

VARIATION IN ASPECTUAL MORPHOLOGY:  
STATIVE VERBS IN THE SPANISH OF SALAMANCA

By

STEPHANIE MICHELLE KNOUSE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2009

© 2009 Stephanie Michelle Knouse

To my parents, Kenneth and Nancy Knouse, for their love and unwavering support  
*Y para Ramón, gracias por no sólo ser mi pareja sino una fuente de eterna inspiración*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the faculty with whom I had the pleasure of working during the dissertation process as well as my years at the University of Florida. First, I would like to thank Jessi Aaron. I am tremendously grateful that you exposed me to the joys of research, the world of functionalist grammar and variation theory. I cannot thank you enough for this and for your support and friendship over these past three years and I honestly do not know where I would be if our paths had not have crossed. I would also like to thank Diana Boxer. I am grateful that you shared with me your knowledge and expertise of sociolinguistics and face-to-face discourse and I also thank you for your understanding and compassion. I would like acknowledge H el ene Blondeau; your keen insight and perspective greatly helped me throughout this process and thank you for allowing me to find my voice in this dissertation. I would also like to thank Fiona McLaughlin. Thank you for broadening the scope of this research project and for helping me discover the infinite possibilities of naturally-occurring data.

I would also like to profoundly thank the Department of Spanish and Portuguese Studies for its support during my years at the University of Florida; especially I want to mention Gillian Lord, David Pharies and Joaquim Camps. Your dedication to the profession and constant advocacy for the graduate students in our department will always be remembered. Likewise, Sue Ollman, Bobbye Pilkington, Ann Carlton and Terry Lopez, I thank you all for the administrative and emotional support. I would also like to express my gratitude to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for granting me the Massey Dissertation Writing Fellowship, which made the completion of this project change from a possibility to a reality.

Thank you to the transcribers of the data—Alfonso Caminas-Mui na, Dorian Dorado, Juli n de la Fuente, Sergio and Isabel Restrepo, Vanessa Elias, Eduardo  lvarez, and Adriana

Velasco—, I truly thank you for your time, patience and help with the participants' transcriptions. Your assistance was formative.

Ahora, quisiera agradecer a todos de International Studies Abroad Salamanca, en particular a Fátima Alfonso Pinto, por haberme financiado el viaje a Salamanca, por vuestro constante entender de esta investigación y por haberme dado una experiencia inolvidable en vuestra ciudad encantadora. Si no me hubierais dado la oportunidad de pasar el verano en Salamanca, no habría la posibilidad de llevar a cabo este estudio. Y a los salmantinos, os quisiera agradecer de todo corazón. Me dejasteis entrar en vuestras casas, y en vuestras vidas, para que pudiera entender un poco más de lo que significa ser 'salmantino'. Por eso, me siento tan agradecida y afortunada de haberos conocido. Ojalá que este estudio os honre y que nos veamos otra vez.

Finally, I would like to express to my family—Kenneth, Nancy and Rebekah Knouse—that I could not have made it without your love, support and concern for me over these past four years. I would also like to thank my dear friends and family Kathryn Lonquist, Giada Biasetti, Kate Hunter Fredericks, Melanie D'Amico, Melissa Tyson Johns, Caroline Isaacs, the Goodling family, the Knouse family, the Edilla family, the MOUs, and numerous others for their belief and positive energy. A special thank you goes to Laurel Hodges Abreu who was my confidant and touchstone these past four years; I am so glad we went through this process together. Finally, Ramón Galiñanes and Sancho Panza, you both were the beacons of light that brightened my way every day. For all of these reasons, I am forever grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	4
LIST OF TABLES .....	10
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	16
ABSTRACT.....	17
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	19
1.1 General Notions of Tense and Aspect .....	19
1.1.1 Tense.....	24
1.1.2 Grammatical and Lexical Aspect .....	25
1.1.3 Intersection of Tense and Aspect .....	26
1.2 Previous Research.....	28
1.2.1 Perfective and Imperfective Aspect in Spanish.....	28
1.2.2 Perfective Aspect and Stative Verbs .....	29
1.2.3 Tense-Aspect Research in Language Acquisition.....	36
1.3 Theoretical Framework.....	39
1.3.1 Usage-Based Models of Language.....	39
1.3.2 Connection with Variationist Research .....	41
1.3.2 Variation Theory .....	42
1.4 Discourse Analysis .....	44
1.4.1 Narrative Analysis.....	46
1.4.2 Discourse Grounding Strategies.....	48
1.4.3 Transitivity .....	51
1.5 Research Questions of the Present Study .....	53
2 METHODOLOGY .....	55
2.1 The Speech Community .....	55
2.1.1 <i>Salmantino</i> Community.....	55
2.1.2 Participant Selection and the Social Network .....	58
2.1.3 Sociolinguistic Interviews .....	62
2.1.4 Corpus.....	67
2.2 Transcription.....	68
2.3 Data Extraction and Exclusions.....	69
2.3.1 General Exclusions.....	69
2.3.2 Exclusions of the Anterior Present Perfect.....	71
2.4 Variable Context of Spanish Past-Tense Aspectual Morphology .....	77
2.5 Coding and Hypotheses .....	79

2.5.1 Linguistic Factors .....	82
2.5.1.1 Temporal determinant .....	82
2.5.1.2 Grammatical person .....	84
2.5.1.3 Structural priming .....	85
2.5.1.4 Collocation .....	87
2.5.1.5 Clause type .....	88
2.5.1.6 Sentence type.....	89
2.5.1.7 Locative expression.....	90
2.5.1.8 Prepositional phrase .....	91
2.5.1.9 Verb class of main verb.....	91
2.5.1.10 Adjective/past participle.....	93
2.5.1.11 Transitivity .....	94
2.5.2 Social Factors .....	95
2.5.2.1 Age .....	97
2.5.2.2 Gender .....	98
2.5.3 Stylistic Factors .....	99
2.5.3.1 Time in interview .....	100
2.5.3.2 Audience design .....	100
2.6 Variable Rule Analysis .....	101
2.7 Discourse Analysis .....	104
<b>3 SOCIAL AND STYLISTIC FACTORS .....</b>	<b>107</b>
3.1 Social Factors.....	107
3.2 Stylistic Factors .....	112
3.2.1 Time in Interview .....	113
3.2.2 Audience Design .....	115
3.3 Summary.....	117
<b>4 LINGUISTIC FACTORS OF ALL STATIVE VERBS .....</b>	<b>118</b>
4.1 Overall Patterns .....	119
4.2 Further Justification of Perfective Aspect .....	120
4.3 Results and Discussion of Linguistic Factors.....	127
4.3.1 Temporal Determinant.....	129
4.3.2 Collocation .....	136
4.3.3 Grammatical Person .....	146
4.3.4 Clause Type.....	155
4.3.5 Sentence Type .....	161
4.3.6 Prepositional Phrase .....	164
4.3.7 Verb Class of Main Verb.....	164
4.3.8 Adjective/Past Participle and Structural Priming.....	169
4.4 Summary.....	173
<b>5 LINGUISTIC FACTORS OF INDIVIDUAL VERB ANALYSES .....</b>	<b>177</b>

5.1	Results and Discussion: <i>Estar</i> ‘Be’ .....	178
5.1.1	<i>Estar</i> : Temporal Determinant.....	181
5.1.2	<i>Estar</i> : Grammatical Person.....	182
5.1.3	<i>Estar</i> : Sentence Type and Clause Type.....	185
5.1.4	<i>Estar</i> : Locative Expression.....	188
5.1.5	<i>Estar</i> : Verb Class of Main Verb.....	189
5.1.6	<i>Estar</i> : Adjective/Past Participle.....	192
5.1.7	<i>Estar</i> : Summary.....	194
5.2	Results and Discussion: <i>Tener</i> ‘Have’ .....	195
5.2.1	<i>Tener</i> : Temporal Determinant.....	200
5.2.2	<i>Tener</i> : Grammatical Person.....	202
5.2.3	<i>Tener</i> : Verb Class of Main Verb.....	204
5.2.4	<i>Tener</i> : Adjective/Past Participle.....	207
5.2.5	<i>Tener</i> : Transitivity.....	208
5.2.6	<i>Tener</i> : Summary.....	212
5.3	Results and Discussion: <i>Haber</i> ‘Be, Exist’ .....	213
5.3.1	<i>Haber</i> : Grammatical Person.....	216
5.3.2	<i>Haber</i> : Temporal Determinant.....	219
5.3.3	<i>Haber</i> : Summary.....	221
5.4	Results and Discussion: Less Frequent Stative Verbs.....	222
5.4.1	Less Frequent Statives: Temporal Determinant.....	224
5.4.2	Less Frequent Statives: Grammatical Person.....	226
5.4.3	Less Frequent Statives: Collocation.....	227
5.4.4	Less Frequent Statives: Clause Type.....	230
5.4.5	Less Frequent Statives: Adjective/Past Participle.....	232
5.4.6	Less Frequent Statives: Summary.....	233
5.5	Results and Discussion: <i>Ser</i> ‘Be’.....	234
5.5.1	<i>Ser</i> : Temporal Determinant.....	240
5.5.2	<i>Ser</i> : Collocation.....	242
5.5.3	<i>Ser</i> : Grammatical Person.....	244
5.5.4	<i>Ser</i> : Clause Type.....	246
5.5.5	<i>Ser</i> : Adjective.....	247
5.5.6	<i>Ser</i> : Summary.....	248
5.6	Chapter Summary.....	249
6	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	251
6.1	Discussion.....	251
6.1.1	Implications of Temporal Determinants.....	252
6.1.2	Grammatical Person, Collocations and Subjectivity.....	259
6.1.3	Narrative Analysis.....	261
6.2	Implications for the L2 Classroom.....	262
6.3	Directions.....	267
6.3.1	Avenues of Future Research.....	267
6.3.2	Limitations.....	268
6.4	Conclusions.....	269

## APPENDIX

A	OFFICIAL LETTER TO SOLICIT PARTICIPANTION FROM THE ISA SALAMANCA NETWORK.....	271
B	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF SOCIAL FACTORS (ORIGINAL VERSION): INDIVIDUAL VERBS.....	272
C	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF SOCIAL FACTORS (FINAL VERSION): INDIVIDUAL VERBS.....	275
D	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF STYLISTIC FACTORS: INDIVIDUAL VERBS ....	277
	LIST OF REFERENCES .....	278
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	291

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
1-1 Feature of lexical aspect classification (adapted from Li & Shirai 2000:16) .....	26
1-2 Perfective and imperfective aspect, uses and functions (adapted from Zayas-Bazán 2006:16-26).....	29
1-3 Linguistic components of Transitivity (taken from Hopper & Thompson 1980:252).....	51
2-1 Interview questions in Spanish and translated in English.....	63
2-2 Number of tokens excluded according to type of exclusion and form .....	70
2-3 Relative frequencies of Preterit, PP and Imperfect statives according to speaker after exclusions.....	76
2-4 Linguistic factor groups coded.....	80
2-5 Social factor groups coded.....	81
2-6 Stylistic factor groups coded.....	82
2-7 Initial stratification schema of the <i>salmantino</i> speech community, Age .....	97
2-8 Second stratification schema of the <i>salmantino</i> speech community, Age.....	98
2-9 Distribution of the <i>salmantino</i> speech community by age and gender , initial version.....	99
2-10 Distribution of the <i>salmantino</i> speech community by age and gender, revised version....	99
2-11 Distribution of past-tense aspectual variants according to time in the interview .....	100
2-12 Example of narrative discourse, participant XII.....	104
3-1 Distribution of the <i>salmantino</i> speech community by age and gender, final version.....	108
3-2 Distribution of the <i>salmantino</i> speech community by age and gender, initial version....	108
3-3 GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, all statives.....	109
3-4 GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, women vs. men .....	111
3-5 GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>estar</i> .....	112

3-6	Distribution of perfective and imperfective variants according to time in the interview .....	114
3-7	GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, all statives.....	114
3-8	GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>ser</i> .....	115
3-9	GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, LF stative verbs.....	115
3-10	Comparison of probability weights of Audience Design and the preference of perfective aspect.....	116
4-1	Distribution of <i>ser</i> , <i>estar</i> , <i>tener</i> and <i>haber</i> as compared to all remaining verbs, listed by variant .....	119
4-2	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of Preterit applied to all past-tense stative verbs.....	121
4-3	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of Present Perfect applied to all past-tense stative verbs .....	122
4-4	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic to the probability of perfective aspect applied to all past-tense stative verbs.....	128
4-5	Narrative excerpt from speaker V .....	140
4-6	Distribution of frequencies of verb + gerund according to stative verb .....	142
4-7	Distribution of frequencies of verb + infinitive according to verb in order of overall frequency.....	144
4-8	Relative frequencies of verb + <i>como</i> according to verb .....	146
4-9	Distribution of relative frequencies of inanimate singular subjects according to verb....	150
4-10	Relative frequencies of inanimate singular subjects of all other verbs.....	151
4-11	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology according to Clause Type .....	157
4-12	Narrative excerpt from speaker VI .....	158
4-13	Narrative excerpt from speaker VII, subordinate complement clause.....	159
4-14	Narrative excerpt from speaker XVIII.....	160
4-15	Narrative excerpt from speaker III.....	160

4-16	Narrative excerpt from speaker I .....	161
4-17	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology according to Sentence Type .	162
4-18	Cross-tabulation of Sentence Type and Clause Type of perfective aspect.....	163
4-19	Relative frequencies of Verb Class of Main Verb .....	167
4-20	Distribution of verb + stative main verbs .....	167
4-21	Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle .....	170
4-22	Probabilities of Structural Priming of perfective variants, from Tables 4-2 and 4-3 .....	172
4-23	Narrative excerpt from speaker I .....	174
5-1	Distribution of <i>ser</i> , <i>estar</i> , <i>tener</i> and <i>haber</i> as compared to all remaining verbs, listed by variant .....	178
5-2	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to <i>estar</i> .....	180
5-3	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of <i>estar</i> according to Sentence Type.....	185
5-4	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of all stative verbs according to sentence type .....	186
5-5	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of <i>estar</i> according to clause type.....	187
5-6	Narrative excerpt from speaker XVI.....	187
5-7	Relative frequencies of Verb Class of Main Verb, <i>estar</i> + gerund* .....	190
5-8	Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, <i>estar</i> .....	193
5-9	Similarities and differences between all stative verb and <i>estar</i> analyses .....	195
5-10	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to <i>tener</i> * .....	198
5-11	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to <i>tener</i> , excluding <i>tener que</i> tokens* .....	199
5-12	Relative frequencies of verb class of main verb, <i>tener</i> .....	205
5-13	Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, <i>tener</i> .....	207

5-14	GoldVarb results of the contributing Transitivity parameters to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to <i>tener</i> .....	210
5-15	Similarities and differences between all stative verb and <i>tener</i> analyses .....	212
5-16	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to <i>haber</i> .....	215
5-17	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to <i>haber</i> , excluding <i>haber que/de</i> .....	215
5-18	Relative frequencies of Grammatical Person, <i>haber</i> .....	217
5-19	Cross-tabulation of Grammatical Person and Temporal Determinant of perfective aspect, <i>haber</i> .....	218
5-20	Relative frequencies of Temporal Determinant of <i>haber</i> .....	219
5-21	Similarities and differences between all stative verb and <i>haber</i> analyses .....	221
5-22	Relative frequencies of LF stative verbs.....	223
5-23	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to LF verbs .....	225
5-24	Probability weights of Grammatical Person and perfective aspect, LF statives vs. all statives.....	227
5-25	Probability weights of Collocation and perfective aspect, LF statives vs. all statives ....	228
5-26	Distribution of frequencies for LF verb + <i>bien/mal</i> .....	228
5-27	Distribution of frequencies of LF verb + infinitive according to verb .....	229
5-28	Distribution of frequencies of LF verb + gerund according to verb .....	230
5-29	Distribution of LF verb + infinitive + gerund.....	230
5-30	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology according to Clause Type, LF stative verbs.....	231
5-31	Narrative excerpt from speaker III.....	231
5-32	Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, LF verbs .....	232
5-33	Similarities and differences between all stative verb and LF stative verb analyses .....	233
5-34	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of the Preterit tense applied to <i>ser</i> .....	235

5-35	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of the Present Perfect applied to <i>ser</i> .....	237
5-36	Relative strength of statistically significant factor groups of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect, <i>ser</i> .....	238
5-37	Comparison of probability weights of Grammatical Person of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect, <i>ser</i> .....	238
5-38	Comparison of probability weights of Clause Type of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect .....	238
5-39	GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of the perfective aspect applied to <i>ser</i> .....	240
5-40	Comparison of probability weights of Collocation, all stative vs. <i>ser</i> analyses .....	242
5-41	Cross-tabulation of <i>ser como</i> and Grammatical Person.....	244
5-42	Relative frequencies of inanimate singular subjects, full NPs/abstract subjects vs. tangible subjects, <i>ser</i> .....	245
5-43	Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of <i>ser</i> according to Clause Type .....	247
5-44	Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, <i>ser</i> .....	248
5-45	Similarities and differences between all stative verb and <i>ser</i> analyses .....	248
6-1	Range values of linguistic factor groups analyzed in the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs.....	251
6-2	Probability weights of individual and collective analyses of past-tense stative verbs without a temporal adverbial .....	255
B-1	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, all statives (original version).....	272
B-2	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>ser</i> (original version).....	272
B-3	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>estar</i> (original version).....	273
B-4	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>tener</i> (original version) .....	273
B-5	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>haber</i> (original version) .....	273

B-6	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, LF stative verbs (original version).....	274
C-1	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>ser</i> .....	275
C-2	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>tener</i> .....	275
C-3	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>haber</i> .....	275
C-4	GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, LF stative verbs.....	276
D-1	GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>estar</i> .....	277
D-2	GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>tener</i> .....	277
D-3	GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, <i>haber</i> .....	277

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GER	Gerund
HP	Historical Present
IMP	Imperfect
INF	Infinitive
PP	Present Perfect
PRES	Present
PRET	Preterit

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

VARIATION IN ASPECTUAL MORPHOLOGY:  
STATIVE VERBS IN THE SPANISH OF SALAMANCA

By

Stephanie Michelle Knouse

December 2009

Chair: Jessica Elana Aaron  
Major: Romance Languages

In Spanish, aspectual morphology is a critical element that speakers use to narrate and discuss past events. Previous qualitative accounts have shown that native Spanish-speakers apply past-tense aspectual morphology to verbs in order to distinguish between events viewed as perfective (bounded, discrete events) and imperfective (unbounded, durative events) (Comrie 1976, Dahl 1985, inter alia), as well as foregrounded and backgrounded actions (Hopper 1979b, 1982). Along with grammatical aspect, one must also consider how the inherent meaning of the verb plays a role in the use and understanding of past-tense narration. Yet, if the lexical aspect of a verb indicates an ongoing state (e.g. *ser* 'be', *estar* 'be'), how is the meaning of the verb interpreted when applied with perfective aspect? In other words, since verbs of state are more naturally applied with imperfective aspect (cf. Hopper 1982), what is the discourse function of the perfective-stative combination in natural face-to-face discourse and what are the contextual and extra-linguistic factors conditioning this use?

The data considered in the present investigation were taken from a corpus of 25 sociolinguistic interviews in Salamanca, Spain, collected by the author in the summer of 2008. All tokens of past-tense aspectual morphology (Preterit, Imperfect, and Present Perfect) were extracted from the *salmantino* corpus ( $N=4511$ ) and analyzed both quantitatively and

qualitatively. Variable rule analyses using GoldVarb X (D. Sankoff, Tagliamonte & Smith 2005) revealed that temporal adverbials and grammatical person conditioned the use of stative verbs in the perfective form. Other linguistic factors were found to influence aspectual choice, but these constraints were not uniform for the four most frequent stative verbs (i.e., *ser*, *estar*, *tener* ‘have’, *haber* ‘be, exist’). The social and stylistic factors did not show a systematic influence on determining aspectual choice in past-tense morphology in *salmantino* Spanish. In addition, qualitative narrative analysis uncovered that speakers can use perfective aspect to convey subjective viewpoints.

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Notions of Tense and Aspect

The study of tense-aspect (TA) has been a deeply explored topic of linguistic analysis for over two millennia.<sup>1</sup> One reason why this area has enjoyed such a long and rich history of linguistic study could be due to the richness of meanings that TA forms embody. These morphosyntactic elements empower speakers of any language to convey not only temporally relevant information (i.e., tense), but also to express his/her perception of a situation (i.e., aspectual viewpoint). Many linguists have focused on describing the synchronic nuances of language-particular TA systems (i.e., Guitart 1978, Hopper 1979a, 1979b, 1982, Silva-Corvalán 1983, Bache 1986, Bertinetto 1986, Thelin 1990, Smith 1991, Giorgi & Pianesi 1997, Schwenter 1994a, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008, among numerous others), while others have ambitiously and insightfully broadened this focus to cross-linguistic analyses, incorporating a multitude of world-wide languages, in order to identify universal characteristics of TA morphosyntactic markings (i.e., Comrie 1976, Dahl 1985, Bybee 1985, Bybee & Dahl 1989, Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994).<sup>2</sup> These language-specific and typological accounts of TA systems have offered great insights to the nature of linguistic systems and how, through discourse, language evolves over time.

Specifically with regard to aspectual viewpoint, numerous grammars and descriptive analyses have characterized aspectual viewpoint (i.e., perfective/imperfective), as a semantic distinction: perfective actions have a bounded time frame, whereas imperfective actions are unbounded (Bybee & Dahl 1989:55). Typologically speaking, many researchers strive to identify

---

<sup>1</sup> The analysis of lexical aspect dates back to Aristotle (Smith 2002:364).

<sup>2</sup> The term ‘universal’ is not synonymous or related to the concept of Universal Grammar.

the basic meaning difference between the two markings; however, this pursuit is not without its obstacles. Dahl (1985:74) expressed the following with regard to this endeavor:

In the literature, there have been many attempts to characterize semantically what underlies perfective: imperfective oppositions. Most of these attempts have aimed at finding a common feature –a ‘Gesamtbedeutung’ – of the perfective members of the oppositions – something which has appeared natural in view of the more apparent ‘polysemous’ character of imperfective categories. If the ‘prototypical’ approach to the semantics of grammatical categories that I am advocating is correct, the search of ‘Gesamtbedeutungen’ will in general be a futile one. The difficulty aspectologists have had in coming to an agreement on the question, What is the essential characteristic of perfectivity?, is understandable if they simply have been looking at different features that make up the description of the prototypical uses of PFV. It may also well be that although the prototypical uses are common to all PFV categories, there is variation among languages in how they delimit PFV.<sup>3</sup> (Dahl 1985:74)

As Dahl stated, how speakers apply perfective or imperfective aspect most likely differs from language to language, although universal trends do exist. The literature also documents that languages vary with respect to how perfective and imperfective aspect is applied to verbs of different lexical classifications (cf. Bybee 1995). For instance, Hopper (1979b:215) noted that ‘one finds. . . a tendency for punctual verbs to have perfective aspect. . . and conversely for verbs of the durative/stative/iterative types to occur in imperfective.’

Specifically with regard to the Spanish language, it is well known that speakers use morphological markings to indicate tense (i.e., past, present, future) as well as to convey aspectual viewpoint (i.e., perfective and imperfective aspect). Likewise, it is widely known and observed that Spanish-speakers apply both perfective and imperfective aspect to verbs of all lexical classes (Squartini 2004). Many linguists who study languages that maintain the perfective-imperfective opposition are particularly interested in how aspectual viewpoint interacts with a verb’s inherent meaning, especially there is a ‘contradiction’ between the

---

<sup>3</sup> Dahl (1985) uses ‘PRV’ when referring to perfective aspect.

verb's lexical definition and the implication given by the morphological form. For instance, if perfective aspect indicates that a past event was viewed as bounded and discrete, its application to a verb of state (e.g. *ser* 'be', *existir* 'exist'), hence known as a stative verb, is 'intrinsically problematic' (Bybee 1995:447) since these verbs denote durative, unchanging situations (Smith 1991:32). It is precisely this linguistic puzzle that was the focus in the present investigation: the interaction between perfective and imperfective aspect with stative verbs in Spanish. Concretely, we examined how speakers from Salamanca, Spain—henceforth referred to as the *salmantino* community—applied aspectual viewpoint to stative verbs in face-to-face conversation.

Let's take some concrete examples to illustrate why this topic was of great interest. Excerpts (1.1) and (1.2) are taken from an interview with a female *salmantino* participant. In example (1.1), the speaker was referring to her son's wedding day; later in the conversation this same speaker relayed to us her experience in Morocco in (1.2).

- (1.1) P: Pero menos, pero sí estaba muy bien. . . .Sí la pasamos todos bien.  
 I: ¿Y la novia?  
 P: También estaba **muy bien**. (V, f58, *salmantino* corpus)<sup>4</sup>  
 P: 'But less, but yes he was (IMP) very good. . . .Yes, we all had a good time.  
 I: And the bride?  
 P: Also she was (IMP) **very good**.'<sup>5</sup>
- (1.2) Pues que allí cuecen de todo en la plaza y los olores son fuertes y eso. Eso me gustó menos. Pero también estuvo **muy bien**. Ya te digo. (V, f58, *salmantino* corpus)  
 'Well there they cook a bit of everything in the main square and the smells are strong and such. That part I liked the least. But also it was (PRET) **very good**. I'm telling you.'

We see that at different conjunctures within the same conversation this speaker applied imperfective and perfective aspect, respectively, to *estar muy bien* 'to be very good'. For some

---

<sup>4</sup> Each participant was assigned a roman numeral (I-XXV). We labeled each excerpt of speech according to the participants' number, gender and age.

<sup>5</sup> 'P' denotes 'Participant' and 'I', 'Interviewer'.

researchers, the application of perfective aspect to *estar* in (1.2) is theoretically ‘incompatible’ or ‘rare’.

Perfective aspect is not compatible with stative verbs, either. This is because stative verbs do not include either a beginning or an end point in their temporal structure. Therefore, perfective aspect, which includes both the beginning and end points of a situation in its focus, cannot normally combine with stative verbs. In rare cases where this combination is possible, it indicates an entry into the state as in *Then I suddenly knew it!* by focusing on the punctual point of entry into that state. This in effect translates a stative verb into an achievement verb. (Li & Shirai 2000:22)

Yet, in Spanish, as in many other languages, this combination is permitted and does not necessarily involve the inception of a state, since ‘Spanish has not gone as far as to conventionalize the implicature [of inception], the inferred meaning, into the basic meaning of the grammatical category, since there is evidence of variation and meaning with this perfective + stative equation’ (Bybee 1995:450). Therefore, many would attribute the difference in aspectual viewpoint to the speaker perceiving the situation as unbounded and imperfective, as in (1.1), versus bounded and perfective, as in (1.2). That may very well be the case, especially since aspect has been defined as ‘the different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation’ (Comrie 1976:3).<sup>6</sup> With that said, however, let’s examine another excerpt taken from different conversation with a member of the *salmantino* community, in (1.3).

(1.3) Bueno, en general, no fue mala. Pero, la profesora, la monja de matemáticas fue terrible. Fue terrible. Para mí era terrible, aparte que era fea. (I, f58)  
‘Well, in general, it was (PRET) not bad. But, the teacher, the Math nun was (PRET) terrible. She was (PRET) terrible. For me she was (IMP) terrible, besides she was (IMP) ugly.’

If we go by the notion that aspectual viewpoint tells us how the speaker perceives the situation, does this indicate that speaker of (1.3) viewed the same referent (*la monja de matemáticas* ‘the Math nun’) differently in the two contiguous clauses *fue terrible* ‘she was (PRET) terrible’ and

---

<sup>6</sup> Comrie cited Holt (1943:6).

*era terrible* ‘she was (IMP) terrible’? Or, does the difference in aspectual markings used in (1.3) reflect a change-of-state, as in the inception of ‘being terrible’ with *fue terrible*, then indicate the ‘state of being terrible’ with *era terrible*? It does not seem as plausible to chalk-up the difference of perfective and imperfective use in (1.3) to these explanations. In fact, Poplack (2001:407) warned researchers about the slippery-slope of semantic interpretations when accounting for morphosyntactic phenomena. With respect to variation of French morphosyntax she stated:

The grammarian typically responds to such situations by attempting to factor out the variability, either by (1) ignoring it, (2) condemning the offending variant, or (3) attempting to redress the form-function asymmetry, typically by assigning to each form a preferred ‘reading’ or function. . . . This makes it possible to attribute the variability to such unobservables as speaker intent, and *thereby explain it away*. The abiding distaste of grammarians (and many linguists) for inherent variability, coupled with the important interpretive component they assign to speaker commitment and hearer inference, conspire in the observations—with which the literature is rife—that each variant forms fulfills a specific semantic task.<sup>7</sup>

Poplack verbalized exactly the position we wanted to take with regard to the perfective and imperfective opposition in Spanish: do speakers *always* intend to convey this semantic distinction with the use of one aspectual form over the other? To further introduce this topic, we will describe general and language-specific notions of tense, aspectual viewpoint, and stative verbs in the following sections. We will also discuss how qualitative analyses have contributed to the knowledge of TA systems, as well as address how variationist sociolinguistics, usage-based models and discourse analysis can broaden the knowledge of this issue. In the last section of this chapter, we will formally present the research questions of the investigation as well as the main motivations for conducting this analysis.

---

<sup>7</sup> Emphasis added. Poplack (2001) studied the variation between three morphosyntactic irrealis structures in French: Subjective vs. Indicative, Synthetic Future vs. Periphrastic Future and Conditional vs. Imperfect.

### 1.1.1 Tense

As part of the overall human experience, we have a need to express the temporality of a situation (Smith 2002:361); one way to achieve this is through tense marking. In essence, ‘tense is grammaticalized expression of location in time’ (Comrie 1985:9). Speakers use the notion of tense to give a situation a temporal component by means of a grammatical form, which includes, but not limited to, affixes (e.g. Spanish *corrió* ‘s/he ran’), infixes (e.g. English *ran*), or auxiliaries (e.g. English *I will go*) (Smith 2002:362); in tenseless languages, the idea of a temporal perspective is conveyed via adverbial markings, as observed in Malay (Hopper 1979b:226-9), Thai, Hebrew (Smith 2002:362), and Mandarin Chinese (Smith 2002:362).

More specifically, tense ‘relates the time of the referred situation to some other time, usually to the moment of speaking. Present, past, and future. It is deictic since it situates the action relative to the situation of the utterance’ (Comrie 1985:2). These are known as absolute tenses, since they connect the situation to the present moment of speech. On the other hand, relative tenses are those that relate the situation to another point in time other than the moment of speech (i.e., Present and Past Perfects in English, Smith 2002:362). In the present discussion, we will focus on only the absolute past tense—or those ‘grams’ that indicate the situation occurred before the moment of speech (Bybee & Dahl 1989:55)—as it relates to aspect in the Spanish morphological system. To clarify, we adopted the terms ‘gram-type’ and ‘gram’ when discussing grammaticalized forms of tense and aspect: ‘gram-types’ are defined ‘semantic’ categories with similar grammatical functions (cf. Bybee & Dahl 1989). The label ‘gram’ will refer to the grammatical morphological markings themselves, including both bound and periphrastic constructions.

### 1.1.2 Grammatical and Lexical Aspect

Like tense, aspect is often conveyed morphologically. Grammatical aspect, also known as aspectual viewpoint, is what gives speakers the ability to express different points of view through the use of different morphological markers (i.e., conjugations) (cf. Comrie 1976). As previously mentioned, the two types of grammatical aspect of focus in the present study were perfective and imperfective grams. It has been found that the choice of these grams can be influenced through language-specific (morpho)syntactic elements, such as in temporal anchors (i.e., adverbial expressions) or other bounding elements (i.e., the Spanish pro-clitic *se*, cf. Clements 2006). More pervasive is how aspect is understood on the discursive level itself. In natural discourse, context is crucial for interpreting grammatical aspect (cf. Silva-Corvalán 1983:761, Smith 1991:6, 2002:365, inter alia), especially since aspectual viewpoint is not always marked by morphology (Smith 2002:365).

Independent from the morphological marking is the verb itself. Each verb carries an ‘inherent meaning’ which is referred to as lexical aspect, situation aspect (Smith 1991) or *Aktionsart*. Many authors consider not only the verb, but also its arguments when determining the lexical aspect of a verbal structure (Smith 1991, Bertinetto 2000, inter alia), since the arguments can change the verb’s inherent meaning (i.e., *escribir* ‘write’ vs. *escribir una carta* ‘write a card’, Gili Gaya 1964:61). For some, a verb’s lexical aspect can be perfective or imperfective (cf. Gili Gaya 1964:61), which also coincides with the terminology for grammatical aspect; yet, generally, more linguistic features are used to classify a verb’s meaning. Vendler (1967) is arguably the most cited author with regard to how researchers have labeled the lexical

aspect of verbs.<sup>8</sup> Based on the three features of telicity (i.e., endpoints vs. no endpoints), punctuality (i.e., instantaneous vs. durative) and dynamicity (i.e., input of effort vs. no input of effort), Vendler determined four types of verbal lexical aspect: achievements (i.e., *caer* ‘fall’), accomplishments (i.e., *pintar una casa* ‘paint a house’), activities (i.e., *correr* ‘run’) and states (i.e., *ser* ‘be’).<sup>9</sup> Table 1-1 presents these parameters according to the four types of verbal lexical aspect. As we see, the inherent meaning of stative verbs implies a lack of an input of energy (-dynamic), duration (-punctual) and salient endpoints (-telic).

Table 1-1. Feature of lexical aspect classification (adapted from Li & Shirai 2000:16)

	Statives	Activities	Accomplishments	Achievements
Dynamic	-	+	+	+
Punctual	-	-	-	+
Telic	-	-	+	+

Even though the inherent meaning of stative verbs is more in line with the assigned implication of imperfective aspect, statives can be applied with perfective aspect in many languages, such as Spanish, as we will discuss more in depth in §1.2.2 and throughout the analysis.

### 1.1.3 Intersection of Tense and Aspect

It is common to find that tense and aspect intersect on many accounts. For instance, the Spanish perfective and imperfective aspectual viewpoints are commonly referred to as tenses (i.e., the Preterit and Imperfect tenses, cf. Dahl 1985:24); however, this is an incomplete description since these tenses (i.e., past tense) overlap with aspectual viewpoint. In other words, both tense and aspect function together to temporally locate the expressed situation in the past, but it is aspect that semantically categorizes that situation (Smith 2002:361). Before proceeding, we would like to make clear that even though the perfective-imperfective distinction in Spanish

<sup>8</sup> Other authors have elaborated on Vendler’s taxonomy of lexical aspect to include other parameters to this classification (cf. Dowty 1979 or Smith 1991, for example). We worked under Vendler’s classification in the present study.

<sup>9</sup> The examples of lexical aspect were adapted and translated into Spanish from Li & Shirai (2000:15).

is commonly referred to as the ‘Preterit vs. Imperfect distinction’, we will not refer to the perfective-imperfective opposition using these terms since since in the Spanish speech community of our study, the *salmantino* community, there exists more than one past perfective form (i.e., perfective Present Perfect). Therefore, it would not be accurate to say ‘Preterit vs. Imperfect’, since we would be excluding the other perfective form (discussed in §2.3). Since tense and aspect commonly coincide in languages (e.g. past perfectives and past imperfectives in Spanish), the distinction between aspect and tense can be blurred even though one might recognize a prototypical case of one or the other: tenses are deictic categories in that they relate time points to moment of speech, while aspects are non-deictic categories, focusing on the internal constituency of a situation (Comrie 1976:3-9, Dahl 1985:24). Dahl (1985:1) also stated that the semantics of aspect ‘tend to be more allusive than that of tenses’.<sup>10</sup>

Spanish maintains a TA organization known as the tripartite hierarchy (Dahl 1985:83), as commonly found in many of other languages, which distinguishes between a present and past imperfective with a perfective.<sup>11</sup> Aspect is argued to be superordinate to tense (Gili Gaya 1964:150, Bybee & Dahl 1989:83-5, Bybee et al. 1994:83) since perfective aspect is only possible in the past tense in this system; therefore, it must be placed higher in the hierarchy. Due to this superordinate position, aspect has greater *relevance* on a verb than tense. Relevance is defined as ‘the extent to which the semantic content of the gram affects the meaning of the lexical stem’ (Bybee 1995:447). Therefore, inflectional aspect has the ability to drastically change the interpretation of the verb’s meaning, as seen in stative verbs in the perfective aspect

---

<sup>10</sup> Dahl (1985) not only focused his study on tense and aspect, but mood as well (TMA).

<sup>11</sup> Thus, Present tense in Spanish is not seen as perfective, since the it maintains the pragmatic convention of communication that speaking is instantaneous and cannot be bound (also known as the Bounded Event Constraint, cf. Smith 2002). Even though many speakers of Spanish use the Present tense in narrative past tense discourse (cf. Silva Corvalán 1983), this form is not evaluated as a present (Bybee 1995:445), but rather a Historical Present (HP) which will be discussed later in the present chapter.

in Spanish (Bybee 1995:447). As we will discuss in the next sections, aspectologists have shown that the perfective stative combination can imply a variety of meanings in Spanish.

## **1.2 Previous Research**

In this section we review previous analyses of perfective and imperfective aspect. First we will review descriptive investigations and grammars of past-tense aspectual morphology in Romance languages, including Spanish, with an emphasis on stative verbs; this is not an exhaustive effort, as there are numerous studies on the various interpretations of past-tense aspectual morphology in these languages. Second, we will discuss empirical findings of TA research in first language (L1) acquisition studies, as well as Second Language Acquisition (SLA) analyses that have contributed to the knowledge of perfective-imperfective use of native and non-native speakers.

### **1.2.1 Perfective and Imperfective Aspect in Spanish**

Hualde, Olarera & Escobar (2001:160) echoed the words of Bybee & Dahl (1989) to describe aspect in Spanish as ‘una categoría que tiene que ver con cómo visualizamos el evento que describe la oración. Podemos ver el evento enfatizando el comienzo, el final, o su totalidad [perfective aspect] o bien verlo en su desarrollo [imperfective aspect].’ With respect to the perfective-imperfective use in Spanish, Table 1-2 outlines the generally agreed upon functions and uses of these aspectual viewpoints. We can see the compatibility of the definition provided by Hualde et al. (2001) to the functions of perfective and imperfective provided in Table 1-2.<sup>12</sup> Yet, many times these descriptive grammars and analyses of past-tense aspectual morphology in Spanish do not make any mention on how lexical aspect factors into the choice of the perfective

---

<sup>12</sup> Therefore, if we go back to (1.1) and (1.2) we can use these parameters to interpret the difference in forms used by the same speaker. It is unclear, however, how we can apply these inferences to (1.3).

Table 1-2. Perfective and imperfective aspect, uses and functions (adapted from Zayas-Bazán 2006:16, 26)

Past perfective aspect	Past imperfective aspect
(1) Completed past actions	(1) Continuous past actions, making no reference to the exact beginning, duration, or end of the action
(2) Actions that began or finished	(2) Repeated, habitual, or continuous actions in the past
(3) Abrupt changes of emotions or physical or mental states	(3) Two simultaneous events
(4) Events that took place in an instant or a limited period of time	(4) When one action interrupts another, the action that interrupts is expressed in the perfective, and the interrupted action in the imperfective
(5) A series of events in narration (to advance the plot)	

and imperfective forms. On the other hand, other analyses, such as Gili Gaya (1964:150), concluded that the verb's lexical aspect can 'enter in conflict' with the aspectual viewpoint used by the speaker. He stated:

Hay casos en que la significación de la acción expresada puede coincidir con el carácter perfecto o imperfecto del tiempo que empleamos. En otros, por el contrario, la perfección o imperfección derivada significado del verbo puede entrar en conflicto con el aspecto del tiempo en que se enuncia. De ellos resultan refuerzos o interferencias de gran valor expresivo.

The following section presents those studies which emphasize the perfective-stative combination and the 'interferencias de gran valor expresivo' that this structure may create.

### 1.2.2 Perfective Aspect and Stative Verbs

Cross-linguistic analyses of TA and its interaction with stative verbs have shown that some languages do not permit the combination of stative verbs and perfectivity (i.e., Tojolabal, Chepang, cf. Bybee 1995:448-9); only its co-occurrence with imperfective aspect is permissible. Conversely, some languages have gone as far as to conventionalize the inferential meaning of this combination as an inceptive/inchoative meaning (i.e., Engenni, Bybee 1995:447-50). The perfective-stative combination is possible in Spanish and researchers have attested the variety of

implications of the perfective-stative. For instance, even though it is recognized that *saber* ‘know’ and *conocer* ‘be familiar’ commonly take inceptive interpretation when applied with the perfective form, Spanish has not completely conventionalized the implicature of perfective aspect with statives since this meaning is not systematically implied upon its application. According to Bybee (1995), the infrequent nature of perfective-stative in Spanish allows for the array of inferences (i.e., inchoative, inceptive, or simply past tense meaning); consequently, ‘the interpretation [of different classifications of statives] varies by verb and context’ (Bybee 1995:450).

Possible interpretations of the past-tense statives in Spanish are accounted for in qualitative analyses by Keniston (1937), Gili Gaya (1964), Guitart (1978), Butt & Benjamin (1994), Bertinetto (1994, 2000) and García Fernández & Camus Bergareche (2004). A common thread in the literature of the perfective-imperfective opposition in Spanish is that states are commonly employed with imperfective aspect, while other lexical classes of verbs are more naturally inclined to be used with perfective marking.

The Preterit tense is used to represent past experience as a series of definite units. It is the regular tense in narration. The Imperfect tense is used to present the past as an indefinite series of progressive or intermittent parts. It is the regular tense in description, both the description of states (the background of actions) and of actions themselves when they are observed rather than recollected (Keniston 1937:181-2).

These studies agree that the lexical aspect of a particular verb often coincides with the semantic nature of the gram-type in Spanish; in turn, it is more ‘natural’ for statives to be used with imperfective aspect (and events with perfective aspect) even though it is observed for perfective-statives to occur, albeit infrequently and with very specific meanings.

Importantly, each study reiterates the central theme in Bybee (1995) that ‘[t]here is no systematic use of the Preterit with statives to show inceptive meaning, as there is variation in the interpretation of the context. With that said, however, there is not variation in the reference to the

past as a “segment of anteriority” (Bolinger 1963:133)’. According to Keniston (1937:186-8), perfective-statives are employed when co-occurring with a definite period of duration, an emphasis on beginning or achievement of the state, or to convey the force of a perfect or pluperfect.<sup>13</sup> However, Comrie (1976:17) noted that past-tense situations can be used with varying degrees of limited periods of duration—three hours, two days, or ten years—and with either perfective or imperfective aspect; perfectivity can suggest a subjectively short or long period, while in the imperfective this subjectivity is neutralized.

With respect to stylistic strategies using aspectual viewpoint in Spanish, Butt & Benjamin (1994:215) reported that imperfective grams in written discourse can be used as an alternative to perfective aspect ‘in order to produce a dramatically drawn-out effect.’ This use is also corroborated in studied by Bertinetto (1986) in Italian and Waugh (1990) in French. Conversely, speakers have been known to use perfective forms—rather than the expected imperfective form—to create an emphasis of the verb in context. Butt & Benjamin (1994:215) cited an excerpt written by Jorge Luis Borges, which is provided in example (1.4) with the verb *saber* ‘know’.

- (1.4) Sir Thomas Brown supo el griego, el latín, el francés, el italiano y el español y fue uno de los primeros hombres de letras que estudiaron anglosajón (J. L. Borges)  
‘Sir Thomas Brown knew (PRET) Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish and was one of the first literary men to study Anglo-Saxon.’ (Butt & Benjamin 1994:215)

The tradition or expected interpretation of the form *supo* ‘he found out’ has inceptive meaning, yet, the authors claimed that the perfective-stative referred to ‘the state of knowing’, commonly expressed by the imperfective form. Here, there is a clear variability of form and meaning of

---

<sup>13</sup> This duration can be marked by an adverbial expression of time (*dos meses* ‘two months), a conjunction (i.e., *mientras* ‘while’), a temporal adjective (*muy tarde* ‘very late’), the word *nunca* ‘never’, or implied by the context (Keniston 1937:186-7). However, it is known the imperfective aspect can also co-occur with these temporal markings, as we will discuss in Chapters 4 and 5.

past-tense aspectual viewpoint. We see here how it is the overall context that determines the interpretation of the verb *saber*.

Guitart (1978) presented an in-depth analysis of some of the nuances of the perfective-imperfective in Spanish, arguing that stative verbs required special attention. The author advised that co-occurring adverbial expressions can radically change the meaning of stative predicates, as in *hasta aquel día* ‘until that day’ or *desde aquel momento* ‘from that moment’, subsequently shifting the emphasis to the inception of the state (i.e., ingressive statives). Also through the use of adverbial expressions, ingressive statives can become egressive, hence marking the end of the state (i.e., *me gustó ese cuadro hasta aquel día* ‘I liked that painting until that day’) (Guitart 1978:152). Furthermore, Guitart discussed that time partitioning verbs—those which divide the time into a ‘before and after’ (i.e., *quedarse* ‘stay’)—needed to be situated in the context for a precise interpretation of the verb’s inference. For instance, example (1.5) does not indicate a change in state, but rather *se quedó* ‘it stayed’ simply describes the resulting condition after the door was open.

- (1.5) La puerta estaba abierta y se quedó así.  
‘The door was open and it stayed (PRET) that way.’ (Guitart 1978:150)

Therefore, according to Guitart (1978), perfective-statives refers to: i) past reference, ii) changes in states, whether the beginning or termination of a state, iii) the continuing of a state without it coming to an explicit end, and iv) a time-partitioning state that was in effect before the new period. High-frequent stative verbs (i.e., *costar* ‘cost’, *gustar* ‘please’, *quedarse* ‘stay’, and above all *ser* ‘be’, *estar* ‘be’ and *tener* ‘have’) may express different meanings in the perfective form and one must interpret the meaning within context of discourse (Guitart 1978:142-9). On the other hand, imperfective aspect conveys that a state (as well as an event) was in effect sometime before the moment of speaking when another situation was taking place. The

distinguishing semantic element of imperfectives compared to perfectives is that they do not imply or make reference to the beginning or the cessation of a state (Guitart 1978:154).<sup>14</sup>

In addition to these uses of past-tense aspectual morphology and stative verbs, Gili Gaya (1964), like Guitart (1978), advocated that the perfective-stative combination has more to do with stylistic concerns rather than reflecting the termination of a state, as other authors have indicated (e.g. Bull 1960). He provided the following example (1.6) to illustrate this point.<sup>15</sup>

- (1.6) He querido a Marta.  
'I have loved (PP) Martha.'  
Quise a Marta.  
'I loved (PRET) Martha.'  
Quería a Marta.  
'I loved (IMP) Martha.' (Gili Gaya 1964:158)

According to Gili Gaya (1964:158), all three tenses indicate that 'loving Martha' has ended and that state was in the past; however, it is the perfective (Preterit) example *quise* 'loved' excludes 'más netamente que *quería* o *he querido*, toda posible continuación de aquel amor en el momento actual.' The author concluded that the perfective and imperfective forms both specify that the state was in the past and the static situation has ended, but the stylistic impact of the perfective (Preterit) form is quite different than the other two forms in (1.6).

In analyses conducted by Bertinetto (1994) and Squartini (2004), the researchers offered a comparison between the Italian past-tense aspectual system with other languages and how these respective systems treat stative verbs.<sup>16</sup> Bertinetto's study emphasized that the perfective-

---

<sup>14</sup> Guitart also mentioned stylistic features of the Imperfect, as did Waugh (1990), and that imperfective aspect applied to states can also emphasize the iterativity of a state.

<sup>15</sup> As Gili Gaya (1964:158) affirmed: 'Por nuestra parte estimamos que no se trata más de un recurso estilístico basado en el contraste del pasado con el presente, y que el mismo efecto se obtiene en español con cualquier otro pretérito.'

<sup>16</sup> Bertinetto (1994) also analyzed English and German in this article. Squartini (2004) compared Italian and Spanish.

stative combination was acceptable in Italian, even though previous research might have concluded otherwise. For instance, he cited the following example of Classic Italian in (1.7).

- (1.7) Buonanno di ser Benizo fu uno fiorentino mercatante di spezieria. Era un uomo basso e largo e grosso. (source unknown)  
'Buonanno of sir Benizo was (PRET) a Florentine merchant of spices. He was (IMP) a fat and broad and big man.' (Bertinetto 1994:118)

Interestingly, Bertinetto explained the difference of perfective (*fu*) and imperfective (*era*) aspect in (1.7) to the former form having 'presentative focus' since perfective aspect was applied to *essere* 'be' to introduce the topic. The latter form, according to the analyst, was used in the imperfective form to describe a background situation. Later, in Bertinetto (2000), he continued this discussion of the 'Perfective=Telic Confusion' or PTC. Under this view, Bertinetto attempted to disabuse the notion that perfective aspect is only applicable to those verbs that have a telic component to its inherent meaning (i.e., *correre una milla* 'run a mile'). Bertinetto (2000) advocated that both past-tense aspectual markings can be applied to verbs of any lexical classification and the interpretation of any given sentence can be easily explained by the general semantic implications of the perfective and imperfective forms.

Similarly, Squartini (2004) discussed the acceptability of perfective aspect to stative verbs in Spanish and Italian; yet, he qualitatively demonstrated that in Italian the use perfective aspect to statives is never permitted with a specific moment in time (i.e., *ieri* 'yesterday') (1.8), while in Spanish this combination is observed and permissible, as shown in (1.9).

- (1.8) *Ieri* \*fu / \*è stato / era l'8 giugno.  
'Yesterday \*was (PRET) / \*was (PP) / was (IMP) June 8th.' (Squartini 2004:328)

- (1.9) *Ayer* fue 8 de junio.  
'Yesterday was (PRET) June 8th.' (Squartini 2004:328)

Squartini (2004:345) concluded that there is a continuum of what is permissible in terms of the interaction of perfectivity-imperfectivity and lexical aspect among the different Romance

languages. In this same study, Squartini also discussed how in Spanish the perfective-stative combination is obligatory with a delimited time frame (*durante unos años* ‘for some years’), as in (1.10).

- (1.10) Mis abuelos \*vivían / vivieron aquí **durante unos años**.  
‘My grandparents lived (PRET) here **for some years**.’ (Squartini 2004:321)

According to Squartini’s analysis of this phenomenon, we would only expect to observe the stative verb *vivir* ‘live’ to be applied with perfective aspect with a delimited time frame, as in (1.11), which was taken from an interview with a *salmantino* speaker. Yet, in (1.12), a different *salmantino* speaker applied imperfective aspect with a delimited time frame, *una época* ‘a time’.

- (1.11) Yo **la época de Franco** la viví muy bien, y muy feliz, muy bien, con mis padres, no millonarios, pero tenían su negocio. Y yo viví muy bien la época de Franco. Yo no puedo decir otra cosa. (XIV, f53, *salmantino* corpus)  
‘Me **in Franco’s time** I lived (PRET) it very well, and very happy, very well, with my parents, not millionaires, but they had their business. And I lived (PRET) very well in Franco’s time. I can’t say anything else.’

- (1.12) Mmm. . .era **una época en la que se vivían** bien los privilegiados y bueno, no era mi caso. (II, f49, *salmantino* corpus)  
‘Uhhh. . .it was **a time in which** the privileged people lived (IMP) well and well, that wasn’t my case.’

Therefore, it appears as though perfective-stative combinations thought to be unacceptable in descriptive analyses may be used in naturally-occurring discourse, albeit infrequently, and contradict claims based on qualitative evidence.

In summary, qualitative studies such as Keniston (1937), Gili Gaya (1964), Guitart (1978), Butt & Benjamin (1994), Bertinetto (1994, 2000) and Squartini (2004) all agree on one idea: both tenses convey anteriority and both are influenced by contextual, stylistic and discursive factors. Hence, these analyses provide important descriptive linguistic clues pointing towards the variability of perfective-imperfective aspect applied to stative verbs in Spanish. While we stress that the information presented in these works is tremendously insightful and valuable in the field

of TA, we have two fundamental criticisms of this body of research. First, the overwhelming majority of the examples used to demonstrate certain hypotheses were not taken from naturally-occurring discourse. It appears that the researchers created examples to explain theoretical positions or arguments, as in (1.10), which might conflict with what native speakers actually do, as in (1.12). Along the same vein, how can an investigator be certain that the examples adequately represent how native-speakers use past-tense aspectual morphology in face-to-face conversations? Do these isolated and created examples accurately capture the past-tense aspectual system as a whole? With what frequency do stative verbs co-occur with perfective and imperfective aspect? What are the most defining contextual linguistic features of a sentence that influence aspectual choice in natural discourse? As Bayley (2002:118) emphasized, quantitative evidence, along with qualitative description, provides the linguist with the capacity to ‘make statements about the likelihood of the co-occurrence of a variable form and any one of the contextual features in which we are interested’ in order to properly evaluate the factors constraining the use each variant. Second, these examples were often used to indicate ‘speaker intention’, yet, without substantial contextual evidence to support the claims, how can the analyst be completely certain of one interpretation or another? For these reasons, it seemed that we could further understand TA systems by adding quantitative analysis to these qualitative explanations, which we explain in detail in §1.5. In the next section, we discuss the empirical analyses that have been conducted on TA research.

### **1.2.3 Tense-Aspect Research in Language Acquisition**

Investigations in First and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) have offered a more empirical approach to the study of TA systems. Based on the fact that emergent linguistic systems aspect is superordinate to tense in first languages (L1), various SLA studies (Andersen 1991:307, Bardovi-Harlig 1999a:353-359, Liskin-Gasparro 2000:831, López-Ortega 2000:488-

489) hypothesized and confirmed that second language (L2) learners would first acquire aspectual distinctions in past-tense narration in accordance with a verb's lexical classification. As Andersen stated (1991:307), 'In beginning stages of language acquisition only inherent aspectual distinctions are encoded by verbal morphology, not tense or grammatical aspect.' This L1 and L2 acquisition model, known as the (Lexical) Aspect Hypothesis (LAH), has shown that perfective forms are acquired and applied initially to achievements, then to accomplishments, activities, and finally to states. Imperfective forms are acquired and applied in the reverse order: first to states, activities, accomplishments, and lastly achievements.<sup>17</sup>

To complement the LAH, other empirical studies within the realm of SLA have investigated L2 discursive grounding strategies in the acquisition of TA systems. Since in the L1 it has been shown that native-speakers commonly employ perfective aspect for foregrounding and imperfective aspect for backgrounding in narratives (Hopper 1979b, 1982), some investigations added the Discourse Hypothesis (DH) to the LAH theoretical framework (Lafford 1996, Güell 1998, García & van Putte 1998, Liskin-Gasparro 2000, Lopez-Ortega 2000, Comajoan 2005, inter alia).<sup>18</sup> Since semantic factors do not always characterize aspectual distinction (Hopper 1982:16), the DH proposes that as the level of formal study increases, L2 speakers will rely less on the systematic use of verbal morphology (i.e., always producing perfective aspect with foregrounded actions and imperfective aspect with backgrounded actions). Likewise, the DH predicts that more advanced non-native speakers will use other lexical means

---

<sup>17</sup> The results of Salaberry (1999a) did not corroborate the LAH. Instead, the data showed that novice L2 learners applied perfective aspectual marking to all past-tense situations, despite the lexical aspect of the verb (statives included).

<sup>18</sup> Foregrounded situations are those which move the storyline along the timeline, maintaining temporal continuity, punctuality and completeness (López-Ortega 2000:489). In contrast, backgrounded situations are those not on the temporal line of sequenced events, mainly for the purpose of narrative description (Hopper 1979b:239). This will be discussed in more detail in §1.4.

of marking foreground and background distinctions, mainly through the use of adverbial expressions (López-Ortega 2000:493). These studies corroborated L2 speakers' dependence of discursive anchoring strategies and found that L2 speakers exhibit acquisition patterns as predicated by the DH and LAH frameworks.<sup>19</sup>

Regarding stative verb trends, these studies demonstrated that L2 learners displayed a strong preference of applying imperfective aspect with statives and perfective aspect with achievements, especially when distinguishing high-focused (foregrounded) and low-focused (backgrounded) events in narration (cf. López-Ortega 2000:493). In addition, Salaberry (2005) discovered that third language (L3) learners' production of stative verbs did not resemble the use of native-speakers even when these participants had strong command of a L2 with a common morphological system.<sup>20</sup> He stated (2005:209) that 'we could argue that the evolving non-native system shows signs of representational limitations to accommodate the degree of complexity inherent to the temporality system instantiated in the target language.' Thus, it can be inferred that the perfective-imperfective opposition involves a wide-array of factors to determine the use of each form in the L1.

While this research offers empirical evidence with valuable implications, it is important to note some criticisms. If the fundamental goal of SLA is for non-native speakers to produce grammatical structures as would a native-speaker, how can one be certain that non-native speakers are producing native-like realizations when there is no baseline norm against which these data are compared? In other words, if there is no point of comparison—specifically relative frequency patterns of perfective/imperfective use in natural discourse—then target-like

---

<sup>19</sup> Other theories have been tested: Default Past Tense Hypothesis, the Distributional Bias Hypothesis and the UG-Minimalist Hypothesis. See Salaberry & Ayoun (2005) for a comprehensive explanation of these theories.

<sup>20</sup> Participants were English natives with Spanish as their L2, and Portuguese as their L3.

production remains undefined. Worse yet, the values based on researchers' intuitions may be biased to what he or she deemed as accurate or target-like. Some of these studies make no mention on how native-speakers realize the phenomenon (e.g. López-Ortega 2000, Liskin-Gasparro 2000, Comajoan 2005), while others relied on the result of native-speaker performance in cloze activities or sentence translations as the baseline level of comparison (e.g. García & van Putte 1998, Güell 1998, Ayoun 2005, Salaberry 2005). Therefore, it seems prudent to use concrete, quantified evidence of the patterns of spoken and written L1 speech against which we compare L2 speech.<sup>21</sup> To our knowledge, none of the studies compared the values of L1 conversational data to that of L2 Spanish learners, a practice for which we advocate to ensure that researcher bias does not inappropriately affect the evaluation of L2 production.<sup>22</sup> With a complete understanding of how native-speakers use the perfective-imperfective distinction, researchers can then accurately assess if L2 speech is more or less target-like in conversational situations.

### **1.3 Theoretical Framework**

#### **1.3.1 Usage-Based Models of Language**

Since perfective and imperfective grams are created and recreated out of frequent instances of language use, we adopted a usage-based approach to language as a theoretical framework. As the name suggests, usage-based models of language emphasize the importance of repeated language use in naturally-occurring discourse which constitutes a 'cognitive organization of one's experience with language' (Bybee 2005:2), grounded in 'usage-events' (Kemmer & Barlow 2000:viii). Although the functionalist perspective had been gaining more credibility since

---

<sup>21</sup> Cloze activities are formal written tasks in which learners fill in the blanks using clues from the context.

<sup>22</sup> Andersen & Shirai (1995) conducted a L1 acquisition analysis of grammatical and lexical aspect of children; they compared the rates of the children's natural speech to the rates of their mothers. Our study is more in line with our position.

the dawn of Labovian variationist linguistics in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it wasn't until Langacker (1987) that the term 'usage-based grammar' was coined and defined in the literature.

He described usage-based grammar as the following concept:

Substantial importance is given to the actual use of the linguistic system and a speaker's knowledge of this use: the grammar is held responsible for a speaker's knowledge of the full range of linguistic conventions, regardless of whether these conventions can be subsumed under more general states. [It is a] a non-reductive approach to linguistic structure that employs fully articulated schematic networks and emphasizes the importance of low-level schemas (Langacker 1987:494).

The author contrasted this model with generative theory in that usage-based models of language are 'maximalist', 'non-reductive' and 'bottom-up', as opposed to 'minimalist', 'reductive' and 'top-down' (Langacker 2000:1-2). He argued that it would be inaccurate to reduce a linguistic system to its most economical form, as in generative traditions, since the size and redundancy of language should be represented in its model (Langacker 2000:2). Likewise, usage-based models reject rule-based systems (i.e., 'top-down' approaches) since language cannot be explained nor adequately accounted for all by elegant rules per the generative tradition.

Along the same vein, Hopper (1998) dismissed generativist rule-based notions which he referred to as 'A Priori Grammar' (APG). Hopper defined APG as a fixed and monologic system containing pre-existing structures with pre-existing meanings and has set grammar rules to govern communication. Instead, Hopper viewed language a constantly-evolving and influx system, which he named Emergent Grammar (EG). This perspective maintains that language is temporal and epiphenomenal; generativist grammar does not account for the fact that language is constantly changing and rebuilding. Under EG theory, discrete grammatical categories as such lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics do not exist (Hopper 1998:172); rather, these discrete categories are eradicated and replaced by prototypical representations of categories along a continuum (Aaron 2006:18). Furthermore, Hopper (1998) explained that the constant

repetitions of language create the structures of a linguistic system; these constructions reflect the usage of a speech community based on one's experience with language. As such, the term *routinization* (Haiman 1991), otherwise known as *entrenchment* (Langacker 1987), is what Hopper (1998:159) considered the mechanism that brings about 'the fading of existential-situational meaning that occurs when any action is constantly repeated until it becomes routine.'

The basic idea is that what may appear to be a coherent structure created according to some underlying design may in fact be the result of multiple applications or interactions of simple mechanisms that operate according to local principles and create the seemingly well-planned structure as a consequence (Bybee & Hopper 2001:10).

Consequently, since routinization or entrenchment arises from frequent patterns of actual language use, the frequency of structures plays an important role in the creation of usage-based or emergent linguistic systems. The usage-based, functionalist perspective of language is grounded in the belief that 'grammar arises diachronically because of the commonly used discourse patterns that humans need to communicate' (Bybee 2007:6).

### **1.3.2 Connection with Variationist Research**

The usage-based framework stresses the incorporation of natural data and quantified corpus-based analysis (cf. Biber 2000). Sociolinguistic-variationist analysis, like usage-based studies, also emphasizes the importance of capturing natural language use, as well as offering quantitative evidence for the patterns that manifest in written and spoken discourse. In addition, both the usage-based and variationist frameworks agree that linguistic investigation should not be based on intuition judgments or ideas of grammaticality.

An utterance is judged as grammatical if it is highly similar to other frequently heard utterances; if an utterance has a part which bears no resemblance to any previously experienced constructions of fixed phrases, it will be judged to be ungrammatical. Clearly, the criteria for such comparisons with past experience are individual, inexact, and scarcely amenable to treatment in terms of precise objective categories. (Bybee & Hopper 2001:19)

In the same spirit, sociolinguistic-variationist research advocates for the elimination of ‘acceptable’ or ‘unacceptable’ grammar in linguistic investigations: not only can this ideology lead to erroneous analyses, but also it can re-enforce linguistic and social stereotypes (Labov 1972a:203, D. Sankoff 1988a).

Thus, usage-based models of language and sociolinguistic-variationist analysis converge on these areas which are central to both schools of thought: the importance of actual language use, corpus-based studies and the incorporation of quantitative measures, as opposed to prescriptive viewpoints, researcher/speaker intuitions and grammaticality judgments (D. Sankoff 1988a:140, 145). While these paradigms agree on the aforementioned concepts, the key element that distinguishes these two fields is that sociolinguistic-variationist study places more emphasis on the social aspect of language as a critical part of linguistic phenomena. Therefore, sociolinguistic-variationist research often integrates extralinguistic factors into the analysis since, as Chambers (2002:3) described, ‘studying language variation proceeds mainly by observing language use in natural social settings and categorizing the linguistic variants according to their social distribution.’

