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/]

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 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. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/resla.29.2.07may](http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/resla.29.2.07may).


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
**Manuscript Number:** RESLA-D-15-00079R2

**Full Title:** Object agreement marking and information structure along the Quechua-Spanish contact continuum

**Short Title:**

**Article Type:** Article

**First Author:** Elisabeth Mayer, PhD

**Other Authors:** Liliana Sanchez, PhD

**Corresponding Author:** Elisabeth Mayer, PhD
Australian National University
Canberra, ACT AUSTRALIA

**Funding Information:**

**Section/Category:** Special Issue

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

**Manuscript Classifications:** Language Learning and Acquisition; Pragmatics

**Abstract:**

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 & Luis 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.

**Author Comments:** we are grateful for the extension you granted us.
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; Belloro 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.
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1. Introduction

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 (Belloro 2007). In bilingual

---

1 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.

2 We refer here to the basic set of direct object or accusative clitics loc(s) and la(s), and also to le(s) in its function as an accusative clitic in monolingual and bilingual contact varieties.
acquisition they are subject to morphological and representational variability specifically in comprehension and production (McCarthy 2008). Based on experimental evidence, McCarthy argues that, in second language learning, the degree of morphological variability of gender and number agreement can be linked to different stages of language acquisition, with intermediate level participants exhibiting greater variability than advanced levels. The emergence of the masculine clitic as a default form also shows the same gradability across levels. In principle, morphological variability is compatible with acquisition of syntactic properties. In fact, some second language learners have been shown to exhibit a dissociation between syntactic and morphological representations (Lardiere 1998, 2005).

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

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

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

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

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

2. Clitic doubling in Spanish, Quechua and Contact Spanish

2.1. Morphosyntactic properties of accusative clitics

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

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

(1) La ve-o
    CL3FSG see-1SG
    ‘I see her.’

(2) Quier-o ver-la
    want-1SG see-INF-CL3FSG
    ‘I want to see her.’

(3) La quier-o v-er
    CL3FG want-1SG see-INF
    ‘I want to see her.’

(4) La est-á v-iendo
    CL3FSG be-3SG see-GER

3 From a lexical perspective, they encode the argument structure of the verb but can also be related to non-argument projections such as ethical datives (Bonet i Alsina 1995; Franco & Huidobro 2008; Ormazabal & Romero 2013), and applicatives (Cuervo 2003).
‘(S/he) is seeing her.’

(5) Est-á v-íendo-la
be-3SG see-GER-CL3FSG
‘(S/he) is seeing her.’

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

(6) Maqa-wa-n
hit-1ACC-3SG
‘S/he hit me.’

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) Single clitic (anaphoric clitics)

(10) La v-i-o
CL3FSG see-PST-3SG

These examples are in Cuzco Quechua spoken by one of our bilingual groups. In this respect, Huánuco Quechua, spoken by the other group, does not differ from Cuzco Quechua. For a full description of object person marking in Cuzco Quechua see Cusihuamán (2001) and for Huánuco Quechua see Weber (1989).
‘(S)He saw her.’

(ii) Clitic Doubling structures (CLD)

(11) La v-i-o a ella/María.
   CL3FSG see-PST-3SG 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 María, (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, María.’

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

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

(16) Wasi-taqa Pirdu- m ruwa-rqa-n
    house-ACC-TOP Pirdu-FOC build-PAST-3S
    ‘The house, Pirdu built.’
    (Sánchez 2010: 71)

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

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

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

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

(19) *Ø Maria la v-i ayer en el mercado
DOM Maria CL3FSG see-PST-1SG yesterday in the market
‘As for Maria, I saw her yesterday in the market.’

(20) * La v-i ayer en el mercado Ø Maria
CL3FSG see-PST-1SG yesterday in the market DOM Maria
‘I saw her yesterday in the market, Maria.’

