Contact-induced change as an innovation

Claudine Chamoreau

Contact-induced change as an innovation[1]

Claudine Chamoreau

1. Introduction

Generally, in a situation of language contact, the syntactic effects on replica language (or receiving language) structure seem to be related to features that have come from one of the languages in contact, frequently the model language (or source language). For example, Thomason's typology of morphosyntactic changes in contact situations shows three types of effects on a receiving language structure: loss of features as a result of language contact; addition of linguistic features through contact-induced changes; and partial or total replacement of old native linguistic features by interference features (2001:60, 85-91). Heine (2006) indicates that generally in the situation of language contact, "speakers recruit material available in R (the replica language) to create new structures on the model of M (the model language) and … rather than being entirely new, the structures created in R are built on existing use patterns and constructions that are already available in R."

This paper explores a specific contact-induced change, that is, innovation, defined as structure that emerges as a consequence of contact between two languages and that diverges from the patterns of both the model language and the replica language. In other terms, these new innovated linguistic features are not created on the model of the model language.

In this paper I investigate the development of new features as consequences of the contact between Purepecha,[2] the replica language, and Spanish, the model language, with which it has been in contact for nearly five centuries. According to the types of contact-induced changes described by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), Purepecha presents a situation of intense contact and the characteristics of a shift situation, since the changes are mainly in phonology and morphosyntax (Chamoreau 2007, 2010).

I specifically examine the domain of comparative constructions of superiority in Purepecha. In this language, almost all superiority comparative constructions clearly show the consequences of contact with Spanish. Certain constructions, such as example (1a), constitute borrowing or replication of the less marked construction in the model language, the particle construction with the degree marker *más* 'more' and the relator *que* 'than' shown in example (1b). Another construction, example (1c), formed by the degree marker *sáni=teru*, the relator *ke*, and the preposition *de*, is created by adapting the model of the Spanish construction with *más…de…que*, example (1d).

(1) a. *enrike* **mas** *ʃepe-s-ti*   **ke** *Pe*dru
         Henry   more   be lazy-AOR-ASS3   than   Peter
         'Henry is lazier than Peter.'   (Cuanajo-Evaristo9: 208)

[2] Purepecha (formerly known as Tarascan) is classified as a language isolate spoken in the state of Michoacan, with approximately 110,000 speakers (Chamoreau 2009). There are different ways of spelling the name of this language. In the literature, it is possible to find it as Purepecha, Purépecha, Purhépecha, P'urépecha, P'urhépecha, Phurhépecha, P'orhépecha, Phorhépicha, etc.

b. *mi   padre baila   **más** rápido **que** mi   madre*
   POS1   father dance.PRES3 more   fast   than POS1   mother
   'My father dances faster than my mother.'

c. *Gervasio **sáni=teru**   prontu   ni-ra-s-ti   **ke**   **de** ima*
   Gervasio   few=more   quickly go-FT-AOR-ASS3 than of DEM
   'Gervasio went more quickly than him.' (Lit. 'Gervasio went more quickly than of him.')   (Cuanajo-Evaristo9: 102)

d. *Él   es   **más** feliz **de lo** **que** pensaba*
   3IND   be.PRES3 more   happy of DEM   than think-PAST.IMPF1
   'He is happier than I thought.'

But an original structure has been conceived on the model neither of the replica language nor of Spanish. This structure employs the preposition *entre* for comparison, for example:

(2) *Puki **mas** kokani xano-nka-ti   **ke** **entre** ima*
     Puki   more   quickly arrive-CENTRIP-ASS3 than between DEM
     'Puki arrives more quickly than him.' (Lit. 'Puki arrives more quickly than between him.')   (San Andrés Tziróndaro-nana1: 101)

In example (2), we recognized the Spanish particle construction with *mas… ke,* but the presence of *entre* is original, and impossible in Spanish for a comparative construction.

The specific innovation studied in this article is not a partial copy (Heine and Kuteva 2005) but an innovation: speakers attribute to a Spanish morpheme a new function not attested in either the model language or the replica language, inventing a new structure. The interesting fact is that on the one hand contact makes a syntactic innovation possible, while on the other hand this innovation seems to correspond to cross-linguistically cognitive tendencies (Matras 2007).

This paper is organized into the following sections: Section 2 introduces some basic typological properties of Purepecha and essential information on data collection procedures. Section 3 presents comparative constructions in Spanish, the model language, and Lengua de Michoacan, the pre-contact replica language.[3] Section 4 illustrates the diversity and complexity of comparative constructions in Purepecha. Section 5 gives a detailed analysis of the innovative construction in Purepecha. Section 6 shows the absence of similar constructions in other Mesoamerican languages. The discussion in section 7 assigns the phenomenon under scrutiny a place in the catalogue of contact-induced structural changes.

2. Essential information about Purepecha

2.1 Basic typological properties

Purepecha has nominative-accusative alignment, where the subject of a transitive verb, like *Selia* 'Celia,' in (4), is encoded like the subject of an intransitive verb, *anima*, 'soul,' in (3). This is a case-marking language in which the nominal subject has no overt marker. In an

---

[3] In order to distinguish the pre-contact replica language from the contact replica language, I adopt the traditional name, Lengua de Michoacan, for the former, the language spoken in the sixteenth century, and the current name, Purepecha, for the latter (Márquez Joaquín 2007).

intransitive construction, as in (3), the single argument *anima-itʃa* 'the souls' has no specific marker. The object is generally marked by the objective case marker *-ni*. This morpheme encodes the object of a transitive verb, *misitu-ni* 'the cat,' in (4), and both objects of a ditransitive verb, such as *inte-ni wantantskwa-ni* and *Puki-ni*, in (5).[4]