### **1.3.2 Variation Theory**

Under variation theory, linguists maintain that the variability of linguistic structure is not random, but rather it is a structured system within a specified social domain. As Tagliamonte (2006:5) aptly explained: ‘the variationist enterprise is essentially, and foremost, the study of the interplay between variation, social meaning and the evolution and development of the linguistic system itself.’ While variationist studies can sometimes place more emphasis on the language-internal factors, which has received its critics (cf. Wolfram 1993:199, Eckert 2000), social and stylistic factors are nevertheless considered a vital part of the variationist enterprise especially

since these factors can point towards a linguistic change in-process (cf. Chambers 2002) or explain other social phenomena manifested in language (cf. Labov 1966, Tagliamonte 2006:7).

Variationist study seeks to identify and explain the different internal and external factors shaping a linguistic variable. This research is also geared to comparing the linguistic systems of different speech communities to explain the difference between dialects of the same language. As such, variation theory connects the synchronic variability of language to the lability of linguistic systems. As Weinreich, Labov & Herzog (1968:100-1) proclaimed, ‘the key to a rational conception of language change—indeed, of language itself—is the possibility of describing orderly differentiation in a language serving a community. It is absence of structural heterogeneity that would be dysfunctional.’ Although variability is a basic characteristic of language itself (Hopper & Tragoutt 2003:125), it does not appear instantaneously without historical or social causes. For example, synchronic variation is created from diachronic *layering*, or ‘the persistence of older forms and meanings alongside newer forms and meanings’; as forms grammaticize the newer forms ‘layer’ on top of the older ones to create present-day variability (Hopper & Tragoutt 2003:124). Polysemy, or one form with two or more functions or two forms with one function, is also a possible outcome of evolving grammatical elements as they acquire multiple functions while retaining older meanings. An increasing number of investigations have used diachronic theories to explain synchronic variability of various Spanish phenomena (i.e., Klein-Andreu 1991, Torres Cacoullos 2001, Aaron 2006, inter alia). One of these diachronic perspectives, grammaticization theory, analyzes how lexical items acquire grammatical functions over time, or how grammatical elements become more grammatical (cf. Bybee et al.1994, Hopper & Tragoutt 2003). Per the words of Silva-Corvalán (2001:216),

grammaticization theory is directly connected to the functionalist underpinnings of Language Variation and Change.

Recordemos que uno de los postulados del funcionalismo es que las lenguas no se pueden comprender cabalmente si no comprendemos también sus procesos de cambio. Esto hace que haya una importante convergencia teórica entre funcionalismo y gramaticalización. Además, la teoría de la gramaticalización ha demostrado que es imposible explicar gramaticalización independientemente del uso de una lengua ya que los cambios surgen precisamente en este uso. (Silva-Corvalán 2001:216)

Since both theories take in account the use of language and acknowledge the role of frequency in linguistic change, these two perspectives converge to create a powerful tool to predict and explain the evolution of linguistic structures and present-day variability. Therefore, in the present investigation of past tense aspectual morphology in *salmantino* Spanish, the functions of perfective and imperfective forms were considered under this framework. Likewise, we also examined the use of these grams above the sentential level.

#### **1.4 Discourse Analysis**

It is through discourse that language is created, sculpted and rebuilt. This concept is reflected in linguistic theories such as cognitive grammar (cf. Langacker 1987, 2000), emergent grammar (cf. Hopper 1998), usage-based models of languages (Barlow & Kemmer 2000) and grammaticization theory (cf. Bybee et al. 1994, Hopper & Tragoutt 2003). In relation to the latter framework, Bybee et al. (1994:50) affirmed that language change inherently involves the repetition of lexical and grammatical items *found in discourse*, leading to the conventionalization of implicature: ‘These focal areas [of semantic space] should represent some of the major, recurring communicative concepts used in structuring human discourse and human thought.’ In other words, understanding how linguistic elements function in discourse has led to a greater understanding of the cognitive, linguistic, and social processes involved in language change. Specifically in regard to the present analysis, perfective and imperfective markings were derived

from and are used in face-to-face discursive situations. Therefore, to better understand their respective functions, we chose to analyze the discursive context in which these grams were observed.

With respect to the study of language in general, functionalist linguists recognize that ‘whatever intrinsic meaning grammatical categories may have, [both] pragmatic factors and discourse context play a crucial role in the interpretation of their meaning’ and that commonly the concept of ‘traditional’ grammatical categories transcend their ‘expected’ grammatical function (cf. Hopper & Thompson 1984, Fleischman & Waugh 1991:1-2). Specifically in regard to the analysis of aspectual viewpoint of any language, Hopper (1982:5, 16) clarified that local, sentence-level analyses will not suffice when examining this phenomenon:

the term ‘aspect’ is restricted to discussion of the semantic/pragmatic division in the sense of perfective and imperfective, but without, of course, the implication of morphological realization of any particular kind. . . I have presented it in this way out of a conviction that morphological and local-syntactic accounts of aspect are either incomplete or, to the extent that they are valid, essentially show the sentence-level correlates or discourse structures.

In other words, when morphological elements—such as the perfective and imperfective markings in Spanish—are analyzed only on the level of the sentence, their true function(s) could be missed if it is not considered within the broader discursive context (cf. Silva-Corvalán 1983).

Additionally, in languages without tense or aspectual morphology, there is no way to determine the conveyed tense or aspect unless a global perspective is taken (cf. Smith 2002).

D. Sankoff & Dubois (2001:282) explained that incorporating discourse into variationist analyses is essential since:

sociolinguists view discourse as the product of a specific verbal interaction resulting from a set of choices vis-à-vis the set of all the potential choices within a language. Discursive competence implies the knowledge of linguistic forms, the context within which they might be used, and the sociolinguistic circumstances which permit them to be realized; these circumstances include the conceptual

universe of the speakers, their sociocultural characteristics, and the interactional strategies between speakers.

Thus, under a variationist-sociolinguistic perspective it is acknowledged that a speaker's choice of one variant or another reflects his/her understanding of the discursive situation within the linguistic and social environment. Ultimately, these choices manifest themselves in the overall distributional patterns of linguistic phenomena, in which variationists employ quantitative measure to 'obtain representative and comparable data' (D. Sankoff & Dubois 2001:282). It is this type of quantified data (i.e., frequencies and probabilities of forms), which allows for a greater understanding of the variable, as well as the discursive situation(s) in which it occurs. Accordingly, variationists have set out to investigate discourse structure, discourse-level variants or how text constrains the selection of one form over another (Schiffrin 1994:282). For these reasons, it was considered necessary to analyze the discursive context when identifying the patterns of perfective and imperfective aspect of *salmantino* Spanish.

#### **1.4.1 Narrative Analysis**

One type of data considered in the present investigation were narratives from the *salmantino* community (to be discussed in Chapter 2). The tradition of using oral narratives in sociolinguistic studies began with Labov & Waletzky (1967), which has been ubiquitously employed in variationist studies since its publication (Macaulay 2002:289). The minimal structure of a narrative contains at least two temporally ordered narrative clauses; these narrative clauses are the basic unit of narrative structure. The other type of clause, the free clause, encompasses those which are not confined to temporal sequencing. Labov (1972a:227) identified six narrative clauses: i) abstract, ii) orientation, iii) complicating action, iv) result/resolution, v) coda, and vi) evaluation. Speakers can introduce narratives with an abstract clause that

summarizes the main point of the story.<sup>23</sup> Orientation clauses usually follow to establish the time, location, protagonist of the story; essentially, these clauses are free clauses describing background circumstances that can be embedded at any point in the narrative. The temporally sequenced actions of the narrative are known as the complicating action clauses, which move the story along the timeline (cf. Smith 1991). Speakers can end the narrative with a result/resolution clause, also temporally ordered, to answer: ‘How did the story end?’ Finally, speakers may indicate that narrative is finished with a free clause known as the coda. The coda typically brings the listener from the past tense back to the present moment of speech, which lets the listener know that the story has concluded.

This leaves us with the evaluation element of narratives. Evaluation is latent throughout the narrative and is considered as important as the complicating action clauses, since ‘speakers can comment on events from outside of the story world, suspend the action through embedded orientation clauses, and report events that themselves indicate the significance of the experience’ (Schiffrin 1994:284). Silva-Corvalán (1983:774) highlighted that evaluations in narratives served to highlight the important events in Chilean and Mexican narratives, making questions like ‘So what?’ obsolete. Similarly, Labov (1972a:231) described evaluations as ‘its *raison d’être*: why [the story] was told, and what the narrator is getting at’; thus, the speaker can offer his/her subjective viewpoint on his/her personal experience.

Furthermore, Labov (1972a) recognized that the importance of using oral narratives in variationist studies is because ‘narratives reveal community norms and styles or personal interaction, but also because speakers regularly shift toward the vernacular when telling a story (Labov 1984:32)’ (Schiffrin 1994:290). Moreover, narrative analysis has demonstrated that many

---

<sup>23</sup> Silva-Corvalán (1983:765-6) noted that in her data abstracts appeared infrequently in comparison to the other types of clauses used in speaker-narratives.

speakers of African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) are linguistically-savvy storytellers; the erroneous notion of this group's 'verbal deprivation' is largely due to the speakers' social reaction to interviewers' position of authority, as opposed to previous ideas of 'genetic inferiority' (Schiffrin 1994:284). Therefore, if researchers give speakers the opportunity to relate a personal experience in his/her own terms, they tend use a more systematic, causal-style of speech (i.e., the vernacular), which allows them to demonstrate linguistic prowess as narrators. Along those lines, the personal experiences that speakers choose to relate via narratives also provide the researcher great insights on the individual himself/herself, as well as his/her speech community. Goffman (1974:504) illustrated that:

A tale or anecdote, that is, a replaying, is not merely any reporting of a past event. In the fullest sense, it is such a statement couched from the personal perspective of an actual or potential participant who is located so that some temporal, dramatic development of the report events proceeds from that starting point. . . . A replaying, in brief, recounts a personal experience, not merely reports on an event.

As such, the highly personal content of narratives can reflect social and cultural norms of a speech community; in turn, the narrative can be a powerful tool when interpreting how speakers choose to convey these norms through linguistic means. In the words of Jaworski & Coupland (1999:32), narrative analysis is crucial as 'it deals with a pervasive genre of communication through which we enact important aspects of our identities and relations with others. It is partly through narrative discourse that we comprehend the world and present our understanding of it to others.'

#### **1.4.2 Discourse Grounding Strategies**

It has been shown that both perfective and imperfective grams used in narratives have come to acquire specific discourse functions over the course of time, because, after all, it is through discourse, narration and face-to-face interactions that language takes place and changes occur (Bybee et al. 1994). Givón (1979:82-3) suggested that the cycle of diachronic language

change (discourse → syntax → morphology → morphophonemic → zero) is in part motivated by the need to make overt distinctions between main actions and secondary details in narratives; thus, these grams accrue different discourse functions as they travel down their respective evolutionary paths. As it has been observed cross-linguistically (Bybee et al. 1994), perfective and imperfective grams have developed specific discourse functions in narrative communication:

The evidence from grammaticization and the existence of universal gram types (Dahl 1985) suggests that the conceptual domain of tense and aspect is universal, as is the way in which it is actualized in discourse. The way human discourse is framed relies on certain ever-present discourse or conceptual functions. One of these occurs in narrative as the main sequence of events and is grammaticized as perfective or simple past. Another is the descriptive or background function, grammaticized in imperfective aspect. (Bybee et al. 1994:295)

It is a universal characteristic of narrative discourse to explicitly differentiate between the events of the story line with those secondary supportive details of the story (Hopper 1979b:213); to make this distinction, speakers often employ either perfective or imperfective grams in response to this need.

Thus, a common trend throughout world-wide languages, including Spanish, is that perfective aspect is used in narratives to ‘relate events belonging to the skeletal structure of the discourse’ (foregrounded actions) and imperfective aspect is used with the ‘supportive material’ of the narrative (backgrounded actions) (Hopper 1979b:213).<sup>24</sup> Foregrounded narrative events are those that are characterized with temporal continuity (as opposed to flashbacks, simultaneous actions), punctuality (as opposed to durative or habitual events), and completeness (López-Ortega 2000:489). As we discussed in §1.2, it is likely for verbs with punctual or dynamic meaning to be applied with perfective aspect in foregrounded clauses, but not required.

---

<sup>24</sup> It is important to reiterate that foregrounded and backgrounded actions do not have to be marked with aspectual morphology. Instead, some languages distinguish ‘high-focus’ and ‘low-focus’ actions through voice (Malay), word order (Old English) or temporal adverbial expressions (Mandarin Chinese) (cf. Smith 2002).

Furthermore, Hopper (1982:15) illuminated that another discourse function of perfective aspect in foregrounded actions is not only to highlight the main events of the narrative, but also to sequence them.

Perfective aspect functions as its core to sequence events in chronological order. If autonomous meanings of ‘complete action’ or the like accrue to it these are synchronically additive meanings; however much they may increase the discourse range of the ‘perfective form’, they do not undermine the characteristic discourse sequencing function.

On the other hand, backgrounded narrative actions are those that ‘give details of indirect relevance to the narrative that may be part of the pre-history, provide a preview. . .or suggest contingent but unrealized events’ (Hopper 1979b:239). Hopper (1979b:215, 219) also mentioned that verbs with durative/stative/iterative inherent aspect are more likely to co-occur in background clauses, along with ‘the discourse-conditioned [imperfective] aspect’, since they do not narrate or introduce new events, but rather support and comment on the pre-existing narration. Since there seems to be a correlation between lexical aspect and the type of grammatical aspect employed in foregrounded or backgrounded clauses, this issue is critical when considering Spanish stative verbs in the past tense.

Although Hopper’s theory of foregrounding (high-focus) and backgrounding (low-focus) has been widely accepted in and applied to narrative analysis, Vet (1991:7-8) posited some limitations of these concepts. He criticized that ‘the foregrounding/backgrounding approach runs the risk of *circularity*: very often the only formal clue for deciding whether a state of affairs belongs to the foreground or background of the story is precisely the presence in the sentence of one of the two aspect markers or tense forms.’ In addition, Vet noted that some authors have considered the foreground/background distinction as either too narrow (Waugh & Monville-Burston 1986) or too black-and-white, as there seems to be more of a continuum between the two levels (Fleischman 1985). To address the issue of circularity, Hopper (1979b:217) affirmed

that ‘I view aspectual distinctions. . . *deriving from* discourse, rather than as ready-made devices *deployed* in discourse because they happen already to exist.’ Therefore, it appears that the discourse functions of past-tense aspectual morphology are created from and reinforced by speakers’ need to differential between main events and secondary details in conversations. Even if there is a ‘continuum’ between foregrounded and backgrounded details in discourse, there is nevertheless a universal trend for speakers to distinguish between high-focused and low-focused information to effectively relay events that occurred in the past.

### 1.4.3 Transitivity

With regard to the foreground-background distinction, Hopper & Thompson (1980) proposed and observed that high-focused and low-focused information was closely related to their notion of Transitivity.<sup>25</sup> The authors considered Transitivity to be more than the traditional concept of an agent (A) transferring an action to an object (O). The Transitivity of a clause should instead be evaluated on a continuous scale based on a set of linguistic parameters. Table 1-3 presents those parameters as well as how the different components rank on the scale of Transitivity within each linguistic factor.

Table 1-3. Linguistic components of Transitivity (taken from Hopper & Thompson 1980:252)

Parameters	High	Low
(1) Participants	2 or more participants, A and O	1 participant
(2) Kinesis	Action	Non-action
(3) Aspect	Telic	Atelic
(4) Punctuality	Punctual	Non-punctual
(5) Volitionality	Volitional	Non-volitional
(6) Affirmation	Affirmative	Negative
(7) Mode	Realis	Irrealis
(8) Agency	A high in potency	A low in potency
(9) Affectedness of O	O totally affected	O not affected
(10) Individuation of O	O highly individuated	O non-individuated

<sup>25</sup> Hopper & Thompson (1980) capitalized ‘Transitivity’ to distinguish between to their notion of the concept and the traditional idea of transitive clauses.

After considering these linguistic properties together, the authors found that high-focused, high-Transitive clauses corresponded to foregrounded actions, whereas low-focused, low-Transitive clauses were linked to backgrounded descriptions in narrative discourse. To exemplify this claim, they presented data from diverse languages (e.g. Malay, Spanish Tagalong) and applied a quantified analysis to three samples of written English. Hopper & Thompson (1980) concluded that Transitivity connected to foregrounding and backgrounding strategies in speaker-narratives. They summarized this finding by stating the following:

The fact that semantic characteristics of high Transitivity such as perfective aspect, individuated O, and agentive subject tend strongly to be grammaticized in the morphosyntax of natural languages points to the importance of the foregrounding-backgrounding distinction, and suggests that this distinction is valuable in explaining certain universals or near-universals of morphosyntax. (294)

Therefore, this concept of Transitivity as it relates to grounding in discourse tied into the analysis of perfective and imperfective aspect.

In a later work, Thompson & Hopper (2001) applied these same ten parameters of Transitivity to conversational data. To the authors' surprise, clauses high in Transitivity were observed with a strikingly low frequency. These low-Transitive clauses were commonly verbal predicates (38%) or copular clauses (37%). Likewise, many of these low-Transitive verbs expressed non-punctual (86%) and non-telic events (99%), or static situations. As opposed to relaying events, Thompson & Hopper (2001:53) concluded that speakers primarily discussed 'how things are from my perspective' by talking about states, expressing feelings and opinions, and ultimately giving the interlocutor a sense of 'who I am' in face-to-face discourse. This finding, that states as opposed to events were more frequently expressed in face-to-face discourse, served as another impetus to study the perfective-imperfective dichotomy of stative verbs in Spanish.

### 1.5 Research Questions of the Present Study

The perfective-imperfective opposition has been a topic of interest within the domain of Spanish linguistics for several decades. To our knowledge, these explorations of past-tense aspectual morphology have exclusively applied interpretive, qualitative techniques to analyze this phenomenon. It also appears that researchers have assumed that all varieties of Spanish are consistent in the application of perfective and imperfective aspectual morphology, as there has been little mention of a need to study TA systems of individual Spanish communities. For these reasons, we decided to take a different approach in addressing how Spanish-speakers apply perfective and imperfective aspect to stative verbs. First, we identified a specific speech community, the *salmantino* Spanish community, and solely analyzed the data from *salmantino* speakers. That way, we could establish native-speaker comparative data. Second, we incorporated sociolinguistic techniques to collect and analyze conversational data, instead of basing explanations and conclusion on invented, unnatural and isolated examples of speech. Third, we followed variationist methodology by using quantitative and qualitative analysis to describe and explain the patterns found with respect to the linguistic variable. Likewise, we considered the function of perfective and imperfective aspect applied to statives in the overall discursive context.

Therefore, the research questions we aimed to answer in the present work were as follows:

- i) What are the linguistic factors that conditioned the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology (i.e., perfective vs. imperfective aspect) applied to stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish?
- ii) How do social and stylistic factors come into play with regard to the use of perfective and imperfective aspect of stative verbs in the *salmantino* community?

Over the course of the next five chapters, we will attempt to provide illustrative answers to these research questions. To begin, we offer a detailed explanation of the *salmantino* speech

community, our methodological techniques and hypotheses of the determining factors hypothesized to affect the linguistic variable (Chapter 2). In Chapter 3, we discuss the impact of the extralinguistic factors in shaping past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in the *salmantino* community. In Chapters 4 and 5 we discuss the results of the linguistic factors that conditioned the choice of the linguistic variable. Specifically, in Chapter 4 we present the results of the analysis of all stative verbs together. In Chapter 5 we individually analyze the patterns of the four most frequent stative verbs (i.e., *ser* ‘be’, *estar*, ‘be’, *tener* ‘have’ and *haber* ‘be, exist’) and offer comparisons of those findings with the results of the less frequent stative verbs. We conclude the analysis with a discussion and summary in Chapter 6. Bybee et al. (1994:175) explained that ‘more detailed language-specific studies need to be made of the lexical co-occurrence patterns of these developing tense and aspect grams. . . to fill in the frustrating gaps in the descriptions.’ Our aim was to ‘fill in [some of these] frustrating gaps’ by adding quantified analyses to explain the linguistic and extralinguistic factors affecting the use of perfective and imperfective aspect with stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish.

## CHAPTER 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 The Speech Community

In the present study, we adopted the traditional viewpoint on what defines a *speech community*. Hymes (1986:54) labeled a speech community as ‘a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one variety.’ Hymes discussed that speakers of the same language did not necessarily constitute the same speech community, for there could be major differences in the way different speakers of the same language communicate. For these reasons, the *salmantino* community was defined as those speakers who were from and lived in the city of Salamanca and who understood and shared the same communicative practices.

#### 2.1.1 *Salmantino* Community

Salamanca is one of nine provinces of the Autonomous Community of Castile- Leon (Castilla y León), which is situated in central-west Spain. Known for its mountainous, wooded terrain in the south and rolling plains in the north, the province of Salamanca—which includes noteworthy cities such as Alba de Tormes, Béjar, Ciudad Rodrigo and the province capital also named Salamanca—spans an area of 4,763 square miles. According to the 2008 annual report of *El Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas* (INE) ‘National Statistics Institute’, the province of Salamanca is home to 353,404 residents. In the rural communities, the geography and climate of the region creates an ideal location for the harvesting of grains, grapes, and olives, as well as live-stock raising and food-manufacturing (Woollbert and Perruca 1997).

The capital city Salamanca encompasses an area of 14.9 square miles and lies along the Tormes River at 2,552 feet above sea level. Since 1900, the city of Salamanca has grown in population from 25,690 residents to a reported population of 155,740 as of 2008. As reported by

the INE in 2008, 44% of the province of Salamanca resides within the boundaries of the capital's urban center. The city of Salamanca is celebrated on the local, national and global scale as a frequently-visited location due to its abundance of history, art, and culture; tourism is vital to the *salmantino* economy as a direct result of being a renowned cultural center. In 1998, the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization) added the Old City of Salamanca to the list of important cities of world due to its outstanding cultural and historic value. Like other cities in Spain, Salamanca has hosted many different civilizations throughout the last two millennia, such as the Iberians, Celts, Carthaginians, Romans, Visigoths, Muslims, Sephardic Jews, and the Christians of the Reconquest. The city's historical monuments and frequently-visited landmarks—e.g., *la Plaza Mayor* 'the Main square', the city's two cathedrals, the roman bridge, and *la Casa de las Conchas* 'The House of Shells'—are testimony to the wide array of people and cultures that populated Salamanca throughout the centuries.

Located in the heart of the Salamanca, the University of Salamanca undoubtedly contributes to the intellectual atmosphere of the city, boasting a long and rich tradition of academic study dating back to the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1</sup> Since its establishment in 1254 by Alfonso X *el Sabio* 'The Wise', the institution has attracted hundreds of thousands of scholars to pursue academic programs of study in the humanities, theology, law, and the sciences.<sup>2</sup> In the 2007-2008 academic year, a reported 26,746 students attended the university (60.5% male and 39.5% female students), which causes a notable influx in population during the academic months. Many

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of Salamanca is the oldest university in Spain and fourth oldest in Europe, behind the University of Bologna, the University of Paris, Oxford University and Cambridge University.

<sup>2</sup> The university was initially established by Alfonso X's predecessor, Alfonso IX, in 1218. Yet, the university's official establishment date is considered May 8, 1254, which is when Alfonso X passed the formal regulations and financial guidelines of the university.

prominent figures in Spanish history received their education at University of Salamanca—such as Miguel de Cervantes, Hernán Cortés, Antonio de Nebrija, Fray Luis de León, Luis de Góngora, and Miguel Unamuno—, which is indicative of the university’s academic quality and prestige.<sup>3</sup>

To take advantage of the renowned educational institutions, Salamanca is also a frequented destination for international students studying the Spanish language. Many global study-abroad organizations have opened locations in the city and, along with tourism, the study-abroad industry is critical to city’s economy. For example, in the summer of 2008 alone Salamanca hosted over 3,000 international students from countries such as the United States, France, Greece, Germany, China, Japan, and Brazil. Fortunately, the program enrollment in *Cursos Internacionales*, the administrative body of the University of Salamanca through which many study-abroad companies operate, did not suffer negative repercussions due to the global economic crisis. *Cursos Internacionales* grossed a reported 7 million Euros from the 2008 summer study-abroad session and is hopeful that business will continue to thrive. As stated in an article discussing the impact of foreign students on the *salmantino* economy: ‘Los estudiantes extranjeros se gastan una horquilla de entre 1.600 y 3.000 euros en su estancia en Salamanca, incluyendo la matrícula en la Universidad, los gastos de alojamiento y una importante repercusión en la industria de ocio’ (Gómez 2008).<sup>4</sup> As the article explains, this booming industry is very important to the *salmantino* community, namely because the financial well being of many families is directly impacted by student enrollment in these educational programs. In

---

<sup>3</sup> Also located in Salamanca is Pontificia University, which shares the historical development as the University of Salamanca; however, today it is independent from the University of Salamanca and is now a private institution emphasizing student preparation before entering the seminary.

<sup>4</sup> Translation: ‘Foreign students spend a price range of 1,600-3,000 Euros each in their stay in Salamanca, including tuition, lodging costs, and an important repercussion in the tourist industry.’

fact, the majority of the *salmantinos* interviewed in our study were host families for domestic and foreign students coming to Salamanca to study. More information on the *salmantino* participants will be described in the section below.

### **2.1.2 Participant Selection and the Social Network**

In regard to data collection, two strategies were used to find willing members of the *salmantino* community to participate in the interviews. First, some participants were selected according to a quasi-random sampling method (judgment selection), which was based on a preconceived stratification of a set of readily observed features of the community, such as age, sex, origin, etc. (Tagliamonte 2006:23). Knowing that there were specific extralinguistic characteristics to be incorporated in the analysis, namely age and gender, we aimed at recruiting members of the *salmantino* community to participate based on these social characteristics. Some participants were found in public domains such as restaurants, shops and central meeting points, such as the *Plaza Mayor*; if they were willing and able at the initial encounter, the data were collected immediately. Otherwise, the participant and the researcher made an appointment to meet at a convenient location; it was emphatically stressed that his or her participation was completely voluntary, as well as uncompensated. Three out of the 25 participants in the present analysis were found via the quasi-random judgment sampling method.

Through the ‘friend-of-a-friend’ connection, otherwise known as the Social Network Method (Milroy 1987a, Johnson 1994), the remaining 22 participants were found. As in numerous other studies in the social sciences (cf. Milroy 2002:549, 556), this method was the most effective technique in recruiting participants of the *salmantino* speech community (cf. Milroy 1987a, 2002, Tagliamonte 2006:21). Even though there exists a variety of definitions on what constitutes a social network among different disciplines, the definition as explained in Milroy (2002:551) was adopted in the present investigation: ‘[Social networks are] the boundless

web of ties which reaches out through a whole society, linking people to one another, however remotely.’ Milroy emphasized that it was easier to study social networks that were characterized by strong ties between community members. Likewise, she distinguished between first and second-order network ties: first-order network ties are acquaintances, family members or friends that are directly connected to the researcher, whereas second-order network ties are characterized as an indirect relationship, or the ‘friend-of-a-friend’ of another member in the speech community (Milroy 2002:550). Variationist research has often depended on first and second-order network ties to recruit participants in scholarly investigations (Milroy 2002:551), and it is through this ‘friend-of-a-friend’ method that researchers have successfully found many participants (Tagliamonte 2006:21).

The social network used for the present study was established through International Studies Abroad (ISA) Salamanca.<sup>5</sup> As an employee of ISA Salamanca during the summer of 2008, the researcher used this network to successfully recruit and interview participants. Many first-order relationships with members of the *salmantino* community were established via ISA, namely with fellow co-workers; yet, most of these first-order contacts could not be included in the study as they were either not originally from Salamanca or had spent considerable time in a foreign country using a language other than Spanish that could possibly affect his or her speech. Only one first-order relationship was a viable participant according to the previously described criteria. Thus, the vast majority of the participants of the *salmantino* corpus from the ISA social network were second-order ties; these participants were recruited primarily through a letter to the host families of students studying in Salamanca through ISA (Appendix A).

---

<sup>5</sup> Of the 22 participants, 21 were found via first-order or second-order network ties through the ISA social network. The remaining participant was met through a ‘friend of a friend’ at the University of Salamanca.

The letter sent to the ISA host families was approved and promoted by the director of the program of in Salamanca. The overall premise of the study was described; yet, at no point did the letter explain the linguistic phenomenon being studied. After the letter was distributed to the families, interested participants were asked to fill out a form indicating the times and dates they would be available for the interview; again, it was emphasized that participation was completely voluntary and uncompensated. Likewise, it was also stressed that there would be no penalty whatsoever if the particular family chose not to participate. Thankfully, there were many prompt and positive responses in a short amount of time, which can be attributed to establishing a mutual point of contact that was a trusted, in-group member of the *salmantino* community with whom these families interacted on a regular basis. Many of the ISA families were quite eager to participate in the oral interviews, which sharply contrasted to the lackluster enthusiasm of those *salmantinos* who were approached outside the social network.

To be a viable participant for our study, the individuals must have lived in the province of Salamanca since 12 years of age without extensive time living in another Spanish town before adolescence, based on the Critical Age Hypothesis.<sup>6</sup> With that said, however, only two participants lived in the city of Salamanca for the entirety of his or her life (Participants IX and XVII), whereas the overwhelming majority of the participants lived in rural areas outside in the province of Salamanca before coming to reside in the city during his/her childhood or adolescence. Also, Participants X and XXII had a different history from the rest of the community. Participant X lived in France from 7-20 years of age; this participant was included in the analysis since Spanish was spoken at home and the participant did not regularly speak French

---

<sup>6</sup> The Critical Age Hypothesis predicts that native-like language acquisition can only occur at a young age. Scovel (2000:215) reported that researchers have not reached a consensus of the critical period of language acquisition and some experts do not believe in such a period. In general, however, many researchers do maintain the belief that the critical period of language acquisition is between five and 15 years of age (Chiswick & Miller 2008:17).

at the time of the study (cf. please see footnote 6 on the Critical Age Hypothesis). Likewise, Participant XXII spent four years in the United States; however, he spoke Spanish since birth and had been living in Salamanca for 17 years without traveling back to the United States.

Furthermore, to be considered a monolingual of *salmantino* Spanish, the participants could not extensively use another language at home; thus, bilinguals of Spanish and any other language were excluded. Even though many participants represented in the *salmantino* corpus hosted foreign students or had spent time abroad in a foreign country, all of these participants were functionally monolingual speakers of Castilian Spanish since Spanish was spoken at home since childhood up to the time of the data collection. Similarly, those *salmantino* participants who were familiar with another language either had limited speaking or reading proficiency or did not use this language with others on a regular basis.

While it would have been ideal to only include those participants without experience abroad or those with no previous exposure to a foreign language, it was difficult to do so for two reasons. First, in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century many Spaniards migrated to other countries in Europe and in the Americas (e.g. France, Germany, United States) to either escape the political persecution of Franco's regime or to find employment due to the unemployment crisis (Kattán-Ibarra 1997:277). With this migration, these Spaniards, including *salmantinos*, were inevitably in direct contact with other languages. Second, since Spain is in such close proximity with other nations in the European community, it is common for Spaniards to travel to these neighboring countries in Europe, as well as for Europeans to visit or live in Spain (Kattán-Ibarra 1997:273-4).

Before entering the *salmantino* community, it was important to be cognizant of the *interviewer effect* (Labov 1984:42), since the interviewer was not an in-group member of the

*salmantino* speech community, nor a native Spanish-speaker. The presence of someone other than an in-group member of the community may cause speakers to shift speech patterns to accommodate the recipient; thus, it was important to proceed with caution and examine the speech community before collecting the data. As Feagin (2002:22) explained: ‘obviously, a different set of problems arise when the fieldworker is a foreigner, of different ethnicity, and not a native speaker of the language.’ To minimize this effect, Feagin advised researchers to become familiar with relevant linguistic, demographic, historical and cultural information of the speech community before conducting fieldwork. As such, the first month in Salamanca was dedicated to research interview norms, attitudes, and practices before conducting the interviews with the *salmantino* community. While it was important to be aware of a non-group member influence on speech, Poplack (2000:12) concluded that studies conducted by outsider researchers do not systematically show an interviewer effect (Poplack & Tagliamonte 1989, 1991, 1994, Tagliamonte & Poplack 1993). It would have been ideal to find a *salmantino* member to conduct the oral interviews to diminish the possibility of an interviewer effect; yet this was not possible due to time and financial constraints. Instead, well-designed methodology was relied upon to facilitate ‘tapping the vernacular’ and to elicit valuable data (D. Sankoff 1988a:157).

### **2.1.3 Sociolinguistic Interviews**

To accurately discover systematic patterns in the vernacular, Labov (1972a, 1984) strongly recommended tape-recording participants, although this creates the well-known dilemma of the Observer’s Paradox. Since a researcher’s aim is to study language in its natural state, the presence of a researcher and recording equipment create an experimental, less-natural conversational setting for the speaker, thus, the paradox. Many times when these experimental conditions are present participants tend to use a more formal register, as opposed to casual speech. In order to diminish this effect, we incorporated commonly-employed sociolinguistic

techniques (i.e., using culturally sensitive questions that elicit emotional responses) to divert participants' attention to speech. Although the ubiquitous 'Danger of Death' scenario was not proposed—which would be most likely more applicable or pertinent to other speech communities—the questions were based on participants' personal experiences to 'recreate strong emotions [s]he has felt in the past' (Labov 1972a:209, Wolfram 1993:206, Feagin 2002:30), as well as culturally-embedded topics (Hymes 1982:9, Briggs 1986:45). The questions proposed in the interviews, as outlined below in Table 2-1, emphasized the narration and elaboration of past experiences. These topics were designed to not only divert the participants' attention to speech, but also to elicit a high number of tokens of past-tense aspectual morphology.

Table 2-1. Interview questions in Spanish and translated in English

Spanish	English
(1) <i>¿De dónde eres? ¿Cómo era tu infancia (o adolescencia) en ese lugar? ¿Puedes recordar un momento muy lindo durante ese tiempo?</i>	(1) Where are you from? What was your childhood or adolescence like in that place? Can you remember a special moment during this time?
(2) <i>Háblame de tu mejor amigo/amiga cuando tenías 13 años.</i>	(2) Tell me about your best friend when you were 13 years old.
(3) <i>¿Cómo pasabas el verano cuando eras niño/niña? ¿Hacías o ibas a un lugar en particular?</i>	(3) How did you used to spend the summers when you were younger? Did you used to do something or go somewhere in particular?
(4) <i>¿Te acuerdas el día cuando se murió Franco?</i>	(4) Do you remember the day that Franco died?
(5) <i>¿Cómo es tu familia? ¿Tienes unos recuerdos específicos de ellos que me quisieras contar?</i>	(5) What is your family like? Do you have any specific memories of them that you would like to tell me?
(6) <i>¿Viajas mucho? ¿A dónde viajaste? ¿Cuándo? ¿Cómo fue el viaje?</i>	(6) Do you travel a lot? Where have you gone? When? How was your trip?
(7) <i>Háblame de un evento en el pasado que te dio mucho miedo (felicidad, tristeza, etc.).</i>	(7) Describe a past event that made you very scared, happy, sad, etc.
(8) <i>¿Trabajas? ¿Cómo conseguiste el trabajo? ¿Cómo fue el primer día? ¿Ha habido algunos conflictos, problemas, momentos buenos en este entorno?</i>	(8) Do you work? How did you get your first job? What was the first day like? Have there been any conflicts, problems, good times in this environment?
(9) <i>¿Qué piensas de las corridas de toros? ¿Has estado una vez? Háblame de esa tradición.</i>	(9) What do you think about bullfighting? Have you ever been to one? Tell me more about this tradition.
(10) <i>¿Cómo pasabas las navidades y las nocheviejas? ¿Tienes unos recuerdos un día festivo de Salamanca o de España?</i>	(10) How would you used to spend Christmas and New Years Eve? Do you have any memories about another holiday in Salamanca or in Spain?
(11) <i>Háblame de la religión y cómo fue integrada en tu niñez.</i>	(11) Tell me about religion and how it was integrated in your childhood.

This schedule served as the point of departure and a guideline for the sociolinguistic interview; there were several instances where all of these questions were not asked due to the participants' propensity to elaborate on topics tangential to these areas. It was also strongly emphasized at the beginning of each recording that if a participant did not feel comfortable talking about a certain topic, s/he had the right to refrain from answering the particular question. Since it was of utmost importance to make speakers feel comfortable and at ease—to elicit the vernacular—, it was critical to allow speakers to depart from the directed questions and elaborate on the topic that seemed more interesting to him or her. For instance, if the speaker wanted to discuss a subtopic of one of the proposed questions in Table 2-1, the flow of conversation was not interrupted; in fear that by doing so, the participant would shift from a causal to a more formal register. Moreover, if it was noticed that a specific topic stimulated more participation from the interviewee, then we asked more follow-up questions on the subject for the same motive as listed above. For instance, when going through the list of questions with Participant XIV, she was not very communicative; yet, when we began to talk about her viewpoints on religion, this participant became very emphatic and spoke about this particular subject matter more than any other topic proposed to her. Therefore, we focused on this subject area and asked her follow-up questions to elicit more data.

A modified version of the sociolinguistic interview was used to elicit data from the *salmantino* community members. The quintessential sociolinguistic interview includes a range of linguistic tasks (e.g. minimal pairs, word lists, open-ended interview questions) in order to elicit a range of speech styles from causal to formal (Labov 1972b, 1984, Holmes, Bell & Boyce 1991). This methodology was slightly adapted by eliminating formal tasks (i.e., passage readings, word lists, etc.). The reasons for eliminating the formal tasks were as follows: i) it was

possible that formal tasks could have indicated the linguistic variable of our study, thus, making participants more aware of how they use past-tense aspectual morphology, ii) formal tasks such as reading lists and minimal pairs are more applicable to phonological studies, as opposed to morphosyntactic analyses, such as the present analysis, and iii) by emphasizing open-ended questions and eliminating formal tasks, speakers could feel more comfortable, pay less attention to their speech and ease themselves into using the vernacular.

According to the ethnography of communication framework, it is also important to bear in mind the ‘role of the interviewer, the setting, and the formal features of the question’ during the interview and while analyzing the data, since the content is highly reflective of the ‘specific type of interview and the relationship that is established between the involved parties’ (Briggs 1986:18).<sup>7</sup> As stated before, during the first month in Salamanca we became more familiar with the community’s norms and ascertained how this community understands the interview communicative event.<sup>8</sup> To do so, several members of the *salmantino* community were informally surveyed before beginning the data collection, asking for their thoughts and opinions on the interview situation. The opinions were varied. On one hand, many of the *salmantinos* expressed concern that if the researcher did not know the community member, the recruited person would not be very open to the interview situation. On the other hand, other *salmantinos* stated that community members would be delighted to give interviews and would enjoy talking for an hour

---

<sup>7</sup> The ethnography of communication perspective to DA finds its roots in anthropology. It emphasizes an *emic* perspective and intense participant observation; consequently, this functional approach is considered the ‘most integrative’, as it ‘reflects the fact that culture itself encompasses or embraces a totality of knowledge and practices’ (Schiffrin 1994:143).

<sup>8</sup> Additionally, Hymes’ SPEAKING grid was considered in each interview (Schiffrin 1994:141-2), as well as when the tapings were used during qualitative analysis and interpretation. The SPEAKING grid is as follows: S(etting, scene), P(articipants), E(nds), A(ct sequence), K(ey), I(nstrumentalities), N(orms of interaction and interpretation), G(enre). This tool assisted us before, during and after the interview situation in the interpretation of the discourse.

or so. Both opinions were found to be true. The latter opinion was correct, but only after having established a first or second-order tie in the social network.

It was recognized that while the sociolinguistic interview aims at eliciting the most natural speech possible, the data elicited were not quintessentially spontaneous, naturally-occurring speech. What we analyzed in the present investigation were responses to interview questions within an interview communicative event (Briggs 1986, Schiffrin 1997, Boxer 2001:18): within these answers were both conversational and narrative data. That is not to say that this type of data made the study less valid; rather, it is a question of i) disclosing the conditions under which these responses took place and ii) understanding interview norms and practices of the *salmantino* speech community. The knowledge of this communicative event allowed for sound methodological techniques and, subsequently, accurate conclusions based on the data (cf. Briggs 1986).

Additionally, since an interview situation naturally elicits both conversational and narrative data, both genres were incorporated into the analysis. Conversational data is considered ‘arguably the most basic of all genres’ (Schlegoff 1993, 1996a, 1996b) and ‘the genre from which all others were derived’ (Thompson & Hopper 2001:27), thus rendering it an imperative genre to include in the analysis. Narratives are an excellent source of data because: i) it is a discourse unit with regular structure, highly independent from surrounding talk (Schiffrin 1994:290) and ii) the subunits within an oral narrative can be labeled fairly easily; each of these subunits performs its own function in the discourse.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the highly personal content of narratives can reflect social and cultural norms of a speech community (Labov 1984:32); the

---

<sup>9</sup> Some authors find narrative structure ‘readily definable’ (Schiffrin 1994:283); however, we were hesitant to include narrative clauses in the quantified analysis due to the nature of our linguistic variable.

narrative can also be a powerful tool when interpreting how speakers choose to convey socio-cultural norms through linguistic means.

#### **2.1.4 Corpus**

The corpus of our study was a collection of 25 oral, sociolinguistic interviews that were conducted in the city of Salamanca, Spain during the summer of 2008. The data collection was limited exclusively to this region of Spain, since it is well documented that the different Spanish-speaking communities within the Peninsula have different linguistic characteristics (Hernando Cuadrado 1994:122).<sup>10</sup> Therefore, in order to adequately observe and isolate *salamantino* speech from other varieties of Peninsular Spanish (PS), we restricted data collection exclusively to city of Salamanca.

The *salmantino* interviews represented a total of 21 hours, 28 minutes of data, with an average duration of 51 minutes, 31 seconds per interview. The duration of each recording ranged from 20 minutes, 40 seconds (shortest) to 1 hour, 33 minutes, 36 seconds (longest). All of the interviews were recorded on either a Sony or Olympus portable digital recorder and took place either in the participant's residence, workplace or a local restaurant or café. Most of the recordings were held in the home of the participant (15), which helped to eliminate extraneous noise from public spaces. Even though some interviews were conducted in public spaces and with other *salmantinos* present (10), we made certain that the interview was conducted in a secluded area of the café or home to avoid noise interference.

---

<sup>10</sup> Hernando Cuadrado (1994:122) explained that '[m]uchos hablantes gallegos y asturianos muestran una marcada preferencia por el empleo del pretérito indefinido sobre el pretérito perfecto, debido a que en su lengua o dialecto, respectivamente, esta última forma no existe, por lo que, cuando hablando en castellano, no establecen la diferencia apuntada.'

## 2.2 Transcription

Once the interviews were complete, the 25 recordings were transcribed based on the coding and practices listed in DuBois (2006), with minor adaptations. There exist different interpretations and methodologies of transcription (cf. Bird 2005:228-232). The definition adopted in our study was that transcription is the conversion of oral data to written form based on observed or recorded conversational interaction; in addition, the text should be accompanied by the coding of paralinguistic features (i.e., laughing, pausing, gestures, etc.) during a recorded interview, discussion or interaction. Since the 25 recordings were in digital form, the interviews were transcribed with the assistance of a computer program, Voicewalker—a tool which facilitates transcription by repeating audio segments step-by-step—and typed into a Word document.

The interviews were transcribed by the present author or by bilingual English-Spanish speakers who were employed to expedite the task. These transcribers were either graduate students or other individuals knowledgeable in linguistics; they were trained on the transcription process and compensated for their work. Since it is known that the process of transcription inevitably reflects and involves ‘subjective’ interpretations of the transcriber (cf. Bird 2005), we carefully reviewed and adapted each transcription done by other researchers to ensure consistency of coding and accuracy of transcription. After reviewing each of the 25 transcripts for accuracy and reliability, the *salmantino* corpus was complete and it was then possible to begin the analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. Before continuing, we would like to stress that the corpus of the present study—a compilation of the transcribed *salmantino* interviews—was ideal for variationist analysis, as a researcher can discover and verify the conditioning contextual and extralinguistic factors that influence the morphosyntactic patterns of native-speaker discourse. By applying ‘a scope and reliability of analysis not

otherwise feasible' (Biber 2002:288), a corpus-based analysis of naturalistic data can offer great insights on the factors shaping the variation of competing forms.

### 2.3 Data Extraction and Exclusions

Initially, the data used for the present study included all tokens of Preterit (PRET), Present Perfect (PP), Historical Present (HP), and Imperfect (IMP) of stative verbs.<sup>11</sup> These examples were labeled as tokens either during the transcription process or upon revision of the transcripts. The utterances that contained the tokens were subsequently extracted from the corpus and copied onto an Excel spreadsheet. The preliminary amount of tokens came to 5,031 occurrences of stative verbs in Preterit ( $N=987$ , 19.6%), PP ( $N=514$ , 10.2%), HP ( $N=42$ , 0.8%), and Imperfect ( $N=3,488$ , 69.3%).

#### 2.3.1 General Exclusions

During the initial stages of the extracting and coding process, all of the examples of Preterit, PP, HP and Imperfect were included. However, since our goal was to uncover the precise contextual and extralinguistic features that shaped the use of perfective and imperfective aspectual use, it was necessary to exclude those examples that were not productive or did not carry out this function in its entirety. These included repetitions (2.1), false starts or truncated utterances (2.2), and contexts not completely audible or understandable (2.3). Table 2-2 outlines the number of exclusions of each variant. It also is important to note that examples of the fixed expression like *es que* 'it's that' were not extracted as a token of the HP; therefore, they are not included in this list of exclusions.

---

<sup>11</sup> In the text, we will write out 'Preterit' and 'Imperfect', but will use PRET and IMP when citing examples from the corpus. The PP and HP will be used in both text and citations to refer to the Present Perfect and Historical Present, respectively.

- (2.1) Pues, pues sí íbamos al. . .al cine, íbamos mucho, claro no nos dejaban mucho salir o sea que tampoco era, **era** una época que por ejemplo cuando tenías diecisiete, dieciocho años tenías que estar a las 10 en casa. (IX, f53)  
 ‘Well, well, we used to go to the. . .the movies, we went a lot, of course they did not let use go out I mean that it was (IMP) not, it was (IMP) [repetition] not an era that for example when you were seventeen, eighteen years old you had to be at home by 10 o’clock.’
- (2.2) Pero, yo sigo yendo con una de mis hermanas y voy a la de Tejares que tengo muy buena combinación, y entonces bueno pues **teníamo-** [truncated] **-éramos** socios desde que mis hijos nacieron. (XII, f62)  
 ‘But, I continue to go with one of my sister and I go to the one in Tejares that I have a very good combination, and then well we **ha-** [truncated] **-we were** (IMP) members since my children were born.’
- (2.3) Era una fábrica de Barcelona. Y tenía que [inaudible conversation] negación. (I, f58)  
 ‘It was a factory from Barcelona. And I had to (IMP) [inaudible conversation] negation.’

Table 2-2. Number of tokens excluded according to type of exclusion and form

	PRET	PP	HP	IMP	Total N
Repeated utterances	13	7	--	54	74
False starts/ truncated utterances	42	1	--	141	184
Context not entirely audible or understandable	--	--	--	3	3
Total N	55	8	0	198	261

Another critical exclusion of the analysis to highlight is the elimination of the HP variant. Initially we were going to exclude only those verbs that ended in *-ar* in the *nosotros* ‘we’ form, since they are identical in both the (Historical) Present and the Preterit tenses. If we take a look at example (2.4), we can see how it would be impossible to label if the speaker used the HP or the Preterit, since *nos quedamos* could be interpreted as ‘we are left’ or ‘we were left’.

- (2.4) Porque cuando me separé, nos arruinamos, nos quedamos sin nada. (XVIII, f58)  
 ‘Because when I got separated, we were ruined, [we are (HP) / were (PRET)] left without anything.’

Even though a logical assumption might be that *nos quedamos* was a past perfective action (Preterit or HP) instead of the true Present tense, since the verb that begins the sequence using the Preterit tense (*me separé* ‘I got separated’), such assumption could not be made. It was impossible to know for sure the exact meaning of the speaker’s utterance, these occurrences had

to be excluded from the analysis. There were a total of 29 ambiguous HP/Preterit examples in the *nosotros* form that were excluded. With those ambiguous HP occurrences taken out of the data, we were only left with 13 examples of stative verbs in the HP. With such a small token count, it was ultimately decided to leave these tokens aside.

### **2.3.2 Exclusions of the Anterior Present Perfect<sup>12</sup>**

Another notable dilemma we faced when trying to circumscribe the variable context was determining how and to what extent to include PP statives in the analysis. Under a variationist framework, researchers have made considerable headway in determining precisely how anterior forms (PP) ‘invade’ certain perfective (Preterit) contexts in PS (Schwenter 1994a, Serrano 1994, Schwenter & Howe 2003, Howe 2006, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008). Likewise, other descriptive analyses (Harris 1982, Fleishman 1983, Squartini & Bertinetto 2000) have demonstrated the same: the PP seems to be following a similar grammaticization path as other Romance anteriors (i.e., French, Sicilian), in that the gram is shifting from an anterior to a perfective, which has also been labeled as ‘aorist drift’.<sup>13</sup> In this well-documented grammaticization path observed in various world languages (Bybee et al. 1994:81), the anterior gram ‘starts out as a true perfect, but under[goes] a process of gradual aoristicization (i.e., of transformation into a purely perfective past)’ and loses its relation to the present (Squartini & Bertinetto 2000:404). In fact, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:30) now claim that the Peninsular PP has ousted the Preterit as the ‘default’ perfective form, basing this conclusion on the PP’s higher relative frequency and its preference in less specified contexts. For these reasons,

---

<sup>12</sup> We refer to the PP as an ‘anterior’ instead of the synonymous term ‘perfect’ to avoid confusion with ‘perfective’ grams.

<sup>13</sup> As coined by Squartini & Bertinetto (2000:404) and used in Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008). ‘Aorist’ aspectual viewpoint is synonymous with perfective aspect (in the case of Spanish).

we felt it imperative to incorporate the PP as part of the variable context in the present investigation.

Yet, as important as this element was to the variable context of our study, we were very hesitant to include all examples of the PP. Since our study focused exclusively on the past perfective-imperfective dichotomy of statives in *salmantino* Spanish, not the grammaticization path of the anterior PP to perfective PP in this Peninsular variety, we wanted to be certain to include only those examples of PP with perfective functions and exclude those examples that still carried out anterior functions (i.e., past actions *with* present relevance) in the discourse. Even though it is well known that the Peninsular PP can be used as a perfective, particularly in hodiernal contexts (Schwenter 1994a, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008), the PP may still be used as a traditional anterior since it has not fully grammaticized to solely convey perfective meaning, as has the *Passé Composé* in French. Also known as ‘retention of meaning’ (Bybee et al. 1994), it is very common for evolving constructions to preserve old meanings and uses in conversation; the gram still can hold on to previous meanings or functions even after fully completing its path of grammaticization. Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:11) explained further:

In grammaticization, evolving constructions retain features of meaning from their source construction. This is known as the ‘retention’ (Bybee & Paglicua 1987) or ‘persistence’ (Hopper 1991) hypothesis. In the evolution of linguistic resources, change is gradual, as properties, both semantic and grammatical persist from the previous stage (Torres Cacoullos & Walker 2009:31).

Therefore, knowing that the Peninsular PP is at an intermediary stage of grammaticization from a anterior to a perfective, we were not surprised to observe anterior uses in the *salmantino* data, as in examples (2.5), (2.6), (2.7), and (2.8). Corroborating what we observed in our corpus, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:30) described the Peninsular PP’s situation as follows:

Some constraints reflecting perfect use still apply to the Peninsular PP, notably proximate temporal expressions, which indicate linking to the present, as well as frequency adverbials and plural objects, both of which are indicative of repeated occurrence, and most strongly, irrelevant temporal reference, congruent with perfects' relational link-to-present meaning.

For this reason, we decided to take a closer look at the PP statives extracted from the *salmantino* corpus and to further delimit the variable context.

Basing these subsequent PP exclusions on the constraints outlined in Schwenter & Torres Cacoulios (2008:30), we took out those PP stative examples that co-occurred with a proximate temporal expressions (e.g. *ahora* 'now', *últimamente* 'lately', *esta semana* 'this week') (2.5), frequency adverbials (e.g. *siempre* 'always', *nunca* 'never', *muchas veces* 'lots of times') (2.6), PP statives co-occurring with plural objects (2.7), and irrelevant temporal reference, as in example (2.8). To clarify, irrelevant temporal reference expressions are those that one cannot inquire 'when?' (cf. Schwenter & Torres Cacoulios (2008:18) for further examples of irrelevant temporal reference extracted from the COREC).<sup>14</sup>

- (2.5) I: ¿Cómo fue la experiencia de escribir este proyecto o hacer el proyecto? ¿Cómo empezaste?  
P: Uf, pues, maja, poco a poco. Hombre, **de últimas** he estado bastante cansada porque trabajo y bueno, mi trabajo, no tienes unos turnos fijos por lo cual tampoco puedes estabilizarte. Es un poco duro, pero bueno. (VIII, f22)  
I: 'How was the experience of writing this project or doing the project? When did you start?  
P: Oh, well, dear, little by little. Man, **lately** I have been (PP) pretty tired because [of] work and well, my job, you don't have set hours so you can't stabilize yourself. It's kind of hard, but oh well.'
- (2.6) Sí, que es un sueldo pequeño pero que **nunca** te ha faltado el sueldo. Tú haces tus cálculos y ya está. (XX, f60)  
'Yes, it's a small salary because you have never lacked (PP) a salary. You make your calculations and there it is.'

---

<sup>14</sup> The COREC stands for the Corpus de Referencia de la Lengua Española Contemporánea: Corpus Oral Peninsular, found at [www.llf.uam.es/~fmarcos/informes/corpus/corpusix.html](http://www.llf.uam.es/~fmarcos/informes/corpus/corpusix.html)

- (2.7) Entonces, me quedé sin hijos, sin marido, sin nada. ¡Ja, ja, ja, ja! O sea, he tenido épocas muy buenas, pero también muy malas. (XV, f58)  
So, I was left with out children, without a husband, with out anything. Ha, ha, ha, ha! In other words, I have had (PP) **really good times**, but also very bad ones.
- (2.8) Sí, es que pasa como en Estados Unidos. Entonces, en Estados Unidos hay gente que. . . los abuelos italianos, alemanes, ¿eh? Pues, en Brasil, como ha habido mucha inmigración, pues pasa igual. (IV, f62)  
'Yes, it's that it's like in the United States. So, in the United States there are people that. . . Italian and German grandparents, right? Well, in Brazil, since there has been (PP) a lot of immigration, well it's the same.'

In total, we excluded 12 proximates, 143 frequency adverbials (114 with *siempre*, 19 with *nunca* and 10 others), 22 with co-occurring plural objects and 40 irrelevant temporal reference. Not excluded were all other examples of PP, especially those of indeterminate temporal reference, in which the analyst or interlocutor can ask 'when?', but may not 'resolve the exact temporal distance' (Schwenter & Cacoullos (2008:19). Indeterminate temporal reference was especially crucial to our analysis and that of Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008), since this seems to be the locus of change from anterior to perfective in PS.

Consequently, these final exclusions left us with a total of 289 examples of the PP that carried out a perfective function, as in examples (2.9), (2.10), and (2.11).

- (2.9) Este fin de semana, el sábado. Han estado aquí **desde el viernes** y se fueron **ayer**. (XIX, f19)  
'This [past] weekend, on Saturday. They were here **since Friday** and left **yesterday**.'
- (2.10) Viajo mucho. He estado por ejemplo **el 28 de julio** en Madrid. (VIII, f22)  
'I travel a lot. I was (PP) for example **on July 28th** in Madrid.'
- (2.11) Me tomaba un cafecito con mi madre y con mis hermanos. Y luego ya veníamos en el coche con él para ir a casa. Ha sido **una infancia** muy bonita. (XXII, f62)  
[Responding to: What was your childhood like?] 'I would have a coffee with my mother and with my siblings. I then we would come home in the car with [my father]. It was (PP) a beautiful **childhood**.'

The interlocutor of example (2.9) expressed that her guests were visiting since Friday, but left on Sunday (the interview took place on the following Monday); the PP was used for a past event

that was temporally bounded by the clause *se fueron ayer* ‘they left yesterday’. Likewise, the speaker of (2.10) applied the PP to denote a past, discrete event which occurred on a specific date (two weeks prior to the speech event). While it has been shown that speakers of PS still favor the Preterit with hesternal and prehesternal actions, speakers did employ the PP in past contexts with greater temporal distance, as in (2.10) (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008:31). Finally, if we take a look at example (2.11), we observe another example of a PP used in a perfective context. The participant’s *infancia* ‘childhood’ was a period in her life that had concluded nearly 50 years before (the speaker was 62 years of age at the time of the interview). Some linguists might interpret the use of the PP in example (2.11) as the speaker’s desire to make the action seem more relevant to the present (cf. Fleischman 1983:200); yet, others consider this argument ‘inadequate, because presumably any group of speakers would desire this’ (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós 2008:32). We were in agreement with the latter position, claiming that (2.11) is an example of possibly how the anterior has generalized to perfective in those situations lacking specific past temporal reference. Another noteworthy point to highlight from example (2.11) was the fact that the interlocutor used perfective aspect as opposed to imperfective aspect, even after a succession of background descriptions (i.e., used to have coffee, would come home). This was exactly the linguistic puzzle we aimed to uncover: what conditioned the use of perfective aspect of the stative verb *ser* in this case?

To reiterate, since perfectives ‘signal that the situation is viewed as bounded temporally. . . in which the situation is reported *for its own sake*, independent of its relevance to other situations (Hopper 1982),’ (2.9), (2.10), and (2.11) are clear examples from the *salmantino* data of how the PP has acquired a perfective function (Bybee et al. 1994:54-61, emphasis added). After eliminating occurrences of PP with anterior meaning, we were better able to analyze the

linguistic variable of perfective versus imperfective stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. While we recognize that it would have been ideal to ascertain precisely how and to what extent the PP has moved into perfective contexts in the *salmantino* variety before beginning the present investigation—especially since these rates have been known to vary among different dialects of Spanish—, we decided to leave this endeavor for future investigation. We felt confident in adopting the criteria delineated in Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008) in how to delimit the occurrences of PP, not only because the authors based their study on a corpus of Peninsular oral data, but also because the authors’ conclusions were supported with current variationist methodology. After these particular instances were eliminated from the extractions, the final token count of all examples of Preterit, PP, and Imperfect stative verbs came to 4,511. Table 2-3 below shows the distribution of examples according to speaker.

Table 2-3. Relative frequencies of Preterit, PP and Imperfect statives according to speaker after exclusions

Speaker	Preterit		PP		Imperfect		Ratios	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
I	92	30.8%	21	7.0	186	62.2%	299	6.6%
II	9	14.8%	3	4.9%	49	80.3%	61	1.4%
III	23	22.8%	3	3.0%	75	74.3%	101	2.2%
IV	61	27.9%	11	5.0%	147	67.1 %	219	4.9%
V	52	38.5%	11	8.1%	72	53.3%	135	3.0%
VI	67	20.7%	8	2.5%	249	76.9%	324	7.2%
VII	59	20.4%	11	3.8%	219	75.8%	289	6.4%
VIII	19	25.7%	15	20.3%	40	54.1%	74	1.6%
IX	31	9.3%	15	4.5%	286	86.1%	332	7.4%
X	27	12.8%	14	6.6%	170	80.6%	211	4.7%
XI	18	10.5%	11	6.4%	142	83.0%	171	3.8%
XII	45	18.2%	13	5.3%	189	76.5%	247	5.5%
XIII	9	21.4%	10	23.8%	23	54.8%	42	0.9%
XIV	22	25.0%	5	5.7%	61	69.3%	88	2.0%
XV	38	20.3%	8	4.3%	141	75.4%	187	4.1%
XVI	52	16.7%	7	2.2%	253	81.1%	312	6.9%
XVII	40	25.6%	5	3.2%	111	71.2%	156	3.5%
XVIII	52	21.7%	33	13.8%	155	64.6%	240	5.3%
XIX	22	19.1%	8	7.0%	85	73.9%	115	2.5%
XX	23	12.0%	13	6.8%	155	81.2%	191	4.2%
XXI	59	24.4%	12	5.0	171	70.7%	242	5.4%
XXII	40	24.4%	26	15.9%	98	59.8%	164	3.6%
XXIII	18	30.5%	9	15.3%	32	54.2%	59	1.3%
XXIV	24	26.7%	11	12.2%	55	61.1%	90	2.0%
XXV	30	18.5%	6	3.7%	126	77.8%	162	3.6%

TOTAL N=	932	20.7%	289	6.4%	3290	72.9%	4511	100%
----------	-----	-------	-----	------	------	-------	------	------

## 2.4 Variable Context of Spanish Past-Tense Aspectual Morphology

The dependent variable of our study was the past-tense aspectual form of stative verbs. Since Wolfram (1993:195) described the linguistic variable as ‘an abstraction; it is made up of a class of variants—varying items that exist in a structurally-defined set of some type’, it was imperative to account for all of the variants that perform the same function. Per Wolfram’s definition and the Principle of Accountability, researchers must accurately delimit *all* of the possible ways (forms) of saying the same thing (function). Unfortunately, defining the envelope of variation of a morphosyntactic variable is not always an easy feat, due to the difficulty of equating form and function of a linguistic variable ‘above the phonological level’ (Tagilamonte 2006:72). Not only can it be laborious to delineate all contexts of a morphosyntactic linguistic variable, it is also important to recognize that these same forms might also perform other functions in different contexts (D. Sankoff 1988a:151).

As stated in §2.3, there were four variants initially considered in the present investigation: Preterit (PRET), Imperfect (IMP), Present Perfect (PP) and Historical Present (HP). The two obvious variants of past-tense aspectual morphology in Spanish are the Preterit (perfective) and Imperfect (imperfective) tenses, as in examples (2.12) and (2.13).

(2.12) [Talking about his girlfriends] ahora ya las dos últimas que he tenido, una fue una apuesta que hizo ella con otra amiga. (XXII, m34)  
 ‘The two last [girlfriends] that I’ve had, one was (PRET) a bet that she made with a friend of hers.’

(2.13) Todos los chicos a los doce años tenían que salirse de allí con lo cual el nivel de estudio era bajadísimo y no estaban preparados ni por físico, ni por fuerza ni por edad para trabajar en esos sitios. (XXIV, m55)  
 ‘Every 12-year-old boy had (IMP) to leave [school] which meant that their level of study was (IMP) low and they were (IMP) not prepared not physically, nor age-wise to work in those places.’

Even though it is widely accepted that Spanish maintains a binary distinction between perfective and imperfective aspect in the past tense (Silva-Corvalán 1983:765, Dahl 1985), the Preterit and Imperfect cannot simply translate over as the only variables considered when defining the envelope of variation for past-tense aspectual morphology. If researchers must delimit all forms that carry out the same function, then the scope of our study would not be scientifically sound unless the PP (2.14) and the HP (2.15) were also included as variants, since it has been found that both these forms in Spanish could express past-tense perfective meaning in discourse.

