



The theory of Andalucism and political ideology: a comparative analysis of Andalusian and Caribbean Spanish

Antonio Reyes

Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA 24450, United States of America

Many internal (linguistic) and external factors are discussed in the Theory of Andalucism. In the first part of this work I briefly review linguistic features employed to connect Andalusian and Caribbean Spanish, building arguments in favor of the Theory of Andalucism. In the second part, the differences between Andalusian and Caribbean Spanish are exposed and the counter-argument is proposed, suggesting a divergent path for these two varieties of Spanish (Trudgill 1999). Linguistic analysis is complemented by a historical examination of external factors, such as emigration patterns to America from Spain, and other sociolinguist observations (Paredes and Sanchez-Prieto Borja 2008). The study extends its contribution by drawing implicit correlations between views on this theory and political positionings, showing that even by presenting a pure linguistic phenomenon such as language change, authors can index very different political ideologies (Van Dijk 1993b, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1997, Seliger 1976)¹. Proposals relating American Spanish to Andalusian Spanish as a continuum reveal the emphasis on cultural identity between Spain and Latin America based on language, similar to the later pan-hispanist movement (Del Valle 2012), which relies on the idea of community to develop economic and political infrastructure.

KEYWORDS: Theory of Andalucism; Andalusian Spanish; Caribbean Spanish; liquid consonants; political ideology.

COPYRIGHT: © 2013 Reyes. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and preproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

For decades authors have discussed the Theory of Andalucism, trying to build convincing arguments to support or refute it (Boyd-Bowman 1956 and 1976, Catalán 1959, Fernandez-Sevilla 1987, Frago Garcia 1994, Guitarte 1958, Lapesa 1964, Menendez Pidal 1962, Noll 2005, Rosenblat 1984). This controversial theory tries to define the Spanish spoken in America as a continuum development of the southern peninsular variety (Andalusian). The opposite view (Anti-Andalucism) proposes that the varieties of

Spanish spoken in America are not derived from Andalusian Spanish but that they constitute dialects that undertook parallel development, which coincidentally ended up having similar phonological features.

Other authors argue that this group of phonological features constitutes a Spanish *koiné*, formed in America through contact among the different dialects in the early times of the conquest, by a leveling mechanism and through linguistic accommodation (De Granda 1991, 1994, Fontanella de Weinberg 1992, Guitarte 1958). This way, the *koiné* would have developed through different stages/periods, with Andalusian features being more noticeable in the early stages (De Granda 1994, Fontanella de Weinberg 1992).

‡Correspondence: reyesa@wlu.edu

Received: 7 March 2013; Accepted: 15 April 2013

The article briefly explains those phonological features discussed by authors to link Andalusian and the Spanish spoken in America, to later analyze in depth one feature: the phenomenon of confusion of liquid consonants. This analysis reveals a more complex and nuanced reality of the phenomenon, and therefore, it questions the feature as a possible link between the varieties of Spanish.

In addition to linguistic features, authors have researched external factors that define the history of the Spanish language in America. Some of the factors refer to the origins of the colonizers (Henriquez Ureña 1932), the patterns of immigration (Boyd-Bowman 1956 and 1976) and/or their possible destinations: Theory of the Low and High Lands (Wagner 1920, 1927).

The current project attempts to reveal and discuss the ideological context in which the Theory of Andalucism is discussed to understand the different positionings and the reaction towards them. I follow Seliger's understanding of ideology: "Sets of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify ends and means of organized social action, and specifically political action irrespective of whether such action aims to preserve, amend, uproot or rebuild a given social order" (Seliger 1976: 14). The Theory of Andalucism does not deal with a mere linguistic fact but with the relation of dependence between the language of the colonizers and the colonized.

Common Linguistic Similarities

Lapesa (1964) addressed three main characteristics between Andalusian Spanish and Spanish varieties in America: phonetic similarities, vocabulary and grammatical features. However, only at the phonological level have studies been able to draw the similarities that feed the controversy. The discussions on vocabulary and grammatical features do not allow us to draw determined conclusions but speculate on possibilities about the theory.

As pointed out by Danesi (1977), Lapesa (1964) and many others later on, such as Rivarola (2001) or Noll (2005), five main phonetic traces link American Spanish and Andalusian Spanish:

- a) Seseo.
- b) Yeísmo.
- c) Aspiration or elision of /s/ in closed syllable or final position.
- d) Confusion of liquid consonants (/r/ and /l/) in closed syllable or final position.
- e) Conservation of the [h] (f- initial in Latin) and its phonetic fusion with /x/.

