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This paper discusses contact-induced changes in American Spanish attributable to both internal and external factors. These changes occur in already unstable and variable areas of the grammar and take advantage of intrinsic evolutionary tendencies of the language in order to impose structures and cognitive processes from the contact language.

Their consequences, going beyond the predictable outcome of internally generated change, can include the reorganization of an entire paradigm (unstressed pronominals), the acceleration of a change in progress and the removal of linguistic restrictions on it (direct object elision), and the assignment of new values to already existing structures (adoption of epistemic values by the preterite tenses). The mechanism responsible for all these changes is linguistic convergence.
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1. Introduction

It is generally acknowledged that language contact situations are inherently complex and result in equally complex linguistic changes, often subject to multiple causation in which both internal and external factors operate. In this paper I discuss whether certain contact-induced linguistic changes in the varieties of

* This research is part of the project “Procesos de cambio lingüístico en situaciones de contacto” financed by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Ref. HUM2005–04374). I would like to thank Romana-Anca Radulescu for translating this paper into English, Théophile Ambadiang and the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and comments, and Carlos Piera and Marleen Haboud for comments and for help with the final English version.
Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages are compatible with the internal tendencies of the language, and to what extent they are attributable to internal evolution or rather to contact with those languages.

The changes to be considered here do not stem from the importing of foreign material into the changing language; in this they differ from those otherwise comparable processes which have received the most attention in the literature so far (Escobar 2000; Flores Farfán 1999; Granda 1988; Krivoshein de Canese & Corvalán 1987; Olbertz & Muysken 2005; Palacios 2008; Zimmermann 1995; among others). They originate instead in pre-existing internally caused variation in the language. In these cases, the contact language acts as an accelerator of the variation process, yielding, at least in colloquial oral registers, a change which, as we will see, may well reorganize a whole paradigm of the language. These changes reveal that specific areas of a grammar can be considered particularly vulnerable, due to their instability, and therefore most likely to undergo linguistic change. We will see that as a result of these contact-induced changes certain patterns are adopted which diverge from what would have been the outcome of internally generated change.

To show this, the course of certain change processes occurring in the language when no external factors are involved will be compared with their different course when external factors interfere. In fact, a very productive way of meeting the communicative needs of the speakers in areas of Spanish-Amerindian historical bilingualism, wherever linguistic contact has been intense, is through indirect changes, that is, those in which no linguistic material is imported from the other language. Generally speaking, indirect changes take place among symmetrical or simultaneous bilingual speakers, but they can extend to monolingual speakers in areas of historically intense bilingualism.

Studies of language contact in recent years help to account for these developments by going beyond merely structural patterns of influence: many processes originating in linguistic contact are not viewed as “direct transfer from one language to another,” but rather as “resulting from the special communicative strategies applying in intercultural communication” (Zimmermann 2001:23). Thus, through the indirect influence of contact language A, significant grammatical changes take place, usually in the oral colloquial register, in language B. They take advantage of the internal evolution of B to extract from it certain grammatical strategies endowed with communicative functionality which bring both languages in closer contact to each other. These changes may result in the speeding up of a specific change already in progress and the removal of the linguistic restrictions which prevent it from spreading: this is what we have in the case of direct object elision. Alternatively, they may mean the restructuring of an entire system (as with the unstressed pronominal system of Spanish in Paraguay
or Andean Ecuador), or else the assignment of new values to structures already present in the language (as happens to the past temporal system in Andean Ecuador Spanish).

I argue that the mechanism responsible of these changes is linguistic convergence, as defined by Gumperz and Wilson (1971), subsequently modified by Granda (1996) and Palacios (2005). I close this paper with some reflections on contact-induced language change.

2. Dialect variation in the third person unstressed pronominal system

2.1 The central variety of Peninsular Spanish

Present-day Peninsular Spanish shows linguistic variation in the third person unstressed pronominal system resulting from both geographic and social factors. This variation was already documented in medieval texts, suggesting that at the time there was already competition between the contrasting pronominal systems which stand at the origin of the present-day ones (Fernández-Ordóñez 2001: 401). The latter are now geographically distributed as follows: An etymological or “differentiating” system, inherited from Latin, is documented in the peripheral areas, whereas in the central Peninsula there is a large compact area characterized by the neutralization of the case feature, thus yielding the notoriously confusing phenomena known as leiismo, laismo and loismo. No clear boundaries separate the two areas; instead, “como es propio de los continua dialectales, existen entre ellas zonas de transición en las que los criterios que determinan la selección pronominal se debe en parte a los principios basados en el caso y en parte a los principios castellanos basados en la referencia” [“as is typical of dialectal continua, there exist between them transition areas in which the criteria for pronoun selection obey in part case-based principles and in part reference-based Castilian principles”] (Fernández-Ordóñez 2001: 402).

The area of the etymological system surrounds the central referential systems areas. The etymological system prevails in most of the Spanish-speaking American territories except, as we shall see, for the areas of contact with American Indian languages. It is also the one that prevailed in the rest of the Romance languages. It is based on a case distinction accusative (direct object) versus dative (indirect object) – although there is an asymmetry in the pronominal exponents of the objects, since the accusative exhibits gender differentiation – lo(s) for masculine referents, la(s) for feminine referents – while in the dative there is no difference – le(s) for both genders – as shown in Table 1.
Table 1. Etymological or case-distinguishing system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>Lo(s)</td>
<td>La(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>Le(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following data, from speakers of southern varieties of Spanish, exemplify this system. The case of the object determines the pronominal form, in such a way that the same referent selects the pronominal forms lo/la when in the accusative (i.e. syntactically, as the direct object) but le if its syntactic function is that of indirect object.

(1)  
   a. A tu hijo no lo veo ya casi nunca. Dile que me llame, por favor.  
      “I hardly ever see your son ACC. Tell-DAT to call me, please.”!
   b. He leído un libro magnífico, cuando quieras te lo presto pero le tienes que poner un forro, porque yo soy muy cuidadoso con mis cosas.  
      “I’ve read a splendid book, when you want I’ll give ACC-(M) to you but you have to put DAT-(M) a cover because I’m very careful with my things.”

(2)  
   a. No digas nada de esto a mi madre, está muy mayor y si le pasa algo no sé qué haría. La quiero mucho.  
      “Don’t tell any of this to my mother, she’s old and if something happens to DAT, I don’t know what I shall do. I love ACC very much.”
   b. Toma tu falda, que ya la he arreglado. Le he puesto una cremallera nueva y lista.  
      “Here you have the skirt, I’ve arranged ACC-(F). I put DAT-(F) a new zip and that’s all.”

On the other hand, in the alternative Castilian referential system the gender pattern prevails, replacing the case pattern. The system includes, however, a count/mass distinction which also determines pronoun selection (Fernández-Ordóñez 2001). As Table 2 shows, for accusatives as well as for datives le is selected for masculine nouns and la for feminine nouns, every time the referent is a count/concrete entity. With mass nouns the preferred pronominal form is lo in both cases.

---

1. In the English version of the examples, ACC and DAT indicate the direct and the indirect object unstressed Spanish pronouns, respectively, whereas (F) and (M) indicate the (F)eminine and (M)asculine gender of the antecedent noun. Mass is used for mass nouns.
Table 2. Castilian referential system (adapted from Fernández-Ordóñez 2001:404)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>MASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following data, from Fernández-Ordóñez (2001), illustrate this system:

3. a. Al niño le llevaron al hospital y le hicieron una radiografía.
   “They took the boy ACC to the hospital and they made DAT an X-ray.”
   b. El tractor hace tiempo que le vendimos para desguace porque le hubiéramos tenido que cambiar el motor.
   “It’s been a long time since we sold the tractor ACC-(M) to the scrapyard otherwise we would have had to change DAT-(M) the engine.”

4. a. A María la recoge un autobús para llevarla al trabajo y la dan de comer allí.
   “A bus picks up Mary ACC to take ACC to work and they give DAT the lunch there.”
   b. A esa camisa la quité el cuello para arreglarla.
   “I removed from this shirt DAT-(F) the collar in order to arrange ACC-(F).”