(3) *yaʃɨ=kʃɨ   tsɨma **anima-itʃa** tsípi-pa-ntha-ʃa-ti*
     now=3PL   DEM.PL soul-PL   be glad-CENTRIF-IT-PROG-ASS3
     'Now these souls are leaving happily ….'   (Jarácuaro-animas5: 10)[5]

(4) *xo Selia ata-ʃ-ti   imeri **misitu-ni***
     yes Celia beat-AOR-ASS3 POS3   cat-OBJ
     'Yes, Celia beat her cat.'   (Jarácuaro-Alfredo25: 94)

(5) *xo Selia aʈi-ʃ-ti   inte-ni   wantantskwa-ni Puki-ni*
     yes Celia tell-AOR-ASS3 DEM-OBJ story-OBJ   Puki-OBJ
     'Yes, Celia told Puki a story.'   (Jarácuaro-Alfredo25: 36)

Purepecha is an agglutinative and synthetic language, and is almost exclusively suffixing. It has an elaborate derivational verbal system. Although bare stems exist, there is a very productive derivational system in which a basic stem can take voice, causative, locative, positional, directional, and adverbial derivative suffixes. Inflectional suffixes follow the stem to mark aspect, tense, mood, and person (Chamoreau 2009; Monzón 2004; Nava 2004).

Subject and object pronouns are expressed by pronominal enclitics that are generally attached to the last element of the first immediate constituent of either the main or the subordinate clause, such as *=kʃɨ,* in example (3) or *=ni* and *=kini* in example (6). They can also be attached to the verb.

Oblique complements are marked by postpositions, such as *itʃorita ximpo* in (6).

(6) *no=tʃka=**ni** xi=thu=**kini** xaʈoa-ta-s-ki   pasari-ni   itʃorita ximpo*
     NEG=well=1 1IND=too=2OBJ help-CAUS-AOR-INT   go though-INF canoe   INST
     'Well, have I not also helped you to cross by canoe?' (Zipiajo-Emelia4: 71)

Purepecha is basically a SV and SVO constituent order language, as illustrated by examples (4) and (5). This order, that is, the order that is pragmatically unmarked, is the basic order in the region of Lake Patzcuaro (Capistrán 2002 and Chamoreau 2009: 55-58). Other orders indicate specific pragmatic properties. Studies on constituent order in the other regions do not as yet exist. However, Purepecha shows traits of a SOV language: (i) tense, aspect, and modal markers following the verb; (ii) postpositions; (iii) the almost exclusive use of suffixes; (iv) enclitics; (v) case markers; (vi) main verbs preceding inflected auxiliaries. SVO and SOV constituent orders are attested in the sixteenth century, and the former has progressively increased since then. The change is probably due to areal contact (Smith, personal communication). Spanish has been the principal contact language for many centuries; however, prior to the Conquest there were speakers of other languages in this territory, mostly from Nahuatl (Uto-Aztecan family) and Otomi (Otopamean family), two languages with verb-

---

[4] The presence or absence of the object case marker depends on different hierarchies: (i) the inherent semantic properties of the referent (human, animate); (ii) properties related to grammatical features (definite, count noun vs. mass noun, generic vs. specific, etc.); and (iii) pragmatic strategies (topic, focus).

[5] The examples of Purepecha come from my own fieldwork data. The first name corresponds to the pueblo, here Jarácuaro; after the hyphen there appears the name of the speaker (real or invented, in accordance with the wish of the speaker) or the name of the narrative, here animas, and then the reference of the recording, here 5: 10.

initial structure. The change probably began under the influence of these languages; Spanish, an SVO language, continued the process, for example by introducing prepositions (Chamoreau 2007).

2.2 Data collection procedures

This investigation is part of a project[6] which aims to document the different ways of speaking Purepecha. So far, I have studied 60 villages located in 21 municipalities, accounting for 70 percent of the villages in which the language is spoken. In each village, I recorded three men and three women, belonging to three age groups (15-29, 30-49, 50 and older). The method I adopted was to record five types of data (during approximately 15 hours in each village):

i) Traditional narratives, descriptions of specific situations, spontaneous speech

ii) Conversations between two or three people from the same village or from different villages

iii) 200 sentences (translated from Spanish), designed to cover all relevant areas of morphosyntax

iv) Sociolinguistic questionnaires (about each village and each speaker) asked in Purepecha

v) Attitude questionnaires (perceptual dialectology) also asked in Purepecha.

3. Comparative constructions in model and pre-contact replica languages

This paper deals with the effects of language contact in the different villages where Purepecha is spoken. We observe these consequences from a synchronic perspective. Nevertheless, in order to understand the different constructions, and to analyze the difference between the impact of contact and that of internal change, it is relevant to show the diversity of constructions attested in Spanish, the model language, and in Lengua de Michoacan, the pre-contact replica language.

3.1 Comparative constructions in Spanish, the model language

Spanish has had and has various types of comparative constructions. I will present here the most frequent constructions that were used in the sixteenth century, the time of contact between Lengua de Michoacan and Spanish. The most frequent and less marked is the particle construction which has a degree marker *más* 'more' and a relator, *que* 'than' (Galant 1998; Price 1990; Rojas Nieto 1990a, 1990b). The comparee NP is the subject and the standard NP is expressed after the quality and appears after the relator *que*. In (7), the degree marker comes before the quality with the be-verb and the adjective. In (8) the position is the same, with quality expressed by the adverb *rápido* 'fast.' In (9) where quality is expressed by the verb *corre* 'run,' the degree marker comes after the verb and beside the comparative marker.

(7) Spanish

*María es   **más** alta   **que** Juan*
Mary be.PRES3   more   tall.FEM than John
'Mary is taller than John.'

(8) Spanish

*mi   perro corre   **más**   rápido **que** tu   gato*
POS1 dog   run.PRES3 more   fast   than POS2 cat
'My dog runs faster than your cat.'

