

Another Look at the Present Perfect in an Andean Variety of Spanish: Grammaticalization and Evidentiality in Quiteño Spanish

Jenny Dumont

1. Introduction

The existence of an extensive body of literature on the Present Perfect (PP), both Spanish-specific (cf. Alarcos Llorach 1947, Copple 2011, Escobar 1997, Gili Gaya 1972, Howe 2013, Rodríguez Louro 2009, Schwenter 1994, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008, *inter alia*) and cross-linguistic studies (cf. Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca, 1994, Comrie 1976 Harris, 1982, Squartini & Bertinetto 2000, *inter alia*), attests to the complexity of accurately describing the uses, meanings and functions of the PP. Among the studies of the PP in Spanish, two main approaches are employed. In one approach, the grammaticalization, analysis of temporal and aspectual uses of the PP are emphasized, and the PP is often examined in relation to the Preterit (Pret) (cf. Copple 2009, 2011, Hernández 2004, Howe & Schwenter 2003, Jara Yupanqui 2006, Rodríguez Louro & Howe 2010, Rodríguez Louro & Jara Yupanqui 2011, Schwenter 1994, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008, Serrano 1994, 1996, *inter alia*). Another approach focuses on non-temporal and non-aspectual uses of the PP, with particular attention to contact situations that appear to have produced innovative evidential uses of the PP (cf. Escobar 1997, Klee & Ocampo 1995, Mendoza 1991, Rojas-Sosa 2008, Stratford 1991, *inter alia*). The specific goals of this paper are to situate the grammaticalization of the Quiteño PP in relation to that of other varieties of Spanish, and to quantitatively test claims that the PP in this variety has acquired evidential meaning.

Cross-linguistically, there is evidence that perfects assume different functions in different contexts. Evidential and inferential meanings attributed to Andean bilinguals in previous work have been observed cross-linguistically (cf. Bybee et al. 1994:95, Comrie 1976:108), as has the grammaticalization of temporal uses of the PP (Harris 1982; Squartini & Bertinetto 2000). Examples from monolingual speakers from Quito suggest that they use the PP in a variety of aspectual and temporal contexts: seemingly perfective and past temporal reference situations, as in (1); in non-perfective contexts, as in (2); and non-past contexts, as in (3). Examples (2) and (3) also show an additional pragmatic function of the PP, a mirative function (that is, the speaker is reacting to new or unexpected information; cf. DeLancey 1997). In (2) speaker C uses the PP following new (to her) information about digital cameras with *no he sabido eso* ('I didn't know that') and in (3) speaker E explains that she has just discovered that her cap is dirty, using the PP in the phrase *ha estado sucia* (lit. 'has been dirty'). Examples such as these highlight the multiple functions the PP has acquired, even within one dialect. It will later be shown that the PP in Quiteño Spanish also shows evidential features.

* Jenny Dumont, Gettysburg College. This work was first presented at HLS 2012 where I received valuable feedback from the audience. I am grateful to Rena Torres Cacoullós and Mary Copple for reading drafts of the presentation and the paper and I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers who offered many helpful suggestions. I wish to acknowledge my research assistants, Allison Brandt, Christopher Dellana and Taylor Plank, for their help with this project. Any errors are, of course, my own.

(1) Perfective use of the Present Perfect

M: *sino con la pena que dos veces,
últimas que me **he ido**,
... **ha llovido**.*

M: 'although regretfully the last two times,
.. that **I went (PP)**,
.. **it rained (PP)**.'

(Café 284-86)¹

(2) Imperfect use of the PP

A: *es que ahora vienen --
en una misma cámara,
o sea es ca- --
es filmadora y [cámara] digital.*

C: [mhm],
*claro.
viene con todo.*

A: *pero me han dicho que no es tan bueno,
porque si se daña la filmadora,
se daña todo,
por ejemplo.*

C: .. hm,
*no **he sabido** eso,
pero ha de ser.*

A: 'it's that now they come --
in just one camera,
so it's a ca- --
it's a video camera and [digital] camera.

C: [mhm],
of course.
it comes with everything.

A: 'but they have told me that it is not as good,
because if the camera is damaged,
everything is damaged,
for example.

C: .. hm,
I didn't know (PP) that,
but it must be.'

(Clases 448-60)

(3) Present temporal reference of the PP

R: *qué te estás viendo en el espejo?*

E: *la gorra,
que **ha estado** sucia.*

R: 'what are you looking at in the mirror?

E: the cap,
that it **is (PP)** dirty.'

(Viejos Amigos 1491-93)

This paper presents the initial results of a larger study that investigates the functions of the PP in a lesser-studied variety of Spanish, Quiteño. This variety has been chosen in order to simultaneously examine the aspectual/temporal uses and the evidential/pragmatic uses in an Andean contact variety. Although all the speakers included in this study are monolingual speakers of Spanish, this variety of

¹ All examples, unless otherwise indicated, are from the corpus of Quiteño Spanish described in Section 4. Information between parentheses refers to the transcript name and line numbers of the example.