5. a. El trigo lo sembraban en noviembre. Y luego, pues en mayo, había que quitarlo los cardos.
   “They sowed the wheat ACC-Mass in November. And then, in May, they had to remove DAT-Mass the thistle.”
   b. Según recogías la sangre del cerdo, lo revolvías, ibas dándolo vueltas.
   “While you collected the pig’s blood, you stirred ACC-Mass, removing DAT-Mass.”

The prevailing variant of this system nowadays tends to disregard the mass/count distinction and is, as a consequence, essentially gender-based. In northern Madrid, for example, the pronominal system prefers le/la forms according to the masculine/feminine gender of the antecedent, irrespective of case. However, when the direct object is inanimate, the form lo prevails for masculine objects, although le strongly competes with lo. In this system, the pronominalization of mass nouns with the form lo has practically disappeared, although older people may still mark

2. Spanish animate direct objects are introduced by the preposition “a” (as in “veo a los niños” I-see “a” the children). Some varieties of the language are beginning to extend this “a” to inanimate objects.
some feminine mass nouns with lo (echas la leche y lo das vueltas; "you throw in the milk and stir DAT-Mass"). The following data illustrate this system:

(6) a. Le traje un regalo a mi sobrino, pero no le vi después, así que no sé si le ha gustado.
   "I brought my nephew DAT a present, but I didn’t see ACC afterwards, so I don’t know if he DAT liked it or not."

b. Acabo de comprar un libro y no tengo tiempo de leerlo, así que le pondré un forro y lo guardaré.
   "I have just bought a book and I don’t have time to read ACC-(M), so I’ll put DAT-(M) a cover and I’ll put ACC-(M) away."

c. El arroz, lo pones en una cacerola y lo cueces sin lavar.
   "You put the rice ACC-Mass in a saucepan and you cook ACC-Mass without washing it."

(7) a. La dije a María que no me hablara así y se enfadó. Desde luego, mi intención no fue molestarla.
   "I told Mary DAT not to talk to me like that and she got angry. Of course, my intention was not to upset ACC."

b. Trae esa muñeca que la lavo. ¡Está sucísima! Yo la quito la ropa y tú la lavas.
   "Give me that doll to wash ACC-(F). It’s awfully dirty. I’ll take DAT-(F) off the clothes and you wash ACC-(F)."

c. Por favor, la leche la cuelas antes de echarla en el vaso, que no la tenga que quitar yo la nata después.
   "Please, strain the milk ACC-Mass before pouring ACC-Mass into the glass, so I don’t have to remove from DAT-Mass the cream later."

Although the basic tendency, as already mentioned, is to mark the gender of animate antecedents with the form le/la, I have registered frequent instances of the same pattern with inanimate referents; that is, le more and more coexists with lo as a mark for masculine inanimate antecedents:

(8) a. No quieres el juguetito, pues no le compres.
   "You don’t want the toy, well, don’t buy ACC-(M)."

b. El arroz te le comes sin tomate, que ya estoy harta de que eches tomate a todo.
   "You must eat the rice ACC-Mass without tomato (sauce). I’m fed up with your putting tomato on everything."

---

3. Data from the author’s fieldwork research in Colmenar Viejo, a town in the North of Madrid with a population of about 50.000 inhabitants.

4. For instance, I detected a preference for le with masculine inanimate referents in six- to ten-year-old children, which obviously could mean that this use is spreading.
We are thus dealing with a less developed stage of the Castilian referential system described above, as the change has not been completed yet. Still, when the direct object has a masculine inanimate referent, le and lo compete for the same distributional space to mark the object. Fernández-Ordóñez (2001) documents similar systems, which she calls “transitional systems,” elsewhere in the Central Peninsula, clearly pointing out their intermediate status between the most developed, referential, system, and the most conservative, etymological or “differentiating,” system.

In short, in the Central Peninsular systems we can detect a tendency which favors the gender pattern above all the rest. This change, however, has not yet been thoroughly consolidated in all the pronominal systems documented in the area: in the less developed systems a pattern of animacy is still in conflict with gender.5

Fernández-Ordóñez traces the genesis of the referential system back to an older Cantabrian system, which differentiated continuous from discontinuous entities and maintained the accusative/dative case distinction, but had borrowed leismo from neighboring areas, in which Spanish was in contact with Basque. In spite of this borrowing, she maintains on the basis of abundant dialectal and historical documentation that the change from a case-based pattern to “patterns based exclusively on the categorization of the referent” (Fernández-Ordóñez 2001:436) must be attributed to internal factors. “Change at this stage does not seem to be externally conditioned. Instead, it follows from a process of syncretic levelling which is internal to the nominal paradigm … This reconstruction, based on both old and modern data, does not go against what is predicted by the tendencies in linguistic change which have been revealed by the evidence of interlinguistic variation. On the contrary, it is perfectly consistent with them” (Fernández-Ordóñez 2001:438). She argues that the linguistic change undergone by the referential system took place in accordance with universal tendencies in linguistic change.6 Specifically, the change affects only

5. It must be kept in mind that the Spanish Royal Academy considers the so called “leismo” de cosa” (le for a thing) a vulgar form that must be avoided: “Debido a su extensión entre hablantes cultos y escritores de prestigio, se admite el uso de le en lugar de lo en función de complemento directo cuando el referente es una persona de sexo masculino […] El leismo no se admite de ningún modo en la norma culta cuando el referente es inanimado: “El libro que me prestaste le lei de un tirón” (http://www.rae.es/). For this reason, perhaps, the change in inanimate objects is less widespread.

6. For Fernández-Ordóñez, the fact that number is more nuclear than gender follows from Greenberg’s universals 32 and 36, whereas it is more nuclear than case by virtue of universals 39. In her view, there is no conflict between this and Rolf Noyer’s hierarchy (1992) for morphological categories (Person > Number > Gender > Class): “Class” is understood here as a category which marks entities as representatives of a certain variety, and therefore can without difficulty include the Mass/Count distinction (Fernández-Ordóñez 2001:439).
the marking of the peripheral categories of the language while reinforcing the nuclear or internal ones, as per the hierarchy Number > Gender > Mass/Count Distinction > Case.

In a process of linguistic change involving morphological loss, this hierarchy predicts that case gets neutralized before gender and number, since its position is more external/less nuclear. In the changes described above for the Central Peninsular varieties, the case differentiation will be the first to disappear from the referential system, and consequently the pronominal selection will cease to be determined by case distinctions. The case that prevails is precisely the unmarked one, as universal change tendencies would suggest, since analogical change processes tends to favor the unmarked forms. Fernández-Ordóñez’ conclusion is based on the fifth rule of Kuryłowicz (1949: 31), “Pour rétablir une différence d’ordre central la langue abandonne une différence d’ordre plus marginal”: To restore a central difference, the language gives up a more marginal one. It also conforms to the fourth principle proposed by Elvira (1998: 227): “El cambio analógico está orientado desde las formas menos marcadas o más frecuentes hacia las marcadas o menos frecuentes”: Analogical change is oriented from the less marked or more frequent forms towards the marked or less frequent ones. In this instance, the dative would be marked, and the change is oriented towards the accusative, whose gender sub-systems it copies.

Fernández-Ordóñez thus provides an independent reason for the reorganization of the referential system: the marked case is lost in favor of the unmarked one, which afterwards copies the gender marks for the object. She invokes a separate, later change for the neutralization of the mass/count distinction – a distinction she judges inadequate for pronominal selection, as attested by the most successful variant of the present-day referential system.

In short, the changes observed in the Castilian referential systems have resulted in a simplification of the paradigm, starting with the loss of the marked case, the dative le, and the spreading of forms of the less marked case, the accusative lo/la, to mark the indirect object. These changes are consistent with tendencies observed in the internal evolution of the language and current theories of universal patterns of linguistic change.

2.2 Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages

The peculiarities of the pronominal systems of Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages have generally been described in terms of partial or even total reorganization of the original systems of unstressed pronouns. These changes have generally been traced back to the speech of speakers of Amerindian languages
who became bilingual in the local Spanish. The starting point of these changes is taken to be the etymological, or differentiating, pronominal system common to American Spanish, characterized, as we have seen in the previous section, by case, number, and gender distinction patterns.

