This volume is an edited collection of articles dealing with Hispanic contact linguistics in the Americas. The project is composed of four main sections, organized according to the type of socio-historical scenario that characterizes the nature of the contact situation: Spanish in contact with indigenous languages; Spanish in contact with coerced-migration languages; Spanish in contact with free-migration languages; and Spanish in contact with languages outside of Latin America, but still within the Americas.

SANDRO SESSAREGO is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Texas at Austin. He works primarily in the fields of contact linguistics, sociolinguistics and syntax.

MELVIN GONZÁLEZ-RIVERA is an Associate Professor of Linguistics in the Department of Hispanic Studies at the University of Puerto Rico-Mayaguez. He specializes in syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and their interface in grammar, with an emphasis on Caribbean Spanish.

SANDRO SESSAREGO
MELVIN GONZÁLEZ-RIVERA (EDS.)

35

New Perspectives on Hispanic Contact
Linguistics in the Americas

SANDRO SESSAREGO
MELVIN GONZÁLEZ-RIVERA
(EDS.)

New Perspectives on Hispanic Contact Linguistics in the Americas

35

**Lengua y Sociedad en el Mundo Hispánico
Language and Society in the Hispanic World**

Consejo editorial / Editorial Board:

Julio Calvo Pérez (Universitat de València)
Anna María Escobar (University of Illinois)
Luis Fernando Lara (El Colegio de México)
Francisco Moreno Fernández (Universidad de Alcalá)
Juan Sánchez Méndez (Université de Neuchâtel)
Armin Schwegler (University of California, Irvine)
José del Valle (The Graduate Center, CUNY)
Klaus Zimmermann (Universität Bremen)

Vol. 35

Sessarego, Sandro; González-Rivera, Melvin (eds.):

**New Perspectives on Hispanic Contact
Linguistics in the Americas**

Iberoamericana - Vervuert - 2015

This book is dedicated to Fabrizio, Marino, Jara and Magda.

© Iberoamericana, 2015
Amor de Dios, 1 – E-28014 Madrid
Tel.: +34 91 429 35 22
Fax: +34 91 429 53 97
info@iberoamericanalibros.com
www.ibero-americana.net

© Vervuert, 2015
Elisabethenstr. 3-9 – D-60594 Frankfurt am Main
Tel.: +49 69 597 46 17
Fax: +49 69 597 87 43
info@iberoamericanalibros.com
www.ibero-americana.net

ISBN 978-84-8489-877-1 (Iberoamericana)
ISBN 978-3-95487-472-9 (Vervuert)

Depósito Legal: M-37169-2015

Diseño de la cubierta: Carlos Zamora

Printed in Spain

The paper on which this book is printed meets the requirements of ISO 9706

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	9
Introduction	11
<i>Sandro Sessarego and Melvin González-Rivera</i>	
Section 1.	
Spanish in contact with Indigenous languages	
Maya-Spanish Contact in Yucatan, Mexico: Context and Sociolinguistic Implications	21
<i>Jim Michnowicz</i>	
Rapanui Features in the Morphosyntactic System of Easter Island Spanish	43
<i>Verónica González López</i>	
The Formal Guaraní and Spanish of Paraguayan Bilinguals	69
<i>Shaw Nicholas Gynan, Ernesto Luis López Almada, Carlos Marino Lugo Bracho and María Eva Mansfeld de Agüero</i>	
Continuity and Innovation in Peruvian Spanish: Pragmatics and Contact in (Differential) Object Marking	99
<i>Elisabeth Mayer and Manuel Delicado Cantero</i>	
Borrowed Clause Combining Patterns in Two Arawakan Languages - Baure and Paunaka	121
<i>Swintha Danielsen and Lena Terhart</i>	
Section 2.	
Spanish in contact with coerced-migration languages	
Codeswitching and Borrowing in Aruban Papiamentu: The Blurring of Categories	155
<i>Yolanda Rivera and Patrick-André Mather</i>	
Nominal Ellipses in an Afro-Hispanic Language of Ecuador: The Choteño Case	177
<i>Sandro Sessarego and Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach</i>	

<i>Cimarroneras</i> in Venezuela: The Role of Isolated Communities in the Potential Development of a Spanish Creole	195
<i>Avizia Yim Long and Manuel Díaz-Campos</i>	
The Individual as the Locus of Variation and Change in a Contact Situation in Panama	215
<i>Delano S. Lamy</i>	

Section 3.

Spanish in contact with free-migration languages

Romance Language Contact in Mexico: The Case of Veneto-Spanish Bilingualism	235
<i>Hilary Barnes</i>	
Portuguese/Portuñol in Misiones, Argentina: Another "Fronterizo"?	253
<i>John M. Lipski</i>	
Preposition Stranding in a Non-Preposition Stranding Language: Contact or Language Change?	283
<i>Melvin González-Rivera, Ramón Padilla-Reyes, and John Rueda-Chaves</i>	
Definite and Indefinite Articles in Nikkei Spanish	301
<i>Ana María Díaz-Collazos</i>	

Section 4.

Latin American Spanish outside of Latin America

Doing Being <i>Boricua</i> on the Island and in the U.S. Midwest: Perceptions of National Identity and Lateralization of /t/ in Puerto Rican Spanish	327
<i>Wilfredo Valentín-Márquez</i>	
Castilian in New York City: What Can We Learn from the Future?	347
<i>Rafael Orozco</i>	
Language Attitudes and Linguistic Identities in Miami	373
<i>Diego Pascual y Cabo</i>	
Heritage Speakers' Spanish in California: How Unbalanced Bilingualism Affects Reverse Construction of the <i>gustar</i> -type	405
<i>Viola Miglio and Stefan Th. Gries</i>	
Spanish and English in Contact in the Cyber World	437
<i>Antonio Medina-Rivera</i>	
Contributors	455

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the panel of scholars who reviewed the chapters and provided valuable feedback for the authors: Michelle Ramos-Pellicia, Chad Howe, Jacqueline Toribio, Kimberly Geeslin, David Korfhagen, Pilar Chamorro, Edith Beltrán, Juliana de La Mora, Marisa Carpenter, Scott Schwenter, Emily Kuder, Rey Romero, Brenda Stelter, Nate Maddux, Jason Doroga, Bruno Estigarribia, Diego Pascual, Nick Faraclas, Ian Tippets, Fernando Tejedo, Ksenija Bilbija, Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach, Nina Longinovic, Bill Cudlipp, Rajiv Rao, Diana Frantzen, Cathy Stafford, Grant Armstrong, Johannes Kabatek, Rafael Orozco, Jim Michnowicz, Ana Carvalho, Tim Gupton, Iván Ortega Santos, Frankie Larson, Chelsea Pfaff, Francoise Rose, Rand Valentine, Haralambos Symeonidis, Cecilia Montes Alcalá, Miquel Simonet, Marcos Rohena Madrazo, Yayoi T. Aird, and Antonio Ruiz Tinoco. We also owe a debt of gratitude to all the authors whose works appear in this volume.

Very special thanks go to the University of Texas at Austin, the Universidad de Puerto Rico, Mayagüez, and the Centro de Investigaciones Lingüística del Caribe (CILC) for their support, which made this publication possible. Last but not least, we wish to thank Klaus Vervuert, Rebecca Aschenberg and the publishing team of *Lengua y Sociedad en el Mundo Hispánico* for their professionalism and help with the publication of this study.

INTRODUCTION

SANDRO SESSAREGO¹ AND MELVIN GONZÁLEZ-RIVERA²

¹*University of Texas at Austin* and ²*Universidad de Puerto Rico - Mayagüez*

The present volume is an edited collection of original contributions, all of which focus on Hispanic contact linguistics in the Americas. The project is composed of four main sections, organized according to the type of socio-historical scenario that characterizes the nature of the contact situation: (i) Spanish in contact with indigenous languages; (ii) Spanish in contact with coerced-migration languages; (iii) Spanish in contact with free-migration languages; and (iv) Spanish in contact with languages outside of Latin America, but still within the Americas. In so doing, the present project covers a variety of languages distributed across Northern, Southern, Central America, and the Caribbean.

In Chapter 1, Jim Michnowicz provides an account of Yucatan Spanish (Mexico). The study describes certain lexical, phonological and morphosyntactic traits of this dialect, which at various times by various researchers have been directly or indirectly attributed to Maya influence (cf. Lope Blanch 1987). The present chapter seeks to present an overview of this contact situation in Yucatan, while addressing areas of possible or likely contact-induced change and the sociolinguistic factors surrounding the use of (perceived) indigenous language forms.

In Chapter 2, Verónica González López focuses on the extended patterns of language shift and diglossia between Rapa Nui and Spanish on Easter Island. Spanish, the prestigious language, is employed in all types of public contexts and official events, while Rapa Nui is relegated to the domestic and private spheres. After collecting the data by means of sociolinguistic interviews, the author provides an analysis of a wide range of morphosyntactic phenomena. Findings appear to be mostly in line with those of other studies on SLA, creolization and bilingualism (e.g., Clements 2009; Escobar 2000; Lipski 2007; Otheguy and Stern 2010), thus suggesting that apart from a set of specific Rapa Nui-driven constructions, the rest of these grammatical elements have to be seen as the result of universal processes that are at work in all cases of language contact.

In Chapter 3, Shaw Nicholas Gynan, Ernesto Luis López Almada, Carlos Marino Lugo Bracho, and María Eva Mansfeld de Agüero take us to Paraguay and present data on the mutual influence of Spanish and Guaraní, which reflect the differential status of urban bilinguals and rural Guaraní-speaking monolinguals (cf. Gynan 2007). This analysis of 100 Guaraní-Spanish guided oral interviews reveals that the phonology of even formal Paraguayan Spanish is influenced by the Guaraní substrate, but there is almost no lexical or morphological influence from Guaraní. This appears to be due to the fact that, for most Paraguayans, borrowing from Guaraní while speaking Spanish carries a stigma, while using Spanish words and phrases when speaking Guaraní is generally acceptable. This unequal acceptance of loanwords and other contact phenomena favors the Spanish norm over the Guaraní norm and has generated heated linguistic ideological conflicts in the past, especially between the *Ateneo de Lengua y Cultura Guaraní* and the Paraguayan Ministry of Education. Resolving the issue of standardization of Guaraní is now the responsibility of the *Academia de la Lengua Guaraní*, recently created by the *Secretaría de Políticas Lingüísticas*.

In Chapter 4, Elisabeth Mayer and Manuel Delicado Cantero analyze the evolution of differential object marking (DOM) on primary object marking in certain Peruvian Spanish contact varieties. In particular, they analyze the cases of extended DOM, that is, the extension of the prepositional accusative to topical inanimate objects. The authors argue that this change is regulated by pragmatic strategies, continuing the diachronically well-attested struggle between the dative and the accusative for primary object status in monotransitive clauses (Company 2003). This constitutes continuity as well as innovation of differential object marking. The paper highlights the contact avenues which arguably favored such changes (between Quechua and Spanish, and between Andean Spanish and Standard Peruvian Spanish), thus illustrating the role of contact as an integral mechanism of change.

