SYNTACTIC CHANGE IN PIPIL[1]

LYLE CAMPBELL

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, ALBANY

1. Introduction. Pipil is a Uto-Aztecan language of the Nahua (Aztecan) subgroup, spoken in El Salvador and now nearing extinction. I present here several kinds of syntactic changes in Pipil and attempt to explain how they came about, relating these changes to theoretical claims about the nature of syntactic change in general.

The data on modern Pipil come from Campbell (1985). Changes in Pipil were determined through comparison with other Nahua dialects and with Proto-Nahua (henceforth PN), and through consideration of the few extant Pipil colonial texts (cf. Campbell, in preparation and Geoffroy Rivas 1969). Unfortunately, PN syntax has not received much attention. This means that references to PN often involve preliminary hypotheses, based either on rather unsystematic comparisons with Classical Nahuatl (henceforth CN) and with other dialects or on assumptions about what existed between Proto-Uto-Aztecan (henceforth PUA) and the modern Pipil forms.[2]

All the remaining few hundred Pipil speakers are bilingual, many with Spanish as their dominant language. As will be seen, most changes in Pipil grammar are due overwhelmingly to influence from Spanish.

2. Kinds of change. For discussion's sake, the changes to be presented here are grouped in the following ways: (*a*) constructions borrowed directly from Spanish, (*b*) shifts in native constructions due to phonetic similarity with Spanish forms, (*c*) expansion of native forms to match

Spanish functions with which originally there was only partial equivalence, (*d*) changes in "thrust" (or "degree") due to overlap with Spanish, (*e*) "boundary loss," and (*f*) other changes, not motivated by contact with Spanish.

3. Constructions borrowed directly from Spanish.

3.1. Comparatives. The comparative construction in Pipil has been borrowed from Spanish, employing the loanword *mas* 'more', as well as *ke* 'than' from Spanish *que*:

Aspects of PUA syntax have been treated by Langacker (1976; 1977*a*; 1977*b*).

Given the current moribund status of Pipil, one might wonder whether any of the changes discussed here are due to "language death." While the concern is legitimate, the fact that other very viable dialects of Nahua have independently undergone parallel changes under Spanish influence (see above) strongly suggests that the Pipil changes are not due to language death.

Examples are cited in the practical orthography; symbols have the following phonetic values:

	Labial	Dental		Alveo-palatal	Velar	Labio-velar	Glottal
Stops & Affricates							
Voiceless	*p*	*t*	*ts*	*ch*	*k*	*kw*	
Voiced	(*b*)	(*d*)			(*g*)		
Fricatives	(*f*)		*s*	*x*			*h*
Liquids		*l*					
		(*r*)	(*rr*)				
Nasals	*m*	*n*					
Semivowels	*w*			*y*			

	Front	Central	Posterior
High	*i i:*		*u u:*
Mid	*e e:*		(*o*) (*o:*)
Low		*a a:*	

The abbreviations used are the following: adj., ADJ = adjective, ABSOL = absolutive, applic., APPLIC = applicative, ART = article, CAUS = causative, CN = Classical Nahuatl (Colonial Nahuatl), COND = conditional, DIMIN = diminutive, dir., DIR = directional, imp., IMP = imperative, IMPERF = imperfective, INCHOAT = inchoative, NOM = nominalization, PAST = past, pers = person, pl., PL = plural, PN = Proto-Nahua (also called Proto-Aztecan), PUA = Proto-Uto-Aztecan, poss., POSS = possessive, possession, pres. = present, perf., PERF = perfect, pret., PRET = preterit (simple past), REDUP = reduplication, REFLEX = reflexive, Sp. = Spanish, SUBOR = subordinate (conjunction).

All examples are from the two main dialects of Pipil, Santo Domingo de Guzmán and Cuisnahuat. While there is minor phonological variation between these two, the grammar is essentially the same for both. Most examples are taken from the texts of Campbell (1985:chap. 7).

(1) *mu-manuh   mas   bibo.*
    your-brother more   smart

    'Your brother (is) smarter'.

(2) *ne   siwa:-t   mas   galá:na ke   taha*
    the woman-ABSOL more pretty   than   you

    'that woman is prettier than you' (cf. Spanish *esa mujer es más linda que tú*).

CN, on the other hand, had several different comparative expressions, none of them very "basic" with respect to the others (cf. Carochi 1645[1892]). One such comparative, mentioned by Langacker (1977a:117), was with *ok* 'yet', as in:

(3) *ne?wa:tl ok   achi ni-tla-mati-ni in   a?mo: iwki te?wa:tl*
    I   yet little I-OBJ-know-er SUBORD no   thus you

    'I am a bit more learned than you' (cf: Andrews 1975:351).

One not mentioned in the grammars is (from Sahagún book 11):

(4) *pipi[y]olin: tepiton, itloc   in   xicotli*
    pipiyolin (bee): small,   its-by the xico?tli (another bee)

    'Pipiyolin: it is small next to the xico?tli' (= 'the *pipiyolin*: it is smaller than the *xico?tli*') (Dibble and Anderson 1969:94; Una Canger's translation, personal communication).

(For others, cf. Andrews 1975:349–53 and Langacker 1977a:118.)

Pipil presumably had different comparatives before contact with Spanish (probably like those of CN), but now it has only the comparatives with *mas* and *ke* from Spanish.

3.2. Coordination. PUA had no reconstructible coordinate conjunctions, only ∅ (simple juxtaposition) for conjoined clauses, though a postposition meaning 'with' may be reconstructible for conjoined nominals (Langacker 1977a:159-60). PN continued this pattern, as did Pipil, until Spanish contact, except that the postposition developed into a relational noun (see below). Compare CN (examples cited from Langacker 1977a:160):

(5) *on-te:-tsa?tsi-lia,   on-te:-no:tsa-ya*
    away-OBJ-shout-APPLIC away-OBJ-call-PAST

    'He proclaims, (and) he called out' (cf. Garibay 1961:145).

(6) *in   a:to:l-namaka-?-ke? i:-wa:n in*
    ART atole-sell-er-PL   it-with   ART

     kakawa-tla-ketsa-l-namaka-?-ke?
     cacao-OBJ-stand-NOM-sell-er-pl

'The atole sellers and the sellers of prepared chocolate' (Dibble
and Anderson 1961:93).

The fact that this second example employs the "singular" *i:-* as the
possessive prefix, where the nouns involved are clearly "plural," suggests
that *i:-wa:n* had already come to function as a conjunction in CN.[3]

While both these constructions are still found in Pipil, they are rare,
and new forms with true coordinate conjunctions either borrowed from
Spanish or brought about by Spanish influence are much more frequent.
The following are examples:

pero, pe:roh	'but'	(Sp. *pero*)
ni, ni ke	'neither nor, nor'	(Sp. *ni, ni que*)
sino	'but'	(Sp *sino*)
y	and	(Sp. *y*)
mas bien	'rather'	(Sp. *más bien*)
o	'or'	(Sp. *o*)
wan	'and'	
ø	'and'	

Notice that all but the last two are borrowed from Spanish. *Pero* 'but'
and *wan* 'and' are by far the most frequent and important. *Wan* is in
origin a "relational noun." Since such constructions come up repeatedly
in what follows, it is important to clarify them here. The locative
constructions called "relational nouns" by Mesoamerican linguists bear
possessive pronominal prefixes on forms, most of which were originally
noun roots; that is, these locatives (and a few other relational nouns
which are not so obviously locative) look like possessed nouns. This trait
is found in most Mesoamerican Indian languages. The constructions are

---

[3] The *i:-wa:n* of CN apparently was used with the meaning 'also' as well, as in:

to:tol-in, i:-wa:n   *i:-to:ka   i²wi-ken,   i²wi-ken-tsin,*
turkey,   it-with (= also) its-name, *i²w-ken(-tsin)* (plumage/feather dress),

i:-wa:n   *i:-to:ka: xiw-ko:ska*
it-with (= also) its-name *xiw-ko:ska* (turquoise ornament)

'the turkey, it also has the name *i²wi-ken*, it also has the name *xiw-ko:ska*' (Dibble and
Anderson III:11, translation from Una Canger, personal communication [cf. also
Andrews 1975:338]).