However, the patterns that govern the unstressed pronominal systems are not the same in every area where Spanish is in contact with Amerindian languages. This is true whether we consider varieties of Spanish spoken by bilinguals (as in Mexico or Guatemala) or monolingual Spanish speakers in former bilingual areas (as in the Sierra of Ecuador). Some linguistic changes have been documented whose effect is the simplification and functional reinterpretation of the unstressed pronouns. I have suggested (Palacios 2005, 2007) that all the relevant changes in the Spanish-Amerindian contact areas are part of a more general and systematic process of linguistic change that goes far beyond the boundaries of any specific area. I have also proposed that these changes respond to two consecutive tendencies, as a result of which two types of reorganization of the unstressed pronominal systems may arise: either a partial reorganization (a two-case system), if only the first change has taken place, or a total reorganization (yielding the simplified system), wherever the additional second change has occurred. All the relevant Amerindian languages (e.g. Guarani, Nahuatl, Tz’utujil, Quechua), in spite of their typological diversity, have one crucial feature in common: they do not grammaticalize gender morphologically or make gender otherwise systemically pertinent. These languages either have no case markers (Guarani) or, if they have them, the third person has zero markers (Quechua). Nahuatl and Tz’utujil have case markers but these case markers do not have gender specifications.

The first change that took place in these historical contact areas was a partial reorganization of the standard etymological system of unstressed pronouns, as typically used by American Spanish speakers from non-bilingual regions. This first stage is attested nowadays, in particular, among bilingual Mayan and Nahua speakers in Guatemala and Mexico, among already monolingual Spanish speakers in indigenous Quechua areas of the Sierra of Ecuador, and among Paraguayan bilingual speakers from around Asunción. This change began by neutralizing the

[7] Flores Farfán (1999) and García Tesoro (2005, 2006) have investigated the Spanish spoken by the Nahuatl and Maya; Godenzi (1986), Calvo Pérez (1996–97), Martínez (2000), and Palacios (2005) have studied Spanish in contact with Quechua in the Andean area; and Granda (1996), Martínez (2000), and Palacios (1998, 2000) have studied Spanish in contact with Guarani.

[8] We have examples of this pronominal reorganization in documents by Indian chroniclers from the Andes dating back to the seventeenth century. Unfortunately there is no comparable documentation from other historically bilingual areas.
gender feature in the selection of the direct object pronouns (*la* for feminine and *lo* for masculine antecedents), that is, crucially not from case neutralization, as occurred in the central systems of Spain. This is shown in Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine/Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>Lo(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>Le(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in the following contemporary examples, the pronominal form *lo* refers to or anticipates the direct object, irrespective of its gender, while *le* refers to an indirect object. Examples in (9) are from the Spanish varieties spoken by bilingual Nahuatl in Mexico (Flores Farfán 1999); Examples in (10) from bilingual and monolingual speakers from the zone in contact with Tz’utujil in Guatemala (García Tesoro 2005, 2008), and Examples in (11) from bilingual and monolingual speakers from the zone of Quechua influence in Ecuador.

(9) a. Sí, yo *lo* conozco a su hija.
"Yes, I know your daughter ACC."

b. *Lo* quería matar a mi hijo.
"S/he wanted to kill my son ACC."

c. Allá *lo* hacen *máscaras*.
"There (they) make masks ACC-(f)."

(10) a. Yo no *lo* quería soltar a mi mamá.
"I didn’t want to let my mother ACC go."

b. Las tradiciones *lo* practican la gente ladina.
"Ladino ACC-(f) people keep the traditions ACC-(f)."

9. Examples taken from Spanish speakers from Otavalo, a bilingual area to the north of Quito.

10. The historical Spanish-Quechua bilingualism typical of the Ecuadorian Andes up to the present day is well-known. It is commonly taken to be at the origin of the different processes of linguistic change occurring in this area, in contrast to the Ecuadorian coast, which has never been bilingual. See, among others, Haboud 1998; Haboud & de la Vega 2008; Palacios 2005. There, Quechua is known as Quichua.

11. The English translation maintains the source structure, in which the unstressed pronoun coexists with the object noun in the same sentence.

c. Tenemos que hacer *tamalitos* así, […], entonces *lo* calentamos y
*lo* mandamos a llevar al campo.

“We have to make *tamalitos*13 this way, … then (we) heat *ACC-(M)* and
have *ACC-(M)* taken to the countryside.”

(11) a. ¿*Lo* baño a *Gabriela*?

“Do I give *Gabriela* *ACC-(F)* a bath?”


“They kill the *pig* *ACC-(M)* but very old.”

c. *Lo* cruza *una calle* y ahí está la feria.

“You cross the *road* *ACC-(F)* and there you have the fairground.”

d. Antes *lo* utilizaban *las balsas* para pescar.

“In the past, they used the *ponds* *ACC-(F)* to fish.”

This eliminates the asymmetry between the direct and the indirect object that is
typical of the etymological system. The manifestations of the pronominal forms
of both accusative and dative become symmetrical, with *le* as the marker of the
indirect object and *lo* as the marker of the direct object, irrespective of the gender
of their antecedents. In other words, the gender of a noun no longer determines
the selection of the corresponding pronominal forms. This situation is completely
different from the one that prevails in the standard Spanish spoken in those parts
of Mexico, Guatemala, or Ecuador which are not characterized by pervasive his-
torical bilingualism.

The pronominal system is thus reorganized and simplified on the basis of a
case parameter. The pronominal forms *le*/*lo* become the case markers in a two-case
system, and more often than not the latter announces the presence of an object
complement in the same clause (Palacios 2005). The neutralization of the gender
features in the accusative pronoun is evidence that a case distinction change has
taken place, in sharp contrast with the central Spanish pronominal systems, where
the gender distinction took over to the detriment of case. Of particular relevance
here is the fact that the American pronominal systems typical of the bilingual areas
reveal the presence of an analogical change which seems to go against the univer-
sal tendencies mentioned above in connection with Peninsular developments.

Indeed, universal change tendencies appear to be based on the greater weight
of the least marked option: the accusative, with its gender differentiation, pre-
vails over the dative, which adopts the distinction from it. In the New World sys-
tems under discussion a contrary analogical spreading process occurs, since the
less marked case is the one that copies the morphology of the marked one: the

dative imposes its morphology on the accusative, which in turn loses the gender differentiation. The change is not the loss of the case marker which, as we have seen, appears to be the less nuclear category and consequently the more marked one in the scale Number > Gender > Case but the loss of the gender distinction while the case distinctions of the pronominal forms are preserved. This change thus does not conform to the general tendencies that have been formulated on the basis of proposed universal cross-linguistic hierarchies.

In the case of the bilingual and Spanish monolingual speakers from the Quechua contact zones close to Quito (Ecuador), an ulterior transition system has been documented. In it the case distinction prevails, but inanimate direct objects select lo, as in (11), whereas le is preferred for animate nouns, as shown in the Examples in (12).

(12) a. Ahí mató al presidente [...], que le mataron.
   "There s/he killed the president ... they killed ACC-(M)."

   b. Si pasa algo le avisamos a Juan.
   "If anything should happen, we'll let Juan ACC-(M) know."

   c. Si yo me caso, les invito a todos.
   "If I get married, I invite them ACC-(M) all."

This system is represented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>Inanimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>le(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>le(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we have the case distinction, and also a second change which is beginning to take shape: case neutralization in favor of the dative form when the direct objects are animate.\(^\text{14}\) This change gives rise to the simplified or leísta unstressed pronominal system of monolingual Quito speakers of any social status, at least in their oral Spanish.\(^\text{15}\) This can be seen in the Examples of (13), taken from Haboud & De la Vega (2008:171).

---

\(^{14}\) Recall that an animacy pattern was also apparent in the transition systems of central Spain.

