

Distinguishing Two “Synonyms”: A Variationist Analysis of *quizá* and *quizás* in Six Spanish Dialects

Christina García
The Ohio State University

1. Introduction

There is a long-standing tradition of studies concerning mood choice in Spanish. Recently, these studies have included the use of subjunctive versus indicative in constructions that contain epistemic adverbs, that is, adverbs that express possibility and probability. This area of research is particularly interesting because traditional grammars state that the use of subjunctive in this context is optional. For example, in (1) and (2), the use of either indicative or subjunctive is grammatical.

- (1) *Quizás terminamos/terminemos el trabajo hoy.*
'We may finish the job today'.
- (2) *Quizá es/sea la mejor opción.*
'Maybe it is the best option'.

This grammatical situation lends itself to sociolinguistic research methods due to the variation demonstrated in the examples above. Scholars have used a variety of methods to get at the question of whether subjunctive or indicative is used in these cases. Forced choice tasks have been one of the most popular methods in studies on mood choice. Other researchers have done raw counts and provided percentages of subjunctive versus indicative in books, newspapers, magazines, and oral data. While these methods have shed light on the broad picture of mood choice with epistemic adverbs, there have been few studies that have attempted to consider the kinds of contextual constraints that impact mood choice with these adverbs. One such study (King, McLeish, Zuckerman and Schwenter 2008) found differences in the constraints on mood choice for various epistemic adverbs, including *quizá* and *quizás*. Thus, more multivariate analyses, like the one presented in this paper on *quizá* and *quizás*, are necessary to fully understand what constrains mood choice in instances like (1) and (2).

The other issue at hand is the fact that these two adverbs are often represented in writing as *quizá(s)*, where the orthographic final 's' is an optional element, suggesting that they are two forms of the same adverb and are more or less interchangeable. Anecdotal evidence goes against this characterization. For instance, some native speakers prefer to use one adverb over the other, suggesting that there are perhaps certain linguistic and extralinguistic factors that influence the use of *quizás* and *quizá*. The goal of this paper is not only to examine mood choice with *quizás* and *quizá*, but also to examine other factors that contribute to the differentiation of the two adverbs. Both of these goals also have pedagogical applications in that they might help to teach non-native speakers of Spanish how to choose between these adverbs in speech and writing.

2. Background

The first logical place to look for information on *quizás* and *quizá* is in Spanish language grammars. Butt and Benjamin (2004) state that with these adverbs, “when the event referred to is happening in the present or happened in the past, use of the subjunctive is optional. The subjunctive

* Thanks to Scott Schwenter for the inspiration for this project and continued support throughout its many stages of development. Thanks also to Terrell Morgan and the attendees of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics for their comments and suggestions.

makes the possibility rather weaker....” (251). The authors go on to say, “If the event is still in the future, the present subjunctive or, much less commonly, the future indicative, is used, but not the present indicative...” (251). There are several problems with this depiction of epistemic adverbs. First, saying that the use of subjunctive is optional leads us to believe that mood choice is completely random, or at best correlates with “possibility”. Secondly, although Butt and Benjamin claim that it would be ungrammatical to say “*quizás viene mañana*” since the event is still in the future, for many native speakers of Spanish it is perfectly acceptable. Thus, it seems that this grammatical account is more prescriptive than descriptive and does not depict these adverbs’ usage

Studies in sociolinguistics have examined the problems with these grammatical descriptions and, as noted in the introduction, different methodologies have been used to do so. Studerus (1995) used a forced choice task to investigate mood choice with epistemic adverbs. He gave a series of sentences to native speakers of Spanish and asked them to choose between the use of subjunctive and indicative. In the stimuli sentences, either mood was grammatical. While he does not report specifically on the patterns with *quizá* and *quizás*, Studerus found that more participants chose the subjunctive for *tal vez* than for *probablemente*. The problem with forced choice tasks is that they do not necessarily represent what the native speaker would actually say or write when they are not forced or allowed to think carefully about it beforehand.

