Clitics and argument marking in Shipibo-Spanish and Ashéninka- Perené-Spanish bilingual speech

Liliana Sánchez and Elisabeth Mayer

Rutgers University / The Australian National University

Direct object clitics in Spanish are morphological markers at the interface of syntax and phonology, morphology, semantics and information structure. We explore variability in direct object clitic doubling and argument marking in bilingual speakers of Shipibo-Spanish and Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish (Mayer & Sánchez, 2017b). We focus on the production of the dative versus the accusative forms of the clitic and on the expression of Differential Object Marking (DOM) (Aissen, 2003; Bossong, 1991; Dalrymple & Nikolaeva, 2011), in particular, on the extension of DOM to definite inanimate DPs and the lack of DOM with animate direct objects required in other varieties of Spanish. We analyze this variability as the coexistence of two different argument-marking systems in these contact varieties of Amazonian Spanish.

Keywords: clitic doubling, differential object marking, argument systems, bilingual acquisition, typological differences, Amazonian Spanish

1. Introduction

In this chapter, we explore variability in direct object clitic doubling (CLD) and differential object marking (DOM) in bilingual speakers of Spanish in contact with Shipibo, an ergative language, and Ashéninka-Perené, a nominative-accusative language. We expand on another proposal (Mayer & Sánchez, 2017b) that focused only on the selection of clitic features from a feature pool perspective (Mufwene, 2001) and we incorporate production of DOM to our data on these two varieties of Amazonian Spanish in order to understand how typological differences in case marking have an effect on bilingual Spanish. We investigate the effect of contact between the two typologically different Amazonian languages and Spanish in terms

of (a) the configuration of the functional features case, person, gender and number in clitics, and (b) the configuration of DOM. In a previous study on bilingual Quechua-Spanish and Shipibo-Spanish (Mayer & Sánchez, 2017a) we found evidence of functional convergence and feature reassembly in both groups in clitics and DOM (Matras, 2010; Sánchez, 2003). In this paper, we explore the role of typological differences in case marking between Shipibo, as an ergative language and Ashéninka-Perené as a language with split intransitivity in the emergence of direct object clitic systems in contact Spanish.

Direct object clitics in Spanish are phonologically unstressed bound morphemes, dependent on a verbal host (Spencer & Luís, 2012; Zwicky, 1985, among others). They exhibit variability across time and space and are specifically vulnerable in bilingual acquisition (McCarty, 2008). In all varieties, they are morphological markers at the interface of syntax and several other language components (Belloro, 2007). At the syntax/semantics/information structure interface, direct object clitics participate in anaphoric and grammatical agreement (Bresnan & Mchombo, 1987), with the latter referring to clitic doubling which involves either an indirect or direct object clitic and the marker *a*. Direct object clitic doubling involves a direct object clitic and the marker *a* as differential object marking which has been assumed to follow from Kayne's Generalization (Kayne, 1975; Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, 2008), and is subject to variable conditions. In some varieties of Latin American Spanish that allow clitic doubling, agreement in gender and number between the clitic and the doubled DP (Lipski, 1994; Sánchez, 2010; Suñer, 1988) is required as well as definite and/or specific interpretations of the DP (Bleam, 1999; Leonetti, 2004, 2007; Mayer, 2008). At the level of information structure, clitic doubling structures have been found out to carry a secondary topic interpretation in some contact varieties (Mayer, 2017; Mayer & Sánchez, 2016; Mayer, 2008, 2010, 2017) and a focus interpretation of the DP in non-contact varieties (Di Tullio & Zdrojewski, 2006; Kiss, 1995; Sánchez, 2010). In Example (1), all agreement requirements for liberal clitic doubling dialects such as Lima and Buenos Aires Spanish are met (Sánchez, 2010; Sánchez & Zdrojewski, 2013).

- (1) Sánchez & Zdrojewski (2013, p. 295)

La vi a la chica que conoc-imos en la fiesta
 CL3FSG see-PST.1SG DOM DET.FSG girl that meet-PST.1PL at the party
 'I saw the girl whom we met at the party.'

In this chapter, we focus on two phenomena. Firstly, the production of the dative versus the accusative forms of the direct object doubled clitic among Shipibo (2) and Ashéninka-Perené Spanish speakers including reduplication in the latter group as shown in (3).

- (2) Shipibo Spanish (Sánchez, FW 2002, 2010)
Y le bota al loro
 and CL3SG throw-3SG DOM-DET.3SG parrot
 ‘And he throws the parrot away.’ (S2)
- (3) Ashéninka-Perené Spanish (Mayer, FW 2006)
Pero no lo han podido matarle
 but not CL3MSG have-3PL could kill-INF.CL3SG
 ‘But they were not able to kill him.’ (A2)

Secondly, we explore the expression of Differential Object Marking (DOM) (Aissen, 2003; Bosson, 1991, 2003; Dalrymple & Nikolaeva, 2011) in clitic doubled expressions focusing on the lack of DOM with animate direct objects (4a) and (4b) that are required in other varieties of Spanish.

- (4) Ashéninka-Perené Spanish (Mayer, FW 2006)
- a. *Ingresaron por dos caminos para atacarle* Ø
 enter-PST.3PL through two ways to attack-INF.CL3SG DOM
los Ashaninkas Campas
 DET.MPL Ashaninkas Campas
 ‘They came in through two ways to attack the Ashaninka Campa people.’
- b. Ø *Esos chunches hay que matarles*
 (DOM) those Indians have-IMPERS to kill-INF.CL3PL
 ‘Those Indians have to be killed.’

Based on fieldwork data from Shipibo-Spanish bilinguals and Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilinguals, our findings indicate lack of gender specification that results in both groups favoring *le* over *lo* in clitic doubling structures but with a more pronounced preference for *le* among the Shipibo bilinguals. Both groups also exhibit lack of DOM with animates. We analyze this variability as the coexistence of potentially two different argument-marking systems in each one of these contact varieties of Spanish with Amazonian languages. Our proposal is that contact with Shipibo, an ergative language and contact with Ashéninka-Perené, a split intransitive language, may result in different preferences for clitic selection in Spanish.¹

1. A reviewer points out that it is possible that based on the universal operation *Agree* there is only one agreement system with different lexical items. However, as we show in Table 10 below, there are differences between the two bilingual varieties of Spanish such as doubling with *se* in Shipibo-Spanish but not in Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish. A fact that seems to indicate that there are differences related to contact with typologically different systems.

Differential object marking is a widespread strategy among genetically unrelated languages to mark a selected range of direct objects following language-specific rules (Aissen, 2003; Bossong, 1991, 2003; Dalrymple & Nikolaeva, 2011, among others). As shown in Examples (2)–(4), Spanish obligatorily marks direct objects bearing human and definite features. Optional marking extends to direct objects with animate and specific features interpreted as identifiable or referentially accessible (such as personified animals, etc.). Additionally, inanimate and specific direct objects can receive DOM under certain conditions depending on the dialect, and indefinite non-specific direct objects remain unmarked (Leonetti, 2004, 2007, 2008; Mayer, 2010, 2017; Mayer & Delicado, 2015; von Heusinger, 2003, among others). Direct object clitic doubling and clitic dislocated structures require DOM, a phenomenon known as Kayne's Generalization (Ormazabal & Romero, 2013; Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, 2008; Zdrojewski, 2013, among others). In terms of informational structure, accusative clitics and DOM in doubling structures tend to mark direct objects that are topical or deemed salient by the subject as the primary topic (Dalrymple & Nikolaeva, 2011). This condition is particularly susceptible to variability in acquisitional varieties. This is more likely to be the case in contact scenarios that involve typologically different languages. The complex combination of differentially applied case and feature agreement requires apart from syntactic competence crucially morphological and discourse/pragmatic competence. The bilingual speaker needs to solve the puzzle of reconfiguring formal features that exist in their native language and in UG, and map those on to L2, a process also known as Feature Assembly (Lardiere, 2008). In order to solve the grammar-meaning interface, a widely-accepted assumption in the generative literature is that syntax and semantic competence is straightforward and available from the context, whereas functional morphology is not and it constitutes the Bottleneck of Language Acquisition (Slabakova, 2009).

