

Grammatical borrowing from Spanish/Portuguese in some native languages of Latin America

Jeanette Sakel – UWE Bristol

jeanette.sakel@uwe.ac.uk

Abstract: In this paper I investigate how different factors can influence the range of grammatical categories affected by language contact, drawing on a sample of ten native languages of Latin America. The languages are all in contact with the highly dominant languages Spanish and Portuguese, but they differ with respect to a range of sociolinguistic factors relating to the contact situation. I am investigating the categories affected by borrowing in the languages of the sample, relating them to these different factors. My aim is to shed light on the reasons for why some Native American languages display borrowing in a wide range of categories, whereas other appears more restricted in what is borrowed.

1 Introduction

Most native languages of Latin America are - or have been - in contact with another language. We often find language contact between indigenous languages, for example within a linguistic area such as Mesoamerica (Campbell et al. 1986) or the Vaupés (Aikhenvald 2002). Other contact situations involve an indigenous dominant language such as Quechua in the ‘Inca Sphere’ of the South American highlands (Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 165) and surrounding regions or Lingua Geral, the creole based on Tupinambá (Campbell 1997: 23), in the Amazon. Today, the dominant contact languages throughout Latin America are predominantly of European descent, in most places Spanish or Portuguese. These former colonizers’ languages have not only left many traces in the indigenous languages of Latin America but a considerable number of indigenous peoples have given up their languages in favor of one of them. If not resulting in language shift and subsequent language death, many of these contact situations have resulted in

endangerment, while others have led to varying degrees of maintenance of the indigenous language.

What are the reasons for such great differences between the sociolinguistic situations of the indigenous languages? Most indigenous languages of Latin America have, to some degree, been given official status in their countries, e.g. Quechua in Bolivia, and bilingual education has become common. Still, in many cases education, trade and success in life are directly linked with being able to speak Spanish or Portuguese. This has led to some speakers of indigenous languages lose sight of the value of transmitting their language to their children. It is frequently exacerbated by negative attitudes toward the indigenous languages by outsiders, but often also by the speakers of the indigenous languages themselves.

In all cases, there is widespread evidence of Spanish or Portuguese influence in the indigenous languages in the form of lexical, and to some degree also grammatical borrowing. The question is whether sociolinguistic differences in the situations lead to differences in the types of loans we find and the categories affected by borrowing. Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) borrowing scale suggests that with more intense contact we find borrowing in an increased number of categories.

In the present paper I analyse a sample of 10 contact situations within Latin America where an indigenous language is in contact with Spanish or Portuguese. I record the grammatical categories affected by language contact, and in more detail to what type (*matter* or *pattern*, cf. discussion below) these loans belong. I relate my results to a number of other factors, and aim to establish whether the degree of contact leads to differences in the loans encountered.

2 Grammatical borrowing

Linguists have been aware of the outcomes of language contact for a long time, and first descriptions of contact phenomena go back to the classical Greek period (cf. Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 1), though it is mainly since Haugen (1950) and Weinreich (1953) that contact phenomena have been studied systematically, including studies of grammatical contact phenomena.

In recent years grammatical borrowing has been looked at from a number of typological perspectives. For example, analysing a wide range of contact situations, Heine & Kuteva (2005) find that language contact at the grammatical level follows patterns of grammaticalisation similar to those in language-internal changes. In a different typological study, Matras & Sakel (2007a) carry out a typological survey of contact situations. Matras (2007) revisits the question whether it is possible to establish borrowing hierarchies such as those set out by Moravcsik (1978) and Thomason & Kaufman (1988). Indeed, he finds various correlations, presenting a number of sub-hierarchies that show what is likely to happen in contact situations.

A number of recent approaches to language contact (Matras & Sakel 2007b; Sakel 2007a) distinguish different types of loans, namely *matter* (MAT) and *pattern* (PAT). The former (MAT) is the borrowing of morpho-phonological material, i.e. taking a word from one language and inserting it into another.¹ The latter (PAT) is the replication of patterns and is often referred to as calque or loan translation, i.e. only the structure or pattern is followed, while the word(s) used are native to the recipient language. An example of MAT is the Imbabura Quichua (Gómez-Rendón 2007a) borrowing of *intonses* (< Spanish *entonces*) inserted into the Quichua frame. It is used in Quichua in a similar way as in Spanish and it consists of the morpho-phonemic material of the Spanish original, with a slight adjustment in its pronunciation to conform with Quichua phonology. An example of PAT is the restructuring of the gender agreement system of Mosestén (Sakel 2002, 2007b): the Spanish pattern is followed by most speakers today in that the masculine gender is used as the unmarked gender when referring to mixed groups, as opposed to the original Mosestén pattern where the feminine gender is the unmarked gender. Thus, older Mosestenes will say *mö'in* 'they, F' when referred to a mixed-gender couple, while most younger Mosestenes will say *mi'in* 'they, M', parallel to Spanish *ellos* 'they, M or mixed group' as opposed to *ellas* 'they, F'. PAT is often an extension of an existing pattern in a language; cf. the discussion of pragmatic extension in borrowing (Silva-Corvalán 1994) as well as the concepts of 'pivot' (Matras & Sakel 2007b) and contact-induced grammaticalisation (Heine & Kuteva 2005). An example of a lexical PAT loan is the

