

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300837729>

# Grammaticalization, Clause Union and Grammatical Relations in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish

Chapter · January 1997

DOI: 10.1075/tsl.35.05hab

---

CITATIONS

10

---

READS

44

1 author:



**Marleen Haboud**

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador

38 PUBLICATIONS 125 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Espanol de contacto [View project](#)



Oralidad Modernidad [View project](#)

# Grammaticalization, Clause Union and Grammatical Relations in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish

Marleen Haboud  
*Linguistics Department*  
*University of Oregon*  
*and*  
*Universidad Católica*  
*Quito, Ecuador*

This is an offprint from:

T. Givón (ed.)

*Grammatical Relations: A Functionalist Perspective*

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

1997

(Published as Vol. 35 of the series

TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN LANGUAGE, ISSN 0167-7373)

ISBN 90 272 2931 7 (hb.) / 90 272 2932 5 (pb.) (European)

1-55619-645-8 (hb.) / 1-55619-646-6 (pb.) (U.S.)

© Copyright 1997 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by  
print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission  
from the publisher.

## 1. Introduction\*

A peculiar set of periphrastic constructions can be observed in the Spanish spoken by monolingual speakers in the Ecuadorian Highlands (henceforth HS). This dialect probably arose through long contact between the variety of Standard Spanish (henceforth SS) spoken in the region and the indigenous language of the area, Quichua.<sup>1</sup> The variety of Spanish arising through such substratum contact displays, in addition to many features of Standard Spanish, a number of peculiarities not attested elsewhere in Spanish. Most relevant to this paper, HS shows peculiar uses of gerund-marked verbs, uses that resemble SS superficially, but in fact represent considerable innovation and syntactic-semantic reanalysis. As a brief illustration consider:

- (1) *Le boté pegando*  
him throw-I hit-GER  
HS: 'I hit him/her *unintentionally*'  
SS: \*'I threw him out hitting (him)'

Construction (1) is ungrammatical in SS, but its semantic interpretation — if possible — would have tagged the gerund-marked second verb as an adverbial subordinate clause, with *botar* 'throw' remaining the semantically main verb. In contrast, the semantic interpretation of (1) in HS tags the gerund-marked *pegar* as the main verb, and the finite *botar* as a **grammaticalized auxiliary** that now carries the adverbial sense 'unintentionally'. In this division between a finite but de-semanticized auxiliary and the non-finite but semantically vigorous complement, HS two-verb constructions such as (1) follow superficially the familiar auxiliary-main-verb pattern of SS, as in:

- (2) *Le estaba pegando*  
 him be/IMPF/I hit-GER  
 'I was hitting him'

In this paper I will first survey the range of periphrastic construction in HS that follow the morpho-syntactic pattern of (1). I will show the various types of semantic reanalysis — or de-semanticization — undergone by the various finite auxiliary verbs involved.<sup>2</sup> I will then survey several syntactic properties of these complex clauses, showing that they have indeed undergone **clause union**. And further, that clause union is clearly reflected in the reanalyzed grammatical relations of the merged clause. The data for this study come from texts, informal conversations with monolingual speakers of HS Spanish, and direct elicitation.

## 2. The variety of grammaticalized gerund constructions in HS

Examples (3) below illustrate the variety of grammaticalized periphrastic constructions in HS to be discussed in this paper.<sup>3</sup>

- (3) a. *Voy llorando*  
 go-I cry-GER  
 SS: 'I cry while going'  
 HS: 'Having cried I go'
- b. *Vengo llorando*  
 come-I cry-GER  
 SS: 'I cry while coming'  
 HS: 'Having cried I come'

- c. *Le dejé matando*  
 him leave-I kill-GER  
 SS: '\*I left him killing'  
 HS: 'I killed him/her (and abandoned him)'
- d. *Le mandé hablando*  
 him order-I speak-GER  
 SS: '\*I sent/order him speaking'  
 HS: 'I scolded him'
- e. *Le boté pegando*  
 him throw-I hit-GER  
 SS: '\*I threw him out hitting him'  
 HS: 'I hit him/her (unintentionally)'
- f. *Le doy cocinando*  
 him give-I cook-GER  
 SS: '\*I give him cooking'  
 HS: 'I cook for/instead of him'

On the syntactic surface, it seems, HS does not distort the standard pattern of finite auxiliary plus gerund-marked complement. Semantically however, all the HS constructions display considerable semantic reanalysis, so that many of them (e.g. (3c-f)) are ungrammatical in SS.

Further, the verbs *mandar* 'send'/'order' (3d), and *botar* 'throw'/'drop' (3a,e) have different selectional restrictions in the two varieties of Spanish. In SS, gerund complements cannot be used with these two verbs (4a,b). Both can take nominal (or pronominal) objects (4c,d), and *mandar* as a manipulation verb can also take an infinitival verbal complement, as in (4e):

- (4) a. \**Te mando enviando el paquete*  
 you send-I send-GER the package
- b. \**Te boto enviando el paquete*  
 you throw-I send-GER the package
- c. *Te mandó el paquete (por avión)*  
 you send-PAST/3s the package (by air)  
 'He sent you the package (by plane)'
- d. *Ya boté la basura*  
 already throw-PAST/I the garbage  
 'I already threw the garbage away'

- e. *Me mandó a callar*  
 me order-PAST/3s to be.quiet/INF  
 'He ordered me to be quiet'

Further, in SS *dar* 'give' cannot take a gerund verbal complement (5a), but takes nominal or pronominal objects as a simple bi-transitive (5b). As a causative verb, it may also take an infinitival verbal complement (5c):

- (5) a. \**Te doy comiendo*  
 you give-I eat-GER  
 b. *Le doy el vestido a María*  
 her give-I the dress to María  
 'I give the dress to María'  
 c. *Doy de comer a los animales*  
 give-I of eat/INF to the animals  
 'I feed the animals'  
 (Lit.: 'I give to eat to the animals')

### 3. Grammaticalization

In treating the HS construction discussed here as cases of grammaticalized finite main verb, I follow Givón (1971, 1973, 1975, 1979, 1995), Heine (1990, 1993), Heine and Reh (1982), Heine et al. (1991), and Traugott and Heine (1991). Within the theoretically-oriented framework of grammaticalization, the pattern described here for HS is viewed as the product of a uni-directional diachronic development whereby lexical words change into grammatical morphemes (Givón 1971, 1975, 1979; Heine 1993; Lehman 1982; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Traugott and Ekkehar 1991).

A number of distinct parallel changes are most commonly involved in such grammaticalization, chief of which are:

- a. functional-semantic re-analysis ('de-semanticization')
- b. syntactic-categorial change ('re-categorization')
- c. phonological reduction
- d. cliticization
- e. clause union ('clause integration')

**De-semanticization** is the process by which a lexical word loses its lexical meaning and acquires a grammatical function. **Re-categorization** is the process by which a lexical word loses its erstwhile syntactic category (noun, verb, adjective) and is then reassigned into a new grammatical morpheme category. **Phonological reduction** involves first de-stressing and then phonological attrition (bleaching) and shortening of the erstwhile lexical stem. **Cliticization**, which invariably follows phonological reduction, involves the adjustment of the morphemic status of the grammaticalized word — from free lexical stem to a bound morpheme, first a clitic, then affix, eventually an inflection. Finally, **clause integration** is not involved in all cases of grammaticalization, but is an essential ingredient when the grammaticalized verb had a verbal complement. In clause union, two erstwhile independent clauses, each with each own set of grammatical relations, merged as a result of the grammaticalization of one of the two verbs, to form a single clause with a single set of grammatical relations (Givón 1980, 1990: ch. 13, 1995: ch. 6).

