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THE CASE FOR ANDALUCISMO RE-EXAMINED

INTRODUCTION

THE purpose of this paper is to examine the case that has been made in favour of andalucismo and to describe how much New World Spanish owes to the influence of Andalusian Spanish. As Rosenblat observes, the term andalucismo has been used by Hispanists to refer to three related, yet distinct, concepts: (1) "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"; (2) "una influencia mayor o menor del habla andaluza sobre la hispanoamericana"; (3) "una clara filiación dialectal (nuestro español de América aparece así como un subdialecto del dialecto andaluz)." 1

At the present time, most Spanish linguists appear to favour, to some degree, an andalucista explanation for the origin of the New World dialects: a belief that has been influenced to a wide extent by what seem to be positive statistical data published by Peter Boyd-Bowman. 2 In the minds of many scholars, this evidence has provided the long-sought proof which appears to have ended, once and for all, the lengthy and at times heated debate between andalucistas (Wagner, Lapesa, Menéndez Pidal, etc.) and the anti-andalucistas (Henríquez Ureña, Amado Alonso, etc.). 3

3 For an excellent and comprehensive summary of this debate, together with all the relevant bibliography, see Rosenblat, "El debatido andalucismo . . .," pp. 149–90.
From the extended list of studies published on both sides of the Atlantic since the turn of the present century, various interesting theories have emerged about the linguistic basis of New World Spanish. Such theoretical speculation led to much debate in the initial stages of the andalucismo controversy. For example, the apparent phonetic contrast between tierras altas and tierras bajas is the basis of the "climatic" theory; that is, the supposed tendency among colonists to settle in regions whose climate resembled the one to which they were accustomed. As Boyd-Bowman correctly asserts, however, all such interesting theories, "plausible though they may be, can never rise above the level of ingenious speculation until we have gathered more accurate statistical data not only on the regional origins of the Spanish colonists of every part of America, but also on the chronology of their migrations." Pedro Henríquez Ureña saw a similar need to support his anti-andalucista position with demographic evidence. As Boyd-Bowman emphasizes, such data would "furnish a sound historical basis for approaching numerous unsolved problems in the field of American Spanish linguistics."

In 1956, with the publication of Boyd-Bowman's figures, an empirical dimension was added to what at first was a purely theoretical debate, and the evidence appeared to weigh heavily in favour of the andalucistas. Mainly because of this dramatic turn of events, Hispanicists have more recently entertained the very interesting socio-geographical theory which claims that the first emigrants to America must have passed through an Andalusian metropolitan centre (such as Seville). These prospective colonists acquired Andalusian linguistic traits (e.g., seseo) which were subsequently exported to America. Lapesa states that "'Sevilla y Cádiz monopolizaron durante los siglos XVI y XVII el comercio y relaciones con Indias. En un momento en que la pronunciaci"
estaba cambiando a ambos lados del Atlántico, Sevilla fue el paso obligado entre las colonias y la metrópoli, de modo que para muchos criollos la pronunciación metropolitana con que tuvieron contacto fue la andaluza." 8

Although Menéndez Pidal admits that the anti-andalucista theories of Henríquez Ureña and Alonso (codependencia and poligenésis) are hard to refute, he believes that: "El calificar de 'codependientes' los fenómenos americanos y españoles no me parece acertado si con ello se sugiere que su génesis en las colonias y en la metrópoli es independiente y sólo tienen en común antecedentes remotos." 9 However, Menéndez Pidal also believes, as Cuervo did three quarters of a century ago, that all regions of Spain contributed to the colonization of the New World: "El español hispanoamericano no fue constituido por el simple trasplante al Nuevo Mundo del dialecto andaluz íntegro y puro; fundamentalmente, el español de América es el español común de España, integrado por el habla peculiar de todas las regiones peninsulares y desarrollado allá con un matiz personal comparable al de cualquiera de esas comarcas españolas." 10

In light of this statement, it is interesting to note that Menéndez Pidal nevertheless supports andalucismo. He bases his conclusions mainly on the single phenomenon of seseo: "Así el español ultramarino recibió un marcado tinte andaluz al aceptar la simplificación fonológica del ceceo-seseo surgida en el reino de Sevilla." 11 Like other eminent Hispanists in this polemical debate, Menéndez Pidal realizes that the only conspicuous and tangible evidence that links New World Spanish to Andalusia is the phonetic similarity known as seseo. Other phonetic and grammatical features, as shall be discussed shortly, do not safely permit an andalucista conclusion. 12