1

A degree of phonological integration may occur.

German word *herunterladen* ‘download’, modeled on the English ‘download’, consisting of the elements *herunter* ‘down’ and *laden* ‘load’.

While the distinction between MAT and PAT is very useful in analysing contact phenomena, it has its limits. MAT loans are often a combination of MAT and PAT, i.e. the morphophonological form appears in the same type of construction as in its source language. MAT is not always a clear copy of the source language form in that it is often phonologically integrated and may have been restricted or extended in its function or meaning. Similarly, PAT is not always an exact copy of the source language, and differences to the original are common.

3 Grammatical borrowing from Spanish or Portuguese in Latin America

The indigenous languages of Latin America are genetically diverse, with a large number of language families and isolates. Most of these languages have in common that they are in similar contact situations with Spanish and Portuguese, the latter two generally being dominant and used as the high variety in situations of diglossia. The indigenous languages are often restricted to informal domains, functioning as the low variety in the same situations. The contact phenomena found in these languages are very similar when compared, in particular with respect to the categories affected by language contact, though there are obvious differences regarding factors such as size of the group, length of contact, language attitudes and education. In their analysis of the linguistic outcomes of language contact, Stolz & Stolz (1996; 1997) find that the same types of Spanish loans appear in the indigenous languages of Central America (1996), as well as in other languages in contact with Spanish as a dominant language (1997), in particular function words (Stolz 2007: 23). These are elements of a particle-like nature that can easily be integrated directly into the indigenous language. Various categories may be present in different contact situations, but not always the same elements from within these categories are borrowed. For example, subordinating conjunctions are frequently borrowed, but some language may use one token, e.g. *porque* ‘because’, while another language will use another one such as *para que* ‘so that’ (Stolz & Stolz 1996).

4 The languages of the sample and their sociolinguistic situations

The data on which this study is based are taken from two principal sources: 1. my own fieldwork on Mosestén, Chimane² and Pirahã³, and 2. contact situations included in the database pertaining to Matras & Sakel (2007a).⁴ My discussion below is based on the following references, describing situations where an indigenous language is in contact with Spanish:⁵ Nahuatl (Canger & Jensen 2007), Yaqui (Estrada & Guerrero 2007), Otomi (Hekking & Bakker 2007), Purepecha (Chamorean 2007), Imbabura Quichua (Gómez-Rendón 2007a), Paraguayan Guaraní (Gómez-Rendón 2007b) and my own study on Mosestén (Sakel 2007c), as well as an indigenous language in contact with Portuguese, Hup⁶ (Epps 2007). Many of these languages are also part of other contact situations, which are not of primary concern here. For example Hup is part of the Vaupés linguistic area (Aikhenvald 2002), as well as in a one to one contact situation with Tukano (Epps 2007).

These languages can be roughly classified as being in situations of endangerment, maintenance or widespread monolingualism, summarised in Table 1.⁷

Table 1 The sociolinguistic situations of the sample languages

2

Also Gill (1999).

3

Everett (1986, 2005).

4

The entire database in Matras & Sakel (2007a) comprises 28 contact situations worldwide, based on a comprehensive questionnaire.

5

In the discussion below these references are not always be mentioned separately, such as when summarising findings from various language contact situations.

6

This article is mainly concerned with the contact situation between Hup and Tukano, but Epps (2007) also deals with the contact situation with Portuguese, which is my focus here.