While there is a large body of literature about clitic acquisition and variability in different contact scenarios (Cuza, Pérez-Leroux & Sánchez, 2013; Escobar, 2011, 2012; Lipski, 2010; Montrul, 2010), previous work on the acquisition of DOM in L1 speakers, heritage speakers and L2 learners is scarce. The findings are that while heritage speaker acquisition of DOM (Montrul, 2004) and monolingual acquisition seem to be largely similar and unproblematic (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, 2008), English-Spanish bilinguals seem to acquire case, but encounter difficulties identifying the person feature in DOM (Guijarro Fuentes, 2011, 2012; Ticio, 2015). A similar result is discussed in the Feature (In)accessibility Hypothesis, which proposes that while structural features such as case (oblique vs. direct) are readily accessible and learnable, 'interpretable' features or object inherent features such as animacy and definiteness/specificity are not equally learnable. Notable is the finding that of those DP inherent features, animacy is easier to acquire – more learnable than

the discourse/pragmatics features definiteness and specificity (Guijarro-Fuentes, 2011, 2012; Lardiere, 2005, 2008). These findings support the Bottleneck Hypotheses (Slabakova, 2009).

In relation to the topic of this chapter, previous work on the bilingual acquisition of clitics and DOM in Amazonian and Andean bilingual varieties has found that there is little difference between Andean and Amazonian Spanish (Caravedo, 1999). Recent work on this topic has identified scalar clitic systems and variable expression of DOM emerging from functional convergence and ecological factors including a complex relationship and interaction of input, education access and contact (Mayer & Sánchez, 2016; Mayer & Sánchez, 2017a). Building on these findings, we investigate in this chapter the similarities and differences in argument marking between the two Amazonian Bilingual Spanish varieties in view of the emergence of multiple evidence of a shared set of features and case marking in contact varieties.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the typological differences in agreement systems and argument marking in Spanish, Shipibo and Ashéninka-Perené. In Section 3, we present the methodology employed, data information and research questions. Section 4 presents the data sets of the Shipibo-Spanish bilinguals and the Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilinguals followed by a discussion of our comparative results in relation to the research questions in (3). In Section 6, we present our proposal for each of the contact varieties analyzed. We end this chapter with concluding remarks in the final section.

2. Argument marking in Spanish, Shipibo and Ashéninka

2.1 Spanish case and object agreement system

Spanish is a nominative-accusative language with optional overt pronominal expression of the nominative subject pronoun in addition to compulsory representation in all transitive and intransitive verbal inflection. Direct object pronouns or clitics are different from subject pronouns and can replace a DP direct object argument as shown in (5).

Anaphoric

- (5) (Ella) *la* *v-io*
 (PRO3FSG) CL3FSG see-PST.3SG
 ‘She saw her.’

Spanish clitics in the previous literature have been analyzed as phonologically unstressed morphological markers bound to the verb (Ordóñez & Repetti, 2006;

Spencer & Luís, 2012; Zwicky, 1985, among others). Clitic features include person and number, with accusative clitics expressing gender, and dative clitics case. They have to be contiguous with their verbal host and can occur as proclitics with finite verbs as shown in (6a) and enclitics in non-finite contexts in (6b):

- (6) a. *Lo /la /le bes-a a él /ella /Juan/Ana*
 CL3MSG/ CL3FSG/ CL3SG kiss-3SG DOM him/her /Juan/Ana
 'S/He kisses him/her/Juan/Ana.'
- b. *Quier-o besarlo/la/le*
 want-1SG kiss-INF.CL3MSG/CL3FSG/CL3SG
 'I want to kiss him/her.'

At the syntactic level, they play an important part in verbal agreement. They have been analyzed as pronominal heads that move (Jaeggli, 1986; Kayne, 1991; Ormazabal & Romero, 2013; Roberts, 1991; Rooryck, 2000; Saab & Zdrojewski, 2010, among others) or as morphological agreement markers between the verb and an internal argument (Suñer, 1988). In clitic doubling constructions (7), clitic left dislocation (8) and clitic right dislocation (9), direct object clitics co-occur with the DOM marker *a*, also known as Kayne's Generalization, creating a complex configuration of grammatical and semantic features. Clitics are subject to feature agreement with the referential DP and to agreement in definiteness/specificity constraints with DOM (Kayne, 1975; Leonetti, 2007, 2008; Mayer, 2010; Mayer & Sánchez, 2016; von Heusinger & Kaiser, 2003, among others).

- (7) *Lo v-i a él /Juan*
 CL3MSG see-PST.1SG DOM him/Juan
 'I saw him/Juan.' [+human/ +animate, definite]
- (8) *A Juan, lo v-i*
 DOM Juan, CL3MSG see-PST.1SG
 'As for Juan, I saw him.' [+human/ +animate, definite]

Note in (9) the strict necessity of clitics to be contiguous with their verbal host.

- (9) *Lo *ayer v-i ayer a Juan*
 CL3MSG *yesterday see-PST.1SG yesterday DOM Juan
 'I saw him yesterday, Juan.'

Finally, in language contact situations divergence at the interfaces may result in new systems, which exhibit considerable cross-dialectal variability dependent on language/dialect contact and ecological factors such as learnability and access to normative education (McCarthy, 2008, among others).

2.2 Shipibo case and agreement system

Shipibo is a Panoan language, spoken in the Huánuco, Loreto, Junín, Ucayali regions of Perú and more recently in the Cantagallo community in the city of Lima by approximately 30.000 speakers (Valenzuela, 2010). The Shipibo pronominal system differs in two important ways from Spanish. As shown in Example (10), the verb lacks overt 3rd person bound morphemes and the verb *kanake* shows no subject nor object agreement markers.

- (10) Lorient, Lauriault & Day (1993, p. 56)
Nímai oín-ṣhon-ra, Jóse-kan kena-Ø-ke
 Nima see-SS.TR-PRT José-ERG call-3-PRF
 ‘When he saw Nima, José called him.’

Shipibo has an ergative case system, namely, a system in which subjects of transitive sentences are marked differently from subjects of intransitive sentences and direct objects. The following examples illustrate the ergative nature of the Shipibo system. Sentence (11) shows the pronoun *jabo* as the subject of an intransitive sentence and in sentence (12) the same pronominal form is the direct object of a transitive sentence:

- (11) Faust (2008, p. 45)
Jabo-ra neno nocó-catit-ai
 PRO3PL-EVID always arrive-PAST-IMPERF
 ‘In the past, they always used to arrive.’
 (12) Faust (2008: 39)
En-ra jabo bi-que
 PRO1SG-EVID PRO3PL receive-PERF
 ‘I have received them.’

On the other hand, the pronominal subject of the transitive sentence (13) is *jabaon*:

- (13) Faust (2008, p. 39)
Jabaon-ra nocon huetsa bi-can-que
 PRO3PL-EVID my brother received-PL-PERF
 ‘They have received my brother.’

