

Theories of the Emergence of Colonial Peruvian Andean Spanish (1533-1821)

Peter Gullette

1. Introduction

1.1. *Past Research in Spanish Historical Linguistics*

In recent years, there have been great advances in documenting the history of the Spanish language in terms of external sociohistorical factors, as well as the language-internal structures of the language. For example, Penny (2002) documents the external social and historical factors that led up to the development and spread of the Spanish language. He also describes some of the language-internal factors in the development from Latin as well. Lloyd (1987) describes the phonological and morphological development of Vulgar Latin into the Romance languages, especially Spanish.

However, to my knowledge, these standard works do not take into account the history of American Spanish, let alone that of Spanish in the Andean region.

1.2. *Past Research in Historical and Comparative Andean Linguistics*

However, many scholars have researched the properties of Andean Spanish, as well as Quechua, especially Southern Peruvian Quechua.

The standard work regarding Quechua linguistics is Cerrón-Palomino (1987).

Mannheim (1991) provides a book-length study that deals with the historical phonology and morphology of Southern Peruvian Quechua since the arrival of the Spanish language in the Americas. His work breaks down the phonology of Colonial Southern Peruvian Quechua into sections on sibilants, ejectives and aspirants, and syllable-final weakenings.

Two major general sources of reference for information on the languages of the Andes are Campbell & Grondona (2012) and Adelaar with Muysken (2004).

Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz (1999) gives an overview of the languages spoken in the Andean region before the arrival of the Europeans, serving to summarize the different language classifications of Quechua and other indigenous languages.

Regarding the external ecology of Andean Spanish, there are many sources to turn to. Clements (2009) explores the contact varieties of Spanish which arose due to colonial expansion and contact with indigenous languages around the world, one of which is Andean Spanish.

Durston (2007) treats the history of Christian translation in colonial Peru from roughly 1550-1650. He lays out the various techniques that the Spanish priests and Crown used to convert speakers of Quechua (and other languages) to Christianity.

Benvenuto Murrieta (1936) explores Peruvian Spanish, as well as Rivarola's work (1985a, 1985b, 1986, 1987).

However, the history and exact development of Andean Spanish has not been completely and accurately described.

* Peter Gullette, The Ohio State University, gullette.3@buckeyemail.osu.edu. I would like to thank Dr. Anna M. Babel for introducing me to Andean Spanish, as well as Miguel García and Daniela Salcedo for their insights on Peruvian Spanish. I also owe thanks to Dr. Fernando Martínez-Gil for his support. I would also like to thank the Hispanic Linguistics Colloquium, Changelings Historical and Sociolinguistics Discussion Group, and SPPO Lings Discussion Group at The Ohio State University for helpful feedback. Special thanks go to Dr. Anna María Escobar as well as two anonymous reviewers for their comments and feedback. All errors are of course mine.

1.3. Andean Spanish and Colonial Southern Peruvian Andean Spanish

As an anonymous reviewer pointed out, the term *Andean Spanish* does not refer to all varieties of Spanish spoken in the Andean region. What it does refer to, however, is the variety of Spanish influenced by the indigenous languages of the region, especially Quechua and Aymara. Table 1 outlines the phonological and morphosyntactic traits common to the Spanish varieties known as Andean Spanish.

Table 1. Phonological and morphosyntactic traits of Andean Spanish (Lipski 1994: 319-321, 323-327).

Phonological Traits	Morphosyntactic Traits
Retention of syllable-final /s/: apical [s̺]	SOV word order
distinction between palatal lateral approximate /ʎ/ and the palatal fricative /j/ (<i>lleísmo</i>)	Clitic pronoun doubling
Pronunciation of voiced intervocalic stops as obstruents [b], [d], [g]	Generalized use of <i>lo</i> as direct object
Merger of /o/-/u/ and /e/-/i/ (Motosidad)	Double possessives
	Lack of noun-adjective gender agreement

Example (1) shows some of the morphosyntactic traits known to characterize Andean Spanish, namely SOV word order and a lack of noun-adjective gender agreement, typical of the L2 Spanish of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals:

- (1) A tu chiquito oveja véndeme.
ACC¹ your.SING little.MASC.SING sheep.FEM.SING sell.me (Lipski 1994:324)

Example (2) shows the verb-final position of Andean Spanish, as well as the frequent use of the gerund (*con toda diligencia acodiendo*). We also see the partial neutralization of the phonemes /e/ and /i/, and /o/ and /u/:

- (2) ...principalmente acodiendo los dichosos forasteros a servir a los dichos curas, con
...principally showing.up the blessed strangers to serve ACC the said priests with

toda diligencia acodiendo...
all diligence attending...