It is important to note that the parallel processes associated with grammaticalization do not proceed at the same pace. Functional and semantic reanalysis (a) is the earliest manifestation of grammaticalization (Givón 1975, 1979). While the more formal syntactic, morphemic and phonological adjustments (b), (c), (d), (e) proceed at a much slower pace.

What is more, all five processes may — at least in principle — proceed gradually through multiple stages (Lehmann 1982, 1985; Bybee 1988).

Clause integration (e) is of particular relevance to this study, since the grammaticalization of modality verbs that take equi-subject complements is the main diachronic source of grammaticalized tense-aspect-modal morphemes (TAMs), as well as of other types of grammatical morphology (Givón 1971, 1973, 1979; Heine 1993). In an embedding language such as Spanish, the initial syntactic configuration that gives rise to TAM auxiliaries is precisely such an equi-subject complementation configuration. In such a configuration, an erstwhile main verb can become a de-semanticized auxiliary, and the complement verb then takes over as the semantic main verb of the merged clause, as in:

- (6) a. *se-lo-estamos explicando*  
 him-it-be-we explain-GER  
 'We are explaining it to him'

- b. *se-lo-han dado*  
 her-it-have-3p give-PART  
 'They have given it to her'

The rise of tense-aspect-modal morphology in embedding languages, via clause union of an equi-subject complementation, often proceeds through an intermediate diachronic stage of **auxiliary verbs**. In this stage, the finite main verb, already re-analyzed as a TAM marker, still retains the finite morphology that characterized it as a main verb. While the complement verb, already re-semanticized as a the main verb of the merged clause, retains its non-finite complement morphology. In Spanish this is particularly glaring with respect to the subject and object pronominal inflections. Those remain cliticized to the auxiliary even after ceasing to bear grammatical relation to it (6a,b).<sup>4</sup> In this way, grammaticalized auxiliaries continue to resemble complement-taking modality verbs that have not been grammaticalized, as in:

- (7) *Los niños siguen cantando*  
 the children follow singing  
 'The children continue to sing'

In this paper I will show how HS utilizes an existing SS morpho-syntactic pattern in forming its new de-semanticized auxiliaries.

What is unique to HS is that many of the lexical verbs that develop into auxiliaries do not likewise grammaticalize in any other dialect of SS. I will then suggest that in many respects Heine's (1993) 'transparency principle' ("one word, one function") is reflected in the HS grammaticalization. So that reanalysis of the formal (morpho-syntactic) properties of the grammaticalized verb follows a three-stage progression:

(8) **Gradual morpho-syntactic change:**

| Stage:                         | early  | intermediate          | late        |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------|
| formal status<br>of main verb: | Verbal | Verbal<br>Grammatical | Grammatical |

#### 4. Semantic re-analysis

The grammaticalized main verbs in HS are both intransitive motion verbs ('go', 'come') and transitive verbs ('leave', 'order', 'throw', 'give'). In this section I discuss the semantic reanalysis of the grammaticalized two-verb constructions in HS by contrasting them with their SS equivalents. The discussion will be divided into two subsections, dealing first with grammaticalized intransitive motion verbs, then with grammaticalized transitive main verbs.

##### 4.1. Grammaticalized intransitive motion verbs

In Both SS and HS, *ir* 'go' and *venir* 'come' denote motion away or toward a reference point:

- (9) a. *Me voy a las siete*  
 me go-I at the seven  
 'I (will) leave at seven'  
 b. *Vengo a las siete*  
 come-I at the seven  
 'I (will) come (over) at seven'

As main verbs taking equi-subject complements, these verbs can function in SS usage, in Ecuador and elsewhere, as auxiliaries. When the second-clause verb is marked as gerund, the sense of two simultaneous events two is conveyed.

In HS, however, these construction also convey two consecutive events, with the one coded by the second, gerund-mark verb *preceding* the one coded by the main motion verb:<sup>5</sup>

- (10) a. *Voy llorando*  
 go-I cry-GER  
 'Having cried I leave (go)' (HS)  
 'I go crying' (SS)  
 b. *Vengo llorando*  
 'Having cried I come' (HS)  
 'I come crying' (SS)

- c. *Voy pegándole*  
 go-I hit-GER-3s  
 'Having hit her I leave (go)' (HS)  
 'I go hitting her' (SS)

In some grammaticalized gerund constructions, HS shows no semantic restrictions over the second (gerund) verb. This makes constructions such as (11a,b) perfectly accepted by HS, but pragmatically odd in SS:<sup>6</sup>

- (11) a. *Me voy operando dos casos graves*  
 me go-I operating two cases dangerous  
 'Having operated two dangerous cases I leave (go)' (HS)  
 '\*I leave operating . . .' (SS)
- b. *Vendrás arreglando todos los problemas legales*  
 come-FUT/2s fixing all the problems legal  
 'Come after fixing all the legal problems' (HS)  
 '\*Come fixing the legal problems' (SS)

#### 4.2. Grammaticalized transitive verbs

##### 4.2.1. Dejar 'leave'/'abandon'

In both SS and HS, the verb *dejar* 'leave', 'abandon' in simple clauses codes agent-initiated motion away initiated by an agent:

- (12) a. *Dejé la casa a las siete*  
 leave-PAST/I the house at the seven  
 'I left the house at 7'
- b. *Dejé mi abrigo en la casa*  
 leave-PAST/I my coat in the house  
 'I left my coat at home'
- c. *Le dejé a Juan en la estación*  
 him leave-PAST/I OB Juan in the station  
 'I left Juan at the station'
- d. *Le dejé por borracho*  
 him leave-PAST/I because drunk  
 'I left him because he was alcoholic'

In complex two-verb constructions in both SS and HS, 'dejar' may be followed by a verb marked either by the perfect (13a) which assumes a causative, or the gerund (13b) which describes two simultaneous events:

- (13) a. *Te dejé dormido*  
 you leave-PAST/I sleep-PERF  
 'I left you asleep'
- b. *Te dejé durmiendo*  
 you leave-PAST/I sleep-GER  
 'I left you sleeping'

However, *dejar* in such a construction may also assume a *causative* sense similar to (13a), as in:<sup>7</sup>

- (14) a. *Te dejó durmiendo*  
 you leave-past/3s sleep-GER  
 'She left you sleeping' (SS, HS)  
 'She made you sleep' (HS)
- b. *Le dejó llorando*  
 him leave-PAST/I cry-GER  
 'I left him crying' (SS, HS)  
 'I made him cry' (HS)

Example (15) below, taken from natural conversation, illustrate the fact that in early stages of grammaticalization usage may be ambiguous, in this case carrying both the original motion sense and the later causative sense of *dejar* 'leave'. The speaker describes here how by the time she left the family she used to work for, the baby she had cared for had learned — from her — to walk well:

- (15) *Conmigo nació el Santi,*  
 with-me born the Santi(ago)  
 '... Santi(ago) was born with me;  
*me fui porque estaba esperando yo también,*  
 me go-PAST/I because be-IMF/I expecting I also  
 I left because I was expecting too;  
*yo caminando bien le dejé*  
 I walk-GER well him leave-PAST/I  
 I left him walking well 3ACC . . .' [RN.01.95]

It is precisely such cases, where the two senses are not in conflict but rather are semantically complementary, that characterize the beginning of the gradual process of semantic re-analysis.