\(^{15}\) The same change takes place in the urban Castilian variety of Paraguay, also a simplified leísta system in the oral register of both bilingual and monolingual speakers, as shown in these examples taken from Palacios (2000): a) Siempre le estamos haciendo [la sopa paraguaya]
Then a second change took place in this simplified system: the case distinction of the two-case system was neutralized and, as a result, the system was reduced to a single pronominal form le(s) which expresses both the direct and the indirect object, irrespective of the gender or animacy features associated with the corresponding noun as well as, significantly, of case specifications. Thus the pronoun merely indicates the presence of an (in)direct object in the clause, as shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCUSATIVE</th>
<th>Masculine/Feminine/Animate/Inanimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>Le(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that this second change is also contrary to the proposed universal change tendencies, since the pronominal form that finally prevailed is the one formerly associated with the dative. The reanalysis of the form and function of the pronominal system has turned le(s) into a purely grammatical indication of objecthood, with no specification of case or gender.

The reason for this peculiar change is precisely the interference of an exogenous factor due to intense contact with the Amerindian languages in those areas.

Although they belong to different linguistic families, the contact languages involved Maya, Nahuatl, Quechua, and Guarani have certain structural characteristics in common. Specifically, they lack an unstressed pronominal system similar to that of Castilian and, most pertinently, they do not morphologize gender. This absence of gender marking goes a long way toward accounting for the changes

("We always make ACC-(F) [the Paraguayan soup]."); d) La policía le desalojó el lugar ("The police evacuated the place ACC-(M)"). As in Ecuador, a two-case system has been documented in the peripheral semi-urban areas of Asunción (Paraguay) (Palacios 2000): a) Lo vas a ver varias mujeres ("You can see several women ACC. See also Palacios (2005)."
observed in those simplified systems: the unstressed pronouns lose the gender distinction and either become mere case markers, in the two-case systems, or else play a purely structural role, in the one-case systems.

What we have here, then, is a linguistic convergence process, rather than something to be filed away under the somewhat vague label of interference. Spanish is simplified by eliminating those of its features which are not felt to be relevant by speakers of the indigenous languages involved, by bilinguals, or even by those who have lost their indigenous language. The marks thus eliminated are those for gender, in the first change, and for case, in the second. The latter change is more restricted, since it only affects Andean Ecuadorian speakers in the Quito area, who are already Spanish monolingual, and bilingual urban Paraguayans.

Throughout this linguistic convergence process the relevant features of the Amerindian languages involved are apparent. While in the changes of the peninsular varieties the gender pattern prevails over the case pattern, in the contact-induced changes no gender pattern is established, because gender is not grammatically relevant for the Amerindian languages involved. Instead, case and animacy features are relevant and therefore determine the resulting pronominal pattern. The reorganization of the pronominal systems induced by contact with the Amerindian languages has thus eliminated the functional distinctions present in General Castilian which were not relevant for speakers of a (former) second language.

This suggests that we are facing a single general process of contact-induced change, which brings about the consolidation of a grammaticalization process that is more developed than the ones occurring in Peninsular pronominal systems. Of interest to us here is that all the changes in the pronominal systems of historically bilingual areas yield similar results, common to every one of these areas, which can be understood as the output of a general contact-induced process of change. They all show comparable effects of a similar mechanism of linguistic convergence. In these indirect contact-induced changes, external factors (historical bilingualism) and internal tendencies (the internal evolution of the language) both play essential roles, and whether the former or the latter prevail is irrelevant to the change process. If one of these sets of factors, internal or external, were to be absent, the change would yield completely different results, as we have seen in the evolution of the pronominal systems of the Peninsular varieties and in the relative fossilization of the pronominal systems of the American varieties with no historical bilingualism. Thus, the analysis of these systems gives us a synchronic view of a change in progress: at one extreme, the unsimplified systems which have not yet experienced any changes (etymological systems), and at the other extreme, the maximally simplified systems, with less
evolved systems corresponding to an intermediate stage (two-case and transition systems) in an intermediate position.

2.3 Elision of the direct object

Elision of the direct object is a very common linguistic phenomenon in Spanish: it consists of the omission of an otherwise expected unstressed third person pronoun, functioning as direct object, when the referent is indefinite and the information lost through this omission can be retrieved from the immediate context. Contemporary evidence about this phenomenon reveals that a change is in progress, since we can find conservative and intermediate varieties of the language in question as well as highly innovative varieties, such as Quito Spanish or Paraguayan Spanish, where this phenomenon is hardly restricted at all.

The restrictions affecting the phenomenon thus vary in accordance with geographical and language contact factors. This synchronic variation enables us to draw a picture of direct object elision in its different stages, and eventually reveals a reasonably accurate description of the corresponding change that is in progress.

2.3.1 Peninsular Spanish: The conservative variety

Direct object elision in transitive constructions is not rare in standard Peninsular Spanish, but occurs only in strictly constrained environments. Campos (1986) has established that only indefinite objects NPs without an article could be elided in standard Spanish. A question like the one in (14) could only be answered without a direct object unstressed pronoun, as in (15):

(14) ¿Has comprado revistas?
    "Have you bought magazines?"

(15) Sí, O he comprado, sí.
    "Yes, I have, yes."

16. The elision we discuss here does not include the omission of the arbitrary objects characterized as [+human, +singular] of the type música clásica convence ("classical music convinces"), which can be rephrased as "convinces everyone." Neither does it cover intransitive uses of transitive verbs, as in Mi hijo siempre come en su habitación ("My son always eats in his bedroom").

17. In the Spanish variety spoken in the Basque Country direct object elision follows parameters completely different from the rest of the Peninsular varieties. This is due to Basque contact. Landa (1995) describes semantic and syntactic contexts of direct object elision very similar to the ones we shall encounter in the American varieties of Spanish in contact with Quechua or Guarani.
On the other hand, if the direct object reference is definite, there is no possibility of eliding the unstressed pronoun in the answer:

(16) ¿Has comprado las revistas?
    “Have you bought the magazines?”

(17) Sí, *Ø he comprado, sí
    “Yes, *I have, yes.”

These alternations are subject to rigorous syntactic restrictions. As Campos (1986) explains, the elision is not possible if the noun is part of an embedded complement sentence (19), a subject clause (20), an adverbial clause (21), or a partial interrogation in which the interrogative is not the direct object (22). Reproduced below are grammaticality judgments by speakers from Madrid on purported answers (19)–(22) to the question in (18):

(18) ¿Sabes si la secretaria pidió/ha pedido/pedirá carpetas ya?
    “Do you know if the secretary asked/has asked/will ask for folders?”

(19) *Corre el rumor de que Ø pidió/ha pedido/pedirá, pero no lo sé con
     seguridad.
     “They say she asked/has asked/will ask Ø, but I don’t know for sure.”

(20) *Que Ø pidió/ha pedido/ pedirá es evidente.
     “It is clear that she asked/has asked/will ask Ø.”

(21) *Sí, la secretaria pidió/ha pedido/pedirá carpetas porque el jefe Ø necesita.
     “Yes, she asked/has asked/will ask for the folders because the boss needs Ø.”

(22) *Sí, pero no sé cuándo Ø pidió/ha pedido/pedirá.
     “Yes, but I don’t know when (she) asked/has asked/will ask Ø.”

Note that in these examples the tense and/or aspect of the verb could be changed without thereby improving the grammaticality of these constructions in standard Peninsular Spanish. The elision phenomenon, therefore, is not affected here by temporal or aspectual restrictions. We can safely consider this variety of the language as very conservative with respect to this particular phenomenon.

2.3.2 Intermediate varieties: The Spanish of Buenos Aires
In the Spanish spoken in Buenos Aires, Rioplatense, direct object elision is at a more advanced stage than in Central Peninsular Spanish.\(^{18}\) Although direct object elision in Buenos Aires is still subject to very strong restrictions, some of

---

18. The data used in this section have been elicited from educated native speakers.
the options we saw above, both of a semantic and a syntactic nature, have been eliminated. As shown in (23), Rioplatense, like Standard Peninsular, cannot in general apply elision to objects which are definite; it can do so, however, in contexts like that in (24), with three participants, or in (25), with verbs of knowledge (conocer, saber “know”), which are prototypically transitive.

