

2011


Variation and Change in Peruvian Spanish Word Order: Language Contact and Dialect Contact in Lima

Carol A. Klee
University of Minnesota

Daniel G. Tight
University of St. Thomas

Rocio Caravedo
Universita degli Studi di Padova

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/ijlasw>

 Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#), and the [Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Klee, Carol A.; Tight, Daniel G.; and Caravedo, Rocio (2011) "Variation and Change in Peruvian Spanish Word Order: Language Contact and Dialect Contact in Lima," *International Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest*. Vol. 30: No. 2, Article 3.

Available at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/ijlasw/vol30/iss2/3>

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest by an authorized editor of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

VARIATION AND CHANGE IN PERUVIAN SPANISH WORD ORDER: LANGUAGE CONTACT AND DIALECT CONTACT IN LIMA

CAROL A. KLEE
University of Minnesota

DANIEL G. TIGHT
University of St. Thomas

ROCÍO CARAVEDO
Università degli Studi di Padova

ABSTRACT. Previous studies have revealed that the direct object/verb (OV) word order typical of Quechua and Aymara is also prevalent in Andean Spanish. The current study examines the frequency of such structures in Lima, Peru, where massive migration over the past 60 years has brought speakers of Andean indigenous languages and rural Andean Spanish into close contact with speakers of *limeño* Spanish. Goldvarb analysis of data from 34 participants (seven first-generation migrants, six 1.5-generation migrants, 10 second-generation migrants, and 11 native *limeños*) indicates that the pragmatic functions that motivated OV order among the participants include those found in non-contact varieties of Spanish, as well as others reported for rural Andean Spanish. Furthermore, L1 speakers of an indigenous language, who were almost all first- and 1.5-generation immigrants, were significantly more likely to use OV word order than L1 Spanish speakers. In contrast, in the speech of second-generation migrants, nearly all of whom spoke Spanish as an L1, the frequency of OV word order was similar to that documented for other non-contact varieties of Spanish.

1. INTRODUCTION. During the latter half of the twentieth century, Lima, Peru experienced a massive increase in population as a result of migration from the provinces. While in 1940 its population was comprised of 645,000 inhabitants, by the end of the 20th century the population was 7.5 million, a more than tenfold

increase in a span of approximately 60 years. Migration from rural areas occurred for economic reasons, but also due to the political violence that primarily affected Quechua-speaking areas in the 1980s and early 1990s. Migrants from Quechua- and Aymara-speaking areas of Peru generally arrive in Lima already speaking a rural variety of Andean Spanish, a dialect that has been heavily influenced by these indigenous languages, which are still spoken by up to seventy percent of the residents of the southern Andes. Because it is a dialect that is associated with the indigenous population of Peru, Andean Spanish is highly stigmatized in Lima. The features of this dialect have been described by a number of linguists (Caravedo 1996, 1999; Cerrón-Palomino 2003; Escobar 1978; Escobar 1988, 2011; Godenzzi 1987; Klee 1996; Lozano 1975; Luján et al 1984; Muysken 1984; Pozzi-Escot 1973; Sánchez 2003). The phonological features of this dialect are similar to those of other conservative varieties of Spanish. Consonants, for example, tend to be retained in syllable-final position, while in coastal Peruvian Spanish they are weakened or deleted. Furthermore, /r/ is frequently assibilated, and this is one of the few remaining areas in the Spanish-speaking world in which the lateral palatal /k/ is maintained. Other features of Andean Spanish include the neutralization of number, case, and gender in third-person object pronouns (i.e. *lo* or *le* is used in place of *la*, *las*, *los*, *les*), more frequent Object-Verb (OV) word order—the word order typical of Quechua and Aymara—and the semantic extension of the present perfect and past perfect verb forms to include an evidential parameter, a parameter which is required in Quechua and Aymara but not typical of non-contact varieties of Spanish.

Migrants from the Andean region of Peru who arrive in Lima as monolingual speakers of an indigenous language shift to Spanish quite rapidly. Marr (1998: 8), in an ethnographic study of Quechua use in Lima, observed that ‘there are virtually no monolingual speakers of Quechua in the capital ... and that children born in Lima do not as a rule acquire any functional competence in the “ethnic” language’. The reason for this rapid language shift is due to the association of Quechua with the countryside, as well as with poverty and powerlessness (Marr 1998: 156). While giving up Quechua does entail some measure of loss and regret on the part of migrants, at the same time the learning of Spanish represents an important step forward. According to Marr (1998: 204-205):

[T]o speak Spanish ... is not to ape coastal ways but to appropriate that part of the *criollo* culture that is associated with modernity, progress, education and material advancement, even ... to challenge notions of *criollo* superiority [T]he acquisition and everyday use of Spanish represents a key (perhaps *the* key) step in the migrant’s odyssey towards the construction of a new self, one that is seen as objectively

superior to the old. To argue for the retention of Quechua would, in these terms, be a return to powerlessness and mute obedience.

Given the rapid shift from Quechua and other indigenous languages to Spanish, part and parcel of the migrants' appropriation of *criollo* culture, the question arises as to what type of Spanish Andean migrants use in Lima. Does their Spanish and that of their children retain characteristics typical of rural Andean varieties or is there a rapid shift to coastal varieties of Spanish? And, given the overwhelming demographic predominance of migrants, have the characteristics of Andean Spanish begun to influence the coastal Spanish spoken by Lima's *criollo* population (particularly the Spanish of the working class, which has more contact with migrants), as some Peruvian linguists have noted? Riva-rola (1990: 171), for example, stated:

[...] la variedad costeña estándar de tipo tradicional ha dejado de tener, en mi percepción, fuerza normativa irradiadora y absorbente. [...] Se da ahora en la costa la presencia de fenómenos ajenos a los patrones tradicionales de esta zona, fenómenos que ejercen presión sobre ellos y que creo pueden terminar modificándolos o sustituyéndolos.

'[...] the traditional, standard coastal variety has ceased to have, in my perception, a normative, radiating, and consuming power. There are now present on the coast phenomena foreign to the traditional patterns of this area, phenomena which exert pressure on them [the traditional patterns], and which I believe could end up modifying or replacing them.'

