

# Contact-Induced Language Change in Lima, Peru: The Case of Clitic Pronouns

Carol A. Klee and Rocío Caravedo  
University of Minnesota and University of Pisa-Italy

## 1. Introduction

The city of Lima, Peru was completely transformed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century by the so-called “invasion” of migrants from the provinces. As a result of migration, Lima grew from a city of 645,000 inhabitants in 1940 to 6.5 million residents by the early 1990s. For native Limeños, who conceived of Lima as the seat of the former Spanish viceroyalty and Creole culture, the massive influx of migrants resulted in an “ethnic, social, cultural, and economic” confrontation (Golte and Adams 1987: 19). The majority of migrants came from rural provinces where indigenous languages, primarily Quechua, are spoken. The reaction of many Limeños to the new immigrants was not a positive one; they viewed the newcomers as socially inferior “invaders” who had taken over Lima, implanting poverty and ugliness (Golte and Adams 1987: 19). However, as Golte and Adams point out, in reality a new type of city was created, one in which new forms of production, both economic and cultural, were developed and in which the principal actors were migrants.

Linguistically, the massive migration is especially interesting given the situation of language contact in Peru. In 1940 when the “invasions” began, over half of the population of Peru spoke an indigenous language. However, by the beginning of the 1980's only one-fourth of the population had some proficiency in one of these languages. It has been estimated that by 1989 approximately 60% of those who spoke indigenous languages in Peru also spoke Spanish (Escobar 2000: 30). Thus, there has been fairly rapid language shift in Peru over the past 60 years. As a result, migration from the Andean region has brought Andean Spanish, a variety that has been influenced by Quechua, into direct contact with coastal Limeño Spanish.

Given the fact that the majority of the population of Lima now comprises migrants and their offspring, several Peruvian linguists have described the possible impact of dialect contact on traditional Limeño Spanish. Rivarola (1990: 171), for example, has 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.” Cerrón-Palomino (1995: 176) has characterized this process in even more radical terms: “el castellano andino [...] ante el desborde popular y la recomposición de las urbes, va arrinconando al castellano académico-normativo peruano, en franco proceso de retirada.”

In this chapter we will describe a pilot study conducted in Lima in which we examine some features of the clitic system of Andean migrants, their adult children, and native Limeños to determine whether certain characteristics of Andean Spanish, particularly *leísmo* (i.e., the use of *le(s)* as an accusative), *loísmo* (i.e., the use of *lo(s)* as a dative), and the use of the archmorpheme *lo*, are spreading to Limeño Spanish.

## 2. Characteristics of Andean Spanish

Features of Andean Spanish that distinguish it from the coastal variety spoken in Lima include object/verb word order, lack of number and gender agreement, the use of the archmorpheme *lo* for direct object pronouns, duplication of direct objects, *loísmo* and *leísmo*. Some of these features, such as lack of number and gender agreement, are very common in the interlanguage of Quechua speakers,

but their frequency diminishes in the speech of more proficient Spanish speakers. Other characteristics of Andean Spanish, particularly the use of the archmorpheme *lo* and *leísmo*, occur even in the speech of monolingual Spanish speakers from the Andean region (Caravedo 1999; Klee 1990, 1996; Rivarola 1990; Valdez Salas 2002)

In a study of bilingual and monolingual Spanish speakers in the Peruvian Andes as well as monolingual speakers of Spanish in Cajamarca, where Quechua has not been spoken for well over 100 years, Caravedo (1999) found in a corpus comprising 19 informants that *leísmo* was used by bilingual speakers approximately 15% of the time, and was used by monolingual Spanish speakers in the Andes 30% of the time. In Cajamarca *leísmo* was found in 19% of the occurrences of the direct object clitic. As is apparent in these results, *leísmo* is found even more frequently in the speech of monolingual Spanish speakers in these two areas than in the speech of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals. Caravedo also found that *loísmo* is used by both monolingual and bilingual speakers but the total occurrence of *loísmo* in her study was less than 6%.