(9) Spanish

*mi   perro corre   **más que** tu   gato*
POS1 dog   run.PRES3 more than POS2 cat
'My dog runs more than your cat.'

This particle type is most widespread in Europe: 93 percent of European languages possess it (Stassen 1985; Heine 1994, 1997).

In Spanish this type coexists with another type, described as a marked type, in which the *de* preposition appears, as can be observed in (10).

(10) Spanish (Rojas Nieto 1990b: 226)

*es   **más** grande **de** lo   normal*
be.PRES3   more   tall   of DEM normal
'He is taller than the normal one.'

The difference is that the *más…que* construction appears before all clause types, whereas the *más…de* construction shows restriction in use. Rojas Nieto (1990b) notes that this construction is found before temporal NPs, relative clauses (11), indefinite clauses, and others, but never before demonstratives (12), possessive NPs, or relative clauses introduced by *quien* 'whose' (13).

(11) Spanish (Rojas Nieto 1990b: 229)

*mandaron   **más** libro-s **de** lo-s   que pedimos*
send.PAST.3PL more   book-PL of DEM.MASC-PL than ask.for.PAST.1PL
'They sent more books than those we asked for.' (Lit. 'They sent more books of those than we asked for.')

(12) Spanish (Rojas Nieto 1990b: 230)

*Vino más gente de estos estudiantes.
*More people came of these students.

(13) **Vino más gente de quien nos dijeron.*
*More people came of who they told us.

This *más…de* construction shows the cognitive relation between comparison and location meaning (Rojas Nieto 1990b; Stassen 1985). The standard NP is conceptualized in terms of spatial relationships. This type is very frequent in languages worldwide.

A third comparative construction exists in Spanish, a lexical structure which is seldom used. It can be classified as belonging to the *verbal type* since this construction involves

lexical concepts that use the idea of surpassing as a degree marker, as in (14). The comparee NP is the subject *el duque* and the standard NP is the object *lo*.

(14)   Spanish (Rojas Nieto 1990a: 449)

> *el duque sólo   lo   **supera**   en linaje*
> the duke   only   him   surpass-PRES3SG   in   lineage
> 'Only the duke surpasses him in lineage.'

This type is widespread in languages that are more verb-like, that is, in which the adjectival category is less developed than in the Indo-European languages, for example (Bath 1994: 184-209). But in Spanish, this construction is marked and generally used when speakers want to insist on the meaning of the verb, for example an action verb which carries the notion of 'surpass' as in example (14).

3.2 Comparative constructions in Lengua de Michoacan, the pre-contact replica language

There are two types of constructions; both have a *xats-* 'surpass' verb which expresses degree. These constructions correspond to the synthetic and the derivational morphological characteristics of the language: the verb is modified by the causative *-ta* and by a suffix expressing transfer *-ma*. This first construction is a clear verbal type. In (15), the comparee NP, *Pedro* is the subject and the standard NP *Xwano-ni* is the direct object.

   The quality is expressed by a non-finite verb *ampake-ni* which functions as an argument of the main verb, forming a complement clause (Noonan 1985). The quality appears after the standard NP which is generally a sign of OV languages (Andersen 1983: 99-138, Dryer 2007). This is the opposite word order to that found in Spanish (examples 7, 8, 9).

(15)   Lengua de Michoacan (Isolate, Gilberti 1987 [1558]: 109)

> *Pedro hatztamahati Juanoni ambaqueni*[7]
>
> *Pedro   **xats-ta-ma-xa-ti***   *Xwano-ni*   *ampake-ni*
> Peter   put-CAUS-TRANSF-PRES-ASS3   John-OBJ   be good-INF
> 'Peter is better than John.'   (Lit. 'Peter surpasses John (in) be(ing) good.')

The second construction is a mixed type which combines a verbal type and a coordination type. In (16), the first clause contains the comparee NP, the subject *Pedro* 'Peter,' the verb *xats* 'surpass,' and the object, the non-finite verb *ampake-ni* 'be good' which functions as an argument of the main verb, a complement clause. The second clause is introduced by the coordinator *ka*. The negation *no* indicates that the standard NP lacks the property. The adverb *isɨ* 'like that' and the negation *no* operate the semantic reference with the verb *xats* 'surpass.' In the second clause, there is no verb. This construction is similar to what Galant describes as stripping (1998: 242). It refers to a process in which all material is eliminated in the second clause except a nominal constituent, here the standard NP, *Xwanu*, a special adverb *isɨ*, and the negative element *no*. The (lexical) verb is identical in each clause and the overall structure is parallel.

---

[7] When an example is quoted, I reproduce the author's transcription in the first line.

(16) Lengua de Michoacan (Isolate, Gilberti 1987 [1558]: 109)

Pedro hatztamahati ambaqueni ca noys Juan

Pedro	**xats-ta-ma-xa-ti**	*ampake-ni*	**ka**	**no**	*isɨ*	*Xwanu*
Peter	put-CAUS-TRANSF-PRES-ASS3	be good-INF	and	NEG	so	John

'Peter is better than John.' (Lit. 'Peter surpasses in being good, and John (is) not like that.')

4. Comparative constructions in Purepecha

In Purepecha comparison of superiority is mapped out by means of ten constructions, which can be grouped into four types: Type A. Particle type; Type B. Particle type with a locative phrase; Type C. Mixed coordination and particle type; Type D. Applicative type. The presentation of these types will follow their frequency as primary and secondary options: only the first two types, the particle type (type A) and the particle type with a locative phrase (type B), may be a primary choice. Type A is the primary choice in almost all the villages except a few north of Lake Patzcuaro where type B is the primary choice and type A the secondary choice. The other two types, the mixed coordination and particle type (type C) and the applicative type (type D), always appear as a secondary choice. In this study, I sum up the characteristics of these four types, in order to understand the organization of the expression of comparison in Purepecha. In another article (Chamoreau, under consideration), I propose a detailed typological analysis of the four types.