2.3 Ashéninka-Perené argument marking

Ashéninka-Perené is an endangered Arawakan language with 1,000 speakers living in the Andean eastern foothills of the Chanchamayo Province, Junín Region in Perú (Mihás, 2014). It has been described as a polysynthetic VAO language

with nominative-accusative grammatical alignment combined with frequent split intransitivity conditioned by grammatical and pragmatic factors (Mihas, 2014). The data discussed here are fieldwork data from Spanish in contact with the Ashéninka-Perené dialect, which has more distinct pronominal forms than other Ashaninka dialects (Reed & Payne, 1986: 330). Unlike Shipibo and like Spanish, Ashéninka-Perené has rich subject and object pronominal agreement. Apart from a set of free personal pronoun forms, Ashéninka-Perené also has a set of 5 person-gender-number distinct bound morphemes as shown in Table 1. Different from Spanish, subject pronouns are verbal prefixes and object pronouns are affixes.

Table 1. Ashéninka-Perené bound and free pronouns

	Subject	Object	Free personal pronouns	
1	no-	-na	1 exclusive	naaka
1+2	a-	-ai	1 inclusive	aaka (aroka)
2	pi-	-mi	2	eeroka (awiroka)
3M	ir-	-ri	3M	irirori
3F	o-	-ro	3F	iroori

As shown in (14), in sentences with transitive verbs, all arguments in the main clause require obligatory pronominal agreement on the verb. In (14), the subject pronoun is a verbal prefix and the direct object pronoun *-ro* is a pronominal suffix marker with non-masculine gender resulting in the feminine as the default gender.

Transitive subject

- (14) Mihas (2010, p. 73)
n=a-ak-i=ro
1SG.A=take-PRF-REAL=3N.M.O → 3F
'I took it.'

Third person plural distinctions do not play a major role in the Ashaninka languages as long as they are recoverable from the context (Reed & Payne, 1986: 325). Additionally, plural marking in the Ashéninka-Perené dialect may involve several possibilities including remaining unmarked as in the singular object suffix in (15a), adding two suffixes to the verbal inflection *-ay...-ni* which is a discontinuous suffix as in (15b), or adding the suffix *-ye* indicating either a partitive or a plural as in (15c).²

2. This example exhibits a regular morphophonemic process where /a/ between consonants epenthesizes at word boundaries. The same process applies to the partitive suffix *-ye*, which receives a /t/.

(15) Reed & Payne (1986, p. 325)

- a. *no-kem-ak-e-ri*
1-hear-PFTV-N-FUT-3M
'I heard him.'
- b. *no-kem-aiy-ak-e-ri-ni*
1-hear-PL-PFTV-N-FUT-3M-PL
'We (1+1) heard him.' 'I heard them.' or 'We (1+1) heard them.'
- c. *no-kema-yet-ak-e-ri*
I-hear-PART-PFTV-N-FUT-3M
'I heard (each of) them.'

In absolutive constructions, the first and second person bound morphemes are syncretic with the object pronominal bound morphemes and used as subject suffixes for intransitive or intransitivized verbs as shown in (16a) and (16b). The other form in (16c) is zero.

Absolutive

- (16) a. *pok-ak-e-na*
come-PFTV-N-FUT-1
'I came.'
- b. *pok-ak-e-mi*
come-PFTV-N-FUT-2
'You came.'
- c. *pok-ak-e-Ø*
come-PFTV-N-FUT-(1+2, 3M3F)
'We (1+2), he, she, came.'

Further, the absolutive constructions in (16) covariate with nominative constructions as in (17), they are interchangeable possibly motivated by discourse structure.

(17) Reed & Payne (1986, p. 326)

- no-pok-ak-e*
1-come-PFTV-N-FUT
'I came.'

There is also a set of free pronouns. Its use is motivated by information structure, as in delineating or introducing new participants into the discourse (18), or as in introducing contrastive focus in (19).

(18) Reed & Payne (1986, p. 326)

- pok-ak=e* *kašekari irirori*
come-PFTV-N-FUT=3M jaguar PRO3MSG
'Then along came Jaguar himself.'

- (19) *p=a-ak-e=ro eeroka*
 2=get-PFTV-N-FUT=3F PRO2SG
 'You get it.' (=you get it, not me or anyone else)

In sum, the fact that some Ashéninka-Perené pronouns are syncretically specified for person, number and accusative gender could play a decisive role in the acquisition of Spanish clitics by Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilinguals. In the discussion, we will also link the free pronouns and their use to the high percentage of clitic right dislocation (CLRD) and clitic left dislocation (CLLD) structures in relation to clitic doubling (CLD) structures we find in the bilingual data, and argue that they could be motivated by discourse structure marking contrastive focus or introducing/delineating the major discourse participants.

Given the typological differences in feature configuration and in argument marking in Shipibo, Ashéninka-Perené, and in Spanish, and the fact that these are indigenous languages spoken in contexts in which their speakers have limited access to formal instruction in Spanish, we explore the following research questions:

1. How do the configurations of Spanish accusative clitics across clitic-related structures differ in Shipibo-Spanish and Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilinguals?
2. Are there significant differences between Shipibo-bilinguals and Ashéninka-Perené-bilinguals in relation to the expression of direct object pronouns and DOM?

3. Methodology

In order to investigate these questions, we analyze two sets of data from two typologically distinct and geographically distant bilingual speaking groups of Shipibo Spanish and Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish.³

3.1 Shipibo Spanish bilingual data

Using an acting-out picture-based elicitation technique (Mayer & Mayer, 1976/2003) the Spanish data from the Shipibo group were obtained from interviews that were conducted with 24 Shipibo-Spanish bilingual adults (12 female, 12 male), ages 29–56 in 2002. All participants had Shipibo as their first language, and had migrated to an urban environment from a rural environment. All participants had primary level

3. These data sets are also analyzed in a separate study that focuses primarily on clitic feature configuration from a feature pool perspective (Mufwene, 2001) in Mayer & Sánchez (2017b).

schooling and some secondary level in Spanish. All transitive verbs with accusative clitics and null objects were coded with a total of 141 tokens.

3.2 Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilingual data

The Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilingual data set is based on an exploratory study through elicitation of oral production based on story-telling and conversational interaction of 4 Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilingual speakers (2 female, 2 male), ages 22–53 in 2006. Two had lower levels of formal instruction (primary level) and two had higher levels of formal instruction (secondary level). All participants stated that Ashéninka-Perené was their first language. Three lived in Pampa Michi, Perené Valley, Chanchamayo Province, Junín Region, and the participant with the highest level of education had moved to San Ramon, a city close by. This participant had additional exposure to Italian and English.⁴ As in the Shipibo study, all transitive verbs with accusative clitics and null objects were coded, 124 tokens in total.

4. Data sets and results

In this section, we present the data and results from both groups studied. In previous work, we compared bilingual Shipibo-Spanish data with bilingual Quechua-Spanish data (Mayer & Sánchez, 2017a) and we also advanced a proposal about bilingual Shipibo-Spanish data and bilingual Ashéninka-Perené data (Mayer & Sánchez, 2017b) focussing on the selection of clitic features from a feature-pool perspective (Mufwene, 2001). In this paper, we focus on an analysis of clitics and DOM that is based on the typological differences in case and agreement between Shipibo and Ashéninka-Perené.

4.1 Shipibo Spanish

The distribution of all clitic-related structures of the Shipibo-Spanish bilingual data is given in Table 2. The feature distribution across those structures reveals a strong preference of the *le* form (104 tokens, 83%) over *se* forms (11 tokens, 9%), *lo* (6 tokens, 5%) and *la* forms (4 tokens, 3%).