2. PREVIOUS STUDIES OF DIALECT CONTACT. While dialect contact can result in either convergence or divergence, the research literature on dialect contact has provided evidence suggesting that migration is often a force for dialect convergence and leveling (Bortoni-Ricardo 1985, Hinskens et al 2005, Martín Butragueño 2004, Otheguy and Zentella 2012). Bortoni-Ricardo (1985) in her study of rural Brazilian migrants to Brazlândia, a satellite city of Brasília, found that first-generation migrants' dialects underwent a process of diffuseness, resulting in a decrease in the frequency of nonstandard rural variants. In a study of the Spanish of migrants from northern Mexico to Mexico City, Serrano (2000) reported that, although first-generation migrants typically maintained many of the features of their original dialect, this was not true of their children, who only maintained a few. By the third generation none of the dialect features of their parents and grandparents were maintained. Similarly, Martín Butragueño (2004: 137) observed that migrants to Madrid from other regions of Spain lost features of their original dialect in one generation, a process he describes as *DESDIALECTALIZACIÓN*:

Las personas de origen inmigrante nacidas ya en Madrid o venidas a corta edad han perdido a pasos agigantados la distribución de variantes fónicas de sus padres o sus abuelos, sea la razón de este fenómeno el prestigio, la imposibilidad de una “norma inmigrante” (pues los lugares de origen son muy variados), el mayor nivel educativo de los jóvenes o la relación con los “iguales” en la escuela y el trabajo.

‘The people of immigrant origin who were born in Madrid or who came at an early age have lost the phonetic variants of their parents or grandparents at an extraordinary speed, the reason for this phenomenon being prestige, the impossibility of an “immigrant norm” (as the places of origin are quite varied), the higher educational level of the young people, or the relationship with “peers” at school or at work.’

Hinskens et al (2005: 25) observe that it is not uncommon in regional or national capitals and economic centers for the standard variety to force its phonological or grammatical structures on a recipient dialect.

Previous studies of dialect contact in Lima have examined several characteristics that distinguish Andean and *limeño* dialects: (1) phonological differences, including the lateral palatal and assibilated vibrants typical of Andean Spanish, and the aspiration and deletion of /s/ typical of the coast (Klee and Caravedo 2006), (2) the clitic system (Klee and Caravedo 2005), and (3) the use of the present perfect in narrative clauses (Caravedo and Klee 2012, Klee et al 2009, Rojas-Sosa 2008). The results indicate that, similar to what has been reported in the research cited previously, phonological change is occurring in only one direction: Andean phonological features are being replaced by features characteristic of Lima, particularly in the speech of second-generation migrants. However, with regard to morphosyntactic phenomena, such as the clitic pronouns, and semantic change in the case of the past tense forms, second-generation migrants appear to have developed a hybrid system, combining features of their migrant parents’ Andean system and features of *limeño* Spanish. In the current paper, we extend the existing research on dialect contact in Lima by focusing on Spanish word order.

3. PREVIOUS STUDIES OF ANDEAN SPANISH WORD ORDER. Most¹ previous

¹One exception is Sánchez’s (2003) study of children in two bilingual communities in rural Peru and in a district in the outskirts of Lima. She found very few cases of OV word orders: 3.5% and 4.5% among bilingual children from the two rural communities and 0.9% among monolingual children from the outskirts of Lima. These rates are even lower than those found in non-contact varieties of Spanish (Ocampo 1990) and may be due to methodological differences. Sánchez notes that OV orders reflect some interference from Quechua.

quantitative studies of Andean Spanish word order (Camacho 1999; Klee 1996; Luján et al 1984; Mendoza 1991; Muntendam 2008a, 2008b; Muysken 1984; Ocampo and Klee 1995) have demonstrated that the direct object/verb (OV) word order typical of Quechua and Aymara, as in *ovejas tenemos* 'sheep we have', occurs with higher frequency in Andean Spanish than in non-contact varieties, where verb/direct object (VO) word order, as in *tenemos ovejas* 'we have sheep' is more typical.² For example, Luján et al (1984) discovered a strong influence of Quechua on the Spanish of bilingual children from Cuzco, who produced OV, GN (possessor/possessed), as in *de Juan su casa* 'of Juan his house', and AN (adjective/noun), as in *chiquita casa* 'little house', structures at elevated rates (Table 1). It is also clear, however, that as those participants increased in age and linguistic competence, their word order began to more closely approximate Spanish norms.

Word Orders	Ages		
	5	7	9
OV/VO	51%/49%	40%/60%	30%/70%
GN/NG	63%/37%	54%/46%	36%/64%
AN/NA	91%/9%	60%/40%	38%/62%

TABLE 1. *Word order acquisition stages in bilingual children*
(Luján et al 1984: 359)

Muysken (1984: 113) similarly found evidence of the role of Spanish language proficiency in his study of Andean Spanish in Ecuador. Specifically, he discovered that XV orders, 'where X is a variable ranging over objects, predicates, sentential complements, and prepositional phrases', were employed more often by incipient and Quechua-dominant bilinguals than by Spanish-dominant bilinguals.

Muysken's (1984) research also suggested a possible role in word order selection for another variable—socio-economic status. His data showed that these same XV orders were more common in the speech of lower-class monolinguals (34%) than in the speech of middle-class monolinguals (22%). Likewise, in interviews with residents of the Andean city of Calca, near Cuzco, Ocampo and Klee (1995) found that OV word order was more frequent in the lower socio-economic class than in the Spanish of a middle group, and that it was least frequent among

²Typologically Quechua and Aymara are postpositional non-rigid V-final languages, while Spanish is a prepositional non-rigid V-medial language (Greenberg's 1966 classification).

the town's professionals, as seen in Table 2. Although the differences among the three groups were not particularly large, the data from the town's professionals are especially remarkable when compared with the OV order found in non-contact varieties of Spanish. For example, Ocampo (1990) found only a 6% occurrence of OV order in the Spanish of middle class speakers from Buenos Aires, notably lower than the percentage of OV order among Calca professionals (15%).

