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Abstract
This paper examines the literary recreation of the colloquial modality in the novel by Juan Goytisolo La Chanca, claiming the syntax as a fundamental level of the stylistic analysis, which arises from a pragmatic-discursive perspective. Consequently, the study focuses on the colloquium syntax and applies the grid analysis developed by the Groupe Aixois de Recherche en Syntaxe. More specifically, attention is paid to the symmetry and enumeration figures, to the suspended statements, and to the cumulative syntax in the work. It is concluded that Goytisolo manages to recreate the colloquial modality in La Chanca, also from the syntactic perspective, capturing not only aspects that are characteristic of the phonetics, the morphology or the lexicon of the diatopic and diastratic variations represented, but also of the constructions which are typical of the colloquial conversation.
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1. Introduction
When comparing fictional with natural dialogue, Toolan (2011, p. 162) points out that the first one “has a noticeable scarcity of a number of almost inescapable features of natural dialogue (unresolved topics, incomplete exchanges, ignored or misheard turns, self-repairs and recycled utterances, and so on); by the same token it has noticeably more coherence, focus, and teleological efficacy than natural dialogue”. Additionally, the features that this author associates with natural dialogue are typical of colloquial syntax and spontaneous oral use. It is therefore appropriate to reflect once again on two fundamental issues: “(i) spoken vs. written modes, and (2) the relationship between literary language and the language of ordinary conversation” (Tannen, 1982, p. 1).

One of the most appropriate theoretical frameworks to approach the oral/written dualism is the one elaborated by Koch and Oesterreicher (2007), who base their proposal on the diasystem concept, defined by Coseriu (1981) as a complex set of ‘dialects’, ‘levels’ and ‘language styles’. Thus, language is not conceived as a unitary system, closed and coherent, but rather it is composed of interrelated systems.

Koch and Oesterreicher (2007) start from the distinction between the means of the realization (phonic/graphic) and the conception (spoken/written): if the distinction between the phonic and the graphic refers directly to the means, the conceptual distinction between what is spoken and what is written is related to the degree of immediacy and communicative distance.
The relationship between the terms of the phonic/graphic binomial differs from that established between the spoken/written; so, if in the first case we find ourselves before a disjunction, that is, a strict dichotomy, in the second it is a continuum between the extreme manifestations of the conception. Within this quadripartite scheme, there are certain affinities between the spoken and the phonic, on the one hand, and the written and the graphic, on the other. However, more unusually there can also be written + phonic and spoken + graphic combinations.

The extra-linguistic parameters that Koch and Oesterreicher (2007) take into account when conceptually characterizing spoken/written dualism are the following: a) the degree of advertising communication, b) the degree of familiarity, c) the degree of emotional involvement, d) the reference field, e) the physical immediacy of the interlocutors, f) the degree of cooperation, g) the degree of dialogicity, h) the degree of spontaneity, and i) the degree of thematic fixation. They are, in the opinion of these authors, factors of a gradual nature. Thus, a), for example, comprises a scale between privacy and the totally public nature of the communication; while b) comprises a graduation that ranges from a great familiarity among the interlocutors to the total ignorance of the same among themselves, etc. Therefore, a continuum is established between the spoken/written concepts, which is given by the gradation of these parameters. This conceptional variation would be understood as a gradual scale between orality and scripturality in which different communicative situational parameters would participate. In the words of Koch and Oesterreicher (2007), it is a direct expression of the universal continuum between immediacy and communicative distance.

An analysis is carried out in this work, in which, from a pragmatic-discursive approach, tries to incorporate the syntactic level to the study of the recreation of the colloquial modality in the literary texts—specifically, we deal with the novel La Chanca, by Juan Goytisolo. In this way, it aims to extend the levels that have been studied traditionally (mainly, the phonic, the morphological and the lexicon) by analyzing how the authors of literary works have recreated the spontaneous spoken use in their texts.

Finally, through the linguistic analysis of the colloquial syntax in La Chanca, we propose to contribute to the stylistic characterization of this narrative work, since “stylisticians believe in the explanatory potential of linguistic analysis (which needs to be sufficient but also efficient, economical as well as thorough) in accounting for literary effects or reader responses” (Toolan, 2011, p. 90).