4. It is possible that increased use of *lo* by this participant could be related to exposure to multiple languages. However, we would like to point out that this participant is not a functional speaker of neither Italian nor English.

Table 2. Accusative clitic distribution in clitic structures

Clitic structure	Tokens and percentages
Anaphoric	60 (43%)
CLD	62 (44%)
CLLD	1 (1%)
CLRD	5 (3%)
Null	13 (9%)
Total	141 (100%)

Overall, the clitic *le* is the preferred form in the distribution of all clitic forms in Table 2 and occurs preferably in CLD structures. In relation to gender marking, only 7 *le* forms correspond to feminine DPs, all others mark masculine DPs. There are also 10 tokens of *se*. The distribution of all clitic forms and structures is shown in Table 3 followed by examples.

Table 3. Clitic features in all clitic structures

Cl features + structure	Tokens and percentages
Le + CLD	53 (42%)
Lo + CLD	2 (2%)
Se + CLD	9 (6%)
La + CLD	1 (1%)
Le + CLLD	1 (1%)
Lo + CLLD	0 (0%)
Le + CLRD	4 (3%)
Lo + CLRD	0 (0%)
Le (anaphoric)	49 (39%)
Lo (anaphoric)	4 (3%)
La (anaphoric)	3 (2%)
Se (anaphoric)	1 (1%)
Total	127 (100%)

The next three examples illustrate clitic-doubling structures with the first two showing the clitic *le* doubling a DOM-marked animate masculine DP in (20) and an inanimate feminine DP without DOM in (21).

- (20) *Y le bot-a al lor-o*
and CL3SG throw-3SG DOM.-DET.MSG parrot.MSG
'And he throws the parrot away.'

(S2)
- (21) *Le abr-e es-a caj-a*
CL3SG open-3SG that-FSG box.FSG
'(He) opens the box.'

(S2)

Additionally, to *le*-doubling, there were some instances of *se*-doubling as in (22) which have no aspectual or reflexive meaning.

- (22) *Se muerde al lo (ro), al lor-o*
 CL3SG bite-3SG DOM-DET.3SG parrot.MSG DOM-DET.3SG parrot
 ‘(He) bites the parrot.’ (S13)

Examples (23) and (24) show again the clitic *le* in a clitic left dislocated and in a clitic right dislocated structure respectively. Both animate and masculine DPs are DOM-marked.

- (23) *Al perr-o le pate-a*
 DOM-DET.3SG dog.MSG CL3SG kick-3SG
 ‘(He) kicks the dog.’ (S13)

- (24) *Y le pate-ó también al lor-o*
 and CL3SG kick-PERF.3SG too DOM-DET.MSG parrot.MSG
 ‘And he kicked the parrot too.’ (S8)

Anaphoric uses exhibit both *le* and *se* in (25) and (26) respectively referring to a masculine singular DP.

- (25) *Después le muerd-e.*
 after CL3SG bite-3SG
 ‘After that, (he) bites him.’ (S15)

- (26) *El nío (niño) se busc-aba.*
 the boy CL3SG look-IMP.3SG
 ‘And the boy looked for him.’

Finally, there were also some instances of null arguments.

- (27) *El perro Ø bo(t-ó)*
 the dog CL throw-PAST.3SG
 ‘The dog threw it.’ (S16)

The overall results for the relationship of DOM and animacy in relation to the clitic structures across all Shipibo-Spanish bilinguals in Table 4 shows, apart from the clear preference for CLD, overall the highest number of unmarked animate DPs closely followed by marked animate DPs. There is one instance of extending DOM to inanimate DPs. An example of an unmarked inanimate CLD sentence would be (21) above.

Table 4. Differential Object marking of DP in CLD, CLLD and CLRD

	Animate DP		Total	Inanimate DP		Total
	+DOM	–DOM		+DOM	–DOM	
CLD	25 (46%)	29 (54%)	54(100%)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	6 (100%)
CLLD	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0	0	0
CLRD	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)	0	0	0
Total	29 (47%)	32 (52%)	61 (100%)	1 (1%)	5 (8%)	6 (100%)

The sole extension of DOM to an inanimate DP is an instance of locative doubling:

- (28) *Y le entr-a al carro*
and CL3SG enter-3SG DOM-DET.MSG car.MSG
'And he enters the car.'

To summarize, the Shipibo Spanish narratives in this data set exhibit a high frequency of CLD structures, found in all speakers in the sample. CLLD was found only in (2) speakers and CLRD in 4 speakers. Shipibo Spanish narratives show a strong preference for accusative *le* over *lo*. *Le* is the only form used with masculine and feminine DPs in all doubling constructions CLD, CLLD and CLRD. There are some instances of *se* in CLDs and there are animates without DOM.

4.2 Ashéninka-Perené Spanish

The distribution of proclitics is 83% to 14% of enclitics and 3% of null clitics, a surprising result given the morphological status of Ashéninka-Perené object pronouns as suffixes. Unlike Shipibo bilinguals, Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilinguals strongly prefer anaphoric structures (68.5%) over CLD and dislocated structures (21.7%). Across all clitic related structures *le* is preferred over *lo* (55.1% vs. 39.05%) but not as strongly as in the Shipibo-Spanish dataset, and there is some production of the feminine clitic *la* (5.85%). There is also some clitic reduplication (5%) and very low numbers for non-argumental and null clitics.

Table 5. Accusative clitics in all clitic structures

Clitic structure	Tokens and percentages
Anaphoric	85 (68.5%)
CLD	11 (9%)
CLLD	7 (5.7%)
CLRD	9 (7%)
Reduplication	6 (5%)
Non-argumental	2 (1.6%)
Null	4 (3.2%)
Total	124 (100%)

The distribution of clitic features across clitic structures is given in Table 6. Unlike the strong preference for *le* in the Shipibo-Spanish bilingual data, the Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish data exhibit equal numbers for *le* and *lo* followed by *la* in CLD structures. For CLLD *lo* is the preferred clitic and *le* is preferred in CLRD. Clitic reduplication and anaphoric structures prefer *le* > *lo*. Overall, *lo* is preferred for masculine DPs, *le* for feminine DPs with equal distribution of *la* referring to masculine and feminine DPs.

Table 6. Clitic features in all clitic structures including CL reduplication

CL features + structure	Tokens and percentages
Le + CLD	4 (3.4%)
Lo + CLD	4 (3.4%)
La + CLD	3 (2.5%)
Le + CLLD	2 (1.7%)
Lo + CLLD	4 (3.4%)
La + CLLD	1 (0.85%)
Le + CLRD	8 (6.8%)
Lo + CLRD	1 (0.85%)
La + CLRD	0 (0%)
Le + reduplication	4 (3.4%)
Lo + reduplication	2 (1.7%)
La + reduplication	0 (0%)
Le (anaphoric)	47 (39.8%)
Lo (anaphoric)	35 (29.7%)
La (anaphoric)	3 (2.5%)
Total	118 (100%)

The following examples represent the variability found in clitic production across all structures in Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish bilinguals. In (29) we find lack of differential object marking (DOM) of a human masculine DP topic, which is then first referred to by a feminine anaphoric clitic *la*, and next by a dative anaphoric *le* with a primary transitive verb. In the second clause, clitic reduplication shows *lo* and *le* referring to the topic:

- (29) *Que Ø el Curaca_i la_i agarr-aron, le_i tortur-aron, pero*
 that Ø DET.MSG Curaca CL3FSG catch-PST.3PL CL3SG torture-PST.3PL but
no lo_i han pod-ido mat-ar-le_i
 not CL3MSG have-3PL can-PARTIC kill-INF.CL3SG
 ‘That they captured the Curaca, they tortured him but they could not kill him.’
 (A3)

Clitic reduplication of the dative (30) also occurs with double use of *le*. There are no data with double *lo* and none at all with *la*. Note also a general loss of the plural feature with three exceptions in the overall data set.

