Yesterday, All My Troubles Have Seemed (PP) So Far Away: Variation in Pre-hodiernal Perfective Expression in Peninsular Spanish

Bonnie C. Holmes and Colleen Balukas
The Pennsylvania State University

1. The Interrelationship between the Present Perfect and the Preterit

In his work on perfective variation, 'The 'Past Simple' and the 'Present Perfect' in Romance', Martin Harris observes that no single topic within historical Romance linguistics has elicited more interest than the "constantly changing interrelationship" between the two indicative past tense paradigms, the 'past simple' and the 'present perfect' (1982:42). Harris (1982) concludes that verb forms that generally mark the present results of past actions (or that mark the present relevance of past events) are prone to grammaticalization as 'present perfects' (61). Alternately, he argues, verb forms that mark perfective aspects are "particularly prone to become primarily temporal in value" (61).

Interest in these two past tense variants has not been confined to the field of historical linguistics, and more recent variationist studies have documented a continuing shift in the relationship between the two. Specifically, it has been well-documented in the literature that the use of the Present Perfect (henceforth, PP) in Peninsular (Spain) Spanish has shifted to perfective contexts that are generally attributed to the Preterit (the 'past simple', as referred to by Harris; cf. Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2008, Schwenter 1994). Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008:2) note that "[t]he Present Perfect in most Peninsular varieties is involved in an active grammaticalization process such that both the Present Perfect … and the Preterit … function as past perfectives (with the exception of areas in Northwestern Spain and the Canary Islands). They illustrate this shift with the following two examples (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2008:2). The Preterit is indicated below as PRET:

1. a. Ayer *he comprado* un aire acondicionado y me da calor (BCON014B)
      'Yesterday I *bought* (PP) an air conditioner and I'm getting heat [from it]'
   b. Estas son prácticamente iguales a las que *compramos* ayer (CCON013C)
      'These are practically the same as the ones we *bought* (PRET) yesterday'

The feature that typically distinguishes the perfect from the perfective is that the former is *relational*, in that it serves to relate the state of affairs of a past event to the current situation (Fleischman 1983:194). Fleischman (1983) defines the PP as a verbal paradigm used to refer to a situation that "began or first occurred at an earlier moment and *is still going on*, or a situation whose reference period satisfies this criterion (e.g. *today, in the past ten years* …) or a *completed past situation regarded as still relevant at the present moment*" (194). Conversely, the perfective (preterit) is used to report an event "for its own sake" (Bybee et. al., 1994:54). Specifically, in the case of the Preterit, the situation described by the verb is "entirely past, is seen as completed rather than in progress at the time in question, and is not represented as being relevant to the speaker's present" (Fleischman 1983:194). Descriptive grammars, such as Ignacio Bosque's *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (Bosque and Demonte, 1999), expound the relational aspect of the PP as well, and in

particular delineates the use of the perfect as those contexts in which the events in question "se refieren a períodos de tiempo no concluidos en el presente" (1999:2903), going on to describe the two time references in detail:

> En cualquier caso, el Pretérito expresa el enfoque más libre y espontáneo para un proceso 'pasado' mientras el Presente Perfecto introduce esa referencia de simultaneidad en tantas ocasiones propiciadas por la situación del proceso en un período de tiempo todavía presente o su puesta en relación directa con alguna situación presente o con las consecuencias actualmente vigentes de dicho proceso. La distinción sistemática entre los contenidos del Presente Perfecto y el Pretérito no funciona actualmente en todos los dialectos del español (Bosque 1999:2903).

In keeping with Bosque and Demonte's final observation, that a distinction between the PP and the Preterit is not currently active in all Spanish dialects, recent research has shown that the PP in most Peninsular varieties of Spanish is in fact experiencing an active process of grammaticalization. In discourse, the PP may in fact function as a past perfective, as in the case of example (1a) above (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos, 2008:2). This distinguishes Peninsular Spanish from other varieties of the language, such as American Spanish, in which use of the PP is said to be more restricted.

