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Abstract

The Spanish spoken today in the Latin American is diverse in many components of grammar. Between every country there exist drastic contrast in the lexicon, syntax, and phonology. These dissimilarities are so vast that even within each country one can find handfuls of regionals dialects that further greaten the linguistic multiplicity of Latin American Spanish. One unique aspect of Latin American Spanish is the linguistic differences between the lowland/coastal and highland/inland varieties that exist throughout several countries. Although scholars agree on the current diverse state of Latin American Spanish they dispute over the origins of these two varieties (lowland vs. highland), and what other factors beside origin might be responsible for the linguistic diversity.

In this thesis I focus on the history of Latin American Spanish with an emphasis on Ecuadorian Spanish. I deconstruct the theories that describe Latin American Spanish and the history of Latin American Spanish. I examine the indigenous, pro-andalucismo, and anti-andalucismo theories in relation to Iberian Spanish, Latin American Spanish, and Ecuadorian Spanish. Through examining the various arguments of different linguists I conclude that the aforementioned theories are not sufficient to stand on their own and fully account for Latin America’s linguistic diversity. I propose that instead these theories be combined together and that rather than imposing a blanket theory over all of Latin American Spanish that each countries history and linguistic situation be taken into account.
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1 Introduction

In this thesis I explore the history of Latin American Spanish and the causes for its linguistic diversity. I deconstruct three theories: the Indigenista (indigenous) theory, pro-andalucista, and anti-andalucista. I examine each theory in relation to Ecuadorian Spanish. The main goal of this thesis is to determine the linguistic origins of highland and lowland dialects displayed in various Latin American countries such as Ecuador.

2 Theories and Concepts: The Historical Formation of Latin American Spanish

In this section I consider the most prominent theories that describe the history of Latin American Spanish. First, I analyze the indigenismos ‘indigenous’ theory. Second, I analyze the pro-andalucistas’ argument. Third, I analyze the anti-andalucistas’ argument in relation to the claims made pro-andalucistas. Lastly, I examine the pros and cons of each theory and discuss how each of these arguments relates to Ecuadorian Spanish.

2.1 Indigenismo/Indigenista Argument (The Indigenous Theory)

During the late nineteenth century the German historical linguist, Rodolfo Lenz (1893 as cited in Mujica, 2001) proposed the Indigenista theory (also called Araucanista theory) in an attempt to describe the formation of Chilean Spanish. During his time in Chile, Lenz documented several unique lexical and phonological characteristics in Chilean Spanish. Some of the phonological traits he found were seseo, yeismo, the aspiration of /s/ in syllable final position, and a unique intonation in common day speech (these phonological features are described in Section 2.2.4). Not being aware of other Latin American Spanish dialects he concluded that these linguistic traits (mainly the phonology) were only present in Chilean Spanish and had origins from the Mapudungun language, one of the languages spoken by the Chilean indigenous population.
With time and advancement in the knowledge and documentation of Latin American Spanish Lenz’s thesis and conclusions were questioned and consequently debunked by later linguists. One of the linguists that disagree with Lenz’s thesis is Rodolfo Oroz (1966). According to Oroz, the phonological traits Lenz found to be unique to the Chilean Spanish are actually traits well spread throughout the Americas. For over a century Spanish linguists have documented the phonological traits mentioned by Lenz (\textit{seseo}, yeismo, and the aspiration of the /s/ in syllable final position) in Spain and in other Latin American Spanish dialects. Since these traits have been documented in other countries before and after Lenz’s observations, the hypothesis that they originate in Chile or are due to close contact with the Mapudungun language is erroneous on account of the fact that the Mapudungun language’s influence is regionally limited and is not spoken all across the Latin America and in Spain. Although Oroz refutes Lenz’s Indigenista theory on the phonological influence of Mapudungun on Chilean Spanish he acknowledges that the Mapudungun language and other Armendian languages have had a direct impact on Chilean Spanish lexicon and intonation. However, he believes that the influence of Mapudungun language is decreasing, this decline is apparent in today’s Chilean lexicon. Oroz (1966:410-411 as cited in Salas, 1996:150) states:

“In Chile, the indigenous element of vocabulary is being reduced more and more... of the 1,600 words R. Lenz stated to find in his etymological dictionary only a small percentage of those words are used constantly today in the common language, with the exception to those who study plants and animals.”

One of the reasons why the lexicon originating from the Mapudungun languages is disappearing in Chilean Spanish is because of its value in Chilean society. Like in most Latin American countries, the native pre-Colombian languages are not highly valued by the general population. In the past, due to the social-class hierarchy constructed by the Spaniards during the colonization period, the Amerindian languages were viewed as inferior to Spanish. Today, while we may not find any Latin Americans that describe ingenious languages as inferior to Spanish, the majority of the ingenious languages do not have prominent roles in Latin American societies. The greater part of the Amerindian languages that do exist today are not
official languages in their respective countries and Latin American governments make limited effort to ensure their prosperity, therefore their level of influence is dwindling. In language contact theory there are different types of influence, the two prime forms are proper borrowing and substratum transfer. Bruil (2008:3) defines proper borrowing as when a prestige language such as Spanish affects a minority language such as Kichwa. Substratum transfer is when a minority language, Kichwa, influences a prestige language, Spanish. In this scenario the prestige language resist using obvious minority language features such as phonological and lexical characteristics but may borrows structural features, that do not readily appear as apart of the minority language. With time, language attitudes may change and direct transfers from the substratum language may occur. This scenario is not the case in Latin America where the lexicon originating from indigenous languages are disappearing in general. This is not to say that one will find any ingenious lexical items in Latin American Spanish dialects just not an abundant amount in all forms of speech.

In agreement with Oroz are Salas (1996) and Vaquero de Ramírez (1991). Both scholars believe that in general indigenous languages’ influences on Latin American Spanish are superficial due to their lack of social impact on their societies. Vaquero de Ramírez (1991) states that indigenous languages’ forms of influence are limited to regions, or strictly local, and that there are a few cases where they influence linguistic aspects such as the phonology (Vaquero de Ramírez 1991: 21). Their reasoning can also account for the loss of words because unless the lesser language(s) become norms in society their presence/strength is lost over time. Salas deduces that if the Chilean indigenous population had much influence on the Chilean Spanish then there would exist strong evidence in all components of the grammar: the pronunciation, syntax, and vocabulary. In reality this is not the case because Chilean Spanish does not have so many footprints of Pre-Hispanic languages (Salas 1996:145). As shown by more recent linguistic evidence the origins of Chilean Spanish are not solely based in indigenous roots.

The validity of the Indigenista theory and the impact that indigenous languages have had on American Spanish dialects varies within every country in
Latin America. The linguistic situation in each Latin American country varies and the population size and historical presence/influence of Amerindian cultures also differs. The Spanish of a country like Argentina, a country that is known to have a very small indigenous population, may show little indigenismos (traces of indigenous languages); contrastingly, a country like Peru, known to have a larger Amerindian population and which has designated one of the indigenous languages (Quechua) as an official language, may have more indigenismos. Although there exists a large degree of variation, one thing that is for certain is that there is some linguistic influence of the American Indian languages on the Spanish language, but to what extent is the influence on every country and regional dialect is open to question.

Given these indecisive conclusions about the level of indigenous language's influences on Latin American Spanish one must turn to other theories that describe the peculiarities of Latin American Spanish. The most debated theory is the andalucismo theory and like the Indigenista theory, the debate around it is divided into three perspectives.

The andalucismo debate has existed for over a century. The main topics that are discussed in this debate are: the demographic strengths of each Spanish colonists population during the colonization, the Spanish that was spoken during the colonization, the linguistic affect the colonists had on Latin American Spanish, and the current similarities found between Latin American and peninsular Spanish. In the following two sections I discuss the arguments of the pro and anti-andalucistas.

2.2 Pro-Andalucismo Argument

Historically Spanish linguists have assumed that Latin American Spanish is based on the Castilian regional dialect of Spanish. However, at the beginning of the nineteenth century many scholars began to explore other possibilities and it is there, where the andalucismo hypothesis arose (Boyd-Bowman 1956:1163). Renowned Spanish linguist, Angel Rosenblat (2002: 141) defines the andalucismo hypothesis as consisting of three concepts:
En realidad, con el término de andalucismo se cubren, o encubren, ideas a veces distintas, que conviene dilucidar claramente: a) un parecido general entre el español americano y el andaluz, que a veces se formula en el campo de la pronunciación o se extiende a la morfología y el léxico; b) una influencia mayor o menor del habla andaluza sobre la hispanoamericana; c) una clara filiación dialectal (nuestro español de América aparece así como un subdialecto del dialect andaluz).

‘In reality, the term andalucismo covers several ideas, although distinct at times, they unite together to clearly explain the meaning of andalucismo into three concepts: (1) a general similarity between American and Andalusian Spanish that is argued in the field of phonology or morphology and/ or lexicology; (2) either the lack or great influence the Andalusian dialect had on the formation of Spanish of the Americas; (3) a clear dialectal filiation between the Spanish of the Americas and the Spanish of Andalucía to the extent that the Spanish’s of the Americas are considered sub-dialects of the dialect Andalusian,’ (my translation).

In this thesis I refer to the andalucismo hypothesis as concept number one “a general similarity between American and Andalusian Spanish that is argued in the field of phonology or morphology and/ or lexicology” (however, I will only focus on the phonological aspect of the argument) and concept number two “either the lack or great influence the Andalusian dialect had on the formation of Spanish of the Americas” (Rosenblet 2002: 141).

According to Noll (2005) the first scholar to reference the similarities between American and Andalusian Spanish was the bishop Lucas Fernández de Piedrahita of Colombia in 1668. In his publication Historia general de las conquistas del Nevo Rieno de Granada (1668) the bishop alludes to the phonological traits of the natives in Cartagena de Indias (Cartagena of the Indies), a beach on the Caribbean coast region of Colombia. Bishop Fernández de Piedrahita (1668 Vol. 3, Cap. 3. as cited in Noll 2005: 95) states:

[... the natives of this land, poorly disciplined in the purity of the Spanish language, generally speak Spanish with the vulgarisms that derive from the costal Andalusians, [...]

Wagner (1927: 25) states that like bishop Fernández de Piedrahita there are countless Spanish scholars that make identical observations about the similarities between Latin American and Andalusian Spanish. Wagner asserts that it cannot be a
mere coincidence that various writers have documented these similarities and that there must exist an underlying connection between these dialects. Although bishop Fernández de Piedrahita’s makes a superficial phonological comparison, this comparison is nonetheless the basis of the pro-andalucismo argument. The premise of the pro-andalucismo argument is that Latin American and Andalusian Spanish are very similar and that these similarities are due to the intense linguistic and physical influence Andalusians had during the initial colonization of Latin America. Below I describe the arguments to the pro-andalucismo argument.

2.2.1  **Demographics of early colonists: Antillean Period (1493-1519)**

From the pro-andalucistas’ standpoint the most crucial time period that dictated the formation of Latin American Spanish was from 1493 to 1519, this period is referred the Antillean period and initial period. The word *Antillean* derives from the word Antilles, which refers to the islands of the greater part of the West Indies in the Caribbean Sea. The reason why the Antillean region important is because it was the first region in which Spanish colonists first settled.

During the initial period the Spanish colonies were consolidated into one island, Hispaniola (de la Cova 1997). Hispaniola lies southwest of Cuba and northeast of Puerto Rico. Today, the island of Hispaniola is comprised of the countries the Dominican Republic and Haiti but in the past it served as the home of new Spanish arrivals and a launching site for the conquest of the rest of the Americas (Lipski 2007:4). According to Boyd-Bowman (1956), because the Spanish colonists were based in a general area of the Caribbean (mainly in Santo Domingo, Hispaniola) Latin American Spanish more than likely started to develop during that time. He states, “it is during this critical initial period, when the Spanish colonial effort was mainly centered in the Antilles, that the earliest form of American Spanish must have developed” (Boyd-Bowman 1956; 1154).

