

## **Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum**

Rutgers University has made this article freely available. Please share how this access benefits you.  
Your story matters. [\[https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/50980/story/\]](https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/50980/story/)

This work is an **ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT (AM)**

This is the author's manuscript for a work that has been accepted for publication. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, final layout, and pagination, may not be reflected in this document. The publisher takes permanent responsibility for the work. Content and layout follow publisher's submission requirements.

Citation for this version and the definitive version are shown below.

**Citation to Publisher** Mayer, Elisabeth & Sanchez, Liliana. (2016). Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics* 29(2), 544-581. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/resla.29.2.07may>.

**Citation to this Version:** Mayer, Elisabeth & Sanchez, Liliana. (2016). Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics* 29(2), 544-581. Retrieved from [doi:10.7282/T3M32Z1H](https://doi.org/10.7282/T3M32Z1H).

**Terms of Use:** Copyright for scholarly resources published in RUcore is retained by the copyright holder. By virtue of its appearance in this open access medium, you are free to use this resource, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings. Other uses, such as reproduction or republication, may require the permission of the copyright holder.

*Article begins on next page*

# Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics

## Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	RESLA-D-15-00079R2
<b>Full Title:</b>	Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum
<b>Short Title:</b>	
<b>Article Type:</b>	Article
<b>First Author:</b>	Elisabeth Mayer, PhD
<b>Other Authors:</b>	Liliana Sanchez, PhD
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Elisabeth Mayer, PhD Australian National Univeristy Canberra, ACT AUSTRALIA
<b>Funding Information:</b>	
<b>Section/Category:</b>	Special Issue
<b>Keywords:</b>	Direct object clitics, object agreement markers, syntax, information structure, monolingual and bilingual contact varieties
<b>Manuscript Classifications:</b>	Language Learning and Acquisition; Pragmatics
<b>Abstract:</b>	Direct object clitics in Spanish are morphological markers at the interfaces of syntax, phonology, morphology, and information structure (Zwicky 1985; Ordóñez & Repetti 2006; Belloro 2007; Spencer & Luís 2012). In bilingual acquisition they are subject to variability (McCarthy 2008). In this paper we explore the morphology-syntax-information structure mapping of direct object clitics in clitic structures in a range of speakers that includes Quechua-dominant bilinguals and Spanish monolingual individuals along a continuum of language contact situations. Our findings indicate clear dissociation between syntactic properties and marking of morphological features. They also indicate a progression from default gender marking in clitics to a scalar system of clitic forms based on animacy and informational value along the continuum of speakers. The findings of this exploratory study support the view that while clitics exhibit common syntactic properties across a continuum of speakers, they vary in morphological marking and informational value.
<b>Author Comments:</b>	we are grateful for the extension you granted us.
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	

# Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum

Elisabeth Mayer y Liliana Sánchez

Australian National University / Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

*Direct object clitics in Spanish are morphological markers at the interfaces of syntax, phonology, morphology, and information structure (Zwicky 1985; Ordóñez & Repetti 2006; Bello 2007; Spencer & Luís 2012). They play an important part in argument morphology in Spanish and are subject to variability in bilingual acquisition (McCarthy 2008). In this paper we explore the morphology-syntax-information structure mapping of direct object clitics in clitic structures in a range of speakers that includes Quechua-dominant bilinguals and Spanish monolingual individuals along a continuum of language contact situations. Our findings indicate clear dissociation between syntactic properties and marking of morphological features. They also indicate a progression from default gender marking in clitics to a scalar system of clitic forms based on animacy and informational value along the continuum of speakers. Finally, while clitics in liberal clitic doubling varieties receive a focus interpretation (Sánchez 2010; Sánchez & Zdrojewski 2013), our data indicate that in some Spanish contact varieties they denote the primary object and secondary topic (Sánchez 2003; Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011; Mayer 2008, 2013, forthcoming). The findings of this exploratory study support the view that while clitics exhibit common syntactic properties across a continuum of speakers, they may vary in morphological marking and informational value.*

**Keywords:** direct object clitics, object agreement markers, syntax, information structure, monolingual and bilingual contact varieties

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In this paper, we explore variability at the interface of syntax, morphology, semantics and information structure in sentences with direct object clitics, clitic doubling (CLD), clitic left dislocation (CLLD) and clitic right dislocation structures (CLRD), in two groups of Quechua-Spanish bilingual speakers, in two Quechua attritted-Spanish dominant speakers and in a monolingual speaker of Spanish, all of them living in Peru.

Direct object clitics in Spanish are morphological markers at the interface of syntax and phonology, morphology, semantics and information structure (Bello 2007).<sup>2</sup> In bilingual

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors would like to thank all participants as well as Maria Jose Cabrera and Yoshidaira Garcia as assistants with data collection and Vidal Carbajal and Daniel Valle as assistants in transcription of the bilingual data. We also thank three anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback.

<sup>2</sup> We refer here to the basic set of direct object or accusative clitics *lo(s)* and *la(s)*, and also to *le(s)* in its function as an accusative clitic in monolingual and bilingual contact varieties.

1  
2 acquisition they are subject to morphological and representational variability specifically in  
3 comprehension and production (McCarthy 2008). Based on experimental evidence, McCarthy  
4 argues that, in second language learning, the degree of morphological variability of gender  
5 and number agreement can be linked to different stages of language acquisition, with  
6 intermediate level participants exhibiting greater variability than advanced levels. The  
7 emergence of the masculine clitic as a default form also shows the same gradability across  
8 levels. In principle, morphological variability is compatible with acquisition of syntactic  
9 properties. In fact, some second language learners have been shown to exhibit a dissociation  
10 between syntactic and morphological representations (Lardiere 1998, 2005).

11  
12  
13 In this paper, we study the availability of a morphosyntactic property (procliticization  
14 and encliticization of accusative clitics) and its relationship to morphological variability in  
15 gender marking as well as to informational structure in a continuum of language contact  
16 situations that goes from lower levels of exposure to contact Spanish to monolingual  
17 development in a variety less affected by contact.

18  
19 Previous work has established that, in addition to anaphoric clitics, CLLD structures and  
20 CLRD structures found in most varieties of Spanish, some varieties of Latin American  
21 Spanish exhibit third person accusative clitics in CLD structures that are characterized by: a)  
22 definite/specific interpretations of the DP (Bleam 1999; Leonetti 2007); b) the availability of  
23 clitic climbing, c) agreement in gender and number between the clitic and the doubled  
24 determiner phrase (DP) (Lipski 1994; Suñer 1988; Sánchez 2010); and d) an exhaustive  
25 identificational focus interpretation of the DP (Di Tullio & Zdrojewski 2006; Sánchez 2010).  
26 This interpretation differs from the topic interpretation found in CLLD structures and the topic  
27 recovery interpretation found in CLRD structures (Arregi 2003; Cardinaletti 2002; Cecchetto  
28 1999, 2000; López 2009; Zubizarreta 1998) or the sentential afterthought interpretation also  
29 proposed for CLRD (Villalba 2000).

30  
31  
32 While these characteristics have been documented in monolingual varieties of Spanish,  
33 third person accusative clitics in some varieties of Spanish in contact with Quechua have been  
34 described as having different characteristics such as lack of agreement in gender (evidenced  
35 by the use of the unmarked dative clitic *le* and/or default masculine *lo*) (Escobar 1978;  
36 Escobar 1990; Klee & Caravedo 2005; Mayer 2008; Sánchez 2003), a lack of restriction on  
37 definite/specific interpretations (Luján 1987), and a secondary topic interpretation of the DP  
38 in clitic doubling structures (Mayer 2008, 2010; Sánchez 2003).

39  
40  
41 Our exploratory study builds on these previous studies. Our goal is to analyse the effects  
42 of crosslinguistic influence and divergent linguistic input on the morphological marking of  
43 clitics in all clitic-related structures and on the informational value of clitic doubling  
44 structures. We study the oral production of two groups of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals, one  
45 group with higher levels of formal instruction in Spanish and living in an urban setting (Cuzco  
46 Quechua-Spanish bilinguals), and the other one with lower levels of formal instruction and  
47 living in a rural setting (Huánuco Quechua-Spanish bilinguals). As a point of comparison we  
48 also look at oral data from two Spanish speakers with attritted Quechua and one Spanish  
49 monolingual speaker living in an urban setting. This first and novel comparison of bilingual  
50 and monolingual data in the rural-urban continuum that characterizes Quechua-Spanish  
51 bilingualism makes it possible to identify morphological and informational structure variation  
52 across speech communities. The variation we found takes the form of morphological scalar  
53 clitic subsystems that develop differently according to different levels of interaction between  
54 crosslinguistic influence (in bilinguals and attritted Quechua-Spanish dominant speakers),  
55  
56  
57  
58

1  
2 linguistic input from different speech communities and access to higher levels of formal  
3 education. In addition, to morphological variation we also found variation in informational  
4 values assigned to different clitic structures.  
5

6 The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the morphosyntactic  
7 properties of clitic structures in Spanish, contact Spanish and Quechua, their representation  
8 on information structure and we link those properties to emerging differences in clitic systems  
9 in bilingual and monolingual contact varieties. In section 3 we present our methodology; our  
10 results are given in section 4 and discussed in section 5. Concluding remarks are given in  
11 section 6.  
12  
13

## 14 15 16 **2. Clitic doubling in Spanish, Quechua and Contact Spanish**

### 17 18 **2.1. Morphosyntactic properties of accusative clitics**

19  
20 There is ample evidence that clitics in most Romance languages are at the interface of syntax,  
21 phonology and morphology (Zwicky 1985; Ordoñez and Repetti 2006; Spencer and Luís  
22 2012). Clitics show internal structure (they may be marked for gender and number) and they  
23 are prosodically weak single words or affixes attached to the verbal host. As such, they cannot  
24 be modified, conjoined, or topicalized and cannot appear in isolation (Kayne 1975). They are  
25 also an important part of the argument morphology of Spanish (Harris 1995).<sup>3</sup>  
26

27 Unlike subject agreement verbal morphemes that are suffixes, clitics can be prefixed or  
28 suffixed onto a verb. In preverbal position they are labelled proclitics, (1) while in postverbal  
29 position they are labelled enclitics (2). With simple verbs they appear as proclitics (1), but in  
30 verbal periphrasis involving a conjugated modal verb and an infinitival form they may appear  
31 as enclitics on the infinitival form (2) or as proclitics on the modal verb (3), and the same is  
32 the case with auxiliaries and gerund forms (4), (5):  
33  
34  
35

- 36 (1) La ve-o  
37 CL3FSG see-1SG  
38 'I see her.'  
39  
40  
41 (2) Quier- o ver-la  
42 want-1SG see-INF-CL3FSG  
43 'I want to see her.'  
44  
45  
46 (3) La quier-o v-er  
47 CL3FG want-1SG see-INF  
48 'I want to see her.'  
49  
50  
51 (4) La est-á v-iendo  
52 CL3FSG be-3SG see- GER  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>3</sup> From a lexical perspective, they encode the argument structure of the verb but can also be related to non-  
56 argument projections such as ethical datives (Bonet i Alsina 1995; Franco & Huidobro 2008; Ormazabal &  
57 Romero 2013), and applicatives (Cuervo 2003).  
58

1  
2  
3           ‘(S/he) is seeing her.’