Spanish has historically been in contact with Quichua and even monolingual Spanish speakers show linguistic features that have been directly attributed to contact with Quichua, for example, the use of the synthetic future for commands (cf. Hurley 1995). In this integrated approach, factors that contribute to aspectual and temporal meanings of the PP, along with factors that point to pragmatic and evidential functions are explored together. The results suggest that employing a broader approach to the study of the PP is both necessary and fruitful to understand the polysemous nature of the form.

The relationship between the PP and the Pret is discussed in the following section, and the third section provides an overview of Andean varieties of Spanish. This is followed by a discussion of the data and methodology, and results are presented in two sections. The paper concludes with a discussion of the broader implications of the findings presented here, along with suggestions for avenues of future research.

2. Grammaticalization, Present Perfect and the Preterit

One does not have to look far to find uses of the PP where it appears to be in variation with the Pret, as in (1). A great deal of previous research has focused on untangling the factors that contribute to the choice of one form or the other in contexts in which they are known to be in variation, with particular attention toward the grammaticalization of the PP as a perfective. The PP is thought to pass through stages of grammaticalization, accumulating different functions ('layering', cf. Hopper, 1991:22–24), including resultative, continuative, and anterior, with the endpoint being a perfective (Schwenter 1994; Squartini and Bertinetto (2000)).

As previously noted, the literature on the PP and the Pret in Spanish is quite extensive and a complete review is beyond the scope of this paper (see, however, Howe 2013 for an excellent summary). The results of two variationist studies, one diachronic in nature (Copple 2011), the other contemporary and cross-dialectal (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós) are considered here due to the similarities in methodology. The underlying assumption of these studies is that the Spanish PP is evolving from a perfect to a perfective, and that the examination of diachronic and diatopic variation in the PP can inform us about the processes and stages involved in grammaticalization. Among the factors found to significantly affect the distribution of the PP and Pret in different points in time and space are Aktionsart (lexical aspect), temporal reference, clause/sentence type, and co-occurrence with particular adverbs (Copple 2011, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008), each of which will be discussed in turn.

It is hypothesized that the correlation between Aktionsart and distribution of the PP and Pret is indicative of earlier stages of grammaticalization of the PP; with later stages corresponding to a loss of significance of Aktionsart². Copple (2011) traces the decrease of the lexical aspect constraints on the PP over time, and Schwenter and Torres Cacoullós (2008) show that lexical aspect is not active as a constraint in contemporary Peninsular Spanish, but is in Mexican Spanish, implying different stages of grammaticalization.

Past temporal reference is also an oft-cited factor in the distinctions between the PP and the Pret. Although temporal reference was not coded for each token in this study³ and is not included in the multivariate analysis, it is included in this discussion as it helps elucidate the temporal functions of each form. As the PP grammaticalizes as a perfective, it favors irrelevant and indeterminate past contexts in which temporal reference is not specified, while the Pret appears in contexts where temporal reference is specified or identifiable from context (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008). Temporal reference effects can also be evidenced in co-occurrence of the PP or the Pret with different classes of adverbs. Copple (2009) reports an increase in the co-occurrence of temporal adverbs with both the PP and the Pret between the 15th and 19th centuries, suggesting that as the PP assumes more functions, speakers must rely more heavily on temporal adverbs, although Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós (2008) do not find differences in rates between contemporary Mexican and Peninsular varieties. The co-occurrence of the PP with one particular adverb, *ya*, has been found to be a

² Note, however, that Rodríguez Louro found no significant effects for Aktionsart in Argentinian Spanish (2009:105).

³ Temporal reference was not coded separately because one of the criteria used to determine temporal reference is co-occurring adverbial, which was coded.

significant predictor of an emergent perfective function of the tense (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008) and provides a further objective measure for tracking the grammaticalization of the PP.

Clause/sentence type has also been found to be a significant factor in the distribution of the forms. In Peninsular Spanish, it had a weak effect in the 15th Century (Cople 2011) but has not been found to be significant in contemporary use; however, in contemporary Mexican Spanish, a more clear effect appears—yes/no questions and relative clauses favor the PP while all other clause types slightly favor the Pret. The authors propose a link between clause type and temporal reference, with the PP more apt to occur in yes/no questions because they are less temporally bound. In addition, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós (2008) explain the higher frequency of the PP in relative clauses in relation to a backgrounding function of the perfect.

In summary, the factors conditioning the use of the PP and the Pret have been shown to vary both diachronically and diatopically, indicating that while the stages of change from a perfect to a perfective appear to adhere to similar processes cross-linguistically, the pace of the change (if it occurs at all) is highly variable.

3. PP in Andean Varieties of Spanish

In addition to the examination of the factors related to temporal and aspectual functions of the PP, this paper also explores the claim that the PP in Andean varieties of Spanish has acquired specialized, non-temporal and non-aspectual pragmatic uses, which may have originated due to contact with other languages. This study aims to look for empirical evidence of evidential functions.