What makes the Antillean period relevant to the andalucismo hypothesis is that many linguists like Boyd-Bowman (1956), Wagner (1927), and Menéndez Pidal (1924 as cited in Wagner 1927: 26) argue that during this period the largest regional group of Spanish colonists was from Andalusia. Boyd-Bowman (1956; 1155) states, “in the initial or Antillean period by far the largest single group, in
every year, and on all major expeditions, were the Andalusians, of whom over 78% came from the two single provinces of Seville (1259-58%) and Huelva (439-20%)."

In agreement with Boyd-Bowman is Dr. Raúl Ávila, who draws attention to the population of women and their origins during the initial colonization of Latin America. Ávila (1992) claims that the majority of the women during the Antillean period were from Andalusia and that when these women became mothers they more than likely taught their children their form of Andalusian Spanish. Ávila (1992: 685) states:

Los andaluces forman el grupo más numeroso de los colonizadores de América en las primeras épocas. Además, de cada diez mujeres que se asentaban en este continente entre 1493 y 1508, seis eran andaluzas. Y esa cifra aumentó hasta casi el setenta por ciento en los siguientes diez años. Las mujeres son, en el caso del lenguaje, más importantes que los hombres: ellas enseñan a hablar a los hijos en lengua materna, o en el dialecto que ellas, a la vez, aprendieron de sus madres.

‘The Andalusians formed the most numerous group of American colonists during the first decades. In addition, every ten woman that arrived to the continent between 1493 and 1508, six of them were Andalusians. This number increased to almost seventy percent during the consecutive ten years. In the case of language women are more important than men: women teach their children how to speak their maternal language or in their dialect and simultaneously, the children learn from their mothers,’ (my translation).

Therefore, when we take into account the general data on immigrant origins and also factor in the great linguistic input a mother has on her children’s speech, it is logical to assume that the Andalusian Spanish dialect would have been the most prominent dialect spoken during the initial colonization of Latin America and the largest dialect passed down to children. Furthermore, because the early colonists were concentrated in one location it is believed that this created an environment for linguistic assimilation and dialect leveling, where all dialectal differences would disappear and Andalusian Spanish would rise to become the standard because it was the most spoken amongst the colonists (Boyd-Bowman 1956; 1155).

After the Antillean period, Spanish emigration did not cease, instead new colonies were found and colonists’ concentrations changed. From 1520 until 1600
the destinations of colonists and the origins of colonists altered. Due to expeditions and the discovery of new colonies, the Antillean islands were no longer the most Spanish inhabited region of Latin America (Boyd-Bowman 1963:167). Along with the shift in colonists’ destinations there was also a fluctuation in migration. Regardless of this change in location and the fluctuation of migration flows, Andalusians remained the largest migrating population in general. Boyd-Bowman (1963: 166) states:

Resulta que la contribución andaluza, hasta 1526 y también en 1536, más del 40% de la emigración total, se reduce al 34.0% en 1528, y a menos del 23.0% en 1538, único año en que el contingente andaluz se ve superado por el de otra región.”

‘The results show that the Andalusian contribution from 1526 and also in 1536, were more than 40 percent of the emigration total, the numbers are reduced to 34 percent in 1528 and less than 23 percent in 1538, the only year the Andalusian quota is surpassed by another region,’ (my translation).

Even if the largest Spanish population in America was Andalusians, Spanish colonists inhabited each colony differently. In his article *La emigración Peninsular a América 1520 a 1539* Boyd-Bowman (1963) explains that there were population differences between each colony. Two countries that exemplify this difference are Mexico and Venezuela. According to Boyd-Bowman’s (1963) data in Mexico during 1520 there were 37.5% Andalusians, 18.5% Old Castellans, 12.6% Extremendians, 11.2% New Castellans, 9.9% Basques and etc.; during the same time period, in Venezuela there were 22.2% Andalusians, 22.0% Old Castellans, 11.4% Leonese, 9.8% New Castellans and etc. With this said, there were obviously different levels of influence occurring from different Spanish regions in different colonies. However, the most recent data collected by Boyd-Bowman shows that overall largest population during the initial colonization of Latin America was Andalusians. Below is a chart that summarizes the early colonists’ origins from 1493 to 1559 (Figure 1 taken from Boyd-Bowman (1967: 64)): 
2.2.2 The linguistic affect the colonists had on Latin American Spanish

As I mentioned above, the pro-andalucistas speculate that because Andalusians were the largest population in the Americas, their Spanish would become the norm during the initial period of colonization of Latin America. This hypothesis is based of the assumption that language acclimatization occurred in the Americas and in Spain.

It is hypothesized that once the Antillean period ended, Peninsular Spanish’s linguistic influence on Latin American Spanish continued but was slowly diminishing, and so any date after the Antillean period is viewed as insignificant,
because of the probability of there being important linguistic influence was minuscule. Boyd-Bowman states, “by the time Spanish spread to large areas of the mainland (Latin America) it had already passed through an initial period of environmental acclimatization and dialectal leveling and was emerging as a distictively New World brand,” (Boyd-Bowman 1956: 1155). With all this said, if by 1519 the Spanish of the Americas was developing into its own new form and resisted linguistic input from Spain then the later arriving Spaniards probably acclimatized to the Spanish that they found in the Americas (Boyd-Bowman 1956; 1155; Ávila 1992: 685).

In addition to the notion of the linguistic acclimatization that occurred in the New World, pro-andalucistas’ speculate that on the peninsula prospective colonists experienced similar environmental acclimatization and dialectal leveling during the time they spent in cities such as Seville (of the Andalusian province) waiting to travel to the New World (Boyd-Bownman 1956:1162). According to Penny (2002), one of the major factors that we must consider when analyzing the origins of the early colonists and their language is that, “groups of colonists from all over Spain gathered in Seville before their departure and were often kept there for months waiting to ship,” (Penny 2002:26). He later goes on to say that it is logical to assume that the immigrants from diverse linguistic backgrounds would adapt to their new surroundings and assimilate to the speech patterns of Seville. Penny (2002: 26) states:

Nor should it be forgotten that almost all contact between Spain and its American colonies was channeled through Seville (or its dependent port of Cádiz...this dominant position of Seville in all dealings with America no doubt favored the continuing spread of Andalusian linguistic features to America...Even before settling out, prospective settlers from the center and north of Spain had probably already acquired at least some of the characteristics features of southern speech. This process of dialectal adjustment is now well understood and can now be said that such processes are normal, even inevitable.

In addition to being surrounded by Andalusians while waiting to depart, while traveling to the Americas colonist had more contact with Andalusians because the
ships were manned mainly by Andalusian workers, therefore colonists’ contact with Andalusian Spanish was inevitable and full circle (Penny 2000:142; Boyd-Bownman 1956:1162).

2.2.4 The Spanish spoken during the colonization of Latin America

Apart from the theories on mother language input and language acclimatization, the strong hold of the pro-andalucista hypothesis has often been their phonological argument. Today there are various phonological processes that are found in present day Andalusian and Latin American Spanish and because of these similarities pro-andalucistas have been able to argue Andalusian linguistic influence. The challenge is determining when and where these processes arose. Provided below is a list of the phonological features that are found in both Andalusia and Latin America and that are used in support of the pro-andalucista argument.

2.2.4.1 The Most disputed phonological processes

The primary phonological features that are discussed in the andalucismo debate are: seseo, yeismo; neutralization of syllable final /r/ and /l/; the deletion of intervocalic and word final /d/; and deletion of syllable final /s/. Provided below is a brief definition of each phonological process.

1) The neutralization of the two phonemes /θ/ and /s/ to the single phoneme /s/: Seseo

Initially in all forms of old Spanish there existed the near minimal pair [ˈkaθa] (caza- ‘game in reference to hunting’) and [ˈkasa] (casa – ‘house’) where the phonemes /θ/ and /s/ distinguished meanings between the two words. However, after the sibilant turmoil of Middle Spanish these two phonemes merged into one phoneme /s/ in Andalusia (discussed in Section) (Penny 2000:119). This merger of the phonemes changed the pronunciation of the words so that both words are pronounced the same; consequently, the only way a listener would be able to determine if the speaker is speaking of his/her house or game would be through context. Seseo is not limited to one syllable position, it occurs in all syllable positions (Izzo, 1984: 109).

2) The neutralization of the phonemes /j/ (written [y]) and /ʎ/ (written [ll]) to the /j/ phoneme: Yeismo
Yeísmo is the neutralization of the phonemes /ʎ/ (formerly written as −ll−) and /ʝ/ (formerly written as −y- to /ʝ/). This form of neutralization occurs in all word and syllable positions in Spanish. Provided below is an example of yeísmo:

/ʎorar/ (llorar ‘cry’), /ʎ/ → [ʝ], [ʝorar]

In the example above the word llorar initially pronounced as [ʎorar] in traditional Spanish can now also be pronounced as [ʝorar] in other forms of Spanish. Speakers are either yeístas or not yeístas, in other words they either distinguish the phonemes or do not distinguish the phonemes.

3) The merger of syllable final liquids: /r/ and /l/

Linguists have not determined if the neutralization of the two phonemes extends beyond syllable final position, because of this, this process is often defined as sporadic for we do not have sufficient information on what induces this change.

Examples of /r/ -> [l] alternation (taken from Enquita Utrilla 1998: 63)
/kuerda/ (cuerda ‘rope’) → [kuela]
/perder/ (perder ‘to lose’) → [peldel]

Examples of /l/ → [r] alternation (taken from Zamora 1960: 248)
/alguno/ (alguno ‘some’) → [arguno]
/bolsa/ (bolsa ‘bag’) → [borsa]

4) The deletion of syllable final and intervocalic /d/.

Not very much is known about the causes of syllable final and intervocalic /d/ deletion. Linguists have found trends between the environments in which intervocalic /d/ deletion occurs the most. Lipski (2011: 80) states that when intervocalic /d/ is elided it mainly occurs in past participial ending -ado.

Examples of intervocalic /d/ deletion (taken from Zamora 1960 251)
/granada/ (Granada ‘Granada, city or pomegranate’) → [grana] *
/pedir/ (Pedir ‘to ask for’) → [peir]  
*In Spanish there are no long vowels and so when the word Granada undergoes intervocalic /d/ deletion, the second /a/ vowel is emitted so Granada → granaa → grana.

Examples of word final /d/ deletion (taken from Zamora 1960: 251)
The weakening of syllable-final /s/: deletion and aspiration

The weakening of syllable final /s/ occurs in different degrees. The lowest degree is the aspiration of /s/ which results into the glottal fricative [h]. The greatest degree is the complete deletion of the sound (Penny 2002: 122). According to Torres Cacoullos (2003), there are many factors and conditions that cause/call for the deletion or aspiration of syllable final /s/. Some factors are the number of syllables in a word, the prosodic stress, and the position of the /s/ (Salcedo 2010: 202).

There are multiple types of syllable final /s/ aspiration in Spanish. First, there is simple aspiration; second, there is germination with pre-aspiration; and third, there is regular germination. The most prominent form is when /s/ is realized as [h] in syllable coda position (Morris 2000, 1). Provided below are examples of /s/ aspiration forms taken from (Morris, 2000: 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example words</th>
<th>Aspiration</th>
<th>Gemination with Pre-aspiration</th>
<th>Gemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obispo ‘bishop’</td>
<td>obi[h]po</td>
<td>obi[hp]po</td>
<td>obi[p]po</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mismo ‘same’</td>
<td>mi[h]mo</td>
<td>mi[hm]mo</td>
<td>mi[hm]mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.5 The phonological evidence

In the past, there has not been much solid evidence that defends the Andalusian origins of the aforementioned phonological traits nor the presence of these features in Latin American Spanish during the colonization period. Nevertheless, today, with linguists gaining access to Spanish documents, more information is being ascertained. Boyd-Bowman (1974:1), a pro-andalucista, argues that the phonological traits now found in both Andalusian and Latin American Spanish did exist in both dialects during the first years of Latin America colonization.
He supports his argument with private letters written by Antonio de Aguilar, a Spanish fugitive residing in Veracruz, Mexico, to his sister and wife, both natives of Seville, Spain, living in Seville during the time the letters were written. Boyd-Bowman states that the letters were not entirely written by Aguilar but instead done by two of his Sevillian friends who immigrated to Mexico in 1566. The letters are full of erratic ‘phonetic’ spelling, which suggest that Aguilar and his friends spoke some form a Veracruz dialect that had “salient features of present-day Andalusian and Caribbean phonology ”. These features were *seseo*, alternation and loss of syllable final /l/ and /r/, and deletion of syllable or word-final /s/.