2. The marginalization of syntax in the literary recreation of the colloquial modality

According to Narbona (1989), the vast majority of the studies on the literary recreation of the colloquial modality are concerned with lexicon and phraseology. Thus, as this author points out, a review of the main works on colloquial Spanish shows a predominance in the attention given to the stereotyped forms, to the typical constructions, to the fixed formulas, to the locutions and phrases made, to the cliches, to the reduced lexical flow, etc. Consequently, the higher levels of analysis have been scarcely addressed. Also, other disciplines such as dialectology or sociolinguistics fundamentally pay attention to the phonic and lexical levels. In this situation, Narbona (1989) claims the presence of syntax in the study of the colloquial modality, because if the fundamental and relevant features of the syntactic path of the spontaneous spoken use are not discovered, the characterization of the same will not go beyond approximate.

López Serena (2007) observes that the first approximations to the colloquial syntax have been made from a scriptist perspective whose modus operandi is based on the characterization of
the structures of the conceptionally colloquial modality from the comparison with the prescriptive schemes of the conceptionally written modality. Narbona (1994), for his part, states that it is precisely the adoption of this perspective that makes many of the usual syntactic schemes in the colloquium be interpreted as not adjusted to the canonical and even dislocated. From this scriptist or dislocated perspective, the colloquial syntactic structures are considered as irregularities (anacolutha, dislocations, ellipsis, inconsistencies, etc.) regarding the regulations (López Serena, 2007).

Koch and Oesterreicher (2007) deal extensively with the internal characterization of the colloquial modality at their different levels and they list a series of linguistic phenomena that have a universal nature because they result from universal communicative conditions, although they need a specific language to carry out their material realization. The speech and word-shift markers, the phatic signals, certain formulation process marks such as hesitation and correction, interjections, as well as some pragmatic modulation toning phenomena stand out at the pragmatic-discursive level. In the syntactic plane are the *ad sensum* constructions, the anacolutha, the contaminations, the postpositions, the reduplications, the segmentations and the dislocations, the suspension of incomplete or unfinished sentences, and the predominance of parataxis and of different types of hypotaxis. The reduced lexical flow, the repetition and the inaccurate referencing through the use of the so-called ‘omnibus’ words, presenting and deictic elements, are worth mentioning at the semantic level. In the phonic plane, the romanists point out the articulatory negligence. However, despite including the pragmatic-discursive level, the authors adopt a somewhat scriptist perspective in the lower levels, since they establish the characteristics of the oral colloquial modality in contrast to the normative schemes of the written modality (see López Serena, 2007).

3. The development of a colloquial syntax and the need for a pragmatic-discursive perspective

López Serena (2007) has synthesized the main syntactic phenomena in which it is intended to flee from the scriptist bias in favor of a syntax of the colloquium itself. If the previous works spoke of a predominance of juxtaposition over the relational structure with nexus and of the preference for parataxis or coordination to the detriment of hypotaxis or subordination, these contributions reject the terminology of the traditional grammar and opt for a *concatenated*, *cumulative* or *parceled syntax*. López Serena (2007) argues that, in the colloquial modality, the link between statements is made by pragmatic connectors and certain prosodic resources, given the weak ordering architecture of the colloquial syntax pointed out by Seco (1992). According to Narbona (1989), these prosodic resources –particularly, the intonation and the existence, or not, of pause(s)– have to be studied together with the syntactic ones, since in them can reside much of the informative content or of the specific orientation of the same. There are other colloquial syntactic phenomena such as the use of repetition as a cohesive resource, the proliferation of the so-called *suspended statements*, the *ad sensum* concordance or the order according to factors of a pragmatic nature.

**The theoretical framework of the Groupe Aixois de Recherche en Syntaxe**

In an attempt to characterize the colloquial modality internally, one can start from the theoretical framework prepared by the linguists of the Groupe Aixois de Recherche en Syntaxe (GARS), directed by Claire Blanche-Benveniste, who consider that the description of the oral language
syntax is an essential part of the general language syntax. From this presupposition, they intend to analyze the production process marks in order to find supraindividual patterns of the unplanned speech construction, i.e., general mechanisms to advance the speech and to comment, as is commonly the case, the very development of the composition (López Serena, 2007).

