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Spanish

Spanish is spoken today by 332 million people in Latin America, Europe and Africa. This number does not include 23 million speakers in 22 countries where the language is not official\(^1\). In geographical distribution Spanish is the fourth language after English, French and Russian.\(^2\) Varieties of Spanish are counted by dozens, perhaps even hundreds according to some authors (cf. Resnick 1975)\(^3\) but intelligibility among them remains to a great extent.

In extension and number of speakers the Americas are the largest continent of those in which Spanish is spoken as a first language.\(^4\) Peninsular Spanish was brought to the continent by European colonizers and developed there peculiar characteristics as a result of its internal evolution and its century-long contact with indigenous languages.

5.1. **Spanish in the Americas: *e pluribus unum***

Following Lapesa (1992: 269) and others (Alba 1992; Moreno de Alba 2004) I use here the expression “Spanish in the Americas” instead of “American Spanish”.\(^5\) The variation of Spanish in the Americas prevents us from qualifying it as a monolithic, indivisible entity. Notwithstanding this, all American dialects remain mutually intelligible and show in essence the same typological characteristics. This situation is underlined by Lapesa when referring to the issue of variation versus unity in Spanish: “at all levels of the language we do not find complete unity, but at all levels

---


\(^2\) According to Otero (1999) Spanish is spoken over 11,990,000 km\(^2\) equivalent to 7.2% of the world area.

\(^3\) For the Americas, Rona gives a number of 23 different dialectal varieties of Spanish (Rona 1964: 215-226). Resnick (1975) puts forward a classification along phonological parameters, according to which the number of dialects of Spanish in the continent would be as many as 276, as noticed by Canfield (1978: 170).

\(^4\) This distinction is relevant in my view if we consider that the number of people learning Spanish as a second language is estimated around twenty million plus another million who speak Spanish as a lingua franca in interethnic communication. Cf. Otero 1999.

\(^5\) “American Spanish” is the standard term in English as opposed to “Peninsular Spanish”. In Spanish, the distinction proposed here is accomplished by the use of prepositions *de* and *en*. The term *español de América* assumes an indivisible entity that was carried to the Americas and remains essentially undifferentiated. The term *español en América*, on the contrary, implies the particularities of the language as spoken in the continent and does not conceive Spanish as an indivisible unity across national boundaries.
we do find a common ground which continues to be much stronger than any particularities” (Lapesa 1966: 307; my translation).

Authors have characterized “Spanish” as a complex diasystem composed of a number of Spanish languages along diachronic, diatopic and diastatic parameters (Rona 1969; Alba 1992; Montes de Alba 2004). For Bartoš (1971: 14ff) Spanish varieties in the Americas should be considered national languages enclosed in the boundaries of nation-states. According to this view, it is just a matter of qualifying the term “Spanish” with the patronyms of each country in order to obtain such aggregates as Mexican Spanish, Paraguayan Spanish and the like. This classification of Spanish dialects is a common practice among specialists and non-specialists. Still, evidence demonstrates that national boundaries do not necessarily match linguistic ones. Border varieties illustrate this situation clearly. The Spanish of Chiapas (southern Mexico) and the Spanish of northern Guatemalan qualify as one single dialect on account of phonetic and lexical commonalities based on Mayan influence. The Spanish of Pasto (southern Colombia) and the Spanish of Tulcan (northern Ecuador) represent one single dialect in similar terms. Both cases show that cover terms such as ‘Mexican Spanish’ or ‘Ecuadorian Spanish’ are useful for general purposes but requires further specification for a more accurate description, especially of those countries that are less homogeneous in linguistic terms. Such specification implies, among other things, dividing line between highland and lowland varieties along phonetic, morphosyntactic and lexical parameters. In fact the highland-lowland distinction is Hispanic America is the results of different colonization patterns.

This chapter does not endorse a diasystemic view of Spanish and considers that cross-dialectal unity prevails all over Hispanic America. Accordingly, the term “Spanish” is used in a broader sense to refer to all dialects and sociolects spoken in the areas of study. Terms such as “Spanish in México” or “Spanish in Ecuador” are used instead of their counterparts “Mexican Spanish” or “Ecuadorian Spanish” so as to leave the door open to dialectal considerations when these help to explain the findings of this investigation.

Hispanicization through colonial expansion is described in sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. Spanish dialectal variation in the Americas and Amerindian influence are discussed in sections 5.1.3 and 5.1.4. Further sections focus on the Spanish dialects of the areas under study, including Highland Ecuador (section 5.2), Paraguay

---

6 Notice that a diasystemic view is prevalent among students of Quechua as well. However, I consider this view to be suitable for the description of linguistic variation in this case, because of the marked fragmentation and divergence of Quechua varieties.

7 For Anderson (1991) the linguistic commonality in the former Spanish colonies laid the foundations for the Independence movement through the dissemination of revolutionary ideas in print form (pamphlets, diaries, books, etc) which would have been impossible, according to Anderson, if dialectal variation had been too large.
(section 5.3) and Highland Mexico (section 5.4). The typological features of Spanish which are crucial for the analysis of loanwords are described in section 5.5.

5.1.1. Hispanicization and diglossia

At the end of the twentieth century Spanish native speakers in the Americas were 294 million people, unevenly distributed in twenty different countries (Otero 1999). The great majority of these countries were traditional Spanish-speaking areas because of their former circumscription in the Spanish Empire for over three hundred years. The United States of America became an important Spanish-speaking area since the second half of the twentieth century as a result of migration from Hispanic American countries. Spanish in Latin America is official in administration and education in nineteen countries and co-official with another language (Guaraní) in one country (Paraguay). While most of these countries have a larger numbers of Amerindian speakers, Spanish is dominant in all of them and co-exists with indigenous languages in a diglossic distribution (cf. section 2.3.1).

The vitality of Spanish in the Americas is strengthened by its official status and the ongoing Hispanicization of native peoples through formal schooling, media and urban migration. The Hispanicization of native peoples began from the early years of colonization and went hand in hand with evangelization. The process speeded up after the wars of Independence and the emergence of the nation states in the early nineteenth century. As part of their goals of national unity, the new republics sought to homogenize their citizens by reducing ethnic and linguistic differences to the minimum (Anderson 1991; Radcliff and Westwood 1999). Language policies were implemented by all administrations, regardless of their conservative or liberal affiliation, in order that non-Spanish speakers learned Spanish as a means of communication with the mainstream society while abandoning their native

---

8 The Spanish-speaking population in the United States was around 29 million by 1997, which represented 11% of the total population (Morales 1999). This number is increasing rapidly as a result of demographic growth and ongoing migration flows. Official estimates give 13.8% of Spanish-speaking population in the United States for 2010 (Silva Corvalán 2000). These numbers exceed by far the size of the Spanish-speaking population in a dozen of Hispanic American countries. Although the vitality of Spanish in the United States is strong enough for it to be the second language in the country, it is clearly losing ground to English. In general, the sociolinguistic status of Spanish with respect to the English in the United States remains diglossic, even in the states with large numbers of Spanish speakers (cf. Silva Corvalán 2000).

9 It is important to stress the national character of bilingualism in Paraguay, because in several countries Spanish is official along with other Amerindian languages only in their respective areas of influence. For example, the 1998 Ecuadorian Constitution establishes that Spanish is the only official language of the country while it is co-official with indigenous languages in their respective areas. Although co-official status encourages the use of native languages in education and other local affairs, it is rather restrictive and does not affect the diglossic situation of the indigenous languages in the Americas.
languages or restricting their use to domestic spaces. Linguistic standardization became a primary goal for policy-makers in the nineteenth century and remains a major concern in today’s language policies in Latin America (Gonzalez Stefan 2000). This is clearly exemplified by the design of most bilingual education programs in Latin America. As evidenced by the increasing Hispanicization of native populations, these programs become, at best, instruments to facilitate the learning of Spanish in early stages of schooling. At present, Indian movements all over the continent are claiming the linguistic rights of native peoples. Still, the dominant position of Spanish vis-à-vis Amerindian languages remains largely intact. Ironically, the only difference from the old establishment is that Spanish becomes the mother tongue of an increasingly large number of indigenous people whose ethnolinguistic identity is dissolved on the way.

5.1.2. Colonial expansion, dialectal leveling and Andalusian influence

Spanish entered the Americas for the first time in 1492 with Columbus and his crew. But the presence of Spanish after the first arrival was to be ephemeral because Taíno Indians murdered all soldiers Columbus left at Hispaniola. It is only after Columbus’ next voyages (1493 through 1497) and the first large migration of peninsular immigrants to the West Indies (ca. 1500) that a considerable number of Spanish colonizers came to settle in the Americas on a permanent basis. From the West Indies the colonization of the continent proceeded to the West (Mexico) and the Southwest (Central America) almost simultaneously. Arias Dávila founded Panama City in 1519 and two years later the Aztec Empire was defeated. The foundation of Cartagena de Indias took place in 1533. Quito, Lima, Bogotá and other major cities along the Andes were founded immediately afterwards. Venezuela was colonized in 1547, nine years after the foundation of Asunción in present Paraguay. The foundation of large urban center in Uruguay, Argentina and Chile took place only in the second half of the sixteenth century because the colonization of the southernmost territories was a long and expensive enterprise. In all, the colonization of the continent took over two centuries, from the first voyage of Columbus to the conquest of the last Araucanian stronghold in southern Chile. Of course, this does not mean that every corner of the continent was eventually settled. In fact, several areas in the Amazon basin remained unexplored today.

Because the colonization of the Americas was not uniform in time and space, the Spanish language that arrived at the continent was not uniform either. This fact explains the dialectal variation existing nowadays. According to Moreno de Alba,

“Es innegable, por tanto, que el español llevado a tierras americanas por los conquistadores y colonizadores no fue exactamente el mismo para las Antillas (fines del siglo XV) que
para el cono sur (fines del XVI y todo el XVII) En más de un siglo, la lengua cambia. Puede pensarse incluso que algunas peculiaridades lingüísticas de las diversas regiones hispanoamericanas tengan su explicación, entre otros factores, en la fecha del inicio de su colonización” [It is indisputable that the Spanish language taken to the Americas by conquerors and missionaries was not the same for the Antilles (in the end of the fourteenth century) as for the southern areas (in the end of the sixteenth century and throughout the seventeenth century). Over a century the language changed. We may even think that some linguistic particularities of the Hispanic American areas may be explained, among other factors, by the time their respective colonization began] (Moreno de Alba 2004: 13; my translation).

In the same year Columbus arrived at the Antilles, the Catholic Kingdom of Castilla expelled the Arabs from their last stronghold in Granada and Antonio de Nebrija published the first Spanish grammar. From 1492 onwards a series of changes in the language took place uninterruptedly, with important consequences for the final configuration of the varieties spoken first in the Peninsula and later in the Americas. According to Alonso (1962: 85-102), these changes were initiated as early as the fourteenth century but took shape only in the sixteenth century, that is, during the first century of Spanish colonization. The changes that molded Spanish to its present shape were mainly phonological. One of them was the merge of the voiced and voiceless palatal fricatives /ʃ/ and /ç/ in the voiceless palatal fricative, by virtue of which [muʃer] ‘woman’ became [muçer]. 10 Another change was the merge of the bilabial fricative /β/ and the bilabial stop /b/ in one voiced bilabial phoneme. Changes of morphological nature took place along with phonological ones: e.g. the replacement of verbal inflectional forms of second person plural (-ades, -edes, -ides) with shorter forms (-áis, -éis –ís). Simultaneously, the expansion of Castilian Spanish in areas of the Peninsula where other languages such as Basque and Arabic were spoken, as a result of the political predominance of the Castilian Kingdom, encouraged the entry of numberless lexical borrowings. All these changes made the linguistic landscape of the Spanish Peninsula by the middle of the sixteenth century one of effervescent transformation.

If the structural changes in sixteenth-century Peninsular Spanish passed to the Spanish colonies overseas, where did Spanish in the Americas get those features which make it different from peninsular varieties, and especially from Castilian Spanish? Why did Spanish in the Americas not follow the same path of Castilian

10 Later in the seventeenth century a voiceless velar fricative /x/ replaced the voiceless alveolar fricative, so that [muçer] finally became [muxer] as in present-day Spanish. I am indebted to Wolf Dietrich for calling my attention to the consecutive order of these changes.
Spanish and produce one homogeneous language instead of a great number of dialects? An answer to this question is possible only if sociohistorical causes and linguistic factors are considered side by side.