‘the blessed strangers principally showing up in order to serve the said priests, attending [to them] with all diligence’ (Rivarola 2000: 110 [XXVIII])

1.4. The ‘Emergence’ of Andean Spanish

The majority of scholars believe that Andean Spanish emerged during the colonial period (Calvo 1995; Cerrón-Palomino 1995; Granda 2001; Rivarola 1989, 1992, 1995).

However, Escobar (2001) argues that the sociolinguistic conditions were not necessary for a contact-induced variety of Spanish to emerge in Peru until a transition period from the end of the eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. Here she uses Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) classification of contact features to classify the phenomena. She claims that lexical borrowing occurred from Quechua into Spanish but that structural interference did not occur.

While she does not deny the existence of bilinguals in southern Peru during the colonial period, she says that

¹ Here are the abbreviations that I am using: ACC = accusative, FEM = feminine, MASC = masculine, SING = singular.

[t]he fact that individual bilingual speakers existed cannot be used as evidence for the existence of a bilingual speech community, unless it can be attested that such a community in fact existed. In short, structural interference occurred at the individual level (as a second-language phenomenon), but not at the social level (as a contact variety). (Escobar 2001: 80)

She claims that from roughly 1550 to roughly 1750, the social conditions were not present for the emergence of Peruvian Spanish.

This paper seeks to review the facts regarding the historical sociolinguistic situation in the colonial Andes and examine two phonological characteristics in light of contact with Quechua, as well as in regard to the internal history of Peninsular and American Spanish. These two theories, the Indigenous Theory of Language Contact and the Andalusian Theory, are outlined in sections 3 and 4, respectively.

Let's look at the sociohistorical situation of the colonial Andean region of Southern Peru.

2. Sociohistorical Factors of the Colonial Southern Peruvian Andean Region

As Penny (2002) points out, Lima was one of two important administrative and cultural centers of Latin America (the other one being Mexico City). These two cities had constant contacts with the Spanish crown and Spanish settlers as well. (23-25)

The Spanish language of Lima was maintained as a close relative of Peninsular Spanish due to contact with Spain. However, as Penny points out, the other areas of Peru did not maintain as close contact with the Crown. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to think that the Spanish of this region, such as Andean Spanish was a different variety from Limeño Spanish.

Penny (2002: 23) plots the path that communication took in the “routes of discovery and conquest”: Seville/Cádiz to the Canary Islands to the West Indies to Lima and Mexico City, and the reverse as well. This is not surprising either in light of Lipski's statement about the Spanish economic goals in Peru.

Mintz (1971) is a framework that explores factors regarding the emergence of creoles in the Anglophone Caribbean. While Andean Spanish is not generally regarded as a creole, these three factors could certainly tell us something regarding the development of Andean Spanish. They are (1) the population demographics of the region, (2) social status and mobility in the region, and (3) the community settings of the region.

2.1. Population Demographics of the Andean Region

Mintz' (1971) first factor is that of the relative proportion of Europeans and indigenous peoples in the region. This is important for the development of Andean Spanish because it gives us a clue as to how widely Spanish was spoken. It is known that over time, Spanish gained prestige and Quechua lost prestige.

Ostler (2005) points out that it is impossible to estimate the number of indigenous peoples in the Americas before the arrival of Europeans. He says that estimates range between 13 million and 180 million.

Smallpox was already prevalent in Peru in 1525, seven years before the arrival of Francisco Pizarro in 1532. Many people in the region were killed by this disease, including the Inca leader Huayna Capac (Ostler 2005: 338).

Diamond believes that European conquest of the Americas was due to “European-transmitted epidemics (probably smallpox)” as well as “the overwhelming military superiority of even tiny numbers of mounted Spaniards, together with their political skills at exploiting divisions within the native population” (Diamond 1999: 373).

2.2. Social Status and Mobility in the Andean Region

Mintz' (1971) second factor deals with the social status and mobility of the different groups of people in the Andean region, for example, whether the level of control of colonial structure. He points out that Spanish policy was relatively controlling, compared to other structures, such as British or French structures.

Escobar (2001: 83) points out that around Lima, in the neighborhood of El Cercado, there was a two-meter-high fence with a door that was closed at night, effectively separating the Europeans from the indigenous people.