In its grammaticalized capacity in HS, *dejar* in (16a) below involves an equi-subject chain. In SS, (16a) is ungrammatical as it stands, unless clarified with an explicit direct object for the second, as in (16b), whereby it clearly displays a switch-subject chain.

- (16) a. *Le dejé pegándole*  
 him leave-PAST/I hit-GER-him  
 HS: 'I left him after first hitting him'  
 SS: '\*I left him (while he was) hitting'
- b. *Le dejé pegándole a Juan*  
 him leave-PAST/I hit-GER-him OB Juan  
 HS: 'I left Juan after first hitting him'  
 SS: 'I left him (while he was) hitting John'<sup>8</sup>

The sense of 'motion away' of *dejar* is still preserved in the HS examples (17a,b):

- (17) a. *Voy a verle a este sinvergüenza...*  
 go-I to see-INF-3s to this shameless  
 'I'm going to see this shameless guy...'  
*le he de dejar castigando*  
 3s have-I of leave-INF punish-GER  
 'I will leave him after first punishing him'  
 (Lit.: 'I am going to see this shameless guy, I will leave him punishing')
- b. *Dejarás limpiando todo*  
 leave-FUT/2s clean-GER all  
 'Clean everything before leaving'  
 (Lit.: 'You will leave cleaning it all up')

As an illustration of the effect of the grammaticalized *dejar*, contrast the two HS examples in (18), (18a) without *dejar* and (18b) with it:

- (18) a. *Mamá me encargó unas pastillas*  
 mom me ask-PAST/3s some pills  
 'Mom asked me to get her some pills'  
 (> no knowledge of Mom's movement is implied)

- b. *Mi antigua vecina me dejó encargando*  
 my old neighbor me leave-PAST/3s ask-GER  
 'My old neighbor (while still here) asked me to get her  
*unas pastillas*  
 some pills  
 some pills (she is gone now)'

The grammaticalized (18b) may be rendered in SS with an explicit adverbial clause:

- (19) *Antes de irse, mi vecina me encargó unas pastillas.*  
 before of leaving my neighbor me-asked some pills  
 'Before leaving, my neighbor asked me for some pills'

#### 4.2.2. Mandar 'send'/'order'

In its sense of 'send', *mandar* in simple clauses in SS is a bi-transitive verb of in caused motion of a PAT toward a goal, as in:

- (20) *Yo mandé una carta a la Universidad*  
 I send-PAST/I a letter to the University  
 'I sent a letter to the University'

In its manipulative sense of 'tell' or 'order', it takes either an infinitival (21a) or a subjunctive (21b) complement, as in:

- (21) a. *A esa lora, le mandé que hable*  
 to that parrot her order-PAST/I SUB speak-SUBJUN/3s  
 'I told that parrot that it should speak'
- b. *A esa lora, le mandé a hablar*  
 to that parrot her order-PAST/I to speak-INF  
 'I ordered that parrot to speak'

In HS, *mandar* 'send' with a gerund-marked verbal complement functions as a causative verb, thus presumably extending the SS caused-motion sense. This is the case with intransitive complement verbs, as in:

- (22) a. *Me manda llorando*  
 me send-3s cry-GER  
 'S/he makes me cry'  
 (Lit.: 'She sends me crying')

- b. *Qué buen doctor, entré casi muerta*  
 what good doctor enter/PAST/I almost dead  
 'What a good doctor! I entered his office half dead  
*y me mandó caminando*  
 and me send-PAST/3s walk-GER  
 and he made me walk' [FO.05.95]  
 (Lit.: '... he sent me walking')

An even more extreme case of semantic reanalysis may be seen in complements with *hablar* 'speak', yielding the combined sense of 'send-speak' as 'reprimand' or 'scold':

- (23) *Todavía no entiendo porque*  
 yet NEG understand-I why  
 'I still don't understand why  
*la señora me mandó hablando*  
 the lady me send-PAST/3s speaking  
 lady scolded me' [NR.13.04.95]  
 (Lit.: 'I still don't understand why the lady sent me speaking')

With transitive verbs as complements, the sense of causation is not evident, although it may well be that some vestige of the sense of 'motion away' of the patient of 'send' is retained, especially in (24d). Thus contrast:

- (24) a. *Me dio flores*  
 me give-PAST/3s flowers  
 'She gave me flowers'  
 b. *Me mandó regalando flores*  
 me send-PAST/3s give-GER flowers  
 'She gave me flowers' (> as I was leaving)  
 c. *Me pegó*  
 me hit-PAST/3s  
 'She hit me'  
 d. *Me mandó pegando*  
 me send-PAST/3s hit-GER  
 'By hitting me she caused me to leave'

HS *mandar* constructions emphasize on the causer while *dejar* constructions emphasize on the causee.

#### 4.2.3. Botar 'throw', 'drop'

The use of *botar* 'throw', 'drop' in simple clauses in SS may be seen in:

- (25) a. *Boté la basura ayer*  
 throw-PAST/I the garbage yesterday  
 'I threw out the garbage yesterday'  
 b. *Le boté al niño*  
 him drop-PAST/I OB-the child  
 'I dropped the child (down)'

This use of *botar* in simple clauses is retained in HS. In addition, however, *botar* can also occur as a grammaticalized auxiliary before transitive gerund-marked complement verbs. This use is characteristic with verbs involving a negative effect to the patient, such as *pegar* 'hit', *patear* 'kick', *matar* 'kill', *destruir* 'destroy', *quemar* 'burn', etc. In this capacity, *botar* conveys the sense of an **unintended result**, as in:

- (26) a. *Estaba planchando bien*  
 be/IMPFV-3s iron-GER well  
 'She was ironing well  
*y le botó dañando (la plancha)*  
 and it throw-PAST/3s ruin-GER (the iron)  
 and wound up ruining it (the iron)'  
 b. *le ha botado matando a la mujer*  
 her have-3s throw-PERF kill-GER OB the wife  
 'He accidentally/unintentionally killed his wife'  
 c. *Me han botado quemando la casa*  
 me have-3p throw-PERF burn-GER the house  
 'Accidentally, someone has burned my house'

In this construction, *botar* follows the pattern of equi-subject auxiliaries in SS. The development of the grammaticalized sense 'unintentionally', 'accidentally' may be due to the conflation of two factors:



- The detrimental sense of 'drop' vis-a-vis the patient
- The detrimental sense associated with the complement verbs.