In Chapter 5, Swintha Danielsen and Lena Terhart provide an account of contact phenomena in Baure and Paunaka, two Bolivian Arawakan languages, both seriously endangered and currently being documented by the authors (cf. Danielsen 2007; Danielsen & Terhart 2014). Arawakan languages are generally very verby and many concepts are therefore expressed by predicates and sometimes by lexicalized verb-like constructions. Clause coordination and subordination are done by specifically marked verbal serial constructions and less often by particles that act as conjunctions. Contemporary Baure and Paunaka show numerous constructions that do not appear to be the result of internal language change; they are better analyzed as the result of a prolonged language contact with Spanish. In particular, the authors find several Spanish conjunctions and adverbs functioning as

conjunctions in Paunaka and Baure. Moreover, a few lexicalized verbal constructions in both languages appear to be applied like Spanish conjunctions. In this article, Danielsen and Terhart explore the distribution of these borrowed elements and try to explain the motivations for these types of contact-induced change.

In Chapter 6, Yolanda Rivera and Patrick-André Mather present results from a study carried out in Aruba (The Netherlands Antilles). They offer an analysis of borrowing, code-switching, and phonological adaptation phenomena in Papiamentu, a Spanish-based creole that is going through a significant process of Hispanization due to more recent contact with Spanish dialects from the Caribbean. Results suggest that code-switching, in the case under inspection, involves much phonological interpenetration of languages, thus showing that there is no clear-cut distinction between single-word codeswitches and integrated borrowings (Muysken et al 1996; Poplack 2004; Bullock and Toribio 2009).

In Chapter 7, Sandro Sessarego and Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach develop an analysis of nominal ellipses in Choteño Spanish, an Afro-Hispanic vernacular from Ecuador, and compare these grammatical phenomena to their respective counterparts in standard Spanish. The authors build on the literature dealing with Spanish N-drop (Brucart 1987; Kester and Sleeman 2002; Ticio 2003, 2005; etc.) to provide a unified account of nominal ellipses in these two dialects.

In Chapter 8, Avizia Yim Long and Manuel Díaz-Campos examine the potential for Creole language development in colonial Venezuela. They provide demographic, sociohistorical, and linguistic data to cast light on the ongoing debate concerning the (non)creole origin of Afro-Caribbean Spanish (Álvarez and Obediente 1998; Díaz-Campos and Clements 2008; McWhorter 2000; Schwegler 1996; etc.). They suggest that the conditions for creole development in Venezuela may have been in place in *cimarroneras* and *cumbes*, marooned communities where fleeing slaves hid during colonial times.

In Chapter 9, Delano S. Lamy studies the variability of voice onset time (VOT) in bilingual Creole English-Spanish speakers in Panama. Data are statistically analyzed through the incorporation of a mixed-effect linear regression in which the individual speaker is included as a random effect factor. The idea is that the individual speaker's results represent stylistic variation in bilingual speech, which includes both Spanish-like and Creole English-like VOT duration (Lisker and Abramson 1964; Poplack and Meechan 1998). By gleaning information from the sociolinguistic interviews and language background questionnaires, it is observed that factors such as language attitudes, language loyalty and maintenance, and cultural identity affect VOT variability, thus shedding light on a variety of social factors that characterize this particular bilingual speech community.

In Chapter 10, Hilary Barnes examines the language contact situation observed in the small town of Chipilo, a Veneto-Spanish bilingual community in Mexico founded in 1882 by immigrants from Northern Italy (Barnes 2009). Data collected from sociolinguistic interviews and reading tasks are discussed, showing that while there are features of bilingual Chipilo Spanish that are common among other varieties of rural Spanish, several characteristics appear to be due to sustained contact with Veneto.

In Chapter 11, John Lipski offers data on a group of Portuguese/"Portuñol"-speaking enclaves within the northeastern Argentine province of Misiones. These communities were founded in the first half of the twentieth century, within living memory, and sufficient sociodemographic information is available to allow for a more accurate diachronic representation. This analysis of the factors responsible for the presence and characteristics of Portuguese in Misiones, supplemented by recently collected data from border areas of Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia (cf. Kaufmann 2009; Lipski 2010, 2011, among others), sheds additional light on the formation of border speech communities. The data also expand the possibilities for studying the contact and alternation—both voluntary and involuntary—between two closely related languages in ways that transcend commonly observed constraints on intrasentential language switching.

In Chapter 12, Melvin González-Rivera, Ramón Padilla-Reyes and John Rueda-Chaves examine preposition stranding under sluicing in Puerto Rican Spanish and argue that speakers of this Caribbean dialect tend to judge this construction acceptable, even though it is not allowed in standard Spanish (Bosque and Gutiérrez Rexach 2009; Campos 1991; Zagana 2002). They suggest that the grammatical judgment reflected by Puerto Rican Spanish speakers may be due to the contact situation between Spanish and English on the island.

In Chapter 13, Ana María Díaz-Collazos analyzes the linguistic outcomes of Spanish in contact with Japanese in Colombia, specifically in the Nikkei community (Befu 2002), and provides a variationist analysis of Spanish articles in the spontaneous speech of these Japanese/Spanish bilingual speakers. Since the Japanese language lacks of a system of articles, this feature is problematic for this population. Her results show that articles are linked to certain noun types or verbal complements in all types of speakers. Bilinguals show different levels of lexicalization according to their specific language situation.

In Chapter 14, Wilfredo Valentín-Márquez examines the sociolinguistic distribution of syllable-final (r) (Canfield 1981; Guitart 1978; Lipski 1994) in two Puerto Rican (PR) communities with different situations of language contact. He compares a community in which Puerto Rican Spanish (PRS) is the only language

spoken by most of the population (Cabo Rojo, Puerto Rico) with a community where PRS is a minority language (Grand Rapids, Michigan). Besides the contribution of linguistic context, life stage, and gender, the author explores whether the degree of integration into the PR community of the informants on the mainland offers explanatory insight into differences between the communities in terms of the variable's distribution. Also, he considers the speakers' perceptions of national identity—based on the meanings and uses of the word "boricua," typically associated with core Puerto Ricanness—and he explores whether those judgments are related to the use of [l], the stigmatized variant of (r), in the two communities.

In Chapter 15, Rafael Orozco explores Spanish-English contact in New York City through the prism of the expression of futurity among speakers of Colombian and Puerto Rican origin. The distribution of the variants of futurity (simple present indicative, morphological future, and periphrastic future) reveals that the periphrastic future is the most frequent form while the morphological future occurs the least. Futurity is conditioned by an intricate combination of internal and external constraints. Internal factors largely condition the variants of futurity similarly in both speaker groups. However, apparently due to contact with English, several constraints no longer affect the Puerto Rican cohort. The impact of linguistic contact is also reflected in younger speakers' lack of use of the morphological future. Furthermore, interesting similarities in the effects of external constraints reflect Colombians' assimilation to their new sociolinguistic landscape as they follow the Puerto Rican lead. Orozco's findings help explain other instances of morpho-syntactic variation leading to change, especially those involving analytic and synthetic variants (cf. Silva-Corvalán 1994). They also provide important information that helps compare the sociolinguistic forces constraining variation in New York City to those in other Hispanic speech communities.

In Chapter 16, Diego Pascual y Cabo examines the perceived attitudes towards language and language use of three distinct groups of Cuban and Cuban-American young adults in Miami, Florida (cf. Lynch 2000; Alfara 2002). In this analysis, he presents combined data from semi-structured oral interviews and surveys that examine these speakers' attitudes towards the Spanish and English languages, their language use, and the extent to which these languages' social realities manifest in their everyday lives. The data presented show that these groups share many of the core aspects that form their social, cultural, and linguistic makeup, but present differences in terms of the linguistic values they assign to each language. These differences, coupled with the existence of additional complex divisions within this community, seem to suggest that language choice is employed to establish social boundaries which may point to a cultural and linguistic shift towards mainstream American monoculturalism and monolingualism.

In Chapter 17, Viola Miglio and Stefan Th. Gries focus on the Heritage Mexican Spanish speakers and L2 speakers from central and southern California. The authors study the recognition of different forms of the reverse construction with the Spanish verb *gustar*, 'to like'. Using a questionnaire, they manipulate the grammaticality of *gustar* constructions. Results indicate that, on the whole, heritage speakers (HS) achieved a higher rate of correct judgments. However, the superior performance of HS is not found across the board; rather, it is part of significant interactions with other factors. In fact, in some cases (such as sentences with negation, or where the position of the syntactic subject is before the verb) HS perform on a par or worse than advanced learners, thus showing, in line with other studies, that "[...] HS' initial linguistic advantages over L2 learners seem to diminish when both groups are compared at the high end of the proficiency spectrum" (De Prada Pérez and Pascual y Cabo 2011: 111).

Finally, in Chapter 18, Antonio Medina-Rivera builds upon Crystal's work on cyber language (2001/2006) to explore language contact outcomes between English and Spanish speakers outside of the conventionalized national borders. He navigates the cyber space to focus on speech communities using different varieties of Spanish and different levels of Spanish/English proficiency. He analyzes a wide range of language contact situations, including, among other phenomena, cases of language innovation as well as the correspondences between oral and written language.

The current collection of articles is a contribution to the growing field of Hispanic contact linguistics. It consists of studies carried out by researchers with a solid and well-established academic profile in the field, as well as articles by younger academics applying the latest theoretical tools to the study of language-contact phenomena. We are honored to have had the opportunity of working with all of them and we hope that this volume will provide students and professors with a forward-looking perspective on Hispanic contact linguistics in the Americas.

REFERENCES

- ALFARAZ, G. (2002). "Miami Cuban Perceptions of Varieties of Spanish". In D. Long, and D. Preston (eds.), *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*, Vol. 2. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 1-12.
- ÁLVAREZ, A./OBEDIENTE, E. (1998). "El Español Caribeño: Antecedentes Sociohistóricos y Lingüísticos". In P. Matthias, and A. Schwegler (eds.), *América Negra: Panorámica Actual de los Estudios Lingüísticos sobre Variedades Hispanas, Portuguesas y Criollas*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, pp. 40-61.
- BARNES, H. (2009). *A Sociolinguistic Study of Sustained Veneto-Spanish Bilingualism in Chipilo, Mexico*. Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.
- BEFU, H. (2002). "Globalization as Human Dispersal: Nikkei in the World". In L. R. Hirabayashi, A. Kikumura-Yano, and J. A. Hirabayashi (eds.), *New Worlds, New Lives: Globalization and People of Japanese Descent in the Americas and from Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 1-18.
- BOSQUE, I./GUTIÉRREZ-REXACH, J. (2009). *Fundamentos de Sintaxis Formal*. Madrid: Akal.
- BRUCART, J. M. (1987). *La Elisión Sintáctica en Español*. Doctoral dissertation. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- BULLOCK, B./TORIBIO, J. (2009). "Trying to Hit a Moving Target: On the Sociophonetics of Codeswitching". In L. Isurin, D. Winford, and K. de Bot (eds.), *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Codeswitching*, pp. 189-206.
- CAMPOS, H. (1991). "Preposition Stranding in Spanish?". In *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 4, pp. 741-750.
- CANFIELD, D. L. (1981). *Spanish Pronunciation in the Americas*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- CLEMENTS, J. C. (2009). *The Linguistic Legacy of Spanish and Portuguese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COMPANY, C. (2003). "Transitivity and Grammaticalization of Object. The Struggle of Direct and Indirect Object in Spanish". In G. Fiorentino (ed.), *Romance Objects. Transitivity in Romance Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 217-260.
- CRYSTAL, D. (2001/2006). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DANIELSEN, S. (2007). *Baure: An Arawak Language of Bolivia*. Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ILLA) 6. Leiden: CNWS.
- DANIELSEN, S./TERHART, L. (2014). "Paunaka." In: M. Crevels, and P. Muysken (eds.), *Las lenguas de Bolivia*, Vol. 3. La Paz: Plural Editors, 221-258.
- DÍAZ-CAMPOS, M./CLEMENTS, C. J. (2008). "A Creole Origin for Barlovento Spanish? A Linguistic and Sociohistorical Inquiry." In *Language in Society*, 37, 3, pp. 351-383.
- ESCOBAR, A. M. (2000). *Contacto Social y Lingüístico: El Español en Contacto con el Quechua en el Perú*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- GUTART, J. M. (1978). "A Propósito del Español de Cuba y Puerto Rico: Hacia un Modelo no Sociolingüístico de lo Sociodialectal." In H. López Morales (ed.), *Corrientes Actuales en la Dialectología del Caribe Hispánico*. San Juan, PR: Editorial Universitaria de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, pp. 77-92.
- GYNAN, S. N. (2007). "The Language Situation in Paraguay: An Update". In R. B. Baldauf, and B. Kaplan (eds.), *Language Planning and Policy in Latin America*, Vol. 1: Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, England, pp. 284-301.
- KAUFMANN, G. (2009). "Falar Espanhol or Hablar Portugués: Attitudes and Linguistic Behavior on the Brazilian-Uruguayan and Brazilian-Argentinian Borders". In *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 60, pp. 276-317.
- KESTER, E. P./SLEEMAN, P. (2002). "N-Ellipsis in Spanish". In *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 2002, 107-116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LIPSKI, J. (1994). *Latin American Spanish*. London: Longman.
- LIPSKI, J. (2007). "El Español de América en Contacto con Otras Lenguas". In M. Lacorte (ed.), *Lingüística Aplicada del Español*. Madrid: Arco Libros, pp. 309-345.