- 4  
5 (5)   Est-á     v-iéndo-la  
6       be-3SG   see- GER-CL3FSG  
7       ‘(S/he) is seeing her.’  
8

9  
10 This property, known in the literature as clitic climbing (Kayne 1989, 1991; Rooryck 2000;  
11 Uriagereka 1995), is not found in Quechua, in which overt object agreement morphemes  
12 appear only as suffixes onto the verb, as in the case of the first person object agreement  
13 morpheme in:  
14

- 15  
16 (6)   Maqa-wa-n<sup>4</sup>  
17       hit- 1ACC-3SG  
18       ‘S/he hit me.’  
19

20  
21 The third person object marker is not overt when the subject is third person, as shown in:  
22

- 23 (7)   Maqa-Ø-n  
24       hit-Ø-3SG  
25       ‘S/He hits (him/her/it).’  
26

27  
28 Unlike in Spanish, object agreement markers cannot be suffixed onto infinitival forms:  
29

- 30 (8)   \*Maqa-wa-y   muna-n  
31       hit-1ACC-INF   want-3SG  
32       ‘(S/he) wants to hit me.’  
33  
34

35 Nor can they be affixed to the main verb with the relevant meaning:  
36

- 37 (9)   \*Maqa-y   muna-wa-n  
38       hit-INF    want-1ACC-3SG  
39       ‘(S/he) wants to hit me.’  
40

41 In addition to structures that involve only a clitic and in which the clitic receives an anaphoric  
42 interpretation dependent on the discourse antecedent (10), many varieties of Spanish are  
43 characterized by having three other structures that involve an accusative clitic and an overt  
44 DP. These are clitic doubling structures (11), clitic left dislocation structures (12), and clitic  
45 right dislocation structures (13):  
46  
47

48  
49 (i) Single clitic (anaphoric clitics)

- 50 (10)   La           v-i-o  
51       CL3FSG    see-PST-3SG  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 <sup>4</sup> These examples are in Cuzco Quechua spoken by one of our bilingual groups. In this respect, Huánuco  
57 Quechua, spoken by the other group, does not differ from Cuzco Quechua. For a full description of object person  
58 marking in Cuzco Quechua see Cusihuamán (2001) and for Huánuco Quechua see Weber (1989).  
59

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

‘(S)He saw her.’

(ii) Clitic Doubling structures (CLD)

- (11) La v-i-o a ella/ María.  
CL3FSG see-PST-31SG DOM her/Maria  
‘(S)He saw her/Maria.’

(iii) Clitic Left Dislocation structures (CLLD)

- (12) A María, la v-i  
DOM Maria CL3FSG see-PST-1SG  
‘As for Maria, (s)he saw her.’

(iv) Clitic Right Dislocation structures (CLRD)

- (13) La v-i ayer a María  
CL3FSG see-PST-1SG yesterday DOM Maria  
‘I saw her yesterday, Maria.’

Clitic doubling structures in which the clitic exhibits gender marking such as (11) are limited to some varieties of Spanish (Jaeggli 1986; Mayer 2006; Ormazabal & Romero 2013; Suñer 1988; Sanchez 2010; Saab & Zdrojewski 2010, among others), one of them being the prestigious variety of Spanish spoken in Lima, the capital of Peru, the country of residence of all participants in this study (Mayer 2006; Sánchez 2003; Zdrojewski & Sánchez 2014). On the other hand, CLLD and CLRD structures are commonly found across most Romance languages (Arregi 2003; Cecchetto 2000; Ordóñez 1990; Rivero 1980; Villalba 2000; Zagana 2000). While structures with anaphoric clitics have traditionally been analyzed as involving movement, clitic doubling structures have been analyzed as involving an object agreement marker that is the spell out of an argument position rather than a moved clitic (Jaeggli 1986; Suñer 1988). There have also been many proposals that have tried to provide a unified account for these three structures (Belletti 2005; Cecchetto 1999; López 2001; Sportiche 1996; Villalba 2000; Zubizarreta 1998). The common idea behind these unified analyses is that the clitic doubling structures and the dislocated ones can be derived from one another by proposing that the clitic and the DP start as part of the same constituent and become separated due to movement of the clitic and/ or the DP (cf. Belletti 2005; Cecchetto 1999).

One argument in favor of a movement analysis for clitic doubling structures is that acusative clitic doubling, in the varieties that allow it, is compatible with clitic climbing with a roclitic (14) and with an enclitic (15):

- (14) La quier-o v-er a María  
CL3FSG want-1SG see-INF DOM Maria  
‘I want to see Maria.’

- (15) Quier-o v-er-la a María  
want-1SG see-INF-CL3FSG DOM Maria  
‘I want to see Maria.’

1  
2  
3 There are many accounts in the literature of what makes clitic climbing possible in most  
4 Romance languages. Movement accounts such as Kayne (1991) propose that the clitic  
5 incorporates to the embedded T projection and the cl-T complex moves to the higher clause.  
6 Other accounts such as Roberts (1991) propose that the clitic moves freely to the main verb.  
7 Rooryck (2000) proposes that, in clitic climbing, clitics move to the main clause through Inf  
8 and embedded T but must reach C in the embedded clause. This happens when T moves to C.  
9 If T in the embedded clause does not move, the clitic remains in the lower clause and is an  
10 enclitic. In contrast to Spanish, Quechua varieties have SOV canonical word order and in  
11 them direct object DPs appear in pre-verbal position (Cerrón-Palomino 1988; Sánchez 2010).  
12 There are no clitic pronouns that undergo clitic climbing (cf. ex. 9) and they cannot be affixed  
13 onto infinitival forms (cf. ex. 10). Since object agreement markers are suffixes in Quechua  
14 and precede subject agreement morphemes in linear order, proposing a movement analysis  
15 for them seems unmotivated. In fact, most Quechua varieties lack other types of object  
16 movement (Sánchez 2010). This would indicate that bilinguals in Quechua and Spanish would  
17 have to develop different representations for accusative or direct object morphemes on the  
18 verb: one involving movement in Spanish and one not involving movement in Quechua. L1  
19 Quechua and/or Quechua dominant bilinguals would have to acquire clitic climbing as a  
20 movement in Spanish.

21 Quechua also differs from Spanish in that topicalized fronted object DPs and right margin  
22 (dislocated) object DPs are possible but they lack object marking on the verb, unlike CLLD  
23 and CLRD structures in Spanish:

24  
25 (16) Wasi-ta-qa Pirdu- m ruwa-rqa-n  
26 house-ACC-TOP Pirdu-FOC build-PAST-3S  
27 ‘The house, Pirdu built.’  
28 (Sánchez 2010: 71)

29  
30 (17) Kay warma-cha qucha pata-pi diha-yku-n [hatun hamp’atu-ta]  
31 this boy-DIM lake near-LOC leave-INT-3S big toad-ACC  
32 ‘This boy left the big toad near the lake.’  
33 (Sánchez 2015: 300)

34  
35 This contrast would also require two different representations: topicalization and right  
36 marginalization in Quechua without object marking on the verb and CLLD and CLRD  
37 structures with object clitics in Spanish.

38  
39 Quechua languages and most varieties of Spanish also differ with respect to the need for  
40 Differential Object Marking (DOM). Spanish varieties require that animate and definite or  
41 specific direct object DPs be marked with ‘a’ (Kayne’s generalization: Bossong 1985; Aissen  
42 2003; Mayer 2010; Mayer & Delicado 2015; Ormazabal & Romero 2013; Rodríguez  
43 Mondoñedo 2007; Zdrojewski 2013, among others). The following contrast shows the  
44 ungrammaticality of an unmarked animate and specific direct object DP in all three structures:

45  
46 (18) \*La v-i Ø Maria ayer en el mercado  
47 CL3FSG see-PST-1SG DOM Maria yesterday in the market  
48 ‘I saw Maria yesterday in the market.’

49  
50 (19) \*Ø Maria la v-i ayer en el mercado



1  
2 DOM Maria CL3FSG see-PST-1SG yesterday in the market  
3 'As for Maria, I saw her yesterday in the market.'

- 4  
5  
6 (20) \* La v-i ayer en el mercado Ø Maria  
7 CL3FSG see-PST-1SG yesterday in the market DOM Maria  
8 'I saw her yesterday in the market, Maria.'

9  
10  
11  
12 2.2. Spanish clitic systems in contact varieties

13  
14 While prestigious Lima Spanish shows gender marking on accusative clitics, Quechua-  
15 Spanish contact varieties exhibit a lack of gender and number agreement (21), and, as noted  
16 in Sánchez (2003), Quechua-Spanish bilinguals show a preference for the unmarked dative  
17 clitic *le*.

- 18  
19  
20  
21 (21) Acá el motelu le carg-a a un sapo  
22 here the turtle CL3SG carry-3SG DOM a toad  
23 'Here the turtle carries a toad.'

24 (Sánchez 2003:124)

25  
26 Monolingual contact varieties preferably use the default masculine *lo*, as shown in (22):<sup>5</sup>

- 27  
28  
29 (22) Yo lo v-i a las chic-as  
30 PRO.1SG CL3MSG see-PST-1SG DOM DET.FPL girl-FPL  
31 'I saw the girls.'

32 (Mayer 2008: 363)

33  
34  
35 Bilingual contact varieties also exhibit a lack of restrictions on definite/specific interpretations  
36 of CLD structures, as shown in (23), in which case the information structure role of the clitic  
37 *lo* has been linked to topic (Sánchez 2003) and secondary topic (Mayer 2008, 2010,  
38 forthcoming), namely, the direct object *una caja* 'a box' is being introduced as a new topic in  
39 discourse or as secondary topic in narrative in which the null subject is the primary topic.

- 40  
41  
42 (23) Se lo llev-ó una caj-a  
43 CL3SG CL3MSG take-PST-3SG INDEF.FSG box-FSG  
44 '(S)/He took a box (with her/him).'

45 (Luján 1987: 115)

46  
47  
48 On the basis of the previous literature mentioned, we propose that contact varieties exhibit a  
49 scalar distribution of variability in gender marking, as shown in (24). This variability is related  
50 to influence from Quechua but also to different levels of exposure to input in the prestigious  
51 normative variety of Peruvian Spanish measured in terms of access to formal instruction in  
52 Spanish administered by appropriately instructed teachers in the official school system.

53  
54  
55  
56  
57 <sup>5</sup> We use the term monolingual contact varieties to refer to those varieties spoken by children or grandchildren  
58 of Quechua-Spanish bilingual speakers who lack comprehension and production skills in Quechua.

1  
2 Exposure to a Peruvian standardized variety of Spanish is very limited in rural areas of Peru.  
3 The more limited the exposure to the official school system the less likely it is for speakers to  
4 receive input in such variety. The scale represents, on the left side, what we expect to find in  
5 Quechua-Spanish bilinguals with low levels of formal instruction and, therefore, limited  
6 exposure to the Peruvian prestigious normative variety, and on the right side, what we expect  
7 to find in monolinguals with high levels of access to formal instruction and therefore higher  
8 exposure to the normative variety.  
9

10  
11  
12 (24) Bilinguals (Low instruction)                      Monolinguals (High instruction)  
13

14        *le* (masc+fem) > *lo* (masc+fem) > *lo* (masc), *le* (fem) > *lo* (masc), *la* (fem)  
15  
16

17 In addition to the scalar system we also found null object pronouns which have been  
18 documented extensively for Spanish bilinguals in contact with Basque, Quechua, Guaraní and  
19 other Amerindian languages (Choi 2000; Landa & Franco 1992; Sánchez 1999). We excluded  
20 this phenomenon from (24) because of our focus in this paper on gender features and the  
21 information structural representation of clitic structures, but we will include them in the  
22 results of the two bilingual populations.  
23  
24

#### 25 2.2.1. Clitic systems in bilingual contact varieties 26 27

28 One prototypical example of a Quechua-Spanish bilingual variety with a strong preference  
29 for *le* as a direct object pronominal clitic is Lamas Spanish, a variety in contact with Lamas  
30 Kechwa. Lamas Spanish exhibits a single clitic system with *le* (singular) and *les* (plural).  
31 Lamas Spanish illustrates the extreme case in which Spanish contact with a language without  
32 gender marking shows gender neutralization and a single clitic system. Apart from Lamas  
33 Spanish, some version of a basic contact clitic system has been found in several Quechua-  
34 Spanish contact varieties (Camacho & Sánchez 2002; Sánchez 2003; Suñer 1989), in Spanish  
35 in contact with other Amerindian languages such as Guaraní in Paraguay (Granda 1988),  
36 Mayan languages in Guatemala (García Tesoro 2010) and in Basque Spanish including clitic  
37 doubling structures (Franco 1993; Landa & Franco 1999; Ormazabal & Romero 2013). For  
38 an excellent overview consult Lipski (1994). A possible explanation that has been proposed  
39 for this type of neutralization is to view *le* as the best candidate available in the input to avoid  
40 gender specification (Sánchez 2003).  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 2.2.2. Clitic systems in monolingual contact varieties 46 47

