



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

'Dar' + gerund in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish: contact-induced grammaticalization?

Olbertz, H.

DOI

[10.1075/sic.5.1.06olb](https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.5.1.06olb)

Publication date

2008

Published in

Spanish in Context

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Olbertz, H. (2008). 'Dar' + gerund in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish: contact-induced grammaticalization? *Spanish in Context*, 5(1), 89-109. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.5.1.06olb>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Dar + gerund in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish: contact-induced grammaticalization?

Hella Olbertz
University of Amsterdam

Abstract:

The benefactive construction *dar + gerund* is used in the North Andean region only and is unknown elsewhere in the Spanish-speaking world. Based on the analysis of spontaneous data from Ecuadorian Highland Spanish, this paper provides a linguistic description of *dar + gerund* and of the social and pragmatic conditions of its use. Departing from this description, I will explain that the construction originates through contact with Ecuadorian Quechua. It will be shown that the geographical restriction of the use of *dar + gerund* is directly related to the specific characteristics of Ecuadorian Quechua.

Keywords: Ecuadorian Highland Spanish, Ecuadorian Quechua, grammaticalization, language contact, benefactive, gerund periphrasis

1. Introduction*

In the Spanish of the Ecuadorian and Southern Colombian Andes one frequently hears a curious gerund construction with *dar* 'give' in an auxiliary function, which is not used elsewhere in the Spanish speaking world. The following example may serve to illustrate the use of this construction:

- (1) [Ecuadorian in Holland talking about immigration formalities]
Ya me han dado hablando (G.M., 05/04)
'They have already been so kind as to do the talking for me'

In this construction *dar + gerund* has a benefactive function, i.e. it expresses that the action described in the main predicate is realized in favour of a participant in the speech act, the speaker in the case of (1), or of a third party. Given the fact that this function does not bear any direct relation to the original meaning of *dar*, we may assume that the construction is highly grammaticalized. As it occurs only in this very restricted region, the most obvious source of the construction seems to be contact with Quechua.

Dar + gerund has been treated in a number of earlier studies, such as Albor (1973), Bustamante & Niño Murcia (1995), Niño Murcia (1995), Hurley (1995a, 1995b), Haboud (1997, 1998, 2003) and Olbertz (2002). However, only Albor (1973) and Haboud (1998, 2003) focus on the possible origin of the construction, although they do not give a fully satisfactory answer to the question of how *dar + gerund* may have come into existence and why it is not used outside the North Andean region, i.e. the Ecuadorian and Columbian Andes. The present paper, which will be based exclusively on data from Ecuador, aims at answering these two questions.

The structure of this paper is as follows: I will address the linguistic properties of the construction (section 2), and then outline a number of sociolinguistic aspects of its use (section 3). In section 4, I will argue that the source of the construction is related to the specific linguistic properties of Ecuadorian Quechua, and show how it has been integrated into the regional standard. Section 5 will be devoted to my conclusions.

In this study, Ecuadorian Highland Spanish in contact with Quechua will be examined via a corpus of rural Spanish compiled in 1978 by Pieter Muysken (Salcedo corpus, SC), and urban monolingual Ecuadorian Highland Spanish will be represented by fieldnotes taken by myself from speakers in Quito, where Quechua is not spoken.¹ The Salcedo corpus consists of 32 hours of informal conversations recorded in natural settings in the small mestizo town of Salcedo (Cotopaxi province) and the indigenous communities nearby. On the basis of

information provided by Muysken, I classified the speakers into Quechua-dominant bilinguals (BQ), Spanish-dominant bilinguals (BS) and lower-class Spanish monolinguals with some basic knowledge of Quechua (M) (for more details see Muysken 1984: 106-107 and 2005: 36-38). For general Spanish data, I will make use of Mark Davies' *Corpus del Español* (CdE).

2. Grammaticalization

In this section, I will demonstrate that *dar* + gerund is a highly grammaticalized periphrastic construction. To do so, I will first define what I mean by “periphrasis”, then compare *dar* + gerund with the homonymous lexical construction and finally consider several details of the syntactic structure of the periphrasis.

A Spanish periphrasis can be defined as the productive and indissoluble combination of a grammaticalized verb with a verbal predicate in a specific non-finite form, i.e. infinitive, gerund or participle, in which the finite verb agrees with the first argument of the non-finite verb. The function of this combination is the semantic modification of what is expressed by the non-finite predicate and its arguments (Olbertz 1998: 32). In the following, I will use “main verb” or “lexical predicate” for reference to the verb in the gerundial form, and “periphrastic auxiliary” to refer to the finite verb.

In the following example, the verb *dar* co-occurs with a gerund in a non-periphrastic construction:

- (2a) *CASYAPA. ¿Qué quiere esta señora?*
MANTARA. También tu bendición. (Se la da imponiendo sus manos)
(Juan Valera, *Teatro*, quoted from CdE)

‘CASYAPA. What does this lady want?
MANTARA. Also your blessing. (She gives it to her laying her hands on her)’

In this example, *dar* is the main verb with the clitics *se* and *la* referring to the indirect and direct objects respectively. The latter clitic refers to the patient argument *tu bendición* mentioned in the preceding clause, and the former to the recipient, a female person. The gerund construction *imponiendo sus manos* is a manner adverbial, consisting of the transitive verb *imponer* and its patient argument *sus manos*. In short, *dar* and the gerund form a bi-clausal construction, in which the two verbs share the agent argument (= the subject) and have further arguments of their own. Given its adverbial character, the gerund clause can be left out without affecting the grammaticality of the remaining clause:

- (2b) *Se la da.*
‘She gives it to her.’

Apart from the manner function illustrated in (2a), clausal gerund constructions can have many other functions (see Fernández Lagunilla 1999); what they all have in common is that there is always the possibility of omission. In most cases it is also possible to substitute the gerund by a pronoun or a finite construction, the nature of which depends on the function of the gerund construction (see Olbertz 1998: 161-166).