#### 4.2.4. Dar 'give'

In simple clauses in both SS and HS, *dar* 'give' retains its original bi-transitive sense, as in:

- (27) a. *Te doy dinero cada semana*  
 you give-I money each week  
 'I give you money every week'

But in addition, *dar* can be used in HS as a grammaticalized auxiliary. The added sense here is a **benefactive** one, but with the inference of 'subject doing the action instead of the beneficiary'. Thus consider:

- (28) a. *Te doy cocinando los domingos*  
 you give-I cook-GER the sundays  
 'I do you the favor of cooking for you on Sundays (instead of you doing it)'  
 (Lit.: 'I give you cooking on Sundays')
- b. *Dame haciendo el pan mientras duermo*  
 Give/IMP-me make-GER the bread while sleep-I  
 'Would you do me the favor of baking the bread for me while I sleep?' (instead of me doing it)  
 (Lit.: 'Give me making the bread. . .')

The complement verb may itself be transitive, as above, or intransitive, when it carries the sense of transitivity as in:

- (29) *Dame saliendo del juego,*  
 give/IMP-me leave-GER from-the game  
*no entiendo nada*  
 NEG understand-I nothing  
 'Would you do me the favor of finishing this game, I don't understand anything' [XZ.12.95]  
 (Lit.: 'Give me leaving from the game. . .')

or even bi-transitive, including 'give' itself:

- (30) a. *Dame vendiendo el libro a María*  
 give/IMP-me sell-GER the book to María  
 'Would you do me the favor of selling the book to María (instead of me)'  
 (Lit.: 'Give me selling the book to María')
- b. *Me dió comprando el libro para María*  
 me give-PAST/3s sell-GER the book for María  
 'He did me the favor of buying the book for María (instead of me)'  
 (Lit.: 'He gave me buying the book for María')
- c. *El nos da dando la ropa a la costurera*  
 he us give/IMP give-GER the clothes to the dressmaker  
 'He is doing us the favor of giving the clothes to the dressmaker (instead of us)'  
 (Lit.: 'He gave us giving the clothes to the dressmaker')

The development of benefactive senses out of 'give' is a near universal tendency in grammaticalization, though it is most commonly associated with verb serialization (Givón 1975). It is, further, also found in the Quichua substratum of HS (Haboud 1995; Taylor 1982; Van de Kerke 1994). What is of course of interest in HS is that this development occurs in an embedding — complementation — syntactic configuration.

#### 5. Clause union and grammatical relations

It is clear that the complex clauses described above in HS, with various auxiliaries followed by a gerund-mark complement verb, have undergone the kind of extensive semantic reanalysis normally associated with grammaticalization. In this section I suggest that these constructions have also undergone considerable syntactic reanalysis, along the process of clause integration ('clause union').

And further, that part of the transition toward clause union involves a reanalysis of grammatical relations. I will begin by outlining the formal criteria that may be used to demonstrate clause union.

5.1. *Criteria for clause union*

Clause union is a complex diachronic development involving a number of morpho-syntactic features (Givón 1980, 1990: ch. 13). For this and other reasons, it cannot be a discrete (either/or) change, but is rather a gradual development. Therefore, as a synchronic product of a gradual multi-featured diachronic process, clause union is likewise a matter of degree. When one of the two verbs in an erstwhile periphrastic construction grammaticalizes semantically, syntactic clause union is then the formal reflection of the fact that what was construed earlier as two separate events is now construed as an integrated single event.

The formal morpho-syntactic criteria used here to determine the degree of clause union of HS two-verb constructions have been adapted from Givón (1980, 1990: ch. 13) as modified by Zavala (1993) and will be discussed in order. They are:

- Scope of negation
- Preposing the gerund clause
- The presence and interpretation of adverbials
- The position and reference of pronominal clitics.

5.2. *Scope of negation*

Contrast first the scope of negation in the SS and HS interpretations of (30a,b). The events in HS are interpreted as having occurred in the immediate past:

- (31) a. *No va comiendo el pobre*  
 NEG go-3s eat-GER the poor  
 HS: 'The poor thing *didn't eat* before going'  
 SS: 'He *is not eating* while going'
- b. *No vengo comiendo nada*  
 NEG come-I eat-GER nothing  
 HS: 'I *didn't eat anything* before coming'  
 SS: 'I *am not eating* while coming'

Likewise in (32a,b) where the SS are semantically odd:

- (32) a. *No va limpiando la casa*  
 NEG go-3s clean-GER the house  
 HS: 'He *did not clean the house* before leaving'  
 SS: '?He *isn't cleaning the house* while leaving'
- b. *No viene enterrando el caballo*  
 NEG come-3s bury-GER the horse  
 HS: 'He *didn't bury the horse* before coming'  
 SS: '?He *doesn't come* while burying the horse'

In the case of the intransitive auxiliaries above, the equi-subject condition makes it theoretically possible to have an interpretation of such negative clauses in SS. This is not possible anymore with the transitive grammaticalized auxiliaries of HS. In the case of *dejar*, the negation test is not decisive because the verb is causative-implicative verb. The scope of negation in such a case necessarily spreads over both verbs. That is:

- (33) a. *No le dejé llorando*  
 NEG her leave-PAST/I cry-GER  
 HS: 'I *didn't make her cry* (before leaving her)'  
 SS: 'When I left, she was not crying'
- b. *No le dejó rompiendo el brazo,*  
 NEG his throw-PAST/3s breaking the arm  
*solo torciéndole*  
 only twist-GER-it  
 HS: 'He *didn't break his arm* (before leaving him), just twisted it'  
 SS: '\*He didn't leave him breaking the arm, only twisting it'

When causative senses are not involved, the exclusion of any independent sense of the grammaticalized verb from the scope of negation is more obvious. This is evident in the case of *mandar-hablar* 'scold':

- (34) *No le mandó hablando, mas bien regalando plata*  
 NEG him send-PAST/3s speak-GER more well give-GER money  
 'He *didn't scold him*, but rather gave him money'

Likewise with *botar* and *dar*:

- (35) a. *No le botó matando, solo asustándole*  
 NEG him throw-PAST/3S kill-GER, only scare-GER-him  
 'He didn't kill him, just scared him'
- b. *No te doy cocinando nada*  
 NEG you give-I cook-GER nothing  
 'I don't do you the favor of cooking anything for you (instead of you)'

### 5.3. Preposing the gerund-marked clause

In SS, gerund ADV-clauses can be preposed for pragmatic effects, as in:

- (36) *todavía buscando a su caballo, regresó*  
 still seach-GER OB his horse return-PAST/3S  
*a la casa*  
 to the house  
 'Still looking for his horse, he returned home'

When the grammaticalized construction in HS involves the intransitives *ir* and *venir*, preposing of the gerund clause is still possible, since two event clauses are still involved. If the construction is negative then, the scope of negation falls over the gerund clause alone:

- (37) *Enterrando el caballo, no viene*  
 Burying the horse, NEG come+3SPR  
 'He didn't bury the horse before coming'  
 SS: '\*Burying the horse, he isn't coming'

The transitive grammaticalized auxiliaries in HS allow preposing of the gerund-marked subordinate clause for emphatic purposes. This is presumably because there are no two independent events here, each with its own independent temporality. This is most striking when negation is also involved. Thus compare:

- (38) a. *No le dejé pegando*  
 NEG him leave-PAST/I hit-GER  
 'I didn't leave him after first hitting him' (HS)

- b. *?Pegando(le), no le deje*  
 hit-GER-(him) NEG him leave-PAST/I  
 (possible as a defense from false accusation)
- c. *No le mandé hablando*  
 NEG him send-PAST/I speak-GER  
 'I didn't scold him'
- d. *?Hablando(le), no le mandé*  
 speak-GER-(him) NEG him send-PAST/I  
 (possible as a defense from false accusation)

The more advanced in the process of grammaticalization the motion verb is, the more restricted pre-posing of the gerund-marked subordinate clause becomes:

- e. *No le boté rompiendo*  
 NEG it drop-PAST/I break-GER  
 'I didn't break it (not even unintentionally)'
- f. *\*Rompiendo(le), no le boté*  
 break-GER-(it), NEG it drop-PAST/I
- g. *No le doy cocinando*  
 NEG her give-I cook-GER  
 'I am not cooking for her'
- h. *\*Cocinando, no le doy*  
 cook-GER NEG her give-I

One might as well note that the behavior of these grammaticalized one-event constructions in HS follows the behavior of grammaticalized TAM auxiliaries in SS, both with and without negation:

- (39) a. *Está durmiendo*  
 be-3s sleep-GER  
 'He is asleep'
- b. *?durmiendo, está*  
 sleep-GER be-3s
- c. *No está durmiendo*  
 NEG be-3s sleep-GER  
 'He is not asleep'

- d. ?*Durmiendo, no está*  
sleep-GER NEG be-3s
- e. \**No durmiendo, está*  
NEG sleep-GER be-3s
- (40) a. *Ha dormido*  
have-3s sleep-PERF  
'She has slept'
- b. \**dormido, ha*  
sleep-PERF have-3s
- c. *No ha dormido*  
NEG have-3s sleep-GER  
'She hasn't slept'
- d. \**Dormido, no ha*  
sleep-PERF NEG have-3s
- e. \**No dormido, ha*  
NEG sleep-PERF have-3s

#### 5.4. The presence and interpretation of adverbials

In the SS usage of *ir* 'go' followed by a gerund adverbial, either verb can be modified by a semantically-appropriate adverbial. Thus:

- (41) SS: a. *Se fue muy rápido(,) comiendo*  
REF go-PAST/3s very fast eat-GER  
'He took off very quickly, eating'
- b. *Se fue comiendo muy rápido*  
REF go-PAST/3s eat-GER very fast  
'He left, eating very fast'

With the auxiliaries 'go' and 'come', which retain the sense of two separate — consecutive — events, this variation is also possible in HS, although to ensure the HS semantics, (42b,c) are preferred:

- (42) HS: a. *Se fue muy rápido(,) comiendo*  
REF go-PAST/3s very fast eat-GER  
'Having eaten, he left very quickly'

- b. *Se fue comiendo muy rápido*  
REF go-PAST/3s eat-GER very fast  
'Having eaten very fast, he left'
- c. *Comiendo muy rápido se fue*  
eat-GER very fast REF go-PAST/3s  
'Having eaten very fast, he left'

The constructions with the auxiliaries 'come' and 'go' are thus shown, once again, to be less grammaticalized.

With the transitive auxiliaries in HS, modifying the auxiliary verb by an adverbial becomes impossible. Consider first the causative *dejar*, as in:

- (43) a. *Le dejaron hiriendo con un cuchillote*  
him leave-PAST/3p wound-GER with a big.knife  
'They wounded him with a big knife (and then abandoned him)'
- b. *Con un cuchillote, le dejaron hiriendo*  
with a big.knife him leave-PAST/3p wound-GER  
'With a big knife they wounded him and (then abandon him)'  
SS: 'With a big knife they left him wounding'
- c. ?*Le dejaron, con un cuchillote, hiriendo*  
him leave-PAST/3p with a big.knife wound-GER<sup>9</sup>  
(possible as an emphatic, as in e.g. news headlines)

Consider next the combination *mandar-hablar* 'scold':

- (44) a. *Le mando hablando como a tonto*  
him send-I speaking like OBJ fool  
'I scold (treat) him like a fool'
- b. *Como a tonto le mando hablando*  
like OBJ fool him send-I speak-GER  
'As if he were a fool I scold (treat) him'  
(possible as an emphatic)  
SS: '\*As if he were a fool I send him speaking'
- c. ?*Le mando, como a tonto, hablando*  
him send-I like OBJ fool speak-GER  
(possible as an emphatic)

Similarly with *botar*:

- (45) a. *Le botó rompiendo como papel*  
 him drop-PAST/3s break-GER like paper  
 'She tore it (the blouse) like paper'
- b. *Como papel le botó rompiendo*  
 like paper it drop-PAST/3s break-GER  
 'Like paper she tore it'  
 SS: '\*Like paper she dropped it tearing'
- c. *?Le botó, como papel, rompiendo*  
 him drop-PAST/3s like paper break-GER

And likewise with *dar*:

- (46) a. *Le da cocinando como a reina*  
 her give-3s cook-GER like OBJ queen  
 'He cooks for her as for a queen'
- b. *Como a reina le da cocinando*  
 like OBJ queen her give cook-GER  
 'As for a queen he cooks for her'  
 '\*As for a queen he gives her cooking'
- c. *?Le da, como a reina, cocinando*  
 her give-3s like OBJ queen cook-GER

While the test of adverbial placement and interpretation seems syntactic, it is transparently a semantic test.

### 5.5. Clitic pronouns, clause union and grammatical relations

#### 5.5.1. Preamble

As is well known elsewhere (Keenan 1975, 1976; Givón 1995, This volume), pronominal agreement on the verb is one of the most common overt coding properties of grammatical relation, both subject and object. When two verbal clauses undergo clause union as a result of the grammaticalization of one of the verbs, especially in an embedding language, the realignment of the clitic pronouns, and often their consolidation around one of the two verbs, is part and parcel of the syntactic reanalysis accompanying clause union (Aissen and Perlmutter 1976; Rizzi 1976; Givón, This volume). This

process is driven by two parallel factors. First, semantically, the grammaticalized verb, as part of its de-semanticization, loses its original grammatical relation to arguments in the condensed clause. And second, syntactically — at least in embedding languages — the complementation configuration that gives rise to clause union marks one of the two verbs (main verb) as finite, the other (complement) as non-finite or nominalized.

Clitic pronouns, in conformance with the common rule for simple finite clauses, tend to gravitate in such configurations to the finite verb even before full clause union. This happens in spite of the fact that upon clause union, the finite verb is the one that most commonly becomes the grammaticalized auxiliary.

In this section I will suggest that the realignment of object clitics around the grammaticalized finite auxiliary in the HS constructions surveyed here follows precisely such a pattern. We will begin with surveying the placement of object clitics in SS.

#### 5.5.2. Clitic object pronouns in SS

While the tendency for object clitics to gravitate to the finite auxiliary is well-established in SS, a certain residual variation remains in their placement in some grammatical contexts. The general rules governing the placement of clitics are summarized below (see also Silva-Corvalán 1994).