(23) a. ¿Compraste pasteles? No, no O compré.
   “Did you buy cakes? No, I didn’t.”

b. ¿Viste si había chicos en la calle? No, O no había.
   “Did you see if there were boys in the street? No, there were not.”

c. ¿Trajiste los libros? *No, no O traje / No, no los traje.
   “Have you brought the books? *No, I haven’t brought O/ No, I haven’t brought them.”

(24) a. Si le O digo, me mata.
   “If I tell him O, he kills me.”

b. Si le digo que le O dijiste, es capaz de no volver.
   “If I tell him that you told him [that] O, he’s capable of not coming back.”

c. ¿Puedes contarnos algún plato típico de allá? Yo te O puedo contar pero no quiere decir que yo lo haga.
   “Can you tell us about some typical dish from there? I can tell you O but this doesn’t mean I would make it.”

   “The waterfalls of Iguazu are amazing, do you know [them] O? No, I don’t know [them] O.”

b. A ella no le gusta la isla flotante. ¡Ah!, no O sabía.
   “She doesn’t like the Praline soufflé. Ah, I didn’t know.”

c. ¿Conoces la leyenda del Pombero? Si O conozco.
   “Do you know the legend of Pombero? Yes, I know [it] O.”

As we can see, in this Rioplatense variant of the language the frequency of direct object elision has increased: it is allowed in a larger set of syntactic contexts, and a larger set of semantic verb types accept it, even though the phenomenon is still very restricted. Note that the standard variety of Buenos Aires has never been in linguistic contact with Amerindian languages and shows no morpho-syntactic influence from them. Thus in its innovative divergence from Peninsular in this respect no exogenous factors, and specifically no language contact factors, are involved. We can only invoke internal factors, and observe that change proceeds in the direction of gradually disregarding certain syntactic and semantic restrictions.
2.3.3 Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages: More evolved varieties

The contact varieties of Spanish exhibit a greater frequency of direct object elision than other varieties. Examples are provided by the simplified systems of Spanish in contact with Mayan languages (García Tesoro 2006) and with Guarani (Palacios 1998), Northeastern Argentinian Spanish (Güllán 2012; Martínez 2000), and the Ecuadorian systems in contact with Quechua (Palacios 2006). The most salient feature of these varieties, for present purposes, is that they have very few restrictions on object elision, in contrast to what we have seen in the case of Peninsular and Rioplatense. To illustrate this, let us consider direct object elision in the varieties in contact with Guarani and Quechua, which represent two of the stages of the change under discussion.

In the simplified leísta system of Paraguayan Spanish the direct object is elided quite frequently. The only relevant restriction appears to be based on the animacy of the referent, which must be [-animate], although sporadic objects with animate referents can also be elided. The Examples in (26), taken from Palacios (1998, 2000), illustrate these characteristics.

(26) a. Él pensaba comercializar con la energía vendiendo O a otros países.
   “He thought of marketing with the energy selling [it] O to other countries.”

b. Las casas no aguantan […] y luego ya al abandonar O, […] se pudren todo.
   “The houses do not hold … and then, when abandoning [them] O everything gets rotten.”

c. El vestido de novia a lo mejor O compra el novio, O compra la novia.
   “The wedding dress perhaps the groom buys O, or the bride buys O.”

d. Todos le pueden decir que O vieron [lo que sucedía].
   “Everybody can tell him they saw O [what happened].”

e. Antes no teníamos policía ni tampoco O necesitábamos. Cuando comenzamos a necesitar O, ya no servía.
   “In the past we didn’t have policemen, and we didn’t need O. When we started to need O, they weren’t useful any more.”

The diversity of the Examples in (26) suggests that we can rule out all semantic and syntactic restrictions on direct object unstressed pronoun elision other than the semantic restriction based on animacy. All the elided objects have inanimate referents. But: (a) they can be both definite or indefinite; (b) no aspectual or temporal restrictions apply; (c) elision takes place with both inflected and uninflected verbs; (d) the semantics of the verb are also irrelevant; and (e) elision of the direct object within an adverbial or a subject clause is also possible, contrary to what happens in Standard Spanish.
Again, direct object unstressed pronoun elision obeys no restrictions in Paraguayan Spanish except in the case of the animacy feature. This is a generalized and very frequent linguistic phenomenon that occurs in both written and oral language and in both monolingual and bilingual speakers of any sociolect (Palacios 1998, 2000). It is very different from what we have seen above for other varieties. We thus observe here a major acceleration of a change process that has been documented in other varieties of Spanish, an acceleration we can attribute to the intense contact with the Guarani language.

Some characteristics of Guarani may have triggered the disappearance of almost all restrictions of the phenomenon under discussion. First, Guarani lacks an unstressed pronominal system similar to the Spanish one; the Guarani pronominal construction requires the presence of a stressed third person pronoun in a postpositional phrase. Second, Guarani pronouns cannot have the same morphematic character as Spanish unstressed pronouns, because they generally are part of a PP. Finally, Guarani pronouns can only refer to animate entities. For example, the question “¿Tu mamá compró su casa?” [“Did your mother buy her house”] cannot be answered with a pronoun object since its reference is inanimate:

(27) ¿Nde sy ojoguápa hóga? ojogua.
    “¿Tu mamá compró su casa? Sí, ya Ø compró.”
    “Did your mother buy her house? Yes, she already bought Ø.”

In Guarani, then, elision of the direct object is frequent if the information can be accessed from the context, a phenomenon that is mandatory in the case of objects with inanimate referents. In the same way, Paraguayan Spanish speakers regularly elide the direct object unstressed pronoun with inanimate referents, without any further lexical, morphological, or syntactic restrictions. It is proximity to Guarani that triggers and accelerates a change that is taking place in other varieties of Spanish.

I have been able to document a pattern of pronominal elision similar to what we have already seen for Paraguay among Spanish speakers of the Ecuadorian Andes who have a two-case pronominal system. Here too the only restriction affecting the elision of direct object unstressed pronouns is that they must be inanimate.

19. In the Spanish varieties in contact with Tz'utujil in Guatemala, the only applicable restriction seems to be the one imposed by the animacy of the object (García Tesoro 2006). It must be pointed out that in the Paraguayan variety, as well as in the northeast of Argentina, only sporadic elisions of direct objects with animate referents may occur (Palacios 1998; Guillán 2012).
Following are some examples from Palacios (2006):

(28) a. En el campo nunca celebramos la Nochebuena […] Ø nunca celebramos en el campo.
   “In the countryside we never celebrate Christmas Eve … never celebrate Ø.”

b. Esos pantalones siempre Ø confeccionamos nosotros mismos.
   “These trousers we always make Ø ourselves.”

c. Estas prendas de lana son de llama […] cuando tú Ø lavas ya dejan de picar.
   “These clothes are made of llama wool … when you wash Ø, they stop itching.”

This change has been favored by a number of characteristics of Quechua (Alderetes 2001; Calvo Pérez 1993; Cole 1987): a) unlike Spanish, it lacks an unstressed pronominal system; b) the direct object personal pronoun that Quechua incorporates into the verb is always animate; c) for the third person the object verbal agreement is a zero morpheme; d) this third person elision extends to the other persons in oral Ecuadorian Quechua. 20

Let us now turn to the simplified Ecuadorian leísta system. This system does not impose any semantic or syntactic restrictions on direct object elision, which takes place with both inanimate and animate referents. This variety of the language corresponds, then, to a more advanced stage in the change process under discussion. Recall that the simplified Ecuadorian pronominal system occupies an extreme position among all the varieties of Spanish: it presents the most advanced and generalized changes in the simplification process, since there the pronoun le(s) is a structural object marker with no gender or case specification. For this reason, we expect direct object elision not to be subject to restrictions in this system, in which the single pronominal form le(s) only contrasts with the absence of the pronoun through elision (Ø), for objects with both animate and inanimate referents, even in syntactic contexts where some other varieties would disallow the elision. This is apparent in the Examples of (29), gathered from monolingual speakers from Quito.