Woehr (1972) and Renaldi (1977) both looked at written data in order to see how epistemic adverbs are used in Spanish language data. Woehr concluded that the subjunctive is more common when the sentence refers to the future or present and much less common with a past temporal reference. Overall Renaldi’s data coincided with this conclusion, only to a lesser degree. The two authors had conflicting results in terms of frequency: *quizá* was more frequent in Woehr’s data, while the opposite was true for Renaldi’s data. This is most likely due to the difference in the sources that they used. Woehr included data from Peninsular as well as Latin American texts; however, Renaldi used only Latin American texts. In his examination of different genres of Spanish, Renaldi comments that novels and theater “potentially reflect current speech patterns” (334). Naturally-occurring conversational data would conceivably provide an even better source for studying current speech patterns.

DeMello (1995) followed the line of research begun by Woehr and Renaldi and expanded it to include oral, conversational, data. He used interviews from twelve different Spanish dialects from the Habla Culta corpora to explore mood choice in a variety of constructions involving possibility and probability. DeMello’s overall results support Woehr’s conclusion about temporal reference, as well as show more subjunctive use for *quizás* (39%: 84/213) than for *quizá* (30%: 29/97). Nevertheless, DeMello’s study was somewhat restricted due to the small number of tokens for each adverb per dialect. Additionally, while raw counts and frequencies can provide a broad perspective, multivariate analysis is needed to uncover the subtle differences in contextual conditioning between *quizá* and *quizás*.

A small multivariate analysis was done by Houle and Martínez Gomez (2009a) that looked at the use of *quizá(s)*, *probablemente*, *posiblemente* and *tal vez* in written texts from the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. The only significant factor group in this study was polarity, with negatives favoring the use of the subjunctive and affirmatives disfavoring the subjunctive. However, the investigation was severely limited by the small number of tokens: a total of 204 for all adverbs. An associated study by the same authors, Houle and Martínez Gomez (2009b), traced the diachronic use of *quizá(s)* through texts from the thirteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This study concluded that the incidence of subjunctive use with *quizá(s)* has increased over time. Again, the number of tokens is an issue with a total of only 176 and a mere 3 tokens for the thirteenth century.

King et al. (2008) was the first large-scale multivariate analysis to look at mood choice with a group of epistemic adverbs, specifically *tal vez*, *quizá*, *quizás*, *posiblemente*, *probablemente*, in data from Argentina, Mexico, and Spain. The study had substantial results for mood choice with epistemic adverbs, as well as important findings about the differences between *quizá* and *quizás*. For instance, they show that different factor groups constrain the use of subjunctive. According to King et al. (2008), mood choice with *quizá* is constrained by temporal reference, mode and adjacency, while for *quizás* it is constrained by temporal reference, dialect and adjacency. Furthermore, for future temporal reference, *quizá* and *quizás* had opposing factor weights in terms of favoring or disfavoring subjunctive: *quizá* exhibited a factor weight of .24, while *quizás* had a factor weight of .55.

The present study builds on the methodology and results of King et al. (2008) in order to take a closer look at the nuanced differences between *quizás* and *quizá*. With the inclusion of additional dialects, the question remains of what constrains mood choice with these adverbs for each dialect analyzed. Additionally, the present study considers other factors that might affect the choice of *quizá* versus *quizás* in order to determine to what extent the traditional representation of an optional ‘s’ as in *quizá(s)* is accurate. The overall hypothesis is that there will be functional differences between *quizá* and *quizás* and that they are not interchangeable in natural language use.