	<i>Lower Group</i>	<i>Middle Group</i>	<i>Professionals</i>	<i>Total</i>
OV	52 (23%)	42 (18%)	44 (15%)	138 (18%)
VO	178 (77%)	192 (82%)	246 (85%)	616 (82%)

TABLE 2. *Word order for speakers in Calca* (Ocampo and Klee 1995: 73)

While OV word order occasionally occurs in standard Spanish, it is pragmatically marked and conveys such functions as contrary to expectation, focus of contrast, focal constituent, and topic (Ocampo 1995). Ocampo and Klee (1995) examined the pragmatic functions of VO/OV word orders among a sample of professionals and lower-group speakers from Calca and found that, while 89% of the constructions in the speech of professionals had informational (VO) word order, only 62% of the lower group utterances had solely an informational function. A pragmatic analysis of the OV constructions demonstrated that, in addition to the pragmatic functions that motivate OV word order in non-contact Spanish, other discourse situations³ also correlated with an inversion of the informational word order in Calca. Specifically, OV word order was used to indicate repetition, summary, agreement and explanation. As can be seen in Table 3, these discourse situations occurred primarily in the speech of the lower group.

Other researchers have indicated the importance of discourse and pragmatic considerations in understanding the word order of Andean Spanish. For example, Muntendam (2008a, 2008b), in a study of Andean Spanish speakers from Tarata, Bolivia, found that OV order occurred at a rate of 19.4% in naturally occurring data. She concluded that OV word order in Andean Spanish is a focus strategy, as in non-contact Spanish, but that the fronting of objects in Andean Spanish is not as restricted as it is in non-contact Spanish. Escobar (2000) also indicated that OV word order in Andean Spanish marks emphasis or focalization, which is reinforced by the OV word order typical of Quechua. Finally, Camacho (1999:

³Ocampo and Klee (1995: 77) note that they use the term DISCOURSE SITUATION rather than PRAGMATIC FUNCTION as they are not yet sure of the theoretical status of these notions.

124), in a study of the interlanguage of bilingual speakers in Lima, observed that the presence of preverbal objects in the Spanish of Quechua speakers 'is perfectly compatible with the focus structure of Quechua, where sentential focus is conveyed by using the OV word order'. Thus, the OV word orders that occur with greater frequency in Andean Spanish are likely the result of contact with indigenous languages.

	<i>Pragmatic Function</i>	<i>Professionals</i>		<i>Lower Group</i>	
		<i>Tokens</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Tokens</i>	<i>%</i>
VO	Conveying information	74/85	87.0	88/141	62.4
OV	Contrary to expectation	2/85	2.4	1/141	0.7
	Focus of contrast	2/85	2.4	2/141	1.4
	Focal constituent			2/141	1.4
	Topic	2/85	2.4	4/141	2.8
	Repetition	2/85	2.4	11/141	7.8
	Summary			11/141	7.8
	Agreement	1/85	1.2	8/141	5.7
	Explanation			4/141	2.8
	Unclear cases	2/85	2.4	10/141	7.1

TABLE 3. *VO and OV orders in the Spanish of Calca*
(Ocampo and Klee 1995: 77)

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 PARTICIPANTS. Rocío Caravedo and Carol Klee conducted 108 sociolinguistic interviews in Lima during 1999-2000 with the help of several fieldworkers.⁴ The interviews were conducted in several shantytowns inhabited by Andean migrants, where participants included (1) first-generation migrants, who had been born in the provinces and migrated to Lima after age 12; (2) 1.5-generation migrants, who had been born in the provinces but migrated to Lima before age 12; (3) second-generation migrants, who had been born in Lima but whose parents had migrated from the Andean region. In addition, interviews were conducted in traditional (i.e. non-migrant), working-class neighborhoods in Lima. The individuals in those neighborhoods and their parents were born in Lima and the consultants had resided there all their lives.

⁴The data collection and analysis for this study was supported by a Grant-in-Aid of Research from the Graduate School and travel funds from the Office of International Programs of the University of Minnesota.

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Generation International in Lima</i>	<i>Family Background</i>	<i>Neighborhood</i>	<i>Sex</i>	<i>Language</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Occupation</i>
1AH	1.5	Non-Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Some secondary	Semi-skilled
2LC	1.5	Andean	Shantytown	F	Quechua	Some primary	Unskilled
3AG	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Some primary	Unskilled
4GT	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Primary	Unskilled
5LBV	1.5	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Skilled
6GB	2	Mixed	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Secondary	Semi-skilled
7IMS	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Bilingual	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled
8FT	2	Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Secondary	Semi-skilled
9FA	1	Andean	Shantytown	F	Aymara	Some primary	Unskilled
10JG	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Some primary	Unskilled
11BI	1.5	Andean	Shantytown	F	Quechua	Primary	Unskilled
12BM	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Aymara	Primary	Semi-skilled
13CC	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some secondary	Unskilled
14EF	2	Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Some secondary	Unskilled
15JF	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Secondary	Semi-skilled
16LS	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled
17MC	3	Non-Andean	Established	F	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled
18JN	3	Non-Andean	Established	F	Spanish	Secondary	Unskilled
19JE	3	Non-Andean	Established	M	Spanish	Secondary	Semi-skilled
20JT	3	Non-Andean	Established	M	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Generation in Lima</i>	<i>Family Background</i>	<i>Neighborhood</i>	<i>Sex</i>	<i>L1</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Occupation</i>
21VA	1	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some secondary	Unskilled
22BTG	1.5	Andean	Shantytown	F	Quechua	Some primary	Unskilled
23CA	1	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some secondary	Housewife
24RB	3	Non-Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some secondary	Unskilled
30CH	2	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Primary	Semi-skilled
31BML	2	Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled
33LMM	2	Non-Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some primary	Housewife
34JM	3	Non-Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Some secondary	Unskilled
46MA	3	Non-Andean	Established	F	Spanish	Some secondary	Unskilled
47BB	3	Non-Andean	Established	F	Spanish	Secondary	Semi-skilled
48GEBS	3	Non-Andean	Established	F	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled
50RDV	3	Non-Andean	Established	M	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Skilled
56RRM	3	Non-Andean	Established	F	Spanish	Some post-secondary	Semi-skilled
67EMR	1.5	Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Some technical ed.	Semi-skilled

TABLE 4. *Characteristics of informants*

Data from 34 of the total 108 informants were analyzed to assess the influence of various social and linguistic variables on word order in the Spanish of Lima. Table 4 describes the relevant characteristics of each informant.

4.2 DATA ANALYSIS

4.2.1 TOKENS. Because, according to Ocampo (1995), a number of different variables can influence word order in Spanish, the current study limited its scope to affirmative, two-constituent (verb and direct object) constructions occurring within a main clause.⁵ For example, utterances such as (1) were excluded because, in addition to the verb and direct object, another constituent is present—the prepositional phrase *para Tumbes*.