The case of Ecuadorian *dar* + gerund is distinct. Consider the following example:

- (3a) *Deme llamando al pasajero A. por favor* (Azafata, 01/03)
‘Be so kind as to call passenger A. please’

There is only one syntactic feature which (2a) and (3a) have in common, i.e. the fact that *dar* and the gerund share their agent argument, which in (3a) refers to the addressee. Apart from this, the syntactic structures of (2a) and (3a) are radically different. The gerund construction *llamando al pasajero A.* is not an adverbial construction modifying some main clause, evidence of which is the fact that (3b), in which the gerund construction is omitted, does not correspond to the meaning of (3a):

- (3b) **Deme por favor.*
 ‘Give [it to] me please.’²

Example (3b) shows that *dar* + gerund as used in (3a) is a periphrastic construction, because the construction cannot be dissolved without losing its specific benefactive meaning. In contrast to (2a), which is a lexical biclausal construction with *dar* and *imponer* as lexical predicates, example (3a) is a monoclausal construction, in which *llamando al pasajero A.* is the main predication and *dar* is a periphrastic auxiliary.³ In what follows, I will show that this periphrastic auxiliary has become highly grammaticalized.

As a lexical verb, *dar* is a ditransitive predicate whose basic semantic structure, which corresponds to its prototypical use, can be roughly described as ‘give (some concrete entity) (to somebody)’. In order to account for the fact that *dar* is an action predicate, rather than, for example, a state predicate or an experience predicate, the following somewhat more formal representation, based on Dik (1997: 78-85), is more appropriate. In this representation, the angle brackets contain selection restrictions, and “A” means “argument”, so that, in an active construction, A1 is the subject, A2 the direct object and A3 the indirect object.

- (4) give (A1: <human>, agent) (A2: <concrete entity>, patient) (A3: <human>, recipient)

Starting from this characterization of the lexical properties of *dar*, let us see how auxiliary *dar* differs.

First, auxiliary *dar* does not have a patient argument of its own. In (3a) it is not the case that the patient argument *el pasajero A.* is shared by *llamar* and *dar*, as shown by the fact that (3c) is inappropriate as well:

- (3c) **Deme al pasajero A. por favor.*
 ‘Give me passenger A., please.’

As a consequence, *dar* can also combine with intransitive verbs such as *hablar* in (1) above and *cocinar* in the following example:

- (5) *Te doy cocinando los domingos* (Haboud 1997: 212)
 ‘I do the cooking for you on Sundays’

Secondly, the original meaning of *dar* has been seriously reduced; in (6) *dar* combines with “itself” without being redundant, and in (7) it modifies *tener*, which is semantically incompatible with lexical *dar*:

- (6) *Nos da dando la ropa a la costurera* (Haboud 1997: 213)
 ‘He/she is so kind as to give the clothes to the seamstress for us’

- (7) [speaker hands a package to hearer to get it out of the way for a moment]
Dame teniendo esto (C.D., 01/03)
 ‘Be so kind as to hold this for me’

In the periphrasis, the basic lexical meaning of *dar* of ‘giving (some concrete entity) (to somebody)’ has been metaphorically extended to the more abstract notion of ‘“giving” (some action) (to somebody)’. Alternatively, one could conceive of the semantic relation between lexical and auxiliary ‘give’ as a metonymic relation, in which the benefactive semantics, or the “human interest” as Newman (1996: 51) puts it, is a peripheral dimension of the lexical meaning of ‘give’, which in the beneficiary function becomes central: what is ‘given’ is not an entity but an act (Newman 1996: 221-222).⁴ In any case, there is an indirect semantic relation between the basic lexical meaning and the benefactive semantics of the periphrasis.

Returning to the syntax of the construction, we find that in all of the examples we have considered so far, auxiliary *dar* is preceded or followed by a dative clitic. It is a normal phenomenon in Spanish periphrases that a clitic “climbs” from its default position before or after the main verb to the position before or after the auxiliary. This clitic climbing is, however, tied to strict rules, especially when there are two clitics. As Fernández Soriano (1999: 1262) shows, double clitics in complex constructions either both climb, as in (8a), or both stay in their default position (8b); splitting double clitics results in ungrammaticality (8c, 8d):

- (8a) *Me la puedo poner.*
 ‘I can put it on’.
 (b) *Puedo ponérmela.*
 (c) **Me puedo ponerla.*
 (d) **La puedo ponerme.*

But now consider the following example of *dar* + gerund:

- (9a) –*Dame despertando a la tía Azucena, mientras yo preparo el desayuno.*
 –*Perdona, no te entendí ¿qué quieres que haga con la tía Azucena?*
 –*Dame despertándola.*
 ‘–Be so kind as to wake Aunt Azucena up for me, while I make breakfast.
 –Sorry, I didn’t hear you, what do you want me to do with Aunt Azucena?
 –Be so kind as to wake her up for me.’

The last element in this example has two clitics, *me* referring to the beneficiary and *la* referring to the patient. If the dative clitic had indeed climbed from the main predicate into the auxiliary position, then (9a), in which *me* groups with the auxiliary and *la* with the main verb, would be ungrammatical. When applying the positional variants illustrated in (8a) and (8b) to the relevant clause in example (9a), the result is as follows:

- (9b) **Dámela despertando.*
 (c) ??*Da despertándomela.*

According to the rules of clitic climbing, (9b) and (9c) should be fully grammatical. However, (9b) is ungrammatical and (9c) is only marginally acceptable and considerably less natural than the original in (9a), which flouts these rules. This leads to the conclusion that the attachment of the dative clitic to auxiliary is not a matter of clitic climbing. Rather than expressing an argument of the lexical predicate, it must somehow belong to the auxiliary, i.e. it must be

the expression of a kind of “argument” of *dar*. This does not mean that auxiliary *dar* retains the recipient argument that corresponds to its original valency as a lexical verb, as in (4) above. Rather, the dative clitic serves to specify the beneficiary in whose favour a given action is (required to be) carried out.

All in all, *dar* + gerund is a highly grammaticalized periphrasis, in which the auxiliary has lost its original meaning and valency. The construction’s benefactive meaning is based on a metaphorical extension of the lexical meaning of *dar*. In its auxiliary function, *dar* is usually accompanied by a clitic which specifies the beneficiary of the action described in the lexical predicate.