48 In monolingual varieties in contact with Quechua, the entire clitic sequence of *le/lo/la*  
49 manifests the properties of a single grammatical relation in a scalar system (Camacho &  
50 Sánchez 2002; Cerrón-Palomino 2003; Escobar 2000; Pérez 2000; Mayer 2010, 2015,  
51 forthcoming). The Limeño Spanish contact varieties (LSCV) monolingual clitic system in  
52 Table (1) shows co-variation of all clitic forms in clitic doubling structures. While all three  
53 clitics (*le*, *lo* and *la*) are possible as accusative clitics in doubling structures, the preferred  
54 order in varieties close to the prestigious norm is governed by animacy of the doubled object.  
55 This means that [+animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *le* than with *lo*, and [-  
56 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
57 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
58 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
59 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
60 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
61 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
62 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
63 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
64 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*. Both [+animate] and [-  
65 animate] objects are more likely to be marked with *lo* than with *le*.

animate] are less likely to be marked for feminine gender. In varieties less close to the prestigious Lima norm, *le* is preferred to mark a primary topic and *lo* is preferred to mark a secondary topic (see section 2.3); *la* can be used too but it has lower levels of preference.

**Table 1.** LSCV monolingual clitic system

	LSCV (+close to prestigious)	LSCV (-close prestigious)
+ ANIM	<i>le / lo / la</i>	<b>PO/SO</b> <i>le / lo / la</i>
- ANIM	<i>lo / le / la</i>	<b>PO/SO</b> <i>lo / le / la</i>

The emergence of invariant *lo* crossreferencing a plural feminine DP in (25), the *le* form in doubling an inanimate masculine DP in (26), and lack of DOM in both cases can be seen as diverging from a gender-marking accusative system based on animacy to a primary object / secondary object marking (PO/SO) (Mayer 2008, 2010, 2013, forthcoming). Despite being animate, the object in (25) is doubled by *lo*, and despite being inanimate, the object in (26) is marked with *le*.

(25) Lo v-i-mos (a) las chic-as  
 CL3MSG see-PST-1PL DOM DET.FPL girl-FPL  
 ‘We saw the girls.’

(26) Le v-i-mos al /el carr-o  
 CL3SG see-PST-1PL DOM-DET.MSG /DET.MSG car-MSG  
 ‘We saw the car.’

This system is unique and it differs from the practically complete monocausal clitic system in Quiteño Spanish, where *le* is used as the only clitic in anaphoric and CLD structures, and *lo* is used only as a propositional anaphor (Suñer and Yépez 1988; Suñer 1989). It also differs from other *le/lo* systems. While co-variation of *lo* and *le* is also found in Basque Spanish contact varieties (Fernández-Ordoñez 1994; Suñer 1989) and for L2 English speakers with Hispanic Background in the United States (Luján & Parodi 1996) it is less clear that in these cases CLD marks secondary topics, although it has been claimed that the doubled DP must be presupposed in Basque Spanish (Franco 1993).

Unlike in bilingual systems, the feminine clitic *la* is used for feminine animate DPs in varieties close to the prestigious Lima norm and extends to inanimate DP objects, as in (27), in less prestigious contact varieties.

(27) La cort-ab-an a la barrig-a  
 CL3FSG cut-PST-3PL DOM DET.FSG stomach-FSG  
 ‘They cut her stomach.’

Given these previous findings, we expect that the comparison of the two bilingual groups with the attrited and the monolingual speaker will be revealing of the different possibilities of variation in the scale presented in (24).

1  
2 2.3. Information structure  
3  
4

5 In terms of information structure clitics in non-contact varieties of Spanish have been  
6 proposed to be interpreted in the following way. Usually, anaphoric clitics receive a topic  
7 interpretation in discourse (Beukema & den Dikken 2000; Casielles-Suarez 2004; Lambrecht  
8 1994) and, in that respect, they differ from the clitic + DP unit in clitic doubling structures.  
9 The latter has been identified as receiving an exhaustive identificational focus interpretation  
10 in some varieties of Latin American Spanish (Belloro 2007; Sánchez 2010; Sánchez &  
11 Zdrojewski 2013), as in, crucially for our study, the prestigious Lima variety. Thus, in an  
12 example such as (28) the DP must be interpreted as referring to all the girls in the relevant set.  
13 It can also refer to a previously identified and therefore presupposed set at the time of the  
14 utterance:  
15  
16

- 17  
18 (28) Las v-i a las chicas  
19 CL3FPL see-PST-1SG DOM the girls  
20 ‘I saw the girls.’ (all of them)  
21  
22

23 Clitic left dislocation structures, on the other hand, have been posited to have either a topic  
24 interpretation or a contrastive interpretation (Arregui 2003) that differs from focus topics as  
25 in singling out one member of a salient set of members. Finally, the DP in clitic right  
26 dislocation structures has been proposed to be interpreted as topic recovery (Arregi 2003;  
27 Cardinaletti 2002; Cecchetto 1999, 2000; López 2009; Zubizarreta 1998) or as sentential  
28 afterthought interpretation (Villalba 2000).  
29

30 In Quechua, on the other hand, third person null objects are usually continuing topics. In  
31 left dislocated structures, fronted constituents marked with the topicalizing suffix – *qa* (cf. ex.  
32 16) introduce new topics and right dislocated elements (cf. ex. 17) have either a  
33 disambiguating function or introduce an afterthought (Sánchez 2010, 2015).  
34

35 In Spanish varieties in contact with Quechua, some clitic doubling structures have been  
36 identified as secondary topics. The notion of secondary topic (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011;  
37 Lambrecht 1994; Mayer 2008, 2010, forthcoming) as a new category has been proposed for  
38 mainly oral based monolingual (attritted or heritage) and also bilingual contact varieties where  
39 topichood is linked to the relationship between an agentive subject and the marked direct  
40 object. Givón (1983) observed that many languages distinguish between direct and indirect  
41 functions. This led him to propose the term secondary topic for the direct object assuming the  
42 subject to be the primary topic. The term secondary topic refers to “an entity such that the  
43 utterance is construed to be ABOUT the relationship between it and the primary topic”  
44 Nikolaeva (2001: 26). Thus, topichood is not uniquely governed by the referential properties  
45 of a DP, such as animacy and definiteness, but by “an aboutness relation” between the subject  
46 (mostly agentive and potentially overtly expressed) as the primary topic and the marked direct  
47 object as the secondary topic in accordance with its topic-worthiness (Comrie 2003). The  
48 following example illustrates the introduction of a secondary topic where the null subject is  
49 the agentive main topic of the story being narrated and the clitic doubled DP *su tortuga* ‘his  
50 turtle’ is introduced as a secondary topic in the story:  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

- 56 (29) Le est-á mir-ando a su tortug-a  
57 CL3SG is-3SG look-GER DOM POSS turtle-FSG  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 'He looks at his turtle.' (H4)  
4

5 The difference between marked and unmarked objects can be analysed as different  
6 information structure roles expressed in syntactic terms. Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2011:  
7 162) argue that marking is preferred "in contexts where the object is salient and the utterance  
8 updates the addressee's knowledge about the relation that holds between the subject and the  
9 object referents". In languages where grammatical marking such as clitic doubling is linked  
10 to information structural role, marked direct objects can be analysed as the syntactic primary  
11 object and as secondary topic on information structure.  
12

13 The difference in informational values found in the prestigious Lima norm and varieties  
14 in contact with Quechua leads us to expect different mappings at the interface of syntax and  
15 information structure in speakers at the opposite ends of the continuum of bilingualism to  
16 monolingualism represented by the participants on this study. We will especially look for the  
17 emergence of morphosyntactic mappings of secondary topics not present in Quechua or in  
18 non-contact Spanish.  
19

20 To summarize, given previous evidence of the scalar system proposed in (24) and of CLD  
21 structures with an emerging secondary topic informational value in Spanish in contact with  
22 Quechua, we propose to examine morphological variation and variation in informational  
23 structure in two groups of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals and in three monolingual individuals  
24 at different points in the spectrum of contact with Quechua.  
25

26 In search of answers to the question of which are the main criteria that guide the  
27 distribution of these new clitic systems in bilingual and monolingual varieties with such a  
28 wide range of variability, we formulated the following research questions.  
29  
30

- 31 1. Are the morphosyntactic properties of accusative clitics (proclitics and enclitics) fully  
32 developed in bilinguals and monolinguals living in contact situations?
- 33 2. Is there neutralization of gender features in accusative clitics in favor of *le* or *lo* in  
34 bilinguals and a more complex system emerges in monolinguals?
- 35 3. What is the informational status of the clitic according to clitic structure in bilinguals and  
36 monolinguals?  
37  
38  
39

40 In assuming dissociation of syntactic and morphological competence in fully developed  
41 bilinguals and monolinguals, we expect little or no difference between bilinguals and  
42 monolinguals in relation to RQ1. In terms of gender features in RQ2, effects from language  
43 contact with a language that does not mark gender should be noticeable in selecting preferably  
44 *le* over *lo* in bilinguals but not in the monolingual individuals. For RQ3 we anticipate that *le*  
45 /*lo* CLDs will have secondary topic values among bilinguals. For the monolingual individuals  
46 who speak a less prestigious norm, *lo* and *la* will be secondary topics in CLDs and, in  
47 dislocated structures, and *le* will be the preferred candidate for primary topic in an anaphoric  
48 relation. The monolingual individual with greater exposure to the prestigious norm will be  
49 closer to an animacy based system or to a fully developed gender marking system in CLD.  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 3. Methodology 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1  
2  
3 In order to address our research questions, we examine differences in clitic production in  
4 anaphoric structures as well as in CLD, CLLD and CLR according to gender specification of  
5 the doubled DP. We also examine differences in informational value according to clitic  
6 structure. Oral production data from two groups of Quechua-Spanish adult bilinguals and data  
7 from three monolingual speakers is examined.