- LIPSKI, J. (2010). "Spanish and Portuguese in Contact". In R. Hickey (ed.), *Handbook of Language Contact*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 550-580.
- LIPSKI, J. (2011). "Encontros Lingüísticos Fronteiriços". In *Ideação* 13, 2, pp. 83-100.
- LISKER, L./ABRAMSON, A. (1964). "A Cross-Language Study of Voicing in Initial Stops: Acoustical Measurements". In R. J. Baken, and R. G. Danilooff (eds.), *Readings in the Clinical Spectrography of Speech*. San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group, Inc, pp. 384-422.
- LOPE BLANCH, J. M. (1987). *Estudios sobre el Español de Yucatán*. México City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- LYNCH, A. (2000). "Spanish-Speaking Miami in Sociolinguistic Perspective: Bilingualism, Recontact, and Language Maintenance among Cuban-Origin Population". In A. Roca (ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla, pp. 271-283.
- MCWHORTER, J. (2000). *The Missing Spanish Creoles: Recovering the Birth of Plantation Contact Languages*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- MUYSKEN, P./KOOK, H./VEDDER, P. (1996). "Papiamentu/Dutch Codeswitching in Bilingual Parent-Child Reading". In *Applied Psycholinguistics* 17, 4, pp. 485-505.
- OTHEGUY, R./STERN, N. (2010). "On So-Called Spanglish". In *International Journal of Bilingualism* 15, 1, pp. 85-100.
- POPLACK, S. (2004). "Code-Switching". In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K.J. Mattheier, and P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language*, second edition, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 589-596.
- POPLACK, S./MEECHAN, M. (1998). "How Languages Fit Together in Code-Mixing". In *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2, pp. 127-138.
- SCHWEGLER, A. (1996). "La Doble Negación Dominicana y la Génesis del Español Caribeño". In *Hispanic Linguistics* 8, pp. 247-315.
- SILVA-CORVALÁN, C. (1994). *Language Contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. New York City: Oxford University Press.
- TICIO, M. E. (2003). *On the Structure of DPs*. Doctoral dissertation, UConn, Storrs.
- TICIO, M. E. (2005). "NP-Ellipsis in Spanish". In *Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* 7, pp. 128-141.
- ZAGONA, K. (2002). *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SECTION 1. SPANISH IN CONTACT WITH INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES

CONTINUITY AND INNOVATION IN PERUVIAN SPANISH: PRAGMATICS AND CONTACT IN (DIFFERENTIAL) OBJECT MARKING

ELISABETH MAYER AND MANUEL DELICADO CANTERO
Australian National University

1. Introduction¹

Spanish shows dependent- and head-marking (Nichols 1986; Bresnan 2001) for both core grammatical functions, the indirect object and direct object. Dependent-marking uses a syncretic form *a* to mark indirect objects and direct objects. Head-marking obtains through a set of feature-specific clitic pronouns (dative and accusative), which optionally cross-reference the object on the verb. This is not maintained in certain contact varieties of Peruvian Spanish. In this chapter we aim to expose the role of contact as an integral mechanism of change based on an exploration of the complex relationship between head- and dependent-marking in specific Peruvian contact varieties exhibiting extensive microvariation of the clitic paradigm as well as extended DOM².

The particular focus is on two co-occurring nonstandard object marking strategies, *leísmo* and *loísmo*³, exemplifying the struggle between the dative and accusative

¹ We want to express our gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for this publication and to Avery Andrews, Jane Simpson, Harold Koch, and Cynthia Allen for their helpful comments and suggestions. A previous version of this paper was presented at the ICHL conference in Osaka in 2011. We thank the audience in this conference for their comments. The usual disclaimers apply.

² The following conventions and abbreviations are used in all examples: 1,2,3: first, second, third person; SG: singular; PL: plural; IOM: indirect object case marking=dative case (DAT); DOM: differential object marking = accusative case (ACC); IOCL: indirect object clitic=dative clitic; DOCL: direct object clitic=accusative clitic; DET: determiner; M: masculine gender; F: feminine gender; IMP: imperative; INF: infinitive; PRFD: predicate feature/lexical form; PRO: pronoun; GEND: gender; PAST: past tense; AGR: agreement; REF: referential; IMPERS: impersonal; REFL: reflexive; PREP: preposition; OM: object marker; FW: Fieldwork; LSCV: Limeño Spanish contact variety.

³ *Leísmo* generally refers to the extension of the use of dative *le* to human and mainly male (accusative) direct object arguments; *loísmo* usually refers to an extension of accusative *lo* to dative arguments. Note that Peninsular or European Spanish and American Spanish *leísta*

for primary object status. In intense contact situations, such as for example in Ecuadorian Andean Spanish as well as in Paraguayan Spanish (Suñer and Yépez 1988; Palacios 2006, among others), the *leísmo* strategy in (1) shows the direct object (*la camioneta*) cross-referenced by an IOCL and DOM extended to an inanimate direct object:

- (1) Ya le_i veo a la camioneta_i
 already IOCL.SG see.1SG DOM DET.FSG minibus.FSG
 'I can already see the minibus'
 (Ecuador, Suñer and Yépez 1988: 512)

The second phenomenon is two co-occurring strategies of non-standard *lo*-doubling of inanimate objects cross-referenced by a singular DOCL and extended DOM in (2a) and without DOM in (2b), henceforth *strange lo* (Cerrón-Palomino 2003):⁴

- (2) a. Lo_i frío a la cebolla_i
 DOCL.MSG fry.1SG DOM DET.FSG onion
 'I fry the onion'
 b. No, y no lo pronunciaba bien la erre
 no and no DOCL.MSG pronounce well DET.FSG I.FSG
 'No, and (s)he did not pronounce well the letter <r>'
 (Limeño Spanish contact variety, FW-LSCV, Mayer)

Contact speakers use a double object marking strategy that allows them to use either forms marked with doubling or unmarked forms. We argue that dynamic competition of these morphosyntactic forms leads to competing grammars, a process that contributes to language change. Both mark essentially the same grammatical relation, although motivated by a difference in semantic and pragmatic strategies. An example for the evolution into a single case system is extensive *leísmo* in Ecuador as shown in (1), where, as a result of contact with Amerindian languages, the shift from accusative to dative has been all but completed in dissociating the patient semantic role from the direct object.

strategies are different from each other, whereas the first is animacy-based, American Spanish *leísmo* is case-based. For an extensive overview of Peninsular Spanish see Fernández-Ordóñez (1999); for American Spanish see Palacios (2005). For a detailed discussion see section 2.3. These commonly accepted definitions do not always match the examples presented in this paper. Deviating uses of these terms will be explained on occurrence.

⁴ An anonymous reviewer suggested that the non-agreeing *lo* in (2b) could represent simply a sporadic agreement error. However, this instance of non-agreeing form is part of a common and well-documented strategy in Peruvian contact Spanish, it has also been reported for Mexican Spanish and other Spanish contact varieties.

We distinguish between standard Spanish and non-standardized Spanish and present data from both. The term standard Spanish refers to the standardized written norm of the Spanish language as laid out and monitored by the Royal Academy of the Spanish Language (Real Academia Española) in Spain and its 21 Academies in Latin America, the United States and the Philippines. Whereas data from standard Spanish are either of written or educated oral origin, data from non-standardized Peruvian varieties are exclusively naturally occurring oral data collected in field-work (Mayer 2006, 2010). We use the term non-standardized, as used in Bresnan (1998), to refer to these varieties as Limeño Spanish contact varieties (LSCV), representing a dialect continuum exhibiting extensive microvariation. LSCV speakers are in contact with the two Spanish contact varieties in Peru, Andean and Amazonian Spanish, both mainly oral varieties. Limeño Spanish (LS) refers to the educated and standardized norm visible in all official written texts and spoken by all educated speakers in Lima and elsewhere in Peru.

2. Differential Object Marking and Clitic Doubling

2.1. DOM in standard varieties

Differential object marking (DOM) is used in many languages to code object relations via morphological marking, showing crosslinguistic variation. As stated in the Real Academia Española (1985), in standard Spanish DOM obligatorily marks human direct objects (3a), extending optional marking to personified animals (3b) and places (3c), and rejects DOM for inanimate, definite and nonspecific NPs/DPs (3d):

(3) a. Vi *(a) Ana/Pablo	[+hum][+anim][+def]
see.1SG DOM Ana/Pablo	
'I saw Ana/Pablo'	
b. Don Quijote cabalgaba (a) Rocinante	[-hum][+anim][+spec]
Don Quijote rode.3SG DOM Rocinante	
'Don Quijote rode Rocinante'	
(RAE 1985: 372)	
c. Deseo ver (a) Roma	[-anim][+spec]
wish.1SG see DOM Rome	
'I wish to see Rome'	
(RAE 1985: 372)	
d. *Frio a la cebolla	[-anim][+def][-spec]
fry.1SG DOM DET.FSG onion	
'I fry the onion'	

Note that in (3a), both the subject and the object share the highest ranking on the animacy hierarchy but cannot give rise to clitic doubled constructions in standard

Spanish with the exception of liberal clitic doubling in River Plate and Limeño Spanish. Both DOM marked objects in (3b) and (3c) must be specific, i.e., referentially recoverable from the context or identifiable (von Heusinger and Kaiser 2005), in other words, topical and highly salient objects in a given context. According to Lambrecht (1994: 78), "the speaker assumes that it has a certain representation in the mind of the addressee which can be evoked in a given discourse."