A similar opinion is expressed by Olga Cock Hincapie: "La posibilidad de que el seseo americano proceda del andaluz se explica si se tiene en cuenta el importante papel de Andalucía en las

relaciones de la Península con América en la primera época de la conquista y el predominio de las gentes de esta región entre los primeros colonizadores.’’ It is therefore little wonder why Hispanists have focused their attention of late on the nature and chronology of the Spanish sibilant changes.

**Statistical Evidence**

In the history of the *andalucismo* debate, the two scholars who have used statistical evidence present divergent results. Pedro Henríquez Ureña published interesting demographic data as the third part of his ‘‘Observaciones sobre el español de América.’’ In this article, the Dominican linguist established the points of origin of 13,948 Spaniards who emigrated to America in the period from 1492 to 1600. His sources were the chroniclers, the *Catálogo* of passengers to the New World, and the biographical catalogues of the *conquistadores* compiled in Mexico and Chile. He presents his findings in two summary tables:

(1) Regional Origins:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Español del Norte</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Español del Sur</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zona intermedia</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonas laterales</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Number of *seseantes* vs. *non-seseantes*:

| Seseo con aspiración (Andaluza, Badajoz, Canarias) | 3,659 |
| Seseo sin aspiración (Vasconia, Cataluña, Valencia, Baleares) | 509 |

| 46.7% *seseantes* |

---


14 See, for example, D. Catalán, ‘‘El çeçe-zezeo al comenzar la expansión atlántica de Sevilla,’’ *BDP*, 16 (1956–57), 306–34; ‘‘The End of the Phoneme /z/ in Spanish,’’ *Word*, 13 (1957), 283–322; and James W. Harris, ‘‘Sound Change in Spanish and the Theory of Markedness,’’ *Language*, 45 (1969), 538–52.

15 In a later work (published in *Cursos y Conferencias*, 4 [1935], 1233–59), Henríquez Ureña modified his percentages by excluding Extremadura from the ‘‘Español del Sur,’’ and thus reducing even more the number of *seseantes*. However, our analysis of his statistics, since it is based on the size of the sample used, is not affected by this modification.
In order to accept the conclusions implied by these figures, one must take into account the size of the population sample. In his monumental study *La población indígena de América desde 1492 hasta la actualidad*, Angel Rosenblat calculates that 140,000 whites inhabited the Spanish-American colonies in 1570; and Boyd-Bowman suggests that in all probability there were around 200,000 Spanish settlers in America up to the end of the sixteenth century. A random sample of 13,948 is equivalent to 6.97% of the total population (200,000). As most social scientists would agree, in any statistical study a random sampling should be followed by at least one other of equal magnitude in order to corroborate or refute the results obtained in the initial one; otherwise, a small random sample by itself is empirically worthless because of the possibility that another one of similar size may produce contrasting results. Consequently, Henríquez Ureña’s figures do not permit any definite conclusion. Nevertheless, it is interesting to observe that the emigration pattern which emerges is clearly one in which all of Spain participated in the colonization of America.

Twenty-five years later this statistical work was continued by Peter Boyd-Bowman in his excellent and influential article “The Regional Origins of the Earliest Spanish Colonists of America”—a study which seemed to establish once and for all that the majority of New World settlers during the first Antillean period (1493–1519) were of Andalusian origin. The *Índice geobiográfico de cuarenta mil pobladores españoles de América* complements the bare statistics by providing the biographical data on each settler (e.g., full name, parentage, place of origin, occupation, marital status, etc.).

16 (Buenos Aires, 1945).
In the "Regional Origins," Boyd-Bowman states that the "critical" period in which major linguistic habits were established by a predominant group was between the years 1493–1519 (the so-called Antillean period): "It is during this critical initial period, when the Spanish colonial effort was mainly centered in the islands of the Antilles, that the earliest form of American Spanish must have been developed." As Rosenblat also observes, this period is important because, "en él se produjo la primera aclimatación, acomodación y nivelación del español en América, que desde allí se expandió por gran parte del continente."  