3. The use of *dar* + gerund

We have seen that *dar* + gerund is a grammaticalized verbal expression with a benefactive meaning. As a logical consequence of its semantics, *dar* can combine only with gerunds of agentive verbs, i.e. verbs that describe an action rather than a state (e.g. *saber* ‘know’) or an experience (e.g. *desmayarse* ‘faint’). Indeed, in the entire sample from the Quito field notes and the Salcedo corpus, *dar* never co-occurs with a non-agentive verb. Apart from this, there is a certain amount of sociolinguistic variation to be observed concerning (i) the pragmatic contexts in which the construction is used, and (ii) the presence of the clitic with *dar*.

As regards its pragmatics, we have seen that *dar* + gerund occurs in declarative and imperative sentence types. It can also occur in questions:

- (10) *Por favor, ¿me da abriendo la maleta, señorita?* (Quito airport, 01/03)
‘Please, could you open the suitcase for me, miss?’
- (11) *¿Ónde le pueden dar haciendo las tarjetas?* (SC-BS 28b, 8)⁵
‘Where can they make these cards for you?’

The difference between these two is that (10) is an indirect request, whereas (11) is a “real question”, i.e. an interrogative speech act. In a similar vein, some of the declarative instances are indirect requests. I, therefore, categorize the instances of periphrastic *dar* in accordance with their primary illocutionary function, i.e. I distinguish between directive (=requests, orders) and non-directive utterances (see e.g. Haverkate 1989: 118) rather than categorizing them by sentence type.

In my sample of 37 instances, directives and non-directives are nearly equally distributed. From Quito, there are 10 directives and 7 non-directives. The non-directives typically consist of offers and acknowledgements, such as illustrated in (12) and (13), respectively:

- (12) [the addressee has some things to be handwashed in a tub and wants to go out]
Déjalo así con el jabón y te doy enjugando después (C.D., 01/03)
‘Just leave with the soap and I’ll wash it out for you afterwards’
- (13) [the speaker tells about her producing handicraft]
Mi mami me daba vendiendo (G.M., 05/04)
‘My mum sold [them] for me’

In the Salcedo corpus, the distribution of utterance types is similar: there are 9 directives in a total of 20 instances. However, the functions of the non-directives are more heterogeneous than those of the Quito sample. Apart from tokens that express offers and

acknowledgements like (12) and (13), there are also cases in which the function of *dar* + gerund is less obvious:

- (14) [...] *la carga que ha dado sobrino recogiendo, entonces el tío va cargando* (SC-BQ, 9b, 3)⁶
‘[...] the load that the nephew had picked up [for him], the uncle then carries’
- (15) – *¿Y ustedes me pueden contar cómo fue Pilaló antes? A los 30 años ¿cómo fue... cómo estaba aquí Pilaló?*
– *En eso no podemos dar contando. No hemos sabido también.* (SC-BQ 25a, 4)⁷
‘– And you can tell me how Pilaló was before? 30 years before, what was Pilaló like?
– We cannot tell [hon]. We don’t know either.’
- (16) *Dizque están dando arroz, azúcar, fideos están dando repartiendo para que voten ... el Sixto.* (SC-BS 17a, 5)
‘They say they are giving rice, sugar, noodles they are [hon] distributing to make them vote ... for Sixto’

While a benefactive reading is probable in (14), which forms part of a narrative about a lazy uncle who has his nephew work for him, examples (15) and (16) suggest a more general reading of *dar* + gerund as an expression of politeness towards the addressee, which I have indicated by means of ‘[hon]’ (for ‘honorific’) in the translation. There are 5 instances of this type, all of which occur in bilingual speech. In this kind of instance, the variation does not only concern pragmatics but also semantics.

Let us now turn to presence or absence of the dative clitic. In all of the instances in the Quito sample, there is a dative clitic accompanying *dar*, with the following notable exception:

- (17) [a bill posted in a stationary stall]
Damos vendiendo sus propiedades. (Quito, 05/02)
‘We sell your properties [for you].’

This is the only written instance of *dar* + gerund in my sample, and as such it is atypical of the use of the construction in urban monolingual Spanish.⁸ This is, however, unrelated to the absence of the clitic. Rather, there is a semantic reason for not referring to the beneficiary by means of a clitic since there is no beneficiary referent: the potential beneficiary is any possible reader of the announcement.⁹ Given its non-referential character, example (17) does not form an exception to the general rule that the beneficiary is specified by means of a dative clitic on *dar* in Quito Spanish.

In the corpus of rural Ecuadorian Highland Spanish, however, there is a tendency not to use the clitic: 10 of the 20 instances of periphrastic *dar* have no clitic. Apart from the non-directive cases without a benefactive meaning like (15) and (16) quoted above, the clitic is also omitted in a number of requests:

- (18) [...] *dé llamando al patrón* (SC-BS 12a, 4)
‘[...] kindly call the boss [for me]’
- (19) [neighbour is returning some item she has lent]
Sí, sí, en la chamiza que dé poniendo, ¿no? (SC-M 1b, 7)
‘Yes, yes, kindly put it on the brushwood, right?’

On the whole, in both Quito and rural Spanish *dar* + gerund occurs in directive and non-directive contexts, where it expresses a benefactive function in most cases. In bilingual Spanish, the construction is also used in a more general polite function. In all varieties of Quito Spanish the beneficiary in question is specified by means of a dative clitic on *dar*, whereas this is not the case in rural Spanish.

4. Origin

In this section I will answer the two central questions of this paper, i.e. how and why *dar* + gerund has come to fulfil the beneficiary function in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish and why it is restricted to this area. I will first discuss three current theories about the origin of this construction (4.1) and then present my own explanation (4.2). I will end this section with a short discussion of how *dar* + gerund fits in with the Spanish periphrastic system (4.3).

4.1 Three theories

The three theories to be discussed here will be addressed in order of appearance in the literature. The first and oldest theory says *dar* + gerund is a syntactic calque from a Quechua construction. The second says that it is unrelated to Quechua. The third and most recent theory considers the *dar* + gerund construction a reflex of morphological benefactive expressions in Quechua.