In the Andean region, viceregal society was divided into two main social levels: the *privileged* and the *unprivileged*. The *privileged* group included the *Peninsulars* (those of Spanish descent) and the *Creoles*. The *unprivileged* group included *Indians*, *Blacks*, and *Mestizos* (Valcarcel 1982: 28-29)².

The *privileged* group were the people who enjoyed privilege in society and “were in part the nobles or ennobled rich people” (Valcarcel 1982: 29). However, as Valcarcel mentions, “riches, wisdom or sainthood partially modified the rigid viceregal [social] scheme” (28-29)³. Therefore, as Valcarcel also mentions, in colonial Peruvian society, there were some (but few) noble Indians. However, for the most part, inhabitants were classified with regard to their socioethnic groups. Even though Escobar’s (2001) generalizations about the stratification of society—and thus Quechua and Spanish speakers—are accurate, it is possible that there was a community of bilingual speakers who did not conform to these social groups.

2.3. Community Settings of the Andean Region

Mintz’ (1971) third factor is that of the community settings of the region, for example, the first being “between plantation and non-plantation settings; the second between rural and urban settings; and the third, the distinctions among predial, domestic and other categories of slaves, and among free and slave populations within the same colony” (482-483).

A quote by Alberto Escobar accurately describes the linguistic and cultural situation the Spanish found themselves in when they arrived to the Peruvian coastal and Andean regions:

It is between this longitudinal classification that we discover the characteristics noted by the Spanish conquistador as he described the geography of the country, as well as the explicit differentiation between the European and native influence, between a world predominately rural vs. a world predominately urban with their corresponding indices of concentration of power and prestige vs. their opposites.” (Escobar 1976: 86-87)

The on-site farm-to-plantation development of the Spanish Caribbean islands in the 1800s was in no way a pan-Hispanic phenomenon. More specifically, the long period of intimate interracial contact—that is, the *société d’habitation* stage familiar to scholars of English and French creoles—simply did not exist in the mainland colonies (34).

The Spanish did not have plantation economies in the Andean region on as great a scale as the English and French had in the Caribbean. However, they did indeed have plantations on the mainland.

McWhorter reports that the Spanish did not have as much economic success with small-scale agriculture in their Caribbean island colonies and therefore turned their attention to large-scale agriculture in their mainland American colonies in New Spain (Mexico), New Granada (Colombia), and Peru (Blackburn 1997: 137-139, 142-144 quoted in McWhorter 2000: 33-34).

In Peru especially, there were many crops grown on the same estate, and a typical estate had more than 20 slaves, some even having more than 40 (Bowser 1974: 89, 94-95 quoted in McWhorter 2000: 35).

As Blackburn (1997) and Descola (1968) report, in Spain’s American colonies, there was a lot of money to be made. In Cuzco itself in southern Peru, there were 19 silver mines (Descola 1968: 217).

We have now reviewed some of the general social factors governing the development of Andean Spanish. Let’s turn now and review two structural features of this development.

As we have seen in Table 1 in Section 1.3, two phonological traits that differentiate Andean Spanish from other varieties of American Spanish are the retention of apical [ʂ] and the retention of the

² Here I have translated the Spanish language terms from Valcarcel 1982. The original terms are *privilegiados* (*peninsulares* and *criollos*) and *no-privilegiados* (*indios*, *negros* and *mestizos*).

³ “La riqueza, la sabiduría o la santidad modificaron parcialmente el rígido esquema virreinal.”

distinction between palatal lateral approximate /ʎ/ and the palatal fricative /j/ (*lleísmo*). There have been proposed many theories to explain these phonological characteristics; however, in this paper we will examine two of them, the Indigenous Theory of Language Contact and the Andalusian Theory of American Spanish.

3. The Indigenous Theory of Language Contact of American Spanish

The Indigenous Theory of Language Contact posits that American Spanish—and thus, Andean Spanish, as well—developed certain characteristics due to contact with indigenous languages (in the case of Andean Spanish, mainly Quechua and Aymara).

Many scholars have posited that the emergence of Andean Spanish as a separate language variety is owed to the history of its contact with Quechua, as well as other indigenous languages. Adelaar with Muysken (2004) gives a summary of this indigenous theory of language contact.

They mention that this theory did not really emerge until after most of the colonies had gained independence from Spain in the early 19th century. However, the indigenous languages certainly had been affecting the Spanish language of these regions since the beginning of contact 3 centuries earlier, at the beginning of the 16th century.