To develop their research, the GARS linguists use the so-called analysis *en grilles* (‘analysis in grids or in cells’), which assumes that one of the main characteristics of orality is the paradigmatic accumulation, caused by the search, correction, hesitation, repetition, restart processes, and others. Thus, it is possible to visualize the ruptures in the arrangement of the language units caused by the irruption of the paradigmatic axis in the syntagmatic axis. In the words of Blanche-Benveniste (1998), this syntactic analysis model allows giving the texts a visual representation which is easier to read than the arrangement in continuous lines.

From the cell analysis procedure, Blanche-Benveniste proposes a formal classification of the colloquial conversation prototypical constructions. This classification consists of four types of syntax figures, namely, the symmetry figure, the enumeration figure, the common factor figure and the parenthesis figure. Next, we will focus on the symmetry and enumeration ones, which are the most representative in *La Chanca*.

### Symmetry Figures

The symmetry figure consists of a repetition of syntactic and lexical materials, i.e., “the iteration of one’s own speech or the speech of a co-participant” (Van Lancker Sditis and Wolf 2015, p. 263). Following Blanche-Benveniste (1998), two fundamental types of symmetry figures can be distinguished: the repetition of syntactic and lexical materials in the same arrangement (1), and the repetition of syntactic and lexical materials in an inverse arrangement, i.e., in chiasmatic form (2).

1. **(1)**
   
   A: *tú no hablas* → *tú no hablas*§
   
   ‘A: you do not speak → you do not speak§’

   (1')
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>you</th>
<th>do not speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>do not speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **(2)**
   
   B: *PERO ME NECESITAS ¿PARA QUÉ? NANO / ¿PARA QUÉ ME NECESITAS?*
   
   ‘B: BUT YOU NEED ME, FOR WHAT? NANO / WHAT DO YOU NEED ME FOR?’

   (2')
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUT</th>
<th>YOU</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>ME, FOR</th>
<th>WHAT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   | NANO, | WHAT | DO | YOU | NEED | ME | FOR?
There are cases in which both the syntax and the lexicon are repeated, although some modifications may occur, these are the ones López Serena (2007) calls exact symmetry or verbatim. In addition to this exact symmetry, there is another in which only the syntactic scheme is reiterated, but not the lexical content (3).

(3) 111 B: [si invita] sí/si hay que pagar
     ‘111 B: [if she invites] yes/if I have to pay’
     (...)  
     113 D: si está ella sí
     ‘113 D: if she is there yes’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3’)</th>
<th>if she invites</th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if I have to</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if she is there</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enumeration Figures
The Enumeration Figure rubric can be applied to all of the paradigmatic stacking cases in the syntagmatic axis due to the juxtaposition of any elements occupying the same syntactic position and can respond to different causes. Formally, three types of enumeration figures can be distinguished: coordinating enumeration (4), restart (5), and sequence under construction (6).

(4) D: pero hablas de esas de- no son de las otras / de las congeladas
     ‘D: but you’re talking about those oof- not of the other ones / of the frozen ones’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4’)</th>
<th>these are the other ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the frozen ones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) D: igual que nosotros / to- tiene la misma edad
     ‘D: just like us / to- is the same age’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5’)</th>
<th>just like us to- is the same age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is the same age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The literary recreation of the colloquial modality in *La Chanca*, by Juan Goytisolo

According to Narbona (1992a), the intended realistic nature of the Spanish novel is based on the apparent willingness of many writers not to distance themselves excessively from the colloquial language and to welcome in their works – in different proportion, depending on the cases – the speech of the spontaneous conversation. In fact, just as López Serena (2007) states, the study of the colloquial Spanish has been closely linked, for a long time, with those realistic literary texts, that have been used as materials for linguistic analysis. Starting from this author’s approaches, it is advisable to insist that any literary creation necessarily implies an artistic or aesthetic transformation of reality. Many terms have been used to refer to this phenomenon: *reproduction, adaptation, transposition, manipulation, reduction, simplification*, etc., although here we opt for recreation.