Boyd-Bowman has established the regional origins of 40,000 colonists prior to 1600, which is of course an impressive 20% sample (40,000/200,000 × 100): "Elaborating the work of these scholars, particularly that of the late Pedro Henríquez Ureña, whose manuscript notes and files are in my possession, and using a wide range of sixteenth-century Spanish and colonial sources, I have been able to establish with reasonable certainty the regional origin of some 40,000 colonists (men, women, and children) who came to the Indies prior to 1600. I would venture to guess that this figure represents, of the total number who emigrated during this time, almost 20%, which I am sure statisticians would consider a highly indicative sample."  

Boyd-Bowman goes on to say that during the Antillean period he determined the origin of only 5,481 colonists: "Though data are not nearly as abundant for the initial period as they are for the later flood of Spanish emigration to Mexico, Peru, and the other continental areas, I have identified the names and lugar de nacimiento or lugar de vecindad of 5,481 persons known to be in the Indies prior to 1520." His analysis shows that from 1493–1508 Andalusians constituted 60% of the emigrants; and that during 1509–1519 they made up 37% of the total.  

However, it must be pointed out that Boyd-Bowman neglects to remind the reader that the figure 5,481 is, in reality, a percentage of a percentage; that is, 5,481 is 13.7% of 40,000, which is itself a 20% sample of an estimated population of 200,000 for the whole

---

20 Rosenblat, "El debatido andalucismo . . .", p. 177.
sixteenth century. In other words, 5,481 emigrants are only a 2.74% sample (13.7% × 20%). Because of the lack of definitive migration data (i.e., an estimated statistical population) for the Antillean period alone, we cannot calculate the proper percentage that 5,481 would represent for this twenty-year time span. The only logical arithmetical conclusion is that 5,481 is at least a 2.74% sample. Even if the percentage were slightly higher, it would certainly be a far cry from the 20% that Boyd-Bowman considers "a highly indicative sample." 23 In the theory of sampling, statisticians generally concur in the opinion that "a small sample in isolation tells us next to nothing about the quality of the batch from which it is drawn." 24 In light of this fact, Boyd-Bowman’s major conclusion that "in the initial or Antillean period by far the largest single group, in every year, and on all major expeditions, were the Andalusians," 25 is not very convincing. Another random sample, equally small, might present contrasting results.

Similar doubts about Boyd-Bowman’s analysis of the emigration patterns to early America have been expressed by Rosenblat: "Cabe hacer algunos reparos sobre el valor de las cifras, sobre todo al 60% del período inicial." 26 Rosenblat points out the following facts. First of all, the population during this initial period was unstable: "De los 1,500 hombres, o más, llegados con Colón en 1493, no quedaron con el Comendador Bobadilla, en 1500, sino unos 300, incluyendo los funcionarios y religiosos que él había llevado." 27 The real colonization began in 1502 with Nicolás de Ovando who brought with him 2,500 men. Furthermore, as Rosenblat indicates, the figures, when looked at microscopically, do not reveal very much: there were 181 Andalusians out of 301 colonists from 1492–1502, and 121 out of 208 from 1503–1508. He also considers very significant the fact that "sobre 404 vecinos (es decir, cabezas de familia) de procedencia conocida que aparecen en las 19 poblaciones de Santo Domingo y que figuraran en el gran repartimiento de indios de 1514, sólo 27% eran andaluces (frente a 23.76% de

26 Rosenblat, "El debatido andalucismo . . .," p. 177.
27 Rosenblat, "El debatido andalucismo . . .," pp. 177–78.
Castilla la Vieja, 10,64 de Castilla la Nueva, 11,63 de León, 8,41 de las Vascongadas, 8,17 de Extremadura, 2,48 de Galicia, etcétera).”  

Rosenblat concludes: “Así, penetrando en la realidad misma, las cifras de Boyd-Bowman son mucho menos imponentes.”

It is also interesting to note that Boyd-Bowman attaches much significance to the linguistic influence of women. He states that between 1509 and 1519, 69% of the total female emigrants were of Andalusian origin—a very impressive figure. However, this percentage is based on a sample of 308. The question that comes immediately to mind is the following one: Even if these andaluzas may have had a formative effect on the linguistic habits of the colonists’ children and servants (an interesting assumption), how much influence can 213 (69% of 308) women have possibly had on the Spanish of South America?