In a recent study of the Andean Spanish spoken in Cajamarca, Valdez Salas (2002) also found a trend toward *leísmo* (i.e. in 15% of her sample) primarily in speakers under age forty who were from urban areas. She discovered that individuals with secondary education were more inclined to use *leísmo* than those with only primary education and interprets this as a move toward *leísmo* as the prestigious norm. She notes that because gender and number pose difficulties for speakers of Andean Spanish, the use of *le* for the direct object may provide a way for speakers to avoid this problem.<sup>1</sup> Her finding that feminine *leísmo* occurs to a much higher degree than in Madrid lends support to this hypothesis.<sup>2</sup> Godenzzi (1991) also found evidence of *leísmo* in Puneño Spanish, but attributes it to speakers originally from Puno with no distinction according to social class or level of education.

In his analysis of so-called *leísmo* in contemporary Spanish American educated speech, DeMello (2002) argues that *leísmo* does not form part of the syntax of non-contact Spanish American Spanish, including that of Lima. While this may be true of “traditional” Limeño Spanish, *leísmo* has been noted in the speech of migrants to Lima (cf. Paredes 1996). Paredes (1996) analyzed the clitic systems used by Quechua-speakers of varying proficiency levels in Spanish who resided in Lima, and found that the tendency to use *le* to mark a direct object was fairly comparable among the four proficiency groups that she examined: 16% for the high proficiency group; 13% for the middle proficiency group; 18% for the low proficient group and 15% for the very low proficiency group. She interpreted this as indicating a tendency toward *leísmo* which, she states, “seems to be accepted by all groups” (p. 136). She also notes that the preference of *le* to mark direct objects is associated with the animacy of the object referent.

A number of studies have examined the use of the archmorpheme *lo* to mark the third person direct object (i.e., neutralization of number and gender). Klee (1990, 1996), for example, examined the clitic pronoun system of speakers in Calca, Peru, a district capital near Cuzco. She found that the use of the archmorpheme *lo* occurred in all social groups, even in the speech of the regional elite. The plural direct object pronoun *los* was found in less than 50% of the expected occurrences even in the speech of professionals. The pronouns *la* and *las* occurred only slightly more than 10% of the time and were generally replaced with the pronouns *lo* and sometimes *los* ( $126/238 = 53\%$ ). Other scholars (Cerrón-Palomino 2003, A. Escobar 1978; A.M. Escobar 1988, 2000; Godenzzi 1991, Lozano 1975, Pozzi-Escot 1973) have also described this phenomenon in Andean Spanish.

Caravedo (1996) has hypothesized that some non-stigmatized features of Andean Spanish have begun to transfer to Limeño Spanish as a result of symmetrical relationships between speakers of Andean Spanish and coastal Spanish speakers who are at the lower levels of the social spectrum. From there, the features may extend to other social levels. Other features of Andean Spanish, particularly stigmatized ones such as assibilated /r/, are likely to be replaced in the speech of migrants with variants that are found in coastal Spanish or with variants that are more acceptable to speakers of Limeño Spanish (cf. Paredes 1992).

### 3. Methodology

To test these hypotheses, we conducted 108 sociolinguistic interviews in Lima in 1999-2000 with the help of several fieldworkers.<sup>3</sup> The interviews were conducted in several shanty towns inhabited by

Andean migrants, and participants included both first generation migrants as well as adults who had been born in Lima but whose parents had migrated from the Andean region. In addition, we conducted interviews in poor, but “traditional” (i.e., non-migrant) neighborhoods in Lima. The individuals in those neighborhoods and their parents were born in Lima and the consultants had resided there all their lives.

We have analyzed a subset of data representing the speech of 15 speakers, including speakers of Andean Spanish as well as native Limeños. (See Table 1 for a description of their characteristics.) The analysis centered on phonological and morphological features that are characteristic of the Andean variety of Spanish and represent the most fundamental differences between the Andean and Limeño dialects. The linguistic variables were quantified and, when appropriate, Varbrul analyses were conducted to determine in what linguistic environments features of Andean Spanish are maintained and to identify correlations between linguistic variables and social variables. As mentioned earlier, the analysis described here focuses on certain characteristics of the clitic pronoun systems used by migrants and the children of migrants, as well as by the native Limeños in our sample.

