

Andean and Amazonian Spanish: Macro-contact with Indigenous Languages

Liliana Sánchez

University of Illinois Chicago

The study of language contact between Spanish and typologically different indigenous languages in Latin America has shown evidence of microvariation and variability in morphological and syntactic phenomena including variation in pronominal systems, gender agreement patterns and syntactic structures at the interface with information structure among others (Escobar 2011; Sánchez 2004, 2015; Mayer and Sánchez 2016, 2017). One of the main questions that language contact and bilingualism studies have tried to answer is the extent to which language change is due to crosslinguistic influence or can be attributed to general bilingualism effects (Sorace & Serratrice 2009). High levels of individual variability among bilinguals in contact situations further problematize the availability of categorical representations (Putnam & Sánchez 2013, Sánchez 2019). D'Alessandro (2021), Adriani et. al (2022) have proposed a focus on the effects of contact between closely related languages (microcontact). Another way of approaching this issue is to study the effects that contact with unrelated languages that diverge in syntactic and morphological properties have on a single language (macro-contact). In this talk, I present results of a series of studies that investigate the effects of contact with three typologically different languages, Quechua, Shipibo, and Ashaninka on Spanish differential object marking and clitic doubling/clitic dislocation structures (Mayer & Sánchez 2017; Mayer & Sánchez 2021; Sánchez et. al in press).

Differential Object Marking (Aissen 2003; Bossong 1991, 2003; Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011) and clitic doubling and clitic dislocation structures exhibit high levels of variability across Spanish dialects (Suñer 1988; Leonetti 2008). In most Spanish varieties, DOM is triggered by features such as animacy and definiteness (1). Mayer and Sánchez (2021) found evidence of different effects on DOM in clitic doubling/dislocation structures in Bilingual Spanish in contact with Quechua, a nominative-accusative language, Ashaninka, a nominative-accusative language with split intransitivity, and Shipibo, a language with ergative-absolutive alignments. The three languages lack DOM, overt definite determiners and, of the three, only Ashaninka has nominal markers of gender. Mayer & Sánchez (2021) hypothesized that DOM would be more prevalent in the Quechua-Spanish data than in the other two contact varieties given the similarity in argument marking patterns since both are nominative-accusative languages and it would be less prevalent in Shipibo-Spanish given its ergative-absolutive alignments. Analyses of the oral production of DOM in clitic doubling/dislocated structures showed a difference between the Quechua-Spanish bilinguals and Ashaninka-Spanish bilinguals ($\beta = 3.05$, $SE = .43$, $z = 7.05$, $p < .001$) such that the former group was more likely to exhibit DOM (1,2). That difference was not found when comparing the Ashaninka-Spanish bilinguals and the Shipibo-Spanish ($\beta = .34$, $SE = .41$, $z = .81$, $p = .42$) (2,3).

Spanish in contact with Huanuco Quechua

[1] *Le acarici-a a su perr-o* [+anim, +DOM]
CL3SG caress-3SG DOM POSS dog-MSG
'(S)/He caresses her/his dog.'

Spanish in contact with Asháninka

[2] *El niño lo agarr-ó Ø el sap-ito* [+anim, +DOM]
the boy CL.3.M.SG grab-PERF.3SG DET.M.SG toad-DIM.M.SG
'The boy grabbed the little toad.'

Spanish in contact with Shipibo

[3] *Le molest-a Ø el ñiñ-o* [+human, -DOM]
CL3SG bother-PRES-3SG Ø DET.MSG child-MSG
'He bothered the child.'

More recently, Sánchez, Camacho, Mayer and Rodriguez (In press) found consistent gender marking on determiners but not on clitics in productive and receptive tasks in Shipibo-Spanish,. Overall, these differences point in the direction of contact between Spanish and typologically different languages resulting in partially divergent DOM and pronominal systems.