8  
9 The first group of bilingual adults (N=14, 5 females, 9 males, age 24-62) lives in a  
10 Quechua-speaking rural area (Chaglla, Huanuco, Peru). Speakers in this group had primary  
11 level schooling and some secondary schooling in Spanish. The second group (N=17, 8  
12 females, 9 males, age 19-33) has college-level education in Spanish and lives in a Quechua-  
13 speaking urban area (Cuzco, Peru). We take the difference in level of formal instruction  
14 attained as representative of their level of exposure to Spanish. Primary level schooling in  
15 rural areas of Peru such as Chaglla differs from college-level education in Spanish not only  
16 with respect to content but also in the level of exposure that Quechua speakers have to the  
17 prestigious variety of the language. While school is one of the main sources of Spanish input  
18 in rural areas such as Chaglla, speakers with college level education living in an urban  
19 environment such as Cuzco have access to a wider network of Spanish speakers and to the  
20 more prestigious variety with higher frequency of exposure. Data for both bilingual groups  
21 were collected using a series of frog story pictures based on Mayer's (1992) story book. These  
22 represent a story with several characters that can be construed as primary and secondary  
23 topics.  
24  
25

26  
27 Monolingual data from three different speakers consist of digitally recorded naturally  
28 occurring conversations between one of the authors as interviewer. While these conversations  
29 were not based on individual visual stimuli, they did elicit narratives related to the  
30 participants' lives, their regular activities and their lives' stories. The interviewer participated  
31 in daily activities with the interviewees over a period of six weeks and recorded weekly  
32 conversations of different activities with a duration of 300 minutes with speaker 1, 200  
33 minutes with speaker 2 and 40 minutes with speaker 3. The narratives are not similar to the  
34 frog stories but they are comparable in that they had the potential to elicit more than one  
35 character or theme as primary and secondary topics as well as eliciting clitic structures under  
36 study. The three speakers lived in the capital (Lima, Peru) at the time of the interviews and  
37 had different levels and place of education as well as varying degrees of contact with  
38 Quechua: two were born to Quechua-speaking parents in the city of Iquitos where they  
39 received primary education and later moved to Lima where they received secondary  
40 education. They are siblings and have very little to no proficiency in Quechua. The third  
41 speaker was born in Lima and has college-level education and no regular exposure to  
42 Quechua. She is the daughter of one of the first two speakers. We use the acronym LSCV 1  
43 to refer to the first speaker, a female, age 40, born in Iquitos who migrated to Lima at 14 years  
44 of age. She received primary schooling in Iquitos and attended secondary evening college in  
45 Lima. The second speaker is LSCV 2, female, age 42, born in Iquitos, who migrated to Lima  
46 at 16 years of age. She received primary schooling in Iquitos and 3 years of secondary  
47 schooling in Lima. Finally, LSCV 3 corresponds to a female, 16, born in Lima with primary  
48 and secondary schooling in Lima.<sup>6</sup>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55  
56 <sup>6</sup> We present the monolingual data by way of comparison not as a control group. The relevance of these three  
57 speakers is the fact that they are related to each other but have been exposed to different levels of dialect contact  
58 in different communities.  
59

## 4. Results

In this section we will first present results from the bilingual group, followed by results from the monolingual group. Due to the non-experimental nature of the data, we base our analysis on descriptive statistics, including a chi-square test, to show the frequency of clitic production and significance of differences across structures and speakers. Our findings indicate some evidence for the scalar distribution shown in (24). They show variability in clitic preference according to animacy and in information structure for the monolingual and bilingual contact groups.

### 4.1. Bilingual contact varieties

The distribution of proclitics and enclitics for both bilingual groups in Table (2) is similar.

**Table 2.** Distribution of proclitics and enclitics in bilinguals

	Cuzco (%)	Huánuco (%)
Proclitics	74 (96t)	63 (67t)
Enclitics	22 (29t)	31 (34t)
Null objects	4 (5t)	5 (4t)
Reduplication	0 (0t)	1 (1t)
<b>Total</b>	<b>100 (130t)</b>	<b>100 (106t)</b>

Table (2) shows the distribution in percentages and tokens in brackets, examples are given below. Both groups exhibit a higher frequency of proclitics than of enclitics, and equal numbers of null objects. A chi-square test does not support independence in preference  $\chi^2(2, N=235) = 3,04$   $p = .21$ . Example (30) illustrates a proclitic and (31), an enclitic:

(30) Bueno, no le encontraron  
well not CL3SG find-PST-3PL  
'Well, they did not find him.'

(31) Entonce(s) empezaron a buscarle  
then start-PST-3PL to find-INF-CL3SG  
'Then they started to find him/her/it.'

There is only one case (32) in the Huánuco group that shows clitic reduplication.

(32) Le está siguiéndole  
CL3SG is-3SG follow-GER-CL3SG  
'(S)/He is following him/her/it.'

We take these data to indicate that proclitics and enclitics are part of the grammatical representations of these two groups and that, unlike in Quechua, there is no lack of third object marking on the verb.

In terms of the percentage of clitics according to type of structure, the distribution for both groups is as shown in Table (3). A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference as follows  $\chi^2(3, N=212) = 11,88 p < .007$ .

**Table 3.** Distribution of clitic structures

	<b>Cuzco (%)</b>	<b>Huánuco (%)</b>
Anaphoric	58 (70t)	50 (52t)
CLD	31 (38t)	40 (41t)
CLLD	2 (2t)	8 (8t)
CLRD	9 (10t)	2 (2t)
<b>Total</b>	<b>100 (120t)<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>100 (103t)</b>

The first difference is that the Cuzco group showed a higher percentage of anaphoric structures (58%) than the Huánuco group (50%). Examples of anaphoric clitics from both groups are shown in (33) and (34):

(33) Lo hab-ían mand-ado a-l río  
 CL3MSG have-PST-3PL send-PART DOM-DETMSG river  
 ‘They had sent him/it to the river.’ (C1)

(34) El perr-o le mir-a  
 DET.MSG dog-MSG CL3SG look-3SG  
 ‘The dog looks at him.’ (H1)

Clitic doubling structures have a lower percentage (31%) in the Cuzco group than in the Huánuco group (40%). The following examples illustrate CLD cases in both groups:

(35) Porque tú le ha-s pate-ado a mi ran-ita  
 Because you CL3SG have-3SG kick-PART DOM my frog-DIMFSG  
 ‘Because you have kicked my froggy.’ (C3)

(36) Le acarici-a a su perro  
 CL3SG caress-3SG DOM POSS dog  
 ‘(S)/He caresses his dog.’ (H2)

Clitic left dislocated structures (CLLD) and Clitic right dislocated structures (CLRD) show low percentages in both groups (below 10%) but with opposite patterns. Example (37) illustrates a case of CLRD from the Cuzco group and (38) a case of CLLD from the Huánuco group:

<sup>7</sup> Predicate clitics were excluded that were counted in the totals in Table 2.



- 1  
2  
3 (37) Lo pon-í-a encima de la tortuga al sapo  
4 CL3MSG place-PST-3SG above of the turtle DOM-DET.MSG frog  
5 y la rana  
6 and DET.FSG frog  
7 ‘(S)/He placed the frog and the toad on top of the turtle.’ (C8) (CLRD)  
8  
9  
10 (38) Al niño pued-e mord-er-le  
11 DOM-DET.MSG boy can-3SG bite-INF-CL3SG  
12 ‘(He) can bite the boy’ (H5) (CLLD)  
13

14 We would like to point out that CLD structures were found in 15 out of 17 speakers in Cuzco  
15 and in 11 out of the 14 speakers in Huánuco. We take this to indicate that this structure is  
16 characteristic of the speech represented by these bilinguals.  
17

18 The distribution of *le* and *lo* in CLD, CLLD and CLRD structures is given in Table (4)  
19 in percentages with tokens in brackets. No distinction was made between singular and plurals.  
20 *Le* had a higher frequency than *lo* in CLD and CLLD structures in both groups. It was,  
21 however, more frequent in the Huánuco data (77%, combined) than in the Cuzco data (53%,  
22 combined). There were fewer tokens of the dislocated structures and their distribution was  
23 not similar. A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference  $\chi^2(5, N=199) = 21,90$   
24  $p < .0005$ .  
25

26 *Le* + masc DP in CLD had a higher percentage (51%, 23t) than *lo* + masc (27%, 12t) in  
27 the Cuzco group. The preference for *le* + masc DP (65%, 32t) over *lo* + masc DP (16%, 8t)  
28 was even higher in the Huánuco group. We take this to indicate that in both groups of  
29 bilinguals *le* appears to take precedence over *lo*.  
30  
31

32 **Table 4.** Distribution of *le* and *lo* across clitic structures with masculine DPs  
33

	le+	lo+	le+	lo+	le+	lo+	Total
	CLD	CLD	CLLD	CLLD	CLRD	CLRD	
Huánuco	65 (32t)	16 (8t)	12 (6t)	2 (1t)	4 (2t)	0	100 (49t)
Cuzco	51 (23t)	27(12t)	2 (1t)	2 (1t)	11 (5t)	7 (3t)	100 (45t)

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Example (39) illustrates a case of *lo* + masc DP from the Cuzco group and example (40) a  
43 case of *le* + masculine from the Huánuco group.  
44

- 45 (39) Encima de la tortuga lo pon-en los dos sap-os  
46 above of DET.FSG turtle CL3MSG put-3PL DET.MPL two toad-MPL  
47 ‘They place the two toads on top of the turtle.’ (C6) (CLD)  
48  
49  
50 (40) El perro le mir-a a los animal-it-os aquí  
51 the dog CL3SG look-3SG DOM DET.MPL animals-DIM-MPL here  
52 ‘And the dog looks at the animals here.’ (H16) (CLD)  
53  
54

55 There are 2 tokens of *le* + fem and 1 token of *lo* + fem in Cuzco and 1 of *lo* + fem in Huánuco:  
56

- 57 (41) Y el sapo le bota de encima de la tortuga a  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

and the toad CL3SG throw-3SG of top of the turtle DOM  
 la ran-ita  
 DET.FSG frog-DIM-FSG

‘And the frog throws the little toad over the top of the turtle.’(C4) (CLR D)

- (42) Y el sapo se lo com-e a la otra rana  
 and the toad SE CL3MSG eat-3SG DOM DET.FSG other frog  
 ‘And the toad eats the other frog.’ (H16) (CLD)

We take these data to point in the direction of a preference for *le* over *lo* that seems to be more pronounced in the Huánuco group.

In terms of information structure, Table (5) shows the results for both groups across all clitic structures. A chi square analysis did not show independence in the distribution of information structures for both groups  $\chi^2(3, N=205)=0,33 p=.78$ .

**Table 5.** Information structure

	Topic (%)	Recovering topic (%)	Secondary topic (%)	Other (%)	Total %
Cuzco	28 (33t)	38 (45t)	28 (34t)	6 (7t)	100 (119t)
Huánuco	35 (36t)	34 (35t)	25 (26t)	6 (6t)	100 (103t)

The following table shows the distribution of informational roles according to clitic structure for the Huánuco group. A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference for all structures as follows:  $\chi^2(9, N=103) = 72,68 p < .001$ .

As table 6 shows, topics are expressed by anaphoric clitics, while recovering topics can be expressed mostly by CLDs but also by other structures. Secondary topics are most frequently expressed by CLDs.

**Table 6.** Informational roles according to structure in the Huánuco group

	Topic%	Recovering topic%	Secondary topic%	Other%
Anaphoric	100 (36t)	17 (6t)	19 (5t)	83 (5t)
CLD	0	57 (20t)	77 (20t)	17 (1t)
CLLD	0	20 (7t)	4 (1t)	0
CLR D	0	6 (2t)	0	0
<b>Total</b>	100 (36t)	100 (35t)	100 (37t)	100(6t)

In the Cuzco group, topics are also expressed as anaphoric clitics and CLDs express mostly recovering topics. Unlike in the Huánuco group, secondary topics are expressed using anaphoric structures. The distribution for the Cuzco group is as shown in Table 7. A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference for all structures:  $\chi^2(9, N=129) = 56,67 p < .001$ .