Besides the data presented by Boyd-Bowman (1974), there has not been much historical information that describes early Latin American Spanish. The majority of the pro-andalucismo argument is based on today’s similarities. In Sections 3.1 I outline Andalusian Spanish, in Sections 4 I outline Latin American Spanish, and in Section 4.3 I discuss these similarities in relation to the pro and anti-arguments. Please refer to these sections for more information on the similarities between Latin American and Andalusian Spanish.

### 2.3 Anti-Andalucismo Argument

The main anti-andalucista argument is that Latin American Spanish does not derive from Andalusian Spanish. Within this perspective are various arguments based on the history of the colonization of the Americas, the language of the colonizers, and the current speech of Latin American. In this section I will explore the various arguments of the anti-andalucistas and discuss their in argument in relation to all the arguments presented by the pro-andalucistas.

The anti-andalucistas’ perspective began during the same time of the andalucismo hypothesis. The leaders in this standpoint were linguists like Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Navarro Tomás, Rufino José Cuervo and Amado Alonso.

#### 2.3.1 Demographics of early colonists

In opposition to the idea that Peninsular Spanish greatly influenced Latin American Spanish, Henríquez Ureña, the first anti-andalucista, argues that during the colonization of Latin America there were too many dialects present, he states:
español de América, considerado en su conjunto, tiene caracteres propios; no procede ni depende de ninguna región especial de España, porque todas las regiones estuvieron representadas en la conquista y la colonización (Urena 1930: 277).

‘Latin American Spanish, considered as a whole, has its own characteristics, it does not originate nor depend upon no specific region in Spain because all the regions were represented during the conquest and colonization,’ (my translation).

From a slightly different perspective are other anti-andalucistas, Navarro Tomás (1957) and Rufino José Cuervo (1885 as cited in Rosenblat 2002: 145), who claim that Latin American Spanish has phonetic influences from all Spanish regions, however, it would be nearly possible to began to deduce the time period, locations and circumstances that could have caused influences from each region, Tomás (1957: 7) states:

“Se comprende que el habla de América debe haber influencias fonéticas de todas las regiones españolas; pero no eso cosa fácil establecer la época, los lugares y las circunstancias relativas a la influencia de cada

‘it is understood that American speech has phonetic influences from all Spanish regions, but it is not that simple to establish the decade, place and circumstances relative to the influences of each region’ (my translation).

Combined Urena, Tomás and Cuervo assert that in the history of Latin America no specific peninsular dialect had the greatest influence because all dialects were present during colonization, furthermore it is virtually impossible to deduce that one dialect such as Andalusian Spanish had the greatest influence in specific regions.

When pro-andalucistas like Wagner (1927) claim that Andalusians were the largest colonist population inhabit the Americas, Henríquez Ureña states that the Andalusian population did not come near one third of the Spanish population percentage, he states “no eran mayoría los andaluces en al conquista y colonización, pues en ningún caso llegan a constituir, siquiera la tercia parte de total,” (Henríquez Ureña 1921: 121 (as cited by Wagner 1927: 29), ‘the Andalusians were not the majority population during the colonization of Latin American, nor were they ever one third of the immigrant population,’(my translation). Henríquez Ureña’s first statement was an assumption but several years later he collected data from the
Spanish catalogues of passengers to the New World and with this data he found that during the period of 1492-1600 Andalusians were not the largest population. Provided below are the conclusions Henríquez Ureña (1935: 1233-59 as cited in Danesi 1977: 184) made about the immigrant population in Latin America:

(1) Regional Origins:
(a) Español del Norte (Northern Spaniards) = 5,823 (41.7%)
(b) Español del Sur (Southern Spaniards) = 5,938 (42.6%)
(c) Zona intermedia = 934 (6.7%)
(d) Zonas laterales = 1,253 (9%)

13,948 (100%) (100%)

Henríquez Ureña’s data shows that from 1492-1600 there was not a large difference between the population percentages of northern and southern Spaniards in the Americas. Today there are not any anti-andalucistas that present data to support the findings of Henríquez Ureña from seventy-eight years ago. Instead there is Boyd-Bowman from the pro-andalucismo standpoint. Boyd-Bowman’s data (1956; 1963; 1967; 1976) (refer to Section 5.2.1 for description of Boyd-Bowman’s data) is more recent and extensive than that of Henríquez Ureña.

Pro-andalucistas speculate that after the initial colonization period the later arriving colonists did not have much linguistic influence on the Spanish that was in Latin America. Instead, they adapted to the new forming Latin American Spanish. Lipski (2002; 2007), a present day anti-andalucista, rebukes this idea by claiming that no such linguistic acclimatization occurred because during the initial colonization period the main cities of Latin America were very small in population size, and when new colonists arrived their population sizes were easily half the resident population in Latin American, and because of the new colonists’ population size in ratio to the that of the residents they could leave a great linguistic impact rather than accommodate to the Spanish already existing in the Americas (Lipski 2007: 11).

2.3.2 The linguistic affect colonists had on Latin American Spanish and the Spanish spoken during the Latin America

According to Lipski (2002: 5) if the Spanish brought over during Antillean period was the foundation of Latin American Spanish then Caribbean Spanish would
resemble Judeo-Spanish. Judeo-Spanish is the Spanish of the exiled Jews that has remained conservative and did not participate in the phonetic evolution that the rest of the peninsular did, and so the Spanish spoken by the decedents of the Jewish-Spaniards is referred to as historical marker in the Spanish language because it has least amount of changes from the 16th century (Alonso 1953: 12). Lipski (2002:5) states:

The only surviving variety of Spanish which closely resembles early 16th century Spanish is Sephardic or Judeo-Spanish (known in the vernacular as judezmo or, in its written form, as ladino, spoken by descendants of Sephardic Jews expelled from Spain beginning in 1492, and who maintained their language in isolated communities in eastern Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, isolated from innovations that spread to the remainder of the Spanish-speaking world. Sephardic Spanish is a reasonable approximation to what Caribbean Spanish might actually be like if the ‘founder principle’ or ‘Antillean period’ models were viable hypotheses for the formation of modern Latin American Spanish dialects.

However, today’s Caribbean Spanish is not like Judeo-Spanish. According to Lipski (2002) Caribbean Spanish continued to receive linguistic influence from Spain. Lipski provides a list of various phonological processes that he hypothesizes occurred on the peninsula after the Antillean period but is found in all dialects of Latin American Spanish. One of the processes is the voicing distinction between /s/ and /z/. Lipski believes that during 1492 all forms of peninsular Spanish had the two phonemes /s/ and /z/ and the devoicing of /z/ was incomplete on the peninsula until the end of the XVI century (after the Antillean period ended). Following his line of thought, if Latin American Spanish truly did receive its foundation of Spanish during the Antillean period then there would be a distinction between the two phonemes /s/ and /z/ in today’s Latin American Spanish, but clearly there is not (Lipski 2002: 4).

Anti-andalucistas refute the hypothesis that a large portion of Latin American Spanish resembles Andalusian Spanish. According to linguists like Alonso (1953), Lipski (2007) and Henríquez Ureña (1921), the only regions in Latin America that really share linguistic characteristics with Andalusians, are the lowland regions of Latin America and the Caribbean islands. Henríquez Ureña (1921: 359 as cited in
Quesada Pacheco (2001) states: "tal andalucismo, donde existe —es sobre todo en las tierras bajas—, puede estimarse como desarrollo paralelo y no necesariamente como influencia del Sur de España" ‘such andalusisms where they exist — especially in the lowlands — and it can be estimated that this is due to a parallel development and not necessary like influence of the South of Spain,’ (my translation). In order to explain the similarities that do exist between lowland and Andalusian Spanish, Henríquez Ureña and Amado Alonso propose that both Latin American and Andalusian Spanish developed at the same time and toward the same direction (Medina Lopez 1993: 214). However, this argument is not well explained.

Further rejecting the possibility of Andalusian Spanish heavily influencing Latin American Spanish are Tomás, Espinosa and Rodríguez-Castellano. According to these three scholars, when claiming the phonological similarities between Andalusian and Latin American Spanish the phonological characteristics: aspiration of /h/, weakening (deletion or aspiration) of syllable final /s/, yeismo, nor any other phenomenon cannot be used because they exist in other Peninsular regions Tomás, Espinosa and Rodríguez-Castellano (1933: 226 as cited in Danesi 1977: 190) emphasis that:

ni la aspiración de la /h/, ni la relajación de la /s/ final de silaba, ni el yeismo, ni otros fenómenos que, hallándose en Andalucía, existen también en otras regiones españolas sin relación de dependencia respecto a la modalidad lingüística andaluz.

‘Nor /h/ aspiration, nor the relaxation of syllable final /s/, nor yeismo, nor other phenomena that are found in Andalusia, because they exist in other Spanish regions without any dependent relation with Andalusian linguistic modalities,’ (my translation).

Instead of Andalusian Spanish being the base of Latin American Spanish, Amado Alonso (1953: 54) argues that the foundation of Latin American Spanish is the dialect leveling that occurred to the entire Spanish colonist population when coming to Latin America. He states that there is no doubt that the Castilians were the largest contributors because “en general todo el mundo estaba preparado para aceptar su hablar como el mejor, puesto que era el más cercano al español” ‘in general all of the world (Spain) were preparing to accept their form of speech as the best, since it was
the most similar to Spanish,’ (my translation). He later goes on to say that the Andalusians played a part in the formation of Latin American Spanish but this role was small in comparison to the vastness of Latin American Spanish.

Following Alonso’s argument is linguist John Lipski, who suggests other factors as being the primary source of Latin American Spanish. One of the two factors he provides is language contact. According to Lipski (2007:12) that the main factor that has caused for the variation within Latin American Spanish is language contact with indigenous, African and European languages; Lipski states: “language contact phenomena are beyond any reasonable doubt the most important factors responsible for the diversification of Spanish across the entire American continent.”

The languages that Latin American Spanish had contact with were indigenous languages, African languages and European languages. In arguing the linguistic influence of the indigenous influence he sides with Bruil (2008) in arguing that because of the prolonged contact with indigenous languages there must be some influence (Lipski 2007:13). However, he concludes that it is difficult to find many Armenuian languages linguistic influence on monolingual Spanish speech communities. Lipski (2007:13) states:

Phonetic and phonological influences of Native American languages on Spanish have been postulated for many speech communities, and in contemporary interlanguage varieties clear cases of transfer can still be heard. As for monolingual Spanish dialects resulting from previous contacts between Spanish and indigenous languages the evidence is less clear, and unsubstantiated claims abound. The most convincing cases can be made in those regions where bilingual speakers with varying degrees of proficiency in Spanish can still be found, alongside monolingual Spanish speakers.

In terms of African influence, Lipski (2007) asserts that African languages influence is clear in the lexicon of multiple Latin American countries. However, other manners of influence are less apparent in the phonology, syntax and morphology of Latin American dialects. Lipski claims that only Caribbean dialects have more chances of displaying linguistic features from African dialects (2007: 37).

As for European languages, Lipski argues that many of the European languages brought to the Americas do not make long lasting imprints on Spanish because of their small population sizes, however over the course of history there has
been one unique case, the Italians. During the mid-nineteenth century Italians began to migrate to Argentina and their massive population has created undisputable linguistic effects on Argentinian Spanish (Lipski 2007: 22). One interesting hypothesis that Lipski suggest about Italian influences on Argentinian Spanish is that the syllable final /s/ deletion found in certain Argentinian dialects are due to their contacts with the Italian language, he states (Lipski 2007: 27):

The interface with speakers of Italian dialects is at least partially responsible for the extraordinary range of /s/-reduction in Rio de la Plata Spanish. None of the Italian dialects implicated in contact with Rio de la Plata Spanish contains word-final consonants, although word-initial and word-internal /s/ + consonant clusters are common. Moreover there are many near-cognates with Spanish in which the only difference is the presence of a final /s/ in Spanish and the absence of a consonant in Italian; this includes the first person plural verb endings (-mos in Spanish, -iamo in Italian), and meno/menos ‘less,’ ma/mas ‘but,’ sei/seis ‘six,’ and many others. These similarities provided a ready template for Italian speakers to massively eliminate word-final /s/ in Spanish, while retaining at least some instances of word-internal preconsonantal /s/.

