

Chapter 2

The linguistic heritage of Spain

Introduction: In search of the 'seeds' of Latin American Spanish

Within Spain, it is popularly believed that Latin American Spanish is quite homogeneous, despite the thousands of miles over which its dialects are spread. Some of the perceptions are accurate, while others represent overgeneralized stereotypes. On the other side of the Atlantic, Latin Americans have equally strong opinions about what 'Spaniards' sound like, based on the speech of Peninsular priests and nuns living in Latin America, and of recent immigrants, predominantly from Galicia and the Canary Islands. In both cases, the stereotypes exist in the absence of details about regional and social variation, and when a speaker from the 'other side' is met for the first time, a shock of non-recognition is frequently the result. An objective perusal of the enormous variation in Latin American Spanish causes one to wonder how observers on another continent could possibly find more similarity than difference, or why apparently minor traits such as lack of *zeta* should be so highly valued. These conflicts of perception underscore the need to learn more about the formative stages of Spanish American dialects. What was the critical time period which solidified the patterns that evolved into contemporary Latin American Spanish? What were the regional dialects of Spain like during this period? What was the relative importance, both demographic and sociopolitical, of each Peninsular variety in the formation of Latin American Spanish? Is Latin American Spanish 'Andalusian', 'Castilian', or neither? What changes can be attributed to dialect levelling, sailors' jargon, and pretentious imitation of prestige variants? Were the settlers whose speech formed the basis for the Latin American dialects predominantly *hidalgos*, artisans, or peasants? Many are the questions, and

many are the attempts to trace both the unity and the diversity of Spanish American dialects.

Patterns and routes of Spanish colonization

For at least two centuries, Spanish settlement of the New World was planned in Castile, engineered in Andalusia, and aided by the Canary Islands. Administrative matters involving the American colonies were handled by the Consejo de Indias, in Madrid. Future settlers made application for passage at the Casa de la Contratación in Seville, and often waited a year or more before embarking for Spanish America. The Consulado de Sevilla, dominated by Sevillian merchants, long enjoyed a monopoly on trade with the Americas. Ships' crews were recruited from Andalusia and the Canary Islands. Many ships left directly from Seville; others departed from the Andalusian ports of Cádiz, San Lúcar and Huelva. Ships picked up supplies and refitted at the Canary Islands, and sailed to a small number of authorized American ports, in order to maintain the royal trade monopoly. Spanish settlement of the Americas almost immediately became intertwined with commercial transactions. Mineral wealth was extracted from mines in Mexico, Central America, Peru and Bolivia, while dyestuffs, spices, hides, wax, pitch and other natural products were shipped to Europe from other colonies. Ships travelling from Spain to the New World carried, in addition to settlers and administrative personnel, trade goods, household items and, once major settlements became established, luxury products.

Very early in the colonial period, Spain recognized the threat from organized pirates and occasional marauders, and painfully discovered the vulnerability of Spanish treasure ships and mainland storage points. Treasure from South America was originally carried to Nombre de Dios, Panama for transshipment to Spain, but repeated pirate attacks on this unprotected village caused the Spanish to resettle in Portobelo, and to construct heavy fortifications there. Similar forts were constructed at Cartagena de Indias, Veracruz, San Juan, Santo Domingo, Acapulco, and Havana.

Pirate attacks also spurred creation of the fleet system, wherein armed convoys of ships travelled together between Spain and the Americas. Once in the Caribbean, some ships would break from the convoy to trade with smaller ports, and illicit trade also resulted in unscheduled port calls, but the majority of Hispano-American contact followed well-delimited paths. Prevailing winds and sea currents, as well as partially fortuitous Spanish colonizing patterns, shaped preferential routes into and out of the Caribbean.

Ships arriving from Spain entered the southern Caribbean, often stopping at Jamaica or another eastern island, and docked at Cartagena, which became the major South American port and trade zone. Other ports were established along the Colombian and Venezuelan coast, among them Santa Marta, Riohacha, Cumaná, Maracaibo and La Guaira, but none rivalled Cartagena. Ships carrying goods and passengers bound for the Pacific coast of South America put in at Portobelo, whence cargo was transferred to Panama City on the Pacific side by a combination of mule trains and river boats. Guayaquil and El Callao were the major Pacific ports, and once Spain began sending galleons to the Philippines, Acapulco was added to the list. On the Caribbean coast of Mesoamerica, Veracruz was the main point of entry, while smaller ports in Central America, particularly Trujillo and Puerto Caballos (modern Puerto Cortés) in Honduras, handled occasional traffic. Ships returning to Spain from Portobelo usually put in again at Cartagena, then headed for the northern Caribbean. Havana became the foremost port of supply for returning ships, while other Caribbean towns quickly lost their early importance.

The basis for 'Andalusian' theories

Many common denominators of Latin American Spanish, such as *yeísmo* (neutralization of the opposition /y/-/ɣ/ in favour of the former), *seseo* (neutralization of /θ/ and /s/ in favour of the latter), and the use of *ustedes* rather than *vosotros*, coincide with the principal dialects of Andalusia. These shared features, set against the backdrop of the Sevillian commercial hegemony during the colonial enterprise, have given rise to *andalucista* theories of Latin American Spanish, according to which Andalusian Spanish provided the principal model throughout the formative period. Incorporating the Canary Islands into the equation, Catalán (1958, 1960, 1964) coined the term *español atlántico*, 'Atlantic Spanish', to define a dialect cluster which encompasses southern Spain, the Canary Islands, and much of Latin America, centring on the Caribbean. Proponents of the *andalucista* viewpoint have claimed that Andalusians were both numerically and sociolinguistically predominant during the formative period of Latin American Spanish, adducing a variety of data in support of this position. It is also noted that immigrants to the New World often spent up to a year in Seville or Cádiz, in the presence of sailors and stevedores, and then spent two or more months at sea, giving them ample opportunity to acquire nautical terms for common shipboard activities such as docking, tying ropes and bailing water. This would explain

the use in daily life of lexical items which in Spain are associated only with nautical environments: *botar* 'to throw out', *amarrar* 'to tie up', *abarrotos* 'provisions', *atracar* 'to physically assault', *balde* 'bucket', *chicote* 'whip', *desguazar* 'to dismantle', *timón* 'steering wheel', and so forth (Garasa 1952, Guillén Tato 1948). The archaic component of Latin American Spanish vis-à-vis modern Spain, including lexical items such as *lindo* 'beautiful', *cobija* 'blanket', *platicar* 'to chat', *pollera* 'skirt', can be attributed to the relative isolation of many areas during the colonial period, and the tendency for older items to remain in peripheral colonial dialects long after they have disappeared from the metropolis. With this, the equation is complete, so that a demonstration of the demographic predominance of Andalusians and Andalusian Spanish in key times and places is the cornerstone of *andalucista* theories. The other key ingredient is the firm conviction that 'Latin American' and 'Andalusian' dialects as a group share enough similarities to warrant the *andalucista* endeavour. Anti-*andalucista* theories have variously challenged both the factual accuracy and the relevance of each ingredient of the *andalucista* paradigm, offering in turn an array of counterproposals and interpretations.

Regional origins of Spanish settlers

When the issue of the regional origins of Spanish American colonists was first raised, little accurate information was available, and writers were guided by intuition and anecdote. Wagner (1920) was among the first modern scholars to suggest an Andalusian origin for American Spanish (although in Wagner (1927) the comparison is limited to lowland/coastal areas), a proposal disputed by Henríquez Ureña (1921, 1932).¹ Henríquez Ureña was the first to attempt rough calculations for some ten thousand of the earliest arrivals to the New World, based on documents collected by Icaza (1923). He arrived at the conclusion that Andalusians represented only about a third of the first colonists. The figures used by Henríquez Ureña are tiny in comparison with the total number of Spanish settlers, and there is no guarantee that the relative proportions of the first few decades of settlement (the period covered by the documents in question) were representative of the entire formative period of Latin American Spanish. Alonso (1961), Gruber (1951), and Neasham (1950) updated Henríquez Ureña's findings through the consideration of other materials, but it was not until the monumental work of Boyd-Bowman (1956, 1963, 1964, 1968a, 1968b, 1972), who identified the regional origins of some 40,000 of the first settlers (an estimated 20% of the total for the first century of

colonization), that any clear idea of settlement patterns emerged. Boyd-Bowman's results are frequently cited as definitive proof of the Andalusian origins of American Spanish, but matters are not that simple. For the first portion of the period studied, before 1519, Boyd-Bowman's records show approximately 30% of the total settlers coming from Seville and Huelva (and forming the majority of the Andalusian contingent). Although this is the largest single contribution, the sum total of settlers from Castile was nearly as large, and when added to those from Extremadura and León, actually outnumber the Andalusians. In the latter portion of the period studied by Boyd-Bowman, emigration from northern regions increased proportionately; Andalusia still provided a large portion, but always less than a majority. The calculations are complicated by the fact that many future colonists awaiting passage in Andalusian ports listed Seville, Huelva or Cádiz as place of residence, even when they had been born and raised elsewhere; many natives of regions outside Andalusia were inadvertently counted as Andalusians.

Figures representing Spanish migration, for diverse colonies and time periods, continue to be analysed, but even if a complete demographic profile for the entire colonial period can be achieved, a fundamental question remains: how much is enough? Nothing suggests a simple correlation between the proportion of the colonial population representing a given region of Spain and the transference of linguistic characteristics typical of this region. The fact that Andalusians represented 30%, 20%, or even 10% of a given colonial population does not preclude a significant Andalusian influence in the developing colonial dialect. This is especially true if the remainder of the population was divided among diverse regional dialects, each of which represented a smaller proportion than the Andalusian component. Conversely, a numerical majority of Andalusians in a particular zone does not automatically entail an Andalusian cast to the regional dialect. The sociolinguistic prominence of regional varieties in the colonial setting is an important detail, often overlooked in tracing the development of Latin American Spanish.

Andalusians and Castilians together made up the bulk of the early immigrants, and continued to dominate Spanish settlement throughout most of the colonial period. Since Andalusian Spanish is fundamentally a variety of Castilian, the 'Andalusian-Castilian' nature of American Spanish is a foregone conclusion. Andalusians themselves, however, did not emerge as an overwhelming demographic force, except in coastal areas. For example, the early *conquistadores* and their lieutenants were mostly from Castile and

Extremadura: Cortés, Valdivia, Pizarro, Pedrarias, Pedro de Mendoza, Hernán de Soto, Coronado, Ponce de León and many others. The successes of these adventurers drew followers from their homelands, so that a high proportion of the driving force behind conquering and colonizing efforts was comprised of non-Andalusians. Once coastal towns became established and trade with Spain fell into regular patterns, an Andalusian component could assume a higher profile in these areas. The contacts between Andalusia and Latin American ports and adjacent coastal areas were intense, and prevailed over any competing linguistic or cultural influences from Spain. Equally importantly, routes of contact among coastal areas *within* Latin America were also defined by the fleet patterns, with significant numbers of colonists travelling among the principal ports. With the expansion of contraband trade, centring on illicit slave deliveries, other coastal areas entered into close linguistic contact with southern Spain; these included remote areas of the Colombian and Venezuelan coasts, Santiago de Cuba, and several Central American locations. Menéndez Pidal (1962) offers the most thorough study of linguistic contacts between Andalusia and coastal Latin America.

Social and occupational origins of Spanish settlers

Some investigators interpret the Spanish conquest and settlement of America as the work of minor nobility, small landowners and members of the Spanish bourgeoisie. For these observers, the roots of Latin American Spanish are to be found in the upper classes of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain. They stress the frequent appearance of noble titles, overlooking the fact that many of these titles were accorded after the fact to originally landless adventurers, as a reward for having provided the Spanish government with American treasure. Also ignored is the fact that by the end of the fifteenth century many Spanish 'nobles' possessed only a title but no privileged position which would enable them to command a wider range of linguistic registers than their more humble compatriots. Others have concluded that much of Latin America was settled by members of the very lowest classes in Spain: peasants and the growing urban proletariat. Still other researchers cite historical documentation which shows middle-class settlement patterns, the establishment of artisans' guilds, the emigration of stable family nuclei, and the urban origins of many settlers.

At the time of the Spanish conquest and settlement of the New World, Castile and Andalusia – the 'Spain' which bore the burden of the colonial effort – had just undergone important demographic

shifts. The final phase of the Reconquest, concluding with the fall of the Caliphate of Granada in 1492, prompted the expulsion or social neutralization of large numbers of Arabs, which decimated the class of artisans, merchants and professionals in southern Spain. The concomitant expulsion of Jews further reduced the middle and professional classes. Reconquered areas in Andalusia, Valencia and Murcia were populated by resettled peasants and small farmers from northern Spain, who had neither the opportunity nor the desire to immediately abandon their new situation and embark on yet another trek. Relatively few peasants emigrated from Spain, for then as now peons and serfs were marginalized beings with little control over their destiny, and lacked the economic wherewithal to leave the land and emigrate to a new world. Only much later were peasants recruited for colonization, and then usually from the Canary Islands. The Spanish urban proletariat faced a similar situation, although emigration was easier in such areas as Seville, Cádiz and later La Coruña, Santander and other port cities, where adventurers could usually find some means of booking passage to the New World. Wealthier Spanish families did bring domestic servants, although after a time indigenous or African labour replaced servants imported from Spain. At the other end of the scale, landed nobility and successful merchants lived profitably in Spain, and felt little urge to leave a sure situation for a risky overseas enterprise. The population which emigrated to the Americas came from narrowly defined categories. First were the dispossessed nobility, including *segundones* (younger sons who would not inherit family properties), as well as families who had lost their wealth. Many of these individuals had already entered the Spanish armed forces, and became the future *conquistadores* of the New World. Commuted sentences were offered to small numbers of prisoners who were willing to establish beachheads in newly discovered territories. Once stable colonies were established, artisans, entrepreneurs, sailors, and small landholders were lured by the developing colonial economy, which contrasted with the decline of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain.

The sociolinguistic profile of Spanish settlers in the New World thus departed significantly from the demographics of the Iberian Peninsula. Both peasants and landed gentry were severely underrepresented in the colonies, and the first waves of settlers were predominantly members of skilled trades, small landowners from marginal zones or areas beset by climatic disasters, and individuals who for whatever reason had not done well economically or socially in Europe. Among the latter were members of the lesser nobility, with varying levels of affluence and formal education (Rosenblat 1977).

Although the growing urbanization of the Americas, together with the establishment of large plantations and estates, eventually attracted a higher social class of merchants, administrators and entrepreneurs, emigration from Spain and the Canary Islands continued to favour the middle classes throughout most of the colonial period.

The decision to emigrate, and the antecedent circumstances which allowed such a decision, immediately placed the future colonist in a class apart from permanent residents of Spain, and considerable preselection of traits which would lead to emigration was occurring in Spain. Fluency in Castilian/Andalusian was an almost automatic consequence of group membership, as was familiarity with evolving urban speech patterns. Rosenblat (1977: 29) affirms that 'la colonización de América en el siglo XVI tuvo carácter eminentemente urbano. La Conquista estuvo a cargo de sectores de la nobleza inferior y de gentes que habían convergido hacia las ciudades o se habían formado en ellas'. This gives to Latin American Spanish a noticeably less rustic character, even at the level of the illiterate rural dweller, than corresponding areas of Spain.

Much of the ongoing controversy on the social origins of Latin American Spanish arises from the notion that the sociolinguistic profile of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain was comparable to that of contemporary Spain and Latin America. In the late twentieth century, there is a close correlation between socioeconomic status and educational level, which carries over to linguistic usage. New privileged groups have replaced landed aristocracy, often based on similar patterns of inherited land and power, but one of the inevitable prerogatives of wealth and influence is education, travel opportunities, and awareness of language usage. Today, illiteracy is the scourge only of the most destitute classes, and the correlation between socioeconomic status and linguistic usage is very high.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, literacy and formal education, while available only to those possessing wealth and high status, was far from an automatic consequence of privilege. Literacy was often the exclusive dominion of the clergy, and indirect comments found for example in Valdés' *Diálogo de la lengua* (published in 1529) inform us that many members of the aristocracy were nearly or totally illiterate. Although possessing a more cosmopolitan vocabulary, the *hidalgos* were by no means the standard bearers of an elite speech mode or *norma culta*. Whether a given area of Latin America was settled by aristocrats or members of the working class, the objective differences in linguistic usage between social classes were smaller than would be the case in the present century.

The reality of Spanish settlement in Latin America favours neither an exclusively plebian origin nor an *hidalgo* basis, but simply a continuation of what were little-differentiated language patterns shared by nobility and working class alike. The mix of socioeconomic groups varied from one colony to the next and across time, but the relative proportions of nobility, bourgeoisie, artisans or peasants was not as important in the formation of the original dialects as was the sociolinguistic profile of later colonists. In rural regions such as the Argentine *pampa* and the lowlands of Central America, Panama, Uruguay, Cuba and Bolivia, small farmers from Spain formed a new class of ranchers and rural landholders, while in nations with a large indigenous population, the latter usually developed into the peasant sector under the Spanish colonial system.

It is unrealistic to think of colonial Spanish America as a replica of social patterns and lifestyles in Spain. Cities which enjoyed exceptional wealth, such as Potosí, Lima, or Mexico City, boasted residents who lived in European-style splendour, and whose social and cultural contact with Spain was as close as if they had remained in the Iberian Peninsula. Although the American continents may have represented increased economic opportunities, the lifestyles of most colonists were more spartan than in Spain, due to the chronic shortage of luxury goods, servants, building materials and leisure activities. Landowners and proprietors of businesses often had to perform tasks which in Europe would be delegated to members of the servant class. As occurred in the British Caribbean, Spanish small farmers frequently worked side by side with indigenous and African labourers, and until the nineteenth century there was little linguistic insulation between members of the colonial elite and the working classes.

Independent developments in Andalusian and Latin American Spanish

Although all similarities between Andalusian and Latin American Spanish have at some point been cited as evidence for an 'Andalusian' basis for American Spanish, some of the shared phonetic traits appear to have arisen independently in several areas, and must therefore lie outside of the polemic surrounding possible Andalusian influences. These include:

- (1) *Yeísmo* (delateralization of /*ʎ*/). This is an ongoing process affecting nearly all Spanish dialects, and nothing suggests direct transmission from Andalusia to other parts of Spain.

Delateralization of /*ʎ*/ is a general Romance phenomenon, having occurred in many vernacular varieties of Portuguese, especially in Brazil, and also in regional dialects of France and Italy. Within Andalusia, particularly in the eastern provinces but also near Seville, *yeísmo* is not complete even today, while up until recently all areas of the Canary Islands maintained /*ʎ*/. In Latin America, there is only partial correlation between retention of /*ʎ*/ and social or geographical isolation. Colonial backwaters such as Paraguay retain /*ʎ*/, but equally isolated Central American zones dropped /*ʎ*/ early on. Important mining areas in Bolivia, the centres of intense colonial activity and contact with the metropolis, have kept /*ʎ*/.

- (2) *Velarization of final /n/*. This pronunciation recurs throughout the Romance languages, and can plausibly be attributed to a universal process of phonological weakening. Within Spain, final /n/ is velarized not only in Andalusia and (less regularly) the Canary Islands, but also in Extremadura, León and Galicia. In Latin America, /n/ is velarized not only in 'Andalusian'-sounding Caribbean and coastal dialects, but also in highland areas of Central America and the Andes, with no apparent correlation between velarization and the imprint of any particular Peninsular dialect.
- (3) *Seseo*. In the general sense of merging the two sibilants *s* [s] and *ç* [ç] to a single voiceless fricative, *seseo* has occurred in other regions of Spain and Portugal, as well as in other Romance languages, and in some dialects of Basque. Shortly after settlement of the New World began, the Spanish affricates /t^s/ and /d^z/ merged to a voiceless dental fricative. This sound, presumably between [s] and [θ], stood in opposition with apicoalveolar [ʃ], resulting from the merger of /s/ and /z/. In Castile, [s] became interdental [θ], remaining distinct from [ʃ], while in most of the rest of Spain [s] and [ʃ] merged, with differing phonetic results.

Beginning around the turn of the sixteenth century, the Andalusian (Sevillian) use of [s] to represent not only the reflexes of /t^s/ and /d^z/ but also the merger of /s/ and /z/ was referred to as *çeçeo* or *zezeo*. In contemporary Spanish, *ceceo* refers to the pronunciation of /s/ as [θ], or to a lisping articulation, but in sixteenth century Spain *çeçeo* meant simply using a convex or non-apical [s], as found today in most of Latin America. The term *seseo*, in turn, refers to the merger of original /s/, /z/, /t^s/ and /d^z/ as a single sibilant. The idea that Latin American *seseo* is simply a borrowing from Andalusia comes from the mistaken notion that only

Peninsular Spanish /s/ (the result of the four-way sibilant neutralization in Andalusia) and never /š/ (the result of merging /s/ and /z/ in northern Spain) reached the Americas. Currently, there are several regions of Latin America in which an apicoalveolar /š/ predominates (including parts of Colombia, as well as the Andean highlands of Bolivia and Peru), and in the past such areas may have been larger. In the Canary Islands, pockets of apicoalveolar /š/ are not uncommon, particularly on the more isolated islands of El Hierro and La Gomera. Peasants in parts of Central America and Mexico use an interdental [θ] for /s/, a modern-day *zezeo*.

In the Canary Islands, eastern Andalusia, and Latin America, peopled by settlers from different regions of Spain, the unstable opposition between /s/ and /š/ was resolved in favour of a single sibilant, but NOT always in favour of the reflex of /t^s/ and /d^z/. In the linguistically more homogeneous and stable environment of Castille, the opposition was stabilized through the phonetic evolution of [s] to an interdental articulation, while in southwestern Andalusia, centering on Seville, the same homogeneity allowed for a single sibilant [s] to coalesce. The existence of a single sibilant in Latin American Spanish is not a surefire indication of direct Andalusian influence, but only of the absence of a sustained Castilian presence, past the time when /θ/ had developed in Castile.²

- (4) 'ASPIRATION' OF /x/ to [h]. The weakening of the posterior fricative /x/ to a simple aspiration [h] is often cited as an 'Andalusian' trait of Latin American Spanish. However, Latin American dialect geography suggests that the /x/ originally brought to Latin America was velar rather than pharyngeal, and that subsequent developments, in which an Andalusian contact may have played an occasional role, resulted in weakening to [h] in certain areas.

The role of dialect levelling

The visitor to contemporary Spain discovers a remarkably homogeneous language throughout the country, in which any given regional or social variety can be readily understood by speakers of other varieties. The only regional Ibero-Romance languages which remain viable are Catalan/Valencian and Galician. Asturian *bable* and Aragonese are rustic curiosities. Leonese, which once enjoyed a rich literary heritage, has completely disappeared. Even a few decades ago, the situation was different; in addition to a higher viability of regional languages, a number of non-standard dialects of Spanish were widely spoken, replete with morphological, syntactic and phonological patterns that depart strikingly from urban

Castilian/Andalusian configurations. Today, such speakers are only found in nursing homes or in isolated rural farmhouses, but extrapolating backwards to earlier centuries when the Spanish colonial effort was underway, the diversity of regional languages and dialects in Spain would be great enough as to nearly impede communication among many varieties, unless deliberate attempts were made at finding a linguistic common ground. The situation just described contrasts sharply with contemporary Latin America, where even the most rustic and isolated dialects spread out over thousands of miles share a greater similarity (and almost total mutual intelligibility) than Peninsular dialects circumscribed by a tiny radius. This homogeneity is not recent; colonial documents reveal comparable levels of similarity among dialects, even at the vernacular level. It would seem that a linguistic alchemy acted on the kaleidoscopic jumble of Peninsular languages and dialects to yield Latin American Spanish. The latter was even more homogeneous in its embryonic stage, with major dialect differences developing in subsequent centuries.

Alonso (1961: 44-46) claimed that beginning in the fifteenth century, almost all regions of Spain were diglossic, with residents possessing some 'Castilian' common denominator in addition to any regional languages or dialects. In the absence of independent verification, this is hard to believe, considering that well into the twentieth century, large numbers of rural residents in Galicia, León, Asturias and Aragón, not to mention Catalonia and the Basque Country, spoke little or no Castilian. Some Spanish American colonists were from social classes which would have guaranteed prior facility with Castilian, but many probably heard 'Spanish' spoken for the first time as they waited to embark in Seville or Cádiz, on shipboard, or in their new destination. However, the facts of Spanish emigration to the New World favored Castilian speakers.

Among the first immigrants to the Americas, speakers of Catalan, Valencian and Aragonese were proportionately few in number, preferring to emigrate to Mediterranean areas such as Sardinia and Sicily. For a time, official Spanish policy actually forbade Catalan emigration to the New World. This leaves a large number of central and western regional languages and dialects which should be factored into the mix of emigrants headed for Spanish America. However, only Castilian/Andalusian features provide the basis for American Spanish, hinting that dialect levelling was already occurring in Spain, and was hastened by the emigration process. It is not necessary to postulate the nationwide diglossia suggested by Alonso; dialect levelling would become crucial only in staging areas

such as Seville, where settlers from many regions of Spain came together for the first time.

Transdialectal accommodations which took place during the formation of American Spanish had Castilian-Andalusian as the central hub. Unlike such ethnically and linguistically coherent regions as Asturias, Aragon, León, Extremadura and Galicia, Andalusia has never been the home of a separate regional language with morphological, syntactic and phonological characteristics radically different from those of Castile. Andalusian Spanish was formed during the Reconquest, peopled largely from Castile, and differs from Castilian primarily in the greater reduction of syllable-final consonants and in the phonetic realization of sibilants. The 'Andalusian' traits of American Spanish are, in their great majority, common to both Andalusian and Castilian. The common denominators of sixteenth-seventeenth century Andalusian and Castilian Spanish were so numerous as to encompass nearly the entire language, with the exception of some phonetic details. Rather than dialect levelling of the sort that occurs among severely discrepant dialects (e.g. in Italy or parts of France), few Andalusians or Castilians had to significantly modify their speech in order to communicate with one another. New arrivals in Seville, whose command of Castilian/Andalusian was imperfect, would have to learn other ways of speaking, while shedding much of their home language. At the level of morphosyntax, this accommodation was nearly total, while pronunciation may have been adjusted less drastically among first-generation immigrants. In the New World setting, the situation was more variable, depending upon the regional mix of settlers in a given region.³

Andalusian influence and the highland-port distinction

In Latin America, 'Andalusian' phonetic traits are concentrated in coastal areas centring on major ports; this includes the Caribbean, as well as the Pacific coast of South America and to a lesser extent the River Plate. The traits in question involve severe reduction of syllable-final consonants, particularly /s/, /r/ and /d/, frequently combined with velarization of word-final /n/, and set against the constant backdrop of *seseo* and *yeísmo*. The reasons for such similarities are not hard to discover: in and around Latin American port cities social and linguistic contact with Andalusia and the Canary Islands prevailed, ensuring a phonetic resemblance with the speech of southern Spain. By the seventeenth century, ports in northwestern Spain were also actively participating in both legal and illicit commerce with the Americas, but the Andalusian domina-

tion remained. No other single area of Spain enjoyed such a preferential relationship with the ports of Latin America, so that the Andalusian-maritime connection dominated the linguistic development of coastal Latin America for several centuries.

In inland areas, regional Spanish linguistic influences were more diverse. In administrative centres such as Bogotá, Mexico City, Quito, and La Paz, contacts with Castile were nurtured by the constant flow of government officials, military and clerical personnel and trade goods. However, linguistic and cultural contact with Castile was not as proportionally strong in inland cities as was contact between (western) Andalusia and the American ports. Official personnel never made up a dominant percentage of any inland population, while highland settlers came from all areas of Spain. That Castilian linguistic patterns never predominated in colonial capitals or other highland regions is demonstrated by the lack of uniquely Castilian developments such as the interdental fricative [θ] (but cf. Guitarte 1973), the uvular [χ], the retention of *vosotros*, and the apicoalveolar [š].

Except for a general retention of syllable-final consonants, highland Latin American Spanish exhibits as many internal differences as similarities, and many dialects bear little resemblance to any variety found in Castile. This contrasts with the strong phonetic and lexical resemblance between Andalusian/Canary Island dialects and Latin American coastal varieties separated by thousands of miles. It is thus inaccurate to propose a simple equation: coastal lowlands = Andalusia; highland capitals = Castile. The Andalusian linguistic impact on coastal regions cannot be dismissed, but what occurred in the American highlands was the ABSENCE of a single predominant regional influence (Izzo 1984 expands on this view). In the highlands, no single Peninsular dialect played the dominant role taken by Andalusian in the port cities, resulting in 'default' speech patterns stemming from dialect levelling and from localized influences.

Isolating the 'formative period' of American Spanish

Prevailing theories of regional influence on the formation of Latin American Spanish, despite deep differences, share the fundamental postulate that the bases for American Spanish were solidified in the sixteenth century, perhaps even in the first half of that century. The 'Antillean period' from 1493-1519 is frequently cited (e.g. by Boyd-Bowman 1956; Catalán 1958; Guitarte 1980; Rosenblat 1977: 20) as having played a decisive role in the linguistic history of Latin America. During this period Spain consolidated its settlements on

Hispaniola and Cuba, and launched expeditions to Central and South America. Santo Domingo was the point of departure for the first expeditions to Puerto Rico, Cuba, Trinidad, Jamaica, Darién, the Caribbean coast of Venezuela and Colombia, and the Yucatan (Rosenblat 1977: 20). Cuba was the launching place for expeditions to the coast of Mexico, while the first explorations of Peru began in the Darién. According to one line of thought, the Andalusian influence became decisive during the early decades of the sixteenth century, when the Spanish settlements in the New World were entirely sustained by maritime contact with Europe. Successive arrivals who participated in exploration and settlement of the mainland would, it is claimed, be immersed in the prevailing speech patterns of the American insular settlements, and would in turn carry this form of speech to colonies established on the mainland. Although Spanish trade with mainland colonies soon bypassed the Antilles, except for purposes of reprobation, the seeds of 'Andalusian-American' Spanish would have been sown (cf. also Lockhart and Schwartz 1983: chap. 3).

The theory just summarized views Latin American Spanish as a living organism which was 'conceived' in the first decades of the sixteenth century, and which has remained indelibly marked by the first linguistic infusions. Although the chronological facts of Spanish settlement are accurate, as are demographic details about the earliest arrivals, the notion that Latin American Spanish is to be represented as accretions to an immobile base must be challenged.

Nothing in the history of Spanish, or of any other language which has evolved in overseas colonies without being completely cut off from the metropolitan language, suggests that the earliest decades should have enjoyed special importance, enough so as to have stifled later change or the continued absorption of new features arriving from abroad. United States English, for example, reflects successive arrivals of different groups, speaking many varieties of English as well as other languages. The English of the Great Plains has been influenced by generations of German and Scandinavian speakers, while the English of Chicago and Milwaukee has not escaped being touched by Polish. New York City English has undergone many reincarnations, including a strong dosage of southern Irish speech, while the southern United States developed much of its distinctive linguistic character as the result of Scots-Irish arrivals in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In all cases, the demographic structure and linguistic behaviour of the earliest settlers were overridden by the speech of later arrivals, and few if any parts of the United States speak a variety of English which bears the overwhelming imprint of its earliest settlers. The history of

Spanish America is no different. The earliest colonists in Santo Domingo and Cuba certainly enjoyed a measure of prestige, and acquired a *savoir faire* which was in high demand among newer arrivals, but their linguistic contribution was soon overshadowed by the plethora of regional and social dialects from all parts of the Iberian Peninsula which arrived with each incoming ship. Even Sephardic Spanish, physically and politically isolated from the speech of Spain since the early sixteenth century, continued to evolve, in many cases arriving at the same general results as mainstream dialects in Spain and Latin America. No Latin American dialect was ever as isolated as Sephardic Spanish; to the contrary, with the exception of tiny enclaves left in the wake of frustrated colonizing efforts (e.g. in Trinidad and Louisiana), all Spanish settlements maintained contact with Europe, albeit with varying degrees of intensity.

Spanish continued to evolve in Latin America whether or not in contact with European innovations. All dialects of Latin American Spanish acquired most of the major linguistic innovations which occurred in Spain at least up to the end of the seventeenth century, and some more recent Peninsular phenomena were also transferred to Latin America. Among the pan-Hispanic changes occurring well past the first century of Spanish-American colonization are the following:

- (1) In 1492, Spanish contained six sibilants, voiced and voiceless: /s/ (ss), /z/ (s), /t^s/ (c), /d^z/ (z), /š/ (x), /ž/ (g/j). /s/ and /z/ were apicoalveolar, like contemporary Castilian /s/. There is some indication that merger of the alveolar fricatives and affricates, the precursor of *seseo*, was already beginning in Andalusia by the end of the fifteenth century, but the change was not complete (Catalán 1956-7). In no Spanish dialect had devoicing of the voiced sibilants even begun. Devoicing, when it did come, originated in extreme northern Spain, in rural regions of Old Castile. By the middle of the sixteenth century, devoicing of sibilants was accepted in the New Castilian court at Toledo, but was not yet the norm in Andalusia. Sephardic Spanish, dislodged from contact with Peninsular dialects by the early sixteenth century, has merged /s/ and /t^s/, /z/ and /d^z/, but retains the voicing distinction. In Latin America, early Spanish borrowings into Nahuatl, Quechua and Guaraní verify that Spanish colonists still maintained the difference in voicing. Within Spain, devoicing of /z/ and /d^z/ was complete by the end of the sixteenth century (Catalán 1957), even in Andalusia. If Latin American Spanish had

received an Andalusian imprint during the 'Antillean period', we should expect a voicing distinction between /s/ and /z/ to have remained indefinitely. Instead, Latin American Spanish kept pace with both Castile and Andalusia in devoicing all sibilants, at approximately the same time as was occurring in Spain.

In the New World and in western Andalusia, all the sibilants fell together to /s/. In the remainder of Spain, the reflex of /t^s/-/d^z/ became an interdental fricative /θ/. Although the strictly Castilian innovation /θ/ never became implanted in any Latin American region, Spanish colonists of the urban elite sometimes used /θ/ during the latter colonial period (Guitarte 1967, 1973).

- (2) As another part of the general devoicing process, Spanish /š/ and /ž/ merged to a voiceless fricative, which later velarized to /x/, with the change being complete by the middle of the seventeenth century (Lapesa 1980: 379). Early borrowings into Native American languages give proof that /š/ was still a prepalatal fricative during the first century of Spanish settlement in the New World, but it too followed the dialects of Spain. The uvular Castilian fricative [χ] never emerged in Latin America (it appears to be a subsequent innovation in northern Spain), but the variety of posterior fricatives which represent /x/ in Spanish America is not a simple transplantation of the weak western Andalusian /x/ > [h].
- (3) Peninsular Spanish at the beginning of the sixteenth century retained an aspiration [h] as the last remnant of word-initial /f-/. Although the aspiration is still found in some rural regions of western Andalusia, it has disappeared from Castile and from Latin American Spanish, except for scattered lexical items among marginalized rural speakers.
- (4) Nebrija's grammar of 1492 and Valdés' *Diálogo de la lengua* of 1529 indicate that /b/ and /v/ were still separate phonemes in Spain during the 'Antillean period' of Latin American settlement. Spanish words taken into Native American languages during the sixteenth century reflect this difference. /b/ and /v/ subsequently merged in all Peninsular and Latin American dialects.
- (5) At the time of the first Spanish settlements in the Americas, the formal pronouns *usted* and *ustedes* had not yet emerged. In Spain, these pronouns did not come into general use until the end of the seventeenth century; Latin American Spanish acquired the pronouns at the same time.
- (6) At the end of the fifteenth century, *vos* and *tú* still vied with one another as both formal and familiar pronouns, with *vos*

still frequently used with plural reference. *Vos* subsequently disappeared from the dialects of Spain, while being retained in much of Latin America. However, most major Latin American cities and surrounding areas adopted the Peninsular preference for *tú* as the familiar pronoun; Maracaibo, Buenos Aires, and Montevideo are noteworthy exceptions.

Latin American Spanish remained sensitive to linguistic developments in Spain up to the end of the seventeenth century, with no special preference for the 'Antillean period.' Many regions continued to absorb patterns from Spain well beyond this date, until some critical population was achieved, speaking a linguistically self-sufficient dialect which lent more than it borrowed. No simple formula pinpoints 'critical periods' for a given dialect zone (cf. Guitarte 1980 for some general ideas). A developing sense of *criollo* identity came at different times to different regions. Many areas underwent massive demographic alterations in the eighteenth, nineteenth or early twentieth centuries, some of which exercised a moulding effect on regional Spanish dialects. To cite only a few examples, Antioquia Colombia received large numbers of immigrants from northern Spain well beyond the sixteenth century, and is one of the few areas of Latin America where a 'Castilian'-type apical /š/ is frequent. The heavy and long-lasting African presence in the Dominican Republic and parts of northwestern Colombia nudged local speech away from pan-Hispanic patterns, and may have played a greater role than any guiding influence from Spain. Canary Island immigrants surged into the Caribbean in the nineteenth century, and the overwhelming Italian immigration to Buenos Aires and Montevideo beginning in the last decades of the nineteenth century has indisputably affected River Plate Spanish. Rural areas of Latin America took their linguistic cues from nearby towns. As colonial towns grew into cities, the speech of newcomers was increasingly absorbed by the prevailing trends, especially when urban growth was gradual. Towns which underwent sudden growth spurts were more likely to yield some ground to linguistic innovations brought by immigrants, whether from nearby colonies or another continent. A glimpse at some colonial demographic trends will show the sort of environments in which an imported linguistic trait could flourish and displace the original Spanish heritage.

A closer look at colonial demographics

Except for a few of the earliest towns such as Nombre de Dios and Portobelo, which were quickly abandoned in the Spanish colonial

scheme, the hubs of Spanish colonial society have evolved into large urban masses. Mexico City is the world's largest city; Bogotá, Caracas, Santiago, Buenos Aires, and Lima each boast several million inhabitants; Panama City, Guayaquil, Havana, Montevideo, Acapulco, San Juan somewhat less; Cartagena, Santo Domingo, Quito, La Paz, Asunción, Veracruz, Cochabamba, Tegucigalpa, San Salvador and Managua are cities of around a million. In Spain, Seville has almost a million inhabitants, Madrid has more than three times that number, and Cádiz, Huelva and La Coruña have several hundred thousand each. Each city is a complex sociolinguistic microcosm, and it is difficult to imagine how any external linguistic force could have a significant impact on the thriving Spanish dialects. The notion that the idiosyncracies of a literal handful of people, no matter how rich or powerful, could permanently transform the speech of an entire city, region or nation lies beyond belief. Aside from the internal dynamics of large urban areas, the only major linguistic shifts occurring in modern Latin America result from rural migration to the cities.

Matters were not always as they are today; the explosive demographic growth that has turned former colonial centres into impersonal urban sprawls has occurred within the past century or less (cf. Sánchez Albornoz 1974). During the time when the foundations for Latin American dialects were laid, the major cities and towns were a tiny fraction of their present size, and models of language change which are unthinkable today were viable options in past centuries. Moreover, the population did not always increase across time; the Spanish colonies were afflicted with epidemics and plagues which sometimes reduced the population of a given area by half or more. As a result, some cities experienced no net growth over a period as long as two centuries. The relatively small size of colonial Latin American cities, and the consequent likelihood that new arrivals could affect speech patterns, can be seen by considering some representative population figures.

Cartagena de Indias was, for much of the colonial period, the principal port of entry for what is now Colombia, as well as an obligatory stopover for ships going to Panama, with shipments bound for Peru, Acapulco or the Philippines. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Cartagena had some 2,500 free inhabitants. The population rose considerably during that century, but following repeated pirate attacks, the population of Cartagena at the beginning of the eighteenth century again reached a low of some 2,500 free inhabitants, plus an undetermined but large number of African slaves. By way of comparison, Seville then had some 80,000 inhabitants, having lost almost as many in earlier decades through the

plague. Madrid was approximately twice the size of Seville. By the middle of the seventeenth century, Potosí, Bolivia grew to more than 150,000 inhabitants, momentarily becoming the largest city in Spanish America, although this growth was as transitory as it was meteoric.

Nombre de Dios, Panama's first port, never boasted a stable population of more than a hundred free adult residents, and often subsisted with a few dozen *vecinos*. During the heyday of the Spanish fleet stopovers, the crucially important town of Portobelo had only a few hundred residents for most of the year, although during the annual *feria* the population temporarily rose to several thousand. Panama City, a major Pacific port, had only 5,000 inhabitants as late as 1850. Three hundred years earlier, the city had the same population, which never rose higher than 8,000 at any point during colonial history (Jaén Suárez 1978). By the end of the century the population had risen to some 25,000, and in 1911, in the height of the Panama Canal construction boom, Panama City boasted more than 46,000 residents. Today it has more than a million inhabitants.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Caracas had some 500 white residents out of a total of slightly more than 3,000. By 1770, the total population had risen to nearly 19,000, and by the beginning of the nineteenth century Caracas had 42,000 inhabitants. Today its population is almost three million.

Quito in 1779 had approximately 25,000 residents. In 1857, the total had risen to only 36,000, and by the early twentieth century, the total population was around 50,000. Its current population is more than one million.

The population of Santiago, Chile, was estimated at 28,000 in 1744, at 69,000 in 1813 and at 98,000 in 1835. Lima, Peru, had a total population of around 90,000 as late as 1836, which approximately doubled by the end of the nineteenth century. The twentieth century has seen Lima grow from a city of 200,000 to a metropolis of more than 5 million residents.

At the time of independence, Mexico City, today the world's largest metropolis, was home to scarcely more than 100,000 residents, and during the colonial period its population was much smaller. At the same point, Veracruz had perhaps 5,000 residents, Guanajuato 35,000, Mérida 30,000 and Zacatecas 26,000.

Buenos Aires, one of the largest cities of Latin America, had little more than 20,000 residents in the final decades of the eighteenth century. The city had only 40,000 residents in 1810, at the dawn of colonial independence. By 1869, the population had risen to 187,000; in 1895 the figure had exploded to 650,000 and by 1914

a million and a half people lived in Buenos Aires. Figures for Montevideo are comparable. Founded in 1726, the city had 10,000 inhabitants by the 1781 census. By 1843, the population had risen to only 31,000. A century later, Montevideo had more than half a million residents; today it has more than a million.

In a series of censuses taken beginning in 1790, Havana had some 51,000 inhabitants, a number which rose to 84,000 in 1817. Potosí had dropped to 22,000 residents, Bogotá had 21,000, Guatemala City fewer than 25,000, and San Salvador only 12,000.

The importance of these population figures is obvious upon consideration of the proposed formative periods of Latin American Spanish. If the 'Antillean' period prior to 1530 is considered crucial, then only a handful of island villages with a total population of a few thousand colonists are at stake. If the entire sixteenth century is taken into account, few cities in Spanish America achieved a population of 5,000 or more inhabitants. Some of today's major population centres, embodying national dialects, had not yet been founded. When one considers that a typical fleet arriving at Cartagena, Portobelo or Lima might bring several hundred settlers, the possible linguistic effects of a contingent of new settlers on an evolving dialect could be considerable. A single fleet could, under some circumstances, bring new arrivals who amounted to nearly half the resident population, and even if not all new settlers remained in the port of entry, their linguistic contributions would not be inconsequential.

By the end of the seventeenth century, some cities in Spanish America had populations ranging in the tens of thousands, not counting African slaves and non-Hispanized Indians, who often outnumbered the population of European descent. Africans and Indians, while definitely influencing the evolving speech patterns, were not in a position to exert the same force on urban speech patterns as the arrival of new settlers had done in the past. Only with large scale Spanish/Canary Island immigration in the latter portions of the nineteenth century did the demographic proportions of new immigrants assume a prominence similar to that of the formative period of Latin American Spanish.

Models of dialect formation which limit the formative period to the first half century or even full century of colonial settlement are unrealistic, for incontrovertible evidence exists that linguistic cross-fertilization between Spain and Latin America extended over several centuries. In any nation arising from colonization, the speech and cultural patterns of the first settlers retains a nostalgic significance which transcends any objective contribution which this group might have made. In reconstructing the true history of a

nation, colonial heroes assume larger-than-life proportions, and the spirit of the original colonists is seen embodied in the current population. These sentimental issues rarely hold up under serious linguistic scrutiny, and in truth Latin American Spanish is the product not only of its first settlers but of the totality of the population, immigrants and natives alike.

Canary Islanders: the 'hidden' Spanish contribution

An indisputable influence in the formation of Latin American Spanish, often overshadowed by discussion of the 'Andalusian' contribution, is the Canary Islands. From the first voyage of Columbus onwards, the Canary Islands were an obligatory way-station for Spanish ships sailing to the Americas, which often stayed in the islands for several weeks for refitting and boarding of provisions. Canary Islanders also participated actively in the settlement and development of Spanish America.

Spain began to colonize the Canary Islands in 1483, and by the time of Columbus's voyages to the New World, the Canary Islands were firmly under Spanish control. The indigenous Guanche language disappeared shortly after the Spanish conquest of the islands, but left a legacy of scores of place names, and some regional words. From the outset, the Canaries were regarded as an outpost rather than a stable colony, and the islands' livelihood revolved around maritime trade. Although some islanders turned to farming, particularly in the fertile western islands, more turned to the sea, as fishermen and sailors. With Columbus's discoveries, the Canary Islands became obligatory stopover points en route to the New World, and much of the islands' production was dedicated to resupplying passing ships. Seville still held a monopoly on commerce, but an ever-growing Canarian merchant class began to challenge that domination. The islands were ideally situated for influencing transatlantic trade, and Canarian merchants began to implement their own agenda, fitting ships to sail directly to the Americas. Many islanders signed on as sailors, joining hands with Andalusians, Galicians and Asturians in providing Spain with a trans-atlantic seafaring class. The Canary Islands were also the site of the first Spanish-owned sugar plantations, and when sugar was introduced into the Antilles, it was from the Canary Islands, complete with Canarian experts in sugar cultivation. The flourishing Caribbean sugar industry overtook the originally prosperous Canary Island production, initiating the economic decline of the islands which would ultimately result in heavy emigration to the Americas.

With the sugar industry already in disarray, islanders turned to winemaking, an activity which still continues. For more than a century, Canarian wines were in demand both in Spain and in the Americas, but once again Peninsular winemaking overshadowed insular production, which was reduced to a cottage industry. The islands next turned to the harvest of dyestuffs, including *orchilla*, made from a lichen, and *cochinilla* or cochineal, made from an insect which infests cactus plants. By this time, however, all possibilities for the Canary Islands to compete economically with Spanish America had disappeared, and in ever larger numbers the islanders turned to emigration, temporarily or permanently.

Once the settlement of Spanish America was underway, Spain established administrative centres in the Canary Islands, in an attempt to halt the flagrant contraband and illicit commerce between the islands and the Americas. A *Juzgado de Indias* or judicial zone was established in the islands in 1566. This entity undertook, among other duties, the inspection of ships bound to and from the Americas, to assure compliance with Spanish laws. For most of the period of island trade, only Tenerife was authorized as a port of exportation; later, Puerto de la Luz near Las Palmas de Gran Canaria also became important. Islanders who ended up in the Americas were often from the two largest islands, whose speech has always showed more Andalusian traits and fewer archaic curiosities of the sort that abound in the more isolated islands.