2.2. Spanish clitic systems in contact varieties

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

(21) Acá el motelu le carg-a a un sapo
here the turtle CL3SG carry-3SG DOM a toad
'Here the turtle carries a toad.'
(Sánchez 2003:124)

Monolingual contact varieties preferably use the default masculine lo, as shown in (22):^5

(22) Yo lo v-i a las chic-as
PRO.1SG CL3MSG see-PST-1SG DOM DET.FPL girl-FPL
‘I saw the girls.’
(Mayer 2008: 363)

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

(23) Se lo llev-ó una caj-a
CL3SG CL3MSG take-PST-3SG INDEF.FSG box-FSG
‘(S)/He took a box (with her/him).’
(Luján 1987: 115)

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

---

^5 We use the term monolingual contact varieties to refer to those varieties spoken by children or grandchildren of Quechua-Spanish bilingual speakers who lack comprehension and production skills in Quechua.
Exposure to a Peruvian standardized variety of Spanish is very limited in rural areas of Peru. The more limited the exposure to the official school system the less likely it is for speakers to receive input in such variety. The scale represents, on the left side, what we expect to find in Quechua-Spanish bilinguals with low levels of formal instruction and, therefore, limited exposure to the Peruvian prestigious normative variety, and on the right side, what we expect to find in monolinguals with high levels of access to formal instruction and therefore higher exposure to the normative variety.

(24) Bilinguals (Low instruction)       Monolinguals (High instruction)

   le (masc+fem) > lo (masc+fem) > lo (masc), le (fem) > lo (masc), la (fem)

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

2.2.1. Clitic systems in bilingual contact varieties

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

2.2.2. Clitic systems in monolingual contact varieties

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSCV (+close to prestigious)</th>
<th>LSCV (-close prestigious)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ ANIM</td>
<td><em>le</em> / <em>lo</em> / <em>la</em></td>
<td><em>le</em> / <em>lo</em> / <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ANIM</td>
<td><em>lo</em> / <em>le</em> / <em>la</em></td>
<td><em>lo</em> / <em>le</em> / <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-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 attritted and the monolingual speaker will be revealing of the different possibilities of variation in the scale presented in (24).
2.3. Information structure

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

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

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

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

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

(29) Le est-á mir-ando a su tortug-a
CL3SG is-3SG look-GER DOM POSS turtle-FSG
‘He looks at his turtle.’ (H4)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 We present the monolingual data by way of comparison not as a control group. The relevance of these three speakers is the fact that they are related to each other but have been exposed to different levels of dialect contact in different communities.
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cuzco (%)</th>
<th>Huánuco (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proclitics</td>
<td>74 (96t)</td>
<td>63 (67t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclitics</td>
<td>22 (29t)</td>
<td>31 (34t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null objects</td>
<td>4 (5t)</td>
<td>5 (4t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduplication</td>
<td>0 (0t)</td>
<td>1 (1t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (130t)</td>
<td>100 (106t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Entonces empezaron a buscarle
    then start-PST-3PL to find-IND-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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cuzco (%)</th>
<th>Huánuco (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>58 (70t)</td>
<td>50 (52t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>31 (38t)</td>
<td>40 (41t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>2 (2t)</td>
<td>8 (8t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLRD</td>
<td>9 (10t)</td>
<td>2 (2t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (120t)</td>
<td>100 (103t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/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:

---

7 Predicate clitics were excluded that were counted in the totals in Table 2.
Lo pon-í-a encima de la tortuga al sapo
CL3MSG place-PST-3SG above of the turtle DOM-DET.MSG frog
y la rana
and DET.FSG frog
‘(S)/He placed the frog and the toad on top of the turtle.’ (C8) (CLRD)

Al niño pues-m-er-le
DOM-DET.MSG boy can-3SG bite-INF-CL3SG
‘(He) can bite the boy’ (H5) (CLLD)