Assuming that waves of colonists from the Peninsula to the Americas were uninterrupted for over three hundred years, there is no reason for Spanish in the Americas to have become different from Peninsular Spanish. But this differentiation indeed occurred as a result of nonlinguistic and linguistic causes. To begin with, Spanish colonists came from different parts of the Peninsula and spoke different dialects of Spanish. Spanish historians have identified eight dialects spoken in the Peninsula by the turn of the sixteenth century, but we cannot be absolutely sure of their number (Catalan 1989). Some dialects were more widespread and politically dominant than others (e.g., Castilian Spanish). In certain cases Spanish dialects were spoken along with other languages such as Basque. In sum, no unified Peninsular Spanish existed at the time of the American colonization, just like no Peninsular Spanish exists today. The Spanish brought to the Americas was heterogeneous not only from a diachronic perspective but, most crucially, from a diatopic perspective, that is, from the point of view of the different dialects brought to the Americas by Peninsular colonists. For several scholars, notably Alonso (1967), the early convergence of dialects in the Americas, particularly in the Antilles, laid the foundation for Spanish in the Americas. This was accomplished through a process of leveling by which the dialects represented in the American speech community gradually lost their differences. The basis of Spanish in the Americas would be therefore a sort of average of the early peninsular dialects. The concept of dialect leveling is close to the notion of koinéization. De Granda characterizes the first stage of Spanish in the Americas as one of koinéization, in which “through a series of linguistic accommodations the initial heterogeneity of languages converges at a final stage that may be called the Spanish of America” (De Granda 1994: 26; my translation). According to Danesi (1977), koinéization explains certain characteristics of American Spanish, such as *seseo* (the alveolar simplification of the phonological alveolar-dental distinction as occurs in Castilian and other Spanish dialects):

“Leaving aside sociological factors, there is a linguistic explanation for the phenomenon of *seseo* in America. What appears to have occurred, in our opinion, is that seseante speech was adopted by colonists from all parts of the Peninsula as a result of phonological systems in contact; that is, the opposition /θ – s/ soon came to have a low functional load in areas of mixed speech and thus became less resistant to merger: /θ – s/ = low yield → /s/” (Danesi 1977: 1992-3).
While the explanation is convincing, Danesi assumes wrongly that the contact of different phonological systems is a purely linguistic factor. Quite the opposite, the contact stems from a sociological motivation: the coexistence of speakers from different speech communities in the same geographical and social space (cf. section 2.2). The question is less why the merger yielded /s/ and not /θ/ rather than how it took place. The explanation is nonlinguistic and lies on the demographical disparity in the leveling process.

Demographic motivations played a decisive in the configuration of Spanish in the Americas. It is a well-known fact that speakers from different parts of Spain were not evenly represented in the first waves of colonization. From the analysis of historical documents linguists have established that the contribution of Andalusian dialects was by far the most important, especially in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. From the analysis of a large corpus of demographic data corresponding to twenty percent of the total population that migrated to the Americas during the so-called Antillean period (1492-1519) Boyd-Bowman concludes that:

“En la época primitiva o antillana, el grupo más numeroso en cada año, y en todas las expediciones, fueron con mucho los andaluces, de los cuales más de 78% procedían de las dos provincias de Sevilla (1259-58%) y Huelva (439-20%). […] de cada tres colonizadores, por lo menos uno era andaluz; de cada cinco, uno era oriundo de la provincia de Sevilla; de cada seis, uno se llamaba vecino o natural de la ciudad del mismo nombre” [During the Antillian stage the largest group in the expeditions was by far that of Andalusians. Of this group over 78% came from the two provinces of Seville (1259-58%) and Huelva (439-20%) […] of every three colonists, at least one was Andalusian; of every five, one had been born in the province of Seville; of every six, one was inhabitant of Seville or had been born there.” (Boyd-Bowman 1964: ix; my translation).

On the basis of these figures scholars have proposed an Andalusian origin to explain several characteristics of American Spanish varieties, including the aforementioned seseo. The Andalusian hypothesis became widely accepted over the years, but disagreement persists now about the time span and the scope of the Andalusian influence. The major presence of Andalusian speakers in the Americas is documented for the first years of colonization but not for the entire sixteenth century. Moreover, there is no systematic study of the demographic composition for periods later than 1520, which prevents us from making any conclusive statements. It is certain that Andalusian dialects influence Spanish in the Americas through the alveolar simplification of /θ/ and /θ/, but several other phonological and phonetic characteristics of Andalusian dialects (e.g. the aspiration of /s/ in coda position, the merger of /l/ and /r/, the weakening of voiced fricatives in intervocalic
environments, etc.) are not widespread across the continental but restricted mainly to
coastal regions including the Antilles, the Mexican coast, Panama, and the littoral
regions of Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru and Chile. Other regions such as the
Mexican Plateau, the Andean Highlands from Venezuela through Chile, and
Paraguay, do not show those features. Toscano (1953) classifies Ecuadorian Spanish
spoken in two clearly identifiable dialects: the coastal variety with a number of
Andalusian traits and the highland variety with few or none of them. Candau (1987:
634), for example, did not find Andalusian features in the Spanish of the southern
highlands of Ecuador.

The accessibility of lowland cities was an influencing factor in this case. Linguistic historians consider that speech innovations brought from Spain through
Andalusia and Canarias found rich soil in coastal cities as a result of their permanent
contact with the metropolis. On the other hand, the language spoken in plateaus and
highlands preserved old Castilian features, many of which are archaic from the point
of view of modern Spanish. This polarity is attested in several countries: Veracruz
(port city) and Mexico City (highland capital); Cartagena (port city) and Bogotá
(highland capital); Guayaquil (port city) and Quito (highland capital); Lima
(lowland capital) and Cuzco (highland city). Interestingly, most administrative
centers of the Spanish Crown were not located on coastal areas but in the interior,
except for Lima, capital of the Viceroyalty of Peru, and Buenos Aires, seat of the
Captainship of Rio de la Plata. The obvious question is, therefore, why non-coastal
centers including the capital of the Viceroyalty of New Spain and several capitals of
Audiencia were not influenced by Andalusian dialects considering their position as
centers of administration and culture. De Granda (1991) maintains that Andalusian
features spread across the Empire with different intensity during the sixteenth
century; some became deeply rooted in specific areas while others disappeared. The
reasons are both sociopolitical and demographic. On the one hand, for Andalusian
features to prevail, an important input of Andalusian speakers was required on a
permanent basis, a condition that could be met only in coastal cities. On the other
hand, it is likely that the dominant dialect in most administrative centers was not
Andalusian but Castilian, since most officials of the Crown came from this area, in
particular from Toledo and Madrid.

A major sociolinguistic motivation to distinguish between lowland and highland
dialects was the Pre-Columbian influence on Spanish language and culture, notably
the Aztec in Central America and the Inca in the Andes, both of which had their
areas of influence in the highlands. According to Rosenblat the strong articulation of
consonants in highland varieties of Spanish go against the internal development of
the language and should be explained by an external force, which, in his view,
cannot be other than the influence of indigenous languages such as Nahuatl in
Central America and Quechua in the Andes (Rosenblat 1967: 150). Moreno de Alba
(2004) summarizes the process of substratum influence proposed by Rosenblat in the following terms:

“Esta influencia tuvo que darse en ciertas condiciones: el lento y complejo proceso de hispanización, la acción del mestizaje, iniciado desde la primera hora y prolongado hasta hoy, el bilingüismo de amplios sectores indios. Habría que distinguir dos momentos: en el primero se cumplen los cambios que estaban en marcha en el español y se está todavía dentro de una básica y amplia unidad del español americano. El segundo momento, iniciado tímidamente al principio, alcanza su fuerza en las generaciones siguientes, debido sobre todo al bilingüismo y a la penetración de voces indígenas. El fonetismo de las tierras altas prueba sin duda que una influencia extraña puede contrarrestar las tendencias propias de la lengua” [This influence occurred in certain conditions: the long and complex process of Hispanicization; the miscegenation process that began from the first contact up to date; the bilingualism of large Indian populations. It is useful to distinguish two stages: in the first stage the changes already in progress in the Spanish language took their final shape, still within the basic unity of the American Spanish; the second stage, which developed only partially at the beginning, gained momentum in the following generations due to the bilingualism and the penetration of Indian loanwords. The phonetic characteristics of the highlands are proof that a foreign influence can counteract the language’s own tendencies.] (Moreno de Alba 2004: 104f; my translation).

The hypothesis of the Pre-Columbian influence has been challenged more than once (e.g. Lope Blanch 1969, 1972). From my point of view the evidence analyzed by Rosenblat is conclusive, let alone the large number of recent studies on the influence of Amerindian languages in regional varieties of Spanish (cf. Haboud 1998 for Ecuadorian Highland Spanish; Dietrich 1995 for Paraguayan Spanish). The question of the influence of Indian languages on Spanish will be addressed again after sketching the dialectal areas of Spanish in the Americas in the following section.

5.1.3. **Dialectal areas of Spanish in the Americas**

Several classifications have been advanced since the first dialectal map of American Spanish proposed by Henríquez Ureña in 1921. This author put forward a division of dialects in five areas: 1) the bilingual zones of the southern and southwestern United States, Mexico and Central America; 2) the Hispanic Antilles, the coast and the plains of Venezuela and northern Colombia; 3) the Andes of Venezuela, the interior and the Pacific coast of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, northern and central Bolivia, and
northern Chile; 4) Central and southern Chile; and 5) Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and southeastern Bolivia. His criteria for classification were geographical (territorial contiguity), cultural (a shared heritage) and historical (indigenous substrata). Unlike later proposals (Rona 1964; Resnick 1976) this classification does not take phonological and phonetic criteria into consideration. In fact, most critiques of Henríquez’ classification focus on his failure to notice linguistic data. For Rona (1964) dialects are linguistic facts in themselves, and therefore any dialectal classification must be based on linguistic facts only. For Rona, nonlinguistic criteria can be proposed only to the extent they support a classification established on linguistic grounds. In these terms, Rona undertakes a different classification by drawing isoglosses along four linguistic criteria which, in his opinion, are the only ones a linguist can be certain of, namely: the phonetic realization of /y/ as [ʒ] (žeísmo); the phonological neutralization between /y/ and /β/ (yeísmo); the use of pronouns vos (voseo) and tú (tuteo); and the verbal paradigm of both pronominal forms. The result is a number of 23 dialectal areas. The dialectal map resulting from the isogloss method looks strikingly different from the map drawn by Henríquez Ureña. Rona groups together the Antilles, the Atlantic coast of Venezuela and Colombia, the eastern half of Panama, and Mexico, excluding the southeastern states of Chiapas, Tabasco, Yucatan and Quintana Roo. Second, Rona does not consider Ecuador as one single area but distinguishes the Andean Highlands from the rest of the country. Third, he considers Paraguay a self-standing area distinct from Rio de la Plata (Buenos Aires and surroundings).

With minor changes, Rona’s classification has been widely accepted in linguistic and nonlinguistic circles. Other classifications (cf. Resnick 1975) consider as many as 16 linguistic features and produce a much larger number of dialectal areas. No classification is definitive, though, as every one depends on the number and type of linguistic features considered, and whether linguistic factors are viewed as independent or interlinked with nonlinguistic ones. Apart from the four features mentioned by Rona (žeísmo, yeísmo, pronominal voseo and tuteo, and the associated verbal paradigms) any reliable classification must include another type of historical linguistic data, which Rona sets aside but is certainly a valuable yardstick for the measurement of dialectal divergence in the Americas: the influence of the Amerindian substratum. This is the topic of the next section.

5.1.4. Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages

For any Spanish speaker in the Americas one of the most striking – and often embarrassing things – when traveling to another country is the discovery that

11 In fact, žeísmo and yeísmo are not independent but phonetic phenomena in complementary distribution.
meanings of words change simply by crossing the border, or that many words that sound Spanish have no meanings to him or her. Anecdotal as it may sound, this fact is evidence of the lexical complexity of Spanish varieties in the continent, one that goes well beyond the phonetic features we described in the previous section. Only a minor part of this complexity is due to the occurrence of archaic Spanish forms in American dialects. The largest part can be explained only by a century-long influence of Amerindian languages on Spanish (cf. Haboud 1998; Olbertz 2005; Palacios Alcaine 2005b). Native languages contributed to the configuration of Spanish in the Americas mainly with their lexicon, although their influence on several aspects of grammar is not unimportant in a number of dialects. Several of the Amerindian languages that contributed to the lexical pool of Spanish in the Americas disappeared a few decades after the first invasions (e.g. Taíno). Others died in the long process of Hispanicization of native peoples (e.g. Chibcha). Others survive with great vitality up to the present (e.g. Nahuatl, Quechua, and Guarani). The different fates of Amerindian languages have determined the type and degree of their influence in each region. In these terms, the analysis of language death or maintenance of Amerindian languages in the Americas can help us explain synchronic differences across American dialects of Spanish, whether they are derived from substratum or from adstratum influences.

Let us begin with those languages that experienced a premature death. The first Amerindian language the Spaniards found in the West Indies was Taíno, an Arawak language spoken at Hispaniola (today’s Dominican Republic and Haiti). Several Taíno Indians were taught Spanish and became interpreters for the Spaniards in their occupation of the Antilles and the Caribbean coasts of Venezuela. The use of Taíno was viable because the language was spoken in several islands and showed a close resemblance to other languages of the Arawakan family. None of the languages once spoken in the Antilles has survived. Many Caribbean Indians died in the years following 1492 by epidemic diseases. The rest perished as a result of slavery and genocide. There is no grammatical description or dictionary of Taíno but the words the Spaniards borrowed from this language in the early times of colonization. Some of these words describe endemic flora and fauna (e.g. tobacco, maize, etc.) while others refer to objects (e.g. hammock) or social institutions (e.g. cacique). Given the short time span of contact with Spanish and the small number of bilingual Taíno Indians who survived, the influence of this language on Spanish remained purely lexical. Because the Antilles were the first area of Spanish occupation and none of the local Amerindian languages survived, the contact with these languages was

---

12 Moreno de Alba (2004: 262) rightly warns us about the ambiguity of the notion ‘archaism’, which is always applied with reference to Peninsular usage. There is nothing archaic about these forms from the perspective of the speakers themselves, of course. This author notes that, even if so-called archaic forms abound almost in every American dialect of Spanish, there are only a few of them used at a continental level (2004: 267).
comparatively short and the influence it exerted on Spanish did not go farther. According to the borrowing scale of Thomason (2001: 70), Taíno-Spanish contact can be classified as type 1 (casual contact).