Lipski’s claim about the Italian language impacting Argentinian syllable final /s/ provides new insight into other possibilities that may have caused for syllable final /s/ deletion in Argentinian rather than solely the andalucismo hypothesis. The only question left is what linguistic or social factors caused for syllable final /s/ deletion to occur in other Latin American dialects?

Lipski’s second factor is the role of the city. Following his line of thought, if during the Antillean period Latin American Spanish was not formed “then attention must be shifted to later events, from the late 16th century to the first decades of the 20th century” (Lipski 2007: 8). Lipski believes that by the middle of the XVIII century the cities in Latin America gained reasonable size and began to resist new linguistic trends brought by new arriving colonists. He proclaims (Lipski 2007:11):

Essentially by the 1700’s most innovations in Spain did not pass unconditionally to Latin America. At the same time the first quintessentially Latin American innovations emerged as distinctive dialectal features. A comparison of the time line (in the Appendix) of changes in Spain and Latin America with the demographic patterns of Spanish American urban zones—ports and capital cities—reveals that once cities reached a critical mass of several tens of thousands, these speech communities effectively resisted full
incorporation of language changes occurring in Spain and arriving with new settlers.

Later he asserts that with their linguistic independence the cities played an important role in shaping Latin American Spanish “first in absorbing and concentrating influences arriving from outside, and subsequently in diffusing and dispersing urban dialects across ever-widening regions,” (Lipski 2002: 6). However, is it possible for the speech forms coming from outside the cities to be of more Andalusian Spanish (as mentioned before by penny (2000: 145).

With the goal of further analyzing the main topics discussed in the Andalucismo debate. In the following sections I explore how Iberian Spanish was spoken during the colonization of Latin America the topics and how it is spoken today.

3 **Iberian Spanish (The Spanish spoken before and during the conquering of Latin America)**

The subject of the Spanish spoken before and during the colonization of Latin America is pivotal in the andalucismo debate. Linguists dispute over the XV century dialects of Spain, because with the determination of the dates and origins of certain phonological processes conclusions can be made on which dialects did and not influence Latin American Spanish. In this section I briefly describe Iberian Spanish slightly before and during the colonization of Latin American.

In all actuality not all peninsular Spanish dialects are discussed in the andalucismo debate. Mainly scholars focus on the linguistic differences between Castilian and Andalusian Spanish and not other regional dialects. Although today there may exist numerous differences between these two dialects it is claimed that before the XV century these differences did not exist (Lapesa 1942: 192). According to Rafael Lapesa (1942) it is not until la revolucion fonética del siglo XVI, ‘the phonetic revolution of the sixteenth century,’ that there became an Andalusian dialect (Lapesa 1942: 192). This phonetic revolution is also referred to as “the sibilant turmoil of Middle Spanish” (Romero, 1995:258; Zamora 1960: 239). Joaquin Romero (1995) states that medieval Spanish contained a large set of dental-alveolar and alveo-palatal frictatives and affricates; however, phonetic simplification
occurred in all the dialects and the results were not same in the North (Castile) and in the South (Andalusia). Romero (1995: 258) states, in the northern dialects of the language (Castilian) the three-way contrast /ʃ, s, ʃ/ was maintained by polarizing the distinctions, thus making them more salient: dental /ʃ/ was fronted to /θ/, alveolar /s/ was retracted slightly to become an apico-alveolar /ʃ/, and the alveolo-palatal /ʃ/ was pushed backwards in the mouth to become velar /x/. In the south (Andalusian) the distinction between /ʃ/ and /s/ was lost and the two merged into a single segment that, as we saw, varies from lamio-dental to predorso-alveolar, while /ʃ/ presumably became /x/ as in Castilian before being weakened further to /h/.

Today, primarily Castilian speakers possess the /θ/, /s/ and /x/ phonemes, whereas on the whole speakers of Andalusia only have the /s/ and /h/ phonemes (Lapesa 1942:70). This divergence in sibilant phonemes is recognized as one of the most important phonological traits that distinguishes Castilian Spanish from Andalusian Spanish (Romero 1995: 257). The retention of the interdental fricative, /θ/ formerly written as –c- or –s- or –z-) and later neutralization of /θ/ and /s/ to /θ/ is known as ceceo (Dalbor 1980: 5). Whereas the neutralization of the two phonemes /θ/ and /s/ (both phonemes are formerly written as -s-) to the single phoneme /s/ is referred to as seseo (a more in depth description of this phenomenon is provided below in Section 2.2.4.1) (Ávila 1992: 680).

Apart from the ceceo and seseo differences there are other phonological process that linguists describe when determining the differences between Castilian and Andalusian Spanish. These phonological processes are; yeísmo, the neutralization of syllable final /ɾ/ and /l/; the deletion of intervocalic and word final /d/; and the deletion of syllable final /s/. Unfortunately the geographic origins and dates of these phonological characteristics are indecisive. As of today not many scholars present physical data that supports a precise time in which these phenomena arose and were large enough to be labeled dialectal differences. This lack of data hinders the process of determining the type of Spanish that was brought to the Americas and which peninsular Spanish dialects had the most impact. Below I provide a description of the aforementioned processes and the hypotheses made about their origins.
3.1 **Iberian Spanish today (differences between Castile and Andalusia and their origins)**

Many scholars claim that the two main factors that differentiate Castilian from Andalusian Spanish are *seseo/ceceo* and syllable final /s/ deletion (Romero 1995: 257). However, many of the known phonological differences between Castilian and Andalusian Spanish cannot be described simply by geographical boundaries. Several scholars have observed traits known to Andalusia in Castilian regions. Below I describe the phonological processes that have been said to differentiate Castilian Spanish from Andalusian Spanish.

3.3.2 **Seseo**

Unlike the other characteristics, *seseo* is one of the only phonological processes that is geographically restricted. Castilian speakers strictly use *ceceo*, while in Andalusia the natives will use *seseo* or *ceceo*, varying by region (Romero 1995: 257; Lipski, nd.: 2). According to Lapesa (1942) the areas in Andalusia which have use *ceceo* are: the majority of the province of Huelva, but not the city of Huelva; the province of Seville, but not the city of Seville; the province of Cádiz; the province of Málaga, excluding the north; and one third of Granada, excluding the city of Granada and small sections in Almería. The regions that have the *seseo* variation are: the city of Seville and its northern region, a partial northern region of the Huelva province, and the south of the Córdoba province (Lapesa 1942: 92; Zamora 1960: 237; Beale-Rivaya 2010: 52).

Provided below is a map describing the distribution of *seseo* and *ceceo* phenomena in Andalusia:
3.3.3 Yeísmo

Although yeísmo is often viewed only as an Andalusian trait, it is also found in the popular speech of Madrid, Toledo, and the Ciudad Real (the Castilian Northern regions) (Lapesa 1942: 239; Calero Vaquero and Calvillo Jurado 1992: 40; Lorenzo 1966: 26). Scholars like Penny (2000: 121), Hualde (2005: 180), and Lapesa (1981: 93 as cited in Calero Vaquero and Calvillo Jurado 1992: 38) estimate that the phonological process began around the late Middle Ages in Spain but not many of them can pin point a location. Out of the aforementioned linguist Ralph Penny is one of the only that suggest an actual location of origin. He argues that yeísmo began in the remote regions of Northern Spain and took root in Andalusia and then spread north to Castile, but he has no evidence to support this notion (2000: 121).

3.3.4 Merger of syllable final liquids: /r/ and /l/

It is said that the neutralization of these two phonemes has been found in Andalusian Spanish since the XVI century, and to this day it still occurs frequently in Andalusian dialects (Boyd-Bowman 1974; Wagner 1927: 24). Of the two
possibilities, /l/ to [ɾ], is more common in Andalusia (Lipski nd. 25). This merger, however, is not limited to Andalusia; it is has been found in many areas of New Castile that encompass the Ciudad Real, Cuenca, Guadalajara, Madrid, and Toledo (Díaz-Campos and Clements 2005:10; Penny 2000: 127; Lipski 1994: 126).

### 3.3.5 Lost of syllable final and intervocalic /d/

In general Andalusian Spanish is known for deleting syllable final and intervocalic /d/. Like many of the phonological process listed above, deletion of /d/ in both environments are present in parts of Castile as well (Zamora 1960: 251; Lipski nd.: 7). John Lipski (nd: 2) and José Ignacio Hualde (2005: 20) both point out that deletion of intervocalic /d/ is so strong in Castile that is even found in educated speech, and not just in lower socio-economic classes. Although word final /d/ deletion is found in Castile it is often retained by speakers.

### 3.3.6 Weakening of syllable-final /s/: deletion and aspiration

There are various hypotheses on the date of introduction of syllable final /s/ aspiration. The most conservative scholars believe that it appeared between the XVII and XVII centuries while others believe that this phenomenon occurred earlier (Romero, 1994; 256; Terrell 1981:116). In Romero’s (1994: 256) perspective it is safe to “to assume that aspiration of /s/ was not considered an unusual phenomenon in Andalusia, particularly in Seville area, toward the first half of the 16th C.” Currently aspiration is found in the Andalusian and Castilian regions such as Toledo and Madrid (Zamora 1960: 60; Lipski nd: 2; Wagner 1927: 22). According to Morris (2000) final /s/ aspiration originated in the southern region of Spain and from there expanded to the Northern regions of the Peninsula; this is why it is found today in Castile.

### 3.3.7 Iberian Spanish in relation to the andalucismo debate

As I mention earlier the phonological processes listed above are central to the andalucismo debate. From the pro-andalucismo perspective the majority of these traits originated and where heavily used in Andalusian Spanish before and during the colonization of Latin America. From the anti andalucismo standpoint these phonological processes appeared too late in Spain for them to have taken root in Latin American Spanish during the colonization. Regardless of the perspective there
lacks clear and decisive data that pinpoints the origin of all these phonological traits. In reality it would be a difficult, nearly impossible task for any scholar to determine the exact dates and locations in which each of these phonological features appeared.

Today, the only information that is clear is that the phonological differences that are often noted in distinguishing Castilian and Andalusian dialects are in reality frequently found in both regions. Perhaps the perceived differences between these two dialects revolve around the frequency of use and level of normalcy of the aforementioned phonological processes in each region. Some hypothesize that the cause for the similarities between these two dialects are most likely due to the migration of Andalusians to the Castilian regions. However, this argument stems from the assumption these phonological features originated in Andalusia.

The andalucismo debate revolves around the phonological differences between Castilian and Andalusian Spanish and the similarities that Andalusian Spanish shares with Latin American Spanish. As I state in Section (3.3.7), today the claimed phonological differences between Castilian and Andalusian Spanish are disappearing, some linguists speculate that these differences are due to the migration of Andalusians to Castilian areas such as Madrid, but nevertheless this phenomenon is making the pro-andalucistas’ argument harder to follow. In Section 2.2 I mention that linguists relate the dialectal differences between Castilian and Andalusian’s dialects and their colonization patterns to the highland and lowland dialectal differences found in various Latin American countries. With these phonological differences disappearing or perhaps never really existing in Spain I question if they still exist in between highland and lowland Spanish in Latin America. I focus on three phonological processes; syllable final /-s/ deletion, alternation between syllable final /-r/ and /-l/ and vice versa; and deletion of intervocalic and word final /d/ (these phonological processes are explained in Section 2.2.4.1).