Noll (2005) refers also to the elision of /d/ in intervocalic position as another feature that both modalities share. However, the elision of intervocalic /d/ is a common feature to many different varieties of peninsular Spanish since elision of /d/ in participles (i.e., /kantao/ for /kantado/) is a common realization in casual speech. This phenomenon may entail a process in development since it is extensive to most of Spain (Quilis 1993). Elision is, nevertheless, avoided in careful speech in Spain and Latin America (Lipski 2011).

Seseo is the linguistic feature per excellence to discuss the relationship between Andalusian and American Spanish. Seseo is extended generally throughout America (Rivarola 2001: 55). According to Penny (1991), only a dental sibilant phoneme /s/ is pronounced (seseo) in the central region of Andalusia (including Seville and Cordoba), in the Canary Islands and in America. Seseo, then, seems to be a common feature between Andalusian and American Spanish although the areas of the coast in Andalusia including Huelva, Cadiz, Malaga and Granada pronounce a more frontal interdental realization of this phoneme (ceceo). A counter-argument for seseo is that seseo is not only found in Andalusia. Alvar (1996) affirms that seseo is common in Extremadura, the borderline area with Portugal. Penny (1991) includes the Canary Islands in the areas where seseo is the norm. This fact has led some authors to reconsider the name for the Theory of Andalucism and to propose a name that would include features from other parts of the south of Spain, such as Southern Features [*Rasgos Meridionales*] (Menendez Pidal 1918: 5, Noll 2005: 98, Rivarola 2001: 63).

Yeísmo is the second most extended linguistic feature after seseo that supports the connection between the two Spanish modalities (Lapesa 1981: 571). And again, it can be argued that it is not an exclusive phenomenon of Andalusian Spanish; according to Quilis (1993: 321-2), yeísmo is present in the oriental area of Andalusia from Cadiz to Almeria, but it also extends to major parts of Spain such as Extremadura, Castile and Madrid. Yeísmo also has an extended use in America and that extended use may point to the fact that yeísmo is a very common phenomenon in different dialects and in the romance languages in general. It is unlikely, therefore, that yeísmo in America has derived from Andalusian Spanish (Lipski 1994: 57).

Aspiration or elision of /s/ in weak positions has also been registered in Andalusian and American Spanish. Although pointed out by Lapesa (1964) as an argument to draw a continuum between the Spanish spoken in America and in Andalusia, this

phenomenon is also common in many other areas in Spain such as Extremadura, the Canary Islands, Murcia, Toledo, Castile and even in areas of the province of Madrid. In Latin America, Quilis (1993) noticed /s/ aspirated in weak positions in many latitudes of the Americas, i.e., in the south of Mexico, Central America, Uruguay, Paraguay, Argentina, Chile, and the interior of Venezuela and Colombia. Rivarola emphasizes the difficulties to account for the chronology of the phenomenon in Peninsular Spanish, and therefore, to draw a clear connection with American Spanish (Rivarola 2001: 65).

Confusion of /l/ and /r/ stands as a common feature in Andalusian and American Spanish in weak contexts (closed syllable and final position). In America, this phenomenon is located mainly in the Caribbean islands and coastal areas. In Andalusia, this phenomenon is nowadays negatively perceived by the majority of Andalusians (Narbona et al. 2005). The omission of final /l/ and /r/ is a widespread phenomenon in the south of Spain and in America with examples such as “comprá” for “comprar,” “coló” for “color” and “Migué” for “Miguel.” The phenomenon of confusion of liquid consonants is documented in Andalusia dating back to the 15th century and even before (Cano Aguilar 2009:81, de Granda 1994: 67). This feature seems to be a plausible continuation in both varieties. However, as the next section shows in detail, it entails different nuances.

Finally a conservation of the [h] (f-initial in Latin) and its phonetic fusion with /x/ appears on both sides of the Atlantic providing examples such as /xámbre/ for “hambre.” This feature is, however, more difficult to trace in America (Rivarola 2001: 64).

Liquid Consonants: A Divergent Path

As seen above, most of the phonetic features described as similarities to link Andalusian and American Spanish can be debated by a counter-argument. The neutralization of /-r/ and /-l/ in weak positions, however, was attested in Andalusian in pre-Colombian times and in America in the early times of the conquest, as shown in the oldest American documents (Rivarola 2001: 66). De Granda points at this neutralization as one feature of the Spanish *koiné* in America that seems to come from Occidental Andalusia (De Granda 1994: 68).

This section looks at the confusion of liquid consonants in Andalusian Spanish and in the Spanish in America in particular. Furthermore, it compares Andalusian and Cuban Spanish since Caribbean Spanish has been connected to the Spanish spoken in the south of Spain through, for example, the Theory of High and Low Lands (explained below).