A longer contact with Amerindian languages induced deeper changes in regional varieties of Spanish. Early in the colonization of the Northern Andes, Spanish entered in contact with several Pre-Columbian languages in addition to Quichua. Quichua coexisted as a lingua franca with these languages since the Inca occupation of present Ecuador until the second half of the sixteenth century (Gómez Rendón and Adelaar, forthcoming). These languages also coexisted with Spanish in the first century of colonization and left noticeable traces in the lexicon and the phonology. Other languages coexisted with Spanish for an even longer period of time and thus exerted a more decisive influence. Some of these were Muisca in the Colombian Andes (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 81f) and Tupi in the province of Rio de la Plata and part of the Amazon lowlands. Spanish speakers living in these areas spoke Muisca and Tupi in order to communicate with native peoples, as can be deduced from a number of borrowings from these languages into local Spanish. These contacts can be classified somewhere between type 2 and type 3 in Thomason’s scale in attention to the type of changes induced in Spanish. However, they belong to type 2 (slightly more intense contact) if intensity is the yardstick. In addition, there are differences in the direction of influence. Contact-induced changes in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish took place by the agency of non-native speakers while the changes induced by contact with Chibcha and Tupi were mostly due to Spanish native speakers. In terms of van Coetsem (1988: 3) the influence of Pre-Columbian languages on Ecuadorian Highland Spanish makes a case of donor-language agentivity, in which speakers of the source language bring about the changes. On the other hand, the influence of Chibcha and Tupi on Spanish is a case of recipient-language agentivity, in which speakers of the recipient language implement the changes. Distinguishing both types of agentivity in contact-induced language change allows us to identify the direction of the influence and the different processes at work (Winford 2005: 373ff). Furthermore, the distinction is helpful when it comes to explaining substratum and adstratum influences from Amerindian languages coexisting to date with Spanish.

The last group of languages considered here are those which not only survived colonization but remain strong for their number of speakers. I do not include under this category a large number of Amerindian languages that are still living but have slight or no influence on local varieties of Spanish. Three languages have

---

13 In a similar way these languages left their imprints on local varieties of Quichua as a result of contact (e.g. aspiration of plosives in onsets).
14 Tupi was perhaps the lingua franca with the widest distribution, as it was spoken not only in Spanish territories but also in the Portuguese Empire, notably along the Atlantic coast of Brazil and the interior.
significantly contributed to the shape of regional varieties of Spanish in terms of distribution, number of speakers and duration of contact: Nahuatl in Central Mexico; Quechua in the Andes; and Guaraní in Paraguay and Northern Argentina. Today these languages have speech communities including millions of speakers. A great number of them are also bilingual in Spanish, with different degrees of proficiency. Many idiosyncrasies of the Spanish spoken in the areas of influence of these languages are explained by the bilingualism of its speakers. Monolingual Spanish speakers have played a minor role, if any, in the transfer of lexical and structural features of these languages. These are cases of source-language agentivity, and the changes induced in Spanish by Amerindian contact correspond roughly to types 2 and 3 in Thomason’s scale. However, an additional distinction is required. The influence of Amerindian languages on Spanish is one of adstratum in those areas in which the two languages coexist today but one of substratum in a number of areas where the languages coexisted in the past. It is therefore possible to group Spanish dialects in five areas according to Amerindian influence. This is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substratum areas</th>
<th>Languages (language family)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mexico and Central America</td>
<td>Nahuatl (Uto-Aztecan), Mayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dominican Republic, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Northern Venezuela and Northern Colombia</td>
<td>Taino, Carib (Arawakan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Andes of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Northern Chile</td>
<td>Quechua, Aymara (Andean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Central and Southern Chile</td>
<td>Mapuche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paraguay and Northern Argentina</td>
<td>Guaraní (Tupi-Guaraní)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Spanish varieties in contact with the Amerindian languages of this study belong to the first area (Otomí), the third area (Quichua), and the fifth area (Guaraní). Substratum and adstratum influences are discussed in the following sections. In this respect it is worth noting that substratum phenomena in South America are few in comparison to adstratum phenomena. While substratum phenomena imply extinct vernaculars, adstratum phenomena implies a long-term contact with living indigenous languages.15

15 I am indebted to Wolf Dietrich for calling my attention to this fact as well as to the implications of both types of phenomena for the contact situations analyzed in this book.
5.2. Spanish in Ecuador

As the official language in Ecuador, Spanish is spoken all over the country. Of a national population of 13,363,593 people (CEPAL 2005), approximately 90 percent is Spanish monolingual (12,000,000) while the rest is bilingual in Spanish and one of the nine indigenous languages of Ecuador, with different degrees of proficiency. Spanish speakers are unevenly distributed in the country, with the Coast and the Highlands containing the bulk of the Spanish-speaking population (95%), and the three major cities (Quito, Guayaquil and Cuenca) taking in 50% of the total number.

The sociolinguistic situation in Ecuador is clearly diglossic. Spanish is the dominant language and the only one used for administration purposes. The situation has not changed since colonial times. The 1998 Constitution grants Indian peoples the right to use their own languages as co-official in their respective territories, but learning and speaking Spanish is simply a matter of fact for them. The process of Hispanicization begins early in the life of non-Spanish speakers. Children in native communities often grow up listening to their parents speaking Spanish. They listen to Spanish in the media and in the public spheres. Furthermore, the process of Hispanicization is reinforced in the schools. Indeed, the process continues despite bilingual education programs implemented since the late eighties (Yánez Cossio 1995) simply because such programs were designed as a bridge to the acquisition of Spanish (cf. supra). It is not surprising, therefore, that most speakers of indigenous languages in present Ecuador speak Spanish with more or less proficiency depending on such factors as age, gender and time of schooling. Correspondingly, bilingual speakers have become functionally monolingual as they do not use their native languages anymore nor speak them to their children (Buttnner 1993). In all, bilingualism is growing in rural indigenous communities while Spanish monolingualism is the rule for an increasing number of indigenous immigrants in the cities (Haboud 1998).

In the context of such a steady process of Hispanicization, it is obvious that interferences in the Spanish of non-native speakers become part of local Spanish once the process of language shift is completed. The outcome is therefore double: interferences in the Spanish interlanguage of non-native speakers (adstratum); and interferences crystallized in the local varieties of Spanish of native speakers with different ethnolinguistic background (substratum). Adelaar and Muysken (2004) summarize this situation in the following terms:

“If we try to imagine how this influence was exerted, the most plausible scenario is one of second-language learning by Quechua speakers in a sociolinguistically complex environment. The particular stratification of variable elements within the Spanish target-language speech community affects the process of acquisition of these elements.
This stratification is crucial because it may reflect, in part, stages of interrupted or incomplete L2 acquisition at an earlier point in time. As time goes on, the products of intermediate and advanced interlanguage grammars (A and B) are incorporated into the native speech community (C and D), but most often as vernacular, non-standard forms. In a synchronic perspective, then, native speakers of the target vernacular end up producing outputs that seem like interlanguage outputs. The particular interlanguage features which come to be adopted as non-standard features in the Spanish target speech community serve as models, at a later stage, for new learners (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 592).

While shift-induced interference is more visible today as a result of the rampant levels of Hispanicization of native populations, it was present from early colonial times. This is reflected on the substratum of several highland dialects, where the bulk of the non-Spanish population (Quichua) lived and continues to live. Still, it is necessary to underline the fact that the agents of these changes are originally speakers of other languages, not Spanish native speakers. The reason for this is the ethnic bias of bilingualism in Ecuador: native speakers of Spanish never learn an indigenous language and therefore cannot transfer features from these languages to Spanish. Except for a number of Spanish colonists in the first years of colonization, who learned Quichua to communicate with native people, one-sided bilingualism persists to date.

The presence of Spanish in today’s Ecuadorian Highlands dates back to the early 1530s when Sebastian de Benalcázar founded the first cities on his march for the conquest of Quito, the last Inca stronghold in the Northern Andes. After the defeat of the last Inca generals, the process of colonization proceeded rapidly. By 1600 the principal cities of the Ecuadorian Highlands had been founded. The evangelization and subsequent Hispanicization of native peoples began immediately after the last Indian uprisings were suppressed by the mid 1500s. The Highlands concentrated most of the Indian population in the Real Audiencia de Quito during colonial times. Today, the demographic distribution of the Indian population is more or less the same. Quichua speakers make up the largest ethnic group, with an approximate number of 1,500,000 speakers in nine of the ten highland provinces. These circumstances provided an ideal setting for contact between Spanish and Quichua, the outcomes of which are reflected in both languages.

16 Letters A-E stand for different types of Spanish speakers with influence from Quechua: A – Quechua speakers learning Spanish; B – stable Quechua-Spanish bilinguals; C – Spanish monolinguals living in bilingual communities; D – Spanish monolinguals living in bilingual regions; and E – Spanish monolinguals living in bilingual countries (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 590).
The process of colonization of other regions in Ecuador was different. Gonzalo Pizarro and Francisco de Orellana explored the Amazonian lowlands early in the 1540s, with the eventual discovery of the Amazon River in 1542. The first Spanish settlements in the Amazonian lowlands were founded shortly afterwards. First the Dominicans and later the Jesuits and the Salesians took up the evangelization of native peoples scattered in the vast regions of the jungle. The presence of Spanish was early in the Amazon basin but it consisted of few Spanish settlements, some of which had to be founded once and again after being devastated by Indian raids. Consequently, the number of Spaniards in the area was considerably smaller and the Indians continued to live scattered all over the jungle. In other words, demographical and geographical factors prevented a widespread contact of languages. Only in recent years the Amazon lowlands have experienced an important growth of Mestizo settlers, with the corresponding increase in language contact and the raise of bilingualism and Hispanicization.
The Pacific lowlands were colonized gradually too. Except for the city port of Guayaquil and its surroundings, vast extensions of land remained largely unexplored until the early nineteenth century (Ayala Mora 1993). The pattern of scattered settlement among the native peoples from the Pacific lowlands barred the colonization of the area: Spaniards could not profit from the local Indian workforce, as they certainly did in the Highlands, where the bulk of the native population was concentrated. In this context the Pacific lowlands did not experience the same process of language contact as the Andes. While contact with indigenous languages was sporadic, contact with Spain and other coastal cities through the port of Guayaquil was permanent. Therefore, the linguistic influence on Lowland Spanish and Highland Spanish were different.

5.2.1. Dialects of Spanish in Ecuador

Of the historical developments just described, two distinctive dialects emerged in the eighteenth century: Highland Spanish and Lowland Spanish. Ecuadorian Highland Spanish (español andino ecuatoriano) has been the object of several studies in the last years (Niño Murcia 1995; Haboud 1998; Olbertz 2002; Palacios Alcaine 2005), most of which focus on its non-standard characteristics resulting from intense contact with Quichua. Ecuadorian Highland Spanish is the source of borrowings in the Quichua of Imbabura and Bolivar. Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish (español costeño or español litoral ecuatoriano) is part of Equatorial Littoral Spanish (español ecuatorial ribereño), a group of dialects spoken along the Pacific coast of Colombia and Ecuador and the northern coast of Peru (Zamora and Guitart 1982). Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish has received considerably less attention from students of contact, even though the influence of an important population of African descent in the Pacific Lowlands provides material for the study of African substratum. In the following I compare the major linguistic features of both dialects and explain their possible origins in language contact phenomena. The features of seseo and yeísmo (cf. section 5.1.1) are excluded from the discussion as they are shared by both dialects and neither can be ascribed to contact.

Since Toscano (1953) it is usual to characterize Ecuadorian Highland Spanish for its strong articulation of consonants (Sp. fuerte consonantismo) as opposed to the

---

17 The current demographic makeup of the Pacific lowlands is the result of migration of Mestizos and Indians from the Highlands during the twentieth century.
18 Spanish spoken in the Amazonian lowlands by monolinguals is not different from Highland Spanish. There are important differences, though, in the Spanish produced by bilinguals whose first language is Amerindian (e.g. Shuar, Cofan, etc.). In fact, one may find different varieties of second-language Spanish depending on the linguistic background of the speakers.
weak articulation typical of Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish. Translating this impressionistic assessment to phonetic terms, it is possible to identify three features of Ecuadorian Highland Spanish: 1) the raising of medial vowels /e/ and /o/ to [i] and [u] (Sp. *mesa* ‘table’ /mesa/ → [miʃa]; Sp. *carro* ‘car’ [kaɾu]); 2) the relaxation and eventual elision of unstressed vowels (Sp. *pues* ‘thus’ /pues/ → [ps]); 3) the fricativization of the trill /rr/ (Sp. *carro* ‘car’ /karro/ → [kaɾo]) and the lateral alveopalatal /l/ (Sp. *calle* ‘street’ /kaɫe/ → [kaɬe]). Because none of these features occurs in Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish, authors assume that their origin is substratum and adstratum influences from Quichua. The explanation is valid for the raising of medial vowels, to the extent that Quichua does not have /e/ or /o/. It is less satisfactory for the phenomena of vowel elision and fricativization. As pointed out by Adelaar and Muysken (2004: 591f), the fact that similar fricativization phenomena are found in many Quichua varieties do not confirm their origin in this language, in particular because more conservative Ecuadorian varieties do not show this feature. Moreover, vowel elision and fricativization occur in other Spanish dialects far from the Andes (e.g. the Mexican central plateau). It is more reasonable to assume that fricativization in the Ecuadorian Highlands is a Sprachbund phenomenon: both languages have influenced each other to such an extent that they begin to share structural features, one of which is fricativization. Such interpretation is suggested by Adelaar and Muysken (2004: 592). Taken together, the elision of unstressed vowels and the fricativization of trills led to the occurrence of consonant clusters not occurring in other Spanish dialects.