(2.14) Y estuvimos todas las fiestas juntos, y en septiembre, luego hablábamos y le dije que si se quería venir unos días conmigo. Y se vino. Y luego yo me fui a Tarragona. Y luego hemos estado un año juntos y me la traje a vivir acá conmigo. Pero era muy jovencita, tenía 20 años por ahí. (XXII, m34)

‘And we were together every holiday, and in September, then we would talk and I told her that if she wanted to come spend some days with me. And she came. And then I went to Tarragona. And then we were (PP) together a year and I brought her to live here with me. But she was very young, she was only 20 years old around there.’

(2.15) Cuando llegó le digo “¿quieres hielo?”, porque el otro día se fue a comprarlo, se fue a comprarlo sin nos dice, yo lo tengo allí. Y que está muy nerviosa. (V, f58)  
 ‘When she arrived I say to her “do you want ice?”, because the other day se went to buy it, she left to buy it without telling us, I have it there. And she is [was] (HP) very nervous.’

Specifically with regard to the PP, it was already discussed in §2.3.2 that that speakers of PS use the PP in many contexts with past-tense meaning lacking reference to a present state, thus, following a similar grammaticization path as the French Passé Composé (cf. Harris 1982; Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008; Schwenter & Howe 2003; Schwenter 1994a, Bybee & Dahl 1989; inter alia).<sup>15</sup> Since *salmantino* Spanish is a variety of PS, it was imperative that the PP be incorporated as a variant of perfective aspect. With that said, however, it was important to recognize that not all PP are perfectives. As in discussed §2.3.2, we eliminated those examples of

---

<sup>15</sup> Concretely, Schwenter (1994a) studied the Alicante speech community and discovered that the PP of this variety of PS was at an intermediately stage of grammaticalization; it has also been observed that PS differs from American Spanish (AS) as speakers of the latter variety commonly substitute the Preterit with the PP in past-tense descriptions (Quesada Pacheco 2001:11-17).

PP that clearly exhibited different patterns of use that most likely maintained a non-perfective function.

Similarly, the HP which is also known as the ‘dramatic’ or ‘narrative’ present, has been described as ‘the present tense. . .used to refer to a past situation [in narration]’ (Comrie 1976:73). Since Bybee (1995:445) emphasized that ‘the major perfective use of the Present, the so-called historical present in narratives, is not a present tense at all (Silva-Corvalán 1983),’ the HP was initially considered as another variant of the linguistic variable. Silva-Corvalán (1983) concluded that native Spanish-speakers, like English-speakers, often employ the HP to offer evaluative perspective on past events during complicating action clauses in narration, where the HP corresponded to perfective aspect. According to Silva-Corvalán (1983), the HP could not represent the Imperfect tense since the ‘simple present cannot alternate with the Imperfect in restricted clauses: if the switch were made, the clause sequence would be interpreted as parallel to the temporal sequence of the events.’ Again, this variant was excluded due to the small amount of occurrences ( $N=13$ ), even though we considered the HP as part of the envelope of variation of past-tense aspectual morphology especially when accounting for narrative discourse.

## **2.5 Coding and Hypotheses**

Deciding which factors groups and factors to test in any variationist investigation involves a deep understanding of the influences that may condition speaker-choice of a linguistic phenomenon. First, we integrated certain factor groups of previous studies to test if these studies’ findings were congruent to the results of the present investigation. Additionally, we modified and incorporated new factor groups based on own hypotheses. In total, there were twelve linguistic factors analyzed in the study: Temporal Determinant, Grammatical Person, Structural Priming, Collocation, Clause Type, Sentence Type, Prepositional Phrase, Locative Expression, Verb Class of Main Verb, Adjective/Past Participle, Number of Participants, and Individuation of the Object

(Table 2-4). The two social factors coded were Age and Gender (Table 2-5). Finally, the two stylistic variables included in the analysis were Time in the Interview and Audience Design.

(Table 2-6).

Table 2-4. Linguistic factor groups coded

Factor groups
Temporal determinant
<i>Absent</i>
<i>Cuando</i>
<i>Durative/marked frame</i>
<i>Habitual</i>
<i>General past adverbial</i>
<i>Punctual marker</i>
<i>Siempre</i>
<i>Temporal sequencer</i>
Grammatical person
<i>First-person singular (yo)</i>
<i>Second-person singular, informal (tú)</i>
<i>Third-person singular (él, ella, Juan, Laura)</i>
<i>Second-person singular, formal (Ud.)</i>
<i>First-person plural (nosotros/as)</i>
<i>Third-person plural (ellos/as)</i>
<i>Second-person plural, informal (vosotros/as)</i>
<i>Third-person plural, formal (Uds.)</i>
<i>Inanimate singular (e.g. la casa ‘the house’)</i>
<i>Inanimate plural (e.g. las casas ‘the houses’)</i>
<i>Animal singular (e.g. la vaca ‘the cow’)</i>
<i>Animal plural (las vacas ‘the cows’)</i>
<i>Impersonal expressions (e.g. se podía ‘one could’, se tenía ‘one had’)</i>
<i>Full noun phrase (e.g. <u>Lo que quería era</u>. . . ‘<u>What I wanted was</u>’)</i>
Structural priming
<i>Prime, prime</i>
<i>No prime, prime</i>
<i>Prime, no prime</i>
<i>No prime, no prime</i>
Collocation
<i>V + bien</i>
<i>V + como</i>
<i>V + infinitive</i>
<i>V + gerund</i>
<i>V + mal</i>
<i>V + none</i>
Prepositional phrase
<i>Present</i>
<i>Absent</i>
Locative expression
<i>Present</i>
<i>Absent</i>

Table 2-4. Continued.

---

Adjective/Past participle
<i>Present</i>
<i>Absent</i>
Clause type
<i>Main clause</i>
<i>Subordinate adverbial/causal clause</i>
<i>Subordinate complement clause</i>
<i>Subordinate relative clause</i>
Sentence type
<i>Positive declarative</i>
<i>Positive interrogative</i>
<i>Negative declarative</i>
<i>Negative interrogative</i>
Verb class of main verb
<i>Stative</i>
<i>Perception/psychological</i>
<i>Change of state</i>
<i>Motion</i>
<i>Speaking</i>
<i>Other dynamic verbs</i>
Number of participants (Transitivity)
<i>One</i>
<i>Two or more</i>
Individuation of the object (Transitivity)
<i>Animate singular</i>
<i>Animate plural</i>
<i>Inanimate singular</i>
<i>Inanimate plural</i>
<i>Animate/inanimate</i>

---

Table 2-5. Social factor groups coded

---

Factor groups
Age
<i>Generation 1 (19-29 years old)</i>
<i>Generation 2 (30-39 years old)</i>
<i>Generation 3 (40-49 years old)</i>
<i>Generation 4 (50-59 years old)</i>
<i>Generation 5 (60-69 years old)</i>
Gender
<i>Male</i>
<i>Female</i>

---

Table 2-6. Stylistic factor groups coded

Factor groups
Time in interview
<i>Minutes 0-10</i>
<i>Minutes 10+</i>
Audience design
<i>Individual</i>
<i>Auditor present</i>
<i>Eavesdropper present</i>

## 2.5.1 Linguistic Factors

### 2.5.1.1 Temporal determinant

The first linguistic factor group, Temporal Determinant, was included in direct response to the body of literature of tense/aspect that classifies the perfective/imperfective distinction by if the action is bounded temporally (perfective) or not (imperfective) (cf. §1.1). We expected a perfective-stative to co-occur with a word or expression referring to a specific (punctual) period of time (i.e., *el otro día* ‘the other day’ or *el año pasado* ‘last year’), as seen in example (2.16), with a durative/marked frame (2.17), or after a temporal sequencer (2.18). Conversely, imperfective-statives were expected to favor a temporal determinant that lacked temporal reference (2.19), expressing habitual routine (2.20) or general past reference (2.21) (cf. Comrie 1976).

(2.16) [Talking about her visit to Scotland] No recuerdo si estuve **un mes**. (X, f48)  
 ‘I don’t remember if I was (PRET) [there] **one month**.’

(2.17) A mí no, no me gusta. Será que porque mi hermana estu-. . . vivió **una temporada** allí  
 ‘I didn’t like it. It’s probable because my sister wa-. . . lived (PRET) for **a time** there.’  
 (VII, f48)

(2.18) P: Entonces mis padres tenían negocio y yo no, y nada más.  
 I: ¿Qué tipo tenían?  
 ‘P: Mis padres tenían una panadería, y **luego** tuvieron una pastelería. (XIV, f53)  
 I: Back then my parents had a business and not I, and that’s all.  
 P: What type did they have?  
 I: My parents had (IMP) a bread store, and **then** they had (PRET) a bakery.’

- (2.19) Tengo dos hermanas, una trabaja en el hospital y trabaja en San Sebastián, vive en San Sebastián. Y tengo otra, otra aquí. Y otro que era policía ha muerto. Estaba en el pueblo. (V, f58)  
 ‘I have two sisters, one works in a hospital and works in San Sebastian, she lives in San Sebastian. I have another, she is here. And another brother that was (IMP) a policeman died. He was (IMP) in the town.’
- (2.20) Yo quería pasarme y ya. En vez de disfrutar como una tonta, pues no disfruté porque yo **todos los meses** era un llanto. (XII, f62)  
 ‘I wanted to get there already. Instead of enjoying [the time] like a stupid girl, well I didn’t enjoy [it] because **every month** I was (IMP) a sob.’
- (2.21) [Discussing typical Christmas gifts] Pero **antiguamente** era pues la muñeca, una muñeca, una bicicleta, un juego de cocina, es que era la cosa más simple. (III, f44)  
 But **back then** it was (IMP) a doll, a doll, a bicycle, a kitchen set, it was a very simple thing.’

Also incorporated in this factor group were clauses using *cuando* ‘when’ (2.22), which was expected to favor the imperfective-stative form.

- (2.22) Es increíble, preparaban una fiesta, **cuando** eran las fiestas en las casas, pues se preparaba la fiesta igual que la fiesta en el pueblo como yo digo. (IX, f53)  
 ‘It’s incredible, they used to prepare a party, **when parties** (IMP) were in houses, well they used to prepare the party like the party in the town I’m saying.’

Finally, the temporal adverb *siempre* ‘always’ was coded separately from other habitual expressions. Initially it was expected that *siempre* would disfavor perfective aspect especially because this expression would help speakers reinforce the habitual nature of certain routine, as in example (2.23).

- (2.23) No, **siempre** eran iguales, no. Yo te digo que era la matanza de las navidades, luego venían los otros abuelos y todo era un círculo. **Siempre, siempre** teníamos algo especial de los reyes, siempre nos daban una sorpresa. (XX, f60)  
 ‘No, they were (IMP) **always** the same, no. I am telling you that it was the Christmas Matanza, then my other grandparents would come and everything was a circus. **Always, always** we had (IMP) something specific from the Wise Men, they always gave us a surprise.’

However, upon a cursory review of the data, there were enough examples of past-tense stative verbs applied with perfective aspect co-occurring with *siempre*, as in (2.24), (2.25), and (2.26), that justified this adverb to be marked independently from other indicators of habituality.

(2.24) ‘Andrés, vete a estudiar. Andrés, vete a hacer los deberes. ¡Andrés!’ Pero, de pequeño, pequeño, **siempre fue** así. (XVIII, f58)  
‘‘Andrew, go and study. Andrew, go and do your homework. Andrew!’ But, when he was young, he **always was** (PRET) like that.’

(2.25) que era la más grande, la que le tenía miedo. Yo me llevaba muy bien con ella, no sé porque, **siempre me sentí** muy unida a ella. (XVI, f40)  
‘that was the biggest one, the one that I was afraid of. I got along very well with her, I don’t know why, I **always felt** (PRET) very close to her.’

(2.26) Claro, mi padre **siempre quiso** que hubiera hecho una carrera. (V, f58)  
‘Of course, my father **always wanted** (PRET) that I had made a career.’

The departure from the expected use of *siempre* past-tense imperfective aspect suggested that this temporal expression might not favor the imperfective variant.

### 2.5.1.2 Grammatical person

The second linguistic factor group, Grammatical Person, was included to corroborate the results of previous studies that linked perfective aspect to first-person (Reid 1976, Hopper 1979b, 1982) and animate subjects in narration (Klein-Andreu 1991). We combined grammatical person and animacy to avoid an overlap between these two groups; the factor group was divided according to human, animal, and inanimate subjects as shown in Table 2-4. As seen in Reid’s (1976) analysis of grounding strategies in French narrations, since first-person subjects were found to co-occur with perfective aspect in foregrounded actions (2.27), we expected to observe this same trend in the present investigation.

(2.27) Eh, yyy la zona de Valencia muy bien y Cataluña, [**yo**] **estuve** hace bastante tiempo pero también [**yo**] **estuve** en Gerona y Barcelona. (XXIV, m55)  
‘Uhh, and the region of Valencia very good and Catalonia, **I was** (PRET) there a long time ago but **I was** (PRET) also in Gerona and Barcelona.’

Additionally, in a preliminary study on past-tense aspectual morphology of *estar* ‘be’ in *madrileño* Spanish (Knouse 2008), we compared these results to Reid’s (1976) and Hopper’s (1979) analyses of French and Russian respectively; it was discovered that first-person plural (.89) and singular (.62) subjects strongly favored the perfective form of *estar*. It has been

suggested that first-person subjects were favored in the perfective aspect to distinguish between high-focus (foregrounded) and low-focus (backgrounded) actions in narrations (Hopper 1982:217), as well as to convey the subjective viewpoint of the speaker (Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008:19).

In the preliminary study of *estar* in *madrileño* Spanish, it was also found that third-person subjects strongly disfavored perfective aspect (.26), thus favoring the Imperfect tense, as seen in (2.28).

(2.28) **La maestra** era una señora mayor. Muy mayor. Pero. . .[**ella**] era muy buena. [**Ella**] era una señora seria, pero muy buena maestra. (I, f58)  
'**The teacher** was (IMP) an older lady. Very old. But. . .**she** was (IMP) very good. **She** was (IMP) a serious woman, but a very good teacher.'

Again, it is possible that speakers use imperfective aspect with these verbs to distinguish between the events of the main storyline (foregrounded actions) and the secondary, non-temporal details (backgrounded actions). These same trends were expected in the present study.

### 2.5.1.3 Structural priming

The third linguistic factor group, Structural Priming, has been defined as 'the process whereby the use of a certain structure in one utterance functions as a prime on to subsequent utterance, such that the same structure is repeated' (Travis 2007: 101). This phenomenon has been studied under the realms of psycholinguistic (Bock 1986, Branigan, Pickering, & Cleland 2000a, Harsuiker, Pickering, & Veltkamp 2004), sociolinguistic (Poplack 1980, Scherre & Naro 1991, Scherre 1997, Cameron & Flores-Ferrán 2003, Travis 2005b, 2007), and corpus-based analysis (Gries 2005, Szmrecsanyi 2005; 2006) (cf. Travis 2007:101). Specifically in regard to morphology, studies by Poplack (1980), Scherre & Naro (1991, 1992), Scherre (2001) and Travis (2005b, 2007) found that morphological markers—in these cases, the expression of subject pronouns—displayed a priming effect over a series of clauses. Likewise, studies of

priming including syntactic variables (Levelt and Kelter 1982, Weiner & Labov 1983, Gries 2005) also concluded that priming effect influenced speaker-choice. This information led us to believe that it could be possible for a priming effect to occur with morphosyntactic phenomena, such as past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs.

These studies have determined that priming, or the repetition of a linguistic structure throughout discourse, can play an influential role in the choice of one variant over another. Therefore, we predicted to observe a priming effect on the past-tense aspectual form of stative verbs; that is, it was expected that if the preceding verb was applied with a particular variant (Preterit, PP, or Imperfect), the subsequent verbal form would also be applied with the same aspectual marking, as in examples (2.29) and (2.30).

(2.29) Bueno, en general, no **fue** (PRET1) mala. Pero, la profesora, la monja de matemáticas **fue** (PRET2) terrible. **Fue** (PRET3) terrible. (I, f58)  
 ‘Well, in general, it [her experience with nuns] was (PRET1) not bad. But, the teacher, the math nun was (PRET2) terrible. She was (PRET3) terrible.’

(2.30) ¡Uf! Y entonces **estaba** (IMP1) en un “Number One” de de muy de moda. **Había** (IMP2) otra discoteca en la carretera de Madrid que **se llamaba** (IMP3) “La Coque” que también **estaba** (IMP4) muy de moda. (XV, f59)  
 ‘Oh! Back then the in a “Number One” was (IMP1) very popular. There was (IMP2) another discotheque on the highway to Madrid that was (IMP3) called “La Coque” that also was (IMP4) very popular.’

Some studies testing the priming effect limited the distance of the priming to primed structure to only the preceding adjacent clause (Poplack 1980, Cameron 1994, also see Travis 2007:107), whereas other studies extended this context to up to five (Weiner & Labov 1983) or ten clauses (Flores-Ferrán 2002). In the present analysis, we chose to limit the scope of the priming effect on aspectual morphology to the two preceding clauses.

While structural ‘persistence’, or priming, was one of the internal factor groups considered having an influence on speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology in *salmantino*

Spanish, it was also recognized that the subsequent repetition of aspectual markings may not be due to priming, but rather it could be related to the structure of the narrative itself. For instance, since perfective aspect is commonly used to express successive events in complicating action clauses in narration (Reid 1976, Hopper 1979b, 1982, Silva-Corvalán 1983), it could be possible that contiguous perfective aspectual markers occur in order to move the storyline along the temporal axis. Therefore, another desired outcome of incorporating this factor group into the analysis was to determine whether the cognitive mechanisms behind priming have a greater impact on the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology or whether it was a discourse function of the narrative.

#### 2.5.1.4 Collocation

The fourth linguistic factor group considered, Collocation, was included in order to discover if past-tense aspectual morphology was conditioned by the presence of another grammatical structure linked to the verbal form, otherwise known as (grammatical) collocations. Collocations are defined as ‘characterizations of a word in terms of the other words that typically co-occurs with’ (Biber 2000:289). It was expected that verb + *como* (2.31), verb + infinitive (2.32), and verb + gerund (2.33) to disfavor the perfective-stative form, since these are typical constructions denoting background descriptions to support narrative detail (i.e., imperfective aspect).

(2.31) Y yo tenía un puesto de trabajo, que yo estaba **como** encargada en una tienda. (XVI, f40)  
 ‘And I had a job, that I was (IMP) **like** in charge of a store.’

(2.32) No me podía **colocar** en una empresa a trabajar, mi padre quería que hiciera algo más. (I, f58)  
 ‘He could not **put** (IMP) me in a company to work, my father wanted [that] I do something more.’

(2.33) Mi marido ya estaba allí **trabajando** de cartero y. . .y. . .ya aquel tiempo, ¿eh? (XX, f60)  
 ‘My husband was (IMP) already there **working** as a mailman and. . .and. . .en that time, right?’

The factors verb + *bien* ‘well’, verb + *mal* ‘bad’, and verb + nothing were also expected to disfavor the perfective-stative form also due to their use in backgrounded information.

### 2.5.1.5 Clause type

The fifth linguistic factor group, Clause Type, was incorporated into the analysis to corroborate the findings of Klein-Andreu (1991), which revealed that the type of clause (i.e., main or subordinate) played a role in determining if the state/action was considered high-focused (i.e., states/actions in main clauses) or low-focused (i.e., states/actions in subordinate clauses) in narratives. She also discovered that of all of the subordinate clauses, complement clauses were typically ‘more foregrounded than other subordinate presentations’ (Klein-Andreu 1991:173). Even with that said, however, we expected that imperfective aspect to favor subordinate clauses—specifically, relative clauses (2.34), object complement clauses (2.35), or adverbial/causal clauses (2.36)—and perfective aspect would favor main clauses (2.37). We justified this hypothesis because according to Reid (1976), Hopper (1979, 1982) and Klein-Andreu (1991), the main clause was the sentence where the high-focused (foregrounded) content of a narrative was situated, thus, favoring perfective aspect.

(2.34) Allí encontramos a la madre superiora y la profesora de gimnasia  
**que era una monja.** (XVII, f31)

‘There we found the mother superior and the gym teacher  
**who was (IMP) a nun.**

(2.35) Pero claro, él ya sabía  
**que mi mamá tenía ocho hijos.**

‘But of course, he already knew  
**that my mother had (IMP) eight children.’**

(2.36) Entonces, he tenido una infancia muy bonita  
**porque éramos una piña con mis hermanas.** (XII, f62)

‘So, I had a very beautiful childhood  
**because we were (IMP) a clan with my sisters.’**

- (2.37) **Primero estuve un año**  
y me vine. (XV, f58)  
'**First I was (PRET) there a year**  
and I came back.'

### 2.5.1.6 Sentence type

The sixth linguistic factor group, Sentence Type, was used to explore Klein-Andreu's (1991) conclusion that the polarity of a sentence could predict whether or not a sentence is considered a foregrounded event or a backgrounded detail in narration. The correlation between grounding strategies and the variable of our study was extremely relevant especially since the literature reported that the vast majority of foregrounded clauses were applied with perfective aspect and, in opposition, backgrounded clauses were commonly applied with imperfective aspect. In addition, since Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:19) affirmed that '[n]egation is said to atelicize, yielding a continuative (perfect of persistent situation) meaning (e.g., Squartini & Bertinetto 2000:412)', we therefore expected the negative sentences containing past-tense stative verbs to favor imperfective aspect, as in example (2.38).

- (2.38) Entonces se trasladaba el agua desde los caños hasta la casa, eh **no había** agua corriente te estoy hablando hace cuarenta años. (XXIV, m55)  
'They one used to transfer the water from the fountains to the house, uh there was (IMP) **not** running water I am talking [about] forty years ago.'

In this factor group we also included the nature of the predicate itself, in other words, whether the sentences were declarative or interrogative, as in (2.39) and (2.40) respectively.

- (2.39) Entonces no, el colegio era nuestra casa. (VII, f48)  
'Then no, the school was (IMP) our house.'

- (2.40) **¿Cuándo estaba embarazada?** Pues, cuando llegaba el mes y tenía dos, tres días de retraso, ya estaba. (XII, f62)  
'**When I was (IMP) pregnant?** Well, when the month came and I [was] two, three days late, I was already [pregnant].'

### 2.5.1.7 Locative expression

The seventh linguistic factor group, Locative Expressions, was included to corroborate the results of our preliminary study of *estar* ‘be’ in *madrileño* Spanish. A locative adverb or phrase gives specific reference to the location of a state or an action. This factor group was only tested with the verb *estar* in our study, mainly since the presence of a locative adverb or phrase is most applicable to this verb. In Knouse (2008), it was found that when a locative adverb or phrase was present in the linguistic context, speakers favored the perfective form of *estar* (.75); conversely, when a locative phrase was not present in the linguistic context, the perfective form of *estar* was disfavored by *madrileño* speakers (.34).

Therefore, we believed the same would hold true for the *salmantino* community: if there was a locative deictic adverb (e.g. *aquí* ‘here’, *allí* ‘there’, *ahá* ‘over there’) or a locative prepositional phrase (e.g. *en la casa* ‘in the house’) in the clause surrounding the token, then we expected the speaker to favor the use of perfective variant of *estar*.<sup>16</sup> Likewise, if a locative adverb or phrase did not co-occur with past-tense *estar*, we expected the imperfective form to be preferred. Even though throughout time the verb *estar* ‘be located’ has semantically lost the spatial meaning in some contexts throughout the centuries (Torres Cacoullós 2001: 447), it was hypothesized that present-day *salmantino* speakers reinforce the exact location of the action by using perfective aspect with a locative element, as in example (2.41).

(2.41) En Portugal, no te digo todas las veces, pero hubo un año ya después de divorciada que fui con las amigas de Madrid que fue fantástico. Que **estuve en Estoril**.  
‘En Portugal, I won’t tell [about] all of the times, but there was a year after being divorced that I went with some friends from Madrid that was fantastic. I was (PRET) **in Estoril**.’

---

<sup>16</sup> See Torres Cacoullós (2001:455) for an exhaustive list of locative expressions. This same taxonomy was used in the present investigation.

### 2.5.1.8 Prepositional phrase

The eighth linguistic factor group, the presence or absence of a preposition phrase, was incorporated in response to the findings of Biber (1992). He proposed that the presence of prepositional phrases (among other linguistic elements) add to the ‘integrated structure’ of a text and that these phrases ‘reflect a highly informational focus and a relatively dense integration of information in a text’ (Biber 2000:303). The results of his 1992 study revealed that different genres have varied degrees of use of integrated and non-integrated (or framing) structures; it was found that interviews used less integrated structures than written genres, but more than most other spoken varieties. Therefore, we felt it appropriate to test if the presence or absence of a prepositional phrase added to the ‘highly informational focus’ of the content. It was hypothesized that if there was a prepositional phrase present in the linguistic context, the speaker would favor the use of perfective aspect, also used for high-focused content (Hopper 1979b, 1982). Similarly, if there was not a prepositional phrase present, an imperfective-stative was expected. It is also important to note that prepositional phrases, such as *en* ‘in’ + place, were excluded from analysis when analyzing the verb *estar* in order to avoid interaction between this factor group and the Locative Expression factor group.

### 2.5.1.9 Verb class of main verb

The ninth linguistic factor group, Verb Class of Main Verb, was included to examine if the modal verbs (e.g. *poder* ‘be able’+ infinitive, *deber* ‘should’ + infinitive, *necesitar* ‘need’ + infinitive, *querer* ‘want’ + infinitive) or other forms with more than one verbal element (e.g. *tener que* ‘have to’+ infinitive, *estar* ‘be’ + gerund) could predict past-tense aspectual choice of the stative finite form. The factors classified in this factor group were stative verbs (e.g. *ser* ‘be’ *estar* ‘be’ *existir* ‘exist’) (2.42), perception and psychological verbs (e.g. *oír* ‘hear’, *ver* ‘see’, *desear* ‘want’) (2.43), motion verbs (e.g. *ir* ‘go’, *salir* ‘leave’, *venir* ‘come’) (2.44), speaking

verbs (e.g. *decir* ‘say’, *preguntar* ‘ask’) (2.45), dynamic verbs (e.g. *trabajar* ‘work’, *hacer* ‘do’) (2.46), and change-of-state verbs (e.g. *ponerse* ‘become’, *matar* ‘kill/die’, *decidir* ‘decide’)(2.47).

(2.42) Tenía que estar pendiente, éramos muchos, y nos tenía todos muy bien ubicados. (XII, f62)  
‘She had to (IMP) **be** very vigilant, we were many [children], and she had us very well located.’

(2.43) Y pues, tampoco podía ver eh revistas sucias, pues los cuerpos, el cuerpo, al nivel de cuerpo no podías tocarte, no podías. (X, f48)  
‘And well, I could (IMP) not **see** uh dirty magazines, well the bodies, the boy, on the level of the body you could not touch yourself, you could not.’

(2.44) Entonces tuvimos que ir al hospital a que le dieron un punto. (XXV, m29)  
‘So we had to (PRET) **go** to the hospital [to] that they gave him stitches.’

(2.45) Y luego estuvo explicando mi hermano mayor: “Pero mujer, ¿cuando te lleva a la cama no ves que tiene las sábanas blancas? Pues ese es.” (VII, f48)  
‘And then he was (PRET) **explaining** to me my older brother: “But woman, when she tasks you to bed don’t you see that it has white sheets? Well that’s it.”’

(2.46) Entonces desde allí nos trasladamos a distintos sitios para recordar Santiago, la Coruña, todos estuvimos haciendo todo, toda una anécdota todo el mes que estuvimos allí. (I, f58)  
‘So from there we moved from different places to remember Santiago, la Coruña, we all were (PRET) **doing** everything, an entire anecdote the entire month that we were there.’

(2.47) Al final tuvo que decidir entre su familia y la política. (XX, f60)  
‘At the end, she had to (PRET) **choose** between his family and politics.’<sup>17</sup>

We predicted for speakers to apply perfective aspect to the finite stative with a main verbs that expressed a telic, punctual action, as in (2.44), (2.45), (2.46) and (2.47); conversely, if the infinitive or gerund form expressed a durative or static condition, as in (2.42) and (2.43), imperfective aspect in the finite stative was expected.

---

<sup>17</sup> In example (2.47), verbs like *decidir* ‘decide’ were considered a change-of-state verb because once the action was performed, the nature of the situation would be different, thus forever changed.

### 2.5.1.10 Adjective/past participle

The tenth linguistic factor group included in the analysis, the presence of an Adjective or Past Participle, was incorporated to verify if a stative + adjective/past participle had an influence on the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology. It was originally hypothesized that a stative verb + adjective/past participle would disfavor perfective aspect, since these constructions would be used to describe backgrounded conditions, as in (2.48).

(2.48) I: ¿Cómo te sentías?

P: Como la mujer más feliz del mundo, era, estaba muy **contenta**, con mi boda, con mi vestido, con mis amigas, estaba mi familia, todo el mundo ahí, no faltaba nadie, pues, además todo salió muy bien, después de todo, así que muy bien.

I: 'How did you feel?

P: Like the happiest woman on earth, I was (IMP), I was (IMP) very **happy**, with my wedding, with my dress, with my friends, my family was there, everyone there, nobody was missing, well, on top of it all everything went very well, after everything so very well.'

Yet, we reconsidered this hypothesis in light of Biber (1992) which found that adjectives, like prepositional phrases, added to the highly informational content of the text, which could imply the use of perfective aspect, as in (2.49).

(2.49) Luego estuve aquí, estuve un poco de tiempo **rebajado** como accidentado y tal, y luego ya me mandaron la cartilla, y hasta ahora.

'Then I was here, I was (PRET) for a bit of time **under the weather** by accident and such, and then they sent me to records, and until now.'

Therefore, we expected perfective aspect to be favored when co-occurring with adjectives or past participles and to disfavor perfective aspect without one of these elements present in the linguistic context. This factor group was initially included as a factor in the Collocation factor group, but it had to be analyzed separately since many times adjectives/past participle also co-occurred with the collocations verb + gerund, verb + *como* and verb + infinitive. Note that when verb + *bien* or verb + *mal* was present in the linguistic context, which also functioned to describe

‘highly informational’ content, we excluded the possibility of an adjective to occur during the coding process in order to eliminate a cross-over effect in the data.<sup>18</sup>

### **2.5.1.11 Transitivity**

The eleventh and twelfth linguistic factor groups considered—Number of Participants and Individuation of the Object—, were grouped under the heading of ‘Transitivity’ based on Hopper & Thompson’s (1980) alternative analysis of the concept, as explained in §1.4.3. To reiterate, the authors argued that transitivity is not simply the presence of a verb and its object(s), but rather verbal predicates should be classified as more or less transitive, based on a continuum of Transitivity. Therefore, the authors established a set of linguistic parameters, including the two incorporated into the present study, to examine if an utterance was high or low on the transitive scale (cf. Hopper & Thompson 1980:252). Some of these categories were not considered in the present analysis since they would have overlapped with the variable context (i.e., Kinesis, Aspect, Punctuality), were not found in the variable context (i.e., Mode), or were already included as another linguistic factor group in the present analysis (i.e., Agency and Affirmation). The remaining factor groups in Hopper & Thompson’s (1980) analysis, Volition and Affectedness of the Object, were not incorporated into the analysis since they were unable to be faithfully replicated.

The eleventh factor group, Number of Participants, was divided into if the utterance included i) one participant or ii) two or more participants. The eleventh factor group, individuation of the object, was labeled as i) human/animate singular, ii) human/animate plural, iii) inanimate singular or iv) inanimate plural, which was a compromise between the classification in Klein-Andreu (1991:171) that only coded for animate/inanimate objects and

---

<sup>18</sup> When coding, to eliminate the consideration of a certain factor, one can mark it with a slash (/) and the program does not include the example in the analysis of the factor group.

Hopper & Thompson (1980:253) that coded for individuated (proper, human/animate, concrete, singular, count, referential) and non-individuated (common, inanimate, abstract, plural, mass, non-referential). Also, if the stative verb did not include an object, consequently the twelfth group was not applicable and excluded from analysis.

The relevance of the collective Transitivity factor groups for the present study related to grounding strategies in discourse. According to Hopper & Thompson (1980) and Klein-Andreu (1991:170), utterances high in transitivity were overwhelmingly apart of the narrative foreground, whereas those low on the transitivity scale tended to be backgrounded clauses. Especially since aspectual morphology was hypothesized to be directly correlated to grounding strategies in discourse (i.e., perfective aspect associated with foregrounding and imperfective aspect associated with backgrounding), these linguistic categories were incorporated to verify the impact of transitivity on the foregrounding and backgrounding uses exemplified in *salmantino* speech.

### **2.5.2 Social Factors**

The two social factor groups included in the study were Age and Gender, as shown in Table 2-5.<sup>19</sup> These are two essential extralinguistic factor groups that allow researchers to predict speaker-choice a linguistic variable, as well as to conclude if the variable is undergoing a (possible) change. As Chambers (1998b) revealed with phonological and lexical features of Canadian English, the incorporation of age in a variationist analysis can help the researcher determine if speakers of different generations exhibit similar or dissimilar patterns of use of a particular linguistic variable. If so, these different rates may point toward a change in progress or may indicate age-grading, which are changes in speech patterns ‘correlated with a particular

---

<sup>19</sup> We recognize that some researchers differentiate between sex and gender (cf. Chambers 1995); however, we chose to use these terms synonymously.

phase in life and repeated in successive generations' (Bailey 2002:324) and 'this retrenchment...undoes what might appear under ordinary circumstances to be an incipient linguistic change' (Chambers 2002:358). Even though age-graded patterns are 'rare' in a speech community, they can and do occur, primarily in adolescent and older generations (Chambers 1995:188, Bailey 2002:324). For that reason, adolescent participants were not asked to participate in the study, as well as *salmantinos* over the age of 70.

With regard to gender, while different patterns among females and males is not always a steadfast determiner of language change, some researchers have shown that different rates of use of a linguistic variable among the sexes can possibly point to a change in progress (Chambers 2002:352, Cheshire 2002:426, based on Labov 1990:210, 213, 215). Regardless, one can use gender to predict speaker patterns, since, according to some, it is common for there to be different patterns of language use between the sexes. For example, it has been widely accepted that women tend to use fewer stigmatized variants than men with stable sociolinguistic variables; likewise, it has also been found that women are most times the innovators of these 'bottom-up' changes (cf. Labov 1990, Chambers 1995).<sup>20</sup> Yet, many researchers do not agree with these ideas and there still is much debate in the field surrounding differences in language use as it relates to gender. With that said, however, we felt that it was important to include gender to discover if females and males exhibited differed patters of use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs.

It was considered that the Age and Gender factor groups were appropriate for the aims of our study since i) Labov highlighted (1972a:251) that 'as far as the synchronic aspect of language structure is concerned, it would be an error to put much emphasis on social factors' and

---

<sup>20</sup> As cited in Cheshire (2002:426).

ii) it was not expected for the extralinguistic factors to result as statistically-significant predictors of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. Although it would have been ideal to include socioeconomic status as another dimension of the study, due to fieldwork constraints, it was not possible to interview enough members of the *salmantino* community to account for this third extralinguistic factor. Demographic and socioeconomic data were elicited from participants, yet, not included as a formal factor in the analysis. For the reasons above, we chose to limit our study to exclusively measure these two extralinguistic factors.

### 2.5.2.1 Age

The first extralinguistic factor considered, Age, was incorporated in order to verify the hypothesis that past-tense aspectual markings of stative verbs were not undergoing change at the time of the study. The 25 participants were initially divided by decade: 19 to 29 years old (Generation 1), 30 to 39 years old (Generation 2), 40 to 49 years old (Generation 3), 50 to 59 years old (Generation 4) and 60 to 69 years old (Generation 5). Again, since age-grading can be present in apparent-time variationist investigations (cf. Chambers 2002:358-60 and Bailey 2002:324), adolescent participants were not included in my analysis. The age divisions were based on the stratification used in Chambers 1998b, as seen in Table 2-7.

Table 2-7. Initial stratification schema of the *salmantino* speech community, Age

Generation	Age (years)	Total
Generation 1	19-29	3
Generation 2	30-39	2
Generation 3	40-49	7
Generation 4	50-59	7
Generation 5	60-69	6
TOTAL		25

With that said, we also considered other stratification schemas that reflected a more balanced distribution of participants, as in Table 2-8, with the hope to discover if age could predict speaker

choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. This distribution was not arbitrary. In fact, these divisions were based on a major event in Spanish life, the end of the Franco regime in 1975 and the transition to democracy from 1975-1981. During Franco’s rule from 1939-1975, it was forbidden to use languages native to Spain other than *castellano* ‘Castilian Spanish’ (i.e., Catalan, Galician, Basque) and the government had tight control over censure and micromanaged language use. Yet, after the dictatorship, there was more freedom of expression in both the public and private sectors. Due to these different atmospheres, it was predicted that those *salmantinos* educated primarily during Franco’s reign could possibly exhibit different patterns of past-tense aspectual morphology. Therefore, speakers 15 years of age and younger at the time of Franco’s death (1975) were grouped into one category, while speakers 15 years and older were grouped into the other, as seen in Table 2-8.

Table 2-8. Second stratification schema of the *salmantino* speech community, Age

Generation	Age (years)	TOTAL
Generation 1	19-48	11
Generation 2	49-65	14
TOTAL		25

### 2.5.2.2 Gender

The second extralinguistic factor, Gender, included 20 female participants and 5 male participants, as shown in Tables 2-9 and 2-10. It is recognized it would have been ideal to have a more distributed number of female to male participants; yet, due to time constraints and fieldwork conditions, it was difficult to find male participants. With more time, we feel confident that further connections to *salmantino* community could have been made which would have increased the number of male participants. The reasons we attribute to finding more females than males to participate were possibly because i) it was easier to solicit female participants, since the researcher was also a female in-group member and ii) females were more accessible to meet during the day for interviews than males.

Table 2-9. Distribution of the *salmantino* speech community by age and gender , initial version

Generation	Age (years)	Female	Male	TOTAL
Generation 1	19-29	2	1	3
Generation 2	30-39	1	1	2
Generation 3	40-49	7	0	7
Generation 4	50-59	6	1	7
Generation 5	60-69	4	2	6
TOTAL		20	5	25

Table 2-10. Distribution of the *salmantino* speech community by age and gender, revised version

Generation	Age (years)	Female	Male	TOTAL
Generation 1	19-48	9	2	11
Generation 2	49-65	11	3	14
TOTAL		20	5	25

To reiterate, since there had been no prior evidence suggesting that a certain past-tense aspectual form was stigmatized in the *salmantino* community, or had there been indicators pointing toward an undergoing language change at the time of the study, it was hypothesized that the social factors would not be as influential in shaping past-tense aspectual choice of stative verbs as the linguistic factors. While the results of these social factor groups were hypothesized to corroborate these previous suspicions, it was necessary to include these factors to do just so.

### 2.5.3 Stylistic Factors

Intra-speaker variation is ‘stylistic variation in the speech of individual speakers’ (Schilling-Estes 2002:375). In order to account for this variation among members of a particular social factor group (i.e., social class, socioeconomic status, age, etc.), William Labov designed the Attention to Speech Model in aims to elicit a range of speech styles during the sociolinguistic interview based on the formal-informal continuum. Style was not analyzed as such in our study, since there was only one task used in the analysis: open-ended interview questions. With that said, however, we did incorporate other stylistic factors into the analysis per the teachings of Labov and other pioneering sociolinguists.

### 2.5.3.1 Time in interview

The first stylistic factor considered, Time in the Interview, was created to test the notion of vernacular speech. According to Labov (1984:29), it is necessary to exclude the first 10-15 minutes of the sociolinguistic interview to allow participants to ‘ease into the vernacular’, as the experimental conditions make it difficult for participants to do so within the first minutes of the taping. To test this theory, the interview was divided according to the beginning of the interview (i.e., 0-10 minutes) and the remainder of the interview (i.e., 10 minutes and after) to examine if there was a shift in past-tense aspectual morphological use according to when the token occurred in the interview. Table 2-11 reports the distribution of the variants according to these divisions.

Table 2-11. Distribution of past-tense aspectual variants according to time in the interview

Time	Preterit		PP		Imperfect		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-10 minutes	182	17.9%	48	4.7%	788	77.4%	1018	22.6%
10+ minutes	750	21.5%	241	6.9%	2502	76.0%	3493	77.4%
TOTAL	932	20.6%	289	6.4%	3290	72.9%	4511	100%

### 2.5.3.2 Audience design

The second stylistic factor group, Audience Design, was based on Bell’s (1984, 2001) Audience Design Model. In contrast to Labov’s Attention to Speech Model, Bell (1984) argued that speakers adapt speech according to the members present, referred to, or addressed during the communicative situations, not according to the formality of the situation. Bell (2001:145) also discussed that ‘the variation on the style dimension within the speech of a single speaker *dervies from and echoes* the variation which exists between speakers on the “social” dimension.’ This theory takes into account that speakers are cognizant of their addressees and accommodate the way they speak to others, taking in to account the different community members present. These ‘overhearers’—or people not involved in the conversation, but known to be within hearing

distance—were present in four of the ten interviews that were collected in public spaces, namely cafés. It is also possible that eavesdroppers—‘ungratified persons who are not known to be present’ could have overheard the conversation as well (Schilling-Estes 2002:382). The other six interviews took place in the common area of the resident hall where the researcher resided while in Salamanca; there was no one else present during these interviews at this location. Congruent to Bell’s theory, the “P” (Participants) of Hymes’ SPEAKING theory recommends for researchers to be cognizant of all the participants present during the communicative situation (Schiffirin 1994:141-2). In efforts to operationalize the theories of both Bell and Hymes, we coded for i) one-on-one interviews, where no other community member was present except for the interviewee, ii) auditor, which referred to a community member present during the interview (usually a family member who lived with the interviewee) that was within hearing distance of the conversation and iii) eavesdropper, the presence of a community member who may or may not have overheard what was said in the interview, usually in a café or another public setting.

## **2.6 Variable Rule Analysis**

Once the coding was complete, the data were quantitatively analyzed, which is a pivotal step of any variationist study. At the beginning of the variationist enterprise, Labov (1972a:226) stressed his position that ‘there are no intuitive judgments accessible to reveal [linguistic competence] to us’ and ‘only with quantitative data. . .can [we] arrive at convincing demonstrations [of a particular phenomenon]’ (Labov 1972a:236). Variationist analysis began to incorporate quantitative measures in response to the limitations of generativist grammar methodologies and to address preconceived notions that variation in language was random and unsystematic. VARBRUL (GoldVarb X)—the multivariate logistic regression program made by sociolinguists for sociolinguists—offers researchers a powerful tool to facilitate the discovery and interpretation of linguistic patterns (cf. Guy 1993, Bayley 2002, Paolillo 2002). VARBRUL

programs are the statistic software of choice among variationist because: i) they more suitable than programs such as ANOVA and more affordable than SPSS (Bayley 2002:124), ii) it was developed before other logistic regression programs were in available (Paolillo 2002:16), and iii) VARBRUL reports the probabilities, while other commercial packages do not present the material in such a practical format.<sup>21</sup> For these reasons, we incorporated GoldVarb X (D. Sankoff, Tagliamonte & Smith 2005) to analyze the linguistic variable in the present study.

VARBRUL programs calculate the input probability of the dependent variable—or the likelihood that the application value (in our study, perfective-stative) is used without the contextual and extralinguistic factors—, as well as probabilistic weights within factor groups to determine the likelihood of co-occurring with the application value (Bayley 2002:126-7). To identify which contextual and extralinguistic factor groups are significant, VARBRUL runs a stepping-up and a stepping-down (i.e., comparing all the factor groups in a stepwise manner) and arrives at the model that is the best fit for the data. Likewise, factor groups are given range from which magnitude can be calculated; this indicates the (relative) strength the factor group exerts over the dependent variable. Within the factor groups, factors that are greater than 0.50 favor the application value, whereas factors less than 0.50 are said to disfavor the application value. Likewise, VARBRUL provides details on the study-design: i) the Chi-square value indicates if interactions between the factor groups are present, ii) the log-likelihood value shows the goodness-of-fit of the model, or the best representative model of exactly what is ‘going on’ (Bayley 2002:126), and iii) the p-value informs the researcher the smallest fixed level at which the null hypothesis can be rejected. Therefore, VARBRUL programs offer probabilities of co-

---

<sup>21</sup> Bivariate statistical programs like ANOVA are designed for controlled experiments with an even distribution of tokens; they cannot handle the varied amount of tokens per cell, or the amount of cells themselves. Thus, these programs are unsuitable for the variable, uncontrolled nature of discourse.

occurring factor groups with the dependent variable which will: i) test hypotheses, ii) verify the reliability of the methodology, and iii) facilitate the explanation of the research interest.

Probabilistic results must involve linguistic interpretation, since these results do not offer black-and-white answers, nor should they since the complexity of language can not be explained in binary terms. The data themselves are objective facts, whereas their understanding indelibly involves an interpretive element; keen linguistic insight and a careful understanding of the variable and speech community is required for a correct analysis (D. Sankoff 1988a, Wolfram 1993:217, Butragueño 2000:11). Yet, if from the very beginning a researcher establishes a sound methodology that reflects the goals of the theoretical framework, the quantitative element may reveal that ‘it is now beyond dispute that much of the variation in language that was previously thought to be random is indeed systematic, and that eloquences, logic and clarity of expression are not the particular properties of standard languages’ (Bayley 2002:134), as well as offering great insights to the overall picture of language variation and change.

To reiterate, the corpus of the 25 interviews elicited a total of 4,511 tokens of stative verbs with past-tense aspectual morphology, which were sufficient data to make strong conclusions and generalizations after quantification (cf. Poplack 2001). Through many different analyses using GoldVarb X, we were able to determine the linguistic, social and stylistic factor groups that resulted as statistically significant to influence speaker-choice of the linguistic variable. Regardless of the groups that did or did not reach statistical significance, the program also provided us with overall percentages of the factors within the factor groups, which was useful when observing general trends and drawing conclusions about the factors that shape the use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. The results of the quantitative analyses will be discussed in the following three chapters.

## 2.7 Discourse Analysis

Even though GoldVarb X offered insightful probabilistic statistics, likelihoods and overall percentages, this was not the only means of analyzing and interpreting the *salmantino* data. The broader discursive context was analyzed—namely the various discourse clauses and how they relate to one another in face-to-face conversation—to explain the motivations behind frequency patterns and probabilities of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in Spanish. Within the narrative data, the subdivisions were based on Labov’s taxonomy of the narrative: abstract, orientation, complicating action, result/resolution and coda (cf. Jaworski & Coupland (1999:227) or Silva-Corvalán (1983) for a complete explanation of each clause), as illustrated in Table 2-12 (with the exception of an abstract and coda clause).

Table 2-12. Example of narrative discourse, participant XII

Speaker XII (f,62)	Narrative clause	English translation
I: ¿Como fue el día que enteraste de de que estabas embarazada?	<i>Proposed question</i>	I: ‘What was the day like when you found out you were pregnant?’
P: (a) ¿Cuándo <u>estaba</u> embarazada?	<i>Orientation</i>	(a) When I <u>was</u> (IMP) pregnant?
(b) Pues, cuando llegaba el mes		(b) Well, when the month came
(c) y <u>tenía</u> dos, tres días de retraso,		(c) and I [ <u>was</u> ] (IMP) two, three days late,
(d) ya <u>estaba</u> .		(d) I <u>was</u> (IMP) already [pregnant].
(e) Me dice marido, ‘calma, espérate un poco’.	<i>Complicating action (evaluative)</i>	(e) My husband tells me, ‘calm down, wait a little.’
(f) Ya iba a la farmacia a comprar al este.		(f) I was already going to the pharmacy to buy that thing.
(g) Ay, qué alegría.		(g) Ah, what joy.
(f) En seguida decirles a mis padres, a mis suegros, a mis hermanas a todo el mundo	<i>Complicating action</i>	(f) Immediately telling my parents, my in-laws, my sisters, everyone
(g) que iba a ser mamá.		(g) that I was going to be a mom.
(h) Ya mi madre haciendo jersécitos.	<i>Orientation</i>	(h) My mother already making little sweaters.
(i) Ya <u>tenía</u> yo en mi habitación cajón solamente de jerséis y gorritos.	<i>Orientation (evaluative)</i>	(i) I already <u>had</u> (IMP) in my room a drawer only for sweaters and little hats.
(j) Otro con las cositas, otro..qué ilusión.		(j) The other with little things, the other. . .what excitement.

Table 2-12. Continued.

(k) Es que mi madre me hacía muchísimas cosas.	<i>Orientation</i>	(k) It's that my mother use to make me many things.
(l) Di a luz en la casa de mi madre y mi marido, claro.	<i>Complicating action</i>	(l) I gave birth in my mother's and husband's house, of course.
(m) Porque no tienes, tienes experiencia pero no tienes experiencia.	<i>Orientation (evaluative)</i>	(m) Because you don't have, you have experience but you don't have experience.
(n) Y entonces, como <u>quedé</u> muy mal	<i>Complicating action (evaluative)</i>	(n) And then, as I <u>was</u> (PRET) very ill
(o) porque <u>eran</u> tantos esfuerzos.		(o) because there <u>were</u> (IMP) so many efforts.
(p) Lo blanco del ojo <u>era</u> todo rojo.	<i>Orientation</i>	(p) The white part of my eye <u>was</u> (IMP) completely red.
(q) Se me rompieron las veinitas de tanto esfuerzo, fatal.	<i>Complicating action (evaluative)</i>	(q) The little veins in my eye broken on me from such effort, awful.
(r) Es que lo pasé muy mal. Lo pasé muy. . .		(r) It's that it was very bad for me. It was very. . .
(s) y además es que <u>fueron</u> 48 horas, y solita.	<i>Orientation clause (evaluative)</i>	(s) And even more it's that they <u>were</u> (PRET) 48 hours, and alone.
I: ¿Y solita?		I: And alone?
P: (t) Horrible. Mis padres y mi marido y todos fuera.	<i>Orientation clause (evaluative)</i>	P: (t) Horrible. My parents and my husband and everyone outside.
(u) “Qué tal, pero todavía está muy verde. Todavía está muy verde.”	<i>Complicating action</i>	(u) “How is everything, but still she's not ready. Still not ready.”
(v) Y allí esperando.		(v) And there waiting.
(w) Y bueno cuando nació mi niña, ffffh. . .	<i>Result/resolution clause (evaluative)</i>	(w) And well when my daughter was born. phhhewh. . .
(x) <u>fue</u> una alegría.		(x) It <u>was</u> (PRET) a joy.

Silva-Corvalán (1983) analyzed the past-tense aspectual system of narratives in Chilean and Mexican Spanish according to this classification. She discovered that abstracts, complicating actions, resolutions, and codas favored the perfective form of the verb, while orientation clauses favored the imperfective form. Evaluations, another key ingredient to the narrative, have been defined as those clauses that express a subjective point-of-view. Silva-Corvalán (1983:774) also emphasized that evaluations in narratives served to highlight the main points of the story, making questions like ‘So what?’ obsolete. Similarly, Labov (1972a:231) described it as ‘its *raison d'être*’: why [the story] was told, and what the narrator is ‘getting at’; the speaker offered his or

her subjective viewpoint on a personal experience. Schiffrin (1994:284) also affirmed that in evaluations ‘speakers can also modify clause syntax as a way of revealing the point (cf. general proposition) of the story.’ The subjective nature of evaluation clauses was considered central to understanding how *salmantino* speakers chose past-tense aspectual markings of stative verbs, especially since these speakers could convey their personal perspective through the use of a particular morphological marker. Per previous analyses (cf. Gili Gaya 1964, Guitart 1978, Butt & Benjamin 1994), it was hypothesized that *salmantino* Spanish-speakers might impose subjectivity via tense/aspect/mood (TMA) categories, including past-tense aspectual morphology.<sup>22</sup> Based on Silva-Corvalán (1983:778), it was proposed that clauses containing an evaluative viewpoint would co-occur with past-tense stative verbs applied with perfective aspect, since perfective aspect can have subjective viewpoint functions (Comrie 1976:17).

To reiterate §1.4, discourse analysis was incorporated to situate the linguistic variable in context and to provide qualitative interpretations of the quantitative findings. This analytic component was imperative to accurately address the research questions, since it was through natural discourse that these past-tense aspectual markings acquired function(s), and it was in natural discourse that these patterns were found (cf. Bybee et al. 1994). A qualitative analysis above the sentence level provided further evidence of the discourse functions of stative verbs applied with either perfective or imperfective aspect in discourse, since the function that a grammatical element performs can only be revealed when looking at the broader discursive context (Givón 1979, Hopper 1982, Fleischman & Waugh 1991).

---

<sup>22</sup> It is important to clarify that evaluative clauses—otherwise known as subjective elements sprinkled throughout the narrative—coincide with the other narrative clause types and involve an element of interpretation to determine if the clause is indeed evaluative or not. Therefore, it was necessary to analyze narrative clauses qualitatively, not quantitatively, since we wanted to ensure that all quantitative factor groups were able to be replicated by any linguist.

## CHAPTER 3 SOCIAL AND STYLISTIC FACTORS

In this chapter we will examine how social and stylistic factors came into play in the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. Even though we expected for the linguistic factors to have a stronger impact on the linguistic variable than these other two categories of factors—since many times language use is determined by internal rather than external features (Labov 1972a:251)—, it was indeed possible that social and stylistic factors may also play a role in variant choice. Since language ‘is primarily a cultural or social product and must be understood as such’ and ‘[the study of language in social context] may mean for the interpretation of human conduct in general’ (Sapir 1929:76-7), we wanted to make sense of the linguistic patterns found in the 25 *salmantino* interviews vis-à-vis the social and stylistic influences which are ingrained and reflected in language use.<sup>1</sup>

### 3.1 Social Factors

The two social factor groups included in the analysis were Age and Gender. As explained in §2.5.2, these factor groups were incorporated into the investigation since systematic changes across successive generations and different rates of use between the sexes can *possibly* indicate a linguistic change in progress (Bailey 2002:324, Chambers 2002:352, Cheshire 2002:426). On the other hand, even if the variable is not undergoing change, social factors can provide defining characteristics of a social group within a speech community and can be used to predict a speaker’s preference of one variant over another. Table 3-1 reports the distribution of the *salmantino* speech community according to age and gender. Initially, the participants were divided into 10-year generations (Table 3-2); however, the results with this distribution did not show a good model of fit since the participants per cell were not well distributed (see Appendix

---

<sup>1</sup> As quoted by Chambers (1995:1).

B for these results); therefore, we opted to analyze the social factors according to the divisions in Table 3-1. Likewise, it was explained in §2.5.2 that the generation divisions in Table 3-1 accounted for those participants raised toward the end of Franco’s regime or afterward (i.e., born in or after 1960, 19-48 years of age at the time of the interview) and those brought up during the era known as *el franquismo* (i.e., born before 1960, 49-65 years of age at the time of the interview).<sup>2</sup>

Table 3-1. Distribution of the *salmantino* speech community by age and gender, final version

Generation	Age (years)	Female	Male	TOTAL
Generation 1	19-48	9	2	11
Generation 2	49-65	11	3	14
TOTAL		20	5	25

Table 3-2. Distribution of the *salmantino* speech community by age and gender, initial version

Generation	Age (years)	Female	Male	TOTAL
Generation 1	19-29	2	1	3
Generation 2	30-39	1	1	2
Generation 3	40-49	7	0	7
Generation 4	50-59	6	1	7
Generation 5	60-69	4	2	6
TOTAL		20	5	25

This generation distinction was extremely pertinent because i) the education during the years of Franco’s dictatorship was very different from the education during and after the transition to democracy (e.g. number of children able to receive education, freedom of expression), ii) the regime created and promoted language policy which prohibited the use of any other language other than Castilian Spanish in all domains of public and private life, and iii) the regime also closely controlled the contents of printed material (Kattán-Ibarra 1997:212-221). Anecdotally, many participants commented in the interviews that the social and cultural environment was very different during and after the dictatorship. As such, it was necessary to reflect this major societal

<sup>2</sup> *El franquismo* or ‘franquism’ is defined as the political and cultural ideology during the regime of General Francisco Franco (1939-1975) that strongly promoted the censorship of any ideology not supported by the government; this was more characteristic of the first half of Franco’s rule, yet, a controlled, regulated atmosphere was omnipresent throughout the span of Franco’s term (Kattán-Ibarra 1997:221).

event in our analysis; to do so, the participants were separated according to the generation brought up during and after Franco’s rule. Furthermore, since there were an uneven number of women and men participants, it was necessary to verify that *salmantino* females and males shared similar patterns of use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs vis-à-vis the linguistic factors.<sup>3</sup> If the patterns between the sexes were very different from each other, we must then consider females and males as two different communities within the overall *salmantino* community and analyze these groups separately.

Tables 3-3 and 3-4 show us that this was not the case. Table 3-3 presents the findings of the GoldVarb analysis of the social factors of all stative verbs. We see that there was a statistically significant difference of perfective stative use between females and males, with males favoring the use of perfective aspect (.57) and females slightly disfavoring this use (.49). We see that the Generation factor group was not selected as statistically significant in predicting the use of past-tense aspectual marking of stative verbs.

Table 3-3. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, all statives

Input probability: 0.270 (27.1%) N=1221/4511				
	% Perf.	Prob.	N	% Data
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	33	.57	235	16
Female	26	.49	986	84
<i>Range</i>		8		
<b>Generation</b>				
Generation 2 (49-65 years old)	28	[.51]*	720	57
Generation 1 (19-48 years old)	25	[.48]	501	43

Log likelihood=-2627.275; p=0.000;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.0006

\*Square brackets indicate that the factor group did not reach statistical significance.

<sup>3</sup> We only analyzed the difference between women and men with all stative verbs together as there were not enough tokens from male participants to conduct separate GoldVarb analyses of the individual stative verbs.

With regard to Gender factor group, since the magnitude of effect was quite small (range=8), we decided to take a closer look at the linguistic factors that constrained female and male choice of the variable.

The GoldVarb analyses in Table 3-4 revealed that women and men were influenced by similar linguistic factors in the use of perfective and imperfective aspect. With the exception of Sentence Type, the analyses had the same statistically significant linguistic factors shaping the use of past-tense aspectual markings of all stative verbs (i.e., Temporal Determinant, Collocation, Grammatical Person, Clause Type and Prepositional Phrase) and were identically ordered in terms of magnitude of effect.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, all of the constraints within these statistically significant factor groups showed the same direction of effect, except for subordinate complement clauses; but even this difference was not too great since men were shown to not overtly favor or disfavor the use of perfective or imperfective aspect (.50) and women disfavored perfective use in these clauses (.32).

There were also differences in the constraint orderings between female and male results of Temporal Determinant (i.e., temporal sequencers and marked frame/durative) and Grammatical Person (i.e., first-person plural and inanimate subjects), since the constraints displayed the same direction of effect this difference was considered minimal. Once it was confirmed that women and men were influenced by the same linguistic constraints in regard to perfective and imperfective use, we went forward and analyzed females and males as a part of the same community.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the analysis of the linguistic factors of the *salmantino* men, Collocation and Grammatical Person shared the same magnitude of effect (range=50).

Table 3-4. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, women vs. men\*

	<i>Salmantino</i> Women Input prob.=0.227 (26.0%) N=986/3794			<i>Salmantino</i> Men Input prob.=0.277 (32.8%) N=235/717		
	%	%	Prob.	<i>N</i>	Prob.	<i>N</i>
Temporal determinant						
Punctual marker	73	.88	180	82	.90	50
Temporal sequencer	58	.78	46	72	.80	21
Marked frame/durative	61	.82	57	44	.63	8
Absent	21	.45	629	27	.45	140
General past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	11	.29	21	8	.14	3
<i>Range</i>		.59			.76	
Collocation						
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	37	.65	19	64	.85	7
Verb alone	27	.52	873	34	.53	188
Verb + gerund/infinitive/both	19	.40	91	28	.40	39
Verb + <i>como</i>	5	.15	3	6	.13	1
<i>Range</i>		.50			.72	
Grammatical person						
1s	41	.68	299	58	.72	92
1p	27	.51	107	37	.56	33
Inanimate singular	31	.57	323	28	.50	60
3s	18	.41	172	28	.48	34
3p, inanimate plural	14	.34	80	14	.26	14
2s	5	.18	5	6	.13	2
<i>Range</i>		.50			.59	
Clause type						
Main clause	29	.54	828	38	.57	215
Subordinate complement clause	22	.50	24	20	.32	3
Subordinate adverbial/causal/relative	16	.36	134	13	.25	17
<i>Range</i>		.18			.32	
Sentence type						
Affirmative	27	.51	906	ns	ns	ns
Negative	20	.43	80	ns	ns	ns
<i>Range</i>		.8		ns	ns	ns
Prepositional phrase						
Present	31	.55	264	44	.60	97
Absent	25	.49	722	28	.47	138
<i>Range</i>		.6			.13	
			Log likelihood=-1856.152 p=0.020; $\chi^2$ /cell=1.3542			Log likelihood=-344.711 p=0.009; $\chi^2$ /cell=1.5024

\*Verb Class of Main Verb did not result as statistically significant in either analysis. The code 'ns' denotes 'not selected as statistically significant'.

Yet, with regard to the individual verb analyses of social factors (Appendix C), the results of the individual verb analyses were not uniform or parallel to the findings presented in Table 3-4. After examining all of the individual verb analyses, the only individual verb analysis congruent with the results in Table 3-4 was the *estar* analysis (Table 3-5).

Table 3-5. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *estar*

Input probability: 0.241 (39.3%)				
<i>N</i> = 335/853	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Gender				
Male	58	.68	112	23
Female	34	.44	223	77
<i>Range</i>		.22		
Generation				
Generation 2 (49-65 years old)	41	[.52]	181	52
Generation 1 (19-48 years old)	38	[.48]	154	48
Log likelihood-553.877; p=0.000; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.0025				

All remaining social factor groups of the individual analyses were not selected as statistically significant in predicting past-tense aspectual morphology of statives according to these social characteristics. Thus, the results of the social factors incorporated in the present investigation did not give us enough evidence to indicate that past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs was constrained by the social characteristics of a *salmantino* community member. Even though language is inherently social and should not be considered separate of its social and cultural context, these findings show us that the use of this particular linguistic variable was not determined by the social factors of the *salmantino* community, but rather by the linguistic factors which are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. In the following section we examine how stylistic factors influenced the variable.

### 3.2 Stylistic Factors

To repeat the definition given in §2.5.3, stylistic variation is known as ‘the variation in the speech of individual speakers (intra-speaker variation) rather than across groups of speakers’

(Schilling-Estes 2002:375). Style has been incorporated into variationist analysis since the advent of the field with Labov's Attention to Speech Model (Labov 1972a). From there, other variationists have incorporated diverse theories and parameters to measure intra-speaker style (cf. Bell 1984, 2001, Eckert 2001, inter alia) and have analyzed style of various linguistic phenomena other than phonological style-shifting. In the present investigation, there were two factor groups tested via multivariate statistical analysis to measure style-shifting: Time in Interview and Audience Design. As in §3.1, we also tested style with all stative verbs together (Table 3-7), as well as individual verb analyses (Appendix D).