One cannot discuss Andean Spanish without recognizing that, for the past five centuries, Spanish has been spoken alongside indigenous languages, and that the subsequent language contact has produced tangible changes to the variety of Spanish spoken in this region. In the case of Quiteño Spanish, some contact-induced change is very obvious and unquestionably of Quichua origin, but other so-called contact innovations are less obvious or less decisively contact-induced. For example, most residents of Quito can identify that commonplace words such as *guagua*, *guambra* and *ñaño* originated in Quichua. Examples of lexical transfer are rather easy to spot and difficult to dispute, but other types of transfer, such as alleged pragmatic functions, can be more subtle and necessitate a more involved linguistic analysis in order to confirm or refute the claims.

While it is undeniable that linguistic transfer can and does occur, it is less clear how or why transfer happens, and what the limits on transferability are. Studies of languages in contact have indicated that certain types of transfer are more likely to occur than others; lexical, semantic and pragmatic transfer are the most frequently observed types of transfer, and cases of syntactic and morphological transfer are infrequently attested (Silva-Corvalán 1994; 2008). Bilingualism appears to be a key mechanism in the process of transfer, which is thought to occur within bilingual individuals, but the transferred items may then extend beyond the bilingual and become characteristic of the speech of monolinguals who never spoke the language from which the transferred item originated.

The varieties of Spanish spoken in the Andean highlands have been in contact with indigenous languages (Quechua, Quichua, Aymara) that grammatically encode evidentiality and mirativity in their verbal morphology. These indigenous languages have three-way systems of evidentiality that distinguish between directly acquired knowledge, inferred/conjectural, and reported (Aikenvald 2006), in addition to marking mirativity (Adelaar 2013). Examples (2) and (3) presented in the introduction of this paper attest a mirative function of the PP in Quiteño Spanish, supporting similar claims made for Ecuadorian Spanish by Muysken (1985) and Olbertz (2009), and Granda's (2004) findings for the Pluperfect in Southern Andean Spanish. Olbertz (2009:70) also points out that in most varieties of Quechua (Quichua in Ecuador) 'both mirativity and hearsay are additional functions of perfect aspect or past tense markers', which some interpret as evidence that these functions are a result of transfer from Quichua. In addition to the attested mirative function, it has been noted by many (Lipski 1994; Klee & Ocampo 1995; Escobar 1997; *inter alia*) that periphrastic past verb tenses in Andean Spanish at times appear to encode evidentiality⁴. In Peruvian and Bolivian Spanish spoken by bilinguals, it has been claimed that PP is used to signal that the speaker directly witnessed events, and the Pluperfect is

⁴ Recall that evidential functions of perfects have been reported for other languages (cf. Comrie 1976; Bybee et. al 1994).

used for hearsay or reported information (cf. Escobar 1997). Bustamante (1991) has attributed a reportative feature to the PP in Quiteño Spanish.

Indicating the source of information is not unique to languages with grammaticalized evidentiality; all languages have mechanisms to indicate the source of information. In both English and Spanish, complement-taking-predicates (CTPs, cf. Thompson 2002) such as ‘they say that/*dicen que*’, ‘I heard that/*oí que*’, and ‘I saw that/*vi que*’ are often found in natural speech to indicate how the speaker acquired the information embedded within the proposition. There is additional evidence that the Spanish reduced form *dizque* may also operate as an evidential in some varieties (cf. Travis 2006 for Colombian Spanish). While expressing evidentiality is not unique to Spanish, it is not usually associated with verb tenses outside of the Andean region.

Given the intensity and duration of language contact in highland Ecuador, along with the attested calques and transferred items at the lexical, semantic and syntactic levels (cf. Haboud 1998; Hurley 1995; Lipski 1994), and the overlap in morphemes used for perfect aspect, past tense, evidentiality and mirativity, the question of contact-induced change is well worth further investigation. It is beyond the scope of the present work to determine whether or not the existence of mirative and evidential functions of the PP in Quiteño Spanish is attributable to contact. In order to better substantiate claims of linguistic transfer, the linguistic manifestations of these pragmatic functions should first be identified in a quantifiable and operationalized manner. Once these have been identified, then cross-dialectal studies should determine whether this is an inherent property of the PP in other varieties of Spanish, or whether it only occurs in contexts of contact with languages that have grammaticalized conventions for expressing these pragmatic functions. The present study focuses on the operationalization of the identification of an evidential function of the PP in Quiteño Spanish. The question of whether or not an evidential function stems from contact should be addressed in future research.