3. Data and Methods

Tokens of *quizá* and *quizás* were extracted from the Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual (CREA) of the Real Academia Española for three dialects of Spanish: Cuban, Peruvian, and Venezuelan. These tokens were combined with the *quizá* and *quizás* tokens from King et al. (2008) for Argentina, Mexico and Spain. Following the previous study’s methodology, all 2,001 tokens were coded for the following independent variables: polarity, tense/aspect of verb, (non-)adjacency of adverb and verb, temporal reference of the verb, person/number, dialect, mode, and verb. Polarity was coded as negative if the inflected verb of interest was negated and as affirmative if it was not negated. For tense/aspect, the grammatical inflection of the verb was coded using the following categories: present, preterit, imperfect, synthetic future (*cantaré*), progressive, perfect, periphrastic future (*voy a cantar*), and conditional. In terms of adjacency, the verb and adverb were considered adjacent when there was no intervening material between them and non-adjacent when there were one more or words intervening in between them. For temporal reference, the surrounding context was used to determine whether the sentence referenced the present, past or future. If a sentence did not fit into these categories (for example, hypothetical sentences) or the temporal reference could not be determined by the context, the token was coded as indeterminate temporal reference. Person/number of the verb was coded using the morphological categorization of the verb inflection: first person singular, second person singular, third person singular, first person plural, second person plural, third person plural, and impersonal. Thus, *ustedes* was coded as third person plural even if it was used to refer to a group of addressees. Naturally, dialect was coded for the country where the token came from: Argentina, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, Spain, or Venezuela. The CREA corpus includes both written data and oral data and each token was coded as one or the other. It is important to note, however, that the oral data is available only as transcriptions and not as audio and therefore I had to trust what was written in the transcriptions. The infinitive of the inflected verb was coded for each token. Moreover, two new independent variables, clause and following phonological context, were added to the analysis. Clause was coded as main if both the adverb and verb were in the main clause of the sentence and as subordinate if they were in a subordinate clause. Following phonological context was coded as the individual phonological segment that followed the adverb (/s/, /t/, /a/, etcetera). Mood choice (subjunctive or indicative) and adverb (*quizás* or *quizá*) were coded as the dependent variables, the former being excluded when the latter was the dependent variable for a given analysis and vice versa.

The envelope of variation includes all instances of *quizá* and *quizás* that have scope over an inflected verb that can appear either in the subjunctive or the indicative. Therefore, this does not include cases where the use of subjunctive is obligatory according to the rules of Spanish, such as (3). Also not included are cases like (4) where the adverb modifies something other than a verb; in this case it modifies a noun phrase. The last exclusion consists of those examples in which the adverb comes after the inflected verb, as in (5). Such tokens were excluded because the adverb does not have scope over the inflected verb. It is important to note that there were cases where the adverb was followed by a pause and yet still had scope over the inflected verb. In these cases, such as (6), there is usually some intervening material between the adverb and verb that is separated by pauses, but the adverb can still influence the verb that comes after, which is evidenced by the fact that the verb is realized variably in the indicative or the subjunctive.

(3) *Espero que quizá hables con él.*

‘I hope you maybe talk with him.’

(4) *El destino, la fatalidad y quizás alguna causa más poderosa...* (CREA)

‘Destiny, fate or maybe some more powerful cause...’

- (5) *Globalización es quizás uno de los conceptos más utilizados...*(CREA)
 ‘Globalization is maybe one of the most utilized concepts...’
- (6) *Quizá, en este momento, sería más urgente empezar porque...*(CREA)
 ‘Maybe, at this moment, it would be more urgent to begin because...’

Two distinct multivariate analyses were run in GoldVarb X (Sankoff, Tagliamonte and Smith 2005). As stated above, one analysis had adverb as the dependent variable, while the other analysis had mood choice as the dependent variable. The first analysis on adverb was run with the independent variables of mode and following phonological context. Since mode came out as significant in the analysis of mood choice in King et al. (2008), it is likely that mood would have an impact on the choice to use *quizá* or *quizás*. Written and oral Spanish are known to differ in many ways and therefore adverb choice is prone to be one of these many ways. The motivation for examining following phonological context has to do with the syllable structure of Spanish and the process of re-syllabification. When a consonant is in the coda of the last syllable of a word and is followed by a vowel in the next word, the consonant re-syllabifies as the onset of the first syllable of the next word. For example, a sequence such as “*quizás aquí*” would syllabify as /ki.sa.sa.ki/. This phenomenon is due to the preference for a CVCV structure in Spanish. Therefore, I hypothesize that in order to fit this prototypical structure, *quizás* will be used most before a following vowel, whereas *quizá* will be used more before a following consonant. Since re-syllabification does not occur across pause boundaries, I do not believe that a following pause will affect adverb choice in this case.