Perhaps it should be mentioned that CN had a particle *aw* 'and' which was used to
introduce sentences; Pipil has no corresponding particle, save perhaps *wan tami* 'after-
wards, and then' (literally 'and later'). It is not clear whether *aw* is old and somehow was
lost early in Pipil or whether it is a later innovation in CN after PN times. In any event, it
seems to have been more an adverbial conjunction serving the discourse function of
introducing sentences connected in the discourse. It apparently did not function to conjoin
independent clauses into a single sentence (cf. Andrews 1975:337 and Langacker 1977*a*:30).

illustrated here in the paradigms for -wan 'with', -(i)hpak 'on', and -pal 'possession', three relational nouns involved in changes to be discussed below:

nu-wan	'with me'	*nu-hpak*	'on me'
mu-wan	'with you (sg.)'	*mu-hpak*	'on you (sg.)'
i-wan	'with him/her/it'	*(y)-ihpak*	'on him/her/it'
tu-wan	'with us'	*tu-hpak*	'on us'
anmu-wan	'with you (pl.)'	*anmu-hpak*	'on you (pl.)'
in-wan	'with them'	*in-ihpak*	'on them'
nu-pal	'mine'		
mu-pal	'yours'		
i-pal	'his/hers/its'		
tu-pal	'ours'		
anmu-pal	'yours (pl.)'		
im-pal	'theirs'		

Wan now appears as a full coordinate conjunction 'and', having lost the relational-noun requirement of occurring only with possessive pronominal prefixes. It had previously functioned to conjoin nominals, e.g., *Juan i-wan Maria* [John her-with Mary] 'John and Mary/John with Mary', but in its new form it also serves to conjoin clauses. Examples of both are:

(7) *ne   ta:ka-t   k-itskih   ne   mich-in   <u>wan</u> ki-kwah.*
    the   man-ABSOL   it-caught   the   fish-ABSOL   and   it-ate.

    'The man caught the fish and ate it'.

(8) *entonses ne   i-siwa:-w   ki-miktih ne   chumpipi, ki-chiw-ki*
    then   the   his-wife-POSS   it-killed   the   turkey,   it-do-PRET

    desplumár, wan ki-chiw-ki ne   komidah, <u>wan</u>
    pluck,   and it-do-PRET the food,   and

    ki-kwah-ke-t.
    it-eat-PRET-PL

    'Then his wife killed the turkey, (she) plucked it, and (she) made the food, and they ate it'.

(9) *<u>a</u>   <u>los</u> <u>tres</u> dias ka   panu-tuk ne   urakán   <u>wan</u>*
    upon the   three days that pass-PERF the   hurricane and

    ki-kwah-tiwi-t ne   chumpipi wa:lah-ke-t   u:me ta:ka-met
    it-eat-PERF-PL the   turkey   came-PRET-PL two   man-PL

    wan se: siwa:-t   ki-te:mua-t.
    and one woman-ABSOL it-look for-PL

'Three days after the hurricane had passed and they had eaten the turkey two men and a woman came looking for it'.

(10) *k-al-i:ka-t*   *ne*   *ye:y*   *pipil-tsi-tsín*   *se:*
it-DIR-take-PL the three boy-PL-DIMIN a

    in-mih-michin-tsi-tsín <u>*wan*</u> *ne* *se:yuk* *k-al-i:ka*   *se:*
    their-PL-fish-PL-DIMIN and the other it-DIR-take a

    i-tapahsul *ne* *wi:lu-tsin*   *mareño.*
    its-nest   the bird-DIMIN mareño

'The three little boys bring some little fish and the other brings a small mareño bird's nest'.

This change from what formerly could occur only as a relational noun to a coordinate conjunction, coupled with borrowed Spanish conjunctions, has altered the general nature of Pipil. From a language of limited coordination with no true coordinate conjunctions (where both parataxis and hypotaxis were much more restricted), Pipil has become, in essence, very similar to Spanish.

In connection with coordination, it should be mentioned that Pipil has three principal subordinate conjunctions, inherited from PN, which introduce adverbial clauses—*ka:n* 'where', *ke:man* 'when', and *ke:n* 'how'—but has added several additional kinds of subordinate conjunctions through the borrowing of Spanish *asta*—*axta* 'until', *porké* 'because,' and *tay ora* 'when' (*tay* 'what', *ora* 'hour' Sp. *hora*)—plus developing *pal* 'in order to, so that' (see below). While CN had some cognate subordinate conjunctions, the "generic" subordinator *in* was very frequently used for all of these, for example:

(11) *mustla*   <u>*in*</u>   *o-ti-te-machti-ke*[ʔ]
tomorrow SUBOR PAST-we-someone-teach-PRET

    ti-tla-kwa-ske[ʔ]
    we-something-eat-FUT

'Tomorrow after we have preached, we will eat' (from Olmos; cf. Suárez 1977:131) (*in* = 'after, when, because, since', etc.).

(12) *san*   *iw*   *o:-tlatwi-k*   *in*   *cho:ka*
only then PAST-dawn-PRET SUBOR cry

'(He) cried until it dawned'/'Only then it dawned as (he) cried' (Carochi 1645 [1892]:524; cf. Suárez 1977:133).

3.3. Relative clauses. Pipil relative clauses have changed, at least in part, due to Spanish influence. Relative clauses in PN were probably essentially the same as in CN, where relativization was signaled in two

main ways: with markerless juxtaposition, i.e., ∅ (no subordinating element), or with the "generic" subordinator *in*, for example:

(13) ∅-type: *yo-ni-kin-ta   miekeh tla-tlakah pihpinawah*
            PAST-I-them-see many PL-man   were ashamed

      'I saw many men who were ashamed' (Hill and Hill 1981:90, from modern Malinche Nahuatl).

(14) *in*-type: *in pa²-tli   in*
            the medicine-ABS SUBOR

      o:-ni-mits-wa:l-no-tki-li-li[²] . . .
      PAST-I-you-hither-REFLEX-carry-CAUS-APPLIC

      'the medicine that I brought you (honorific) . . .' (Garibay 1961: 142; cf. Langacker 1977*a*:181).

Also, "headless" relatives in CN have been the subject of considerable discussion, though in fact they are a subtype of these just considered. They contain *a*[:]*kin* 'someone' (animate referents) or *tlein* 'thing, that which, what' (inanimates), which turn out not to be relative pronouns (cf. Rosenthal 1972) but independent pronominal heads (arguments of the main verb) with a following juxtaposed markerless (∅-type) relative clause (cf. Karttunen 1976, Langacker 1975, and Hill and Hill 1981), that is:

(15) *amo ka² <u>akin</u>   tekiti-s*
      no   is   someone work-FUTURE

      'There is no one who will work/who works' (Hill and Hill 1981:89) (i.e., [amo ka² akin] [tekiti-s] rather than [amo ka²] [akin tekiti-s]).

(16) *xi-k-kaki   in   tlein ni-mits-ilwia*
      IMP-it-hear SUBOR what I-you-say

      'Listen to what I say to you (pl.)' (Carochi 1645 [1892]:468).

(Note that *tlein* in such constructions frequently was preceded by the *in* subordinator, as in 16.)

Pipil relative clauses, while in some ways still like CN, show considerable changes in the direction of Spanish. The first type, juxtaposition (∅-marker), has been almost completely eliminated. The second type is still introduced by *ne*, the reflex of the Proto-Nahua relative marker (and generic subordinator) **in*. However, other types have been innovated. Relative clauses with *ke* (a borrowing of the Spanish relative marker *que*) are more frequent, though *ka*(*h*) 'who, what' also occurs:

(17) *naha ni-k-ita-k   ne siwa:-t   <u>ne</u> ki-pa:k   ne*
      I   I-her-see-PRET the woman-ABSOL that it-washed the

kwah-kwa:ch-ti.
PL-clothes-ABSOL

'I saw the woman who washed the clothes'.

(18) *Naha ni-k-kuh-ki   ne   ka:wayu ne   ti-k-ida-k*
I   I-it-buy-PRET the horse   that you-it-see-PRET

ya:luwa.
yesterday

'I bought the horse which you saw yesterday'.

(19) *kunih ne ta:ka-t   ke   ki-kutamin k-itskih   ne*
then the man-ABSOL that it-throw   it-grabbed the

chumpipi k-wi:ka ka i-chan.
turkey   it-take to his-house

'Then the man who threw it down grabbed the turkey (and) took
it to his house'.

(20) *ni-k-namaka-k ne   uchpa:nwas ke   k-al-wi:ka-ke-t.*
I-it-sell-PRET   the broom   that it-DIR-take-PRET-PL

'I sold the broom that they brought'.

(21) *ki:sa se: animál ke   yehemet k-ilwia-t "tsun-tekuma-t".*
leave an animal that they   it-say-PL "skull"

'An animal appears which they call (the) "Skull".'