7

This division is very general and does not take into account the different sociolinguistic situations within each contact situation, for example between urban areas and rural areas.

	family, country	nr. of speakers	contact since	situation today
Nahuatl	Uto-Aztecan, Mexico	1,000,000	16 th century	endangered
Otomi	Otomanguean, Mexico	310,000	16 th century	endangered
Purepecha	isolate, Mexico	110,000	16 th century	endangered
Mosetén	Mosetenan, Bolivia	800	16 th century	endangered
Yaqui	Uto-Aztecan, Mexico	15,000	16 th century	maintenance, bilingualism
Imbabura Quichua	Quechuan, Ecuador	150,000	16 th century	maintenance, bilingualism
Paraguayan Guaraní	Tupí-Guaraní, Paraguay	5,000,000	16 th century	maintenance, bilingualism
Hup	Makú, Brazil	1500	proper contact: last decades	high degree of monolingualism
Chimane	Mosetenan, Bolivia	5000	proper contact: last decades	high degree of monolingualism
Pirahã	Muran, Brazil	450	18 th century (on and off)	high degree of monolingualism

The languages can be divided up into 1. endangered languages, 2. languages that experience bilingualism and language maintenance, and finally 3. languages which still have a high degree of monolingualism today. Those classified as endangered display language shift, which means that while elders may be monolingual or bilingual, many children do not learn the language. This is the case in Nahuatl, Otomi, Purepecha and Mosetén. For example, Purepecha has 10% of monolingual speakers, but only 28% of children learn to speak the language, i.e. transmission of Purepecha to the next generation is very low. In all of the languages with high endangerment, the indigenous language is restricted to very informal domains such as with family and friends. The languages are often predominantly, if not exclusively, used orally. Some of the languages have recently

had written forms established by linguists, but these are not in common use. Others, such as Nahuatl, had a spelling system since the 1540s, which, however, is no longer used (Canger & Jensen 2007: 403). The lack or disuse of written forms can be linked to a lack or failure of bilingual education efforts. Furthermore, negative attitudes from within and outside the community affect the use of the languages. We find this for Otomi and Mosestén, where the building of roads with better access and resulting contact has led to increased Spanish influence. For example, the Mosestenes have seen a substantial migration into their traditional area by Spanish-speaking farmers from the Andean highlands (von Stosch 2009), coinciding with a decline in the use of Mosestén.

The situations classified as bilingualism with language maintenance (Yaqui, Imbabura Quichua and Paraguayan Guaraní) are likewise situations of diglossia. Spanish is the high language, while the indigenous language are used in informal domains, such as within the family and the community (but see Dietrich this volume on Paraguayan Guaraní). Maintenance coincides with viable bilingual programs in school, positive attitudes towards the indigenous languages, and in the case of Imbabura Quichua and Paraguayan Guaraní the existence of (oral) media.

The three remaining languages (Hup, Chimane, Pirahã) are viable and transmitted to children, the culture is intact (to a large degree) and attitudes toward the language and culture are positive. Many speakers of these languages are monolingual. In two of the situations, Hup and Chimane, contact has only recently become a permanent feature, though there was sporadic contact with speakers of Spanish or Portuguese before this time. In the case of Pirahã, there has been some contact with speakers of Portuguese for a long time, while the group itself has remained monolingual.⁸ All three languages with predominantly monolingual speakers have in common that their speakers belong to small, coherent groups.

Group size alone, however, is not the determining factor in language maintenance. This can be seen when comparing the two neighboring languages Mosestén and Chimane, which together make up the language family Mosestenan. Both groups are small in that Mosestén has around 800 speakers, and Chimane has between 4000 and 6000 speakers.

8

Cf. Sakel (forthc.) and Sakel & Stapert (2009).

These two groups are very different sociolinguistically: while Mosestén is endangered, Chimane is viable and has many monolingual speakers. The reason for this can be found in the history of the groups: the Mosetenes have lived in established missions for several centuries, while the Chimanes successfully evaded missionaries until recently (Sakel 2004: 5; Gurven 2004: 8). Many Chimanes are monolingual and they are proud of their heritage. The Mosetenes, on the other hand, have largely negative attitudes toward their language and culture, reinforced by Bolivian settlers living in the area. The Pirahã are in a similar situation to the Chimanes when comparing them to the speakers of the other languages of the Muran family. The latter have are believed to have shifted entirely to Portuguese, while the group of Pirahã is still largely monolingual (Thomason & Everett 2005: 13).

5 Results: categories of grammatical borrowing⁹

This section is concerned with the grammatical categories affected by borrowing, as well as the different types of borrowing (MAT and PAT). Table 2 summarises my findings from the languages of the sample. It shows the types of loans and the categories of the target language in which they appear. MAT loans are frequent in function-word categories, which I divide up further into coordinators, discourse markers, adverbs & adpositions, subordinators, numerals, quantifiers, diminution & augmentation and nominalisation. This division is an attempt to further classify the function words appearing in my data and is not intended as the final word on which categories are prone to borrowing. It also includes the category of numerals, which may not be a prototypical ‘function word’ category, but is often found to be prone to borrowing (e.g. Matras 2007: 51), and is likewise attested in a number of languages in my sample.