Even if there is confusion of liquid consonants in weak positions in Cuban and Andalusian Spanish, there are two different phenomena explaining the majority of the variants found in those positions. The predominant variant in Andalusia is rothicization (/r/ instead of /l/ i.e., “a/r/to” instead of “a/l/to”) and in Cuba, lateralization (/l/ instead of /r/ i.e., “ce/l/do” instead of “ce/r/do”). The question is how different these phenomena are.

In this respect, it is relevant to consider the Theory of Lenition; phonologically, lenition is driven by a phonetic imperative to minimize articulatory effort (Kirchner 2001). If we observe which realization of the liquid consonants implies a reduction in the articulatory effort we must conclude that when /l/ is realized as rothicization [r] (Andalusian Spanish), it is not responding to a lenition process since the vibration of [r] requires more articulatory effort. However, when /r/ is realized as [l] lateralization, or [i] vocalization, the pronunciation of the consonant is undertaking a reduction in the articulatory process.

Following Hock’s (1991) strength scale for consonantal sounds:

gemminate stops > voiceless stops > voiced stops > voiceless fricatives > voiced fricatives > liquids > laryngeals > glides > Ø

Cuban Spanish (characterized by its lateral realization) on a scale of different realizations of /r/ from maintenance /r/ to elision would show as follow:

/r/ > laterals (Cuba) > approximants > glides > vowels > Ø (elision)

Andalusian Spanish (characterized by its rothic realization) cannot be placed in our model for realizations of /l/ from maintenance /l/ to elision:

/l/ > approximants > glides > vowels > Ø (elision)

In Andalusian Spanish, /l/ > [r] involves a tension in the pronunciation of liquid consonants, a marked process in post-nuclear position. It acts against the Descent Principle (Chela-Flores 1994), implying that the liquid sounds /l/ and /r/ do not present the same difficulty. This principle is a process of relaxation which refers to tongue movements from upper positions or marked positions in the vocal cavity to lower positions, in search of the normal (unmarked) tongue position. It thus appears to be easier to go from /r/ to [l] (lateralization), than the other way around (rothicization), since rothicization requires an effort in articulation. This analysis indicates that /l/ > [r] and /r/ > [l] do not present the

same difficulty in pronunciation, presenting a divergent path in these two varieties of Spanish (Trudgill 1999).

In addition to these differences, we find in Cuban Spanish the geminate realization of liquid consonants in closed syllable before plosive consonants i.e., [áppa] for “arpa,” [góppe] for “golpe.” This variant does not appear in Andalusian Spanish and, contrary to the process of lateralization and vocalization of /r/, it requires an effort in articulation, as shown in Hock’s scale above (1991).

Although confusion of liquids is a phenomenon present in Spanish on both sides of the Atlantic, their variants point at different directions in each dialect.

In addition, in many languages around the world, liquid consonants show particular behavior displaying relationships among themselves, including neutralization (Azevedo 1981, Carlton 1991, Chela-Flores 1994, Gick 2002, Kirchner 2001, Narayanan, Byrd & Kaun 1999, van der Torre 2003, Walsh Dickey 1997, Zitzke 2001). It seems plausible, therefore, that different phenomena associated with the liquid consonants develop in Andalusian and American Spanish (rothicization and lateralization or even vocalization) without one having to be the continuation of the other.

Looking at diachronic data, examples of neutralization of /r/ and /l/ are found in Spain from the 12th to the 15th centuries and in America from 1525 to 1560 (Lapesa 1981). Contreras (2000) studied 216 documents, paleographically transcribed, including peninsular as well as Chilean (criollos) authors, from 1548 to 1798. With respect to Andalusian features in Chilean documents, Contreras found confusion of liquids in examples like “Ferrel” (in Juan de Agurto 1670), and “mujel” (in Juan Gómez 1696). He found “buerba” (vuelta), “mir” (mil), and “sardrá” (saldrá) in 1766. Contreras (2000) states that neutralization of /l/ and /r/ took place in the Chilean dialect until the end of the 18th century. Contreras (2000) ascribes the confusion of liquid consonants in Chilean Spanish to the influence of the Andalusian dialect.

On the other hand Navarro Tomás (1948) studied the confusion and distribution of liquid consonants in El Jíbaro, Puerto Rico, showing the Spanish modality that peasants spoke in Puerto Rico around 1845. In relation to liquid consonants, he mentions examples such as “cuelpo (cuerpo),” “parrmillo (palmillo),” “pueita (puerta),” and “aiguno (alguno)” which display different realizations for liquids: /l/ instead of /r/ (lateralization), /r/ instead of /l/ (rothicization), something in between (approximant) and vowel instead of liquid consonants (vocalization). Navarro Tomás (1948) concluded that the language that colonizers brought to America was a mixture of

different features, and both dialects developed in a parallel manner and the similarities nowadays are simply coincidental.