In essence, although both Henríquez Ureña and Boyd-Bowman saw the need to bring empirical demographic data into the arena of theoretical debate, neither scholar is capable of establishing any convincing evidence to support or refute the theory of andalucismo. If anything, they both tend to confirm Cuervo’s original hypothesis that all of Spain contributed to the colonization of the New World.  

The overall picture that emerges from these studies, when seen in a proper perspective, is one that suggests that the emigration patterns to America were unpredictable and heterogeneous.

**LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE**

In his excellent article “El andaluz y el español de América,” Rafael Lapesa lists three criteria which give “la impresión general

---


30 For a synthetic treatment of Cuervo’s ideas, see Rosenblat, “El debatido andalucismo . . .,” pp. 151–56. It is interesting to note that G. L. Guitarte, “Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña y la polémica sobre el andalucismo de América,” *PR*, 17 (1958), 363–416, considers Henríquez Ureña’s anti-andalucista position as a reaction (on the part of the Dominican scholar) to the concept of Peninsular ties.

31 In Presente y futuro de la lengua española, II (Madrid, 1963), 173–82. This article is a comprehensive statement of Lapesa’s ideas on andalucismo which are found partially in “Sobre el eceo y el seseo en Hispanoamérica,” *RI*, 21 (1956), 409–16; “Sobre el eceo y el seseo andaluces,” in Estructuralismo e Historia: Miscelánea homenaje a André Martinet, 1 (Tenerife, 1957), 67–94; and Historia de la lengua, pp. 348–56.
de semejanza entre el uso lingüístico hispanoamericano y el andaluz":

(1) phonetic coincidences;
(2) an abundant common vocabulary;
(3) a few grammatical features.\(^{32}\)

In all of the literature pertaining to the andalucismo debate, there emerges no study that has produced convincing evidence of an abundant common vocabulary supposedly shared by South America and Andalusia. Certainly no one has been willing to take an andalucista position on the basis of lexical similarity alone. As Zamora Vicente clearly demonstrates, the lexical base of South America is heterogeneous with influences from all parts of the Peninsula and from the Indoamerican languages.\(^{33}\) He concludes his analysis of South America’s lexicon by pointing out that: “El fondo de arcaísmo, vulgarismo, neologismo . . . voces indígenas y extranjerismos . . . dan su peculiar fisonomía léxica al español americano.”\(^{34}\) A similar argument may be made for grammatical features (morphological and syntactic). Even Lapesa concedes that there are only “ciertos rasgos sintácticos.”\(^{35}\) Therefore, it appears to be the opinion of most Hispanists, and it is certainly ours, that the only physiognomical similarity between American and Andalusian Spanish is primarily, if not exclusively, phonetic.

According to Lapesa (and to most Spanish linguists), there are five major phonetic traits which link the Spanish of South America to that of Andalusia:

(1) \textit{seseo};
(2) \textit{yeismo};
(3) aspiration and loss of final (word or syllable) /s/;
(4) neutralization of final (word or syllable) /r/ and /l/;
(5) conservation of \textit{[h]} (<Latin initial \textit{r-}) and its phonetic fusion with [x].

The first feature—the most significant in the entire debate—is perhaps that aspect of American Spanish which more closely re-

\(^{32}\) Lapesa, “‘El andaluz y el español de América,’” p. 173.
\(^{34}\) Zamora Vicente, \textit{Dialectología española}, p. 431.
\(^{35}\) Lapesa, “‘El andaluz y el español de América,’” p. 173.
sembles Andalusian. As Lapesa says: "El más importante de los rasgos sólo compartidos por el andaluz, canario, cartagenero y español de América es la confusión de eses y zetas mediante la eliminación de los fonemas ápico-alveolares representados hoy por la /s/ cóncava del norte y centro de España. Mientras esta /s/ mantiene la oposición con la /θ/ resultante de las antiguas dentales ɣ (= [ʃ] > [ʃ]) y z (= [ʒ] > [ʒ] > [ʒ]), en casi toda Andalucía, Canarias e Hispanoamérica el fonema procedente de las antiguas dentales, muy variamente articulado, ha invadido el campo de las eses ápico-alveolares hasta anularlas por completo." 36 In our opinion, seseo is in fact the only piece of linguistic evidence used in the andalucismo debate which appears to establish an Andalusian parentage. We shall return to this feature after discussing the remaining criteria listed by Lapesa.