Table 1. Characteristics of Speakers for Pilot Study

Speaker	Generation in Lima	Family Background	Neighborhood	Sex	1 <sup>st</sup> Ing	Education	Occupation
3AG	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Some primary	Retired
4GT	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Primary	Retired market vendor
8FT	2	Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Secondary	Military
9FA	1	Andean	Shantytown	F	Quechua	Some primary	Unemployed
10JG	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Some primary	Building caretaker
11BI	1	Andean	Shantytown	F	Quechua	Primary	Unemployed
12BM	1	Andean	Shantytown	M	Quechua	Some primary	Unemployed
13CC	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some secondary	Unemployed
14EF	2	Andean	Shantytown	M	Spanish	Some secondary	Unemployed
15JF	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Secondary	Unemployed
16LS	2	Andean	Shantytown	F	Spanish	Some college	Factory worker
17MC	Non-migrant	NonAndean	Established Neighborhood	F	Spanish	Some college	Nurses' assistant
18JN	Non-migrant	NonAndean	Established neighborhood	F	Spanish	Secondary	Unemployed
19JE	Non-migrant	NonAndean	Established neighborhood	M	Spanish	Secondary	Unemployed
20JT	Non-migrant	NonAndean	Established neighborhood	M	Spanish	Secondary	Security guard

## 4. Analysis

### 4.1 *Leísmo*

In our pilot study the overall rate of *leísmo* was 15% (i.e. 104 tokens of *leísmo* out of a total of 693), which corresponds with Paredes's (1996) findings. However, her data was exclusively from Quechua-Spanish bilinguals. While our first-generation speakers were all Quechua-Spanish bilinguals, our study also included second-generation speakers, none of whom spoke Quechua, as well as monolingual speakers of coastal Spanish. Although the overall rate of *leísmo* was 15%, individual speakers show large differences as shown in Table 2 below.<sup>4</sup> The analysis showed that most favorable to non-standard object pronouns were speakers 11, 16, 15, 4, and 9 (in that order). First generation

migrants tend to have higher rates of non-standard variants, although many second generation migrants, such as speakers 15 and 16, but also speakers 13 and 14 have relatively high rates of non-standard usage. The native Limeños tend to use non-standard variants rarely, ranging from 3% to 7%.

Table 2. Leísmo

Speaker	No. of cases	%
<b>MIGRANTS</b>		
3AG	6/40	15%
4GT	5/25	20%
9FA	6/31	19%
10JG	3/22	14%
11BI	17/44	39%
12BM	4/27	15%
Total	41/189	22%
<b>CHILDREN OF MIGRANTS</b>		
8FT	0/44	0%
13CC	9/75	12%
14EF	5/30	18%
15JF	16/57	28%
16LS	24/62	39%
Total	54/268	20%
<b>LIMEÑOS</b>		
17MC	3/78	4%
18JN	2/72	3%
19JE	1/15	7%
20JT	3/71	4%
Total	9/236	4%
<b>Total for all speakers</b>	104/693	15%

Clitic choice for the third person object can be conditioned by features of the object referent (e.g. information status, definiteness of the NP referent, animacy, specificity of the object referent) and the interaction of pragmatic strategies (cf: García and Otheguy 1977, 1983; Klein 2000). We will examine these aspects as our analysis continues; however, for now we focus on the use of *leísmo* with [+human], [+animate, -human], and [-animate] direct objects.

*Leísmo* occurs primarily when the direct object is a human male, as can be seen in Table 3 and in examples (1) – (6) below.