(22) *ni-k-i:xtu:ka ne gato tik ne ka:hó:n ke   ki-chiw-ki*
I-it-insert   the cat in the box   that it-make-PRET

nu-manu.
my-brother

'I stuck the cat in the box which my brother made'.

(23) *kunih ahsi-ke-t   i-chan   ne ta:ka-t   kah*
then arrive-PRET-PL his-house the man-ABSOL who

ki-kutamin-ki.
it-throw-PRET

'Then they arrived (at) the house of the man who threw it down'.

(24) *ni-k-miktih ne mistun ka   ki-kwah ne tu:tu-t.*
I-it-killed   the cat   that it-ate   the bird-ABSOL

'I killed the cat which ate the bird'.

In examples (23) and (24), Pipil *ka(h)* is a relative pronoun, unknown
in PN or CN. However, *ka(h)* also can function as a complementizer,
that is, to introduce "headless" relative clauses. It corresponds in func-

tion with CN *a[:]kin, a[:]ka²* 'someone' (see above), but it has changed from an argument of the main verb (followed by a markerless [∅-type] relative clause) to a true relative pronoun, as in examples (23) and (24), where no "headless" interpretation is involved. Nevertheless, it is still found in "headless" relatives (complement structures), but as a pronoun here as well, as in Spanish, unlike its function in CN.[4] Some examples are:

(25) *a:n   ni-yaw ni-k-chih kontár ka   nin   nemi se:*
     today I-go   I-it-did   tell   that here is   an

     chu:le-t   ke   yaha própio yaha nech-ilwih-tuk ka
     old man-ABSOL that he   himself he   me-tell-PERF   that

     i-na:n   wan i-te:ku   ne: tik arkuh nemi-t.
     his-mother and his-father there in arch is-PL

     'Today I (am) going to tell that here there is an old man who he
     himself has told me that his mother and his father are there in
     (the) arch'.

(26) *ya klaroh k-ita-k   kah wi:ts ne siwa:-t.*
     he clear   it-see-PRET that come the woman-ABSOL

     'He saw clearly that the woman was coming'.

(27) *tesu ki-mati katka ka   ne i-siwa:-w   se: bru:hah.*
     no   it-know BEFORE that the his-wife-POSS a   witch

     '(He) didn't know before that his wife was a witch'.

---

[4] Suárez (1977:147) thought that the emphatic particle *ka* of CN, which generally appeared in direct quotations, may have been involved in the introduction of *ke*, borrowed from Spanish, e.g.:

k-ilwi[²] in   weweton ka   nikan natki in   pa[²]tli
it-said   the old man QUOTE here is   the medicine

'The old man said, "here is the medicine"' (Garibay 1961:98 and Suárez 1977:147).

This could be the CN cognate to Pipil *ka(h)* as a complementizer and relative clause marker, though the picture may be more complex. Suárez (1977:155) thought Pipil *ka[h]* was related to Isthmus Nahuatl *iga*, both deriving from *i:-ka:* 'for (him/her/it)', and he related it to the possible ambiguity in sentences such as:

ki-kowa ... tsikawal iga   yawa ki-makti i-yixwiyo
it-buy   comb   SUBOR go   it-give his-stepdaughter

'He buys a comb *that* he is going to give to his stepdaughter'/'He buys a comb *for* giving (in order to give it) to his stepdaughter'.

It may be that Pipil *ka(h)* is from a merging of several forms, from *a[:]kah 'someone', *ka* the emphatic particle, and *-ka:* the relational noun 'for', which does not exist at all in Pipil (cf. *pal* 'for').

(28) *ne reynah bi:dah   ki-mati <u>ka</u> ki-chih-ke-t   atendér.*
the queen   delicious it-know that him-do-PRET-PL attend

'The queen feels good that they attend him'.

(29) *ni-k-elna:miki <u>ka</u>   an-ehemet an-nu-a:migitus.*
I-it-remember that you pl.   you pl.-my-little friends

'I remembered that you are my little friends'.

Also, *tay/ta:* 'what' (cognate with CN *tlein*, from PN **tlahi-* + *in*)
functions as a complementizer, exactly equivalent to Spanish *que/lo que*
'that, that which'. It is unlike its CN counterpart in that it never
cooccurs with *ne* (cognate with *in*), and it is now clearly a member of the
subordinate clause, not an argument of the main verb with no role in the
subordinate clause, as it was in CN (see above). Some examples are:

(30) *na ni-k-elna:miki <u>tay</u>   nech-ilwih nu-no:yah   wan*
I   I-it-remember what me-told   my-grandmother and

nu-tatanoy.
my-grandfather

'I remember what my grandmother and my grandfather told me'.

(31) *wan mu-chiw-ki   proponér ke   era demás   <u>tay</u>*
and REFLEX-do-PRET propose   that was too much what

wi:ts-et ki-chiwa-t tik tu-chan.
come-PL it-do-PL   in our-town

'And it was proposed that it was too much that which they came
to do in our town'.

(32) *k-ita <u>ta:</u>   ki-chiwa nemi ne i-siwa:-w.*
it-see what it-do   is   the his-wife-POSS

'(He) sees what his wife is doing'.

(33) *kenemeh nemi ne: nana:watsin, ya k-ita <u>ta:</u>   ki-chiwa*
since   is   there Nanahuatzin, he it-see what it-do

ne in-lama
the their grandmother

'Since the Nanahuatzin is there, he sees what their grandmother
does'.

(34) *<u>ta:</u>   ki-kwa ne ta:ka-t   k-i:xtilia.*
what it-eat   the man-ABSOL it-take away

'What(ever) the man eats, (she) takes (it) away from him'.

The addition of new relative markers and the near elimination of
∅-marking has brought about no grand alteration of the basic structure

of Pipil syntax. Nevertheless, it has given relative clauses greater defini-
tion by providing a means for distinguishing them more clearly from
other subordinate clauses which were also introduced originally by ∅ or
*in (in Pipil ne). (Note that similar changes in relative clauses due to
Spanish influence have taken place in other dialects of Nahuatl; cf. Hill
and Hill 1981, Karttunen 1976, and Suárez 1977.)

The combined effect of the changes in coordination and relative
clauses makes a rather large variety of complex sentences more dis-
tinguishable and hence more like Spanish in their actual deployment. In
this, Pipil matches Boas's (1929:6) observations for central Mexican
Nahuatl that "the syntactic subordination and coordination of phrases
has yielded to Spanish types." The significance of this is considered
below.

4. Shifts due to phonetic similarity. Some native Pipil forms have
acquired functions like those of Spanish forms with which they have a
phonetic similarity, contributing to functional shifts. Some examples
follow.

4.1. *Pal.* Pipil -*pal* 'possession' (e.g., *nu-pal* 'mine'; see above) was
originally a "relational noun" and could appear only as such. There are
many relational nouns which have undergone no changes. However, on
the model of Spanish *para* 'for, in order to', to which -*pal* bears phonetic
similarity (i.e., there is no *r* in native Pipil words), it now appears in
constructions without the originally required possessive pronominal pre-
fixes and has come to mean 'in order to, so that', having thus acquired
the function of introducing a kind of subordinate clause which formerly
did not exist in the language. Some examples are:

(35) <u>inmediatámente</u> ki-chiw-ki   ordinár i-siwa:-w   ma:
     immediately   her-do-PRET order   his-wife-POSS IMP

    ki-mikti ne chumpipi <u>pal</u> ki-kwa-t.
    it-kill   the turkey   so   it-eat-PL

    'Immediately (he) ordered his wife that (she) kill the turkey in
    order that they (could) eat it (= for them to eat it)'.

(36) kunih x-al-kwi   uk   se:yuk   tortah, nah ni-k-ta:lia tik
     then IMP-DIR-grab other another bun,   I   I-it-place in

    nu-ma:ta-w <u>pal</u>   ni-k-kwa mu:sta.
    my-net   so that   I-it-eat tomorrow

    'Then bring another bun (and) I (will) put it in my netbag for me
    to eat tomorrow'.

(37) *ni-mu-kets-ki   ni-k-tatia ti-t   pal ni-mu-tutu:nia.*
     I-REFLEX-arise-PRET I-it-burn fire-ABSOL so I-REFLEX-heat
     'I got up to light (the) fire in order to warm myself'.[5]

4.2. -se:l. Another example is the relational noun *-se:l* 'alone' (cf. *nu-se:l* 'by myself, I alone', *i-se:l* 'by him/herself, alone', etc.), which has been remodeled after phonetically similar Spanish *sólo* 'alone, only' to an adverb (not requiring possessive prefixes) *se:l* 'alone, only'. Not only has it changed in form, its meaning has been extended from 'alone' to include the 'only' meaning of Spanish *solo* as well.[6]

5. Expansions of native constructions to match additional functions of only partially corresponding Spanish constructions. This kind of change involves a partial coincidence of function between some native and a corresponding Spanish construction, where the Spanish form has additional functions not originally served by the native Pipil forms but which the native forms are expanded to cover. Examples follow.