##### a. Finite main verb — the default choice:

When the verb to which a pronouns bear object relation is finite, and no grammaticalized finite auxiliary is present, the clitics appear prefixed to that finite verb:

- (47) *me-lo-compró*  
*me-it-buy-PAST/3s*  
 'She bought it for me'

##### b. Imperative verb:

When the verb is in the imperative, and thus cannot take an auxiliary, its object pronoun always appears as a suffix:

- (48) *cóme-te-lo*  
*eat-you-it*  
 'It it up!'

c. **Following the finite perfect auxiliary 'have':**

When the semantic main verb is marked as perfect and is preceded by the finite auxiliary 'have', the pronouns referring to its semantic objects appear as prefixes on the finite auxiliary:

- (49) *Ya se-la-he comprado*  
 already her-it-have-I buy-PERF  
 'I have already bought it for her'

d. **Following the finite progressive auxiliary 'be':**

When the semantic main verb is marked as gerund and follows the auxiliary 'be' (or other progressive auxiliaries), the clitic can be placed as either a prefix on the auxiliary or a suffix on the gerund-marked verb:

- (50) a. *te-lo-estoy contando*  
 you-it-be-I tell-GER  
 'I am telling it to you'  
 b. *Estoy contándo-te-lo*  
 be-I tell-GER-you-it  
 'I am telling it to you it'

When the gerund-marked verb appears without an auxiliary, naturally only the suffix option (50b) can be exercised:

- (51) *Viéndo-la te acordarás de ella*  
 see-GER-her REF remember-FUT/2s of her  
 'Seeing her you'll remember her'

e. **Infinitive-marked complement after a finite main verb:**

When a finite verb is followed by an infinitive-marked complement, pronouns referring to the objects of the complement may appear as either prefixes on the main verb or suffixes on the complement:

- (52) a. *te-vine a hablar*  
 you-come-PAST/I to talk-INF  
 'I came to talk to you'  
 b. *vine a hablar-te*  
 come-PAST/I to talk-INF-you  
 'I came to talk to you'

- c. *te-quiero ver*  
 you-want-I see-INF  
 'I want to see you'  
 d. *quiero ver-te*  
 want-I see-you  
 'I want to see you'  
 e. *me-hizo abrir-la*  
 me-make-PAST/3s open-INF-it  
 'He made me open it (the window)'  
 f. *me-la-hizo abrir*  
 me-it-make-PAST/3s open-INF  
 'I saw him break it (the window)'

5.5.3. *Clitic pronouns in HS grammaticalized clauses*

As seen above, in SS gerund complement verbs following the finite progressive auxiliary 'be' allow the option of either taking their object pronouns as suffixes or ceding them as prefixes on the finite auxiliary. In HS (except with 'go' and 'come' still in the first stages of grammaticalization), only one option is preserved — all object pronouns that refer to semantic arguments of the complement verb must be prefixed to the finite auxiliary.

- (53) a. *María le(lo)-dejó matando*<sup>10</sup>  
 María him-leave-PAST/3s kill-GER  
 'Maria killed him (and then left)'  
 b. \**María dejo matándo-le*  
 c. *Juan le-botó pegando*  
 Juan her-drop-PAST/3s hit-GER her  
 'Juan hit her unexpectedly'  
 d. \**Juan botó pegándo-le*  
 e. *María le-mandó hablando*  
 Maria him-send-PAST/3s talk-GER  
 'Maria insulted him'  
 f. \**María mando hablándo-le*  
 g. *Juan (0)-le-dió escribiendo*  
 Juan her-it-give-PAST/3s write-GER  
 'Juan wrote it for her (instead of her)'

- h. \**Juan dió escribiéndole*  
 i. *María le vino pegando a Juan*  
 María **him**-come-PAST/3s hit-GER OB Juan  
 'Maria came after hitting Juan'  
 j. *María vino pegándole (a Juan)*  
 María come/PAST/3s hit-GER-**him** (OB Juan)  
 'Maria came after hitting him (Juan)'

Note, finally, the presence of **clitic doubling** and in HS, so that the same object pronoun may appear on *both* verbs. Such uses may be considered sub-standard even in HS:<sup>11</sup>

- (54) a. ?*Le-dejó pegándole*  
**him**-leave-PAST/3s hit-GER-**him**  
 'He hit him (and left)'  
 b. ?*Le-botó pegándole*  
**him**-drop-PAST/3s hit-GER-**him**  
 'He hit him (accidentally)'  
 c. ?*Te-doy cocinándote*  
**you**-give-I cook-GER-**you**  
 'I cook for you (instead of you)'  
 d. ?*Se-viene comiéndose*  
 REF-come-3s eat-REF  
 'He comes after eating'

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1. De-semanticization

The conflation of all the evidence suggests that the periphrastic two-verb construction in HS are syntactically all highly grammaticalized. But the concomitant de-semanticization has not advanced at the same pace for all verbs. Thus, the intransitive auxiliaries *venir* 'come' and *ir* 'go' still retain the sense of motion verb, as well as the sense of two separate events, one following the other.

In the cases of the transitive *mandar* 'send' and *dejar* 'leave' their original lexical meaning, of motion, is retained, at least in some uses. But that sense is almost lost in other uses. The grammaticalized sense that becomes is now that of causation.

And in some combinations, such as e.g. *mandar + hablar* to yield 'scold', the original lexical sense of 'send' is almost entirely gone.

At the top of the de-semanticization scale, the transitives *botar* 'drop' and '*dar* 'give' have just about lost their original lexical meaning. *Botar* now adds the meaning 'unintentionally', and *dar* that of 'benefactive'.

One may thus view these verbs along a continuum of semantic re-analysis:

### (55) Continuum of de-semanticization of HS auxiliaries:

|              |                     |              |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| least        | .....               | most         |
| <i>ir</i>    | ..... <i>mandar</i> | <i>botar</i> |
| <i>venir</i> | ..... <i>dejar</i>  | <i>dar</i>   |

## 6.2. Syntactic re-analysis

### 6.2.1. Scope of negation

The negation test suggest that even in the least grammaticalized *ir* and *venir*, the two clauses are so well integrated semantically that only a single sense of negation may be obtained. That sense, however, centers on the gerund-marked complement, excluding the grammaticalized auxiliary. This contrast sharply with the morphologically-similar SS construction, where the scope of negation of the main verb covers *both* clauses. In the case of the further de-semanticized transitive auxiliaries of HS, the scope of negation, rather expectedly, excludes the auxiliary, covering only the gerund-marked verb.

### 6.2.2. Preposing of the gerund-marked clause

All the grammaticalized HS surveyed here resist preposing the gerund-marked VP. This contrasts sharply with SS gerund adverbial clauses, which are readily preposed. The removal of freedom of pre-posing suggests that the HS construction is not a loose parataxis, but rather a rigid syntactic

configuration displaying a considerable measure of syntactic integration — i.e., clause union.

### 6.2.3. *Interpretation of adverbials*

Only with the least grammaticalized auxiliaries *ir* and *venir* can one modify both clauses with an adverbial. With the more grammaticalized transitive auxiliaries, the adverbial can only modify the gerund-marked semantic main verb, never the grammaticalized and largely de-semanticized auxiliary.