For example, while in Mexican varieties the PP is used to refer to certain perfect actions initiated in the past that continue until the time of utterance (Schwenter, 1994:77, Moreno de Alba, 2006:17), in Peninsular Spanish the PP may be used in reference to past perfective (completed) actions that may be viewed as relevant at the time of the utterance (Schwenter, 1994:77). In an utterance such as '*Hoy (llegar) tarde a mi trabajo*' (Today (to arrive) late to work), Mexican speakers would use the Preterit, as the action is fully completed before the time of the utterance '*Hoy llegué tarde a mi trabajo*' (Today I arrived (PRET) late to work). Peninsular speakers, on the other hand, would most likely use the PP '*Hoy he llegado tarde a mi trabajo*' (Today I have arrived (PP) late to work) in order to express an action that, while already completed, is still relevant within the 'ahora' (now).

This opposition between the usage of the PP in Mexican and Peninsular varieties reflects an evolution that has historically occurred in (but which is not exclusive to) the Romance languages, whereby the PP has extended to domains that previously pertained to the Preterit. Schwenter (1994) notes that beginning with Latin, "most Romance PP have gradually invaded the semantic domain which was previously accorded to the older Preterit forms" (77). The figure below represents the 'evolutionary trend' that the PP has followed in Romance varieties.

Figure 1. (Adapted by Schwenter (1994) from Harris 1982; Fleischman 1983)

Stage	PP	Preterit
1. (Sicilian)	Present states resulting from past actions	All past perfectives
2. (Mex. Spanish/Portuguese)	Past situations still ongoing in present	Most past perfectives
3. (Peninsular Spanish, Catalan)	Past situations with current relevance	Past situation without current relevance
4. (French, Northern Italian)	Past situations – all	Formal, written

Schwenter (1994) demonstrates that the current distribution of the PP and the Preterit in Peninsular Spanish follows a strict hodiernal/prehodiernal (today/before today) distinction (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2008:8), where the extension of the PP into previously Preterit domains only occurs when speakers reference events that occurred the same day as the utterance. He posits that this hodiernal restriction is due to Peninsular Spanish being positioned at an intermediate stage in the gradual process of "aoristic drift" towards a later stage in which the temporal distance restrictions between *today* and *before today* are lost. Dahl (1984:105), notes that French followed a similar trajectory and that hodiernal restrictions that characterized the French PP in the 17th century have since been completely lost. As a result, in modern spoken French the PP is used to refer to all past perfective situations regardless of their distance or relevance to the moment of utterance.

Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008) examine in great detail the apparent form-function asymmetry that characterizes the use of the PP and the Preterit in Peninsular Spanish, as well as the factors that influence speakers' choice of one or the other. In Table 1 below, we reproduce the results of their analysis (2008:21), which show that the two factor groups that contribute most significantly to the variation are Temporal Reference and Temporal Adverbial.

Table 1. (from Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2008)
Factors contributing to choice of PP over Preterit in Peninsular Spanish
(non-significant factor groups within brackets)

	Probability		% PP	Total N	% Data
Temporal reference					
Irrelevant	.94		96	142	8
Today	.93		96	287	16
Indeterminate	.23		73	574	32
Yesterday and before	.13		16	780	44
Range:		81			
Temporal adverbial					
Proximate, frequency	.82		91	118	7
None	.51		57	1345	76
Other	.33		27	317	18
Range:		49			
Noun number					
Plural object	.65		68	123	20
Singular object	.46		50	499	80
Range:		19			
Ya					
Present	.65		75	91	5
Absent	.49		53	1684	95
Range:		16			
Clause					
Yes-no question	[.58]		72	78	5
Relative clause	[.56]		59	140	8
All others	[.49]		52	1485	87
Aktionsart					82
Durative	[.51]		54	1438	18
Punctual	[.46]		53	316	

Total $N = 956/1783$, $p=0.036$, Corrected mean $= .61$ (54%)
Log likelihood: -732.474, Chi-square, cell 1.1768

Not selected as significant: clause type, Aktionsart

More specifically, in the Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos study, past tense references for which temporal reference is either irrelevant, occurred the same day as the utterance or whose temporal reference is indeterminate most favored the use of the PP. Additionally, past tense references which

co-occurred in conjunction with a proximate adverbial (e.g. *ahora* 'now' or *últimamente* 'lately') or a frequency adverb (e.g. *cada año* 'every year or *a veces* 'sometimes') also favored the PP, while actions completed in the "Yesterday and Before Range" most strongly disfavored the PP.