---

[5] While in Pipil *-pal* means 'possession', in CN it meant 'by, by means of', which is more like the meaning of Spanish *para* 'for, in order to' than the Pipil cognate is, though in CN it was not used to introduce subordinate 'in order to' clauses. It is probable that the Pipil form originally had broader uses than it has today, given its meaning in CN. That is, had the original meaning of *-pal* been 'dirt' or 'sing' or some such thing, one would not expect it to become a subordinate conjunction, regardless of the function of phonetically similar Spanish forms.

[6] Pipil has another example in the suffix *-ta(:)l*, derived from the native root *ta:l* 'land', with the basic meaning of 'place of many'. It corresponds to the Spanish suffix *-al, -ar, -(t)al*, with which it is partially similar; cf. Spanish *cafetal* 'coffee orchard' (cf. *café* 'coffee'), *platanal* 'plantain grove' (cf. *plátano* 'plantain'), *pinal* 'pine grove' (cf. *pino* 'pine'), *carrizal* 'canebrake' (cf. *carrizo* 'cane, reed'), etc. This Pipil suffix's meaning and current productivity, and perhaps even its origin as a suffix, are due at least in part to influence from the phonetically similar Spanish suffix. Some examples are:

a:ka-tal	'canebrake, place of reeds'	(*a:ka-* 'reed')
e:-tal	'bean patch, bean field'	(*e:-* 'bean')
saka-tal	'pasture'	(*saka-* 'grass')
uku-tal	'pine grove'	(*uku-* 'pine')
u:wa-tal	'canebrake, uncleared land'	(*u:wa-* 'cane')

It should be noted that other Nahua dialects do not have this ending, though CN had *-tla*ʔ 'place of many', e.g., *xo:chi-tla*ʔ 'flower garden' (*xo:chi-* 'flower'). It is possible that Pipil *-ta(:)l* is cognate with this and that the final *-l* is due in part to influence from the Spanish *-al* suffix and in part to analogy with native *ta:l* 'ground, land'.

Changes due to phonetic similarity with Spanish have also been reported in other Nahua dialects. For example, in the Malinche region, *akin* 'someone' has supplanted the *akah* and *akihkeh* forms of the same meaning, presumably because *akin* is phonetically closer to Spanish *alguien* 'someone'; *kwak* 'when' has driven out competing *ihkwak, kienman,* and *kienmanian* (closer to Spanish *cuando*); and *kemeh* 'how' is favored over *ken* (cf. Spanish *como*) (Hill and Hill 1981:100–101).

5.1. Past participles as adjectives. For example, Spanish past participles, like their English counterparts, function not only in verb forms (e.g., *ha roto* 'has broken') but also often as adjectives (e.g., *el vidrio roto* 'the broken glass'). Pipil past participial forms formerly functioned only in verbal constructions (e.g., *ki-chiw-tuk* [it-do-PAST PARTICIPAL] 'he/she has done it') but have been extended to bear an adjectival function as well, based on the Spanish model. Some examples are:

ahsi:lih-tuk	'having goosebumps'
chihchi:lih-tuk	'reddening, reddened'
ku:wak-tuk	'skinny, dried'
sulu:n-tuk	'swollen'
tawa:n-tuk	'drunk'
te:n-tuk	'full'
utsti-tuk	'pregnant'

(38) *kabál uksi-tuk ne wahkal.*
     exact ripe-PERF the gourd
     'The gourd was just ripe'.

(39) *a:xa:n nech-ilwia ne pa:leh a:su ni-k-piya se: nu-finki:ta,*
     now me-tell the priest if I-it-have a my-little farm,

     ma: ni-yu i-wan wan ne chih-chi:l-tik tsapu-t
     that I-go her-with and the PL-red-ADJ zapote-ABSOL

     ma: ki-kwa ne uh-uksi-k, wan tami ma: ki-maka wan
     that it-eat the PL-ripe-PERF, and after that her-give with

     ne chih-chika:h-tuk pal ni-k-mik-tia.
     the PL-hard-PERF so I-her-die-CAUS

     'Now the priest told me, if I have a farm that I should go (there) with her and, the red zapotes, that she should eat the ripe ones, and then (I should) hit her with the hard ones in order to kill her'.

(40) *kunih, ke:man ahsi-k ne ta:ka-t ke k-wi:ka ne*
     then, when arrive-PRET the man-ABSOL who her-take the

     siwa:-t ilpih-tuk wan i-sinidór, k-ilwia,
     woman-ABSOL tie-PERF with his-sash, it-say,

     "nana Lionah".
     "Miss Leonarda"

     'Then, when the man arrived who brought the woman tied up with his sash, he said, "Miss Leonarda!".'

5.2. Conditionals and imperatives as subjunctives. Pipil, like other Mesoamerican Indian languages, originally had no formal morphological or syntactic "subjunctive"; however, conditional and imperative forms have come to be employed in ways exactly paralleling Spanish subjunctives.

The conditional suffix is *-skiya* 'singular' and *-skiya-t* 'plural', e.g., *ni-panu-skiya* 'I would pass', *ti-panu-skiya-t* 'we would pass'. It has the approximate meaning of 'would' in English; however, at times it is equivalent to 'should'. This connotation of obligation comes from the Spanish subjunctive, which has both the 'conditional' and the 'obligational' senses:

(41) *Si hubiera   hecho algo.*
    if had (past subjunctive) done something

    'If (he) had/would have done something'.

(42) *Que hubiera   hecho algo.*
    that had (past subjunctive) done something

    '(He) should have done something'/'Oh that he had done something'.

A Pipil example is:

(43) *ma: ki-maka ne   konse:hoh ke:n ki-chiwa-skiya.*
    that him-give the advice   how it-do-COND

    'Let him give advice (about) how he should do it' (cf. Sp. *que le de un consejo cómo lo hiciera* [subjunctive]).

The second-person imperative morpheme is *xi-/x-*. Its sense is 'imperative' or 'subjunctive'. There are also imperative forms for the other persons (save first singular) composed of the exhortative particle *ma:*, which functions largely like the *que* with Spanish subjunctives when these are employed imperatively or exhortatively, for example:

xi-k-kwa	'eat it! (you sg.)'
ma: ki-kwa	'let him/her eat!'
(ma:) ti-k-kwa-kan	'let's eat it!'
xi-k-kwa-kan	'eat it! (you pl.)'
ma: ki-kwa-kan	'let them eat it!'

In Spanish, in most contexts for most persons, imperative and subjunctive verb forms are identical, or nearly so (e.g., *coman* 'eat!' [third-person pl. imp.], *quiero que coman* 'I want them to eat' want-I that eat [third-person pres. subjunctive]). Some Pipil example sentences which

illustrate the imperatives used as corresponding Spanish subjunctives are:

(44) *xi-k-ilwi*   *(ka)*   *te: ma: yawi.*
IMP-him-tell (that) no IMP go

'Tell him not to go'. (Literally, 'Tell him that he not go'; cf. Sp. *Dile que no se vaya*, where subjunctive is required after commands as in the case with the verb 'tell'.)

(45) *tesu ni-k-neki ma: xi-k-mikti.*
no   I-it-want IMP IMP-it-kill

'I don't want you to kill it'. (Literally, 'I want that you not kill it'.)

(Notice the second-person imperative *xi-* used as the subjunctive in Spanish after a verb of 'desire'.)

(46) *inmediatamente ki-chih-ki*   *ordinár i-siwa:-w*   *ma:*
immediately   her-do-PRET order   his-wife-POSS that

     ki-mikti ne chumpipi pal ki-kwa-t.
     it-kill   the turkey   for it-eat-PL

Immediately (he) ordered his wife to kill the turkey so they (could) eat it'.

(Here the imperative/hortative particle *ma:* is used corresponding to Spanish *que* of subjunctives, and *ki-mikti* 'kill it' has third-person imperative morphology; cf. Sp. . . . *ordenó que lo matara*.)