Table 3. Leísmo and Animacy

	Human		Animate [-Human]		Inanimate		Inanimate w/ llamar	Total leísmo with inanimate
	M	F	M	F	M	F		
<b>Migrants</b>	24/41 (59%)	8/41 (20%)	0/41 (0%)	0/41 (0%)	3/41 (7%)	1/41 (2%)	5/41 (12%)	9/41 (22%)
<b>Children of Migrants</b>	41/54 (76%)	7/54 (13%)	0/54 (0%)	0/54 (0%)	1/54 (2%)	1/54 (2%)	4/54 (7%)	6/54 (11%)
<b>Limeños</b>	7/9 (78%)	2/9 (22%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)

### Migrants

(1) yo le dije a la hi, señora, a su hija le dije que me había encontrado con una prima y me dijo, ah, que bueno, así puedes salir, pa' que no te estés aburriéndote me dijo, dile que venga, quiero hablar con ella me dijo, **le llevé**, uy la mamá se privó dijo qué tiene que ver, acá no hay familia [...] (9FA: 7)

(2) como es el único mi nietecito que tengo, ya pues, **le quiero** bastante. (11BI: 10)

### Children of Migrants

(3) Por ejemplo, mi mamá se enteró que él tenía otra y **le agarró** y le ... dijo pues ¿cómo es posible? (13CC: 1)

(4) a veces cuando hay cumpleaños de cada chica le sa, **le sacan a almorzar** (16LS: 5)

### Limeños

(5) incluso la mujercita también, que se enamoró, también me dijo y, pero no, no más allá que **la, le he limitado**, ¿no? (17MC: 6)

(6) Ya hay problemas, que quiere sacarlo [al hijo del colegio], mucho problema, mucho problema, y en realidad yo estaba ahí ahí luchando, pero así, él lo quiere sacar que lo saque, yo dije ya, espera Julio, que no falta nada, faltan dos meses, espera Julio, **sácale** y ponlo donde tu quieres. (18JN: 7).

In examples (5) and (6) which come from Limeños there is vacillation. The speaker in example (5) first provides the correct form of the pronoun, which refers to her daughter, but immediately changes to *le*. In example (6) the speaker begins by explaining that her husband wants to take her son out of his school, using the expected form *lo*: “*que quiere sacarlo*” but later when quoting herself, she uses the form “*sácale*.” This vacillation was not found in the speech samples of migrants and their children.

As can be seen in Table 3, native Limeños in this sample only used *leísmo* with human direct objects, never with inanimate objects. However, both migrants and their children use *le* on occasion with inanimate direct objects, as in examples (7) – (10).

### Migrants

(7) ella estaba estudiando, estaba estudiando administración, pero, de ahí conoció, ya pues, **le dejó el estudio**<sup>5</sup> y ahí vino el hijo, ya pues, se quedó en nada (11BI: 8)

(8) Porque nuestra idioma [xxx] allá es pues la madre del idioma. Ah .. claro, posiblemente los de acá en Lima también podemos decir, pero también tiene sus fallos, ¿no? Bah... no sé cómo **le llaman eso..** (12BM: 13)

### Children of Migrants

(9) antes nosotros a veces nos íbamos de paseo **a un sitio que le llamábamos la Grama** (15JF: 5)

(10) Pero cuando te dicen en quechua, ay como yo no ... los que **le entienden**, se amarran y lo regresan ... pero yo que no lo entiendo, estoy tranquila, ahí bailando. (13CC: 13)

The children of migrants use *leísmo* to a lesser degree with inanimate direct objects than the migrants themselves (11% vs. 22% respectively). Both groups frequently use *le* with the verb *llamar*, as in examples (8) and (9). There is only one example of *llamar* used in this context with a direct object pronoun, which lacks gender agreement: “Porque ya **uno lo llama casa**, casa cuando es una casa ya totalmente construido” (BM, pg. 8). The use of *le* instead of a direct object pronoun appears to be

generalized among the migrants and children of migrants when the verb *llamar* is conjugated and used transitively with the meaning “to name.”

The children of migrants in this study maintain *leísmo* at rate equivalent to their parents (20% vs. 22% respectively). They use *leísmo* primarily when referring to male human direct objects at a rate similar to that of Limeños (76% vs. 78% respectively). Unlike Limeños, they sometimes use *leísmo* with inanimate direct objects, but the rate at which they do so is less than that of the first-generation migrants (11% vs. 22%). The Limeños in the pilot study never used *leísmo* in this context. In addition, the occurrence of *leísmo* among Limeños is very limited (i.e. 4% of the sample). *Leísmo* seems to be one feature of Andean Spanish that is brought to Lima by migrants and is being passed on to their children.