Topicality is a property subjects and objects have in common. Subjects are natural primary topics. Objects can appear either in canonical postverbal focus position or as topics. Topical objects appearing inside the VP are marked by DOM, and outside by left dislocation / word order restructuring (see Torrego 1999, among others).

2.2. DOM and clitic doubling

According to the Real Academia Española (1985) and Bello (1984), among other sources, direct object clitic doubling (DOCLD) with gender and number distinct accusative clitics is obligatory for pronominal NPs/DPs (4a), and restricted to just those in standard Spanish varieties (4b):

- (4) a. *(La/Lo)_i vi a ella/él_i [+def][+spec]
 DOCL.MSG/DOCL.FSG saw.1SG DOM PRO.FSG/PRO.MSG
 'I saw her/him'
 b. (*Lo)_i vi a tu hermano ayer
 DOCL.MSG saw.1SG DOM POSS brother yesterday
 'I saw your brother yesterday' (Standard Spanish)

Liberal DOCLD varieties such as River Plate Spanish⁵ or Limeño standard Spanish (Mayer 2008) extend clitic doubling (CLD) to definite, specific and referential objects (5), in other words, to contextually salient and topical objects (see Lambrecht 1994: 78 in the previous section and further discussion in section 4.2). This strategy is still subject to semantic restrictions but is already pragmatically motivated, constituting the interface between grammatical function and discourse function (GF/DF):⁶

- (5) Lo vi a tu hermano ayer [+def][+spec][+referential]
 DOCL.MSG saw.1SG DOM POSS brother yesterday
 'I saw your brother yesterday'

⁵ River Plate Spanish is a variety spoken in Buenos Aires and the greater La Plata region (see Estigarribia 2005).

⁶ By discourse functions we mean non-core grammatical functions with a pragmatic value, such as TOP, FOC and SUBJ, see Bresnan (2001: 96-98).

Different from direct objects, all indirect objects are obligatorily case marked (IOM) using the same syncretic form *a*. In indirect object clitic doubling (IOCLD), the co-occurrence of the clitic and its referential object NP/DP is restricted to argument datives, and dative clitics show number and case features as shown in (6):

- (6) Le_i di el libro *(a) Ana/Pablo_i [+def][+spec]
 IOCL.SG give.1SG DET.MSG book OM Ana/Pablo.
 'I gave the book to Ana/Pablo'

In sum, case marking uses a syncretic marker obligatorily for dative objects and differentially for accusatives. Head-marking obtains via a set of feature-specifying and case differentiating clitics, again obligatorily for argument datives and restricted to pronominal objects in accusatives in standard Spanish. This reflects semantic marking strategies based on two-dimensional DOM, that is, on animacy and specificity conditions. The extension to highly topical objects in liberal CLD varieties such as standard Argentinian and Peruvian varieties marks the move from semantic to pragmatic marking, which in turn is based on topicality of the marked object "in contexts where the object is salient and the utterance updates the addressee's knowledge about the relationship that holds between the subject and the object referents" (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2007: 37). Co-occurrence⁷ of head-marking and dependent-marking in DOCLD is subject to Kayne's Generalization, which stipulates that clitic doubling is only possible when the doubled NP/DP has a case assigner such as a preposition (Kayne 1975).

2.3. Brief review of the formation of DOM and CLD and their interaction

A historical overview of the emergence of DOM in Spanish helps to corroborate its increase and systematization across time. As Lapesa (2000: 94) indicates, DOM *a* was much less systematic in the medieval period, as evidenced by seemingly random alternations in the same text with a similar kind of object/referent. Such is the case in *El Cid*, a text where *veré a la mugier* (lit., 'I will see to the woman') coexists with *veremos vuestra mugier* ('we will see your woman') (Lapesa 2000: 94).

The extensive literature on the emergence of DOM – in Spanish and other Romance varieties – has pointed out three different but interacting factors (see Laca 2006):

- Differentiation subject/ object
- Accusative vs. dative marking
- Topic marking

⁷ See also Melis (1995).

a. *Differentiation subject/ object.* For Bosson (1991), DOM arises in order to maintain a diachronically constant differentiation of the object and the subject.

b. *Accusative vs. dative marking.* Lapesa (2000: 98-99) speaks of neutralization of dative and accusative marking. Similarly, Company (2001: 148) argues that the extension of DOM *a* emerged as analogy with Dative marking, moving down a semantic scale (personal pronouns > proper nouns > [+human] > animates > inanimates), to the point of becoming an object marker (Company 2001: 149; see also Laca 2006). The variable argument structure of certain verbs, shifting from direct objects to indirect objects and vice versa, also supported the extension of DOM (Laca 2006: 427-428, 470). This is part of the widespread assumption that the dative 'is invading' the space of the accusative (Company 2001; Fernández-Ordóñez 1993, 1999).

A traditionally poorly understood aspect of Spanish syntax is the diachronically attested inherent variation of the 3rd person clitic paradigm as a referential system, termed *leísmo*, *loísmo* and *laísmo*⁸, as mentioned earlier. In traditional grammar the variation is based on a twofold distinction, either animate (personal) vs. inanimate (things), or on eliminating gender in favor of case distinctions.

Loísmo is the use of *lo* for *le*, and represents an extension of the accusative into the dative. *Loísta* dialects refer to the male human direct object in (7) with the gender specific accusative clitic:

- (7) Ayer vi a Pepe y lo di el libro
 Yesterday see.1SG. PAST DOM Pepe and DOCL.MSG give.1SG. PAST DET.MSG book.MSG
 'I saw Pepe yesterday, and I gave him the book'

Leísmo is a highly complex multisystem, showing distinctions based on geographical variation, contact with non-gender marking languages, different usage in written and oral language and finally the actual use compared to the educated "standard" use. *Leísmo personal* (personal *leísmo*) in (8) is the use of the dative *le* for the accusative *lo* referring to mainly singular male humans in Peninsular Spanish since the 16th century:

- (8) Ayer le vi a Pablo
 yesterday IOCL.SG saw.1SG IOM/DOM Pablo
 'Yesterday I saw Pablo'

In Latin American Spanish, on the other hand, *leísmo* is case-based (Palacios 2005; Mayer 2010) and extends to female humans in (9):

⁸ See Fernández-Ordóñez (1999) for an extensive discussion and overview.

- (9) Ayer le vi a Ana
 yesterday IOCL.SG saw.1SG IOM/DOM Ana
 'Yesterday I saw Ana'

Note the ambiguous role of *a*, which in both (8) and (9) can be interpreted as a (reinterpreted) indirect object case marker (IOM) or as a case of DOM with *leísmo*. Personal *a* in standard Spanish is already ambiguous with regard to objective case. In the contact variety discussed here, synchronic variation of canonical and noncanonical object marking, morphological marking of both objects with a case syncretic marker, and covariation of *loísmo* and *leísmo* produce conflictive analyses with regard to the syntactic distinction of objects (see Bosson 1991 for the creation of a new accusative case marker; Alsina 1996 for a binary distinction into $\pm$ dative case).

Finally, under extensive *leísmo*, DOM and *leísmo* doubling extends to inanimate objects (10) in Ecuadorian Spanish (Suñer 1988: 512):

- (10) Ya le veo a la camioneta
 already IOCL.SG see-1SG OM DET.FSG minibus.FSG
 'I can already see the minibus'

Extensive *leísmo* is a significant feature of Ecuadorian Andean and Paraguayan Spanish and a strong sign of the struggle of both internal objects for primary object status as well as a significant indicator of a language change in progress.

Based on extensive documentation of the reanalysis of the locative preposition *a* in Mexican Spanish, Company (2003) links the struggle between dative and accusative for primary object status to the reanalysis of the preposition from a case marker of "cannibalistic" datives to the spread of DOM to inanimates. In her analysis, DOM marking for [+human] and [+anim] objects is only a transitory stage leading to extensive [Dat+] marking through extending DOM to [-anim] objects. This analysis can be linked to the [Dat $\pm$] hypothesis by Alsina (1996).

c. *Topic marking.* In addition to semantics, pragmatics and information structure have also influenced the formation of DOM. Pensado (1995) remarks that the Romance origin of DOM marking originates in the use of the preposition *ad* with tonic personal pronouns, as in *ad mihi* (Pensado 1995: 191), which were highly likely to be used as topics (dislocation for topicalization). The loss of dative case morphology in the pronouns and its substitution by the prepositional phrase with *ad*, with the help of analogical generalizations, help DOM extend to non-pronominal uses as well. This idea of topic is crucial in Givón (1976) and, more recently, in Darlymple and Nikolaeva (2007), who locate the rationale for DOM in secondary topic marking.

The interaction between DOM and CLD is attested as early as in *El Cid* (Melis 1995; Laca 2006: 428). From a syntactic/morphological point of view, the question of the categorical nature of these duplicating clitics has been argued extensively in the literature. Rivero (1986) argues for a full NP (DP, in current terms) nature of those clitics in the old language, as opposed to their later re-categorization as agreement markers (objective morphology). Such syntactic representation is captured in Suñer (1988) and Franco (2000), among others. The typical examples of IO and DO reduplication in Spanish are semantically constrained by animacy, specificity and/or definiteness.

Franco (2000: 167) notes that "feature erosion in pronominal affixes is a characteristic typical of agreement systems". Interestingly, feature loss is the final necessary step for CLD (agreement markers) to become proper object markers (OM). This is what we find in Ecuadorian Andean Spanish and Peruvian Spanish contact varieties (Bossong 2003: 38; Palacios 1998, 2006, among others). At this point, the "clitic" suffices as object marker, which forces the redundancy of DOM *a*. Previously applicable semantic constraints, such as animacy/referentiality, are erased. We obtain the following dialectal divergence:

1. DOM due to semantic restrictions [+def], [+spec] (Suñer 1988; Torrego 1999; von Heusinger and Kaiser 2005; among many others). This still applies to standard Spanish and River Plate CLD + DOM.
2. DOM > OM; no semantic restrictions on the object (no animacy or definiteness/specificity constraints).

3. DOCLD with non-agreeing clitics in contact varieties or non-standardized varieties

Previous accounts reflect the interactions of contact and ongoing grammaticalization processes. Apart from Mayer (2003, 2006), Sánchez (2005) is the only study on Standard Limeño Spanish (StLS) optional clitic doubling with fully referential agreeing clitics. Work on optional direct object clitic doubling with agreeing clitics in liberal CLD varieties focuses on semantic and pragmatic strategies where DOM and CLD are licensed by the interaction of the referential categories animacy, definiteness and specificity.

Recall that the norm for standard Spanish does not include CLD and DOM of inanimate and non-specific lexical direct objects (see examples in (3) above). Liberal CLD varieties such as River Plate (RP) and Limeño Spanish (LS) extend CLD and DOM to inanimates with agreeing (coreferential) clitics (11). This constitutes the first Latin American (LA) Spanish innovation regarding CLD and can be linked to marking the topical or salient object (Silva-Corvalán 1995; Estigarribia 2005).