4 Latin American Spanish

In this section I provide a brief overview of social and phonological aspects of Latin American Spanish. I provide a general outline of phonological linguistic traits that unify and distinguish Latin American Spanish.
4.1 Dialect diversity

Given the geographical size of Latin America, linguists divide Latin American Spanish into geographic categories. José Hualde (2005) offers one method of dividing Latin American Spanish dialects. He dissects the region into seven regional dialects: (1) Mexican; (2) Central American (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica); (3) Caribbean (Cuba, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Panama, coast of Venezuela and Colombia); (4) Andean (highlands of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia); (5) Paraguayan (Paraguay and lowlands of Eastern Bolivia); (6) Chilean; (7) River Plate (Argentina and Uruguay). Provided below is an imitation of a map created by Hualde (2005: 26) to describe the regional dialects of Latin American Spanish.

Figure 3
4.1.2 **Mexico**

There are plenty of linguistic variations within the country of Mexico, however, to generalize, the majority of the country uses *yeísmo* and maintains syllable final /s/ and other final consonants, except for Veracruz and some other small coastal areas. Mexico is also known for maintaining word final alveolar /n/ in its original place of articulation (Lispki 1994: 282; Hualde 2005: 26).

4.1.2 **Central America**

Central American Spanish encompasses the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. These countries all share in common syllable final /s/ aspiration, which is widespread but not in the highland regions, and the velarization of the alveolar /n/ (Hualde 2005: 28; Rosenblat 1965: 34, Florez 1963: 7-8).

4.1.3 **Caribbean**

Caribbean Spanish is described as the Spanish spoken in Cuba, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Panama, and the coastal regions of Venezuela and Colombia. This dialect is referred to as “the most innovative or radical among the geographic varieties of Latin America,” because of its unique phonological features (Hualde 2005: 28). The most prominent phonological features of Caribbean Spanish are consonant weakening which include: syllable final /s/ deletion, deletion of intervocalic /d/ and neutralization of syllable final /r/ and /l/, and the velarization of word final alveolar /n/ (Hualde 2005: 28; Cotton and Sharp 1988: 204, Quesada Pacheco 2001; Wagner 1927: 22; Alonso 1953: 285).

4.1.4 **Andean region**

Andean Spanish encompasses the Spanish of the highland regions of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. It is most known for its strong retention of syllable final /s/; maintenance of the contrast between /j/ and /λ/: and deletion of unstressed vowels (Terrell 1981:116).

4.1.5 **Paraguay**

Paraguay is known for its contrast between /j/ and /λ/ even more than the Andean regions, aspiration of syllable final /s/, elision of /d/ /s/ /n/ /l/ /r/ in word
final position, and the insertion of a glottal stop word initially and between vowels in hiatus (Hualde 2005: 30; Gómez rendón 2008: 145).

### 4.1.6 Chile

Chile is known for aspiration of syllable final /s/, alternation between syllable final /r/ and /l/, yeísmo, and the articulation of a retracted / devoiced / tr/ (dental plosive + alveolar flap) (Cotton and Sharp 1988: 223; Hualde 2005: 30).

### 4.1.7 River Plate

The river plate dialect includes the Spanish spoken in Argentina and Uruguay. In both countries there is syllable final /s/ aspiration, loss of intervocalic /d/ and yeísmo, and maintenance of syllable final /r/ and /l/. What makes this dialect unique is its realization of both phonemes /ʎ/ and /ʝ/ as [3], which later is devoiced to [ʃ] (Hualde 2005: 30; Cotton and Sharp 1988: 243; Lipski 1994: 168). Some linguists refer to this phenomenon as zeímo (Rona 1964: 220), provided below are example words.

/maJo/ (mayo ‘May’) → /maʒo/ → [maʃo]

/kal/e/ (calle ‘street’) → /kaʒe/ → /kaʒe/ → [kaʃe]

### 4.2 Similarities between Latin American Spanish dialects

Despite all the variation between the Latin American Spanish dialects there are some similarities. In general the one phonological trait that unifies all of Latin American Spanish phonology is seseo (a description of this process is described in Section 2.3.1) (Cotton and Sharp 1988:146; Rosenblat 1990:248).

Following the phenomenon seseo, the second largest phonological trait that connects most Latin American Spanish dialects is yeísmo (Lipski, 1984:189). Although it is often perceived that all Latin Americans Spanish speakers are yeístas, this is not the case. In fact there exists a regional separation in Latin America between the yeístas and non-yeístas. According to many linguists, in the highland regions of the countries in the Andes (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia) speakers distinguish the /ʎ/ and /ʝ/ as separate phonemes (Cotton and Sharp 1988:147; Ureña 1930: 279). Below is a map that marks the Spanish and Latin American regions that do and do not distinguish the phonemes /ʎ/ and /ʝ/.
Two other reoccurring phonological processes that are common in several Latin American dialects is the velarization of the alveolar /n/ and syllable final /s/ aspiration. Provided below is a map, outlining the regions in which syllable final /s/ is aspirated.

**Figure 5**

**Note:**
Dark Purple indicates regions that aspirate syllable final /s/
Light Purple indicates regions that do not aspirate syllable final /s/
4.3 Latin American Spanish in relation to the Andalucismo debate

Where did the Spanish of the Americas get the features that make it different from Castilian Spanish?

Although the physical distance between Latin America and Spain is great, to this day they share many linguistic traits (Cotton and Sharp 1988:145, Rosenblat 1990:215). Specifically focusing on phonology, the majority of the phonological features described above can also be found in different regions in Spain (Hualde 2005: 23). What is interesting is that some dialects of Latin American Spanish are almost parallel to dialects in Spain. One particular dialect is Caribbean Spanish.

Countlessly it has been noted that Caribbean Spanish resembles the Spanish of Andalusia (Lipski 2007:6; Servio 1980:10; Díaz-Campos and Clements 2005: 49).
Both Andalusian and Caribbean Spanish share in common: yeismo, seseo, and high rates of consonant weakening which includes: deletion of syllable final /s/, deletion of intervocalic /d/, and neutralization of syllable final /r/ and /l/ (refer to section 2.3 for a description of Andalusian Spanish and Section 3.2.3 for a description of Caribbean Spanish) (Lipski 1994: 231). On account of the stark phonological similarities between these two dialects arose the andalucismo hypothesis. Naturally because Caribbean Spanish resembles Andalusian Spanish, it has been the primary focus in the andalucismo debate (Lipski 2007:6). As mentioned in Section 3.2.3, Colombia and Venezuela are incorporated into the Caribbean dialect, but what is unique about these two countries is that only their coastal regions have similarities with Andalusia. Meanwhile their inland regions are phonologically different and instead described as Andean Spanish.

To what do we attribute the vast differences between the coastal and inland Spanish dialects of the aforementioned countries? Why are their coastal Spanish dialects so similar to the Spanish spoken in the Caribbean islands? Is it because of their geographic proximity to the Caribbean islands or is it due to the colonization patterns of the Spaniards?

Rosenblat (1990: 227) states that the primary difference between the highland and lowland dialects of Latin America is that the highlands weaken their vowels while the lowlands weaken their consonants, he states: “las tierras altas se comen las vocales, las tierras bajas se comen las consonants” ‘the highlands eat their vowels and the lowlands eat their consonants,’ (my translation). Rosenblat (1990: 227) goes on to say that the differences between the highland and lowland dialects of the Americas are due to the different colonization patterns of these regions, he argues that:

las tierras bajas han sido colonizadas predominantemente por gentes de las tierras bajas de España, sobre todo de Andalucía, y tienen más bien impronta andaluza. Las tierras altas tienen más bien sello castellano, y su consonantismo tenso, a veces enfático, manifiesta la influencia de las lenguas indígenas.

‘the lowland land have been colonized predominantly by people from the lowland lands of Spain, especially in Andalusia and have more of an
Andalusian influence. The highlands have more of a Castilian influence with their intense pronunciation of consonants, occasionally empathic, it demonstrates indigenous influences,’ (my translation).

Based on Rosenblat’s description there are other countries that display highland and coastal/lowland dialect differences, however, their lowland Spanish is not characterized as Caribbean Spanish. Mexico, for example, displays dialectal division between its highland and lowland regions. Ureña describes Mexico’s highlands as having strong consonant pronunciation but weak vowel pronunciation, whereas on the coast the vowels are pronounced strongly but the syllable final consonants are weakened or deleted (1921: 358 as cited by Wagner 1927: 30). He states that in Mexico:

> las consonantes se pronuncian con gran precisión y aun minuciosidad, en cualquier posición que estén...; las vocales son breves, y las inacentuadas tienden a perderse...; en Veracruz, la vocal recobra --- al menos en gran parte --- su plenitud española, y en cambio la consonante en fin de sílaba y en otras posiciones, verbigracia, la de intervocálica, tiende a delimitarse, si bien no tanto como en las Antillas, donde el vulgo acostumbra --- según su propia expresión --- ‘comerse las letras’. Es probable que en toda América haya parecidas diferencia de fonética entre las tierras bajas y las tierras altas...

‘the consonants are pronounced with great precision and thoroughness, in any position they are in...; the vowels are short the unstressed ones tend to be deleted...; in Veracruz the vowel is strong --- at least the majority of the time --- its plenitude of Spanish, on the other hand syllable final consonants and in other positions, for example intervocalic /d/ tends to be delineated, although not as much as in the West Indies, where this vulgar form is the norm, according to their expression (the people of Mexico) ‘eat the letters’. It is probable that in all of America there exist similar phonetic differences between the highland and lowlands,’ (my translation).

In thesis I question where Ecuador stands in the Andalucismo debate? Is it more Andalusian, Castilian or neutral? Ecuador’s coastal region shares similar features to Colombian and Venezuelan coastal dialects (Ecuadorian coastal dialects is discussed in Section 4.3.1) (Toscano 1963:116; Galindo 1993). Furthermore, political boarders do not determine the expansion and existence of linguistic traits and Ecuador shares a border with Colombia.
5 Ecuadorian Spanish

In this section I provide general information about the country of Ecuador. First I provide general information about the country and its linguistic situation. Second I discuss the phonological commonalities and differences between the highland and lowland regions. Lastly discuss the Indigenismo, pro-andalucismo, and anti-andalucismo hypothesizes/arguments in relation to Ecuadorian Spanish.

Ecuador is a country located in the continent of South America. It is on the west coast of the South American continent with the Pacific Ocean to its west, Colombia to its north, and Peru to its south and east (Refer to Figure 3). The official language of Ecuador is Spanish and there are multiple indigenous languages spoken by the natives; nevertheless approximately ninety percent of the population is Spanish monolingual (Goméz Rendon 2008: 134). The largest Amerindian language spoken is Kichwa, an Ecuadorian version of the Quechuan language.

5.1 Ecuador’s Linguistic Situation

Frequently Ecuador is divided up into three large linguistic regions, the Andes, Equatorial (coast), and the Amazon (Lispki 1994:247). Within the Andean (andino) region there are the Northern, Central, Cuencano, and Lojano dialects; within the coastal regions there are the Esmeraldeño, Manabita, and Guayaquileño dialects; and within the Amazon region there are the Quijo and Shuar dialects (Toscano 1963:112). While this method of dividing Ecuador into general dialectal regions is simple, the languages spoken there more elaborate. According to Mike Olsen (2010: 3), the dialects of Ecuador are far more complex than geographic divisions and “other layers must be added for a more fine-grained division of dialects” but for simplicity of exposition in this thesis I will refer to the dialects of Ecuador by the previous mentioned names. The term Highland will be used to refer to Andean region of Ecuador, excluding the Amazonian region.

Provided below is a map of Ecuador that color codes the dialectal regions:
Figure 6

(Figure 6 taken from: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Dialectos_Ecuador.png)

Linguist Gómez Rendón (2008: 137) reports that the regional dialectal differences in Ecuador are due to the different colonization patterns of each region. Spaniards began to colonize Ecuador during the 1530s and once they defeated the Incas and seized Quito, the colonization of the rest of the Highland region came about fast, and by the 1600s the principal cities of the highlands were founded. Due to the high concentration of the indigenous people and their steady workforce, the cities of the Highland region became the centers of business and Spanish populations (Toscano 1953: 114). The same process did not occur in the coast because the native populations were scattered and not condensed like those in the highlands. The
scattered nature of the people of the coast inhibited the colonization of the area because the Spaniards could not profit off using them as workforce as they did in the Highlands with the other indigenous populations (Gómez Rendón 2008: 137). As a result, each region received different linguistic influences, creating some of the differences in Spanish dialects that still exist today.