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

The distribution of le and lo in CLD, CLLD and CLRD structures is given in Table (4) in percentages with tokens in brackets. No distinction was made between singular and plurals. Le had a higher frequency than lo in CLD and CLLD structures in both groups. It was, however, more frequent in the Huánuco data (77%, combined) than in the Cuzco data (53%, combined). There were fewer tokens of the dislocated structures and their distribution was not similar. A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference $\chi^2 (5, N=199) = 21.90, p< .0005$.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>le+</th>
<th>lo+</th>
<th>le+</th>
<th>lo+</th>
<th>le+</th>
<th>lo+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>CLRD</td>
<td>CLRD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huánuco</td>
<td>65 (32t)</td>
<td>16 (8t)</td>
<td>12 (6t)</td>
<td>2 (1t)</td>
<td>4 (2t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 (49t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>51 (23t)</td>
<td>27 (12t)</td>
<td>2 (1t)</td>
<td>2 (1t)</td>
<td>11 (5t)</td>
<td>7 (3t)</td>
<td>100 (45t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (39) illustrates a case of lo + masc DP from the Cuzco group and example (40) a case of le + masculine from the Huánuco group.

Encima de la tortuga lo pon-en los dos sap-ös
above of DET.FSG turtle CL3MSG put-3PL DET.MPL two toad-MPL
‘They place the two toads on top of the turtle.’ (C6) (CLD)

El perro le mir-ä a los animal-it-os aquí
the dog CL3SG look-3SG DOM DET.MPL animals-DIM-MPL here
‘And the dog looks at the animals here.’ (H16) (CLD)

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

Y el sapo le bota de encima de la tortuga a
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) (CLRD)

(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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic (%)</th>
<th>Recovering topic (%)</th>
<th>Secondary topic (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>28 (33t)</td>
<td>38 (45t)</td>
<td>28 (34t)</td>
<td>6 (7t)</td>
<td>100 (119t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huánuco</td>
<td>35 (36t)</td>
<td>34 (35t)</td>
<td>25 (26t)</td>
<td>6 (6t)</td>
<td>100 (103t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic%</th>
<th>Recovering topic%</th>
<th>Secondary topic%</th>
<th>Other%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>100 (36t)</td>
<td>17 (6t)</td>
<td>19 (5t)</td>
<td>83 (5t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57 (20t)</td>
<td>77 (20t)</td>
<td>17 (1t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (7t)</td>
<td>4 (1t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (2t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (36t)</td>
<td>100 (35t)</td>
<td>100 (37t)</td>
<td>100(6t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic%</th>
<th>Recovering topic%</th>
<th>Secondary topic%</th>
<th>Other%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>97 (32t)</td>
<td>13 (6t)</td>
<td>82 (28t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>3 (1t)</td>
<td>71 (32t)</td>
<td>8 (3t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (2t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (7t)</td>
<td>5 (2t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (33t)</td>
<td>100 (45t)</td>
<td>100 (34t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(43) El perro también le mira ahí
DET.MSG dog as well CL3SG look-3SG there
‘The dog looks at him there as well.” (H7)

(44) Y les lleva 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 está sentado. (Es)tá bien. El tortuguita
the toady is-3SG seat-GER. Be-3SG well. The turtle-DIM.FSG
se ha parado
CL3SG has stand up-PART
b. El niño se asusta
The boy CL3SG.REF frightens

c. Acá tortuga le está fastidiando 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.
(46) Le est-á mir-ando a su tortug-a
    CL3SG is-3SG look-GER DOM POSS turtle-FSG
    ‘He looks at his turtle.’ (H4)

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

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

There was also one instance of CLRD as an afterthought:

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

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

4.2. Monolingual Limeño Spanish contact varieties

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proclitics (%)</th>
<th>Enclitics (%)</th>
<th>Null (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSCV1</td>
<td>85 (314t)</td>
<td>10 (37t)</td>
<td>5 (19t)</td>
<td>100 (845t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCV2</td>
<td>85 (161t)</td>
<td>12 (23t)</td>
<td>3 (6t)</td>
<td>100 (190t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCV3</td>
<td>92 (22t)</td>
<td>8 (2t)</td>
<td>0 (0t)</td>
<td>100 (24t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

