. The misconception that a new language (whether referred to as fronterizo or portuñol) has emerged along the border has only furthered negative perceptions of the language varieties spoken along the border. In situations of language contact, both languages exhibit greater and lesser degrees of influence on the linguistic patterns of individual speakers. This has certainly been the case for the Portuguese spoken along the border. Consequently, when addressing language use in northeastern Uruguay, we should speak of bilingual dialects of this language rather than a new language that is somehow distinct from Portuguese altogether.
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Notes

1. Definitions of bilingualism should not be based on language use alone, however, since attitudes toward both languages also shape a bilingual’s identity (Ben-Rafael, Olstain, and Geijst 1998; Hoare 2001; Joseph 2004; Lawson and Sachdev 2004). In other words, bilingualism is not merely a linguistic phenomenon involving frequency of use, but rather a social one as well, which is defined largely by its role within the community. Consequently, these attitudes affect the bilingual’s choice of one language or another.

2. Five of six of these speakers are of the second generation, while only one is of the third generation (speaker 15, female, professional occupation). The social attributes of each consultant, however, vary. Of the second generation, two males (one with a professional job and one with a nonprofessional job) did not complete the questionnaire. Likewise, the three women who did not complete the questionnaire cover both occupational classes (two professionals and one nonprofessional), thereby maintaining the diversity of the original composition of social characteristics for this generation.

3. Nonprofessionals differ from professionals in that the work they perform does not require formal academic training. These members of the community are taxi drivers, shopkeepers and their employees, hotel owners and their employees, waiters, bartenders, construction workers, etc.

4. Some of the younger consultants indicated percentages of language use with a spouse, which most clarified by writing in the margin novio or novia ‘boyfriend’ or ‘girlfriend.’
These percentages were not included in the rate calculations presented in Table 4 since these interlocutors do not belong strictly to home domains.
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Appendix 1

(Original questionnaire)

Nombre: ___________________________ Edad: ______

Profesión: ___________________________

Nacionalidad: _________________________

Nacionalidad de padre: __________________

Nacionalidad de madre: __________________

Frecuencia con que usa el español  %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En casa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el trabajo/la escuela</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En la iglesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el banco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el correo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En restaurantes/bares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con el marido/la mujer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los hijos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los padres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los parientes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los amigos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con el jefe/los maestros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MUCHÍSIMAS GRACIAS

(Translation of questionnaire)

Name: ___________________________ Age: ______

Profession: ___________________________

Nationality: _________________________

Father’s nationality: __________________

Mother’s nationality: __________________

Frequency of Spanish use  %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work/school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the post office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In restaurants/bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With boss/teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH