

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 / Δ / 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-

tions not attested in Spain. In pronunciation and syntax, many Latin American dialects present systematic innovations which are not easy to explain away as linguistic drift, the inheritance of Spanish settlers, or borrowing from neighbouring dialects. Particularly in areas where the indigenous population has remained demographically and ethnically prominent, it is not unreasonable to suppose that some unique features of regional Spanish dialects are attributable to prolonged contact with indigenous languages. Henríquez Ureña (1921) went so far as to divide all of Latin American Spanish into dialect zones based on prevailing indigenous substrata: Nahuatl, Carib/Arawak, Quechua, Mapuche/Araucano, and Tupi/Guaraní. As discussed in Chapter 1, this approach is inadequate for several reasons, not the least of which is demographic inaccuracy. In most of the dialect zones postulated by Henríquez Ureña, differences among regional varieties of Spanish outweigh fundamental similarities. In the Caribbean, for example, the indigenous populations rapidly disappeared, and had little effect on the development of Spanish. In Venezuela, Argentina, Uruguay and Chile, hostile indigenous populations were pushed ever further from Spanish settlements. In much of Colombia and Costa Rica, and in coastal Peru and Ecuador, Spanish settlers had minimal contacts with the indigenous population. This contrasts with Paraguay, Mexico and the Andean countries, in which indigenous languages remain vigorous even today, and where many Spanish colonists learned and used the native tongues. Tracing the indigenous imprint in Latin American Spanish requires a finer-grained approach than Henríquez Ureña's broad categories, enriched by a deeper knowledge of Spanish dialect variation than that possessed by the pioneers of Latin American dialectology.

Few claims of indigenous influence have been accompanied by a demonstration of the purported substrate patterns, nor of the opportunity for bilingual interlanguage to percolate upward into regional dialects of Spanish. Too often, the mere demographic presence of a large indigenous or *mestizo* population has uncritically been taken as the source of 'peculiarities' of a given dialect zone, without verifying either the viability of the hypothesis in linguistic and historical terms, or the existence of alternative explanations. The case for an indigenous influence on non-lexical features of Latin American Spanish must be presented as in a court of law, demonstrating motive, method and opportunity.

The nature of Spanish-indigenous cultural and linguistic contacts

During the sixteenth century (often regarded as the formative period for Latin American Spanish) and even later, indigenous populations often outnumbered Europeans by hundreds to one, and yet the nature of Spanish settlement was not always conducive to substratum influences. In order for an indigenous language permanently to influence colonial Spanish, a special set of conditions was required, which were not present in all colonies nor at all times.

For an indigenous lexical item to enter the Spanish vocabulary, it is merely necessary for a colonist to ask the name of an unknown object. This can be done regardless of the linguistic skills of either individual and does not necessarily entail any further interaction. Columbus learned some indigenous words (not always accurately) by means of gestures, and later through native interpreters whose command of Spanish may have been only partial. The same effect was produced when Spaniards acquired the rudiments of an indigenous language; Spanish missionary activity was a major vehicle for this type of transfer. Finally, an indigenous population which had acquired fluency in Spanish could continue to contribute lexical items to Spanish colonists, without any other characteristics of the native language being carried over.

Native Americans who use Spanish only occasionally, having learned it as a second language past childhood, speak an interlanguage in which the phonology, morphology and syntax of the native language are superimposed on Spanish patterns. Today such speech can be heard in indigenous redoubts throughout the Amazon Basin, the Andes and Mesoamerica; in the past, it existed in nearly every Spanish colonial settlement. Even when Spanish is used on a daily basis, between workers and employers, or between rural residents and priests, fluency may never rise above the level of a rough pidgin. Such indigenously-flavoured Spanish has no ready way of expanding beyond the group which has created it, and ordinarily leaves no traces on natively spoken Spanish. In order for an indigenous interlanguage permanently to penetrate regional varieties of Spanish, a major sociolinguistic shift must break the equilibrium which sustains the interlanguage. Speakers of the interlanguage need to occupy positions in which their speech becomes the norm. Such speakers must be present in great enough numbers to make the interlanguage demographically prominent. The interlanguage itself, by definition the result of having learned Spanish as a

second language, must gradually become a first language, without shedding the indigenous accretions. This requires insulation from normative standards, or a social environment in which such standards are no longer relevant. The permanent insertion of indigenous elements into regional Spanish follows the same pattern by which a pidgin, originally a survival-level contact language spoken natively by no member of a linguistically heterogeneous population, evolves into a creole, learned as a native language. As with creolization, a myriad of different events can lead to the same result. Holm (1988: 9) has coined the term 'semi-creole' to refer to a language variety which has 'both creole and non-creole features but . . . does not necessarily imply that they were ever basilectal creoles, since both creoles and non-creoles . . . can become semi-creoles by borrowing features.' A semi-creole has never undergone the radical pidginization + renativization which characterizes creole formation, but has been significantly restructured with respect to the original superstrate language. Black American English and vernacular Brazilian Portuguese are possible examples of semi-creoles. A similar result would presumably obtain when European Spanish was partially restructured under appropriate conditions of contact with a Native American language. In this vein, it is instructive to consider some possible scenarios.

In a long-standing language contact environment such as that found in the Andean region of South America, the indigenous population gradually acquired Spanish as a native language, not necessarily through the loss of the first language, but via an increasingly Spanish-dominant bilingualism. In a racially and socially segregated environment such as existed in colonial Latin America, Spanish is used not only for essential contacts with the population of European descent, but also among members of the same indigenous community. *Mestizos* provide a bridge between the cultures, and facilitate language transfer and the development of a stable ethnic interlanguage. Indigenous patterns freely enter the Spanish of these balanced bilinguals, and unimpeded communication is ensured by the fact that all bilingual speakers will implicitly draw on the same indigenous linguistic patterns when interpreting innovative Spanish structures. For example, the Quechua speaker who says

Mariya-x wasi -n

Maria-POSS house-POSS 'Mary's house'

in Quechua will instantly recognize the Spanish phrase *de María su casa*, which follows an identical order of major constituents (Gómez Bacarreza and Arévalo Soto 1988: 29). The monolingual Spanish

speaker lacking any knowledge of Quechua structures, and whose grammar includes only the combination *la casa de María*, will be at a disadvantage in terms of rapid interpretation.

As long as racial and cultural boundaries rigidly separate indigenous and European communities, nativized indigenous Spanish exists as a stable but closed sociolect. Usage may be fluent, but contact between indigenous and European Spanish occurs only on the periphery of each group, and the indigenous Spanish does not as yet transcend the boundaries imposed by the colonial administration. As a *mestizo* class arises, characterized by a range of socioeconomic opportunities not generally available to the indigenous community, Indo-Spanish comes into more intimate contact with European Spanish. When *mestizaje* becomes defined by behavioural patterns and economic power rather than by simple racial criteria, more and more members of the indigenous community enter the *mestizo* linguistic sphere, creating a fluid sociolinguistic spectrum whose polar extremes are still 'white' and 'Indian', but the majority of whose speakers use intermediate varieties. If structural changes in society or simple demographic predominance undermines 'European' Spanish as the prestige standard, features of the formerly 'indigenous' sociolect may come to be sociolinguistically unmarked, i.e. will be accepted as the new standard.

There exist several ways for an originally marginal indigenous Spanish sociolect to achieve predominance as a standard dialect. A key ingredient is a discontinuity in the sociolinguistic evolution of a given region, whereby the speech of previously neglected sectors of society is moved into a more prestigious position. A social upheaval can have this effect: the Bolivian revolution of 1952, although by no means displacing the European-based aristocracy and its monolingual Spanish norms, facilitated the penetration of indigenous-influenced sociolects in higher spheres of government, education, mass media and commerce. The Cuban Revolution of 1959 produced, among other effects, a linguistic shift away from stilted, European-sounding Spanish for official and mass media purposes to a more 'Cuban' speech pattern. A similar effect ensued during the Sandinista Revolution of Nicaragua, which achieved power in 1979 and whose legacy is still present in Nicaraguan educational, literary and political language. In colonial times, social revolutions were not viable, but separatist movements often achieved the same results. 'Peninsular' speech, once admired and imitated, fell out of favour, and nationalist sentiments infused *criollo* words and expressions with sudden vigour.

The role of indigenous women as wives of Spanish men, and as domestic servants and nursemaids for children of European origin,

provides another means for indigenous-influenced Spanish to achieve wider circulation. For much of the colonial period, men greatly outnumbered women among European settlers, especially in zones where prolonged military action was required. This resulted in ethnically mixed unions, in which an indigenous woman whose command of Spanish may have been far from complete became the primary care-giver and linguistic role model for 'Spanish' children. The extreme case occurred in Paraguay, where the extensive bilingualism among Paraguayans who claim 'European' descent has been attributed to the colonial family structure. The prototypical Paraguayan family consisted of a Spanish-speaking father and a Guaraní-speaking mother, with the latter originating Paraguayans' preference for Guaraní in intimate, personal and familiar domains (cf. Service 1954). Moreover, many Spanish men fathered children by several (indigenous) wives, who in turn raised the offspring, imparting Guaraní as the dominant language (cf. Roett and Sacks 1991). The Paraguayan case may have been overstated, but families such as those just described were documented for many parts of colonial Spanish America. Children of mixed marriages, more often than not recognized by their fathers and hence by the Spanish government and the Church, were considered *criollos* and entered colonial society at a much higher level than was possible for members of the indigenous community. This provides an additional mechanism whereby an ethnically flavoured Spanish could become the native language of the economically and socially dominant population.

Even when sanctioned marriage between Spanish men and indigenous women did not occur, the linguistic behaviour of servants and nursemaids could exercise a powerful influence in reshaping prestige norms. Usually only the wealthiest families entrusted their children to members of the indigenous population, but the formative effects of the indigenous penetration can be considerable. If this top-down percolation is combined with influences which have crept upward into the middle sociolinguistic strata from mixed-ethnic marriages, a model is provided by which an indigenous 'substratum' can affect a large community without the need for either a profound social upheaval or an overwhelming demographic predominance.

In colonial Spanish America, the conditions described above were not always met. In the Antilles, for example, the native population disappeared after only the briefest ethnolinguistic interaction with Spanish, providing for the transfer of lexical items but having no other effect. Native Americans of Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, and parts of Central America, were also driven away and

exterminated, leaving only sketchy linguistic remains. In the Amazonian Basin, Spanish settlement has been relatively recent, and linguistic assimilation of the indigenous population is partial at best, while in many highland Andean regions, as well as in isolated rural zones of Mexico and Guatemala, the Spanish-speaking population was never large enough for Spanish to be implanted as a viable native language. Long-lasting and stable contacts between Spanish and indigenous languages took place with Native American communities which had achieved a dominant regional status, and could maintain their demographic strength and some social and economic power. This includes part of Paraguay and much of the former Inca and Aztec empires.

Indigenous interlanguage, past and present

Indigenous approximations to Spanish have varied over time, as have Spanish speakers' reactions to such interlects. In contemporary Latin America, bilingual speakers still produce configurations which diverge sharply from monolingual Spanish usage. With few exceptions, these contemporary interlanguages do not correspond to any well-established monolingual or fluent bilingual variety of Spanish. The recessive Spanish of bilinguals in, for example, Paraguay, Mexico, Guatemala and the Andean highlands contains syntactic and phonological traits which have not seeped into the corresponding regional varieties of Spanish. A continuum of Spanish variants with increasingly less indigenous influence is found in such bilingual areas, similar to the continuous variation which existed during earlier periods.

In order to judge the potential for indigenous penetration of regional Spanish phonology and syntax, it is useful to consider specimens of Spanish interlanguage spoken by Native Americans. Indians' approximations to Spanish have been recorded, not always accurately, since the earliest colonial times. Most texts from the past were written by Europeans who rarely adopted a sympathetic attitude toward indigenous cultures, which they regarded as inferior to their own. They frequently equated difficulties in learning Spanish with native intelligence. Indigenous writers, and those who respected native culture, carefully avoided imitation of 'Indian' Spanish, although their own command of Spanish may have been influenced by a Native American language. As with the written representations of Africanized Spanish, imitations of 'Indian' Spanish are not necessarily inaccurate just because they reflect a negative attitude toward the speakers.

Andean Spanish

In the Andean region, the Spanish conquerors came into contact with a vast Quechua-speaking empire, whose constituents were sometimes allies, sometimes foes, but never far removed from the Quechua language. Spanish religious orders adopted and standardized Quechua as a lingua franca, extending it to peripheral areas and displacing still viable regional languages (cf. Mannheim 1991). From the outset, Quechua began absorbing large quantities of Hispanisms, and entered into a symbiotic relationship with Spanish. The often imperfect mastery of Spanish by Quechua speakers did not escape the notice of Spanish settlers, who at an early date began the imitations and parodies of 'Indian' Spanish that have continued up to the present. Rivarola (1987, 1988) has documented the early history of Andean Spanish, including the parodies of Juan del Valle Caviedes, who imitated both *criollo* and indigenous Spanish of Peru towards the end of the seventeenth century. Caviedes observed, disapprovingly, the loss of the opposition /k/-/y/ among the Lima *criollos*, and mocked the *lengua de indios*:

Balca il diablo, gorgobado
que osastí también ti casas
sin hallar ganga in so doti
sino sólo mojiganga.

Parici ostí jonto al novia
tan ridondo y ella larga
como in los trocos di juego
taco, bola in misma cama.

Ella dio el sí con so tiple,
ostí con voz retumbada,
qui los gorgobados siempre
hablan dintro dil tinaja.

These satirical verses do not exemplify the typically Quechua-influenced word order frequently found in Andean Spanish, but do demonstrate characteristically Quechua morphological and phonological transfer. In the Caviedes text, simplification of the Spanish five-vowel system to approximate the three vowels of Quechua is shown in *osastí* > *usasté*, *ti* < *te*, *parici* < *parece*, *jonto* < *junto*, *trocos* < *trucos*, *so* < *su*, etc. Also found in many of Caviedes' poems is the erosion of noun-adjective concordance (*al novia*, *dil tinaja*), and occasional lack of articles (*in misma cama*). This stereotypical modification of mid and high vowels (known as *motosidad*) has continued until the present time in the Andean region, but when not accompanied by other indications of an indigenous interlanguage, examples such as the ones just cited are

more indicative of prejudice than legitimate examples of proto-Andean Spanish.

The seventeenth century Peruvian *mestizo* Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala, in his own writings, gives indirect indications of vocalic modifications in indigenous Spanish, as well as occasional errors of concordance, use of uninflected *lo* as direct object marker, elimination of direct articles, and other proto-Andean tendencies (Rivarola 1988): *este mes esta la comida maduro* 'this month the crops are ripe', *multiplicaron los dichos yndios, que todo lo sabe Dios y como poderoso lo puede tener aparte esta gente de yndios* 'the aforesaid Indians multiplied, as known by almighty God who keeps these Indians apart', *nosotros quisieramos ir a Chuquisaca o Lima alcançar algún provisión para descanso de pobres indios* 'We would like to go to Chuquisaca or Lima to obtain some food to sustain the poor Indians'. These unconsciously introduced hints of Andean Spanish, more so than the deliberate imitations by European writers, indicate that Andean characteristics could have been used by members of the indigenous intelligentsia, who employed Spanish as a vehicle of literary and political expression, and who because of their hegemony over large numbers of indigenous residents may have sowed the first seeds of a parallel indigenous Spanish dialect.

A study of the grammatical patterns found in interlanguage varieties of Andean Spanish gives a hint of the potential for large-scale transfer. In reality, such interference has occurred only at the periphery of monolingual Spanish; in areas where bilingualism is the norm rather than the exception (i.e. outside of a few large urban areas), phenomena which were once part of the indigenous interlanguage are now found in middle-class Spanish, sometimes even as used by monolingual Spanish speakers. Cerrón-Palomino (1976), Hardman de Bautista (1982), Laprade (1981), Rivarola (1988), Stratford (1988) and others have demonstrated unequivocal calquing from Quechua and Aymara.

One case is the use of the pluperfect tense to indicate reported events rather than personally experienced events, an innovative use which creates in Spanish a distinction found in Aymara and Quechua. This usage is found in bilingual Spanish of Bolivia and Peru. The use of postposed *nomás* and *siempre*, common in Bolivian highland Spanish, is sometimes found in other regions, for example Mexico. Postposed *pero*, however, as in *¿vas a tomar café, pero?* 'You're not going to have coffee, then?' is not found in non-Andean regions. Curiously, this least Spanish-like of all Altiplano 'particles' is also the least like its Aymara counterpart *-raki* (Laprade 1981: 219), and may come not from direct syntactic transfer but rather from an origin as a topicalized or right-

dislocated comment in the indigenous interlanguage. The same may be true of postposed *dice*, which rather than a calque from Aymara or Quechua may simply represent a fossilization of an originally independent conjoined comment. Combinations of two or three particles, usually in the order *nomás-pues-pero*, are almost impossible to accept as having arisen spontaneously in Spanish without an indigenous contribution, although these combinations do not always correspond on a morpheme-by-morpheme basis with Quechua or Aymara patterns (cf. Laprade 1981: 220).

Nicaragua: the *Güegüense*

Colonial Central America contained large indigenous groups, but surviving documents make little reference to their approximations to Spanish. The most important extant text is the anonymous skit *El güegüense*, depicting Nahuatl life in colonial Nicaragua and evidently written in that country. The date of composition is unknown, but is probably somewhere towards the beginning of the eighteenth century. The time period covered by the events, as well as the language of the text, appear to centre on the seventeenth century. Among the earliest commentators of the *Güegüense*, Brinton (1883: xvi) speaks of '... a mixed dialect ... composed of a broken-down Nahuatl and a corrupt Spanish, which, at first, served as a means of communication between the conquerors and their subjects, and later became, to some degree, the usual tongue of the latter'. The author goes further (p. xvii), to suggest that such a mixed language once formed a pan-Mesoamerican creole; 'This jargon was carried into the various nations who came into contact with the Spaniards and half-breeds, and hence we may find scattered words traceable to it in many of their tongues ...' In reality, the *Güegüense* contains very few deviations from standard Spanish of the time period. It is written in a combination of Spanish and Nahuatl, with extended passages in the latter language intercalated in the form so often found among fluent bilinguals.¹ The Spanish of the *Güegüense* is not obviously influenced by a Nahuatl substratum; rather, the two languages are superimposed on each other. Henríquez Ureña (1938: 326) speculates that the written text was only meant to be a guide for the actors, who in turn would adopt a mix of Spanish and Nahuatl appropriate to their individual audiences. The language of the text is colloquial and archaic, as befits the play's protagonists, a group of muleteers. There is some indication that it is not Spanish but rather Nahuatl which has suffered from this bilingual contact. This could reflect the fact that low-ranking Spanish military figures, as well as artisans and teamsters, also spoke Nahuatl, or that the Nahuatl speakers in Nicaragua

were already undergoing shifting to Spanish. A sample of the *Güegüense*, including Brinton's translation is (Brinton 1883: 42-3, 50-51):

- GÜEGÜENSE: Pues mas ha sido carpintero, hacedor de yugos aunque sean de papayo, hacedor de arados, aunque sean de tecomajoche ya pachigüe mayule Sor. Gob^{or} Tastuanes 'Then he has been a carpenter, a maker of yokes, though of papaya wood, a maker of plows, though of temple tree wood. This should satisfy the clever Governor Tastuanes.'
- GOBERNADOR: Ya pachigüete no pachigüete, pues Güegüense asanese palparesia mo Don Forcico timaguas y verdad tin oficios 'No, I am not yet satisfied. Let Güegüense tell his son, Don Forcico, to give a truthful account of his trades.'
- GÜEGÜENSE: Pues si cana amigo Capⁿ Alg¹ M^{or} Mayague nistipampa Sres. principales, sones, mudanzas, velancicos, necana y palparesia Don Forcico timaguas y verdad tin oficios. 'Then, if friend Captain Chief Alguacil will, in my presence, cause the leading men to suspend the music, dances, songs and ballets, Don Forcico will give a truthful account of his trades.'

If the *Güegüense* is a legitimate sample of Hispanic-Nahuatl speech in colonial Nicaragua, it would suggest a very fluent and penetrating bilingualism, rather than a halting interlanguage.

El Salvador

Another Central American area for which indigenous substrata have been implicated in phonological and morphological evolution is El Salvador. No creole stage can be postulated for El Salvador, since a fundamental ingredient was lacking: the predominance of speakers of mutually unintelligible languages, who were forced to use imperfectly learned Spanish for essential communication, in the absence of extensive native-speaker linguistic models. Even during the most intensive Hispanization, indigenous Salvadorans could and did use their own native languages to communicate among themselves. There is no accurate documentation of the language(s) used among different ethnic groups in precolonial and colonial El Salvador, although linguistic contact probably took place only along the edges of the Pipil- and Lenca-speaking regions, either via bilingualism or through use of a single lingua franca. Pipil, representing the culturally dominant group, is the most likely choice. More recent interethnic contacts have adopted Spanish, and while there have always been indigenous Salvadorians whose command of Spanish falls below that of native speakers, nothing suggests progressive reinforcement of non-native patterns.

The Lenca language remains little studied, and Lenca contributions to Central American Spanish are an enigma. In the case of Pipil, claims of substrate phonological influence on Salvadorian Spanish are not lacking. For example, Geoffroy Rivas (1978: 17) offers a number of assertions which, while at odds with observed linguistic behaviour, are representative of substratist theories of Central American Spanish. With respect to pronunciation of /s/, he notes that Pipil speakers 'suprimieron toda diferencia entre s, c y z, substituyéndolas por el fonema nahua velar, fricativo, no sonoro que suena como una j suave, que aún usamos al decir, por ejemplo, *nojotros*, y que tan notorio es en el habla de los nicaragüenses.' (suppressed the differences among s, c and z, replacing them by the Nahuatl voiceless velar fricative which sounds like a soft j, which we still use, for example, when we say *nojotros*, and which is so noteworthy in the speech of Nicaraguans.) The example *nosotros* > *nojotros* is unconvincing, since this change recurs in popular Spanish throughout the world, and is transparently the result of a bimorphemic interpretation as *nos + otros*. Assuming that Geoffroy Rivas is referring to aspiration of syllable-final /s/, as well perhaps as to aspiration of word-initial and occasional word-internal intervocalic /s/, this flatly contradicts the oft-mentioned claim that Nahuatl influence was responsible for RETENTION of syllable-final /s/ in Mexican Spanish. Even if Pipil as spoken in El Salvador had replaced Spanish /s/ by [x] or [h], Geoffroy Rivas' claim leaves unexplained the retention of [s] in positions other than syllable/word-final. Little accurate information exists on the pronunciation of Pipil in colonial El Salvador, but descriptions from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century give no support to claims that indigenous phonetic transfer lies behind weakening of /s/ in Salvadorian Spanish.²

Next to nothing is known about the Lenca language as used during the time of the colonization of El Salvador. Contemporary Lenca (as spoken during the early decades of the present century) provides no basis for reduction of /s/. Indeed, Lenca contains instances of syllable-final /s/, although closed syllables are not particularly common (cf. Mendoza 1959). Lenca influence is thus ruled out in accounting for modification of /s/ in Salvadorian Spanish.

Despite the fragility of the preceding claims, Pipil influence may have indeed provoked a phonetic change in rural Salvadorian Spanish, a trait which is fading as monolingual Spanish usage encompasses the entire nation. Pipil retains /t^s/ in syllable- and word-final positions, although deaffrication to [s] is attested (Baratta 1951-2: vol 1, 277). However, although Pipil permits

closed syllables, the phoneme /t^s/ is not common syllable-finally. Much more frequent is the groove fricative /š/ (orthographically x or sh), both word-internally and word-finally. The replacement of Spanish syllable-final /s/ by /š/ is a recognized characteristic of Pipil-influenced Spanish in El Salvador, and has given rise to innovative Spanish words: *maestro* 'teacher' vs. *maishtro* 'artisan.' Salvadorian popular literature frequently represents the shift /s/ > /š/ as found among rural peasants of Nahuatl-speaking background, as shown by the following excerpts from Salarrué (1969):

No te resbalés, ¿oishte? (440)

Llegó a la escuela y buscó al *maishtro*, pero el *maishtro* se había acostado . . . (441)

Pero el mal estaba en su querencia *egoishta* (436)

Aishtá ese baboso (419)

Few speakers of Pipil remain in El Salvador (cf. Campbell 1985), but this phonetic trait remains to signal the last vestiges of what was once a more widespread ethnolinguistic trait.

Representing earlier stages of indigenous interlanguage in El Salvador are several texts for folklore which imitate the speech of Pipil- and Lenca-speaking Salvadorians. The following Pipil-influenced texts give a hint of earlier ethnolinguistic varieties:

Cuando lo cantó la gayu,
lo pegó un pugno el mula,
Casás porque lo ha nacido
La Ninguio que está en el cuna . . .
Eso digu yo también,
Porque lus dos li hemos oydo,
Dicen que lo nacio en Belén
Y lu queremos conocer (Baratta 1951-2; v. 2, 612).

No lu tráigo nada qué dar,
Me lu robaron los lagronis,
Cométe este tu yuca,
Jrenti l' templu istá l' Ceiba
centenariu, hermusu, beyu,
centinela del mi pueblu
almiradu pur el cerrus
y culinas vigilantis
unde l' sul cun el julgures
lustá lumbrando nel tardes . . .
Lu hay barrancus y lu hay burdus,
piegras grandis y peñunis,
y nel altu campanariu . . .

Huy l' tiempo lu es testigu
cuando lu rueda l' caminu
vieju riyu Chanazigua
cuandu l' so agua va in carrera . . .

'In front of the temple is the centenarian and beautiful ceiba tree, sentinel of my village, admired by the vigilant mountains and hills, and lit by the afternoon sun . . . there are hollows and valleys, large and small rocks, and in the tall belfry . . . today the weather witnesses the twisting path of the river Chanazigua, whose waters go racing by . . .'
Deodanes (1972: 1-4)

These texts coincide with known facts of Nahuatl-influenced Spanish. Nahuatl/Pipil is noted for its predominantly three-vowel system ([e] is assumed to be an allophonic variant of /i/, and [o] is a variant of /u/). Also observable is difficulty in articulating /ñ/, suggesting at times a velar nasal (*singuior*) and at other times a consonant cluster /ny/ (*lenyita*). The pleonastic clitic *lo* is also a recurring trait of Spanish-Nahuatl contact.

Texts imitating Lenca-influenced Spanish are few, but demonstrate similar phonetic characteristics. Unlike Pipil, Lenca has a five-vowel system, containing the same vowels as Spanish. The preceding texts show some raising of unstressed final /o/ to [u], a phenomenon which has its roots in popular Peninsular Spanish, but which could have been reinforced by congruent patterns in Lenca. The remaining phonetic traits are common in rural Spanish of other areas:

Señor San Pegru,
que me llenen mi huacal
y para otro año
venirlu a llevar.
Santo Señor San Pegru,
te lu estamos celebrando
tu día, dejarnos llegar
otro año, te lu haremos mejor.
(Baratta 1951-2: vol 1., 343)

Both Pipil- and Lenca-based Spanish interlanguage reveal morpho-syntactic traits currently found in other regions where Mesoamerican languages are spoken. This consistency suggests that literary and folklore texts like the ones just given accurately reflect intermediate stages of Spanish interlanguage, which in some regions may have become nativized.

Models of indigenous phonological penetration: the most likely candidates

The claim is often made that indigenous languages permanently influenced regional Spanish pronunciation. Such theories range between two contradictory viewpoints. According to one position, Spanish-Amerindian linguistic contacts extracted phonological common denominators for the developing regional dialect. Spanish sounds, phonotactic combinations or oppositions not found in the indigenous language were neutralized or eliminated. Opposed to this view of phonological levelling is the assertion that indigenous speakers found certain Spanish sounds so difficult to articulate that their extraordinary efforts resulted in retention in the local Spanish dialect even when other regions had eliminated the sound. Neither theory completely excludes the penetration of new sounds or oppositions from one language to the other, provided that certain unspecified conditions are met. A brief sampling of proposed cases of indigenous influence on Latin American Spanish pronunciation will illustrate the complexity of the issues involved.

Paraguay

If indigenous phonetic influence is to be found in any variety of Spanish, it must surely appear in the nation where a Native American language has captured the hearts and minds of even its inhabitants of European descent. The use of Guaraní in Paraguay, and the fluent code-switching exhibited by bilingual Paraguayans, has given rise to sweeping claims of indigenous influence on Paraguayan Spanish pronunciation. At one time or another, virtually every phonetic detail of Paraguayan Spanish has been implicated, including alveolar /t/ and /d/, affricated /tr/, loss of syllable-final /s/, presence of phrase-initial fricative [β], and certain vowel reductions. Most of these claims are tenuous, and have been refuted by careful research (e.g. Cassano 1971a, 1971b, 1971c, 1972a, 1972b, 1972c, 1972d; Granda 1979a, 1980, 1982a). Sometimes a self-fulfilling prophecy is at work, the 'discovery' of substratum influence in a region where the indigenous language is so obviously vigorous. Inaccurate descriptions of Paraguayan Spanish are also to blame, including early studies based on expatriate informants or hasty visits which resulted in non-representative speech samples.³

One of the more tenacious claims of Guaraní influence involves retention of the palatal lateral /ʎ/, which, from Malmberg (1947: 5) onwards, many have attributed to Guaraní. Guaraní itself does not have this phoneme, and apparently never did; early Spanish borrowings into Guaraní used either the affricate [j] or a simple vocalic

hiatus. This fact has not deterred proponents of a substrate influence; as put by Cotton and Sharp (1988: 273-4) 'when the Guaraní mastered the difficult foreign sound, they made a point of distinguishing it from /y/, creating an island of *lleísmo* in contrast to the *yeísmo* of the surrounding areas.' This is an astounding claim, which if substantiated would be without precedent in the history of language contact. It is not necessary to hold out such extreme views, for the simple geographical and social isolation of Paraguay, as compared with the rapidly developing metropolitan area at the mouth of the River Plate, provides a more than adequate explanation. Islands of /*ʎ*/ are also found in other remote regions of South America whose histories are not much different from that of Paraguay, as well as in rural enclaves of Spain and the Canary Islands.⁴

The feature of Paraguayan Spanish pronunciation which most vigorously resists a non-substrate analysis is the glottal stop frequently heard between words, particularly when the second word begins with a vowel. Two facts combine to suggest a legitimate substrate contribution, if not direct cause, for this pronunciation. The first is that among regional Spanish dialects of South America, this glottal constriction coincides almost exactly with Guaraní presence: Paraguay, extreme northeastern Argentina, and the eastern extremes of Bolivia. Guaraní inserts a similar glottal element, both in patrimonial Guaraní forms and in borrowings from Spanish. Strongly Guaraní-dominant bilinguals exhibit the glottalization to an even greater degree than Spanish-dominant speakers, further implicating Guaraní prosodic patterns. In peripheral areas such as eastern Bolivia, bilingualism with Guaraní was not prolonged, and is currently limited to a small indigenous population (Schuchard 1979). Glottal occlusions, while occurring in eastern Bolivian Spanish, are considerably less frequent than in areas where Guaraní continues to be spoken. In a context of extended bilingualism such as Paraguay, where children were raised by Guaraní-speaking mothers who spoke Spanish as a second language, such a global phonological constraint could feasibly be carried over to the evolving Paraguayan Spanish dialect.

If Spanish-Guaraní language contact was strong enough to implant a Guaraní prosodic trait in the regional Spanish dialect, we might wonder why more non-Spanish syntactic patterns are not found with comparable regularity. Granda (1979b, 1988), Meliá (1974), Welti (1979) and others have described Guaraní-influenced syntactic configurations, or simple results of imperfect learning of Spanish, but such patterns predominate only among Spanish-recessive bilinguals; educated Paraguayans use a syntax which is

indistinguishable from that of other Southern Cone nations. A reasonable explanation is not hard to find. In order for Guaraní-induced syntactic patterns to have penetrated Paraguayan Spanish, a Guaraní-induced Spanish interlanguage would have had to exist in colonial Paraguay. Such language would be used by indigenous subjects to Spanish colonists, who spoke little or no Guaraní and who maintained physical and social distance from the indigenous community. In Paraguay, however, bilingualism was the rule from the very outset, and code switching into Guaraní took the place of Guaraní-induced calques in Spanish. It is feasible to assume that at the beginning the proportion was heavily weighted in favour of Guaraní, with Spanish words introduced only to fill lexical gaps. It was during this stage that the earliest and most 'Guaraní-like' Spanish words were borrowed. In subsequent periods, when Spanish was spoken fluently by large groups of (urban) speakers, code switching into Guaraní assumed more stylistic and emotive functions. Glottalization, extended across both Spanish and Guaraní, underscored the bilingual contact situation.

Mexico

Although dozens of indigenous languages were spoken in colonial Mexico, the events leading to the Spanish conquest of Tenochtitlán and subsequent interaction with the well-organized and politically strong Aztecs gave a special prominence to Nahuatl. In the Yucatan, Maya was also a major language, although accorded little importance by the Spaniards. Throughout Mexico and Central America, Nahuatl was used by Spaniards as a lingua franca, even in some areas where Nahuatl had not previously been spoken. Spanish-Nahuatl linguistic contacts were intense and penetrating (cf. Heath 1972). Not only did Spanish religious personnel adopt Nahuatl as the language of evangelizing, but Spanish civilians and military also acquired some fluency in the language, as witnessed by the number of grammar books published during the colonial period. Indeed, the first books published in Mexico were written in Nahuatl. Whereas Spain never treated Nahuatl-speaking Native Americans as equals, the political strength of the former Aztec empire and the need to maintain cordial relations with its heirs resulted in a greater diffusion of the Nahuatl language among Spaniards. As in Paraguay, mixed-ethnic marriages, producing children raised by Nahuatl-speaking mothers, were instrumental in fostering a symbiotic relation between Spanish and Nahuatl. Nahuatl disappeared as an urban home language much faster in Mexico than Guaraní in Paraguay, since the demographic proportions and social barriers were different in each country. No trust-

worthy documentation of earlier stages of Hispano-Nahuatl bilingualism survive to document what were surely intermediate configurations of code-switching and language admixture, but the language of the *Güegüense* is probably representative. Nothing suggests the prior existence of a stable Nahuatl-induced interlanguage, which could have allowed extra-Hispanic grammatical patterns to coalesce. While there were always Nahuatl-speaking residents who spoke little Spanish, the Hispanization of the Nahuatl community soon created a dominant society in which Spanish was the first language. Within the urban zones where Mexican Spanish was formed, Nahuatl became the home language of an increasingly smaller population. The lack of a transitional interlanguage accounts for the nonexistence of Nahuatl syntactic structures in Mexican Spanish. What can still be found in Nahuatl-speaking areas is a transitory interlanguage, which is usually overcome after a single generation, and which may evolve in the lifetime of individual speakers (Hill 1987, Hill and Hill 1986, Siade 1974). Nahuatl speakers who acquire Spanish as a native language do not use such structures, which leave no traces on Mexican Spanish.

Few phonetic traits of Mexican Spanish lend themselves to theories of an indigenous substrate. Some have suggested a Nahuatl influence in loss of /k/, assibilation of final /r/ (Malmberg 1965: 124), intonational patterns, and reduction of unstressed vowels, but these claims are not substantiated by empirical data (cf. Lope Blanch 1967a). Most frequently associated with an indigenous transfer is the extraordinary resistance of syllable-final /s/ (cf. Malmberg 1965: 123-4, Henríquez Ureña 1938: 336, Alonso 1938: 336). Early investigators hypothesized that Nahuatl had no /s/, at least word-finally, but only an affricate /tʰ/. This sound replaced /s/ in indigenous pronunciation of Spanish, and when eventual deaf-frication occurred, the 'stronger' original articulation persisted in the form of a sibilant [s]. According to this viewpoint, the 'Andalusian' reduction of /s/ to [h] ran unchecked in regions where /s/ had not been previously reinforced to an affricate, thus explaining the prevalence of sibilant [s] in the Mexican highlands vs. loss of /s/ in the Caribbean. Canfield (1934), Lope Blanch (1967b) and others have demonstrated that Nahuatl did indeed contain a final /s/, which was equated with Spanish *c* and *z*, already reduced to [s] by the turn of the sixteenth century. The Castilian apical [ʃ] was equated with Nahuatl [ʃ], but Nahuatl /tʰ/ never consistently replaced Spanish /s/.

In the Mexican Yucatan, Mayan languages have prevailed over Spanish for a longer time period; cities and towns have been Spanish-speaking islands in the midst of a Mayan-speaking country-

side. Given that speakers of Maya are employed as domestic servants, labourers and vendors, almost no urban *yucatecos* lack contact with Mayan-influenced varieties of Spanish. The social caste system of the Yucatan is still in effect, so that upward spread of linguistic features is inhibited by the nearly total lack of upward socioeconomic mobility of the indigenous population. The linguistic traits associated with the Mayan substratum (glottalized consonants, glottal stops, and certain syntactic features) have remained in stasis, found among large numbers of indigenous subjects but not penetrating into the monolingual Spanish of urban dwellers. For the latter change to occur, a fundamental shift in the sociodemographics of Yucatan would have to take place.

The Andean highlands

The contemporary existence of Quechua- and Aymara-influenced interlanguages in the Andean region, and the unusual characteristics of the Andean Spanish dialect cluster, have resulted in numerous claims of indigenous influence in segmental and suprasegmental phonology and syntax. From extreme southern Colombia to north-eastern Chile and northwestern Argentina, 'Andean' Spanish exhibits a recurring cluster of phonetic traits, including unreduced and frequently voiced /s/ combined with unstressed vowel reduction, a groove fricative /r/, a sibilant syllable-final /r/, quasi-affricate pronunciation of the cluster /tr/, and retention of the phoneme /k/ as opposed to /y/, usually assigning some type of lateral articulation to the former. Among Quechua and Aymara speakers for whom Spanish is a weak second language, effective reduction of the Spanish five-vowel system to a three-vowel system also occurs, but no traces of such reduction are found in monolingual Andean Spanish dialects. A possible exception is the recurring tendency to pronounce the diphthong /ie/, as in *tierra*, as [i].

Contacts between Spanish and Quechua speakers, especially those belonging to the dominant Inca culture, parallel Hispano-Nahuatl contacts in Mexico. Spanish clerics immediately seized upon Quechua as a lingua franca for religious and political purposes, and while extending Quechua to areas where it was not indigenous, also created a pool of native Spanish speakers proficient in Quechua. From the earliest contact with Europeans, Quechua began to absorb Hispanisms. There is some indication that those Quechua dialects which currently possess the palatal lateral /k/ acquired it from contact with Spanish, rather than contributing to the retention of this phoneme in Andean Spanish. At the same time, high-ranking Incas or *mestizos* such as Garcilaso de la Vega obtained European education, and became proficient writers in

literary Spanish. In between the two poles, i.e. Spaniards who spoke Quechua (possibly with interference from Spanish), and Quechuas who were completely fluent in Spanish, were the indigenous masses, who at first had no contact with Spanish at all, and consequently no influence on its evolution in the Andean colonies. As Spanish recruitment of indigenous labour for mines and agriculture came into full swing, the inevitable interlanguage arose, always mediated by a layer of *mestizo* overseers, foremen, artisans, and the like. Unlike what happened in Paraguay, where there was never an attractive accumulation of easy wealth, the mineral riches of Peru, Bolivia and later Ecuador and Colombia attracted large numbers of Spaniards of all classes and professions, including stable family nuclei and single women. Hispano-indigenous marriages, while not uncommon, did not automatically produce 'Spanish' offspring and did not always receive the tacit acceptance found in less affluent areas. A more rigid caste system was maintained, creating fewer opportunities for upward penetration of indigenous-based structures into urban colonial Spanish.

At the interface of the Spanish-speaking elite and the indigenous underclasses in the Andean region was a *mestizo* population which was eventually to become numerically dominant in urban areas, and whose linguistic traits would gradually lose the stigma associated with the underprivileged. It is impossible to determine whether the sounds associated with /r/, /rr/, /ʎ/, etc. in Andean Spanish have been influenced by Quechua or Aymara, even when the same sounds are found in the latter languages. This is because the influence of Spanish pronunciation on Andean languages, including the incorporation of new phonemes (such as /e/, /o/ and perhaps /ʎ/), must also be reckoned with. The almost exact geographical coincidence between the cluster of 'Andean Spanish' phonetic traits and the area where Quechua or Aymara was spoken seems too great to be due to mere chance, but the facts of Hispano-indigenous cultural and linguistic contacts in the Andean zone do not easily explain such coincidences. It remains beyond dispute that in most of the region, extreme forms of consonantal modification and vowel reduction carry a sociolinguistic stigma, and are found more frequently among bilingual members of the indigenous community.

A syntactic epiphenomenon: clitic doubling

Syntactic transfer from indigenous languages to Spanish is usually confined to the non-native interlanguage of non-fluent bilinguals. In addition to the instability of morphological endings, the word order of the native language may be transferred, resulting in non-

Hispanic combinations, or Spanish verb forms such as the gerund or infinitive may be used in ungrammatical fashion, reflecting the behaviour of equivalent forms in the indigenous language. The resulting constructions are transparent carryovers from the speaker's native language. Other putative instances of indigenous syntactic influence are more resistant to a simple morpheme-by-morpheme analysis, causing sceptics to reject a substrate origin. Among the most interesting of the recurrent Latin American syntactic phenomena strongly correlated to an indigenous presence is 'clitic doubling' of inanimate direct object nouns, particularly by invariant *lo*. Examples of this usage typify the bilingual Spanish of Quechua and Aymara speakers throughout the Andes, and are also found in Nahuatl-influenced Spanish dialects of Mexico, and in bilingual Central American Spanish. In the Central American dialects and occasionally in Mexico, but not in Andean Spanish, pleonastic *lo* is also used in locative constructions and with some intransitive verbs. In none of the dialects does the use of *lo* in bilingual Spanish correspond in a one-to-one fashion with any single element in the indigenous language, much less with an object pronoun, and yet the fact that these uses of *lo* are exclusively found in bilingual contact zones encourages the search for a substratum influence.

In the case of clitic doubling with inanimate direct objects (*lo tengo el carro* 'I have the cart'), and invariant *lo* (e.g. *lo pongo la caja* 'I place the box'), a purely Hispanic solution is not readily apparent, and no parallels can be found in dialects lacking an indisputable indigenous substrate.⁵ In Puno, Peru, for example, the sociodemographics strongly favour the possibility of indigenous linguistic transfer to Spanish, since as much as 90% of the population speaks Quechua or Aymara. Benavente (1988) found that among university students in Puno, acceptance of clitic-doubled constructions occurred at levels of 70–80% and even higher, including non-agreeing *lo* as in *¿quién lo tiene la llave?* 'who has the key?', impossible in other Spanish dialects. Moreover, bilingual speakers accepted these combinations more readily than did monolingual Spanish speakers. Godenzzi (1988), also studying the Spanish of Puno, obtained comparable results. Clitic doubling was preferred among the lowest socioeconomic sectors (among which indigenous speakers are overrepresented), as were redundant possessive constructions. In Mexico, clitic doubling with *lo* is found only in the Spanish interlanguage of Nahuatl-speaking bilinguals (Hill 1987), and is unknown among monolingual Spanish speakers of the same regions.

A comparison of Spanish constructions involving doubled *lo* and

the equivalent combinations in Quechua and Nahuatl suggests possible modes of transfer, more subtle than a word-by-word translation. Two models of indigenous penetration will be briefly sketched, by way of illustration.

Nahuatl-influenced Spanish is currently found in some parts of Mexico, among Spanish-recessive bilinguals. Such usage has recently disappeared from El Salvador, and vestiges of clitic-doubling which may indicate a Nahuatl substrate are found in Honduras and Nicaragua. The following examples from El Salvador illustrate the range of syntactic possibilities exhibited by *lo*, where the item 'doubled' by the clitic is given in brackets:

lu alistás tus caites, te *lu* ponés tu sombrero viejo 'you tie up your sandals and put on your old hat.'
 {definite direct object}
 yo no *lu* tengo milpa 'I don't have a cornfield.' {indefinite direct object}
 No *lu* traigo nada qué dar 'I don't bring anything to give' {negative direct object}
 no *lu* sabemos quién es Esa Persona que esté en los cielos 'we don't know who the person in heaven is'
 {interrogative direct object}
 ya me *lo* voy a mi casa 'now I'm going home' {locative}
 dicen que *lo* nació en Belén 'They say that he was born in Bethlehem'
 {intransitive verb}
 yo *lo* heyy venido 'I have come' {intransitive verb}
 tan bonito que te *lo* sois 'you are so pretty' {intransitive verb}

Similar constructions are found in Nahuatl-speaking areas of Mexico (e.g. Hill 1987). Clitic doubling with inanimate and indefinite direct objects is frequent in Mexicano speech, as is use of *lo* with intransitive verbs:

Lo compramos la harina 'we buy the flour'
lo trae un chiquihuite 'he brings a basket'
 la mamá *lo* está mirando la novia 'the mother is looking at the bride'
 No *lo* saben hablar en castilla 'they don't know how to speak Spanish'
lo compra un medio kilo . . . 'he buys half a kilo'
 ¿A quién *los* quiso? 'Who did she love?'
lo ponen abajo los plátanos 'they put the bananas underneath'
 ya *lo* lleva la novia . . . 'now he takes the bride . . .'
 comida *lo* vamos a dar 'we are going to give food'

In Mexico, this interlanguage is unstable, and usually evolves even during the lifetime of individual speakers. Apparently the same occurred in El Salvador, but in rural regions the shift from

Nahuatl/Pipil or Lenca to Spanish occurred slowly, and indigenous-influenced syntactic structures at times became nativized, and persisted for several generations.⁶

Even the most cursory glance at the grammar of Nahuatl reveals that no one element corresponds to the 'non-Spanish' uses of *lo* as shown above (cf. Andrews 1975, Sullivan 1976). However, more subtle forms of interlanguage transfer suggest themselves. Nahuatl forms sentences with a SVO word order similar to Spanish, but Nahuatl transitive verbs take a direct object prefix (*qui* in the third person singular and *quin* in the third person plural), which is also combined with direct object nouns, even when questioned:

Ni- qui-tta in cihuatl
 1S 3S see the woman {Yo *lo* veo a la mujer}
Tle ti- qui-tta?
 What 2S 3S see = What do you see? {¿Qué *lo* ves?}

Here the correspondence between *qui(n)* and Spanish *lo* is even closer, since the corresponding Nahuatl element is also a clitic, albeit with different distributional characteristics. Like Spanish *lo*, *qui(n)* is invariable for gender. Moreover, the minimal differences between the singular and plural forms in Nahuatl might additionally prompt a single choice in Spanish.

Nahuatl- and Pipil-influenced Spanish, unlike Andean varieties, frequently uses invariant *lo* for intransitive verbs and locative constructions. Nearly all documented cases involve verbs in the preterite tense; *lo* accompanies few intransitive verbs in other tenses. In Nahuatl, a frequent morphological indicator of the preterite is the prefix *o-*, placed before the proclitic subject pronoun and the verb stem. This morpheme is invariable, combined with frequent stem changes depending upon the class of verb:

o- ni-coch
 PRET 1S sleep = 'I slept' (*lo dormí*)
o- O tlacat
 PRET {he/she} born = 'He/she was born' (*lo nació*)
o- ti-nen
 PRET 2S live = 'You lived' (*lo viviste*)

The preterite marker *o-* occupies the same relative position as Spanish clitic *lo* (assuming a null subject pronoun in normal Spanish usage), and moreover bears a phonetic similarity with *lo*. Given the relative paucity of Spanish clitics which could be appropriated in representation of Nahuatl clitics, *lo* appears to have been pressed into duty with several distinct functions, corresponding to

separate particles in Nahuatl. Quechua does not have a single particle for either intransitive or preterite corresponding in both position and consistency, and use of Spanish invariant *lo* is not normally found in Andean Spanish in combination with intransitive verbs.

Quechua-influenced Spanish exhibits a more restricted range of clitic doubling, at the least fluent levels involving the invariable element *lo*. Clitic doubling occurs only with direct objects; *lo* is never combined with intransitive verbs, in locative constructions, or in other combinations where no direct object is involved. Unlike Nahuatl, where a direct object marker is attached to the verb, in Quechua it is the direct object noun itself which is inflected (cf. Catta 1985, Cole 1985, Cusihamán 1976, Gálvez Astorayme 1990, Lastra 1968). Quechua marks direct object nouns with the suffix *-ta* (or *-man* if following a verb of motion). This suffix is invariable, cliticizes to all direct object nouns whether definite or indefinite, and even attaches to questions and relative clauses, as shown by the following (Peruvian) examples (an approximation in 'Andean' Spanish is given in parentheses):

T'ika -ta kuchu-ni

Flower-ACC cut 1S = 'I cut the flower' (*lo corto la flor*)

ima- ta kuchi-ni?

What-ACC cut 1S = 'What do I cut?' (*¿qué lo corto?*)

Challwa-ta apa -nki

Fish -ACC carry 2S (FUT) = 'You will carry fish' (*lo llevarás pescado*)

Asta -ni unu -ta

Carry 1S water-ACC = 'I carry water' (*lo acarreo agua*)

The accusative marker *-ta* does not occupy the identical syntactic position as the invariable *lo* of the corresponding Andean Spanish sentences, which would be roughly as indicated above. However, it would be easy for a speaker of Spanish interlanguage to interpret the clitic *lo*, statistically the most frequent, as some sort of transitivity marker comparable to Quechua *-ta*. Although in Quechua this element is always attached to the direct object noun, in a canonical Quechua SOV transitive sentence where the direct object immediately precedes the verb, *-ta* coincidentally comes just before the verb, i.e. in the identical position to Spanish proclitic *lo*. In Quechua, the case marker *-ta* has other functions, including adverbial and locative uses. It is also used to signal direct objects in certain double-object constructions involving verbs of helping and teaching. In nearly all instances, however, *-ta* does not appear in immediate preverbal position, nor in any other single canonical position that might cause *-ta* to be calqued by an object clitic in Andean

Spanish. Postnominal *-ta* may also be followed by other enclitic particles in non-dative constructions, in effect being 'buried' among the clitics and not corresponding in any clear way with a Spanish element. Only in the case of accusative *-ta* is the linear order convergent enough with Spanish CLITIC + VERB combinations to make transfer feasible. It is not irrelevant that Spanish *lo* itself marks an accusative relationship, albeit not in the fashion of Quechua *-ta*. A speaker of the developing indigenous interlanguage, encountering preverbal *lo* only in clearly transitive sentences (including the possibility of clitic doubling with human DOS, as in the Southern Cone), would be all the more likely to overgeneralize the need for *lo* to appear in all transitive clauses. Since the quintessential Quechua-influenced interlanguage maintains an O-V word order, Spanish *lo* would at first be misanalysed as a case marker attached to the noun, in a direct calque of Quechua *-ta*:

el poncho-lo tengo

As interlanguage speakers develop greater fluency in Spanish, word order gravitates to the more usual O-V for non-clitic DOS. It is at this stage that *lo*, now recognized as an object clitic, remains behind in proclitic position, yielding the stable Andean Spanish clitic-doubled pattern. This pattern of events is admittedly speculative, but it does correlate well with observations on the development of Spanish proficiency among Quechua speakers (cf. also Muysken 1984).

The consistency of clitic doubling and use of invariant *lo* in regional varieties of Spanish influenced by widely separated and unrelated indigenous languages does not have a unique origin, whatever the contemporary manifestations of such clitics. The clitics in question are identical with normal Spanish direct object clitics, albeit at times exhibiting apparent loss of agreement. In addition, Spanish dialects for which no indigenous syntactic patterns can be postulated, e.g. in the Southern Cone, allow wider patterns of 'clitic doubling' of direct objects than dialects of Spain or elsewhere in Latin America. For example, personal definite direct objects can and usually are doubled by the corresponding clitic: *Lo conozco a Juan* 'I know John'. Contemporary syntactic analyses of the extensive clitic doubling in Andean Spanish have usually departed from the notion that the Andean clitics, including invariant *lo*, occupy the same structural position and carry out the same function as in other varieties of Spanish (e.g. Barrenechea and Orecchia 1977, Luján 1987, Suñer 1988). The few theoretical studies of Nahuatl-influenced structures in Mexican interlanguage

Spanish (e.g. Hill 1987) have postulated a different syntactic structure for direct object nouns, but regard invariant *lo* as carrying out the functions of a normal Spanish direct object clitic. The theoretical arguments entail the conditions under which a direct object noun and its respective clitic are allowed to co-occur in the same clause. It is possible that Spanish speakers in Mexico or the Andean region who have natively acquired clitic doubling with invariant *lo* are treating this element on a par with object clitics in other Spanish dialects, but for interlanguage speakers this is doubtful. Moreover, the range of environments permitted by invariant *lo* in these indigenous-influenced dialects, including questions and with indefinite direct objects, departs so radically from usual Spanish patterns to make a simple 'parameter resetting' interpretation appear unlikely. Closer examination of the use of *lo* in Andean and Nahuatl-influenced Spanish shows differences as well as similarities, and the differences highlight the fact that under situations of bilingual contact, both interlanguages have appropriated a Spanish clitic and its accompanying position vis-à-vis the Spanish verb, but for different reasons in each case. The use of invariant *lo* in both bilingual contact situations can be considered as an intrusion of the indigenous substrate in a very real sense, but not in a transparent word-by-word fashion. The wide range of syntactic and morphological functions represented by Spanish *lo*, including direct object clitic, neuter article, component of relative pronouns, etc., creates the potential for this same item to be used as a portmanteau particle in the interlanguage. Originally, this element was interpreted by indigenous speakers as a calque of an invariant morpheme in their respective languages, which fortuitously occupied the same position in the linear string as Spanish preverbal *lo*, was monosyllabic, and sometimes bore a phonetic resemblance to *lo*. As these speakers became more fluent in Spanish, *lo* was expanded to include the entire range of Spanish direct object clitics, particularly when doubling a direct object noun, but except for Spanish-dominant bilinguals, it is unlikely that these clitics occupy either of the canonical argument positions. Additional fluency in Spanish brought further expansion of *lo* in the interlanguage, with the adoption of such Spanish-like patterns as enclitic adjunction to infinitives, clitic 'climbing' with restructuring verbs (e.g. *quiero hacerlo* → *lo quiero hacer* 'I want to do it'), etc. The use of double clitics sometimes found in Andean Spanish (e.g. *lo quiero hacerlo*) provides indirect proof that a non-Spanish syntactic substratum is at work: *lo* is still carried over as a representation of the Quechua accusative marker, but is optionally attached to both possible positions in the corresponding Spanish sentence. In the case of *lo*

combined with intransitive or existential verbs in Nahuatl-influenced Spanish, a Spanish function is never assumed, and this element cannot be analysed as a Spanish syntactic pattern.

The case of clitic doubling in indigenous interlanguages illustrates that substrate influence need not always take the form of semantically and syntactically transparent borrowings, but may involve transfer at a more abstract level. Since no one-to-one correspondence between Spanish and the indigenous constructions can be postulated, the case for substrate influence will always be circumstantial, bolstered as much by the lack of comparable constructions in Spanish dialects without a demonstrable indigenous substratum as by positive correspondences with a given substrate language.

Summary of necessary conditions

Mere geographical proximity of Spanish and Native American languages is not sufficient to postulate substratal influences on regional Spanish dialects, nor is a demographic predominance of indigenous populations. Lexical borrowing can occur under the most superficial contact conditions, but transfer of phonological or syntactic patterns requires a special mix of demographic, sociolinguistic and historical conditions. Two basic mechanisms allow for indigenous phonological or syntactic influences on regional Spanish dialects. The first is the mixed-ethnic bilingual household, with a European Spanish-speaking father and an indigenous mother. In such a household, if both parents become bilingual, code-switching rather than structural interference will dominate the linguistic environment, and children will learn fluent and minimally modified versions of each language. Transfer from the indigenous language to Spanish will be limited to intonation, rhythm and possibly some segmental traits. Paraguay comes closest to embodying this configuration. In bilingual households where children spend most time with primary care-givers who speak only indigenous languages and/or nonfluent Spanish, acquisition of Spanish by children may not coincide with the European standard. The other method of transfer is the gradual language shift of a predominantly indigenous population, resulting in the stabilization and nativization of a Spanish interlanguage. Whether or not such nativized interlanguage becomes accepted as a regional or national standard depends upon sociopolitical considerations. It is possible for the two to coexist for long periods of time without interlanguage features entering prestige norms. This has occurred, for example, in much of Bolivia, Ecuador, the Yucatan, and in the Amazon Basin. With the gradual upward social mobility of indigenous and mestizo groups, the door

is opened for upward transfer of certain features into regional norms.

Notes

1. The question of the language and origins of the *Güegüense* are studied by Brinton (1883), in the first critical edition of the work, by Elliot (1884), Henríquez Ureña (1938: 325-7), Mántica (1989), Arellano (1984), and many others. Elliot (1884) and Arellano (1984) feel that the *Güegüense* is the work of two authors, at least one of whom was a native Spanish speaker.
2. Geoffroy Rivas (1978: 17) also claims Nahuatl influence for Spanish *yeísmo* (neutralization of /y/ and /ɣ/) and of epenthetic /y/: 'la ll se cambió por una y muy marcada, que no sólo substituyó a aquel fonema sino que se introdujo donde no existe. No sólo decimos cabayo, estreya, etc., sino que la pronunciamos separando el diptongo ia y decimos *diya*, *habiya*, *teniya*, etc.' However, loss of the palatal lateral phoneme has occurred throughout much of Spain and Latin America, and dialect levelling resulted in extensive neutralization of /ɣ/ and /y/ in Spanish America. Neither Pipil nor Lenca contain a palatal lateral phoneme, and nothing suggests that such a phoneme existed in previous centuries. Thus, incipient *yeísmo* in the Spanish arriving in Central America may have been reinforced through contact with bilingual speakers whose Spanish continued to be influenced by indigenous languages. To claim indigenous influences as the sole cause behind neutralization of /ɣ/ and /y/ in El Salvador is to completely ignore the wider comparative perspective, which situates this sound change in the context of the evolution of Peninsular Spanish during the 16th and 17th centuries. In Pipil, the palatal lateral is absent, while there is a palatal fricative /y/. This element occurs freely before nonfront vowels (/a/ and /u/), but does not occur before the front vowel /i/-/e/. On the other hand, Pipil does have diphthongs and hiatus combinations whose first element is [j]. Available descriptions of Salvadorian Pipil give no hint of epenthetic intervocalic [y], from which we are led to conclude that the epenthetic sound in modern Salvadorian Spanish cannot be a direct transfer from Pipil. Loss of /y/ in contact with front vowels, however, could have been nudged to completion by the lack of corresponding combinations in Pipil. Lenca, like Pipil, contains /y/ and lacks a palatal lateral. It freely permits intervocalic /y/ in contact with nonfront vowels, while excluding intervocalic /y/ in contact with front vowels; some instances of word-initial /y/ before front vowels are found. Lenca also contains instances of diphthongs and hiatus combinations involving /i/, with no indication of epenthetic [y] (Mendoza 1959). Geoffroy Rivas (1978: 17) offers yet another broad generalization on possible Nahuatl influence on Salvadorian Spanish pronunciation:

'en el aspecto morfológico, los nahuas trasladaron al español los patrones, formas y procedimientos propios del polisintetismo. Unieron dos o más palabras, suprimiendo fonemas, para formar nuevas palabras, surgiendo así en el habla mestiza formas como *vapué* (vaya pues), *puesí* (pues sí), *vuá* (voy a) . . . *idiay* (y de ahí), *aloshte* (ya lo oíste), *onde* (donde) . . . *enque* (aunque), *ende* (desde), *endenantes* (desde antes) . . . En otros casos, nos conformamos con suprimir fonemas: *pué* (pues), *ay* (ahí), *ma* (toma), *va* (vaya), *ante* (delante), *bajo* (debajo), *tas* (estás).' (as for morphology, the Nahuatl translated their polysynthetic forms and patterns to Spanish. By joining two or more words together, while eliminating phonemes, to form new words, the mestizo speech developed forms like *vapué* (vaya pues), *puesí* (pues sí), *vuá* (voy a) . . . *idiay* (y de ahí), *aloshte* (ya lo oíste), *onde* (donde) . . . *enque* (aunque), *ende* (desde), *endenantes* (desde antes) . . . in other cases, we simply eliminate phonemes: *pué* (pues), *ay* (ahí), *ma* (toma), *va* (vaya), *ante* (delante), *bajo* (debajo), *tas* (estás).)

The reader familiar with Spanish of other regions will immediately notice that most if not all of these examples are widely attested elsewhere, representing either the natural fusion of words in connected speech (*puesí*, *vua*), results of popular morphology (*va*), frequent loss of initial or final syllables (*ta*), or archaic but authentic Spanish carryovers from earlier centuries (*onde*, *endenantes*, *enque*, etc.). None of the examples is qualitatively different than connected speech found in other Spanish dialects, and there is no justification for positing a substrate influence for this admixture of popular elements.

3. For example, Cassano (1972a) challenges earlier descriptions which claimed that /t/ and /d/ are usually alveolar in Paraguayan Spanish. Granda (1980, 1982a) disputes the existence of a uniformly affricate /y/ throughout Paraguay.
4. Granda (1979) has pointed to a demographic predominance of settlers from northern Spain, where /ɣ/ is still viable, as another contributing factor.
5. Not all agree with this line of reasoning, however. For example, Pozzi-Escot (1972) has suggested that clitic-doubled direct objects in Andean Spanish may be an archaism, giving some examples from earlier periods of Spanish. Lozano (1975) believes that analogy with the normal clitic-doubling of indirect objects in Spanish (e.g. *le di el dinero a Juan* 'I gave the money to John') is at work, rather than Quechua or Aymara influence.
6. Also found in Mesoamerican interlanguage is the combination of article/demonstrative and possessive (*esa tus naguas*, *estos mis verbos*, *un tu desimulo*, *este tu munguieca juino*, etc.). Such configurations were not infrequent in old Spanish, and continue to exist in Portuguese. However, they are not frequently found in Latin American Spanish except for Guatemala and El Salvador. (Martin 1978, 1985) attempts to trace this construction in Guatemalan Spanish to Mayan influence, but the interlanguage data from Pipil and Lenca speakers suggest

broader areal characteristics. The noteworthy absence of similar constructions in most of Mexico in turn may indicate regional variation of Nahuatl dialects.

Chapter 4

The African connection

Introduction

Latin American Spanish embodies linguistic and cultural contributions from four continents. In addition to the patrimonial European heritage and the results of contact with indigenous populations in the two American continents, Spanish came into contact with African languages, spoken by the tens of thousands of Africans who formed the slave labour force of the developing colonies. During the Spanish colonial period, it is estimated that more than 1.5 million African slaves were imported into Spanish America (Curtin 1969), and in many colonies the African population outnumbered residents of European descent for nearly the entire time. The possible African contributions to Latin American Spanish are closely bound up with the tragic history of slavery, with racism and marginality, and with emerging nations' search for self-identity, often postulated on a European-American axis which excludes Africa altogether. During most of the history of Latin America, Africans and their descendants have occupied the lowest rungs of society, ranging from slaves to peons and subsistence-level farmers and fishermen. Their lives and activities were not documented, except to criticize or when they had run afoul of law or tradition, while few Africans were equipped to write their own history. Postcolonial trends towards 'whitening', both demographically and through historical revisionism, further impede assessing the full African linguistic impact in Latin America. Without this key information, the reconstruction of Spanish in the Americas is incomplete.

The history of Africans in Latin America begins with the first European voyages of exploration, some of which carried free African sailors. The African presence in the Iberian Peninsula had