The first and most popular theory has been presented in classic studies such as Kany (1945) and Toscano Mateus (1953):

El origen de esta forma es puramente quichua: *Apamushpa cuy* (literalmente, ‘trayendo da’) [...], con la típica supresión del pronombre complemento. En el habla vulgar también se dice ‘da trayendo’, ‘da haciendo’. (Toscano Mateus 1953: 285)¹⁰

This theory, which in turn is based on Vázquez (1940: 127), has had many proponents since. Hurley (1995a) for instance presents examples from Otavalo, in which the Quechua structure parallels the Spanish construction:

(20a) *Papa-gu-ta randi-shpa cara-hua-y*
potato-DIM-ACC buy-SUB.SS give-me-IMP
‘Buy some potatoes for me, please’¹¹

(20b) *Dame comprando unas papas*
‘Buy some potatoes for me, please’ (Hurley 1995a: 248)

From the parallel exemplified in (20) the author concludes that the Spanish construction is a loan translation from Quechua (Hurley 1995a: 250, 1995b). Niño Murcia (1995: 97) makes similar observations, although she admits that the analytic Quechua construction may be considered acceptable by informants in the province of Imbabura only. Haboud (1998: 219) argues that constructions like the one exemplified in (20a) can be obtained through elicitation from bilingual speakers, but that it is not used in spontaneous conversation. In the English version of her 1998 book, Haboud shows that the construction is completely unknown in certain regions, such as the province of Cotopaxi (Haboud 2003: 261). This means, that rather than Quechua being the source of the Spanish construction, Quechua has calqued it from Spanish.

The second theory was advanced by Albor (1973), who radically opposes the idea of the calque as originally presented by Vázquez (1940: 127). Albor argues that *dar* + gerund has been formed in analogy with the existing gerund periphrases of general Spanish, such as

the ones with *estar* ‘be [located]’, *ir* ‘go’ and *andar* ‘walk’. He explains this process both as a consequence of the simplified language input from the colonial intruders (e.g. the excessive use of gerunds in commands), and the simplifying output by the indigenous people, who employ the gerund as an invariant verb form instead of a large number of different inflected forms (Albor 1973: 317). Although there is a case for the latter point (see example (24) below), Albor fails to account for two problems. The first problem is the basic incompatibility of ditransitive verbs like *dar* with the system of gerund periphrases in general Spanish, which combine with auxiliaries derived from intransitive verbs, such as the movement verbs *ir*, *andar* and *venir* ‘come’ and the originally positional verb *estar*. This point will be further elaborated in section 4.3. The second problem is the fact that it is difficult to conceive of an independent motivation for the grammaticalization of benefactive meaning, which is, moreover, restricted to this particular area.

The third theory is proposed by Haboud (1998: 218-223), who claims that the origin of the construction is related to the grammaticalized benefactive in Quechua, as expressed by both the nominal benefactive case morpheme *-paq* and its allomorphs and the verbal morpheme *-pu* or its allomorphs, among which is *-pa* in Ecuadorian Quechua (see Cerrón-Palomino 1987: 267-287 for more details on Quechua morphology). It should be noted that in Ecuadorian Quechua the verbal benefactive morpheme *-pa*, has acquired a general honorific or polite meaning (see Taylor 1982; Cole 1982: 185).¹² Consider the following example quoted from Haboud (2003: 254):

- (21) *Chay-ta* *María-man* *ñuka-pac* *ranti* *apamu-pa-y*
 this-ACC María-to I-BEN instead.of bring-HON-IMP
 ‘Would you please do me the favour of bringing this to María?’

Of the three theories Haboud’s seems to be the most plausible, and this is why I followed it without reserve in Olbertz (2002). It has two serious disadvantages, however. First, Haboud fails to distinguish the nominal from the verbal morphemes in a systematic way. Furthermore, she does not answer the question why *dar* + gerund came to develop in the Northern Highlands and not elsewhere in Andean Spanish. I will address both these matters next.

4.2 *Dar* + gerund as an Ecuadorian contact phenomenon

I continue to follow Haboud here in that I assume that *dar* + gerund is likely to be a reflex of the Quechua benefactive. However, I consider only the verbal morpheme *-pa* in Ecuadorian Quechua a possible source for the construction in Spanish. The reason for this is twofold. In the first place, Spanish already has nominal expressions of benefactive meaning, i.e. the pronouns *a* and *para* for lexical nominal expressions and the dative clitic for non-lexical ones. Secondly, since both Quechua and Spanish distinguish between nouns and verbs, the most likely source of an innovative verbal expression in Spanish is a verbal expression in Quechua, given the fact that native intuitions regarding the basic distinction between the two categories will naturally coincide.

Haboud apparently resorts to the nominal morpheme as an additional source because *-pa* lacks a specific benefactive meaning in modern Ecuadorian Quechua. I nevertheless maintain the theory of the verbal source because of the history of *-pa*. This verbal morpheme is the successor of the truly benefactive morpheme *-pu*, whose meaning seems to have widened to a general honorific sense in the seventeenth century (Dedenbach-Salazar Saénz 1993: 29-30). The morpheme *-pu* must have disappeared from Ecuadorian Quechua around 1700, while *-pa* is first documented in the Juan Leon Mera’s 1892 grammar (Muysken 1999: 102-106). In my view, it is probable that, even after the generalization of the function

of *-pul-pa* to a politeness marker, it continued to receive a benefactive reading when co-occurring with a nominal benefactive. This is why it seems plausible that the verbal morpheme *-pa* is the historical source of *dar* + gerund. Additional support for this theory comes from second language acquisition: the fact that in bilingual Spanish *dar* + gerund is used in the same way as *-pa* in modern Ecuadorian Quechua, i.e. that the meaning of *dar* + gerund is generalized in analogy to that of *-pa*, as illustrated in (15) and (16) above, indicates that the speakers intuitively associate the verbal expressions in both languages.

In what follows, I will first explain how the morpheme *-pa* from Ecuadorian Quechua may have led to the realization of *dar* + gerund in Spanish and then go into the question of why it is a typically Ecuadorian phenomenon.