Type A. Particle type

Andersen (1983: 118), Stassen (1985: 45, 491), and Heine (1994: 63) stress that the so-called particle construction is heterogeneous. A typical characteristic of this construction is the presence of a specific comparative marker that accompanies the standard NP (see also Rivara 1990, 1995). In Purepecha, it is identical to the Spanish marker *ke*[8] or to the particle that introduces a complement clause *iʃki* or to one of its variants (Chamoreau 2009: 259-262). In examples (17) through (20), the particle construction consists of one clause with complex structure, in which the comparee NP is encoded as the subject of the predicate, whereas the standard NP, which has no case marker, appears after the comparative marker. The quality is generally encoded by a verb, as in (18) and (19), but also by an adverb, as in (17), or an adjective, as in (20). The order follows the Spanish order when quality is expressed by an adjective or an adverb (see examples (7) and (8)). The degree marker may be the Spanish marker *mas* or the Purepecha morpheme *sániteru,* which means 'more.' This type presents four subtypes.

---

[8] One possible hypothesis is that *ke* is borrowed from Spanish because the form and the function are similar to the Spanish particle *que*. Nevertheless, another possibility is convergence or syncretism between the Spanish *ke* and a native Purepecha element. Purepecha also had a relator with the form *ki*, and a subordinator encoded as *ka*, attested in the sixteenth century. They now function in various particles such as *iʃka, iʃki, enka*, *enki,* and their variants. Convergence or syncretism between the two elements might have been favored because they presented a similar form and functioned in similar contexts. This topic has not yet been studied. Nevertheless, in the comparative constructions, we can consider that *ke* is borrowed for this function, as the entire comparative construction is borrowed or replicated.

Subtype A1. Particle constructions with the degree marker mas *and the comparative marker* ke

The first subtype is a clear grammatical borrowing in which both the structure and the phonetic substance appear in the replica or recipient language. The particle type and the two Spanish morphological elements *mas* and *ke* are borrowed.

(17)   *ima   xu-ṛa-ʃ-ti*   **mas**   *yóntakwa* **ke**   *tʃi*   *wátsɨ-ti*
          DEM   come-FT-AOR-ASS3   more   late   than   POS2   son-KPOS2
          'He came later than your son.'   (Jarácuaro-Celia28: 170)

Subtype A2. Particle constructions with the degree marker sániteru *and the comparative marker* eska *or* eʃki

This construction is a grammatical replication (also known as a calque), that is, it is produced when speakers create a new grammatical structure based on a model of another language, using the linguistic resources available in their own replica language (Heine and Kuteva 2003, 2005). This type of transfer does not involve phonetic substance of any kind. This is a grammatical replication in which we recognize the Spanish construction but the specific morphological elements are taken from the native language, Purepecha. In (18) the degree marker *sániteru* is analyzed as *sáni* 'few' and the clitic *=teru* 'more,' while the particle *eʃki* 'than,' or its variant *eska*, is a complementizer which may introduce a complement clause (Chamoreau 2009). The degree marker is placed before the quality.

(18)   *nanaka-etʃa* **sáni=teru**   *tere-kuri-ʃin-ti*   **eska**=*ni*   *xi*
          girl-PL   few=more   laugh-MID-HAB-ASS3   than=1   1IND
          'The girls are laughing more than me.'   (Arantepacua-Esperanza7: 99)

Subtype A3. Particle constructions with the degree marker sániteru *and the comparative marker* ke

In (19), we find a particular situation in which only one grammatical item is borrowed, namely the marker *ke*, while the degree marker is the Purepecha morpheme *sániteru*. It is thus a mixture of borrowing and grammatical replication. Logically, two possibilities exist: borrowing the degree marker *mas* and using the marker *iʃki*, or using the degree marker *sániteru* and borrowing the marker *ke***.**

    In the data, only the second option is found. In (19), we observe the same order as presented in the examples above; the quality is between the degree marker and the marker.

(19)   *i*   *kamisa* **sáni=teru**   *xuka-para-s-ti*   **ke**   *iʃu*   *anapu-e-s-ti*
          DEM   shirt   few=more   put-shoulder-AOR-ASS3   than   here   origin-PRED-AOR-ASS3
          'This shirt is more expensive than the one made here.' (Ihuatzio-Agustina1: 39)

Subtype A4. Particle constructions with the degree marker sániteru *and the comparative markers* ke *and* eʃka

In this fourth subtype, the two comparative markers *ke* and *eʃka* coexist in the same construction. This is perhaps additional evidence that *ke* is borrowed from Spanish in this context (see footnote 8). This redundancy may be explained as a 'Purepechization' of the subtype A3, that is, the construction with *sániteru ...ke*, the unmarked construction. It seems that the goal of this construction is to give it a more Purepecha-like feel (Chamoreau, under consideration).

(20) *iʃu* **sáni=teru** *khéri-i-ʃ-ti*   **ke** *eʃka* *xiniani*
      here few=more   big/tall/old-PRED-AOR-ASS3 than than   there
      'It's bigger here than there.'   (Ocumicho-Rutila7: 82)

These four subtypes are clear examples of contact-induced restructuring. The constituent order is the same as in Spanish. The encoding of both the degree marker and the comparative marker is borrowed or replicated from the model language, Spanish.

    Purepecha has adopted the unmarked and more frequent Spanish comparative construction of superiority with *más…que*. The particle type has superseded the verbal type (see 3.2, example (15)). This process shows clear convergence with Spanish and also indicates that the language has come to use a new strategy, exploiting morphological categories to express the degree marker and the comparative particle. The other consequence is that the quality is no longer expressed by a non-finite verb but by a verb, an adjective, or an adverb.