Various GoldVarb runs were done in order to determine the best way to collapse the factors for following phonological context. An analysis with the collapsed factors of consonant (C), vowel (V), and pause (P) was compared to another that included the segments /a/ and /s/ as separate factors. This was done to assure that the avoidance of sequences /a a/ and /s s/ was not the main factor in adverb choice. Once it was found that the factor weights for /a/ and /s/ were similar to those of other vowels and consonants respectively, the collapsed factors of C, V and P were chosen for the final analysis. The results for mode in the first multivariate analysis will not be presented here because the distribution of the data was very uneven between written and oral sources, as will be discussed later in detail.

The second multivariate analysis on mood choice included all of the independent variables as factor groups, except tense/aspect and following phonological context. The factor group of tense/aspect was found to interact heavily with temporal reference. Given that King et al. (2008) found temporal reference to be more important in describing the variation than tense/aspect, the factor group of tense/aspect was not included in the analysis. For the factor group person/number, singular and plural were collapsed producing first person, second person, third person and impersonal. Also, indeterminate temporal reference was collapsed with present. The other two factors remaining in this group were past and future temporal reference. Finally, verb was collapsed from the infinitive of the individual inflected verb to the nine most common verbs in the extracted data versus all others. These verbs were: *estar*, *haber*, *hacer*, *ir*, *poder*, *saber*, *ser*, and *tener*, with distinctions between auxiliary and non-auxiliary *estar* and *haber*. After comparing several GoldVarb runs, this distinction was further collapsed to the five most common verbs (*estar*, *haber*, *poder*, *ser*, and *tener*) versus all others, since this represented the best analysis.

4. Results

The results from the first analysis are seen in Table 1, which shows the raw counts of the two adverbs based on the following phonological context. While this distribution is significant according to statistical measures, it does not reveal the whole picture. If we were to just look at this table, we would tend to think that a following vowel favors *quizás*, a following pause might slightly favor *quizás*, and a following consonant has no effect. Without multivariate analysis, that is all we can say about the influence that following phonological context has on the choice between *quizá* and *quizás*.

Table 1: Raw counts of *quizá* vs. *quizás* per following phonological context (chi-square = 30.13, df = 2, p < .01)

Following Phonological Context	<i>Quizá</i>	<i>Quizás</i>	Total
Vowel	198 (35.9%)	353 (64.1%)	551
Consonant	679 (49.8%)	685 (50.2%)	1364
Pause	40 (45.5%)	48 (54.5%)	88

The effect of following phonological context on the choice between the two adverbs becomes much clearer when the GoldVarb results are taken into consideration, as shown in Table 2. The analysis of choice of adverb was done individually by country and following phonological context was selected as significant for all countries except Spain and Mexico. Overall, the factor weights follow the same tendencies from Table 1: a following consonant favors the use of *quizá*, while a following vowel disfavors the use of *quizá*. While this is true across the board for the four dialects in Table 2, the factor weights for pause show some dialect variation. In Argentina, a following pause favors *quizá*; however, in Cuba, Peru and Venezuela, a following pause disfavors *quizá*, with varying degrees of disfavoring for each of the dialects. Instead of suggesting something about the choice between *quizá* and *quizás*, I think the different results for pause are due to the small number of tokens that had a pause following the adverb. When all of the data is considered as a whole, pause neither favors nor disfavors *quizá*, which suggests that the apparent dialectal differences seen for pause are merely an artifact of the data.