4. Data and Methodology

The data for this study come from a larger corpus of Quiteño Spanish collected in 2006 (Dumont 2011). The portion used in this study includes the transcripts of 13 spontaneous conversations between close friends and family members, representing seven and a half hours of speech. Seventeen different individuals, eight men and nine women, participated in these conversations. They range in age from 18-84 and are middle class with at least a high school education. It is important to note that these speakers are all monolingual speakers of Spanish; none of them speak Quichua, have parents who spoke Quichua, or regularly interact with Quichua-speaking individuals. However, historically this dialect has been in contact with Quichua for several centuries, and the social nature of that contact has changed throughout the centuries (cf. Haboud 1998; Lipski 1994). It is worth mentioning that these speakers all employ non-standard grammatical structures in their speech that have been attributed to contact with Quichua, such as the use of the synthetic future for commands (see (4)), the imperative use of *dar* + gerund exemplified in (5)⁵ as well as a high frequency of diminutives and an extension of the diminutive to other parts of speech (6).

(4) Synthetic future as a command

M: *así dirasle,
despacito.*

M: ‘so tell him,
slowly.’

(Café:1684-85)

(5) Benefactive *dar* command

Dame pasando pan

‘Pass the bread for me.’

(Haboud 1998:219)

⁵ This command is not found in this corpus so the example given is from Haboud (1998). During fieldwork, I observed these speakers using this form in their daily interactions, and it is widely noted in the literature on highland Ecuadorian Spanish (cf. Haboud 1998; Hurly 1995; Lipski 1994; Olbertz 2008)

(6) Adverb with a diminutive suffix

M: *no.**más allacito.*

M: ‘no.

more over there.’

(Café: 2468-69)

These examples illustrate the fact that contact with Quichua has left an imprint on the variety of Spanish that is spoken today by monolingual Quiteños. For this reason, it is natural to investigate the possibility that the Quichua system of encoding evidentiality and mirativity in perfect verbs may have also directly or indirectly influenced the verbal system of this variety, as has been suggested for other varieties of Andean Spanish, in addition to the temporal/aspectual functions of the PP in this variety.

All tokens of the PP (n=499) and Pret (n=1760) were extracted, yielding 2259 verbs. In order to gain an understanding of the state of grammaticalization of the PP in Quiteño Spanish, and how it compares to other varieties of Spanish, the data were coded for lexical aspect and co-occurrence with temporal adverbs. It is hypothesized that the PP in these data will differ from contemporary Peninsular data and bear more resemblance to earlier stages of grammaticalization in Peninsular Spanish, as well as share similarities with Mexican Spanish.

Following Schwenter and Torres Cacoullós (2008), Vendler’s four types of lexical aspect were coded: states (*ser, estar, tener, etc.*), activity (*trabajar, hablar, jugar, etc.*), accomplishment (*decir, pedir, nacer, etc.*), and achievement (*dar, entrar, poner, etc.*). If Quiteño Spanish is not found to show many signs of grammaticalization as a perfective, as predicted, then lexical aspect should still be a significant factor in differentiating selection of the PP or the Pret, with the PP more likely to favor durative/atelic verbs.

It was also noted for each token whether or not it occurred with an adverb, and, following Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós (2008), the adverbs were divided into four classes: durative/iterative (*siempre, nunca, muchas veces, etc.*), proximate deictic adverbs (*hoy, ahora, esta mañana*), specific temporal reference (*ayer, hace quince días, entonces, al comienzo, etc.*), and the adverb *ya* constituted its own class. As it is hypothesized that the Quiteño PP is not grammaticalizing as a perfective, it is expected that, when adverbs do co-occur with the PP or the Pret, the Pret should occur more often with adverbs of specific temporal reference and the PP with iterative/durative adverbs. In addition, if the grammaticalization of the PP is not as advanced in this variety as it is in present day Spain, there should be no evidence of a *ya* + PP construction.

The coding for clause type departs from the schema used in other studies of PP that looked at clause type as a function of grammaticalization and related to temporal reference. In this study, it was hypothesized that clause type could correlate with evidential/epistemic functions; specifically that if the PP is found to fulfill an evidential function, it should be more likely to occur in nominal clauses, which follow CTPs. The logic for this classification derives from Thompson’s (2002) work showing evidence that complement clauses function as main clauses modified by epistemic/evidential/evaluative predicates. Given the posited relationship between epistemicity (and other pragmatic functions) and the PP in Andean Spanish, this would be one way to operationalize and test the hypothesis quantitatively. Four types of clauses were distinguished main clauses (yes/no questions were included here, low token numbers made it necessary to collapse the categories), relative clauses, adverbial clauses, and nominal or complement clauses. Clause types are exemplified in (7)-(10)

(7) Main clause

G: .. *ha crecido el Toni algo?*G: ‘.. *has Toni grown some?’*

(Café, 1072)

(8) Relative clause

B: .. (H) *estas situaciones que me han ocurrido,*B: .. (H) these situations *that have happened to me,*

(Hermanos 709)

(9) Adverbial clause

L: *no sé si tú has oído,*L: 'I don't know if you have heard,'

(El Banco, 447)

(10) Nominal/complement clause

A: *pero le cuento que ha salido una nueva ley,*A: 'but I'll tell you that a new law has come out,'

(Vacaciones, 5410)

5. Frequency of forms

In order to understand how the PP in Quiteño Spanish compares to other varieties of Spanish, Table 1 shows the frequency of the PP relative to the Pret cross-dialectally.