On the other hand, it is necessary to determine which linguistic features influence on the greater or lesser fidelity of the literary recreation of the colloquial. In the words of López Serena (2007), if the distance between the colloquial modality and its literary imitation were to be conceived as a gradual scale, the continuum would range from the reproduction of phenomena assigned to the lower levels of analysis, mainly the lexicon – above all, words marked diagnostically and abundant idioms – until the capture of the constructional peculiarities of the immediate communication. This position agrees with that of Seco (1983), for whom the most successful degree in capturing the colloquial language is not in finding a marked lexicon, but in that of a certain syntax freed from the canons of the written language.

However, literature has often based its intended linguistic realism on the reproduction of a series of lexical cliches, among which the most popular are the locutions, the idioms, the made phrases, the stereotyped forms, the omnibus words or the variably marked words. It is not until the XXth Century that a more successful recreation of the colloquial modality begins in the dialogues recreated in the realistic literature, given that some novels capture the constructional peculiarities characteristic of the communicative immediacy of the colloquial conversations. It is interesting, therefore, to analyze in the works of this period, the mimesis of the orality in literature, just as Seco (1992) has done with *Entre Visillos*, by Carmen Martín-Gaite, Narbona (1992b) with *El Jarama*, by Rafael Sánchez Ferlosio, and López Serena (2007) with both novels.

*La Chanca* (Goytisolo, 1962) is a novel that ascribes to the current of social realism. This movement emerges in the 1950s, in Spain, and aims to reflect the society’s reality at the time, emphasizing the misery resulting from the civil war and the postwar in this country. Although the novels of social realism are usually narrated in the third person, in order to achieve the greatest possible objectivity, the case of *La Chanca* is singular because it is a kind of first-person narrative travel book. The work was published in France in 1962 and circulated clandestinely in Spain until
1981, when it could be published complete – a fragment had appeared before in the *Destino* magazine –.

When stylistically characterizing the group of novels in which *La Chanca* is included, the critics have pointed out the following:

“With a certain stylistic debugging, with greater care of the language, and with the adoption of objectivist techniques that reach the dialogical behaviorism, those principles mark the titles that were scandalized in the 1960s, prior to Señas de identidad: the novel *La isla* (1961), the collection of stories *Fin de fiesta* (1962), the two journeys through the undeveloped Almería geography –*Campos de Níjar* (1960) and *La Chanca* (1962)– and a Cuban report, *Pueblo en marcha* (1963), apology of the Castro’s revolution” (Sanz Villanueva, 2009, p. 139).

Throughout *La Chanca*, Goytisolo enters the marginal neighborhood of the city of Almería (Spain) which gives the novel its name to portray it socially (see Figure 1). In this social portrait, the dialogue between the characters plays an essential role, reason why Juan Goytisolo chooses the conversation as genre representative of the colloquial modality. The socio-linguistic characterization of the speaker-characters is important because they dialectally belong to the Spanish Southeast variety, while they are diastically characterized for having a low cultural and economic level.

Following the theoretical framework of GARS and taking the analysis by López Serena (2007) in *La Chanca* as a reference, we can identify two types of syntax figures: Symmetry Figures and Enumeration Figures.


**Symmetry Figures**

Formally, all of the symmetry figures appearing in *La Chanca* have an identical arrangement, so that we do not find chiasmus in an inverse arrangement. In the case of (13), it is a symmetry with interleaved elements. Samples (7), (12), (14), (16), (17) and (18) are figures of exact symmetry or *verbatim*, whereas (8), (9), (10), (11), (13), (15), (18), (20) and (21) are examples of syntactic symmetry.
Functionally, the symmetry figures that predominate in *La Chanca* are the self-repetitions with an emphasis function, which can occur within the same intervention, as is the case in (7), (8), (9), (12), (14), (19), (20) and (21), or in different interventions, like in (11), (16), (17) and (18). We also find three examples of evaluative allo-repetitions, one of contradiction (10), and two of corroboration, (13) and (15). Cases (7) and (18) could be interpreted as discursive planning self-repetitions.