- (30) *Le va-mos brindarle nuestro danz-as*
 CL3SG are-1PL giving-CL3SG POSS.MSG dance.FPL
 ‘We are giving you our dances.’ (A3)

The null object in (31) refers to a singular, masculine DP, the discourse topic.

- (31) *Allí Ø ten-ían*
 there him-Ø have-3PL
 ‘That’s where they held him.’ (A4)

Lo in (32a) is used as a single anaphoric reference to a plural feminine object. In clitic clusters, as in (32b), *lo* takes the first slot. This is consistent with Ashéninka DO-IO cluster order and contrary to the Spanish order IO-DO.

- (32) a. *Lo limpi-an pa cultivar*
 CL3MSG clean-3PL to farm
 ‘They clean (las tierras) to grow crops.’ (A4)
 b. *Lo les desinfect-an*
 CL3MSG CL3PL desinfect-3PL
 ‘They disinfected them.’ (A4)

The following examples illustrate the lack of DOM for human and definite/specific direct objects in doubling and dislocated structures with CLD in (33), CLLD in (34), and CLRD in (35).

- (33) *Ingresaron por dos caminos para atacarle Ø los*
 enter-PST.3PL through two ways to attack-INF.CL3SG Ø DET.MPL
 Ashaninkas Campas
 Ashaninkas Campas
 ‘They came in through two ways to attack the Ashaninka Campa people.’ (A3)
 (34) *Ø esos hay que matarles*
 Ø those Indians have-IMPERS to kill-INF.CL3PL
 ‘Those Indians have to be killed.’ (A3)
 (35) *Le jaló de su ropita Ø mi hijita*
 CL3SG pull-PST.3SG PREP POSS clothes Ø my daughter
 ‘She pulled her daughter by the clothes.’ (A2)

Finally, in Table 7 the relation between differential object marking and animacy is given with examples to follow. All marked and unmarked objects were definite.

Table 7. Differential Object marking of DP in CLD, CLLD and CLRD

	Animate DP		Total	Inanimate DP		Total
	+ DOM	– DOM		+ DOM	– DOM	
CLD	4 (67%)	6 (33%)	2 (100%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
CLLD	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
CLRD	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	8 (100%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Total	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	16 (100%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)	11 (100%)

Ashéninka-Perené bilingual Spanish exhibits some lack of DOM with animate/human direct objects and extension of DOM to inanimate DPs across all structures. Specifically, speaker (A4) uses invariant *lo* in anaphoric and invariant *lo* in combination with DOM in highly transitive constructions:

- (36) *Mi papá [...] lo conoc-íó a mi mamá*
 my papa CL3MSG know-PST.3SG DOM my mama
 ‘My father met my mother.’ (A4)

The data also show DOM⁵ *a* replaced with the preposition *en* as in (37). Note also the lack of periphrastic *a*:

- (37) *Le iba Ø picar semejante culebra en su bebita*
 CL3SG was going Ø bite-INF huge snake PREP POSS baby
 ‘That huge snake was going to bite her baby.’ (A2)

To summarize, the data set from Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish narratives exhibits a very high number of anaphoric structures, low frequency of CLD constructions, preference for dislocated structures with similar numbers for CLD, CLRD and CLLD produced by all speakers. Clitic reduplication is not productive and restricted to Speaker 3. Further, the data show a slight preference of *le* over *lo* and some production of *la* in anaphoric clitics and CLD. *Le* is preferred for feminine DPs and *lo* for masculine DPs. Clitic reduplication shows a mix of *le* and *lo*. Some speakers exhibit some loss of number in clitics with three exceptions, 2 of those in Speaker 4, who also shows extensive use of invariant *lo*. There is evidence for lack of DOM with animate DPs and quite even numbers for production and omission of DOM. There are also instances of DOM where *a* is replaced by the preposition *en*.

5. Replacement of DOM *a* with the locative *donde* ‘where’ together with the relative *que* ‘that’, used to link clauses and topics has also been reported. Bossong (1991: 148) mentions that in Northern Peru *onde* which is equivalent to *donde* has been found to replace DOM *a* (*Buscaré onde l corderito más gordo*).

5. Discussion of comparative results

The expression of the specific objects under investigation in each of the three languages in Table 8 show that Shipibo is unlike Spanish and Ashéninka-Perené in relation to the type and features of the clitic morpheme and case typology. Ashéninka-Perené is closer to Spanish than Shipibo. In light of the existence of typological differences, we expect to find different scalar systems of feature expression in clitics and variable results in DOM with regard to animacy in the Spanish of both bilingual groups.

Table 8. Case and verbal agreement in Shipibo, Ashéninka-Perené and Spanish

	Shipibo	Ashéninka-Perené	Spanish
Type of 3rd person morpheme	None	Suffix	Proclitic (pre-verbal) or, enclitic (post-verbal)
Morpheme features	none	person, gender (number, case)	person, gender, number, case
Case typology	ergative-absolutive	nominative-accusative with split intransitivity	nominative-accusative

In answer to our first research question, about what kind of differences we would find in the configuration of accusative clitics across all clitic-related structures between the two contact varieties, we found that from a modular perspective, the results presented in Section 4 indicate that the core syntactic operations involved in the clitic-related structures have been acquired.⁶ Table 9 shows that both contact varieties use all clitic related structures however with significant differences. Whereas Shipibo Spanish exhibits low numbers of anaphoric and clitic dislocated structures as well as high numbers of CLD, Ashéninka-Perené Spanish shows high numbers of anaphoric structures and low numbers for CLD and clitic dislocated structures with a preference for CLRD as well as some clitic reduplication.

Table 9. RQ1 comparative results

Shipibo Spanish	Ashéninka-Perené Spanish
– CLD: high frequency	– CLD, CLLD, CLRD: low, but CLRD preferred
– CLLD: low, 2 speakers	– CL reduplication: 1 speaker
– CLRD: low, 4 speakers	– Anaphorics: high
– Anaphorics: low	

6. Such evidence has also been found among Quechua-Spanish bilinguals (see Mayer & Sánchez, 2016).

In response to our second research question about significant differences in the expression of DOM and direct object pronouns, we find that for the latter, the configuration of both data sets confirms convergence of features in favor of the less marked form *le*⁷ in Shipibo as well as in Ashéninka-Perené-bilinguals. There are however differences in accordance with the respective typological settings of each Amazonian language, as shown in Table 10.

Table 10. RQ2 comparative results

Shipibo Spanish	Ashéninka-Perené Spanish
Anaphorics and all CLD structures:	– Anaphorics and CLD: <i>le</i> > <i>lo</i>
– absolute <i>le</i> in CLD	– fem DP: <i>le</i> > <i>lo</i> > <i>la</i>
– few <i>lo</i> , <i>la</i> in anaphorics	– masc DP: <i>lo</i> > <i>le</i> > <i>la</i>
– some instances of <i>se</i>	– clitic reduplication: <i>lo</i> , <i>le</i>
	– some use of <i>la</i>
Scalar system:	Scalar system:
<i>le</i> > <i>se</i> > <i>lo</i> > <i>la</i>	<i>le</i> > <i>lo</i> > <i>la</i>
85% > 7% > 5% > 3%	55.1% > 39.05% > 5.85%
Animates without DOM	Equal numbers for lack and production of DOM;
	– Lack with animate DPs
	– Replacement of DOM <i>a</i> with preposition <i>en</i>

We propose that the clitic systems for both bilingual data sets show the scalar distribution in (38). The distribution for both groups differs substantially in terms of numerical values with the exception of *la*. While *le* is ranked higher than *lo* in both groups, the Shipibo-Spanish group ranks *le* considerably higher. This could be attributed to Shipibo being an ergative language unlike Ashéninka-Perené.