---

20. It is interesting to note that in the grammars of Quechua there can be found translations from Quechua into Spanish of sentences in which the definite object pronominal is elided. Thus, in the Quechua grammar by Cerrón Palomino (1976), the translation of some sentences into Spanish shows object elision: Estoy llevando Ø para comer (“I am taking Ø to eat”)/Y si hubiera dormido aquí Ø habría sentido [los ruidos] (“And if I had slept here, I would have heard Ø [the noise]”).
(29) a. Veo como hacen ellas las comidas españolas, y bueno, así tiene que hacer Ø.
   "I see how they make the Spanish dishes, and well, that's the way they must make Ø."

b. Me he ido a las discotecas a ver cómo eran y sí, Ø veo bien diferentes.
   "I went to the discos to see how they were and, yes, I see Ø quite different."

c. Yo traía unos dólares de allá y tengo que cambiar Ø si de repente Ø necesito.
   "I had some dollars from there and I must change Ø if I need Ø suddenly."

d. A mis niñas, antes Ø dejaba en la guardería, pero me desconfiaba mucho.
   "My daughters, I used to let Ø in the kindergarten but I mistrusted a lot."

e. Hay muchos ecuatorianos que vienen aquí, pero no Ø he visto todavía.
   "There are many Ecuadorians coming here, but I haven't seen Ø yet."

The data indicate that here the animacy feature has no positive or negative effect on pronominal elision, in contrast with other varieties of Spanish subject to language contact. The Ecuadorian simplified system is now undergoing a second and more advanced change with respect to the more conservative two-case system of that country. Like most pronominal systems of the contact areas, that system raises the question of why animacy should be the only remaining relevant feature. Note that this same feature can be taken to play the main role in the change from a two-case pronominal system to a leísta system, as shown by the transition systems discussed above. Clearly, we are dealing here with a robust feature whose action is neither accidental nor casual but systematic and generalized in the two pronominal simplification cases we have examined. Our discussion so far shows that animacy plays a prominent role in Spanish pronominal variation, whether in internal or in contact-induced changes.21

To sum up, we have seen that the varieties of Spanish in intense contact with Amerindian languages have passed through two consecutive changes that may be described as follows:

Change 1: elision with animacy restriction (Paraguayan Spanish, northeastern Argentina, Guatemalan Spanish from the contact areas, Ecuadorian Spanish two-case systems).
Change 2: unrestricted elision (Ecuadorian Spanish with leísta simplified system).

21. In Mayan and Nahuatl languages the animacy feature also plays a role in certain morpho-syntactic processes (García Tesoro 2006; Flores Farfán 1999).
The simplified leísta system of the Andean Ecuadorean variety that exhibits further changes in progress is the most innovative of all the systems studied thus far.\textsuperscript{22} It would not be unreasonable to predict a future evolution towards that system in Paraguayan Spanish and in the Spanish spoken in northeastern Argentina, since a few cases of animate object elision have already been documented in these varieties.

I conclude that here we have change in progress that seems to result from internal language factors. This change is very slow and its direction indicates that the linguistic restrictions it confronts are very strong, although in the somewhat less strict of the conservative varieties, that of Buenos Aires, they disappear in very specific contexts. Nevertheless, when external factors intervene, as when there is contact with Amerindian languages, the change accelerates spectacularly and the restrictions disappear. The external influence fuels the pace of change, eliminates the functional distinctions associated with semantic features that are not relevant to the native speakers of the source language (the Amerindian languages), and strengthens underlying cognitive structures in the Amerindian languages coinciding with those of the object language, namely Spanish. This is tantamount to saying that the structural consequences have been triggered by the influence of a cognitive system unrelated to Spanish, which has also made it possible to reinterpret the underlying contrasts of the general pronominal system and then recategorize its forms. Note that the influence of the Amerindian languages has produced general, systematic, and predictable changes in all the varieties of Spanish under contact, reflecting the structural and cognitive characteristics of the languages involved.

The change progression could be represented as follows:

Peninsular dialect \(\rightarrow\) American dialects with no contact \(\rightarrow\) dialects with contact
[least innovative] \(\rightarrow\) intermediate \(\rightarrow\) [most innovative]

I should stress that different pronominal systems coexist in every one of the linguistic communities considered here. Simplified pronominal systems compete with more traditional etymological ones, even in the speech of the same individual. All the systems exhibit variation, including the most conservative ones. This kind of linguistic variation is to be expected in areas of grammatical instability while grammaticalization processes are under way.

What is most significant here is that in areas of longterm bilingualism subject to intense indigenous language contact, all the varieties of Spanish have undergone

\textsuperscript{22} It must be pointed out that the two-case and one-case systems coexist with the etymological system in the Ecuadorian Andes (Palacios 2005, 2006). Speakers using the etymological system present a process of object elision with the same restrictions as the Buenos Aires variety (Palacios 2006).
partial or total reorganization of their pronominal systems, whether clearly defined or as incipient tendencies. This cannot be at random: these changes call for a systematic and general account, based on specific, consistent linguistic patterns. In this they clearly differ from direct changes involving straight borrowing from the contact language, which may perfectly well correspond to a linguistically inconsistent process.

2.4 The values of the preterite tenses

The values for the Spanish preterite tense, specifically perfecto simple (past tense, PT) and perfecto compuesto (present perfect, PP), exhibit some amount of variation in the Peninsular territory itself. This diversity was inherited by American Spanish, with relatively similar uses and values. However, in Andean Ecuadorian Spanish modal values indicative of the truthfulness of the information transmitted by the speaker have been documented, values which are not registered in Peninsular Spanish. In this section I discuss linguistic changes affecting the temporal values of the past, both where Spanish is in contact with Quechua and where there is no linguistic contact. I then analyze these changes with respect to their internal and external causes, to show that the grammaticalization processes of the varieties with no linguistic contact follow change patterns different from the ones that govern the grammaticalization processes of the contact varieties.

2.4.1 Central Peninsular Spanish

In Spanish, PP and PT “compete” for the expression of past actions, and in both tenses temporal and aspectual values coexist. Throughout the history of the language, these tenses/aspectual values have undergone change, resulting in the adoption of values other than those present in Latin. In the more conservative Peninsular varieties, the PT, as in Latin, expresses any past action and indicates the perfective aspect. The semantics of the PP are much more reduced. Essentially this form is related above all to the imperfective aspect; however, as pointed out by Meier (1968) and Squartini and Bertinetto (2000), among others, since the fifteenth century a tendency has been documented for the compound tense (PP) to gradually occupy the ground of the simple form (PT). Partly as a result of

23. Perfecto simple and perfecto compuesto roughly correspond to the English Past and Present Perfect respectively. Henceforth perfecto simple will be referred to as PT, and perfecto compuesto as PP. The similarity to English is mostly formal, however, and does not extend to use. As a consequence, some of the examples below, while completely grammatical in Spanish, may be ungrammatical in translation. Throughout this section, by “simple form/tense” I mean perfecto simple (PT) and by “compound form/tense” I mean perfecto compuesto (PP).
this, the PP nowadays expresses actions largely concerned with relevance to the present moment, giving priority to the proximity between the past moment and the moment of speaking over the associated aspectual values. As Rojo and Veiga (1999) claim, in Central Peninsular Spanish the PT is used to indicate the perfective aspect and also to mark that the past event is moving away, subjectively or objectively, from the present moment. The compound tense (PP) is used to indicate both the perfective and imperfective aspects; it is interesting that the speaker subjectively or objectively evaluates the distance between the moment of action and the moment of speech. The notion of current relevance is subjective: the speaker judges the relevance of the past event to the present situation and to the time of speech, and selects the PP if it is relevant to the time of speech, the PT if it is not.