Not all speakers of Spanish in the Andean and surrounding regions were influenced in the same way by Quechua. As we see in Table 2 below, Adelaar and Muysken have divided up speakers whose language is influenced by Quechua in some way into five groups, A-E.

The speaker groups A-E are placed on a scale with regard to the amount of influence that Quechua has on their Spanish. For example, a speaker in group A is more than likely to commit errors typical of L2 learners of Spanish. Escobar (1994) calls the Spanish spoken by this group of people ‘Bilingual Spanish.’ She differentiates Bilingual Spanish, which is an L2 variety of Spanish spoken by Spanish language learners, from Andean Spanish, which is a monolingual variety of Spanish spoken by speakers in all parts of the Andean region of southern Peru.

Table 2. Types of speakers of Spanish that may show influence from Quechua (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 590).

A	Quechua speakers learning Spanish
B	Stable Quechua-Spanish bilinguals
C	Spanish monolinguals living in bilingual communities
D	Spanish monolinguals living in bilingual regions
E	Spanish monolinguals living in bilingual countries

One strength of the indigenous theory is that it can apply to many places in Latin America. One simply has to take into account the language and factors specific to that area, in this case, Quechua.

One disadvantage of the theory is that it cannot take into account internal historical changes that a language has undergone due to development from its parent language, for example, in this case Spanish.

In our case, a separate question would be which variety of Spanish Andean Spanish is directly descended from. This is a question the theory discussed below seeks to answer.

In Table 3 we see the sound system of consonants of Southern Peruvian Quechua as it was spoken in the 16th century when the Spanish arrived on the continent.

3.1. Sibilants of Southern Peruvian Quechua

As we see in Table 3 below, Common Southern Peruvian Quechua only had two sibilants, an apico-alveolar /s/, similar to that of Castilian Spanish and a dorsal /s̺/, similar to the dental sibilant in Andalusia and southern Spain.

Mannheim (1991) reports that Southern Peruvian Quechua had a distinction between dental (dorsal) /s̺/ and apical /s/. He also claims that Spanish had this distinction as well. However, in modern-day Quechua, we see that the distinction between the two sibilants has disappeared and both have merged into the apico-alveolar /s/.

Thus, it is not clear whether the presence of the apico-alveolar /s/ in Andean Spanish is due to the presence of this phoneme in Southern Peruvian Quechua or an independent retention from Peninsular Spanish.

Table 3. Consonant system of Common Southern Peruvian Quechua (adapted from Mannheim 1991: 123).

Stops		p	t		ch	k	q	
Aspirated stops		ph	th		chh	kh	qh	
Ejectives		p'	t'		ch'	k'	q'	
Nasals		m	n		ñ			
Sibilants			ɣ	ɣ̃				h
Rhotic				r				
Laterals			l		ll			

3.2. Laterals of Southern Peruvian Quechua

Noll (2005: 103) mentions that the retention of the palatal lateral phoneme /ʎ/ in the Spanish of Santiago del Estero (a Quechua-speaking region in northern Argentina) could be from influence from Quechua. While Andean Spanish inherited this sound from the Spanish spoken by peninsular settlers, it is not unreasonable that the presence of this phoneme in Quechua reinforces the distinction between the two phonemes in Andean Spanish.

As we will see later on, Quechua-Spanish contact does indeed play a role—an indirect role if not a direct role—with regards to the phonological development of Southern Peruvian Andean Spanish. For example, we will see that this dialect retained the distinction between /ʎ/ and /j/ as a conservative feature of Spanish phonology. However, it is reasonable that this distinction has been maintained in this dialect where it has not been in other dialects due to the fact that Southern Peruvian Quechua has the phoneme /ʎ/.

4. The Andalusian Theory of American Spanish

We have seen one theory on the influence of Quechua on Andean Spanish. Now let's look at the other side of the coin, the influence from other varieties of Spanish.

Many scholars have written about the theory of *el andalucismo*, the theory that American Spanish is directly descended from the Spanish of Andalusia in southern Spain.