5.2 Ecuadorian Highland and Lowland Spanish Dialects

Ecuador is one of the Latin American countries that displays differences between highland and lowland Spanish. The theories suppose that the dialectal differences between these two regions are due to different colonization patterns and the presence of indigenous languages (Gómez Rendón 2008: 137). Although geographically Ecuador is a small country there is no thorough study on written on its Spanish phonology. Linguists always divide the country into regions and describe the traits of each region. Extraordinarily, the only phonological feature that unites Ecuadorian Spanish is the common use of *seseo* (Gómez Rendón 2008: 137). Below I describe the most salient phonological differences between Ecuador’s highland and lowland Spanish.

5.2.1 Lowland (Coast)

Ecuador is a country known for its large indigenous population; however, not all regions of Ecuador display indigenous linguistic influence. The Spanish of the coast lacks many indigenous influences that the Spanish of the highlands displays due to the small number of indigenous languages present on the coast (Gómez Rendón 2008: 139; Lipski 1994: 246). According to Toscano (1963:112), the only two indigenous languages that have survived on the coast are the Cayapa, and the Colorado languages. Today, due to migration, there are many indigenous people who live on the coast; however, the indigenous people do not maintain their indigenous language and instead change their form of speech to adapt to their new linguistic environment resulting in no indigenous linguistic influence due to new migration (Toscano 1963:114). On the coast of Ecuador there is a large presence of African descendants but “given the chronology of the African slave trade to Spanish America, only in the Caribbean dialects is there a high probability of detecting an African contribution that goes beyond lexical borrowings,” (Lipski 2007: 33).
The prominent phonological traits of Ecuador’s coast are the weakening of syllable final /s/, alternation between syllable final /r/ and /l/, deletion of syllable final and intervocalic /d/, yeismo, and seseo (Lipski 1994: 247; Cotton and Sharp 1998: 179). These features are known to exist throughout the coast. Other traits known to be present in Ecuadorian coastal Spanish is intervocalic /s/ becoming a voiceless velar fricative [x], and deletion of syllable final /r/ (Cotton and Sharp 1988: 178 and Lipski 1994: 247).

5.2.3 Highland

Unlike the coastal regions of Ecuador, the highland dialects of Spanish are known for having indigenous language influences, particularly from the Kichwa language. The influence is apparent in the speech of the indigenous bilinguals who confuse the vowels [e-i, o-u] and have issues with pronouncing the Spanish diphthongs (Toscano 1963: 117; Clements 2009: 188). Apart from influences from other languages, highland Spanish is said to devoice unstressed vowels; retain syllable final /s/ in all environments; distinguish the phonemes /j/ and /λ/ (opposite of yeismo); maintaining syllable final /r/ and /l/; and the retract/devoice /t r/ (dental plosive + alveolar flap); velarized word final /n/, voice word final /s/ to [z]; and change /λ/ to [ʒ], however, unlike Argentina Spanish (refer to Section 3.2.7) [ʒ] remains in phonetic contrast with /j/ and is not devoiced (Cotton and Sharp 1998: 179; Penny 2000: 157, Lipski 1990:4; Lipski 1994:248; Gómez Rendón 2008: 138).

The retraction and devoicing of the consonant cluster /t r/ is a unique trait. Essentially what occurs in this phonological process is that the flap/ r/ is devoiced or fricatized and the dental /t/ is retracted to the alveolo-palatal position resulting in [t ş] or [t ş]. This phonological change is heard in words such as otro ‘other’ and tren ‘train’ (Penny 2000: 157).

5.3. Linguistic theories applied to Ecuadorian Spanish

In this section I discuss the indigenous, pro and anti-andalucistas’ arguments in relation to Ecuador’s linguistic environment.

5.3.1 Indigenous theory applied to Ecuador (refer to Section 2.1 for information on the Indigenous theory)
As mentioned earlier, Ecuador is home to numerous groups of indigenous people. However, due to societal issues and their population sizes, the linguistic influence of each of these indigenous groups and their languages are small and limited to regional boundaries. Having said that, there is one Amerindian language that has been said to influence Ecuadorian Spanish more than others. This language is Kichwa. Like most Latin American countries, the majority of Ecuador’s population is composed of monolingual mestizos, people of mixed European and indigenous heritage, who dominate the society in all facets and marginalize the indigenous and Afro populations (Roitman 2008:3). With that said, Kichwa is viewed as a “lesser” language and has been in danger of extinction for quite some time (Bruil 2008: 3).

Even though in Ecuador’s society the Kichwa community and their language are marginalized, there is still language contact between Kichwa and Ecuadorian Spanish. According to Bruil (2008: 7), Kichwa’s linguistic impact is something we cannot ignore; she says: “We find too many changes in Ecuadorian Spanish to say that it is not influenced by Quichua (Kichwa)”. While Bruil’s statement has validity, in all reality the linguistic impact she speaks of is rather limited. The most widely spoken of Kichwa influence on Ecuadorian Spanish is the usage of the verbal periphrasis dar ‘give’ + a gerund. However, there is much controversy over this topic and other linguists speculate that this feature has its roots in the Spanish language itself not Kichwa (H. R. Albor 1973: 317). Apart from this feature and various lexical items, other Kichwa’s influence is less transparent. Researchers have found that the indigenous people that do not have complete fluency in Spanish neutralize the Spanish high and middle vowels and realize the consonant /f/ as [hw] (Lipski 1994:...
37; Lipski 1994:249 as cited in Bruil 2008: 4). However these oft-cited phonological characteristics are not apparent in the speech patterns of Ecuadorian monolingual mestizos.

Although there are certain linguistic aspects of Ecuadorian Spanish that can be accounted for by language contact with the Kichwa language, it is clear that the Kichwa language cannot be the sole factor that has created the linguistic diversity in Ecuadorian Spanish. Virtually no linguist argues that the weakening of syllable final /s/ alternation between syllable final /r/ and /l/, deletion of syllable final and intervocalic /d/, yeísmo and seseo are due to Kichwa influences. Kichwa has an important role in defining certain Ecuadorian dialects, but in reality Kichwa’s influences are not well dispersed into all forms of Ecuadorian Spanish. With this said, we have to look to other theories to accurately describe Ecuadorian Spanish.

5.3.2 **Pro-andalucismo hypothesis applied to Ecuadorian Spanish**

Throughout all of Ecuador there is only one Andalusian trait that is displayed among all forms of speech: this phonological process is seseo. This is not a rare finding because the same is said for all the Latin American countries due to the fact that all Latin American Spanish dialects use seseo.

Through examining the highland and lowland dialect differences it is apparent that Ecuador behaves like the counties of Colombia and Venezuela, because the only Ecuadorian dialect that strongly relates to Andalusian Spanish is that of the coast. Ecuador’s highland Spanish drastically differs from Andalusian Spanish and because of the lack of unity we cannot solely relay on the pro-andalucista argument to properly describe Ecuadorian and Latin American Spanish.
Various linguists have suggested a difference in colonization populations, but no precise information on individual countries has been produced. The issue with the pro-andalucistas' argument is that it does not account for all the phonological peculiarities that arise in Latin American Spanish.

5.3.3 Anti-andalucismo hypothesis applied to Ecuadorian Spanish

Although there a multiple linguistic traits found in Latin America that can be related to peninsular Spanish there are some Latin American oddities that cannot be related. Therefore, there is validity in the anti-andalucista argument, because not everything can be explained by Andalusian influence. Specifically, Ecuadorian Spanish consist of several phonological traits that are not readily affiliated to peninsular. Two of these features are deletion of unstressed vowels and the retraction/devoicing of / tr/ (refer to Section 4.3.2 for more information) (Penny 2000: 157; Terrell 1981:116). Linguists hypothesize that the deletion of unstressed vowels derives from language contact with Kichwa, but as for the retraction/devoicing of / tr/ its root of origin is unknown.

While linguists like Lipski’s speculate about the African languages and European languages affecting Latin American Spanish these hypotheses do not fully apply to Ecuadorian Spanish. In none of the literature do linguists attribute Ecuadorian phonological trait as solely deriving from the African languages once spoken by Afro-Ecuadorians. The same can be said for the European languages. In reality the only family of languages that has been noted to affect Ecuadorian Spanish are the indigenous languages, and at that, these influences are limited to certain regions and linguistic populations.
6 Methods

Purpose for Research

The majority of the literature that discusses the regional dialectal differences between Ecuadorian highland and lowland Spanish are outdated and lack depth, and data to support observations. Because language is not stagnant, and is instead constantly changing Ecuadorian Spanish deserves more attention. I sought out to determine whether or not the claimed phonological differences between Ecuadorian highland and lowland Spanish still exist and how Ecuadorian Spanish relates to the Andalucismo debate.

From February 2012 to mid-May 2012, I attended an undergraduate study abroad program in Quito, the capital of Ecuador. During my stay I traveled throughout Ecuador’s coastal and Andean regions recording the everyday speech of Ecuadorians. In total I traveled to six cities: Olmedo, Manta, Salinas, Ibarra and Otavalo. I selected these six cities based on the programs’ field excursions, natives’ suggestions, level of safety and accessibility via public transportation.

6.1 The Selected Cities

The city of Olmedo is a small rural coastal town in the province of Esmeraldas. It currently consists of four hundred and forty-five people all of African descent. During my visit I stayed in a community run hostel. The majority of my recordings from this town come from community leaders and tour guides.

The city of Manta is a large coastal city in Manabí. Apart from it being a big tourist attraction, it is also an important port city in Ecuador. While visiting I stayed in a hotel, and due to the high crime risk for tourists, my recordings and observations were limited to shopping centers, the beach and taxi drivers.

Salinas, a coastal city in Guayas, it is smaller and safer than Manta but often frequented by tourists. In order to avoid recording people from other regions I recorded the speech of people who were more possibly locals those of which were hotel employees and street vendors.

Ibarra and Otavalo are cities in the Andean region of Imbabura, both these cities are heavily populated with indigenous groups and because of the large
indigenous population, both cities are tourist attractions. In terms of proximity these cities are very close to each other and more or less represent the same regional dialect. The majority of my recordings come from tour guides.

Quito, as mentioned before is the capital of Ecuador. It is located in the Andean region of Pichincha. It is the largest city I recorded in and it has the second largest population in Ecuador and it is a big tourist attraction. The majority of my recordings come from tour guides.

The cities of Manta, Salinas, Ibarra, and Otavalo were all very touristy cities, which attracted many internationals and natives from various regions of Ecuador to both work and vacation. Therefore, it is highly possible that the speakers I recorded are not all natives of the areas that I recorded them in.

Provided below is a map indicating the locations I traveled to in Ecuador:
Due to time and financial constraints I did not spend over three days in any one city. For similar issues, my study was limited to the six cities I selected, which unfortunately did not encompass all of the Andean region and more of the coastal region. The data sampling was more based on practical issues than on striving for ideal conditions for data collection.

6.2 Methods of data collection

While in Ecuador, my data collection was under the supervision of my study abroad program. In order to ensure that I recorded everyday speech, I sought participants that seemed to be much involved in Ecuador’s society and so the majority of the participants were people you might meet in everyday activities such as taxi drivers, street vendors, and tour guides. In total there were nine male and
four female adult participants. On average the recorded interviews did not last longer than five minutes and no less than two minutes. There were four interviews that lasted over five minutes, two lasted ten minutes, one lasted twelve, and one lasted eighteen minutes. The interviews were conducted without any list of pre-established interview questions, consequently, the conversation topics varied, which therefore affected the range of lexical items used by each speaker. The interviews were unplanned both in location and time and so I did not control the environments in which the conversations occurred. For this reason large portions of my recordings have high amounts of background noise, a fact that has decreased the clarity and overall quality of the audio and in some situations inhibited me from analyzing the data. For this thesis I am using a small portion of the data collected.

6.3 Analyzing the data

With the recorded audio I counted the number of times that the environment for one of the phonological rules arose – and calculated how many of those times the rule actually applied. For analyzing the data I used an average audio listening program.