(55) \textit{La carg-o a su hij-a}  
\textit{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) \textit{Sí, las claras los pong-o a usted}  
\textit{Yes DET.FPL eggwhite CL3MPL give-1SG DOM YOU}  
‘Yes I give you the eggwhites’ (LSCV1)

(57) \textit{Al ají, lo hag-o hervir}  
\textit{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) \textit{Entonces, la lav-o bien la var-it-a}  
\textit{then CL3FSG wash-1SG well DET.FSG stalk-DIM-FSG}  
‘Then I wash well the stalk.’ (LSCV2)

The distribution of \textit{le}, \textit{lo} and \textit{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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSCV1</th>
<th>LSCV2</th>
<th>LSCV3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{le}+CLD</td>
<td>28 (19t)</td>
<td>19 (8t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{lo}+CLD</td>
<td>20 (13t)</td>
<td>10 (4t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La+CLD</td>
<td>Le+CLLD</td>
<td>Lo+CLLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 (12t)</td>
<td>50 (1t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (8t)</td>
<td>2 (1t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (2t)</td>
<td>5 (2t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 (6t)</td>
<td>10 (4t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (2t)</td>
<td>2 (1t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1t)</td>
<td>15 (5t)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (60t)</td>
<td>100 (41t)</td>
<td>100 (2t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
mayormente
mostly

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

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

Table 11. Differential object marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSCV1</td>
<td>80 (43t)</td>
<td>20 (11t)</td>
<td>100 (54t)</td>
<td>22 (10t)</td>
<td>78 (38t)</td>
<td>100 (48t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCV2</td>
<td>94 (31t)</td>
<td>6 (2t)</td>
<td>100 (33t)</td>
<td>17 (4t)</td>
<td>83 (10t)</td>
<td>100 (14t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCV3</td>
<td>100 (1t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199 (1t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

(66) Al ají la hag-o hervir

---

8 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 χ² (3, N=376) =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

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

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 χ² (9, N=378) =37.94, p< .0001

Table 13. Informational roles according to structure in LSCV1

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

The distribution of information structure roles for LSCV2 is given in Table (14). A chi-square test confirmed independence of preference for all structures χ² (9, N=198) =61.5, p< .0001
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Table 14. Informational roles according to structure in LSCV2

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

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

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

(74) El pollo lo p-us-e solamente sal, le
det.MSG chicken CL3MSG put-PST-1SG only salt CL3SG
ech-é sal, y luego ya le he pic-ad
add-PST-1SG salt and then already CL3SG have-1SG cut-PARTIC

cebolla y hoy ya puse la cebolla […]
onion-FSG and today already add-PST-1SG the onion […]

‘The chicken I seasoned only with salt, I added salt, and then I cut some onion and today I already added the onion…’ (LSCV1)

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

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

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

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

(77) Y si no Ø quier-e picante, las sac-o las venas
and if not CL want-3SG hot CL3FPL cut-1SG DET.FPL vein-FPL
de adentro y la l icu-o sin pepas
from inside and CL3FSG blend-1SG without seed-FPL
‘And if you do not like to eat it hot, I take out the veins and I blend it without the seeds.’ (LSCV2)
In sum, all three monolingual participants living in dialect contact situations (Andean Spanish - Lima prestigious norm) show fully developed morphosyntactic properties of accusative clitics with correct use of clitic placement (proclitics and enclitics). Our results show a scalar production of lo over le for LSCV1 and the reverse, le over lo with some la for LSCV2. The Lima-born individual shows no divergence from the prestigious Lima norm. In relation to DOM, both migrant individuals exhibit a lack of DOM with [+animate] DPs and extension of DOM to [-animate] definite DPs; LSCV3 again exhibits structures very close to the prestigious Lima norm.

5. Discussion

Our analysis was guided by three research questions and respective hypotheses, repeated below.