#### 4.2 *Loísmo*

Because *loísmo* is an important characteristic of the clitic system of Andean Spanish, we analyzed this phenomenon in our sample. As seen in Table 4, there is very little *loísmo*, even in the speech of

Table 4. *Loísmo*

Speaker	No. of cases	%
<b>MIGRANTS</b>		
3AG	0/56	0%
4GT	0/11	0%
9FA	2/69	3%
10JG	1/13	8%
11BI	1/21	5%
12BM	0/4	0%
Total	4/174	2%
<b>CHILDREN OF MIGRANTS</b>		
8FT	0/17	0%
13CC	0/60	0%
14EF	0/22	0%
15JF	0/73	0%
16LS	0/66	0%
Total	0/238	0%
<b>LIMEÑOS</b>		
17MC	0/33	0%
18JN	0/27	0%
19JE	1/34	3%
20JT	0/99	0%
Total	1/193	1%

first generation migrants. It occurs in the speech of only three of the migrants and even in their speech its frequency is quite low, between 3% and 8%. No examples of *loísmo* were found in the speech of children of migrants and only one token was found in the speech of Limeños, as is seen in example (11).

(11) por el papá pues, yo (quiero) que su papá lo escuche, **lo grita** lo, (...) sea rebelde, así como, (mm), gritan (a mí) en su casa, también gritará allá, y que no hará allá, pero yo no pensé que estaba tan bajo en conducta, (18JN: 13)

Because *loísmo* occurs so infrequently in the speech of the migrants in this sample, it is not a phenomenon that is transmitted to the next generation. It also occurs very rarely in the speech of traditional Limeños.

#### 4.3 The Use of the Archmorpheme *lo*

In areas where Andean Spanish is spoken the use of the archmorpheme *lo* in place of the direct object pronouns *la*, *las*, and *los* is frequent. For this reason, we examined its use among the participants in the pilot study. As can be seen in Table 5, the migrants tend to use singular *lo* in plural contexts. In addition, they use the pronoun *lo*, and sometimes *los*, for feminine direct object pronouns the vast majority of the time. The children of migrants also neutralize number and gender distinctions, but do so to a lesser degree than first generation migrants. In our sample, the rate of neutralization of the plural by children of migrants was 57% compared to 64% by first generation migrants. This compares to a rate of 22% by Limeños.

Table 5. Archmorpheme *lo*

Speaker	No. of cases of <i>lo</i> for plural	%	No. of cases of <i>lo(s)</i> for feminine	%
<b>MIGRANTS</b>				
3AG	1/3	33%	6/7	86%
4GT	2/2	100%	5/5	100%
9FA	3/6	50%	5/5	100%
10JG	6/7	86%	4/6	67%
11BI	5/8	62%	5/6	83%
12BM	1/2	50%	6/12	50%
Total	18/28	64%	31/41	76%
<b>CHILDREN OF MIGRANTS</b>				
8FT	9/17	53%	0/3	0%
13CC	1/4	25%	3/14	21%
14EF	3/4	75%	2/4	50%
15JF	0/0	-%	5/24	21%
16LS	3/3	100%	1/8	12%
Total	16/28	57%	11/53	21%
<b>LIMEÑOS</b>				
17MC	2/9	22%	0/26	0%
18JN	1/3	33%	0/8	0%
19JE	1/2	50%	1/6	17%
20JT	0/4	0%	0/23	0%
Total	4/18	22%	1/63	2%

In regards to the neutralization of feminine direct object pronouns, the migrants rate is quite high at 76%. They tend to have a partial clitic system (as defined by García and Otheguy 1983); that is, one that includes case but not gender, as in examples (12) and (13):

(12) [...] no solamente acá en todas partes hay, las malcriadeces de los muchachos, **lo pintan la calle, lo ponen la piedra** pa' jugar<sup>6</sup> (3AG: 33)

(13) [hablando de su esposa] Sí, claro, que **lo ayudaba yo** todo, porque, desde que se operó de la cadera, cuando se operó de la cadera estaba como dos años en cama, y **yo lo atendía a su, su gente**, de-pués de ahí (4GT: 28)