- (11) ¿La_i frío a la cebolla_i? [-anim][+spec][+agr][+ref]
 TOP2 fry.1SG DOM DET.FSG onion.FGS
 'Shall I fry the onion?'
 (RP, StLS)

On the other hand, non-standardized varieties such as LSCV show two additional co-occurring innovations. The first innovation in (12) exhibits the same extension to inanimates as in (11), but with the non-agreeing (nonreferential) clitic *lo*:⁹

- (12) Lo_i frío a la cebolla_i [-anim][+spec][-agr][-ref]
 TOP2 fry.1SG DOM DET.FSG onion.FSG
 'I fry the onion'
 (LSCV, Mayer 2010)

The second innovation is seen in (13), which shows that in cases of doubling DOM *a* has become redundant. Both innovations (12) and (13) occur in contact varieties and covary with the contact specific variants of *loísmo* and *leísmo*, where *strange lo* as an instance of *lo*-doubling in (13a) covariates with a specific variant of *leísmo* doubling (13b), both violating Kayne's Generalization:

- (13) a. No, y no lo pronunciaba bien la erre
 no and no TOP2 pronounce.3SG.PAST well DET.FSG r.FSG
 'No, and (s)he did not pronounce well the letter <r>'
 b. No le sabían pronunciar bien las erres
 not IOCL.SG know.3PL pronounce.INF well DET.FPL r.FPL
 'They don't know how to pronounce the letter <r>'
 (LSCV, Mayer 2010)

In non-standardized contact varieties we expect to find unstable and transitory stages where several strategies (old and new) coexist. In both cases the inanimate object is quite specific, if there were a pause after the *bien*, we could think of right dislocation, but that is not the case in the data in question.

The preverbal, non-agreeing and non-referential clitic *lo* in (12) is known in the literature as *strange lo*, as mentioned above (Cerrón-Palomino 2003, among others). *Strange lo* is a featureless and invariant form "that can act as a surrogate for the entire category" (Greenberg, 1966; Bresnan 2001: 61) producing interesting morphosyntactic variation which is not restricted to a particular geographic region or dependent on extra-linguistic factors alone.

⁹ This combination is very unusual and highly stigmatized. However, according to personal communication from native speakers of River Plate in the greater Buenos Aires region, the same variation can be found in nonstandard River Plate Spanish.

Additionally, contact clitics exhibit morphological simplification in (14) as a sign of an ongoing reanalysis process:

- (14) Le_i entregamos el regalo *(a) los niños_i
 IOCL.SG give.1PL DET.MSG gift IOM DET.MSG children.MSG
 'We give the gift to the children'

An originally Andean Spanish phenomenon also found in LSCV nowadays is locative doubling, as illustrated in (15). It can be analyzed either as an intransitive goal that has been reached (Ritter and Rosen 2001), or as a boundedness delimitation of an event, secondary agreement of an oblique¹⁰ (Kiparsky 1998: 266):

- (15) Lo llegaron a este pueblo
 DOCL.MSG arrive.3PL LOC DEM.MSG village.MSG
 'They arrived at this village'
 (Andean Spanish, Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 168-170)

All innovations exposed for LSCV exist in an Andean continuum, which is synonymous with rural conditions, and much more precisely expressed by Cerrón-Palomino (2003: 190) as *español rural*, which has been serving as the only language of communication in those areas for almost 500 years. Here we find the same inter- and intra-speaker variation situated at different stages of evolution based on extra-linguistic factors favoring and accelerating an ongoing reanalysis process in the pronominal paradigm for 3rd person.

4. A pragmatic analysis

Our data from Peruvian Spanish contact varieties corroborate the commonly accepted idea that language change proceeds gradually, since not all linguistic features shift at the same time and sometimes different variants coexist even in the same text (Kroch 1994; Croft 2000; Joseph and Janda 2003, among many others). This is evident in LSCV, where coexistence of variant forms is present in inter-speakers and intra-speakers.¹¹

4.1. Object marking systems

The variation over time and space is summarized in Table 1:

object	case	standard clitic	contact clitic (Peru)	Ecuador/Paraguay
IOBJ	dative a	le(s)	le/lo	Le
OBL	locative a		lo	le/lo
DOBJ	DOM a	M: lo(s), F: la(s)	lo>le>la	le>lo

Table 1. Object marking systems

The striking case syncretism in column 1 finds its counterpart in the Quechua case marker *-ta*. Feature-specifying standard clitics follow a semantic strategy distinguishing unambiguously between indirect and direct object in anaphoric agreement and subject to Kayne's Generalization, in grammatical agreement. As shown above, River Plate (Silva-Corvalán 1995; Estigarribia 2005) and Limeño Spanish (Mayer 2003, 2006; Sánchez 2005) varieties show the first reanalysis processes in terms of liberal direct object CLD marking highly topical direct objects. This constitutes a first move from semantic object marking strategies to pragmatically motivated object marking in contact clitics. As previously mentioned, contact fast-tracks inherent changes in clitics through a reanalysis process from feature-specifying agreement markers to featureless object markers. In that respect, the Quechua topic marker *-qa* plays an important role in the Peruvian Andes. Finally, a glimpse of an endpoint is the extensive *leísmo* in Ecuador –also in Paraguay, in contact with Guaraní– where *lo* survives as a propositional anaphor in certain regions, e.g. in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish (Suñer and Yépez 1988; Haboud 1998; Palacios 2002).

4.2. The role of secondary topic and its relation to primary object

We link *strange lo* to the pragmatic notion of secondary topic marking (TOP2) following a new DOM theory by Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2007). As the exponent of TOP2, this featureless and invariant form cross-references animate and inanimate objects in LSCV that are topic-worthy (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva, 2007). The notion of topic here is restricted to sentence or clause topics, including topical participants; it does not extend to discourse topics (Lambrecht 1994). In defining sentence topic as "the thing which the proposition expressed by the sentence is about" (Lambrecht 1994: 118), and in taking the communicative context into account, the 'aboutness' relation combines the topic referent and the object referent and the resulting propositions in a given discourse.

The pragmatic notion of *secondary topic* is based on an opposition of direct and indirect argument functions active in many languages. Based on the assumption that the subject is the primary topic, Givón (1983) proposed the term *secondary*

¹⁰ The distinction between oblique and indirect object is debatable.

¹¹ For more evidence for that see Allen (1995) on the gradual loss of dative experiencer subjects from Old to Early Modern English and Allen (2000) for a gradual shift from OV to VO in Early Middle English.

topic for the grammatically marked direct object. Based on work on Ostyak, Nikolaeva (2001: 26) defines the secondary topic as "an entity such that the utterance is construed to be ABOUT the relationship between it and the primary topic". In a new DOM theory, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2007) analyze the differences between marked and unmarked objects as different information structures expressed in syntactic terms representing two different grammatical functions. According to their theory, marking is preferred "in contexts where the object is salient and the utterance updates the addressee's knowledge about the relationship that holds between the subject and the object referents" (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2007: 37). In these terms, marked direct objects in some languages can be analyzed as the primary object and the secondary topic.

Crucial for the distinction between TOP and TOP2 in LSCV is the resulting implication that TOP can be either the subject or another grammatical relation in the proposition.

Another important distinction is the difference between natural topicality (Croft 1991) and topic-worthiness (Comrie 2003). The former reflects the pragmatic relation between the referent and the proposition, and the latter represents the potential to become a topic by the degree of pragmatic saliency they show for the interlocutors. Specifically highly agentive subjects are in charge of monitoring the close relationship between primary and secondary topic (see Givón 1976; Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2007), in other words, topic-worthiness depends on the primary topic's selection to specifically mark the strong relationship between itself and the object, a strategy also known as double actant marking (Bossong 2003). The distinction between TOP and TOP2 constructions is shown in examples (16) and (17).

TOP or topical constructions in liberal CLD standard varieties such as River Plate in (16a) and Limeño standard Spanish in (16b) differ from TOP2 constructions in several ways. Liberal CLD extends to inanimates and quantifiers albeit with feature specifying clitics as agreement markers; these constructions are part of syntactic functions and have also made their way into written language:

- (16) a. La frío a la cebolla
 DOCL.FSG fry (D)OM DET.FSG onion.FSG
 'I fry the onion'
 (River Plate Spanish, Rodríguez Louro pc)
- b. No lo vieron a nadie en esta playa [-spec]
 not DOCL.MSG saw OM nobody PREP DEMONSTR.FSG beach
 'They didn't see anyone on this beach'
 (Limeño Standard Spanish, Mayer 2010: 96)¹²

¹² See also Merma Molina (2007: 223).

Secondary topics in LSCV, as shown in (17a) and (17b), are referents that are more marked; they show [$\pm$ DOM] and the featureless form *lo*, as part of object marking morphology:

- (17) a. Lo frío a la cebolla
 DOCL.MSG fry (D)OM DET.FSG onion.FSG
 'I fry the onion'
 (LSCV, Mayer 2010: 210)
- b. No, y no lo pronunciaba bien la erre
 no and no DOCL.MSG pronounce well DET.FSG I.FSG
 'No, and (s)he did not pronounce well the letter <I>'
 (LSCV Mayer, fieldwork, 2006)

Secondary topics or TOP2 also show a very close relationship to the primary topic, and they are the central point of attention of the primary topic (see Bossong 2003 for his description of double actant marking). TOP2 are never new information (that is, they are not FOC), and they are the targets of several actions performed by the primary topic: they are activities, events or goals accompanied by body language (gestures for example); the attention shifts between primary and secondary topic with an intent to assure concentration on the object (the secondary topic) that is talked about, worked with, etc. The expression of secondary topics as illustrated above is attested in oral communication rather than in written language; it is very much part of oral language in contact. Independent justification for these pragmatic structures comes from extensive research in Peruvian Andean Spanish and Quechua (Weber 1989, 1993; Cerrón-Palomino 2003, among many others), where TOP2 marking can be linked to contact with Quechua. The next section provides some evidence of the role of contact in the general evolution of the pronominal system in this part of the Spanish-speaking world.

5. The role of contact

The remaining question to answer is the role contact plays in relation to secondary topic marking in the Peruvian Andes and in extensive *leísmo* in Ecuadorian Andean Spanish.

5.1. Early attestations of contact effects on pronouns

The literature on the contact effects on the pronominal system of Andean (Ecuadorian/Peruvian) Spanish is extensive, particularly on the simplification of 3rd person pronoun features (Palacios 1998, 2006; Cerrón Palomino 2003).

In the case of extensive use of *leísmo* with doubling, early evidence in texts produced by bilingual speakers is found in Guamán Poma's *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno* (1615).¹³ Notice the use of *le* for direct object and with plural referents in (18a) and (18b); as well as the use of DOM with inanimate objects in (19c), where the direct object is a corpse:

- (18) a. y le mató a los susodichos dos ermanos Topa Amaro, Uari Tito Ynga
and IOCL.MSG killed DOM the said two brothers Topa Amaro, Uari Tito Ynka
'And he killed the aforementioned two brothers Topa Amaro, Uari Tito Ynka'
b. Dizen que aquello le espantó al Ynga y a los
Say that that IOCL.MSG frightened DOM.the.MSG Inka and DOM.DET.MPL
yndios questauan en los dichos baños de Caxamarca
Indians that.were in the said baths of Cajamarca
'They say that that frightened the Inka and the Indians that were in the aforementioned baths of Cajamarca'
c. Y aci le uenció y le prendió al cuerpo de Uascar Ynga
and thus IOCL.MSG defeated and IOCL.MSG grabbed DOM.DET.MSG body of Uascar Inka
'And thus he defeated him and grabbed Uascar Inka's body'

It is also possible to find early evidence of the special use of *lo* in texts written by bilingual speakers (Rivarola 2000):

- (19) a. an benido juntos, lo están en vna misma casa
have come together DOCL.NEUT are in a same house
'They have come together; they are in the same house'
(*Memorial que presenta el fiscal Agustín Capcha*, Nov 14th 1662, 17th c.)
(Rivarola 2000: 77)
b. y que a esto lo dixo su dicha mugger
and that to this DOCL.NEUT said his said wife
'And to this answered his wife'
(*Memorial que presenta el fiscal Agustín Capcha*, Nov 20th 1662, 17th c.)
(Rivarola 2000: 85)

Equivalent examples of these special uses of clitics *le(s)* and *lo(s)* are attested in the chronicle written by the bilingual speaker Juan Santa Cruz Pachacuti (17th c.), particularly rich in contexts of doubling, which Palacios (1998: 137, 139) analyzes as evidence of the grammatical role of *le/lo* as agreement objective morphology. For Palacios the bilingualism of Santa Cruz Pachacuti (Quechua/Spanish) is an important cause behind the attested pronominal system, favored nevertheless by the pre-existing pronominal flexibility attested in old Spanish (Palacios 1998: 142). The transmission of Quechua patterns of object duplication morphology into Spanish by Quechua native speakers with Span-

ish as L2 and the syntactic possibilities of the old language provide, according to Palacios (1998: 143), a basis for the initial steps in the simplification of the pronominal system of the Andes. In any case, contact was a necessary mechanism for this change.