**Table 7.** Informational roles according to structure in the Cuzco group

	Topic%	Recovering topic%	Secondary topic%	Other%
Anaphoric	97 (32t)	13 (6t)	82 (28t)	58 (4t)
CLD	3 (1t)	71 (32t)	8 (3t)	28 (2t)
CLLD	0	0	5 (2t)	0
CLRD	0	16 (7t)	5 (2t)	14 (1t)
<b>Total</b>	100 (33t)	100 (45t)	100 (34t)	100 (7t)

Examples of anaphoric clitics as topics from both groups are shown in:

- (43) El perro también le mir-a ahí  
 DET.MSG dog as well CL3SG look-3SG there  
 ‘The dog looks at him there as well.’ (H7)
- (44) Y les llev-a la tortuga  
 and CL3PL take-3SG the turtle  
 ‘And the turtle takes them.’ (C3)

CLDs are used by both groups to recover a previous topic. Example (45) is a fragment that illustrates a case of topic recovery. The toad is mentioned in (45a), (45b) is an intervening sentence with a different subject and in (45c). *El sapo* ‘the toad’ is recovered as a previously introduced topic:

- (45) a. El sapito est-á sent-ado. (Es)t-á bien. El tortugu-ita  
 the toady is-3SG seat-GER. Be-3SG well. The turtle-DIM.FSG  
 se ha par-ado  
 CL3SG has stand up-PART
- b. El niño se asusta  
 The boy CL3SG.REF frightens
- c. Acá tortuga le est-á fastidi-ando al sapo  
 here turtle CL3SG is-3SG bothering-GER DOM.DEF.MSG toad  
 ‘The toad is sitting. He is OK. The little turtle has stood up. The boy is frightened.  
 Here the turtle is upsetting the toad.’ (H5)

CLD structures are also used to introduce a secondary topic. They are more frequent in the Huánuco group than in the Cuzco group. An example of a CLD structure where the doubled DP is a secondary topic is shown in (46). The topic of the narrative is the null subject, in this case one of the characters in the frog story (the boy) who in this sentence has an agentive role. As mentioned in section 2.3, the direct object *su tortuga* ‘his turtle’ in (46) falls under Nikolaeva’s (2001) definition of “an entity such that the utterance is construed to be ABOUT the relationship between it and the primary topic” Nikolaeva (2001: 26). In (46), the turtle is introduced as a topic related to the first topic ‘the boy’ referred to by the null subject.

1  
2  
3  
4 (46) Le est-á mir-ando a su tortug-a  
5 CL3SG is-3SG look-GER DOM POSS turtle-FSG  
6 ‘He looks at his turtle.’ (H4)  
7

8  
9 CLLD structures had low frequency in both groups. Some were used to introduce a secondary  
10 topic that is also contrastive:

11  
12 (47) Y al pequeñito le bot-a al agua  
13 and DOM-DET.MSG small-DIM.MSG CL3SG throw-3SG LOC-DET.MSG water  
14 ‘And the small one throws her into the water.’ (C13)  
15

16  
17 There was also one instance of CLRD as an afterthought:

18  
19 (48) Eh, un día sal-en de paseo a una  
20 ehm, INDEF.MSG day leave-3PL PREP walk PREP INDEF.FSG  
21 laguna en un botecito y para dej-ar-lo  
22 lagoon PREP INDEF.MSG boat-DIM-MSG and for leave-INF-CL3MSG  
23  
24  
25 al borde de la laguna, al sapo grande  
26 PREP-DET.MSG edge of the lagoon DOM- DET.MSG frog big  
27  
28 ‘One day, they go on a walk to a lagoon in a small boat and to leave him, the big frog  
29 at the edge of the lagoon.’ (C12)  
30  
31

32 Overall, results show that the two Quechua Spanish bilingual groups show a preference for  
33 accusative *le* over *lo* that coexists with correct placement of proclitics and enclitics. *Le*  
34 is more frequent with masculine DPs in CLD, CLLD and CLRD than *lo* in both groups  
35 indicating preference for the clitic unmarked for gender. In both groups, anaphoric clitics are  
36 more frequently topics, although in the Cuzco group they also introduce secondary topics.  
37 CLD are used primarily to reintroduce topics in discourse in both groups, but in Huánuco they  
38 also introduce secondary topics.  
39  
40  
41  
42

#### 43 4.2. Monolingual Limeño Spanish contact varieties

44  
45 The monolingual group displays a split and scalar distribution between the migrant  
46 individuals showing preference of *lo* over *le* for masculine DPs and *le* over *la* for feminine  
47 DPs, with the Lima-born individual exhibiting full gender specification. The monolingual  
48 migrants use the default masculine clitic *lo* and *le* for CLD with indefinite DPs and exhibit  
49 some uses of *la* for definite DPs, showing scalar levels of variability at the interfaces.  
50

51 Table (8) shows no differences for the very high preference for proclitics, a minimal  
52 difference for enclitics and very small numbers of null objects. The Lima-born individual  
53 exhibits a very different distribution for proclitics, enclitics and no null objects. All results of  
54 the last participant are based on very small numbers of tokens and have to be judged  
55 accordingly; they will not be included in the chi-square tests unless pointed out explicitly. A  
56  
57  
58  
59

chi-square test confirmed no significant difference in preference for the distribution of proclitics and enclitics for the migrant group  $\chi^2(2, N=560) = 1,61$   $p = .4$ .

**Table 8.** Distribution of proclitics and enclitics in monolinguals

	Proclitics (%)	Enclitics (%)	Null (%)	Total
LSCV1	85 (314t)	10 (37t)	5 (19t)	100 (845t)
LSCV2	85 (161t)	12 (23t)	3 (6t)	100(190t)
LSCV3	92 (22t)	8 (2t)	0 (0t)	100 (24t)

An example for a proclitic is given in (49) and (59) shows an enclitic.

(49) Practicamente le cri-o el señor  
 practically CL3SG raise-PST-3SG DET.MSG boss  
 ‘The boss practically raised her.’ (LSCV1)

(50) Hay que duch-ar-le  
 must-3SG that shower-INF-CL3SG  
 ‘She needs to have a shower.’ (LSCV3)

The percentages of clitics according to type of structure across both groups in Table (9) are similar and consistent with the previous results with very minor differences for anaphoric clitics in the migrant individuals and a very high percentage for LSCV3 due to very small number of tokens. A chi-square test confirmed no independence of preference for the distribution for clitic structures across all participants  $\chi^2(4, N=597) = 11,88$   $p = .15$ .

**Table 9.** Distribution of clitic structures

	Anaphoric (%)	CLD (%)	CLLD (%)	CLRD (%)	Null (%)	Total
LSCV1	70 (266t)	12 (47t)	9 (30t)	4 (15t)	5 (19t)	100 (377t)
LSCV2	72 (145t)	14 (28t)	4 (28t)	7 (13t)	3 (6t)	100 (220t)
LSCV3	90 (20t)	5 (1t)	5 (1t)	0 (0t)	0 (0t)	100 (22t)

Anaphoric *lo* is shown in (51), and a gender specific anaphoric clitic is given in (52).

(51) Lo licu-o sin sac-ar las pep-as  
 CL3MSG blend-1SG without take-out-INF DET.FPL seeds-FPL  
 ‘I blend it without taking out the seeds.’ (LSCV2)

(52) Recién la ha reconoc-ido  
 very recently CL3FSG has-3SG recognize-PART  
 ‘He recognized her only recently.’ (LSCV3)

The most salient difference for all other clitic structures is that clitic doubling structures (CLD) are preferred, followed by the dislocated structures (CLLD and CLRD). Examples for CLD structures are given in (52) -(55).

(53) Yo no le mand-o a nadie  
 PRO1SG not CL3SG command-1SG DOM nobody  
 ‘I do not tell anyone what to do.’ (LSCV1)

(54) Lo licu-o al ajo  
 CL3MSG blend-1SG DOM-DET.MSG garlic-MSG  
 ‘I blend the garlic.’ (LSCV2)

(55) La carg-ó a su hij-a  
 CL3FSG carry-PST-3SG DOM POSS daughter-FSG  
 ‘He carried his daughter.’ (LSCV3)

Clitic left dislocation (CLLD) shows high numbers for LSCV1, and LSCV2 and LSCV3 pattern together.

(56) Sí, las claras los pong-o a usted  
 Yes DET.FPL eggwhite CL3MPL give-1SG DOM YOU  
 ‘Yes I give you the eggwhites’ (LSCV1)

(57) Al ají, lo hag-o hervir  
 DOM-DET.MSG chili CL3MSG make-1SG boil-INF  
 ‘As for the chili, I boil it.’ (LSCV2)

Results for clitic right dislocation (CLRD) are the reverse for LSCV1 and LSCV2 with zero for LSCV3.

(58) Entonces, la lav-o bien la var-it-a  
 then CL3FSG wash-1SG well DET.FSG stalk-DIM-FSG  
 ‘Then I wash well the stalk.’ (LSCV2)

The distribution of *le*, *lo* and *la* in CLD, CLLD and CLRD structures is given below in Table (10) in percentages with tokens in brackets, with examples to follow. A chi-square test over LSCV1 and LSCV2 confirmed independence for the distribution of clitic structures and clitic gender for LSCV1 and LSCV2  $\chi^2(8, N=109)=26,44$   $p < .0001$ . LSCV 3 could not be included in the analysis because of the low number of tokens.

**Table 10.** Distribution of *le*, *lo* and *la* across clitic structures

	LSCV1	LSCV2	LSCV3
Le+CLD	28 (19t)	19 (8t)	0
Lo+CLD	20 (13t)	10 (4t)	0

La+CLD	4 (3t)	30 (12t)	50 (1t)
Le+CLLD	21 (14t)	7 (3t)	50 (1t)
Lo+CLLD	11 (8t)	2 (1t)	0
La+CLLD	3 (2t)	5 (2t)	0
Le+CLRD	9 (6t)	10 (4t)	0
Lo+CLRD	3 (2t)	2 (1t)	0
La+CLRD	1 (1t)	15 (5t)	0
<b>Total</b>	100 (60t)	100 (41t)	100 (2t)

For *le* + masc DP, LSCV1 shows the highest percentages (17%), followed by LSCV2 (10.3%) and LSCV3 (7.1%).

(59) Pues no es de peg-ar-le a su herman-o  
 well not is-3SG PREP hit-INF-CL3SG DOM POSS brother-MSG  
 ‘Well he is not the kind to hit his brother’. (LSCV 1)

LSCV1 also exhibits the highest percentage for *le* + fem DP with 41% over LSCV3 (35.7%) and LSCV2 (28.2%). Percentages for LSCV3 have to be judged in light of very small numbers.

(60) No le sab-en pronunciar bien la err-e  
 not CL3SG know-3PL pronounce-INF well DET.FSG ‘ar’-FSG  
 ‘They don’t know how to pronounce well the ‘ar’.’ (LSCV 1)

*Lo* + masc DP has the same order as *le* + masc DP with LSCV1 (15%), followed closely by LSCV2 (12.8%) and finally LSCV3 (7.1%).

(61) Lo he licu-ado un poco de agua  
 CL3MSG have-1SG blend-PARTIC INDEF.MSG bit PREP water  
 ‘I have mixed a bit of water.’ (LSCV2)

The order for *lo* + fem DP is again the same. However, percentages vary greatly. LSCV1 (18%) has a much higher percentage than LSCV2 (2.6%) and there are no cases for LSCV3.

(62) No, y no lo pronunci-ab-a bien la err-e  
 no and not CL3MSG pronounce-PST-3SG well DET.FSG ‘ar’-FSG  
 ‘No, and she did not pronounce well the ‘ar’.’ (LSCV1)

Finally, results for *la* + fem DP show a striking difference between LSCV3 (50%) and LSCV2 (46.2%) followed by very low number for LSCV1 (9%).