The obvious reason why linguists have been hesitant to arrive at an andalucista conclusion on the basis of the remaining phonetic traits (2–5) is simply because these features are not found homogeneously throughout South America. For example, Rosenblat points out that "la pronunciación aspirada de la j abarca mucho menos de la mitad de Hispanoamérica, y no se da ni aun en todas las que llamamos ‘tierras bajas’: no se conoce en la Argentina, el Uruguay y Paraguay; en Chile más bien avanza hacia el paladar, sobre todo ante e, i; en Tabasco (tierra baja de México) es una velar fuerte; al subir desde Guayaquil a la Sierra del Ecuador se nota en seguida el contraste entre la j costeña y la serrana." 37

Furthermore, as Navarro, Espinosa, and Rodríguez-Castellano have observed, these features do not distinguish separate Castilian and Andalusian linguistic zones. In order to delimit geographically distinct Castilian and Andalusian dialect areas, one cannot use "ni la aspiración de la h, ni la relajación de la s final de sílaba, ni el yeísmo, ni otros fenómenos que, hallándose en Andalucía, existen también en otras regiones españolas sin relación de dependencia respecto a la modalidad lingüística andaluza." 38 Lapesa also admits in regard to the aspiration of final /s/ that: "A uno y otro lado del Atlántico ofrece gran variedad en sus manifesta-

36 Lapesa, "‘El andaluz y el español de América,’" p. 173.
37 Rosenblat, "‘El debatido andalucismo . . .’", p. 156.
38 T. Navarro Tomás, A. M. Espinosa, and L. Rodríguez-Castellano, "‘La frontera del andaluz,” RFE, 20 (1933), 226.
Henríquez Ureña states emphatically that: ‘‘En España el empleo de y por ll no se limita a Andalucía, sino que se extiende a Castilla la Nueva, incluyendo a Madrid.’’ He indicates that in America ‘‘se conserva la ll en todos los países del continente meridional a lo largo de los Andes . . . En suma: Andalucía es uniforme en el uso de la y por ll; América no lo es.’’ Similar opinions are found in other Hispanists involved in the andalucismo controversy. The point is clear: it appears that only seseo (a Thorn in the sides of the anti-andalucistas who could never really refute this striking similarity) may be used to establish an Andalusian influence on New World Spanish.

In recent times, Hispanists have demonstrated that seseo occurred in the Peninsula first in Andalusia. Alonso’s three-stage theory has been virtually disproved by the publication of documents by Cock Hincapie which clearly show that seseo is attested right from the first available testimonial evidence. In ‘‘El çeço-zezeo al comenzar la expansión de Sevilla,’’ Diego Catalán points out that: ‘‘Podemos afirmar que en el siglo xv se hallaba tan generalizada en el habla común del reino de Sevilla la pérdida del originario carácter africado de /c/ y /z/, que la /ç/ se asemejaba peligrosamente a la /ss/, y la /z/ a la /s/, dando lugar a una creciente tendencia a identificar estos fonemas en una pareja única de dorsodentales fricativas, sorda y sonora.’’

Lapesa indicates that there are two types of sibilant articulation in Andalusia, and that these vary according to class: the urban and cultured pronunciation is seseante, whereas a ceceante speech identifies a rustic and uncultured speaker. In America, however, seseante speech prevails: ‘‘Sin embargo, la pronunciación que domina en el español de América es la siseante con [s] coronal o predorsal; pero en esto Hispánomérica no difiere de la ciudad de Sevilla, norte de su provincia, Córdoba con toda la suya y cier- tas zonas de Huelva, Málaga y Jaén; además, en el resto de la

39 Lapesa, ‘‘El andaluz y el español de América,’’ p. 174.
40 Pedro Henríquez Ureña, El supuesto andalucismo de América (Buenos Aires, 1925), p. 118.
41 Henríquez Ureña, El supuesto andalucismo, p. 118.
42 See also A. Alonso, Estudios lingüísticos: Temas hispanoamericanos (Madrid, 1953), pp. 196–262.
43 See Cock Hincapie, El seso en el Nuevo Reino de Granada.
44 Catalan, ‘‘El çeço-zezeo . . .’’, p. 328.
Andalucía confundidora la dicción siseante es más fina y urbana, la cieceante más rústica y vulgar.’’