### 6.2.4. *Clitic object pronouns and grammatical relations*

Spanish, both SS and HS, follows the general trend of embedding languages (Givón 1995, This volume), whereby in complement constructions, most finite morphology gravitates to the main verb. This tendency remains strong in the grammaticalization of main verbs into TAM auxiliaries in SS, although some variation is still allowed in two non-finite verb forms, gerund and infinitive. But in the case of the progressive auxiliary followed by a gerund-marked verb, object clitics can only appear as prefixes on the grammaticalized finite verb — the tail end of the clause-union process.

One could of course raise the obvious question — is the general tendency in Spanish and other embedding languages counter intuitive? That is, how come the verb that de-semanticizes and grammaticalizes nonetheless winds up with all finite marking, including tense-aspect modality, subject pronominal agreement and object clitic pronouns? The answer to this ought to be rather obvious, although it is perennially obscured by linguists' abiding attachment to the writing systems of languages such as English or Spanish: In clause union associated with grammaticalized auxiliaries, not only does the auxiliary wind up with all finite morphology for the merged clause, but it itself also cliticizes on the non-finite semantic main verb.

In the process of clause union in embedding languages, the finite morphology — including the grammaticalized auxiliary — winds up being re-attached precisely where it should be, to the *now finite* semantic main verb. Since all grammatical relations are now relevant to that verb alone, the assignment of object clitics as prefix on that verb, riding piggyback on the erstwhile auxiliary, is a return to the default rule of simple main clauses. It simply reasserts that it is to the finite semantic-main verb that all grammatical roles now bear their grammatical relations. That is, that the merged clause now has a merged single set of grammatical relations.

### Abbreviated Grammatical Terms

|        |                       |
|--------|-----------------------|
| COND   | Conditional           |
| FUT    | Future                |
| GER    | Gerund                |
| HS     | Highland Spanish      |
| IMP    | Imperative            |
| INF    | Infinitive            |
| NEG    | Negative              |
| OBJ    | Object                |
| PERF   | Perfect               |
| PAST   | Past                  |
| REFL   | Reflexive             |
| SS     | Standard Spanish      |
| 3p     | third person plural   |
| 3s     | third person singular |
| SUBJUN | Subjunctive           |
| TAM    | tense-aspect-modality |



## Notes

- \* I am indebted to T. Givón and Roberto Zavala for comments on earlier versions of the manuscript.
1. For the language contact situation in the Ecuador Highlands, see Toscano (1953), Niño-Murcia (1988), or Haboud (1994, 1995, 1996).
  2. These are known in the linguistic literature as 'aspect auxiliaries', 'aspectuals' (García 1967), 'co-verbs', 'quasi auxiliaries' (Bolinger 1980: 297; Heine 1993: 15), or 'semi auxiliaries' (Green 1987b: 261; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Myhill 1988).
  3. Most of my data on HS were collected between May 1992 and January 1993 as well as summer 1993. Much of the data is based on text from various sources, including Moya (1992), Perez-Torres (1991) and Stolen (1987). Most of my oral text elicitation took place on the campus of the Universidad Católica de Ecuador in Quito, or during social, family and taxi-riding occasions. During 1994 and 1995, e-mail correspondences with other native speakers of HS augmented my textual data-base.
  4. This is the so-called "affix climbing" of Romance languages, see Aissen and Perlmutter (1986).
  5. Previous studies suggest that the perfectivity associated with these constructions is due to the influence of the Quichua substratum (Haboud 1994; Niño-Murcia 1988; Toscano 1953).
  6. The morphological future in HS can also function as an informal (familiar) *imperative* (Haboud 1995).
  7. According to JG (native HS speaker), (13a) also implies that the action-event has been totally completed while (14a) the end result may be uncertain. Further research is needed to draw specific conclusions.
  8. See Yépez (1986), and Suñer and Yépez (1988) for analyses of clitic doubling and clitic deletion in Quiteño Spanish.
  9. Example (43b,c) may be used for extreme emphatic purposes as headlines of small local newspapers.
  10. The region focus of this study (Central Ecuadorian Highlands) is characterized as *leista* because of the use of the pronouns *le/les* replacing *lolla* in all contexts. Nevertheless, Niño-Murcia (1995) accounts for similar constructions on the Northern Ecuadorian Highlands which are mainly *loistas* (use of *lolfos* in all contexts), as in: *darámelo leyendo* 'Read it to/for me' (1995: 90).
  11. This double-clitic pattern is characteristic of bilingual Quichua-Spanish speakers as shown by Muysken (1977).

## References

- Alcina, Juan and Jose M. Blecuca. 1980. *Gramática Española*. Barcelona: Ed. Ariel.
- Aissen, Judy and D. Perlmutter. 1986. "Clause reduction in Spanish", In *Studies in Relational Grammar*, D. Perlmutter, (ed.), 1, (360-404). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1988. "Wanna and the gradience of auxiliaries." In G. Brettschneider and C. Lehman (eds) 1980, 292-299.
- Bybee, Joan, W. Pagliuca and Revere Perkins. 1991. "Back to the Future." In E. Traugott and B. Heine (eds) 1991: II, 17-58.
- Campos, Héctor. 1993. *De la Oración simple a la oración compuesta*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1991. *A New approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Emonds, J. 1976. *A transformational approach to English Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Freed, Alice. 1979. *The semantics of English complementation*, Dordrecht, Boston, and London: D. Reidel.
- García, Erica. 1967. "Auxiliaries and the criterion of simplicity." *Language* 43,4: 853-70.
- García, Erica. 1985. "Quantity into quality: synchronic indeterminacy and language change." *Lingua* 65: 275-306.
- Givón, T. 1971. "Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archaeologist's field trip." In *CLAS 7*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Givón, T. 1973. "The time-axis phenomenon." *Language* 49,4.
- Givón, T. 1975. "Serial verbs and syntactic change: Niger-Congo." In *Word Order and Word Order Change*, C. Li (ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Givón, T. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, T. 1980. "The Binding hierarchy and the typology of complements." *Studies in Language* 4:3:333-377.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax: A functional Typological Introduction*, vol. I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1995. *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gómez-Torrego, Leonardo. 1986. *Teoría y Práctica de la Sintaxis*. Madrid: Ed. Alhambra.
- Green, John. 1987a. "The status of Romance auxiliaries of voice." In N. Vincent and R. Ramat (eds) 1987: 97-138.
- Green, J. 1987b. "The evolution of Romance auxiliaries: Criteria and chronology." In N. Vincent and R. Ramat (eds) 1987: 257-67.
- Haboud, Marleen. 1994. "On language contact and grammatical changes in Highland Ecuadorian Spanish", University of Oregon (ms).
- Haboud, Marleen. 1995. "Semantic Transfer in Highland Ecuadorian Spanish", Paper presented at the Conference: Lenguas del Sur del Río Bravo. Tulane University. Tulane (January 1995) (ms).