Table 2: Results from GoldVarb Analysis of *quizá* vs. *quizás* (application value = *quizá*)

	Argentina (N = 404) (48% <i>quizá</i>)	Cuba (N = 278) (48.6% <i>quizá</i>)	Peru (N = 170) (42.4% <i>quizá</i>)	Venezuela (N = 337) (33.2% <i>quizá</i>)
Following Phon.				
Consonant	.56	.58	.59	.56
Vowel	.28	.28	.33	.40
Pause	.92	.46	.46	.37
	<i>Range 64</i>	<i>Range 30</i>	<i>Range 26</i>	<i>Range 19</i>

The results from the second quantitative analysis help to further illustrate the functional characteristics of *quizá* and *quizás*. Table 3 shows the raw counts and frequencies for the analysis of mood choice. The *p*-value greater than .50 shows that the distribution of the table is not statistically significant. That is, looking at just the raw numbers with all of the dialects combined into one large dataset, there is no difference between the two adverbs in terms of mood choice.

Table 3: Raw counts and frequencies of subjunctive vs. indicative for each adverb (chi-square = 0.019, degrees of freedom = 1, p > .05)

	Subjunctive	Indicative	Total
<i>quizás</i>	494 (45.5%)	592 (54.5%)	1086
<i>quizá</i>	419 (45.8%)	496 (54.2%)	915

Table 4: Results from GoldVarb Analysis of mood choice by adverb (application value = subjunctive)

	<i>Quizás</i> (N = 1086) Input = .442 (45.5% Subj) LL = -652.855	<i>Quizá</i> (N = 915) Input = .449 (45.8% Subj) LL = -565.830
Temporal Reference		
Future	.64	.43
Present	.60	.66
Past	.30	.29
	Range 34	Range 37
Dialect		
Argentina	.67	[.56]
Cuba	.61	[.45]
Spain	.50	[.56]
Mexico	.48	[.48]
Peru	.41	[.38]
Venezuela	.33	[.45]
	Range 34	
Person		
Impersonal	.59	[.53]
2nd	.59	[.44]
3rd	.52	[.50]
1st	.32	[.54]
	Range 27	
Verb		
<i>haber</i> 'to have'	.66	.67
<i>tener</i> 'to have'	.56	.40
<i>ser</i> 'to be'	.51	.53
<i>poder</i> 'to be able to'	.48	.61
<i>estar</i> 'to be'	.46	.32
Other	.46	.45
	Range 20	Range 35
Clause		
Main	.54	.53
Subordinate	.40	.44
	Range 14	Range 9
Adjacency		
Adjacent	.56	.58
Non-Adjacent	.46	.45
	Range 10	Range 13
Mode		
Written	[.51]	.55
Oral	[.48]	.40
		Range 15

The results from the multivariate analysis vary considerably from the results just mentioned for the raw counts and frequencies. Table 4 shows the factor weights of two independent GoldVarb runs: one for mood choice with *quizás* and the other for mood choice with *quizá*. In each case, the application value is the subjunctive. The fact that there are different significant factor groups selected for the two adverbs confirms the results from King et al. (2008). Temporal reference, dialect, person, verb, clause, and adjacency were chosen as significant for *quizás*, while temporal reference, verb, clause, adjacency, and mode made up the significant factor groups for *quizá*. The numbers shown in brackets in the table are the probabilities for the factor groups not selected as significant. Careful examination of each factor group shows, in some cases, dissimilar factor weights for *quizá* and *quizás*.

The first factor group, temporal reference, demonstrates an important difference between the two adverbs. As was seen in King et al. (2008), while past temporal reference disfavors and present favors the use of subjunctive for both adverbs, future temporal reference disfavors the subjunctive for *quizá* (.43), but favors the subjunctive for *quizás* (.64). Therefore, future temporal reference exemplifies a context in which mood choice is quite different for the two adverbs. Overall, we can see that temporal reference is extremely important to mood choice since this factor group had the greatest range (34 for *quizás* and 37 for *quizá*) for both adverbs.