(47) *k-ilwih-ke-t*   *ma: ki-ma:walti*   *chi:l.*
him-tell-PRET-PL that her-smear[-IMP] chili

'They told him that (he should) smear her (with) chili'. = 'They told him to smear her with chili'. (Literally, 'They told him that he smear her (with) chili'; cf. Sp. *Le dijeron que la untara chile*.)

5.3. Periphrastic future. The future suffixes today in spoken Pipil are extremely rare, unused and almost unknown for the most part. Usually, future meanings are given in periphrastic constructions, e.g., *ni-yu ni-k-chiwa* [I-go I-it-do] 'I'm going to do it'. In this, Pipil corresponds to local Spanish, where the periphrastic forms, e.g., *lo voy a hacer* (cf. *ni-yu ni-k-chiwa*) 'I'm going to do it', are the most typical, with future forms such as *lo haré* (cf. *ni-k-chiwa-s*) 'I will do it' very rare and stilted. The Pipil future suffixes are *-s* 'singular' and *-s-ke-t* 'plural', e.g., *ni-panu-s* 'I will pass', *ti-panu-ske-t* 'we will pass'.

It should be noted that this old morphological "future" (*-s/-s-ke-t*, cognates of which are still quite active in other Nahua dialects) did not

occur once in many hours of recorded texts, including several examples of the most conservative traditional folklore. While it can still be elicited from some speakers, with some difficulty, for all practical purposes it has been lost in the change to the periphrastic future with the auxiliary 'go', due to Spanish influence. (*Yawi* has several shapes: (*y*)*u*(:) in faster speech, particularly when used as an auxiliary, *yaw* as an intermediate form between full *yawi* and very abbreviated (*y*)*u*(:), and *ya*(:)*h* in preterit and perfect forms.) Some examples are:

(48) *Na ni-yawi ni-mu-kwepa   ni-k-ilpia.*
     I   I-go   I-REFLEX-return I-her-tie
     'I'm going to tie her up again'.

(49) *n-yu ni-mitsin-ilwitia.*
     I-go I-you pl.-show
     'I am going to show you (pl.)'.

(50) *n-yu n-al-in-nu:tsa.*
     I-go I-DIR-them-speak
     'I am going to call them'.

(51) *uk   yu wi:ts ne: tu-kuhkul.*
     now go come there our-bogeyman
     'Now our bogeyman is going to come there'.

(52) *ti-yu-t   ti-yawi-t   ti-pa:xa:lua-t ne:pa ka ku:htan.*
     we-go-PL we-go-PL we-walk-PL   there in woods
     'We are going to go take a walk there in (the) woods'.

(53) *yawi-t-a   wi:ts-et   ne   nu-pila:-wan-tsi-tsin.*
     go-PL-already come-PL the my-boy-PL POSS-PL-DIMIN
     'My little boys are going to come now'.

5.4. The development of prepositions. From the beginning, locative constructions in Pipil have had an interesting history.

Unlike PUA (Langacker 1977*a*:92–93), Pipil has no productive postpositions. However, it has reflexes of former postpositions both in the relational nouns and in certain of its locative suffixes. That is, while many Uto-Aztecan languages have postposed locatives as in, for example, Cora *mi-kiyé-hete* 'under that tree' (*mi-* 'that', *kiye-* 'tree', *-hete* 'under'), Pipil has changed, having acquired the typical Mesoamerican pattern

with relational nouns, e.g., *i-tan ne kwawi-t* 'under the tree' (*i-* 'its', *-tan* 'under', *ne* 'the', *kwawi-t* 'tree').[7] The change from postpositions to relational nouns was brought about by contact within the Mesoamerican linguistic area (see Campbell, Kaufman, and Smith-Stark 1986).

Later, under the influence of Spanish, some relational nouns in Pipil shifted both form and function to become true prepositions of the Spanish type.

The relational noun *-(i)hpak* 'on, upon, over, on top of' still occurs as such with its possessive pronominal prefixes, but it also occurs frequently in a remodeled form, *pak*, functioning fully as a preposition:

(54) *pak kal*   'on top of the house'

(55) *pak me:sah*   'on the table'

(56) *ki-maka-k   pal mu-ta:lia pak se: tru:suh-tsín.*
     her-give-PRET for REFLEX-sit on   a   block-DIMIN

     'He gave it to her so she could sit on a small block of wood'.

(57) *uk   ki-nu:ts-ki   mu-tamu:ta-k   ne   tsuntekuma-t,*
     when her-speak-PRET REFLEX-throw-PRET the skull-ABSOL,

     mu-sa:luh   pak i-kech-ku:yu.
     REFLEX-stuck on   her-neck-stock

     'When he spoke to her, the Skull threw itself (and) stuck on his neck'.

---

[7] CN had not developed quite as far as Pipil toward converting all postpositions into relational nouns. Carochi (1645) lists some (locative suffixes) as occurring only with nouns: *-k/-ko* 'in, at', *-ka:n* 'place of', *-tla?* 'place of many', *-na:l/-na:l-ko* 'beyond', *-tew* 'like'; while others occurred with either nouns or possessive prefixes, e.g.: *-pan* 'upon', *-tlan* 'below', *-ka* 'by means of', *-tech* 'near, between', *-wi:k* 'toward', *-tsa:lan* 'between', *-nepantla?* 'midst', *-na:wak* 'near', and *-ikpak* 'on top of'. That is, the latter set could appear either as the Uto-Aztecan postposition, attached to a noun root, or as a relational noun with its possessive pronominal prefixes, e.g.: *no-kal-na:wak* [my-house-near] or *i-na:wak in no-kal* [its-near the my-house] 'near my house'. Nevertheless, several other modern Nahua dialects have developed along the same lines as Pipil, eliminating postpositions for the possessed construction of the relational nouns. In North Guerrero, a preposition (without possessive prefixes) has developed, *pa*, e.g., *pa tlalli* 'on (the) ground', presumably from native *-pa(n)* 'on', influenced by phonetically similar Spanish *pa*, the Mexican short form of *para* 'for, to, toward' (Canger 1980*b*).

The postpositional origin of Pipil *-tan* 'under' is perhaps still to be seen in the non-productive locative suffix *-tan*, e.g., *tsapu-tan* 'Ishuatan', a town name which meant literally 'under the zapote trees', now meaning 'place of zapotes' (*tsapu-t* 'zapote', *-tan* 'locative'). CN, however, had two separate forms, not found in Pipil, *tlani* 'under' and *-tlan* 'next to, among/between'. Some might interpret the *-tan* of Pipil *tsapu-tan* as being cognate with the later ('next to') form rather than the former ('under').

(58) *la:h— mu-sa:luh   ni:kan pak ne   masa:-t.*
　　　Lah— REFLEX-stick here   on   the deer-ABSOL
　　　'Wham—it stuck here on the deer'.

The relational noun *-pal* 'possession' (e.g., *nu-pal* 'mine'), as seen above in the form *pal*, acquired a new function equivalent to Spanish *para* to introduce subordinate clauses with the meaning 'in order to' or 'so that'. *Pal* also became a true preposition, functioning without its originally required possessive pronominal prefixes as a periphrastic genitive construction equivalent to Spanish *de* 'of'. In this case it is connected with the possessive sense of the relational noun, 'possession', from which it is derived, unlike the *pal* introducer of clauses, which seems to owe its origin largely to phonetic similarity with Spanish *para*. The possession of one noun by another normally is, and in former times exclusively was, shown by the pattern which is very general throughout most of Mesoamerica, e.g., 'his-dog the man' for 'the man's dog', *i-pe:lu ne ta:ka-t* in Pipil. Some examples of the new competing periphrastic possessive construction are:

(59) *ki-neki-t   ki-kwa-t ne   naka-t,   ne   ihya-k*
　　　it-want-PL it-eat-PL the meat-ABSOL, the stinking-ADJ

　　　naka-t   pal ne   masa:-t.
　　　meat-ABSOL of   the deer-ABSOL

　　　'They want to eat the meat, the stinking meat of the deer'.

(60) *mu-chiwa fihár   ne   ta:ka-t   ka   ne   siwa:-t   ne*
　　　REFLEX-do notice the man-ABSOL that the woman-ABSOL the

　　　i-ih-ikxi   tesu i-ih-ikxi   ke:n pal henteh.
　　　her-PL-feet no   her-PL-feet like of   people

　　　'The man notices that the women's feet are not like the feet of people'.

(61) *desde luego ka nin   tik nu-ma:ta-w oh-ombrón plastas pal*
　　　certainly   in here in my-net-POSS PL-big   cowpies of

　　　turuh wi:ts, yaha ni-k-kwah, tesu pan.
　　　cow   come, this I-it-ate,   not bread

　　　'Certainly what came here in my bag are big cow plasters (plasters of cow); that's what I ate, not bread'.