PAT loans appear in a wide variety of categories. Only word order changes are found in more than one contact situation looked at here, and hence presented separately in Table 2. The other categories where PAT loans and some MAT loans appear are

9

As I am focusing on grammatical loans, lexical borrowing is not considered here, though some of the categories, e.g. numerals, may be regarded as belonging to both lexicon and grammar.

summarised for now as *other grammatical categories*. They will be discussed in greater detail below.

Table 2 gives an indication as to which categories are affected by borrowing, and also of which type the loans are. I have not attempted a count of the total number of types and tokens in each category for a number of reasons: It would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish the total quantity of loans. Even though all the descriptions of language contact situations are based on first-hand fieldwork, some situations are described in more detail than others. Also, some loans may not have been captured because they are only used by some individuals and may have been classified as code-switches rather than established loans. The detailed quantification of loans is not the aim of this study. Rather, I am interested in the categories affected by borrowing. The indications of MAT and PAT in Table 2 show that at least various types and tokens are attested within the given category. When presented in brackets, (MAT) and (PAT) indicate that there are only few types and/or tokens attested. In order to make a visual impact, PAT is presented in bold print.

Table 2 Grammatical borrowing in the sample languages: an overview

	N ah ua tl	Ot o mi	Pur epe cha	M os eté n	I. Q ui ch ua	P. G ua ra ní	Ya qu i	Chi man e	H up	Pira hã
Coordinators	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	
Discourse markers	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	(MAT)		(MAT)
Adverbs, adpositions	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT			MAT	
Subordinators		MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT	MAT				
Numerals	MAT		MAT (PAT)	MAT	MAT	MAT		MAT	MAT	
Quantifiers	MAT			MAT	MAT	MAT				
Diminution/ augmentation			MAT	MAT	MAT					

Nominalisation					MAT		MAT			
Other grammatical categories	PAT	PAT	PAT	PAT	PAT MAT	PAT MAT	MAT			
Word order	PAT	PAT	PAT	PAT	PAT					

The two main findings are that 1. MAT and PAT are distributed differently over the categories and 2. some languages have MAT/PAT loans in a variety of categories, while the rightmost languages in the Table have no PAT loans, and MAT loans appear in fewer categories. This appears to relate to the types of contact situations the respective languages are in. These issues will be explored separately below.

5.1 The distribution of MAT and PAT in different categories

MAT loans appear in various categories in the language of the sample, but cluster around function word categories, such as coordinators, and discourse markers. Coordinators include (the Spanish or Portuguese word for) ‘but’, ‘or’ and ‘and’, the latter appearing in fewer cases, confirming Matras’ (2007: 54) borrowing hierarchy within coordinators. Discourse markers include e.g. *pues* ‘well’, the tag *nove* ‘right’ used in Mosetén, and the quotative *dizi* in Imbabura Quichua (Gómez-Rendón 2007a: 496). Subordinators are also frequently borrowed as MAT in these contact situations. The data confirm the observation by Stolz & Stolz (1996) that elements from a certain category are often borrowed, though these elements are not necessarily the same in all languages. For example in my sample, Yaqui (Estrada & Guerrero 2007: 425) borrows the subordinator *si* ‘if’ from Spanish, while this is not found in Otomi (Hekking & Bakker 2007: 452-3). Otomi, on the other hand, has *que* ‘that’, *por que* ‘why’, *para que* ‘so that’, *como* ‘like’ and *cuando* ‘when’.

Another common type of elements that have been borrowed as MAT are treated under the general heading of adverbs and adpositions in Table 2 and comprise deictic as well as other elements. There are adverbs, such as *ya* ‘already’ in Purepecha (Chamoreau 2007: 474-5), and prepositions, which are very frequent in Otomi, including *con* ‘with’ and *pa* (from *para*) ‘for’ (Hekking & Bakker 2007: 447-8). This category also includes some markers with negative meanings, such as *ne* (> Brazilian Portuguese *nem*)

‘neither/nor’ in Hup, and *embesde* ‘instead’ from Spanish borrowed into Mosetén (Sakel 2007c: 575-6) and Otomi (Hekking & Bakker 2007: 449). These markers are indeed rather diverse and my reasoning for treating them under the same heading is that many contact situations show borrowing of at least one of these elements, while not all of them necessarily have to be present.