### 3.2.1 Time in Interview

With respect to the first factor group, Time in Interview, as standard practice in variationist research the first 10 to 15 minutes of an open-ended interview are typically discarded (cf. Labov 1972a). This is generally done since participants would not have had enough time to forget about the experimental nature of the conversation and to 'ease' into vernacular speech. In order to measure if *salmantinos* showed a statistically significant difference in the use of perfective aspect according to the time in the interview, the data were separated into two categories: i) the beginning portion of the interview (i.e., 0-10 minutes) and ii) the remainder of the interview (i.e., 10 minutes and after). Table 3-6 presents the relative frequencies of the perfective and imperfective variants; logically there were less past-tense stative variants in the beginning portion of the interview (23% [1018/4511]) than in the later portion (77% [3493/4511]). Yet, if we focus on perfective use during the different portions of the interview, the rate of perfective aspect usage increased in the later portion (28% [991/3494]) when compared to the beginning portion (23% [230/1018]). A pair-wise comparison showed that the difference of past-tense aspectual use according to the time in the interview reached statistical significance ( $\chi^2=13.32965$ ,  $p\leq 0.0003$ ).

Table 3-6. Distribution of perfective and imperfective variants according to time in the interview

Time	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
0-10 minutes	230	23%	788	77%	1018	23%
10+ minutes	991	28%	2502	73%	3493	77%
TOTAL	1221	27%	3290	73%	4511	100%

This finding was confirmed in the multivariate analysis of style of all stative verbs. Table 3-7 reports that perfective aspect was slightly favored in the later portion of the interview (.52) and slightly disfavored in the beginning ten minutes (.45). Likewise, this factor group was selected as statistically significant in the individual analyses of *ser* (Table 3-8) and LF statives (Table 3-9); the direction of effect was parallel in each of these analyses. However, in the individual *estar*, *tener* and *haber* analyses (Appendix D), this factor group was not selected as statistically significant in the use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs.

Table 3-7. GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, all statives

Input probability: 0.269 (27.1%) <i>N</i> =1221/4511					
	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data	
Audience design					
Auditor present	32	.56	366	25	
Individual interview	26	.48	567	50	
Eavesdropper present	25	.47	288	26	
<i>Range</i>		.09			
Time in interview					
10+ minutes	28	.52	991	77	
0-10 minutes	23	.45	230	23	
<i>Range</i>		.07			
Log likelihood=-2618.160; $p=0.001$ ; $\chi^2/\text{cell}=1.1732$					

One possible explanation for the results of this factor group stems from the structure of the interview. Since participants had more opportunities to narrate about specific events or situations in the later portion of the interview, more perfective stative variants were used to convey these discrete narrative actions. During the first 10 minutes, the interviewer asked general questions about the past to stimulate conversation and the participant responded to these basic inquiries (Table 2-1). Once there was a sense of rapport established between the two

interlocutors, the interviewer proposed more specific questions about concrete events and, consequently, participants relayed more personal narratives, thus, more perfective aspect was used. It is also possible that participants felt more comfortable to freely present these narratives after establishing more trust with the interviewer, even when unprompted to do so.

Table 3-8. GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *ser*

Input probability: 0.241 (24.2%)				
<i>N</i> = 402/1658	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Audience design				
Auditor present	27	.53	100	23
Individual interview	26	.52	217	51
Eavesdropper present	20	.44	85	26
<i>Range</i>		9		
Time in interview				
10+ minutes	26	.52	932	76
0-10 minutes	20	.44	324	25
<i>Range</i>		8		
Log likelihood= -912.532; p=0.046; $\chi^2$ /cell=0.6749				

Table 3-9. GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, LF stative verbs

Input probability: 0.313(31.7%)				
<i>N</i> = 271/855	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Audience design				
Auditor present	38	.56	84	26
Individual interview	32	.51	135	50
Eavesdropper present	25	.42	52	24
<i>Range</i>		14		
Time in interview				
10+ minutes	34	.53	227	77
0-10 minutes	23	.40	44	23
<i>Range</i>		13		
Log likelihood= -525.792; p= 0.035; $\chi^2$ /cell=0.0880				

### 3.2.2 Audience Design

With respect to Audience Design, this factor group was based on Bell (2001:143) who proposed that ‘speakers design their style primarily for and in response to their audience’. When the data were collected, there were three different one-on-one interview situations: i) individual

interviews with no other *salmantino* community member present, ii) interviews with the presence of another community member in the room (auditor) who occasionally interjected and iii) interviews conducted in a public space where other community members could possibly be listening in (eavesdroppers). A comparison of the probability weights of the analysis of all stative verbs (Table 3-7) as well as the individual analyses revealed that these results were rather varied. Table 3-10 reports the probability weights of the Audience Design factor group for each stative verb analysis; we find that all statives, *ser*, *estar* and LF statives selected this factor group as statistically significant in shaping past-tense aspectual use; however, this factor group was not selected as statistically significant in the *tener* and *haber* analyses.

Table 3-10. Comparison of probability weights of Audience Design and the preference of perfective aspect

Audience design	All statives	<i>ser</i>	<i>estar</i>	<i>tener</i>	<i>haber</i>	LF statives
Auditor present	.56	.53	.56	ns	ns	.56
Individual interview	.48	.52	.42	ns	ns	.51
Eavesdropper present	.47	.44	na*	ns	ns	.42
<i>Range</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>11</i>	ns	ns	<i>14</i>

\*In the *estar* analysis, the auditor and eavesdropper factor groups were combined.

It was also observed that the constraints did not follow the same direction of effect in all of the analyses that selected Audience Design as significant in conditioning past-tense aspectual choice of stative verbs. Likewise, the probability weights of Audience Design in each analysis only slightly favored or disfavored the use of perfective aspect; there was no evidence of one interview situation strongly favoring or disfavoring the variant. Therefore, it is doubtful that this stylistic factor group played a pivotal role in determining which past-tense aspectual variant speakers were more likely to use according to the interview situation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup>As discussed in §2.5.3.2, Bell (2001) also claimed that the stylistic features of a speaker is directly related to and derives from the social group(s) to which the speaker belongs. The results of the social and stylistic factors tested in the present investigation seem to have contradicted Bell's assertion that stylistic variation directly stems from social variation. We notice that in Table 3-7 the stylistic factor groups were selected as statistically significant, yet in §3.1 it was found that there was little to no difference of past-tense aspectual marking use between female and male participants or between the different generations. Therefore, these results were of particular interest since according

### 3.3 Summary

Per our hypothesis in §2.5.3, the results of the extralinguistic factor groups did not provide us with enough evidence to conclude that social or stylistic factors played a major role in conditioning the use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. There were some multivariate analyses in this chapter that did select certain social and stylistic factor groups as statistically significant in shaping the use of perfective or imperfective aspect; however, this influence was minimal since the results were quite varied and inconsistent throughout the individual verb analyses. The fact that extralinguistic factors did not play a pivotal role in shaping speaker-choice of this linguistic variable was not surprising since, in Labov's terms (1972a:251), 'the great majority of linguistic rules are quite remote from any social value.'

It is important to underscore that even though past-tense aspectual morphology was not used differently by the various *salmantino* social groups analyzed in this chapter, this finding does not indicate that aspectual choice is isolated from these extralinguistic factors all together. To reiterate, language is inherently a social phenomenon since it is always performed in a social context. These results simply indicated that one cannot predict the preference of perfective or imperfective aspectual markings of stative verbs according to the age or gender of a *salmantino* participant, not that this linguistic variable was not used in a social situation. In the following two chapters, we analyze how the linguistic factors conditioned speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs to uncover if the patterns of variation were internally motivated.

---

to Bell (2001:145) differences in style 'carry social meaning'; however, in this investigation, this did not appear to be the case.

## CHAPTER 4 LINGUISTIC FACTORS OF ALL STATIVE VERBS

In present chapter, we report and discuss the linguistic factors found to influence how *salmantino* speakers used past tense aspectual morphology throughout the sociolinguistic interviews. We begin by presenting the multivariate analyses for all stative verbs together and subsequently discuss the factor groups selected as statistically significant, as well as those not selected as significant. We also offer possible explanations of the motivating factors behind the choice of one variant, always emphasizing that the discursive context is crucial in the use and understanding of past-tense aspectual markings.

It is also important to highlight how we tested the variants of the statistical analyses. In §2.4, it was explained how we delimited the envelope of variation: included were all examples of the Preterit and Imperfect, as well as a specific set of PP tokens—only those PP occurrences with perfective functions. Again, the HP was eliminated completely from the study due to a low token count.<sup>1</sup> As discussed in depth in the previous chapter, the PP and Preterit were combined as one perfective variant per the conclusions of Schwenter & Torres Cacoullós (2008); however, prior to combining these two variants as one, we analyzed the Preterit vs. Imperfect and the PP vs. Imperfect separately to ensure that both of these *perfective* variants demonstrated similar patterns of use. After comparing the results for the Preterit vs. Imperfect with the PP vs. Imperfect, all analyses—with the exception of the individual results of the verb *ser*—showed similar trends and directionality; therefore, we have chosen to only discuss those results from the perfective (Preterit/PP) vs. imperfective (Imperfect) analyses for all verbs, excluding *ser*.<sup>2</sup> Another

---

<sup>1</sup> As described in full detail in §2.3.1, no repetitions, truncated utterances or inaudible excerpts were factored into the analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Chapter 5 will present the statistical results of *ser* separately as Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect, since the individual analyses showed important differences.

important detail to mention is that while Structural Priming was included in the original analysis, this factor group had to be excluded upon combining the Preterit and PP as one (perfective) variant, since Priming was coded according each individual variant (P, HP, PP, I), not perfective primes (Preterit, PP) vs. imperfective primes. We will return to Structural Priming in §4.3.8.

#### 4.1 Overall Patterns

Table 4-1 reports the relative frequencies of the stative verbs and their respective variants as observed in the *salmantino* corpus. As expected, the verbs *ser* (37%), *estar* (19%), *tener* (18%), and *haber* (7%) were the overall most frequent of all stative verbs, with a combined relative frequency of 81%; all other stative verbs represented the remaining 19% of the *salmantino* data. These less frequent verbs will be explained in greater detail in Chapter 5.

Table 4-1. Distribution of *ser*, *estar*, *tener* and *haber* as compared to all remaining verbs, listed by variant

Verb	Preterit		PP		Imperfect		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Ser</i> ‘be’	311	19%	91	5%	1256	76%	1658	37%
<i>Estar</i> ‘be (located)’	238	28%	97	11%	518	61%	853	19%
<i>Tener</i> ‘have’	136	16%	40	5%	640	78%	816	18%
<i>Haber</i> ‘exist’	29	9%	8	2%	292	89%	329	7%
All other verbs	218	25%	53	6%	584	68%	855	19%
TOTAL	932	21%	289	6%	3290	73%	4511	100%

Additionally, Table 4-1 outlines the distribution of the past-tense aspectual variants according to the stative verb. Considering only the four most frequent statives, the Imperfect resulted as the most frequently used variant by speakers (73%), followed by the Preterit (21%), and lastly the PP (6%); even though the four most frequent stative verbs were consistent with this overall distribution, the variants of each verb had different rates of use. Starting with the most frequent verb in the corpus, *ser* ( $N=1658$ ), the variants patterned as follows: 76% Imperfect, 19% Preterit, and 5% Present Perfect. With regard to the second most frequently observed verb, *estar* ( $N=853$ ), speakers used the Imperfect less frequently than with *ser* (60%); the use of the

perfective variants increased to a total of 39% (28% Preterit and 11% PP). The third most frequent verb, *tener* ( $N=816$ ), patterned similarly to *ser*, with 75% Imperfect, 16% Preterit, and 5% PP. Lastly, the verb *haber* ( $N=329$ ) showed the highest rate of Imperfect use of these four verbs (89%) and, consequently, the lowest rates of Preterit (9%) and PP (2%) use.

#### 4.2 Further Justification of Perfective Aspect

As previously mentioned, we initially ran separate GoldVarb analyses of the Preterit vs. Imperfect (Table 4-2) and the PP vs. Imperfect (Table 4-3) before combining the Preterit and PP as one perfective variant; these analyses confirmed that both variants displayed similar trends and directionality. If we compare the results of Tables 4-2 and 4-3, we notice that both analyses display similar results. In both the Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect analyses, the factor groups Temporal Determinant, Grammatical Person, Priming, Clause Type, and Prepositional Phrase were selected as significant in conditioning speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. In addition, the factors within these statistically significant factor groups share the same direction of effect, with only minor exceptions. For instance, the Temporal Determinant factors of both analyses share the same direction of effect; however, those occurrences lacking an adverbial temporal expression in the linguistic context displayed a slightly different pattern:

in the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis the perfective form was slightly disfavored (.45), whereas in the PP vs. Imperfect analysis, the perfective form slightly favored the absence of a temporal expression (.51). This discrepancy can be explained by Tagliamonte (2006:155):

In the literature, you will often find absolute reference to factor weight over .50 being favoring and those under .50 as disfavoring. In actuality, this is not the whole truth. The contrast is not black and white, but relative. While a factor that has a weight of .59 may be said to favor the application value, its relative position in the constraint ranking is more important. For example, if it is only one factor in a group of three categories, where another factor has a weight of .85, and the other a weight on .31, then the factor with the weight of .59 is intermediary between the two.

Table 4-2 GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of Preterit applied to all past-tense stative verbs

Input probability 0.172 (22.1%)				
<i>N</i> =932/4222	% Preterit	Probability	Total <i>N</i>	% Data
Temporal determinant				
Punctual marker	71	.90	212	8
Temporal sequencer	57	.82	54	2
Marked frame/durative	48	.79	42	2
Absent	17	.45	550	82
<i>Siempre</i>	14	.42	10	2
Habitual	12	.34	6	1
General past	5	.16	5	3
<i>Range</i>		.74		
Collocation				
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	38	.71	22	1
Verb alone	23	.52	800	83
Verb + infinitive/gerund/both	18	.42	107	14
Verb + <i>como</i>	4	.14	3	2
<i>Range</i>		.57		
Grammatical person				
1s	36	.68	282	19
Inanimate singular	28	.61	328	28
1p	24	.53	107	11
3s	16	.43	160	25
Inanimate plural	11	.29	22	5
3p	7	.28	31	10
2s	2	.10	2	3
<i>Range</i>		.58		
Clause type				
Main clause	25	.55	801	76
Subordinate complement clause	14	.40	16	3
Subordinate adverbial/causal clause	14	.36	72	13
Subordinate relative clause	11	.33	43	10
<i>Range</i>		.22		
Priming				
No prime, no prime	30	.59	391	31
Prime, no prime	25	.57	114	11
No prime, prime	24	.55	187	18
Prime, prime	14	.39	240	40
<i>Range</i>		.20		
Sentence type				
Affirmative	23	.51	867	90
Negative	15	.40	65	10
<i>Range</i>		.11		

Table 4-2. Continued.

Prepositional phrase				
Present	26	.54	256	23
Absent	20	.49	676	77
<i>Range</i>		5		
Verb class (gerund/infinitive)				
Change of state	29	[.65]	9	5
Dynamic	20	[.55]	56	47
Motion/speaking	16	[.47]	29	30
Stative/psychological/perception	15	[.41]	15	16
<i>Haber</i> + participle	6	[.24]	1	3
Log likelihood= -1794.136; p= 0.033; $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.1019				

Table 4-3. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of Present Perfect applied to all past-tense stative verbs

Input probability 0.021 (8.1%) N=289/3579				
	% PP	Probability	Total N	% Data
Temporal determinant				
Marked frame/durative	33	.85	23	2
Temporal sequencer	24	.77	13	2
Punctual marker	19	.67	18	3
Absent	8	.51	223	87
Habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	2	.19	2	3
General past	1	.10	1	3
<i>Range</i>		.75		
Priming				
No prime, no prime	16	.74	179	31
No prime, prime	8	.57	50	18
Prime, no prime	6	.47	20	10
Prime, prime	3	.30	40	42
<i>Range</i>		.44		
Clause type				
Subordinate complement clause	10	.61	11	3
Main clause	9	.55	242	73
Subordinate adverbial/causal clause	5	.41	19	10
Subordinate relative clause	4	.27	17	13
<i>Range</i>		.34		
Grammatical person				
1s	18	.72	109	17
1p	9	.55	33	11
Inanimate singular, plural	7	.44	68	31
2s, 3s, 3p	5	.44	79	41
<i>Range</i>		.31		

Table 4-3. Continued.

Verb class (gerund/infinitive)				
Change-of-state/dynamic	6	.60	16	51
Stative/psychological/perception/ <i>haber</i> + participle	4	.47	4	19
Motion/speaking	3	.35	4	30
<i>Range</i>		.25		
Prepositional phrase				
Present	15	.61	130	23
Absent	9	.47	268	77
<i>Range</i>		.14		
Sentence type				
Affirmative	8	[.51]	263	89
Negative	7	[.45]	26	11
Collocation				
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	10	[.60]	4	1
Verb alone	9	[.53]	261	83
Verb + infinitive/gerund/both	5	[.37]	23	14
Verb + <i>como</i>	1	[.21]	1	2
Log likelihood= -822.723; p= 0.000; $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.0173				

Therefore, we would argue that both probabilities fall as the intermediary value of each respective analysis if the constraint ranking is taken into account, since the probabilities of Temporal Determinant of the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis ranged from .90 to .16 and the Present Perfect from .85 to .10. What is most important about this factor group is that Temporal Determinant had the highest magnitude of effect in both Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP. vs. Imperfect analyses (range=.74 and .75, respectively), indicating that temporal adverbial expressions conditioned the use of past-tense aspectual morphology more than any other factor group.

Another difference in between the Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect analyses was the direction of effect of inanimate singular subjects under the factor group Grammatical Person; all other constraints of this factor group followed the same direction of effect except for this factor. As shown in Table 4-2, inanimate singular subjects favored the Preterit form (.61),

whereas this type of subject was disfavored (.44), as seen in Table 4-3. It is believed that certain verbs like *gustar* ‘please’, *faltar* ‘miss’, *ser* ‘be’ favored the Preterit form, as opposed to the PP form, which will be discussed at length in §4.3.3 and Chapter 5, as we discuss the respective analyses of Grammatical Person and *ser*. Another difference in constraint ranking was found in the Clause Type factor group: in the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis (Table 4-2), a past-tense stative occurring in a subordinate complement clause disfavored the Preterit form (.40) and ranked second below main clause (.55), in the constraint hierarchy. These results were in line with our hypothesis (§2.5.1.5) that subordinate clauses would convey more background information than main clauses, thus, stative verbs in the latter linguistic context would disfavor the perfective form. Yet, in the PP vs. Imperfect analysis, subordinate clauses favored the PP form (.61) and changed direction of effect with main clause (.55) to become the factor with highest probability.

Aside from these mutually significant factor groups in both analyses, it is also important to point out those groups not selected as significant in either analysis: Collocation, Sentence Type, and Verb Class of Main Verb. For example, Collocation was incorporated in the analysis to verify if ‘association patterns’ or the frequent co-occurrence of grammatical features with other linguistic features played a role in speaker choice of past-tense aspectual morphology (Biber 2000:289). While this factor group was significant in the Preterit vs. Imperfect, as well as the second in terms of magnitude of effect (range=54), it was not selected as significant in the PP vs. Imperfect analysis. Yet, if we take a look at Table 4-3, one can see that the factors have a similar distribution of frequencies as in the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis: verb + *bien* ‘good/well’ or *mal* ‘bad’ had the highest rate of use with the perfective form, followed by verb alone, verb + infinitive/gerund/both, and, lastly, verb + *como* ‘like’. Likewise, Sentence Type was not selected

as significant in the PP vs. Imperfect, but was in the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis; yet, the distribution of both analyses followed the same pattern: both perfective variants co-occurred more frequently than Imperfect in affirmative sentences with *and*, consequently, less frequently in negated sentences. Additionally, if the stative verb functioned as an auxiliary (*estar* + gerund, ‘be V-ing’) or semi-auxiliary verb (*poder* + verb ‘able to + verb’, *tener que* ‘have to + verb’), the factor group Verb Class of Main Verb was used to test if the lexical aspect (*Aktionsart*) of the infinitive or gerund conditioned the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of the finite verb. We hypothesized that verbs which expressed changes-of-state or dynamic actions would favor the perfective form; we also expected those verbs expressing states, perception, or psychological frame of mind to disfavor the perfective form. In the initial Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis, this factor group was not selected as significant, however, the relative frequencies of the factors patterned congruent to our hypotheses. On the other hand, Verb Class of Main Verb was selected as significant in the PP vs. Imperfect analysis; yet, while changes-of-state and other dynamic actions favored the PP form (.60), states, perceptions and psychological frame of mind (.47) ranked higher than verbs expressing speaking and motion actions (.35).

The final notable disparity between the Preterit vs. Imperfect and Present Perfect vs. Imperfect analyses was the difference in the values for input probability, also known as the corrected mean. This number represents the ‘average frequency of occurrence of the application value of the dependent variable’ (Paolillo 2002:79, as cited in Tagliamonte 2006:156). By simply examining the overall frequencies of the Preterit (22.1%) and PP (8.1%), it was expected for the Preterit (.17) to display a higher input probability than the PP (.02). The difference of the correct mean values can be attributed to two possible and related explanations: i) only those PP forms with perfective function were included in our study; therefore the lower frequency could be due

to using only a select group of PPs from the *salmantino* data, and ii) the reason we had to include only certain PP occurrences was because in Peninsular Spanish the anterior gram is still at an intermediary stage of grammaticization and has not (yet) ousted the Preterit as the only form used in past perfective spoken contexts, as observed in other world languages (cf. Bybee et al. 1994:81). To be clear, it is not to say that the different rates of use of the Preterit and PP indicated that the two variants performed different functions in the discourse; however, before proceeding with the combination of the variants in the analysis, it was necessary to ensure that there were enough similarities to further justify combining the two variants.

As explained in this section, there were differences between the Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect analyses that were important to discuss. Yet, these differences were minimal to the overall picture of the statistical analyses. If we take a close look at Tables 4-2 and 4-3, the similarities between the two analyses outweighed the differences, as evidenced by the mutual factor groups selected as significant (Temporal Determinant, Priming, Grammatical Person, Clause Type, Prepositional Phrase); almost all of the factors within these factor groups showed the same direction of effect and even the factor groups not selected as statistically significant displayed similar patterns of relative frequencies. The decision for combining the Preterit and PP as one perfective variant was mainly supported by the justification in §2.3.2 and the conclusions of Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008)—that the PP now appears to hold the position of the ‘default perfective’ in Peninsular Spanish—; the patterns found in the individual analyses further validated our rationale for joining the two variants as one. The question of how and to what extent the PP has grammaticized to perfective function in *salmantino* Spanish has yet to be fully answered; our preliminary analyses of the Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect indicates that the selected PP occurrences pattern in a similar fashion when compared to the Preterit data.

These minor differences of the PP could be the result ‘layering’, a possible outcome of linguistic forms undergoing language change as discussed in §1.3.

Within a broad functional domain, new layers are continually emerging; in the process the older layers are not necessarily discarded, but may remain to coexist with and interact with new layers (Hopper 1991:22). Layering is the synchronic result of successive grammaticalization of forms which contribute to the same domain. (Hopper & Traugott 2003:124-5)

It is very possible that the few differences observed in the Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect data can be attributed to this layering effect and the retention of older meanings and functions: the PP forms might still preserve certain anterior characteristics, even while functioning as a perfective (cf. Bybee et al. 1994:17 on the development of *Passé Composé* in French). For now, we will leave this puzzle for future investigation. Unless otherwise indicated, the results that will be discussed from this point on will focus on the analyses of the Preterit/PP (perfective) vs. Imperfect (imperfective) to address and explain how *salmantino* speakers used past-tense aspectual morphology with stative verbs in the sociolinguistic interviews.

### **4.3 Results and Discussion of Linguistic Factors**

We predicted that the linguistic (internal) factors would condition the use of the linguistic variable more than social or stylistic factors; the results of the quantitative analysis gave us a good insight on the factors influencing past-tense aspectual morphology. Table 4-4 presents the GoldVarb results of all stative verbs in the *salmantino* corpus. In order of magnitude of effect, the linguistic factor groups selected as statistically significant in contributing to speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs was as follows: Temporal Determinant (range=72), Collocation (range=55), Grammatical Person (range=52), Clause Type (range=20), Sentence Type (range=9), and Prepositional Phrase (range=8). The factor group not selected as

Table 4-4. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic to the probability of perfective aspect applied to all past-tense stative verbs

Input probability 0.234 (27.1%)				
<i>N</i> =1221/4511	% perfective	Probability	Total <i>N</i>	% Data
<b>Temporal determinant</b>				
Punctual marker	74	.88	230	7
Temporal sequencer	62	.80	67	3
Marked frame/durative	59	.80	65	3
Absent	22	.45	769	82
Habitual	15	.32	6	1
<i>Siempre</i>	14	.32	10	2
General past	6	.16	8	2
<i>Range</i>		.72		
<b>Collocation</b>				
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	42	.69	26	1
Verb alone	28	.52	1061	82
Verb + infinitive/gerund/both	21	.41	130	14
Verb + <i>como</i>	5	.14	4	2
<i>Range</i>		.55		
<b>Grammatical person</b>				
1s	44	.69	391	20
Inanimate singular	31	.56	383	28
1p	29	.52	140	11
3s	19	.41	206	24
3p, Inanimate plural	14	.33	94	15
2s	5	.17	7	3
<i>Range</i>		.52		
<b>Clause type</b>				
Main clause	30	.55	1043	76
Subordinate complement clause	22	.48	27	3
Subordinate adverbial/causal/relative clause	16	.35	151	21
<i>Range</i>		.20		
<b>Sentence type</b>				
Affirmative	28	.51	1130	90
Negative	20	.42	91	10
<i>Range</i>		.9		
<b>Prepositional phrase</b>				
Present	34	.56	361	24
Absent	25	.48	860	76
<i>Range</i>		.8		
<b>Verb class (gerund/infinitive)</b>				
Change-of-state	29	[.58]	9	5
Dynamic	24	[.55]	72	48
Stative	20	[.52]	13	10
Motion/speaking	18	[.45]	33	29
Psychological/perception	18	[.34]	6	5
<i>Haber</i> + participle	6	[.24]	1	3

Log likelihood= -2213.259; p= 0.008;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.1816

statistically significant in the multivariate analysis was Verb Class of Main Verb. The importance of the relative strength hierarchy of the statistically significant factor groups is to indicate to the analyst which (linguistic) element exerts the most influence on the dependent variable; these values become ‘particularly important when you are comparing the variable grammar of a linguistic feature across a number of varieties’ (Tagliamonte 2006:242). While in our study we only analyzed *salmantino* Spanish, the magnitude of factor groups will be very useful when comparing the results of individual analyses of *ser*, *estar*, *tener*, *haber*, and all other stative verbs (Chapter 5); this will assist us in determining if different factor groups have more or less influence on the stative verbs tested in the investigation. Likewise, these values will be of use in future comparative analyses of past-tense aspectual morphology of statives in other varieties of Spanish.

#### **4.3.1 Temporal Determinant**

The factor group found to have the strongest effect on past-tense aspect in *salmantino* speech was Temporal Determinant. As expected, a stative verb that co-occurred with a punctual adverbial marker (.88), temporal sequencer (.80), and marked/durative time frame (.80) strongly favored perfective aspect. Conversely, the absence of such an expression (.45) slightly disfavored the perfective form; the adverbial *siempre* ‘always’ (.32), habitual temporal expressions (.32), and general past (.16) disfavored a perfective stative.

Comrie (1976:42) affirmed that ‘a punctual situation, by definition, has no internal structure, and in a language with separate imperfective forms to indicate reference to the internal structure of a situation, then clearly punctuality and imperfectivity will be incompatible.’ Applying this notion to punctual temporal markers, we hypothesized that a stative verb co-occurring adverbial expression indicating a specific moment of time, as in *ese día* ‘that day’ (4.1) or *el año pasado* ‘last year’ (4.2), would favor the perfective form.

- (4.1) No, no nevó como el día. . .no, **ese día fue** en septie-, en agosto. Oy, no, estuvo, fue en mayo. (X, f58)  
 ‘No, it didn’t snow as the day. . .no, **that day was** (PRET) in Septem-, in August. Oh, no, it was, was (PRET) in May.’
- (4.2) Depende del año. Por ejemplo, **el año pasado, el año pasado ha sido** un año que ha hecho bastante calor. (XXV, m29)  
 ‘It depends on the year. For example, **last year, last year was** (PP) a year that was pretty hot.’

Since perfective aspect indicates that a situation is ‘bounded temporarily’, these markers could reinforce as well as condition the use of aspect indicating such ‘boundness’ (Bybee et al. 1994:54). Durative/marked frame temporal adverb was also used to operationalize this same hypothesis that a stative verb co-occurring with an adverbial expression marking a past time frame with a clear beginning and end would favor perfective aspect, as in (4.3), (4.4), (4.5) and (4.6). These durative/marked temporal expressions are slightly different from punctual markers because they do not express a specific calendar day, year, etc., but rather a bounded past time frame in the past, as in *durante unos años* ‘for a few years’, *toda la vida* ‘all my life’ or *infancia* ‘childhood’. In Kattán-Ibarra & Pountain’s (1997:437) terms: ‘In contrast with the preterite, the imperfect cannot refer to states or actions which took place in a *closed period of time*, even when these may have been prolonged or repeated.’<sup>3</sup>

- (4.3) Y entonces compramos un local, continuamos con el trabajo por nuestra cuenta. Y fue muy bien **durante unos años**. (I, f58)  
 ‘And then we bought a place, we continued with the work for ourselves. It was (PRET) very good **for a few years**.’
- (4.4) Lo que es el barrio donde yo vivía, eh, todo el mundo la quería mucho, mi madre **toda la vida** la conocí enferma. (XVIII, f58)  
 ‘That what is the neighborhood where I used to live, uh, everyone loved her a lot, my mother all my life I knew (PRET) her sick.’
- (4.5) Cambiaron todas las cosas porque empezó la democracia. Y entonces tuvimos una infancia diferente a la que había llevado anteriormente. (XIII, f42)

---

<sup>3</sup> Emphasis added.

‘Everything changed because the democracy began. And so we had (PRET) a different **childhood** than then one I had had beforehand.’

- (4.6) Entonces, he tenido una infancia muy bonita porque éramos una piña con mis hermanas y seguimos siéndolo. (III, f44)  
‘So, I had (PP) a very beautiful **childhood** because were we a gang, with my sisters, and we continue being one.’

What is interesting in example (4.4) is the interpretation of *conocer* ‘know person, place’. It has been well-documented that, when applied with perfective aspect, the translation of *conocer* changes from ‘know’ to its inceptive interpretation ‘meet (a person)’ (Bybee 1995:447). Yet in example (4.4), the interpretation of the verb ‘met’ does not seem accurate, since it does not seem logical that the speaker expressed ‘all my life I *met* my mother sick’. The presence of this durative/marked past time frame appears to have cancelled out the perfective meaning, thus giving us the interpretation ‘knew’ instead of ‘met’.

Likewise, temporal sequencers—such as *primero* ‘first’ (4.7), *luego* ‘then’ (4.8), and *al año siguiente* ‘the next year’ (4.9)—were found as expected to co-occur with perfective aspect. This finding makes sense since these adverbials are often used in conjunction with the narration of past, discrete actions to clearly report how the events unfolded (Kattan-Ibarra & Pountain 1997:436). Since it has been claimed that ‘imperfective forms are typically used in discourse for setting up background situations, in contrast with perfective forms, which are used for narrating sequences of events (Hopper 1979b, 1982)’ (Bybee et al. 1994:126), it was not surprising that these successive perfective events had the propensity to co-occur with temporal narrative sequencers, as in examples (4.7), (4.8), and (4.9).

- (4.7) **Entonces** allí preparé allí las suposiciones, estuve primero de interino. . . estuve dos años así, después me preparé las oposiciones. (XXI, m61)  
‘**Then** there I prepared there the suppositions, I was (PRET) **first** an intern. . . I was (PRET) two years like that, **after** I prepared the Oppositions.’

- (4.8) Ya te digo, fue, fue terrible. Pero **después luego** no han sido así, como para decir que no han tenido malos haceres como niños, digo. (I, f58)  
 ‘I tell you, it was, it was horrible. But **after then** they were not (PP) like that, to say that they did not have (PP) bad doings as children, I mean.’
- (4.9) **Luego, al año siguiente**, estuve dos años ahí interna, estuve haciendo formación profesional, auxiliar de clínica allí. Y **al año siguiente** tuve una monja que era la más grande, la que le tenía miedo. (XVII, f31)  
 ‘**Then, the next year**, I was (PRET) two years there as an intern, I was doing professional development, clinical assistant there. And **the next year** I had (PRET) a nun that was the biggest, the one that I was the afraid of.’

It appears that verbs of state, whose inherent meaning indicates an unchanging situation, might/could be applied with perfective aspect when a *salmantino* speaker wished to highlight a specific order of events; this succession likewise appears to be reinforced with these temporal sequencer adverbials. Examples (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9) above demonstrate how ‘narrative time advances with perfective event sentences (and with explicit temporal adverbials), and fails to advance otherwise’ (Smith 2005:232).

Let’s now take a look at the temporal adverbial expressions that disfavored perfective aspect, starting with stative verbs co-occurring with *siempre* ‘always’. Before reviewing the data, we initially hypothesized that if *siempre* was present in the linguistic context, the stative verb would strongly disfavor perfective aspectual marking, mainly since Imperfect in Spanish is often used to convey habituality in the past (Kattan-Ibarra & Pountain 1997:81), as in examples (4.10) and (4.11).

- (4.10) Y podrías salir de lunes a domingo, el día que quisieras porque **siempre siempre** había mucha gente. (XV, f59)  
 ‘And you could go out from Monday to Sunday, the day that you would want, because **always always** there were (IMP) a lot of people.’
- (4.11) Y con los demás, sí, me llevaba bien con todo el mundo, pero **siempre** tenías más relación con unas personas que con otras, sí. (VII, f48)  
 ‘And with the rest, yes, I used to get along well with everyone, but **always** you would had (IMP) more of a connection with some people than other, yes.’

After an initial screening of the *salmantino* data, the adverb *siempre* ‘always’ was coded separately from other habitual temporal expressions, since we wanted to compare how the patterns with *siempre* compared to those with other habitual expression, as in (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14). We found that when all stative verbs were analyzed together that the patterns of *siempre* (14% perfective [10/72]) and other temporal adverbials indicating habitual activity (15% [8/54]) were fairly analogous in terms of frequency.

(4.12) Pues mis papás vivieron **siempre** con nosotros, porque al ser hija sola, entonces yo le dije a mi marido. (XVII, f58)  
 ‘Well my parents lived (PRET) **always** with us, because being an only child, so I told my husband.’

(4.13) Yo me llevaba muy bien con ella, no sé porque, **siempre** me sentí muy unida a ella. (XVI, f40)  
 ‘I got along well with her, I don’t know why, I **always** felt (PRET) very close to her.’

(4.14) Y pero, bueno, **siempre** estudié con beca, o sea que **siempre**. . fui buena estudiante, pero luego ya, claro, las cosas fueron distintas y mi padre no me dejaba salir, yo nunca salí, **siempre** estudiando siempre con ellos, **siempre** muy súper protegida con mis primos, con los amigos, pero nada más. (XI, f48)  
 ‘And but, well, I always studied with a scholarship, I mean that I **always** was (PRET) a good student, with then, of course, things were different and my father did not let me go out, I never went out, always studying, always with them, always super protected with my cousins, with friend, but nothing else.’

As seen with the latter example, the speaker applied perfective aspect first with the activity verb *estudiar* ‘study’ and subsequently with the stative verb *ser* ‘be’. We would have expected for the speaker to use the Imperfect with both verbs, especially when co-occurring with an adverbial like *siempre*, since the notion of habituality would be reinforced with both imperfective aspect and the adverbial together. It seems as though the interpretation of habituality in this sentence is provided by the adverbial itself, rather than the aspectual marking of the verb(s). This finding is important, as it appears that temporal adverbials can cancel out the meaning given by aspectual viewpoint. Through the GoldVarb analysis it was confirmed that *siempre* disfavored perfective

form (.32) and ranked exactly the same as other habitual expressions (.32), as in examples (4.15), (4.16) and (4.17), when all stative verbs were analyzed together.

(4.15) En vez de disfrutar como una tonta, pues no disfruté porque yo **todos los meses** era un llanto. (XII, f62)  
'Instead of enjoying [it] like a stupid girl, well I didn't because I **every month** was (IMP) a sob.'

(4.16) **Normalmente** por la zona de la sierra, por toda España, por la sierra. **Normalmente** estábamos dentro de Castilla y León **siempre**; pero, por la sierra. (XIX, f19)  
Normally around the area of the mountains, all throughout Spain, around the mountains. Normally we were (IMP) in Castilla y León always, but in the mountains.

(4.17) Después, fijate, cuando hacías la comunión, toda, toda la preparación, había día de misa **los domingos** porque el cura iba a otro pueblo, entonces **todos los domingos** había misa, todo. (XX, f60)  
'Afterwards, look, when you would do communion, all, all of the preparation, there were (IMP) days of mass **on Sundays** because the priest would go to a town, then **every Sunday** there was (IMP) mass, everything.'

All of these habitual expressions *todos los meses* 'every month', *normalmente* 'normally', and *todos los domingos* 'every Sunday' co-occurred with the verb in imperfective aspect, which is what we expected to observe. Yet, there was still variation of habitual expression and the choice of aspectual viewpoint as demonstrated by (4.18).

(4.18) Y estuvimos **todas las fiestas** juntos, y en septiembre, luego hablábamos y le dije que si se quería venir unos días conmigo. (XXII, m34)  
'And we were (PRET) together **every holiday**, and in September, then we would talk and I told her that if she wanted to come [spend] some days with me.'

Additionally, general past tense expression disfavored perfective aspect (.16), which was the expected direction of effect. It was hypothesized that general past expressions such as *antes* 'before, in the past' and *antiguamente* 'long ago, in the past', as seen in examples (4.19), (4.20) and (4.21), respectively, would co-occur with imperfective aspect to assist speakers to relay background information and conditions.

(4.19) **Antes** era lo que era, lo que era un barrio aquí de Salamanca podía ser, pero pero todo el mundo, o sea, todo el mundo eso en la calle. (XIX, f53)

‘**Before** it was (IMP) what it was (IMP), what was a neighborhood here from Salamanca it could (IMP) be, but but everyone, I mean, everyone that in the street.’

- (4.20) Ahora si vives por encima de las posibilidades de cada uno y y y. . .seguridad no tiene a que lo como se vive ahora como se vivía **antes**. (XI, f65)  
‘Now if you life above the possibilities of each one and and and. . .there is no security in comparison to how one lives now to how one used to live (IMP) **before**.’
- (4.21) ¿Sabes también por qué? Creo que **antiguamente** la madre estaba en casa. (III, f44)  
‘Do you also know why? I think that **long ago** the mother was (IMP) at home.’

Example (4.22) below demonstrates the variability of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs co-occurring with general past-tense descriptions: where we would have expected imperfective aspect, the speaker applied perfective aspect.

- (4.22) Sí, era un. . .buenísima. Otras no ¿eh? Otras, otra. . .me acuerdo de una que tuve **antes**. Yo es que ni. . .nada, no. Ella estaba preparando sus oposiciones para todo el año. Y **antes** también tuvimos una maestra que también, no, pero con esa sí que trabajaba muchísimo con nosotros. (XX, f60)  
‘Yes, she was (IMP) a. . .great one. Others, no, okay? Others, another. . .I remember one that I had (PRET) **in the past**. She was preparing her Oppositions for the entire year. And **in the past** we also had (PRET) a teacher that also, no, but with her yes, she used to work a lot with us.’

What is interesting about example (4.22) is that the speaker used imperfective aspect when describing a teacher that she had in the past (*era* ‘she was’), but then switched to perfective aspect when using the verb *tener* ‘have’ with *antes* ‘in the past’.

Finally, verbs that did not co-occur with any sort of temporal expressions slightly disfavored the use of the perfective (.45). With grammatical aspect aside, stative verbs by definition are intrinsically imperfective (Gili Gaya 1964:61); thus, it was not surprising that the imperfective form of the stative was preferred without the presence of a temporal adverbial to possibly condition the use of past-tense aspectual marking. With this said, what is noteworthy is the fact that the probability value is fairly close to 0.50: although perfective aspect was slightly disfavored, we expected to observe a stative verb without this contextual factor in the linguistic

environment to more strongly disfavor perfective aspect, especially since 71% of the total occurrences in the data were found in the imperfective form.<sup>4</sup> As such, we expected the probability weight of this constraint to exhibit a much *stronger disfavoring of perfective aspect*, due to the lack of these adverbial cues; but, the result was fairly neutral. In languages lacking ‘an elaborate tense-system’, aspectual morphology in narrations seems to be ‘supplemented by adverbs and other more lexicalized markers’ (Hopper 1979b:240); it appears that temporal adverbial expressions likewise had a tremendous impact on conditioning the use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs of the *salmantino* corpus and the interpretation of past-time events. In Chapters 5 and 6, we further discuss the impact of the Temporal Determinant factor group on the choice of the past-tense aspectual variants.

#### 4.3.2 Collocation

The factor group that ranked second in the overall hierarchy of relative strength of the GoldVarb analysis of all stative verbs was Collocation. As explained in §2.5.1.4 and §4.2, collocations or association patterns ‘are used to characterize grammatical features as well as words, with respect to systematic co-occurrence patterns with other words, other grammatical features, or non-linguistic characteristics of the context.’ (Biber 2000:289). We tested various linguistic features surrounding the past-tense stative verb to ascertain if and how these frequently co-occurring words and/or structures had an influence on speaker-choice of perfective or imperfective aspect. In the overall analysis of all stative verbs together, the verb’s collocation did in fact play an important role in the choice of past-tense aspect: verb + *bien* ‘good/well’ or *mal* ‘bad’ favored perfective aspect (.69), verb alone only slightly favored perfective aspect (.52),

---

<sup>4</sup> In her analysis of *estar* + gerund versus *andar* + gerund, Torres Cacoullós (2001:466) stated that the general activity verb class (of the gerund) ‘does not seem to favor one auxiliary over the other, as indicated by a factor weight very close to .500’. We adopted the same perspective in the present analysis: after considering all of the constraints in the factor group per Tagliamonte (2006), if the probability value is close to 0.50, this can be an indicator that the factor does not appear to favor or disfavor the application value.

verb + gerund/infinitive/both disfavored perfective aspect (.41), and verb + *como* ‘like’ strongly disfavored perfective aspect (.14).

With regard to verb + *bien/mal*, it was expected for this collocation to disfavor perfective aspect since this construction could be used in backgrounded clauses (commonly employed with imperfective aspect) to describe the condition of a situation or object. However, the data showed that this factor favored the perfective form in the *salmantino* data (.69), as seen in examples (4.23), (4.24) and (4.25).

- (4.23) Sí, es grave meningitis, te puede quedar tonta y muerta. Pero vamos, ella quedó muy **bien**. (V, f59)  
‘Yes, meningitis is serious, it can leave you stupid and dead. But, she ended up (PRET) very **well**.’
- (4.24) Yo me crié un poco con mis hermanos y mis hermanas, las mayores. Y bueno, pero estuvo **bien**. (VII, f48)  
‘I was raised a bit with my brothers and sisters, the old ones. And well, it was (PRET) **good**.’
- (4.25) Recuerdo que tuve unas chicas aquí, que tenía tres chiquitas desde Francia y una desde Estados Unidos. Me sentí tan **mal** con las cosas que le decían las francesas a la chica de los Estados Unidos. (XVI, f40)  
‘I remember that I had some girls here, that I had three girls from France and one from the United States. I felt (PRET) so **bad** about the things that the French girls were saying to the girl from the United States.’

In fact, it appears from these results that the perfective verb + *bien/mal* carried out a specific function in the discourse, which related to speaker subjectivity and narrative structure. First, many authors—such as Reid (1976), Hopper (1979b, 1982), Dry (1983), Givón (1984), García and vanPutte (1988), Salaberry & Ayoun (2005:16), inter alia—, agree that where the verb is positioned in the narrative structure can often predict which aspectual marker native speakers will use.<sup>5</sup> For example, Silva-Corvalán (1983) found that speakers of Mexican and Chilean

---

<sup>5</sup> In §1.4.1 and §2.7, it was noted that narrative structure is comprised of abstract, orientation, complicating action, climax, result/resolution, and coda clauses. All of these clauses do not have to be present in every narrative; for instance, in the narratives studied in Silva-Corvalán (1983:763-4), abstracts were not commonly used (6/30). In fact,

Spanish used the Imperfect mainly in orientation clauses and perfective aspect in complicating action clauses and coda/resolution clauses.<sup>6</sup> In examples (4.23), (4.24) and (4.25), the verb was located in the result/resolution clause of the narrative, which serves to answer ‘What finally happened?’ (Theberge-Rafal 1999:58, quoted in Rickford 1999). The verb + *bien/mal* collocations *quedó bien* ‘she was fine’, *estuvo bien* ‘it was fine’, *me sentí mal* ‘I felt bad’ were used after the peak of the speakers’ narratives and functioned to tell the listener how the story ended. We see this more clearly in Table 4-5, which shows us the narrative of (4.23) in its entirety.

Likewise, statements as in *quedó bien*, *estuvo bien*, or *me sentí mal* were not simply reported facts: these structures conveyed the speakers’ subjective viewpoint on, or evaluation of, the situation. Another important narrative clause, evaluations, is an essential element of the narrative and ‘makes infelicitous a remark like “So what?” by the listener’ (Silva-Corvalán 1983:774). Evaluations can exist independently from other clauses in the narrative, ‘but [also] may be found in various forms throughout the narrative’ (Labov (1972a:234), quoted in Jaworski & Coupland 1999). Even though Silva-Corvalán (1983:777) found that speakers conveyed evaluative viewpoint via the HP in 22 of the 30 narratives, she also recognized that Wolfson (1974) found the Preterit to be used with these types of evaluative, ‘dramatic’ events rather than the HP in narrative clauses. In spite of this discrepancy, Silva-Corvalán concluded the HP served the same function as a *past perfective* in complicating actions and, especially, at the most

---

Labov (1972:226) specified that there had to be a minimum of two temporally ordered narrative clauses to constitute a minimal narrative.

<sup>6</sup> In Silva-Corvalán (1983) she labels the HP as having perfective function in these clauses; therefore, perfective refers to occurrences of both Preterit and HP.

decisive moment of the narrative, the peak.<sup>7</sup> The connection between these analyses and the present study is that perfective aspect likewise appears to be used in evaluative complicating action and coda/resolution clauses. If we take another look the full narrative in Table 4-5, the speaker uses perfective aspect, the Preterit in this case, throughout the narration of her house guest's illness. She concluded with *quedó bien* 'she was fine', also in the Preterit tense. Furthermore, in (4.24), although a much shorter narrative, the speaker concluded with *estuvo bien*, also conveying a subjective, evaluative viewpoint. Example (4.25) likewise ended her narration with *me sentí tan mal* 'I felt very bad'. Schiffrin (1997) explained that 'evaluation pervades the narrative: speakers can comment on events from outside of the story world, suspend the action through embedded orientation clauses, and report events that themselves indicate the significance of the experience. Speakers can also modify clause syntax as a way of revealing the point. . . of the story.' Interestingly enough, the definition of *subjectivity* in discourse—'the expression of self and the representation of point of view and perspective, whether of a speaking subject or a narrated one' (Finegan 1995:2)—appears to overlap with evaluation clauses, or the *raison d'être* of the story (Labov 1972a:231). Therefore, it is possible that two elements come into play with the preference of perfective verb + *bien/mal*: i) the speaker's subjective perspective (evaluation) using *bien/mal* to convey their viewpoint and ii) where this perspective is found in the narrative structure (coda/resolution clause).

---

<sup>7</sup> Fleischman (1986:220) also considered the narrative present (congruent to the HP) in French to function as a past perfective in complicating action clauses. She reported that 'these present could in all instances be replaced by perfective pasts without changing the semantic interpretation, but not by imperfective pasts. If imperfects are substituted, the events referred to by these verbs cease to be narrative events and become the kind of descriptive or background in formation normally found in free or restricted clauses but not in narrative clauses.'

Table 4-5. Narrative excerpt from speaker V

Excerpt from speaker V (f, 58)	Narrative	English Translation
(a) I: Hoy sí. Al terminar, salimos. Sí, es que. . . nada. A lo mejor si nos cansa, si bueno si nos cansa el viaje vamos a parar. Luego no sé porque, ¿cuántas horas de aquí a. . .?	Conversation leading to narrative	Today, yes. Upon finishing, we are leaving. Yes, it's that. . .nothing. Maybe if it tires us, yes, well, if the trip tires us we are going to stop. Then I don't know because, how many hours from here to. . .?
(b) P: Cinco, sí. Yo <u>tuve</u> una niña que fue a Santiago andando. . .con su novio.	<i>Orientation</i>	Five, yes. I <u>had</u> (PRET) a girl that went to Santiago walking. . .with her boyfriend.
(c) P: Bueno hicieron los 100 kilómetros últimos, los hicieron andando.	<i>Complicating action</i>	Well, they did the last 100 kilometers, they did them walking.
(d) I: Porque <u>estuvo</u> aquí, <u>estuvo</u> muy mala. <u>Tuvo</u> meningitis. <u>Estuvo</u> malísima, Abby <u>estuvo</u> muy grave. <sup>8</sup>	<i>Abstract</i>	Because she <u>was</u> (PRET) here, she <u>was</u> (PRET) very sick. She <u>had</u> (PRET) meningitis. She <u>was</u> (PRET) extremely sick, Abby <u>was</u> (PRET) very seriously ill.
(e) Luego, me hizo la promesa y fue.	<i>Complicating action</i>	Then, she made me the promise and left.
(f) Su novio <u>estaba</u> donde en Granada me parece.	<i>Orientation</i>	Her boyfriend <u>was</u> (IMP) in Granada it seems.
(g) Y vino aquí, se fueron los dos a Santiago andando.	<i>Complicating action</i>	And he came here, the two of them went to Santiago walking.
(h) P: Andando.		Walking.
(i) I: Sí sí. Pues por ahora <u>fue</u> . Y luego estuvo aquí. . . <u>estuvo</u> . . . <u>fue</u> después de Carnaval, es en marzo, abril.	<i>Complicating action</i>	Yes, yes. Well around then it <u>was</u> (PRET). And then she <u>was</u> (PRET) here. . .she <u>was</u> (PRET). . .it <u>was</u> (PRET) after Carnival, it's in March, April.
(j) <u>Fue</u> cuando cayó mala. <u>Estuvo</u> ingresada muy grave.	<i>Peak</i>	That <u>was</u> (PRET) when she got sick. She <u>was</u> (PRET) in the hospital very ill.
(k) ¿Muy grave?		Very ill?

<sup>8</sup> All names in the examples in our study were change to respect the anonymity of the *salmantino* participants.

Table 4-5. Continued

(l) Sí, es grave meningitis, te puede quedar tonta y muerta.	<i>Orientation clause</i>	Yes, meningitis can leave you brain damaged and for dead.
(m) Pero, vamos, ella <u>quedó</u> muy bien. Vino su madre <u>estuvo</u> aquí una semana con ella y luego se le pasó la niña muy bien. <u>Siguió</u> estudiando, <u>se quedó</u> aquí y se recuperó muy bien. Y ya te digo.	<i>Coda/resolution</i>	But, whatever, she <u>was</u> (PRET) very well. Her mother came, she <u>was</u> (PRET) here a week with her and then the girl had a good time. She <u>continued</u> (PRET) to study, she <u>stayed</u> (PRET) here and got better very well. And I'm telling you.

With regard to the collocation verb + gerund/infinite/both, it was expected and subsequently found that these structures disfavored perfective aspect (.41). Chi-square tests were conducted to check for statistically significant differences between verb + gerund, verb + infinitive or verb + both structures.<sup>9</sup> Table 4-6 reports the distribution of verb + gerund and verb + infinitive in the *salmantino* corpus: we notice that the two main sources of this collocation were i) the past-progressive form *estar* + gerund ‘be V-ing’ and ii) the deontic/epistemic expression *tener que* + infinitive ‘have to V’ expression.

Beginning with *estar* + gerund ‘be V-ing’, this construction was expected to disfavor the perfective form since these forms are commonly used in background descriptions in orientation clauses:

The orientation section has some interesting syntactic properties; it is quite common to find a great many past progressive clauses in the orientation section—sketching the kind of thing that was going on before the first event of the narrative occurred or during the entire episode’ (Labov 1972a:229).

Since orientation clauses function to set up the scene for narrative events (Hopper 1979b, 1982, Silva-Corvalán 1983), we expected and found imperfective aspect to be favored in the finite auxiliary form of this construction (.41).

<sup>9</sup> An example of verb + both gerund and infinitive: *Podíamos* (IMP) *ir* (INF) *caminando* (GER) *hasta ver a mis padres para que no tuviese ninguna eh, yo que sé, ansia por ir con ellos.* ‘We would (IMP) go (INF) walking (GER) until seeing my parents so that I didn’t have any, uh, I don’t know, anxiety from walking with them.’ This collocation was observed rarely in the corpus (N=11) and we will chose not to focus on this form in detail.

Table 4-6. Distribution of frequencies of verb + gerund according to stative verb

Verb + gerund	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Estar</i> + gerund	57	32%	119	68%	176	94%
Other verbs + gerund <sup>10</sup>	2	18%	9	82%	11	6%
TOTAL	59	32%	128	68%	187	100%

Let's take a closer look at the progressive *estar* + gerund in examples (4.26) and (4.27).

(4.26) Sí, sí porque me me estaba todo el día **armando**, en el, me tocaba todas las cosas y me las subía en todos los sitios. (IX, f53)  
 'Yes, yes because she was (IMP) **causing a raucous** all day long, in the, she would touch all my things and put them up all over.

(4.27) Porque cuando me separé nos arruinamos, nos quedamos sin nada. Entonces mis hijos los dos estaban estudiando. (XVIII, f58)  
 'Because when I separated [from my husband] we were ruined, we were left without anything. Then my children both of them were (IMP) **studying**.'

As Torres Cacoullós stated, the *estar* + gerund structure 'cover[s] a range of uses in imperfective territory, from progressive to habitual (as defined by Comrie 1976:24–5)'. In example (4.26), the speaker related to us how her daughter habitually 'caused a raucous', while the speaker of example (4.27) conveyed the progressive condition that 'both her son and daughter were studying [in college]' at the time she separated from her husband. Both (4.26) and (4.27) provide secondary descriptions of what was taking place, which orients the listener to the background conditions at the time of the event. Yet, as it will be explained in further detail in Chapter 5 when we discuss the individual results for the verb *estar* 'be', perfective aspect was also commonly used by *salmantinos* in the past-progressive form, as in examples (4.28) and (4.29).

(4.28) Y luego estuve jugando al *Blackjack* y gané ahí otros 100 dólares más. (XXII, m34)  
 'And then I was (PRET) **playing** Blackjack and I won there another 100 dollars.'

(4.29) Recuerdos muy buenos, sí, sobre todo de una época entre los cinco y los diez años estuve viviendo en un pueblo cerca aquí de Salamanca. (I, f58)  
 Very good memories, yes, above all from the time between five and seven years I was (PRET) **living** in a town close here to Salamanca.

<sup>10</sup> The other verbs + gerund included *ser* (N=1), *tener* (N=3), *conocer* (N=1), *poder* (N=1), *quedar* (N=5).

Comrie (1976:122) maintained that the perfective form of *estar* + gerund, which is ‘rarely’ used, allows the speaker to express a persistent situation that has salient beginning and end points.

In Spanish, in the past tense, the opposition Simple Past versus Imperfect can be expressed independently of the opposition Progressive versus non-Progressive, the former by the form of the finite verb, the latter by the use or non-use of the construction *estar* plus Present Participle. In principle, then, one might expect, on structural grounds the form Aorist of *estar* plus Present Participle, i.e. in effect a perfective progressive, such as *estuvieron entrando* ‘they entered, were entering’. And in practice such forms do occur, albeit rarely, as in *toda la tarde estuvieron entrando visitas* ‘all the afternoon visitors kept arriving’. This situation described is one that lasted through time (in fact, the whole of the afternoon), and consists of a number of distinct phases (the various arrivals), whence the Progressive; however, the whole complex is equally presented as a single complete whole, whence the Simple Past.

While we are not arguing that perfective *estar* + gerund does not carry out this function in *salmantino* discourse, this structure was observed more frequently in the *salmantino* data than Comrie indicated. Of the *estar* + gerund collocations observed in the *salmantino* data, 32% (57/176) were applied with perfective aspect: although it was observed that this structure did prefer imperfective aspect, slightly more than one-fourth of all past-progressive forms in the *salmantino* corpus were perfective *estar* + gerund occurrences.

The other structure, verb + infinitive, was most frequently observed with the *tener que* + infinitive ‘have to do V’ construction (39%, Table 4-7), as seen in throughout example (4.30), here with imperfective aspect. Again, since this structure conveys the ‘state of obligation’ (cf. Guitart 1978), the semi-auxiliary *tener* was expected to disfavor perfective aspect.

- (4.30) Pasamos unos ratos tremendos subiendo la paja arriba a un pajar. Tenías que echarla con una brinda arriba, luego tenía que haber otra persona arriba, la tenía que mover. . . mucho trabajo. . .muy laborioso.  
‘We spent a tremendous amount of time taking up the hay up to a barn. You had to throw it up with a support above, then there had to (IMP) be another person above, he had to (IMP) move it. . .a lot of work. . .very laborious.’

Table 4-7. Distribution of frequencies of verb + infinitive according to verb in order of overall frequency

Verb + infinitive	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Tener que</i> ‘have to’ + infinitive	37	23%	124	77%	161	39%
<i>Poder</i> ‘able to’ + infinitive	9	9%	96	91%	105	25%
<i>Querer</i> ‘want’ + infinitive	13	19%	57	81%	70	17%
<i>Ser</i> ‘be’ + infinitive	4	15%	22	85%	26	6%
<i>Gustar</i> ‘please’ + infinitive	2	12%	14	88%	16	4%
<i>Haber que</i> ‘have to’ + infinitive	1	6%	15	94%	16	4%
<i>Saber</i> ‘know’ + infinitive	0	0%	8	100%	8	2%
Other + infinitive <sup>11</sup>	2	25%	7	75%	9	2%
<i>Costar</i> ‘cost’ + infinitive	1	25%	3	75%	4	1%
<i>Necesitar</i> ‘have’ + infinitive	0	0%	2	100%	2	1%
TOTAL	69	16%	348	84%	417	100%

As indicated in Table 4-7, 77% (124/161) of these constructions was applied with imperfective aspect, while 23% (37/161) of the finite verbs of the *tener que* + infinitive collocations was applied with perfective aspect, as in example (4.31).

(4.31) Luego, ha estado muchos años en la política de la reputada. Sí. ¡Uf! Y la pobre lo pasó muy mal. Al final, tuvo que **decidir** entre su familia y la política. (XX, f60)  
 ‘Then, for many years she was in the high politics. Yes. Oh! And the poor woman had a bad time. At the end, she had to (PRET) **decide** between her family and politics.’

As we will discuss in §4.3.7, it seems as though other contextual factors at work in this construction constraining the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology, namely the Verb Class of Main Verb (change-of-state verb, *decidir* ‘decide’) and Temporal Determinant (temporal sequencer, *al final* ‘at the end’).

It was possible to get a better picture of the collocation verb + infinitive by taking a closer look at Table 4-7. The next two most frequent verb + infinitive collocations were *poder* ‘able to’ + infinitive and *querer* ‘want’ + infinitive. Together, these verb + infinitive collocations

<sup>11</sup> The ‘other’ verbs + infinitive (N=9) were as follows: *estar* + infinitive (N=4), *deber* + infinitive (N=2), *faltar* + infinitive (N=2), *quedar* + infinitive (N=1).

compared to *tener que* + infinitive in regard to overall frequency (42%), yet, patterned very differently in terms of perfective and imperfective aspectual use of the finite verb. The structure *poder* + infinitive was used 91% (96/105) with imperfective aspect and 9% (9/105) with perfective aspect; *querer* + infinitive was used 81% with imperfective aspect (57/70) and 19% (13/70) with perfective aspect. Chi-square pair tests between *tener que* + infinitive and *poder* + infinitive show that there is a statistically significant difference between the two factors ( $\chi^2=9.226575, p\leq 0.0024$ ). In contrast, there was no statistical difference between *tener que* + infinitive and *querer* + infinitive or *poder* + infinitive and *querer* + infinitive.<sup>12</sup> These pair-wise comparisons indicate that the choice of aspectual morphology for verb + infinitive depended on the finite stative verb (i.e., *tener que* and *poder*).

Finally, it was found in the analysis that the collocation verb + *como* ‘like’ strongly disfavored the perfective form (.14). Table 4-8 provides us with the distribution of frequencies of verb + *como* according to the statives included in the analysis. First, by examining the overall distribution of frequencies, 95% of the occurrences of verb + *como* were in applied with imperfective aspect, whereas 5% with perfective aspect. Additionally, it was observed that 75% of all occurrences of verb + *como* were *ser como*, as in (4.32) and (4.33).

- (4.32) Mi padre tiene una hermana que vive en Tarragona y nosotros lo que hacíamos era, cuando éramos más pequeños, íbamos un año cenábamos aquí y otro año nos íbamos a Tarragona. Pero ya cuando empezábamos a ser un poco más mayores, ya era como. . .uf. (XXV, m29)  
 ‘My father has a sister that lives in Tarragona and what we would do was when we were younger, we would go one year, we would eat dinner here and another year we would go to Tarragona. But we were getting to be a bit older, already it was (IMP) **like**. . .ugh.’
- (4.33) Y tuve un trauma allí feo. O sea que tuve. . .porque nos separaron. ¿Entiendes? Éramos como gemelos. (XXIII, m55)

---

<sup>12</sup> The *p*-value of the Chi-square tests between *poder* + infinitive and *querer* + infinitive was 0.051. Since  $p > 0.05$  was the boundary for determining statistical significance, we had to reject the Null Hypothesis.

‘I had an ugly [traumatic experience]. I mean that I had. . .because they separated us. Understand? We were (IMP) **like** twins.’

In both examples (4.32) and (4.33), speakers used this collocation (*era como* ‘it was like’ and *éramos como* ‘we were like’, respectively) to compare X to Y. This structure is a simile, a common rhetorical device speakers or writers use to compare ‘two. . .different things. . .indicated by the word like or as’ (Abrams 1999:97).

Table 4-8. Relative frequencies of verb + *como* according to verb

Verb + <i>como</i>	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Ser</i> + <i>como</i>	3	5%	53	95%	56	75%
<i>Estar</i> + <i>como</i>	0	0%	7	100%	7	9%
<i>Tener</i> + <i>como</i>	0	0%	5	100%	5	7%
Other + <i>como</i>	1	20%	4	80%	5	7%
<i>Haber</i> + <i>como</i>	0	0%	2	100%	2	3%
TOTAL	4	5%	71	95%	75	100%

While the examples *era como ugh!* ‘it was like ugh!’ or *éramos como gemelos* ‘we were like twins’ might be considered the same as a simile found in poetry or other literary forms, it seems as though *salmantinos* made use of this collocation to describe background situations or conditions via this strategy of comparison to the interlocutor. As in (4.32), the speaker conveyed his dislike of traveling north to Tarragona, saying that ‘it was like ugh!’, which equated to ‘we used think, do we really have to go all the way up there?’. In (4.33), the speaker expressed how much he felt emotionally dependent on his brother through using the comparison ‘we were like twins’. In Chapter 5 when discussing *ser*, we will revisit the *ser como* collocation and its connection with Grammatical Person.