This theory was based on several features that American Spanish—for the most part—shared with Andalusian Spanish:

- (3) the consolidation of the voiceless dental fricative /s̺/, the voiceless apico-alveolar fricative /s̺/, the voiced dental fricative /z/, and the voiceless dental fricative /z̺/ into one phoneme, which is pronounced similarly to the voiceless dental fricative /s̺/
- (4) the delateralization of the palatal lateral approximant /ʎ/ and the merger of this phoneme with /j/ (called *el yeísmo*)
- (5) in the Caribbean and Pacific coasts, the exchange, vocalization or loss of implosive /ɾ/ and /l/ (called *el trueque de líquidas*)
- (6) in some regions, the aspiration of [h] that originates from /f/ in Latin; for example, pronouncing /'arto/ as ['harto] or ['χarto]; pronouncing /a'blar/ as [ha'βlar] or [χa'βlar]

For the Andean region and Andean Spanish in general, factors (3) and (4) are relevant to the discussion here. This paper will look at factors (3) and (4) with regard to Andalusian and Andean Spanish in general.

Up until the 1930s, it was widely believed that the Andalusian hypothesis was correct. Starting in 1930s, however, scholars began to debate and doubt the theory. Henríquez Ureña (1932) was a very strong critic of the Andalusian theory. He proposed that barely a third of Spanish emigrants to the Indies (Americas) were of Andalusian origin.

However, Boyd-Bowman (1964) refuted these population demographics. In 1964 and subsequent years he pointed out that between 1493 and 1508, 60 percent of settlers to the Indies were Andalusian; and in the next decade two-thirds of the women who immigrated to the Americas were from Seville. And finally, between 1520 and 1579, the period in which the Spanish originally came to Peru, the population coming from Seville increased 33 percent (Lapesa 1980).

Penny also reminds us that all communications between Spain and the New World went through Seville, a fact which gives more credibility to the prestige level of the speech of Seville (Penny 2002: 26).

As we will see in Section 5, however, the Andalusian theory cannot fully account for Andean Spanish due to the fact that Andean Spanish has retained the apical /s̺/, whereas Andalusian Spanish possesses the non-apical /s/, like most varieties of American Spanish.

Now let's take a look at the development of the sibilants in 16th century Spanish on the Iberian Peninsula.

5. Historical Vestiges of Spanish: A Phonological Approach

5.1. Sibilants in 16th Century Peninsular Spanish

Table 4 gives an overview of the sibilant phonemes present in Peninsular Spanish at the beginning of the 16th century, right before the Spaniards arrived in Peru.

Table 4. Spanish sibilant system of 16th century Spanish (Penny 2002: 99).

	Voiceless	Voiced
Dento-alveolar fricative	/s̺/ or /s̺ ^h /	/z̺/
Alveolar fricative	/s/	/z/
Prepalatal fricative	/ʃ/	/ʒ/

Penny (2002) reports that in Andalusian Spanish, all of the medieval sibilants had merged into one phoneme: the voiceless dental sibilant /s̺/ by the beginning of the 17th century. This fits in well with the idea of some that general American Spanish is descended from Andalusian Spanish.

Non-Andalusian varieties of Spanish, i.e. the Spanish of Madrid and the northern and central parts of the Peninsula, did not retain a dental /s̺/. The /s/ of this region is the apical /s̺/.

Canfield warns us to take a Spanish speaker's orthographic conventions at face value and not to assume that her or his orthography represents the general pronunciation of the time: "Since speech habits are usually formed early in life, would not the date of an author's birth be more pertinent in an estimate of the pronunciation of his generation than the date of his published reactions? Even a writer of sixty who describes the sounds of an Indian language will think of these sounds in terms of his own speech of a half century earlier" (Canfield 1952: 26).

Example (7) comes from an example from a letter from Ponce de León, who was born in Spain in the latter half of the 15th century. It can be seen that he uses orthographic transcriptions that represent all 6 syllables from Table 2:

⁴ Different authors use different IPA phonemes to represent the same basic sound: /s̺/ (dental alveolar fricative) or /s̺/ (laminal dental fricative). For consistency I will use /s̺/ to represent the sound.

- (7) “Partirme e de aqui para *seguir* mi *viaje* de aquí a *cinco* o seys días. De lo que se *heziere* o se viere en aquellas partes por donde andobiere hare relacion a la vuelta a Vuestra *Magestad* y pidire *mercedes*. Y desde agora soplico me las haga, porque yo no *osaria* enprender tan gran cosa...Y sy hasta aqui e *dexado* de las pedir ha sido por ver que Vuestra Magestad tenia poco reposo y mucho trabajo...” (Navarro Tomás 1948: 27-29 quoted in Canfield 1952: 26)

In example (7), the six phonemes of 15th-16th century Spanish are present. Table 5 shows the correspondences between the orthographic representations and the phonemes.