Type B. Particle type with locative phrase

The basic construction here is that of the particle type (see Type A above). The original feature of type B is the presence of a preposition accompanying the standard NP. Two possibilities exist: (i) A *source*-subtype (B1), in (21), with the Spanish preposition *de* 'from'; the standard NP is marked as the source of a movement. (2) A *static*-subtype (B2), in (22), with the Spanish preposition *entre* 'between'; this preposition is a particular illustration of the static locative type.

Subtype B1. Source subtype. Particle type with the degree marker mas *as in example (21a) (or* sáni=teru, *as in example (21b)) and a locative phrase*

(21)a. *inte atʃa* **mas** *khéri-e-s-ti*   **ke** **de** *ʃo* *anapu yamintu*
      DEM man more   old-PRED-AOR-ASS3 than of here origin all
      'This man is older than anyone else here.' (Lit. 'This man is older than of all the others from here.')   (Teremendo-Cleotilde1: 301)

    b. *Gervasio* **sáni=teru** *prontu ni-ra-s-ti*   **ke** **de** *ima*
      Gervasio   few=more   quickly go-FT-AOR-ASS3 than of DEM
      'Gervasio went more quickly than him.' (Lit. 'Gervasio went more quickly than of him.') (Cuanajo-Evaristo9: 102)

Subtype B2. Static subtype. Particle type with the degree marker mas *and a locative phrase*

(22) *iʃu* **mas** *khé-ʃ-ti*   **ke** **entre** *xini*
      here more   be big/tall/old-AOR-ASS3 than between there
      'It's bigger here than there.' (Lit. 'It's bigger here than between there.')
                    (San Andrés Tziróndaro-Valentín4: 71)

The particle type with a locative phrase shows the creation of a new type, using a process that is not attested in Lengua de Michoacan: the use of a locative phrase with the particle construction. This construction with the preposition **de** is attested in Spanish but the order and the conditions of use are different from Purepecha. This construction does not have the semantic and syntactic restrictions it shows in Spanish (see 3.1), and it is the dominant type in various villages, while in Spanish it is a marked construction (see Chamoreau, under

consideration). Furthermore, the construction with *entre* is not found in Spanish to express comparative meaning (see section 5 for the analysis of this innovative construction).

Type C. Mixed coordination and particle type

This mixed type presents the combination of two constructions. The basic construction is the coordinated positive-negative polarity in which the comparee NP has the property while the standard NP lacks the property. The basic construction is defined as the complete one, that is, the coordination construction, a structure similar to the one attested in the sixteenth century (see example (16)); the particle construction combines with the coordination one, but presents only some features of this type. In this case, the particle construction is represented only by the presence of the degree marker.

In example (23), this mixed type is formed by two clauses; the first one contains the comparee NP *kumantʃikwaʈu intʃarini*, the degree marker *mas* (it is also possible to find *sániteru*), and the quality *xoʈepekwa xaʈasti*. The second clause is introduced by the coordinator *ka*. The negation *no* indicates that the standard NP lacks the property. This clause has a stripping structure; the verb is deleted, signifying that it is identical to the verb in the first clause.

(23)   *kumantʃikwa-ʈu   intʃarini   **mas**   xoʈepekwa   xa-ʈa-s-ti*
    house-LOC   inside   more   warm   be there-FT-AOR-ASS3

    ka   ***no***   *wérakwa*
    and   NEG   outside
    'It is warmer inside the house than it is outside.' (Lit. 'It is warmer inside the house and not outside.')   (Janitzio-Simon1: 29)

This construction is a clear consequence of the restructuring of the comparative construction domain in Purepecha. This mixed type shows interaction between internal evolution and contact-induced change. The former is shown by the fact that the coordination construction is maintained (see example (16) in Lengua de Michoacan); the latter is illustrated by the process in which verbal type is lost in favor of particle constructions.

Type D. Applicative type

This type has only one construction, expressing quality through a synthetic derivative structure. In (24a), the basic construction, the quality is expressed by an adjective *khéri* 'big/tall/old,' accompanied by a predicativizer *e*. In (24b), *khéri* is modified by the applicative morpheme *ku*, which increases the valence and introduces another argument *imeri pirimpani* 'his sister,' which is the syntactic object, and which has the role of the possessor of the quality. The subject *Petu* 'Peter' is the comparee NP, while the object *imeri pirimpani* 'his sister' is the standard NP. The superiority degree is a consequence of the modification by the applicative morpheme.

(24)a.   *Petu   khéri-e-ʃ-ti*
      Peter   big/tall/old-PRED-AOR-ASS3
      'Peter is tall/big/old.'

b. *Petu   khéri-e-**ku**-ʃ-ti   imeri   piri-mpa-ni*
Peter   old-PRED-3APPL-AOR-ASS3   POS3   sister-KPOS3-OBJ
'Peter is older than his sister.' (Lit. Peter applies his old age to his sister.')
                                                            (Cucuchucho-Francisco3: 401)

This construction was not described in the grammars of the sixteenth century and is now seldom found. It shows the generally agglutinative and derivative character of the language. It is possible to hypothesize that this construction existed in Lengua de Michoacan, but then fell into disuse, until it survived only in a few villages and only with the adjective *khéri*.
The four types and the different constructions are summed up in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison. Types and sub-types

Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Particle type	*Particle type with a locative*	*Mixed coordination and particle type*	*Applicative type*
A1 Borrowing **mas…ke**	B1 Source localization – Borrowing **mas…ke…de**	Borrowing **mas…ka no**	Applicative **-ku**
A2 Replication *sániteru…eʃka*	Source localization – Replication **sániteru…ke…de**	Replication **sániteru…ka no**	
A3 Replication+ borrowing **sániteru…ke**	B2 Static localization – Borrowing **mas…ke…entre**		
A4 Replication+ borrowing and replication **sániteru…ke…eʃka**			

5. An innovative construction in Purepecha

In this section I analyze the constructions in type B, demonstrating that subtype B1, in examples (25) and (26), is a creation on the model of Spanish, whereas subtype B2, in example (27), constitutes an innovation.