- (38) a. Ashéninka-Perené-Spanish
 Anaphoric: *le* (55%) < *lo* (40%) < *la* (5%)
 b. Shipibo-Spanish
 Anaphoric: *le* (85%) > *se* (7%) > *lo* (5%) > *la* (3%)

Further support for this comes from a study of Spanish in contact with Tikuna, a nominative-accusative Amazonian language (Montes, 2004), considered an isolate, in which Ramírez-Cruz (2018) reports a similar level of competition between *le* and

7. As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the existence of *le*-forms in Amazonian Spanish could be attributed to contact with Andean Spanish where *le*-forms are found. However, for both bilingual groups in the study, contact with Andean Spanish is minimal as the Shipibo group lives in the city of Lima in the Cantagallo community. The Ashéninka-Perené individuals on the other hand could potentially be in contact with Andean Spanish due to their location. However, they do exhibit feminine forms that are less frequent in Andean Spanish (Mayer & Sánchez, 2016).

lo as accusative clitics. These are also similar to our previous findings in a study on Quechua-Spanish bilinguals (Mayer & Sánchez, 2016). Not surprisingly, Quechua is also a nominative accusative language. Furthermore, for Tikuna-Spanish, Ramírez-Cruz (2018) does not report the existence of *se* in the Spanish-Tikuna data unlike what we found in the Shipibo-Spanish data.

Lack of DOM with animate, definite DPs is attested for both data sets. Ashéninka-Perené-bilingual Spanish differs from the Shipibo bilingual Spanish in that it shows replacement of DOM *a* with the preposition *en*.

To summarize our findings, both bilingual groups favor *le* over *lo* in clitic doubling structures and exhibit lack of DOM with animates in CLD in both groups up to 54% in the Shipibo group, and 33% for the Ashéninka-Perené bilinguals. The use of *le* is indicative of some level of gender neutralization. Both, gender neutralization and lack of DOM are evidence that crosslinguistic influence affect the syntax/semantics interface. We analyze this variability as the coexistence of two different argument-marking systems in these contact varieties of Spanish with Amazonian languages and propose some explanations in the next section.

6. Proposal

We would like to propose that some of the case marking characteristics observed in Spanish in contact with Shipibo and Ashéninka-Perené can be attributed to a process of feature reassembly and new morphological mappings that reflect some of the case marking properties of Shipibo and Ashéninka-Perené. In this section, we will discuss the proposals for each of the contact Spanish samples analyzed.

6.1 Ergativity in Shipibo and its consequences for Shipibo Spanish

We propose that these results are compatible with a hierarchy of direct object clitics that runs from lower to higher levels of morphological specification in Shipibo Spanish:

(39) *se* > *le* > *lo* > *la*

Shipibo Spanish, unlike other contact varieties, allows *se* because Shipibo is an ergative language that marks the subject of an intransitive verb in the same way as the direct object of a transitive verb, as previously shown in Examples (11)–(13). *Se* as the subject marker of an intransitive verb in Spanish can be generalized to the direct object clitic so that a form such as *se buscaba* ‘she looked for’ for *le buscaba* as in ‘looked for it’ is possible.

The following examples show the fact that *se* in Spanish occurs both as coreferential with the subject of intransitive verbs (40) and as a VP-internal modifier (41);

Intransitive subject

- (40) *Maria se corre del peligros-o*
 Maria *se* run-3SG DET.MSG danger.MSG
 'Maria runs away from danger.'

VP-internal modifier

- (41) *Maria se come una manzan-a*
 Maria *se* eat-3SG INDEF.FSG apple.FSG
 'Maria eats an apple (completely/for her benefit).'

This pattern may contribute to the generalization of *se* as a clitic that doubles a VP-internal direct object as shown in (42):

Transitive object in Shipibo Spanish

- (42) *El sapo se muerde al lor-o*
 the toad ACC bite-3SG DOM-DET.MSG parrot.MSG
 'The toad bites the parrot.'

The lack of DOM marking with animates is also consistent with Shipibo being an ergative language. In Shipibo, the DP subject of a transitive verb receives ergative marking whereas the object does not receive marking as illustrated by the following example (Faust, 1990):

- (43) *Ochiti-nin-ra baque nateshque*
 dog-ERG-EVID bite boy
 'The dog has bitten the boy.'

In this example, we see that the subject *ochiti* 'dog' is marked with the ergative marker *nin* but the object *nateshque* 'boy' receives no marking. This contrasts with generalized DOM marking in non-contact Spanish as shown in:

- (44) *El perro ha mordido al niñ-o*
 the dog has-3SG bite-PARTIC DOM-DET.MSG boy.MSG
 'The dog has bitten the boy.'

Shipibo-Spanish bilinguals would be less sensitive to a special marker for the direct object in transitive sentences resulting in sentences such as:

- (45) *Le sac-ó un lor-o*
 CL3SG take-out-PST-3SG INDEF.MSG parrot.MSG
 '(S/he) took out a parrot.'

(S2)

6.2 Mixed properties and their effect on Ashéninka-Perené bilingual Spanish

The Ashéninka-Perené bilingual production data clearly reflect the structural and typological similarities between this language and Spanish in showing convergence with similar structures. The Ashéninka-Perené bilingual Spanish data demonstrate an important parallel to the Spanish third person paradigm, which allows to relate existence and expression of all gender-specifying clitics in Ashéninka-Perené Spanish bilinguals to person/gender/number specifying pro- and enclitics which are semantically motivated and highly grammaticalized. Specifically, the lack of plural marking in Ashéninka-Perené Spanish bilinguals can be linked to optional number marking in their L1.

With regard to clitic reduplication, Ashéninka-Perené has a mechanism whereby object suffixes can be doubled with the same verb to distinguish between direct and indirect object (Payne & Payne, 1986, p. 325; Payne, 1981, 1982). This parallel is potentially reflected in bilingual Ashéninka-Perené Spanish sentences with clitic reduplication such as shown in (46).

- (46) *Pero no lo han podido matarle*
 but not DET.MSG have-3PL can-PARTIC kill-INF.DEF.DAT
 ‘But they could not kill him.’ (A2)

For the invariant clitic *lo* in (46) we propose to analyze it as a topic and transitivity marker based on the following parallel to Spanish. In the Ashéninka-Perené dialect, the third person pronoun stem *-ri* is shared with the demonstratives, distinguishing between anaphoric and cataphoric reference. Cataphoric references are expressed by attaching the prefix *h* to the anaphoric pronoun, for example, anaphoric near is *irika* (M) and *iroka* (F) vs. cataphoric *hirika* (M) and *hiroka* (F) (Reed & Payne, 1986, p. 330). This could account for invariant *lo* as cataphoric reference delineating a highly transitive event affecting a topical object in bilingual Ashéninka-Perené Spanish.

In relation to the relatively high percentage of CLRD and CLLD structures over CLD structures in Ashéninka-Perené Spanish bilinguals, we propose that these could be motivated by the existence of cleft constructions with free pronouns as in (47) and (48), marking contrastive focus or introducing/delineating the major discourse participants in Ashéninka-Perené.