It is not surprising that a morphologically expressed category in a largely agglutinative language such as Quechua comes to be expressed by means of a periphrasis in an inflectional language with a tendency towards analyticity such as Spanish. In fact, “an exact correspondence between source-language structures and target-language structures is not even very likely, much less inevitable” (Thomason & Kaufman 1991: 63). There are, however, two major points that call for an explanation: why a gerund, and why *dar*?

As regards the former question, the gerund is omnipresent in Andean Spanish. One of the causes is related to simplification in language acquisition, which has already been mentioned by Albor (1973: 317): incipient indigenous learners of Spanish tend to use the gerund instead of a finite verb (Muysken 1984: 104-105; Escobar 2000: 129). Another important cause of the high frequency of gerunds in Andean Spanish is the fact that Quechua adverbial subordination is expressed by two gerund-like forms, *-shpa* and *-kpi* in the Ecuadorian variety. The subordinator *-shpa* (and its allomorph *-sha*) indicates that the subordinated subject is coreferential with that of the main clause, whereas *-kpi* indicates non-coreferentiality, as shown in the following two examples, quoted from Muysken (2005: 46):

(22) *Tamia-kpi mana shamusha-chu*
 rain-SUB.DS not come-1FUT-NEG
 ‘If it rains, I won’t come’

(23) *Puri-sha shamuni*
 walk-SUB.SS come-1SG
 ‘I come walking’

Muysken (2005: 45-46) shows that in the Salcedo corpus there is a clear relationship between the preference for non-finite adverbial subordination in Spanish and contact with Quechua: Quechua-dominant bilinguals are more likely to use gerund constructions in adverbial subordination; moreover, they use more gerund constructions in which the subject differs from the matrix subject than the other speakers from the corpus. The following example from a Quechua-dominant bilingual with little knowledge of Spanish illustrates the use of the gerund with different subjects as well as its use as a finite verb:

(24) *Todo indo a Machachi yo sólo quedando cocinando comemos no más.*
 (SC-BQ 22b, 3)
 ‘When all had gone to Machachi and I stayed by myself, I just cooked and we ate.’
 (quoted from Muysken 2005: 46-47)

The subject of the regularized form *indo* (instead of *yendo*), is *todo* (for *todos* in monolingual Spanish), rather than being coreferential to the first-person singular of the main clause. The gerunds *quedando* and *cocinando* substitute the finite forms *quedé* and *cociné*, respectively. In addition, bilinguals sometimes use the gerund instead of the infinitive or the

participle in other periphrases, as in example (25), where *acabar* would be followed by the preposition *de* plus an infinitive in general Spanish:

- (25) [...] *yo ya vengo acabando limpiando el, el maíz ahora sí queda limpiecito*
 (SC-BQ 10a, 3)
 ‘[...] I have just finished weeding the corn field, it is clean now’,¹³

The high frequency of the gerund in contact Spanish explains why the gerund is the most obvious candidate for the main verb form in an innovative periphrastic construction.

As regards the question why *dar* should have been chosen as an auxiliary, the answer lies in the relation between the lexical meaning of *dar*, ‘give something to somebody’ (see section 2 above) and the benefactive meaning ‘effectuate some action for somebody’, which is mediated through the metaphor “give some action to somebody” (see section 4.3 below). Moreover, benefactive uses of verbs meaning ‘give’ occur in many genetically unrelated languages (see Haboud 1998: 218). In his study of the literal and figurative uses of ‘give’ in the languages of the world, Newman (1996: 221-222) discusses benefactive uses of ‘give’ in Japanese, Cantonese, Hokkien and a number of North-American languages, which are grammaticalized to different degrees. In a more recent study, Lord et al. (2002) deal with the grammaticalized expression of benefactives and other meanings by way of ‘give’ in Akan (Niger-Congo) and Thai. In analogy to *dar* in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish, the ‘give’-morpheme in Hokkien, Akan and Thai is grammaticalized to such a degree that it can combine with intransitive verbs, as illustrated in the following example:

- (26) Thai
kwáw yím hây chan
 he smile give I
 ‘He smiles for me’ (Lord et al. 2002: 221)

It will be clear from the above that using *dar* for the grammaticalized expression of benefactive meaning is a natural choice, which is in accordance with its basic semantics.

Let us now turn to the question why the construction has come into existence specifically in the Ecuadorian Highlands. In order to give a satisfactory answer to this it is necessary to take a look at Quechua morphosyntax first.

In addition to person and number marking of the subject, the verb in general Quechua possesses a paradigm for the marking of the subject-object relation with human referents, traditionally called *transiciones* ‘transitions’.¹⁴ Figure 1 demonstrates the basic idea of this system.

Subject	Object	
	1st person	2nd person
1st person	–	-yki
2nd person	-wa	–
3rd person	-wa	-su (-nki)

Figure 1. Transitions in general Quechua

The most striking feature of the transition system is the fact that the form of the second person object varies according to the referent of the subject.¹⁵ However, the system is less straightforward than it may appear to be. The combination of *-su* with the 2nd-person subject ending *-nki* yields a 3rd-person subject acting on a 2nd-person object, as in example (27). On the other hand, the morpheme *-yki* does not require any additional subject marking, as

illustrated in example (28) (Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 220-221).¹⁶ Both examples are from Ayacucho Quechua:

(27) *muna-su-nki*
 want-3SUBJ.2OBJ-2SUBJ
 ‘He/She wants you’

(28) *muna-yki*
 want-1SUBJ.2OBJ
 ‘I want you’

While this complex system for pronominal reference survives in all other varieties of Quechua, it was gradually lost in Ecuadorian Quechua, which is due to the creole-like character of this variety.¹⁷ On the basis of a diachronic reconstruction, Muysken (1999) shows that *-su-nki* probably disappeared from Ecuadorian Quechua in the seventeenth century, while *-yki* and *-wa* were optional. The disappearance of *-yki* must have taken place in the early eighteenth century, and, in the modern Ecuadorian variant, *-wa*, the only surviving morpheme of the transition system, is gradually becoming obsolete as well (see also Cole 1982: 104, 159). Example (29), quoted from Adelaar & Muysken (2004: 240)¹⁸, illustrates the fact that object marking is no longer needed.