Crucially for the present study, the PP accounted for 16% of the tokens that occurred in the "Yesterday and Before Range", despite the fact that it was still disfavored in this context. The mere existence of PP tokens in this context suggests that the hodiernal/pre-hodiernal distinction advocated by Schwenter (1994) is not as complete as previously thought. Although the occurrence of the PP in the "Yesterday and Before Range" is quite reduced when compared its predominance in the Irrelevant, Today and Indeterminate temporal contexts (accounting for 96%, 96%, and 73% of the tokens respectively), the PP's presence in this range nevertheless supports an apparent relaxation in the temporal reference restrictions. The tokens in question also contrast with the tokens extracted from the Mexican Spanish corpus, in which not a single token of the PP in the "Yesterday and before Range" was identified, indicating that the extension of the PP to erstwhile Preterit contexts is specific to the Peninsular variety.

In the current study, we extract our data from the same Peninsular Spanish corpus as utilized by Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008). Restricting ourselves to only those tokens that referred to events occurring "Yesterday or before", we offer here two examples that illustrate this relaxation in temporal reference restriction. In examples (2) and (3) below, it becomes clear that both the PP and the Preterit are compatible with references to perfective events occurring in a "yesterday" range. Meanwhile, example (4) demonstrates the expected hodiernal use of the PP in the Peninsular variety, with the speaker utilizing the PP to refer to an event that occurred earlier the same day, and more specifically earlier in the same conversation.

2. … y ayer lunes, pues como ***he estado*** todo el día en casa y – y …
   '… and yesterday Monday, well since I ***was*** (PP) at home all day and-and …' COREC (165)
3. Es que no saben ustedes que es que ayer se ***cumplió*** un año de que esta señora **fue** madre
   'What you all don't know is that yesterday ***made*** (PRET) one year that that lady **became (PRET)** a mother' COREC(13)
4. Pues este crecimiento en Madrid yo le veo normal, ¿no? Pasa igual que... en cuanto ***hemos hablado*** antes de la moda.
   'Well the growth in Madrid I see as normal, right? The same thing happens … regarding what we ***have talked about*** (PP) before fashion' HABLA CULTA MA-01 (104)

While Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008) show that Irrelevant as well as Today and Indeterminate temporal reference contexts (the latter referring to cases in which the PP is used to refer to perfective, but not temporally specified events) most strongly favor the PP, what has not been examined are those factors that may condition the PP only within the 'Yesterday and Before' range. If use of the PP in Peninsular Spanish is in fact drifting towards stage 4 of the developmental stages of Romance PP and Preterit (as shown in Table 1), we have the unique opportunity to analyze the early stages of this grammatical shift. The purpose of the current study is thus to identify those factors which condition the relative frequency of the two past perfective variants and which favor the extension of the PP into the pre-hodiernal range.

2. Methodology and Data Extraction

The dependent linguistic variable (PP versus the Preterit) was circumscribed within a functional domain, specifically that of "Yesterday and Before Range" temporal reference. Following Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos study (2008), the envelope of variation is delimited broadly as the evolutionary "perfect-to-perfective path" to include instances in which the preterit covers the same uses as the PP (or vice versa), indicating that speakers were able to choose between the two forms. That is, we examine the extension of the PP to those contexts that were formerly entirely dominated by the Preterit, where speakers' may vary in their choice of one or the other as the PP gradually replaces the Preterit.

A total of 619 PP and Preterit tokens were extracted from two corpora, the COREC corpus of Peninsular Spanish (Marcos Martín, 1992) and the Madrileño Spanish data from the *Habla Culta* corpus (Esgueva and Canterero, 1981). Together, the two corpora comprise more than 300,000 words. The first consists of transcriptions of primarily extemporaneous (and often informal) speech, while the latter is made up of a series of interviews conducted in semi-formal speech (hence, *Habla Culta*).