Table 5. Orthographic representations of 15th-16th century Spanish sibilants.

Phoneme	Orthography	Example(s)
/s/	s	<u>se</u> guir, mer <u>ce</u> des
/z/	je, ge	via <u>je</u> , mag <u>e</u> stad
/s/	ce,ci	<u>cin</u> co, mer <u>ce</u> des
/z/	z	he <u>z</u> iere
/z/	V-s-V	o <u>s</u> aria
/ʃ/	x	de <u>x</u> ado

5.2. Sibilants in 16th Century Colonial Andean Spanish

Lipski reports that in Cusco and Puno it is possible to find an apical /s/, tying Andean Spanish as a whole to the Castilian dialects of Madrid and northern Spain and not to Andalusia, as in other parts of the Americas. He also reports nonsystematic use of [θ] in certain words; however, he doubts its position as a phoneme in the Spanish of Cusco (Lipski 1994: 320).

Cassano (1974: 475-476) reports:

The voiceless dental or alveolar fricative /s/ of Quechua has definitely reinforced the syllable-final word-interior reflex of the Spanish [-s] in certain areas of Spanish America and has possibly also reinforced the word-final reflex of this same phoneme to the extent that both of these reflexes occur in borrowing from the Quechua. This is to say that there is direct philological evidence that Spanish speakers whose lexical inventory includes *quechuismos* employ a [s] in the syllable-final position, a phone which is generally being spirantized to [-h] in this position in most dialects of American Spanish.

However, example (8) from Agustín Capcha in 1662 shows that Colonial SPAS was a *seseante* dialect, that is, it retained the merger between the phonemes /s/ and /θ/ as the phoneme /s/:

- (8) ...ase lligado a mí *notisia* que cómo en este dicho pueblo avía endia *hechisera* qui fueron nombradas...(Rivarola 2000: 61 [IX])

Here, we see that the scribe has confused orthographic conventions for the phoneme /s/. If the phoneme /θ/ had been present, he would not have made this orthographic error and would have spelled the words *noticia* and *hechicera*.

5.3. Lleísmo and Yeísmo in 16th Century Spanish

Therefore, it is necessary to seek another historical explanation for the difference between the Andean Spanishes and Limeño Spanish.

Even though Penny's (2000) distinction seems to work, it is not perfect. The data for Lima do not place it very neatly into either category. As we shall see in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, the changes that Peninsular Spanish—and the Spanish of Lima—underwent were present in Madrid and Seville; this would make it seem that at a certain point the Madrid-Seville distinction was not present.

One problem that is evident with historical phonology—and historical linguistics in general—is that it is very hard to assign an exact date to many sound changes that have taken place in Latin on its way

to Proto-Romance and later on, specifically to Spanish. However, one solution to this is to propose a *relative* chronology, in place of an *absolute* chronology.

Another problem with looking at historical vestiges of Southern Peruvian Andean Spanish is documentation (Anna Babel, PC; Anna María Escobar, PC; Miguel García, PC). It is hard to find documents during the colonial period from southern Peru. Most of the colonial documents that we have on hand are from Lima because it was the capital of the viceroyalty—and therefore the most important urban area.

This is another contrast that Andean Spanish has from Limeño Spanish. Lloyd (1987: 346) points out that the merger of the two phonemes was already prevalent in Lima by the end of the seventeenth century. He also mentions that in some parts of South America today, the merger of the two phonemes is seen as an urban norm (1987: 347).

As mentioned above, Noll (2005: 103) mentions that the retention of the palatal lateral phoneme /ʎ/ in Santiago del Estero could be from influence from Quechua. While it is probable that Andean Spanish inherited this sound from the Spanish spoken by Peninsular settlers, it is not unreasonable that the presence of this phoneme in Quechua reinforces the distinction between the two phonemes in Andean Spanish.