(29) *uku hunda-da ni-ki-bish mashna-da ni-ki-bish ñuka-ga*
 room full-ACC say-SUB.DS-ADD how.much-ACC say-SUB.DS-ADD I-TOP
ku-sha-lla-mi
 give-1FUT-LIM-AFF
 ‘Even if you want a room full, whatever you want, I’ll give you.’

In this example the second person beneficiary in the last verb is omitted (otherwise *-wa* should follow the stem *ku-*). Interestingly, it is the verb ‘give’ that appears without any object marking whatsoever and as such neatly illustrates the point I wish to make here. When object marking is no longer relevant to the system, then intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verbs are treated alike. Consequently, when acquiring Spanish, the speakers of Ecuadorian Quechua have no native intuitions allowing them to distinguish between the different valencies of verbs that can be used as finite verbs with gerunds: any verb goes. This specific property of Ecuadorian Quechua explains why gerund constructions with a three-place verb like *dar* could arise in this area and not elsewhere.

Against this background, it is obvious why in rural Spanish in contact with Quechua *dar* is frequently used without a beneficiary clitic: the very non-specification of arguments is the basis of the construction.

4.3 The integration of *dar* + gerund into the regional standard

In this section, I will come back to my critical remark on Albor’s theory, showing how *dar* + gerund fits into the Spanish periphrastic system despite of the ditransitivity of lexical *dar*.

As we have seen, the meaning of auxiliary *dar* is a metaphorical extension of the meaning of lexical *dar*. In order to get a clear picture of how this works and how it affects the syntactic structure of the periphrasis, let us consider two simple examples:

(30) *Por favor, dame un tenedor.*
 ‘Please, give me a fork.’

- (31) *Por favor, dame abriendo la puerta de atrás* (M-D sr. 01/03)
'Please, open the back door for me'

Let us, for the sake of the argument, treat *dar* as if it were a full verb in examples (30) and (31). In both cases the subject of *dar* refers to the addressee, and the indirect object refers to the speaker. In (30) the direct object is a thing, while in (31) it is the action *abriendo la puerta de atrás*. Thus, in both (30) and (31), all argument slots of *dar* are filled, the only difference being that in the periphrasis “the predicate takes *events*, rather than objects, as its complement” (Heine 1993: 45; emphasis in the original). The analogy between the lexical and the periphrastic construction allows for a “conceptual shift” (Heine 1993: 45-48) from the lexical to the periphrastic meaning.

Such a conceptual shift has occurred in the grammaticalization of many Spanish periphrases, such as *ir a* + infinitive, expressing prospective aspect or near future, *volver a* + infinitive, expressing repetitive aspect, *tener* + participle expressing resultative aspect, and *estar* + gerund expressing progressive aspect (Olbertz 1998: 320-321). In (32) the meaning of each of these periphrases is illustrated by way of a simple made-up example, which is followed by a schematic description of the basic conceptual shift that is characteristic of the relation between the original meaning and the grammatical meaning:

- (32a) *Voy a abrir la maleta.* (movement in space > “movement” in time)
Literally: I go to open the suitcase ‘I am going to open the suitcase’
- (b) *Vuelvo a abrir la maleta* (movement in space > “movement” in time)
Literally: I return to open the suitcase ‘I open the suitcase again’
- (c) *Tengo abierta la maleta* (possession of an object > “possession” of a result)
Literally: I have open the suitcase ‘I have the suitcase open’
- (d) *Estoy abriendo la maleta* (position in a place > “position” in a situation)
Literally: I am (located in) opening the suitcase ‘I am opening the suitcase’
- (e) *Te doy abriendo la maleta* (giving an object to s.o. > “giving” an action to s.o.)
Literally: I give you opening the suitcase ‘I open the suitcase for you’

Example (32e) adds *dar* + gerund to the picture, and the conceptual shift of *dar* is a perfect analogy with those that take place in the other cases exemplified in (32a-d).

For a construction originating from contact with a non-prestige language to integrate into the regional standard, its compatibility with the linguistic structure of the receiving language is a necessary precondition. Once this precondition is fulfilled, it depends on the language attitudes of the speakers whether such a construction is actually used, and, if so, under which circumstances. Although most educated speakers of Ecuadorian Spanish will not be aware of the Quechua origin of the construction, many of them will certainly be aware of its limited geographic spread. This, in addition to the awareness of the overexploitation of the gerund in bilingual speech will probably give rise to a situation in which the use of the gerund in innovative contexts will be associated with a stigmatized group and may therefore be avoided in situations of conscious language use.

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have shown how the highly grammaticalized periphrasis *dar* + gerund is related to the morphological expression of the benefactive meaning at an earlier stage of Ecuadorian

Quechua, and that it is due to the specific grammatical properties of Ecuadorian Quechua that it has arisen in this restricted geographic area. Thus, the question raised in the subtitle of this paper can be answered affirmatively: *dar* + gerund is indeed a case of contact-induced grammaticalization.

The case of *dar* + gerund can be considered evidence of the view of language contact as advocated by Silva-Corvalán. She argues that “what is borrowed is *not* a syntactic structure, but the semantics or pragmatics of a construction”, and that “only those [borrowings] that are compatible with the structure of the borrowing language [...] will be adopted, disseminated and passed on to new generations” (Silva-Corvalán 1998: 242; emphasis in the original). I think Silva-Corvalán is right at least as far as language change in a prestige language through the adoption of interlanguage features from a non-prestige language is concerned. However, it may be that the influence of a prestige language on a non-prestige language can proceed beyond such constraints (see e.g. Aikhenvald 2003: 5-6).

Notes

* A shortened version of this paper was presented at the First Conference on Language Contact in Times of Globalization at the University of Groningen in September 2006. The comments and suggestions from the audience are gratefully acknowledged. Furthermore, I would like to thank Pieter Muysken for sharing his data with me, Jorge Gómez Rendón for serving me as an informant, and Evelien Keizer, Joost den Haan, Marleen Haboud, Vera Hubers and Ysolde Bentvelsen as well as two anonymous referees for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. All remaining deficiencies are, of course, my responsibility.