Spanish numerals are likewise frequent MAT loans in indigenous languages. Usually, the entire set of Spanish numerals is taken over and exists alongside lower numbers (up to 5 or 10) in the indigenous language. In most cases the use of Spanish/Portuguese numerals coincides with increased trade or other contact, and may even be due to a conscious choice. For example, the Chimanes use Spanish numerals introduced by missionaries in the schools, which are otherwise Chimane-speaking. In this case the Spanish numerals were introduced by the missionaries, who preferred their greater simplicity as compared to the often very long indigenous numerals. It is questionable whether the Spanish numeral system may also have influenced the setup of indigenous systems as a PAT loan. Chamoreau (2007: 470) argues that in Purepecha a vigesimal system was turned into a decimal system due to contact with Spanish. Likewise, the Mosetén and Chimane numeral system may have developed from a quinary to a decimal system under the influence of Spanish (Schuller 1917 xiii; Sakel 2004: 168).¹⁰

Other elements borrowed in some of the indigenous languages are quantifiers such as *todo* ‘all’ and *poco* ‘little’ in Paraguayan Guaraní (Gómez-Rendón 2007b: 541). Also the marker *mas* ‘more’ is borrowed in a number of cases. In Imbabura Quichua it is used within a Spanish construction - varying along a continuum with the native construction (Gómez-Rendón 2007a: 511).

While all the forms above are free elements, there are also a number of bound markers that have been borrowed from Spanish or Portuguese into indigenous languages: these are markers of diminution, augmentation and agentive nominalisation.

10

While numbers from one to five have their separate lexical forms in Mosetén, numbers from six onwards are complex nominal structures, which could indicate that the original system was based on five (Schuller 1917), though this is no longer the case. Apart from these differences in the forms of numerals, the indigenous numeral system of Mosetén uses a ten-based system (cf. Sakel 2004: 167ff).

In Imbabura Quichua, Spanish diminutive and augmentative markers are used alongside native markers with the same meanings (Gómez-Rendón 2007a: 491-2). In Purepecha the masculine diminutive suffix *-ito* has been borrowed. Arguably, this is the masculine form since there is no gender distinction in Purepecha (Chamoreau 2007). It is used as a discourse marker and as a loan in Purepecha its meaning has been extended to express ‘just’. For example ‘(just) alone’ in (1) means ‘I stayed alone’:

- (1) *xantiakhu-itu*
 alone-DIM
 ‘I stayed alone’ (Purepecha, Chamoreau 2007: 469)

There are two different agentive nominalisation markers in the present sample. In Imbabura Quichua, *-dur* (> Spanish *-dor* ‘agentive nominalisation’) appears both on borrowed and on native words, such as Quichua *kalpa* ‘run’ in (2):

- (2) *kalpa-dur*
 run-NOM
 ‘runner’ (Imbabura Quichua, Gómez-Rendón 2007a: 492)

Likewise, *-ero* appears with Yaqui nouns, displaying a number of allomorphs in this language, including *-reo*. It is productively added to native and borrowed words, e.g. *bwik-reo* ‘singer’ from Yaqui *bwike* ‘sing’ (Estrada & Guerrero 2007: 422).¹¹

Hence, not only free forms can be borrowed as MAT, but also bound MAT loans appear in various languages. These bound forms have in common that they are ‘detachable’ in meaning and form: they have a clearly defined meaning such as nominalisation or diminution and usually also a clearly defined form that can be attached to different bases without major changes (but cf. the allomorphy in Yaqui).

11

Meanings of some loans (compounds) are different, e.g. *wakareo* from Spanish *vaca* ‘cow’ ‘butcher (the person who sells meat)’ rather than ‘cowboy’.

(3) *A'mo miyek-in kal-tin.*
 NEG much-PL house-PL
 'There are not many houses.' (modern North Puebla Nahuatl, Canger &
 Jensen 2007: 404)

(4) a. *Ti-wel-la-mati-s* *in* *i:n-na:wak*
 SUB.1PL-well-OBJ.INDEF-know-FUT DEF POSS.3PL-near
to-te:k^w-yo:-wa:n *siwa:pipiltin*.
 POSS.1PL-lord-DER1-POSS.PL *cihuāpipiltin*
 ‘You will be happy near our goddesses, the *cihuāpipiltin*.’ (Classical
 Nahuatl, Canger & Jensen 2007: 405)

b. *Ma ya* *ø-m-namaka* *na* *Lupe Peña*.