One of the most visible influences of Quichua substratum on Ecuadorian Highland Spanish at a morphological level is the widespread use of diminutives, even in lexical items that generally do not take them, such as adverbs and, most importantly, pronouns. A similar use is not found in the lowlands. In the same way, the simplification of the clitic pronouns *la* and *lo* (Sp. leísmo) occurs across the Highlands (cf. Zamora and Guitart 1982: 224) but only for certain areas of the

---

19 The vowel salience in Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish is the product of two phonetic processes not found elsewhere in Ecuador: the aspiration and eventual elision of /s/ in coda position and the elision of /d/ in intervocalic position. While the first process results in CV-type syllables, the second produces diphthongs from the fusion of two syllables. Altogether, these processes cause vowels to stand out in a string of sounds. Sánchez Méndez (1998: 80ff) analyzed historical documents of the seventeenth century in order to find traces of the aspiration of /s/. His findings are surprising: the aspiration of /s/ was common not only in the Coast but in vast areas of the Highlands, including Quito. Later, this phonetic feature disappeared from the highland dialect but remained in the littoral dialect. This confirms to a certain extent de Granda’s proposal that all the characteristic features of today’s American dialects disseminated all over the continent, but not all of them were preserved uniformly depending on a series of factors internal to the language (De Granda 1991: 38).

20 Interestingly enough, these and other dialects where elision of unstressed vowels and fricativization occur, belong to highland varieties. This confirms in part the highland-lowland distinction.
Ecuadorian Pacific Coast. The Coast either prefers the use of *lo* (Sp. *loísmo*) or makes a distinctive use of pronominal clitics as in Peninsular varieties. Other features are shared by Lowland and Highland dialects alike: the use of *voseo*, albeit particularly frequent in the northern Highlands; and the alternation of *tú* and *vos* (Quillis 1992: 603). The lack of number and gender agreement between articles and nouns is found also in both regions. In the Highlands this lack is typical of lower sociolects of Quichua–Spanish bilinguals. In Lowland Spanish this feature is also typical of lower sociolects, but its origins cannot be due to shift-induced interference, because speakers are Spanish monolingual. In the latter case the lack of number and gender agreement might be explained by two substrata: 1) a Quichua substratum based on the intensive migration from the Highlands to the Lowlands in the second half of the twentieth century; 2) a substratum influence from African languages. African substratum has been called for to explain the occurrence of a syntactic feature typical of certain sociolects of Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish: double negation. Whatever the case may be, the lack of in-depth studies on the topic prevents us from making conclusive statements in this respect. On the other hand, syntactic developments typical of Ecuadorian Highland Spanish have received more attention by linguists in the last years. In this context, two of the most characteristic syntactic features of Ecuadorian Andean Spanish (gerund constructions with perfective meaning and the use of tenses with evidential value) have been explained, satisfactorily in my view, by the influence of Quichua morphosyntax (cf. Haboud 1998; Olbertz 2002).

Another point of differentiation between highland and littoral dialects of Spanish in Ecuador is the lexicon. Quichua lexical borrowings occur even in the higher sociolects of Highland Spanish, but their presence is very limited in the Pacific Lowlands. Besides, it is hard to find Quichua borrowings of cross-dialectal use. The Quichua word *wawa* ‘child’ used by monolingual and bilingual speakers all over the Highlands occurs is virtually inexistent in Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish. In general, Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish lacks words of indigenous origin because Spanish in the Pacific Lowlands did not coexist with any native language as it did in the Highlands.

Table 5.2 below summarizes the major linguistic features from both dialects of Spanish. There is a clear-cut distinction between the two dialects at all linguistic levels. Spanish in the Highlands is modeled by substratum and adstratum influences from Quichua. In the Pacific Lowlands, substratum influence of African languages is a potential influencing factor, although conclusions are only speculative for the lack of studies in the field. The Andalusian influence on the phonetics and phonology of Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish is much more relevant, especially on the aspiration of

---

21 Lipsky (1987) found lack of number and gender agreement in the Black Spanish of the Chota Valley.
voiceless sibilant /s/ in coda position and the elision of /d/ in intervocalic environments as is typical of other coastal varieties of Spanish in the Americas.

Table 5.2 Dialects of Spanish in Ecuador: distinctive linguistic features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Ecuadorian Highland Spanish</th>
<th>Ecuadorian Littoral Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonetics/Phonology</strong></td>
<td>• Elision of vowels in unstressed syllables&lt;br&gt;• Fricativization of the trill /rr/, realized often as a voiced sibilant /r/ or a voiced sibilant in lower sociolects.&lt;br&gt;• Fricativization of the lateral palato-alveolar /ʎ/, realized as the voiced alveolar /β/ (lleísmo)</td>
<td>• Aspiration or elision of /s/ in coda position&lt;br&gt;• Aspiration of fricative velar /ʃ/ as [h]&lt;br&gt;• Elision of /d/ in intervocalic position.&lt;br&gt;• Occasional alternation of /l/ and /h/ without elision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphology</strong></td>
<td>• Leísmo across communities and strata&lt;br&gt;• Simplification of gender and number distinctions in clitics&lt;br&gt;• Lack of number and gender agreement (typical of non-native Spanish speakers)&lt;br&gt;• Voseo, widespread in the Highlands and coexisting with tuteo in higher sociolects&lt;br&gt;• Frequent use of diminutives on nouns, adjectives and adverbs</td>
<td>• Limited use of voseo (prevalent in indicative constructions)&lt;br&gt;• Lack of number and gender agreement, especially in lower sociolects&lt;br&gt;• Reduced leísmo; pronominal clitics preserve number and gender distinctions in some areas while loísmo is prevalent in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
<td>• Use of gerund constructions with perfective meaning&lt;br&gt;• Use of tenses with evidential value (reportatvity and sudden discovery)&lt;br&gt;• Use of SOV order (only in the Spanish of Quichua bilinguals)</td>
<td>• Double negation in some sociolects (probably of African origin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexicon</strong></td>
<td>• Borrowings from Quichua and other Pre-Columbian languages</td>
<td>• No native borrowings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As regards the Spanish varieties of Imbabura and Bolivar, where samples for the Quichua corpus were collected, differences are minor because both are highland subdialecets. The demographic composition and the levels of bilingualism of Quichua speakers are more relevant for these varieties. According to the 2001 census,\(^{22}\) Imbabura and Bolivar have a population of 344,044 and 169,370, respectively. This difference in size is partly explained by higher rates of growth in Imbabura as compared to Bolivar (2.01% vs. 0.34% in the period from 1990 to 2001). The pattern of settlement in both provinces also determines the influence of Quichua on Spanish. Half of the population of Imbabura lives in the cities but only one third of the population of Bolivar lives in urban centers. Because the Quichua population is concentrated in the countryside, a less intense contact between Spanish and Quichua is expected in Bolivar. Evidence for this is the fact that roughly half of the population of Otavalo (the second largest city in Imbabura) is Quichua-speaking while only a minor percentage of the population speaks Quichua in Guaranda (capital of Bolivar). In addition, Imbabura Quichua speakers are more bilingual than Bolivar Quichua speakers and thus influence local Spanish more deeply, because the access of indigenous speakers to the local variety of the dominant language determines their degree of influence on this.\(^{23}\) This access is determined not only by demographical factors but also by education. In these terms, the higher accessibility of native Spanish to Quichua speakers in Imbabura (especially in the cities) cancels the contact effects of a larger indigenous population and explains why Imbabura Spanish is essentially the same as Bolivar Spanish.

Even with different settlement patterns, the presence of an important number of Quichua speakers in both provinces leads to expect noticeable linguistic effects as a result of the crystallization of non-native features and their transfer to local Spanish. If the number of bilinguals is large enough to disseminate these features in the target-language speech community, these might be traced also in the speech of Spanish monolinguals. While several data from our fieldwork in Imbabura corroborate this assumption, the lack of a systematic corpus of local Spanish in these provinces prevents us from making conclusive statements. Still, Imbabura Spanish and Bolivar Spanish are closely similar, and thus any difference in the outcomes of Spanish borrowing between Imbabura Quichua and Bolivar Quichua cannot be ascribed to differences in the input.


\(^{23}\) The stratification of features influences the outcomes of second language acquisition. It is determined by the accessibility of the native variety of the target language. Accessibility, in turn, is determined by nonlinguistic factors such as geography (e.g. distance from urban centers), demography (e.g. smaller number of native speakers) or sociocultural factors (e.g. segregationism). An additional factor is the stability of bilingualism. In Ecuador and other Andean countries bilingualism is only a bridge to Hispanicization. The data from the sociolinguistic survey conducted between 1992 and 1993 in Ecuador point to this direction (cf. Buttner 1993).
5.3. Spanish in Paraguay

Spanish in Paraguay is co-official with Guaraní. Paraguay is the only country in Latin America where Spanish is co-official with another language, notably an Amerindian language. According to the 2002 census, Spanish monolingual speakers make a small sector of the population (6%) while Spanish-Guaraní bilinguals are the largest (59%), followed by Guaraní monolinguals (27%) and speakers of other languages (8%). In all, Guaraní is spoken by 86% of the population including monolinguals and bilinguals, while Spanish is spoken only by 65%. Generally speaking, Spanish is prevalent in the cities while Guaraní prevails in the countryside. Considering the high rates of urban-rural mobility and the shared knowledge of cultural traits in both areas, this partition is definitely artificial. The population in Paraguay is rather evenly distributed in urban and rural areas despite that urbanization rates have been lower than in other countries. These facts might explain, to a certain extent, the slow process of Hispanicization in Paraguay, which in countries like Ecuador or Mexico is concomitant with high rates of urbanization.

Apart from Spanish, other European languages spoken in Paraguay include Portuguese, German (Plattdeutsch), Italian and Ukrainian. Portuguese has become stronger in Paraguay in the last decades as a result of an intensive contact with the Brazilian society. Portuguese is spoken today along with Spanish and Guaraní in border cities like Pedro Juan Caballero and Ciudad del Este. Paraguay also has seventeen indigenous languages from four different families (Tupi, Mascoian, Mataco-Guaicuru and Zamucoan). Most of their speakers are bilingual in Spanish but their native languages are not as robust as Guaraní.

The majority of Spanish monolinguals lives in the cities, especially in Asuncion, and belongs to middle and upper classes. Bilingual speakers are distributed in the cities and the countryside. Bilingualism varies across speakers and areas, from incipient in poor rural zones to coordinate in educated middle classes of the capital. In general, higher levels of bilingualism, not found in other Spanish-speaking countries, are present in Paraguay. Still, Paraguay is essentially different from other Latin American countries in one respect: Spanish continues to be the higher variety vis-à-vis Guaraní, in spite of the co-official status of the latter. This means that bilingualism in Paraguay is essentially diglossic (Krivoshein de Canese 1999: 2).

---

24 According to CEPAL (2005) this situation will change dramatically in the coming years: urban resident will make 64% of the total population by 2015, which corresponds to an increase of 25% as compared to 1990.
Guaraní is associated with national identity, solidarity and intimacy, while Spanish is associated with social mobility and job opportunities. The law orders that administrative and legal proceedings be bilingual, but in practice they are conducted in Spanish and translated to Guaraní only if necessary. Spanish is dominant too in the audiovisual media and the press, despite that an increasing number of publications in Guaraní appear every year in the form of popular literature or school texts. The position of Spanish in education is pretty much the same, even though Paraguay boasts a long tradition of bilingual education. In practice, Spanish shares the classroom with Guaraní in primary education while clearly prevailing over this language in secondary and tertiary education.

The history of Spanish in Paraguay is different from other countries. The main reasons are demographic: different colonization patterns plus a marked disparity in the number of Indians and Spanish settlers throughout colonial times. The development of Spanish in Paraguay is not a self-contained process but is closely related to the history of Guaraní. A full account of the historical and social processes involved in the configuration of the linguistic landscape of present Paraguay is presented in Chapter 7. For the time being, suffice it to say that nothing like a widespread Hispanicization took place in colonial times in Paraguay, because the cities remained the only strongholds of the European language until the late nineteenth century.
Spanish in Paraguay is highly uniform across geographical areas. In contrast, differences are important across social strata. This means that language variation in Paraguay is largely diastratic. In this aspect Paraguay differs from Ecuador and Mexico, where variation is both diatopic and diastratic. On the other hand, the influence of native languages other than Guaraní on Spanish is minimal. Accordingly, differences in the sociolects of Paraguayan Spanish should be attributed to contact with Guaraní and the bilingualism of large sectors of the population.

5.3.1. Linguistic characterization of Spanish in Paraguay

Spanish in Paraguay is no doubt one of the most interesting dialects in terms of lexical and structural idiosyncrasies. Differences from other varieties may be so great in certain cases that intelligibility is compromised. The motivations and factors modeling the emergence of this unique variety boil down to contact with an indigenous language. The Guaraní influence on Spanish has become a serious problem for educational policy makers in Paraguay while it provides a fertile ground to test sociolinguistic theories and study the linguistic outcomes of bilingualism for linguists and other students of language.