(7)  
*Tóquenla sin temor, señoras y señores* (...)  
‘Touch it without fear, ladies and gentlemen (...)’  
*Porque yo quiero que se convenzan de una vez, señoras y señores, de que* (...)  
‘Because I want you to be convinced once and for all, ladies and gentlemen, that (...)’  
*y, no es por decirlo, señoras y señores, pero* (...)  
‘and, I’m not just saying, ladies and gentlemen, but (...)’  
*Lo que importa en la manta no es el aspecto, señoras y señores*  
‘What matters en the blanket is not the appearance, ladies and gentlemen’

(7)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ladies</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladies</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8)  
*Lo que importa en la manta no es el aspecto* (...)  
‘What matters about the blanket is not the appearance (...)’  
*Lo que cuenta (...) es el casco*  
‘What counts (...) is the helmet’

(8')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what</th>
<th>matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>counts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9)  
*Te dicen blanco, y tú blanco*...  
‘They tell you white, and you (go/tell) white...’  
*Negro, y tú negro*...  
‘Black, and you (go/tell) black...’
La culpa no es de nosotros
‘It’s not our fault’

La culpa es de tos...
‘It’s everyone’s fault…’

el hijo de Damiana, el que anda cojo
‘Damiana’s son, the one with a limp’

(...) el hijo de la Chata, el electricista
‘(…) Chata’s son, the electrician’

Ya no, Luiso –dice–
‘Not anymore, Luiso –he says–’

Ya no
‘Not anymore’

Antes las cosas iban de otra manera…
‘Long ago things went differently…’

Antes, antes... Ahora tos marchamos el paso

‘Long, long ago... Now we all march to the same drum’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13’</th>
<th>long ago</th>
<th>things</th>
<th>went</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>long ago</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>we all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14) (...) usté ha arruinao pa siempre mi vía, pero un día me las pagará

‘(...) you’ve ruined my life forever, but one day you’ll repay me’

por Dios, la Virgen y los santos del cielo que me las pagará

‘by God, the Virgin and the Saints in heaven that you will repay me’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14’</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>will</th>
<th>repay</th>
<th>me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>repay</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15'</th>
<th>why</th>
<th>wasn’t</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>born</th>
<th>(…)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>why</td>
<td>ain’t</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15’</th>
<th>why</th>
<th>wasn’t</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>born</th>
<th>(…)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>why</td>
<td>ain’t</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) Mi marío es muy señorito e imagina que tié una sirvienta en su casa...

‘My husband is a toff and imagines he has a maid in his house…’
Mi marión es un hombre muy simpático...
‘My husband is a very friendly man...’

El señor lleva más papeles que un ministro...
‘The man carries more papers than a minister...’
El señor se desprecia de paseá conmigo
‘The man despises himself for walking with me’

(...) ¿os acordáis?
‘(...) do you remember?’

En primavera, regaliz y caña
‘In Spring, licorice and cane’

En verano, higos chumbos y uva
‘In Summer, prickly pears and grapes’
(19')

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>licorice</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>prickly pears</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20) ¿*Y a pedí fiao en las tiendas...*?
‘*And ask on credit at the stores...*’

¿*Y a pagá cuarenta duros de alquilé...*?
‘*And pay forty duros rent...*’

(20’)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(21) *Almería ha perdido el sol*
‘*Almeria has lost the sun*’

*Ha perdido el aire*
‘*It has lost the air*’

(21’)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almeria</td>
<td>has lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>the sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has lost</td>
<td>the air</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enumeration Figures**

As for its form, the enumeration figures in *La Chanca* are mainly coordinative, since we find a single restart case (23) after a digression. In terms of function, the coordinative enumerations of a single speaker predominate due to semantic imperatives, either of accumulation (24), (29), (30), (31), (33), (34), (35), (37) and (38), of precision (25), (27) and (32), or of accumulation and precision (36).