Of those tokens that we extracted, 150 were excluded. We set aside tokens that arose in ambiguous contexts where the content was insufficient to allow for accurate coding, as in the case of false starts (5a) and interruptions (5b). Immediate repetitions of syntactically identical phrases (5c) were also set aside, as was any quoted material (5d). Also excluded were instances of the progressive verb *estar* '(to be)' or the verb *ir* '(to go)' plus a gerund form (5e) per Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008).

5. a. Yo sólo ***tuve***… una vez recuerdo un año que tenía clase a las 9 y media …
'I only ***had***… one time I remember one year I had class at 9:30 …' (COREC 1831)
   b. (Speaker 1): pero nunca ***ha dicho***… (Speaker 2): …es que ahora no hay ninguna así
(S1): 'but he/she ***has*** never ***said***…' (S2): '… It's that now there isn't any one like that' (COREC 687)
   c. A mí sí que me ***gustó***, sí. A mí sí me ***gustó***
'I ***liked*** it, yes. I ***liked*** it' (COREC 384)
   d. porque yo tenía poqusísimos años, pero me llamaba de usted, y eh "***he estado*** en Moscú,"
'because I was really young, but he called me Usted [formal], and uh "I ***have been*** in Moscow"'(COREC 1794)
   e. También ella pues se resiste un poco a vivir en el clasismo que ***han estado*** viviendo antes
'Also she well she resists a little to live in the classism that they ***have been*** living in before'(Habla Culta MA-01, 175)

Tokens which fell outside the variable context and were therefore not extracted included instances in which the temporal reference is essentially non-existent or irrelevant (6a) and (6c) and those tokens which refer to an event that occurred the same day as the utterance (6b) (those which do not have prehodiernal temporal reference). Determining hodiernal/pre-hodiernal context in tokens such as (6b) entailed reading through the transcripts in the corpora to determine temporal reference. In the particular instance of example (6b), the speakers had just entered a café and were discussing the terraza, indicating that the token therefore had hodiernal temporal reference (the event in question occurred just moments before the utterance) and did not fall within our variable context. In order to determine whether or not tokens had "irrelevant" temporal reference, we employ the method utilized by Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008:18); that is, tokens were considered to have "irrelevant" temporal reference if they could not be queried by *¿cuándo?* such as in (6c). "Irrelevant" tokens include those which were modified by the adverbials *siempre* and *nunca*, as something that has "always" or "never" occurred cannot be queried by *¿Cuándo?* (6a). These are largely canonical perfect uses.

6. a. Los hombres siempre ***hemos perdido*** con las mujeres
'Men ***have*** always ***lost*** against women' (COREC 130)
   b. ¿***Has visto*** que terraza, que bonita?
'***Have*** you ***seen*** what a pretty terraza?' (COREC 778)
   c. Los problemas estos de fuera es lo que ***ha repercutido*** en el malestar que tenéis vosotros dentro
'Problems from the outside are what ***have caused*** the unease that you have inside'(COREC 1262)

Following these exclusion protocols, we were left with a total of 469 tokens, 216 of which come from the *Habla Culta* corpus, with the remaining 253 from the COREC corpus. Approximately 27% of all usable tokens (125/469) were PP constructions.

3. Hypotheses and Coding of Tokens

In this section, we discuss the underlying hypotheses and predictions for each of the factor groups for which we coded. The factor groups and coding are based on Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008).

3.1. Determinacy of temporal reference

If the Peninsular PP continues to serve a hodiernal perfective function, then temporal distance should constrain PP/Preterit variation. However, if the PP in Peninsular Spanish is following the same path of grammaticalization as other Romance Languages, (e.g. French), we might expect remoteness distinctions to relax, and a gradual extension of the PP into more remote temporal references to take place (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008:30). Comrie (1976:61) argues that this process has historically been crucial in the extension of the PP:

> Gradual relaxation of the degree of recentness required for the use of the Perfect seems to have been a key part of the development of the Perfect in many Romance languages to oust the Simple Past completely … The development that has taken place [in Romance] can be seen as a gradual reduction of the presentness of the relevant forms, which finally become purely past.

We initially aimed to code for temporal reference in increments (yesterday, within one month, within 6 months, etc.) in order to reveal the gradient nature of this extension. Not all categories in our sample, however, contained a sufficient number of tokens, so token coding was collapsed into two broad categories: specific temporal reference and indeterminate temporal reference.