Table 1: PP and Pret rates cross-dialectally⁶

	PP	Pret
Argentina (Rodríguez Louro 2009)	6%	94%
México (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008)	15%	85%
Ecuador	22%	78%
El Salvador (Hernández 2004)	22%	78%
Perú (Caravedo 1989)	27%	73%
Spain (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008)	54%	46%

When the range of rates of PP and Pret cross-dialectally are compared, it is clear that there is a lot of variation from one variety to another. Argentina is at one end of the continuum, with the lowest percentage of PP at just 6%. Spain is at the other end of the continuum, the only variety where the PP has surpassed the Pret in frequency, with 54% of the verbs in the PP. The Quiteño data in this study falls solidly in the middle, with El Salvador, each showing rates of 22% PP.

Howe (2013) notes that the clearest division is the Peninsular/Latin American distinction, but that, within Latin America, there are still remarkable differences in rates of occurrence. With the former, we have an increase in use of the PP associated with the more advanced grammaticalization as a perfective. With the latter, the Pret is the default perfective in all varieties, however the PP has different uses across varieties. In Argentine Spanish it is highly specialized and used as a marker of indefinite past (Rodríguez Louro 2009), and the higher rates in Salvadoran and Peruvian Spanish are thought to be correlated to its advancement as a perfective (Hernández 2008; Howe 2013).

What, then, do these data tell us about Quiteño Spanish? On the one hand, the rates indicate that grammaticalization towards a perfective should not be as advanced as it is in Spain, but that it may show significant traits of a perfective, as seen in Salvadoran Spanish where the rates of PP to Pret are identical to Quiteño Spanish. On the other hand, the higher rates, when compared to Mexican Spanish and the highly specialized Argentine Spanish, could point toward additional functions of the PP in Quiteño Spanish. The results of the multivariate-analysis in the following section are useful in interpreting the significance of the rates of usage in Quiteño Spanish.

⁶ Country labels (e.g. Ecuador, El Salvador) were chosen in lieu of more specific labels (e.g., Quito, San Sebastián) in order to provide a consistent way of comparing across studies, some of which are more representative of larger areas (i.e., countries) than others which are more specific. There is, undoubtedly, variation within each country that is not represented in this table.

6. Analysis

Rbrul was used to perform multivariate analysis of the three independent factors hypothesized to elucidate temporal, aspectual and evidential uses of the PP in Quiteño Spanish. The results are presented in Table 2. Type of adverb was not included due to low token numbers in the multivariate analysis but is examined below.

Table 2: Factors contributing to the choice of PP over Pret in Quiteño Spanish

N= 2259 Input .221 (Overall weight = 23%)				
	Weight	% Pret	Tokens	% Data
Clause type				
Nominal	.71	46%	154	7%
Relative	.48	25%	155	7%
Main	.42	20%	1778	79%
Adverbial	.38	17%	172	8%
	<i>Range</i>	33		
Lexical Aspect				
State	.64	35%	365	16%
Activity	.47	21%	654	29%
Accomplishment	.45	19%	593	26%
Achievement	.44	19%	647	29%
	<i>Range</i>	20		
Adverb Present⁷				
<i>Ya</i> present	[.52] ⁸	25%	193	9%
<i>Ya</i> absent	[.48]	22%	2066	91%

These results, particularly the lexical aspect further discussed below, suggest that there is little reason to believe that the higher rates of PP in Quiteño Spanish (when compared to Mexican and Argentine Spanish) are due to further advancement along the grammaticalization path toward becoming a perfective. They do suggest, and the reasons will become clearer in the discussion of clause type that follows, that there is evidence that the PP in this variety has acquired some evidential uses.

The most robust effect, as measured by the range, is found in the factor group clause type. Here we see that only one type of clause favors the PP—nominal clauses. This is consistent with the hypothesis that if the PP is used to convey epistemic/evaluative/evidential meaning, then it should be favored in nominal/complement clauses. In order to come to a more precise understanding of the epistemic/evaluative/evidential meaning expressed by the PP, the matrix verbs of the main clause were examined; the distribution is given below in Table 3.

Table 3: Matrix verbs of PP and Pret in nominal clauses

	PP	Pret
<i>acordarse</i>	1	7
<i>creer</i>	7	21
<i>decir</i>	46	5
<i>saber</i>	2	4
<i>ser</i>	7	25
<i>ver</i>	1	3
<i>other</i>	11	23
Total	75	79

⁷ Many thanks to Stefan Th. Gries who suggested that I look for interaction between presence/absence of *ya* and lexical aspect. Interaction was not found to be present in these data.