1. Are the morphosyntactic properties of accusative clitics (proclitics and enclitics) fully developed in bilinguals and monolinguals living in contact situations?
   Hypothesis: In assuming dissociation of syntactic and morphological competence in fully developed bilinguals and monolinguals, we expected no or little difference between bilinguals and monolinguals.

2. Is there neutralization of gender features in accusative clitics in favour of le or lo in bilinguals, and a more complex system emerges in monolinguals?
   Hypothesis: In terms of gender features, effects from language contact with a language that does not mark gender should be noticeable in bilinguals who we expected to prefer le over lo in bilinguals, while monolingual varieties should differ in this respect. We also expected bilinguals with lower levels of exposure to Spanish in formal instruction settings to have a stronger preference for le.

3. What is the informational status of the clitic according to clitic structure in bilinguals and monolinguals?
   Hypothesis: We anticipated that bilinguals will have a preference for le in CLDs to introduce secondary topics. We also expected the monolingual individuals to have lo and la in CLD structures with secondary topics and dislocated structures with le as a preferred candidate for primary topic in anaphoric relation especially in the two monolingual individuals who speak the less prestigious norm. We expected the monolingual with greater exposure to the prestigious norm will be closer to an animacy based system or to fully developed gender marking system in CLD.

In relation to our first research question, our hypothesis based on the dissociation model of syntactic representation and morphological variability (Lardiere 1998, 2005) is confirmed by the data, as both monolingual groups show evidence of proclitics and enclitics over null objects. Furthermore, both bilingual groups and the monolingual individuals show the full range of clitic structures. From a modular perspective, our results indicate that the core syntactic operations involved in the clitic-related structures have been acquired by bilinguals and are part of monolingual speech too. Bilinguals and monolinguals show a higher frequency of anaphoric clitics than of any other clitic structure, and a higher frequency of CLD over dislocated structures. This may be due to the narrative structure of the oral data in which
several topics are introduced and reintroduced creating the need to mark secondary topics or reintroduce topics. The two migrant individuals show differing results for CLLD and CLRD.

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

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

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

For our third research question, addressing the informational status of \( le, lo \) and \( la \) according to clitic structure in bilinguals and monolinguals, our hypothesis was that \( le, lo, la \) among bilinguals and \( lo, la \), to a minor extent, among monolinguals will be secondary topics in CLD and dislocated structures. This was the case especially for Huánuco bilinguals and for monolinguals.

Both bilingual groups and the monolingual individuals treat anaphoric clitics preferentially as topics. CLD are used most frequently to reintroduce topics in discourse by bilinguals and to introduce secondary topics by monolingual individuals. For the monolingual individuals anaphoric clitics are topics, including continuing topics. \( Lo, le \) and \( la \) in CLD,
CLLD and CLRD structures show a tendency to express secondary topics, introducing and reintroducing secondary topics. Gender-specific *la* is used for highly affected animate and inanimate secondary topics, mostly in the sense of aboutness topics.

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

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

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

6. Concluding Remarks

This study examined clitic structures, morphological variability in clitic systems and their syntax-information structure mapping in bilingual speakers of Andean Spanish and monolingual speakers of Lima Spanish. The novelty of our approach lies in a comparison of language and dialect contact across urban and rural domains with common linguistic input determined by access to formal education and clitic feature inventories in the respective communities. The main contributions of this paper are that we have identified a continuum of scalar monolingual and bilingual clitic subsystems with the range of morphological variability constrained by morphological availability in their respective typological space. The range goes from gender neutralization among bilinguals with lower levels of formal instruction in Spanish to an animacy-based scale and/or a gender based distinction in monolingual individuals. We have also provided evidence of the emergence of a mapping of secondary topic informational values onto CLD and anaphoric clitic structures. We have also shown the
use of clitic doubling structures to reintroduce topics in a way that differs from its uses in non-contact varieties.
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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; Belloro 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.
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