3.2. Lexical Aspect

For the sake of replicability, we adopted the criteria used by Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008:34 for coding of punctual predicates, in opposition to all other verb types.[1] Aspect was not significant in either our study or the 2008 study, as predicted by the hypothesis that if the PP in Peninsular Spanish has advanced further on the grammaticalization continuum, then punctual predicates should not be as greatly restricted as in other varieties of Spanish. Examples of punctual and non-punctual tokens are illustrated respectively in examples (7a) and (7b) below:

7. a. Bueno, tú *te fuiste* a duchar.
      'Well, you *went* to shower.' (Punctual) (COREC 457)
   b. Pues ahí *he estado* yo mucho
      'Well I *have been* there a lot of times' (Non-punctual) (COREC 494)

As our initial analysis did not show a significant aspectual effect, we recoded the items according to verb type for high frequency verbs in order to determine if the inherent aspect of specific verbs had any impact on Preterit or PP selection. Verbs like '*estar*', '*decir*', '*ir*', and '*irse*', for instance, received their own codes. However, we found that individual verb type was non-significant; that is, no high frequency verb showed a markedly higher or lower rate of the PP than average.

3.3. Priming

To determine whether preceding verbs affected the speakers' choice of the PP or Preterit, we coded for structural priming, taken here to refer to "the process whereby the use of a certain structure

---

[1] Punctual verbs included the following: *acabar* 'finish'; *acordarse* 'remember'; *caer* 'fall'; *coger* 'grab, take'; *conocer* 'meet'; *dar* 'give' (plus object); *darse cuenta* 'realize'; *dejar* 'abandon, give something, or permit'; *empezar (a)* 'begin'; *enterarse* 'find out'; *entrar* 'begin'; *irse* 'leave'; *llegar* 'arrive'; *matar* 'kill'; *meter* 'put'; *nacer* 'be born'; *parar* 'give birth'; *pedir* 'ask for'; *pegar* 'hit'; *perder* 'lose'; *ponerse a* 'start to'; *romper* 'break'; *terminar* 'end'; *ver* 'see.'

in one utterance functions as a prime on a subsequent utterance, such that that same structure is repeated" (Travis 2007:1). We coded for such priming by looking at the verbs in the three clauses preceding each token. A clause was defined as a sentential unit containing a finite verb, and we identified whether tokens were preceded by the Preterit, PP or by neither. In the case that both the Preterit and PP appeared in the three preceding clauses, we coded for the verb that most immediately preceded each token. The four types of contexts found in the data are illustrated by (8) a-d below:

8. a. Es que no ***hemos ido*** mucho a playas. ***<u>Hemos ido</u>*** más a la selva.
   'The thing is we ***haven't gone*** much to the beaches. ***<u>We've gone</u>*** more to the rainforest'(PP preceded by PP) (COREC 781)
   b. (S1) No, lo ***han dejado***. Simón no lo sabía. Ni yo tampoco. (S2) No, a mí me lo ***<u>dijo</u>***
   (S1) 'No, they ***broke up***. Simon didn't know it. Neither did I.' (S2) 'No, he ***<u>told</u>*** me.' (Pret preceded by PP) (COREC 438-   440)
   c. la referencia que me ***dio*** María Teresa es - no lejos de su casa, o sea, no lejos de su casa, que ***<u>(he) venido</u>*** andando
   'the reference that María Teresa ***gave*** me es – not far from here house, not far from here house, I ***<u>have come</u>*** on foot' (PP preceded by Pret) (COREC 1456)
   d. (S1) Bueno, y ese día no las ***encontraste***, claro está. (S2) Sí, sí las ***<u>encontré</u>*** ese mismo día.
   (S1) 'Well, that day you didn't ***find*** them, of course' (S2) 'Yes, yes, I ***<u>found</u>*** them that same day' (Pret preceded by Pret) (COREC 193, 194)

3.4. Clause Type

As noted by Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008), citing Givón (1982), if the function of perfects in narratives is to present background information that is relevant to a situation at a given point, we would expect the PP to be generally favored in relative clauses which include background information (21). We coded tokens as either 'relative clause' or 'other', as initial analysis revealed other distinctions (e.g. main versus subordinate) to be insignificant.