The previous data seems to point to a crucial process in variation and change; it seems that the propagation of linguistic features in the Americas is determined by the contact between speakers of many mutually intelligible varieties, which produces a “multiplicity of competing variants” (Penny 2000: 51-52). When variants compete, the simplest variant normally emerges as the winner (Trudgill 1986: 109). In the Spanish of the Americas, there is not one single variant for the realizations of /l/ and /r/. The variant of vocalization (Wells 1982) is found, for example, in the Dominican Republic; in parts of Venezuela, vocalization has become the dialectal characteristic for /l/ and /r/, e.g., /áito/ instead of “alto,” /káita/ instead of “carta” (Zamora y Guitart 1988).

In Andalusia, rothicization is a common realization of /l/. In many variants of Caribbean Spanish (Antilles, Cuba) and Chilean Spanish, /r/ is realized as /l/ (Lapesa 1981). As mentioned above, there are also many examples of approximants, geminates, elisions, etc. (Chela-Flores 1994). Even in Cuba, liquid consonants in weak positions display different realizations depending on the region, social group and phonetic contexts (before consonant or in final position) (Lipski 1994:257).

It is also important to keep in mind that even if historical documents provide crucial insights into the matter, researchers face difficulties because the historical knowledge of the language that they are trying to explain lies in the paradox of obtaining information about the spoken language from written documentation from the studied period (Paredes & Sánchez-Prieto Borja 2008: 37).

This section shows that, when a single linguistic feature such as the confusion of liquid consonants is analyzed in depth (Broce and Torres Cacoullous 2002, Fontanella de Weinberg 1984, Lapesa 1981, Quilis 1993), the similarities at first sight do not account for the extension and complexity of the phenomenon per se.

Extra-linguistic Factors: A Sociolinguistic Perspective

In 1932, Pedro Henriquez Ureña presented a book, *El problema del Andalucismo dialectal de América*, with data he collected from chronicles about the Indies, the General Archive of the Indies in Seville, conquerors of Mexico and Chile, and travelers to the Indies in general. This book provided essential information about extra-linguistic factors in the Theory of Andalucism.

He collected colonizers' data (name and place of origin) from 1492 to the early 17th century. In his data, the variety of Northern Spanish represents 41.7% of the total varieties coming from Spain; Southern Spanish, 42.5%. If we add the Southern Spanish numbers to the numbers from Cáceres and Murcia (since they share many phonological features), we arrive at a total of 6,845 persons, representing 49% of the total 13,948 subjects (Henríquez Ureña 1932:113). Additionally, López Morales pointed out that 58% of the people coming from Andalusia were from Seville, a city that enjoyed great prestige due to its role in the conquest, and this prestige was transferred to the linguistic features of the Spanish spoken in Seville (López Morales 1998: 52-53).

This percentage is important but Henríquez Ureña (1932) does not consider it sufficient to formalize the hypothesis and assure that the Spanish of the Americas owes its origin to Andalusian Spanish.

According to Henríquez Ureña (1932) the fact that two of the conquistadores, Cortes and Pizarro, were from the south of Spain (Extremadura) emphasizes the belief of the influence of the south of Spain in the conquest.

An important fact that cannot be corroborated is whether the people who registered to board ships to America were truly from the locations they attested to be from, and whether they were presenting their true identification, given the lack of documentation and the fact that many people looked for passage to America as a way to escape the law.

The foundation of the "Casa de Contratación" of Seville in 1501 was an argument used by authors like Lapesa (1981) in favor of Andalusism. Lapesa suggests that even many colonizers going to America were not from Andalusia; given the extended waiting periods between voyages (sometimes even years), it is likely that they acquired linguistic Andalusian features in Seville while waiting their turn to cross the Atlantic. This hypothesis is also difficult to test because we do not know exactly how long the waiting periods were, nor how frequently they were exposed to those linguistic Andalusian features. It is also plausible that the newcomers gathered in small communities with people from their own region(s). In order to analyze that phenomenon, we need a sociolinguistic study to decode the way societies functioned in the past (Paredes and Sanchez-Prieto Borja 2008).

Boyd-Bowman (1976) provided extensive data on the issue of immigration in an attempt to identify the first colonizers, their origins and their final destination in America. He studied 40,000 colonizers from 1493 to 1600 and discovered that 40% of them were from Seville and 14% were from Extremadura.

Seventy percent of the sailors hired for America were also from Andalusia.