¹ The field notes reflect spontaneous speech, i.e. none of the speakers was conscious of being observed. The notes were taken during two stays in Quito in 2002 and 2003 as well as in Amsterdam in conversations with an Ecuadorian immigrant, shortly after her arrival in 2004. The examples from the field notes will be followed by the speaker’s initials and the month and year of utterance (in brackets).

² Although (3b) would probably be considered ungrammatical in most standardized varieties of Spanish, it is quite acceptable in Ecuadorian Spanish given the appropriate context, where there is a strong tendency towards omitting direct-object clitics.

³ In Olbertz (1998: 38-44) I show that the omission and substitution tests as applied to these examples are necessary and sufficient for the identification of periphrases. However Haboud (1997) presents an additional test, the reversal of the mutual order of the finite verb and the gerund. Used with the present data, it yields another piece of evidence in support of my arguments:

(2c) *Imponiéndole la mano se la da*. ‘Laying her hand on her she gives it to her’

(3d) **Llamándo al pasajero A. deme*. ‘Calling passenger A. give me’.

Although these cases are perfectly clear in the sense that the lexical construction allows for word-order change and the periphrasis does not, the general validity of this test is doubtful, since the test may yield highly marked results with other non-periphrastic constructions (e.g. *“A nadar aprendo* ‘To swim I learn’).

⁴ For a detailed discussion of metaphor and metonymy in grammaticalization see Traugott & Hopper 1993, ch. 4; and for an application to Spanish and Catalan periphrases see Pérez Saldanya 2003.

⁵ SC = Salcedo corpus, BQ = Quechua-dominant bilingual, BS = Spanish-dominant bilingual, M = monolingual in contact with Quechua.

⁶ The transcriptions of the examples from the Salcedo corpus are accurate representations of the original utterances, i.e. in the case of (14) *sobrino* is used without an article, and the speaker pronounces *entonces* without pronouncing the final /s/, although the elision of final /s/ is not the rule in Andean Spanish.

⁷ In standard Ecuadorian Highland Spanish *fue* as used here should be *era*, *a los 30 años* should be *hace 30 años*, *en eso* should be *eso*, *podemo* should be *podemos* and *también* should be *tampoco*. The remaining examples for the Salcedo corpus should be read in an analogous way.

⁸ The more educated monolingual speakers are, the more restricted their use of *dar* + gerund to highly informal oral interaction is. It is due to this lack of authentic data on *dar* + gerund in oral corpora that, for the linguistic documentation of the construction in educated urban speech, I had to resort to field-notes. Oral corpora mostly consist of more or less guided interviews, which are recorded in situations that are too formal for *dar* + gerund to be used. Not surprisingly, the *Corpus del Español* contains no examples, and 9 interviews which I held with speakers in Quito did not yield any instance either. Kany (1945: 158-159, 201f) gives a number of examples from literary texts which imitate bilingual usage.

⁹ Specifying a beneficiary by means of the dative clitic *le* in such a situation would result in a semantically unwarranted pseudo-specificity, which could, however, be employed as a pragmatic strategy in order to make the reader feel as if he/she were addressed personally. In a similar vein, Haboud (1998: 217; 2003: 250) gives examples of “depersonalized” requests, i.e. requests without a specific addressee, and thus without a clitic.

¹⁰ “The origin of this form is purely [Ecuadorian] Quechua: *Apamushpa cuy* (literally ‘bringing he/she gives’) [...] with the typical object pronoun ellipsis. In vulgar speech *dar trayendo* ‘give bringing’, *dar haciendo* ‘give doing’ is also common.” (My translation, H.O.).

¹¹ The abbreviations used in the glosses have the following meanings: 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person, ACC = accusative, ADD = additive (‘also’, ‘even’), AFF = affirmative, BEN = benefactive, DIM = diminutive, DS = different subject, FUT = future, HON = honorific, IMP = imperative, INTER = interrogative, LIM = limitative (‘just’), NEG = negation, OBJ = object, SG = singular, SS = same subject, SUB = subordinator, SUBJ = subject, TOP = topic. Full stops are used inside complex morphemes to separate their components.

¹² The limitative *-lla* ‘just’, is also used for the mitigation of imperatives (see Cole 1982: 31). It is, however, unrelated to the benefactive meaning.

¹³ The Salcedo corpus contains 6 instances of *acabar* + gerund against 22 of *acabar de* + infinitive. Half of the cases of *acabar* + gerund express the meaning corresponding to this construction in general Spanish, i.e. ‘end up’. The other three cases, two of which are from bilingual speech, are strongly marked in that *acabar* + gerund is used instead of *acabar de* + infinitive for the expression of recent past. In addition to this, the present example contains the innovative periphrasis *venir* + gerund, which simultaneously expresses recent past and movement towards the deictic centre (see Haboud 1997, 2005; Olbertz 2003).

¹⁴ What I call “general Quechua” is the most widespread Quechua dialect group, generally referred to as Quechua II in comparative linguistics. In addition to Quechua II, there is also a small group of older, highly conservative dialects, Quechua I (see Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 163-191 for more details).

¹⁵ Furthermore, it can be gathered from this figure that there is no marking on verbs for 3rd person objects. The empty spaces in Figure 1 mark impossible combinations within the transitions system. This figure is a simplified version of a figure presented in Cerrón-Palomino (1987: 275), in which both Quechua II and Quechua I realizations are included.

¹⁶ For a more detailed explanation of the transitions system see Adelaar (1977) and Weber (1989).

¹⁷ The Incas invaded the North Andean area only in the last decade of the 15th century, approximately 40 years before the Spanish conquest in 1532. By then Quechua was used as a *lingua franca* by the nobility, civil servants and traders, while the autochthonous languages continued to be spoken by the people. Two hundred years later, Quechua had become the native language of the indigenous population of the Northern Highlands, which implies a massive second-language learning and language shift (Muysken 1999: 89).

¹⁸ The orthography of this example has been adapted to the norms used in the rest of this paper.