### 4.3.3 Grammatical Person

The factor group that ranked third in terms of magnitude of effect of the overall analysis of stative verbs together was Grammatical Person (range=52). The results for this factor group were both expected and somewhat unexpected. Our hypotheses were based on Reid’s (1976) analysis

of the French past-tense aspectual system, upon which Hopper (1979b, 1982) constructed the ideas of foregrounding and backgrounding (please refer to §1.4.2 for the full explanation of the two latter terms). As cited in Hopper (1979b:221), Reid concluded that the French's past historic (perfective) form was favored in the following contexts:

1. Action are opposed to states
2. Affirmative as opposed to negative verbs
3. Human subjects as opposed to nonhuman subjects
4. First person subjects as opposed to third person (definite animate pronominal subjects)
5. Singular subjects as opposed to plural subjects
6. Main character of discourse as subject as opposed to secondary character as subject
7. Main clause as opposed to subordinate clause
8. Proper name subject as opposed to pronominal subject

In this analysis of Grammatical Person, we were mainly concerned with points (3), (4), and (5) of the Reid's findings and expected our results to follow this outline above. If we refer back to Table 4-4, statistical analyses showed us that first-person singular (.69), inanimate singular (.56), and first-person plural (.52) favored the perfective form. Conversely, third-person singular (.41), third-person and inanimate plural (.33), and lastly second-person singular (.17) disfavored perfective aspect. Note that there were no examples of the informal second-person plural *vosotros*, formal second-person *usted* (expressed with third-person morphology), or formal second-person plural *ustedes* of stative verbs in the *salmantino* corpus. This can be attributed to i) the one-on-one interview did not naturally lend allow for the use of second-person plural since there were only two people present during the conversational setting, ii) the interviewer was younger and already familiar with most participants via the ISA Social Network, and iii) unlike other varieties of the language, Peninsular Spanish does not frequently make use of the formal *usted* form in conversation (cf. Uber 1985, Pharies 2007:217).

The results of Grammatical Person of all stative verbs together agreed with Reid's analysis of French: first-person subjects favored perfective aspect (4.34), third-person singular and plural subjects (4.35), and inanimate plural disfavored perfective aspect (4.36).

- (4.34) Vivimos en Alcalá de Henares pues, hasta el ochenta y cuatro que vine trasladado a Salamanca, y muy bien. En Madrid [**yo**] estuve muy bien. (XX, f60)  
'We lived in Alcalá de Henares well, until '84 and I came to Salamanca and very good. In Madrid [**I**] was (PRET) very well.'
- (4.35) Se ha venido hasta la puerta de casa y [**él**] estaba sentado en las escaleritas de la calle. (I, f58)  
'He came to the door of the house and [**he**] was (IMP) sitting on the little stairs of the street.'
- (4.36) Es curioso porque hay gente que vacaciones juntas y demás y antes era mucho más dado a compartirlo con los amigos o gente o con tal sí sí sí o grupos o en **excursiones** que estaban hechas, ahora ya no. (XXIV, m55)  
'It's strange because there are people that vacations together and everything and before it was more given to share it with friends or people or with such yes yes yes or groups or on **trips** that were (IMP) made, now no.'

We see that with these examples of *estar* 'be' how the first-person singular was applied with perfective aspect and the third-person singular and inanimate plural subjects with imperfective aspect. According to Hopper (1979b:217), 'the subjects of main-line verb are, furthermore, higher on the agency hierarchy than subjects of backgrounded verbs; hence the preference for proper names and first person pronouns.'

What remains to be explained is the constraint ranking of inanimate singular subjects in the *salmantino* data. In a historical analysis of how the Spanish *-ra* gradually lost Pluperfect meaning and acquired a past subjunctive function, Klein-Andreu (1991) proposed that the subjunctive meaning ousted the Pluperfect based on the assertiveness (indicative) or non-assertiveness (subjunctive) of a sentence, as these notions respectively coincided with 'high-focus' (foregrounded) versus 'low-focus' (backgrounded) actions. She hypothesized that animate subjects would favor the 'high-focus' Pluperfect form, causing the events to be 'more. . .

deserving of attention’ (Klein-Andreu 1991:170), thus, foregrounded information, and inanimate subjects to favor the “low-focus” *-ra* form, or backgrounded information. Results showed that the relative frequency of animate subjects was higher in the Pluperfect (28%) than the inanimate subjects (16%), leading her to the conclusion that animate subjects tended to occur in the ‘high-focused’ (foregrounded) clauses and inanimate subjects tended to occur in ‘low-focused’ (backgrounded) clauses of the Pluperfect. While our study analyzed different past-tense forms than the one of study in the present investigation, it corroborated the conclusions of Reid (1976) and Hopper (1979b, 1982) that inanimate subjects should favor imperfective aspect in backgrounded clauses. With regard to the present investigation, the GoldVarb analysis of all stative verbs together (Table 4-4) shows us that inanimate singular subjects, as in examples (4.37), (4.38), and (4.39), favored perfective aspect (.56) instead of the expected imperfective aspect.

(4.37) P: ¿Te acuerdas, te acuerdas de un regalo específico que te daban?

I: **La bicicleta** fue divina. (III, f44)

P: Do you remember, do you remember a specific gift that they would give you?

I: **The bicycle** [that they gave me] was (PRET) divine.

(4.38) Y entonces dije que no volvía a tener más hijos. Pero me confundí con María. Y luego **el parto de María** ya fue distinto. (XVIII, f58)

‘And so I said that I would not have children again. But I got confused with María. And then **María’s delivery** was (PRET) different.’

(4.39) Entonces parecía como si yo hubiera rejuvenecido 10 años. Quedé como si fuera 10 años más joven. [Ø] Fue muy divertido. Una experiencia muy bonita. (XXII, m34)

So it seemed as if I had gotten 10 years younger. I was like if I was 10 years younger. **It was** (PRET) very fun. A very nice experience.

The inevitable questions were subsequently proposed: how can we explain the results of inanimate singular favoring perfective aspect and why do our findings contradict the trends found in the previous research on Grammatical Person in past-tense aspectual morphology? To address this puzzle we examined the verbs individually to ascertain if there the preference of one

specific verb that could have skewed the results. Table 4-9 reports the distribution of frequencies of past-tense aspect of inanimate singular subjects.

Table 4-9. Distribution of relative frequencies of inanimate singular subjects according to verb

Verb with inanimate singular	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Ser</i>	276	34%	527	66%	803	65%
Other	73	45%	101	55%	174	14%
<i>Haber</i>	22	15%	121	85%	143	12%
<i>Estar</i>	8	10%	72	90%	80	6%
<i>Tener</i>	4	9%	39	91%	43	3%
TOTAL	383	31%	860	69%	1243	100%

The most frequent verbs that co-occurred with inanimate singular subjects were *ser* (65% [803/1243]), followed by all other verbs (14% [174/1243]). The distribution of perfective and imperfective aspect with inanimate singular subjects of these verbs patterned quite differently to *haber* (15% perfective), *estar* (10% perfective), and *tener* (9% perfective), in that *ser* (31% perfective) and all other verbs (45% perfective) displayed higher rates of perfective use than the three former verbs. Thus, these finding led us to investigate the puzzle a bit further. Returning to examples (4.37), (4.38), and (4.39), the excerpts show how the perfective form *fue* ‘it was’ was used with a range of inanimate singular subjects from more concrete (4.37) to more abstract ideas, (4.38) and (4.39). The inanimate subject of (4.37), *la bicicleta* ‘the bicycle’, is a concrete, tangible object, while *el parto de Mariluz* ‘Mariluz’s delivery’ in (4.38) is more abstract; the latter inanimate subject was not a physical item like a bicycle, but rather it represents the totality of the speaker’s experience of the delivery her daughter. In example (4.39) the implicit ‘it’ and pleonastic subject in *fue divertido* ‘it was fun’ is the most abstract of the three subjects, expressing that [the relationship the participant had with his former girlfriend and all of the things they used to do] *fue divertido* ‘was fun’. If the speaker of (4.39) was specifically referring

to the girlfriend *la novia*, the experience *la experiencia*, or the relationship itself *la relación*, the morphological ending of *divertido* would subsequently be altered to the feminine form (*divertida*).

Table 4-10. Relative frequencies of inanimate singular subjects of all other verbs

Verb with inanimate singular	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
All others (including <i>ser estar, tener, haber</i> )	313	29%	784	71%	1097	88%
<i>Gustar</i>	43	44%	55	56%	98	8%
<i>Quedar</i>	14	82%	3	18%	17	1%
<i>Faltar</i>	6	60%	4	40%	10	1%
<i>Costar</i>	5	56%	4	44%	9	1%
<i>Parecer</i>	1	11%	8	89%	9	1%
<i>Poder</i>	0	0%	2	100%	2	<1%
<i>Vivir</i>	1	100%	0	0%	1	<1%
<i>Querer</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	383	31%	860	69%	1243	100%

If we separate ‘all other verbs’ according to the most frequently observed verbs in the corpus (excluding *ser, estar, tener, haber*), as well as by the verbs there were expected to display frequent use of inanimate singular subject, we notice that there are some striking results (Table 4-10). The verbs *quedar* ‘stay/remain’ (82% perfective), *faltar* ‘miss’ (60% perfective), *costar* ‘cost’ (56% perfective), and *gustar* ‘please’ (44% perfective) displayed a higher proportion of perfective aspect with inanimate singular subjects than other verbs in the corpus, even more so than *ser* ‘be’ (34% perfective). This finding was not surprising especially when taking into account the syntactic and lexical nature of these verbs in Spanish, as in (4.40), (4.41), (4.42) and (4.43). First, all of these verbs are commonly used with an object pronoun (i.e., *me costó, me gustó, le quedó*); in fact, with *gustar* this indirect object is practically obligatory. Furthermore, while the interpretation of *gustar* in English is ‘like’, in Spanish speakers ‘code the patient in the same way as a single participant with an intransitive verb; the experiencer then appears in an oblique case’ (Hopper & Thompson 1980:254); the literal meaning of the verb would be

equivalent to ‘please’. Therefore, the syntactic nature of the *gustar* construction lends to the use of inanimate singular subjects in general, as in (4.40).

- (4.40) Pues por ejemplo a mí **la** que más me gustó es la zona de Galicia. (IX, f53)  
‘Well for example **the one** that pleased (PRET) pleasing to me the most is the region of Galicia.’<sup>13</sup>

Semantically, these verbs also facilitated a higher frequency of overall use of inanimate singular subjects. For instance, it would be rare to observe the verb *costar* ‘cost’ with subjects other than inanimate singular or plural ones, since it is more common than an object would cost money than would an animate subject (4.41). In Spanish, *costar* also can mean ‘be difficult’; but, this too would be more logically applied to a tedious task than would a person (4.42). In fact, all of the occurrences of *costar* ( $N=9$ ) were with an inanimate singular subject.

- (4.41) Y querían quitarse el lastre un poco otros lo aprovechamos para comprarlo y ahora recuerdo que me costó **ese coche** 2.025.000 pesetas, o sea estamos hablando de unos 13 o 14 mil euros, ¿eh? (XXIV, m55)  
‘And they wanted to get rid of it a bit, others we took advantage to buy it and now I remember that **that car** cost (PRET) me 2,025,000 pesetas, I mean we’re talking about some 13,000 to 14,000 Euros, okay?’
- (4.42) No era normal, entonces fue algo muy difícil y [Ø] me costó unos años realmente superarlo. (IX, f53)  
‘It was not normal, so it was something very difficult and **it** cost (PRET) me some years really to get over it.’

With respect to the verb *quedar* ‘remain, be left over’, Clements (2006:262) explained that ‘one finds in the vast majority of cases—if not exclusively—inanimate and largely partitive subjects. In fact, definite, referential, non-partitive subjects are not possible with *quedar*, as is the case in the English equivalent.’ As exemplified in (4.43), the inanimate subject of the sentence, *una lesión* ‘an injury’, was what remained with the speaker’s mother after the birth of her first-born child.

---

<sup>13</sup> Only 1 example of the first-person singular subject of *gustar* was found in the *salmantino* corpus.

- (4.43) Siempre la hemos arropado, siempre estuvo enferma, que le quedó una lesión del primer parto y luego tuvo siete, cinco hijos vivos y dos, pero bueno en aquellos tiempos, pues no había nada. (XVIII, f58)  
'We always took care of her, she was always sick, that an **injury remained** (PRET) with her from the first delivery and then she had seven, five living children and two, but well in those times, there wasn't anything.'

Upon taking into consideration the particular stative verbs that showed higher frequencies of inanimate singular subjects in the perfective, it seems as though the favoring of perfective aspect was conditioned by i) Preterit *ser* and ii) the semantic and syntactic properties of *gustar*, *faltar*, *costar*, and *quedar*.

With regard to the results of second-person singular, perfective aspect was strongly disfavored when used with this subject (.17). The findings upon which we based our hypotheses of Grammatical Person— Reid (1976), Hopper (1979b, 1982) and Klein-Andreu (1991)—did not make any mention to the patterns of past-tense aspectual morphology of second-person subject. For that reason, we did not particularly expect one aspectual variant over the other with respect to second-person person singular prior to data collection. However, it was noticed during the interview process that *salmantinos* commonly used the *tú* 'you' form in narratives, not directed to the addressee (specific *tú*), but rather in referring to general actions that *one* frequently did in the past (non-specific *tú*). Let's take a look at examples of the use of second-person singular subjects in (4.44).

- (4.44) Mi abuelo era muy bueno. No, no, no te reñía, no te pegaba, que en aquella época había una educación de otro estilo, pero era muy bondadoso. Y cuando te miraba y [**tú**] sabías que [**tú**] estabas haciendo que no era correcto, lo [**tú**] sabías. (III, f44)  
'My grandfather was very nice. He never ever ever yelled at you, he did not hit you, in those times there was another type of discipline, but he was very kind. And when he looked at you and **you knew** that **you were** doing something that was not right, **you knew** it.'

The speaker in (4.44) described to the listener what her grandfather was like and what would happen if ‘you’ were doing something that ‘you’ shouldn’t have been doing; even earlier in the excerpt the speaker used the second-person singular object pronoun in *no te reñía* ‘he did not yell at you’ and *no te pegaba* ‘he did not hit you’. Thus, it seems logical to infer that the examples of ‘you’ in (4.44) referred to the participant herself or those in direct contact with her grandfather, rather than being addressed to the interlocutor. There has been considerable research in regard to pronoun expression in Spanish (please see Silva-Corvalán 2001:154-169 for a comprehensive overview, as well as Abreu 2009), all which analyze the linguistic, social, and conversational factors to constrain the expression of subject pronouns in L1 speech. The way these analyses connected to our investigation was in regard to the frequency of the non-specific *tú* in Peninsular Spanish, not overt/covert expression of the pronoun itself. For example, Cameron (1996) analyzed the differences in *tú* expression between Puerto Rican and *madrileño* Spanish. It was observed that there were fewer examples of non-specific *tú* use overall in *madrileño* Spanish ( $N=58$ ) than in the Puerto Rican variety ( $N=145$ ). When reviewing Cameron (1996), Silva-Corvalán (2001:164) concluded that Peninsular Spanish speakers did not use *tú* in the non-specific sense as frequently as other varieties possibly because of prescriptive grammar rules emphasized in Spain.

Las gramáticas del español peninsular condenan el uso de ‘*tú* indefinido o impersonal’. Gómez (1992:61), por ejemplo, afirma que en vez de *tú* se deben usar las formas impersonales, *se*, *uno* y la primera persona plural. Es posible que éstas y otras normas prescriptivas sean más severas y se respetan más en España que en Latinoamérica.

Contrary to Silva-Corvalán’s conclusions, we observed that *salmantino* speakers did make frequent use of the non-specific *tú* as a discursive strategy in narratives. One possible function of the use of non-specific *tú*, as opposed to impersonal expressions or the *nosotros* ‘we’ form, could

be to involve or engage the listener or to bring to life background descriptions that the participant personally experienced or witnessed. Of the 129 occurrences of second-person singular subjects of stative verbs in the *salmantino* corpus, only 4 were cases of specific *tú* use, all of which were applied with perfective aspect (4.45).

(4.45) P: Estuve por Santillana del Mar también.

I: Acabo de ir.

P: ¿Has estado? (XXIII, m34)

P: ‘I was around Santillana del Mar also.

I: I just went.

P: **You** (specific) were there?’

With respect to aspectual morphology in the second-person singular form, 122/129 (95%) were applied with imperfective aspect and only 7/129 (5%) with perfective aspect. Therefore, the data overwhelmingly show that (non-specific) second-person singular favored imperfective aspect and, most probably, was used in background descriptions.

#### 4.3.4 Clause Type

Clause Type was the fourth most important factor in terms of magnitude of effect of conditioning *salmantino*-speaker choice of past-tense aspectual morphology (range=20). It has been found that main clauses are more frequent in spoken narratives than written narratives since ‘[Labov (1972) and Syder & Pawley (1983) claimed that narratives are] fragmented into a series of separate main clauses rather than into complex units integrating clauses through embedding and subordinating conjunctions, which appear in writing’ (Clancy 1982:70). In terms of overall frequency of the clauses in which stative verbs were observed in the *salmantino* corpus, 76% of all tokens were in main clauses, 12% in adverbial/causal clauses, 9% in relative clauses, and 2% in complement clauses.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The factor *es que* ‘it is that’ was originally coded separately from main clauses. After finding the same direction of effect in all of the statistical analyses, as well as confirming via Chi-square tests that there was no significant difference between these two groups, we grouped all examples of *es que* with the main clause constraint.

Studies by Reid (1976), Hopper (1979, 1982), Givón (1984), Klein-Andreu (1991), and Diessel (2001) determined high-focused (foregrounded) actions and new topics introduced to the narrative are primarily found in main clauses; main clauses serve advance the storyline temporally in complicating action, climax and resolution narrative clauses. As such, these authors found it common for past-perfective aspect in main clauses in narrative discourse. For this reason, we hypothesized that stative tokens in main clauses would favor perfective aspect, since these clauses commonly introduce new topics and temporally advance the narrative. With respect to subordinate clauses, Bybee (2002:4-5) affirmed that ‘complement clauses. . .serve to recall the information that had somehow been shared earlier. Adverbial clauses that are subordinate use give information to help the hearer identify causes, conditions, times and place.’ As discussed in Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:17), Klein-Andreu (1991), Reid (1976), inter alia, relative clauses, like other subordinate clauses, provide background information to support or further explain the antecedent of the main clause. Yet, Fox & Thompson (1990:306) found the opposite to be true for relative clauses in English narratives: instead of providing background information on already introduced information, new topics and main action events in conversational narration were frequently found to be in relative clauses.

Interestingly, some previous research might lead us NOT to expect the New information in an utterance to occur in a 'subordinate clause' (cf. Givón's 1979 claim that assertions [New information] are accomplished with main clauses rather than non-main clauses). In particular, relative clauses have been generally assumed to provide 'background' information (Givón 1979). However, evidence in favor of our claim that it is the relative clauses in these cases, rather than the main clauses, which are providing the new information comes from the fact that 43% of these main clauses exhibit the semantically bleached transitive verb *have* or *have got*, a significantly higher rate than in transitive main clauses outside of relative-clause utterances. That is, 43% of the Object Heads in our data are. . . where the main clause contains a subject pronoun and *have* or *have got* which ground the object but do not in themselves present any assertion; it is then up to the relative clause to do that asserting work. We see, then, that certain relative clauses can easily serve to convey assertions. In fact, given the relatively high percentage of Object Heads

with Object-relatives in our corpus, it would seem that asserting is a major function of this particular type of 'subordinate' clause, at least in English.

Although the findings of Fox & Thompson (1990) contradicted previous research and offered convincing arguments on how relative clauses might not always function to provide supportive details to main events in narration, we expected that all subordinate clauses, even relative clauses, served to provide background information rather than to introduce new information (main narrative events). Thus, since imperfective aspect is known to convey supportive background details, we expected a disfavoring of perfective aspect of stative verbs in all subordinate clauses.

Table 4-11. Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology according to Clause Type

Clause Type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Main	1043	30%	2384	70%	3427	76%
Sub. adverbial/cause	89	16%	457	84%	546	12%
Sub. relative	62	15%	353	85%	415	9%
Sub. complement	27	22%	96	78%	123	3%
TOTAL	1221	28%	3290	73%	4511	100%

By looking at the relative frequencies in Table 4-11, we notice that stative verbs in main clauses are applied 70% with imperfective aspect and 30% with perfective; yet out of all of the perfective statives in the corpus ( $N=1221$ ), 85% ( $1043/1221$ ) occurred in main clauses, which is congruent with Hopper (1979b, 1982) and Reid (1976). Conversely, stative verbs in all subordinate clauses were less frequently used with perfective aspect (15% [ $178/1221$ ]).

If we return to results of the GoldVarb analysis (Table 4-4), the findings were in line with our hypotheses: main clauses favored perfective aspect (.55), while subordinate complement clauses (.48) and subordinate adverbial/causal/relative clauses disfavored perfective aspect (.35).<sup>15</sup> There were not significant differences between any of the subordinate clauses; however,

<sup>15</sup> In the analysis, the combination of subordinate adverbial/causal clauses and relative clauses was supported by Chi-square test that showed there was not a statistically significant difference between the two factors.

each type of subordinate clause showed a significant difference when tested against main clause (complement clause  $\chi^2=4.05829$ ,  $p\leq 0.0439$ ; adverbial/cause clause  $\chi^2=46.18101$ ,  $p\leq 0.000$ ; relative clause  $\chi^2=43.37774$ ,  $p\leq 0.000$ ). Likewise, when grouping all subordinate clauses together, we found a statistically significant difference between all subordinate clauses and main clause ( $\chi^2=81.92873$ ,  $p\leq 0.000$ ). This evidence allowed us to conclude that the clause in which stative verbs were used by *salmantinos* conditioned the use of past-tense aspectual morphology.

Let's take a look at a few examples from the *salmantino* corpus to further illustrate this claim. The *salmantina* of example (Table 4-12) relayed an emotional event she witnessed in catholic school. To recount how this experience unfolded, the speaker used a series of main clauses (a-c, e-f) to narrate the complicating actions, then concluded they story with the state of the girls watching *se quedaron blancas* 'they were (left) white'. As Labov (1972a) described, face-to-face narratives are primarily composed of fragmented, yet numerous main clauses to facilitate listener comprehension; subordinate clauses are used as well to provide further description of the background (d), but less frequently. Clancy (1983:76) found this to be the case with oral narratives in Japanese, which 'reduces the cognitive burden upon the speaker' as well as 'making [the narrative] easier to understand [for the listener].'

Table 4-12. Narrative excerpt from speaker VI

Excerpt from speaker VI (f, 43)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Si la vieras como salió,	<i>Main clause</i>	'If were to see how she [the nun] came out,
(b) la vio	<i>Main clause</i>	she saw her
(c) y la cayó al suelo de la torta	<i>Main clause</i>	and she knocked her to the floor from the blow
(d) que la dio	<i>Subordinate relative clause</i>	that she gave her
(e) la cayó al suelo,	<i>Main clause</i>	it knocked her down to the floor,
(f) y <b>se quedaron blancas</b>	<i>Main clause</i>	<b>and they [the girls watching] were (PRET) left white.'</b>

As Clancy observed in Japanese oral narratives, the *salmantino* speaker of Table 4-12 narrated the successive events of this experience (complicating action) with five short main clauses, ending with *se quedaron blancas* ‘they were white’ (resolution). As opposed to main clauses, we observed that background details were predominately found in the different types of subordinate clauses. Table 4-13 below demonstrates a how past-tense imperfective stative was used in a complement clause.<sup>16</sup>

Table 4-13. Narrative excerpt from speaker VII, subordinate complement clause

Excerpt from speaker VII (f, 48)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Esta niña <u>era</u> muy problemática,	<i>Main clause</i>	‘That girl was very problematic,
(b) <u>era</u> muy problemática.	<i>Main clause</i>	she was very problematic.
(c) Eh, en cuanto a la comida, en cuanto yo que sé	<i>Main clause</i>	Uh, in regard to food, in regard to I don’t know
(d) no sé,	<i>Main clause</i>	I don’t know,
(e) pero creo que	<i>Main clause</i>	but I think that
(f) <b>tampoco <u>estaba integrada en el, en el grupo.</u></b>	<i>Subordinate complement clause</i>	<b>she <u>was (IMP) not integrated into the, into the group either.</u></b>

The speaker of the narrative excerpt highlighted in Table 4-13 was describing the behavior of one of her houseguests; the complement clause *creo que* ‘I think that’ provided further background details of this person, subsequently supporting the speaker’s claim that her houseguest *era problemática* ‘she was problematic’ by offering the interlocutor more details (*tampoco estaba integrada en el grupo* ‘she was not integrated in the group’). Tables 4-14 and 4-

<sup>16</sup> In an analysis of complement clause in English, Thompson (2002) did not consider that structures such as ‘I think that X’—equivalent to the Spanish *creo que* (subordinate complement clause)—should be analyzed as two separate clauses; instead, these structure only involve one main clause. As Torres Cacoullos & Walker (2009:9) summarized: ‘Thompson (2002) argues further that such structures involve not two clauses but rather combinations of fragments which serve as frames of speaker stance with finite indicative clauses: that is, certain complement-taking predicates are really modals and epistemic/evidential adverbs, while their putative subordinate clauses carry out “the work that the utterance is doing” (Thompson 2002:155). In her view, such “complement constructions” are in fact single clauses that include a speaker-stance frame (Thompson 2002:142).’ In this analysis, we take the traditional view that verbs like *creo que* ‘I think that’ (subordinate complement clause) are two separate clause (main and subordinate, respectively), but, recognize that they could be analyzed in a different fashion.

15 also demonstrate how stative verbs with imperfective aspect were used to provide background description in subordinate causal and adverbial clauses, respectively.

Table 4-14. Narrative excerpt from speaker XVIII

Excerpt from speaker XVIII (f,58)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Eh, lo pasé mal,	<i>Main clause</i>	'Uh, I had a bad time,
(b) lo pasé mal, mal,	<i>Main clause</i>	I had a bad, bad time,
(c) <b>porque eran unos nervios horrorosos,</b>	<i>Subordinate causal clause</i>	<b>because my nerves were (IMP) horrendous,</b>
(d) adelgacé muchísimo.	<i>Main clause</i>	I lost a lot of weight.

Table 4-15. Narrative excerpt from speaker III

Excerpt from speaker III (f, 44)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Luego la negrita he visto	<i>Main clause</i>	'Then I saw the black one [dog]
(b) <b>cuando estaba abandonada y embarazada,</b>	<i>Subordinate adjective clause</i>	<b>when it was (IMP) abandoned and pregnant,</b>
(c) y me vine para ir a casa.	<i>Main clause</i>	and I came to bring [her] home.'

The information of both Tables 4-14 and 4-15 depicted the conditions at the time (orientation) when other main events occurred. In Table 4-14, the main events (a, b, d) were ordered temporally, telling us that since she had a bad time, she subsequently lost weight. The subordinate relative clause (c) was not temporally ordered, as were the main clauses (a, b, d), so that if the order of the latter clauses were changed, then the story would take on a different interpretation; the relative clause (c) did not have these sequencing restrictions. Likewise, in Table 4-15, the participant first saw the dog (a), then decided to bring her home (c); again, the subordinate clause (b) could change positions in the narrative and the story's meaning would not be affected. Both subordinate clauses in Tables 4-14 and 4-15 demonstrate that subordinate clauses often times functioned to provide background details in the *salmantino* narratives.

Table 4-16 furthermore demonstrates how a stative verb was used to in a relative subordinate clause to describe the high school that the participant attended as a teenager.

We see here that the speaker described the details of her high school and how her admission was an exceptional case. As these examples have shown, *salmantino* speakers often used stative verbs with imperfective aspect in subordinate clauses to provide supportive details to the narrative plot. Our argument is not that the information provided was already given to the listener, but rather that the background description in subordinate clauses further support speakers' descriptions in the narrative and give more explicit details to why certain events transpired. Moreover, the fact that stative verbs, by definition, naturally lend themselves to describing background detail more so than other lexical classifications of verbs (i.e., achievements, accomplishments, activities), it seems logical that statives would tend to carry out this function in subordinate clauses.

Table 4-16. Narrative excerpt from speaker I

Excerpt from speaker I (f, 58)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Entré en ese colegio,	<i>Main clause</i>	I got in to that high school
(b) no <u>podía</u> entrar por la edad	<i>Main clause</i>	I <u>couldn't</u> (IMP) get into because of my age
(c) porque <u>era</u> un colegio	<i>Main clause</i>	because it <u>was</u> (IMP) a high school
(d) <b>que <u>estaba</u> patrocinado por el Ministerio de. . .de Obras Públicas.</b>	<i>Subordinate relative clause</i>	<b>that <u>was</u> (IMP) sponsored by the Department of. . .of Public Works.</b>
(e) Y solamente <u>podían</u> entrar personas mayores de de dieciocho años.	<i>Main clause</i>	And only older people around 18 years old <u>could</u> (IMP) get in.
(f) Pero mi padre <u>conocía</u> a la directora de ese colegio, entonces, claro,	<i>Main clause</i>	But, my father <u>knew</u> (IMP) the principal of that high school, so, of course,
(g) yo con catorce años ¿qué iba a hacer?	<i>Main clause</i>	being 14 years old, what was I going to do?

#### 4.3.5 Sentence Type

The fifth factor group selected as significant in the analysis of all stative verbs together was Sentence Type (range=9). In original coding schema, we made the distinction not only between affirmative and negative sentences, but also between declarative and interrogative sentences. Since there were very few occurrences of affirmative interrogative ( $N=16$ ) and negative interrogative sentences ( $N=1$ ) in the data set ( $N=17$ ). Due to this scarcity, we combined

each respective interrogative type according to the polarity of the sentence. As a side note, it was not surprising to observe a low token count of stative verbs in interrogative sentences in the *salmantino* corpus, since a sociolinguistic interview situation is structured so that the interviewer is the one proposing the questions and the participant is the one responding. We would expect to find a greater frequency of interrogatives in spontaneous conversation, since the interlocutors would have more control over proposing new topics of conversation and experimental interview-directed conditions would be less prevalent.

Since previous research has supported the claim that foregrounded actions occurred more frequently with affirmative verb as opposed to negated ones (Reid 1976, Hopper 1979b:221, Klein-Andreu 1991), we expected for stative verbs applied with perfective aspect to favor affirmative sentences. The results of the GoldVarb analysis (Table 4-4) were in line with the conclusions of these investigations: stative verbs applied with perfective aspect favored affirmative sentences (.51) and disfavored negated sentences (.42). Table 4-17 reports the overall frequencies of sentence type for all statives (90% affirmative, 10% negative). To clarify, we labeled negative sentences as those with a pre-verbal *no* ‘no’, *tampoco* ‘neither’, *nunca* ‘never’, *jamás* ‘never’, and *ni* ‘nor’. Notably, in Table 4-17, we see a decrease in frequency of affirmative sentences with imperfective aspect (72% affirmative, 80% negative) and an increase of frequency of affirmative sentences with perfective aspect (28% affirmative, 20% negative).

Table 4-17. Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology according to Sentence Type

Sentence type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Affirmative	1130	28%	2916	72%	4046	90%
Negative	91	20%	374	80%	465	10%
TOTAL	1221	28%	3290	73%	4511	100%

Examples (4.46) and (4.47) demonstrate how speakers used perfective aspect in affirmative sentence (in main clauses) and imperfective aspect in negative sentences (in subordinate clauses).

(4.46) Eso fue muy divertido, porque él. . . no, **no** había nadie en esa casa. (II, f49)  
That was (PRET) very fun, because he. . .no, there was (IMP) **not** anyone in that house.

(4.47) Fue, vamos, una guerra civil que **no** tenía sentido. (IX, f53)  
'It was (PRET), come on, a civil war that did not make (IMP) sense.'

Therefore, we decided to take a closer look at how sentence type related to clause type. The results of a cross-tabulation of perfective aspect between the two factor groups, shown in Table 4-18 provide us further evidence to corroborate findings in Reid (1976), Hopper (1979), Klein-Andreu (1991): 'high-focused' clauses (applied with perfective aspect) are observed more frequently in affirmative sentences and main clauses.

Table 4-18. Cross-tabulation of Sentence Type and Clause Type of perfective aspect

	Main clause % (N)	Adverbial/causal % (N)	Relative % (N)	Complement % (N)	Total % (N)
Affirmative	32 (968)	16 (80)	15 (57)	22 (25)	85 (1130)
Negative	20 (75)	18 (9)	18 (5)	18 (2)	75 (91)
TOTAL N	1043	89	62	27	1221

One can see that the frequency of affirmative sentences of main clauses of stative verbs in the perfective form (32%) is higher than negated main clauses (20%). Yet, when we look at subordinate adverbial/causal and relative clauses, the opposite pattern was found: the frequency of negative sentences in the perfective form (both 18%) was higher than affirmative sentences of subordinate clauses in the perfective form (16% subordinate adverbial/cause, 15% subordinate relative). Subordinate complement clauses followed the same trend as did main clauses, with a higher relative frequency of perfective aspect affirmative clauses (22%), than in negated sentences (18%).

#### 4.3.6 Prepositional Phrase

The final factor group selected as statistically significant in the analysis of all stative verbs was the presence of absence of a prepositional phrase (range=8). It was hypothesized the presence of one or multiple prepositional phrases would favor perfective aspect and those occurrence without a prepositional phrase would disfavor perfective aspect. As explained in §2.5.1.8, we based this hypothesis on the findings in Biber (1992), which found that the presence of prepositional phrases in oral interviews to give the clause a ‘highly informational focus’, and since ‘high-focus’ content has been associated with perfective aspect and foregrounding in narratives, it was expected for perfective stative verbs to be preferred in this context. The GoldVarb analysis (Table 4-4) showed that when co-occurring with a prepositional phrase, perfective aspect was favored (.56); when there a lack of a prepositional phrase, perfective aspect was disfavored (.48).

(4.48) Pero la educación que tuve [**en mi casa**], no la cambio por nada. (III, f44)  
‘But the discipline that I had (PRET) [**in my house**], I don’t change it for anything.’

(4.49) Es una muñeca simplemente, no tenía nada especial, le tocas la tripa y hace un ruido.  
‘It is simply a doll, it didn’t have (IMP) anything special, you touch it’s belly and it makes a noise.’

Although statistically significant, the constraint probabilities (.56-.48) do not indicate a strong favoring or disfavoring of perfective aspect with the presence of a prepositional phrase.

#### 4.3.7 Verb Class of Main Verb

The concept of *Aktionsart*, or the inherent aspect a verb, was the focus of this factor group, since many stative verbs are used as auxiliaries (*ser, estar*) or semi-auxiliary (*tener que, poder, querer, deber, haber que/de, necesitar*), thus, like many other languages, in Spanish one finds constructions consisting of a stative verb and a main verb in the infinitive or gerund form. For example, as discussed in §4.2, the progressive construction in Spanish is comprised of the stative

*estar* ‘be’ as the auxiliary verb and the gerund as the main verb; likewise, the expression of obligation, *tener que* + infinitive, was another commonly observed construction containing a finite verb and main verb. It was of our interest to examine the main verb in the constructions of stative verbs + infinitive/gerund to ascertain if the inherent aspect of the latter had an effect on the former. We classified main verbs according to the following categories: change-of-state (4.50), dynamic (4.51), motion (4.52), speaking (4.53), perception/psychological (4.54) and (4.55), stative (4.56), and *haber* + participle (4.57).<sup>17</sup>

(4.50) **Change-of-state verb:**

Ellos se habían encargado de todo, eh, de localizarlos y muchos se tuvieron que **cambiar de estado**, venir de un estado para vernos. (VII, f48)  
 ‘They had been in charge of everything, uh, of finding us and many had to (PRET) **change states**, come from a state to see us.’

(4.51) **Dynamic verb:**

Pues, mi padre también fue también emigrante, estuvo en Francia **trabajando**. (XV, f59)  
 ‘Well, my father also was an emigrant. He was (PRET) in France **working**.’

(4.52) **Motion verb:**

Yo lo pasé muy bien. Lo único que, que tuve que **andar** moviendo cosas, y estuve en el, este militar de Valladolid.<sup>18</sup> (XXI, m61)  
 ‘I had a good time. The only thing that that I had to (PRET) **go around** moving things, and I was in the, this military from Valladolid.’

(4.53) **Speaking verb:**

Y luego estuvo **explicando** mi hermano mayor: “Pero mujer, cuando te lleva a la cama, ¿no ves que tiene las sábanas blancas? Pues eso es”. (VII, f48)  
 ‘And then my brother was (PRET) **explaining** to be: ‘But woman, when she takes you to bed, don’t you see that it has white sheets? That is it.’”

(4.54) **Perception verb:**

Y estando en Alicante en el paseo marítimo, pues como lo que te digo era muy inquieta, pero había que estar detrás de ella, estábamos **viendo** la ría, estábamos a las grandillas, y la niña estaba aquí, de repente cuando la vio, casi con todo el cuerpo fuera, porque la agarré por el vestido si no se me cae. (I, f58)

<sup>17</sup> In the analysis, perception and psychological main verbs were always analyzed as one factor.

<sup>18</sup> Example (4.52) is contains both an infinitive and gerund; the main verb was classified as motion was *andar* ‘go around’.

‘And being in Alicante on the boardwalk, well as I told you she was very restless, but one had to always be after her, we were (IMP) **looking** at the inlet, we were at the big ones, and my daughter was here, all of a sudden when I saw her, almost with her entire body over, because I grabbed her by the dress so she wouldn’t fall.

(4.55) **Psychological verb:**

Sí, este, el otro día estaba **preocupando** de la pierna. (V, f58)  
‘Yes, uh, the other day she was (IMP) **worrying** about her leg.’

(4.56) **Stative verb:**

Se juntó con una amiga de, del cole, y como le gustaba tanto **ser** peluquera, pues le cogió, cogió las tijeras y le hizo un corte. (XXI, m61)  
‘She got together with a friend from, from school and since she liked (IMP) **being** a hairdresser a lot, well she took her, took the scissors and gave her a haircut.

(4.57) **Haber + participle:**

Yo quería **haberme casado** en la catedral vieja, pero había, no sé, una misa por alguna cosa, algún acontecimiento de la ciudad, no sé que era. . .Nos casamos en la catedral nueva, y muy bien, la verdad es que todo muy bien. (VI, f43)  
‘I wanted (IMP) **to have gotten married** in the Old Cathedral, but there was, I don’t know, a mass for something, some event of the city, I don’t know what it was. . .We got married in the New Cathedral, and very good, the truth is that everything very good.’

It was expected that if a stative verb co-occurred with a main verb whose lexical aspect expressed a change-of-state (4.50) or any type of dynamic action (4.51-4.53), perfective aspect of the stative (semi-)auxiliary would be preferred; if a stative verb co-occurred with a main verb that conveyed perception/psychological (4.54-4.55), stative meaning (4.56), or with *haber* + participle (4.57), perfective aspect was expected to disfavor these environments.

The results of the GoldVarb analysis (Table 4-4) showed that this factor group did not have a statistically significant effect on speaker choice of past-test aspectual morphology. Subsequent Chi-square tests also revealed that there were no significant differences between any of the constraints in the factor group. While the results of Verb Class of Main Verb did not achieve statistical significance in either the GoldVarb or Chi-square tests, the unexpected and

interesting patterns were observed in the relative frequency patterns of the factor group, as shown in Table 4-19.

The distribution of the factors in Table 4-19 confirms some of our hypotheses, but not all. It was expected and found that main verbs expressing change-of-state (29%) and dynamic actions (24%) to be more frequent when co-occurring with a perfective stative. Likewise, it was

Table 4-19. Relative frequencies of Verb Class of Main Verb

Sentence type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Change-of-state (e.g. <i>matar, cambiar, decidir</i> )	9	29%	22	53%	31	5%
Dynamic (e.g. <i>cantar, trabajar, hacer</i> )	72	24%	230	76%	302	48%
Stative (e.g. <i>estar, ser, tener, vivir</i> )	13	<b>20%</b>	53	80%	66	10%
Motion (e.g. <i>ir, venir, llegar, correr, andar</i> )	24	<b>19%</b>	105	81%	129	20%
Speaking (e.g. <i>decir, preguntar, contestar</i> )	9	<b>16%</b>	47	84%	56	9%
Perception/psychological (e.g. <i>ver, enfadar</i> )	6	18%	27	82%	33	5%
<i>Haber</i> + participle (i.e., <i>haber ido, haber sido</i> )	1	6%	15	94%	16	3%
TOTAL	134	21%	499	79%	633	100%

also observed that finite statives co-occurring with main verbs with perception/psychological meaning (18%) and the *haber* + past participle form (6%) were less frequent in the data.

However, we did not expect that stative (semi-)auxiliaries co-occurring with motion or speaking main verbs (examples 4.52 and 4.53) to be less frequent in the data than statives main verbs (4.56). This unexpected result drew us back to the *salmantino* data to examine exactly which stative verbs were used in the verb + stative constructions.

Table 4-20. Distribution of verb + stative main verbs

Stative Main Verbs	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Verb + <i>estar</i>	0	0%	21	100%	21	32%
Verb + <i>ser</i>	3	19%	13	81%	16	24%
Verb + <i>tener</i>	2	13%	13	87%	15	23%
Verb + <i>vivir</i>	<b>5</b>	<b>62%</b>	3	38%	8	12%
Verb + other	1	25%	3	75%	4	6%
Verb + <i>quedarse</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	0	0%	2	3%
TOTAL	13	20%	53	80%	66	100%

Table 4-20 outlines the stative main verbs that *salmantino* speakers used in verb + main verb constructions. It becomes apparent that two of these main verbs were more frequently used with perfective aspect than other stative main verbs in the data: i) *vivir* ‘live’ (62% [5/8]) and ii) *quedarse* ‘stay’ (100% [2/2]). Five out of these seven occurrences are provided below in (4.58), (4.59), (4.60), and (4.61).

(4.58) P: De hecho, mi hermana, la que de detrás de mí, mi padre y madre y yo tuvimos un accidente en Portugal que íbamos por 8 días y que nos quedamos todo el mes de septiembre también. Nos quedamos. . .mira, [*signaling with hand*], este es el puente y el coche se quedó colgado aquí, por debajo pasaba el tren y más abajo el río.<sup>19</sup>

I: ¿Qué pasó al coche?

P: Pues, por eso **nos tuvimos que quedar** porque el coche. . .era un Opel Capitán y no había los repuestos. Nos tenían que mandar de Alemania. Y **nos tuvimos que quedar** en el hotel hasta que nos arreglaron. Y . . .y nos fuimos todo el mes estuvimos el Costa Nova, cerca del Prado. Al lado de Alveiro. (XI, f65)

P: ‘In fact, my sister, the one after me, my father and mother and I had an accident in Portugal that we were going for eight days and we stayed the entire month of September also. We stayed. . .look, [*signaling with hand*], this is the bridge and the car was hung here, underneath the train would pass by and lower down the river.

I: What happened to the car?

P: Well, for that reason we **had to** (PRET) **stay** because the car. . .it was an Opel Captain and there weren’t any parts. They had to send [them] from Germany. And we **had to** (PRET) **stay** in the hotel until they fixed it. And. . .and we went the entire month. We were in Costa Nova, close to Prado. Next to Alveiro.’

(4.59) Mira, yo soy de aquí de Salamanca, nacida, criada, vivida, etcétera. Solamente **estuve** cinco años fuera **viviendo** en las Palmas de Gran Canaria. . .pero siempre he vivido en Salamanca. (XVIII, f58)

‘Look, I am from here, from Salamanca. Born, raised, lived, etc. I only **was** (PRET) five years away **living** in the Palms of the Canary Islands. . .but I have always lived in Salamanca.’

(4.60) Recuerdos muy buenos, sí, sobre todo de una época entre los cinco y los diez años **estuve viviendo** en un pueblo cerca aquí de Salamanca. (I, f58)

‘Very good memories, yes, above all from the time from five to ten years old I **was** (PRET) **living** in a town close here to Salamanca.’

(4.61) Entonces **estuvimos viviendo** allí un año, yo examiné allí. (XXI, m61)

<sup>19</sup> It is not clear whether the verb *nos quedamos* was used in the Preterit or HP, since the morphological endings for both first-person plural forms are the same in Spanish. We are going to interpret this verb as ‘we stayed’ (Preterit), as did Silva-Corvalán (1983:775, footnote 25), although it is possible to interpret the verb as ‘we stay’ (HP).

‘Then we were (PRET) **living** there one year, I tested there.’

As we see in (4.58), the same speaker used both instances of the perfective verb + *quedarse* construction (*nos tuvimos que quedar* ‘we had to stay’) with the semi-auxiliary *tener* in the first-person plural form. The speakers of examples (4.59), (4.60) and (4.61) of *estar* + *viviendo* also employed the first-person plural and singular forms as well. Furthermore, all of *estar* + *viviendo* examples co-occur with specific or marked time frames (*cinco años* ‘five years’, *entre los cinco y los diez años* ‘between the age of five and ten years old’, *un año* ‘one year’). Recall that first-person subjects, as well as specific and marked time frames, were two constraints that favored perfective aspect in the GoldVarb analysis of all stative verbs (Table 4-4). Therefore, it seems as though the other factor groups shown to have a statistically significant effect on the linguistic variable (i.e., Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person) came into play with speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology with these particular constructions.

#### 4.3.8 Adjective/Past Participle and Structural Priming

There were two factor groups that were not included in the multivariate analysis shown in Table 4-4: the presence/absence of an Adjective/Past Participle and Structural Priming. With respect to the first factor group, the presence/absence of an adjective/past participle, it was originally included in the statistical analyses. In fact, it was an important factor group to examine, since we expected stative verbs co-occurring with adjectives would favor perfective aspect. This hypothesis was based on Biber (1992), who concluded that when adjectives, like prepositional phrases (§4.3.6), can indicate that the statement has a ‘highly-information[al] focus’. Let’s take a look at a few examples adjectives that co-occur with perfective stative verbs in (4.62) and (4.63).

(4.62) P: ¿Cómo era esa época?

I: Pues, fue muy **buena**, y luego muy **mala**. (XIV, f53)

P: What was that time like?

I: ‘Well, it was (PRET) very **good**, and then very **bad**.’

- (4.63) Ha sido todo trayectoria. Ehh, todo poco a poco. Ehh, sí, es verdad que cambiamos de la televisión de blanco y negro a la televisión en color. ¡Ja, ja, ja, ja! Que fue **importante**, un cambio muy importante. (XIII, f42)  
 It’s all been a journey. Uhhh, everything little by little. Uhhh, yes, it is true that we changed from black-and-white television to color television. Ha, ha, ha, ha! It was (PRET) **important**, a very important change.’

In examples (4.62) and (4.63), the respective speakers conveyed their perspectives of a certain moment in the past by using the perfective statives with the adjectives *buena* ‘good’, *mala* ‘bad’, *importante* ‘important’, all of which helped to communicate the speakers’ subjective point of view. However, we also see that in (4.64), participant XX applied imperfective aspect to express her opinion of the political environment she was living in before moving to Madrid.

- (4.64) Luego ya nos marchamos a Madrid, venimos traslado por la política porque estaba estaba muy **feo** en aquella época. . . .San Sebastián. (XX, f60)  
 ‘Then we left for Madrid, we moved because of the politics because it was it was (IMP) very **ugly** in that time. . . .San Sebastián.’

Therefore, to explain this variation, we wanted to test if the presence (or absence) of an adjective affected speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology. Unfortunately, it was not possible to include the factor group in the multivariate analysis, since it did not provide a good model of fit to account for the *salmantino* data in any of the analyses.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, the presence/absence of an adjective/past participle was analyzed separately via Chi-square tests.

Table 4-21. Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle

Adjectives	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No adjective/past participle	968	27%	2620	73%	3588	81%
Adjective/past participle	227	26%	636	74%	863	19%
TOTAL	1195	27%	3256	73%	4451	100%

<sup>20</sup> The adjectives were originally coded as V + adjective in the Collocation factor group; yet, they were separated from Collocation because there were many example of more than one type of factor in the linguistic context (e.g. gerund + adjective). To more accurately code the data, we separated Adjectives from Collocation. Likewise, to avoid a cross-over effect, verb + *bien/mal* was marked with a slash (/) when an adjective was present. It is unknown why the Adjective factor group did not provide a good fit for the data.

The results showed that there was no significant difference between stative verbs with or without an adjective or participle in the linguistic context. If we look at the reported frequencies in Table 4-21, we also see that the distribution of perfective and imperfective aspect is fairly consistent with the overall relative frequencies with or without an adjective. The claim that speakers used perfective aspect + adjective/past participle to highlight discursive content and to convey subjective viewpoints in the narrative could not be supported by the results of statistical analyses.

Structural Priming was the final factor analyzed in the present investigation, but not included in the overall multivariate analysis of perfective (Preterit and PP combined) vs. imperfective aspect of stative verbs (Table 4-4). Recall that priming refers to ‘the process whereby the use of a certain structure in one utterance functions as a prime on to subsequent utterance, such that the same structure is repeated’ (Travis 2007:101). Priming was initially included in the analysis to operationalize our hypothesis that if perfective aspect was applied to a verb in one of the two preceding clauses, stative tokens also would prefer that same perfective marking. When analyzing Structural Priming, we coded for the prime of the specific variant in the two preceding clauses. Let’s take a look at examples (4.65), (4.66), (4.67) and (4.68) to better illustrate how the factors were coded.

- (4.65) **Prime, Prime** (both preceding forms were applied with the same past-tense aspectual markings as the token):  
 Luego se le pasó <sub>(P1)</sub> la niña muy bien. Siguió <sub>(P2)</sub> estudiando, se **quedó** aquí. (V, f58)  
 ‘Then the girl had <sub>(P1)</sub> a very good time. She continued <sub>(P2)</sub> studying, she **stayed** here.’
- (4.66) **Prime, No Prime** (only the first of the two preceding forms was applied with the same past-tense aspectual marking as the token):  
 Luego yo no me atrevía <sub>(P1)</sub> a subir a casa que, cuando llegamos <sub>(No P)</sub>, **era** tarde. (X, f48)  
 ‘Then I did not dare <sub>(P1)</sub> to go to that house that, when we arrived <sub>(No P)</sub>, it **was** late.’
- (4.67) **No Prime, Prime** (the latter verb, but not the former, was applied with the same past-tense aspectual marking as the token):  
Fue <sub>(No P)</sub> terrible. Para mí, era <sub>(P1)</sub> terrible, aparte que **era** fea. (I, f58)  
 ‘She was <sub>(No P)</sub> horrible. To me, she was <sub>(P1)</sub> horrible, besides she **was** ugly.’

- (4.68) **No Prime, No Prime** (neither form was applied with the same past-tense aspectual marking as the token):  
 La verdad que el muchacho ya murió (No P), una cesaría tuvieron (No P) que hacer de urgencias, eh la niña no quería nacer. (XVII, f31)  
 ‘The truth that the boy already died (No P), a cesarean they had (No P) to do urgently, uh the girl did not want to be born.’

This factor group was analyzed in all individual analysis of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect; however, once we joined the Preterit and PP as one perfective variant, we were unable to include Structural Priming into the analysis due to the specificity of the coding, seen in the examples above.

While the factor group was not incorporated into the perfective vs. imperfective multivariate analysis (Table 4-4), the results of Structural Priming of the individual analyses were quite surprising. The probability values in Table 4-22 were taken from the original analyses of Preterit vs. Imperfect (Table 4-2) and PP vs. Imperfect (Table 4-3) of all stative verbs; in both analyses this factor group was selected as statistically significant. Surprisingly, we found that the direction of effect for the highest and lowest constraint of Structural Priming was exactly the opposite of what we expected. The results of each analysis showed that the respective perfective stative (Preterit or PP) was favored if the verbs in the two preceding were *not* applied with the same perfective variant (as in 4.68). Conversely, the perfective stative form was disfavored if both verbs in the two preceding clauses were of the same perfective aspect (as in 4.65).

Therefore, it seems that there was an ‘unpriming effect’ rather than a priming one.

Table 4-22. Probabilities of Structural Priming of perfective variants, from Tables 4-2 and 4-3

Structural Priming	Probability of Preterit	Probability of PP
No prime, no prime	.59	.74
Prime, no prime	.57	.47
No prime, prime	.55	.57
Prime, prime	.39	.30
<i>Range</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>44</i>

Furthermore, Structural Priming ranked second in terms of magnitude of effect in PP vs. Imperfect (range=44) and fifth in Preterit vs. Imperfect analyses (range=20); since the relative strength can 'be used to compare the variable grammar of linguistic features across analyses', we can conclude that Structural Priming had a stronger effect in conditioning the PP use than Preterit use (Tagliamonte 2006:242).

A possible explanation for this finding is two-fold and relates to narrative structure and face-to-face interaction. First, it could be that the scope of the analysis of Structural Priming with respect to past-tense aspectual morphology was not broad enough to account for the cognitive factors involved in oral narrations. Perhaps it was necessary to analyze more preceding clauses or to focus on the introduction to new topics in conversation through inter-speaker priming. Another possible reason that Structural Priming patterned the way it did could be due to narrative structure itself. When narrating a story, it is rare that a speaker simply narrates the main events of a story without inserting some evaluative judgments, background information or additional commentary. Take, for example, the following excerpt (Table 4-23) from participant I (f, 58).

#### **4.4 Summary**

In this chapter, we have provided quantitative and qualitative analysis to determine the linguistic factors contributing to *salmantino* speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. Through multivariate analysis of perfective vs. imperfective aspect of all stative verbs together, it was discovered that the factor groups Temporal Determinant, Collocation Grammatical Person, Clause Type, Sentence Type, and Prepositional Phrase were selected as statistically significant in conditioning the use of past-tense aspectual markings. The linguistic and discursive environments that prefer a perfective stative are as follows:

Table 4-23. Narrative excerpt from speaker I

Excerpt from speaker I	Type of narrative detail	English Translation
(a) <u>Falleció</u> mi madre	<i>Event</i>	My mother <u>died</u> (PRET)
(b) para mí <u>fue</u> un golpe un duro, muy duro	<i>Event</i>	for me it <u>was</u> (PRET) a very hard blow, very hard
(c) porque yo <u>estaba</u> muy unida a ellos	<i>Background</i>	because I <u>was</u> (IMP) very close to them
(d) y mi madre para mí <u>era</u> todo.	<i>Background</i>	and my mother to me <u>was</u> (IMP) everything.
(e) Lo <u>pasé</u> muy mal,	<i>Event</i>	I went <u>through</u> (PRET) bad time,
(f) <u>enfermé</u> eh. . .	<i>Event</i>	I <u>got</u> (PRET) sick uh. . .
(g) a los cinco años de morir ella <u>tuve</u> un cáncer de la mama	<i>Event</i>	five years after she died I <u>got</u> (PRET) breast cancer
(h) y me lo <u>quitaron</u> ,	<i>Event</i>	they <u>took</u> (PRET) it out,
(i) gracias a dios <u>estoy</u> aquí.	<i>Commentary</i>	thank goodness I <u>am</u> (PRES) here. <sup>21</sup>
(j) Y luego <u>he tenido</u> otra serie de enfermedades	<i>Event</i>	and then I've <u>had</u> (PP) another series of illnesses
(k) y. . .bueno pues, las <u>voy</u> salvando	<i>Commentary</i>	and. . .well, I <u>am surviving</u> (PRES) them
(m) como <u>puedo</u> .	<i>Commentary</i>	as I <u>can</u> (PRES).

1. When co-occurring with temporal adverbial expressions of a specific, punctual past time frame
2. In verb + *bien/mal* collocations
3. First-person singular and plural and inanimate singular subject (of specific stative verbs)
4. Main clauses as opposed to subordinate clauses
5. Affirmative sentences as opposed to negative sentences
6. With the presence of a prepositional phrase
7. Complicating actions, peaks, resolution clauses

<sup>21</sup> Abbreviation for present tense.

8. Evaluative, subjective commentary (coinciding with the narrative clauses above)
9. Stative verbs lacking a temporal adverbials or collocation structure did not favor nor disfavor one
10. aspectual variant over the other

Again, these are the conclusions when examining all stative verbs together. Yet, some substantial questions remain to be answered: how do the most frequent stative verbs (*ser*, *estar*, *tener*, *haber*) compare when analyzed separately? Are the same factor groups selected as statistically significant? Do the factors within these factor groups have the same direction of effect? To partially respond to these questions, Chi-square tests of perfective vs. imperfective occurrences were conducted between *ser*, *estar*, *tener* and *haber*. It was subsequently found that there were significant differences between all of the verbs ( $p \leq 0.000$ ), with the exception of *ser* vs. *tener* ( $p \leq 0.1390$ ). Because of this evidence, we continued the investigation of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verb with the aim to discover if all stative verbs displayed similar patterns, or if the individual stative verbs were conditioned by a different set of linguistic factors. We explore this topic in Chapter 5 and offer a comparison of the findings for the individual stative verbs to the all stative analysis discussed in this chapter.

We would like to emphasize one final element with regard to the analysis before concluding this chapter: the importance of narrative structure in the analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology. It would be misleading not to take the different narrative clauses into account, as the linguistic functions of linguistic forms, especially tense and aspect, are ‘derived from and deployed in discourse’ (Hopper 1979b:222). Echoing this affirmation, Brown & Yule (1983:1) explained:

The analysis of discourse, is necessarily, the analysis of language use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms and independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs.<sup>22</sup>

One of the main goals of our study was to capture how the *salmantino* community expresses past-tense events using stative verbs; our analysis of past-aspectual morphology could not be divorced from the discursive context in which forms are situated (see Silva-Corvalán 1983). We examined sentences in terms of ‘high-focus’ and ‘low-focus’ (Klein-Andreu 1991) and, as the data have shown, foregrounded or backgrounded clauses were not always determined by which form of the past-tense aspectual morphology was used by *salmantino* speakers.<sup>23</sup> Rather, these concepts helped us in the interpretation and explanation of the results, and allowed us to further understand how *salmantino* used the linguistic variable in the face-to-face interviews.

---

<sup>22</sup> As cited by Schiffrin (1994:31).

<sup>23</sup> Additionally, we recognize, as do other researchers (cf. Vet 1990), that it is a circular argument to say that all verbs in foregrounded clauses are applied with perfective aspect and all backgrounded clauses with imperfective aspect.

## CHAPTER 5 LINGUISTIC FACTORS OF INDIVIDUAL VERB ANALYSES

The present chapter is an extension of the analysis of linguistic factors influencing speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology as applied to stative verbs (Chapter 4). Since we found a statistically significant difference between perfective vs. imperfective use of the four most frequent stative verbs (*ser* ‘be’, *estar* ‘be (located)’, *tener* ‘have’, *haber* ‘exist’), we wanted to further examine each individual verb, as well as all other verbs (e.g. *poder* ‘be able’, *querer* ‘want’, *vivir* ‘live’), to discover if the patterns were congruent to the findings of all stative verbs analyzed together (Table 4-4).<sup>1</sup> To remind the reader, the factor groups that were selected as statistically significant in conditioning the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of all stative verbs were as follows (in order of magnitude of effect): Temporal Determinant, Collocation, Grammatical Person, Clause Type, Sentence Type, and Prepositional Phrase. The factor group not selected as statistically significant was Verb Class of Main Verb. Also to facilitate the discussion in this chapter, we repeat below the frequencies of all stative verbs as seen in Chapter 4 in Table 5-1.<sup>2</sup>

Let us now examine the results for the individual analyses on the four most frequent and all other stative verbs to address these questions and further delve into to the linguistic puzzle of how *salmantinos* used stative verbs applied with past-tense aspectual morphology in face-to-face discourse. We will report the results of the individual analyses and compare these findings to the analysis of all stative verbs together. The comparative method in sociolinguistic has been

---

<sup>1</sup> As discussed in §4.4 all Chi-square tests were significant with  $p \leq 0.000$ , except between *ser* and *tener* ( $p \leq 0.1390$ ).

<sup>2</sup> Also recall that in §4.2 we explained that the Preterit and perfective PP tokens were combined as one perfective variant and tested against all instances of the Imperfect tense, the imperfective variant. Unless otherwise indicated, all preliminary results of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect analyses shared similar significant factor groups and direction of effect.

commonly employed to compare and contrast the linguistic systems of different varieties of a particular language or vernacular (e.g. Poplack & Tagliamonte 2001, Torres Cacoullos & Schwenter 2008); here, we incorporate this method to compare the findings of the different stative verbs by using the three lines of evidence: i) factor groups that did or did not achieve statistical significance, ii) the magnitude of effect of these groups, and iii) the constraint hierarchies within each of these factor groups (Tagliamonte 2006:235, 245). To conclude this chapter, we will offer a summary section of the results of the linguistic factors shown to condition *salmantino*-speaker choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs.

Table 5-1. Distribution of *ser*, *estar*, *tener* and *haber* as compared to all remaining verbs, listed by variant

Verb	Preterit		PP		Imperfect		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Ser</i> ‘be’	311	19%	91	5%	1256	76%	1658	37%
<i>Estar</i> ‘be (located)’	238	28%	97	11%	518	61%	853	19%
<i>Tener</i> ‘have’	136	16%	40	5%	640	78%	816	18%
<i>Haber</i> ‘exist’	29	9%	8	2%	292	89%	329	7%
All other verbs	218	25%	53	6%	584	68%	855	19%
TOTAL	932	21%	289	6%	3290	73%	4511	100%

### 5.1 Results and Discussion: *Estar* ‘Be’

The verb *estar* ‘be (located)’ was the second most frequently observed stative verb in the *salmantino* corpus, representing 19% of all instances of verbs of state applied with past perfective or imperfective aspect ( $N=853$ ). Of the four most frequent stative verbs in the data, *estar* had the highest rate of perfective variants— Preterit (28% [238/853]) and PP (11% [91/853])—and, consequently, the lowest percentage of the imperfective variant (61%). Originating from the Latin verb *stare* ‘stand’, *estar* takes on copulative (5.1), locative (5.2), auxiliary (5.3), and passive voice functions (5.4).

- (5.1) El viaje de ida, y todo el tiempo ahí muy bien, el viaje de vuelta fue uf porque estábamos todos muy **cansados**, y era un viaje muy largo. (XXV, m29)

‘The trip there, and all the time there very good, the trip back was ugh because we were (IMP) all very **tired**, and it was a long trip.’

(5.2) Yo estuve **en una plaza muy bonita** (V, f58)  
‘I was (PRET) **in a very beautiful square**.’

(5.3) Estaba **haciendo** un curso de piscina, estuve **haciendo** otro de . . . de cuerno. Estuve **aprendiendo** también a tamboril, hice un curso de tamboril, tocaba la gaita y tamboril. (XXI, m61)  
‘I was (IMP) doing a **swimming** course, I was (PRET) **doing** another . . .horn [course]. I was (PRET) **learning** also the drums, I took a drums course, I used to play the bagpipes and drums.

(5.4) Pero bueno éramos también adolescentes que, y, y yo cuando me venía de haber duchado, de haber lavado, mi cama ya estaba **hecha**. (VI, f43)  
‘But well we were also adolescents that, and, and I when I would come back from having showered, from having washed, my bed was (IMP) already **made**.’