(63) A ella la apreci-an bastante, la respet-an  
 DOM PRO3FSG CL3FSG appreciate-3PL a lot CL3FSG respect-3PL

1  
2 mayormente

3 mostly

4  
5 ‘As for her, they appreciate her a lot, they respect her mostly.’ (LSCV2)

6  
7  
8 In order to understand the difference between the bilingual data presented in the previous  
9 section and the monolingual data with respect to doubling structures indicating sensitivity to  
10 informational structure versus sensitivity to animacy, we present data on the distribution of  
11 differential object marking (DOM) among monolinguals.<sup>8</sup> The results for differential object  
12 marking of [+animate] and [-animate] DPs in CLD, CLLD, and CLRD in the monolingual  
13 group is given below in Table (11), with examples following. A chi-square analysis of the  
14 overall distribution of DOM with [+animate] and [-animate] DPs showed independence  
15 between LSCV1 and LSCV2 (both migrants),  $\chi^2(3, N=212) = 43.88, p < .001$ . A chi-square  
16 over DOM marking [+animate] DPs also showed independence between both groups  $\chi^2(1,$   
17  $N=150) = 14.6, p < .001$ ; but it did not confirm independence over [-animate] DP’s  $\chi^2$   
18  $(1, N=62) = 0.37, p = 5$ . Again, LSCV 3 could not be included in the analysis because of the low  
19 number of tokens.  
20  
21

22  
23 **Table 11.** Differential object marking

24

	+DOM	-DOM	Total	+DOM	-DOM	Total
	[-anim]DP	[+anim]DP	[+anim]	[-anim]DP	[-anim]DP	[-anim]
LSCV1	80 (43t)	20 (11t)	100(54t)	22 (10t)	78 (38t)	100(48t)
LSCV2	94 (31t)	6 (2t)	100(33t)	17 (4t)	83 (10t)	100(14t)
LSCV3	100 (1t)	0	199(1t)	0	0	0

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 LSCV1 (64) exhibits the highest percentage of extension to [-animates] in CLD, CLLD, and  
35 in CLRD. Definite and indefinite [+animate] DPs receive DOM in CLD, CLLD and CLRD  
36 with LSCV1 again showing the highest number of lack of DOM for [+animate] DPs.  
37

38  
39 (64) Pues yo al fresco le he licu-ado  
40 well PRO1SG DOM-DET.MSG fresh-MSG CL3SG have-1SG blend-PARTIC  
41 ‘Well, I blended the fresh chillies.’ (LSCV1)  
42

43  
44 LSCV2 shows a comparable percentage of extension of DOM to [-animate] definite DPs in  
45 CLD as in (65) and CLLD as in (66), and for CLRD. DOM on [+animate] definite DPs is  
46 highly preferred for CLD, followed by CLRD, and a low number for CLLD. Lack of DOM  
47 for [+animate] (human) DPs, as in (67), is highest in CLLD and shows equal percentages for  
48 CLD and CLRD.  
49

50  
51 (65) Lo sancoch-o a la yuca  
52 CL3MSG cook-1SG DOM DET.FSG cassava  
53 ‘I cook the cassava.’ (LSCV1)  
54

55 (66) Al ají la hag-o hervir  
56

57  
58 <sup>8</sup> We do not present DOM data for bilinguals because animacy does not play a role in CLD in bilingual speech.



DOM-DET.MSG chili CL3FSG make-1SG boil-INF  
 ‘As for the chili, I’ll boil it.’ (LSCV2)

(67) Cuando Ø ella la cort-ab-an a la barriga  
 when DOM PRO3FSG CL3FSG cut-PST-3PL DOM DET.FSG stomach  
 para sac-ar-la al bebe  
 to take-out-INF-CL3FSG DOM-DET.MSG baby  
 ‘When they cut her stomach to take out the baby.’ (LSCV2)

The migrant individuals show a clear difference in DOM with [+animate] DPs with LSCV2 closer to the prestigious Lima norm and similar percentage in extending DOM to [-animate] DPs. LSCV3 exhibits no divergence with 100% DOM with [+animate] DPs and no extension to [-animate] DPs, representing the standard norm.

The distribution of the information status for all clitic structures in Table (12) shows different results between the two migrant individuals and results close to the prestigious Lima norm for the Lima-born individual. Examples for the monolingual individuals are given below. A chi-square analysis of the distribution of information structures of LSCV1 and LSCV2 showed independence between both  $\chi^2(3, N=576) = 9.45, p < .02$ . LSCV 3 could not be included in the analysis because of the low number of tokens.

**Table 12.** Information status of all clitic structures

	Topic%	Recovering topic%	Secondary topic%	Other%	Total%
LSCV1	39 (149t)	14 (53t)	42 (158t)	5(18t)	100 (378t)
LSCV2	49 (97t)	15 (29t)	35 (70t)	1(2t)	100 (198t)
LSCV3	54 (13t)	4 (1t)	38 (9t)	4 (1t)	100 (24t)

Table (13) shows the distribution of information structure roles for LSCV1 with overall comparable numbers of tokens for topic and secondary topic however with a different distribution in favour of secondary topic in CLD and CLLD structures. A chi-square test confirms independence of preference for all structures  $\chi^2(9, N=378) = 37.94, p < .0001$

**Table 13.** Informational roles according to structure in LSCV1

	Topic%	Recovering topic%	Secondary topic%	Other%
Anaphoric	88 (131t)	87 (46t)	61 (97t)	67 (12t)
CLD	6 (9t)	2 (5t)	20 (31t)	11 (2t)
CLLD	3 (4t)	0.5 (1t)	14 (22t)	17 (3t)
CLRD	3 (5t)	0.5 (1t)	5 (8t)	5 (1t)
<b>Total</b>	100 (149t)	100 (53t)	100 (158t)	100 (18t)

The distribution of information structure roles for LSCV2 is given in Table (14). A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference for all structures  $\chi^2(9, N=198) = 61.5, p < .0001$

**Table 14.** Informational roles according to structure in LSCV2

	<b>Topic%</b>	<b>Recovering topic%</b>	<b>Secondary topic%</b>	<b>Other%</b>
Anaphoric	77 (75t)	66 (19t)	49 (34t)	50 (1t)
CLD	1 (1t)	10 (3t)	34 (24t)	0
CLLD	22 (21t)	10 (3t)	4 (3t)	50 (1t)
CLRD	0	14 (4t)	13 (9t)	0
<b>Total</b>	100 (97t)	100 (29t)	100 (70t)	100 (2t)

Anaphoric clitics in both individuals are topics, as in (68), show high numbers for LSCV2 and LSCV1 and very low numbers of tokens for LSCV3 (13t). They also serve to recover previous topics (69) with no instances in LSCV3's data and equal percentages for the migrant individuals. All three monolinguals use anaphoric clitics to refer to secondary topics at a similar rate.

(68) Pel-o la yuca, lo lav-o y  
 peel-1SG DET.FSG cassava-FSG CL3MSG wash-1SG and  
 lo hag-o en trozos  
 CL3MSG cut-1SG in pieces  
 'I peel the cassava, I wash it and cut it in pieces.' (LSCV1)

(69) Pero mir-a-la, ve quier-e est-ar par-ada  
 but look-IMP-CL3FSG look-IMP want-3SG be-INF standing-PARTIC  
 'But look at her, she wants to be standing up.' (LSCV2)

CLD as in (70) and (71) with overt subject expression mainly introduce secondary topics at a very high percentage only for LSCV2 closely followed by LSCV1.

(70) Y desde allí yo lo conozc-o a la señora  
 and since then PRO1SG CL3MSG know-1SG DOM DET.FSG woman  
 'And since then I know the woman.' (LSCV1)

(71) Yo no la mand-o a mi hija sola  
 PRO1SG not CL3FSG send-1SG DOM POSS daughter alone-FSG  
 'I do not send my daughter alone.' (LSCV2)

Dislocated structures show overall very low numbers and mark the role of secondary topic. CLLD, as in (72), is slightly preferred by LSCV1 over LSCV2, with practically even numbers for CLRD (73) for both, LSCV1 and LSCV2.

(72) ∅ Ella, yo le llev-é a Iquitos  
 DOM PRO3FSG PRO1SG CL3SG take-PST-1SG LOC Iquitos  
 'As for her, it was me who took her to Iquitos.' (LSCV1) (CLLD)

1  
2 (73) Ella abiertamente así me las d-i-o  
3 PRO3FSG openly like this CL1SG CL3FPL give-PST-3SG  
4 en bandeja la confianza y el apoyo  
5 in plate DET.FSG trust and DET.MSG support  
6  
7 ‘She gave me openly like this the trust and support.’ (LSCV2) (CLRD)  
8  
9

10 In CLD structures, both clitics, *lo* and *le*, occur as secondary topics for LSCV 1 and LSCV2.  
11 Immediate anaphoric clitics within one sentence or paragraph covariate with the same topic  
12 as shown in (74).  
13

14  
15 (74) El pollo **lo** p-us-e solamente sal, **le**  
16 DET.MSG chicken CL3MSG put-PST-1SG only salt CL3SG  
17 ech-é sal, y luego ya **le** he pic-ado  
18 add-PST-1SG salt and then already CL3SG have-1SG cut-PARTIC  
19  
20  
21  
22 cebolla y hoy ya puse la cebolla [...]  
23 onion-FSG and today already add-PST-1SG the onion [...]  
24  
25 ‘The chicken I seasoned only with salt, I added salt, and then I cut some onion and  
26 today I already added the onion... (LSCV1)  
27  
28

29 The migrant individuals also exhibit gender specific *la* when introducing secondary topics  
30 which are considered highly affected secondary topics (aboutness topics), especially when  
31 they occur with an overt subject, as in (75). The Lima-born individual shows one instance of  
32 CLD and one of CLLD, both with secondary topic marking.  
33

34  
35 (75) Yo sigo vi-éndo-la, ador-ándo-la a ella  
36 PRO1SG keep-1SG see-GER-CL3FSG adore-GER-CL3FSG DOM PRO3FSG  
37 ‘As for her, I keep on seeing her, loving her.’ (LSCV2)  
38  
39

40 Dislocated structures also refer in small numbers to the information structure roles of topic  
41 and recovering previous topics. Finally, continuing topics can be null, this includes  
42 [+animate] and [-animate] DPs:  
43

44 (76) La suegra Ø fue llev-ando un enterito  
45 the mother-in-law CL is-PST-3SG bring-GER INDEF overall  
46  
47 ‘The mother-in-law was giving her a baby a coverall.’ (LSCV1)  
48

49 (77) Y si no Ø quier-e picante, las sac-o las venas  
50 and if not CL want-3SG hot CL3FPL cut-1SG DET.FPL vein-FPL  
51 de adentro y la l icu-o sin pepas  
52 from inside and CL3FSG blend-1SG without seed-FPL  
53  
54 ‘And if you do not like to eat it hot, I take out the veins and I blend it without the  
55 seeds.’ (LSCV2)  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2 In sum, all three monolingual participants living in dialect contact situations (Andean Spanish  
3 - Lima prestigious norm) show fully developed morphosyntactic properties of accusative  
4 clitics with correct use of clitic placement (proclitics and enclitics). Our results show a scalar  
5 production of *lo* over *le* for LSCV1 and the reverse, *le* over *lo* with some *la* for LSCV2. The  
6 Lima-born individual shows no divergence from the prestigious Lima norm. In relation to  
7 DOM, both migrant individuals exhibit a lack of DOM with [+animate] DPs and extension of  
8 DOM to [-animate] definite DPs; LSCV3 again exhibits structures very close to the  
9 prestigious Lima norm.  
10  
11

## 12 13 14 **5. Discussion** 15

16  
17 Our analysis was guided by three research questions and respective hypotheses, repeated  
18 below.  
19

- 20 1. Are the morphosyntactic properties of accusative clitics (proclitics and enclitics) fully  
21 developed in bilinguals and monolinguals living in contact situations?

22 Hypothesis: In assuming dissociation of syntactic and morphological competence in  
23 fully developed bilinguals and monolinguals, we expected no or little difference  
24 between bilinguals and monolinguals.  
25

- 26 2. Is there neutralization of gender features in accusative clitics in favour of *le* or *lo* in  
27 bilinguals, and a more complex system emerges in monolinguals?

28 Hypothesis: In terms of gender features, effects from language contact with a  
29 language that does not mark gender should be noticeable in bilinguals who we  
30 expected to prefer *le* over *lo* in bilinguals, while monolingual varieties should differ  
31 in this respect. We also expected bilinguals with lower levels of exposure to Spanish  
32 in formal instruction settings to have a stronger preference for *le*.  
33

- 34 3. What is the informational status of the clitic according to clitic structure in bilinguals  
35 and monolinguals?