Paraguayan standard Spanish is similar to other national standards in Latin America, with the difference that it is used only in formal situations involving administration, education and mass communication. That not every Spanish speaker in Paraguay is proficient in the standard demonstrates the width of the gap between

25 The different forms of Spanish interlanguage spoken by indigenous speakers and first-generation immigrants are not included.
26 In fact the influence between Spanish and Guaraní is reciprocal, so that both languages converge in quite a few aspects. In this context Melià (1998) proposes the existence of a third language in Paraguay, which is neither Spanish nor Guaraní. The idea has been challenged by several authors in Paraguay, for whom it is just another case of language contact in Hispanic America.
27 From my analysis of the interviews in the Atlas Lingüístico Guaraní-Románico (2002) I conclude that the position of most Paraguayans towards the introduction of Spanish in Guaraní is tolerant to some degree while their attitude towards the introduction of Guaraní in Spanish is negative without exception. A number of authors (cf. Krivoshein de Canese 2000; Trinidad Sanabria 2005) consider this type of mixture and the resulting differentiation of Paraguayan Spanish from other national varieties a major obstacle for social and cultural development.
28 Since the first in-depth study of bilingualism in Paraguay (Rubin 1968) multitude of papers and books have been published on this and other related topics. Various studies on linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of Spanish in Paraguay appeared in the two volumes of Sociedad y Lengua: Bilingüismo en el Paraguay edited by Grazziella Corvalán and Germán de Granda (1982). More recent studies are Dietrich (1995; 1996), de Granda (2000; 2004); Palacios Alcaine (2001; 2003) and Shaw (2004).
the colloquial language and the standard, which in Paraguay is larger than in other countries.

Table 5.3 lists the most salient features of colloquial Spanish in Paraguay. Following Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán (1987:15) I call this variety ‘Colloquial Paraguayan Spanish’ (CPS) to distinguish it from the national standard (Paraguayan Spanish, PS). A large part of the data presented here comes from the contrastive study made by both authors between Spanish and Guaraní (op. cit). The table includes the main features of CPS at phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical levels. It should be underlined that these features are not the outcome of imperfect language learning. Of these features, those of relevance for language contact are further elaborated in order to explain the phonetic shape of Spanish loanwords in the Guaraní corpus.

Table 5.3 Linguistic features of Colloquial Paraguayan Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonetics and Phonology</td>
<td>Aspiration (and eventual elision) of /s/ in coda position</td>
<td>&lt;espinazo&gt; ‘spine’ [espinás]→[ehpinás]→[epinás]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspiration [h] in positions where Old Spanish had the voiceless labiodental [f]</td>
<td>&lt;huir&gt; ‘to flee’ [fuir]→[hoyo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement of the voiced bilabial stop [b] with the fricative labiodental [v]</td>
<td>&lt;burro&gt; ‘donkey’ [buño]→[vuño]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-nasalization of the voiced bilabial stop [b] as [mb] in onsets</td>
<td>&lt;bromista&gt; ‘jester’ [bromista]→[mbromista]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspiration of the voiceless fricative labiodental [f] as [h]</td>
<td>&lt;función&gt; ‘function’ [funsión]→[hunsión]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vowel /a/ realized as tensed central [i] in diphthong /ue/</td>
<td>&lt;puerta&gt; ‘door’ [puerta]→[pierta]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elision of /d/, /s/, /n/, /l/, /r/ in word final position</td>
<td>&lt;pared&gt; ‘wall’ [pared]→[paré]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elision of /u/ accompanied by nasalization of the vowel segment</td>
<td>&lt;camión&gt; ‘truck’ [kamión]→[kami]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insertion of glottal stop [’] in intervocalic position</td>
<td>&lt;caí&gt; ‘I fell (off)’ [caí]→[ka’i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Replacement (or eventual elision) of stop /t/ with /θ/ in consonant clusters | <Atlántico> ‘Atlantic’
[atlántiko]→[atlántiko]→[alántiko] |
<p>| • Nasalization of velar /g/ in onsets as /ŋ/ | &lt;Miguel&gt; [migel]→[mirgel] |
| • Voseo | Vos sos buena conmigo ‘You are good to me’ |
| • Use of Guaraní nde (2S) as a vocative | ¡Nde, qué cosa rara! ‘Hey, that’s weird!’ |
| • No gender distinction in pronominal clitics (leismo) | Le quiero a mi hijo ‘I love my son’ |
| • Doubling of pronominal objects, sometimes without agreement | Le encontré a ello en casa ‘I found her at home’ |
| • Use of demonstratives before possessive adjectives | Aquel otro tu hermano esta afuera ‘One of your brothers is outside’ |
| • Double marking of possession: possessive adjective + complement | Se perdió de mi mi canasto ‘I lost my basket’ |
| • Replacement of definite articles with demonstrative adjectives | Este padre de tu amigo vino hoy ‘Your friend’s father came today’ |
| • Lack of number and gender agreement between articles, adjectives and nouns. | Lo ladrillo bien cocinada The well-cooked bricks |
| • Use of Guaraní suffix –kue instead of Spanish prefix ex- | La mi novia kue ‘My ex girlfriend’ |
| • Use of Guaraní quotative and reportative particles ko and niko | Si es así nikó ya podé venir no más ‘If it is as you say, then just come’ |
| • Use of mitigating particles of Guaraní in imperatives: e.g. na, mi, ke. | Quedate na un poco más conmigo ‘Please, stay a bit longer with me’ |
| • Use of Spanish todo ‘all’ to mark perfectivity. | ¡Tu hijo creció todo ya! Your son has grown! |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spanish</strong></th>
<th>147</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lexicon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of Guaraní verbal particles <em>kuri</em> and <em>ra'e</em> for recent and distant past</td>
<td>• Lexical items borrowed from Guaraní without phonological or semantic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comí <em>kuri</em> con ellos</td>
<td><em>mita'i</em> ‘child’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I’ve just eaten with them’</td>
<td><em>tajachí</em> ‘policemen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuando llegaste, yo salí <em>ra'e</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘When you arrived, I had long left’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verbal forms of <em>voseo</em></td>
<td>• Lexical items borrowed from Guaraní with phonological change only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vos sabés que te quiero</td>
<td><em>acané</em> ‘fool’ &lt; <em>akâne</em> ‘stinky head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You know I love you’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of prepositions in nominal complements</td>
<td>• Lexical items borrowed from Guaraní with phonological and semantic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandó hacer una <em>casa dos pisos</em></td>
<td><em>ra'i</em> ‘friend’ &lt; <em>ra'y</em> ‘son’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He had a two-storey house built’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elision of the head noun in phrases whose complement indicates origin</td>
<td>• Spanish lexical items with meanings calqued on Guaraní semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tobatí no son miedosos</td>
<td><em>prestar</em> ‘lend’ = ‘borrow, lend, use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘People from Tobatí are not afraid’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of prepositions for direct objects</td>
<td>• Hybrid words with morphemes from Guaraní and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me piso por el pie</td>
<td><em>platami</em> ‘tip’ &lt; money+DIM(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He treaded my foot’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of preposition <em>en</em> for motion verbs and stative verbs alike</td>
<td><em>yaguarear</em> ‘betray’ &lt; dog+INF(Sp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me fui <em>en</em> la iglesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I go to the church’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of possessive forms for relatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ese es el hombre <em>que su</em> vaca se perdió. ‘That is the man whose cow got lost’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of preposition <em>mediante</em> instead of <em>para</em> in causative constructions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediente que llovió creció el maíz</td>
<td>‘Because it rained, the maize grew’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not all features listed are exclusive of CPS. The aspiration of /s/ in coda position and the use of voseo with its corresponding verbal forms occur in several dialects of Rio de la Plata and other lowland and highland areas of the continent (cf. 5.1.1). In a similar way, leísmo, though less widespread, occurs also in Highland Ecuador (Zamora and Guitart 1982: 167). What makes these features characteristic of CPS is their widespread dialectal and geographical distribution. Thus, while the aspiration of /s/ occurs only in the lowland dialect of Ecuadorian Spanish it occurs in all sociolects of CPS. Similarly, voseo coexists with tuteo in Highland Ecuador, but its use is exclusive of other forms of second person singular in CPS. In sum, the aforementioned features characterize CPS as a national dialect. This is possible because there is a high degree of dialectal uniformity.

Some features listed in Table 5.3 are explained as internal developments of the language whereas others are products of internal and external factors. Examples of internal development are the retentions of older Spanish forms. The initial aspiration in a word like huir ‘to flee’ is documented for sixteenth and seventeenth century Spanish (Alarcos Llorach 1981: 257). Because this phenomenon is not reported for Guaraní, contact with this language cannot be the explanation in this case. In a similar way, the aspiration of the voiceless fricative labiodental [f] → [h] is explained as retention from older Spanish. However, the absence of [f] in Guaraní is a condition reinforcing aspiration in this case. Language-internal and language-external factors converge also in the elision of /d/, /s/, /l/, /r/ and /h/ in word-final position. This elision is attested in other varieties of Spanish (e.g. Antillean) but none of these sounds occur in coda position in Guaraní. In contrast, the bilabial-labiodental distinction /b/ - /v/ cannot be explained as archaic because such a distinction disappeared from peninsular Spanish before the time of the American conquest (Moreno de Alba 2004: 18). The adstratum influence from Guaraní is a decisive factor in this case because both sound are phonemic in this language. The remaining phonetic-phonological features of CPS are equally explained by contact with Guaraní. The pre-nasalization of the voiced bilabial stop is explained by the allophonic occurrence of /b/ as [mb] in Guaraní. The nasalization of /k/ as /g/ is also allophonic in this language. The insertion of the glottal stop in intervocalic position is determined by the Guaraní rule prohibiting the diphthongization of vowels. The nasalization of vowels after elided nasal segments resembles the elision of nasals in word-final position in other dialects, with the difference that the preceding vowel is

---

29 Gregores and Suárez explain this phenomenon as follows: “The non-diphthongal transition is a special characteristic of Guaraní, particularly noticeable to Spanish speakers, because the diphthong is the more frequent transition between higher unstressed vowels and lower ones in Spanish. For instance, the Spanish word piola is always [pióla] in Spanish; when it occurs, as a loanword in Guaraní, it is [pi ó la]: there are two phonetic syllables and very little difference in prominence between the vowels (due to stressed [o]), and the last about twice as long as one vowel […]” (Gregores and Suárez 1967: 54).
not nasalized as in CPS. The same process is involved in the phonological accommodation of Spanish loanwords ending with /hu/. In all, evidence points to changes induced by contact with Guaraní.

In morphology, all the features of CPS – except for voseo and leísmo – are induced by contact with Guaraní. They can be classified in two types: those which calque Guaraní morphology and those which use Guaraní morphology. The first type includes: the lack of number and gender agreement in the noun phrase, induced by the non-marking of these categories in the indigenous language; the double marking of possession, modeled on similar construction in Guaraní; and the use of the Spanish todo ‘all’ to indicate perfectivity. The second type is illustrated by the use of demonstratives before possessive adjectives and the replacement of definite articles with demonstrative adjectives. Among the calqued features commonly interpreted as grammatical borrowings are the use of Guaraní particles ko and niko for quotative and reportative clauses, Guaraní mitigating particles for imperatives, past-tense particle kue, pronominal nde for second person singular vocatives, and particles kuri and ra’e for recent and distant past. The case of demonstratives is particularly interesting, because Guaraní borrows Spanish articles la and lo as demonstratives and uses them with more or less the same distribution as their native counterparts (Gómez Rendón 2007b). For this particular case – but also for several others – one may speak of convergence between colloquial Paraguayan Spanish and Guaraní through the reciprocal borrowing of elements from overlapping grammatical categories, with the semantic value they have in one of the languages, most likely the dominant language in the mind of bilingual speakers (i.e. Guaraní).

With the exception of verbal voseo, CPS syntax shows evidence of changes induced by contact with Guaraní. The mechanism in all cases is the same: the calquing of syntactic structures from Guaraní through elision of constituents or re-functionalization of native material. No influence of Guaraní on CPS word order is reported, probably because the indigenous language shows a relatively flexible word order and its most frequent pattern (SVO) overlaps with that of Spanish. This is the opposite to the situation in Ecuadorian Spanish, where a tendency towards verb-final order is induced by Quichua SOV pattern. The syntactic features listed in Table 5.3 are typical of CPS. However, similar constructions have been reported for Spanish interlanguages produced by native speakers of other Indian languages with typological characteristics similar to Guaraní. Such is the case of prepositions used in direct object complements or the simplification of the distinction a-en (Flores Farfán 2004). The difference lies on the fact that these (and other) features are not transitory outcomes of imperfect learning but have crystallized in the colloquial speech of the bilingual Paraguayan community.