There are also some examples of coordinative enumerations due to the intervention of several speakers (22), (26) and (28), whose function is, rather than that of a response, a mere accumulation for the continuation of the speech, although (26) and (28) could be considered examples of corroboration. The function of (23) is related to the informative structuring.
(22) ¡El tomate! ¡El gato! ¡El ratón!
‘The tomato! The cat! The mouse!’
¡El pimiento! ¡La calabaza! ¡La muerte!
‘The bell pepper! The pumpkin! Death!’

(22')

the tomato!
the cat!
the mouse!
the bell pepper!
the pumpkin!
death!

(23) (...) lo que me interesa, y vaya ello como una confesión...
‘(...) what interests me, and that goes as a confession...’
lo que me interesa, decía, es la popularidá...
‘what interests me, he said, is popularity...’

(23')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what</th>
<th>interests</th>
<th>me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>interests</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(24) (...) es el casco, el cuenco, la molla y el tejido...
‘(...) is the helmet, the bowl, the meat and the weave...’

(24')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>is</th>
<th>the helmet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the weave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(25) *Es una manta de sultán. Una manta de novia y novio. Una manta de noche de bodas...*

‘It’s a Sultan’s blanket. A bride and groom’s blanket. A wedding night’s blanket...’

(25')

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it’s</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Sultan’s</td>
<td>blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>bride and groom’s</td>
<td>blanket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>wedding night’s</td>
<td>blanket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(26) *Cuando servía en Tenerife (…)*

‘When I served in Tenerife (…)’

*Yo en Málaga (…)*

‘Me, in Málaga (…)

*En Albacete (…)*

‘In Albacete (…)’

*A mí, en Canarias (…)*

‘For me, it was the Canary Islands (…)’

(26')

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>I served</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Tenerife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Málaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Albacete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for me</td>
<td>(it was)</td>
<td>the Canary Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27) *A veces, algún regalillo, cualquier tontería, unas medias de nailon...*

‘Sometimes a little present, any little thing, nylon stockings...’

(27')

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>little present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any</td>
<td>little thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nylon stockings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(28) 

(...)*Que si el portero*

‘(...)*That the doorman (this, the doorman that)*’

*Que si el del taxi...*

‘That the one in the taxi...’

*Que un ramito de flores*

‘That a little flower bouquet’

*Que si el guitarrista...*

‘That the guitarist...’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>that</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>doorman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flower bouquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>guitarist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28’)

(29) 

*La mujé, sí señó... Y la suegra, y los cuñaos...*

‘The wife, yes sir... And the mother-in-law, and the brother-/sister-in-law...’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the</th>
<th>wife</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>sir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brother-/sister-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(29’)

(30) 

*Aquí solo suben los curas, los sacamantas, o ellos...*

‘Up here we only see the priests, the collectors, or them...’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>up here</th>
<th>we</th>
<th>only</th>
<th>see</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the</td>
<td>collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(31) *Hay gachas, pimientos, sardinas... Lo que comemos los trabajadores de esa parte*

‘We have porridge, bell peppers, sardines... What we workers in that part eat’

(31')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>we have</th>
<th>porridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bell peppers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sardines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(32) (...) *dijeron que no, que ya estaban bien*

‘(...) they said no, that they were fine’

(32')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>they</th>
<th>said</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that</td>
<td>they were fine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(33) *El patrono de la barca se ha portado bien. El tío nos paga los gastos de doctor y de medicinas...*

‘The skipper was nice to us. The guy has paid for all our doctor and medicine expenses...’

(33')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>has paid</th>
<th>for all our doctor and medicine expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(34) (...) *que mi marido es más cristiano que muchos que presumen (...), que es recto*

‘(...) that my husband is more Christian than many of those who brag (...), that he’s fair’

(34')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>that</th>
<th>my husband</th>
<th>is</th>
<th>more Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(35) *De habé querío se fuera encumbrar como tantos y prefirió seguir portando el minerá de la mañana a la noche y llegó a casa rendío y cobró una semana de miseria*
‘He’d have got to the top as many did and he preferred to continue carrying the ore from morning to night and arrive home exhausted and get paid for a week of misery’