Likewise *estar* has been the focus of several studies with regard to its innovative use in adjectival predicates in language contact situations as well as in monolingual varieties (Jonge 1987, Gutiérrez 1989, Silva-Corvalán 1986, 1994a, among others). Bybee et al. (1994:130) furthermore described special properties and functions of the verb:

The Spanish auxiliary that produces a progressive construction with the present participle is *estar*, which comes from the Latin *stare* meaning ‘to stand’. However, by the time the Spanish Progressive developed, probably very little of the specific postural meaning of *estar* remained. On the other hand, the use of *estar* in contrast with the other Spanish copular, *ser*, retain some locative and postural nuances, as it is *estar* that is always used for location and temporary states.

For these reasons, when examining the verb *estar*, we decided to add another factor group not included in other multivariate analyses: the presence or absence of a locative expression.

While we recognize that other stative verbs also co-occur with locative elements (e.g. *vivir*, *quedarse*, *ser*), it was determined this factor group would best be examined with *estar* due to its etymological origin. Adopting the criteria employed in Torres Cacoullos (2001:454-5), locative expressions were defined as i) prepositional phrases (i.e., *en* ‘in’ + place, *con* ‘with’ + person, *por* ‘around’ + place) ii) deictic adverbs (i.e., *aquí* ‘here’ or *allí* ‘there’, *allá* ‘other there’), and

Table 5-2. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to *estar*

Input probability: 0.341 (39.3%)				
N=335/853	% perfective	Probability	Total <i>N</i>	% Data
Temporal determinant				
Punctual marker	82	.85	107	16
Temporal sequencer/marked frame/durative	74	.78	37	6
Absent	31	.42	174	71
General past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	8	.11	4	6
<i>Range</i>		.74		
Grammatical person				
1s	64	.74	163	30
1p	46	.54	65	17
2s, 3s	32	.43	85	32
3p	15	.27	14	11
Inanimate singular, plural	9	.19	8	11
<i>Range</i>		.55		
Sentence type				
Affirmative	41	.52	332	96
Negative	8	.14	3	4
<i>Range</i>		.38		
Clause type				
Main clause	46	.58	303	77
Subordinate clause	16	.25	32	23
<i>Range</i>		.33		
Locative Expression				
Present	52	.62	183	42
Absent	30	.41	151	59
<i>Range</i>		.21		
Verb class (gerund)				
<i>Estar</i> + change-of-state/dynamic	33	.54	42	71
<i>Estar</i> + speaking/motion/psych./perception/ stative	28	.40	15	29
<i>Range</i>		.14		
Collocation				
<i>Estar</i> alone, <i>estar</i> + <i>bien/mal</i>	42	[.54]	278	79
<i>Estar</i> + gerund	31	[.36]	55	21
Prepositional phrase				
Present	38	[.51]	131	69
Absent	31	[.50]	70	31
Log likelihood=-393.593; p= 0.001; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.9751				

iii) other adverbial expressions (e.g. arriba ‘above’, abajo ‘below’, adentro ‘inside’, afuera ‘outside’).<sup>3</sup>

Table 5-2 presents the results of the GoldVarb analysis of all linguistic factor groups, including the Locative factor group. Congruent to the findings for all stative verbs in Chapter 4, the factor group with the highest magnitude of effect conditioning speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of *estar* was Temporal Determinant (range=74). Also selected as statistically significant were Grammatical Person (range=55), Sentence Type (range=38), Clause Type (range=33), Locative Expression (range=21), and Verb Class of Main Verb (range=14); the latter factor group was not selected as significant in the analysis of all statives. The factor groups that did not achieve statistical significance in the analysis of *estar* were Collocation and Prepositional Phrase; in contrast, these two factor groups in the analysis of all stative verbs were selected as statistically significant.

### 5.1.1 *Estar*: Temporal Determinant

The constraints of the Temporal Determinant factor group followed the same direction of effect as the analysis of all statives together, with punctual markers (.85), temporal sequencers and marked frame/durative expressions favoring perfective *estar* (.78); the absence of a temporal adverbial expression slightly disfavored perfective *estar* (.42) and *siempre* ‘always’ and general past and habitual expressions strongly disfavored perfective *estar* (.11).<sup>4</sup> Even though *siempre* disfavored perfective aspect in the overall analysis of statives in Chapter 4 (.32), the probability of *siempre* co-occurring with *estar* applied with perfective aspect was more strongly disfavored than before. If we take a closer look at the frequencies of the latter constraint, only

---

<sup>3</sup> When coding for locative expression, if the prepositional phrases (e.g. *en* ‘in’ + place, *con* ‘with’ + person, *por* ‘around’ + place) were present in the linguistic environment, the presence of a prepositional phrase was marked with a slash (/) to avoid statistical interactions between the two groups.

<sup>4</sup> Chi-square tests showed no significant difference between general past, habitual expressions and *siempre*.

7% (2/26) of perfective *estar* instances co-occurred with *siempre*, but this rate was higher in the analysis of all statives (14% [10/72]).

- (5.5) Eh. . .se trataban bien, entonces mis padres se conocían desde los seis años y **siempre** fueron. . . estuvieron juntos hasta que se casaron y vivieron juntos. (I, f58)  
'Uh. . .they got along well, so my parents knew each other since six years old and **always** they were. . .were (PRET) together until they got married and lived together.
- (5.6) Siempre la hemos arropado, **siempre** estuvo enferma que le quedó una lesión del primer parto y luego tuvo siete, cinco hijos vivos y dos, pero bueno en aquellos tiempos, pues no había nada. (XVIII, f58)  
'We always took care of her, she **always** was (PRET) sick, that an injury remained with her from the first delivery and then she had seven, five living children and two. . ., but well in those times, there wasn't anything.'

Regardless, the important points to take away from the results of the Temporal Determinant factor group of *estar* were i) the factor group had the highest magnitude of effect and ii) the constraints displayed the same direction of effect as the overall analysis of all stative verbs.

### 5.1.2 *Estar*: Grammatical Person

With regard to the second strongest factor group conditioning speaker-choice of past-tense aspect, Grammatical Person (range=55), we noticed similar trends but an important difference in the individual constraint hierarchy when compared to the results of all stative verbs in Chapter 4. Parallel to the results reported in Table 4-4, first-person singular (.74) and plural subjects (.54) favored the perfective form of *estar*, while second and third-person singular (.43) and third-person plural subjects disfavored the application of perfective aspect with *estar* (.27). These patterns were also congruent to the previous research which expected for first-person subjects to favor perfective aspect and third-person subjects to disfavor perfective aspect (§4.3.3). Yet, the noteworthy difference between the multivariate analyses of all stative verbs together and *estar* was in regard to inanimate subjects. In the analysis of all statives, inanimate singular subjects favored perfective aspect (.61), whereas the individual analysis of *estar*

inanimate singular and plural subject strongly disfavored the form (.19).<sup>5</sup> It was explained in §4.3.3 that the choice of inanimate singular subjects appeared to be constrained by the lexical and syntactic properties of specific stative verbs (i.e., *quedar*, *costar*, *faltar*, *gustar*, *ser*); the results of *estar* were in line with conclusions by Reid (1976), Hopper (1979b), and Klein-Andreu (1991). Out of 80 instances of inanimate singular subjects used with *estar*, only 8 were applied with perfective aspect (10% [8/80]); there were no occurrences inanimate plural subjects in the perfective form of *estar* (0% [0/14]). If we take a closer look at the data, there are two important observations to mention in regard to inanimate singular subjects and perfective *estar*. First, 75% (6/8) of these examples of inanimate singular subjects with perfective *estar* co-occurred with the adverb *bien* ‘good, well’, as in (5.7) and (5.8), and 25% (2/8) with an adjective or past participle, as in (5.9) *cerrado* ‘closed’ and *flojo* ‘weak’ (5.10).

- (5.7) [Discussing her wedding day] Y fue una experiencia muy bonita porque para la gente que vino de fuera, la gustó muchísimo ir a Alba de Tormes y todo estuvo bien. (XV, f58)  
 ‘And it was a very beautiful experience because for the people that came from outside, they liked going to Alba de Tormes a lot and everything was (PRET) **good**.’
- (5.8) P: Pues no llegaron a tres meses de campamento y otros dos meses y pico, seis meses o sea, estaría de mili.  
 I: Entonces no estuvo tan mal-  
 P: No, no, no, nada, nada, nada. El mili estuvo muy **bien**. (XXI, m61)  
 P: ‘Well, they didn’t arrive in three months of camp and another two months and some, six months, I mean, I would be in the army.  
 I: So it wasn’t too bad-  
 P: No, no, no, nothing, nothing, nothing. The army was (PRET) very **good**.’
- (5.9) [Discussing the immediate outcome of Franco’s death] Todo música militar todos los días. Y los cuatro días que estuvo todo automáticamente **cerrado**, las discotecas, los bares, todo. (III, f44)  
 ‘All military music every day. And for four days everything was (PRET) automatically **closed**, discos, bars, everything.’

---

<sup>5</sup> There was no significant difference found between inanimate singular and inanimate plural subjects ( $\chi^2=1.323563$ ,  $p \leq 0.2500$ )

- (5.10) Parece que se arregló un poquito la cosa, pero en esos meses ha estado la organización un poco **flojo**. (XV, f58)<sup>6</sup>  
 ‘It seems that the thing got fixed a bit, but during those months the organization was (PP) a bit **weak**.’

The speakers used all of the inanimate singular subjects either with an adverb, past participle or adjective (100% [8/8]). Second, 75% (6/8) of the inanimate singular subjects were abstract ideas—*todo* ‘everything’ in (5.7) and (5.9)—, instead of tangible, concrete nouns (25% [2/8]) (e.g. *una casa* ‘a house’, *la ventana* ‘the window’, *un helicóptero* ‘a helicopter’). If we compare this ratio with inanimate singular subjects of *estar* applied with imperfective aspect (90% [72/80]), 65% (47/72) of these subjects were concrete, tangible nouns, whereas only 35% (25/72) of these subjects were used to express more abstract ideas (i.e., pleonastic ‘it’ (21/72), *todo* ‘everything’ (3/72) or *algo* ‘something’ (1/72)). An example of imperfective aspect used with a tangible, inanimate singular noun is provided below (5.11).

- (5.11) Y amigas especiales, las de la infancia, prácticamente la mayoría de ellas, siempre tenemos anécdotas de cuando, de algo que nos contamos, recuerdas cuando, recuerdas cuando hacíamos esto, cuando íbamos a la casa. . . **una casa** que estaba en Molinas. (XVI, f40)  
 ‘And special friends, the ones from your childhood, practically the majority of them, we always have stories of when, of something that we tell each other, you remember when, you remember when we used to do this, when we would go to the house. . . **a house** that was (IMP) in Molinas.’

Per our findings in §4.3.3 of *ser* and inanimate subjects, which will be discussed in greater detail in §5.5.3, a similar preference was found in regard to inanimate singular subjects: these subjects tended to be abstract notions or unexpressed, non-referential subjects ‘[it] was’.<sup>7</sup> With this evidence, it seems that we can deduce that *salmantino* speakers preferred perfective *estar* to describe abstract singular ideas (*estuvo* ‘it was’ + *bien* ‘good, well’/adjective/past participle).

<sup>6</sup> The subject *la organización* ‘the organization’ is actually a proper noun, but the name was changed in order to protect the speaker’s anonymity.

<sup>7</sup> In English, the inanimate subject ‘it’ is known as a pleonastic subject; yet, in Spanish speakers do not use the explicit ‘it’, rather a pleonastic null pronoun is used. (Zagona 2002:26).

### 5.1.3 *Estar*: Sentence Type and Clause Type

In terms of magnitude of effect, the third and fourth ranked factor groups of the *estar* analysis were Sentence Type (range=38) and Clause Type (range=33). Notably, both of the ranges of these factor groups were higher than in the analysis of all stative verbs together as reported in Table 4-4 (range=9 and 20, respectively). Specifically with regard to Sentence Type, we expected for affirmative sentences to favor perfective *estar* and negative sentences to disfavor perfective *estar*. Confirming this hypothesis, the constraints within this factor group displayed the same direction of effect in the *estar* and all statives analyses: affirmative sentences slightly favored the perfective form of *estar* (.52) and negative sentences strongly disfavored the perfective form (.14). Also note that while both analyses showed a disfavoring of past perfective aspect with negative sentences, the probability weight of perfective *estar* was lower (.14) than in the analysis of all stative verbs together (.42). An example of a negative sentence of past-tense *estar* is provided below (5.12).

- (5.12) Luego se salió de monja, se salió de monja, ya con los años, después de yo salirme del colegio, cuando yo ya **no estaba** en el colegio, me dijeron que se había salido de monja. (VI, f43)  
 ‘Then she stopped being a nun, she stopped being a nun, with the years, after leaving that school, when I was (IMP) **not** in the school, they told me that she had stopped being a nun.’

To further investigate this issue, let’s take a look at the frequencies reported in Table 5-3. We chose to repeat Table 4-17 (Table 5-4) of the frequencies of Sentences Type of all stative verbs to facilitate the discussion.

Table 5-3. Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of *estar* according to Sentence Type

Sentence type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Affirmative	332	41%	484	59%	816	96%
Negative	3	8%	34	92%	37	4%
TOTAL	335	39%	518	61%	853	100%

Table 5-4 (4-17). Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of all stative verbs according to sentence type

Sentence type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Affirmative	1130	28%	2916	72%	4046	90%
Negative	91	20%	374	80%	465	10%
TOTAL	1221	28%	3290	73%	4511	100%

If the rates of Sentence Type of *estar* (Table 5-3) are compared with those in the analysis of all stative verbs (Table 5-4), we find a different pattern of usage of affirmative and negative sentences: overall, *salmantino* speakers used affirmative sentences with a past-tense form of *estar* slightly more (96% [816/853]) than affirmative sentences with all stative verbs together (90% [4046/4511]); consequently past-tense *estar* was used less frequently in negative sentences (4% [37/853]) when compared to the analysis of all statives together (10% [465/4511]). With regard to the use of perfective aspect according to sentence type, we observed a higher rate of perfective *estar* use with affirmative sentences (41% [332/816]) than with all stative verbs together (28% [1130/4046]) and a decrease of perfective *estar* forms in negative sentences (8% [3/37]), as compared to all stative verbs together (20% [91/465]). This pattern could explain why a stronger disfavoring of perfective *estar* was observed in negative sentences.

With respect to Clause Type, it was expected for stative verbs in main clauses to prefer perfective aspect and statives in subordinate clauses to prefer imperfective aspect, based on Reid (1976), Hopper (1979b), and Klein-Andreu (1991). When comparing the results of the *estar* analysis with all stative verbs, the constraints of both analyses displayed the same direction of effect: past-tense *estar* tokens found in main clauses favored perfective aspect (.58), whereas past-tense *estar* tokens found in subordinate clauses disfavored perfective aspect (.25).<sup>8</sup> To look

<sup>8</sup> All subordinate clauses (i.e., relative, adverbial/causal, and complement) were combined as one constraint. Chi-square tests verified that there were no significant differences between any of the subordinate clauses at the 0.05 level.

a bit closer at the frequencies of perfective *estar* in each type of clause (Table 5-5), we observed 46% (303/656) in main clauses, 18% (11/62) in relative clauses, 17% (19/110) in adverbial/causal clauses, and 8% (2/25) in complement clauses.

Table 5-5. Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of *estar* according to clause type

Clause type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Main	303	46%	353	54%	656	77%
Sub. adverbial/causal	19	17%	91	83%	110	13%
Sub. relative	11	18%	51	82%	62	7%
Sub. complement	2	8%	23	92%	25	3%
TOTAL	335	39%	518	61%	853	100%

The frequencies of perfective use according to clause type were fairly similar to those observed in the analysis of all statives together, with the exception of main clause and subordinate complement clauses. Main clauses showed a lower rate of perfective use (30%) and the subordinate complement clauses displayed a higher rate of 22% perfective use ([27/123]) in the analysis of all statives together (Table 4-11).<sup>9</sup> Table 5-6 provides us with an example how *estar* was most commonly used in subordinate complement clauses, applied with imperfective aspect.

Table 5-6. Narrative excerpt from speaker XVI

Excerpt from speaker XVI (f, 40)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Pero una vez recuerdo	<i>Main clause</i>	But one time I remember
(b) <b>que <u>estábamos en un pasillo hablando varias chicas,</u></b>	<i>Complement clause</i>	<b>that various girls and I were (IMP) in a hall talking</b>
(c) y la monja vino	<i>Main clause</i>	and the nun came
(d) y pasó por el miedo	<i>Main clause</i>	and passed right in the middle
(e) pero, yo me quedé mirándola,	<i>Main clause</i>	but, I stayed there watching her,
(f) giró su cuerpo hacia nosotras:	<i>Main clause</i>	she turned her body around towards us:
(g) '¡Vaya educación y vaya modelo!'	<i>Quoted speech</i>	'What manners, what a model!'

According to Bybee (2002:2), subordinate clauses tend to 'contain backgrounded information that is much less likely to be subject to topicalization, contrast and presentative focus; such manipulations are more appropriate and more commonly occur in main clauses.' This is also

<sup>9</sup> The frequencies of perfective aspect according clause type in the analysis of all statives together was as follows: 30% main clause, 16% adverbial/causal clauses and 15% in relative clauses, and 22% complement clause (see Table 4-18).

known as ‘low-focus’ in Klein-Andreu’s terms (1991). We see that the main clause in (a) *recuerdo que* ‘I remember that’ is followed by an imperfective *estar* form in (b) to describe what the background situation before the main actions of the narrative were presented in clauses (c-f). The fact perfective *estar* was only used 8% out of all of the past-tense instances of *estar* in subordinate complement clauses shows us that imperfective *estar* was apt more likely to perform the expected discourse function (i.e., provide backgrounded information) in these clauses. It also appears that the patterns of past-tense *estar* in subordinate complement clauses followed ‘typical’ subordinate clause patterns, as opposed to Thompson’s (2002) analysis of this clause type in English which did not follow the same trends as other subordinate clauses.

#### 5.1.4 *Estar*: Locative Expression

The presence/absence of a locative element was the fifth in terms of relative strength (range=22). Recall that a locative element is an expression indicating a place or location (e.g. with a person), which could be a deictic or other adverb (e.g. *allí* ‘there’, *arriba* ‘upstairs’) or prepositional phrase with a place (e.g. *en* ‘in’+ place). We predicted that the perfective form of *estar* would be preferred when co-occurring with a locative element and disfavored when lacking a locative phrase or adverbial. This expectation was based on the results on a pilot study of *estar* in *madrileño* Spanish (Knouse 2008), which found that the perfective form of *estar* was favored with the presence of a locative (.75) and disfavored without such an expression (.34).<sup>10</sup> Congruent to this hypothesis and previous findings, the results of the multivariate analysis of *salmantino* Spanish showed that perfective *estar* was preferred with a locative expression (.62)

---

<sup>10</sup> When coding for locative element, any prepositional phrase with *en* ‘in’ + place or *con* ‘with’ + person was eliminated from being a prepositional phrase (i.e., marked with a slash (/)) in order to avoid a cross-over effect in the data.

and disfavored without a locative (.41). Examples (5.13), (5.14), (5.15) and (5.16) demonstrate the use of perfective *estar* with the different locative expressions.

- (5.13) Entonces las llevé a un colegio de monjas y estuvieron allí pues estuvieron hasta un año o dos. (IX, f53)  
'So I took them (my daughters) to a catholic school and they were (PRET) **there**, well they were [there] for a year or two.'
- (5.14) Su hermana había viajado a Barcelona y estaba eh. . .tan triste cuando él estuvo con nosotros, que me quería llevar para Estados Unidos. (VII, f48)  
'His sister had traveled to Barcelona and he was uh. . .so sad when he was (PRET) **with us**, that he wanted to take me to the United States.'
- (5.15) Y el otro estuvo en un colegio de monjas, pero a ese le sacaron los padres porque estas monjas se pasaban demasiado. (XXV, m29)  
'The other one was (PRET) **in a catholic school**, but his parents took him out because those nuns would go too far.'
- (5.16) Entonces fueron muchas horas que no estuve en planta. Estuve abajo allí en paritorios con el gotero y la oxitocina desde el primer momento y yo fatal, fatal, muchos dolores pasé. (VI, f43)  
'They were many hours that I was not in the medical ward. I was (PRET) **downstairs there in the delivery room** with the IV and oxycontin from the first moment and me awful, awful, I had a lot of pain.'

As we notice in example (5.16), many times there were more than one locative expression present in the linguistic context (i.e., *abajo* 'downstairs', *allí* 'there', *en paritorios* 'in the delivery room'). Therefore, it appears as though the presence of one or more of these locative expressions provided more of a 'presentative focus' to the clause, thus making it more of a 'high-focused' event.

### 5.1.5 *Estar*: Verb Class of Main Verb

The final factor group selected as statistically significant was Verb Class of Main Verb (range=14); this factor group did not result as statistically significant in the analysis of all stative verbs together. The verb class of the *estar* + gerund construction was the only one tested in the *estar* + main verb analysis, since there were only four examples of *estar* + infinitive and only

three examples of *estar* + gerund/infinitive.<sup>11</sup> As discussed in §4.3.7, we expected the finite verb of *estar* to favor perfective aspect when co-occurring with a gerund that expressed a change-of-state, dynamic, motion or speaking action. Conversely, we expected the finite *estar* form to disfavor perfective aspect when the gerund expressed a perception, psychological or stative action. Table 5-2 reports that the constraint ordering was as follows: *estar* + change-of-state/dynamic verb favored the perfective form (.54), whereas *estar* + all other verb classes (i.e., motion, speaking, perception/psychological, and stative) disfavored the perfective form (.40).<sup>12</sup> While it might seem logical for change-of-state and dynamic main verb actions to favor the perfective *estar* form, as these types of events would most likely be a part of main narrative actions, we found different patterns when examining the frequencies of each type of main verb. Table 5-7 reports those frequencies (please see Table 4-19 and §4.3.7 for examples of verb class).

Table 5-7. Relative frequencies of Verb Class of Main Verb, *estar* + gerund\*

Verb Class (gerund)	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dynamic	42	34%	79	65%	121	67%
Speaking	6	25%	18	25%	24	13%
Perception/psych	4	25%	12	75%	16	9%
Stative	4	57%	3	43%	7	4%
Change-of-state	0	0%	6	100%	6	3%
Motion	1	17%	5	83%	6	3%
TOTAL	57	32%	123	68%	180	100%

\*There were no examples of *estar* + *haber* + past participle in the *salmantino* corpus

<sup>11</sup> Additionally, *estar* + infinitive and *estar* + gerund/infinitive were excluded from the data analysis since, when incorporated, those elements did not provide a good model for the data. Thus, it was necessary to only incorporate *estar* + gerund.

<sup>12</sup> Chi-square tests were run to ensure there were no statistically significant differences between the factors that were grouped together in the analysis.

The justification to combine the change-of-state main verbs and other dynamic verbs was based on the lexical similarities of the two classes (Tagliamonte 2006:170).<sup>13</sup> Yet, interestingly, there were no examples of perfective *estar* + change-of-state gerund in the data, only imperfective *estar* + change-of-state gerund (5.17).

(5.17) No entraba la gente, la cantidad de gente que había no entraba en la casa, no entraban en la habitación, yo **me estaba volviendo** loca, lo único que quería era que me casara rápido. (XVII, f31)  
'The people didn't fit, the amount of people that there were, they didn't fit in the house. They didn't fit in the room, I was (IMP) **going crazy**, the only thing that I wanted was to get married fast.'

Additionally, it was observed that the highest frequency of perfective *estar* + gerund was *estar* + stative gerund (57% [4/7]); all of these examples perfective *estar* + *viviendo* 'was/were living' (5.18). This observation was also addressed in §4.3.7 when discussing Verb Class of Main Verb in the analysis of all stative verbs together.<sup>14</sup>

(5.18) I: ¿Y bueno, y decías, bueno Salamanca es tu ciudad preferida?  
P: Porque mira, yo he estado **viviendo** en Barcelona. (IV, f62)  
I: 'And well, and you were saying, well Salamanca is your favorite city?  
P: Because look, I was (PP) **living** in Barcelona.'

Even though this factor group was selected as statistically significant in the multivariate analysis of *estar*, it seems as though the frequencies tell us a bit more of the real story. The statistical analysis showed that perfective *estar* was disfavored when co-occurring with a stative gerunds, yet, more than half (57% [4/7]) of the examples of *estar* + *viviendo* were applied with perfective aspect. The GoldVarb results revealed that change-of-state gerunds conditioned the finite form of *estar* to favor perfective aspect, yet no examples of this lexical type of gerund were

---

<sup>13</sup> Tagliamonte (2006:170) stated that 'there must be linguistic justifications for these modifications'; in this case the justification was combining two similar lexical classes of verbs.

<sup>14</sup> For more instances of perfective *estar* + *viviendo* 'living', please see §4.3.7, examples (4.59), (4.60) and (4.61). As reported in this section, many of the *estar* + *viviendo* instances co-occurred with a temporal expression marking the time frame.

found to co-occur with perfective *estar*. Furthermore, pair-wise comparisons showed that the difference between change-of-state and stative gerunds reached statistical significance ( $\chi^2=4.952381, p\leq 0.0261$ ); the difference between the other factors did not achieve such significance. In hindsight, it appears that joining change-of-state and dynamic gerunds in the multivariate analysis, since they were lexically similar, was not the most precise way to analyze this factor group. While we recognize that under the variationist framework researchers agree that probabilistic weights and constraint hierarchies are more powerful than observed frequencies to explain speaker-choice of a certain linguistic variable (cf. Poplack & Tagliamonte 2001), here returning to the data and the relative frequencies of factors within this group provided us with a more insightful view of how perfective *estar* + gerund was used in the *salmantino* community. Along with the fact that Verb Class of Main Verb had the lowest magnitude of effect (range=14), we are inclined to say that this factor group was not as influential as other factor groups in affecting speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual choice of the finite *estar*.

### **5.1.6 *Estar*: Adjective/Past Participle**

Not incorporated into the multivariate analysis of *estar* was the presence/absence of an adjective/past participle. As explained in §4.3.8, it was not possible to include this factor group into the GoldVarb analysis since it did not provide a good model for the data; therefore, we opted to analyze this factor group separately. The presence/absence of an adjective/past participle was especially pertinent to *estar*, since the verb can function as a copulative or linking verb that ‘does not add meaning to the sentence, but serves as a bridge between the subject and the noun or *adjective*’ (Hualde et al. 2001:241, our translation from Spanish to English, emphasis added); likewise, this construction can express passive voice. To reiterate our hypothesis, it was expected

that a stative verb that co-occurred with an adjective or past participle would favor perfective aspect based on Biber (1992).<sup>15</sup>

As shown in Table 5-8, we report the relative frequencies of perfective and imperfective *estar* with the presence or absence of an adjective/past participle. From these frequencies, we observe that 81% (662/821) of the past-tense *estar* examples did not co-occur with an adjective/past participle, whereas the other 19% (159/821) did co-occur with an adjective/past participle.<sup>16</sup> Additionally, we noticed that imperfective *estar* + adjective/past participle constituted the majority of the *salmantino* corpus (87% [138/159]), while perfective *estar* + adjective/past participle accounted for the remaining portion (13% [21/138]). When an adjective/past participle was not present, the rate of perfective *estar* increased to 31% (207/662) and, consequently, the rate of imperfective *estar* decreased to 67% (455/662). Also note that when these rates were compared with the results of all stative verbs, the rates of perfective *estar* + adjective/past participle (13% [21/159]) were lower than stative verb + adjective/past participle (26% [227/863]) and, consequently, the rates of imperfective *estar* + adjective/past participle were higher (Table 4-21).

Table 5-8. Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, *estar*

Adjectives	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No adjective/past participle	207	31%	455	67%	662	81%
Adjective/past participle	21	13%	138	87%	159	19%
TOTAL	228	28%	593	72%	821	100%

Below we provide examples of perfective *estar*, in (5.19) and (5.20), and imperfective *estar*, in (5.21) and (5.22), with and without an adjective or past participle.

<sup>15</sup> This hypothesis was explained in detail in §4.3.8.

<sup>16</sup> Recall that during the coding process we eliminated (/) the possibility of *estar* + adjective/participle when there was a *estar* + *bien* ‘good, well’ *estar* + *mal* ‘bad’ collocation present in the context; this was done to ensure that there would not be a cross-over effect between the Collocation and Adjective factor groups.

- (5.19) La verdad es que me trataron fenomenal. Estuve muy **contenta**. Era una familia encantadora, luego se divorciaron, pero tuvimos contacto con ellos. Vinieron aquí a España, vinieron a mi casa. (VI, f43)  
 ‘The truth is that they treated me wonderfully. I was (PRET) very **happy**. They were a great family, then they got divorced, but we maintained contact with them. They came here to Spain, they came to my house.’
- (5.20) Yo vine a Salamanca para ser mecánico soldado y me tocó de todo. Y en Salamanca no estuve nada más que medio año o quizá menos.  
 ‘I came to Salamanca to be a soldier mechanic and I had to do everything. And in Salamanca I was (PRET) not here more than a half a year or maybe less.’
- (5.21) P: ¿Os llevabais muy bien, cuando de pequeño?  
 I: Sí, sí, sí, sí. Estábamos siempre muy, muy **unidos**. (XIV, f53)  
 P: ‘Did you all get along well, when [you all were] young?’  
 I: Yes, yes, yes, yes. We were (IMP) always very, very **close**.’
- (5.22) Y me puse yo a servir allí, estábamos unos cuantos, y les serví yo. (XIX, f19)  
 ‘And I started to server there, we were (IMP) some [people], and I served them.’

A Chi-square test of the past-tense forms of *estar* and this factor group revealed that there was a statistically significant difference these factors ( $\chi^2=20.85011, p\leq 0.000$ ); however in the analysis of all statives there was not a statistically significant difference between perfective and imperfective statives and the presence or absence of an adjective/past participle. Therefore, as opposed to the analysis of all statives together, the presence/absence of an adjective/past participle does condition the use of past-tense aspectual morphology.

### 5.1.7 *Estar*: Summary

Throughout this section we reported the results for the individual analysis of *estar* and compared these findings with the analysis of all stative verbs together. Below in Table 5-9 is a summary of the similarities and differences between the two analyses we have seen thus far. According to the ‘three lines of evidence’ criteria, the two analyses shared important trends in regard to which linguistic factors motivated speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual forms, which factors favored and disfavored perfective aspect, and the factor group that was the most influential in determining past-tense aspectual choice. Nevertheless, since there were noteworthy

differences between the two analyses, it seems as though we cannot definitively conclude that all stative verbs were conditioned in exactly the same manner or by the same linguistic factors as in the *estar* analysis.

Table 5-9. Similarities and differences between all stative verb and *estar* analyses

Similarities
1. Factor groups selected as statistically significant: Temporal Determinant, Grammatical Person, Sentence Type and Clause Type.
2. Temporal Determinant had the highest magnitude of effect in both analyses, followed by Grammatical Person in both analyses.
3. Same direction of effect in all statistically significant factor groups, with the exception of inanimate singular subjects.
Differences
1. Inanimate singular subjects were strongly disfavored in the perfective <i>estar</i> , whereas these subjects favored perfective aspect in the analysis of all statives.
2. Locative Expression was incorporated and found to be statistically significant.
3. Verb Class of Main Verb was selected as statistically significant in the <i>estar</i> analysis, but not in the analysis of all stative verbs together.
4. Prepositional Phrase and Collocation were not selected as statistically significant in the <i>estar</i> analysis, but was in the all stative verb analysis.
5. Chi-square tests revealed that Adjectives were statistically significant in <i>estar</i> , but not in the all stative verb analysis.

Therefore, we will continue the analysis of the most frequently observed statives in the *salmantino* corpus to further investigate how these individual results compare to the analysis of all statives together.

## 5.2 Results and Discussion: *Tener* ‘Have’

The third most frequently observed stative verb in the *salmantino* corpus was *tener* ‘have’ (18% [816/4511]). With regard to the distribution of the past-tense aspect variants, 16% (136/816) of all instances of *tener* were found in the Preterit form, 5% (40/816) were in the PP form, and 78% (640/816) were in the Imperfect form. As compared with the other most frequently observed stative verbs in the *salmantino* corpus, *tener* displayed the second highest rate of imperfective use and the second lowest rate of perfective use, behind the verb *haber* ‘be, exist’. The verb *tener* can be used alone to express possession of an object (5.23), lexicalized

expression of feeling/psychological states—(5.24) and (5.25)—, to be X years old (5.26), *tener* + past participle (5.27), or epistemic or deontic (obligation) meaning with *tener que* + infinitive (5.28).<sup>17</sup>

(5.24) Pero mi madre nunca me dejó tener ani-, mi madre tenía una casa, la típica casa . . . perfecta. (III, f44)

‘But my mother never left me have ani-, my mother had (IMP) **a house**, the typical perfect house.’

(5.25) Tenía miedo de las represalias, tenía miedo de que dejaran ser atendidos. (XIV, f53)  
I was scared of retaliation, I was scared that they would stop being attended.’

(5.26) Además que estaba en plena lucidez, tenía 72 años, pero muy activa, muy lúcida de cabeza. (I, f58)

‘Plus she was in plain lucidity, she was 72 years old, but very active, very clear-minded.’

(5.27) Tenían el colegio concertado, era de curas y lo tenían concertado con el ministerio. (IX, 53)

‘They had the school subsidized, it was a catholic school and they had it subsidized with the government.’

(5.28) Nos han educado que los domingos **nos teníamos que bañar**, ponernos la ropa nueva e ir a misa, y era nuestra salida de los domingos.

‘They raised us that on Sundays we had to (IMP) **bath ourselves**, put on new clothes and go to mass, and that was our outing on Sundays.’

According to Butt & Benjamin (1994:216), the principle difference between *tener que* in the Preterit (perfective) and *tener que* in the Imperfect (imperfective) is a matter the implicature of completion. The authors provided the examples (5.29) and (5.30) below to illustrate their point: the conventionalized implicature given by the perfective form of *tener* in example (5.29) means that the speaker *fulfilled* his or her need to talk to the person in question, whereas this is not the case in example (5.30) when *tener* is applied with imperfective aspect; the completion of the task in the latter example may or may not have been fulfilled.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Tener* can also mean ‘hold’; historical analyses have shown how *tener* has competed with *haber* ‘have’ (cf. García Gallarín 2002).

(5.29) Tuve que hablar con ella.  
'I had to (PRET) **talk** to her (and did)'

(5.30) Tenía que hablar con ella.  
'I had to (IMP) **talk** to her' (and may or may not have done)

It was exactly this type of assumed, prescribed meaning of aspect that we wanted to challenge in our study, since, in our view, this interpretation may not be totally accurate. It is widely accepted among variationists that 'distinctions in grammatical function among different forms can be neutralized in discourse' (D. Sankoff 1988a:153), therefore, it is very possible that the perfective-imperfective distinction could be lost in the unfolding of natural conversation, indicating only that the event was in the past and not that the speaker viewed it as completed or not completed. While we are not negating that perfective *tener que* and imperfective *tener que* could possibly convey these two different meanings (i.e., completion and non-completion), we question whether this was always the implied inference when a speaker uses one aspectual variant over the other. Let's take (5.31) and (5.32) below from the *salmantino* corpus to further explain.

(5.31) Es que se hizo por- porque pues por poco de tener miedo, es decir, conoce todo el mundo y sabe que voy por donde las guardias y todo. Y tenía que ir, porque era su servicio, era su reparto. (XX, f60)  
'It's that it was done bec- because well out of a little bit of fear, it's to say, he knew everyone and knew that I went around where the police were and everything. And he had to (IMP) **go**, because it was his service, it was his delivery route.'

(5.32) Fuimos, bueno el otro día fuimos a jugar al futbol, y se chocó contra otro chico, y como jugaba con las gafas, se clavó, las gafas, entonces tuvimos que ir al hospital a que le dieron un punto.  
'We went, well the other day we went to play soccer and he crashed into other guy, and since he was playing with glasses, he got cut, the glasses, so we had to (PRET) **go** to the hospital so they could give him stitches.'

Here, each speaker in (5.31) and (5.32) expressed that someone 'had to go' somewhere.

According to Butt & Benjamin, (5.31) implies that the person may or may not have gone to the

destination, whereas the speaker in (5.32) the obligation of going to the hospital was carried out. It was revealed in the course of the conversation with the speaker of (5.31) that this person, her husband, also *carried out* the obligation of going on his delivery route. Therefore, it could be that the motivation behind the use of perfective or imperfective *tener que* could be better explained by looking at other patterns in the *tener* analysis. Likewise, it is possible that the perfective and imperfective distinction was ‘neutralized’, leaving only behind the meaning of past-time reference.

Therefore, a GoldVarb analysis was conducted in order to ascertain the conditioning linguistic factors behind *salmantino*-speaker choice of past-tense aspect in relation to *tener* (Table 5-10). As with the analysis of all stative verbs and *estar*, the factor group with the highest magnitude of effect was Temporal Determinant (range=78). Likewise, Grammatical Person (range=57) and

Table 5-10. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to *tener*\*

Input probability: 0.182 (21.6%) N=176/816				
	% Perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
Temporal determinant				
Punctual marker	63	.89	41	9
Temporal sequencer/marked frame/durative	57	.81	8	2
Absent	18	.47	117	84
General past	18	.45	3	2
Habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	4	.11	1	4
<i>Range</i>		78		
Grammatical person				
1s	32	.67	84	32
1p	28	.65	46	20
3p	15	.44	17	14
3s	13	.39	23	21
Inanimate singular/plural	11	.32	5	6
2s	2	.10	1	7
<i>Range</i>		57		
Verb class				
Change-of-state/dynamic	33	.67	27	48
Motion/speaking	18	.34	9	29
Stative/psych/perception/ <i>haber</i> + participle	8	.27	3	23
<i>Range</i>		40		

Table 5-10. Continued

Clause type				
Main clause	23	[.51]	144	77
Subordinate clause	17	[.46]	32	23
Collocation				
<i>Tener</i> + infinitive/gerund/both	23	[.61]	39	21
<i>Tener</i> alone, <i>Tener</i> + <i>como</i>	21	[.47]	137	79
Prepositional phrase				
Present	25	[.55]	46	22
Absent	20	[.49]	130	78

Log likelihood=- 217.294; p= 0.000;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.9603

\*Sentence Type not included in the analysis; pair-wise comparisons showed no statistically significant difference between affirmative and negative sentences.

Table 5-11. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to *tener*, excluding *tener que* tokens\*

Input probability: 0.186 (21.3%) N=137/644				
	% Perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
Temporal determinant				
Temporal sequencer	70	.90	14	3
Marked frame/durative	67	.87	8	2
Punctual marker	62	.85	16	4
Absent	13	.46	91	85
General past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	6	.35	4	5
<i>Range</i>		.55		
Grammatical person				
1s	32	.65	71	34
1p	26	.61	32	19
3p	12	.38	18	23
3s	12	.37	11	14
Inanimate singular/plural	10	.27	4	6
2s	5	.22	1	3
<i>Range</i>		.43		
Clause type				
Main clause	23	[.51]	109	75
Subordinate clause	17	[.47]	28	25
Prepositional phrase				
Present	24	[.54]	33	21
Absent	21	[.49]	104	79
Sentence type				
Negative	21	[.53]	17	13
Affirmative	21	[.50]	120	87

Log likelihood=- 288.223; p= 0.000;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.0639

\*Upon excluding all infinitives, gerunds, and infinitive + gerund constructions, the Collocation group was eliminated from the analysis due to low token frequencies (i.e., *tener* alone 99.2%, *tener* + *como* 0.8%); a pair-wise comparison showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the factors.

Verb Class of Main Verb (range=40) also reached statistical significance. Not selected as statistically significant were Clause Type, Collocation and Prepositional Phrase.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, to corroborate that *tener que* ‘have to’ tokens did not skew the overall results of *tener*, a separate GoldVarb analysis was performed on *tener* excluding *tener que* expressions (Table 5-11). We provide as evidence that the results for this analysis were congruent to the findings in the analysis including *tener que* expressions (Table 5-10); this issue will not be discussed further.

### 5.2.1 *Tener*: Temporal Determinant

Once again, Temporal Determinant was the factor group with the strongest magnitude of effect in the conditioning of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in the *salmantino* corpus. The constraints followed the same direction of effect as the previous analyses and per the findings in previous research. Favoring the perfective form of *tener* were co-occurring punctual markers (.89) and temporal sequencer/marked frame/durative expressions (.81).<sup>19</sup> Slightly disfavoring *tener* applied with perfective aspect were the absence of such an expression (.47) and general past expressions (.45). Strongly disfavoring this form were expressions of habituality, including *siempre* (.11).

An interesting finding within the constraint ranking of Temporal Determinant was in regard to general past expressions. In the previous analysis of all statives and *estar*, this factor strongly disfavored the perfective form, yet, in the analysis of *tener*, it was only slightly disfavored. If we look at the frequency, only 18% (3/17) of *tener* examples co-occurring with

---

<sup>18</sup> The factor group Sentence Type was not included in the analysis, since it did not contribute to the goodness-of-fit of the statistical model. A Chi-square test revealed that the difference between affirmative and negative sentences was not selected as significant ( $p \leq 0.8205$ ); thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

<sup>19</sup> It was verified through a Chi-square test that there was no significant difference between temporal sequencers and marked frame/durative expressions.

this type of temporal expression was applied with perfective aspect. These three instances are provided below in (5.33) and (5.34).

- (5.33) Tuvimos **anteriormente** otras chicas que jugaban muchísimo, me acuerdo de las primeras chicas, o sea era que jugaba y hacia el avión, y hacia cantidad de cosas con Carmen. (XVI, f40)  
‘We had (PRET) **before** other girl that placed a lot, and I remember the first girls, I mean it was that she would play and do the airplane and she would do a lot of things with Carmen.
- (5.34) Sí, era un. . .buenísima. Otras no ¿eh? Otras, otra. . .me acuerdo de una que tuve **antes**. Yo es que ni. . .nada, no. Ella estaba preparando sus oposiciones para todo el año. Y **antes** también tuvimos una maestra que también, no, pero con esa sí que trabajaba muchísimo con nosotros. (XX, f60)  
‘Yes, she was (IMP) a. . .great one. Others, no, okay? Others, another. . .I remember one that I had (PRET) **in the past**. She was preparing her Oppositions for the entire year. And **in the past** we also had (PRET) a teacher that also, no, but with her yes, she used to work a lot with us.’

The general past expressions used in (5.33) and (5.34)—*anteriormente* ‘previously, before’ and *antes* ‘before, in the past’—both express anteriority, but do not indicate exactly when in the past; but even more notable is that all of these three instances of perfective *tener* co-occurred with animate singular direct objects (i.e., *otras chicas* ‘other girls’, *una* ‘one [teacher], *una maestra* ‘a teacher’). When examining other animate direct objects, with temporal expressions aside, it was found that speakers commonly used the perfective *tener* form, as in (5.35), (5.36) and (5.37).

- (5.35) Sí. . .tuve a **un tío** y **un sobrino**. Y el sobrino era mayor que el tío. (XI, f65)  
‘Yes. . .I had (PRET) **an uncle** and **a nephew**. And the nephew was older than the uncle.’
- (5.36) Luego la educación era muy importante para para mi familia, y tuve **una maestra particular** y luego empecé a ir a un colegio privado de monjas. (X, f48)  
‘Then education was very important for for my family, and I had (PRET) **a private teacher** and then I started to go to a private catholic school.’
- (5.37) La chica que me llevaba a mí a Madrid, su mamá **la tuvo** de soltera y entonces eh, eran dos vecinas que tuvieron **un niño** y **una niña** de solteras, no se casaron, entonces, eh, nosotros no teníamos posiblemente **lujos**, no teníamos **ropa nueva** pero **para comer** siempre teníamos. (VII, f48)  
‘The girl that would take me to Madrid, her mother had (PRET) **her** as a single mother and then uh, they were two neighbors that had (PRET) **a boy** and a **girl** as single mothers,

they didn't get married, so, uh, we did not possibly have (IMP) **luxuries**, we did not have (IMP) **new clothes**, but **[food] to eat** we always had (IMP).'

In (5.33) and (5.35), the inference that the perfective *tener* brings to these utterances is that these people—*otras chicas* 'other girls' and *un tío* 'uncle', *un sobrino* 'nephew'—stayed at the homes of the speakers. Examples (5.34) and (5.36), the respective speakers used the perfective *tener* form to indicate that they had teachers they had in the past. Likewise, in examples such as (5.37), we observe the perfective *tener* used with animate objects (i.e., *la* 'her', *un niño* 'a boy', *una niña* 'a girl'), but imperfective form of *tener* with inanimate objects (*lujos* 'luxuries', *ropa nueva* 'new clothes', *para comer* '[food] to eat'). Therefore, it seems as though the use of perfective *tener* in (5.33) and (5.34) with co-occurring general past expressions were perhaps conditioned by the presence of an animate singular subject, rather than the temporal expression itself. We will return to highlight this point when discussing transitivity in §5.2.5.

### 5.2.2 *Tener*: Grammatical Person

The results of Grammatical Person of the *tener* analysis were in line with our hypothesis that first-person subjects would favor the perfective aspect and third-person and inanimate subjects would disfavor perfective aspect (Table 5-10). The constraint ordering was as follows: first-person singular subjects (.67) and first-person plural (.65) favored perfective aspect, while third-person plural (.44), third-person singular (.39), inanimate singular and plural subjects (.32), and finally second-person singular subjects (.10) disfavored the perfective form of *tener*. As with the results of *estar*, the factors followed the same direction of effect as the all stative analysis, with the exception of inanimate singular subjects.

In the analysis of all stative verbs, we observed that inanimate singular subjects favored perfective aspect with a probability weight of .61; this subject changed direction of effect in the *tener* analysis to disfavor perfective aspect. Upon separating the inanimate singular and plural

subjects, it was also found that the frequency of perfective form of *tener* with inanimate singular subjects (9% [4/43]) was strikingly lower than in the analysis of all stative together (31% [383/1243]). This overall lower frequency of could be attributed to the lexical nature of *tener* itself; perhaps it is more common that human beings, as opposed to inanimate subjects, *have* or possess qualities and objects more worthy of mention in narrative discourse. Yet, how do we explain the difference between perfective and imperfective aspectual use with these subjects? When returning to the data (5.38), it appears that *salmantinos* commonly used imperfective *tener* with inanimate subjects (91% [39/43]), as in *la muñeca* ‘the doll’, to describe general qualities or characteristics, like *tenía unos ojos azules* ‘had blue eyes’.

(5.38) **La muñeca** tenía unos ojos azules que parecían que eran de verdad. ¡Ja, ja, ja! (VII, f48)  
 ‘**The doll** had (IMP) blue eyes that seemed that they were real. Ha, ha, ha!’

However, in example (5.39) the choice of perfective aspect could have been conditioned by the main clause *fue la primera casa* ‘it was the first house’. It is possible that speaker wanted to emphasize the beginning of the possession of the tiles; or it could be that this distinction was neutralized in discourse.

(5.39) Fue **la primera casa en Béjar** que tuvo, eh, baldosenes. (X, f48)  
 ‘It was **the first house in Béjar** that had (PRET), uh, tile.’

To further illustrate this possibility, we see that in (5.40) both imperfective and perfective forms of *tener* were used by the speaker to describe the same restaurant, or *ese sitio* ‘that place’. In the first two sentences of the excerpt, the speaker described the background conditions of the restaurant; yet, once the speaker mentioned *al principio* ‘at the beginning’, he then applied perfective aspect to *tener*.

(5.40) No tenía muy buena fama **ese sitio** porque era nuevo. Entonces la gente todavía no se había habituado a las cocinas y a todo, y al principio tuvo muchas quejas, pero luego poco a poco se fueron. (XXV, m29)

‘It did not have (IMP) a good reputation **that place** because it was new. So people had not become accustomed to the food and to everything, and at the beginning it had (PRET) a lot of complaints, but then little by little they went away.’

As in (5.39), the speaker of excerpt (5.40) used perfective *tener* with an inanimate subject when there was an indication of the inception of the ‘having’ (i.e., *la primera casa, al principio*). Since 67% (2/3) of the perfective *tener* examples with inanimate subjects co-occurred with expressions of inception, the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology could have been conditioned by these co-occurring linguistic elements. Although this claim is only provisional due to the lack of inanimate singular perfective examples, it appears could help explain why perfective aspect was applied in (5.39) and (5.40).

### 5.2.3 *Tener*: Verb Class of Main Verb

Per our discussion in §4.3.2, §4.3.7 and §5.1.5, it was of interest to examine the lexical aspect of the main verb in *tener que* + infinitive constructions ( $N=161$ ) to discover if this element influenced *salmantino*-speaker choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of the finite form of *tener*. Also included in this category were *tener que* + infinitive + gerund ( $N=8$ ) and *tener* + gerund ( $N=3$ ), as seen respectively in (5.41) and (5.42).

(5.41) La mayor era más tranquila, más, ella dormía, se levantaba tarde y eso. Pero pero la pequeña por las mañanas tenías que **estar oyendo** porque. . .es que cualquiera te podía preparar o sea no sabías qué hacer. (IX, f53)  
‘The older one was calmer, more, she would sleep, she would wake up late and such. But but the little one in the mornings you had (IMP) **to be** (INF) **listening** (GER) because . . .it’s that whatever [thing] she could prepare for you I mean you didn’t know what to do.’

(5.42) Y cuando llegábamos ya nos tenían el taxi allí **esperando**. (I, f58)  
‘And when we arrived they already had (IMP) for us the taxi there **waiting** (GER).’

Recall that we predicted for change-of-state and all other dynamic actions, including motion and speaking verbs, to prefer perfective aspect in the finite verb; conversely, we expected perception/psychological, stative and *haber* + participle verbs to disfavor perfective aspect in the finite verb. This hypothesis was based on the fact that ‘*Aktionsart* partially intersects with

Aspect, in that there is a strong correlation between, e.g., punctual actions and perfective predicates' (Hopper & Thompson 1980:271). According to the results reported in Table 5-10, only some of our expectations were corroborated: if the main verb expressed a change-of-state or dynamic action the finite form of *tener* favored perfective aspect (.67), whereas main verbs expressing motion and speaking actions (.34) as well as stative, perception/psychological, and *haber* + participle events disfavored perfective *tener* (.27). By taking a closer look at the frequencies of each type of main verb (Table 5-12), one can see that the frequencies of perfective *tener* of change-of-state (5.43) and dynamic main verbs (5.44) were higher than the other types of main verb classes.

Table 5-12. Relative frequencies of verb class of main verb, *tener*

Verb	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dynamic	21	31%	47	69%	68	40%
Motion	7	18%	33	83%	40	23%
Stative	2	8%	24	92%	26	15%
Change-of-state	6	40%	9	60%	15	9%
Speaking	2	20%	8	80%	10	6%
<i>Haber</i> + past participle	0	0%	8	100%	8	5%
Perception/psych	1	20%	4	80%	5	3%
TOTAL	39	23%	133	77%	172	100%

(5.43) Y entonces pues no tenía padre. Él tuvo que **empezar** a trabajar de niño, pues mi abuela tenía.. eran cuatro hijos, mi abuela se quedó con cuatro hijos, entonces pues imagina tú, a ver como sobrevivían pues haciendo un montón de cosas, tuvo que **empezar** a trabajar desde niño. (VI, f43)

‘And so well he didn’t have a father. He had to (PRET) **start** working as a child, well my grandmother had. . .there were four children, my grandmother was left with for children, so well, imagine, see how they used to survive well doing a ton of things, he had to (PRET) **start** working since [he was a] boy.’

(5.44) Después ya no, después yo sacaba mejores notas. Pero yo tuve que **estudiar** mucho, **trabajar** mucho. Fue muy duro para mí. (VII, f48)

‘After then no, after I would get better grades. But I had to (PRET) **study** a lot, **work** a lot. It was very hard for me.’

Pair-wise comparisons of these factors revealed that the difference between the following factors reached statistical significance: dynamic and stative main verbs ( $\chi^2=5.473021$ ,  $p\leq 0.0193$ ), change-of-state and stative main verbs ( $\chi^2=6.322028$ ,  $p\leq 0.0119$ ) and change-of-state and *haber* + participle main verbs ( $\chi^2=4.329412$ ,  $p\leq 0.0375$ ). Pair-wise comparison of the other factors did not show a statistically significant difference.

With these results, along with the findings of the multivariate analysis of *tener*, it appears as though past-tense aspect of the finite form of *tener* was conditioned by the lexical aspect of the main verb. We can say with more confidence that *salmantinos* preferred a perfective *tener* with a change-of-state and dynamic main verbs and, conversely, imperfective *tener* with a stative and *haber* + participle main verb. With regard to the results of the motion and speaking verbs, it was not initially clear to why these verbs patterned differently than other dynamic actions to disfavor the perfective *tener* form; for that reason we took a closer look at their function in the conversation. We provide examples of speaking main verbs in (5.45), (5.46) and (5.47) and motion main verbs in (5.48), (5.49), and (5.50).

- (5.45) Y así ha sido toda la vida, para estudiar, aun no. A Marta la tenía que reñir para que saliera, pero “María ven a vernos”, todo el día metida en su habitación. (XVIII, f58)  
 ‘And like that he has been all of his life, to study, even no. I had to (IMP) **yell** at Martha for her to get out, but “Martha come to see us”, all day stuck in her room.’
- (5.46) Pero vamos, tenían que hablar poco. No podían expresarse como ellas quisieran. (IX, f53)  
 ‘But come on, they had to (IMP) **speak** a little. They could not express themselves how they wanted to.’
- (5.47) Pero es que como él entraba hablando francés y le tenías que responder en francés y cuando le preguntabas algo tenía que ser en francés, porque en español decía que no, que no, que no, pues entonces te obligaba. (VII, f48)  
 ‘But it’s that when he entered speaking French and you had to (IMP) **respond** to him in French and when you asked him something it had to be in French, because in Spanish he said no, no, no, well then he forced you.’

- (5.48) Una vez es que tenía que ir a y otra a Madrid. Tenía que ir dos días de la semana a Madrid. Era muy duro. (XX, f60)  
 ‘Once a week it’s that she had to (IMP) **go** to Cáceres and the other to Madrid. She had to (IMP) **go** two days out of the week to Madrid. It was very hard.’
- (5.49) Y eso es lo que hacíamos. Pero te tocaba a trabajar en casa mucho. Tenías que ir a la, a la fuente y a buscar agua que eso. (V, f58)  
 ‘And that is what we used to do. But it was your turn to work at home a lot. You had to (IMP) **go** to the, to the spring and to get water and such.’
- (5.50) Y claro no había, no había, no había medios de, de criar a tanta familia, entonces tenían que salir por donde fuera. (XXI, m61)  
 ‘And of course there wasn’t, there wasn’t, there wasn’t means of of raising a big family, so they had to (IMP) **leave** to wherever.’

In all six of the above examples, the respective speakers were describing past conditions and past obligations. We could argue that since none of these excerpts of *tener que* + speaking main verbs (*reñir* ‘yell’, *hablar* ‘talk’, *responder* ‘respond’) or motion main verbs (i.e., *ir* ‘go’, *salir* ‘leave’) were a part of a narrative story, the speaker used imperfective aspect to convey backgrounded information. However, the same argument could apply to (5.43) and (5.44); these examples were also not a part of a successive chain of narrative events, but the finite *tener* form was used with perfective aspect. Therefore, it appears that the finite form of *tener* was susceptible to influence from the *Aktionsart* of the main verb which followed, even in analogous conversational contexts.

#### 5.2.4 *Tener*: Adjective/Past Participle

As with the analyses of all stative verbs and *estar*, the Adjective/Past Participle factor group was analyzed apart from the GoldVarb analysis of *tener*. Adjectives rarely co-occurred with his verb (5.51); examples of *tener* + past participle were found in some linguistic contexts, as in (5.52) and (5.53), albeit infrequently.

Table 5-13. Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, *tener*

Adjectives	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No adjective/past participle	172	22%	605	78%	777	95%
Adjective/past participle	4	10%	35	90%	39	5%
TOTAL	176	22%	640	78%	816	100%

- (5.51) Sí, y luego tuvo el sarampión y le salió el pelo más oscuro y lo tenía **finito finito finito** y le salió pero más oscuro y fuerte. (XI, f65)  
 ‘Yes, and then she had the measles and her hair came out darker and she had (IMP) it **fine fine fine** and it came out but darker and thicker.’
- (5.52) Entonces en la ficha me tenían **puesta** que sólo trabajaba en julio y agosto. (XVIII, f58)  
 ‘So in the index card they had (IMP) me **down** that I only worked in July and August.’
- (5.53) P: ¿Pero siempre querías venir para Salamanca un día?  
 I: Sí, sí. Yo tenía **pensado** de venirme.  
 P: But you always wanted to return to Salamanca one day?  
 I: Yes, yes. I had (IMP) **thought** to come back.

Pair-wise comparisons revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference between these two factors, as in the analysis of all stative verbs together.

### 5.2.5 *Tener*: Transitivity

As it was discussed in §1.4.3, Hopper & Thompson (2001, 1980:251) made a convincing argument that Transitivity should be determined by a set of ‘discourse-determined’ parameters and viewed as a continuum (i.e., from low to high), rather than the mere presence of an Agent ‘transferring’ an action to the Object (i.e., Sally (A) kicked John (O)). As stated in §1.4.3 and §2.5.1.10, Hopper & Thompson (1980) identified specific features that linguists should use when determining if a clause rates high or low on ‘the scale of Transitivity’; they are as follows:

Participants, Kinesis, Aspect, Punctuality, Volitionality, Affirmation, Mode, Agency,

Affectedness of O, and Individuation of O.<sup>20</sup> Relating the notion of Transitivity to the present

investigation, the authors’ main claim is that Transitivity is directly linked to foregrounding and backgrounding:

In languages like English, foregrounding is not marked absolutely, but is instead indicated and interpreted on a probabilistic basis and the likelihood that a clause will receive a foregrounded interpretation is proportional to the height of that clause on the scale of Transitivity. (Hopper & Thompson 1980:284)

---

<sup>20</sup> Please see §1.4.3 and Table 1-3 where we explain in detail the particulars of these criterion.

Even though foregrounding and backgrounding are said to be marked by morphosyntactic elements in Spanish (i.e., perfective and imperfective aspect, respectively), we wanted to corroborate Hopper & Thompson's hypothesis by using their criteria of Transitivity. Note that stative verbs themselves are automatically lower on the Transitivity scale since actions that are inherently punctual (i.e., kick) rank high on the scale of Transitivity, while non-punctual verbs (i.e., carry) are classified as low-Transitive.<sup>21</sup> With that said, however, since it has been observed for stative verbs to be used in foregrounded events in the narrative, and since Transitivity itself is a matter of degree (Hopper & Thompson 1980:251), we felt it possible as well as necessary to incorporate this element into the analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish.

The scope of the analysis of Transitivity was limited to only the verb *tener*. Lexically, *tener* 'have, hold' is more apt to have more than one argument in the clause structure, at least more so than the other frequent statives (*ser* 'be', *estar* 'be', *haber* 'exist') in our study. We also excluded all examples of *tener que* in the analysis of Transitivity. Furthermore, only certain parameters of Hopper & Thompson's Transitivity Hypothesis were incorporated into our analysis of Transitivity since i) Kinesis, Aspect, Punctuality were too close to the linguistic variable, thus, not incorporated, ii) Mode could not be incorporated because we were only analyzing events expressed in Indicative, not Subjunctive, and iii) the coding for Volitionality and Individuation of O was not faithfully replicable and consequently eliminated from the analysis. Therefore, the following factor groups were used to corroborate the Transitivity Hypothesis: i) Participants (i.e., one vs. two or more participants), ii) Affirmation (i.e., affirmative or negative sentences), iii) Agency (i.e., animate vs. inanimate subjects), and iv)

---

<sup>21</sup> Examples cited in Hopper & Thompson (1980:252).

Individuation of O (i.e., animate singular, animate plural, inanimate singular, inanimate plural, animate/inanimate objects). Based on Hopper & Thompson (1980), we expected for perfective *tener* to be favored when co-occurring with two or more participants, in affirmative sentences, with animate subjects, and with animate and singular objects.

Table 5-14 provides the results of the GoldVarb analysis of *tener* with the Transitivity factor groups. Out of the four parameters tested, only Individuation of O was selected as statistically significant (range=62). Notably, the direction of effect of the constraints was in line with the Transitivity hypothesis: animate singular (.78), animate plural (.66) and inanimate singular objects (.57) favored perfective *tener*, while animate/inanimate objects and inanimate plural objects disfavored perfective *tener*. According to Hopper & Thompson (1980:253), ‘an action can be more effectively transferred to a patient which is individuated than to one which is not’; in our analysis, animate and singular objects, which are highly individuated, were found to favor a co-occurrence with perfective *tener*.

Table 5-14. GoldVarb results of the contributing Transitivity parameters to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to *tener*

Input probability: 0.176 (21.3%) N=176/644				
	% perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Individuation of object</b>				
Animate singular	43	.78	36	15
Animate plural	29	.66	18	11
Inanimate singular	22	.57	58	48
Animate and inanimate	14	.44	1	1
Inanimate plural	4	.16	5	24
<i>Range</i>		62		
<b>Affirmation</b>				
Negative	21	[.52]	17	13
Affirmative	21	[.50]	120	87
<b>Agency</b>				
Animate subjects	22	[.51]	133	94
Inanimate subjects	10	[.34]	4	6
<b>Participants</b>				
Two or more	22	[.51]	118	85
One	19	[.47]	19	15
Log likelihood = -305.825; p = 0.000; $\chi^2$ /cell = 1.1637				

The authors further explain that in foregrounded actions (usually marked with perfective aspect in Spanish) it is much more common for individuated objects to occur in these clauses since the principle discourse function of foregrounded clauses is to highlight key actions of the narratives; these types of objects have more of a high-focus than inanimate and plural objects. We repeat examples (5.33) and (5.34) below to follow up on our discussion in §5.2.1.

(5.33) Sí. . .tuve a **un tío** y **un sobrino**. Y el sobrino era mayor que el tío. (XI, f65)  
'Yes. . . I had (PRET) **an uncle** and **a nephew**. And the nephew was older than the uncle.'

(5.34) Luego la educación era muy importante para para mi familia, y tuve **una maestra particular** y luego empecé a ir a un colegio privado de monjas. (X, f48)  
'Then education was very important for for my family, and I had (PRET) **a private teacher** and then I started to go to a private catholic school.'

As seen in these examples, as well as the other instances provided in §5.2.1, perfective aspect was applied to *tener* with co-occurring animate, referential objects. Hopper & Thompson (1980:292) argue that these types of objects in some languages 'signal foregrounding in the language' and are 'associated with high Transitivity.' This could explain why these examples were used with perfective aspect: the nature of the object indicated a highly-focused and foregrounded action, thus, perfective aspect was preferred.

What is also interesting about the results in Table 5-14 is the fact that the other factor groups did not achieve statistical significance, especially (number of) Participants. We would have expected for the presence of two or more arguments to prefer perfective aspect, since this aspectual marking is associated with foregrounded clauses, which many times have two or more NPs. Also, backgrounded clauses, associated with imperfective aspect, typically have one argument since they are 'those parts of a discourse which provide scenic and other subordinate detail' and 'tend to be expressed through verbal forms which denote states—and in which, therefore, there is no "passing" of an action from one participant to another' (Hopper &

Thompson 1980:284). It is possible to attribute this findings to only analyzing one verb that is inherently stative. We find much value in the Transitivity Hypothesis and how it connects to the idea of foregrounding and backgrounding in discourse and invite future investigation of quantitative and qualitative analysis of Transitivity in Spanish, not only of stative verbs but also of all lexical classes to further examine the validity of this claim. For now, we can conclude that an individuated object conditioned the use of perfective *tener* as evidenced by the *salmantino* data.