5.2. Fossilization of *lo* in the Peruvian Andes

The lack of 3rd person object clitics in Quechua is generally assumed to be the reason for the apparent free variation of 3rd person clitics in the Peruvian Andean region. Camacho and Sánchez (2002: 37) show in an OT framework that competing case in both grammars allows for permeability and transfer concluding that "dialects in contact with Quechua can simplify either in favor of the dative or the accusative". On the other hand we have a fossilized clitic *lo* which we analyzed as secondary topic marker in the previous section.

The comparison of the Quechua topic marker *-qa* and the TOP2 marker *lo* is given in Table 2:

PROPERTIES	<i>lo</i>	<i>-qa</i>
phonologically dependent	yes	yes
specific locality conditions	yes	yes
co-occurrence with case marker	yes	yes
multiple occurrence	no	yes
grammatical agreement	yes	yes
head-marking	yes	yes
cataphoric reference	yes	yes
no object drop	yes	no

Table 2. Quechua and LSCV TOP makers

Adjacency conditions for both are specific and different as to the host category; however, both are restricted to main clause constituents only; *-qa* can attach to a number of syntactic categories which *lo* cannot use as a host; both can co-occur with a case marker. Both are part of grammatical agreement and, as cataphoric agreement, point towards the relevance of the subject and object and their relationship in the context. By that Weber (1989: 404) addresses "the set of propositions that the speaker assumes the hearer to know at the point at which he says the sentence." Weber emphasizes the high frequency of use of *-qa* in folktales as opposed to a low one in personal narratives, ascribing this to the pointing effect when shifting speakers and events. This is the reason for the cataphoric reading in the chart.

¹³ The Guamán Poma Website: <www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/info/en/frontpage.htm>.

The high degree of affinity between the Quechua topic marker *-qa* and the LSCV TOP2 marker *lo* as shown in Table 2 is illustrated in the following examples.¹⁴ Primary topics in (20) are morphologically marked and stay in situ. LSCV monotransitive clauses such as (17a) are very similar in extending DOM to topic inanimates, whereas standard Spanish restricts DOM to specific and animate objects except for topicalization purposes:

- (20) Wasi hunt's-ta riku-ni
house full.ACC see.1SG
'I see a full house'
(Lefebvre and Muysken 1988: 105)

Co-occurrence of the TOP marker *-qa* and the object marker *-ta* is restricted to main clause constituents in (21):

- (21) Hatun wasi-ta-qa muna-:
big house-ACC-TOP want.1SG
'I want a big house'
(Weber 1989: 395)

Secondary topics as in (22) can appear either on the right or on the left periphery of the verb, and co-occurrence of a co-indexed lexical pronoun and the case marker *-ta* in the same clause is constrained to the pronoun in topic position. This is very similar to LSCV TOP2 marking and can be linked to double actant marking (Bossong 2003):

- (22) Hamu-q warma-(ta)-qa, Santiyagu riku-n
come.a girl.(ACC).TOP Santiago see.3
'Santiago sees the girl that is coming'
(Lefebvre and Muysken 1988: 138)

The typological differences, and even more so, the similarities of both languages are of particular importance with regard to argument marking and potential transfer via Andean Spanish to LSCV. Hence, we can assume that prolonged contact has facilitated innovative structures through lexical and semantic borrowings, yielding a specialized pragmatic strategy appropriate for communication in a multilingual environment.

¹⁴ For the compilation of the Quechua parameters we relied on Weber's (1989) grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua.

5.3. Extensive leísmo under contact

The main extra-linguistic difference between Peru and Ecuador in relation to contact is the fact that Cuzco, home to administrative offices and as such to highly educated standard Spanish speakers, was exposed to European Spanish and Andean Spanish for centuries. This was not the case in Ecuador; however, in both countries contact with Spanish was mainly mediated by Andean Spanish.¹⁵ Under extensive leísmo in Ecuadorian Andean Spanish the THEME object in (23a) receives primary and secondary agreement¹⁶ and fulfills all the requirements for primary objecthood including passivization in (23b):

- (23) a. Ya le veo a la camioneta
already IOCL.SG see OM DET.FSG minibus.FSG
'I can already see the minibus'
(Ecuador, Suárez and Yépez 1988: 512)
b. La camioneta es vista (por mí)
DET.FSG minibus.FSG is.3SG seen (PREP me)
'The minibus is seen by me'
(Haboud, pc)

These apparent ungrammatical phenomena are based on two concurrent and independent processes: the constant evolution of DOM and the reanalysis process of clitics, as visualized in table 3:

STAGE	I	II	III
DOM	ANIM/DEF	SPEC/TOP	OM
	TOP	→	TOP2/→ ±DAT
CLD	Agr PRO	Agr PRO	lo/le/ → le

Table 3. Three stages of DOM and CLD evolution

Standard Spanish is representative for stage I. Liberal clitic doubling varieties (non-contact varieties such as River Plate and Standard Limeño) for stage II. The final stage III shows the transient (and maybe fossilized) state of non-standardized contact varieties such as LSCV and also non-standard River Plate. Stage III also shows the struggle for primary object status through TOP2 marking.

¹⁵ According to Muysken (1984), the most plausible explanation for the lack of fossilized *lo* in Ecuador is a crucial syntactic difference in subject-predicate agreement between Southern Quechua spoken in Peru and Ecuadorian Quichua. Whereas Southern Quechua shows agreement, Ecuadorian Quichua lacks it.

¹⁶ Primary agreement here refers to DOM and secondary agreement to CLD.

ing and the co-variation of *leísmo* and *strange lo*. The arrows point to varieties exhibiting *extensive leísmo*, such as Quiteño and Paraguayan Spanish, where the single case clitic paradigm signals completed change.

6. Conclusion

The variation found in non-standardized varieties of Peruvian contact Spanish shows a combination of archaic features, continuing on from old Spanish, and "peculiar" innovations which can be related to extra-linguistic factors such as remoteness, high levels of illiteracy and under-education. The intra-linguistic factors involved include the well-known diachronic variation of the clitic paradigm (the struggle between DAT and ACC), and extended DOM regulated by pragmatic strategies taking precedence over semantic strategies (as opposed to River Plate Spanish and other such varieties, where semantic restrictions are very much in place). The effects of primary contact between Spanish and Amerindian languages gave rise to Andean Spanish. Today's Peruvian Spanish contact varieties are the result of additional contact between Andean Spanish and Standard Peruvian Spanish.

In terms of morphosyntax, clitics turned into morphological agreement markers (via feature loss) have evolved into topicality and transitivity markers (mere object markers, thus [-referential]) denoting secondary topics. Furthermore, CLD as a secondary topic/OM construction does not necessarily show *a*, which is optional once the 'clitic' becomes the OM and thus makes DOM *a* redundant. In this sense, we find that, contra Kayne (1975), there is no need for DOM *a* for doubling; in contrast, "regular" CLD falls under Kayne's generalization.

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, C. (1995). *Case-Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ALLEN, C. (2000). "On the development of a friend of mine". In T. Fanego, Teresa, M. J. López-Couso, and J. Pérez Guerra (eds.), *English Historical Syntax and Morphology. Selected papers from 11 ICEHL*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 23-41.
- ALSINA, A. (1996). *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar. Evidence from Romance*. Stanford: CSLI.
- BELLO, A. (1984). *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*. Madrid: EDAF.
- BRESNAN, J. (1998). "Morphology Competes with Syntax: Explaining Typological Variation in Weak Crossover Effects". In P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. McGinnis, and D. Pesetsky (eds.), *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press and MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, pp. 59-92.
- BRESNAN, J. (2001). *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- BOSSONG, G. (1991). "Differential Object Marking in Romance and Beyond". In D. Wanner, and D. A. Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 143-185.
- BOSSONG, G. (2003). "Nominal and/or Verbal Marking of Central Actants". In G. Fiorentino (ed.), *Romance Objects. Transitivity in Romance Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 17-49.
- CAMACHO, J./SÁNCHEZ, L. (2002). "Explaining Clitic Variation in Spanish". In M. Amberber, and P. Collins (eds.), *Language Universals and Variation*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, pp. 21-41.
- CERRÓN-PALOMINO, R. (2003). *Castellano Andino. Aspectos sociolingüísticos, pedagógicos y gramaticales*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- COMPANY, C. (2001). "Multiple Dative-Marking Grammaticalization. Spanish as a Special Kind of Primary Object Language". In *Studies in Language* 25, 1, pp. 1-47.
- COMPANY, C. (2003). "Transitivity and Grammaticalization of Object. The Struggle of Direct and Indirect Object in Spanish". In G. Fiorentino (ed.), *Romance Objects. Transitivity in Romance Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 217-260.
- COMRIE, B. (2003). "When agreement gets trigger-happy". In *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101, 2, pp. 313-337.
- CROFT, W. (1991). *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- CROFT, W. (2000). *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*. London: Longman.
- DALRYMPLE, M./NIKOLAEVA, I. (2007). *Topicality and Nonsubject marking: Agreement, Casemarking and Grammatical Function*. ms. Oxford University.
- ESTIGARRIBIA, B. (2005). "Why Clitic Doubling? A Functional Analysis for Rioplatense Spanish". In M. Butt, and T. Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, pp. 116-135.
- FERNÁNDEZ-ORDÓÑEZ, I. (1993). "Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo: estado de la cuestión". In O. Fernández Soriano (ed.), *Los pronombres átonos*. Madrid: Taurus, pp. 63-96.
- FERNÁNDEZ-ORDÓÑEZ, I. (1999). "Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo". In: I. Bosque, and V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 1317-1397.
- FRANCO, J. A. (2000). "Agreement as a Continuum. The Case of Spanish Pronominal Clitics". In F. Beukema, and M. den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 147-190.
- GIVÓN, T. (1976). "Topic, Pronoun, and Grammatical Agreement". In C. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 149-188.
- GIVÓN, T. (ed.) (1983). *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GREENBERG, J. H. (ed.) (1966). *Universals of Language*. 2nd edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- GUAMÁN POMA, F. (1615). *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*, available at: www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/info/en/frontpage.htm
- HABOUD, M. (1998). *Quichua y castellano en los Andes ecuatorianos. Los efectos de un contacto prolongado*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- VON HEUSINGER, K./KAISER, G. (2005). "The evolution of differential object marking in Spanish". In K. von Heusinger et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop "Specificity and the Evolution/Emergence of Nominal Determination Systems in Romance"*, Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, pp. 33-70.
- JOSEPH, B./JANDA, R. (eds.) (2003). *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- KAYNE, R. (1975). *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- KIPARSKY, P. (1998). "Partitive case and aspect". In M. Butt, and W. Geuder (eds.), *Projecting from the Lexicon*. Stanford: CSLI, pp. 265-307.
- KROCH, Anthony (1994). "Morphosyntactic Variation". In K. Beals et al. (eds.), *Papers from the 30th Regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society: Parasession on Variation and Linguistic Theory*. Available at: <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~kroch/>
- LACA, B. (2006). "El objeto directo. La marcación preposicional". In C. Company (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española*. Vol. 1. México DF: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, pp. 421-475.
- LAMBRECHT, K. (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LAPESA, R. (2000). *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- LEFEBVRE, C./MUYSKEN, P. (1988). *Mixed Categories. Nominalizations in Quechua. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- MAYER, E. (2003). *Clitic Doubling in Limeño. A Case Study in LFG*. MA Ling thesis, Canberra, Australian National University.
- MAYER, E. (2006). "Optional Direct Object Clitic Doubling in Limeño Spanish". In M. Butt, and T. Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. 328-342.
- MAYER, E. (2008). "Clitics on the Move: from Dependent Marking to Split Marking". In M. Butt, and T. Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. 352-372.
- MAYER, E. (2010). *Syntactic variation of object arguments in Limeño Spanish contact varieties*. PhD dissertation, Canberra, Australian National University.
- MELIS, C. (1995). "El objeto directo personal en el Cantar de Mio Cid: estudio sintáctico-pragmático". In: C. Pensado (ed.), *El complemento directo preposicional*. Madrid: Visor, pp. 133-163.
- MERMA MOLINA, G. (2007). *Contacto lingüístico entre el español y el Quechua: un enfoque cognitivo-pragmático de las transferencias morfosintácticas en el español andino peruano*. PhD dissertation, Universidad de Alicante.