- Haboud, Marleen. 1996. Quichua and Spanish in the Ecuadorian Highlands: The Effects of Long-term Contact. PhD. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Heine, B. 1990. "Grammaticalization chains as linguistic categories." *Studies in Language* 16.2:335-68.
- Heine, B. 1993. *Auxiliaries: Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, U. Claudi, and F. Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B. and M. Reh. 1982. *Patterns of Grammaticalization in African Languages*, AKUP 47, University of Koeln.
- Hopper, P. and S.A. Thompson. 1984. "The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar." *Language* 60:703-752.
- Kany, Charles. 1976. *Sintaxis Hispanoamericana* (version española de Martín Blanco Álvarez) Biblioteca Románica Hispánica. Madrid: Ed. Gredos.
- Keenan, E.L. 1975. "Some universals of passives and relational grammar", *CLS 11*, University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Keenan, E.L. 1976. "On the notion 'subject' in universal grammar." In *Subject and Topic*, C.N. Li (ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Lehman, Christian. 1982. "Thoughts on grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch." I, AKUP 48, Cologne: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb classes and alternations*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moya, Ruth. 1992. "El Bilingüismo del Maestro y del Niño en la Escuela Quichua-Castellano." Ponencia presentada al seminario Bilingüismo y Educación. Tema 3. Perspectivas Pedagógicas y Bilingüismo. Academia de Educación Indígena, Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, México.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1977. *Syntactic Developments in the Verb Phrase of Ecuadorian Quechua*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Myhill, John. 1988. "The grammaticalization of auxiliaries: Spanish clitic climbing." *BLS* 14:352-363. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Niño-Murcia, Mercedes. 1988. *Construcciones verbales del español andino: Interacción quechua-española en la frontera colombo-ecuatoriana*, PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Niño-Murcia, Mercedes. 1995. "The Gerund in the Spanish of the North Andean region." In Silva-Corvalán (ed.). 1995:83-100.
- Palmer, F.R. 1974. *The English Verb*. London: Longman.
- Payne, Thomas. 1994. "The pragmatics of voice in a Philippine language: Actor-focus and goal-focus in Cebuano narrative." In *Voice and Inversion*, T. Givón (ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins [Typological Studies in Languages 28].
- Pérez Torres, Raúl. 1991. *Cuentos Escogidos*, Colección Antares. Quito: Libresa.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1976. "Ristrutturazione: Rivista di Grammatica Generativa" (ms).
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Spanish in Los Angeles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1995. *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press [Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism].
- Stolen, Kristi A. 1987. *A Media Voz: Ser Mujer Campesina en la Sierra Ecuatoriana*. Quito: CEPLAES.
- Subirats-Rüggeberg, Carlos. 1987. "Sentential Complementation in Spanish: A lexicogrammatical study of three classes of verbs." *Linguística Investigaciones Suplementa*, 14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Suñer, Margarita and María Yépez. 1988. "Null Definite Objects in Quiteño." *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:3. Cambridge, MA.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1985. "Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms." In *Language typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. III, T. Shopen (ed.), 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toscano, Matheus. 1953. *El español en el Ecuador*, Madrid.
- Traugott, Elizabeth and Bernd Heine (eds) 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, I, II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins [Typological Studies in Language 19].
- Traugott, Elizabeth and Ekkehard König. 1991. "The Semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited." In E. Traugott and B. Heine (eds) 1991: vol. I.
- Taylor, Gerald. 1982. "Le morphème de respect /-pa-/ dans les parlers quechuas de la sierra équatorienne." *Amerindia Paris: Centre de Recherche de l'Université de Paris VIII* 7:55-61.
- Twadell, W. Freeman. 1963. *The English Verb Auxiliaries*, 2nd edition. Providence, RI: Brown University Press.
- Van de Kerke, Simon. 1994. "Mismatches between affix order and interpretation: Quechua *chi-*, *-mu*, and *-pu* revisited." in *Language in the Andes*, P. Cole, G. Hermonand and M. Martín (eds), 231-245. Delaware: University of Delaware.
- Vincent, Nigel and M. Harris (eds). 1987. *Studies in the Romance Verb*. London: Croom Helm.
- Yépez, María. 1986. "Direct Object Clitics in Quiteño Spanish." Cornell University, MA Thesis.
- Zavala, Roberto. 1993. *Clause Integration with Verbs of Motion in Mayan Languages*, MA Thesis, University of Oregon, Eugene.

In the series TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN LANGUAGE (TSL) the following titles have been published thus far:

8. SLOBIN, Dan I. & Karl ZIMMER (eds): *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*. 1986.
9. BYBEE, Joan L.: *Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. 1985.
10. RANSOM, Evelyn: *Complementation: its Meaning and Forms*. 1986.
11. TOMLIN, Russel S.: *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse. Outcome of a Symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984*. 1987.
12. NEDJALKOV, Vladimir (ed.): *Typology of Resultative Constructions. Translated from the original Russian edition (1983). English translation edited by Bernard Comrie*. 1988.
14. HINDS, John, Shoichi IWASAKI & Senko K. MAYNARD (eds): *Perspectives on Topicalization. The case of Japanese WA*. 1987.
15. AUSTIN, Peter (ed.): *Complex Sentence Constructions in Australian Languages*. 1988.
16. SHIBATANI, Masayoshi (ed.): *Passive and Voice*. 1988.
17. HAMMOND, Michael, Edith A. MORAVCSIK and Jessica WIRTH (eds): *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. 1988.
18. HAIMAN, John & Sandra A. THOMPSON (eds): *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. 1988.
19. TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth C. and Bernd HEINE (eds): *Approaches to Grammaticalization, 2 volumes (set)* 1991
20. CROFT, William, Suzanne KEMMER and Keith DENNING (eds): *Studies in Typology and Diachrony. Papers presented to Joseph H. Greenberg on his 75th birthday*. 1990.
21. DOWNING, Pamela, Susan D. LIMA and Michael NOONAN (eds): *The Linguistics of Literacy*. 1992.
22. PAYNE, Doris (ed.): *Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*. 1992.
23. KEMMER, Suzanne: *The Middle Voice*. 1993.
24. PERKINS, Revere D.: *Deixis, Grammar, and Culture*. 1992.
25. SVOROU, Soteria: *The Grammar of Space*. 1994.
26. LORD, Carol: *Historical Change in Serial Verb Constructions*. 1993.
27. FOX, Barbara and Paul J. Hopper (eds): *Voice: Form and Function*. 1994.
28. GIVÓN, T. (ed.): *Voice and Inversion*. 1994.
29. KAHREL, Peter and René van den BERG (eds): *Typological Studies in Negation*. 1994.
30. DOWNING, Pamela and Michael NOONAN: *Word Order in Discourse*. 1995.
31. GERNSBACHER, M. A. and T. GIVÓN (eds): *Coherence in Spontaneous Text*. 1995.
32. BYBEE, Joan and Suzanne FLEISCHMAN (eds): *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. 1995.
33. FOX, Barbara (ed.): *Studies in Anaphora*. 1996.
34. GIVÓN, T. (ed.): *Conversation. Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives*. 1997.
35. GIVÓN, T. (ed.): *Grammatical Relations. A functionalist perspective*. 1997.
36. NEWMAN, John (ed.): *The Linguistics of Giving*. n.y.p.

A full list of titles published in this series is available from the publisher.