The factor groups of dialect and person were only selected as significant for *quizás*. The results for dialect show a major dialect difference ranging from a strong favoring of the subjunctive mood in Argentina with a factor weight of .67 to strongly disfavoring subjunctive in Venezuela at .33. The range of 34 shows that dialect has a very large effect on mood choice for *quizás*. On the other hand, dialect does not seem to be as important for mood choice with *quizá*, since it was not selected significant and because most of the factor weights for the different dialects cluster around .50. The results for the person factor group for *quizás* show that impersonal, second, and to a lesser degree, third person favor the use of subjunctive, while first person disfavors subjunctive. The ordering of these is not matched by the factor weights for person for *quizá* (where person was not selected as significant), revealing another difference between the two adverbs.

Clause and adjacency were chosen as significant for both adverbs and exhibit the same overall tendency. The subjunctive is favored when the adverb and verb are in a main clause, whereas the subjunctive is slightly disfavored when they are located in a subordinate clause. Corresponding to the results of King et al. (2008), subjunctive is favored when the adverb and verb are adjacent, and disfavored when they are not adjacent. Given that these adverbs introduce the notion of possibility into the phrase, it follows that a verb would be conjugated in the subjunctive when the adverb is fresh in the mind of the speaker, and that the probability of subjunctive would decrease as more intervening material occurred between the adverb and the verb. Verb, which was also chosen as significant for both adverbs, demonstrates similar factor weights between *quizás* and *quizá* for some of the verbs and dissimilar weights for others. For *haber*, *ser*, *estar* and “other”, the tendencies in terms of favoring and disfavoring are the same for the two adverbs. Nonetheless, *quizás* and *quizá* have opposing factor weights for *tener* and *poder*. Additionally, the effect of verb on mood choice is much greater for *quizá* since it is the factor group that has the second highest range for that adverb. The global results for verb demonstrate that more frequent verbs use the subjunctive more than less frequent verbs, which to some degree confirms the results for lexical effect found in Finanger (2010). The last factor group, mode, was significant only for *quizá*, showing that subjunctive is favored for written texts while it is disfavored in the oral data for *quizá*. Again, far more written data was extracted than oral data and therefore the results for mode perhaps have more to do with the distribution of the data itself than with mood choice constraints.

In order to take a closer look at the dialect differences shown in Table 4, an analysis by dialect was performed separately for each adverb. Table 5 presents the results of twelve separate GoldVarb runs isolating each dialect and adverb pair. Due to space constraints, Table 5 only provides the factor groups that were selected as significant for each adverb/country pair. These results serve to further substantiate the importance of temporal reference. Indeed, temporal reference was selected as significant for all country/adverb pairs except *quizá* in Peru. None of the dialects studied show the same significant factor groups for *quizás* and *quizá*, illuminating more fine-grained differences between the two adverbs. Even for dialects where the two adverbs had one factor group in common (which was almost always temporal reference), the adverbs exhibited dissimilar factor weights. For example, *quizá* in Argentina strongly disfavors the subjunctive in contexts of future temporal reference with a factor weight of .04, while *quizás* in Argentina favors subjunctive in the future at .58.

Additionally, for inflected verb in Argentina, *quizás* and *quizá* display opposing tendencies of subjunctive use for all verb categories except *haber*. While Argentina is simply used as an example here, opposing factor weights for *quizás* and *quizá* can be seen in the other dialects as well, showing the subtle differences between the two adverbs in each dialect. Finally, Table 5 illustrates how one or two country/adverb pairs are responsible for the appearance of most factor groups in the combined analysis that was presented in Table 4, speaking to the dialect variation present for mood choice with these adverbs.