- (1) *Agarraron carro para Tumbes.* (10JG)
 '[They] got a car [to go] to Tumbes.'

Furthermore, only full, lexical NPs (i.e. no personal pronouns) capable of being replaced by the direct object clitics *lo*, *la*, *los*, and *las* (i.e. no 1st- or 2nd-person object clitics) were included. The lexical NPs may or may not have actually been accompanied by such clitic pronouns. Thus, (2) – (5) were all admissible in the analysis.

- (2) *Hice el trabajo.* (20JT)
 '[I] did the work.'
- (3) *La respeto a mi mamá.* (17MC)
 CL [I] respect PREP my mom
 'I respect my mom.'
- (4) *Sandalias vendía.* (34JM)
 sandals [he] used to sell
 'He used to sell sandals.'
- (5) *A uno lo han matado.* (2LC)
 PREP one CL [they] killed
 'They killed one person.'

In (3) the direct object *mi mamá* has the coreferential clitic *la*, while in (5) the direct object *uno* is coreferential with the clitic *lo*. Silva-Corvalán (1984) regards cases like (2) through (5) as reflecting a variable phenomenon of object-verb

⁵Note, however, that quantifiers (e.g. numbers, *mucho*), demonstratives (e.g., *ese*, *esta*), and possessive adjectives (e.g. *mi*, *su*) were permitted prior to the NP.

agreement, which is in a process of diffusion in a number of Spanish varieties. For our purposes, what is relevant is simply that (2) and (3) have a postverbal direct object and (4) and (5) have a preverbal direct object.

4.2.2 VARIABLES. The dependent variable in the current study was word order, with two values—verb first (VO) and direct object first (OV). The independent social variables considered in the analysis, along with their possible values, are listed in Table 5.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Values</i>
Generation	1st (came to Lima at or after age 12) 1.5 (came to Lima before age 12) 2nd (at least one parent member of 1st generation) 3rd (at least one parent member of 2nd generation)
Gender	Male Female
First Language	Spanish (or bilingual) Indigenous
Education	SOME PRIMARY SCHOOL Primary school complete Some secondary school Secondary school complete Some higher education

TABLE 5. *Social Variables*

Additionally, two linguistic variables were analyzed for their effect on word order. The first of these is the status, new or given, of the direct object NP. We adopt Prince's (1981) typology of new and given information. New referents are those that are introduced into the discourse for the first time (Prince's 'Brand New', 'Brand New Anchored', 'Inferable', and 'Unused' types). Given referents are those that have already been introduced (Prince's 'Textually Evoked') or those that are present in an extratextual context (Prince's 'Situationally

Evoked'). The second linguistic variable analyzed was the pragmatic function (or discourse situation) represented by the direct object NP or the clause in general. Table 6 lists the values of this variable, along with a brief description of each.

<i>Classification</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Description</i>
Pragmatic function	Contrary to Expectation ¹	Unexpected information given the context
	Focus of Contrast ²	Member of group contrasted against other members
	Focal Element	Requested information in answer to a question
	Information	Informant merely conveys information
	Topic	The element about which a sentence says something
Discourse situation	Agreement	Informant agrees with statement by interviewer
	Explanation	Informant provides the reason for a state/action
	Repetition	Informant repeats a previous statement s/he made
	Summary	Informant summarizes a series of earlier statements

¹ In more recent work Ocampo (2004) uses the term 'deviation from expectation'.

² In more recent work Ocampo (2004) uses the terms 'contrast' or 'contrastive constituent'.

TABLE 6. *Pragmatic functions/discourse situations*

4.2.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS. All data were entered into GoldVarb 3.0 for descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. The descriptive analysis involved the identification of general trends in the data, including the discovery of any knockouts (variable levels which always corresponded to one or the other value of the dependent variable, and therefore showed no variation). Subsequent to the elimination of knockout data, inferential statistics were run on the remaining data, using multiple regression analysis to determine which of the independent variables had a significant ($p < .05$) effect on the occurrence of the dependent variable. Such analysis also revealed whether each value of the significant

variables favored or disfavored a given word order, and the relative weighting of those values.

Note that, to address one of the knockouts in the data set, the “First Language” factors Spanish and Bilingual (referring to the simultaneous acquisition of Spanish and an indigenous language), were combined. This is because the only bilingual L1 participant always used VO order, which approximated the VO use of L1 Spanish speakers (93.8%) more than that of L1 indigenous language speakers (81.1%). In addition, one third-generation participant, 34JM, whose family is originally from a black-Peruvian enclave in Chincha, was an outlier in his use in terms of both number of instances and of OV word order frequency. This speaker works as a paper recycler in one of the shantytowns of Lima and at the time of the interview he was General Secretary of Recyclers in Lima. He had extensive social networks, which included both Andean and non-Andean speakers. Since the current study focuses on contact between Andean migrants and non-migrant *Limeño* speakers and a detailed pragmatic analysis of this unique speaker’s use of OV word order is beyond the scope of this paper, his data were removed and must await further analysis.

5. RESULTS. Data analysis revealed a total of 556 affirmative main clauses including only a verb and a full, lexical NP direct object. Of those 556 instances, 503 (90.5%) represented VO word order, while 53 (9.5%) instead showed OV word order.

Two knockouts were observed among the variable values included. One of the participants did not reveal her level of education; the 8 tokens she produced were all VO word order. In addition, the pragmatic function, contrary to expectation (1 token), was always rendered with OV word order, as can be seen in (6). In this example a first-generation migrant is describing how difficult her life has been given the extreme poverty in which she has lived and in that context notes *y tanto hijo he tenido* ‘and so many children [I] have had’. Contrary to expectations given her difficult living conditions, she gave birth to 17 children.

(6) Contrary to expectation:

Diga, ¿cómo, cómo he podido hacer eso? Si yo, yo ahora que pienso, pienso y veo digo pero ¿qué he hecho yo? y tanto hijo he tenido. Porque no debía de haber sido así, con la vida que pasamos, ¿no? pero parece que Dios, Dios no sé... (23CA)

‘Say, how was I able to do that? If I, I, now that I think about it and I see, I say but what did I do? and I have had so many children. Because it shouldn’t have been like that, with the life that we had, right? but it seems that God, God, I don’t know...’

All knockout data were excluded from further statistical analyses.