36 Hypothesis: We anticipated that bilinguals will have a preference for *le* in CLDs to  
37 introduce secondary topics. We also expected the monolingual individuals to have *lo*  
38 and *la* in CLD structures with secondary topics and dislocated structures with *le* as a  
39 preferred candidate for primary topic in anaphoric relation especially in the two  
40 monolingual individuals who speak the less prestigious norm. We expected the  
41 monolingual with greater exposure to the prestigious norm will be closer to an  
42 animacy based system or to fully developed gender marking system in CLD.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 In relation to our first research question, our hypothesis based on the dissociation model of  
48 syntactic representation and morphological variability (Lardiere 1998, 2005) is confirmed by  
49 the data, as both monolingual groups show evidence of proclitics and enclitics over null  
50 objects. Furthermore, both bilingual groups and the monolingual individuals show the full  
51 range of clitic structures. From a modular perspective, our results indicate that the core  
52 syntactic operations involved in the clitic-related structures have been acquired by bilinguals  
53 and are part of monolingual speech too. Bilinguals and monolinguals show a higher frequency  
54 of anaphoric clitics than of any other clitic structure, and a higher frequency of CLD over  
55 dislocated structures. This may be due to the narrative structure of the oral data in which  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2 several topics are introduced and reintroduced creating the need to mark secondary topics or  
3 reintroduce topics. The two migrant individuals show differing results for CLLD and CLRD.

4  
5 In relation to our second research question, we find that gender neutralization and lack of  
6 DOM are evidence that crosslinguistic influence affects the syntax/semantics interface.  
7 Gender neutralization affects mostly the varieties spoken by the bilingual groups and it shows  
8 more prominently in the Huánuco group, the group with lower levels of formal instruction in  
9 Spanish and, therefore, of lower access to the gender marking prestigious norm. Our results  
10 are also consistent with the effect of contact with Quechua, a non-gender marking language.  
11 Gender neutralization becomes less prominent in the monolingual individuals as expected by  
12 their higher levels of access to linguistic input and more varied clitic feature inventories in  
13 their respective communities. Among monolingual individuals we found gender marking as  
14 follows. LSCV2 and LSCV3, mother and daughter, with three years of evening college and  
15 full secondary education in Lima respectively, had prominent numbers of gender-specific *la*  
16 for [+animate] and definite DPs marked as secondary topics. LSCV1, on the other hand, with  
17 secondary evening college, shows a strong tendency to use the default masculine *lo* for  
18 [+animate] definite secondary topics, despite living with four speakers of the prestigious Lima  
19 norm (three male and one female, all with University education).

20  
21 Overall the Huánuco group shows clear evidence of neutralization while the Cuzco group  
22 shows more covariation in *le* and *lo* forms. The monolingual migrant individuals show  
23 emergence of invariant *lo*, or the default masculine form, in covariation with *le*, and we find  
24 use of all three clitics in the Lima-born individual. For the monolingual individuals, we find  
25 neutralization of gender features in accusative clitics in favour of *le*, but different tendencies  
26 between the two migrants based on animacy. LSCV1 shows a tendency to prefer *le* for  
27 masculine and feminine [+animate] DPs and *lo* for [-animate] DPs, and the use of *la* is  
28 minimal (9% in comparison to LSCV2 and LSCV3). LSCV2 shows extensive use of *la* (37%)  
29 for feminine [+animate] DPs, the use of *la* for [-animate] DPs is restricted to highly affected  
30 secondary topics and alternates with the default *lo*. There is no divergence from the prestigious  
31 Lima norm for LSCV3.

32  
33 As for the distribution of *le* and the other accusative clitics (*lo*, *la*) in monolingual  
34 discourse, LSCV1 shows a preference for *lo* over *le* for masculine and feminine [+animate]  
35 DPs, and very low numbers of *la* for feminine [+animate] DPs. LSCV2, on the other hand,  
36 strongly prefers *la* for feminine [+animate] DPs, and *lo* over *le* for masculine [+animate] DPs.  
37 LSCV3 strongly prefers *la* over *le* for feminine [+animate] DPs, with equal numbers for *le*  
38 and *lo* in reference to masculine [+animate] DPs and is the only one with no use of *lo* for  
39 feminine [+animate] DPs. The findings in relation to our second research question show  
40 support for the idea that input from the communities these speakers live in as well as access  
41 to formal education plays an important role in the development of diverging clitic systems.

42  
43 For our third research question, addressing the informational status of *le*, *lo* and *la*  
44 according to clitic structure in bilinguals and monolinguals, our hypothesis was that *le* /*lo*  
45 among bilinguals and *lo*, and also *la*, to a minor extent, among monolinguals will be secondary  
46 topics in CLD and dislocated structures. This was the case especially for Huánuco bilinguals  
47 and for monolinguals.

48  
49 Both bilingual groups and the monolingual individuals treat anaphoric clitics  
50 preferentially as topics. CLD are used most frequently to reintroduce topics in discourse by  
51 bilinguals and to introduce secondary topics by monolingual individuals. For the monolingual  
52 individuals anaphoric clitics are topics, including continuing topics. *Lo*, *le* and *la* in CLD,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

1  
2 CLLD and CLRD structures show a tendency to express secondary topics, introducing and  
3 reintroducing secondary topics. Gender-specific *la* is used for highly affected animate and  
4 inanimate secondary topics, mostly in the sense of aboutness topics.  
5

6 In monolinguals, the difference between marked and unmarked objects relates to different  
7 information structures expressed in syntactic terms. Based on a crosslinguistic survey,  
8 Darlymple & Nikolaeva (2011:166) conclude that the marked object shows more core  
9 grammatical functions and maps as the primary object to the information structural role of  
10 secondary topic. This syntactic-pragmatic relationship between clitics and DOM is crucial for  
11 the interpretation of secondary topic as a syntactic means to mark the primary object. Among  
12 the monolingual individuals, DOM patterns vary greatly except for LSCV3, who shows  
13 patterns that are quite similar to those found in prestigious varieties in the contact situation.  
14 LSCV1 exhibits the highest extension of DOM to [-animate] DPs, which is strongly linked to  
15 secondary topic marking with the default masculine *lo*. The combination of a default form  
16 and DOM is a classic example for deliberate syntactic marking of a secondary topic by the  
17 subject as the primary topic.  
18

19 Overall, we found that, in this language contact situation, divergence at the interfaces of  
20 morphosyntax and information structure between the first language and the second language  
21 has, in fact, resulted in new systems, expressing new information structures that are clearly  
22 different from Quechua and the non-contact Spanish varieties.  
23

24 This exploratory study has certain limitations such as low numbers of tokens for the  
25 speaker closest to the educated prestigious Lima norm. However, morphological variability  
26 in this monolingual speaker's data set is consistent with the prestigious Lima norm, which can  
27 be linked to standardizing input. Another potential problem could be comparability problems  
28 arising from data sets for bilinguals and monolinguals stemming from differing ways data  
29 have been sourced. We have addressed this potential difficulty in this article, but we also  
30 recognize that further research is needed to address these limitations. Particular consideration  
31 should be given to increased numbers of monolinguals (attritted heritage speakers and  
32 monolinguals close to the standardized norm) to be considered in more comprehensive studies  
33 to confirm or dispute the findings from this exploratory study.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **6. Concluding Remarks**

42  
43 This study examined clitic structures, morphological variability in clitic systems and their  
44 syntax-information structure mapping in bilingual speakers of Andean Spanish and  
45 monolingual speakers of Lima Spanish. The novelty of our approach lies in a comparison of  
46 language and dialect contact across urban and rural domains with common linguistic input  
47 determined by access to formal education and clitic feature inventories in the respective  
48 communities. The main contributions of this paper are that we have identified a continuum of  
49 scalar monolingual and bilingual clitic subsystems with the range of morphological variability  
50 constrained by morphological availability in their respective typological space. The range  
51 goes from gender neutralization among bilinguals with lower levels of formal instruction in  
52 Spanish to an animacy-based scale and/or a gender based distinction in monolingual  
53 individuals. We have also provided evidence of the emergence of a mapping of secondary  
54 topic informational values onto CLD and anaphoric clitic structures. We have also shown the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2 use of clitic doubling structures to reintroduce topics in a way that differs from its uses in non-  
3 contact varieties.  
4  
5  
6

## 7 **References**

- 8  
9  
10 Aissen, J. (2003). Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural*  
11 *Language & Linguistic Theory*, 21, 435-483.  
12 Arregi, K. (2003). Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization. In  
13 *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium, Penn Working Papers*  
14 *in Linguistics* 9(1), 31-44. Penn Linguistics Club, Philadelphia.  
15 Belletti, A. (2005). Extended doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus*, 17, 1-35.  
16 Belloro, V. (2007). *Spanish Clitic Doubling: A Study of the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface*.  
17 PhD. Dissertation, SUNY.  
18 Beukema, Frits & Marcel den Dikken (Eds.), (2000). *Clitic Phenomena in European*  
19 *Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.  
20 Blear, T. (1999). *Leísta Spanish and the Syntax of Clitic Doubling*. Unpublished PhD  
21 dissertation, University of Delaware.  
22 Bonet i Alsina, M. E. (1995). Feature Structure of Romance Clitics. *Natural*  
23 *Language and Linguistic Theory*, 13, 607-647.  
24 Bossong, G. (1985). *Empirische Universalienforschung, Differentielle Objektmarkierung*  
25 *in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.  
26 Bossong, G. (2003). Nominal and/or Verbal Marking of Central Actants. In G. Fiorentino  
27 (Ed.), *Romance Objects. Transitivity in Romance Languages* (pp. 17-49). Berlin:  
28 Mouton de Gruyter.  
29 Camacho, J. & L. Sánchez. (2002). Explaining Clitic Variation in Spanish. In M. Amberber  
30 & P. Collins (Eds.), *Language Universals and Variation* (pp. 21-41). Praeger Publishers.  
31 Cardinaletti, A. (2002). Against optional and null clitics. Right dislocation vs. marginali-  
32 zation. *Studia Lingüística*, 56, 29-57.  
33 Casielles-Suárez, E. (2004). *The syntax-information structure interface: Evidence from*  
34 *Spanish and English*. Routledge.  
35 Cecchetto, C. (1999). A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance.  
36 *Studio Linguistica*, 53, 40-67.  
37 Cecchetto, C. (2000). Doubling structures and reconstruction. *Probus*, 12(1), 93-126.  
38 Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1987). *Lingüística Quechua*. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Rurales  
39 Andinos 'Bartolomé de las Casas'.  
40 Cerrón Palomino, R. (2003). *Castellano Andino. Aspectos Sociolingüísticos, Pedagógicos y*  
41 *Gramaticales*. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú: Fondo Editorial.  
42 Choi, J. K. (2000). [-Person] Direct Object Drop: The Genetic Cause of a Syntactic Feature  
43 in Paraguayan Spanish. *Hispania*, 531-543.  
44 Comrie, B. (2003). When agreement gets trigger-happy. *Transactions of the Philological*  
45 *Society*, 23, 50-61.  
46 Cuervo, M. C. (2003). *Datives at large*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of  
47 Technology.  
48 Cusihuamán, A. (2001). *Gramática Quechua*. 2nd edition. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios  
49 Rurales Andinos 'Bartolomé de las Casas'.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2 Dalrymple, M & I. Nikolaeva. (2011). *Objects and Information Structure*. Cambridge:  
3 Cambridge University Press.  
4  
5 Di Tullio, A. & P. Zdrojewski. (2006). Notas sobre el doblado de clíticos en el español  
6 rioplatense. Asimetrías entre objetos humanos y no humanos. *Filología*, 1, 13-44.  
7  
8 Escobar, A. (1978). *Variaciones sociolingüísticas del castellano en el Perú*. vol. 18:  
9 Perú Problema. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.  
10  
11 Escobar, A. M. (1990). *Los Bilingües y el Castellano en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios  
12 Peruanos.  
13  
14 Escobar, A. M. (2000). *Contacto Social y Lingüístico. El Español en Contacto con el*  
15 *Quechua en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.  
16  
17 Fernández-Ordóñez, I. (1994). Isoglosas Internas del Castellano. El Sistema Referencial  
18 del Pronombre Átono de Tercera Persona. *Revista de Filología Española*, 74, 71–125.  
19  
20 Franco, J. (1993). *On Object Agreement in Spanish*. Doctoral dissertation, University  
21 of Southern California. [Distributed by GSIL Publications, USC Linguistics].  
22  
23 Franco, J. & S. Huidobro. (2008). Ethical Datives, Clitic Doubling and the Theory of pro. In  
24 J. Bruhn de Garavito & E. Valenzuela (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 10th Hispanic*  
25 *Linguistic Symposium* (pp. 215–224). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.  
26  
27 García Tesoro, A.I. (2010). Español en contacto con el tzutujil en Guatemala: cambios en el  
28 sistema pronominal átono de tercera persona. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística*  
29 *Iberoamericana*, 133-156.  
30  
31 Givón, T. (1983). *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*.  
32 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.  
33  
34 Granda, G. de. (1988). Notas sobre retenciones sintácticas en el español de Paraguay.  
35 *Lexis*, 12, 43-67.  
36  
37 Harris, J. (1995). The Morphology of Spanish Clitics. In H. Campos & P. Kempchinsky,  
38 (Eds.), *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honour of Carlos*  
39 *Otero* (pp. 169–197). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.  
40  
41 Jaeggli, O. (1986). Three issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled NPs, and  
42 Extraction. In H. Borer (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 19. The Syntax of Pronominal*  
43 *Clitics* (pp. 15-42). Orlando (FL): Academic Press.  
44  
45 Kayne, R. (1975). *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*. Current Studies in  
46 Linguistics. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.  
47  
48 Kayne, R. (1989). Null Subject and Clitic Climbing. In K. Safir & O. Jaeggli (Eds.), *The*  
49 *Null Subject Parameter* (pp. 239-261). Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic  
50 Theory 15. Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
51  
52 Kayne, R. (1991). Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22,  
53 647-686.  
54  
55 Klee, C. & R. Caravedo. (2005). Contact-Induced Language Change in Lima. In  
56 D. Eddington (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*  
57 (pp. 12–21). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.  
58  
59 Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus and the*  
60 *Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, vol.71.  
61 Cambridge: Oxford University Press.  
62  
63 Landa, A. & J. Franco. (1992). Objetos nulos en el castellano del País Vasco (CV).  
64 Dos Estatus para dos Interpretaciones". *ASJU International Journal of Basque*  
65 *Linguistics and Philology*, 777-792.