In relation to their final destinations, he found that, out of the total number of colonizers who arrived in Mexico, 31% were from Andalusia, 13% from Extremadura. In Puerto Rico, 42.3% were from Andalusia.

Dealing with female immigration from 1493-1519, he affirmed that 69% of the women were from Andalusia. Female immigration is crucial due to the role women have in the education of their children in the early years of the language acquisition process. These percentages reflect the important role of the Andalusian population in the process of colonization in America. The immigration argument has been used repeatedly as a pro-Andalusism argument. However, even if an important percentage of the first colonizers came from Andalusia and the Canary Islands, that does not imply that the language spoken in America will reflect that influence from those dialects in the same percentages (Lipski 1994: 53).

Another theory based on the origin of the colonizers tries to argue that colonizers were looking for a similar landscape and meteorological conditions in America as the ones they left behind. This Theory of Low and High Lands, also known as the climate theory (Wagner 1927), can be supported by Boyd-Bowman's data (1976) but still leaves questions unanswered. How can we track the trace of colonizers in their trans-Atlantic adventures? How can we confirm that they arrived to their intended destinations? How do we know the length of their stay in a specific location? How can this theory explain such different phenomena between Andalusian (rhoticization) and Cuban Spanish (lateralization)? For many, the Theory of Low and High Lands is unsustainable. Lipski, for example, argues that there is no correlation in Spain between climate areas and pronunciation, and supports this affirmation by comparing the high lands of Andalusia with the high lands in Hispanoamerica (Lipski 1994: 21).

The theories and data discussed above do not provide sufficient evidence to either affirm or discard the assumption of a continuum between Andalusian and American Spanish. For each argument in favor or against, a counter-argument has been proposed. For Lipski, for instance, there is not enough categorical evidence to support the Theory of Andalusism. Some of the features presented in the arguments above are not restricted to Andalusian Spanish (Lipski 1994: 36-9). At the time of the first trips to America, the languages in the Peninsula were at the early stages of their development, and therefore they were very different

to the current form they display today (Mar-Molinero 2000: 30).

The fact of the matter is that there will always be arguments in favor or against the Theory of Andalucism because this topic, which seems merely historic-linguistic, also reveals ideological positionings about the historic-political relationship between America and Spain.

From Historical Linguistics to Political Ideology

The sections above summarize the data argued to defend or refute the Theory of Andalucism. These facts and data do not constitute sufficient evidence to tilt the balance towards one side or the other. Many of these studies leave the controversy unsolved, partly because we need more specific and trustworthy data related to the first voyages to America, the people on those ships, and where they settled in America.

Since those first trips to America, the two continents have defined and established their relationship on many different grounds. Taking into account the close relationship between language, identity and the possible sense of belonging of individuals who share a language and its features, the linguistic arena has been fertile ground to produce many arguments in favor and against a close relationship of dependency between the two Spanish varieties. Until the 1920s and 30s, it was a common belief that the Spanish spoken in America was a clear continuation of Andalusian Spanish. In those decades, the work of Henriquez Ureña (1932) challenged this theory arguing that the diversity of features found in the Spanish spoken in America shows an independent development from Andalusian Spanish, constituting a parallel dialect which coincidentally shares similar features (Anti-Andalucism). At the middle of the 20th century, Spanish authors such as Catalán (1959), Lapesa (1964) and Menendez Pidal (1962) resume the debate, advocating in favor of the Theory of Andalucim (except from Alonso [1953] who supported Henriquez Ureña's position), but recognizing also that the features of American Spanish could not be explained solely from the influence of Andalusian Spanish. According to Narbona et al. (2005), in recent years, a more reconciliatory position is accepted in which there is recognition of the importance and influence of Andalusian Spanish in the development of American Spanish while also noting important considerations: (1) the influence focused on the first stage of the conquer and colonization; (2) the influence is limited to phonetic features more than grammatical or lexical; (3) it did not influence all the different areas

and countries equally; and (4) there are other approaches and processes that affect the Spanish spoken in America (Narbona et al. 2005:142).

A crucial factor that prevents objective accounts of the data has to do with the ideology embedded in the Theory of Andalucism itself. The arguments debated index ideological alignments connected to historic-political views. To support the Theory of Andalucism is to create a language connection (a continuum) between Andalusian Spanish and the Spanish spoken in the Americas. Support for this theory reactivates a discussion related to dependence, power and historical subjugation. It is to say that the American Spanish origin derives from Andalusian Spanish. This view establishes or reestablishes dependence from Spain, viewing American Spanish as a derived continuum.

The different positions convey meanings that go beyond the linguistic features and relate to issues of identity and ideology in a similar way that language is related to a "nation-building process" (Blommaert 2009: 415, Edwards 2009).