(30) a. El año pasado viajé a Italia.
   “Last year I went to Italy.” (implication: no relation to moment of speech time).

b. Mi padre murió el mes pasado.
   “My father died last month.” (implication: no relation to moment of speech time).

c. Mi padre ha muerto el mes pasado.
   “My father has died last month.” (implication: the past event is relevant to the moment of speech; the speaker subjectively links them both).

d. Ayer tomé algo que me ha sentado mal.
   “Yesterday I ate something that didn’t sit well with me.” (implication: yesterday situates the event in a temporal unit which is prior to the one including the day in which speech is taking place).

e. Ayer he tomado algo que me ha sentado mal.
   “Yesterday I have eaten something that didn’t sit well with me.” (implication: the speaker subjectively attributes relevance to the past event and situates it in the moment of speech).

f. Esta mañana he desayunado café con leche.
   “This morning I have had café au lait.”

As we can see, in Central Peninsular Spanish the compound forms are invading territories that previously corresponded to the simple forms. Speakers can choose one or the other depending on the meaning intended. If they want to highlight the perfective aspect, they can choose the simple form; if, on the contrary, they want to highlight the permanence of the process up to the present moment or its consequences or relevance for the present, they will choose the compound form, as can be seen in (30c, e). In (30f), the past action is placed in the middle of the temporal unit in which the speaker is situated, and for that
reason the compound form is the only option available. Indeed, in the most conservative varieties of Spanish the sentences in (30) would require the simple forms because the perfective aspect of the past action prevails over any other temporal consideration.24

What we have here, in the more innovative variety, is a process of linguistic change that seems to follow cross-linguistic patterns. The compound forms take over the meanings previously expressed using the simple forms, in a grammaticalization process conditioned by temporal factors related to the moment of the action and the moment of speech (Bybee et al. 1994; Schwenter 1994; Serrano 1994; Squartini & Bertinetto 2000). This change is still in progress, as the compound form is now undergoing change in even more innovative varieties of the language, as we shall see in the next section.

2.4.2  **Ecuadorian Spanish**

The variety of Spanish spoken in Andean Ecuador exhibits the traditional values in the preterite tenses, as far as the temporal and aspectual domains are concerned. There the compound form is used to express the duration of a past action (aspect) or its relevance to the moment of speech, as can be seen in the following Examples.25

\[(31)\quad a.\quad \text{Más que nada porque cada cual tiene su alcalde, ¿no?, y como fue el de la capital, pues él ya ha hecho todo, la mayor parte.}\\
   \quad \text{"Especially because everyone has its own mayor, isn't it? And since he was the mayor of the capital city, he has already done everything, most of it."}\\
   b.  \text{Bueno, a hacer cola en donde sea, ir a pedir comida en las iglesias, [...] pero luego asimilas todo eso y se te queda como, más vale, a mí me ha hecho más valiosa la vida y me ha hecho madurar super.}\\
   \quad \text{"Well, queue wherever possible, ask for food at the churches ... but then you assimilate all this and well, it's for the best, it has made life worth living for me, it has mellowed me a lot."}\\
\]

---

24. This does not exclude other values of the compound forms, values expressing e.g. resultative, continuative, or experience processes, as in, for example, Juan se ha marchado ("Juan has gone") / He viajado a París desde entonces ("I have been to Paris since then") / Juan ha visitado París ("Juan has visited Paris"). All these processes illustrate values that express the relevance or continuity of the past action in the present moment (Comrie 1976; Dahl 1985).

25. All the examples in this section are taken from Palacios (2007).
In the case of the simple form, the examples from Ecuadorian speakers in (32) show that the temporal proximity or distance of the past event with respect to the present moment does not condition the tense selection:

(32) a. ¿Quieres una coca-cola? No, gracias. Ya tomé una hace 5 minutos.
   “Would you like a coke? No, thanks. I already had one five minutes ago.”

b. ¿Tienes lista tu tarea? Claro, esta mañana la hice.
   “Have you done your homework? Of course, I did it this morning.”

c. Ayer fui al cine.
   “Yesterday I went to the cinema.”

However, in addition to these values, but only in the Andean area, the preterite tenses also include more innovative values associated with the evidentiality of the action. These marked modal evidential values indicate how the speaker got the information and whether s/he believes or not in its truthfulness. They are, obviously, subjective and therefore optional, and for that reason are activated at the speaker’s choice. Their distribution is as follows: The compound form is used to convey that the speaker did not exactly experience or witness the reported event, and therefore s/he cannot be sure of its veracity but merely reports it. Compare to the following colloquial fragment, which shows how the Ecuadorian speaker uses the simple form to narrate a personal experience.

(33) Nosotros tuvimos un, estuvimos atravesados por el fenómeno del Niño, que arrasó con toda la costa en el cual todas las personas salieron de las partes rurales salieron a la ciudad, a Quito, que es la capital, que es donde yo también vivo, y pues igual también fuimos afectados bastante el cual nos afectó a nosotros también en el cual es pues las cosas de en viveres subió bárbaramente.
   “We had a, we were crossed by the El Niño phenomenon which devastated all the coast and the people got out from the rural zones and went to the cities, to Quito, which is the capital, which is where I live too, and we also were quite affected, which affected us too, and the prices of everything rose considerably...”

26. These innovative values have been documented in all the Andean varieties, although the distribution of the values for the simple and compound form is not the same in all the corresponding regions. Thus, Escobar (1997) and Schumacher (1977) show that in the Peruvian Andes it is the compound form that expresses the direct participation of the speaker in the event, and not the simple form. In turn, How and Schwenter (2003:74) claim that in the Andean Spanish of Bolivia, “there still exists functional specialization of the two forms, such that the Preterite is mainly restricted to parking temporally sequenced events in narrative contexts, and the Present Perfect is heavily favored in contexts of non-temporally-sequenced past situations.”
The simple form is thus used to convey that a certain fact has been experienced by the speaker or else that the speaker is absolutely confident that it occurred. In contrast, the compound form (PP) is used to express facts that the speaker could not confirm (hence unreal, false or doubtful, mythical or historical facts). It can also indicate a sudden discovery or refer to something the speaker does not know at the moment of speaking. The fragment transcribed below, from a Quito speaker, exemplifies the opposition between the simple and the compound forms and the distribution of their uses. The speaker is narrating a conversation that his mother had with a stranger. When he is reproducing the stranger’s words he uses the compound form; in contrast, when he is reporting his mother’s answers he uses the simple form, giving in this way greater reliability to his mother’s words.

(34) De una señora, suponte, en Gran Vía que estaba mi madre sentada, ¿sí?, y le ha dicho: Oye, india, lárgate de aquí. ¿Pero qué le pasa? Lárgate de aquí, que te largues, dice. Me largo porque tengo educación y no voy a estar peleando, o sea, eso es lo que le contestó.

"Of a lady, let’s say in Gran Vía, my mother was sitting there, yes?, and that woman has told her ‘You Indian, get off here. What’s the matter with you? Get off here, out of here,’ she says. ‘I’ll go because I am an educated person and I don’t want to fight with you,’ that’s what she answered."

The next two examples, also by speakers from Quito, show how the compound form is resorted to in order to express unreal or false statements (35a) or the sudden discovery of an unknown fact (35b):

(35) a. Nos han dicho que hay mucho trabajo aquí, que aquí hay trabajo lo que quieras, que pueden ir a trabajar, pero eso no ha sido verdad.

“They have told us that there is a lot of work here, that here you can easily find a job, but this has not been true.”

b. Ayer vi a Mauricio y ha estado casado (resulta que está casado).

“Yesterday I saw Mauriceo and he has been married (he is married).”

As we can see, the selection of the past forms is conditioned by factors indicating a subjective perception of the reliability of the information which is transmitted, reported, or experienced, as well as the responsibility of the speaker in relation to it.

This linguistic change is so widespread that it has become the Andean norm, even among Castilian monolingual university students. In the specialized literature, it is regularly taken to be induced by Quechua contact. The Quechua verbal system has two past tense suffixes indicating evidentiality, not aspect. Past events not witnessed by the speaker are expressed using the reportative past tense suffix *-sqa, which is used to refer to myths, historical information, or reported information. Faller (2002: 30) considers *-sqa part of the so-called perfect of evidentiality. The perfect of evidentiality suffixes “combine reportative interpretations with
interpretations as inferences from result states to the causing event and mirative interpretations.” Grammarians use the label “pasado delegatorio” for this form. Events with “the direct participation or under conscious control of the speaker in a time after the speaker’s childhood and before the moment of speech” are expressed using the past tense suffix -*rqa* (Cusihuaman 2001: 156).

