VII. LATIN-AMERICAN STUDIES
I. LANGUAGE
AMERICAN SPANISH

By P. Russell-Gebbett, Senior Lecturer in Spanish in the
University of Essex

I. LEXICOGRAPHY

The BRAE, xlv, 41-64, bears a list of emendations and
additions approved by the Spanish Academy for inclusion in
their dictionaries; a large number of them are AmSp. either
in form or in one of their meanings (under A occur abalear,
-eo, ajustar, -ero, alagartado, -arse, altipampa, alzo, amansador,
aplanador, arretranca, aviso). E. M. Hernández, in RPh, xviii,
1964-5, 479-85, revs F. J. Santamaría's excellent Diccionario
de mejicanismos, Mexico D.F., Porrúa, 1959, xxiv + 1197
pp.; he approves Santamaría's interpretation of a regionalism
or provincialism, i.e. all items used in Mex. but not incl. in
the DRAE, items in DRAE but used in Mex. with different
meaning, all Aztequisms whether or not in DRAE. The only
really serious shortcoming H. notes is S.'s failure to mark
pronunciation consistently, a defect of most AmSp. regional
dictionaries; it would indeed be most valuable to have a clear
indication of the local treatment(s) of standard aí, aú, etc., of
eá, eó, etc., of implosive bilabials and velars, although it would
be unreasonable to expect typographically costly indications
of e.g. r/rr, 'vocales caducas', etc. Even so, if every AmSp.
country produced a dictionary such as this, a worthy successor
to the work of Ramos y Duarte and to which only L. Sandoval's
Diccionario de guatemaltequismos (1941) can hold a candle, then
A. Berro García's proposal for a 'master' AmSp. dictionary
would not be difficult to realize. He outlines his project, first
(1963), 7-12.

Other lexicographical items of interest are: A. Salas, 'Los
diccionarios académicos y el estado actual de la lexicografía',
BFC, xvi, 1964; L. Flórez, 'Muestra de anglicismos y galicismos
en el español de Bogotá', BACol, xiv, 1964, and one which
although not recent should not be overlooked: J. P. Rona, 'Vulgarización' o adaptación diastática de neologismos y cultismos, Montevideo, 1962 (sep.).

In the field of bilingual (Amerindian-Spanish) lexicography J. A. Suárez has a very important and well-documented review article in RPh, xvii, 1963-4, 155-69, where he gives merited short shrift to E. Erize, Diccionario comentado mapuche-español, BA, Univ. Nacional del Sur, 1960, 550 pp., with maps and sketches.

Two other revs should be noted, both in RPh, xvii, 1963-4; they are S. L. Robe on Kany's works on AmSp. semantics and euphemisms (pp. 179-84), and L. F. Sachs on M. Hildebrandt, La lengua de Bolivar. I: Léxico, Caracas, Univ. Central de Venez., 1951, 525 pp. (pp. 476-8).

2. PHONETICS AND LINGUISTICS

B. Malmberg, Estudios de fonética hispánica, M, CSIC, Inst. Miguel de Cervantes, xv + 154 pp., reprints ten of his studies; all of them are of interest to AmSp. Although the coll. in which they appear does not plan another vol. of Malmberg's studies it would be valuable if more of his, of A. Alonso's, of T. Navarro's, and of P. Henríquez Ureña's, could be made accessible.

D. L. Canfield's book on AmSp. pronunciation (see YWML, xxv, 151) has prompted two good revs: J. Lope Blanch in HR, xxxii, 1964, 372-5, and R. L. Hadlich in RPh, xix, 1965-6, 95-9. The former questions C.'s theory that 17th-c. phonetic developments are to be explained by criollo infls, and prefers to see in the 17th c. a continuing infl. of andaluz; he points out that P. Boyd Bowman's researches on the provenance of Sp. conquerors and settlers (to which C. had had access in unpubl. form) show that considerable numbers thereof came from S. Spain. Hadlich's main quarrel with C. arises from the latter's proneness to seek a causal relationship between AmSp. and peninsular traits; H. would have preferred a more thoroughgoing structuralist approach within AmSp. varieties, and points to traces of an AmSp. system of syllabification quite foreign to that of PenSp. Both revs, as is the wont of the RPh team esp., contain much useful bibl. material.

Some other articles of interest are: A. Rosenblat, 'Base del