Subtype B1. Particle type with a degree marker mas/sáni=teru *and a locative phrase with* de

(25)   *ka   Enrike   **mas**   ʃepe-h-ti   **ke   de**   Carlos*
       and   Henry   more   be lazy-AOR-ASS3   than of   Charles
       'And Henry is lazier than Peter.' (Lit. 'And Henry is lazier than of Peter.')
                                                            (San Jerónimo-Adelaida1: 170)

(26)   *pedru **sáni=teru**   prontu   xano-nku-ti   **ke   de**   tʰu*
       Peter few=more   quickly   arrive-CENTRIP-ASS3 than of   2IND
       'Peter arrives more quickly than you.' (Lit. 'Peter arrives more quickly than of you.')
                                                            (Cuanajo-Evaristo9: 102)

Subtype B2. Particle type with the degree marker mas *and a locative phrase with* entre

(27) *Pedro* **mas** *sesi-e-s-ti*   **ke**   **entre**   *Xwanu*
      Peter more good-PRED-AOR-ASS3 than between John
      'Peter is better than John.' (Lit. 'Peter is better than between John.')
                                        (San Andrés Tziróndaro-Valentín2: 11)

The constructions in type B are contact-induced changes. There can be no doubt that the four morphemes *mas, ke, de, entre* are taken from Spanish. But the two prepositions *de* and *entre* are not direct borrowings: although they are Spanish prepositions, since Purepecha has only postpositions, they never occur alone with the semantic features which they have in Spanish. They only appear in code-switching Spanish phrases like *de veras* 'really, truly,' *la seis de la mañana* 'six in the morning.' The preposition *entre* only occurs in Purepecha in the comparative construction, as in (27). Purepecha has postpositions and case markers which generally satisfy the use contexts of the Spanish prepositions *de* and *entre*.

5.1 Subtype B1: a creation on the model of Spanish

In Spanish, as in example (28), the *de*-construction encoded with *más…de…que* has specific characteristics. First, the order is the degree marker *más*, then the quality *temprano*, the preposition *de*, the object pronoun *lo*, and the relative clause introduced by the relator *que* and the verb *esperabas*. Second, the use of the demonstrative *lo* is obligatory; this is an anaphoric strategy. Third, in this construction in Spanish a verb is obligatory after the relator (this is a relative clause). Fourth, this construction is marked and not frequent; this is a pragmatic strategy used to stress specific information (Rojas 1990b).

(28) Spanish

    *El presidente regresó **más** temprano **de** lo **que** tú esperabas*
    the president   return.PAST3 more early   of DEM than 2IND expect.PAST.IMPF2
    'The president returned earlier than you expected.'

These four characteristics are absent in Purepecha: in subtype B1, the order is, first, the two markers *mas…ke,* and then the preposition *de,* which appears after the comparative marker. There is no demonstrative anaphoric pronoun, no verb after the comparative marker (this is not a relative clause as in Spanish), and in many villages north of Lake Patzcuaro, in the municipality of Quíroga, this construction is the unmarked and dominant one, used in all contexts. We can hypothesize that the speakers have adopted the Spanish construction, adapting it with a particular strategy: they have conserved the unity and the order of the *mas…ke* particle type construction (type A), but have created a new construction, adding the standard NP in a locative phrase introduced by *de*.

5.2 Subtype B2

5.2.1 An innovative construction

The subtype B2 strategy is different from the construction in subtype B1. Purepecha displays a use of *entre* which deviates from the patterns of its Spanish use. No similar construction has been found among the local Spanish speakers, nor among bilingual Spanish speakers. Purepecha speakers have apparently innovated the construction with *entre*, since Spanish has

no comparative construction of superiority with the preposition *entre*. One may find a superlative construction as in (29), but the NP with the preposition *entre* is not obligatory in a superlative construction; it is merely additional information.

(29)   Spanish

[Entre esto-s niño-s], Juventino es el más inteligente.
between DEM-PL boy-PL Juventino be.PRES3 the more intelligent
'Between these boys, Juventino is the more intelligent.'

In (29), with the NP introduced by *entre*, the nominal must be plural (or at least involve two entities), since it indicates a possibility of choice between various elements. This is not the case in Purepecha (see examples (2), (22), and (27)). The morpheme *entre* appears before singular items: a demonstrative *ima*, in example (2), an adverb *xini* in example (22), and a proper name *Xwanu* in example (27). The morpheme *entre* changes in meaning content (it does not indicate a possibility of choice). The use of *entre* in Purepecha has been extended to a new context (absent in Spanish and original in Purepecha).

There is no correlation with other structures in Purepecha, as *entre* is only used in this construction, and there is no comparative construction in pre-contact replica Lengua de Michoacan with a locative pattern that might be used as a model.

5.2.2 Sociolinguistic particularities

It is relevant to point out that the construction with *mas…ke…de* (subtype B1) essentially appears to the north of Lake Patzcuaro, in the eastern area. More specifically, this construction is attested in the four villages studied in the municipality of Quíroga and in some villages of the Zacapu region which are in contact with the villages to the north of the lake. In the four villages (Santa Fe de la Laguna, Chupícuaro, San Jerónimo P'urhenchecuaro, and San Andrés Tziróndaro) this is the dominant unmarked choice, used by all speakers. San Andrés Tziróndaro is the only village that also uses the innovative construction with *mas…ke…entre* (subtype B2). These four villages, along with Azajo, constitute a sub-area of the eastern area which exhibits great vitality (unlike the rest of the area). All of these villages include more than 87 percent Purepecha speakers (except San Jerónimo P'urhenchecuaro, with 50 percent), and the people, even the young people, speak Purepecha in everyday conversation. This original sociolinguistic situation, in a region where language diversity is generally losing ground, is revealed through a strategy by which speakers try to distinguish themselves from others. This is also mirrored on historical, social, and cultural levels, especially in the village of Santa Fe de la Laguna, showing that they explore and use the vitality and creative possibilities of Purepecha. The B constructions constitute a distinctive characteristic of this sub-area to the north of Lake Patzcuaro.