At the American end, trade with the Canary Islands was extremely limited at first, due to the strict Spanish monopolistic practices which limited official trade to a handful of Latin American ports. From the eighteenth century until colonial independence in the 1820s, Spain was forced by the growing discontent among colonists and merchants at home to loosen its grip. Canarian ships regularly travelled to Havana, Santiago de Cuba, Santo Domingo, La Guaira, Cumaná, Chagres, Portobelo, Riohacha, Santa Marta, Cartagena, Veracruz, Campeche, Omoa, and several smaller ports.

The climate of the Canary Islands is capricious. The easternmost islands receive hot winds from the Sahara Desert, and support only sparse vegetation and a few vegetable crops. The western islands are greener, but undergo periodic droughts which make stable agriculture risky. Canary Islanders repeatedly petitioned the Spanish government for relief, but the Spanish Crown was more concerned with extracting wealth from its American colonies, and the Canarian pleas fell on deaf ears. Since many islanders had already travelled to the Americas as sailors or in pursuit of island-based commercial activities, emigration to the New World was a logical next step. Emigration was not based only on economic necessity,

for the Spanish government at times actively recruited islanders for various settlement plans. Emigration from the Canary Islands to the Americas began almost as soon as the latter region became settled, in small numbers and leaving no verifiable linguistic traces. It was not until the eighteenth century that any large-scale emigration began, following well-established trade routes to the Caribbean (Morales Padrón 1951, 1977). The Antilles and Venezuela were the preferred destinations, although Canary Islanders settled in other regions. In the last decade of the eighteenth century, Spain actively recruited Canary Islanders to settle areas of Louisiana, establishing a territorial presence against real or imagined French encroachment. These settlers were later abandoned following the transfer of Louisiana to French and then American ownership, and the descendants lived in relative isolation in central and extreme southeastern Louisiana. The latter group, the *Isleños* of St. Bernard Parish, still retains the Spanish language (Armistead 1992, Lipski 1990c, MacCurdy 1950), while descendants of the first group, known as *Brulis* (Armistead 1978, 1983, 1985, 1991, 1992; MacCurdy 1959) have lost the Spanish language. Canary Islanders were also settled in the western areas of Santo Domingo to counter the increasing French presence (Moya Pons 1980: 107–8, 127). To this day, the speech of this region bears great similarity to the rustic vernacular of the Canary Islands.

With the coming of independence to most of Latin America in the early nineteenth century, Spanish trade with the New World diminished considerably. The Canary Islands increased their commercial traffic with the United States, and emigration concentrated on the two remaining Spanish-American colonies, Puerto Rico and particularly Cuba. Alvarez Nazario (1972a) has traced the successive waves of Canary Island immigration to Puerto Rico, where entire villages were formed of relocated islanders. In Cuba, the *isleño* became a well-known personage, characterized by a combination of industriousness and peasant superstition, and the speech and behaviour of Canary Islanders figure prominently in Cuban literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Spain was always ambivalent about the Canary Islands and its inhabitants. Islanders were viewed as provisioners of passing ships, and as a ready source of cheap labour, military conscripts, and settlers for new colonies. During most of the colonial period, Canary Islanders were officially prohibited from travelling to the American continent except as soldiers. In practice, this prohibition was seldom respected. As traffic with the Caribbean grew, so did the number of Canary Islanders residing in the Americas. Given the preferred trade routes, the majority ended up in Venezuela, with a large number also reaching the Antilles.

Some representative figures hint at the magnitude and linguistic importance of the Canarian presence in Latin America. In 1714, for example, the governor of Caracas observed that half the white population of the city was composed of Canary Islanders (Béthen-court Massieu 1981: 18). Following the wars of colonial independence and until 1853, official Spanish policy allowed islanders to emigrate only to the remaining Spanish possessions: Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Few took the last option, but emigration to Cuba grew steadily during the remainder of the nineteenth century. In 1853, a royal decree permitted emigration to all American territories, whether Spanish colonies or free nations. This increased Canary emigration to other Latin American areas, especially Argentina and Uruguay, as well as providing more immigrants for Venezuela, but the majority continued to head for Cuba. Accurate figures for immigrants during the nineteenth century do not exist, but an approximate picture can be reconstructed (Hernández García 1981). In the 20-year period from 1818–1838, for example, more than 18,000 islanders emigrated to the Americas, most to Cuba and proportionately fewer to Venezuela and Puerto Rico. This represents a significant proportion of the islands' population, and given the relative size of cities in Latin America in the early nineteenth century, a not inconsiderable shift in the linguistic balance of such places as Caracas, Havana and Santiago de Cuba. In the half century from 1840 to 1890, as many as 40,000 Canary Islanders emigrated to Venezuela alone. In the period from 1835–1850, more than 16,000 islanders emigrated to Cuba, a rate of approximately 1,000 per year. In the 1860s, Canary emigration to the Americas took place at the rate of over 2,000 per year, at a time when the total islands' population was perhaps 240,000. In the two year period 1885–6, of the more than 4,500 Canarians who emigrated to Spanish possessions (including the Philippines and Fernando Poo), almost 4,100 went to Cuba and 150 to Puerto Rico. During the same time period, some 760 Canary Islanders emigrated to Latin American republics, with 550 going to Argentina/Uruguay and more than 100 to Venezuela. By the period 1891–1895, Canary emigration to Argentina/Uruguay was slightly more than 400 while to Puerto Rico it was 600; immigrants arriving in Venezuela numbered more than 2,000, and in Cuba more than 17,000. By comparison, in the same half century or so, emigration to Cuba from other regions of Spain included: 14,000 from Barcelona, 18,000 from Asturias and more than 57,000 from Galicia. During the same period more than 18,000 Galicians arrived in Argentina/Uruguay, but only a handful arrived in Venezuela. These are only official figures; when clandestine emigration is taken into

account, the numbers would be much larger. For example, Guerrero Balfagón (1960) has documented the illegal but significant immigration of Canary Islanders to Argentina and Uruguay in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Following the Spanish-American War of 1898, Cuba and Puerto Rico were no longer Spanish territories, but Canary emigration to the Americas continued. Until the Spanish Civil War of 1936, most islanders arrived in Cuba, and it is difficult to find a Canary Island family today in which some family member did not go to Cuba during the early decades of the twentieth century. In some of the poorer regions, entire villages were left virtually without a young male population. Many islanders returned after a few years, although some made several trips to Cuba or remained indefinitely, thus increasing the linguistic cross-fertilization between the two regions. Following the Spanish Civil War, which created even more severe economic hardships in the Canary Islands, islanders once more turned to Venezuela as the preferred area of emigration, a trend which continued until the early 1960s. Contemporary Venezuela still harbours a large Canary-born population, which retains much of the vocabulary, traditions and speech forms of the Canary Islands, more so than in any other region of Latin America. In nineteenth-century Cuba and Puerto Rico, Canary Islanders worked principally in agriculture, particularly the sugar industry, and to a lesser extent in urban areas. In the twentieth century, islanders in Cuba and Venezuela found more employment in cities, although some moved to rural areas in search of permanent homesteads.

The linguistic contributions of Canary Islanders are difficult to separate from those of Andalusia, given considerable similarities as well as the close linguistic and cultural contacts between Andalusia and the Canaries. Few exclusively Canary lexical items penetrated Latin American Spanish, so the fact that a given term is used in the Canary Islands and also in Latin America does not automatically entail direct transfer. Sometimes the choice of competing variants can be influenced by migratory trends. Thus, for example, Laguarda Trías (1982: 50) suggests that the preference for *durazno* instead of *melocotón* 'peach' in the Southern Cone may reveal a Canary influence. Cubans and Venezuelans know the word *gofio*, although the word no longer designates the same mixture of ground toasted grains as in the Canary Islands. The word was once used in Argentina and Uruguay, especially by the *canarios*, a term coming to mean all rural dwellers regardless of origin (Guarnieri 1978: 32–3). The term *guagua* is used in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea and Puerto Rico to refer to a city bus. At the

turn of the twentieth century, the term referred to a horse-drawn wagon, and *viajar de guagua* meant 'to ride for free'. The same term is found in the Canary Islands, with identical meaning, and is used even in the most remote regions, on all seven islands. Most analyses of Canary Spanish attribute this term to Cuban influence, brought back by returning islanders who had lived in Cuba. The use of *guagua* in Equatorial Guinea (formerly Fernando Poo) has also been attributed to the Cuban exile and slave population which was sent to the island in the mid 1800s (González Echegaray 1959: 64). The form, however, bears the characteristic shape of Guanche words, and the existence of this word among the *Isleños* of Louisiana, whose ancestors left the Canary Islands in the late 1700s, suggests the opposite route of transfer. The general absence of the word in the Spanish of Venezuela, where the Canary Island presence was also strong, adds to the confusion concerning the origins of *guagua*.