5.4. Lleísmo vs. Yeísmo in Colonial Southern Peruvian Andean Spanish

Before specifically talking about the issue of *lleísmo* vs. *yeísmo* in Peru, Escobar (1978) mentions some presuppositions about *yeísmo* that are generally accepted (60-61):

- (9) The loss of opposition between /ʎ/ and /j/ started out “as an anarchical confusion” (61) but later became fused as one (phonological) form and thus, one phoneme. This factor still persists as a difference in dialects today.
- (10) The Spanish phonological system united the two phonemes /ʎ/ and /j/ and the result was the merger of both into /j/; in areas where dephonologization did not occur,
- (11) Due to its early attestation in South America, it was once thought that *yeísmo*, the merging of the two phonemes, was specific to the South American continent. However, this has been shown to be false, because the phenomenon exists in parts of Spain and is absent in parts of South America, as well.
- (12) Seville is not the only area on the Iberian Peninsula where *el yeísmo* exists, nor it is believed, as it once was, that it has originated from Seville any earlier than in other focal points.
- (13) With regard to the New World, three cities seem to be the cities from which *el yeísmo* began to spread: Lima, Mexico City and Buenos Aires.
- (14) The earliest documentation of *yeísmo* originated in satire poems by Juan del Valle Caviedes, born in Jaén (Andalusia) who settled in Lima in 1665. Another documentation was Salinas y Córdova’s text from 1630.
- (15) Finally, what has happened with /ʎ/ and /j/ in Spanish is a factor of great importance for the treatment of Spanish dialectology in general and also in order to interpret the history and evolution of Spanish-speaking Peruvian language and society.

Escobar (1978) divides Peruvian Spanish into two groups depending on how it developed with regard to *lleísmo* and *yeísmo*. He calls Andean Spanish Group 1, the language variety that retained the distinction between the phonemes /ʎ/ and /j/ (*lleísmo*). All of the other varieties of Peruvian Spanish are classified in Group 2.

There have been several explanations for the retention of the distinction of these two phonemes in Southern Peruvian Andean Spanish.

One reasonable explanation for the distinction, pointed out to me by an anonymous reviewer, is that the Spanish of southern Peru developed differently from other varieties of Spanish is that Quechua has the phoneme /k/. This is an argument in favor of the indigenous theory.

Another reasonable explanation is that the Spanish of the settlers who settled in southern Peru had lleísmo, the distinction between the two phonemes /k/ and /j/. It is certainly plausible that the fact that Quechua had the palatal lateral phoneme /k/ strengthened its use. More than likely which theory is correct will never be proven satisfactorily.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have sought to review the facts regarding the historical sociolinguistic situation in the colonial Andes and examine two phonological characteristics in light of contact with Quechua, as well as in regard to the internal history of Peninsular and American Spanish.

In Section 2, we looked at some of the sociohistorical factors governing the development of Andean Spanish, namely the population demographics of the Andean region, the social status and mobility of indigenous peoples, and the community settings of the Andean region. These are indeed important to the development of Andean Spanish because they give us an idea of whether or not speakers of Quechua had enough contact with Spanish speakers to form bilingual speech communities.

Sections 3 and 4 gave us a snapshot of two major theories explaining the development of Andean Spanish. The Indigenous Theory of Language Contact posits structural interference from Quechua as a driving factor in the development of Andean Spanish, whereas the Andalusian Theory of American Spanish posits a historical evolution from the Andalusian dialects of Spanish. It is clear from phonological data with the Spanish sibilants and laterals that both theories are valid and that neither theory can stand on its own.

The phonological analysis in Section 5 sought to synthesize these two theories and bring us closer to a unified theory on the development of Andean Spanish. It is hoped that more historical phonological and sociohistorical research will be done in the future in order to explore this topic more.

References

- Adelaar, Willem F.H. with Pieter C. Muysken. 2004. *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benvenuto Murrieta, Pedro Manuel. 1936. *El lenguaje peruano*. Vol. I. Lima: Talleres de Sanmartí y compañía.
- Blackburn, Robin. 1997. *The making of new world slavery*. London: Verso.
- Boyd-Bowman, Peter. 1964. *Índice geobiográfico de cuarenta mil pobladores españoles de América en el siglo XVI*. Vol. I. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Calvo, Julio. 1995. El castellano andino y la crónica de Guamán Poma. In María Teresa Echenique et al. (eds.), *Historia de la lengua española en América y España*, 31-39. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Campbell, Lyle and Verónica Grondona (eds.). 2012. *The indigenous languages of South America: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Canfield, Delos Lincoln. 1952. Spanish American data for the chronology of sibilant changes. *Hispania* 35 (1), 25-30.
- Cassano, Paul V. 1974. The influence of Inca phonology on contact Spanish dialects. *Orbis* 23 (2), 459-483.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1987. *Lingüística quechua*. Cusco: Centro de Estudios Rurales Andinos «Bartolomé de Las Casas.»
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1995. Guamán Poma redivivo o el castellano rural andino. In Zimmermann, 161-182.
- Clements, J. Clancy. 2009. *The linguistic legacy of Spanish and Portuguese: Colonial expansion and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz, Sabine. 1999. Las lenguas andinas. In Luis Guillermo Lubreras (ed.), *Historia de América Andina. Volumen I. Las Sociedades Aborígenes*, 499-537. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar.
- Descola, Jean. 1968. *Daily life in colonial Peru, 1710-1820*. Trans. by Michael Heron. New York: Macmillan.
- Diamond, Jared. 1999. *Guns, germs, and steel: The fates of human societies*. New York/London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Durston, Alan. 2007. *Pastoral Quechua: The history of Christian translation in colonial Peru, 1550-1650*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