In a similar way, *-wan* 'with' could originally occur only as a relational noun (see above), but now *wan* 'with' is quite common, appearing without possessive prefixes as a full preposition. Some examples are:

(62) *nin   ni-nemi nu-chan   ti-se:n-nemi-t   a   la par wan*
    here I-am   my-house we-together-are-PL on the level with

    se: nu-amiguh, wi:ts ka   wehka.
    a   my-friend, come from far

    'Here I am at my house, sitting together equally with my friend
    (who) comes from far away'.

(63) *ta-ta:wilua   wan i-espehuh, pero ne   tesu yaha i-destinuh;*
    REDUP-shine with his-mirror, but this no   that his-fate;

    te: ke:man ki-miktih.
    no when   him-kill

    'He shines with his mirror, but that was not (to be) his fate; he
    (the devil) didn't kill him'.

(64) *kunih, ke:man ahsi-k   ne ta:ka-t   ke   k-wi:ka*
    then, when   arrive-PRET the man-ABSOL that who her-take

    ne siwa:-t   ilpih-tuk wan i-sinidór, k-ilwia,
    the woman-ABSOL tie-PERF with his-sash, it-say,

    "nana Lionah."
    "Miss Leonarda"

    'Then, when the man arrived who brought the woman tied with
    his belt, he said, "Miss Leonarda".'

(65) *mas   ka tiyu:tak wi:tsa-ya   wan ne i-tapak.*
    more in evening come-IMPERF with the her-wash

    'Later in the evening she was coming with her wash'.

It should be recalled that *wan*, like *pal*, also has another function as
the conjunction 'and' (see above).

It is probable that the syntactic change from postpositions to preposi-
tions was aided by the existence of Spanish prepositions borrowed into
Pipil, for example:

    de   'from, of' (infrequently used)
    axta, asta 'until, to, up to' (from Sp. *hasta*)
    huntik   'near, next to' (from Sp. *junto*)

In any case, Spanish influence is clearly behind the change.

6. Changes of enhancement. Several aspects of Pipil grammar, while
probably not unknown before Spanish contact, seem to have changed
"in spirit" to conform to Spanish norms. That is, in some cases, origi-
nally more marginal native constructions have been enhanced, become
more salient, due to the more central role played in Spanish grammar of

constructions with corresponding functions. A few cases follow. (Cf. Birnbaum 1984 for similar cases elsewhere.)

6.1. Articles. Today, Pipil nouns occur with both definite (*ne*) and indefinite (*se:*) articles, quite parallel to Spanish. While in pre-Conquest times such constructions were not unheard of, the definite had a much more demonstrative ring to it (like 'that [one]') and the indefinite was not an article at all but rather the number 'one'. (Cf. Langacker 1977*a*:100.) Their usage has come to be nearly a complete match of Spanish articles.

6.2. Progressive. Pipil has a 'progressive' verbal construction formed with *nemi* 'to be' + finite verb (e.g., *nemi ni-ta-kwa* [is I-OBJ-eat] 'I am eating'). Among all the Nahua varieties, a progressive of this form is found only in Pipil (though Isthmus Nahua has a similar construction, see Campbell 1985). A progressive construction formed with a verb meaning 'to be' (as in English 'I *am* eating' or Spanish *estoy comiendo*) may develop independently, as it did in Pipil. However, the frequency and usage matches that of the Spanish 'progressive' so exactly that Spanish influence is clear.[8]

6.3. Impersonal and passive verb forms. Although Pipil once had several passive suffixes (-*lu*, -*lw*-, and -*ua*), these are no longer productive and are now found only in frozen verb forms. The only form equivalent to a passive productive in the modern language is an impersonal construction formed of 'third-person plural' verbs (i.e., with the suffix -*t*) where the subject is not otherwise specified. The meaning is as in, for example, 'fish are eaten in Japan', whose form is equivalent to English 'they' in 'they eat fish in Japan'. For example:

(66) *nech-tawilih-ke-t ne   pe:lu.*
me-give-PRET-PL   the   dog

'They gave me the dog' = 'I was given the dog'.

(67) *de mala swerte ki-mu:tia-t.*
of bad   luck   him-frighten-PL

---

[8] Actually, the very verb *nemi* 'to be' shows considerable Spanish influence. The cognates in other Nahua dialects are *nemi* 'to live' and *nehnemi* 'to walk'. Other dialects typically have ∅ in copular constructions, while Pipil has a very high frequency of occurrence of *nemi* 'to be', paralleling Spanish closely in its usage. For example, in sentences meaning 'to be + location', where Spanish requires *estar* (not *ser*) 'to be', Pipil always requires *nemi* (never ∅ copula), showing the influence of the Spanish construction. Canger (1980*b*) discusses extensions of suffixes originally meaning 'to be somewhere' in Guerrero Nahuatl to correspond to the very frequent 'progressive' construction in Spanish.

'Unfortunately they frightened him' = 'Unfortunately, he was frightened'.

(68) *yaha ki-tahtan se: konse:hoh wan ki-maka-ke-t.*
he   it-asked   an advice   and it-give-PRET-PL

'He asked for advice and they gave it (to him)' = 'He asked for advice and was given it'.

(69) *k-ilwih-ke-t   ma: ki-ma:walti chi:l.*
him-tell-PRET-PL that her-smear   chili

'They told him to annoint her (with) chili' = 'He was told to smear chili on her'.

(70) *nech-ilwih-ke-t ka   nu-siwa:-w   bru:hah.*
me-tell-PRET-PL that my-wife-POSS witch

'They told me that my wife (was a) witch' = 'I was told my wife is a witch'.

Impersonal verb forms represent utterances whose subject is unspecified. Passives may be a kind of impersonal construction in many languages where the logical subject is not specified and the logical object is made surface subject. In Pipil, true passives are not involved, but it is often the case that the third-person plural impersonals function to leave some specific logical subject unspecified (as in the sense of agentless passives), rather than being limited to general or generic senses, as is the case with such impersonals in English. For example, in context, sentences (69) and (70), from a text about a certain supernatural being, have a specific subject: it is the priest who gives the advice and who tells him to smear chili on his wife. There is no general sense that some unspecified 'they' did the advising or the telling. It is known that it was the priest, but in these two cases the priest as subject is clear from the context and the impersonal is used to put other features in focus.

It is quite clear that the widespread usage of third-person plural forms for impersonal utterances, which have replaced totally the former passive constructions, has been stimulated by the similar Spanish employment of third-person plural forms as impersonals (cf. *Comen pescado en Japón* 'they eat fish in Japan', 'fish are eaten in Japan'). Nevertheless, while extremely rare, similar examples are not unknown from CN texts. Thus, it is not clear whether this construction owes its origin in Pipil to Spanish (with CN having undergone an independent development) or whether Pipil, like CN, had the construction and came to replace other passives/impersonals with it because of its similarity to Spanish.

In either case, Spanish influence may be only part of the picture. Since such constructions are so widespread in the world and are a seemingly natural way to represent impersonal sentences without overtly specified subjects, it is possible that the change is due in part to the natural ease with which such constructions develop independently. In this case, given the replacement of older forms, it seems reasonable to suspect multiple causation, both Spanish influence and development toward the form that occurs naturally so often, in the explanation of their origin in Pipil and of the loss of older passive forms.

7. Boundary loss. Langacker (1977*b*) emphasizes "local" (or lexically governed) syntactic changes, where boundary loss is one important type. If the loss of a boundary between certain kinds of morphemes were general, rather than lexically governed, one could speak of "grammatical loss" due to the fusing of formerly distinct morphemes. Pipil has no cases of such loss due to complete merger, but it does illustrate Langacker's local changes. For example, Pipil (as well as Nahua generally) has a noun suffix, traditionally called the "absolutive," which occurs whenever the noun otherwise bears no other affixes. This absolutive suffix (*-ti* after a C, *-t* after V's) does not occur with possessed nouns, e.g., *kak-ti* 'sandal-ABSOL', *nu-kak* 'my-sandal'; *elu-t* 'ear of corn-ABSOL', *nu-elu* 'my-ear of corn'. With a very few roots the historical absolutive suffix is not dropped with possessive pronominal prefixes are present, for example:

-a:pan-ti	'irrigated field'
-kal-tsun-ti	'beam, roof pole'
-a:wa-t	'bud'
-chankwita-t	'corn candy'

In most cases, it may be assumed that the old absolutive has become frozen as part of the root, e.g., *-a:panti*. The probable causal factor in this merging of the old absolutive with the noun root (Langacker's loss of a boundary) is to be found, once again, in Spanish. Local Spanish has borrowed the Pipil forms with the absolutive reflected in the loan. These borrowed Spanish forms, in turn, seem to have influenced native Pipil words to establish a root more like the Spanish version, e.g., *-awa-t* is in local Spanish *aguate*, *-kal-tsun-ti* is *calsonte*. Thus, even here, the boundary loss seems to be caused by Spanish influence.