- (47) Payne & Payne (1986, p. 326)
pok-ak=e kašekari irirori
 come-PFTV-N-FUT=3M jaguar he
 ‘Then along came Jaguar himself.’

- (48) *p=a-ak-e=ro eeroka*
 2=get-PFTV-N-FUT=3F YOU
 ‘You get it.’ (=you get it, not me or anyone else)

Our final point is that the even numbers for marking and lack of marking of human/animate DPs raises doubts about animacy as the governing factor for DOM in Ashéninka-Perené Spanish bilingual speakers. Difficulties in identifying animacy as a trigger for DOM can be explained by the fact that both languages have a multifunctional case marker that also serves as a locative marker expressed in Spanish by *a* and in Ashéninka-Perené by the suffix *-ki* as in (49) (Bhat, 2004: 135; Mihas, 2010; Reed & Payne, 1986, p. 330).

- (49) Mihas (2010, p. 3)
i=tyaNk-ai-t-ak-i=na Irimashi-ki
 3MA=send-IMP.P-EP-PRF-REAL=1SG.O Lima-LOC
 ‘They sent me to Lima.’

In addition, the Ashéninka-Perené dialect has possessive pronouns, which can show person, number and gender features and co-occur with the locative marker as in (50). In Ashéninka-Perené Spanish, the replacement of DOM *a* with the locative preposition *en*⁸ in possessive constructions as in (51), repeated from (37) can be directly linked to the L1 structure.

- (50) Mihas (2010, p. 93)
n=ako-ki kar -ak-i=na
 1SG.POSS=ARM-LOC break-PRF-REAL=1S.O
 ‘I broke my arm.’
- (51) *Le iba Ø picar semejante culebra en su*
 CL3SG is-PST-3SG going Ø bite-INF huge snake PREP POSS
beb-ita
 baby-DIMIN.FSG
 ‘That huge snake was going to bite her baby.’ (A2)

In sum, Ashéninka-Perené Spanish bilinguals exhibit convergence of functional features and their mapping onto morphology available in both languages.

8. In the literature cited, Ashéninka-Perené bilinguals also replace DOM *a* with the preposition *de*, however there is no evidence for this in the AS data investigated here.

7. Concluding remarks

Our findings are consistent with previous work in relation to scalarity of clitic systems dependent on a proficiency continuum (Mayer & Sánchez, 2016). Both bilingual groups exhibit a scalar clitic system, and convergence of argument marking systems, with the individual configuration in both groups reflecting the respective typological settings. Bilingual speakers seem to be able to acquire multiple clitic-related structures. On the other hand, acquisition of functional morphology expressing features such as gender, number and case for clitics and semantic features such as animacy/definiteness for DOM is not straightforward and shows divergence between both groups. The contact specific results for feature assembly and new morphological mappings reflect the typological properties of the contact languages Shipibo and Ashéninka-Perené. Nevertheless, both contact varieties share a set of features and case marking informed by existence of similar structures in the contact languages.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all participants and acknowledge the following individuals for their help with data collection: Maria José Cabrera (Cusco Q-Spanish), Yoshidaira García (Huánuco Q-Spanish), Sarita Zavaleta and Enrique Espinoza (Shipibo-Spanish); and for transcription: Vidal Carbajal (Cusco and Huánuco Q-Spanish) and Enrique Espinoza (Shipibo-Spanish). We would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments. We use the following abbreviations:

A	Agent	PRO	pronoun
O	object	POSS	possessive
S	subject	TR	transitive
SS	same subject	PRT	participle
LOC	locative	ERG	ergative
F	feminine	PRF/PFTV	perfective
M	masculine	IMPERF/IMP	imperfective
N.M	non-masculine	PAST	past tense
1	first person	FUT	future
2	second person	N-FUT	non future
3	third person	EP	epenthesizer
SG	singular	IMP.P	impersonal passive
PL	plural	REAL	realis
PART	partitive	EVID	evidential

References

- Aissen, J. (2003). Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 21, 435–483. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024109008573>
- Belloro, V. (2007). Spanish clitic doubling: A study of the syntax-pragmatics interface (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). SUNY.
- Bhat, D. N. S. (2004). *Pronouns*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bleam, T. (1999). Leista Spanish and the syntax of clitic doubling (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Delaware.
- Bossong, G. (1985). *Empirische Universalienforschung, Differentielle Objekt-markierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Bossong, G. (1991). Differential Object Marking in Romance and beyond. In D. Wanner & D. A. Kibbee (Eds.), *New analyses in Romance linguistics* (pp. 143–185). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.69.14bos>
- Bossong, G. (2003). Nominal and/or verbal marking of central actants. In G. Fiorentino (Ed.), *Romance objects. Transitivity in Romance languages* (pp. 17–49). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110919837.17>
- Bresnan, J., & Mchombo, S. A. (1987). Topic, pronoun and agreement in Chicheŵa. *Language*, 63, 741–782. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415717>
- Caravado, R. (1999). *Lingüística del corpus: Cuestiones teórico-metodológicas aplicadas al Español. Gramática Española: Enseñanza e investigación* (Vol. 6). Salamanca, Spain: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Cuza, A., Pérez-Leroux, A. T., & Sánchez, L. (2013). The role of semantic transfer in clitic drop among simultaneous and sequential Chinese-Spanish bilinguals. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 93–125. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000691>
- Dalrymple, M., & Nikolaeva, I. (2011). *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511993473>
- Di Tullio, A., & Zdrojewski, P. (2006). Notas sobre el doblado de clíticos en el español rioplatense. Asimetrías entre objetos humanos y no humanos. *Filología*, 1, 2006–2007, 13–44.
- Escobar, A. M. (2011). Spanish in contact with Quechua. In M. Diaz Campos (Ed.), *The handbook of Hispanic sociolinguistics* (pp. 323–352). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444393446.ch16>
- Escobar, A. M. (2012). Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages. In J. I. Hualde, A. I. Olarra, & E. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The handbook of Hispanic linguistics* (pp. 65–88). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118228098.ch4>
- Faust, N. (1990). *Lecciones para el aprendizaje del idioma shipibo-conibo* (2nd ed.). Lima, Perú: Ministerio de Educación. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Faust, N. (2008). *Lecciones para el aprendizaje del idioma shipibo-conibo* (Documento de Trabajo No 1). Lima, Perú: Instituto de Lingüístico de Verano.
- Guijarro Fuentes, P. (2011). Feature composition in Differential Object Marking. In L. Roberts, G. Pallotti, & C. Bettoni (Eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook 11* (pp. 138–164). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Guijarro Fuentes, P. (2012). The acquisition of interpretable features in L2 Spanish: Personal a. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition*, 15(4), 701–720. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728912000144>