The lexicon of GPS is remarkably influenced by Guaraní. The lexemes in Table 5.3 by no means exhaust all Guaraní lexical borrowing in CPS. In addition, there is a large number of native Spanish items whose meaning is calqued on that of
equivalent items in Guaraní. The case of *prestar* is one of the most interesting. The following examples are taken from Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán (1987: 78f):

1) CPS: Estoy *prestando* este cuchillo
   PS: Estoy *usando* este cuchillo
   PG: Aipuru aña ko kyse
   ‘I am using this knife

2) CPS: *Presté* este cuchillo de Pedro
   PS: Tomé prestado este cuchillo de Pedro
   PG: Aipuru ko kyse Perúgui
   ‘I borrowed this knife from Pedro

3) CPS: *Préstame* un poco tu cuchillo
   PS: *Préstame* tu cuchillo por favor
   PG: Eipurúkami cheéeve nde kyse
   ‘Please lend me your knife’

Only the third construction in CPS has an equivalent semantic meaning in PS while the other two are expressed in PS through a different verb (*usar*) and a verbal periphrasis (*tomar prestado*). From the Guaraní gloss it becomes clear that CPS is calquing Guaraní semantics. The result is one single word used with three different meanings, whereas standard (Paraguayan) Spanish uses three different words for each meaning. Figure 5.1 illustrates this ambiguity.

**Figure 5.1 Meanings of *prestar* in Colloquial Paraguayan Spanish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>prestar</em></td>
<td>puru</td>
<td>usar (to use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recibir en préstamo (to borrow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dar en préstamo (to lend)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These examples suffice to demonstrate that Guaraní influence on CPS is one of far-reaching consequences. Different from the outcomes of other situations of Spanish-Amerindian contact (e.g. Quichua or Nahuatl) the outcomes in this case are at all levels of linguistic structure. Considering formal schooling and socioeconomic status, it is true that sociolectal differences are many. Nevertheless, most features of Table 5.3 recur across CPS social strata. Guaraní influence is more extensive in varieties with a high degree of lexical and structural borrowing. These varieties make a case for language intertwining (Bakker 1994). They are colloquially known in Paraguay as *castení* (a hybrid of *castellano* and Guaraní). The following fragment from *Ramona Quebranto* (Ayala 1989), a novel written in *castení* gives an idea of the type of language mixing involved. Guaraní borrowings appear in italics.
4) Cuando baja agua limpiamos ¡rovy’a! Cualquiera no mira hasta que pasa necesidá. ¡Dónde pa en otro parte alguno va repará por nosotros? La ecuelita de mi hijo oñe inundá, pero ndaipóri la problema, porque veterano kuera guerra Chaco preta su galpón a maetra, y santa pacua. […] ¡Che memby kuera! trabaja má fácil aquí! Petei ovendé chicle calle Palmape; upe otro, canillita; ha otro, lutrabota centrope. ¡Naumbréna! Che aexpícal bien, pero no entendéi voi, porque su cabeza oiko en otra parte, y no e Chacariteña. (Margot Ayala 1989: 89ff)30.

Notice that the whole novel is written in phonetic spelling for the purpose of capturing colloquial speech as accurately as possible. Several of the aforementioned phonetic features of CPS appear in the text, among others, the aspiration of /s/ in coda position in hatá ‘until’ (< hasta). The text contains a few Guaraní loanwords (rovy’a ‘glad’, petei ‘one’) and one function word (upe ‘that’). Grammatical borrowings include, among others, the plural marker kuera, the postposition –pe, the singular first-person pronoun che and the negation –i. Finally, there are two code switches to Guaraní, one verb phrase (ndaipóri, ‘there is not’) and one noun phrase (che memby kuera, ‘my sons’). Spanish native speakers cannot understand the above passage in its full meaning unless they speak Guaraní as well. The question is therefore how to classify this variety: ‘Guaraníticized’ Spanish or hispanicized Guaraní? In order to answer this question we must know the matrix language of the mixture. This has been undertaken elsewhere (Gómez Rendón, forthcoming/a).

The occurrence of these varieties along with more conservative ones suggest the existence of a dialect continuum between Spanish and Guaraní in similar terms to those proposed by Muysken for Highland Ecuador (Muysken 1985). This continuum has standard Paraguayan Spanish and standard Paraguayan Guaraní on its ends, with intermediate varieties according to their level of Hispanicization or Guaraníticization. This is shown in the following figure.

---

30 “When waters recede, things become clear. We don’t care until we need. Who is going to take care of us? My son’s school was flooded, but that is not a problem because the Chaco veterans lend their building to the teacher and that is it! My sons work easier here. One of them sells chewing gum on Palma Street. The other sells newspapers. And the third works as a shoeshine boy in the downtown. It is something I don’t like much. I explained it to him once and again but he doesn’t get it, he is daydreaming somewhere else, he is not one from Chacaréñita slum anymore.” Free translation.
The arrows indicate the direction of the mixing process. At one point the mixture becomes so enmeshed as a result of borrowing and codeswitching that we cannot tell which language provides the morphosyntactic matrix. Intermediate varieties are essentially unstable mixed lects that might crystallize as a distinct third language (Melià 1975). While our analysis confirms in part the emergence of a third language, it is by no means conclusive and further research on Spanish-Guaraní mixing is required. Hispanicized Guaraní varieties, which make the second part of the continuum, are analyzed in Chapter 7.

5.4. Spanish in Mexico

Spanish is the only official language in Mexico. The vast majority of the country’s population speaks Spanish as their first or second language. By 1997 Spanish speakers in Mexico amounted to 94,275,000, which correspond to 98.5% of the total population.\(^31\) The ongoing process of Hispanicization leads to assume that this percentage was even higher by 2005, for which date Mexico’s population was 106,147,000 according to CEPAL estimations. Mexico is therefore the country with the largest Spanish-speaking population in the world, the bulk of which lives in the central and northern plateaus and the Caribbean and Pacific coasts. The central and northern plateaus are home to the three biggest cities in Mexico concentrating one third of the country’s population: Mexico City in the central plateau, with a metropolitan area of 20,000,000 million speakers (20% of Mexico’s population); Guadalajara, also in the central plateau, with a population of 4,300,000 inhabitants; and Monterrey, in the northern plateau, with an estimated population of 4,200,000. The unbalance between the cities and the countryside in demographic terms is more noticeable in Mexico than in the other countries as a result of the rampant levels of uninterrupted urbanization since the end of the nineteenth century. Like in Ecuador, the urbanization process in Mexico led to the racial miscegenation and Hispanicization of rural immigrants in the cities. This explains why even native speakers of Amerindian languages speak Spanish nowadays. The bulk of rural immigration to the cities is composed of Indian people who speak Amerindian languages. Spanish in Mexico coexists with about sixty languages from ten different families, including Uto-Aztecan, Otomangue, Mayan, Tarascan, Totonaco-Tepehua, Mixe-Zoque, Tequistlateco-Jicaque, Huave, Yuma-Seri and Algonquian. In 1997 Amerindian speakers above five years of age amounted to 6,044,547, out of a national population of 97,483,412 inhabitants. In all, Amerindian speakers represented 6.2% of the country’s population. Of them, roughly 82% were bilingual

\(^{31}\) From Jaime Otero, *Demografía de la lengua española*, in the 1999 *Anuario* of Centro Virtual Cervantes. This figure does not include Mexican-origin immigrants in the United States, most of which maintain Spanish as their language in domestic and community settings.
in Spanish (4,924,412) with different degrees of proficiency, and 18% (1,002,236) were monolingual. According to Ortiz Álvarez (2005: 65), only one percent of the total Mexican population did not speak Spanish by 2000.  

Map 5.3. The Languages of Mexico

Ortiz Álvarez (2005: 74) notes that bilingualism among Amerindian speakers increased steadily during the twentieth century, with a yearly average growth of 1.6%. From 1930 to 2000 the indigenous bilingual population increased from 1,065,924 to 4,924,412 (i.e. 362% in 70 years) 33. These figures confirm an unchecked process of Hispanicization.

Bilingualism and monolingualism are different depending on gender and age. Most Amerindian monolinguals are found among elders and the number of monolingual women is generally higher than the number of monolingual men. This is reflected also in lower rates of literacy among women as compared to men. Differences in bilingualism are also important. From case studies such as Hekking (1995) and Hekking and Bakker (2005) one concludes that an important number of bilinguals are subordinate: their command of Spanish is limited to oral communication in informal settings while their reading and writing skills in the

---

32 Compare Quichua monolingualism in Highland Ecuador, estimated about 8.7% in 1993 (Buttner 1993: 69). Quechua monolingualism is much higher in Peru and Bolivia.

33 The southern states of Oaxaca, Chiapas and Veracruz have the largest concentration of bilinguals in the country. In addition these states show the largest number of monolinguals.
language are minimal. Most bilinguals of Indian descent speak a variety of Spanish with interferences of their respective languages and their knowledge of standard Mexican Spanish is poor. In general the Spanish of Amerindian speakers is known as 'Indian Spanish'. Indian Spanish varieties are generally stigmatized and become an obstacle for the social mobility of their speakers (Flores Farfan 2000). Still, linguistic features characteristic of Indian Spanish have entered regional varieties of monolingual Spanish in predominantly indigenous areas. (e.g. Comiteco Spanish in Chiapas).

Sociolinguistically, Mexico does not differ from other Hispanic American countries, if perhaps for the number of Amerindian languages in contact with Spanish. Like in any other corner of Hispanic America, the knowledge of Spanish in Mexico provides an easier access to public services and clears the way for the effective participation in the market economy. In sum, Spanish is the socially and politically dominant variety. Spanish pervades education, administration and the media. The rapid integration of non-Spanish speakers to the national society through early Hispanicization is a factor common to all educational policies implemented in Mexico since the Independence, especially during the Porfiriato (1886-1911) and the post-revolutionary period.34

Dating back to the 1960s, indigenous bilingual education is older in Mexico.35 There are bilingual programs at local and district levels (e.g. Otomí-Spanish bilingual education in the state of Hidalgo) but most of them work on their own, in the absence of an encompassing national policy. With a few exceptions, these programs have been mostly transitional, because they view indigenous languages as instruments to help pupils acquire literacy skills and basic knowledge while adapting to the Spanish-speaking society. Only the last years have witnessed an emerging awareness among policy maker about the need of bilingual schooling to match the goals of national education and language maintenance36.

34 José Vasconcelos (1882-1959) is the undisputed epitome of this integrationist ideology in Mexico Similar views in other Hispanic American countries prevailed from the second half of the nineteenth century (e.g. Sarmiento’s ideas in Argentina). Stating the importance of biological, cultural and linguistic miscegenation (mestizaje) for the Latin American republics, these ideologies set in motion state apparatuses for the integration of non-Hispanic ethnic groups. In most cases the result was the Hispanicization of ethnolinguistic minorities. In others the outcome was their physical extermination.

35 In most Andean countries indigenous bilingual education began in the late seventies. Legislation on bilingual education was passed in 1978 in Colombia and one year later in Venezuela. In Ecuador the first law on bilingual education dates from 1981. Peru passed a law in 1984. Bolivia is still waiting a law, even though it is the country with the largest indigenous population in South America. For an overview of bilingual education programs in the Andes, see Adelaar and Muysken (2004: 606ff).

36 To acknowledge the rights of language minorities and remedy the chaotic situation of indigenous education (motivated by the large number of speech communities and their divergent interests), the Mexican Senate passed a law on the linguistic rights of indigenous
The Hispanicization of native peoples in Mexico went hand in hand with the colonization of its large territory. Spanish colonization of Mexico began relatively early in comparison to South American countries. The conquest of the Aztec Empire commenced in 1519 and ended two years later with the final takeover of Tenochtitlan. From 1521 a series of successful enterprises allowed the Spaniards to seize a vast extension of land extending from the north of today’s Texas in the United States through the Mexican plateau and Central America down to Panama City. These lands formed the Voce-royalty of New Spain in 1535. The process of Hispanicization was not that rapid. The cultural and linguistic isolation of ethnic groups under the protection of missionary orders which promoted the use of native languages slowed down the expansion of Spanish in the first century. To clear the way for their language, Spaniards used native institutions to their advantage. They knew well that any project of Hispanicization in a stratified society would meet with failure unless the top of the societal ladder becomes involved. In these terms, the role of the indigenous elites was decisive for colonization. Spaniards took children of the local elites to special education centers in which they could be immersed in the language and culture of the conquerors. The best known of these centers was Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco, founded in Mexico in 1536, which received 60 pupils of the Indian nobility only in the first year. After a long period of intensive instruction, Indian trainees were sent back to their communities to serve as brokers between the Crown and their people, and agents of cultural and linguistic change. This strategy maximized the efforts of the Spaniards to homogenize the enormous linguistic and cultural diversity they found in Mexico. In this process of homogenization a few Amerindian languages were used as lingua franca for evangelization and interethnic communication. The most important of these languages was Nahuatl. It became so widespread in certain areas that it ended up by replacing vernacular languages in few decades. These vehicular languages leveled linguistic variation in early colonial times. When the Bourbon reforms banished their use from administration and education in 1770, these and other minor languages had been almost replaced by Spanish. The process varied from one area
to another, depending on a number of geographic, demographic and sociopolitical factors. But language homogenization did not attain its ultimate goals of shift and leveling at a national level. Over sixty Indian languages exist in present Mexico, and their influence on local Spanish is not unimportant. Indian varieties of Spanish continue to emerge at the rate of Hispanicization and crystallize as native varieties once their speakers are acculturated. Many features of regional Spanish in Mexico are the product of substratum and adstratum influence from Amerindian languages.