Several syntactic patterns found in the Caribbean region may be of Canary origin, or may have been reinforced by the arrival of large numbers of Canary Islanders (Gutiérrez Araus 1991). One such case is the combination *más nada* 'nothing else', *más nunca* 'never again', *más nadie* 'no one else', used very frequently in Caribbean and Canary dialects. Other Spanish dialects prefer the reverse word order, although combinations beginning with *más* are occasionally found in Andalusia and elsewhere in Latin America. These combinations bear a close resemblance to Galician/Portuguese constructions, and in view of the documented Portuguese/Galician influence in the Canary Islands, may be part of the Galician/Portuguese contribution. In Cuba and Venezuela, the Canary influence cannot be entirely separated from the direct influence of Galician Spanish speakers.

Non-inverted questions of the sort *¿qué tú quieres?* 'what do you want?' are usual in Cuban, Puerto Rican and Dominican Spanish, somewhat less so in Venezuelan and Panamanian Spanish, and quite uncommon in the remainder of Latin America, as well as being extremely rare in the Iberian Peninsula.⁴ In the Canary Islands, non-inverted questions are not as common as in the Caribbean, but among older speakers in rural regions, the frequency rises appreciably, indicating a higher rate of usage in the past, when the Canary influence on Caribbean Spanish was strongest. Galician/Portuguese also employs non-inverted questions, but not due to the cliticization of subjects but rather to the general lack of subject-verb inversion. The tight concentration of non-inverted questions in Latin American Spanish, limited to the Antilles and a few coastal Caribbean regions, correlates neatly with Canary Island influence, and also with recent Galician arrivals.

Found throughout the Caribbean are combinations in which an infinitive is preceded by an overt subject, usually following a preposition, with *para* being the most common preposition: *para yo salir* 'in order for me to leave', *para ellos entender* 'for them to understand', *antes de yo venir* 'before I came', etc. Unlike non-inverted questions or the word *guagua*, preposed subjects of infinitives are not limited to the Antilles or the Caribbean, although they are most common in that area. On the other side of the Atlantic, such constructions are usual in the Canary Islands. In peninsular Spain, infinitives with preposed subjects are not unknown in Andalusia, although never common. In Galicia, such combinations occur in Spanish as translations of Galician patterns. In Latin America, the Canary/Galician contribution converged most strongly in the Caribbean, which is where infinitives with preposed subjects are most frequent. This distribution provides circumstantial evidence in favor of a Canarian contribution in the Caribbean zone (cf. Lipski 1991).

Phonologically, Canary Island Spanish could easily be confused with Cuban, Panamanian or Venezuelan Spanish by the casual observer (cf. Almeida 1989a, 1989b, 1990; Alvar 1959, Catalán 1960, 1964; Lorenzo Ramos 1976; Samper Padilla 1990). Even members of these speech communities are not always able to distinguish between a Canary Islander and a speaker of Caribbean Spanish. Although some have seen a direct Canary Island influence in Caribbean Spanish pronunciation (e.g. Alvarez Nazario 1972a), this cannot be objectively verified. The phonological patterns of the Canary Islands continue the patterns of consonantal weakening found throughout southern Spain, but do not differ qualitatively from Andalusian and Extremaduran dialects. Canary Island immigration to the Caribbean added to phonetic tendencies which were already well-developed, but the overall Canarian contribution is largely supportive rather than innovative.

Conclusions

The formation of Latin American Spanish cannot be reduced to simple formulas or to short time periods, and research cannot be based exclusively on patterns and correlations found in the contemporary world. Latin American Spanish did not evolve in isolation from trends marking Peninsular Spanish. Both highland and lowland areas of Latin America continued to absorb linguistic innovations occurring in Spain, particularly when emigration from a single area resulted in significant demographic shifts.

Notes

1. The latter author claimed to be following the lead of Cuervo (1901) in his anti-Andalusian stance, but Guitarte (1958) has shown that Cuervo's position was much more cautious.
2. Sephardic (Judeo) Spanish, reflecting Peninsular speech trends of the turn of the sixteenth century, including Castile and other non-Andalusian zones, shows that *seseo* was already a viable process in Spain. It is not *seseo* but rather the particular realization of the former $\zeta = [s]$ to $[\theta]$ in Castile which is the unusual development.
3. The simplistic notion that Castilians settled in the highlands and Andalusians stayed in coastal lowlands cannot be adequately substantiated, but many developing communities did receive a major proportion of immigrants from a single region of Spain. For example Granda (1979a) has suggested, based on historical reconstruction, that the retention of /k/ in Paraguay may be at least partially due to the high concentrations of settlers from the northern Basque provinces of Spain. Another regional distribution which merits further study is the use of the diminutive suffix *-ico*, characteristic of Aragón, and widespread in Cuba, Costa Rica and Colombia.
4. Most dialects of Spanish allow non-inverted questions when the interrogative element is in non-argument position (cf. Torrego 1984), i.e. as an adverbial adjunct: *¿Cómo Juan pudo lograr eso?* 'How did John manage to do that?', *¿En qué momento ustedes se dieron cuenta de lo que pasaba?* 'At what point did you become aware of what was happening?' When the interrogative element occupies an argument position (subject, direct object, etc.), general Spanish requires inversion. In the Caribbean region, non-inverted questions routinely contain interrogative elements in direct object position, but only when the subject is a PRONOMINAL; **¿Qué Juan quiere?* 'What does John want?' is not an acceptable sentence. There are additional constraints on non-inverted questions, even in the Caribbean area. For example it is not usual for adverbs, negative items or other elements to intervene between the subject pronoun and the verb: **¿Qué tú no quieres?* 'What don't you want?', **¿Qué tú a veces piensas?* 'What do you sometimes think?', etc. If object clitics intervene between the pronominal subject and the verb, the acceptability is usually higher, although not as high as when nothing separates the subject from the verb: *¿Qué tú le dijiste?* 'What did you tell him/her?' These facts suggest that in the Caribbean dialects, subject pronouns are acting as phonological CLITICS, motivated by the high rate of retention of subject pronouns, in compensation for the loss of final consonants and the concomitant erosion of person/number differentiation on verbs.

Chapter 3

Before and after Spain – the Native American contribution

Introduction

During Columbus's voyages to the Caribbean, native peoples of the Americas established the first recorded linguistic contacts with Europeans. Spanish speakers encountered new flora, fauna, peoples, cultures and meteorological phenomena, together with the terms used to describe them. Words of Caribbean origin were carried throughout Latin America by subsequent explorers, where they often displaced local equivalents. *Aji* 'pepper', *hamaca* 'hammock', *huracán* 'hurricane', *canoa* 'canoe', *maíz* 'corn', *maní* 'peanut' and many other words are now used throughout Central and South America, as well as in Spain. Writers such as Bernal Díaz de Castillo, Garcilaso de la Vega and Columbus himself were instrumental in introducing residents of Spain to Native American lexical items, and the prestige associated with having visited the Americas induced many Spaniards to deliberately use *americanismos*. Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Quevedo are among the many Spanish writers who brought such words to a wider public. In the American colonies, the incorporation of Native American lexical items was naturally more extensive, as blending of European and American cultural and social practices created the need for words to describe hitherto unknown concepts. Spanish American place names also reflect this mixture; a frequent combination consists of a Spanish saint's name and an indigenous place name: Santa Fe de Bogotá, San Francisco de Quito, San Miguel de Tucumán, etc.

Aside from indigenous lexical items and toponyms, there is no consensus on the effects of Native American languages on Spanish. The Spanish of Latin America is widely varied, including configura-