7 Data Collected in Ecuador

Provided below is information extracted from the audio I collected in Ecuador. I focused on three phonological processes: syllable final /s/ deletion, alternation between syllable final /r/ and /l/ and vice versa, and deletion of intervocalic and word final /d/ (these phonological processes are explained in Section 2.3). I focused on these phonological processes because they are the main characteristics discussed in the andalucismo debate. They are often described as the traits that connect Andalusian Spanish to Latin American Spanish. Although there are other phonological processes mention that connect Andalusian Spanish to Latin American Spanish due to lack of time I excluded those features, an example feature that was not analyzed in this study is syllable final /s/ aspiration.

With the goal of analyzing how Ecuador falls in the andalucismo debate and whether or not the lowland and highland dialects display the phonological differences observed by other linguist, I calculated the frequency rates of these processes in the speech of coastal and highland Ecuadorians.
7.1 **Syllable final /s/ Deletion**

In the majority of the interviews there were numerous instances in which the environment for syllable final /s/ deletion arose. My methods for determining /s/ deletion were simple. I viewed syllable /s/ deletion as: the instances in which syllable final /s/ was deleted with no sound replacing it and when /s/ went to [h] (please refer to Section 2.2.4.1 for information on syllable final /s/ deletion and aspiration).

*Table 3*

**Syllable final /s/ Deletion in the Coastal Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>/s/ Deletion</th>
<th>/s/ Retention</th>
<th>Deletion %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Waiter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Manta</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male Hotel Clerk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male jewelry vendor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salinas</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Woman</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Olmedo</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the range in syllable final /s/ deletion varied, in general the participants from the coast deleted syllable final /s/ . On average the coastal participants deleted sixty-six percent of /s/ and retained thirty-four percent. The highest rate of deletion was ninety-three percent, which was found in the female from Olmedo. The lowest rate of deletion was zero percent, which was found in the male waiter from Manta. The second largest rate of deletion was seventy-seven
percent found in both a man from Olmedo and a male taxi driver from Manta. The second lowest rate was twenty-five percent found in a male vendor from Salinas.

The male waiter from Manta with zero percent /s/ deletion is an outlier in the data. In the interview with the waiter from Manta there are only nine tokens of the syllable final /s/ deletion, because of this limited data it is impossible to make conclusions on his speech patterns. There are various social factors that could explain why he showed no /s/ deletion. It is possible that he was not originally from the coast and so he shared no dialect similarities with others from Manta. If he is originally from the coast, perhaps his level of education was high. Education level might well influence the rate of /s/ deletion since teachers strive to model prestige language, and /s/ retention is associated with prestige and education language (Salcedo 2010:202). Since all interviews were conduction on the spur of the moment, as the opportunity arose, my data do not include background on the linguistic consultants.

In the data we see a correlation between the origins of the speakers and their percentage of /s/ deletion. The two highest rates of /s/ deletion derive from speakers from Olmedo and the two lowest rates of /s/ deletion from Manta and Salinas. Perhaps because Olmedo is a very rural small town, forms of non-standard speech appear more frequently, whereas in larger cities such as Manta and Salinas these forms of non-standard speech are not readily “visible” in natives’ speech. It is well-known that rural and urban varieties of a given language differ (this is commonly supported in the literature; an example study is Frazer 1983), and that the urban varieties often carry a higher prestige value (again, there are many studies that discuss this idea, such as Ibrahim 1986), although, certainly, both rural and urban speech can maintain non-standard dialects (for discussion, see Milroy and Milroy 2007). Given this, I suggest that the high frequency of non-standard speech in Olmedo is correlated to the fact that it is a very rural small town, in contrast to the larger urban communities of Manta and Salinas, where these non-standard forms are less apparent. Provided below are instances in which /s/ deletion occurred.

Examples of /s/ deletion from speakers:
Note that in these examples, $\emptyset$ indicates the site of a deletion rule (of one or multiple sounds). For example, in:

\[
\text{quiere} \emptyset \{\text{quieres} \ '\text{want. present. second person. singular}'\}
\]

the $\emptyset$ indicates the site of the /s/ deletion rule.

**Example 1a: Male Taxi Driver 2 in Manta: 01:40**

Por ejemplo que quiere$\emptyset$ comprar, que tu diga$\emptyset$

Por ejemplo que quieres comprar, que tu digas

‘For example what do you want to buy, what would you say?’

**Example 1b: Female in Olmedo: 00:40**

Tenemo$\emptyset$ dos escuela$\emptyset$

Tenemos dos escuelas

‘We have two schools.’

**Example 1c: Male street vendor in Salinas: 00:30**

Hay cadena así también así mismo aquí ve e$\emptyset$ta la cadena

Hay cadena así también mismo aquí ve esta la cadena

‘There are necklaces like this as well, here you see this necklace?’

From the examples above it is apparent that in the costal participants’ speech patterns, syllable final /s/ deletion was not limited to any particular syllable or word position, nor was syllable final /s/ deletion limited to one morphological category, occurring in verbs (such as tenemo(s)), nouns (such as escuela(s)), and adjectives (such as e(s)ta).
### Table 3b

**Syllable final /s/ Deletion in the Highland Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>/s/ Deletion</th>
<th>/s/ Retention</th>
<th>Deletion %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otavalo: Male Clinic tour guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbabura: Male tour director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Imbabura</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female Farm tour guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Male Garden Tour Guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female School Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female from Loja</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Quito</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the highlands the average rate of /s/ deletion is zero percent. My findings do correlate with the descriptions of Andean (highland Spanish) given by other linguists. Provided below are examples in which syllable final /s/ is retained.

**Examples of /s/ retention from speakers:**

**Example 2a: Male Clinic tour guide in Otavalo: 00:12**

Buenos días con todos.

‘Good day to all.’

**Example 2b: Male Garden Tour Guide in Quito: 00:26**

Vamos, vamos ¿no tenemos idea?

‘Come on, come on, we do not have any idea?’
Syllable final /s/ deletion conclusions

The data shows that there exists a clear distinction in the rate of /s/ deletion between the coastal and Andes’ regions of Ecuador. There was a sixty-six percent rate of /s/ deletion in the coastal regions whereas a zero percent rate of deletion in the highland regions. These findings correlate with the conclusions of other linguists such as Humberto Toscano (1963) and Gómez Rendon (2008). Provided below is a table that compares syllable final /s/ deletion between Ecuador’s coastal and Andean (highland) regions:

Table 3c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/s/ Deletion</th>
<th>/s/ Retention</th>
<th>Deletion %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Syllable final /l/ alternation with /r/ (and vice versa)

Within the limited data in the interviews there were not many instances in which the environment for syllable final /l/ alternation with /r/ (or vice versa) arose. There were two interviews in which no instances of syllable final /l/ arose, these two interviews were with the male waiter in Manta and the male hotel clerk in Salinas. These two situations are due the issues stated before: the lengths of the interviews and the interview topics that did not provoke the instances of syllable final /l/ and /r/ alteration.

7.2.1 Syllable final /l/ alternation with /r/

Note that in these examples, [ ] indicates the site of the environment for alternation rule. For example, in:

Kue[ll]da (cuerda ‘rope’)

The [ ] indicates the site for the environment of the /l/ alternation with /r/ rule. In the examples below, boldface combined with underlining indicates the site of the
environment for an alternation rules. For example, in:

**Español ('spanish')**

The boldfaced underlined final consonant is a site for the environment of the /l/ alternation with /r/ rule. Additionally, in these examples we find many instances in which /s/ deletion is applied, this is indicated with parentheses around the letter – s-, like so: [s].

**Table 4a**

**Syllable final /l/ → [r] in the Coastal Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>/l/ → [r]</th>
<th>/l/ Retention</th>
<th>/l/ → [r]</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Waiter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Manta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male Hotel Clerk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male jewelry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salinas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Woman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Olmedo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the data there are no cases of syllable final /l/ alternation with [r] in the coast. This data contradicts the findings of Lipski (1994) and Toscano (1953) who state that in the coast there is /l/ alternation with [r]. Provided below are examples of instances in which syllable final /l/ is retained.

**Examples of /l/ retention from speakers:**

**Example 3a: Male Taxi Driver 2 in Manta: 01:30**

Si yo me voy y no hablo español, ingle(s) estoy jodido
‘If I were to go (to the United States) and I do not speak Spanish English I would be in a predicament.’

**Example 3b: Male Hotel Clerk in Salinas: 01:15**

Más fácil ir a Guayaquil

‘It is much easier to go to Guayaquil’

**Table 4b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>/l/ (\rightarrow) [r] Retention</th>
<th>/l/ (\rightarrow) [r] % Retention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otavalo: Male Clinic tour guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbabura: Male tour director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Imbabura</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female Farm tour guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Male Garden Tour Guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female School Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female from Loja</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Quito</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete Totals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected from the highlands shows that no participant alternated /l/ with [r]. My findings do correlate with the descriptions of Andean (highland Spanish) given by other linguists. Provided below are examples of syllable final /l/ retention.

**Examples of /l/ retention from speakers:**

**Example 4a: Female School Director in Quito: 06:43**
La situación más difícil que tienen los niños
‘The most difficult situation the children have...’

**Example 4b: Female Farm Guide in Quito: 00:50**

Trabajos fundamentalmente con mujeres
‘We fundamentally work with women.’

**Conclusions about syllable final /l/ alteration with [r]**

The rates of syllable final /l/ alteration with [r] between the coast and the Andes are identical. In neither region was there any occurrence of alternation of the /l/ phoneme with [r]. This information contradicts the comparisons made by other linguists about syllable final /l/ alteration with [r] in Ecuadorian highland and coastal dialects. According to the linguist Gómez Rendón (2008), the highland regions retain /l/ and in the coast there is alternation with /l/ to [r]. However, my data shows no distinction between the speech of the highlanders and coastal people when it comes to syllable final /l/ alteration with [r]. Provided below is a table that compares syllable final /l/ alteration with [r] between the Ecuador’s coastal and Andean regions.

**Table 4c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>/l/ → [r]</th>
<th>/l/ Retention</th>
<th>/l/ → [r] %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.2 Syllable final /r/ alternation with [-l]

Table 5a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>/r/ → [l]</th>
<th>/r/ Retention</th>
<th>/r/ → [l]</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Waiter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Manta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male Hotel Clerk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male jewelry vendor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salinas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Woman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Olmedo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the speech of the coastal participants there were no forms of syllable final /r/ alternation with [l]. This data does not follow the trends depicted by scholars like Toscano (1963:118), who claim that syllable final /l/ alternation with /r/ is frequent in the coastal regions of Ecuador. Provided below are examples of /r/ retention.

Example of /r/ retention from speakers:

Example 5a: Female in Olmedo: 02:36

Hay vienen a visitar la familia que han quedado
‘They come to visit their family that stayed behind’

Example 5b: Male taxi driver 2 from Manta: 01: 40

Y viene(s) a Ecuador y tu no hablas e(s)pañol la misma vaina
‘And if you come to Ecuador and do not speak Spanish it is the same problem.’