3.5. Temporal Adverbials

In coding for temporal adverbials, we aimed to determine whether different types of adverbials (or their absence) constrain the use of the PP in pre-hodiernal cases. Previous studies (e.g. Dahl, 1985: 137) suggested that if the PP in Peninsular Spanish retains a continuative function, then adverbials indicating that the event is temporally proximate to the moment of utterance, or those that refer to periods of time extending up to the moment of speech (*ahora* 'now', *últimamente* 'lately', and expressions with proximate demonstratives such as *esta semana* 'this week' or *este mes* 'this month') should favor the PP. However, we found so few adverbials in our data (and no significance for any of them) that we collapsed them into a single group to indicate that an adverb was present. This left us with two groups: Present or None.

3.6. Person

Also hypothesized by Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008:19) is that if the PP is more subjective than the Preterit, in that it expresses "meaning based on the speakers' internal belief or attitude", then there may be a higher rate of instances of the PP in first person contexts. Tokens were therefore coded according to whether or not the token corresponded to First, Second, or Third person. The categories were not broken down further into single and plural person. After our initial analysis, second person was excluded from the analysis due to the limited number of tokens.

3.7. Polarity

Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008) cite Squartini & Bertinetto (2000:412) in their discussion of polarity. Particularly, they mention that negative polarity should favor the PP because it is not telic;

in other words, it is said to "atelicize", therefore yielding a continuative meaning (perfect of a persistent situation), which we could reasonably expect to favor the PP. Furthermore, the authors mention other studies in which negative polarity also coincided with irrelevant temporal reference contexts, suggesting that there may be a high proportion of negative sentences which also have irrelevant temporal reference, although these instances are not an issue for this study as tokens of irrelevant temporal reference were not extracted. We ultimately coded all tokens for the presence or absence of negative polarity.

4. Results: Factors Contributing to the Selection of the PP/Preterit

In Table 2 below, we lay out all of the factors as they were analyzed through variable-rule analysis, conducted using the Windows application GoldVarb X (D. Sankoff et al., 2005). We include both those factors that were found to have a significant role in determining the selection of the PP over the Preterit (Previous Verb and Temporal Reference), as well as those that were ultimately found to be non-significant. Any non-significant factors are in the lower section of the table, and their factor weights are surrounded by brackets.

Table 2.   *Factors contributing to the use of PP over Preterit in Madrileño Spanish*
                     (nonsignificant factor groups within brackets)

	Probability		% PP	Total N	% Data
Previous verb					
Present perfect	0.9		68	72	15
Neither PP nor preterit	0.69		39	161	34
Preterit	0.23		6	235	50
Range:		67			
Temporal reference					
Indeterminate	0.7		42	255	55
Specific	0.27		9	213	45
Range:		43			
Polarity					
Affirmative	[.52]		27	438	94
Negative	[.50]		27	30	6
Adverbial					
None	[.51]		28	415	89
Present	[.41]		15	53	11
Clause type					
Relative clause	[.56]		41	69	15
Other	[.49]		24	399	85
Person					
3rd	[.52]		30	253	55.8
1st	[.48]		23	200	44.2

Aspect				
Punctual (Achievement)	[.58]	30	101	22
Other	[.48]	26	367	78

Total *N* = 468/619, *p*=0.000, Log likelihood: -182.99

Not selected as significant: Polarity, adverbial, clause type, person, aspect

The Goldvarb analysis revealed that only two factors were crucial in determining the selection of the PP or the Preterit for Peninsular speakers in the "Yesterday and Before Range" in this study: Previous Verb and Temporal Reference. All other factor groups for which we coded were found to be non-significant. Looking at this from the perspective of the PP, we found that when a PP verb-form was used in any of the preceding three clauses, it favored a following PP with a factor weight of .90, and a relative frequency of 68%. With respect to Temporal Reference, indeterminacy of the reference also favored the use of the PP with a factor weight of .70 and a relative frequency of 42%. We treat each of these factors in turn in the following paragraphs, discussing them independently and in interaction with one another.