Multiple regression analysis revealed that two of the independent variables significantly predicted the application of the dependent variable—pragmatic function and first language. Table 7 lists the specific variable values and their weight, where any weight above .500 favors VO word order and any weight under .500 favors OV word order.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Factor Weight</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>
Pragmatic Function	Information	.741	99	415
	Repetition	.088	81	68
	Explanation	.072	75	12
	Agreement	.062	67	6
	Focal Element	.041	68	19
	Summary	.025	53	17
	Focus of Contrast	.004	17	6
	Topic	.003	8	13
	<i>Range</i>	738		
First Language	Spanish (or bilingual)	.616	94	392
	Indigenous	.245	81	164
	<i>Range</i>	371		
Total N				556
Input 0.979, Log Likelihood = -88.383, Chi-square/cell = 0.294				

TABLE 7. *Multivariate analysis of the contribution of significant internal and external factors to VO order*

No other independent variables were shown to significantly affect word order in the current study.

In addition to the previously mentioned knockout, the pragmatic function of contrary to expectation, Table 8 shows that the pragmatic functions of repetition, explanation, agreement, focal element, summary, focus of contrast, and topic also were more commonly rendered with object-first constructions, although to different degrees, than was the pragmatic function of merely conveying information.

VARIATION AND CHANGE IN PERUVIAN SPANISH WORD ORDER

<i>Function</i>	<i>Incidence</i>	<i>VO</i>	<i>OV</i>	<i>Total</i>
Information	N	411	4	415
	%	99.0	1.0	74.6
Repetition	N	55	13	68
	%	80.9	19.1	12.2
Explanation	N	9	3	12
	%	75.0	25.0	2.2
Agreement	N	4	2	6
	%	66.7	33.3	1.1
Focal Element	N	13	6	19
	%	68.4	31.6	3.4
Summary	N	9	8	17
	%	52.9	47.1	3.1
Focus of Contrast	N	1	5	6
	%	16.7	83.3	1.1
Topic	N	1	12	13
	%	7.7	92.3	2.3
Total	N	503	53	556
	%	90.5	9.5	

TABLE 8: *Word order by pragmatic function*

Examples of each of these functions can be seen below in (7) through (13).

(7) Repetition:

El limeño usa mucha jerga, mucha jerga hablan. (5LBV)
 ‘Limeños use a lot of slang; a lot of slang [they] speak.’

(8) Explanation:

— . . . *formaron una comitiva entre ellos mismos y pusieron su capitán*

y hicieron botar todo lo que es basura (sí) y lo rellenaron con tierra, o con desmonte, ya no firme ya, allá han construido y está bien bonito eso pues.

— *Sí está bien bonito.*

— *Lo único que malogaron es la, la fábrica de yeso, de cal.*

— *Ah . . .*

— *Toda su fachada la, la, la blanqueaban. . . y a veces los niños dicen que sufrían también ya con ese polvillo. (1AH)*

— ‘. . . they formed a committee among themselves and named a captain and threw out everything that was garbage (yes) and they filled it in with dirt, or with scrap, but not solid, they built there and it’s quite pretty.’

— ‘Yes, it’s quite pretty.’

— ‘The only thing they ruined was the plaster, the lime factory.’

— ‘Ah. . .’

— ‘The whole façade [they] CL,CL,CL whitened . . . and at times it is said that the children suffered from that dust, too.’

(9) Agreement:

— . . . *sí pues, él tenía una, una viña tenía él, sí, en Huaral tenía él, una chacra.*

— *Una chacra tenía. (4GT)*

— ‘. . . yes well, he used to have a, a vineyard he used to have, yes, in Huaral he used to have, a small farm.’

— ‘A small farm [he] used to have.’

(10) Focal element:

— *Y ¿cuántos hijos tiene?*

— *Cinco hijos tengo. (17MC)*

— ‘And, how many children do you have?’

— ‘Five children [I] have.’

(11) Summary:

No había luz solo recuerdo que ahí -onde vivía, -onde la tía, -onde nosotros vivíamos, ella daba luz ella tenía su motorcito prendi-a y entonces a, a determinadas personas que podían . . . pagar entonces les daba luz por horas . . . esa era la luz pero de-pués de las diez de la noche ya ella cortaba su motor y todo era en silencio pero, pero, pero no había, no había droga, no había delincuencia, no nosotros no nos preocupábamos de esto, y como todos vivíamos aquí nos conocíamos unos con otros ¿no? Sí, eso, eso recuerdo. (5LBV)

‘There wasn’t any light only I remember that there, where she used to live, where my aunt, where we used to live, she would give light she

used to have her little motor on and then certain people who could ... pay then she would give them light by the hour. . . that was the light but after ten at night then she would turn off the motor and everything would be silent, but , but there were no, there weren't any drugs, there wasn't any delinquency, no, we didn't have to worry about that, and since everyone lived here we knew each other well, right? Yes, that [I] remember.'

(12) Focus of Contrast

— *Y con la otra se casó, y con mi mamá no . . . y con mi mamá ya tenía cuatro hijos.*

— *Ah sí ¿no?*

— *Y a mi mamá la dejó. Imagínese.* (13CC)

— 'And he married the other woman, but not my mother ... and he already had four children with my mother'

— 'Oh, really?'

— 'And PREP my mother CL [he] left. Imagine that.'

(13) Topic

— *Hacia la misa pues, y esos siempre tenía y el padre tenía este su, cómo se llama?*

— *Un barrilito.*

— *Su, su vino.*

— *Su vino, sí.*

— *No, su vino tenía guardado, pa' hacer la misa tenía el vino guardado.* (22BG)

— 'He was saying mass, and he always and the priest always had this, what do you call it?'

— 'A little cask.'

— 'His, his wine.'

— 'His wine, yes.'

— 'No, his wine [he] had stored away, to say mass he had the wine stored away.'

Object-first word order was used by both Spanish L1 speakers and indigenous L1 speakers to express each of the pragmatic functions just mentioned, with the exception of agreement (discussed below). Nevertheless, in all cases those with an indigenous L1 used an equal or greater percentage of OV word order to convey such messages than those who learned Spanish as an L1, as can be seen in Table 11.

The pragmatic function of information was the only one that instead favored VO word order, as illustrated in (14).

(14) Information:

— *Bueno, nosotros los que salimos elegidos así como la actual junta directiva hicimos campaña.*

— ¿Sí?