On the other hand, refuting this theory liberates American Spanish from any specific origin (Andalusian Spanish) explaining that the Spanish in the Americas was created out of an amalgam of different dialects that were brought from Spain but that have their own development in the Americas. This view does not support a continuum but a parallel development, a fresh start, breaking the specific connection with Andalusian Spanish. This position states that the new Americans alone are responsible for the Spanish that is currently spoken in Latin America. Support of the anti-Andalucism movement reactivates the discussion about Spain's repression and dominance over the Americas and indexes the idea of independence toward the old Metropolis.

These are implicit correlations between views on the Andalucism theory and political positionings showing that a pure linguistic phenomenon such as language change can be used or manipulated by authors to project different political ideologies (Seliger 1976). These authors represent a power gained through their positions and access to discourse as elites (van Dijk 1995a, 2005). They are known and respected figures in Academia, and they know the effect of what they argue or defend. These authors, through their published works, shape the audience's perception of reality.

The dilemma of Andalucism has been embraced by the pan-hispanist movement. Even if this movement coincided with a time of prosperity in Spain (the 1990s) and the corporate projection in Latin America (Del Valle & Villa 2012: 36), the philosophy behind the movement is closely related

to ideological positionings in favor of the Theory of Andalucism. The pan-hispanist movement attempts to define and to emphasize a cultural identity between Spain and the old colonies, based on the language (Sepúlveda 2005). Once a community is formed through cultural connection (language), the idea is to transform that into economic and political infrastructure (Del Valle 2012: 186). The different academies of the Spanish language have played a fundamental role in order to achieve this goal (Del Valle 2012). Lapesa and Menéndez Pidal were two of the most important supporters of the Theory of Andalucism. Both authors worked at universities in Madrid and belonged to the Spanish Royal Academy. Madrid and the Spanish Royal Academy have symbolized cultural and political centers from which rules and legislations affecting Latin America have been passed and approved throughout centuries. Today, even though Madrid no longer dictates legislation to Latin American countries, the Spanish Royal Academy still has great influence in the legislation of the Spanish language inside and outside the Spanish territory: “The majority of the Latin American academies are affiliated to the Spanish body” (Paffey 2007: 325). The Theory of Andalucism still represents a connection, a relation of continuum with the language spoken in Spain and therefore with Spain. This position represents the construction of the historical Hispanic culture defending unity versus a propagation of a variety of Spanish modalities. The cultural ideology of “Hispanismo” promotes attempts to associate Spanish American culture with Hispanic culture, and within this Hispanic culture, Spain occupies a hegemonic position (Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002: 6). Often this position reflects a concern for fragmentation of the language and a weakening of the Hispanic cultural heritage. This concern is particularly present from the perspective of a member of the Spanish Royal Academy whose motto is “Limpia, fija y da esplendor” (“[It] cleans, fixes, and gives splendor”), which implies fixing the Spanish language.

Henriquez Ureña (1932) represents one of the most relevant voices against the Theory of the Andalucism. We need to understand this positioning within a socio-cultural background. Henriquez Ureña was influenced by the Mexican intellectual movement of the Generation of the Centenary. In his twenties, the intellectual Germanic and French production was perceived as superior to the Spanish production (Generation of the 98). The Generation of the Centenary reacted then against the cultural atmosphere in Spain, refuting the Theory of Andalucism (Del Valle 1998).

This ideological discussion does not deny that there are serious studies on the topic of Andalucism based on empirical data, or that authors sometimes choose one position or another regardless of his or her cultural background or perceptions of a specific issue (like Alonso [1953], who presented a position against the Theory of Andalucism regardless of his birthplace—Spain). This study emphasizes the ideological context to understand different arguments, and even more, why this argument has gone on for so long.

These ideologically charged positionings and the criticism towards the two sides (Henriquez Ureña 1921, 1932 on one side and Wagner 1920, 1927 on the other) has even prevented the possibility of presenting a “legitimate correlation between the geography of Hispanoamerica and the demography of Spain” (Lipski 1994:21).

Conclusions

This paper presents the linguistic arguments proposed by pro-Andalucism authors to explain the similarities between Andalusian and American Spanish. Counterarguments have been proposed to debate those connections when a particular phenomenon, such as the confusion of liquid consonants, is analyzed in detail.

A similar result is found with external factors such as the nature of the colonizers, their origins and their possible destinations. Although researchers have gathered a considerable amount of data related to the conquest and this Theory, it is not enough to draw categorical conclusions about the connection between the two varieties of Spanish. More sociolinguistic studies to decode the modus operandi of the societal groups at that time are needed to understand how they functioned (Paredes and Sanchez-Prieto Borja 2008).