5.2.3 A cross-linguistic tendency

I consider the construction of subtype B2 to be an innovation, because the Purepecha speakers have "tinkered" with the Spanish constructions but have not created a construction on the model of a specific comparative Spanish construction. The motivation behind the use of the preposition *entre* is perhaps its meaning: it involves location (like the preposition *de* in subtype B1), and indicates the cognitive relation between comparison and location meaning. This leads us to a second complementary explanation: there is a general tendency to connect

comparison with location and to express comparison through the locative type. This is the largest class in the typology of comparatives, comprising nearly 50 percent of Stassen's (1985) and Heine's (1994) samples. It could thus very easily have developed in the domain of comparison in Purepecha, since in this language spatial expressions are highly relevant in various domains (Chamoreau 2009; Friedrich 1971; Monzón 2004). Furthermore, this construction is in accordance with the relations between location and particle constructions developed in several languages (Andersen 1983:168-185; Stassen 1985:49).

6. Similar constructions in other Mesoamerican languages

Stolz and Stolz claim that "Hispanicization of comparative constructions was almost commonplace among the indigenous languages of Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador" (2001: 38). Particle type is attested in all Mesoamerican families (Chamoreau 2008), generally showing the transfer of the Spanish particle construction as in Purepecha in type A - for example, borrowing in Totonac in (30) and replication in Nahuatl de Xaltipan in (31).

Totonac (Totonac-Tepehua, Mexico, Levy 1990: 131)

> *pa:caps   xa-tabique   **mas**   ta':lá   **que**   ta-pa:lhta:m*
> wall   DET-brick   more   endure   than   INGR-clay
> 'The wall made of bricks is stronger than the one made of clay.'

(31)   Nahuatl de Xaltipan (Uto-Aztecan, Sánchez personal communication)

> *neh   **kachi**   ni-nohnel   **tein**   ti-yetok-eh   kal-ihtik*
> 1   more   1-small   than   1PL-be.there-PL   house-LOC
> 'I am smaller than we [who] are in the house.'

But the transfer of the Spanish comparative construction with *mas* and a preposition is not very common. A review of Mesoamerican languages shows that the presence of this construction in Zoque, in example (32), is a borrowing of the Spanish construction with *mas…de* respecting the order of the elements of the model language, as in (10).

(32)   Zoque de Chimalapa (Mixe-Zoquean, Knudson 1980: 134)

> *te   ladriyus   neʔa   **mas**   pɨʔm-pa   **de**   ka   mɨki nas   neʔa*
> DEM   brick   wall   more   have-strong of   DEM   clay   wall
> 'The wall made of bricks is stronger than the one made of clay.' (Lit. 'The wall made of bricks is stronger of the one made of clay.')

It is also possible to find a borrowing of the *mas…de…que* construction. In this case the languages, Zoque in (33) and Otomi in (34), also respect the order of the elements of the Spanish construction in (11); nevertheless the constructions in these two languages do not possess restrictions like those in Spanish. For example, no verb is attested after the comparative marker.

(33)   Zoque de Chimalapa (Mixe-Zoquean, Knudson 1980: 135)

> *teʔp   **mas**   **de**   kiʔpɨhi   **ke**   ʔɨcciʔ*
> DEM   more   of   tall   than   1
> 'He is taller than I am.' (Lit. 'He is taller of than I am.')

14

(34) Otomi de Santiago Mexquititlán (Otopamean, Hekking personal communication)

*ar Pedro **mäs** Ø=ar dätä **di-ge** ar Mariya*
SG Peter more 3PRES.NPRED=SG tall of-that SG Mary
'Peter is taller than Mary.' (Lit. 'Peter is more the tall of that Mary.')[9]

The constructions found in other Mesoamerican languages have resulted from the transfer of the Spanish particle construction (see examples (30) and (31)) and the borrowing of the Spanish construction with *más…de* or *más…de…que* that are closer to the model construction than the Purepecha one (in particular because of the respecting of the order of the elements). No construction with *entre* has been found.

7. The strategy of innovation

According to the typology proposed by Thomason (2001), it is clear that the constructions studied in this article, in particular the type B constructions, represent a replacement of older native linguistic features by interference processes. This replacement was created on the model of Spanish constructions in subtype B1 (as defined by Heine and Kuteva), but the strategy was not the same in the case of subtype B2. Another strategy is displayed. Something new has been invented. Speakers of Purepecha have taken the Spanish construction with *más…de…que* as a point of departure, but the result diverges from it. They have also innovated using *entre* differently from its function in Spanish, and the resulting construction in Purepecha is distinct from the comparative constructions in this language.

  Speakers have transferred elements from the model language and attributed new functions to them. This is surprising because *entre* is not a loan word, and it is only used in this structure in Purepecha. It is difficult to understand the original motivation behind the transfer of *entre* and its use in that structure; it may be due to its locative meaning, which may express a possibility of choice between (at least) two entities.

  In short, Purepecha displays a use of comparative constructions with *entre* that deviates from the patterns of comparative construction in Spanish and from the use of *entre* in Spanish. The transfer of Spanish *entre* allows Purepecha to innovate in the expression of the comparison of superiority and in the context of the use of this Spanish preposition.