The assimilation of these modal values might be explained in terms of adoption from a cognitive perspective. Castilian incorporates modal values that are both typical of Quechua and compatible with its own value system, since it has a narrative or reported past indicating that the speaker did not witness the facts s/he is reporting. It also has a series of obligatory validation suffixes that permit the specification of the information source (Alderetes 2001; Calvo Pérez 1993; Nardi 1976–1977).

The Andean Ecuadorian speaker has transferred the Quechua evidentiality system from Quechua into Castilian, taking advantage of the internal structure of both languages. The standard Castilian PT (*perfecto simple*) expresses perfectivity, termination, conclusion, and therefore knowledge. Conversely, the compound form (PP) expresses ambiguous and continuous values and imperfective aspect, and thus indicates lack of continuity (lack of an ending point) thus it is related to the unknown (Piñero 2000). Under such perspectives, it is relatively easy to explain how this contact-induced change occurs, by bringing together the Spanish syntax with quechua choices regarding its values of evidentiality: direct experience and knowledge, or certainty, of the information conveyed vs. lack of personal experience and/or uncertain reliability of given information. In other words, the speaker brings his/her variety of Spanish nearer to the Quechua validation system by exploiting Spanish resources (two differentiated past tenses) as well as Quechua resources (the “pasado delegatorio”), thereby introducing cognitive distinctions and communicative strategies which do not exist in Spanish but are available to speakers of Quechua. Not surprisingly this interesting outcome has not been documented by any other Spanish variety. In short, we are dealing with changes where new cognitive structures, unknown by the standard, underlie the already existing Spanish structures. Such changes have to do with functional and pragmatic transformations.

3. Final considerations

The contact-induced changes that we have discussed occur in intense contact situations, due to the instability or vulnerability of certain grammatical areas (Matras 2007) already subject to pre-existing internally generated linguistic variation. Their results are different from those of contact-induced changes in which
morpho-syntactic material from outside the language is imported or morpho-
syntactic structures are replicated, in the sense of Heine and Kuteva (2005). The
latter do not require previous internal variation,27 since any structure can be
replicated and any morpheme incorporated into a language under intense contact,
as happens in Paraguayan Spanish (González Sandoval 2006; Granda 1998;
Krivoshein de Canese & Corvalán 1987; Palacios 2008; Zajícová 2010).

What is of particular interest here is that the exogenous factor in a contact situ-
ation has unexpected consequences: the reorganization of an entire paradigm (the
pronominal system), the disappearance of linguistic restrictions and the increase
in the relative frequency of a phenomenon (direct object elision) and, finally, the
adoption of new semantic values (verbal präterites).

At the same time, the contact situation accelerates the change process, thus
yielding riskier and more innovative solutions than do internally generated
changes. As I have tried to show in this paper, when the contact-induced changes
do not involve the importing of morpho-syntactic material or structures, changes
whether caused by internal or external factors follow systematic guidelines: that is,
they follow patterns conditioned by the structures of the languages involved in the
contact situation. This means that the contact-induced changes start from existing
evolutionary tendencies, as is made clear by the contrast between the reorganiza-
tion of the Peninsular pronominal systems – internally generated, and conforming
to general change tendencies based on language universals and cross-linguistic
hierarchies – and the reorganization that results from language contact, whose
effects diverge from these proposed general tendencies.

Contact-induced grammaticalization processes also require us to take
into account the structural characteristics of both Spanish and the Amerindian
languages involved. It is worth noting that the same linguistic effects have been
documented in every variety of Spanish in contact: first, reduction of a two-
case system, then, at a more advanced stage, reduction to a one-case system.
The changes are general and have systematic effects. However, these linguistic
effects are the way they are precisely because of the common characteristics that
the Amerindian languages in question exhibit. If these characteristics had been

27. Paraguayan speakers very often incorporate into their colloquial Spanish a number of
Guarani morphemes for which there is no Spanish parallel: vení-na“ven-atenuador imperativo”
(“come-attenuate imperative”)/Era nico propiamente voi la voz del finado don Simeón “It was
nico precisely voi the voice of the deceased don Simeón”; nico and voi are Guarani discursive
markers that reinforce the assertion. Equally frequent is the replication of Guarani syntactic
structures: La puerta cayó por mi pie (Peninsular “me pillé el pie con la puerta”) “I caught
my leg in the door”/Ella me vio como mal ejemplo y no se quiso juntar más por mí (“...no se
quiso juntar más conmigo”) “she didn’t want to meet me again” (Palacios 2008).
different, the results of the linguistic changes would have been different as well. In this type of contact-induced change, the direction of the changes is marked by the structures of the languages involved. These structures represent a more powerful change factor than either the evolutionary tendencies internal to a single language or the universal tendencies (as shown, for example, by the evolution of the preterite tenses). This is what allows us to predict, to a certain extent, where in the language these changes may take place in any contact situation, given the appropriate structural and cognitive characteristics. We need to keep in mind that, to a certain extent, and on the basis of the structural and cognitive characteristics displayed by each language, the outcome of contact situations might be predictable, although unexpected results can also emerge.

In my view, it is the mechanism of linguistic convergence that is responsible for the changes discussed here: the evolution of a language is favored by internal structures on which an external factor (the contact language in this case) acts, thus leading to the borrowing of distinctions that can be utilized communicatively, as in the case of evidential values. Linguistic convergence is a very productive mechanism, which might be defined as a set of processes that result in the development of common grammatical structures in both languages, or varieties of the same language, under contact. The similar structural features in two languages or varieties A and B that coexist in a certain area make it possible for one of them to influence the other. This can produce various linguistic outcomes: alterations in the frequency of an existing linguistic phenomenon, an increase or decrease in the number of restrictions constraining a phenomenon (as with direct object elision), the neutralization of marked features, paradigms becoming simpler or more complex (the reorganization of the pronominal systems), and the adoption of functional distinctions from the contact language (the functional specialization of the verbal preterite tenses). Note that this mechanism accounts for changes whose effects go beyond mere grammatical copying, since the speakers involved are able to exploit the resources of both languages cognitively and

28. It is important to keep in mind that the typological distinction between the languages cannot prevent the changes from occurring.

29. Note that in areas like Central America or Venezuela the compound preterite has adopted modal values (enhancing the information or showing surprise) that could be accounted for on the basis of the internal structure of the language. If this is true, it means that contact with indigenous languages such as Quechua, in which evidentiality plays a significant role, can trigger linguistic changes with unexpected effects.

30. In Palacios (2005, 2006) linguistic changes in Spanish in contact with Quechua are analyzed from the perspective of the linguistic convergence.
communicatively. In this respect, linguistic convergence is quite similar in its behavior to the processes of contact-induced grammatical replication described in Heine and Kuteva (2005).

Thus, both the structural characteristics of a language and its tendencies toward internal variation trigger, or play a role in, contact-induced grammaticalization changes. This interpretation of contact-induced change helps us to predict in which unstable or vulnerable zones of the language these changes are likely to occur, and in which direction they may go. As repeatedly underscored above, it is revealing that similar processes, in different areas of contact between Spanish and Amerindian languages, have similar outcomes caused by external and internal factors and by the linguistic convergence mechanism that has been outlined in these pages.

Needless to say, the linguistic changes studied here represent only one facet of some notoriously complex contact situations. No reference has been made here to similar convergence processes moving in the opposite direction, that is, from Spanish toward Amerindian languages. Their study is beyond the scope of this paper, but there is abundant literature showing that these are bi-directional processes, also present in Amerindian languages in contact with Spanish (see, among others, Canger & Jensen 2007; Chamoreau 2007; Estrada Fernández & Guerrero 2007; Flores Farfán 1999; Gómez Rendón 2007; Hekking & Bakker 2007; Hill & Hill 1999; Muysken 1997; Zajícová 2010).
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