Danesi (1977) argues that this puzzle will never be solved due to the lack of tangible evidence, demographics or linguistics, all of which could establish a direct link or no association whatsoever between Andalusian Spanish and the Spanish spoken in the Americas.

In addition to the need of tangible evidence, this paper describes ideological alignments associated with each position, implying a more complex reality associated with the Theory of Andalucism. By supporting one view or another, authors are making a stand about a historical event—reactivating a discourse of dependence and subordination or independence and freedom between colonizers and the colonized.

This paper proposes different nuances that need to be analyzed in order to acquire a more complete

and holistic vision of a theory and its different positionings. Ideology and a historic-sociological analysis often accompany language changes and theories. To neglect them is to ignore the fact that, with a specific use of language, ideologies are defined and shaped. Speakers align with a particular positioning in relation to an event. For many years, authors have tried to avoid the analysis of the implications of presenting different views, ignoring an important motivation to support one view or another. If the Theory of Andalucism is still controversial today, it is because it not only stands as a pure linguistic issue but also as a position re-defining political and historical events.

Works Cited

- Alonso A (1953) *Estudios Lingüísticos Temas Hispanoamericanos*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Alvar M (ed.) (1996) *Manual de Dialectología Hispánica: El Español de España*. Barcelona: Ariel Lingüística.
- Azevedo MM (1981) *A Contrastive Phonology of Portuguese and English*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Blommaert J (2009) Language, Asylum and the National Order. *Current Anthropology* 50 (4): 415-441.
- Boyd-Bowman (1956) *TRhe Regional Origins of the Earliest Spanish Colonists of America*. Bogotá: PMLA. 71: 1152-1172.
- Boyd-Bowman (1976) Patterns of Spanish Emigration to the Indies until 1600. *American Historical Review* 56: 580-604.
- Broce M & Torres Cacoullous R (2002). *Dialectología Urbana Rural: la Estratificación Social de (r) y (l) en Coclé, Panama*. *Hispania* 85: 342-355.
- Cano Aguilar R (2009) *Lengua e Identidad en Andalucía: Visión desde la historia*. In A. Narbona (ed.) *La identidad Lingüística de Andalucía*. Sevilla, Spain: Centro de estudios Andaluces: 67-131.
- Carlton TR (1991) *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers.
- Catalán D (1959) Génesis del Español Atlántico. *Ondas varias a través del Océano*. *Revista de Historia Canaria* 24: 1-10.
- Chela-Flores G (1994) A Polysystemic Approach to the Problem of the Neutralization of Liquids in Spanish. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 95 (5): 355-61.
- Chouliaraki L & Fairclough N (1997) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Contreras M (2000) Linguistic Nativeness in Chilean Spanish of the Colonial Period. *Estudios Filológicos* 35: 41-59.
- Danesi M (1977) The Case for Andalucismo RE-Examined. In R.P. Sebold (ed.), *Hispanic Review* 45: 181-193. University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.
- De Granda G (1991) *El Español en tres Mundos. Retenciones y Contactos Lingüísticos en América y África*. Valladolid, Spain: Universidad deValladolid.
- De Granda G (1994) *Español de America, Español de Africa y Hablas criollas Hispánicas*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Lle J (1998). *Andalucismo, Poligénesis y Koineización: Dialectología e Ideología*. In I.J. López (ed.), *Hispanic Review* 66:131-149. University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.
- lle J (2012) *Academias y Panhispanismo: Notas sobre la Perenne Reinención de las Academias y su Historia*. In A. Luengo y S. Schlieckers (eds.), *La Reinención de Latinoamérica: Enfoques Interdisciplinarios desde las dos Orillas*: 185-200.
- Del Valle J & Gabriel-Stheeman L (2002) Nationalism, Hispanismo and Monoglossic Culture. In J. Del Valle & L. Gabriel-Stheeman (eds.), *The battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: Language ideologies and Hispanic intellectuals*: 1-15. London: Routledge.
- Del Valle J & L Villa (2012) *La Disputada Autoridad de las Academias: Debate Lingüístico-Ideológico en Torno a la Ortografía de 2010*. *RILL – Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 10(1/19): 29-55.
- Edwards J (2009) *Language and Identity: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Fernandez-Sevilla J (1987) *La Polémica Andalucista: Estado de la Cuestión*. In H. López Morales & Vaquero, M. (eds.), *Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre el Español de América*. San Juan: Academia Puertorriqueña de la Lengua Española: 231-253.
- Fontanella de Weinberg M B (1984) Confusión de Liquidas en el Español Rioplatense (s XVI a XVIII). *Romance Philology* 38: 432-445.
- Frago Garcia JA (1994) *Andaluz y Español de América: Historia de un Parentesco Lingüístico*. Sevilla, Spain: Junta de Andalucía.
- Frago Garcia JA (1992) *Nuevas Perspectivas en el Estudio de la Conformación del Español Americano*. *Hispanic Linguistics* 4(2): 275-299.
- Gick B (2002) *The American Intrusive L*. *American Speech* 77 (2): 167-85.
- Guitarte GL (1958) *Cuervo, Henríquez Hureña y la Polémica sobre el Andalucismo en América*. *Vox Romanica* XVII (2): 363-416.
- Henríquez Ureña P (1932) *Sobre el Problema del Andalucismo Dialectal de América*. Buenos Aires: Hernando SA
- Hock H (1991) *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (2d ed.). Berlin:
- de Gruyter M, Kirchner RM (2001) *An Effort Based Approach to Consonant Lenition*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Lapesa R (1964) *El Andaluz y el Español de América. Presente y Futuro de la lengua española* 2: 73-182.
- Lapesa R (1981) *Historia de la Lengua española*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Lipski JM (1994) *Latin American Spanish*. London: Longman.
- Lipski JM (2011) *Socio-Phonological variation in Latin American Spanish*. In Manuel Díaz-Campos (ed.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA.: Wiley-Blackwell: 72-97.
- López Morales H (1998) *La Aventura del Español en América*. Madrid: Espasa.
- Mare-Molinero C (2000) *The Politics of Language in the Spanish-Speaking World: From Colonisation to Globalisation*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Menendez Pidal R (1918) *La Lengua Española*. *Hispania* 1: 1-14.
- Menendez Pidal R (1962) *Sevilla frente a Madrid: Algunas Precisiones sobre el Español de América*. In *Miscelánea homenaje a André Martinet, III*. Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife: 99-165.
- Narayanan S, Byrd D & Kaun A (1999) *Geometry, Kinematics, and Acoustics of Tamil Liquid Consonants*. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 106 (4): 1993-2007.
- Narbona AR Cano & Morillo R (2005) *El Español hablado en Andalucía*. Sevilla, Spain: Fundacion José Manuel Lara.
- Navarro Tomás T (1948) *Español en Puerto Rico; Contribución a la Geografía Lingüística Hispanoamericana*. New York, NY: Ganis & Harris.
- Noll V (2005) *Reflexiones sobre el llamado Andalucismo del Español de América*. *Language and Society in the Hispanic World* 11: 95-111.
- Paffey D (2007) *Policing the Spanish Language Debate: Verbal Hygiene and the Spanish Language Academy (Real Academia Española)*. *Language Policy* 6 (3-4): 313-332.
- Paredes F & P, Sanchez-Prieto B (2008) *A Methodological Approach to the History of the Sociolinguistics of the*