⁸ Factor weights in brackets were not found to be statistically significant.

The most striking result in Table 3 is the high rate of the PP following the matrix verb *decir*—there is no other matrix verb that favors the PP. When looking at the PP alone, it is easy to see that almost two thirds of PP tokens in nominal clauses occur after *decir*; no other single verb comes close to as many tokens. Not only is it frequent when compared to other matrix verbs occurring before the PP, but when rates of *decir* as a matrix verb with the Pret are compared to those with the PP, it is clear that *decir que* + PP, as exemplified in (11) and (12), is a much more productive construction⁹, occurring over nine times as often as *decir que* + Pret¹⁰. No other matrix verb has such a strong effect in the data, although there appears to be an association between certainty (*creer, saber, es que*) and personal experience (*acordarse, ver*) with the Pret. However, when these tokens are more closely examined, it becomes clear that *acordarse* and *ver* are primarily used in the second person to prompt an interlocutor's memory or witnessing of an event, as in (13) and (14). When the *decir que* + PP tokens are more closely examined, it is clear that the purpose is to report another person's speech; 40/46 tokens have a 3rd person singular subject, two have third person plural subjects, three have a first person singular subject and one is second person singular.

(11) *Decir que* + PP

G: (H) *al Pablo no le he visto nunca más.*

B: hm=,

*el Pablo creo que es uno de los que se ha quedado para atrás,
porque él es guardia un= --
de la Coca Cola,
me parece.*

G: .. (H) *pero --*

viéndole no le reconocería.

B: *guardia en la Coca Cola.*

mhm.

*no se casa todavía=a,
dice la mamá que **ha tenido** una desilusión ... amorosa.*

G: 'I haven't seen Pablo again.

B: hm=,

*Pablo I think is one of the ones that has stayed back,
because he is a security guard a= --
of Coca Cola,
it seems to me.*

G: .. (H) *but --*

seeing him I wouldn't recognize him.

B: *security guard at Coca Cola.*

mhm.

he isn't married yet,

*his mom says that **he has** had a disappointment ... in love.'*

(Hermanos 3275-84)

⁹ *Decir que* was found to occur primarily with the matrix verb in the present tense (*dice(n) que*) or the preterit tense (*dijo/dijeron que*).

¹⁰ *Decir que* + Imp is also infrequent in these data, with only 16 tokens out of 93 tokens of the imperfect in nominal clauses.

(12) *Decir que* + PP

R: .. *llegó borrachazo ayer.*

A: *au,*

me vibro. ((RE: Cell phone vibrating in his pocket))

R: *hasta el Jorge dijo hoy de mañana que ha estado bien borracho.*

R: ‘.. he arrived very drunk yesterday.

A: *ow,*

I’m vibrating.

R: even Jorge said this morning that he was really drunk.’

(Fumar: 517-520)

(13) *Acordarse* + Pret

A: *te acuerdas que me salí por ahí?*

A: ‘do you remember that I went out that way?’

(Fumar:1225)

(14) *Ver* + Pret

R: ... *cómo así va a haber asamblea aquí?*

A: ... *no ves que ya mataron perros.*

R: .. *mataron perros?*

A: *ah ah.*

R: ‘... why is there going to be an assembly here?’

A: ... don’t you see that they already killed dogs.

R: .. they killed dogs?

A: *uh huh.’*

(Fumar:592-596)

These findings substantiate the claim that the PP in Quiteño Spanish is indeed used when reporting information from other sources, as described by Bustamante (1991). They also show that if indeed evidentiality is being grammaticalized in the PP in Andean Spanish, it is not a uniform grammaticalization across the different countries, as the reportative is attributed to the Pluperfect in Peruvian and Bolivian Spanish. Also contrary to what Escobar (1997) and Klee and Ocampo (1995) have found for bilingual speakers in Peru, there is no evidence to indicate that the PP is used for events that were directly experienced; if this were the case, it would pattern with verbs such as *acordarse* and *ver*, which were found more often with the Pret.

Table 2 also shows that there is an effect for lexical aspect; in Quiteño Spanish, states favor the PP, while all the dynamic verbs favor the Pret. It is not the favoring of the stative verbs that is noteworthy, rather it is the disfavoring of activity verbs that is contrary to expectations, given the patterns in Mexican and Peninsular Spanish. Schwenter and Torres Cacoullós (2008:14-15) equate lexical aspect restrictions with earlier stages of grammaticalization, and these results for Quiteño Spanish indicate that lexical aspect restrictions are significant in Quiteño Spanish, albeit in a different manner than in Mexican Spanish. Hernández (2004:87) found a high proportion of stative verbs with the Perfect of Persistent Situation in Salvadoran Spanish, which is correlated with the second stage of grammaticalization; again indicating an early stage of grammaticalization for the Quiteño PP.