8. Other syntactic changes not due to Spanish influence. To this point all the changes considered have been due, at least in part, to influences from Spanish. Changes unrelated to Spanish contact involve basic word order.

The most common neutral order for transitive sentences is: Verb-Object-Subject (VOS). This is a relatively rare order in the world's languages and represents a change from the former VSO basic order of PN shared by Classical Nahuatl and many modern Nahua dialects. La Huasteca Nahuatl preserves VSO (Beller and Beller 1979), while several others have SVO, sometimes alternating with VSO, and in any case almost always VS in intransitive sentences.

PUA basic word order was SOV (Langacker 1977a:24); however, Nahua changed to VSO, a trait shared by other Southern-Uto-Aztecan languages.

Pipil, on the other hand, changed again from Proto-Nahua's VSO to VOS when its speakers migrated into Central America and became the neighbors of speakers of Mayan and Xincan languages, which have VOS basic order. It seems highly likely that Pipil has acquired this unusual order due to contact with these languages (cf. Campbell 1978; 1985). That is, language contact seems a reasonable explanation for the change from VSO to the more highly "marked" (rarer, less expected) order, VOS.

A few example sentences of transitive verbs with both subject and object illustrating this word order are:

(71) *ki-miktih   ne   wa:kax   ne   ta:ka-t.*
     it-killed   the cow   the man-ABSOL

     'The man killed the cow'.

(72) *ki-ta:lih   ne   i-chaketah   ne   ta:ka-tsin.*
     it-place   the his-jacket   the man-DIMIN

     'The little man put down his jacket'.

(73) *mitsin-maka-tuk   ne   konse:hoh   ne   chimpe.*
     you pl.-give-PERF the advice   the youngest son

     'The youngest son has given you (pl.) the advice'.

(74) *kin-maka-k   pwestoh   ne   prínsipeh   ne   se:yuk*
     them-give-PRET   office   the prince   the other

     pih-pi:pil-met.
     PL-boy-PL

     'The prince gave the other boys (a) position'.

(75) *ki-chih-ke-t   ne   ti:-t   ne   pipil-tsi-tsín.*
     it-make-PRET-PL   the fire-ABSOL the boy-PL-DIMIN

     'The boys made the fire'.

9. Explanations and conclusions. How are these changes in Pipil grammar to be explained, and how do they relate to theoretical claims

about syntactic change? Do the theoretical claims render these changes more understandable, or are the changes more instructive about the value of such theorizing? I now turn to these questions.

From a theorist's point of view, Pipil syntactic changes are at once both exciting and dull—exciting because of their substantial number and because they are on the whole clear and uncontroversial, dull in that they reflect little of the sorts of change so dear in recent theoretical discussions. That is, in spite of the many changes, the basic pattern of the language has remained relatively unaltered and scarcely any attested syntactic phenomenon has been fully lost or replaced (save the nearly complete loss of passives and the old future). One perceives no telling typological shift or drift (Lehmann 1976, Vennemann 1974, and Harris 1978), no salient abductive reinterpretation of otherwise ambiguous or unclear surface patterns (Andersen 1973, Harris 1978, and Timberlake 1977), no therapeutic grammatical overhaul in the wake of phonological and morphological decay (Harris 1978 and Campbell and Ringen 1981). One finds no compelling restructuring or reanalysis in defense of transparency, ridding the language of foul opacity (Langacker 1977b and Lightfoot 1979). Changes are not seen to happen in sentences that undergo superficial rules before sentences in which major cyclic rules apply (Chung 1977). There are no instances where the applications of the "system" (of grammatical possibilities) have led to alterations in the "norms" (the actually realized grammatical forms), save those where the corresponding Spanish pattern has influenced part of the "system" to take on a larger role or frequency in the occurring "norms" (Coseriu 1978).

In short, most of the claims about the nature of syntactic change are by and large simply irrelevant in the case of Pipil. In nearly every change the overwhelming causal factor has been contact with other languages, primarily Spanish, but also with neighboring native languages in the case of the change from VSO to VOS basic word order. This may be distressing to those who maintain that syntactic borrowing as an explanation of change is usually insignificant or wrong.

What the Pipil case means, given the nature of the changes involved, is that borrowing and language contact must be accorded a significant position in the ranks of causal factors in syntactic change. I hasten to add a clarification. While I hold the syntactic borrowing in Pipil sufficiently clear to demonstrate for skeptics that syntactic borrowing must be admitted among the causes of grammatical change, it is also important to acknowledge well-intentioned caution. That is, strained and even absurd claims are well known where unsubstantiated borrowings, language contact, or substrata have been offered as explanations. More-

over, both the traditional and more recent literature contain solid examples of syntactic borrowing. The important point, then, is to avoid the excesses and abuses and shift attention to the kind of support or documentation for the borrowing. The evidence for syntactic borrowing in Pipil should be sufficient even for the very skeptical.

Of course, borrowing is not the only causal factor in some of the Pipil changes. That is, while it is involved in most changes, it is important to stress the potential for multiple causation. To use an analogy, suppose a list of potential causal factors in automobile accidents contains such varied things as excessive speed, bad road conditions (e.g., icy highway), impaired driver (e.g., blurred vision, drunkenness, etc.), mechanical malfunctions, etc. Now suppose a car crashed against a tree, when it was dark, the road was icy, the driver was drunk, a tire blew out, and the driver was speeding. It is to be presumed that any single factor might have been sufficient to cause the accident, but that it is also possible, even probable, that these factors combined, working in concert, contributed multiply to cause the wreck. So it is with linguistic change. While we may, in this case, be reasonably certain that borrowing was a principal causal factor, it may not always be the sole element bringing about the changes. At least two other concomitant factors may have contributed to certain of the Pipil changes.

One is naturalness. Some changes are so natural that languages easily undergo them independently, and instances of the change are found repeatedly in the world's languages. Some structures are so natural, languages easily undergo changes by which these constructions are acquired. An example is the third-person plural for impersonal verb forms. It is so common in languages generally that Pipil could have acquired it independently. Nevertheless, given its presence also in Spanish and Spanish's strong influence in other areas of Pipil grammar, it seems wisest to suppose that both Spanish influence and the natural tendency for easy innovation of such constructions converged, multiply causing this particular Pipil change, promoting this impersonal construction to the demise of others. The periphrastic future may be another example. So, naturalness is an additional causal factor in the Pipil story and is available in syntactic change in general.

The other potential factor contributing to syntactic change is grammatical "gaps." Some structural phenomena are highly valuable as communicative resources in a language, and any language which lacks them is said to have a "gap" in its grammar. Clearly, such languages find it easy to acquire the missing but valuable grammatical resources (cf. Hale 1971, Hill and Hill 1981, Karttunen 1976, and Campbell and Mithun 1981). This is very likely the case with Pipil complex sentences.

Formerly the language had very limited and perceptually none-too-salient resources of coordination and subordination (e.g., ∅ [juxtaposition] for coordinate clauses, *i-wan* [relational noun] 'with' for coordination of nominals, and *ne* for many kinds of subordinate clauses, relatives included). While this state of affairs did not represent a complete "gap" or lack of means for indicating these kinds of complex sentences, it clearly was not as efficient as a grammar with overt conjunctions, different for the varied kinds of clauses involved. Thus, it is probable that the changes in Pipil (through the borrowing of Spanish conjunctions and the reshaping of certain relational nouns to function as conjunctions) were motivated in part by the fact that such "grammatical gaps" are very susceptible to change and in part by contact with Spanish. Thus, it is probable that these changes in complex sentences also involve multiple causation, both Spanish influence and the tendency for "gaps" to get filled.

It could be noted that the filling of "grammatical gaps" might be considered just one kind of "natural" change, as considered above. It might also be claimed that opacity is involved in that, once filled, these Pipil complex sentences are more easily distinguished and perceptually more transparent. While this is true, naming it "transparency" in this case is just not very revealing (and not the result of the language becoming opaque through accumulated changes in Lightfoot's 1979 sense of the term); one yearns for more fine-grained explanations. In any event, Spanish contact is an essential ingredient to the explanation of these changes.