- 1  
2  
3 Landa, A. & J. Franco. (1999). Converging and diverging grammars. *International*  
4 *Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology*, 33(2), 569-581.
- 5 Lardiere, D. (1998). Dissociating syntax from morphology in a divergent L2 end-state  
6 grammar. *Second Language Research*, 14, 359-75.
- 7 Lardiere, D. (2005). On morphological competence. In L. Dekydtspotter, R. A. Sprouse &  
8 A. Liljestr and (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Generative Approaches to Second*  
9 *Language Acquisition* (GASLA 2004) (pp. 178-92). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla  
10 Proceedings Project.
- 11 Leonetti, M. (2007). Clitics do not encode specificity. In G. Kaiser & M. Leonetti (Eds.),  
12 *Proceedings of the workshop Definiteness, Specificity and Animacy in Ibero-Romance*  
13 *Languages* (pp. 111-140). Arbeitspapier Nr. 122. Universit at Konstanz.
- 14 Lipski, J. (1994). *Latin American Spanish*. London, New York: Longman.
- 15 L opez, L. (2001). On the (Non) complementarity of  $\theta$ -Theory and Checking Theory.  
16 *Linguistic Inquiry*, 46, 657-701.
- 17 L opez, L. (2009). *A derivational syntax for information structure*. Oxford: OUP
- 18 Luj an, M. (1987). Clitic-Doubling in Andean Spanish and the Theory of Case Absorption.  
19 In T. Morgan, J. Lee & B. Vanpatten (Eds.), *Language and Language Use: Studies in*  
20 *Spanish* (pp. 109–121). Washington: University Press of America.
- 21 Luj an, M. & T. Parodi. (1996). Clitic doubling and the acquisition of agreement in Spanish.  
22 In J. Guti errez-Rexach & L. Silva-Villar (Eds.), *Perspectives on Spanish Linguistics* (pp.  
23 119-138). Los Angeles: UCLA.
- 24 Mayer, E. (2006). Optional Direct Object Clitic Doubling in Lime no Spanish. In M. Butt &  
25 T. King Holloway (Eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference* (pp. 310-327). Stanford,  
26 Ca: CSLI Publications.
- 27 Mayer, E. (2008). Clitics on the Move: from Dependent Marking to Split Marking. In M.  
28 Butt & T. King Holloway (Eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference* (pp. 352- 372).  
29 Stanford, Ca: CSLI Publications.
- 30 Mayer, E. (2010). *Syntactic variation of object arguments in Lime no Spanish Contact*  
31 *Varieties*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Australian National University.
- 32 Mayer, E. (2013). Floating agreement in American Spanish le ista dialects. *Australian*  
33 *Journal of Linguistics*, 33(2), 152-169.
- 34 Mayer, E. forthcoming. *Spanish clitics on the move, variation in time and space*.  
35 Mouton de Gruyter.
- 36 Mayer, E. & M. Delicado Cantero. (2015). Continuity and contact-induced change in  
37 Peruvian Spanish contact varieties: the case of prepositional differential object marking.  
38 In M. Gonz alez -Rivera & S. Sessarego (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Hispanic Contact*  
39 *Linguistics in the Americas* (pp. 99-120). (Language and Society in the Hispanic World).  
40 Madrid & Frankfurt am Main, Vervuert Iberoamericana.
- 41 Mayer, M. & M. Mayer. (1992). *One Frog Too Many*. New York, NY: Dial Press.
- 42 McCarthy, C. (2008). Morphological variability in the comprehension of agreement: an  
43 argument for representation over computation. *Second Language Research*, 24(4), 459-  
44 486.
- 45 Nikolaeva, I. (2001). Secondary Topic as a Relation in Information Structure. *Linguistics*,  
46 39, 1–49
- 47 Ord o nez, F. (1998). Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish. *Natural Language andLinguistic*  
48 *Theory*, 16, 313-346.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Ordóñez, F. & L. Repetti. (2006). "Stressed Enclitics?" In Montreuil, Jean-Pierre (Ed.), *New Analyses on Romance Linguistics* (pp. 167-181). Volume II: Phonetics, Phonology and Dialectology (Selected Papers from the 35th LSRL 35). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ormazabal, J. & J. Romero. (2013). Differential Object Marking, Case and Agreement. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, 2(2), 221-239.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.7557/1.2.2.2808>
- Pérez, J. (2000). Distribución y estructura interna de los clíticos del español: análisis de cuatro fenómenos desde la Morfología Distribuida. *Lexis*, 24(2), 259-281.
- Rivero, M.L. (1980). On Left-Dislocation and Topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11(2), 363-393.
- Roberts, I. (1991). Excorporation and minimality. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 209-218.
- Rodríguez Mondoñedo, M. (2007). *The syntax of objects: Agree and differential object Marking*. PhD dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Rooryck, J. (2000). *Configurations of sentential complementation: perspectives from Romance languages*. Routledge: London.
- Saab, A. & P. Zdrojewski. (2010). *Syntactically Inert Clitics: A Paradox Involving Clitic Doubling and its Resolution*. [Presentation]. Paper presented at Romania Nova IV, Campos de Jordão, São Paulo, November 8.
- Sánchez, L. (1999). Null Objects in Contact varieties of Spanish. In J.-M. Authier & B. Bullock (Eds.), *Formal Perspectives on Romance Linguistics* (pp. 227-242). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sánchez, L. (2003). *Quechua-Spanish Bilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 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.
- Sánchez, L. (2015). Right Peripheral Domains and Informational Structure in Southern Quechua. In A. Muntendam & M. Manley (Eds.), *Quechua Expressions of Stance and Deixis* (pp. 287-322). Leiden: Brill Studies in Indigenous Languages of the Americas.
- Spencer, A. & A. R. Luís. (2012). *Clitics. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sportiche, D. (1996). Clitic Constructions. In J. Rooryck & L. Zaring (Eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon* (pp. 213-276). Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Suñer, M. (1988). The Role of Agreement in Clitic-doubled Constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6 (3), 391-434.
- Suñer, M. (1989). Dialectal Variation and Clitic-Doubled Direct Objects. In C. Kirscher & J. Decesaris (Eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics* (pp. 377-395). Selected Papers from the 27th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XVII) (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Uriagereka, Juan. (1995). Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26, 79-123.
- Villalba, X. (2000). *The Syntax of Sentence Periphery*. (PhD Dissertation). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.

- 1  
2 Weber, D. (1989). *A grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*. (Vol. 112). University of  
3 California Press.  
4  
5 Zagana, K. (2002). *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
6  
7 Zdrojewski, P. (2013). Spanish DOM as a case of lacking Case. Differential Object marking  
8 Workshop, University of Tromsø, May 23-24, 2013.  
9  
10 Zdrojewski, P. & L. Sánchez. (2014). Variation in accusative clitic doubling across three  
11 Spanish dialects. *Lingua*, 151, 162-176.  
12  
13 Zubizarreta, M. L. (1998). *Prosody, Focus and Word Order. Linguistic Inquiry*. Monograph  
14 33. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Weber, D. (1989). *A grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*. (Vol. 112). University of California Press.
- Zagana, K. (2002). *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zdrojewski, P. (2013). Spanish DOM as a case of lacking Case. Differential Object marking Workshop, University of Tromsø, May 23-24, 2013.
- Zdrojewski, P. & L. Sánchez. (2014). Variation in accusative clitic doubling across three Spanish dialects. *Lingua*, 151, 162-176.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. (1998). *Prosody, Focus and Word Order. Linguistic Inquiry*. Monograph 33. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Zwicky, A. (1985). Clitics and Particles. *Language*, 61, 283–305.

Los pronombres de objeto directo (clíticos) en español son marcadores morfológicos que se encuentran en las interfaces entre sintaxis, fonología, morfología y estructura informativa (Zwicky 1985; Ordóñez & Repetti 2006; Bello 2007; Spencer & Luís 2012). Los clíticos tienen un papel importante en la morfología argumentativa y son susceptibles a variabilidad en la adquisición bilingüe (McCarthy 2008). En este artículo exploramos el mapeo de los clíticos en las interfaces de morfología, sintaxis y estructura informativa en estructuras producidas por un amplio espectro de hablantes situados en un continuo de contacto que va desde bilingües dominantes en quechua hasta monolingües en español. Nuestros resultados indican que existe una disociación clara entre las propiedades sintácticas y el marcado de los rasgos morfológicos. Además, muestran evolución de un sistema de marca básica de género a un sistema escalar de clíticos basado en animacidad y valor informativo a lo largo del continuo de hablantes. Finalmente, aunque los clíticos en variedades con libre doblado de clítico pueden interpretarse como foco (Sánchez 2010; Sánchez & Zdrojewski 2013), nuestros datos indican que pueden ser interpretados como objeto primario y tópico secundario en algunas variedades de contacto (Sánchez 2003; Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011; Mayer 2008, 2013, en prensa). Los resultados de este estudio exploratorio apoyan la tesis de que, aunque los clíticos exhiban propiedades sintácticas comunes en un continuo de hablantes, éstos pueden a la vez mostrar variación en la morfología y el valor informativo.

**Palabras claves:** clíticos, pronombres de objeto directo, marcadores de objeto, sintaxis, estructura informativa, variedades de contacto monolingües y bilingües.