— *Pegamos afiches, sacamos volantes todo.* (6GB)

— ‘Well, we who were elected just like the current board of directors ran a campaign.’

— ‘Really?’

— ‘[We] put up posters, published fliers and everything.’

In addition to pragmatic function, the other factor that was significant was the speakers’ L1. Native speakers of an indigenous language favored the use of OV word order, while native speakers of Spanish favored the use of VO word order. This pattern is detailed in Table 9 and illustrated in (15) and (16).

(15) Indigenous:

A otro le pegaron. (10JG)

‘PREP Another one CL [they] hit.’

(16) Spanish:

Lo mataron al zorrillo. (1AH)

‘[They] CL killed PREP the little fox.’

<i>L1</i>	<i>Incidence</i>	<i>VO</i>	<i>OV</i>	<i>Total</i>
Spanish	N	370	22	392
	%	94.4	5.6	70.5
Indigenous	N	133	31	164
	%	81.1	18.9	29.5
Total	N	503	53	556
	%	90.5	9.5	

TABLE 9. *Word order by first language (L1)*

Because L1 was a significant factor, a separate multivariate analysis was conducted of each group to determine whether the pragmatic functions were used in an equivalent fashion by indigenous L1 and Spanish L1 speakers. The results are

summarized in Table 10. For both groups, information word order heavily favors VO word order, while other pragmatic functions generally favor OV order.

<i>Indigenous L1</i>					<i>Spanish L1 (and bilingual)</i>			
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Factor</i>	<i>Factor Weight</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Factor</i>	<i>Factor Weight</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Total</i>
Pragmatic Function	Information	.707	97	118	Agreement	knockout (all VO)		(3)
	Explanation	.165	75	4	Information	.737	100	291
	Repetition	.069	65	17	Repetition	.054	85	48
	Focal Element	.054	50	4	Explanation	.028	75	8
	Summary	.010	17	6	Focal Element	.026	73	15
	Agreement	.009	33	3	Summary	.025	73	11
	Topic	knockout (all OV)	--	(10)	Topic	.005	33	3
	Focus of Contrast	knockout (all OV)	--	(2)	Focus of Contrast	.003	25	4
	Contrary to Expectation	Did not occur	--	0	Contrary to Expectation	singleton (OV)	--	(1)
<i>Range</i>		<i>698</i>		<i>Range</i>		<i>734</i>		
Gender	Female	.799	.94	54	Female	[.507] ¹		206
	Male	.318	.84	98	Male	[.492]		174
	<i>Range</i>				<i>Range</i>	<i>[015]</i>		
Total			152	Total			380	

Indigenous L1: Input 0.959, Log Likelihood = -31.003, Chi-square/cell = 0.1735
 Spanish L1: Input 0.990, Log Likelihood = -50.413, Chi-square/cell = 0.0000

¹ Nonsignificant factor weights are indicated in brackets.

TABLE 10: *Multivariate analysis of the contribution of significant internal and external factors to VO order according to L1.*

Similarities between the two groups can be seen by comparing the conditioning variables as well as the internal ranking of their factors. Overall, in spite of the low number of tokens in some categories, the results demonstrate that the same pragmatic functions and discourse situations motivate OV word order in each group; the one exception is the discourse situation agreement, which does not motivate OV word order in the L1 Spanish speakers in this sample. This was one of the discourse situations found in the Andean data from Calca (Ocampo and Klee 1995). This particular discourse situation may not motivate OV word order in L1 Spanish speakers in general, although more research on this issue is needed. Table 11 gives a detailed breakdown of word order by pragmatic function and discourse situation for indigenous L1 and Spanish/bilingual L1. Because of the small number of tokens in some cells, the results must be interpreted with caution.

<i>Function</i>	<i>Indigenous L1</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>Incidence</i>	<i>VO</i>	<i>OV</i>	
Information	N	115	3	118
	%	97.5	2.5	77.6
Explanation	N	3	1	4
	%	75.0	25.0	2.6
Repetition	N	11	6	17
	%	64.7	35.3	11.2
Focal Element	N	2	2	4
	%	50	50	2.6
Summary	N	1	5	6
	%	16.7	83.3	3.9
Agreement	N	1	2	3
	%	33.3	66.7	2.0
Topic	N	(0)	(10) ¹	(10)
	%	0.0	100	--
Focus of Contrast	N	(0)	(2)	(2)
	%	0.0	100	--
Contrary to Expectation	N	(0)	(0)	(0)
	%			--
Total	N	133	19	152
	%	87.5	12.5	

<i>Spanish/Bilingual L1</i>				
<i>Function</i>	<i>Incidence</i>	<i>VO</i>	<i>OV</i>	<i>Total</i>
Agreement	N	(3)	(0)	(3)
	%	100.0	0.0	--
Information	N	290	1	291
	%	99.7	0.3	76.6
Repetition	N	41	7	48
	%	85.4	14.6	12.6
Explanation	N	6	2	8
	%	75.0	25.0	2.1
Focal Element	N	11	4	15
	%	73.3	26.7	3.9
Summary	N	8	3	11
	%	72.7	27.3	2.9
Topic	N	1	2	3
	%	33.3	66.7	0.8
Focus of Contrast	N	1	3	4
	%	25.0	75.0	1.1
Contrary to Expectation	N	(0)	(1)	(1)
	%	0.0	100.0	--
Total	N	358	22	380
	%	94.2	5.8	

¹ The numbers in parentheses were knockouts or singletons and were not included in the statistical analysis that generated the totals in this table.

TABLE 11: *Word order by pragmatic function for Indigenous L1 and Spanish/bilingual L1*

Among the indigenous L1 speakers, in addition to pragmatic function, a second variable was significant: gender. As can be seen in Table 12, male L1 speakers of an indigenous language used OV order significantly more than females: 16.3% vs. 5.6%. In fact, the rate of usage of OV order among L1 indigenous women is very similar to that of L1 Spanish women (6.3%) and men (5.2%). This similar frequency of OV order among Spanish L1 males and fe-

males rendered gender not significant when the multivariate analysis was carried out on this group.