The Previous Verb factor group emerges from the Goldvarb analysis as the single most powerful predictor of the use of either the PP or the Preterit. As mentioned above, the PP is strongly favored (.90) when another PP form is used in a preceding clause. This observation lends further support to the argument that structural priming does indeed occur, as has been previously observed in other corpus studies (see, for instance: Travis 2007). Importantly, studies like Travis (2007) and others argued for the existence of structural priming in *synchronic* language use. The results of the present study, on the other hand, point to the role that structural priming can play in *diachronic* language change.

The second most powerful predictor of PP use in pre-hodiernal contexts was that of Temporal Reference. However, before discussing this factor in isolation, it is crucial that we address an important question that arises when discussing the effect of structural priming in the same breath as that of Temporal Reference. Could the two effects be one and the same? That is, it can be argued that within three clauses (the measurement that we used to measure priming), a given speaker is most likely to continue to refer to the same time temporal reference, for the simple fact that a discussion of an event lasts more than just a few clauses. The structural priming effect that we observe for increased PP usage may be an artifact of repeated references to the same indeterminate time. Is it possible then to disentangle the two? We demonstrate here that it is in fact possible, and we argue that the effect of priming is still observed even when Previous Verb and Temporal Reference are compared in a cross-tabulation (see Table 3 below, with key results bolded). The PP is more strongly favored by the combination of an indeterminate temporal reference and a previous PP verb (80%, compared to the overall 68% mentioned above), and it is less favored in cases where there is a previous PP verb but the temporal reference is specific (41%), but in the later case, this is still higher than the overall average rate of PP (27%).

Table 3. Present Perfect use by Temporal Reference (horizontal) and Preceding Verb Form (vertical)

	Indeterminate Reference	Specific Reference	Totals
Neither	50% (54/109)	15% (8/52)	39% (62/161)
Present Perfect	**80% (40/50)**	**41% (9/22)**	**68% (49/72)**
Preterite	12% (12/96)	1% (2/139)	6% (14/235)
Totals	42% (106/255)	9% (19/213)	27% (125/468)

As we consider the effect of Temporal Reference in its own right, recall that, for the purposes of determining the extent of possible PP encroachment on the pre-hodiernal domain, we excluded all hodiernal references. Thus, in contrast with those distinctions made in Temporal Reference by

Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2008), our analysis considers only those that occurred before the "today" of each token, distinguishing between "specific" and "indeterminate" references. The primary finding is that the specificity of the temporal reference consistently disfavors the use of the PP in this dialect of Spanish. That is, in instances where the speaker refers to a particular time or day in speaking of a past event, they tend to use the Preterit rather than the PP. Finally, the fact that Person was found to be non-significant is noteworthy. Whether the Person was 1st or 3rd had no appreciable effect on the selection of the PP or the Preterit. If the PP still had relational meaning (if it ever had any) then we would have expected to find the 1st person favoring selection of the PP.

Given that the PP previously referred to past tense events that have relevance at the time of utterance, one possible explanation for this finding is that the specific temporal reference constrains the speaker, situating their event unequivocally in the completed past. In this sense, specific temporal reference is similar to the presence of an adverbial. The latter, though not statistically significant as an independent variable, essentially halves the likelihood of PP occurrence (15% for present adverbial versus 28% for none, where overall PP use is 27%). The PP gains the most ground on the Preterit in those cases where there is an interaction of a non-specific temporal reference, a previous PP form, and a lack of an adverbial. When the contexts are reversed (specific temporal reference, previous Preterit form, and presence of an adverbial), the PP form is disfavored and surfaces only 6% of the time. See Table 4 below for the interaction of Temporal Reference and Adverbial alone.