In summary, Pipil syntactic changes suggest that (1) a significant place is to be attributed to language contact in theories aimed at explaining syntactic change, and (2) multiple causation is to be recognized fully in attempted explanations.

REFERENCES

ADRIAN, KAREN; ET AL. 1976. Diccionario de vocablos aztecas en el Arte de la lengua mexicana de Horacio Carochi. Instituto de Sociología de las Religiones y de Lenguas y Culturas Indígenas de América. Copenhagen: Department of the Sociology of Religion, University of Copenhagen.
ANDERSEN, HENNING. 1973. Abductive and deductive change. Language 49:765–93.
———. 1974. Towards a typology of change: bifurcating changes and binary relations. Historical Linguistics, vol. 2, ed. John Anderson and Charles Jones, pp. 17–60. Amsterdam: North Holland.
ANDREWS, RICHARD J. 1975. Introduction to Classical Nahuatl. Austin: University of Texas Press.

BELLER, RICHARD, AND PATRICIA BELLER. 1979. Huasteca Nahuatl. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar, vol. 2, Modern Aztec Grammatical Sketches, ed. Ronald W. Langacker, pp. 199–306. Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.

BIRNBAUM, HENRIK. 1984. Notes on syntactic change: cooccurrence vs. substitution, stability vs. permeability. Historical Syntax, ed. Jacek Fisiak, pp. 25–46. Berlin: Mouton.

BOAS, FRANZ. 1929. Classification of American Indian languages. Language 5:1–7.

CAMPBELL, LYLE. 1978. Distant genetic relationship and diffusion: a Mesoamerican perspective. Proceedings of the International Congress of Americanists 52:595–605.

———. 1985. The Pipil Language of El Salvador. Berlin: Mouton.

———. In preparation. Arte de la lengua vulgar mexicana de Guatemala qual se habla en Ezcuintla y otros pueblos deste Reyno. [Facsimile and paleographic edition of a colonial Pipil grammar.]

———, AND RONALD W. LANGACKER. 1978. Proto-Aztecan vowels. IJAL 44:85–102, 197–210, 262–79.

———, AND MARIANNE MITHUN. 1981. Syntactic reconstruction: priorities and pitfalls. Folia Linguistica Historica 1:19–40.

———, AND JON RINGEN. 1981. Teleology and the explanation of sound change. Phonologica, ed. Wolfgang Dressler, O. E. Pfeiffer, and J. R. Rennison, pp. 57–68. Innsbruck: Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Schrachwissenschaft.

———; TERRENCE KAUFMAN; AND TOM SMITH-STARK. 1986. Mesoamerica as a linguistic area. Language 62:530–70.

CANGER, UNA. 1980a. Five Studies Inspired by Nahuatl Verbs in -oa. Copenhagen: Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague.

———. 1980b. Sociolinguistic variation in Aztec. Ms., Department of the Sociology of Religion, University of Copenhagen.

———. 1983. Early Nahuatl dialectology. Revised version of paper presented at the Forty-fourth International Congress of Americanists, Manchester, England, 1982. [To be published in Mesoamerican Dialectology and Language History, edited by Katherine Josserand.]

CAROCHI, HORACIO. 1645. Arte de la lengua mexicana con la declaraciòn de los adverbios della. Mexico. [Reprinted several times, e.g., in: Colecciòn de gramáticas de la lengua mexicana 1:395–538, Anales del Museo Nacional, la època, vol. 5, 1892; as: Compendio del arte del al lengua mexicana, dispuesto con brevedad, claridad, y propiedad, por el P. Ignacio de Paredes (Puebla, 1910); and in: Boletìn de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografìa y Estadìstica, 4a època, 4:147–216, 313–38, 422–32, 559–73, 623–733 (1897); as: Arte de la lengua mexicana (gramàtica nàhuatl), facsimile edition of Carochi and Paredes's 1759 version (Mexico: Editorial Innovaciòn, 1979); in a facsimile edition of the 1645 version (Mexico: Editorial Innovaciòn, 1981); and also in a facsimile edition of the 1645 version, with an introduction by Miguel Leòn-Portilla (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autònoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Històricas, 1983).]

CHUNG, SANDRA. 1977. On the gradual nature of syntactic change. Mechanisms of Syntactic Change, ed. Charles N. Li, pp. 3–56. Austin: University of Texas Press.

COSERIU, EUGENIO. 1978. Sincronìa, diacronìa e historia: el problema del cambio lingüìstico. 3d ed. Madrid: Gredos.

DAKIN, KAREN. 1979. Phonological changes in Nahuatl: the tense/aspect/number systems. IJAL 45:48–71.

———. 1982. La evoluciòn fonològica del protonàhuatl. Instituto de Investigaciones Filològicas, Colecciòn Lingüìstica, no. 2. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autònoma de Mèxico.

DIBBLE, CHARLES E., AND ARTHUR J. O. ANDERSON. 1961–69. The Florentine Codex. [Translation of Fray Bernardino de Sahagùn, General History of the Things of New Spain.] Santa Fe: School of American Research and the Museum of New Mexico.

GARIBAY, K., ÀNGEL MARÌA. 1961. Llave de nàhuatl. Mexico: Editorial Porrua.

GEOFFROY RIVAS, PEDRO. 1969. El nawat de Cuscatlàn: apuntes para una gramàtica tentativa. San Salvador: Ministerio de Educaciòn, Direcciòn General de Cultura, Direcciòn de Publicaciones.

HALE, KENNETH. 1971. Gaps in grammar and culture. Linguistics and Anthropology in Honor of C. F. Voegelin, ed. Dale Kinkade, Kenneth Hale, and Oswald Werner, pp. 295–315. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

HARRIS, MARTIN B. 1978. The Evolution of French Syntax: A Comparative Approach. London: Longmans.

HILL, JANE H., AND KENNETH C. HILL. 1981. Variation in relative clause construction in modern Nahuatl. Nahuatl Studies in Memory of Fernando Horcasitas, ed. Frances Karttunen, pp. 89–103. Austin: Department of Linguistics, University of Texas.

KARTTUNEN, FRANCES. 1976. Uto-Aztecan and Spanish-type dependent clauses in Nahuatl. Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, ed. S. F. Steever, C. A. Walker, and S. S. Mufwene, pp. 150–58. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

LANGACKER, RONALD W. 1975. Relative clauses in Classical Nahuatl. IJAL 41:46–68.

———. 1976. Non-distinct Arguments in Uto-Aztecan. UCPL 82. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

———. 1977a. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar. Vol. 1: An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar. Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Press.

———. 1977b. Syntactic reanalysis. Mechanisms of Syntactic Change, ed. Charles N. Li, pp. 57–139. Austin: University of Texas Press.

LEHMANN, WINFRED P. 1976. A preface to diachronic syntactic investigation. Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, ed. S. F. Steever, C. A. Walker, and S. S. Mufwene, pp. 169–78. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

LIGHTFOOT, DAVID W. 1979. Principles of Diachronic Syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROSENTHAL, JANE M. 1972. On the relative clauses of Classical Nahuatl. The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival, ed. P. M. Peranteau et al., pp. 246–55. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

———. 1981. How Uto-Aztecan is the Nahuatl possessive? Nahuatl Studies in Memory of Fernando Horcasitas, ed. Frances Karttunen, pp. 182–214. Austin: University of Texas Press.

STEELE, SUSAN M. 1976. A law of order: word order change in Classical Nahuatl. IJAL 42:31–45.

SUÁREZ, JORGE A. 1977. La influencia del español en la estructura gramatical del nàhuatl. Anuario de Letras 14:115–64. Mexico.

———. 1983. The Mesoamerican Indian Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SULLILVAN, THELMA D. 1980. Reconstrucciòn de las consonantes del protonàhuatl: estudio preliminar. Cuadernos de la Casa Chata, no. 31. Mexico: Centro de Investigaciones Superiores del Instituto Nacional de Antropologìa e Historia.

TIMBERLAKE, ALAN. 1977. Reanalysis and actualization in syntactic change. Mechanisms of Syntactic Change, ed. Charles N. Li, pp. 141–77. Austin: University of Texas Press.

VENNEMANN, THEO. 1974. Topics, subjects and word order: from SXV to SVX via TVX. Historical Linguistics, vol. 1, ed. John Anderson and Charles Jones, pp. 339–76. Amsterdam: North Holland.