Abbreviations

AOR	Aorist
APPL	Applicative
ASS	Assertive
CAUS	Causative
CENTRIF	Centrifugal
CENTRIP	Centripetal
DEM	Demonstrative
FEM	Feminine
FT	Formative
IMPF	Imperfect

---

[9] I thank Enrique Palancar for helping me to analyze this example.

IND	Independent
INF	Infinitive
INST	Instrumental
INT	Interrogative
IT	Iterative
KPOS	Kinship possessive
LOC	Locative
MASC	Masculine
MID	Middle
NEG	Negation
NPRED	Nominal predication
OBJ	Object
PAST	Past
PL	Plural
POS	Possessive
PRED	Predicativizer
PRES	Present
PROG	Progressive
SG	Singular
TRANSF	Transfer
*	Ungrammatical

References

Andersen, P. 1983. *Word Order Typology and Comparative Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bath, D. N. S. 1994. *The Adjectival Category. Criteria for Differentiation and Identification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Capistrán, A. 2002. Variaciones de orden de constituyentes en p'orhépecha. Topicalización y focalización. In *Del Cora al Maya Yucateco. Estudios lingüísticos sobre algunas lenguas indígenas mexicanas,* P. Levy (ed.), 349-402. México: UNAM.

Census INEGI. 2005. http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/sistemas/conteo2005/iter2005/selentcampo.aspx

Chamoreau, C. 2007. Grammatical borrowing in Purepecha. In *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Y. Matras and J. Sakel (eds), 465-480. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chamoreau, C. 2008. 'Contribución de algunas lenguas de Mesoamérica a la tipología de las construcciones de comparación de superioridad.' Talk at *X Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noreste*. Hermosillo: University of Sonora.

Chamoreau, C. 2009. *Hablemos purepecha*, *Wanté juchari anapu*. Morelia: Universidad Intercultural Indígenas de Michoacán/IIH-UMSNH/IRD/CCC-IFAL/Grupo Kw'anískuyarhani de Estudiosos del Pueblo Purépecha.

Chamoreau, C. 2010. Development of analytic constructions in Purepecha. In *A New Look at Language Contact in Amerindian Languages*, C. Chamoreau, Z. Estrada Fernández, and Y. Lastra (eds). Munich: Lincom. 69-87.

Chamoreau, C. under consideration. The geographical distribution of typologically diverse comparative constructions of superiority in Purepecha.

Cuzzolin, P. and Lehmann, C. 2004. Comparison and gradation. *Nr.* 155: 1212-1220.

Dryer, M. S. 2007. Word Order. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Clause Structure*, T. Shopen (ed.), 61-131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (second edition revisited).

Friedrich, P. 1971. *The Tarascan Suffixes of Locative Spaces: Meaning and Morphotactics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Galant, M. R. 1998. Comparative constructions in Spanish and San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec. Ph.D. diss. Los Angeles: University of California.

Gilberti, M. 1987 [1558]. *Arte de la lengua de Michuacan*. Morelia: Fimax.

Heine, B. 1994. Areal influence on grammaticalization. In *Language Contact and Language Conflict,* M. Pütz (ed.), 55-68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heine, B. 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine, B. 2006. Contact-induced word order change without word order change. In *Working papers in Multilingualism. Arbeiten zur Mehrsprächigkeit*. 76. Hamburg: University of Hamburg.

Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. 2003. On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27.3: 529-572.

Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knudson, L. 1980. *Zoque de Chimalapa*. Mexico: Colegio de México/Centro de Investigación para la Integración Social [Archivo de lenguas indígenas de México 6].

Márquez Joaquín, P. 2007. *Tarascos o P'urépecha? Voces sobre antiguas y nuevas discusiones en torno al gentilicio michoacano*. Morelia: UMSNH-IIH/El Colegio de Michoacán, Gobierno del Estado de Michoacán/Universidad Intercultural Indígena de Michoacán/Grupo Kw'anískuyarhani de Estudiosos del Pueblo Purepecha/Fondo Editorial Morevallado.

Matras, Y. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing, *Linguistics* 36.2: 281-331.

Monzón, C. 2004. *Los morfemas espaciales del p'urhépecha*. Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán.

Nava, F. 2004. La voz media en p'urhepecha. Un estudio de formas y significados. Ph.D. diss. Mexico: FFL-UNAM.

Noonan, M. 2007. Complementation. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Complex Constructions*, T. Shopen (ed.), 52-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Price, S. 1990. *Comparative Constructions in Spanish and French Syntax*. London: Routledge.

Rivara, R. 1990. *Le Système de la comparaison: sur la construction du sens dans les langues naturelles*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Rivara, R. 1995. Pourquoi il n'y a que deux relations de comparaison. *Faits de Langues* 5: 19-39.

Rojas Nieto, C. 1990a. Comparación léxica, comparación sintagmática. In *Homenaje a Jorge A. Suárez. Lingüística indoamericana e hispánica,* B. Garza Cuarón and P. Levy (eds), 447-457. Mexico: El Colegio de México.

Rojas Nieto, C. 1990b. El término de las construcciones comparativas de desigualdad: *de* o *que*. In *Estudios de Lingüística de España y México*, V. Demonte and B. Garza Cuarón (eds), 225-241. Mexico: El Colegio de México / UNAM.

Stassen, L. 1985. *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Stassen, L. 2001. Comparative constructions. In *Language Typology and Language Universals: an International Handbook.* M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, and W. Raible (eds), 993-997. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Stassen, L. 2005. Comparative constructions. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, M. Haspelmath, M. Dryer, D. Gil, and B. Comrie (eds), 490-491. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stolz, C. and Stolz, T. 2001. Hispanicised Comparative Constructions in Indigenous Languages of Austronesia and the Americas. In *Lo propio y lo ajeno en las lenguas austronésicas y amerindias*, K. Zimmerman and T. Stolz (eds), 35-56. Frankfurt/ Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana.

Thomason, S. G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, S. G. and Kaufman, T. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.