Table 4. Present Perfect use by Temporal Reference (horizontal) and Adverbial (vertical)

	Indeterminate Reference	Specific Reference	Totals
None	41% (100/242)	10% (17/173)	28% (117/415)
Present	46% (6/13)	5% (2/40)	15% (8/53)
Totals	42% (106/255)	9% (19/213)	27% (125/468)

5. Conclusion and Discussion

To conclude, the two factor groups that had a statistically significant effect on the likelihood of PP use were Previous Verb (as PP) and Temporal Reference (indeterminate). The presence (or lack thereof) of an adverbial, while not significant on its own, also played a role when considered in conjunction with either of the previous two factors. Despite our conclusion that specificity (especially of Temporal Reference) acts to recall the already-terminated nature of past events, and thus favors Preterit use, the fact remains that speakers still used the PP 9% of the time in cases where the Temporal Reference was specified. It is possible that aoristic shift of the Perfect is slowly spreading beyond the "today" (to which Schwenter 1994 argued it was restricted) to pre-hodiernal events that are generally considered the domain of the Preterit in other dialects (as defined by Fleischman, p. 194). While this hypothesis is not supported by our data taken in isolation, continued comparative analysis with an earlier corpus would enable us to confirm or refute this hypothesis (see discussion below).

One caveat to the present analysis is that it relies on corpora that consist of data collected about two decades ago or earlier (in the early 1990s in the case of COREC, and in the 1970s in the case of the Habla Culta). Analysis of a more recent corpus may be useful in determining whether the PP is expanding. Since very little recent data is actually available for general use, we intend to pursue our own data collection. This will be useful in that we will thus be able to more accurately determine temporal reference in cases where it might be ambiguous to readers unfamiliar with each specific interview's context, and to format our interviews in such a way that we can elicit more natural, autobiographical recollections by interviewees.

We are also interested in exploring if any normative pressures are at work in Peninsular Spanish with respect to the expanding use of the PP (cf. Schwenter & Torres, 2008, p. 35). That is, if speakers have become aware of this aoristic shift, are there prescriptive pressures to avoid using the PP in perfective contexts? Any such pressures in academic, social, and work-related contexts appear to be

largely undocumented to our knowledge. Consideration of these and their possible effects on everyday speech may prove fruitful in understanding (potential) stylistic or individual speaker differences that occur in the COREC and *Habla Culta* corpora, and in any corpora that we may incorporate into or develop for future analyses.

References

Bosque, Ignacio. (1999). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española.* Madrid: Espasa.

Bybee, Joan, Perkins, Revere & Pagliuca, William. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: The grammaticalization of tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comrie, Bernard. (1976). *Aspect: An introduction to verbal aspect and related problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. (1984). Temporal distance: Remoteness distinctions in tense-aspect systems. In Brian Butterworth, Bernard Comrie, & Östen Dahl (eds), *Explanations of language universals*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 105-122

Esgueva, E. and M. Cantarero, eds. (1981). El habla de la ciudad de Madrid: CSIC.

Fleischman, Suzanne. (1983). From pragmatics to grammar: diachronic reflections on complex pasts and futures in Romance. *Lingua* 60:183-214.

Harris, Martin. (1982). The 'past simple' and 'present perfect' in Romance. In Martin Harris & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Studies in the Romance verb*. London: Croom Helm. 42-70.

Howe, Chad & Schwenter, Scott A. (2008). Variable Constraints on Past Reference in Dialects of Spanish. In Selected Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics, eds. Maurica Westmoreland and Juan Antonio Thomas, 100-108. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 100-108.

Marcos Marín, Francisco (dir). (1992). COREC: Corpus de Referencia de la Lengua Española Contemporánea: Corpus Oral Peninsular

Moreno de Alba, José G. (2006). Valores Verbales de los Tiempos Pasados de Indicativo y su Evolución. *Sintaxis Histórica de la Lengua Española* Vol. 1:5-94.

Schwenter, Scott A. (1994). The Grammaticalization of an Anterior in Progress: Evidence from a Peninsular Spanish Dialect. *Studies in Language* 18-1: 71-111.

Schwenter, Scott A., and Torres Cacoullos, Rena. (2008). Defaults and Indeterminacy in Temporal Grammaticalization: the 'Perfect' Road to Perfective. *Language Variation and Change* 20.1:1-39.

Travis, Catherine E. (2007). Genre effects on subject expression in Spanish: Priming in narrative and conversation. *Language Variation and Change*, 19(2)**:** 101–135.

Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics

edited by Jim Michnowicz
and Robin Dodsworth

Cascadilla Proceedings Project   Somerville, MA   2011