(35) and he preferred | to continue
---|---
| and arrive
| and get paid

(36) Cogía esparto, chumbos, palmitos, lo que se cría acá por la montaña
‘He collected esparto, prickly pears, hearts of palm, what is grown here in the mountain’

(36’) he collected | esparto
---|---
| prickly pears
| hearts of palm
| what is grown here in the mountain

(37) ¿... y me siente a fumá un puro, y una hembra de esas que te privan el sentío, me telefonee y me diga, vienes a verme, cariño? Y, apenas he colgado, me llame otra, y luego otra, y así toda la vía, viviendo y disfrutando
‘... and I sit to smoke a cigar, and a female of those who deprive you of your senses, calls me on the phone and says, are you coming to see me, darling? And just as I hang up, another one calls me, and then another, and so on all my life, living and enjoying’

(37’) and | a female of those who deprive you of your senses | calls me | on the phone
---|---|---|---
| and says
| and just as I hang up | calls | me

(38) Por ejemplo, “nosotros”... ¿Quiénes somos nosotros?... Uno ve escrito “somos”, “tenemos”, “hacemos”, “queremos”, y no es, ni tiene, ni hace, ni quiere lo que reza el diario... Son ellos y no nosotros... Es un “nosotros” que no es nuestro...
For example, “we”... Who are we?... One sees written “we are”, “we have”, “we do”, “we want”, and one is not, nor has, nor does, nor wants what the newspaper says... It is them and not us... It is an “us” that is not ours...'

Suspended Statements
Throughout La Chanca we also find other syntactic phenomena characteristic of the colloquial modality. This is the case of the abundance of suspended statements, which try to imitate the intonation of orality itself –see (39) to (53)–. According to Hidalgo (1998), these statements are not incomplete, but rather constitute, in many cases, authentic statements, i.e., their meaning is complete, since it is either inferable by the listener from the context shared with the speaker, or the absent fragment forms part of a general cultural presuppositional background, i.e., it is implicitly present. Thus, from a pragmatic-discursive perspective, these are statements whose illocutionary force is implicit and must be inferred by the listener from the communicative context. In fact, Briz (1998) considers that the suspended statements constitute a type of contextual strategy, since the text is often conditioned to the context, the contextual comes first and what is presupposed and implied is sometimes as much as what is written.

(39) Cuando una chica no quiere se ve en seguida...
   ‘When a girl does not want, it can be seen at once...’

(40) Si hubiera unidá...
   ‘If there was unity...’

(41) Precisamente debo devolvé algo a un compañero...
   ‘I just have to give something back to a companion...’

(42) Como saberlo, sí lo sé... Pero no lo encontrará usté...
   ‘How to know, yes I know... But you won’t find him...’

(43) Eso lo sabrá usté mejó que yo...
‘You’ll know that better than I do…’

(44)  

Es que creíamos que era usté… Bueno, usté ya me comprende

‘It’s just that we thought it was you… Well, you know what I mean’

(45)  

¿Ya sabe que…?

‘Do you already know that…?’

(46)  

Si lo viera usté peleá...

‘If you saw him fighting...’

(47)  

Si no lo estorbo a usté...

‘If I do not bother you...’

(48)  

Si quíe unté un plato...

‘If you want a plate...’

(49)  

Si quiés vení tú...

‘If you want to come...’

(50)  

Pues no sabía na...

‘Well I knew nothing...’

(51)  

Estaban en la cama él y la cuñá, tan y mientras Emilio...

‘They were in bed, he and the sister-in-law, so and while Emilio...’

(52)  

Cásate y verás...

‘Get married and you’ll see...’

(53)  

Luego, comenzó a bebé...

‘Then he began drinking...’
Cumulative Syntax

In addition, in *La Chanca* there are samples of the so-called concatenated, cumulative or parceled syntax, as it can be seen in (54), (55), (56), (57), (58) and (59). In these examples, the oral modality is recreated, in which, according to Briz (1998), the statements that constitute the intervention of a speaker seem to be added, many times, as they come to the mind of the speaker.