The children of migrants have more complex clitic systems, which seem to be a combination of first-generation migrants' partial system and the Limeños full system in which there are clear distinctions between case, number, and gender. Some speakers, such as 16LS or 8FT, have systems that approximate that of Limeños. The following are examples from speaker 16LS who has the highest incidence of *leísmo* among second-generation speakers:

(14) desde acá estoy ya estoy un año y ya **las veo pues a mis amigas** (16LS: 8)

(15) siempre constantemente **voy a verlas a mis primas**<sup>7</sup> (16LS: 14)

Other children of migrants seem to vacillate between the first-generation migrants' partial system and the Limeños' full clitic system, as in examples (16) and (17) from speaker 13CC below:

(16) mi suegro también ... se buscó otra y se fue a vivir con otra. Mi suegra se murió y ahí mismo se casó él con otra. [...] Entonces ya **la casa lo dejó**. Entonces, como no estaba tan construida, así era de ... medio construir, entonces **lo repartió** pa' sus cinco hijos. (13CC: 10)

(17) mi padrastro dijo que mejor mi mamá se fuera a vivir, esto en Viñedo, por Surco; él **se la llevó** ahí ... y **la casa de mi mamá que está en Villa María, la dejó** ... (13CC: 3)

Whether this hybrid system will be passed on to future generations or whether future generations adopt the system used by Limeños remains to be seen.

## 5. Conclusions

Overall, our study confirms previous research on *leísmo* as a variable that occurs in Andean Spanish and is brought to Lima by migrants from the sierra. Unlike other phenomena such as vocalic alternations or assimilated /r/, *leísmo* appears to be a variable that is not overtly stigmatized, and, as such, is passed along to many second generation migrants. The native Limeños in the pilot study do not use *leísmo* to the same degree as migrants and their children. However, the fact that *leísmo* occurs in Limeño Spanish in some formal styles with certain verbs, such as *considerar* and *saludar*, may contribute to the expansion of Andean *leísmo* among Limeños, perhaps in certain contexts and with certain types of referents. This is an area that warrants further investigation.

Surprisingly, as it has commonly been considered one of the main characteristics of Andean Spanish, *loísmo* is found very infrequently in our sample, even among first-generation migrants, and is not used by the children of migrants. It clearly will not affect traditional Limeño Spanish.

First-generation migrants tend to maintain the archmorpheme *lo*, neutralizing gender and number differences in the direct object pronoun. Their clitic system can be defined as a partial system based on case alone, while the Limeños have a full clitic system, which includes both case and gender. The children of migrants tend to have hybrid clitic systems, which include elements of both. Whether the hybrid system will be transmitted to future generations remains to be seen.

The results of this pilot study need to be interpreted with some caution given the small number of speakers and the overlap of some of the variables (e.g., first generation migrants tend to have only primary education). Future studies will incorporate a larger number of speakers in each of these neighborhoods and will attempt to identify the social networks of each of the speakers to explain the wide variance in the use of these variables. We are also aware that clitic choice for the third person object can be conditioned by features of the object referent (e.g. information status, definiteness of the NP referent, animacy, specificity of the object referent) and the interaction of pragmatic strategies (cf: García and Otheguy 1977, 1983; Klein 2000) and plan to examine these aspects as our analysis continues.



In spite of the limitations of the pilot study, it is clear that Lima has been transformed as a result of the migration from the provinces. In the same way that the migrants hybrid culture is expressed through music (e.g., *música chicha* and *rock-chicha*) as well as through street and independent theater and other artistic forms, their language and, to a lesser degree, that of native Limeños is also changing.

## Notes

1. Paredes (1996:30) also notes that “the use of the Quechua case marker –TA to indicate dative, accusative, goal and locative arguments may help to overgeneralize a functionally equivalent form in Spanish.”
2. *Le* was used as a direct object pronoun in 25.26% of the cases in Madrid (Quilis et al 1985), but of this 25.26%, less than 2% is used in the feminine.
3. The 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.
4. Due to large differences between individual speakers, a Varbrul analysis that included extralinguistic variables could not be conducted.
5. *Le* is a reduplicated direct object pronoun which refers to *el estudio*.
6. *Lo* in this context is a reduplicated direct object pronoun which refers first to *la calle* and then to *la piedra*.
7. This speaker also exhibits one case of fluctuation: (pg. 13): LS: ...las chicas no, no las veo, no las veo a las chicas. [N: La señora, la ingeniera?] LS: No tampoco no, no no da, no no lo veo.