### 5.2.6 *Tener*: Summary

We present a summary of the similarities and differences between the analysis of all stative verbs and *tener*. It appears as though there is a recurrent trend with regard to Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person: these two factor groups in both analyses, as well as with

Table 5-15. Similarities and differences between all stative verb and *tener* analyses

---

#### Similarities

---

1. Factor groups selected as statistically significant: Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person.
  2. Temporal Determinant had the highest magnitude of effect in both analyses, followed by Grammatical Person.
  3. Same direction of effect in Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person analyses, with the exception of inanimate singular subjects.
  4. Chi-square test revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference between the presence and absence of an Adjective/Past Participle in both analyses.
- 

#### Differences

---

1. As with *estar*, inanimate singular subjects showed a different magnitude of effect than in the all statives analysis: in the *tener* analysis, inanimate singular subjects were strongly disfavored, while they were favored in the analysis of all statives.
  2. Verb Class of Main Verb was selected as statistically significant in the *tener* analysis, but not with all statives.
  3. Clause Type, Collocation, and Prepositional Phrase factor groups were statistically significant in the analysis of all statives, but not with *tener*.
  4. Sentence Type, analyzed separately, did not show a statistically significant difference in the *tener* analysis, but was selected as statistically significant in the analysis of all statives.
  5. Individuated objects (animate and/or singular) conditioned the use of perfective *tener* form.
-

the analysis of *estar*, resulted first and second in terms of magnitude of effect and showed similar constraint orderings. These were the two common factor groups selected as significant; there were no other shared statistically significant factor groups.

### 5.3 Results and Discussion: *Haber* ‘Be, Exist’

The fourth most frequent stative verb in the *salmantino* data was *haber* ‘be, exist’ (7% of the data,  $N=329$ ). In terms of perfective vs. imperfective distribution, *haber* displayed the lowest rate of perfective use (11% [37/329]) and, consequently, the highest rate of imperfective use (89% [292/329]) when comparing the frequencies of the four most frequent statives. Common uses of *haber* are the existential ‘be’ (5.54) and *haber que* + infinitive ‘one should do X’ which expresses obligation (5.55).<sup>22</sup>

(5.54) Pues, de niño en aquella época, en aquella época que no había peligros, no había nada, jugábamos pues en la calle. (IX, f53)  
‘Well, as a child in that time, in that time there were (IMP) no dangers, there was (IMP) nothing, we used to play well in the street.’

(5.55) Y luego ¿qué pasaba? Pues que cuando tenía fiebre y había que poner inyecciones de penicilina, me las ponía mi padre. (X, f48)  
‘And then, what would happen? Well when I had a fever and one had to (IMP) **give shots** of penicillin, my father used to give them to me.’

Of course *haber* is also used in conjunction with the past participle to form the Present Perfect which, as we have mentioned, appears to be in an intermediary stage of grammaticization from anterior to perfective function in Peninsular Spanish. None of the PP tokens were considered as an instance of *haber*. Another form of obligation with *haber* is the expression *haber de* ‘have to’; yet, only 1 example of *haber de* was found in the 25 *salmantino* interviews.

---

<sup>22</sup> The third-person singular conjugation of existential *haber* is considered the most standard use (e.g. *hay, había, hubo*, etc.); it is possible for some speakers in certain varieties to use *haber* in the third-person plural form with a plural subject (e.g. *habían muchas personas* ‘there were a lot of people’) (cf. DeMello 1994). We do not find any examples of the latter use in the *salmantino* data.

As in the previous analysis of all stative verbs, *estar* and *tener*, we analyzed the linguistic factors thought to condition the use of aspectual morphology of *haber*. Our hypotheses were the same as in the other analyses. Before presenting the results of *haber*, we should mention that the Verb Class of Main Verb and Collocation factor groups were excluded from the GoldVarb analysis. Only 6% (1/16) of all the examples of the Verb Class of Main Verb factor group was perfective; due to this lack of variation (i.e., knockouts) the factor group could not be tested and was omitted. Similarly, the Collocation factor group was excluded since the only factor that showed any patterns of variation was *haber* alone (36/311 perfective, 275/311 imperfective); yet, *haber + como* (2/2 imperfective) and *haber + infinitive* (15/16 imperfective) were both knockouts. Also the presence/absence of an Adjective or Past/Participle was not included in the analysis since this factor group did not apply to the existential meaning of *haber*.<sup>23</sup>

Table 5-16 presents the results of the multivariate analysis of *haber*. Found to be statistically significant in conditioning past-tense aspectual morphology were Grammatical Person (range=32) and Temporal Determinant (range=30). The factor groups that were not selected as statistically significant were Clause Type, Prepositional Phrase and Sentence Type. As in the *tener* analysis, we removed those examples of *haber que* and conducted a separate GoldVarb analysis in order to confirm the *haber que + infinitive* did not skew the overall results of *haber*. The findings are reported in Table 5-17; as one can see, the results are remarkably similar, thus, we felt it appropriate to keep the *haber que* token in the overall *haber* analysis. These results will not be discussed any further; only Table 5-16 will be the focus of our analysis of *haber*.

---

<sup>23</sup> There were examples found in the *salmantino* corpus such as *había muchas* ‘there were a lot’, but *muchas* represents a NP, thus, these were not counted as adjectives.

Table 5-16. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to *haber*

Input probability: 0.096 (11.2%)				
N=37/329	% Perf.	Probability	Total N	% Data
Grammatical person				
Inanimate singular	15	.63	22	44
Inanimate plural	12	.52	10	25
3s	6	.39	4	20
3p	3	.20	1	12
<i>Range</i>		32		
Temporal determinant				
Punctual marker/temporal sequencer/ marked frame/durative	27	.75	12	14
Absent/general past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	10	.45	25	86
<i>Range</i>		30		
Clause type				
Main clause	13	[.53]	32	78
Subordinate clause	7	[.38]	5	22
Prepositional phrase				
Absent	12	[.53]	30	77
Present	9	[.41]	7	23
Sentence type				
Affirmative	12	[.52]	30	78
Negative	10	[.42]	7	22
Log likelihood=-106.296; p= 0.025; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.8928				

Table 5-17. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to *haber*, excluding *haber que/de*

Input probability: 0.097 (11.2%)				
N=36/313	% Perf.	Probability	Total N	% Data
Grammatical person				
Inanimate singular	15	.63	22	46
Inanimate plural	12	.52	10	27
3s	6	.37	3	16
3p	3	.20	1	12
<i>Range</i>		43		
Temporal determinant				
Punctual marker/temporal sequencer/ marked frame/durative	28	.76	12	15
Absent/general past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	10	.45	24	85
<i>Range</i>		31		

Table 5-17. Continued

Clause type				
Main clause	13	[.53]	31	78
Subordinate clause	7	[.39]	5	22
Prepositional phrase				
Absent	12	[.54]	30	77
Present	9	[.38]	6	23
Sentence type				
Affirmative	12	[.54]	31	78
Negative	8	[.39]	5	22
Log likelihood=-102.459; p= 0.034; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.4629				

### 5.3.1 *Haber*: Grammatical Person

With regard to Grammatical Person, the analysis of *haber* was different than the other verbs due to its particular morphosyntactic properties. Since existential *haber* is not conjugated like other verbs in Spanish—meaning existential *haber* only accounts for third-person singular and plural subjects and is typically marked with third-person singular morphology—, the results reflected this use and did not incorporate first or second-person subjects. Based on Reid (1976), Hopper (1979b) and Klein-Andreu (1991), it was expected for both third-person and inanimate subjects to favor of perfective aspect; we anticipated that the latter subject type would more strongly disfavor perfective aspect than the former. Surprisingly, the results in Table 5-16 revealed that the constraint hierarchy was the reverse of these expectations: inanimate singular (.63) and inanimate plural subjects (.52 ) favored perfective aspect, whereas third-person singular (.39) and third-plural subjects (.20) disfavored perfective *haber*. Unlike the *estar* and *tener* analyses, the result of inanimate singular subjects of *haber* was congruent with the findings in the analysis of all stative verbs. Table 5-18 presents the relative frequencies of the subjects and shows that inanimate subjects were more frequent than animate subjects.

Table 5-18. Relative frequencies of Grammatical Person, *haber*

Grammatical Person	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Inanimate singular	22	15%	121	85%	143	44%
Inanimate plural	10	12%	73	88%	83	25%
Third-person singular	4	6%	61	94%	65	20%
Third-person plural	1	3%	37	97%	38	12%
TOTAL	37	11%	292	89%	329	100%

These results were a bit puzzling, especially because the previous research has shown that animate subjects favored perfective aspect more so than inanimate subjects. Likewise, even though in the other analyses of stative verbs discussed thus far third-person singular and plural subjects disfavored perfective aspect, we still anticipated it to rank higher than inanimate subjects in the constraint hierarchy. When returning to the data, it became more apparent why these constraints were ordered in this fashion. Let's take examples (5.56), (5.57) and (5.58): the first two show us inanimate singular and plural subjects with *haber* and the last example is of both animate singular and plural subjects.

(5.56) Hubo una vez que, que también hizo una travesura muy grande.

'There was (PRET) **one time** that that she also did a very big prank.' (XXI, m61)

(5.57) Pero que hubo años difíciles cuando Franco. (XV, f59)

'But that there were (PRET) **difficult years** during Franco.'

(5.58) Bueno pues había una monja que era como muy poquita cosa, como que le tenías miedo incluso a los, a las chicas, y había una chica muy, muy, terrible y había chicas que se recogían, pues, de la calle. (XVI, f40)

'Well there was (IMP) **a nun** that was like a very small thing, such that you were scared of her including the, the girls. . . and there was (IMP) **a very, very terrible girl** and there were (IMP) **girls** that they picked up, well, from the streets.'

Examples (5.56) and (5.57) gave us more insight to why inanimate singular and plural subjects favored perfective aspect. As we can see in these excerpts, the inanimate subject of the sentence also functioned as a specific, marked past time frame (i.e., *una vez* 'one time', *unos años* 'some years'). Conversely, this is not the case in example (5.58); the grammatical subjects were people being described (i.e., *una monja* 'a nun', *una chica* 'a girl', *chicas* 'girls') rather than subjects

implicating some sort of time frame. Due to observing other examples in the *salmantino* corpus like (5.56) and (5.57) above, we wanted to know how the frequencies of Temporal Determinant intersected with those of Grammatical Person. Table 5-19 shows us that the rate of perfective aspect of inanimate subjects co-occurring with punctual, closed temporal expressions was higher than with animate subjects; many times these specific temporal expressions were the subjects themselves, as in seen in (5.56) and (5.57) as well as (5.59), (5.60) and (5.61) below.

Table 5-19. Cross-tabulation of Grammatical Person and Temporal Determinant of perfective aspect, *haber*

	Punctual/marked frame/temporal sequencer % (N)	Absent/general past/ habitual/ <i>siempre</i> % (N)	Total % (N)
Inanimate singular	44 (7)	13 (15)	17 (22)
Inanimate plural	29 (5)	8 (5)	12 (10)
Animate singular	<b>0 (0)</b>	8 (4)	7 (4)
Animate plural	<b>0 (0)</b>	3 (1)	3 (1)
TOTAL N	27 (12)	10 (25)	12 (37)

(5.59) Yo ya hubo un momento que ya, “Hijos sois libres”. (XVII, f58)  
‘I already there was (PRET) **a moment** that now, “Children you are free.”’

(5.60) Hubo un día en clase, la profesora de historia, es mayor ya y un chico llevó una camiseta amarilla fosforita a clase y se sienta delante de todo y lo mandó a sentar atrás porque la camiseta le hacía daño a la vista.  
‘There was (PRET) **a day** in class, the History teacher, she is older now and a boy wore a fluorescent yellow shirt to class and he sat in front of everything and she sent him to sit in the back because the shirt was hurting her eyes.’

(5.61) Ya es, he trabajado un poquito más con dos, dos, dos, porque porque estuve mucho tiempo con una, una, una y hubo dos años ahí con un trimestre ninguna.  
‘It already is, I have worked a little more with two, two, two because because I was a long time with one, one, one and there were (PRET) **two years** there with a trimester none.’

With this evidence, taken along with our quantitative findings, the higher rate of perfective *haber* can be attributed to the use of grammatical subjects that also functioned as markers of specific past time frames. Table 5-19 furthermore reveals that there were no examples of animate

singular or plural subjects of *haber* to co-occur with a punctual marker, temporal sequencer or marked frame expression.

### 5.3.2 *Haber*: Temporal Determinant

The second and final factor group selected as statistically significant in shaping *salmantino*-speaker choice of *haber* was Temporal Determinant. The GoldVarb results (Table 5-16) revealed that punctual marker, temporal sequencer, marked frame/durative expressions favored perfective aspect (.75), whereas *siempre*, habitual expression, general past expression and *haber* tokens lacking temporal expressions disfavored perfective aspect (.45). Table 5-20 reports the relative frequencies of each factor.

Table 5-20. Relative frequencies of Temporal Determinant of *haber*

Temporal Determinant	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Absent	25	11%	210	89%	235	76
Punctual marker	9	50%	9	50%	18	6
Marked frame	2	12%	14	88%	16	5
General past	0	0%	14	100%	14	5
Temporal sequencer	1	10%	9	90%	10	3
Habitual	0	0%	7	100%	7	2
<i>Siempre</i>	0	0%	6	100%	6	2
TOTAL	37	11%	292	89%	329	100%

Subsequent pair-wise comparisons showed us that there was a statistically significant difference between punctual markers and *every other constraint* of this factor group: punctual marker vs. absent ( $\chi^2=22.26822, p\leq 0.000$ ), punctual marker vs. marked frame ( $\chi^2=5.442688, p\leq 0.0285$ ), punctual marker vs. general past expressions ( $\chi^2=9.73913, p\leq 0.0018$ ), punctual marker vs. temporal sequencer ( $\chi^2=4.48, p\leq 0.0343$ ), punctual marker vs. habitual expressions ( $\chi^2=5.46875, p\leq 0.0194$ ) and punctual marker vs. *siempre* ( $\chi^2=4.8, p\leq 0.0285$ ). Therefore, it appears that punctual markers (i.e., *dos años* ‘two years’, *un momento* ‘a moment’, *una vez* ‘one time’, *un día* ‘a day’) strongly conditioned *salmantino*-speaker use of perfective *haber*.

Even though this factor group ranked second in terms of relative strength, the presence of a punctual temporal expression greatly affected the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of the verb *haber*. If the discourse function of these elements is examined, we can further understand why punctual adverbials and perfective aspect are closely intertwined. It has been explained that high-focused content (foregrounding) is critical to the plot of the narrative; many times foregrounding is marked with perfective aspect *and temporal adverbials together*. How the latter component comes into play in discourse can best be explained by Hopper & Thompson (1980:286, emphasis added):

Foregrounded clauses typically recount sequences of events which mimic the chronological order of those events, as they are supposed to have occurred. Each event in foregrounding is thus viewed in its entirety; from the viewpoint of the discourse, it is bounded at its beginning by the termination of the preceding event, and at its end by the initiation of the next event. The discourse thus imposes a perfective interpretation on foregrounded events. The boundaries provided by the progression of the discourse have a natural correspondence, at the level of sentence grammar, in the various strategies for bounding an action—including *aspectual morphology*, and *time adverbs* which set an explicit limit on an action.

Narrative events are discrete, bounded actions which are temporally sequenced; the story cannot advance if an action is incomplete or unbounded and these time-specific adverbs help bind that action. The examples we have seen in this section show us how these adverbial markers greatly facilitated the use of perfective aspect, which is associated with foregrounding. These time-bounding adverbials were even used as the grammatical subject of *haber*, which of course is verb specific, as the morphosyntactic nature of the *haber* permits this to occur. On the other hand, *salmantinos* categorically employed imperfective *haber* with a co-occurring general past and habitual temporal expression, as well as with *siempre* (27/27). There were also no examples of time-bounding, punctual adverbials to co-occur with third-person subjects (0/0). Therefore, it appears the imperfective *haber* functioned in the canonical sense to background the narrative. Instances of imperfective *haber* were overwhelmingly used to illustrate background situations, as

well as those individuals present in the particular setting (5.58); this opposes the use of perfective *haber*, which often functioned to denote specific moments in the past (e.g. (5.57) and (5.61)) or to begin the elaboration of a story (e.g. (5.56) and (5.60)).

### 5.3.3 *Haber*: Summary

As seen above, the two factor groups shaping past-tense aspectual choice of *haber* were Grammatical Person and Temporal Determinant, which were also found statistically significant in the analysis of all statives together. Yet, it appears that *haber* was used strictly to foreground specific past actions and to background supportive details. Verb-specific phenomena were also observed. Clause Type, Prepositional Phrase and Sentence Type were not selected as statistically significant factor groups in determining past-tense aspectual morphology of *haber* in *salmantino* Spanish, but were selected as statistically significant in the analysis of all stative verbs together.<sup>24</sup> Likewise, Collocation and Verb Class of Main Verbs did not show enough variation to test the effect of these factor groups and were not incorporated into the statistical analysis.

Below we

Table 5-21. Similarities and differences between all stative verb and *haber* analyses

Similarities

1. Factor groups selected as statistically significant: Grammatical Person and Temporal Determinant.
2. Same direction of effect in both analysis Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person analyses, except that inanimate plural subjects favored perfective aspect in the *haber* analysis.

Differences

1. Grammatical Person was the factor group with the highest magnitude of effect in the *haber* analysis, as opposed to Temporal Determinant in the analysis of all statives together.
2. Clause Type, Sentence Type, and Prepositional Phrase factor groups were statistically significant in the analysis of all statives, but not with *haber*.
3. Little to no variation in the *haber* analysis: Collocation and Verb Class of Main Verb.
4. Time-bounding adverbials were used as inanimate singular subjects which conditioned the use of perfective aspect of *haber*.
5. The Adjective/Past Participle factor group did not apply to this analysis

---

<sup>24</sup> Chi-square tests were used to verify that there were no significant differences between the factors of these respective factor groups.

provide a summary of the similarities and differences of the analysis of *haber* and all stative verbs together. The results of *haber* revealed that there were some similarities, but more differences when comparing these findings with those of all stative verbs: the disparities indicates that *haber* has verb-specific properties that set it apart from other stative verbs. Examples from the corpus supported the quantified evidence that *haber* was exceptional in carrying out the canonical foregrounding-backgrounding (perfective-imperfective) function in the discourse; temporal adverbials were also key in making these distinctions. We are not claiming that other stative verbs did not perform this function in discourse; however, the results and data of *haber* showed overwhelming evidence to support that the perfective-imperfective distinction of *haber* functioned to maintain grounding differences in narrative discourse.

Nevertheless, we do not wish to downplay the similarities between the *haber* and all stative verbs analyses. The fact that Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person consistently ranked the two strongest factor groups in terms of magnitude of effect provided us with conclusive evidence of the linguistic factor groups that conditioned past-tense aspectual choice. Now we will examine the results for all other stative verbs, other than the four most frequent verbs, to ascertain if this conglomeration shared the same trends we have seen in the analyses discussed thus far.

#### **5.4 Results and Discussion: Less Frequent Stative Verbs**

The other stative verbs considered in the analysis comprised 11% of all instances of statives in the *salmantino* corpus ( $N=855$ ). Since the results of the all stative verbs analysis (Chapter 4) revealed that select verbs pertaining to the less frequent (LF) stative verb category influenced the constraint rankings of certain linguistic factor groups, we decided to take a closer

look at this remaining, yet influential 11%.<sup>25</sup> Table 5-22 presents the relative frequencies of each verb by past-tense aspectual variant.

Table 5-22. Relative frequencies of LF stative verbs

Verb	Preterit		PP		Imperfect		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Poder</i> ‘able to’	17	11%	6	4%	130	85%	153	3%
<i>Querer</i> ‘want’	17	13%	5	4%	110	83%	132	3%
<i>Vivir</i> ‘live’	19	16%	21	18%	79	66%	119	3%
<i>Gustar</i> ‘please’	36	34%	8	8%	62	58%	106	2%
<i>Quedar</i> ‘remain’	50	58%	8	9%	28	33%	86	2%
<i>Conocer</i> ‘know’	47	55%	1	1%	37	44%	85	2%
<i>Saber</i> ‘know’	1	2%	0	0%	40	98%	41	1%
<i>Llamarse</i> ‘be named’	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%	26	1%
<i>Sentir</i> ‘feel’	9	39%	2	9%	12	52%	23	1%
Other	5	23%	0	0%	17	77%	22	<1%
<i>Faltar</i> ‘miss’	8	50%	1	6%	7	44%	16	<1%
<i>Necesitar</i> ‘need’	0	0%	1	8%	12	92%	13	<1%
<i>Parecer</i> ‘seem’	1	9%	0	0%	10	91%	11	<1%
<i>Costar</i> ‘cost’	5	56%	0	0%	4	44%	9	<1%
<i>Merecer</i> ‘deserve’	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	<1%
<i>Existir</i> ‘exist’	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	<1%
<i>Deber</i> ‘ought to’	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3	<1%
<i>Durar</i> ‘last’	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2	<1%
<b>TOTAL (LF)</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>855</b>	<b>11%</b>
<i>Ser, estar, tener, haber</i>	714	20%	236	6%	2706	74%	3656	89%
<b>TOTAL (ALL VERBS)</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3290</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>4511</b>	<b>100%</b>

The overall frequencies of each variant were fairly comparable to those of the four most frequent verbs: 26% (218/855) Preterit, 6% (53/855) PP, and 68% (584/855) Imperfect. Note that the rate of Preterit use applied to LF stative verbs was slightly higher than the four most frequent verbs and the rate of PP use was exactly the same in both groups (6%). However, if we observe the frequencies of the variants by individual verb, we notice a wide spectrum of frequencies for each variant. For instance, there were no examples of perfective aspect applied to verbs like *llamarse* ‘call oneself’ (0/26), *merecer* ‘deserve’ (0/4), or *existir* ‘exist’ (0/4), yet, verbs such as *quedar*

<sup>25</sup> In order to run a multivariate statistical analysis, there needs to be at least 250 tokens of the linguistic variable; none of these verbs reached such a token count, so they were grouped together.

‘remain, stay’ (67% [58/86]), *costar* ‘cost’ (56% [5/9]), *durar* ‘last’ (100% [2/2]), *faltar* ‘miss’ (56% [9/16]) and *conocer* ‘know’ (56% [48/85]) exhibited much higher rates of perfective aspect as compared to the overall tendency.<sup>26</sup>

The results of the multivariate analysis of the LF stative verbs reported in Table 5-23 shows us that there were four linguistic factor groups selected as statistically significant: Temporal Determinant (range=74), Grammatical Person (range=49), Collocation (range=39), and Clause Type (range=15). As with the results of the other analyses, Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person ranked the highest in terms of magnitude of effect; this trend is recurrent in every analysis examined thus far. The factor groups that were not chosen as statistically significant were Prepositional Phrase, Sentence Type and Verb Class of Main Verb.

#### 5.4.1 Less Frequent Statives: Temporal Determinant

Temporal Determinant once again was the strongest factor group to influence *salmantino*-speaker choice of past-tense aspect of LF stative verbs. On the whole, the constraint hierarchy followed the order as seen in the other analyses, with the exception of *siempre*. Favoring perfective aspect were punctual markers (.90), marked frames/durative expressions (.79), temporal sequencers (.73) and, unexpectedly, *siempre* (.63). Slightly disfavoring perfective aspect was the lack of temporal adverbial (.47) and strongly disfavoring perfective aspect was habitual and general past temporal expressions (.16). As the directions of effect these factors were parallel to our hypotheses, as well as the findings of the other stative verb analyses, we decided to simply focus on why LF verbs favored perfective aspect when co-occurring with *siempre*.

---

<sup>26</sup> Recall that we combined all examples of Preterit and PP; from here out the discussion will be between perfective vs. imperfective variants.

Table 5-23. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect applied to LF verbs

Input probability: 0.278 (31.7%)				
<i>N</i> =271/855	% perfective	Probability	Total <i>N</i>	% Data
<b>Temporal determinant</b>				
Punctual marker	82	.90	27	4
Marked frame/durative	64	.79	7	1
Temporal sequencer	47	.75	8	2
<i>Siempre</i>	44	.63	4	1
Absent	29	.47	209	89
Habitual/general past	9	.16	2	3
<i>Range</i>		.74		
<b>Grammatical person</b>				
1s	43	.64	112	31
Inanimate singular	42	.61	73	20
1p	25	.43	20	10
3s	23	.42	44	22
3p, inanimate plural	19	.35	19	12
2s	6	.15	3	6
<i>Range</i>		.49		
<b>Collocation</b>				
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	50	.66	10	2
Verb alone	38	.58	231	72
Verb + <i>como</i>	20	.30	1	1
Verb + gerund/infinitive/both	13	.27	29	26
<i>Range</i>		.39		
<b>Clause type</b>				
Main clause/subordinate complement clause	35	.54	217	73
Subordinate adverbial/causal clause	24	.40	30	15
Subordinate relative clause	23	.39	24	12
<i>Range</i>		.15		
<b>Prepositional phrase</b>				
Present	33	[.53]	66	24
Absent	31	[.49]	205	76
<b>Sentence type</b>				
Affirmative	34	[.52]	230	79
Negative	23	[.44]	41	21
<b>Verb class (gerund, infinitive, both)</b>				
Change-of-state	25	[.76]	2	3
Stative	21	[.62]	6	12
Motion	18	[.56]	13	31
<i>Haber</i> + past participle	13	[.47]	1	3
Dynamic	10	[.44]	9	37
Perception/psychological	9	[.39]	1	5
Speaking	5	[.33]	1	8

Log likelihood=-454.404; p= 0.009;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.0153

In terms of relative frequency, when *siempre* was present in the linguistic environment 44% (4/9) of the past-tense LF verbs were applied with perfective aspect. These examples are provided below in (5.62), (5.63), (5.64) and (5.65).

- (5.62) Y la gente es más egoísta. Se tienen las envidias, cosas de familia. Yo **siempre** me faltó nada muy pronto. (V, f58)  
'And people are more selfish. They are jealous, family things. I **always** was missing (PRET) nothing urgent.'
- (5.63) No me podía colocar en una empresa a trabajar, mi padre quería que hiciera algo más. Claro, mi padre **siempre** quiso que hubiera hecho una carrera. (I, f58)  
'He couldn't put me in a company to work, my father wanted that I do something more. Of course, my father **always** wanted (PRET) that I had done a career.'
- (5.64) Pues mis papás vivieron **siempre** con nosotros, porque al ser hija sola entonces yo le dije a mi marido. (IV, f62)  
'Well my parents lived (PRET) **always** with us, because being an only child so I told my husband.'
- (5.65) Yo me llevaba muy bien con ella, no sé porque, **siempre** me sentí, muy unida a ella. (XVI, f40)  
'I got along very well with her, I don't know why, I **always** felt (PRET), very close to her.'

Since there wasn't a particular LF verb that preferred perfective aspect when it co-occur with *siempre*, the change in direction of effect could be attributed to the low token count ( $N=9$ ).

Nonetheless, these examples display the variable nature of past-tense aspectual morphology even with the presence of a Temporal Determinant known to condition the use of imperfective aspect.

#### 5.4.2 Less Frequent Statives: Grammatical Person

The fact that Grammatical Person ranked second in magnitude of effect, behind Temporal Determinant, was not surprising since this was a recurrent trend we were starting to notice across the different analyses. The ordering of the constraints was fairly congruent with the analyses discussed thus far: favoring perfective aspect were first-person singular subjects (.64) and inanimate singular subjects (.61). Disfavoring perfective aspect were first-person plural subjects (.43), third-person singular subjects (.42), inanimate and third-person plural subjects (.35), and

lastly second-person singular subjects (.15). Table 5-24 shows us that the constraint hierarchy was remarkably similar to the ordering of Grammatical Person in the all stative verb analysis, with the exception of first-person plural subjects.

Table 5-24. Probability weights of Grammatical Person and perfective aspect, LF statives vs. all statives

Grammatical Person	LF statives	All statives
1s	.64	.69
Inanimate singular	.61	.56
1p	<b>.43</b>	<b>.52</b>
3s	.42	.41
3p, inanimate plural	.35	.33
2s	.15	.17
<i>Range</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>52</i>

We would have expected for first-person plural subjects to favor perfective aspect, since first-person subjects were commonly found in perfective aspect in previous investigations (Reid 1976, Hopper 1979b, 1982); yet, in the LF stative analysis they were found to slightly disfavor perfective aspect. Also, per the discussion in §4.3.3, it was explained inanimate singular subjects of the verbs *gustar* ‘please’, *quedar* ‘remain’, *faltar* ‘miss’, and *costar* ‘cost’ strongly favored perfective aspect due to lexical and syntactic properties of these verbs.

### 5.4.3 Less Frequent Statives: Collocation

The third factor group, Collocation, was found to be statistically significant in both LF stative verbs and in the analysis of all statives together. The factors in each respective analysis displayed the same direction of effect: verb + *bien/mal* (.66) and verb alone (.58) favored perfective aspect, whereas verb + *como* (.30) and verb + gerund/infinitive/both (.27) disfavored perfective aspect. These results were congruent with our expectations.

Table 5-25 presents the probability weights of both the LF and all statives analyses; one can see that the weights for verb + *bien/mal* and verb alone are fairly comparable to one another. With regard to LF verb + *bien/mal*, below we report in Table 5-26 that *quedar bien/mal*, *vivir*

*bien* and *sentir bien* were the three LF verbs that used these adverbials. As it was explained in §4.3.2, many of the perfective verb + *bien/mal* collocations were used during complicating action or resolution clauses to express evaluative viewpoints at crucial moments of the narrative (5.66).

Table 5-25. Probability weights of Collocation and perfective aspect, LF statives vs. all statives

Collocation	LF statives	All statives
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	.66	.69
Verb alone	.58	.52
Verb + <i>como</i>	<b>.30</b>	<b>.14</b>
Verb + gerund/infinitive/both	<b>.27</b>	<b>.41</b>
Range	39	55

Table 5-26. Distribution of frequencies for LF verb + *bien/mal*

LF verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Vivir bien</i>	7	47%	8	53%	15	75%
<i>Sentir mal</i>	1	33%	2	67%	3	15%
<i>Quedar bien/mal</i>	2	100%	0	0%	2	10%
TOTAL	10	50%	10	50%	20	100%

(5.66) Porque no tienes, tienes experiencia pero no tienes experiencia. Y entonces, como quedé muy **mal** porque eran tantos esfuerzos. (XII, f62)  
 ‘Because you don’t have, you don’t have experience, but you don’t have experience. And then, like I was (PRET) very **bad** because there was such much effort.’

With that said, however, examples of *vivir bien* ‘live well’ were not typically embedded into narratives; rather, this collocation was used to describe a specific moment of time in the past.

Take examples (5.67) and (5.68) below:

(5.67) Y, y bueno pues yo cuando Franco pues relativamente viví muy **bien**. (XII, f62)  
 And, and well me during Franco well relatively I lived (PRET) very **well**.’

(5.68) Yo la época de Franco la viví muy **bien**, y muy feliz, muy bien, con mis padres, no millonarios, pero tenían su negocio, y yo viví muy **bien** la época de Franco. Yo no puedo decir otra cosa. (XIV, f53)  
 ‘Me in the time of Franco I lived (PRET) it very **well**, and very happy, very well, with my parents, not millionaires, but they had their business, and I lived (PRET) **well** during Franco’s time. I can’t say anything else.’

Both of (5.67) and (5.68) demonstrate how different speakers applied the perfective form of *vivir bien* when describing *la época de Franco* ‘the time during Franco’. Even though these excerpts

were not apart of a narrative storyline per se, perfective aspect was used since *la época de Franco* was a closed, bounded past time frame; this use of *vivir bien* applied with perfective aspect was observed in 7/16 (47%) instances.

When comparing the LF verbs and all statives analyses, it was observed that verb + *como* ( $N=5$ ) ranked higher than verb + gerund/infinite/both ( $N=219$ ) in the LF stative analysis.<sup>27</sup> Since the latter collocation was more frequently found in the data, we decided to take a closer look at the distributions of verb + gerund/infinite/both individually. In Tables 5-27, 5-28 and 5-29, the frequencies of verb + infinitive, verb + gerund, and verb + both are presented separately according to verb. Per our discussion in §4.3.2, the collocation *tener que* + infinitive was the most frequent in the *salmantino* corpus (39%), followed by *poder* + infinitive (17%), and *querer* + infinitive (17%). In §4.3.2, Table 4-7 also showed us that *tener que* + infinitive displayed a higher rate of perfective examples (23% [37/161]) than these verb + infinitive collocations. In the LF stative analysis, the *poder* and *querer* + infinitive collocations comprised 83% of all LF verb + infinitive examples (50% *poder* + infinitive, 33% *querer* + infinitive), where 9% (9/105)

Table 5-27. Distribution of frequencies of LF verb + infinitive according to verb

LF verb + infinitive	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Poder</i> ‘able to’ + infinitive	9	9%	96	91%	105	50%
<i>Querer</i> ‘want’ + infinitive	13	19%	57	81%	70	33%
<i>Gustar</i> ‘please’ + infinitive	2	12%	14	88%	16	8%
<i>Saber</i> ‘know’ + infinitive	0	0%	8	100%	8	4%
<i>Costar</i> ‘cost’ + infinitive	1	25%	3	75%	4	2%
<i>Necesitar</i> ‘have’ + infinitive	0	0%	2	100%	2	1%
<i>Deber</i> ‘should’ + infinitive	1	50%	1	50%	2	1%
<i>Faltar</i> ‘miss’ + infinitive	1	50%	1	50%	2	1%
<i>Quedar</i> ‘be’ + infinitive	0	0%	1	100%	1	<1%
TOTAL	27	13%	183	87%	210	100%

<sup>27</sup> The LF verb + *como* construction had 1 perfective and 4 imperfective examples in the corpus.

Table 5-28. Distribution of frequencies of LF verb + gerund according to verb

LF verb + gerund	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Quedar</i> + gerund	0	0%	5	100%	5	71%
<i>Conocer</i> + gerund	0	0%	1	100%	1	14%
<i>Poder</i> + gerund	0	0%	1	100%	1	14%
TOTAL	0	0%	7	100%	7	100%

Table 5-29. Distribution of LF verb + infinitive + gerund

LF verb + infinitive + gerund	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Poder</i> + infinitive + gerund	0	0%	1	100%	1	50%
<i>Querer</i> + infinitive + gerund	0	0%	1	100%	1	50%
TOTAL	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%

of *poder* + infinitive were applied with perfective aspect and 19% of *querer* + infinitive 19% (13/70) were as well. Therefore, since *tener que* was not a part of the LF stative analysis, it becomes more apparent why the probability weight was lower in this analysis when compared to the all stative analysis. Likewise, if variant frequencies presented in Tables 5-28 and 5-29 are examined, the lack of any perfective tokens in LF verb + gerund and verb + infinitive + gerund also supports the claim that a lower frequency in the LF verb + infinitive/gerund/both analysis contributed to the lower probability weight when compared to the all stative verb analysis. With this said, however, the important point here is that the verb + infinitive/gerund/both collocation shared the same direction of effect in both the LF stative and all stative analyses.

#### 5.4.4 Less Frequent Statives: Clause Type

The fourth and final factor group that was chosen as statistically significant in determining past-tense aspectual morphology of LF stative verbs was Clause Type. We saw in Chapter 4, as in the individual verb analyses of the present chapter, stative verbs in main clauses favored perfective aspect and disfavored perfective aspect in subordinate clauses. Yet, the results for the LF stative analysis were slightly different than what was observed in the *tener*, *estar*, and all stative analysis: verbs in main clauses and subordinate complement clause favored perfective

aspect (.54), whereas verbs in subordinate adverbial/causal clauses (.40) and subordinate relative clauses disfavored perfective aspect (.39). Table 5-30 reports the individual factors' frequencies according to variant; pair-wise comparisons revealed that the difference between main clauses vs. subordinate adverbial/causal clauses ( $\chi^2=5.594714$ ,  $p\leq 0.0180$ ) and main clauses vs. subordinate relative clauses ( $\chi^2=6.153226$ ,  $p\leq 0.0131$ ) reached statistical significance.

Table 5-30. Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology according to Clause Type, LF stative verbs

Clause type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Main	211	35%	393	65%	604	71%
Sub. adverbial/causal	30	24%	95	76%	125	15%
Sub. relative	24	23%	82	77%	106	12%
Sub. complement	6	30%	14	70%	20	3%
TOTAL	271	32%	584	68%	855	100%

Table 5-31. Narrative excerpt from speaker III

Excerpt from speaker III (f, 48)	Clause type	English Translation
(a) Ehm. . . bueno se comenta	<i>Main clause</i>	'Uhm..well one commented
(b) que Franco ya <u>estaba</u> muerto.	<i>Subordinate complement clause</i>	that Franco <u>was</u> (IMP) already dead.
(c) Todo cerrado.	<i>Main clause</i>	Everything closed.
(d) Toda la televisión todo el día música, todo música militar todos los días.	<i>Main clause</i>	Everything on TV all day long music, everything military music every day.
(d) Y al cuatro días <u>estuvo</u> todo automáticamente cerrado, las discotecas, los bares, todo.	<i>Main clause</i>	On the fourth day everything <u>was</u> (PRET) automatically closed, the clubs, the bars, everything.
(e) <u>Fue</u> como un luto nacional impresionante, la verdad.	<i>Main clause</i>	It <u>was</u> (PRET) like an impressive national mourning, the truth.
(f) Y claro tú eres una niña	<i>Main clause</i>	And of course you are a child
(g) y lo entiendes	<i>Main clause</i>	and you understand it
(h) y no lo entiendes.	<i>Main clause</i>	and you don't understand it.
(i) Pero, <u>fue</u> muy fuerte, ¿eh?	<i>Main clause</i>	But it <u>was</u> (PRET) very powerful, right?
(j) Además la gente lloraba muchísimo. . .	<i>Main clause</i>	Plus people were crying a lot . . .
(k) No pensé	<i>Main clause</i>	I didn't think
<b>(l) que Franco <u>quiso</u> tanto a la gente.</b>	<i>Subordinate complement clause</i>	<b>that Franco <u>cared for/loved</u> (PRET) the people so much.</b>
(m) Sobre todo a la gente mayor la <u>adoraba</u> .	<i>Main clause</i>	Above all the older people he <u>adored</u> (IMP).

We provide an example in Table 5-31 of a LF perfective verb (i.e., *quiso* ‘he cared for’) located in a subordinate complement clause (1). It was verified that LF stative verbs did not show a preference of perfective aspect in subordinate complement clauses; we suspect that the change in the constraint ranking could have been due to a low token count in this analysis ( $N=20$ ). It is also possible that LF statives in complement clauses did not function the same when in other subordinate clauses.

#### 5.4.5 Less Frequent Statives: Adjective/Past Participle

Not tested in the multivariate analysis was the presence/absence of an Adjective or Past Participle. In the analysis of all stative verbs together, a pair-wise comparison between the factors did show a statistically significant difference at the .05 level. Contrary to this finding, the difference between the presence and absence of an Adjective/Past Participle in the LF stative verb analysis *did* reach statistical significance ( $\chi^2=26.53575$ ,  $p\leq 0.0000$ ).

Table 5-32. Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, LF verbs

Adjectives	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No adjective/past participle	229	29%	556	71%	785	94%
Adjective/past participle	32	54%	18	36%	50	6%
TOTAL	261	31%	574	69%	835	100%

Table 5-32 reports the distribution of frequencies; of the examples of perfective + adjective/past participle ( $N=32$ ), *quedar* ( $N=17$ ), *vivir* ( $N=5$ ), and *sentir* ( $N=5$ ) were the most common LF statives used with these structures.<sup>28</sup> Below we provide examples of each respective LF verb + adjective/past participle.

- (5.69) Me quedé sola porque mi hija tuvo que llevarla al pueblo con mis padres porque tenía que trabajar.  
 ‘I was (PRET) **alone** because my daughter I had to take her to the town with my parents because I had to work.’

<sup>28</sup> The remaining LF verb + adjective/past participle was *faltar* ( $N=1$ ), *verse* ( $N=1$ ), and *conocer* ( $N=2$ ).

(5.70) Estuvieron juntos hasta que se casaron y vivieron **juntos**.  
'They were together until they got married and lived (PRET) **together**.'

(5.71) Pero yo llegó a un momento que me sentí **negada** para las matemáticas totalmente.  
'But I time came that I felt (PRET) **useless** at Math totally.'

These results were of interest, since with the all stative, *estar* and *tener* analyses the difference between factors did not achieve statistical significance.

#### 5.4.6 Less Frequent Statives: Summary

There were some striking similarities between the all stative analysis and the LF stative analysis. The two analysis shared four statistically significant factor groups in common: Temporal Determinant, Grammatical Person, Collocation and Clause Type. The factor groups that were selected as statistically significant also shared similar constraint hierarchies, with the exception of *siempre* in the Temporal Determinant factor group and subordinate complement clauses in the Clause Type factor group. Since both of these constraints had a low token count in the LF stative analysis, it was explained that this could have had an effect on the probabilities in each respective factor group.

Table 5-33. Similarities and differences between all stative verb and LF stative verb analyses

---

#### Similarities

---

1. Factor groups selected as statistically significant: Temporal Determinant, Grammatical Person, Collocation, and Clause Type.
  2. The direction of effect of the constraints in the statistically significant factor group was the same, with minor exceptions.
  3. Temporal Determinant had the strongest magnitude of effect in both analyses; Clause Type was the fourth in terms of magnitude of effect in both.
- 

#### Differences

---

1. Factor group selected as significant in the all stative analysis but not the LF stative analysis: Prepositional Phrase and Sentence Type.
  2. Chi-square test revealed that the difference between LF verb + adjective/past participle was statistically different.
  3. Siempre favored perfective aspect in the FL stative analysis, but disfavored the variant in the analysis of all statives.
  4. Subordinate complement clauses were found to favor perfective aspect.
-

Therefore, with the minor exceptions aside, we see notable similarities between the two analyses. While the relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual choice of the individual LF verbs were quite varied (Table 5-22), the multivariate analyses of the LF statives and all statives in Chapter 4 were fairly comparable, more so than the individual results of the *estar*, *tener* and *haber* analyses.

### 5.5 Results and Discussion: *Ser* ‘Be’

The verb *ser* ‘be’ was saved for last. This was done purposefully because the findings were quite different than for the other individual analyses discussed thus far. This verb was the most frequently observed in the *salmantino* corpus ( $N=1658$ ), consisting of 37% of all of the past-tense aspectual tokens of stative verbs (Table 5-1). With regard to variant frequencies of the *ser* examples, 19% (311/1658) were used in the Preterit, 5% (91/1658) were in the PP and 76% (1256/1658) were in the Imperfect. In comparison to the other frequent and LF statives, this distribution was not in any particular way different; rather, all of these percentages seemed to fall close the median of all of the variants (Table 5-1). The verb *ser* is commonly used as a copulative verb to link an nominal or adjectival attribute to a subject (5.72), to show possession (5.73), origin (5.74) and to indicate the location/time of an event (5.75).

- (5.72) Yo conocí allá a Paco. Paco Rostinni era **profesional**, era el **fotógrafo profesional**. (XVII, f31)  
 ‘I met there Paco. Paco Rostinni was (IMP) a **professional**, he was (IMP) a **professional photographer**.’
- (5.73) Hicimos escala en una isla que era **del gobierno**. (VI, f43)  
 ‘We had a layover in an island that was (IMP) **the government’s**.’
- (5.74) Y luego tuvimos un chico que estuvo un mes que nos contó que su papá era **americano**, su papá estaba en China. (IV, f62)  
 ‘Then we had one boy that was here one month that told us that his father was (IMP) **American**, his father was in China.’
- (5.75) Porque la otra cita era **a las 11:30**. (III, f44)  
 ‘Because the other appointment was (IMP) **at 11:30**.’

*Ser* is also used in passive voice constructions (i.e., *ser* + past participle), but there were no examples of this structure in the *salmantino* data.

As we explained in Chapter 4, Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect analyses were conducted in order to verify that these ‘perfective’ variants exhibited similar findings in each respective multivariate analysis. This was the case for the all stative, *estar*, *tener*, *haber* and LF stative analyses, however, not for the preliminary analyses of *ser*. The differences between Preterit *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* and PP *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* were salient enough to merit discussion before proceeding. In Tables 5-34 and 5-35, we present these initial GoldVarb analyses. When comparing these analyses, we again followed the ‘three lines of evidence’ guidelines as described by Tagliamonte (2006:245): i) statistically significant factor groups, ii) the relative

Table 5-34. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of the Preterit tense applied to *ser*\*

Input probability: 0.129 (19.8%) N=311/1568				
	% Preterit	Probability	Total <i>N</i>	% Data
Temporal determinant				
Punctual marker	69	.91	58	6
Temporal sequencer/marked frame/durative	64	.87	42	5
Absent	14	.45	179	87
General past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	5	.13	2	3
<i>Range</i>		.78		
Grammatical person				
Full NP <sup>29</sup>	40	.79	94	15
Inanimate singular, plural	25	.58	158	40
1s	14	.44	13	6
2s, 3s	10	.41	38	25
3p	4	.20	5	8
1p	3	.14	3	6
<i>Range</i>		.65		
Collocation				
<i>Ser</i> + <i>bien/mal</i>	43	.70	3	1
<i>Ser</i> alone	21	.52	303	94
<i>Ser</i> + gerund/infinitive/both	11	.37	3	2
<i>Ser</i> + <i>como</i>	4	.14	2	4
<i>Range</i>		.56		

<sup>29</sup> NP=noun phrase

Table 5-34. Continued.

Clause type				
Main clause	23	.56	279	77
Subordinate complement clause	15	.46	7	3
Subordinate adverbial/causal clause	10	.33	18	12
Subordinate relative clause	6	.24	7	8
<i>Range</i>		32		
Priming				
Prime, no prime	26	.65	41	10
No prime, no prime	25	.57	123	31
No prime, prime	22	.55	64	19
Prime, prime	13	.38	83	40
<i>Range</i>				
Prepositional phrase				
Present	20	[.50]	295	84
Absent	20	[.50]	16	16
Sentence type				
Affirmative	20	[.50]	263	95
Negative	20	[.45]	48	5

Log likelihood=-592.841; p= 0.006;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.1342

\*Verb Class of Main Verb was not incorporated in the multivariate analysis due to low token count and little variation.

contribution of the linguistic factor groups selected as significant (i.e., range), and iii) the constraint hierarchies within each statistically significant factor group.

With regard to the first line of evidence, the factor groups chosen as statistically significant in both *ser* analyses were Temporal Determinant, Grammatical Person, Priming and Clauses Type; however, the Collocation factor group (range=56) was selected as significant in the Preterit *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* analysis, but not for the PP *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* analysis. More notably, the relative strength of these statistically significant factor groups was different, as shown in Table 5-36.

The relative strength ordering of Preterit *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* was fairly congruent to the other analyses of past-tense aspectual morphology discussed in Chapter 4 and the present chapter. Yet, the ordering of the statistically significant factor groups of the PP *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* reveal that Priming had the most influence over variant choice, followed by Temporal Determinant, Clause Type and, lastly, Grammatical Person.

Table 5-35. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of the Present Perfect applied to *ser*\*

Input probability: 0.021 (6.8%)				
N=91/1347	% PP	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Priming</b>				
No prime, no prime	15	.89	66	32
No prime, prime	7	.74	17	18
Prime, no prime	5	.63	6	9
Prime, prime	<1	.18	2	41
<i>Range</i>		<i>71</i>		
<b>Temporal determinant</b>				
Marked frame/durative	38	.88	9	2
Punctual/temporal sequencer	15	.70	6	3
Absent	6	.50	72	90
General past/habitual/ <i>siempre</i>	2	.18	1	5
<i>Range</i>		<i>70</i>		
<b>Clause type</b>				
Subordinate complement clause	17	.77	8	4
Main clause	7	.55	74	74
Subordinate adverbial/causal clause	3	.32	3	9
Subordinate relative clause	3	.26	6	13
<i>Range</i>		<i>51</i>		
<b>Grammatical person</b>				
1s	19	.79	19	8
Full NP	7	.56	11	11
3p	6	.53	7	10
1p	6	.50	6	8
Inanimate singular, plural	6	.45	30	37
2s, 3s	5	.45	18	29
<i>Range</i>		<i>34</i>		
<b>Collocation</b>				
<i>Ser + bien/mal</i>	20	[.85]	1	1
<i>Ser alone, ser + gerund/infinite/both</i>	7	[.51]	89	96
<i>Ser + como</i>	2	[.24]	1	4
<b>Prepositional phrase</b>				
Absent	7	[.52]	81	85
Present	5	[.39]	10	15
<b>Sentence type</b>				
Negative	7	[.52]	5	5
Affirmative	7	[.50]	86	95

Log likelihood=-255.337; p= 0.003;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.0080

\*Verb Class of Main Verb was not incorporated in the multivariate analysis due to low token count and little variation.

Table 5-36. Relative strength of statistically significant factor groups of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect, *ser*

Factor group	Preterit <i>ser</i>		PP <i>ser</i>	
	Range	Ranking	Range	Ranking
Temporal Determinant	78	1	70	2
Grammatical Person	65	2	34	4
Clause Type	32	4	51	3
Priming	27	5	71	1

With respect to the third line of evidence, or constraint hierarchies, some important differences were observed when comparing the *ser* analyses. If we examine Grammatical Person and Clause Type, there were differences in the directions of effect for one or more constraints. In Table 5-37 of Grammatical Person, first-person singular and third-person plural subjects applied with perfective aspect were disfavored in the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis, but were favored in the PP vs. Imperfect analysis of *ser*. Likewise, inanimate subjects applied with perfective aspect were favored in the Preterit vs. Imperfect analysis of *ser* (.58), but disfavored in the PP vs.

Imperfect analysis (.45). Furthermore, first-person subjects in Preterit vs. Imperfect were found

Table 5-37. Comparison of probability weights of Grammatical Person of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect, *ser*

Grammatical person	Preterit <i>ser</i>	PP <i>ser</i>
Full NP	.79	.56
Inanimate singular, plural	<b>.58</b>	<b>.45</b>
1s	<b>.44</b>	<b>.79</b>
2s, 3s	.41	.45
3p	<b>.20</b>	<b>.53</b>
1p	<b>.14</b>	<b>.50</b>
<i>Range</i>	65	34

Table 5-38. Comparison of probability weights of Clause Type of Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect

Clause type	Preterit <i>ser</i>	PP <i>ser</i>
Main clause	.56	.55
Subordinate complement clause	.46	.77
Subordinate adverbial clause	.33	.32
Subordinate relative clause	.24	.26
<i>Range</i>	32	51

to *strongly* disfavor perfective aspect (.14), yet in the PP vs. Imperfect, these subjects did not seem to overtly favor or disfavor one variant over the other (.50). With regard to Clause Type

(Table 5-38), the important difference between the two analyses was that PP examples of *ser* were strongly favored in subordinate complement clauses, even more so than in main clauses. This finding goes against all of the previous research on perfective vs. imperfective aspect in discourse (Reid 1976, Hopper 1979b, Klein-Andreu 1991), as well as the results in Chapter 4 and the present chapter. To echo what we discussed in the previous chapter when facing this same dilemma with the analysis of all stative verbs together, it is possible, albeit speculative, that the PP *ser* form still retains former anterior characteristics (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993) and therefore it displays different patterns when compared to Preterit *ser*. Since this is not the focus of the present study, although a fascinating phenomenon, this issue will be put aside for now and left for future investigation. We will rely on the explanation presented in Chapter 2 as well as the results of Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008) to justify the combination of these two perfective variants. Nevertheless, it was important to report the differences between the preliminary Preterit and PP *ser* vs. Imperfect analyses, since these findings were the most noteworthy of all of the individual and collective stative verb analyses.

Table 5-39 presents the GoldVarb analysis of *ser* with the Preterit and PP combined as one perfective variant. The factor groups selected as statistically significant were the same ones in the Preterit *ser* vs. Imperfect *ser* analysis: Temporal Determinant (range=76), Collocation (range=64), Grammatical Person (range=36), and Clause Type (range=29). Prepositional Phrase and Sentence Type were not selected as statistically significant as determining factor in the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of *ser* in salmantino Spanish. With the exception of the latter factor groups, the four significant factor groups of this analysis were also selected as significant in the all stative verbs analysis in Chapter 4.

Table 5-39. GoldVarb results of the contributing linguistic factors to the probability of the perfective aspect applied to *ser*

Input probability: 0.196 (24.2%)				
N=402/1568	% perf.	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Temporal determinant</b>				
Punctual marker	71	.89	62	6
Marked frame/durative	71	.86	36	3
Temporal sequencer	65	.86	17	2
<i>Siempre</i>	31	.65	4	1
Absent	19	.46	247	85
General past/habitual	5	.13	3	4
<i>Range</i>		.76		
<b>Collocation</b>				
<i>Ser + bien/mal</i>	50	.70	4	1
<i>Ser</i> alone	25	.52	391	95
<i>Ser + gerund/infinitive/both</i>	14	.35	4	2
<i>Ser + como</i>	5	.16	3	3
<i>Range</i>		.64		
<b>Grammatical person</b>				
Full NP	43	.73	105	15
1s	28	.61	32	7
Inanimate singular, plural	28	.52	188	39
2s, 3s	14	.39	56	25
3p	9	.29	12	8
1p	9	.26	9	6
<i>Range</i>		.36		
<b>Clause type</b>				
Main clause/ sub. complement clause	28	.55	368	81
Subordinate adverbial/causal clause	12	.33	24	12
Subordinate relative clause	8	.26	10	8
<i>Range</i>		.29		
<b>Prepositional phrase</b>				
Present	25	[.51]	344	85
Absent	23	[.45]	58	15
<b>Sentence type</b>				
Affirmative	24	[.50]	381	95
Negative	24	[.47]	21	5
Log likelihood=-761.240; p= 0.000; $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.0675				

### 5.5.1 *Ser*: Temporal Determinant

With the Preterit and PP *ser* variants combined, the Temporal Determinant factor group ranked first in terms of relative strength of the *ser* multivariate analysis (Table 5-39). As with the

other analyses, punctual markers (.89), marked frame/durative expressions (.86) and temporal sequencers (.86) favored the perfective form of *ser*; likewise, the absence of a temporal expression (.46) slightly disfavored perfective *ser*, and general and past temporal expressions (.16) strongly disfavored the perfective *ser*. However, *siempre* (N=13) favored the perfective form of *ser* with a probability weight of .65. Below we give two examples of such use in (5.76) and (5.77).

(5.76) I: Y ¿a qué se dedicaban sus padres?

P: ¿Mis padres? Mi padre fue **siempre** el contable de una empresa de aquí de Salamanca, y mi madre ama de casa. (XVIII, f58)

I: ‘And what did you parents do?’

P: My parents? My father was (PRET) **always** the accountant of a company here in Salamanca, and my mother [a] housewife.’

(5.77) Y pero, bueno, siempre estudié con beca, o sea que **siempre** fuí buena estudiante. (X, f48)

‘And but, well, I always studied with a scholarship, I mean that I **always** was (PRET) a good student.’

In describing persistent, backgrounded conditions, we would have expected for these speakers to apply imperfective aspect to *ser*; yet, perfective aspect was used. We propose three possible explanations of why this pattern was observed: i) subjectivity of viewpoint, ii) individual speaker stylistic use of past-tense aspect and iii) frequency in the data. First, since the speaker’s father of (5.76) was deceased at the time of the interview, the past condition of ‘he was an accountant’ could have been viewed as a bounded time frame, rather than a background description.

Similarly, since at the time of the interview the participant of (5.77) was no longer a student, the past situation of ‘being a student’ could have also been subjectively considered a closed past time frame. Additionally, the speakers of (5.76) and (5.77) were the only two speakers who applied perfective *ser* when it co-occurred with *siempre*; this was possibly a stylistic feature that these participants used with the verb *ser*. Moreover, since the *siempre* + past-tense *ser* only

constituted 1% of the data (4/13 perfective *ser*), it is possible that this constraint was shown to favor perfective aspect due to this low number. Aside from these explanations, the probability weight of *siempre* co-occurring with a perfective was higher than other habitual temporal expressions; a pair-wise comparison shows a statistically significant difference between *siempre* and habitual temporal expressions ( $\chi^2=4.727273$ ,  $p\leq 0.0297$ ). Apart from this constraint of the *ser* analysis, the direction of effect of the remaining factors within the Temporal Determinant group was what we had observed in the other stative verbs analyses.

### 5.5.2 *Ser*: Collocation

The factor group that ranked second in regard to relative contribution of past-tense aspectual choice was Collocation. The constraint hierarchy was consistent with that of the analysis in Chapter 4: *ser bien/mal* (.70) strongly favored the perfective form, *ser* alone slightly favored the perfective form (.52), *ser* + gerund/infinitive/both disfavored perfective aspect and *ser como* (.16) strongly disfavored the perfective. As seen in Table 5-40, there are striking similarities between the all stative verb analysis of Chapter 4 and *ser*.

Table 5-40. Comparison of probability weights of Collocation, all stative vs. *ser* analyses

Collocation	All statives	<i>Ser</i>
Verb + <i>bien/mal</i>	.69	.70
Verb alone	.52	.52
Verb + gerund/infinitive/both	.41	.35
Verb + <i>como</i>	.14	.16
Range	55	64

In §4.3.2, we discussed that the collocation verb + *bien/mal* was related to its function in the narrative structure. For instance, many times these structures were located in critical moments of the story (i.e., complication action, peak, or resolution clauses). Likewise, these structures could be influenced by temporal expressions in the narrative. For instance, let's take a look at (5.78).

(5.78) La boda fue preciosa, muy muy bonita. Y iba muy guapa, mi marido guapísimo. Todas mis hermanas. . .tengo un álbum precioso del día de la boda. Y bueno pues me casé ya te digo **cuando Franco** y para mí todo fue muy, muy **bien**. (XII, f62)

‘The wedding was beautiful, very very beautiful. I looked very pretty, my husband very handsome. All of my sisters. . . I have a beautiful album from my wedding day. And well I got married I tell you **during Franco’s [regime]** and for me everything was (PRET) very, very **good**.’

We see that in (5.78) the speaker described her wedding day and upon closing the topic (resolution narrative clause), she stated *todo fue muy, muy bien* ‘it was all very, very good’. In addition, *cuando Franco* ‘during Franco’s [regime]’ seemingly had a binding effect on the past time frame.

Also mentioned in detail in §4.3.2 was *ser como* ‘was like’. Out of all of the examples of verb + *como* in the *salmantino* corpus, 75% were of *ser como* (56/75). Of those 56 examples, 95% (53/56) were used with imperfective aspect and 5% (3/56) with perfective aspect. It was discussed that *ser como* functioned to compare backgrounded information with other points of reference (i.e., objects or emotions) to convey situational conditions to the interlocutor (see §4.3.2). Additionally, it was found that inanimate singular subjects were often used in *ser como* collocations, as in (5.79) and (5.80).

(5.79) Antes el campo era como una gran familia. (XI, f65)  
‘Before the country was (IMP) **like** a big family.’

(5.80) Y en Tarragona había un, como un parque. . . hacían un parque en navidades, se llamaba el Parque Natal, pues era como una nave muy grande. Hacían distintas cosas, pues había para hacer escalada, había karts, había para pintar, cosas para los niños.  
‘And in Tarragona there was a, like a park. . . they would put a park during Christmas, it was called the Christmas Park, well it was (IMP) **like** a very big ship. They did different things, well there one could go climbing, there were go-carts, one could paint, things for children.’

A cross-tabulation of *ser como* and grammatical person (Table 5-41) reveals that 68% (38/58) of the *ser como* tokens were used with inanimate singular subjects, as in the examples (5.79) and (5.80); 92% (35/38) of these examples were applied with imperfective and 8% (3/38) with

perfective aspect. Instances of *ser como* with other grammatical subjects were categorically used with imperfective aspect (18/18).

Table 5-41. Cross-tabulation of *ser como* and Grammatical Person

<i>Ser como</i>	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full NP, inanimate singular	3	8%	35	92%	38	68%
3s, 2s	0	0%	10	100%	10	18%
1p	0	0%	4	100%	4	7%
1s	0	0%	3	100%	3	5%
Inanimate plural	0	0%	1	100%	1	2%
3p	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	3	5%	56	95%	56	100%

### 5.5.3 *Ser*: Grammatical Person

The results for Grammatical Person showed us some interesting trends. Per our original hypotheses, first-person subjects had been expected to favor perfective aspect and third-person and inanimate subjects to disfavor perfective aspect. Yet, we began noticing that inanimate singular subjects in certain analyses did not pattern according to these previous expectations. It was discussed in §4.3.3 that inanimate singular subjects appeared to favor perfective aspect in the analysis of all statives together due to the influence of a few select verbs, with *ser* being one of them. This was confirmed by the individual analysis of *ser* (Table 5-39): full NPs (.73), first-person singular subjects (.61), and inanimate singular and plural subject (.52) favored perfective aspect. Disfavoring perfective aspect were second and third-person singular subjects (.39), third-person (.28) and first-person plural subjects (.26).

When we originally analyzed inanimate singular subjects, it was often observed that full NPs and abstract nouns were commonly used with perfective aspect, as opposed to tangible inanimate subjects (e.g. bicycle, picture, house). Therefore, in the *ser* analysis we differentiated between full NPs and abstract notions—(5.81) and (5.82)—from tangible inanimate subjects (5.83) to examine if this played a role in the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology.

- (5.81) I: ¿Y cómo fue cuando nació el primer. . .el primero?  
 P: A mí, a mí, ¡fue una gran alegría! (XXIII, m60)  
 I: And how was it when your first. . .first one was born?  
 P: For me, for me it [**the birth of his first child**] was (PRET) a great joy!
- (5.82) Y. . .**el nacimiento de la niña** fue, bueno, fue, no sé, indescriptible. (I, f58)  
 ‘And. . .**the birth of my granddaughter** was (PRET), well, it was (PRET), I don’t know, indescribable.’
- (5.83) Estos cuadros serán de él. Porque. . .con lapicero. Por mi cumpleaños me regalaba cada año. [*Pointing to the drawings*] Este fue primero, este fue segundo.  
 ‘Those pictures are probable his. Because. . .with pencil. For my birthday he would give me one each year. **This one** was (PRET) first, **this one** was (PRET) second.’

The full NP in (5.81) was not expressed, but inferred from the context of the conversation, which was the essentially same subject in (5.82) which was expressed, ‘the birth of a child’. The inanimate singular subject in (5.83) ‘picture’ was definitely more tangible than a notion of a birth.

Table 5-42. Relative frequencies of inanimate singular subjects, full NPs/abstract subjects vs. tangible subjects, *ser*

Inanimate singular subjects	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full NP/abstract subject	105	42%	143	58%	248	31%
Tangible inanimate subject	168	30%	383	70%	551	69%
TOTAL	273	34%	526	66%	799	100%

Table 5-42 presents the distribution of frequencies according to past-tense aspectual variant; a pair-wise comparison showed a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of full NPs and tangible inanimate subjects ( $\chi^2=10.67437, p\leq 0.0001$ ). Even though there was a statistically significant difference, both types of the inanimate subjects favored perfective aspect.