References

- Adelaar, Willem F.H. 1977. *Tarma Quechua*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.
- Adelaar, Willem F.H. with the collaboration of Pieter C. Muysken. 2004. *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2003. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Albor, Hugo R. 1973. “Da + gerundio, ¿un quechuismo? y otras maneras de atenuar los imperativos”. *Hispania* 56. 316-318.
- Bustamante López, Isabel & Mercedes Niño Murcia. 1995. “Impositive speech acts in Northern Andean Spanish: a pragmatic description”. *Hispania* 78. 885-897.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1987. *Lingüística quechua*. Cuzco: Centro de estudios rurales andinos “Bartholomé de las Casas”.
- Cole, Peter. 1982. *Imbabura Quechua*. Lingua descriptive studies 5. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Davies, Mark. online. *Corpus del español* (www.corpusdelespanol.org).
- Dedenbach-Salazar Saéñz, Sabine (ed.). 1993. *Una gramática colonial del quichua del Ecuador. Transcripción e interpretación de un manuscrito del Archivo Histórico Nacional de Colombia*. Bonner Amerikanistische Studien 20 / Institute of Amerindian Studies, University of St. Andrews 25.
- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The structure of the clause*, 2nd rev. ed. by Kees Hengeveld. Functional Grammar series 20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Escobar, Anna María. 2000. *Contacto social y lingüístico. El español en contacto con el quechua en el Perú*. Lima: Fondo editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Fernández Lagunilla, Marina. 1999. “Las construcciones de gerundio”. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* ed. by Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte, 3443-3503. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Fernández Soriano, Olga. 1999. “El pronombre personal. Formas y distribuciones. Pronombres átonos y tónicos”. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* ed. by Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte, 1209-1273. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Haboud, Marleen. 1997. “Grammaticalization, clause union and grammatical relations in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish”. *Grammatical relations: a functionalist perspective* ed. by Talmy Givón, 199-231. Typological studies in language 35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haboud, Marleen. 1998. *Quichua y castellano en los Andes ecuatorianos: los efectos de un contacto prolongado*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Haboud, Marleen. 2003. *Quichua and Spanish in the Ecuadorian Highlands: the effects of long-term contact*. Quito: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador [revised version of Haboud 1998].
- Haboud, Marleen. 2005. “El gerundio de anterioridad entre bilingües quichua-castellano y monolingües hispanohablantes de la Sierra ecuatoriana”. *UniverSOS* 2. 9-38.
- Haverkate, Henk. 1989. *Modale vormen van het Spaanse werkwoord*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hurley, Joni Kay. 1995a. “Pragmatics in a language contact situation: verb forms used in requests in Ecuadorian Spanish”. *Hispanic Linguistics* 6-7. 225-264.
- Hurley, Joni Kay. 1995b. “The impact of Quichua verb forms used in Spanish requests in Otavalo, Ecuador”. *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism* ed. by Carmen Silva-Corvalán 39-51. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Kany, Charles E. 1945. *American Spanish syntax*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lord, Carol, Foong Ha Yap & Soichi Iwasaki. 2002. “Grammaticalization of ‘give’: African and Asian perspectives”. *New reflections on grammaticalization* ed. by Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald, 217-235. Typological Studies in Language 49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1984. “The Spanish that Quechua speakers learn: L2 learning as norm-governed behaviour”. *Second languages: a cross-linguistic perspective* ed. by Roger W. Andersen, 101-119. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1999. “Fuentes misioneras del quichua ecuatoriano: evidencia para su desarrollo histórico”. *La lengua de la cristianización en Latinoamérica: catequización e instrucción en*

- lenguas amerindias / The language of Christianization in Latin America: catechisation and instruction in the Amerindian languages* ed. by Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Saéñz & Lindsey Crickmay, 89-113. Bonner amerikanistische Studien 32 / Centre for Indigenous American Studies and Exchange - St. Andrews, Occasional papers 29. Bonn: Verlag Anton Sauerwein.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2005. "A modular approach to sociolinguistic variation in syntax: the gerund in Ecuadorian Spanish". *Syntax and variation: reconciling the biological and the social* ed. by Leonie Cornips & Karen P. Corrigan, 31-53. Current issues in linguistic theory 265. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Newman, John. 1996. *Give. A cognitive linguistic study*. Cognitive linguistic research 7. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Niño Murcia, Mercedes. 1995. "The gerund in the Spanish of the North Andean region". *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism* ed. by Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 83-100. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Olbertz, Hella. 1998. *Verbal periphrases in a Functional Grammar of Spanish*. Functional Grammar series 22. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Olbertz, Hella. 2002. "Dar + gerundio en el español andino ecuatoriano: sintaxis, semántica, origen". *Círculo de lingüística aplicada a la comunicación* 12 (www.ucm.es/info/circulo/).
- Olbertz, Hella. 2003. "<Venir + gerundio> en el español andino ecuatoriano – un producto de contacto lingüístico". *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero-)romanischen Sprachen* ed. by Claus D. Pusch & Andreas Wesch, 89-103. *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Beiheft 9. Hamburg: Buske.
- Pérez Saldanya, Manuel. 2003. "La gramaticalización del verbo *ir* en construcciones narrativas del español". *Medievalia* 35. 62-89.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1998. "On borrowing as a mechanism of syntactic change". *Romance linguistics: theoretical perspectives. Selected papers from the 27th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Irvine, 20–22 February, 1997* ed. by Armin Schwegler, Bernard Tranel & Myriam Uribe Etxebarria, 225-246. Current issues in linguistic theory 160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taylor, Gerald. 1982. "Le morphème de respect /-pa/ dans les parlers quechuas de la sierra équatorienne". *Amerindia* 7. 55-60.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1991 [1988]. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Toscano Mateus, Humberto. 1953. *El español en el Ecuador. Revista de filología española*, Anejo 16. Madrid: Gredos.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Paul Hopper. 1983. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vázquez, Honorato. 1940. *Reparos en nuestro lenguaje usual*. Quito: Ecuatoriana.
- Weber, David John. 1989. *A grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Author's address

ACLC-UvA
 Spuistraat 210
 1012 VT Amsterdam
 The Netherlands

h.g.olbertz@uva.nl