When co-occurrence with temporal adverbs is taken into account, as Table 4 shows, marked differences between the PP and the Pret are observed. The overall rate of co-occurrence with a temporal adverb in the data is 77%, similar to what has been observed in Mexican and Peninsular data (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008) with the Pret more likely than the PP to occur with a temporal adverb (24% vs. 17% of PP). As expected, the Pret is more likely to occur with specific temporal reference adverbs (Fisher’s exact test $p < 0.0001$), and the PP is found more often with durative/iterative adverbs than the Pret (Fisher’s exact test $p < 0.0001$). These findings suggest an emerging continuative function, which belongs to the second stage of grammaticalization.

Table 4: Co-occurrence with adverbs

		PP		Pret
Proximate deictic	<1%	3	3%	47
Durative/Iterative	4%	22	1%	25
Specific temporal reference	3%	13	12%	206
<i>ya</i>	10%	48	8%	147
No adverb	83%	413	76%	1335
Total	100%	499	100%	1760

Lastly, no effect was found for the presence/absence of *ya*, further indicating that grammaticalization of the PP has not yet reached the degree of perfectivity that it has in Peninsular Spanish.

7. Summary

The goals of this paper were to situate the grammaticalization of the Quiteño PP in relation to that of other varieties of Spanish, and to quantitatively test claims that the PP in this variety has acquired evidential meaning. With respect to the first goal, there is no evidence that the PP is advancing towards a perfective in Quiteño Spanish. This was measured in three ways here: the presence of Aktionsart constraints, which are associated with earlier stages of grammaticalization, the co-occurrence patterns with temporal adverbs also indicating an early stage of grammaticalization, and the lack of a *ya* + PP construction. There is no evidence that the PP in Quiteño Spanish has acquired any of the functions associated with later stages of grammaticalization. The elevated frequency of the PP in Quiteño Spanish, as compared to Mexican and Argentinian Spanish, does not appear to be correlated to an increase in perfective functions, as seems to be the case in Salvadoran Spanish. It may, however, stem from additional pragmatic uses, such as evidentiality and mirativity.

It is clear that one of these specialized uses of the PP is as part of a construction used to signal reported information, as evidenced in the unexpectedly high rates of occurrence after *decir que*. The co-occurrence of these two markers may represent a layering of meaning (Hopper 1991), which is often seen in grammaticalization. What is not clear at this point, however, is that this use is a transfer from Quichua. From studies of languages in contact and language change, we know that it is often impossible to identify the impetus or source of a change, and that often there are multiple factors contributing to a change (cf. Klee & Lynch 2009). In addition, as Comrie (1976) and Bybee et al. (1994) have observed cross-linguistically, evidential readings are compatible with the perfect.

This is an important, yet preliminary, step toward a better understanding of the PP in an Andean variety of Spanish. Future studies should continue to integrate measures of temporal and aspectual grammaticalization alongside operationalizable methods for identifying pragmatic uses of the PP, such as evidentiality and mirativity. More cross-dialectal research using the similar methodology on comparable data sets would be especially useful in documenting the uses of the PP in Andean varieties Spanish.