Table 5: Significant factor groups selected for each adverb split by country (application value = subjunctive)

	<i>Quizás</i>	<i>Quizá</i>
Argentina	Temporal Reference Mode Verb	Temporal Reference Clause Verb
Cuba	Temporal Reference Verb	Temporal Reference Person Mode
Spain	Temporal Reference Mode	Temporal Reference
Mexico	Temporal Reference	Temporal Reference Adjacency
Peru	Temporal Reference	Clause
Venezuela	Temporal Reference	Temporal Reference Mode Clause

Mode seems to be an important factor to consider in mood choice with these adverbs since it was selected as significant for three dialects for *quizá* and one dialect for *quizás*. The results from the individual adverb/country analyses match what was seen in Table 4, except for the Cuba analysis. While in general written data favors subjunctive and oral data disfavors subjunctive, the opposite is true for *quizá* in Cuba. While these are certainly noteworthy results, the cross tabulation of dialect and mode for each adverb, displayed in Tables 6 and 7, presents some problematic distributions. It is evident in the tables that the dialects whose data are most skewed are Cuba and Peru. In both cases, the amount of tokens that come from written texts is the vast majority of the total number of tokens. In fact, there were zero tokens of *quizá* in oral data from Cuba and only four tokens of *quizás* in oral data from Peru. Therefore, while mode seems to be important, the uneven distribution of the data must also be taken into consideration.

Table 6: Cross tabulation of dialect and mode for *quizá*

	Mexico	Argentina	Spain	Cuba	Peru	Venezuela
Oral	23	48	160	0	12	40
Written	186	146	33	135	60	72
<i>Total</i>	209	194	193	135	72	112

Table 7: Cross tabulation of dialect and mode for *quizás*

	Mexico	Argentina	Spain	Cuba	Peru	Venezuela
Oral	40	34	68	27	4	94
Written	170	176	132	116	94	131
Total	210	210	200	143	98	225

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The results from the first quantitative analysis in Table 2 show that the choice of *quizá* versus *quizás* is phonologically conditioned. *Quizá* is more likely to be chosen when it is followed by a consonant, while *quizás* is more likely before a vowel, confirming the previously presented hypothesis concerning adverb choice and following phonological context. It is interesting that this phonological conditioning is present despite the fact that most of the data is taken from written texts. As was explained earlier, even the oral data comes from transcribed texts and therefore the present study relies on the orthographic rendering of said oral data. This is especially problematic in dialects where /s/ aspiration and deletion is present since it is unclear whether the transcripts are merely orthographic or if they took into account phonological processes such as reduction of /s/. It is likely that if phonetically transcribed data were to be examined, the effect of following phonological context would be even greater due to the syllable structure and re-syllabification of Spanish.

While mode was selected as significant for the analysis of adverb choice, the cross tabulations of mode with dialect in Tables 6 and 7 verify that this result is probably due an uneven distribution of the data. It may indeed be the case that *quizá* is more prevalent in written data; however, this may differ from country to country. The overall results from the first analysis demonstrate clearly that the traditional parenthesized representation of the optional <s> in *quizá(s)* is inaccurate. The 's' that is put in parentheses is to a certain degree phonologically conditioned.

There are other differences in use that came out of the second analysis on mood choice with these adverbs. In the first part of analysis two, we saw that there are different factor groups that constrain the use of subjunctive versus indicative for *quizá* and *quizás*. Most relevant for both adverbs is temporal reference, although the two differ when the future is referenced. The avoidance of past subjunctive for both adverbs coincides with general tendencies that have been seen in past subjunctive use in Spanish (Lunn and Lunsford 1996). Since the past subjunctive is being used less, at least in some dialects, where prescriptive grammars say it should be obligatory, it follows that past subjunctive use would decrease with epistemic adverbs as well. Of the other factor groups selected, dialect is arguably the most important for *quizás*, portraying perhaps a pragmatic difference in how distinct dialects use this adverb. This result could also be looked at in terms of language change. Houle and Martínez (2009b) claim that despite the fact that overall subjunctive use is decreasing in Spanish, their results show subjunctive use for *quizás* and *quizá* increasing from the thirteenth century to today. If this is indeed the case, it seems that *quizás* is the adverb that is changing since it exhibits such great dialectal variation. For *quizá*, the next most important factor group is verb, showing that more frequent verbs appear in the subjunctive at a higher rate than less frequent verbs.