5.4.1. Dialects of Spanish in Mexico

Three authors have proposed different classifications of Spanish dialects in Mexico, mainly on the basis of phonetic features. The first classification was presented by Henríquez Ureña (1934). He identifies five dialectal areas, excluding the southwest of the United States. These areas include 1) central Mexico; 2) northern Mexico; 3) the lowlands of the Mexican Gulf which connect to the Pacific lowlands through the Isthmus of Tehuantepec; 4) Yucatan; 5) Chiapas (and most Central America). Rona (1964) is the author of another classification. He makes a fundamental distinction between the Spanish spoken in the states of Chiapas, Tabasco, Yucatan and Quintana Roo (corresponding in Henríquez’ division to the third, four and fifth areas, respectively) and the dialect spoken in the rest of the country, which he considers rather homogeneous. On the other hand, the classification of Zamora and Guitart (1982) classifies Mexican dialects in three distinct areas: eastern coast of Mexico; central and northern Mexico; and the southern Mexican states on the Guatemalan border. These classifications differ mainly in the number of dialects but agree in other respects, namely: a) central Mexico has a clearly identified dialect; b) the eastern lowlands make also a well-defined dialectal area; and c) the dialects of southern and southeastern Mexico are different from the rest of the country. These distinctions are preserved to some extent in the latest classification of the Atlas Lingüístico de México (1990-2001), which upgraded the methodological criteria of previous attempts and obtained more accurate results.

In each of the major dialectal zones (central Mexico; eastern Coast and southern Mexico) the Amerindian influence has its own contribution. Thus, while some Amerindian substratum is present in central and southern Mexico, this is far more important in the south. In contrast, the Amerindian substratum in the eastern Coast is comparatively minor. The Amerindian contribution is not decisive either in central Mexico, where a moderate Nahuatl substratum combines with other factors (e.g. geographical isolation) to explain the present configuration of dialects. The following table summarizes the main phonetic characteristics of the three dialectal areas according to phonetic and morphosyntactic parameters:
Table 5.4. Phonetic and morphological features of Mexican Spanish dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect zone</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/x/</th>
<th>Voseo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Mexico</td>
<td>fricative alveolar</td>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Coast</td>
<td>aspirated or dropped</td>
<td>Glottal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mexico</td>
<td>dropped or aspirated</td>
<td>Glottal</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first criterion separates the dialects that aspirate or drop /s/ in coda position (eastern Coast and southern Mexico) from the dialects that maintain /s/ as a fricative alveolar. The second criterion concerns the velar realization of /x/ in central Mexico as opposed to the glottal realization of the same phoneme in eastern Coast and southern Mexico. A third criterion distinguishes the areas that use pronominal and verbal *voseo* (central Mexico and southern Mexico) from the areas that do not use *voseo* in any form (eastern Coast). Other distinctions are less clear. For instance, all the areas are characterized as *yeistas* (/ll/ → [y]), the realization of /y/ is diatopical, with a fricative alveolar [ž] in Oaxaca and a relaxed open fricative /y/ in the rest of the country (Moreno de Alba 2002: 111). Similarly, vowel relaxation is characteristic of the central plateau, though exclusively, because others (e.g. the Pacific Coast) tend to relax /i/ and /o/ as well. In the same way, the velarized realization of /n/, not attested in central Mexico or the eastern Coast, is not typical of the entire southern area but only of Yucatan and Chiapas (Moreno de Alba 2004: 216).

Since the early years of the conquest the central plateau became the scenario of intensive contact between Spanish and Amerindian languages of Uto-Aztecan, Otomangue and Tarascan families. The most important of these languages in terms of vitality and lexical contribution to Spanish is Nahuatl. Nevertheless, from an extensive study of lexicography Lope Blanch (1969) showed that Amerindian loanwords are less numerous than often assumed:

“Podríamos afirmar que los indígenismos de uso general en el español de México ascienden, en total, a la cantidad de 156 vocablos, correspondientes a 121 lexemas; sumando a ellos las voces de uso o conocimiento parcial se llegaría a 245 vocablos y 186 lexemas. Cantidades no descartables, por cierto, pero tampoco tan elevadas como para suponer que su desaparición “produciría un caos verdaderamente horrible” en el habla mexicana, según creía D. Rubio (cf. *supra*, n. 15)” [We may state that Indian loanwords of widespread use in Mexican Spanish amount to 156 items corresponding to 121 lexemes. Add to this number the loanwords of partial use, and we have 245 words and 186 lexemes. While these numbers are not unimportant, they are not so important that their fall in disuse would produce a really disturbing effect in Mexican Spanish, as D. Rubio thought] (Lope Blanch 1969: 49; my translation).
Of the 156 items identified by Lope Blanch, 141 come from Nahuatl. Other Amerindian language families represented are Maya (9), Tarascan (5) and Otomí (1). Only 95 of all the loanwords are known in all Mexico while the rest are used by smaller sectors of the population in the cities or the countryside. Despite the rigorous analysis of the data by Lope Blanch, two remarks need to be made:

1) The sample studied by Lope Blanch was collected in the capital, and consequently his findings have a limited scope;

2) Amerindian loanwords will continue to enter local and regional varieties of Spanish as the process of Hispanicization advances in different areas of the country. These areas include Spanish varieties which are the product of imperfect learning by Amerindian speakers and therefore show the crystallization of lexical items from their first languages. These areas were not considered by the study of Nahuatl loanwords by Lope Blanch. His findings reflect only the use of Spanish monolinguals in the capital city.

5.4.2. Spanish in Querétaro

The state of Querétaro is located at the heart of the central plateau (Mesa Central de Anahuac). It has an extension of 11,499 square kilometers. The state capital (Querétaro) is located 211 kilometers north of Mexico City. The capital is home to 615,850 people representing two thirds of the state population (962,470). The great majority of people are Spanish monolingual and only a small part (22,000) bilingual in Spanish and Otomí (Ortiz Álvarez 2005: 55).

There are two studies on the Spanish spoken in Querétaro. One is due to Muñoz Ledo y Mena (1934). The other is the aforementioned Atlas Lingüístico de México (1990-2001), which includes an individual section for this area. From a comparison of the data of both sources, it is clear that the phonetic features of Querétaro Spanish have remained intact. Because there is only fragmentary information in both studies about the lexicon and other aspects of grammar, the following discussion deals exclusively with the phonetics.

Two of the most salient features of the central plateau are present in Querétaro: the non-aspiration of the fricative alveolar /s/ and the velar realization of /x/. Five additional features are reported for this variety, as shown in the following table.

---

38 The same applies to the phonetic and grammatical influences of Amerindian languages on Mexican Spanish. Lope Blanch (1972) states that excepting the morpheme -eco, extensively used in toponyms, Nahuatl influence on Mexican Spanish is not certain because all of the often adduced Amerindian traits were present in previous stages of Peninsular Spanish and occur in other parts of Hispanic America where Nahuatl is not present, such as the Antilles and the Andes. For a realistic evaluation of these statements, it is necessary to conduct research on local varieties of Spanish heavily influenced by Amerindian substratum which are often spoken in areas far from the principal urban centers.
Table 5.5. Phonetic features of Spanish in Querétaro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relaxation or elision of unstressed vowels:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/ → [ə] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>&lt;pues&gt; [pas] ~ [ps]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/ → [ə] ~ [ɔ]</td>
<td>&lt;oscuro&gt; [askuro] ~ [skuro]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average devoicing or elision of intervocalic /d/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d/ → [d] ~ [∅] if V_V</td>
<td>&lt;cerrado&gt; [señado] ~ [señao]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;enchilada&gt; [enčilada] ~ [enčila:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merger of intervocalic /ll/ and its eventual elision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ll/ → [y] if V_V</td>
<td>&lt;ardilla&gt; [ardy'α] ~ [ardía]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ll/ → [∅] if V_V</td>
<td>&lt;tortilla&gt; [tortiy'α] ~ [tortia]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibilant fricativization of /l/ in coda position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/ → [f] if V_#</td>
<td>&lt;comer&gt; [komeɾ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full realization of cluster /kt/ with sonorization of /k/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kt/ → [g] ~ [kt]</td>
<td>&lt;actor&gt; [aktoɾ] ~ [agtoɾ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Occurrence restricted to bilinguals

These features are not exclusive of Querétaro Spanish. Most of them occur all over the high plateau, even though their realization is particularly marked in Querétaro. As regards the relaxation of unstressed /e/ and /o/, Moreno de Alba (1989: 41) suggests that this feature is regular and perceptible in the entire central plateau while occurring occasionally in the eastern Coast (states of Veracruz, San Luis Potosi and Tamaulipas). About the generally assumed Amerindian substratum of this phonetic feature, Lope Blanch states that no clear link may be traced between the relaxation of unstressed vowels and the influence of Nahuatl because a similar relaxation is not reported for Nahuatl itself while it occurs in several areas of the Andes.

The second feature (devoicing or eventual elision of intervocalic /d/) is more intriguing for a dialectal classification, because it is typical of the Eastern coast and has a clear peninsular origin. Its occurrence might be explained as a phonetic ‘leftover’ of a set of Andalusian features present in early colonial times. However, even if right, this interpretation does not answer why the phonetic feature in question took root in Querétaro and not in other areas.

The third feature is interesting from a language contact perspective. The realization of /ll/ in most dialects of Mexican Spanish is [y] (Moreno de Alba: 2002: 113). If /ll/ is preceded by /i/ like in tortilla and ardilla, two phenomena may occur: either the vowel merges with the approximant to produce the segment [y] or the approximant coalesces with the vowel to produce the segment [i]. Rosenblatt (1967: 117) notes that the relaxation and eventual elision of /y/ in intervocalic environment is typical of lowland dialects. However, Querétaro Spanish is spoken in the highlands. We are therefore left with two possible explanations for this
phenomenon: the elision is either an Andalusian remnant or an outcome of imperfect learning of Spanish by Amerindian speakers. A piece of evidence for the second explanation is provided by Muñoz Ledo (1934: 105: 106), who found the coalescence of the vowel with the approximant in the Spanish speech of Otomí Indians from Querétaro. Additional support for this interpretation is the fact that similar mergers occur in the Spanish of indigenous speakers from other areas of the high plateau.

Another feature which deserves some comment here is the sibilant-like fricativization of /r/ in coda position. According to Moreno de Alba (2004: 130ff) the distribution of this feature corresponds roughly to the area of central Mexico, which is characterized by a strong articulation of consonants (Sp. fuerte consonantismo) as opposed to the eastern Coast. He supports this view with data from the Atlas and points out that sibilant-like fricativization of /r/ does not occur in any of the places where /s/ is aspirated or elided (a feature associated with prominent vowels and dark obstruents). While some authors like Malmberg (1948) put forward a Nahuatl substratum for this feature on the basis of its highland distribution, Lope Blanch (1972) considers this hypothesis erroneous for several reasons. First, the Amerindian language before contact had neither trills nor flaps. Second, the fricativization of /r/ is only one of several realizations of this phoneme in Mexico. And third, the frequency of fricativized /r/ is comparatively lower than the frequency of other realizations. For Lope Blanch the fricativization of the vibrant is not dialect-specific but associated with certain emphatic registers. However, the contact hypothesis cannot be overlooked. For its widespread distribution the fricativization of /r/ may be due to substratum influence from an indigenous language, not necessarily Nahuatl. According to Suárez (1983: 46), twelve languages of a sample of 38 from different Mesoamerican families do have vibrants. Tarascan has a set of two vibrants while Otomí has one vibrant phoneme (Hekking 1995: 31).39 Both are spoken in the central plateau, specifically in areas where the fricativization of /r/ shows the highest frequency.

I am specific in the description of several phonetic phenomena of Querétaro Spanish in order to show their possible Amerindian substratum, but also because they influence the borrowing and accommodation of Spanish loanwords in Otomí (cf. Chapter 10). Thus, the relaxation of unstressed vowels (e.g. escuela) may produce target forms in Otomí with vowel elision (e.g. [skuela]).

---

39 Hekking notes, however, that the trill /rr/ occurs only in Spanish borrowings, e.g. burro. No mention is made about whether the vibrant is fricativized or not.
5.5. **Spanish: a typological characterization**

This section takes as its point of departure the premise that Spanish is one and the same across continents and countries, regardless of dialectal, sociolectal and other variations. The evolution of Spanish in the Americas did not modify its typological nature but enriched the language in ways nobody could imagine before 1492. Even if Spanish is not a monolithic, indivisible entity – not even within the sociopolitical space of Latin America – Spanish remains to date one of main agglutinating factors in the continent. The present section is thought as a linguistic complement to the social and historical events described in section 5.1.1. To the extent that Spanish is the source language in the three borrowing situations studied in this book, its linguistic description will be a solid basis for the analysis of typological constraints on borrowing. The following characterization focuses on morphological typology and parts of speech but includes other parameters such syllable structure, type of affixation, order of constituents, alignment and so forth.

Genetically, Spanish is a language of the Romance branch of the Indo-European family, akin to Portuguese, French and Italian, all of them direct heirs of Latin, with which they share a number of typological characteristics. Spanish originated in the Castilian plains. From there it expanded first throughout the Peninsula since the twelfth century, during the Christian Re-conquest. Later, since 1492, it spread to the five continents in the context of the Spanish colonization.