- MUYSKEN, P. (1984). "The Spanish that Quechua Speakers Learn: L2 Learning as Norm-governed Behaviour". In R. W. Andersen (ed.), *Second Languages: a Crosslinguistic Perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 101-119.
- NICHOLS, J. (1986). "Head-Marking and Dependent-Marking Grammar". In *Language* 62, 1, pp. 56-119.
- NIKOLAeva, I. (2001). "Secondary Topic as a Relation in Information Structure". In *Linguistics* 39, pp. 1-49.
- PALACIOS, A. (1998). "Santacruz Pachacuti y la falsa pronominalización del español andino". In *Lexis* 22, 2, pp. 119-146.
- PALACIOS, A. (2002). "Leísmo y loísmo en el español ecuatoriano: el sistema pronominal del español andino". In E. Hopkins Rodríguez (ed.), *Homenaje al Dr. Luis Jaime Cisneros, vol. I*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, pp. 389-408.
- PALACIOS, A. (2005). "Aspectos teóricos y metodológicos del contacto de lenguas: el sistema pronominal del español en áreas de contacto con lenguas amerindias". In: V. Noll, K. Zimmermann, and I. Neumann-Holzschuh (eds.), *El español en América: Aspectos teóricos, particularidades, contactos*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, pp. 63-94.
- PALACIOS, A. (2006). "Cambios inducidos por contacto en el español de la sierra ecuatoriana: la simplificación de los sistemas pronominales (procesos de neutralización y elisión)". In *Tópicos del seminario* 15, pp. 197-229.
- PENSADO, C. (1995). "La creación del complemento directo preposicional y la flexión de los pronombres personales en las lenguas románicas". In C. Pensado (ed.), *El complemento directo preposicional*. Madrid: Visor, pp. 179-233.
- PENSADO, C. (ed.) (1995). *El complemento directo preposicional*. Madrid: Visor
- REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA (1985). *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- RITTER, E./ROSEN, S.T. (2001). "The Interpretive Value of Object Agreement". In *Language Sciences* 23, 425-451.
- RIVAROLA, J. L. (2000). *Español andino. Textos bilingües de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- RIVERO, M. L. (1986). "Parameters in the Typology of Clitics in Romance and Old Spanish". In *Language* 62, pp. 774-807.
- SÁNCHEZ, L. (2005). "Clitic-Doubling and the Checking of Focus". Rutgers University, unpublished manuscript. Available at: http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~lsanchez/researchprojects/Focus_doubling.pdf
- SILVA-CORVALÁN, C. (ed.) (1995). *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- SUÑER, M. (1988). "The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions". In *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory* 6, 3, pp. 391-434.
- SUÑER, M./YÉPEZ, M. (1988). "Null Definite Objects in Quiteño". In *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, pp. 511-519.
- TORREGO, E. (1999). "El complemento directo preposicional". In I. Bosque, and V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 1779-1806.

WEBER, D. J. (1989). *A Grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

WEBER, D. J. (1993). *The Binding Properties of Quechua Suffixes*. Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics vol. 37. Grand Forks, ND: University of North Dakota.

BORROWED CLAUSE COMBINING PATTERNS IN TWO ARAWAKAN LANGUAGES – BAURE AND PAUNAKA

SWINTHA DANIELSEN AND LENA TERHART
University of Leipzig

1. Introduction

Baure and Paunaka are two Bolivian Arawakan languages, both seriously endangered and currently being documented by the authors. Both languages have undergone long-term Spanish contact since the colonization of Bolivia and for both linguistic communities Spanish is the dominant means of communication. Nevertheless, we find important differences between the two languages when it comes to strategies of clause combining. While in Baure, TMA affixes on the predicates provide clues on how the semantic connection between clauses is to be understood, Paunaka hardly makes use of this strategy. Nominalization plays a role to mark subordinate verbs in Baure, whereas in Paunaka there is a specialized verbal affix to indicate subordinate verbs. And last, but not least, Paunaka frequently employs connectives borrowed from Spanish, where Baure uses native particles and applies them on a Spanish syntactic model. In this paper, we compare the different strategies used in the two languages. We argue that the loss of TMA marking on the predicates, the frequent employment of connectives, and most obviously, the use of borrowed connectives in Paunaka is due to contact-induced change. We then try to give an explanation as to why two very closely related languages in a similar contact scenario re-structured their systems of clause combining strategies differently.

This chapter is structured as follows: first, the sociolinguistic settings of Baure and Paunaka are described and the general terminology concerning clause combining is introduced (Section 2). In Section 3, the different clause combining patterns found in Baure are illustrated and compared, with respect to more native constructions (3.1) that are still in use today, and clause combining constructions that have been modelled on Spanish syntax (3.2). In 3.3, the role of Spanish contact on Baure is summarized. In Section 4, Paunaka clause combining constructions are illustrated, again first focusing on native patterns (4.1) and then moving to construction borrowed from Spanish (4.2). The process of continuing replacement of

- HOCKETT, C. (1958). *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- HYMES, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- HUDSON, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GUMPERZ, J. (1982). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LABOV, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- LYONS, J. (ed.), (1970). *New Directions in Linguistics*. London: Penguin.
- WARDHAUGH, R. (2009). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (5th ed.). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cyber-group:

<http://foro.univision.com/t5/El-Gordo-y-La-Flaca/bd-p/elgordoyflac>

CONTRIBUTORS

Hilary Barnes

Hilary Barnes is an Assistant Professor of Spanish at the College of Charleston in Charleston, South Carolina. She received her B.A. in Spanish and Hispanic Cultures from Juniata College, and her M.A. and Ph.D. in Spanish Linguistics from the Pennsylvania State University. Her areas of interest include language contact, sociolinguistics, bilingualism, language maintenance, language and identity, and language attitudes. She continues to visit and conduct fieldwork in Chipilo and is currently collecting data for projects focusing on Chipilo Veneto.

Swintha Danielsen

Swintha Danielsen studied English linguistics, Philosophy, and Mathematics at the University of Hanover, Germany. She is now a linguistic researcher, who has worked with Arawakan languages since 2003. Having completed her doctoral thesis on the Bolivian Arawakan language Baure in 2007, she held a number of documentation and analytic corpus projects, at the University of Leipzig. She is interested in Bolivian indigenous languages and language contact phenomena worldwide.

Manuel Delicado Cantero

Manuel Delicado Cantero is Lecturer of Spanish at the Australian National University. His research focuses on Spanish and Romance formal syntax, both synchronic and diachronic, with particular attention to prepositional finite clauses and dialect syntax. He is also working on a collaborative project on Spanish pronunciation teaching and learning in Australia. He is the author of *Prepositional Clauses in Spanish. A Diachronic and Comparative Syntactic Study* (De Gruyter 2013).

Manuel Díaz-Campos

Manuel Díaz-Campos is an Associate Professor of Hispanic Sociolinguistics at Indiana University, Bloomington. He has published on the acquisition of sociolinguistic variables in L1, sociolinguistic variation, acquisition of second language phonology, and topics in Spanish laboratory phonology. He is especially interested in phonological variation in child and adult language as well as in the acquisition

of second language phonology by native speakers of English learning Spanish. His research appears in notable journals such as *Language in Society*, *Probus*, *Lingua*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Spanish in Context*, *Hispania* among others. He is the editor of the *Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2011) and *Introducción a la Sociolingüística Hispánica* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2014).

Ana María Díaz Collazos

Ana María Díaz Collazos is a Visiting Assistant Professor at the College of Wooster. She holds a Ph.D. in Hispanic Linguistics from the University of Florida, and an M.A. in Spanish linguistics from the Instituto Caro y Cuervo (Bogotá, Colombia). Her research interests are quantitative sociolinguistics, historical linguistics, dialectology, discourse analysis and lexicography in the Spanish speaking world. She currently focuses on the sociolinguistic history of terms of address in the Spanish of Colombia. She is the author of *Desarrollo sociolingüístico del voseo en la región andina de Colombia* (De Gruyter, 2015).

Verónica González López

Verónica González López is Assistant Professor of Spanish Linguistics at the Arizona State University. Dr. González López holds an undergraduate degree in English Philology from the University of Oviedo, Spain; a M.A. degree in Hispanic Linguistics from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst; and a Ph.D. in Hispanic Linguistics from the Pennsylvania State University. Her research interests lie primarily in L2 and bilingual phonology and syntax. In particular, she studies the syntactic mechanisms that underlie the Spanish morphosyntactic system, and apply current theories to explain the syntactic and phonological structural outcomes in both early and late bilinguals. In addition, she conducts research that examines how gender, power, and prestige affect the construction of individual and group identity in bilingual and multilingual enclaves. This area of her research is included in a larger frame that explores, compares, and contrasts Spanish as a minority language (e.g. Spanish in the US) and as an official or "de facto" language (e.g. Spanish in Asturias).

Melvin González-Rivera

Melvin González-Rivera is an Associate Professor of Linguistics in the Department of Hispanic Studies at the University of Puerto Rico-Mayagüez. He specializes in syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and their interface in grammar, with an emphasis on Caribbean Spanish.