References

- Adelaar, Willem F. H. 2013. A Quechuan mirative? In Alexandra Aikhenvald & Anne Storch (eds.), *Perception and Cognition in Language and Culture*, 99-105. Leiden: Brill.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2006. Evidentiality in grammar in Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2nd edition*, 320-325 Elsevier: Oxford.
- Alarcos Llorach, Emilio. 1947. Perfecto simple y compuesto en español. *Revista de Filología Española* 31. 108-139.
- Bustamante, Isabel. 1991. El presente perfecto o pretérito perfecto compuesto en el español quiteño. *Lexis* 15. 195-231.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: The grammaticalization of tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Caravedo, Rocío. 1989. *El español de Lima Materiales para el estudio del habla culta*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Copple, Mary T. 2009. *A diachronic study of the Spanish perfect(ive): Frequency of use and language change*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico dissertation.
- Copple, Mary T. 2011. Tracking the constraints on a grammaticalizing perfect(ive). *Language Variation and Change* 23(2). 163-191.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 33-52.
- Dumont, Jenny. 2011. *NPs in conversations and narratives: The effects of genre, information flow and interaction*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico dissertation.
- Escobar, Anna María. 1997. Contrastive and innovative uses of the present perfect and the preterite in Spanish in contact with Quechua. *Hispania* 80. 859-870.
- Gili Gaya, Samuel. 1972. El pretérito de negación implícita. *Studia Hispanica in honorem R. Lapesa, Vol. I*. 251-256. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Granda, Germán de. 2002. La modalidad verbal epistémica en el español andino de Argentina. In Germán de Granda (ed.), *Lingüística de contacto: español y quechua en el área sudamericana*. 103-121. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Haboud, Marleen. 1998. *Quichua y castellano en los andes ecuatorianos: Los efectos de un contacto prolongado*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Harris, Martin. 1982. The 'past simple' and 'present perfect' in Romance. In Martin Harris & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Studies in the Romance verb*. 42-70. London: Croom Helm.
- Hernández, José Esteban. 2004. *Present perfect variation and grammaticization in Salvadoran Spanish*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico dissertation.
- Hernández, José Esteban. 2008. Present Perfect semantics and usage in Salvadoran Spanish. *Revista internacional de lingüística iberoamericana*. 12(2). 115-137.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In Elizabeth Traugott and Bernard Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Vol. I*. 17-36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Howe, Chad. 2013. *The Spanish perfects: Pathways of emergent meaning*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Howe, Chad & Scott Schwenter. 2003. Present perfect for preterite across Spanish dialects. In Tara Sánchez & Uri Horesh (eds.), *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics: Selected Papers from NWAV-31*, 9(2). 61-76.
- Hurley, Joni Kay. 1995. The impact of Quichua verb forms used in Spanish requests in Otavalo, Ecuador. In Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*, 39-51. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Jara Yupanqui, Margarita. 2006. *The use of the preterite and the present perfect in the Spanish of Lima*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh dissertation.
- Klee, Carol & Alicia Ocampo. 1995. The expression of past reference in Spanish-Quechua Bilingual Speakers. In Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*, 52-70. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Klee, Carol & Andrew Lynch. 2009. *El español en contacto con otras lenguas*. Georgetown University Press.
- Mendoza, José. 1991. Aproximación al castellano paceño. In Carol Klee, & Luis Ramos-García (eds.), *Spanish-speaking world: Iberia, Latin-America, United States*, 207-229. Arizona: Bilingual/Bilingüe.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1985. Contactos entre quichua y castellano en Ecuador. In Segundo E. Yáñez (ed.) *Memorias del primer simposio europeo sobre antropología del Ecuador*, 377-452. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Olbertz, Hella. 2008. Dar + gerund in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish: Contact-induced grammaticalization? *Spanish in Context* 5(1). 89-109.
- Olbertz, Hella. 2009. Mirativity and exclamatives in functional discourse grammar: Evidence from Spanish. In Evelien Keizer & Gerry Wanders (eds.), *The London papers I Vol. 82. Web Papers in Functional Discourse Grammar*, 66-82. Amsterdam: Functional Grammar Foundation.
- Rodríguez Louro, Celeste. 2009. *Perfect evolution and change: A sociolinguistic study of Preterit and Present Perfect usage in contemporary and earlier Argentina*. Melbourne, Australia: University of Melbourne dissertation.
- Rodríguez Louro, Celeste & Chad Howe. 2010. Perfect potential: Semantic change in narrative contexts across Spanish. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*. 8(2). 157-176.
- Rodríguez Louro, Celeste & Margarita Jara Yupanqui. 2011. Otra mirada a los procesos de gramaticalización del Presente Perfecto en español: Perú y Argentina. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 4(1). 55-80.
- Rojas-Sosa, Deyanira. 2008. The Use of Past Tenses in the Spanish of Lima: Variation in a Situation of Contact. In Joyce Bruhn de Garavito & Elena Valenzuela (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 10th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 265-275. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Schwenter, Scott. 1994. 'Hot news' and the grammaticalization of perfects. *Linguistics* 32:995-1028.

- Schwenter, Scott & Rena Torres Cacoulllos. 2008. Defaults and indeterminacy in temporal grammaticalization: The 'perfect' road to perfective. *Language Variation and Change* 20(1). 1-39.
- Serrano, María José. 1994. Del pretérito indefinido al pretérito perfecto: Un caso de cambio y gramaticalización en el español de Canarias y Madrid. *Lingüística española actual* 16. 37-57.
- Serrano, María José. 1996. Sobre el uso del pretérito perfecto y pretérito indefinido en el español de Canarias: Pragmática y variación. *Boletín de Filología* 35. 533-566.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2008. The limits of convergence in language contact. *Journal of Language Contact*, Thema 2. 213-224.
- Squartini, Mario & Pier Marco Bertinetto. 2000. The simple and compound past in Romance languages, in Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 403-439. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stratford, Dale. 1991. Tense in Altiplano Spanish. In Carol Klee, & Luis Ramos-Garcia (eds.), *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking world: Iberia, Latin-America, United States*, 163-181. Arizona: Bilingual/Bilingüe.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. 'Object complements' and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26.1. 125-164.
- Travis, Catherine E. 2006. Dizque: a Colombian evidentiality strategy. *Linguistics* 44:1269-97.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. Verbs and times. In Zeno Vendler (ed.), *Linguistics and philosophy*, 97-121. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Jennifer Cabrelli Amaro,
Gillian Lord, Ana de Prada Pérez,
and Jessi Elana Aaron

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2013

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium
© 2013 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-459-1 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Dumont, Jenny. 2013. Another Look at the Present Perfect in an Andean Variety of Spanish: Grammaticalization and Evidentiality in Quiteño Spanish. In *Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Jennifer Cabrelli Amaro et al., 279-291. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2940.