- Escobar, Alberto. 1976. Bilingualism and dialectology in Peru. *Linguistics* 14 (177), 85-96.
- Escobar, Anna María. 1994. Andean Spanish and bilingual Spanish: Linguistic characteristics. In Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon, and Mario Daniel Martín (eds.), *Language in the Andes*, 51-73. Newark, DE: University of Delaware.
- Escobar, Anna María. 2001. Contact features in colonial Peruvian Spanish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 149, 79-93. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Granda, Germán de. 2001. Procesos de estandarización revertida en la configuración histórica del español americano: el caso del espacio surandino. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 149: 95-118.
- Henríquez Ureña, Pedro. 1932. *Sobre el problema del andalucismo dialectal de América*. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología de la Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Lapesa, Rafael. 1980. *Historia de la lengua española*. 8th edn. Biblioteca Románica Hispánica. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Lipski, John M. 1994. *Latin American Spanish*. London: Longman.
- Lloyd, Paul M. 1987. *From Latin to Spanish. Vol I: Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Spanish Language*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Mannheim, Bruce. 1991. *The language of the Inka since the European invasion*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- McWhorter, John H. 2000. *The missing Spanish creoles: Recovering the birth of plantation contact languages*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.
- Mintz, Sidney W. 1971. The socio-historical background to pidginization and creolization. In Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages: Proceedings of a Conference held at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica, April 1968*, 481-496. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2012. Contacts between indigenous languages in South America. In Campbell & Grondona, 235-257.
- Navarro Tomás, Tomás. 1948. *El español en Puerto Rico: Contribución a la geografía lingüística de Hispanoamérica*. Río Piedras: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Noll, Volker. 2005. Reflexiones sobre el llamado andalucismo del español de América. In Volker Noll, Klaus Zimmermann, and Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh (eds.), *El español de América: Aspectos teóricos, particularidades, contactos*, 95-111. Madrid/Frankfurt: Vervuert/ Iberoamericana.
- Ostler, Nicholas. 2005. *Empires of the word: A language history of the world*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Penny, Ralph. 2000. *Variation and change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Penny, Ralph. 2002. *A history of the Spanish language*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1985a. *Lengua, comunicación e historia del Perú*. Lima: Lumen.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1985b. Un testimonio del español andino en el Perú del siglo 17. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica* 1, 203-211. Valladolid.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1986. El español del Perú. Balance y perspectiva de la investigación. *Lexis* 10, 25-52. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1987. Parodias de la 'lengua del indio' en el Perú (SS XVII-XIX). *Lexis* 11, 137-164. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1989. Bilingüismo histórico y español andino. In Sebastián Neumeister (ed.), *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*, 153-163. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1992. Aproximación histórica al español del Perú. In César Hernández Alonso (ed.), *Historia y presente del español de América*, 697-717. Junta de Castilla y León: Pabecal.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1995. Aproximación histórica a los contactos de lenguas en el Perú. In Zimmermann, 135-160.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 2000. *Español andino: Textos de bilingües de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Textos y Documentos Españoles y Americanos. Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/ Vervuert.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tuten, Donald N. 2003. *Koineization in Medieval Spanish*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 88. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Valcarcel, Carlos Daniel. 1982. *Historia del Perú colonial*. Lima: Editores Importadores, S.A.
- Zimmermann, Klaus (ed.). 1995. *Lenguas en contacto en Hispanoamérica*. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Jennifer Cabrelli Amaro,
Gillian Lord, Ana de Prada Pérez,
and Jessi Elana Aaron

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2013

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium
© 2013 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-459-1 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Gullette, Peter. 2013. Theories of the Emergence of Colonial Peruvian Andean Spanish (1533-1821). In *Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Jennifer Cabrelli Amaro et al., 292-302. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2941.