Stefan Th. Gries

Stefan Th. Gries is currently (Full) Professor of Linguistics in the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB), Honor-

ary Liebig-Professor of the Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen (since September 2011), and Visiting Chair (2013-2018) of the Centre for Corpus Approaches to Social Science at Lancaster University (since August 2013). He earned his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Hamburg, Germany in 1998 and 2000. He was at the Department of Business Communication and Information Science of the University of Southern Denmark at Sønderborg (1998-2005), first as a lecturer, then as Assistant Professor and tenured Associate Professor; during that time, he also taught English linguistics part-time at the Department of British and American Studies of the University of Hamburg. In 2005, he spent 10 months as a visiting scholar in the Psychology Department of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany, before he accepted a position at UCSB, starting November 1, 2005. Gries was a Visiting Professor at the 2007, 2011, and 2013 LSA Linguistic Institutes at Stanford University, the University of Colorado at Boulder, and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach

Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach is Professor of Spanish and Linguistics at The Ohio State University. His areas of interest are in semantics, syntax, pragmatics, and their interfaces. He is the author/editor of *Interfaces and Domains of Quantification* (OSU Press, forthcoming), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Spanish Linguistics* (forthcoming), *Semantics: Critical Concepts* (Routledge, 2004), *From Words to Discourse* (Springer, 2002), *Conceptual Structure and Social Change* (Prager, 2002), *Meaning and the Components of Grammar* (Lincom, 2002). He has published more than one hundred articles and book chapters in journals such as *Lingua*, *Probus*, *Journal of Semantics*, *International Review of Pragmatics*, *Language & Linguistics Compass*, *Folia Linguistica*, etc.

Shaw Nicholas Gynan

Shaw Nicholas Gynan was born in 1954 in the United States. He holds an undergraduate degree in languages from Georgetown University, an MA in Spanish from the University of Texas at El Paso and a PhD in Ibero-Romance Philology and Linguistics from the University of Texas at Austin. Gynan has published a number of articles and books on sociolinguistic aspects of Paraguayan bilingualism. Gynan teaches Spanish language and linguistics and is the world languages teaching endorsement advisor at Western Washington University.

Delano S. Lamy

Delano S. Lamy is an Assistant Professor of Spanish Linguistics at the Universidad de Puerto Rico - Río Piedras. His main research interests are in phonological/phonetic variation and change and topics in language contact and bilingualism. He is currently researching phonetic variation and change among Creole English-Spanish bilinguals of West Indian origin living in various regions of Panama.

John M. Lipski

John M. Lipski is Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Spanish Linguistics in the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese at the Pennsylvania State University. His research interests include Spanish phonology, Spanish and Portuguese dialectology and language variation, the linguistic aspects of bilingualism, and the African contribution to Spanish and Portuguese. His books include *Linguistic aspects of Spanish-English language switching*; *The Spanish of Equatorial Guinea*; *Fonética y fonología del español de Honduras*; *El español de Malabo*; *Latin American Spanish*; *The language of the Isleños of Louisiana*; *The speech of the Negros Congos of Panama*; *El español de América*; *El español en síntesis* [with the late Eduardo Neale-Silva]; *A history of Afro-Hispanic language*; *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*; *Afro-Bolivian Spanish*; *El habla de los Congos de Panamá en el contexto de la lingüística afrohispanica*.

Ernesto Luís López Almada

Ernesto Luís López Almada was born in 1979 in Paraguay. He holds undergraduate degrees in Guaraní-Spanish Bilingualism and English Language from the National University of Itapúa. López Almada wrote one of his senior theses on Proficiency of Guaraní Speakers in the Department of Itapúa. López Almada teaches English language and literature at the National University of Asunción, where he is also the coordinator of research in the Division of Research and Extended Education.

Carlos Marino Lugo Bracho

Carlos Marino Lugo Bracho was born in 1951 in Paraguay. He holds a degree in accounting and the MBA from Catholic University of Asunción, as well as an undergraduate degree in Guaraní from the National University of Asunción. Lugo Bracho wrote his senior thesis on Lexical Interference of Spanish on Guaraní. He is Dean of the business college at the Intercontinental Technical University in Asunción and also teaches in National University of Asunción's Guaraní program.

María Eva Mansfeld de Agüero

María Eva Mansfeld de Agüero was born in 1953 in Paraguay. She holds elementary and Guaraní teaching degrees, an undergraduate degree in Guaraní (from the National University of Asunción), a Masters in Educational Science and a Doctorate in Educational Administration (from the National University of Itapúa). Mansfeld de Agüero wrote her dissertation on Language Attitudes and Proficiency of Educators in Rural Paraguay. Mansfeld de Agüero is currently a member of the Academy of the Guaraní Language and teaches in the National University of Asunción's Guaraní program.

Patrick-André Mather

Patrick-André Mather is Professor of French and Linguistics at the University of Puerto Rico. He has authored many articles and book chapters on sociophonetics,

creole studies, foreign language teaching, and language policy and planning. In addition to his research projects, he has taught French, English, linguistics and translation at McGill University, the University of Ottawa, the University of Pittsburgh, and the City University of New York (CUNY). In 2009-2010, he was a Visiting Scholar at New York University.

Elisabeth Mayer

Elisabeth Mayer is a Lecturer in Spanish and Hispanic Linguistics in the School of Literature, Languages and Linguistics at the Australian National University, Canberra. Her research interests include language variation and change, dialect syntax in Andean Spanish in rural and urban areas in contact with Standard Spanish, Quechua and other Amerindian languages, second language/dialect acquisition and bilingualism. She has published in the areas morphosyntactic variation, change and information structure of clitic pronominal systems in monolingual and bilingual Andean Spanish contact varieties.

Antonio Medina-Rivera

Antonio Medina-Rivera is Professor of Spanish and Linguistics at Cleveland State University. He is chairperson of the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, and the executive editor of the open-access Journal of Cultural Encounters, Conflict, and Resolutions. His areas of study include Spanish in the US, Puerto Rican Spanish, US Hispanics Literature, Puerto Rican Literature, and male representation in literature and film.

Jim Michnowicz

Jim Michnowicz is Associate Professor of Spanish at North Carolina State University. His research focuses on language and dialect contact, as well as linguistic expressions of identity. His publications have examined the contact between Maya and Spanish in Yucatan, as well as that standardization of Yucatan Spanish via contact with other varieties. Along with co-authors, he has also published on pronouns of address and questions of identity in Chile, El Salvador and Costa Rica, as well as language contact in central Mexico.

Viola G. Miglio

Viola G. Miglio is currently Associate Professor of Linguistics and Barandiaran Endowed Chair of Basque Studies in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). She has M.A.s in Germanic Philology from the University of Edinburgh (1989) and the University of Bologna (1993), and an M.A. & Ph.D. in Linguistics from the University of Maryland (1997, 1999). She taught English and Romance linguistics at the University of Iceland (1997-2002), before accepting a position at UCSB (2002). She was a visiting professor at U.N.A.M. University, Mexico, and Bologna Uni-

versity, Italy, in 2001, at the University of Iceland (2005-6), at Boise State University (2009, 2011, 2013), and taught a workshop on Linguistic Diversity at the LSA Linguistic Institute at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in July 2013. She has published a number of articles on Hispanic linguistics, a book on *Interactions between Markedness and Faithfulness Constraints in Vowel Systems* (Routledge 2005, reprint 2012), and is co-editor with Xabier Irujo of the books *The Protection of Cultural Diversity* (published by the Center for Basque Studies/University of Nevada Press, in press), and *Basque Whalers in the North Atlantic* (Strandagaldur, Iceland, 2013).

Rafael Orozco

Rafael Orozco (Ph.D. New York University) is Associate Professor of Spanish Linguistics and Director of the Interdepartmental Program in Linguistics at Louisiana State University. Teaching and research interests include sociolinguistics, Colombian Spanish, Caribbean Spanish, Spanish in the United States and perceptual attitudes in/toward Spanish. Editor of *New Directions in Hispanic Linguistics* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014); coeditor of *Subject Pronoun Expression in Spanish: A Cross-Dialectal Perspective* (Georgetown, 2015), and *Colombian Varieties of Spanish* (Iberoamericana, 2012). His work has appeared in journals such as *Spanish in Context*, *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana (RILI)*, and *Lingüística*, as well as in several edited collections.

Ramón E. Padilla-Reyes

Ramón E. Padilla-Reyes was born in San Juan, Puerto Rico. He completed an MA in Philosophy at the University of Puerto Rico and a MA in Hispanic Linguistics at the Ohio State University. During his MA in Philosophy he specialized in Contemporary Philosophy and Philosophy of Language and Logic. As a PhD student at the Ohio State University he is currently working on the Syntax and Semantics of the Puerto Rican Spanish, degree modifiers and pluractionals.

Diego Pascual y Cabo

Diego Pascual y Cabo is Assistant Professor and Director of the Spanish Heritage Language Program in the Department of Classical & Modern Languages & Literatures at Texas Tech University. His primary research interests lie in the areas of heritage speaker bilingualism, second language acquisition, as well as the interface between language and identity. Diego's work has appeared in several scholarly journals, proceedings, and edited volumes.

Yolanda Rivera-Castillo

Yolanda Rivera-Castillo is currently a Professor at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras campus. She has taught at different institutions in the US, and has chaired first-year language programs. Her research interests include the study of

the Papiamentu prosodic system, as well as nasalization and vowel harmony in Papiamentu and other Atlantic Creoles. She has published papers on Creole phonology as well as on the Phonology-Syntax interface.

John Rueda Chaves

John Rueda Chaves is currently a PhD student in Linguistics at El Colegio de México (COLMEX). He is a member of the Research Group of Sociolinguistic Studies of the Caribbean and Spanish America (GIESCAH) at the Universidad de Atlántico, Colombia. He has participated in many research projects, such as, PRE-SEEA, Dispolex, and Languages in Contact in the Colombian Caribbean. He is currently researching language contact between Spanish and Creole on the island of San Andrés.

Sandro Sessarego

Sandro Sessarego is Assistant Professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Texas at Austin. He works primarily in the fields of contact linguistics, sociolinguistics and syntax. He is the author of *Introducción al idioma afroboliviano: Una conversación con el awicho Manuel Barra* (Plural Editores, 2011), *Chota Valley Spanish* (Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2013), *The Afro-Bolivian Spanish Determiner Phrase: A Microparametric Account* (The Ohio State University Press, 2014), and *Afro-Peruvian Spanish: Spanish Slavery and the Legacy of Spanish Creoles* (John Benjamins, 2015).

Lena Terhart

Lena Terhart studied Anthropology of the Americas and Linguistics at the Free University Berlin, Germany, which she completed with an MA thesis on the classifier system of the Baure language in 2010. Now she is a junior linguistic researcher, currently writing her doctoral thesis on the Bolivian Arawakan language Paunaka. She has undertaken fieldwork in Bolivia with the Baure and the Paunaka languages.

Wilfredo Valentín-Márquez

Wilfredo Valentín-Márquez is Assistant Professor of Spanish at Millersville University. He specializes in the sociolinguistic aspects of Puerto Rican Spanish, particularly in the relationship between language and national identity. His research examines phonological variation, youth speech, urban music, and language change.

Avizia Yim Long

Avizia Yim Long is a doctoral student in Hispanic Linguistics at Indiana University. Her research interests include second language acquisition of phonology and morphosyntax and the intersection of second language acquisition and sociolinguistics.