- Spanish language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 193/194: 21–55.
- Penny R (1991) *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Penny R (2000) *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quilis A (1993) *Tratado de Fonología y Fonética Españolas*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Rivarola JL (2001) *El Español de América en su Historia*. Valladolid, Spain: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Rosenblat A (1984) El Debatido Andalucismo del Español de América. *Estudios sobre el Español de América*: 169–212.
- Seliger M (1976) *Ideology and Politics*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Sepúlveda I (2005) *El Sueño de la Madre Patria. Hispanoamericanismo y Nacionalismo*. Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- Trudgill P (1986) *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Trudgill P (1999) Dialect Convergence and Vestigial Variants. *Journal of English Linguistics* 27: 319–27.
- Van der Torre EJ (2003) Dutch sonorants: The role of place of articulation in phonotactics. Utrecht, The Netherlands: LOT. (<http://www.lotpublications.nl/index3.html>)
- van Dijk T (1995a) *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk T (1995b) Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4 (2): 249–285.
- van Dijk T (2005) *Discourse and Racism in Spain and Latin America*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wagner ML (1920) Amerikanish-Spanish und Vulgärlatein. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 40: 286–312, 385–404.
- Wagner ML (1927) El Supuesto Andalucismo de América y la Teoría Climatológica. *RFE* 14: 20–32.
- Walsh Dickey L (1997) The phonology of liquids. *Electronic Doctoral Dissertations for UMass Amherst*. Paper AAI9721443. (<http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI9721443>)
- Wells JC (1982) *Accents of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zamora JC & Guitart JM (1988) *Dialectología Hispanoamericana*. (2nd ed.). Salamanca: Ediciones Almar.
- Zitzke BC (2001) Um Levantamento de Metáteses na Fala de Crianças em Fase de Aquisição de Linguagem. *Letras de Hoje* 36: 219–227.