Table 5b

**Syllable final /r/ → [l] in the Highland Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>/r/ → [l]</th>
<th>/r/ → [l] Retention</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otavalo: Male Clinic tour guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbabura: Male tour director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Imbabura</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female Farm tour guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Male Garden Tour Guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female School Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female from Loja</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Quito</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example of /r/ retention from speakers:**

**Female from Loja in Quito: 02:45**

Puede ser muy parecido a muchas cosas Mexicanas

‘It can be very much similar to Mexican speech’

**Male tour director in Imbabura: 00:08**

Tres meses antes pero dentro de la oficina trabajar con misma (familia) para ver como están

‘Three months before, we work inside the office with the same families to see how they are doing.’
Conclusions on alternation between syllable final /l/ and /r/ (and vice-versa)

In both the highland and coastal regions none of the participants alternated between syllable final /l/ and /r/. My data does not coincide with the observations made by other scholars such as Toscano (1953), Galindo (1993), Cotton and Sharp (1988), and Alonso (1953: 296) who state that in the coastal regions of Ecuador there is alternation between syllable final /l/ and /r/. This difference in data-findings is more than likely due to the locations in which I recorded. As mentioned earlier the majority of the locations I recorded in were large tourist attraction cities. It is likely that I would find more non-standard forms of speech such as the alternation between /l/ and /r/ in rural parts of the coastal regions of Ecuador. What is striking about these results is that even in a more rural location, Olmedo, no alternation was found. Provided below is a table that compares syllable final /r/ alternation with [l] between Ecuador’s coastal and Andean regions

Table 5c

Syllable final /r/ → [l] in Coastal and Highland Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/r/ → [l]</th>
<th>/r/ Retention</th>
<th>/r/ → [l] %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Deletion of intervocalic /d/

In the data there were not many instances in which the environment for intervocalic /d/ arose. There were two interviews, the Male waiter in Manta and the Male Hotel clerk in Salinas in which there were no intervocalic /d/s.
Table 6a

Intervocalic /d/ Deletion in the Coastal Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>/d/ Deletion</th>
<th>/d/ Retention</th>
<th>Deletion %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Taxi Driver 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manta: Male Waiter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Manta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male Hotel Clerk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas: Male jewelry vendor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salinas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Woman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo: Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Olmedo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of intervocalic /d/ deletion from speakers:

**Male Taxi Driver 2 in Manta: 05:45**

- *esta∅o unidos, ah bueno*
- *estado unidos, ah bueno*

‘The united states, oh ok.’

**Man in Olmedo File 8: 02:34**

- *siempre hay pelea , hay bronca con el esta∅o*
- *siempre hay pelea , hay bronca con el estado*

‘There is always a fight, there’s a battle with the state.’

The average rate of deletion of intervocalic /d/ in the coastal speakers is nine percent. These results do correlate with the observations made by other linguists.
Linguists like Toscano (1953: 119) and Gómez Rendón (2008) state that in the coastal dialect of Ecuador there is a general relaxation of consonants. However, the data presented above shows that deletion of intervocalic /d/ is only at nine percent with the speakers and is therefore not very frequent. The interviews of the Male waiter in Manta and the Male Hotel clerk in Salinas do affect the data because in their interviews there were no instances of the intervocalic /d/. It is possible that these two speakers do delete intervocalic /d/ but no opportunities were available in their interviews. It is also possible that these two speakers do not delete intervocalic /d/ and that the data I collected is representative of their actual speech habits.

What is interesting is that the only form of intervocalic /d/ deletion that occurred was between the vowels /a/ and /o/ in this environment: a_o#. Lipski (2011: 80) states that when intervocalic /d/ is elided it mainly occurs in past participial ending –ado, but in the data the only occurrence of /d/ deletion was in a noun estado ‘state’. There is a strong possibility that deletion of intervocalic /d/ in the word estado is no longer a phonological rule. It could be a special property of word estado.
Table 6b

Intervocalic /d/ Deletion in the Highland Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highland</th>
<th>/d/ Deletion</th>
<th>/d/ Retention</th>
<th>Deletion %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otavalo: Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic tour guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbabura: Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tour director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Imbabura</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm tour guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Tour Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quito: Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loja: Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quito</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected none of the speakers of the Andean region deleted intervocalic /d/. These results correlate to the findings of Toscano (1953: 119), who states that in the highland regions of Ecuador the natives maintain the intervocalic /d/ with much force.

Examples of intervocalic /d/ retention from speakers:

Female school director in Quito: 00:52

No todos los libros da el estado
‘The state does not provide all of the books’

Male garden tour guide in Quito: 00:09

¿Han conversado de esto antes?
‘Have you all talked about this before?’

**Conclusions about intervocalic /d/ deletion**

The data shows that there exists a distinction between the rate of intervocalic /d/ deletion between the coastal and Andes’ regions of Ecuador. Although my data is limited, if we apply a Fisher’s exact test to the data we get a p value of .039 which shows that my data is significant. There is a nine percent rate of /d/ deletion in the coastal regions whereas a zero percent rate of deletion in the Andean region. These results correspond to the distinction made by Toscano (1953). Provided below is a chart that compares intervocalic /d/ deletion between Ecuador’s coastal and Andean regions:

**Table 6c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/d/ Deletion</th>
<th>/d/ Retention</th>
<th>Deletion %</th>
<th>Retention %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.4 Data Conclusions**

As discussed in Section 4, many linguists have found phonological differences between the coastal and highland dialects of Ecuador. These differences often revolve around the phonological processes: *yeísmo*, deletion of syllable final /s/, alternation of syllable final /r/ and /l/, and deletion of intervocalic /d/. In this analysis I focused on the distinctions between Ecuadorian highland and lowland Spanish in relation to how each dialect treated the three processes of syllable final /s/ deletion, alternation of syllable final /r/ and /l/, and deletion of intervocalic /d/.

The majority of my data supports the findings of other linguists. The one exception is the alternation between syllable final /l/ and /r/: there were no distinctions between highland and lowland Ecuadorian Spanish because there were no instances in which participants from either region altered the sounds. Below I
summarize the results of each phonological process.

**Syllable final /s/ deletion**

In line with the findings of Cotton and Sharp (1988), Toscano (1953), and Lipski (1994), there was a clear division between highland and lowland dialects with the phonological process of syllable /s/ deletion. The participants from the coast delete syllable final /s/ and the participants from the highlands do not (Toscano 1953: 118; Lipski 1994: 248). In the data, the deletion rate in the coast is sixty-six percent whereas the deletion rate in the highlands is zero percent. Although syllable final /s/ deletion is high in the coast, not all the participants deleted /s/ and those who did apply the rule, did not do it in every possible instance.

**Deletion of intervocalic /d/**

In terms of deletion of intervocalic /d/, the data shows that there exists a difference between the coastal and highland dialects of Ecuador. There is a nine percent rate of /d/ deletion in the coastal regions, while there is a zero percent rate of deletion in the highland regions. According to Lipski (1994: 247), the intervocalic /d/ is “very weak and frequently falls” in the coastal dialects of Ecuador, however, in my data the average rate of deletion is low. As mentioned earlier, this contradicting outcome is probably due to the limited amount of instances in which intervocalic /d/ occurred, the length of the interviews, and social factors such as the level of education of the participants.

**Alternation between syllable final /l/ and /r/ (and vice-versa)**

No instances of alternation of the liquids /l/ and /r/ occurred among the people I recorded, regardless of region. This means that the speech of the participants in the coast and the highlands did not differ in their treatment of syllable final /l/ and /r/. This data contradicts the claims made by Lipski (1994, 2011), Toscano 1953, and Gómez Rendón (2008), who state that there is a difference in liquid retention and alteration rates between the highland and coastal regions of Ecuador. In general most scholars agree with Galindo (1993) who proclaims that in the coastal regions of Ecuador “the neutralization of the two liquids is very rare: it occurs sporadically in very vulgar or rural speech”; my data, however, shows no presence of this process occurring in the coast. Perhaps, because
this process is “very rare” explains why I did not observe it any of my participants’ speech.

Interesting enough correlations have been found between the alternation of syllable final liquids /l/ and /r/ and deletion of coda /s/. Lipski (2011: 78) states that the alternation between liquids in Spanish may conform to an implicational hierarchy in which the neutralization of coda liquids only occurs in dialects in which coda /s/ is frequently aspirated or deleted; “at the same time there are many dialects of Spanish in which coda /s/ is aspirated or deleted, but which coda liquids are not modified.” The latter situation describes the dialects of the participants from the coast who did deleted syllable final /s/ but did not alternate between /l/ and /r/ (and vice-versa).

In summary the limited data collected in this study displays that today there are still phonological differences between highland and coastal Ecuadorian Spanish. Apart from the one speaker from the coast who did not display any coastal features, my participants’ speech patterns indicate that they are from the regions (or are from nearby regions) in which I recorded them. My data does not display signs of the lowland and highland dialects merging, like what is happening between Castilian and Andalusian Spanish dialects. A possible sign for the merging of the two dialects is for instance, a highland participant occasionally alternating syllable final /l/ with [r] or deleting an intervocalic /d/. One factor that I must note is that none of my participants are teenagers. This factor further limits my data, because it is possible that the speech of Ecuadorian youth displays the merging of the two dialects.

With the limited amount of data I was able to collect, and with the far from ideal conditions under which I collected it, decisive conclusions cannot be made. Furthermore, since I was viewed as a tourist, there’s always the possibility that speakers altered their speech with me (as often happens when people talk with foreigners, and see Long 1983). Nevertheless, a difference between highland and lowland Ecuadorian Spanish was observed.

8 Final Conclusions

In this thesis I have deconstructed the indigenous, pro-andalucista, and anti-andalucista theories/arguments. The Indigenous theory’s role in this paper was to
provide an opposing argument to the *andalucismo* debate. For quite some time linguists have concluded that the indigenous theory does not encompass enough linguistic and social aspects to properly describe Latin American Spanish. The true debate is between the pro-andalucista and anti-andalucista arguments. I found that neither theory alone can be used to describe Latin America’s linguistic diversity, specifically the highland and lowland differences. To this day we still lack sufficient data to come to a conclusion on what were the underlying factors that pushed Latin American Spanish to be what it is today, and because of this lack of information both arguments share flaws.

The data I collected in Ecuador shows that today, like in the past, there are dialectal differences between Ecuador’s highland and lowland Spanish. This does not support the idea that Andalusian Spanish was the largest influencer in the colonization period. If Andalusians did have the largest linguistic impact then a small country like Ecuador would display more underlying Andalusian features in all of its dialects, however this not true. Provided below is a table that displays Andalusian, Castilian, Ecuadorian highland and lowland Spanish in relation to the “Andalusian phonological characteristics”: 
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonological Processes</th>
<th>Andalusia</th>
<th>Castile</th>
<th>Ecuador's Highland</th>
<th>Ecuador's Coast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seseo</td>
<td>Certain regions not all</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeísmo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Certain regions not all</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable final /s/ deletion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Certain regions not all</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger of liquids /l/ and /r/</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reported in other studies but not found by me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervocalic /d/ deletion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Refer to Section 2.3 for details on Andalusian and Castilian Spanish and Section 4.3 for details on Ecuadorian lowland and highland Spanish)

The table above shows that the phonological differences between Andalusian and Castilian Spanish are disappearing, that is Castilian and Andalusian Spanish dialects are sharing more and more phonological traits (refer to Section 4.3 for more detailed information). This current phenomenon makes it more difficult to determine where the “Andalusian phonological characteristics” originate from and it weakens the pro-andalucista argument because we are not absolutely sure that processes like yeísmo are originally Andalusian traits.

Even though pro-andalucistas present data that provides insight into the early colonists’ demographics we have no sure way of determining their final destination and how the majority of them spoke. If it is true that Ecuador’s different geographic regions were populated by different groups then who were the colonizers of the highland? The coast may show clear indications for Andalusian colonists’ presence but we only have theories and assumptions for the highlands.
Historically, scholars turn to the Castilians as being the Spanish inhabitants of the highlands but today Castilian Spanish is not the same as Ecuadorian highland Spanish. Were they similar in the past? Has Castilian Spanish evolved due to close contact with Andalusian Spanish and Ecuadorian Spanish remained the same with limited regional influences?

Besides sufficient data the pro-
andalucismo argument is limited to phonological processes. Languages encompass various aspects and so if the only features we can attest for are phonological no final conclusions can be made.

The multiple anti-
andalucistas' arguments and theories do not fully account for Ecuadorian Spanish. Although I did not analyze any of Ecuador’s unique linguistic traits that distinguish it from other forms of Spanish or the African, indigenous, and European possible influences on Ecuadorian Spanish. No literature centers the linguistic diversity of Ecuadorian Spanish around one of these languages or all three of them together. Even though Lipski (2007) argues that language contact with the three aforementioned groups of languages is important in describing Latin America’s Spanish dialects he does not present enough data to fully define and describe Latin American Spanish and specifically Ecuadorian Spanish.

Taking this information into account, I believe that if we were to combine these different arguments and factors together rather than focus one viewpoint we would be closer to describing the history of Latin American Spanish and the causes for its highland and lowland differences. Latin America is too diverse in history and language to be defined by one general theory that would ignore other important historical and linguistic aspects.
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