IMP go SUB.3-REFL-sell.PRES at Lupe Peña
 ‘Off we go, it sells at Lupe Peña’s house.’ (North Guerrero Nahuatl,
 Canger & Jensen 2007: 405)

Furthermore, the verb ‘have’ is used to express obligation, modeled on the Spanish *tiene que* which expresses both ‘have’ and ‘obligation’, alongside native ways of expressing obligation. A periphrastic future tense has been introduced due to contact with Spanish, and now exists alongside the original morphological future of Nahuatl. The constituent order was changed at the phrase level, leading to the loss of pre-head relative clauses. Finally, many of the above changes have lead to a breaking up of the polysynthetic structure of Nahuatl, becoming more similar to the structure of Spanish, e.g. using periphrastic constructions, rather than morphological marking.

Mosetén has a number of possible PAT loans as well, but contrary to Nahuatl there are very few old materials to compare the modern language with, and PAT loans may go unnoticed. Apart from a possible change in the numeral system (cf. above), PAT loans in Mosetén include a shift in the unmarked gender from feminine to masculine, as discussed in section 2. This shift is mainly noticeable diachronically, in that older people prefer the use of the feminine for mixed groups, while most young people chose the masculine gender for this purpose (cf. Sakel 2002).

Some categories, such as prepositions show both MAT and PAT loans: In Nahuatl prepositions are formed from native elements (PAT), in Mosetén and other languages prepositions are taken over directly from Spanish (MAT). What is common to all the loans discussed here, however, is that MAT loans usually appear within the extended category of function words. These have in common that they generally belong to a closed class of parts of speech at the interface of lexicon and grammar. They are often separate words, or clearly separable affixes with specific functions assigned to them. They function at a discourse or lexical level, outside the core of the clause.

Still, Table 2 reveals that MAT loans also appear in other categories and that MAT loans are therefore not restricted to the typical MAT categories identified here. In Imbabura Quichua (Gómez-Rendón 2007a) Spanish modal verbs are borrowed as MAT, while Paraguayan Guaraní (Gómez-Rendón 2007b) borrows the morphosyntactic form of

some Spanish determiners that are used with slightly different functions in the recipient language (2007b: 529). Finally, Yaqui shows MAT borrowing of Spanish nouns in their plural form, taking on a singular meaning in Yaqui (Estrada & Guerrero 2007: 421).

Altogether, MAT clusters around the general categories of function words.¹² Analysing a wider sample of language contact situations, I found that function words are predominantly borrowed as MAT, even in cases where PAT is prevalent otherwise (Sakel 2007a: 26).

5.2 The types of loans/categories with respect to the sociolinguistic situations

Moving on to the second finding from Table 2, some languages displayed loans in a wide variety of contact situations, while others were more restricted. Looking at the categories affected by borrowing, one could bundle the first six languages in the table together into group 1: Nahuatl, Otomi, Purepecha, Mosetén, Imbabura Quichua and Paraguayan Guaraní show borrowing in a wide variety of categories, and all have some PAT borrowing somewhere in the language. Group 2 consists of the last 4 languages: Yaqui, Chimane, Hup and Pirahã, which show contact influence in fewer categories, exclusively of the type MAT.

Looking at the sociolinguistic situations of group 1, these languages are all spoken alongside Spanish. Some of the languages are endangered and some people of the indigenous group have shifted entirely to Spanish (e.g. among the Mosetenes). Above, I classified them as belonging to the groups ‘endangered languages’ and ‘languages that experience bilingualism and language maintenance’. These six languages are in situations of diglossia, in which Spanish is the high (H) language and the indigenous language the low (L) language. With some exceptions, the indigenous languages are confined to the home & friends domains, while Spanish is spoken in most other situations. While the sociolinguistics in the languages of group 1 differ in a number of other respects, dominance of Spanish and generally widespread bilingualism seem to be the main aspects where they resemble each other.

12

cf. also the wider sample of Matras & Sakel 2007a where MAT loans cluster around function words, but are not restricted to this category.

Turning to group 2, three of the languages are in similar contact situations: Chimane, Hup and Pirahã are classified above as displaying ‘high degrees of monolingualism’. Hence, less contact means loans in fewer grammatical categories.¹³ The one exception in this groups is Yaqui, which in the same way as Imbabura Quichua and Paraguayan Guaraní is in a situation of maintenance with bilingualism. There are only some older monolinguals in Yaqui, otherwise widespread bilingualism with Spanish as highly dominant in most public domains (Estrada & Guerrero 2007: 419). How can it be that Yaqui looks similar to the three other languages in group 2 regarding the categories and types of loans found? An answer may lie in the cultural background of the language: According to Estrada & Guerrero (2007: 419), the Yaqui have a strong culture and show “strength, pride” and a “demanding character”, for example by not allowing photographs being taken. In this way, they are similar to the other three languages in group 2: the Pirahã are very proud of their way of life, and while accepting a number of improvements to their lifestyle brought in from the outside (e.g. fishing rods, cloth, boats) they generally find that they have little to gain from the outside world (Everett 2005; own fieldnotes). Likewise, the Hup and Chimane have very strong cultural identities. The difference is that the Hup, Chimane and Pirahã societies have had a chance to avoid close contact with Spanish/Portuguese, mainly due to their location and history. The Yaqui, on the other hand, live in areas of central west Sonora in Mexico and more recently in the US, where contact with Spanish is unavoidable.