(54) *Yo en Málaga frecuentaba una casa de menores, algo como para chuparse los dedos... Tú ibas allí, la patrona te enseñaba sus fotos y elegías la que querías. Y como le cayeses bien a la nena no te pedía nada. A veces, algún regalillo, cualquier tontería, unas medias de nailon...*

‘In Málaga I used to go to a children’s home, something that could be finger lickin... You went there, the mistress would show you their photos and you could choose the one you wanted. And if the girl liked you, she did not ask you for anything. Sometimes a little present, any little thing, nylon stockings...’

(55) *Cuando los alemanes, anduve en el maquí. En mi patrulla había tres tipos de Albox. Gente estupenda. A uno, le afusilaron en Grenoble.*

‘When the Germans, I was in the maquis. In my patrol there were 3 guys from Albox. Great people. One, was shot in Grenoble’

(56) *No hemos preparao na: no hay más comida que la de diario. Pero estaremos muy contentos de compartirlo con usté...*

‘We have not prepared anything; there is no more food than the daily one. But we will be very happy to share it with you...’

(57) *Ya no hay horas extraordinarias ni puntos... La gente no tié otro remedio que emigra*

‘There are no hours or points anymore... People have no choice but to emigrate’

(58) *Aquí, el pobrecico estaba paro la mitá del año y daba grima verlo... To’l día aburrió de la casa al puerto, del puerto a la taberna... Sin un reá en el bolsillo. Viviendo de fiao...*

‘Here the poor man was unemployed for half of the year and it was awful to see him... Bored all day, from the house to the port, from the port to the tavern... without a penny in his pocket. Living on an inexisten credit...’

(59) *Unas muy caras que traen de Alemania. El patrono de la barca se ha portao bien. El tío nos paga tos los gastos de dotor y de medicinas...*

‘Some very expensive ones they bring from Germany. The skipper was nice to us. The guy has paid for all our doctor and medicine expenses...’

5. Conclusion

In this study, the concept of orality has been linked to the idea of communicative immediacy, and not to that of a phonic medium. Also, the need to integrate, from a pragmatic-discursive perspective, the syntactic level in the analysis of the colloquial modality that is recreated in the literary texts has been claimed, as a consequence of the above.

More specifically, the analysis has focused on the study of colloquial syntax in *La Chanca*. Attention has been paid to the symmetry and to the enumeration figures, as well as to the suspended statements and to the cumulative syntax in this level, due to their representativeness...
in the novel. The predominant symmetry figures in the work present the same disposition and are placed in the same intervention, so they tend to be auto-repetitions with an emphasis function. However, we found a few cases of evaluative allo-repetitions in different interventions. The enumeration figures are all coordinative, except for a single restart case; they also usually appear in the same intervention with semantic imperatives, although there are some cases of enumerations among several speakers with an evaluative function. They are scarce – only two symmetry figures and one enumeration figure – and doubtful the figures with a discursive planning function.

As for the suspended statements, these are very frequent in the novel and they intend, on the one hand, to imitate the intonation of orality and, on the other hand, to transmit something implicitly to the listener so that he infers it in relation to the context. We also find quite a few examples of cumulative syntax, which clearly reflect Juan Goytisolo’s intention to recreate the improvisation determined by the immediacy of the colloquial modality.

Also, the colloquial modality is reflected in the phonic level, which reproduces numerous features that are typical of the dialectal variety of the speaker-characters of the novel, as well as in the morphological and lexical, through the use of colloquial and vulgar expressions and vocabulary associated, in this case, with the low cultural level of the characters. However, the characteristic that we wanted to emphasize most in our analysis of the colloquial modality in La Chanca is that, as it has been proven, Juan Goytisolo manages to recreate it without forgetting the syntactic path of orality, this being fundamentally understood as communicative immediacy.

Endnotes

i The pragmatic-discursive and conversational perspectives have been present in stylistic analyzes in which attention has been paid to diverse categories such as conversational maxims (Chen, 1996), overlaps (Ivanchenko, 2007), implicatures (Chapman, 2012) or Grice’s cooperative principle (Lambrou, 2014).

ii A broader view of the problems concerning the constitution of the meaning in Juan Goytisolo’s novels – especially those published between 1980 and 1993 – is the one offered by Llored (2009).
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