The analysis by dialect in Table 5 adds even more to the picture of these two adverbs. Most importantly, the large influence of temporal reference is once again seen, since it was significant for every dialect/adverb pair except *quizá* in Peru. With this in mind, one could say that temporal reference is the most critical factor group to consider in determining mood choice with *quizá* and *quizás*. Also important to this discussion is the fact that the GoldVarb runs for *quizás* and *quizá* for each country reveal different significant factor groups. Mode (written vs. oral) is undoubtedly relevant to the discussion of mood choice with these adverbs; however, the distribution of the current data does not allow for overall conclusions to be made. Therefore, the next step in the project would be to examine more oral data, in particular from Cuba and Peru.

The results from both analyses support the hypothesis that there are considerable differences between *quizá* and *quizás*. Despite their usual representation as *quizá(s)*, the first analysis shows that

this 's' is in part phonologically conditioned. The analysis of mood choice exhibits different constraints as well as factor weights for the two adverbs and reveals that there are meaningful dialect differences to consider. It seems that instead of talking about two forms of the same adverb, we should consider *quizá* and *quizás* as two independent adverbs, and conceivably teach them as such to second language learners. In conclusion, this study reveals that there are both functional and pragmatic differences between *quizás* and *quizá* and offers a new, more nuanced, alternative to their usual representation as equivalent alternatives.

References

- Butt, John and Carmen Benjamin. 2004. *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- DeMello, George. 1995. Alternancia modal indicativo/subjuntivo con expresiones de posibilidad y probabilidad. *Verba* 22.339-61.
- Houle, Leah and Rebecca Martínez Gómez. 2009a. La alternancia del subjuntivo e indicativo con los adverbios epistémicos. Ms., University of New Mexico.
- Houle, Leah and Rebecca Martínez Gómez. 2009b. A closer look at *quizá(s)*: Grammaticalization and an epistemic adverb. Abstract of paper presented at *Hispanic Linguistics Conference*, Universidad de Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, San Juan, October 2009.
- Finanger, Elizabeth. 2010. Time reference, adjacency, and lexical effects in mood choice following Spanish epistemic adverbs *quizá(s)*: a dialectal comparison. Paper presented at the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, April 2010.
- King, Christy; Megan McLeish; Jessica Zuckerman; and Scott Schwenter. 2008. Epistemic adverbs and mood choice in three Spanish dialects. Paper presented at *New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 37*, Rice University, Houston, November 2008.
- Lunn, Patricia V. and Ernest Lunsford. 1996. Patterns of non-use of past subjunctive in Quito Spanish. (Unpublished ms.).
- Real Academia Española: Banco de datos (CREA) [en línea]. *Corpus de referencia del español actual*. <<http://www.rae.es>>
- Renaldi, Thomas W. 1977. Notes on the functions of *acaso*, *quizá(s)* and *tal vez* in American Spanish. *Hispania* 60.332-36.
- Sankoff, David, Sali Tagliamonte, and Eric Smith. 2005. *GoldVarb X: a variable rule application for Macintosh and Windows*. Department of Mathematics, University of Ottawa, and Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.
- Studerus, Lenard. 1995. Some unresolved issues in Spanish mood use. *Hispania* 78.94-104.
- Woehr, Richard. 1972. *Acaso, quizá(s), tal vez*: Free variants? *Hispania* 55.320-37.

Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics

edited by Jim Michnowicz
and Robin Dodsworth

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2011

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics
© 2011 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-443-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

García, Christina. 2011. Distinguishing Two “Synonyms”: A Variationist Analysis of *quizá* and *quizás* in Six Spanish Dialects. In *Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, ed. Jim Michnowicz and Robin Dodsworth, 103-112. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2510.