The languages of group 2 are therefore characterized by resistance to contact influence and groups with strong cultural identities.

6 Conclusion

The languages in the sample show similarities with respect to the grammatical categories affected by language contact and the types of loans encountered. Function words, in particular coordinators and discourse markers, are affected by borrowing in all contact

13

Spanish/Portuguese influence may not be direct: In Hup, the source of the loans from Portuguese could be indirectly through another indigenous language, Tukano, with which Hup is in close contact and in which “virtually all” (Epps 2007: 551) speakers are bilingual.

situations¹⁴, even those with otherwise very little borrowing. Other function word categories, such as adverbs and adpositions, subordination markers and numerals are also commonly borrowed, in particular in situations where Spanish or Portuguese are highly dominant. All of these are generally MAT loans. PAT-loans appear as well, but there is no clear pattern as to which categories are affected, apart from word order. Furthermore, PAT loans do not appear in languages with less widespread bilingualism.

The number of categories affected by borrowing seems to be linked to the sociolinguistic profile of the contact situation: in situations of less widespread bilingualism, borrowing appears in only some of the categories and is restricted to MAT loans. In cases where Spanish and Portuguese are highly dominant, at least half of the categories identified are affected by borrowing, irrespective of whether the indigenous language is maintained or endangered. Apart, that is, from Yaqui. It appears that the cultural strength of this group has an impact on the number and type of loans adopted from Spanish. Even though Yaqui is spoken in a situation of diglossia, the categories affected by contact as well as the type of contact phenomena found (MAT) resembles that of the languages with less widespread bilingualism.

This leads to the conclusion that with increased intensity of contact, bilingualism and cultural pressure the number of grammatical categories affected by contact increases, as predicted by Thomason & Kaufman's (1988: 74-6) borrowing scale. Additionally, all loans from Spanish/Portuguese into the indigenous language are MAT at the early stages. With increasing bilingualism and acculturation, more categories are affected by contact. At this stage PAT loans can be introduced into the indigenous language. PAT loans require a good knowledge of the source language (i.e. in this case Spanish or Portuguese) and generally dominance of that language.¹⁵

The categories affected by contact borrowed in almost all contact situations of my sample, even those with predominantly monolingual groups, are coordinators and

14

This is very restricted for Pirahã.

15

From the very early stages of contact between indigenous languages and Spanish or Portuguese PAT transfer is likely in the other direction, from the indigenous language into the Romance language (cf. discussions about transfer in L2 acquisition such as Odlin 1989; Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008).

discourse markers. One can therefore assume that these are borrowed first - or at least early on - in a contact situation. They are followed in my sample by subordination markers, and adverbs and adpositions. These findings coincide with Thomason & Kaufman's (1988: 74) prediction that conjunctions and adverbial markers are borrowed early on, and it is also reflected in findings on the typology of grammatical borrowing (Matras 2007: 63-4; Sakel 2007a: 23, among others). Hence, the fact that the two source languages in my sample - Spanish and Portuguese - are closely related does not necessarily affect the generalisability of the results. Rather, one can see Latin America as a test case of the factors that affect grammatical borrowing: the contact situations are similar from the perspective that native American languages are in contact with a generally highly dominant (former) colonizers' language that is generally the high language in a diglossic situation. By comparing the types of categories affected by contact with the factors involved in the contact situation, we can use synchronic data to understand what happens diachronically, regarding the grammatical categories affected by contact.