Gender	Incidence	Indigenous			Spanish/Bilingual		
		VO	OV	Total	VO	OV	Total
Female	N	51	3	54	193	13	206
	%	94.4	5.6	35.5	93.7	6.3	54.2
Male	N	82	16	98	165	9	174
	%	83.7	16.3	64.5	94.8	5.2	45.8
Total	N	133	19	152	358	22	380
	%	87.5	12.5		94.2	5.8	

TABLE 12. *Word order by gender for Indigenous L1 and Spanish/Bilingual L1*

What could explain this difference in indigenous L1 speakers? It may be the case that the women who have an indigenous L1 have more contact with *limeño* speakers because of the types of employment that they find. For example, one of the female participants, who arrived in Lima when she was twelve, found work as a nanny in a *limeño* household. This is how she describes her experience:

entré a trabajar como niñera pa- cuidar bebes, porque yo no sabía hacer nada, no sabía hablar castellano, todo era quechua nomás, y [], así aprendí pues, difícil ¿no? porque, no entendía lo que me hablaba la señora, ni yo tampoco le entendía, (-sea que ya) la señora me tenía que hablarme mímicamente, ¿no? eh, señalarme, [] poco a poco ya iba, captando, iba acostumbr-, ahí he trabaja-o como, cinco años. (11BI)
 'I began to work as a nanny, to take care of babies, because I didn't know how to do anything, I didn't know how to speak Spanish, everything was only Quechua, and [...] that's how I learned, [it was] hard, right?, because I didn't understand what the lady was saying to me, and I didn't understand her either, I mean, the lady had to speak to me mime-like, right?, making signs [...] little by little I was catching on, I was becoming accustomed, I worked there for about five years.'

This type of experience is not unusual for indigenous women in Lima and provides them with close contact with middle class *limeños* for a number of

years. In contrast, one of the male participants, 10JG, arrived in Lima at age 18 and worked for a few months in his great aunt's restaurant, then a few months with relatives in a small farm close to Lima, before finding work in construction. After several years, he entered the army, where he served for two years and then worked in the military school in Lima for thirteen years as a repairman. These types of positions gave him much less close access to *limeños*; the people he interacted with on a daily basis tended to be other Andean migrants. The types of work available to male and female migrants may provide varying degrees of close contact with traditional *limeño* speakers, which affects the type of Spanish they are exposed to. This notion of linguistic market first proposed by Bourdieu and Boltanski (1975) and later operationalized by Sankoff and Laberge (1978) may also be a useful measure to take into account in future studies.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS. Overall, our results indicate that the incidence of OV word order among L1 Spanish speakers in Lima (approximately 6%) corresponds closely to that of some non-contact varieties of Spanish, such as Buenos Aires Spanish (6%, Ocampo 1990). This percentage is clearly much smaller than that found in regions where Andean Spanish is spoken, such as Calca, Peru (18%, Ocampo and Klee 1995) and Tarata, Bolivia (19%, Muntendam 2008a, 2008b). L1 indigenous speakers in Lima used significantly more OV constructions (19%) in the current study than their L1 Spanish counterparts; the rate of OV usage was similar to that found in previous studies of rural Andean Spanish.

The pragmatic functions that motivate VO/OV word order in both monolingual and bilingual Spanish in Lima appear to be largely the same as those found in non-contact varieties of Spanish. When speakers merely wish to communicate information, they tend to use VO word order. On the other hand, they invert this order when conveying pragmatic functions such as contrary to expectation, focus of contrast, focal element and topic. Interestingly, we also found evidence that L1 Spanish speakers native to Lima used OV word order, though to a lesser degree than L1 speakers of an indigenous language, in some of the discourse situations previously described only for Andean Spanish—namely repetition, explanation, and summary.

Finally, though generation did not emerge as a significant variable in our analysis, it nonetheless merits some attention. Specifically, it should be noted that all but one of the indigenous L1 speakers in the current study were first- or 1.5-generation migrants; only one of the second-generation migrants (and none of the native *limeños*) spoke Quechua as an L1, a finding that coincides with Marr's (1998) observation that this group quickly adopts Spanish as their primary language as a means of empowerment and advancement. Furthermore, with respect to the frequency of use of OV word order, we also see a distinction

emerge with the second generation. While the first generation (15.7%) and generation 1.5 (12.5%) patterned together in more closely reflecting the word order of rural Andean Spanish, second-generation speakers (3.6%) would seem to approximate the norm found for non-contact varieties of Spanish. Based on prior research (Siegel 2010), which indicated that, for morphosyntactic variants, children who arrive in a new dialect zone before their mid teens tend to acquire the new variants, we expected generation 1.5 participants to behave like second-generation speakers. However, three of the six generation 1.5 participants in this study arrived in Lima as monolingual Quechua-speakers and acquired Spanish, rather than a second dialect, in Lima as children. In spite of acquiring Spanish before the age of 12, these speakers behave similarly to first-generation migrants with respect to VO/OV word order. The contact situation in Lima is complex given the fact that some first-generation Andean migrants arrive as monolingual speakers of an indigenous language, while others arrive speaking a rural variety of Andean Spanish. Nonetheless, it would seem that, in regard to word order, Andean norms disappear in the second generation, as was also the case with phonological variables in studies of dialect contact.

REFERENCES

- BORTONI-RICARDO, STELLA MARIS. 1985. *The urbanization of rural dialect speakers: a sociolinguistic study in Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BOURDIEU, PIERRE and LUC BOLTANSKI. 1975. *Le fétichisme de la langue*. Actes de recherché en sciences sociales 4.2-32.
- CAMACHO, JOSÉ. 1999. From SOV to SVO: the grammar of interlanguage word order. *Second Language Research* 15.115-32.
- CARAVEDO, ROCÍO. 1996. *Varietades en contacto: propuestas para una investigación del español del Perú*. *Signo y Señal* (Buenos Aires) 6.493-511.
- CARAVEDO, ROCÍO. 1999. *Lingüística del corpus: cuestiones teórico-metodológicas aplicadas al español*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- CARAVEDO, ROCÍO and CAROL A. KLEE. 2012. El contacto de dialectos en Lima: un análisis del pretérito perfecto en las cláusulas narrativas. *Lengua y migración* 4. 5-24.
- CERRÓN-PALOMINO, RODOLFO. 2003. *Castellano andino*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