- Jaeggli, O. (1986). Three issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, doubled NPs and extraction. In H. Borer (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 19* (pp. 63–88). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Kayne, R. (1975). *French syntax. The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1991). Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 647–686.
- Kiss, K. É. (Ed.) (1995). *Discourse Configurational Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lardiere, D. (2005). On morphological competence. In L. Dekydsprotter, R. A. Sprouse, & A. Liljestrang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference* (pp. 178–192). Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Lardiere, D. (2008). Feature-assembly in second language acquisition. In J. Liceras, H. Zobl, & H. Goodluck (Eds.), *The role of formal features in second language acquisition* (pp. 106–140). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leonetti, M. (2004). Specificity and object marking: The case of Spanish a. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 75–114. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.106>
- Leonetti, M. (2007). Clitics do not encode specificity. In G. A. Kaiser & M. Leonetti (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop Definiteness, Specificity and Animacy in Ibero-Romance Languages. Arbeitspapier 122*, 111–139. Konstanz Germany: Universität Konstanz.
- Leonetti, M. (2008). Specificity in clitic doubling and in Differential Object Marking. *Probus*, 20, 33–66. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PROBUS.2008.002>
- Lipski, J. (1994). *Latin American Spanish*. London, UK: Longman.
- Lipski, J. (2010). Spanish and Portuguese in contact. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (pp. 550–580). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch27>
- Loriot, J., Lauriault, E., & Day, D. (1993). *Diccionario shipibo-castellano*. Yarinacocha, Perú: Ministerio de Educación and Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Luján, M. (1987). Clitic-doubling in Andean Spanish and the Theory of Case Absorption. In T. Morgan, J. Lee, & B. VanPatten, (Eds.), *Language and language use: Studies in Spanish* (pp. 109–121). Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Matras, Y. (2010). Contact, convergence and typology. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (pp. 66–85). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch3>
- Mayer, E. (2008). Clitics on the move: From dependent marking to split marking. In M. Butt & T. Holloway King (Eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference* (pp. 352–372). Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Mayer, E. (2010). Syntactic variation of object arguments in Limeño Spanish contact varieties (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Australian National University.
- Mayer, E. (2017). *Spanish clitics on the move, variation in time and space*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514213>
- Mayer, E., & Delicado Cantero, M. (2015). Continuity and contact-induced Change in Peruvian Spanish contact varieties: The case of prepositional Differential Object Marking. In M. González Rivera & S. Sessarego (Eds.), *New perspectives on Hispanic contact linguistics in the Americas*. (pp. 99–120). Madrid, Spain/Frankfurt, Germany: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Mayer, E., & Sánchez, L. (2016). Object agreement marking and information structure in monolingual and bilingual Andean Spanish. Special Issue: *The acquisition and processing of Spanish and Portuguese morphosyntax: Theoretical and experimental issues*. *Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics /RESLA*, 29(2), 544–581.

- Mayer, E., & Sánchez, L. (2017a). Feature variability in the bilingual-monolingual continuum: Clitics in bilingual Quechua-Spanish, bilingual Shipibo-Spanish and in monolingual Limeño Spanish contact varieties. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1322037>
- Mayer, E. & Sánchez, L. (2017b). Forthcoming. Feature selection in clitic expression in Amazonian Spanish. In R. Zariquiey, P. Valenzuela, A. Escobar, & M. Jara (Eds.), *Spanish diversity in the Amazon: Dialect and language contact perspectives*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Mayer, M., & Mayer, M. (1976/2003). *One frog too many*. New York, NY: Puffin.
- McCarthy, C. (2008). Morphological variability in the comprehension of agreement: an argument for representation over computation. *Second Language Research*, 24(4), 459–486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658308095737>
- Mihas, E. (2010). Essentials of Ashéninka Perené grammar (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Mihas, E. (2014). Expression of information source meanings in Ashéninka Perené (Arawak). In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *The grammar of knowledge: A cross-linguistic typology* (pp. 209–226). Oxford: UK: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701316.003.0010>
- Montes, M. E. (2004). Lengua ticuna: Resultados de fonología y morfosintaxis. *Forma y Función*, 17, 145–178.
- Montrul, S. (2004). Subject and object expression in Spanish heritage speakers: A case of morpho-syntactic convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7, 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001464>
- Montrul, S. (2010). How similar are adult second language learners and Spanish heritage speakers? Spanish clitics and word order. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 31(1), 167–207. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S014271640999021X>
- Mufwene, S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612862>
- Ordóñez, F., & L. Repetti. (2006). Stressed enclitics. In J.-P. Montreuil (Ed.), *New perspectives on Romance linguistics, Vol. II: Phonetics, phonology and dialectology* (pp. 167–181). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.276.13ord>
- Ormazabal, J., & Romero, J. (2013). Object clitics, agreement and dialectal variation. *Probus*, 25, 301–344.
- Payne, D. (1981). *Phonology and morphology of Axininca Campa* (SIL Publications in Linguistics 66). Dallas, TX: SIL and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Payne, D. L., Payne, J., & Sánchez, J. (1982). *Morfología, fonología y fonética del asheninka del Apurucayali* (Serie Lingüística Peruana 18). Lima, Peru: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Ramírez-Cruz, H. (2018). Yo no le conocía a mi abuela: The use of clitics *le*, *lo*, and *la* in Amazonian Colombian-Spanish. In J. King & S. Sessarego (Eds.), *The dynamics of language variation and change: Varieties of Spanish across space and time* (pp. 175–198). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Reed, J., & Payne, D. L. (1986). Asheninka (Campa) pronominals. In U. Wiesemann (Ed), *Pronominal systems* (pp. 323–331). Tübingen: Günther Narr.
- Roberts, I. (1991). Excorporation and minimality. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 209–218.
- Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, M. (2008). The acquisition of Differential Object Marking in Spanish. *Probus*, 20, 111–145. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PROBUS.2008.004>

- Rooryck, J. (2000). *Configurations of sentential complementation: Perspectives from Romance languages*. Routledge: London.
- Saab, A., & Zdrojewski, P. (2010). Syntactically inert clitics: A paradox involving clitic doubling and its resolution. Paper presented at Romania Nova IV, Campos de Jordão, São Paulo, November 8.
- Sánchez, L. (2003). *Quechua-Spanish Bilingualism*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lald.35>
- Sánchez, L. (2010). La aparente opcionalidad del doblado de clíticos en el español limeño. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 1 (nueva serie), 94–105.
- Sánchez, L., & P. Zdrojewski. (2013). *Restricciones semánticas y pragmáticas al doblado de clíticos en el español de Buenos Aires y de Lima. La variación en la gramática del español actual. Special volume of Lingüística*, 29(2), 271–320.
- Slabakova, R. (2009). Features or parameters: Which one makes SLA easier, and more interesting to study? *Second Language Research*, 25(2), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658308100291>
- Spencer, A., & Luis, A. (2012). *Clitics. An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139033763>
- Suñer, M. (1988). The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6(3): 391–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00133904>
- Ticio, E. (2015). Differential object marking in Spanish-English early bilinguals. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 5(1), 62–90. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.5.1.o3tic>
- Valenzuela, P. (2010). Ergativity in Shipibo-Konibo, a Panoan language of the Ucayali. In S. Gildea & F. Queixalós (Eds.), *Ergativity in Amazonia* (pp. 65–96). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.89.o4val>
- von Heusinger, K., & Kaiser, G. (2003). The interaction of animacy, definiteness and specificity in Spanish. In K. von Heusinger & G. Kaiser (Eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop: Semantic and syntactic aspects of specificity in Romance languages* (pp. 41–65). Konstanz, Germany: Universität Konstanz.
- Zdrojewski, P. (2013). *Spanish DOM as a case of lacking case. Differential Object marking Workshop*, University of Tromsø, 23–24.
- Zwicky, A. (1985). Clitics and particles. *Language*, 1, 283–305. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414146>

Author queries

Please provide a complete reference for the citation ‘(McCarty, 2008), (Sánchez, 2002), (Mayer, 2006), (Payne & Payne, 1986), (Payne, 1982), (von Heusinger, 2003), (Guijarro-Fuentes, 2011, 2012),’ in this article.

Please provide a citation for the reference id “CIT0522 (Bossong, G. (1985)), CIT0548 (Luján, M. (1987)), CIT0568 (Payne, D. L., Payne, J., & Sánchez, J. (1982))” since citation is missing in the article.