Abbreviations

DEF	definite
DERI	derivational morpheme
DIM	diminutive
F	feminine
FUT	future tense
H	high (language in diglossia)
IMP	imperative
INDEF	object prefix referring to no referent
L	low (language in diglossia)
M	masculine
MAT	<i>matter</i> loan
NEG	negation
NOM	(agentive) nominalisation
OBJ	object

PAT	<i>pattern</i> loan
PL	plural
POSS	possessive pronoun
PRES	present tense
REFL	reflexive
SUB	subject

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2002. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adelaar, Willem & Muysken, Pieter. 2004. *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1997. *American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of Native America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, Lyle; Kaufman, Terence & Smith-Stark, Thomas. 1986. "Meso-America as a Linguistic Area Language", *Language* 62 (3), 530-570.
- Canger, Una & Jensen, Anne. 2007. "Grammatical borrowing in Nahuatl." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 403-418.
- Chamoreau, Claudine. 2007. "Grammatical borrowing in Purepecha." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 465-480.
- Estrada Fernández, Zarina & Guerrero, Lilián. 2007. "Grammatical borrowing in Yaqui." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 419-433.
- Epps, Patience. 2007. "Grammatical borrowing in Hup" In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 551-565.
- Everett, Daniel. 1986. "Pirahã." In: *Desmond Derbyshire and Geoffrey Pullum* (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, vol. I: 220–326.
- Everett, Daniel. 2005. "Cultural constraints on grammar and cognition in Pirahã: Another look at the design features of human language." *Current Anthropology* 76 (4), 621–646.
- Gill, Wayne. 1999. *A pedagogical grammar of the Chimane (Tsimane') language*. Bolivia: New Tribes Mission, manuscript.
- Gómez-Rendón, Jorge. 2007a. "Grammatical borrowing in Imbabura Quichua (Ecuador)" In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 551-565.
- Gómez-Rendón, Jorge. 2007b. "Grammatical borrowing in Paraguayan Guaraní." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 523-550.

- Gurven, Michael (2004) "Economic Games Among the Amazonian Tsimane: Exploring the Roles of Market Access, Costs of Giving, and Cooperation on Pro-Social Game Behavior." *Experimental Economics* 7, 5–24.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing." *Language* 26 (2), 210–231.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2005. *Language Contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hekking, Ewald & Bakker, Dik. 2007. "The case of Otomi: a contribution to grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 435-464.
- Jarvis, Scott & Pavlenko, Aneta. 2008. *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. "The borrowability of structural categories." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 31-73.
- Matras, Yaron & Sakel, Jeanette. 2007a. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron & Sakel, Jeanette. 2007b. "Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence" *Studies in Language* 31 (4), 829-865.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. "Language contact." In: Joseph E. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of human language I*. Stanford University Press, 95-122.
- Odlin, Terence. 1989. *Language transfer: cross-linguistics influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2002. "Gender agreement in Mosestén." In: Mily Crevels et al. (eds.) *Current studies on South American languages*. Leiden: CNWS, 287-305.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2004. *A grammar of Mosestén*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (Mouton Grammar Library vol. 33).
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007a. "Types of loan: Matter and pattern." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 15-29.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007b. "Language contact between Spanish and Mosestén - a study of grammatical integration" *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11 (1), 25-53.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007c. "Mosestén borrowing from Spanish." In: Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 567-580.
- Sakel, Jeanette (2010 forthc.) "Transfer and language contact: the case of Pirahã." In: Jeanette Sakel & Jeanine Treffers-Daller (eds.) "New perspectives on language transfer". Special issue of *International Journal of Bilingualism*.
- Sakel, Jeanette & Stapert, Eugenie. 2009. "Pirahã – in need of recursive syntax?" In: Harry van der Hulst (ed.) *Recursion*. Studies in Generative Grammar series. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schuller, Rudolph. 1917. *Introduction to Benigno Bibolotti's Moseteno vocabulary and treaties from an unpublished manuscript in possession of Northwestern's University Library*. Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language contact and change – Spanish in Los*

- Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2007. "Romancisation worldwide." In Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker & Rosa Salas Palomo (eds.) *Aspects of language contact*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-42.
- Stolz, Christel & Stolz, Thomas. 1996. "Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch-Amerindischer Sprachkontakt." (Hispanoindiana II). *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49 (1), 86-123.
- Stolz, Christel & Stolz, Thomas. 1997. "Universelle Hispanismen? Von Manila über Lima bis Mexiko und zurück: Muster bei der Entlehnung spanischer Funktionswörter in die indigenen Sprachen Amerikas und Austronesiens." *Orbis* 39, 1-77.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Everett, Daniel. 2005. "Pronoun borrowing" *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 27, 301-315.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Kaufman, Terence. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- von Stosch, Kristina. 2009. "Land Hochland- und Tieflandindigene im Konflikt: Land und Ressourcen im Alto Beni / Bolivien." PhD thesis manuscript, La Paz, Bolivia.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Author's address:

Dr Jeanette Sakel

Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies

University of the West of England

Coldharbour Lane

Bristol

BS16 1NT

UK

jeanette.sakel@uwe.ac.uk