- ESCOBAR, ALBERTO. 1978. *Variaciones sociolingüísticas del castellano en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- ESCOBAR, ANNA MARÍA. 1988. *Hacia una tipología del bilingüismo en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- ESCOBAR, ANNA MARÍA. 2000. *Contacto social y lingüístico. El español en contacto con el quechua en el Perú*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- ESCOBAR, ANNA MARÍA. 2011. Spanish in contact with Quechua. *The handbook of Hispanic sociolinguistics*, ed. by Manuel Díaz-Campos, 323-52. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- GODENZZI, JUAN CARLOS. 1987. *Lengua, cultura y región*. Cusco: Centro de Estudios Rurales Andinos Bartolomé de las Casas.
- GREENBERG, JOSEPH H. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. *Universals of language* (2nd ed.), ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, 73-113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- HINSKENS, FRANS, PETER AUER and PAUL KERSWILL. 2005. The study of dialect convergence and divergence: conceptual and methodological considerations. *Dialect change: convergence and divergence in European language*, ed. by Peter Auer, Frans Hinskens and Paul Kerswill, 1-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KLEE, CAROL A. 1996. The Spanish of the Peruvian Andes: the influence of Quechua on Spanish language structure. *Spanish in contact: issues in bilingualism*, ed. by Ana Roca and John B. Jensen, 73-91. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- KLEE, CAROL A., and ROCÍO CARAVEDO. 2005. Contact-induced language change in Lima, Peru: the case of clitic pronouns. *Selected proceedings of the 7th Hispanic linguistics symposium*, ed. by David Eddington, 12-21. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. <<http://www.lingref.com>>, document #1082 (January 19, 2011).
- KLEE, CAROL A., and ROCÍO CARAVEDO. 2006. Andean Spanish and the Spanish of Lima: linguistic variation and change in a contact situation. *Globalisation and the Spanish-speaking world*, ed. by Clare Mar-Molinero and Miranda Steward, 94-113. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- KLEE, CAROL A., DANIEL G. TIGHT, and ROCÍO CARAVEDO. 2009. Dialect contact in Lima: perfects vs. perfectives in narrative clauses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Hispanic linguistics symposium. Universidad de Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, Puerto Rico.

- LOZANO, ANTHONY G. 1975. Syntactic borrowing in Spanish from Quechua: the noun phrase. *Lingüística e indigenismo moderno de América. Actas y memorias del XXXIX congreso internacional de americanistas*, ed. by Rosalía Avalos de Matos and Rogger Ravines, 297-305. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- LUIJÁN, MARTA, LILIANA MINAYA and DAVID SANKOFF. 1984. The universal consistency hypothesis and the prediction of word order acquisition stages in the speech of bilingual children. *Language* 60.343-71.
- MARR, TIMOTHY GORDON. 1998. The language left at Ticlio: social and cultural perspectives on Quechua loss in Lima, Peru. Liverpool: University of Liverpool dissertation.
- MARTÍN BUTRAGUEÑO, PEDRO. 2004. El contacto de dialectos como motor del cambio lingüístico. *Cambio lingüístico. Métodos y problemas*, ed. by Pedro Martín Butragueño, 81-144. México: El Colegio de México.
- MENDOZA, JOSÉ. 1991. El castellano hablado en La Paz. *Sintaxis divergente. La Paz: Universidad Mayor de San Andrés*.
- MUNTENDAM, ANTJE. 2008a. Crosslinguistic influence in Andean Spanish: word order and focus. *Selected proceedings of the 2007 second language research forum*, ed. by Melissa Bowles, Rebecca Foote, Silvia Perpiñán, and Rakesh Bhatt, 44-57. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- MUNTENDAM, ANTJE. 2008b. Transfer in the C-domain: word order and focus in Andean Spanish. *Boston university conference on language development (BUCLD) 32 proceedings*, ed. by Harvey Chan, Heather Jacob, and Enkeleida Kapia, 311-22. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.
- MUYSKEN, PIETER. 1984. The Spanish that Quechua speakers learn: L2 learning as norm-governed behavior. *Second languages: a crosslinguistic perspective*, ed. by Roger W. Andersen, 101-19. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- OCAMPO, FRANCISCO. 1990. The pragmatics of word order in spoken Rioplatense Spanish. Los Angeles: University of Southern California dissertation.
- OCAMPO, FRANCISCO. 1995. The word order of two-constituent constructions in spoken Spanish. *Word order in discourse*, ed. by Pamela Downing, and Michael Noonan, 425-47. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- OCAMPO, FRANCISCO. 2004. Word-order variation in spoken Spanish in constructions with a verb, a direct object, and an adverb. *Cognitive approaches to linguistic analysis*, ed. by Ellen Contini-Morava, Robert S. Kirsner, and Betsy Rodríguez-Bachiller, 341-60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- OCAMPO, FRANCISCO and CAROL A. KLEE. 1995. Spanish OV/VO word-order variation in Spanish/Quechua bilingual speakers. *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism*, ed. by Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 71-82. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- OTHEGUY, RICARDO and ANA CELIA ZENTELLA. 2012. *Spanish in New York: language contact, dialectal leveling, and structural continuity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- POZZI-ESCOT, INÉS. 1973. *Apuntes sobre el castellano de Ayacucho*. Documento de Trabajo No. 21. Lima: Centro de Investigación de Lingüística Aplicada, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- PRINCE, ELLEN. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. *Radical pragmatics*, ed. by Peter Cole, 223-55. New York: Academic Press.
- RIVAROLA, JOSÉ LUIS. 1990. *La formación lingüística de Hispanoamérica*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- ROJAS-SOSA, DEYANIRA. 2008. The use of the past tenses in the Spanish of Lima: variation in a situation of contact. *Selected proceedings of the 10th Hispanic linguistics symposium*, ed. by Joyce Bruhn de Garavito and Elena Valenzuela, 265-75. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla. Proceedings Project. <<http://www.lingref.com>>, document #1802.
- SANKOFF, DAVID and SUZANNE LABERGE. 1978. The linguistic market and the statistical explanation of variability. *Linguistic variation*, ed. by David Sankoff, 239-50. New York: Academic Press.
- SÁNCHEZ, LILIANA. 2003. *Quechua-Spanish bilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SERRANO, JULIO. 2000. Contacto dialectal (¿y cambio lingüístico?) en español: el caso de /tʃ/ sonorese. *Estructuras en contexto: estudios de variación*, ed. by Pedro Martín Butragueño, 45-59. México D.F.: Colegio de México.
- SIEGEL, JEFF. 2010. *Second dialect acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SILVA-CORVALÁN, CARMEN. 1984. Semantic and pragmatic factors in syntactic change. *Historical syntax*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, 555-73. Berlin: Mouton.