However, it must be emphasized that Lapesa was describing a purely modern sociolinguistic distinction in Andalusia; there is no evidence that such a dichotomy did or did not exist in the sixteenth century. Amado Alonso ventured to guess, in 1952, that this social distinction, ‘‘quizá obrara ya en la época decisiva de la sedimentación.’’ Alonso, moreover, provides ample evidence that there was, in fact, confusion of /θ/ and /s/ in Andalusia during the sixteenth century, whether or not it entailed a class cleavage. The obvious question that arises is why, if one insists on a strict Andalusian influence on New World Spanish in regard to seseo, this confusion was not maintained in America. As Cock Hincapie has established beyond a doubt, seseo was used by speakers of all classes in South America; even the indigenous people who learned Spanish from the colonists used the sibilant articulation.

Rosenblat’s lengthy investigations into the social origins of the settlers can lead one to account for the universality of seseo in America on purely sociological grounds. According to Rosenblat, the upward social mobility of the conquistadores was accompanied by an upward levelling of language: ‘‘Pero ya en la misma hueste conquistadora, y aún más al constituirse la sociedad hispanoamericana, se produjo una nivelación igualadora hacia arriba, una ‘hidalguización.’ El hecho de la conquista hizo que todos se sintiesen señores, con derecho a títulos, y adoptasen como modelo superior los usos, y entre ellos los usos lingüísticos, de las capas superiores.’’ This being so, one could postulate the spread of seseo in America as due to the ideal of upper-class language held by the settlers.

Leaving aside sociological theories, there is a linguistic explanation for the phenomenon of seseo in America. What appears to have occurred, in our opinion, is that seseante speech was adopted

45 Lapesa, ‘‘El andaluz y el español de América,’’ p. 176.
46 Alonso, Estudios lingüísticos, p. 142, n. 1.
47 See A. Alonso, De la pronunciación medieval a la moderna en español, II (Madrid, 1969), 110–44.
49 A. Rosenblat, ‘‘Base del español de América: Nivel social y cultural de los conquistadores y pobladores,’’ BFC, 16 (1964), 171–230.
by colonists from all parts of the Peninsula as a result of phonological systems in contact; that is, the opposition /θ ~ s/ soon came to have a low functional load in areas of mixed speech and thus became less resistant to merger: /θ ~ s = low yield → s/. The concept that a sound may be internalized through a merger as a result of linguistic systems in contact is not new. It is, in fact, in line with the theory of least effort.\textsuperscript{50} However, as is the case with most of the speculations in the entire debate, it cannot be proved that the seseo pronunciation of South America is a product of the process of merger (as a result of interference): it is merely another drop in the theoretical ocean. On the other hand, neither can it be established, with any degree of certainty, that American seseo is due directly to Andalusian influence.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Although there exists a general phonetic similarity between American and Andalusian Spanish (particularly in respect to seseo), the dilemma facing Hispanists still remains: Is this similarity due to a direct influence? In our opinion, this puzzle may never be solved because there exists no tangible evidence, demographic or otherwise, which establishes a direct link. The data that do exist are equivocal to say the least and may be interpreted, as has been done throughout the andalucismo controversy, to fit one’s particular theory. The point is that we are still left with the query that Rosenblat expresses very eloquently: “El español de América se parece al andaluz en una serie de rasgos que lo diferencian del castellano. El problema es cuáles de esos rasgos se deben a influencia andaluza.”\textsuperscript{51} The answer to this question may never be found.

\textit{University of Toronto}

\textsuperscript{50} See A. Martinet, \textit{Économie des changements phonétiques: Traité de phonologie diachronique} (Berne, 1955), p. 54.

\textsuperscript{51} Rosenblat, “‘El debatido andalucismo . . .’,” p. 156.