Phonetically, Castilian Spanish has twenty-three distinct segments, of which eighteen are consonant and five vowels. While the number of vowels is the same for all varieties of Spanish – with certain differences such as vowel relaxation or elision, for example, in Ecuador and Mexico – the number of consonants in Andalusian and American varieties goes down to sixteen. The reason is the loss, in these dialects, of the dental-alveolar distinction /ð/-/s/ and the lateral-approximant distinction /ʃ/-/y/. Both phenomena are characteristic of the vast majority of American varieties of Spanish and were amply discussed in section 5.1.1. The typical Spanish syllable is open (CV), though several other sequences are possible too, the most typical being CVC (e.g. *tan-to*) and CCV (e.g. *tra-bajo*). Diphthongal syllabic nuclei are also very frequent in Spanish, especially those of rising type (second segment stressed). Onsets may be simple or complex. Simple syllabic onsets show no restriction while complex ones are only of the type occlusive-plus-flap. In contrast, codas show a larger number of restrictions, especially in word-final position (e.g. stops are not permitted in coda position at the end of a word).

As regards morphological typology, Spanish is a typical – though not prototypical – example of a fusional language. It shares this characteristic with other languages of the Romance branch due to their common origin in Latin, a highly fusional language. Spanish words usually contain more than one morpheme. However, morphemes in a word do not correspond to the linear sequence of morphs
in this word (Crystal 2006: 194). As a result, the identification of morphological segments is often unfeasible by the fusion of features in one single morph. 40 This is all the more evident in the Spanish verb phrase. Let us consider the verbs in the following sentence.

5) él no quiso que vinieran
3S.MASC NEG want.PST.PRF.3S that come.PST.PRF.SBJ.3PL

‘He did not want them to come’

The verbs of the main clause (quiso) and the subordinate clause (vinieran) are morphologically complex: they contain several morphemes which indicate number, person, tense, aspect and mood. Plural number in the subordinate verb is expressed by /-n/, the lack of which in the main verb indicates singular. Person is not indicated by separate morphs, but the same morph for number serves this purpose, i.e. one morph stands for two features. Tense, aspect and mood are even more difficult to assign in morphological terms. The only possible way to know that quiso is a perfective form is by comparing it to the verb stem (quer- ‘want’) and assigning the former to a specific paradigm of aspect. The same procedure applies to the verb vinieran, the stem of which is ven- ‘come’. 41 Notice that aspect and tense are closely related in Spanish, so that quis- and vini- indicate also past tense. The morphological identification of mood is not less complex. The subjunctive in (5) can be roughly assigned to the bound morph -era, but this assignment depends on the tense of verb. The morpheme is different when the verb is in present tense (e.g. veng-a-n, come-PRS.SUBJ.3PL).

The rich verb morphology of Spanish allows the optional suppression of the pronoun subject in a sentence. This is typical of pro-drop or null-subject languages. Because verbal endings usually enable the identification of subjects without further marking, personal pronouns are used mainly for emphasis and contrast.

These examples show the intricacies of Spanish verb morphology and illustrate the fusional character of this language. Fusion is present in other word classes such as articles and pronouns (plus pronominal clitics). The Spanish article deserves some description for it occurs as a grammatical borrowing in Guaraní. Developed from Latin demonstratives, Spanish articles not only indicate definiteness and number but also grammatical gender, and must concord with nouns in these features. Consider the following examples:

40 Notice my use of the terms ‘morpheme’ and ‘morph’. The former refers to the form and the semantic feature together, while the latter refers only to the form.
41 In fact, both quis- and vini- are suppletive forms in their corresponding paradigms.
6) \( \text{el} \) niño; \( \text{la} \) niña
   DEF.S.MASC  boy;  DEF.S.FEM  girl
   ‘the boy’;   ‘the girl’

7) \( \text{los} \) niños; \( \text{las} \) niñas
   DEF.PL.MASC boy.PL;  DEF.PL.FEM girl.PL
   ‘the boys’;   ‘the girls’

Notice that only the plural morpheme /-s/ can be segmented, even though the grammatical features involved are three (definiteness, gender and number). Because the Spanish article is a deictic itself, it cannot be preceded or followed by deictic forms such as demonstratives. This makes constructions like (8) ungrammatical.

8) \( \text{Ese} \) \( \text{el} \) hombre*
   DEM.DIST  DEF.S.MASC  man
   ‘That the man’

Possessive adjectives cannot precede or follow articles either. This is shown by the ungrammatical noun phrase in (9). To indicate possession, either a possessive adjective follows the noun (9a), or a possessive adjective precedes it (9b):

9) \( \text{La} \) \( \text{tu} \) casa*
   DEF.S.FEM  ADJ.POSS.2S  house
   ‘That your house’

9a) \( \text{La} \) casa \( \text{tuya} \)
   DEF.S.FEM  house  PRO.POSS.2S
   ‘Your house’

9b) \( \text{Tu} \) casa
   PRO.POSS.2S  house
   ‘Your house’

According to the Principle of System Compatibility (section 3.6.1) Spanish as a fusional language may borrow practically any form-meaning unit from any type of language, since no restrictions exist to morphological compatibility. In contrast, languages of other types (e.g. agglutinating or isolating) can borrow from Spanish only certain types of items depending on their compatibility: agglutinating languages can borrow independent words, roots and one-meaning affixes; isolating languages can borrow independent words and roots. These restrictions will be incorporated in
formulating the language-specific hypotheses on borrowing for the three languages of this study.

The preceding examples showed that Spanish verbal morphology is based on suffixation (i.e. bound forms attach to the end of stems or roots). Indeed, the entire Spanish inflectional morphology is made up of suffixes. Prefixes belong mostly to derivational morphology. Notice that the Spanish noun phrase shows less morphological fusion than the verb phrase. Compared to verb morphology, noun morphology is rather simple in this language. The reason for this simplification is the lack of morphological cases and the replacement thereof with a rich set of prepositions.

Spanish has a considerable number of simple and complex prepositions. These are prepositional periphrases in which basic prepositions combine with nouns to form a prepositional constituent (e.g. de acuerdo con ‘in accordance with’). In certain grammatical frameworks, the half-open nature of prepositions in Spanish supports their treatment as function words of lexical nature, i.e. items positioned in between lexicon and grammar. In Spanish, prepositions are a salient typological feature determining its degree of analyticity.

In the noun phrase, possession is indicated either by a set of possessive adjectives inflected for person and number, or by the use of preposition de. The following examples illustrate both types of possessive constructions:

10) Mi patria es tu hogar
   ‘My fatherland is your home’

11) El nieto de Antonio
    ‘Antonio’s grandson’

12) Gente del campo
    ‘People from the countryside’

13) Muros de piedra
    ‘Stone walls’

Preposition de is used to link non-possessive modifiers in the noun phrase. In (12) and (13) the nouns headed by the preposition refer to origin and material, respectively. Clausal modifiers in Spanish are linked by a number of relative pronouns (e.g. que, cuyo) and adverbial conjunctions (e.g. donde, cuando).
Relativization in Spanish is the most frequent clause-linking strategy. Coordination and subordination are accomplished by a series of connectives including simple conjunctions (e.g. y, o, si, como, porque) and a closed set of simple and complex adverbial conjuncts (e.g. así, ya que, desde que). The extensive use of connectives reinforces the Spanish preference for hypotactic constructions. Indeed, Spanish hypotaxis is diametrically opposed to the parataxis characteristic of languages like Guaraní.

Word order in Spanish is rather flexible. (S)VO is the unmarked word order in declarative sentences (14). Other orders are used with pragmatic value. Further mechanisms of clause dislocation include topic fronting (15) and cleft sentences (16).

14) El campesino trabaja la tierra
   DEF.S.MASC peasant work.PRS.3S DEF.S.FEM land
   ‘The peasant works the land’

15) La tierra la trabaja el campesino
    DEF.S.FEM land PRO.3S.ACC work.PRS.3S DEF.S.MASC peasant
    ‘The land is worked by the peasant’

16) Es la tierra la que trabaja
    be.PRS.3S DEF.S.FEM land DEF.S.FEM.ACC REL work.PRS.3S
    el campesino
    DEF.3.MASC peasant
    ‘It is the land which the peasant works’

The fronted topic in (15) does not have any marker indicating this function. Instead, the speaker uses an accusative clitic pronoun concordant with the fronted noun in number and gender. The strategy in (16) consists of a complex relative structure made up of the article and the relative pronoun in accusative case. These examples show clearly that alignment in Spanish distinguishes accusative arguments either morphologically (through pronominal clitics and prepositions) or syntactically (post-verbal position in declarative sentences) while subjects and agents are both unmarked.

The System of Parts of Speech in Spanish

I base the following description of the parts of speech in Spanish on the typology proposed by Hengeveld (1992) and Hengeveld et al (2004). The identification of Spanish along the scale of parts of speech is crucial to the analysis of lexical
borrowings and the formulation of language-specific hypotheses about the type of lexical classes borrowed and their use in the recipient language.

Spanish is a language with a differentiated parts-of-speech system (Type 4). It has individual lexical classes for each of the syntactic slots in predicate and referential phrases. Lexical classes in Spanish include verbs (used as heads of predicate phrases), nouns (used as heads of referential phrases), adjectives (used as modifiers of referential phrases), and manner adverbs (used as modifiers of predicate phrases).

The first distinction in the system of parts of speech of Spanish is based on morphological criteria. Spanish nouns and adjectives are usually marked for number (e.g. plural -(e)s) and gender (e.g. -a feminine, -o masculine), as shown in (17) and (18). In turn, verbs are marked for number but not for gender, and most importantly, finite verbs are always marked for tense, aspect and mood, as illustrated in (19). None of the latter markers occurs on nouns and adjectives.

A second distinction, based on morphological criteria as well, separates nouns, verbs and adjectives from manner adverbs. The majority of manner adverbs originate in adjectives, being derived from them by the suffix *mente*: e.g. casual ‘coincidental’ > *casual-mente* ‘coincidentally’; serio ‘serious’ > *seria-mente* ‘seriously’.

On the other hand, nouns and adjectives share a good part of morphology but they are different in two important aspects: first, nouns have intrinsic gender while adjectives do not; second, only adjectives can modify referential phrases while the great majority of nouns cannot.

As regards compounding, a few nouns can form compounds with verbs and other nouns, as illustrated by examples (20a) and (20b):
However, noun-noun compounding is highly restricted, because not any noun can form a compound with any verb or any noun. This is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (21), where two nouns cannot stand independently in the same referential phrase. In this case a prepositional connective is required (21b) in between the two nouns.

21)    a) casa piedra*  b) casa de piedra
       house stone  house OF stone

‘the stone house’  ‘the house of stone’

The fact that noun-noun compounds are only few while the number of verb-noun compounds is much larger is further evidence of the non-inherent modifying function of nouns. Nouns can stand alone own in the noun phrase, that is, without any further modifier. This is their defining characteristic. Interestingly, adjectives can also stand alone in the noun phrase, that is, without an explicit noun head. This feature typical of Spanish adjectives is not evidence, however, that adjectives can occupy both the syntactic slots of heads and modifier of the referential phrase. In fact, noun heads are implicit and can be most of the times retrieved from discourse if required, as shown in (22) below. Exceptional are cases of nominalization of adjectives, as in los Rojos ‘the Red’ (the communists).

22)  ¿Te gustan los rojos?
     You.ACC like.PRS.PL DEF.PL.MASC red.PL.MASC
        - ‘Do you like the red ones?’

     ¿los zapatos rojos?
     DEF.PL.MASC shoe-PL red.PL.MASC
        - ‘The red shoes?’

A final issue concerns the relative flexibility of Spanish adjectives, according to which they may be used also as modifiers of predicate phrases (adverbs) without further measures. However, this flexibility is restricted to a small subclass of adjectives. Members of this subclass can modify nouns and verbs alike by filling the syntactic slots modifier of referential phrase and modifier of predicate phrase. Consider the adjective rápido ‘fast’ in (23) below. The ambiguity of the sentence is caused by the fact that rápido can modify the head noun tren ‘train’ (interpretation A) or the verb tomar ‘take’ (interpretation B). Still, rápido can become a full-fledged manner adverb by taking the adverbial ending (mente), in which case it produces the second interpretation of (23).
23) No pude tomar el tren rápido
   NEG  could  take  ART  train  fast
Meaning A: ‘I could not take the fast train’
Meaning B: ‘I could not take the train quickly’

24) No pude tomar el tren rápidamente
   NEG  could  take  ART  train  quickly
‘I could not take the train quickly’

The number of adjectives that can be used also as predicate phrase modifiers is small. Most adjectives cannot be used adverbially. This is shown in (25). The adjective sincero ‘honest’ cannot modify the verb decir ‘tell’ unless it takes the adverbial ending. Finally, there are a few adjectives that cannot take the adverbial ending and are used therefore as manner adverbs in their adjective form (26).

25) dime la verdad sincéramente / sincero*
tell:1.DAT  ART  truth  honestly / honest
‘Tell me the truth honestly’

26) no corras, ve despacio/despaciamente*
   NEG  run:PRS.IND.2S  go.IMP.2S  slow/slowly
‘I left (the place) running’

The above discussion confirms the classification of Spanish is a type-4 language: a language with individual lexical classes for every syntactic slot. Verbs differ from nouns, adjectives and manner adverbs in that they take markers of tense, aspect and mood while the others not. In turn, nouns are different from adjectives in that they have intrinsic gender and cannot modify other nouns except in compounding. Finally, adjectives differ from manner adverbs in that the vast majority of them cannot act as predicate modifiers without further measures. While a closed class of adjectives behaves flexibly as modifiers of both types of phrases, prototypical adjectives modify only referential phrases. All of this makes Spanish a differentiated language.