## References

- Caravedo, Rocío. 1996. Variedades en contacto: propuestas para una investigación del español del Perú. *Signo y Seña* (Buenos Aires) 6. 493-511.
- . 1999. *Lingüística del corpus: cuestiones teórico-metodológicas aplicadas al español*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1995. Guamán Poma redivivo o el castellano rural andino. *Lenguas en contacto en Hispanoamérica*, ed. by Klaus, Zimmerman, 161-92. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert).
- . 2003. *Castellano andino: aspectos sociolingüísticos, pedagógicos y gramaticales*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- DeMello, George. 2002. Leísmo in contemporary Spanish American educated speech. *Linguistics* 40.261–283
- Escobar, Alberto. 1978. *Variaciones sociolingüísticas del castellano en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Escobar, Ana María. 1988. *Hacia una tipología del bilingüismo en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- . 2000. *Contacto social y lingüístico: el español en contacto con el quechua en el Perú*. Lima, Perú: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- García, Erica and Ricardo Otheguy. 1977. Dialect variation in leísmo: a semantic approach. *Studies on Language Variation*, ed. by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy, 65-87. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- . 1983. Being polite in Ecuador: Strategy reversal under language contact. *Lingua* 61. 103-132.
- Godenzzi, Juan Carlos. 1991. Variantes sociolectales de español en el espacio andino de Puno, Peru. *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-speaking world: Iberia, Latin America, the United States*, ed. by Carol A. Klee and Luis A. Ramos-García, 182-206. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press.
- Golte, Jürgen and Norma Adams. 1987. Los caballos de Troya de los invasores: estrategias campesinas en la conquista de la Gran Lima. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Klee, Carol A. 1989. The acquisition of clitic pronouns in the Spanish interlanguage of Quechua speakers: A contrastive case study. *Hispania* 72.402-408.
- . 1990. Spanish-Quechua language contact: The clitic pronoun system in Andean Spanish. *Word* 41.35-46.
- . 1996. The Spanish of the Peruvian Andes: The influence of Quechua on Spanish language structure. *Spanish in contact: Studies in bilingualism*, ed. by John B. Jensen and Ana Roca, 73-91. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Klein-Andreu, Flora. 2000. *Variación actual y evolución histórica: los clíticos le/s, la/s, lo/s*. Muenchen: LINCOM EUROPA 2000.
- 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, Perú: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Paredes, Liliana. 1992. Assibilation of /r/ in the Andino-Spanish variety in Lima. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Spanish in Contact with Other Languages, University of Minnesota.

- . 1996. The Spanish continuum in Peruvian bilingual speakers: A study of verbal clitics (Quechua). Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California dissertation.
- 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.
- Quilis, Antonio, Margarita Cantarero, María José Albalá and Rafael Guerra. 1985. *Los pronombres le, la, lo y sus plurales en la lengua española hablada en Madrid*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Rivarola, José Luis. 1990. *La formación lingüística de Hispanoamérica*. Lima: Pontífica Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Valdez Salas, María Luz. 2002. Clitics in the speech of monolingual Andean Spanish speakers. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh dissertation

# Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by David Eddington

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2005

## Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium  
© 2005 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-57473-403-2 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](http://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, e-mail: [sales@cascadilla.com](mailto:sales@cascadilla.com)

## Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at [www.lingref.com](http://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:

Klee, Carol A. and Rocío Caravedo. 2005. Contact-Induced Language Change in Lima, Peru: The Case of Clitic Pronouns. In *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. David Eddington, 12-21. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Klee, Carol A. and Rocío Caravedo. 2005. Contact-Induced Language Change in Lima, Peru: The Case of Clitic Pronouns. In *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. David Eddington, 12-21. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #1082.