The findings of first-person plural subjects were also of interest. Contrary to the results of previous research, first-person plural subjects of *ser* strongly disfavored perfective aspect; only 9% (9/105) of sentences with this subject were used the perfective ‘we were’ form.

- (5.84) Muy bien, para mí, feliz. Normal. Una infancia feliz. [**Nosotros**] éramos cuatro hermanos y mi madre quedó viu- viuda pues cuando yo tenía cuatro años. (IX, f53)

‘Very good, for me, happy. Normal. A happy childhood. [We] were (IMP) four children and my mother was a wid- widow well when I was four years old.’

(5.85) P: Entonces teníamos que estar debajo de ellos y al. . .trabajando siempre.

I: ¿Y cuántos hijos erais? (XXI, m61)

P: Eh, **nosotros** hemos sido tres. Yo el mayor, luego mi hermana, y otro que ya murió. Tres hi- tres hermanos.

P: ‘So we had to be under them and working always.

I: And how many children we you all?

P: Uh, **we** were (PP) three. Me the oldest, then my sister, and other that already died. Three chi- three siblings.’

In (5.84), the speaker was describing how many siblings she had during her childhood. The speaker of (5.85) did the same, but also mentioned that one of his siblings had already passed away; it is interesting that perfective aspect was used in the latter excerpt when this detail was included in the context. For the most part, however, first-person plural subjects of *ser* were applied with imperfective aspect as in (5.84).

#### 5.5.4 *Ser*: Clause Type

The fourth and final statistically significant factor group in the analysis of *ser* was Clause Type. We found that main and subordinate complement clauses favored perfective aspect (.55), where as subordinate adverbial/causal (.33) and subordinate relative clauses (.26) disfavored the application value. As discussed early in this section, the PP vs. Imperfect *ser* analysis revealed that past-tense *ser* token in subordinate complement clauses strongly favored the PP form; this is mostly likely why it was favored in the analysis present in Table 5-39. If we separate the

frequencies out by individual factor (Table 5-43), we see that the variant frequencies of main and subordinate complement clauses was fairly analogous. Subsequent pair-wise comparisons showed a statistically significant difference between the follow constraints: main clause vs. adverbial/causal clause ( $\chi^2=20.73937$ ,  $p\leq 0.000$ ), main clause vs. relative clause ( $\chi^2=23.7585$ ,

$p \leq 0.000$ ), complement clause vs. adverbial/clausal clause ( $\chi^2 = 7.297023$ ,  $p \leq 0.007$ ) and complement clause vs. relative clause ( $\chi^2 = 12.35158$ ,  $p \leq 0.0004$ ). Perhaps this finding—that subordinate clauses and main clauses show very similar tendencies in the *ser* analysis—is evidence to support conclusions by Thompson (2002) who posited that complement clauses do not function as do other subordinate clauses and should be analyzed and considered as different linguistic entities. This is a tentative claim that merits further investigation.

Table 5-43. Relative frequencies of past-tense aspectual morphology of *ser* according to Clause Type

Clause type	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Main	353	28%	927	72%	1280	77%
Sub. adverbial/causal	24	12%	171	88%	195	12%
Sub. relative	10	8%	118	92%	128	7%
Sub. complement	15	27%	40	73%	55	3%
TOTAL	402	24%	1256	76%	1658	100%

### 5.5.5 *Ser*: Adjective<sup>30</sup>

It was of special interest to discover if there was a statistically significant difference between the presence and absence of an adjective in the *ser* analysis. Even though this group could not be incorporated into the multivariate analysis, we at least wanted to test if there was a statistically significant difference between the presence/absence of an adjective. Like *ser + bien/mal*, *ser + adjective* provide the listener highly informational content with an adjective present (cf. Biber 1992), as in (5.86); this type of high-focus detail is many times incorporated into foregrounded events. Table 5-44 reports the frequencies of the Adjective factor group.

- (5.86) Y luego mira, se casó mi prim, mi hija la mayor el día veintiuno de octubre del 2000. Y mi marido murió en el 98, pues imagínate, que boda. La cena, luego, ya bueno ya, pero la misa **fue horrible** para mí, para mis hijos, para mis hermanas, para los amigos, para todos porque era una persona extrañable.  
 ‘And then look, my firs- my oldest daughter got married on the 21st of October in 2000. And my husband died in ’98, well imagine, what a wedding. The reception, then, well,

<sup>30</sup> There were no past participles, since no examples of the passive voice using *ser* were observed in the corpus.

but the mass was (PRET) **horrible** for me, for my children, for my sisters, for the friends, for everyone because he was a missed person.’

Table 5-44. Relative frequencies of the presence of an adjective/past participle, *ser*

Adjectives	Perfective		Imperfective		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No adjective/past participle	232	22%	811	78%	1043	63%
Adjective/past participle	166	27%	441	73%	607	37%
TOTAL	402	24%	1252	76%	1256	100%

Pair-wise comparisons showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the presence and absence of an adjective ( $\chi^2=5.461413, p\leq 0.0194$ ). While we cannot conclusively say whether *ser* + adjective preferred perfective or imperfective aspect, there was a significant difference between the constraints. This fact alone indicates that perfective and imperfective *ser* + adjective functioned differently in the discourse.

### 5.5.6 *Ser*: Summary

When comparing the all stative verb analysis (Table 4-4) with the results of *ser* (Table 5-39), we find many similarities and only minor differences. We report in Table 5-45 a summary of

Table 5-45. Similarities and differences between all stative verb and *ser* analyses

Similarities
1. Factor groups selected as statistically significant in the <i>ser</i> and all stative analyses: Temporal Determinant, Collocation, Grammatical Person, and Clause Type.
2. The direction of effect of these statistically significant factor groups were essentially the same in both analyses, with the exception of <i>siempre</i> in Temporal Determinant and subordinate complement clauses in Clause Type.
3. The factor groups had the same order of relative contribution of the shared statistically significant factor groups.
4. Inanimate singular subjects favored perfective aspect in both analyses.
Differences
1. Factor groups selected as statistically significant in the all stative analysis but not in <i>ser</i> : Prepositional Phrase and Sentence Type.
2. The temporal adverb <i>siempre</i> favored perfective aspect in <i>ser</i> , but disfavored perfective aspect in the analysis of all statives together.
3. Tokens in subordinate complement clauses favored perfective aspect in <i>ser</i> , but disfavored the variant in the all stative analysis.
4. There was a statistically significant difference in the presence or absence of an adjective in the <i>ser</i> analysis, but not in the all stative verbs analysis.

the precise similarities and differences. Returning to the ‘three lines of evidence’, we see that i) four of the six tested factor groups were selected as statistically significant in both analyses, ii) most of the constraints had the same ordering and/or direction of effect with minor exceptions, and iii) the order of the factor groups in terms of magnitude of effect was the same for the four statistically significant factor groups of the all stative and *ser* analyses.

## 5.6 Chapter Summary

The individual analyses in this chapter gave us great insight to the linguistic factors that conditioned speaker-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. We have connected these factor groups to how they function in discourse and have shown how discourse can often times determines aspectual choice. On the other hand, we have also discussed how past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs might have been ‘neutralized’ in *salmantino* discourse and have challenged assumed interpretations generally describing aspectual distinctions of statives.

We have seen many recurrent, indicative trends in the different analyses, as well as some particular results that were not ubiquitously observed. When compared to the analysis of all stative verbs together, the individual analyses of *estar*, *tener*, *haber*, LF statives and *ser* shared many important similarities; however, it was the *ser* analysis that compared the most to the all stative verbs analysis. The fact that *ser* was the most frequent verb in the entire corpus led us to believe that these similarities were dictated by the patterns of the verb *ser*. Yet there were some irrefutable trends that were observed across all of the individual analyses in the present chapter as well as in Chapter 4 with all stative verbs analyzed together. They were as follows:

1. Temporal determinant by far was the most influential linguistic factor group shaping past-tense aspectual choice: punctual, specific markers tended to co-occur with perfective aspect, and general, habitual expressions with imperfective aspect.
2. Verbs without a temporal marker either slightly disfavored perfective aspect.

3. Grammatical person and Clause Type (all but *haber*) were also important contributing linguistic factor group in every analysis.
4. First-person singular subjects favored perfective aspect; third-person singular and plural subjects disfavored perfective aspect.
5. Stative verbs in main clauses favored perfective aspect; these verbs in subordinate adverbial/causal and relative clauses disfavored perfective aspect.

There were also verb-specific patterns as seen in the different analyses of the four most frequent statives, as well as in LF statives analysis. The most noteworthy were:

1. The initial Preterit vs. Imperfect and PP vs. Imperfect *ser* analysis showed more differences than the other verbs.
2. Locative expressions conditioned past-tense aspectual choice of *estar*; the presence of these expressions favored perfective aspect.
3. Inanimate singular and plural subjects favored perfective *haber*; this was due to the morphosyntactic nature of the verb which allowed for specific temporal expressions to also be the grammatical subject.
4. *Tener que* + infinitive collocations were influenced by the *Aktionsart* of the main verb; this was not the case in the other analyses.
5. Highly individuated objects favored perfective aspect in the analysis of *tener*.
6. Inanimate singular subjects favored perfective aspect in the analysis of LF Statives.
7. Past-tense tokens of *ser* in subordinate complement clauses, as well as inanimate singular subjects, favored perfective aspect.

We have shown that the linguistic factors greatly influenced *salmantino*-choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. This was congruent with the expectation that the internal factors would greatly affect the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs as compared to the extralinguistic factors. In the next chapter we offer a discussion of the findings in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 and how they can apply to the knowledge of TA systems in general as well as other areas of linguistic study.

CHAPTER 6  
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

**6.1 Discussion**

It has been shown in the preceding three chapters that the contextual linguistic factors were pivotal in shaping *salmantino* speaker-choice of stative verb past-tense aspectual marking. The ubiquity of influence from the Temporal Determinants and Grammatical Person factor groups in the collective (Chapter 4) and individual analyses (Chapter 5) allow us to use these categories to draw further conclusions about the use of perfectivity and imperfectivity in this variety of Spanish (to be discussed in §6.1.1). For individual stative verbs, there were other linguistic factors involved in conditioning the choice of aspectual viewpoint, namely Collocation (*ser*, LF statives), Clause Type (*ser*, *estar*), Sentence Type (*estar*), Locative Expression (*estar*), Verb Class of Main Verb (*estar*, *tener*) and Adjective/Past Participle (*ser*, *estar*).<sup>1</sup>

Table 6-1. Range values of linguistic factor groups analyzed in the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs

	All statives	<i>Ser</i>	<i>Estar</i>	<i>Tener</i>	<i>Haber</i>	LF statives
Temporal determinant	72	76	74	78	30	74
Grammatical person	52	36	55	57	32	49
Collocation	55	64	ns	ns	--	39
Clause type	20	29	33	ns	ns	ns
Sentence type	9	ns	38	ns*	ns	ns
Prepositional phrase	8	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Locative expression	--	--	21	--	--	--
Verb Class (Main)	ns	--	14	40	--	ns
Adjective/past part.**	No	Yes	Yes	No	--	No

-- indicates that the factor was not tested in the multivariate analysis; 'ns' indicates 'non-significant factor group'  
 \*In the *tener* analysis, sentence type was excluded due to interactions in the data; tested separately via Chi-square tests revealed that there was not a significant difference between the affirmative and negative sentences.  
 \*\*Recall that adjectives/past participles were tested separately from the other factors via Chi-square tests; 'yes' indicates that there was a significant difference between the presence or absence of an adjective/past participle.

Recall that in Chapter 1 it was emphasized that the focus of the present work was to add a quantitative component to the previous qualitative research of how aspectual viewpoint intersects

<sup>1</sup> The Prepositional Phrase group was only selected as statistically significant in the analysis of all statives together.

with stative verbs. At the beginning of the variationist enterprise, Labov (1972a:226) stressed his position that ‘there are no intuitive judgments accessible to reveal [linguistic competence] to us’ and ‘only with quantitative data. . .can [we] arrive at convincing demonstrations [of a particular phenomenon]’ (Labov 1972a:236). Another goal was to verify if past-tense aspectual use could be predicted by social characteristics of *salmantino* community: the results showed that past-tense aspectual morphology was not affected by other external factors, such as age, gender. It was also found that stylistic factors were not systematic in shaping past-tense aspectual marking of stative verbs.

With regard to the qualitative accounts of past-tense aspectual morphology of statives, linguists (cf. Comrie 1976, Guitart 1978, Smith 1991, Bybee 1995, Bertinetto 1994, 2004, inter alia) have made important and detailed contributions on the interpretation of aspectual viewpoint when considering the lexical aspect of the verb. The present work supports many of these previous analyses in regard to the large range of interpretations of perfective statives. As seen in both the present investigation as well as these qualitative accounts, perfective statives can imply the following: i) speakers viewing the situation as a bounded time frame, ii) the inception or termination a state, or iii) a required effort in the inception of an action. One further interpretation of past-tense aspectual morphology will be proposed in the section below, which was borne out of the results of the multivariate analyses in Chapters 4 and 5.

### **6.1.1 Implications of Temporal Determinants**

With regard to the Temporal Determinant factor group, the presence of a temporal adverbial expression greatly affected the choice of perfective or imperfective in discourse. Past-tense statives co-occurring with temporal expressions specifying a limited period of time (e.g. *ayer* ‘yesterday’, *la infancia* ‘childhood’) or those which functioned to temporally sequence events (e.g. *primero* ‘first’, *luego* ‘then’) were overwhelmingly used with perfective aspect. On

the other hand, those past-tense stative co-occurring with expressions indicating habituality (*siempre* ‘always’, *todos los meses* ‘every month’) or general past expressions (e.g. *antiguamente* ‘back then, in the past’, *antes* ‘in the past, before’) were commonly employed with imperfective aspect.

These findings are not groundbreaking since, according to Bertinetto (1994:118), Romance languages ‘maintain this aspectual opposition very firmly’. With the help of temporal adverbials (Guitart 1978:144, Hopper & Thompson 1980:286), perfective aspect functioned to bind verbal actions so that these ‘completed actions’ could be sequentially ordered (if they occur) in foregrounded narrative clauses (Hopper & Thompson 1980:286). Conversely, imperfective aspect mainly served to describe background descriptions, such as habitual, progressive and repetitive actions (Hopper 1979b:216-7). With this said, however, the results of the multivariate analyses and as exemplified by the *salmantino* data, the opposition between perfective and imperfective aspect as applied to stative verbs was not systematic even with the presence of these temporal adverbial expressions. In other words, the meaning expressed by the temporal adverbial did not always correspond to the aspectual marking that *salmantino* speakers assigned to the stative verb. Let’s take for example (6.1) and (6.2). The temporal expressions *siempre* ‘always’ and *todas las fiestas* ‘every holiday’ indicate habituality, repetition and general past background description, all of which are normally depicted with imperfective aspect.<sup>2</sup> Yet, the speakers employed perfective aspect in these cases, contrary to prototypical uses also instantiated in the *salmantino* data.

---

<sup>2</sup> García Fernández (2004:41) attributed the difference in meaning of past-tense aspectual use of the stative verb *ser* ‘be’ with *siempre* ‘always’ is due to the different interpretations of *siempre*. According to the definition given in María Moliner, *siempre* can refer to *durante todo el período* ‘during the entire time’ or *en cada ocasión* ‘on every occasion’. Therefore, the interpretation of *siempre era* ‘s/he was always’ maintains a habitual interpretation, where as *siempre fue* ‘s/he was always’ indicates that the speaker referring to a delimited moment of time. While we are not refuting this interpretation, it was not always possible to confirm this semantic difference using the surrounding discursive context.

- (6.1) Siempre la hemos arropado, **siempre estuvo** enferma que le quedó una lesión del primer parto y luego tuvo siete, cinco hijos vivos y dos, pero bueno en aquellos tiempos, pues no había nada. (XVII, f58)  
 ‘We always took care of her, she **always was** (PRET) sick, that an injury remained with her from the first delivery and then she had seven, five living children and two. . . , but well in those times, there wasn’t anything.’
- (6.2) Y **estuvimos todas las fiestas** juntos, y en septiembre, luego hablábamos y le dije que si se quería venir unos días conmigo. (XXII, m34)  
 ‘And we **were** (PRET) together **every holiday**, and in September, then we would talk and I told her that if she wanted to come [spend] some days with me.’

Therefore, even though the perfective and imperfective opposition was generally ‘maintained’ especially with the assistance of a temporal adverbial to reinforce this aspectual distinction, there was still variation in aspectual use when applied to stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. This was also the case for punctual, marked frames and temporal sequencers; the results of the multivariate analyses revealed that speakers *by and large* used perfective aspect with a stative verb when co-occurring with these types of adverbial expressions, but not always. These non-categorical, but predictable patterns support the underpinnings of variationist analysis itself: language is inherently heterogeneous and variation is expected to exist, yet with discernable patterns to explain and predict such variation.

Another important detail to highlight with respect to the Temporal Determinant factor group was the when the past-tense stative verb lacked a temporal expression. Past-tense statives without a temporal adverbial were the most frequent of the Temporal Determinant factor group in every analysis. Table 6-2 presents the results of the multivariate analyses of Temporal Determinant when the past-tense stative lacked a temporal expression. As shown by the percentage of the data column, this factor was by far the most frequent in every analysis.

Table 6-2. Probability weights of individual and collective analyses of past-tense stative verbs without a temporal adverbial

No temporal adverbial (absent)				
	% perfective	Probability	Total <i>N</i>	% Data
LF statives	29	.47	209	89
<i>Ser</i>	19	.46	247	85
<i>Tener</i>	18	.47	117	84
All statives	22	.45	769	82
<i>Haber</i>	11	na*	25	76
<i>Estar</i>	31	.42	174	71

\*In the *haber* analysis, examples of past-tense *haber* lacking a temporal expression were grouped together with the *siempre*, general past and habitual expressions factors; together these factors slightly disfavored the perfective form (.45).

If the lexical aspect of stative verbs is inherently imperfective and if stative verbs are generally associated with imperfective aspect in ‘prototypical’ native speech (c.f. Andersen & Shirai 1994), it was expected for those past-tense statives lacking a temporal determinant to strongly prefer imperfective aspect without the help such a temporal expression. Since it has been shown that temporal adverbials with a delimited time frame conditioned the use of perfective aspect and affected the interpretation of the verb itself, the imperfective form was expected especially since this is the ‘prototypical use’. The data showed that this was not the case. Rather, in each individual and collective analysis, perfective aspect was only *marginally* disfavored. Below we will explain the relevance of this finding.

In their cross-dialectal examination of how anteriors extend to perfective contexts in Spanish, Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:29) claims that the context through which the former gram generalizes to perfective meaning is the ‘most frequent, less specified contexts,’ as opposed to the traditional claim of gradually extending by temporal remoteness.<sup>3</sup> They stated:

Instead, the route uncovered in the data from hodiernal perfective to default past perfective status is primarily via temporally indeterminate contexts. Indeterminate contexts are more open to the generalization of the PP than determinate (specific, definite) temporal reference, due to their lack of temporal anchoring.

<sup>3</sup> Recall that the anterior-to-perfective is mainly observed in Peninsular Spanish.

When the linguistic context lacks an overt marker indicating the specific temporal reference, there is more flexibility for speakers to generalize the meaning of the anterior. Over time, the anterior loses the focus of present relevance starting with these unspecified contexts, to then only imply a past-perfective action without present relevance. According to Bybee et al. (1994:4-6), highly frequent material is subject to semantic changes throughout the course of its evolution and one potential outcome is a ‘semantic reduction’ or a generalization in contexts where before such a use was restricted or inexistent. The authors affirmed that ‘[typically] as the gram loses more and more of its original semantic content, its interpretation is more and more dependent on the meaning contained in the context, and it eventually is affected by this context’ (Bybee et al. 1994:7). It is possible for this same argument to apply to the analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs, as the linguistic environment surrounding the past-tense stative (i.e., presence of a particular temporal adverbial) greatly impacted the choice of perfective or imperfective aspect in *salmantino* Spanish.

Since the most frequent context of the Temporal Determinant factor group was the absence of such a temporal adverbial expression, this ‘lack of temporal anchoring’ in some cases could have opened the door for a more generalized use of past-tense aspect, leaving behind the perfective (bounded) or imperfective (unbounded) distinction in select cases. As Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos (2008:33) concluded in their study of anteriors and perfective grams:

D. Sankoff (1988a:153–154) proposed that neutralization in discourse is the “fundamental discursive mechanism of (nonphonological) variation and change.” The favoring of the PP in indeterminate temporal reference contexts is what we could call a ‘perfect’ illustration of the neutralization-in-discourse mechanism.

A negligible disfavoring of perfective aspect was observed when we would have expected a strong preference of imperfective aspect especially since the inherent meaning of statives are

more naturally compatible with the latter aspectual marking. Therefore, we propose that the perfective and imperfective opposition *could have* become neutralized in some contexts without an explicit temporal expression. Let's take the example (6.3) that was introduced in Chapter 1. Recall that the speaker described her experience as a young girl in Catholic school.

(6.3) Bueno, en general, no fue mala. Pero, la profesora, la monja de matemáticas fue terrible. Fue terrible. Para mí era terrible, aparte que era fea. (I, f58)  
'Well, in general, it was (PRET) not bad. But, the teacher, the Math nun was (PRET) terrible. She was (PRET) terrible. For me she was (IMP) terrible, besides she was (IMP) ugly.'

Even though it was understood that the speaker was referring her experience at this school, it is unknown and inexplicitly stated whether she viewed this time as a bounded past time frame or as a general past, unbounded time frame. Also, one can not assume exactly how the speaker was conceptualizing the concept, since, according to Aaron (2006:167), 'speaker intention is most often unavailable to the analyst, and as such, if there are no overt clues about what the speaker wishes to communicate, then features said to be embodied in the forms themselves cannot serve as the basis of an analysis (Du Bois 1987:811-812, D. Sankoff 1988a, Poplack & Turpin 1999:145-146).' The speaker oscillated between the use of perfective and imperfective aspect with *ser* 'be' in analogous linguistic contexts (i.e., *fue terrible* 'she was terrible' and *era terrible* 'she was terrible'). All of the clauses above did not have any 'overt clues', or temporal expressions, indicating exactly how the speaker conceptualized the time frame in these contiguous clauses.

To furthermore support this claim, Bertinetto (1994:118), the same author who stated above 'Romance languages maintain this aspectual opposition very firmly', also wrote the following in same paragraph:

Now, as is well known, the modern Romance languages (French even more than Italian) have normally lost the ability to convey such distinctions with permanent

statives, so that with these verbs the perfective/imperfective opposition tends nowadays to be neutralized.

While Bertinetto did not mention how Spanish compared with French and Italian, it can be assumed that this statement is applicable to Spanish as it belongs to the family of Romance languages. We are not claiming the perfective/imperfective opposition was neutralized in most or in all of the examples lacking a temporal anchor. In fact, it is possible that this finding was influenced by another type of discourse condition (e.g. information flow, to be discussed below). Nevertheless Bertinetto's observation supports our claim of a (possible) 'neutralization in discourse' with regard to this morphosyntactic variable. Even though it is assumed that speakers bear in mind the common semantic distinctions between perfective and imperfective aspect—or prototypical cases would not exist to exemplify such distinctions (Bertinetto 1994:133)—, examples like (6.3) provided evidence of the possibility for aspectual meaning to be meaning to be neutralized, especially without the presence of a temporal adverbial.

Another potential explanation of why the lack of temporal expressions did not show a strong disfavoring of perfective aspect is related to a discourse phenomenon known as information flow (Chafe 1987, Du Bois 1987). According to Chafe (1987:22), throughout a conversation speakers are cognitively limited; they are only capable of uttering and processing a small amount of information at a given moment. The cognitive nature of language use is reflected in the structure of spontaneous speech and can be measured in terms of intonation units or 'the sequence of words combined under a single, coherent intonation contour, usually preceded by a pause' (Chafe 1987:22). Due to these cognitive limitations, speakers generally use many of these concise phrases to convey his/her thoughts, which is compatible with narrative structure theory that observes the use of many short main clauses in narration (cf. Labov 1972a, Clancy 1982:70). Chafe (1987:24) also stated that 'if the total amount of information that can be

active at any one time is severely limited, there must be other information that is passing out of the active status, being replaced by other, newly activated material'. Du Bois (1987:816) also addressed 'new/active', 'accessible/semi-active' and 'old/inactive' information in discourse to explain ergative patterns in a Mayan language, Sacapultec.<sup>4</sup> He argued that:

New information must virtually always be integrated within a framework of shared (old) information, in order to be usefully interpretable; hence, in natural discourse, almost all messages contain both types of information [new and old]. Typically, the larger part of a message will consist of given or presupposed material, while 'only a small chunk consists of the actual message, new information' (Givon 1975:204).

If we relate the concept of information flow to how *salmantino* speakers used past-tense aspectual morphology with stative verbs, it could be fair to say that the active concept of a past time frame could have been replaced with the introduction of new ideas to the conversation. With the introduction of new material to the discourse, in Chafe's terms, 'they represent a kind of disfluency, or deviation from the ideal' (Chafe 1987:24). On the other hand, since 'the larger part of message will consist of given or presupposed material', it is just as likely for speakers to bear in mind the presupposed, already 'given' information (i.e., bounded or unbounded time frame) when applying perfective or imperfective aspect to a stative verbs and assumes that his/her interlocutor understands the point of reference.

### **6.1.2 Grammatical Person, Collocations and Subjectivity**

With regard to Grammatical Person, this factor was also extremely influential in determining the choice of perfective and imperfective aspect of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish. First-person singular subjects were found to favor the perfective stative verb in all of the collective and individual analyses, whereas third-person singular and plural disfavored

---

<sup>4</sup> 'New' or 'active' concepts are those details of present focus, 'accessible' or 'semi-active' concepts are those ideas that a speaker is aware of, but not of present focus, and 'old' or 'inactive' concepts are those ideas in a 'person's long-term memory, but neither focally nor peripherally active' (Chafe 1987:25).

perfective aspect. These results corroborated the findings of Reid (1976), Hopper (1979b) and Klein-Andreu (1991). Since in narrative discourse the narrator is often the main protagonist of the narrative events, first-person subjects were preferred since they are ‘higher on the agency hierarchy than subjects of backgrounded verbs’ (Hopper 1979b:217).

Inanimate singular subjects were found to favor perfective aspect in the analysis of all stative verbs, LF stative verbs *haber* and *ser*, but not in the analyses of *estar* and *tener*. It was claimed that inanimate subjects would disfavor perfective aspect (cf. Hopper 1979b:217) and the results of the three former analyses went against these expectations. As discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, inanimate singular subjects appeared to perform another discourse function in the *salmantino* interviews: to convey subjective, evaluative viewpoints. To that end, it was also shown that these inanimate subjects frequently co-occurred with the verb + *bien* or verb + *mal* collocations, as well as verb + adjective/past participle. Scheibman (2001:63) found the same trends of subjective expression in her analysis of verb type and person. She explained that language use in spontaneous discourse ‘always represents a speaker’s interpretation of the world’ and, as such, the manifestation of speakers’ personal perspective is seen through the usage of grammatical person. After analyzing nine recordings of informal, group conversations in American English, she showed that first-person subjects, as well as third-person *inanimate* subjects, were the locus of such subjective, evaluative expressions. With regard to third-person subjects, relational verbs (i.e., copular verbs, ‘be’) with third-person inanimate subjects were the most frequently observed verb type + grammatical person combination; these relational verbs frequently occurred with some sort of evaluative, subjective element (e.g. it’s not *fair*, that’s *true*). She explained that ‘functionally, these relational clauses index attitude and less frequently, place’ and ‘relational predicates. . .tend to be evaluative (surely, to varying degrees). In these

conversational utterances, it appears as though the conveying of information is rarely (if ever) purely descriptive' (Scheibman 2001:83).

It was shown in §5.5.3 that the copulative verb *ser* favored inanimate singular subjects in the perfective form. It was also discussed that the verb + *bien/mal* collocations also favored perfective aspect in the *ser* analysis. Furthermore, pair-wise comparisons showed a statistically significant difference in perfective and imperfective forms of *ser* with the presence or absence of an adjective, as in (6.4).

- (6.4) Entonces parecía como si yo hubiera rejuvenecido 10 años. Quedé como si fuera 10 años más joven. [Ø] Fue muy **divertido**. Una experiencia muy bonita. (XXII, m34)  
So it seemed as if I had gotten 10 years younger. I was like if I was 10 years younger. **It was** (PRET) very **fun**. A very nice experience.

Guitart (1978:148) claimed that examples such as (6.4) indicate that the speaker 'conveys the notion that [s/he] perceived a certain experience as being of the [fun] kind and continued to perceive it as such.' The use of *fue* + adjective or *fue* + *bien/mal* to convey a subjective perception of a past experience as a collective whole was also observed with the other Spanish copula *estar*. Even though inanimate subjects disfavored perfective aspect, 75% of these perfective *estar* forms co-occurred with either *bien/mal* or an adjective (§4.1.2), as in (6.5).

- (6.5) Parece que se arregló un poquito la cosa, pero en esos meses ha estado la organización un poco **flojo**. (XV, f58)  
'It seems that the thing got fixed a bit, but during those months the organization was (PP) a bit **weak**.'

Thus, this type of 'subjective perceptions' of a 'be-ingressive predicate' (Guitart 1978:148) of inanimate singular subjects played a role in the choice of perfective aspect with the copula verbs *ser* and *estar*.

### 6.1.3 Narrative Analysis

The importance of situating the examples of past-tense aspectual morphology of statives in discourse has been stressed throughout the present work. The different points in the narrative

often determined which aspectual form the speaker applied to the stative verb. The concepts of foregrounding (high-focus actions) and backgrounding (low-focus actions) proved pivotal in the interpretation of the results. By analyzing the discursive context, it was also shown through narrative analysis how the *salmantino* community conveyed subjective, evaluative viewpoints at critical moments in the story.

*Salmantino* narratives were not the only type of data considered in the present, since the majority of the data were responses to interview questions as opposed to actual narratives (Schiffrin 1997:89). Yet, when a story was relayed by a *salmantino* speaker, we saw how perfective statives (associated with high-focus, foregrounded clauses) occurred in main clauses, as opposed to subordinate clauses, and used in affirmative sentences, as opposed to negative sentences. It was also typical for participants to apply perfective aspect to stative verbs in complicating action, peak, and resolution clauses; many times these clauses contained an evaluative component through the use of an adverbial (i.e., *quedó bien* ‘she was good good’, *me sentí mal* ‘I felt bad’). While we did not include narrative clauses in the quantitative analysis, out of the preoccupation of reliability and replicability, it has been shown that the use of perfective and imperfective aspect applied to stative verbs corroborated the discourse functions observed in previous analyses of aspect and discourse (cf. Reid 1976, Hopper 1979b, Klein-Andreu 1991).

## **6.2 Implications for the L2 Classroom**

One of the main motivations of our study stemmed from teaching past-tense aspectual distinctions of stative verbs to native English speakers learning Spanish as a second language (L2). As reported in Chapter 1, there is a considerable body of research in SLA dedicated to the study of how and to what extent L2 Spanish learners acquire past-tense aspectual morphology, namely because ‘English speakers’ conceptualization of aspectual distinctions in past tense is a more limited concept than the one embodied by Romance languages’ (Salaberry & Ayoun

2005:2). Different SLA analyses on TA have shown that the acquisition of past-tense morphology of stative verbs is extremely difficult for these learners due to i) the common association and application of imperfective aspect with stative verbs and, related to the present investigation, ii) the complexity of stative verb use and interpretations in the native grammar (Salaberry 2005:205-6).

While it is recognized that SLA research has made great strides in explaining how L2 Spanish learners acquire past-tense aspectual morphology, we challenge i) how these studies have evaluated this particular topic of interest and ii) how these aspectual distinctions are presented in L2 Spanish texts. With regard to the first point, it has been shown in the present investigation that the perfective/imperfective distinction in native-speaker discourse was conditioned by the presence or absence of certain linguistic factors; yet, we saw that past-tense aspectual opposition was not categorical with these co-occurring linguistic features. The present investigation has proven that the perfective/imperfective opposition applied to statives is an inherently variable linguistic phenomenon. We gave probabilistic values and discussed trends found throughout the analyses to determine how *salmantinos* applied past-tense aspectual morphology to statives in a face-to-face discursive situation. Yet, since we are speaking in terms of ‘probabilities’, ‘likelihoods’ and ‘trends’, at no point in this analysis have we been claiming all-or-nothing conditions (e.g. \*if a punctual temporal adverbial is used, a perfective stative is *always* used). Language is indelibly variable. Even though we can predict variant use, native speech is nonetheless variable. With this said, how can researchers be 100% certain that the forms L2 speakers use go against what a native speaker would use if there is variability in native-speaker speech? How can researchers accurately account for the intra-speaker variability of past-tense aspect of *ser* in (6.3)? Furthermore, since this analysis focused solely on how the

*salmantino* community used past-tense aspectual morphology with stative verbs, it is quite possible (and anticipated) for other varieties of Spanish to exhibit different patterns of use. Therefore, how can we account for dialectal differences in native speech when evaluating how L2 learners acquire and apply this linguistic element?<sup>5</sup>

Likewise, it is an enormous feat to clearly present and adequately explain the concept of past-perfective/imperfective to L2 Spanish students. With respect to how perfective and imperfective concepts are conveyed in L2 Spanish texts, many textbooks are very thorough in describing the differences of each respective use. Yet, it is rare that authors provide instances of actual native speech to exemplify the ‘Preterit-Imperfect’ distinction. Instead, the authors of L2 Spanish texts often invent examples to convey how past-tense aspect is used; while this is done out of the necessity to contextualize this concept with other information in the chapters (e.g. lexical items, different grammatical structures), do these invented models of perfective/imperfective use accurately reflect how native-speakers employ past-tense aspectual viewpoint with statives? For instance, in a L2 Spanish textbook for beginning learners, *Mosiacos*, the authors gave the following advice to students in regard to imperfective aspect: ‘Some expressions of time and frequency that often accompany the imperfect to express ongoing or repeated actions or states in the past are *mientras* [while], *a veces* [sometimes], *siempre* [always], *generalmente*, and *frecuentemente* [frequently].’ (Castells et al. 2006:267) The examples which accompany this passage display how the imperfective form of the verb is used when co-occurring with *siempre*; however, if we return to examples (6.6) and (6.7), we see that

---

<sup>5</sup> To clarify, many studies take into account native-speaker values, although experimental in nature, and compare these values to those of non-natives (cf. Güell 1998, Salaberry 2005 for example).

on occasions *salmantino* speakers applied perfective instead of imperfective aspect with the co-occurring *siempre* adverb.

- (6.6) Mi padre fue **siempre** el contable de una empresa de aquí de Salamanca, y mi madre ama de casa. (XVIII, f58)  
My father was (PRET) **always** the accountant of a company here in Salamanca, and my mother [a] housewife.’
- (6.7) Mi papá era maquinista de la RENFE. **Siempre ha sido** maquinista. (XXII, f62)  
My father was (IMP) an engine driver for the RENFE. He was (PP) **always** an engine driver.’

Likewise, many textbooks recognize that a different past-tense aspectual marking implies a different interpretation with regard to certain statives. Verbs like *conocer*, *costar*, *poder*, *querer*, *saber*, *tener* and *tener que* are commonly addressed in many texts. For instance, in the L2 Intermediate Spanish text *Conexiones*, the authors explain that the Preterit form of these statives involves the beginning of the action or an implied effort, while the Imperfect form does not point toward a specific moment of the action or imply a determined amount of effort (Zayas-Bazán et al. 2006:28). They provide the following examples—(6.8), (6.9) and (6.10)—to exemplify this concept with *conocer* (i.e., perfective *conocer* implies ‘met’), *tener* (i.e., perfective *tener* implies ‘get’ or the beginning of having) and *querer* (i.e., perfective *querer* implies ‘tried’ with effort involved).

- (6.8) Conocí a la conductor en una fiesta. (*Conexiones*, p. 28)  
‘I met (PRET) the driver at a party. (beginning of knowing)’
- (6.9) La señora quiso comprar un auto de lujo. (*Conexiones*, p. 28)  
‘The woman tried (PRET) to buy a luxury car. (wanted and acted upon it).’
- (6.10) Tuve una noticia muy emocionante. (*Conexiones*, p. 28)  
‘I received (PRET) very exciting news. (beginning of having)’

Let’s compare the meaning of these examples with (6.11), (6.12) and (6.13) taken from the *salmantino* corpus.

- (6.11) Lo que es el barrio donde yo vivía, eh, todo el mundo la quería mucho, mi madre toda la vida la conocí enferma. (XVIII, f58)  
 ‘That what is the neighborhood where I used to live, uh, everyone loved her a lot, my mother all my life I knew (PRET) her sick.’
- (6.12) No pensé que Franco quiso tanto a la gente. (III, f44)  
 ‘I didn’t think that Franco loved (PRET) the people so much.’
- (6.13) Mi infancia fue muy buena, muy bonita. Soy hija única. Y entonces tuve unos padres maravillosos, en todos los aspectos. (I, f58)  
 ‘My childhood was very good, very beautiful. I am an only child. And so I had (PRET) some marvelous parents, in every aspect.’

The explanations given by the authors emphasizing ‘the beginning of the event’ or ‘effort involved’ do not seem to capture the meanings of excerpts (6.11), (6.12) and (6.13). For instance, it’s not logical that the speaker in (6.11) ‘met’ her mother as ‘sick’. It is also not likely that the speaker of (6.12) meant that Franco ‘wanted and acted upon’ caring of the people of Spain. Furthermore, it is also unlikely that the speaker of (6.13) was emphasizing the beginning of having ‘marvelous parents’. Excerpts (6.11), (6.12) and (6.13) are exactly the kind of examples that can bewilder L2 Spanish learners if they happen to interact with a native Spanish-speaker after learning these ‘accepted’ meanings whether at home or abroad.

In the authors’ defense, the overwhelming majority of the examples in the *salmantino* corpus did reflect these meaning differences between the perfective and imperfective forms in (6.8), (6.9) and (6.10). We are also not advocating for authors to use these infrequent examples of native speech to introduce to past-tense aspectual morphology to L2 learners of Spanish, nor to base how native speakers generally use past-tense aspectual morphology with stative verbs. Nevertheless, from the beginning, it could be worthwhile to inform L2 students of Spanish of the variability of native speech and how it is possible for native Spanish-speakers to deviate from ‘prototypical uses’ to apply a ‘non-standard’ form of perfective/imperfective aspect where the opposite aspectual marking would be expected. Of course, it would involve a tremendous

amount of reflection before integrating this method into the L2 classroom and L2 textbooks. Yet, by carefully planting the idea to L2 Spanish students that native speech is variable in any L1, this could possibly give L2 students a more accurate picture of the Spanish language and how native-speakers use past-tense aspectual morphology with stative verbs.

## 6.3 Directions

### 6.3.1 Avenues of Future Research

The analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish can serve as the point of departure for many future investigations. It is important to study other varieties of Spanish—including different Peninsular dialects, Latin American and Caribbean varieties, as well as those Spanish-speaking communities in contact with other languages (e.g. English, Indigenous languages)—in order for researchers to ascertain if there are universal characteristics of native-speaker perfective and imperfective use with statives or if there are significant differences between the aforementioned varieties. That way, investigators and teachers alike can more accurately assess L2 production of past-tense aspectual morphology by relying on a broad scope of baseline native speaker values, rather than depending on researcher or teacher intuitions. Likewise, a comparison of native speech of written and spoken language with respect to past-tense aspectual morphology of statives is in order, as the differences between these two genres are well attested to in the literature (cf. Tannen 1982); there are even noteworthy differences in the subgenres of written and oral discourse (cf. Biber 2000).

Another possible direction is to take a historical perspective in the analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology applied to stative verbs. The present investigation analyzed this linguistic variable in its synchronic ‘state’; adding a diachronic component to this analysis could prove to be very fruitful, since ‘in Romance languages the possibility of employing perfective pasts with permanent statives has been severely constrained in modern times, as compared with the

situation to be observed up to the 14th-15th centuries (Dausen 1981)' (Bertinetto 2000:12). Bybee et al. (1994:3) also supported diachronic analysis of morphosyntactic elements because '[it] greatly increases the explanatory power of linguistic theory.' Linguists can integrate diachronic analysis to explain synchronic patterns and through the study of how the form 'came in to have that function' in a variety of typologically dissimilar languages, linguists can identify universal trends and grammaticization paths. Synchronically it has been shown perfective statives i) are never observed (e.g. Island Carib), ii) can imply a variety of interpretations (e.g. Spanish), and iii) have a conventionalized inceptive meaning (e.g. Oceanic) (Bybee et al. 1994, Bybee 1995:450). Thus, a diachronic component can lead to a better understanding of how and why these different present-day conditions exist in various languages with respect to stative predicates.

Finally, it would be enlightening to compare the stative verb patterns of aspectual marking to the patterns of activity, accomplishment and achievement verbs. In the present investigation we determined the factors that constrained the use of aspectual viewpoint of these verbs. Yet, it is still unknown whether or not these linguistic influences affected all other types of verbs alike or if statives functioned differently, as lexical class. Therefore, an expansion of our study would offer those details and allow us to make broader conclusions of stative verb patterns.

### **6.3.2 Limitations**

There were some limitations to mention with regard to the present work. First, the disparate ratio of male to female participants is something that will be remedied in the future. It is important to analyze evenly distributed cells of participants according to social factors and in the future more data from male participants will be added to the analysis of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verb in *salmantino* Spanish. Likewise, it would be ideal to find more female and male participants from the ages of 19-39 years old to even out the distribution of the

cells. Furthermore, it would be advantageous to incorporate the socioeconomic status of the *salmantino* participants, as this component has been a determining factor in many variationist analyses (cf. Labov 1966 and Lafford 1982, for example).

#### 6.4 Conclusions

The present work addressed the following research questions: i) What are the linguistic factors that conditioned the choice of past-tense aspectual morphology (i.e., perfective vs. imperfective aspect) applied to stative verbs in *salmantino* Spanish? and ii) How do social and stylistic factors come into play with regard to the use of perfective and imperfective aspect of stative verbs in the *salmantino* community? It was found that Temporal Determinant and Grammatical Person had a profound affect on *salmantino*-speaker of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. To a lesser degree, it was shown that the choice of perfective and imperfective aspect of individual stative verbs was constrained by other linguistic factors: Sentence Type, Clause Type, Prepositional Phrase, Collocation, and Adjective/Past Participle. Our study also revealed that the patterns of external factors were not systematic enough to predict the use of past-tense aspectual morphology of stative verbs. Since the different analyses show inconsistent and disparate results (Chapter 5), we did not feel confident in making any broad conclusions about these factors' affect on the linguistic variable.

As it has been stated before, the perfective/imperfective distinction is known in the literature as a semantic one. *Salmantino* speakers generally relied on this opposition in conveying foregrounding and backgrounded information. For the most part, *salmantino* Spanish-speakers 'maintained' the perfective/imperfective opposition with verbs of state. Yet, the results of this work have also led us to propose that, in select instances, aspectual viewpoint could have been become neutralized in throughout the course of the conversation. Nevertheless, through quantitative measures and qualitative interpretation, the patterns of how the *salmantino*

community used this linguistic variable were determined. It is with much hope that these findings will be useful for different types of linguistic analyses as well as in the L2 Spanish classroom.

APPENDIX A  
OFFICIAL LETTER TO SOLICIT PARTICIPANTION FROM THE ISA SALAMANCA  
NETWORK



Salamanca, 17 de julio de 2008

Estimada \_\_\_\_\_:

Me llamo Stephanie Knouse y estoy haciendo el doctorado en la Universidad de Florida, en los Estados Unidos. Este verano estoy trabajando como becaria de ISA para ayudar con los estudiantes y otros asuntos de la oficina. Fátima me ha dado permiso para ponerme en contacto con las familias que trabajan con estudiantes de ISA y me ha dicho que, aunque cada una de vosotras es diferente, todas sois muy amables y que seguro que podríais ayudarme con algo que necesito.

Te escribo porque estoy haciendo una investigación para mi tesis doctoral sobre los sonidos y las estructuras del habla salmantina. Los objetivos de este estudio son: (1) describir con agudeza cómo es el habla en Salamanca y (2) mejorar los libros que se usan en Estados Unidos para enseñar a los estudiantes a hablar y escribir en español. Por tanto, me gustaría saber si estarías dispuesta a ayudarme con el estudio. Tu participación sólo consistiría en una conversación grabada, una charla informal sobre temas variados (por ejemplo, qué hacías cuando eras pequeña, cómo era tu mejor amigo/a, etc.). La conversación dura más o menos 45 minutos. No tengo ningún problema en reunirme contigo donde te resulte más conveniente (en tu casa, en una cafetería, en un parque, etc.). En cuanto a la hora, puede ser entre las 9.00 y las 14.00 horas. Quisiera enfatizar que tu participación es totalmente voluntaria, no remunerada, y que en cualquier momento del estudio tienes total libertad para retirarte sin problema.

Si quieres participar, por favor rellena el formulario que acompaña esta carta e indica el día y la hora que más te convienen. Luego, si puedes mandármelo por \_\_\_\_\_, creo que sería la forma más fácil para todos. Te llamaré después de recibir el formulario para que podamos quedar en un sitio concreto. Si además de ti hubiera otro miembro de la familia interesado en participar en el estudio, yo estaría encantada de incluirlo y tremendamente agradecida.

Gracias con anticipación por tu tiempo y ayuda.

Saludos cordiales,

Stephanie Knouse  
Candidata doctoral, University of Florida  
Teléfono móvil: 697 63 06 50  
E-mail: steph825@ufl.edu

APPENDIX B  
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF SOCIAL FACTORS (ORIGINAL VERSION):  
INDIVIDUAL VERBS

Table B-1. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, all statives (original version)

Input probability: 0.269 (27.1%) N=1221/4511	%			
	perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Age</b>				
30-39 years old 2	35	.57	111	7
50-59 years old 4	31	.56	369	26
19-29 years old 1	29	.50	100	8
60-69 years old 5	26	.48	339	29
40-49 years old 3	23	.45	302	30
<i>Range</i>		<i>12</i>		
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	33	.56	235	16
Female	26	.49	986	84
<i>Range</i>		<i>6</i>		
Log likelihood= -2613.247; p=0.009; $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.6837				

Table B-2. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *ser* (original version)

Input probability: 0.239(24.2%) N=402/1658	%			
	perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Age</b>				
30-39 years old 2	30	.58	28	6
50-59 years old 4	30	.58	145	29
19-29 years old 1	27	.54	35	8
40-49 years old 3	21	.46	108	31
60-69 years old 5	20	.44	86	26
<i>Range</i>		<i>14</i>		
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	26	[.51]	58	13
Female	24	[.50]	344	87
Log likelihood= -908.240; p=0.000; $\chi^2$ /cell= 1.1254				

Table B-3. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *estar* (original version)

Input probability: 0.389(39.3%) N= 335/853	% perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Age</b>				
30-39 years old 2	58	.61	57	12
50-59 years old 4	39	.53	80	24
60-69 years old 5	43	.52	100	28
40-49 years old 3	30	.45	67	27
19-29 years old 1	34	.39	31	11
Range		22		
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	58	.67	112	23
Female	34	.45	223	77
Range		22		

Log likelihood=-548.074; p=0.021;  $\chi^2$ /cell=3.7970

Table B-4. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *tener* (original version)

Input probability: 0.216 (21.6%) N= 176/816	% perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Age</b>				
60-69 years old 5	24	[.54]	69	35
50-59 years old 4	23	[.53]	41	22
40-49 years old 3	23	[.49]	52	31
19-29 years old 1	17	[.42]	10	7
30-39 years old 2	10	[.28]	4	5
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	23	[.54]	32	17
Female	21	[.49]	144	83

Log likelihood= -425.457;  $\chi^2$ /cell=0.7013

Table B-5. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *haber* (original version)

Input probability: 0.112 (11.2%) N= 37/329	% perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Age</b>				
60-69 years old 5	14	[.57]	14	31
19-39 years old 1, 2	12	[.53]	4	10
50-59 years old 4	11	[.49]	9	26
40-49 years old 3	9	[.44]	10	34
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	11	[.51]	31	85
Male	12	[.46]	6	15

Log likelihood= -115.687;  $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.5954

Table B-6. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, LF stative verbs (original version)

Input probability: 0.315(31.7%) N= 271/855	% perfective	Probability	Total N	% Data
<b>Age</b>				
19-39 years old 1	39	.61	20	6
50-59 years old 4	39	.58	94	28
20-29 years old 2	28	.50	22	9
40-49 years old 3	29	.45	65	27
60-69 years old 5	27	.45	70	30
<i>Range</i>		<i>16</i>		
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	33	[.52]	244	87
Male	24	[.40]	27	13
Log likelihood= -526.635; p= 0. 056; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.1418				

APPENDIX C  
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF SOCIAL FACTORS (FINAL VERSION): INDIVIDUAL  
VERBS

Table C-1. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *ser*

Input probability: 0.242 (24.2%)				
<i>N</i> =402/1658	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Generation				
Generation 2 (49-65 years old)	26	[.51]	162	57
Generation 1 (19-48 years old)	23	[.48]	240	43
Gender				
Male	26	[.53]	58	13
Female	24	[.50]	344	87
Log likelihood= -908.240; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.1176				

Table C-2. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *tener*

Input probability: 0.216 (21.6%)				
<i>N</i> = 176/816	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Generation				
Generation 2 (49-65 years old)	23	[.52]	110	58
Generation 1 (19-48 years old)	19	[.46]	66	42
Gender				
Male	23	[.51]	32	17
Female	21	[.50]	144	83
Log likelihood= -425.457; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.7736				

Table C-3. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *haber*

Input probability: 0.112 (11.2%)				
<i>N</i> = 37/329	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Generation				
Generation 2 (49-65 years old)	13	[.53]	24	58
Generation 1 (19-48 years old)	9	[.45]	13	42
Gender				
Male	12	[.50]	6	15
Female	11	[.50]	31	85
Log likelihood= -115.687; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0.3946				

Table C-4. GoldVarb results of the contributing social factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, LF stative verbs

Input probability: 0. 317(31.7%)				
<i>N</i> = 271/855	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Generation				
Generation 2 (49-65 years old)	33	[.51]	165	59
Generation 1 (19-48 years old)	31	[.49]	106	41
Gender				
Female	33	[.52]	244	87
Male	24	[.40]	27	13
Log likelihood= -533.995; $\chi^2$ /cell= 0. 0121				

APPENDIX D  
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF STYLISTIC FACTORS: INDIVIDUAL VERBS

Table D-1. GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *estar*

Input probability: 0.391(39.3%)				
<i>N</i> = 335/853	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Audience design				
Auditor/eavesdropper present	45	.56	222	58
Individual interview	32	.42	113	42
<i>Range</i>		<i>11</i>		
Time in interview				
10+ minutes	40	[.50]	280	83
0-10 minutes	38	[.49]	55	17
Log likelihood= -564.130; $p=0.000$ ; $\chi^2/\text{cell}=0.0055$				

Table D-2. GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *tener*

Input probability: 0.216 (21.6%)				
<i>N</i> = 176/816	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Audience design				
Auditor present	26	[.55]	56	27
Individual interview	20	[.48]	83	50
Eavesdropper present	20	[.47]	37	23
Time in interview				
10+ minutes	22	[.51]	137	76
0-10 minutes	20	[.48]	39	24
Log likelihood= -425.457; $\chi^2/\text{cell}=0.1801$				

Table D-3. GoldVarb results of the contributing stylistic factors to the probability of past perfective aspect, *haber*

Input probability: 0.112 (11.2%)				
<i>N</i> = 37/329	% Perf.	Prob.	<i>N</i>	% Data
Audience design				
Auditor present	15	[.60]	12	24
Individual interview	11	[.50]	19	53
Eavesdropper present	8	[.40]	6	24
Time in interview				
0-10 minutes	14	[.59]	11	23
10+ minutes	10	[.47]	26	77
Log likelihood= -115.687; $\chi^2/\text{cell}=0.4899$				

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aaron, Jessica Elana. 2006. Variation and change in Spanish future temporal expression. Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico.
- Abreu, Laurel. 2009. Spanish subject personal pronoun use by monolinguals, bilinguals and second language learners. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Andersen, Roger. 1991. Developmental sequences: The emergence of aspect marking in Second Language Acquisition." *Crosscurrents in Second Language Acquisition and linguistic theories*, eds. Thom Huebner and Charles A. Ferguson. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Andersen, Roger, and Yasuhiro Shirai. 1994. Discourse motivations for some cognitive acquisition principles. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16.135-56.
- Andersen, Roger, and Yasuhiro Shirai. 1995. The acquisition of tense-aspect morphology: A prototype account. *Language* 71.743-762.
- Ayoun, Dalila, and M. Rafael Salaberry (eds.). 2005. *Tense and aspect in Romance languages*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ayoun, Dalia. 2005. The acquisition of tense and aspect in L2 French from a Universal Grammar perspective. *Tense and aspect in Romance languages*, ed. M. Rafael Salaberry and Dalila Ayoun, 79-120. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bache, Carl. 1986. *The study of aspect, tense and action: Towards a theory of the semantics of grammatical categories*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 1999a. From morpheme studies to temporal semantics: Tense-aspect research in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21.341-382.
- Barlow, Michael, and Suzanne Kemmer. 2000. *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bayley, Robert. 2002. The quantitative paradigm. *The handbook of language variation and change*, eds. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 117-41. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bell, Allan. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13.145-204.
- Bell, Allan. 2001. Back in style: Reworking audience design. *Style and variation*, eds. John R. Rickford and Penelope Eckert, 139-69. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bertinetto, Pier. 1986. *Tempo, aspetto e azione nel verbi italiano*. Florencia: Accademia ddella Crusca.

- Bertinetto, Pier. 1994. Temporal reference, aspect and actionality: Their neutralization and interactions, mostly exemplified in Italian. *Tense, aspect and action: Empirical and theoretical contributions to language typology*, eds. Carl Bache, Hans Basbøll and Carl-Erik Lindberg, 113-38. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bertinetto, Pier. 2000. On a frequent misunderstanding in the temporal-aspectual domain: The 'Perfective=Telic Confusion'. *Quaderni* 1-34.  
<[http://alphalinguistica.sns.it/QLL/QLL00/PMB\\_misunderstandings.pdf](http://alphalinguistica.sns.it/QLL/QLL00/PMB_misunderstandings.pdf)>
- Bertinetto, Pier. 2004. Estativos, progresivos, habituales. *El pretérito imperfecto*, eds. Luis García Fernández and Bruno Camus Bergareche, 273-316. Madrid: Gredos.
- Biber, Douglas. 1992. Using computer-based text corpora to analyze the referential strategies of spoken and written texts. *Directions in Corpus Linguistics: Proceedings of Nobel Symposium* 82.214-52.
- Biber, Douglas. 2000. Investigating language use through corpus-based analyses of association patterns. *Usage based models of language*, eds. Suzanne Kemmer and Michael Barlow, 287-313.
- Bird, Cindy. 2005. How I stopped dreading and learned to love transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry* 11.226-48
- Bock, J. Katherine. 1986. Syntactic Persistence in Language Production. *Cognitive Psychology*, 18.355-87.
- Boxer, Diana. 2002. *Applying sociolinguistics: domains and face-to-face interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Branigan, Holly P., Martin J. Pickering, and Alexandra A. 2000a. Syntactic co-ordination in dialogue. *Cognition* 75.B13–B25.
- Briggs, Charles. 1986. *Learning how to ask: a sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bull, William. 1960. *Time, tense and the verb: A study in theoretical and applied linguistics with particular attention to Spanish*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Butragueño, Pedro Martín. 2000. Prólogo. *Estructuras en contexto: estudios de variación lingüística*, ed. Pedro Martín Butragueño, 9-12. México: El Colegio de México.
- Butt, John, and Carmen Benjamin. 1994. *A new reference grammar for modern Spanish*. Chicago: NTC Publishing Group.

- Bybee, Joan. 1995. Spanish tense and aspect from a typological perspective. *Studies in language learning and Spanish linguistics in honor of Tracy Terrell*, eds. Peggy Hashemipour, Ricardo Maldonado and Margaret van Naerssen, 442-457. San Francisco: McGraw Hill.
- Bybee, Joan. 2002. Main clauses are innovative, subordinate clauses are conservative. *Complex sentences in grammar and discourse*, eds. Joan Bybee, Michael Noonan and Sandra A. Thompson, 1-18.
- Bybee, Joan. 2005. From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. LSA Presidential Address 2005.
- Bybee, Joan. 2007. *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, Joan, and Paul J. Hopper. 2001. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structures*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cameron, Richard. 1996. A community-based test of a linguistic hypothesis. *Language in Society* 25.61-111.
- Cameron, Richard, and Nydia Flores-Ferrán. 2003. Perseveration of subject expression across regional dialects of Spanish. *Spanish in Context* 1.41-65.
- Castells, Matile, Elizabeth Guzmán, Paloma Lapuerta, and Judith Liskin-Gasparro. 2006. *Mosaicos: Spanish as a world language*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, ed. Russell S. Tomlin, 21-52. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chambers, J. K. 1995. *Sociolinguistic theory: linguistic variation and its social significance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chambers, J. K. 1998b. Whither withers: last gasp of the oldest sound change. *New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 27*, University of Georgia.
- Chambers, J. K. 2002. Patterns of variation including change. *The handbook of language variation and change*, eds. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 349-372. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cheshire, Jenny. 2002. Sex and gender in variationist research. *The handbook of language variation and change*, eds. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 429-443. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Chiswick, Barry and Paul Miller. 2008. Test of the Critical Period Hypothesis for language learning. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29.16-29.
- Clancy, Patricia. 1982. Written and spoken style in Japanese narratives. *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*, ed. Deborah Tannen, 55-76. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Clements, J. Clancy. 2006. Transitivity and Spanish Non-Anaphoric *se*. *Functional approaches to Spanish syntax*, ed., J.C. Clements and Jiyoung Yoon. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Comajoan, L. 2005. The acquisition of perfective and imperfective morphology and the marking of discourse grounding in Catalan. *Tense and aspect in Romance languages*, eds. Dalila Ayoun and M. Rafael Salaberry, 36-79. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- DeMello, George. 1994. Pluralization of the impersonal verb *haber* in educated spoken Spanish. *Studia Neophilologica* 66.77-91.
- Diessel, Holger. 2001. The positional patterns of subordinate clauses in crosslinguistic perspective. *Fourth Meeting of the Association for Linguistic Typology*, Santa Barbara.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word meaning and the Montague grammar: the semantics of verbs and tiems in Generative semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Dry, Helen. 1983. The movement of narrative time. *Journal of Literary Semantics* 12.19-53.
- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Language* 63.805-855.
- Du Bois, John W. 2006. Transcription symbols by Delicacy: Levels 1-4.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Linguistic variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of social identity in Belten High*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eckert, Penelope, and John R. Rickford. 2001. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Feagin, Crawford. 2002. Entering the community: fieldwork. *The handbook of language variation and change*, eds. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 20-39. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Finegan, Edward. 1995. Subjectivity and subjectivisation: an introduction. *Subjectivity and subjectivisation*, eds. Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1983. From pragmatics to grammar: Diachronic reflections on pasts and futures in Romance. *Lingua* 60.183–214.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1985. Discourse functions of tense-aspect oppositions in narrative: towards a theory of grounding. *Linguistics* 23.851-82.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1986. Evaluation in narrative: The Present tense in Medieval ‘performed stories’. *Yale French Studies*, 70.199-251.
- Fleischman, Suzanne, and Linda R. Waugh 1991 (eds.). *Discourse, Pragmatics and the verb: evidence from Romance*. New York: Routledge.
- Fox, Barbara A., and Thompson, Sandra A. 1990. A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation. *Language* 66.297–316.
- García, Erica, and F. van Putte. 1998. The value of contrast: Contrasting the value of strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 26.4.263-80.
- García Fernández, Luis and Bruno Camus Bergareche (eds.). 2004. *El pretérito imperfecto*. Madrid: Gredos.
- García Fernández, Luis. 2004. El pretérito imperfecto: repaso histórico y bibliográfico. *El pretérito imperfecto*, eds. Luis García Fernández and Bruno Camus Bergareche, 1-61. Madrid: Gredos.
- García Gallarín, Consuelo. 2002. Usos de haber y tener en textos medievales y clásicos. *Iberoromania* 55.1-29.
- Gili y Gaya, Samuel. 1964. *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. Barcelona: Bibliograf.
- Giorgi, Alexandra and Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and aspect: From semantics to morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1984. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*, Vol. 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974: *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. London: Harper and Row.

- Gómez, Francisco. 2008. Los cursos para extranjeros en Salamanca generan en verano un negocio de 7 millones. <[http://www.nortecastilla.es/20080824/castilla\\_leon/cursos-para-extranjeros-salamanca-20080824.html](http://www.nortecastilla.es/20080824/castilla_leon/cursos-para-extranjeros-salamanca-20080824.html)>.
- Gries, Stefan. 2005. Syntactic priming: a corpus-based approach. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 34.365-399.
- Güell, Lodes. 1998. La adquisición del tiempo verbal en el aprendizaje del español como lengua extranjera. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Guitart, Jorge. 1978. Aspects of Spanish aspect: A new look at the Preterit/Imperfect distinction, *Contemporary studies in Romance linguistics*, ed. Margarita Suñer, 132-168. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Gutiérrez, Manuel. 1989. Michoacan Spanish/Los Angeles Spanish: Trends in a process of linguistic change. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes. 1986. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guy, Gregory. 1993. The quantitative analysis of linguistic variation. *American dialectresearch*, ed. Dennis R. Preston, 223-249. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haiman, John. 1991. Motivation, repetition and emancipation: the bureaucratization of language. *Linguistic Studies Presented to John L. Finley*, ed. H. C. Wolfart, 45-70. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Harris, Martin. 1982. The 'past simple' and 'present perfect' in Romance. *Studies in the Romance verb*, eds. Martin Harris and Nigel Vincent, 42-70. London: Croom Helm.
- Hartisuiker, Robert, Martin J. Pickering, and Eline Veltkamp. 2004. Is syntax separate or shared between languages. *Psychological Science* 15.409-414.
- Hernando Cuadrado, Luis Alberto. 1994. *Aspectos gramaticales del español hablado*. Madrid: Ediciones Pedagógicas.
- Holmes, Janet, Allan Bell, and M. Boyce. 1991. *Variation and change in New Zealand English: A social dialect investigation. Project report for Social Sciences Committee of the Foundation for Research, Science, and Technology*. Wellington: Victoria University.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1979a. Some observations on the typology of focus and aspect in narrative language. *Studies of Language* 3.37-67.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1979b. Aspect and foregrounding in discourse. *Syntax and semantics: Discourse and syntax*, ed. Talmy Givón, 213-41. New York: Academic Press.
- Hopper, Paul. J. 1982. *Tense-aspect: Between syntax and pragmatics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Hopper, Paul J. 1998. Emergent grammar. *The New Psychology of Language*, 155-175.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60.703-752.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993/2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howe, Chad. 2006. Cross-dialectal features of the Spanish present perfect: A typological analysis of form and function. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Hualde, José Ignacio, Antxon Olarrea, and Anna María Escobar. 2001. *Introducción a la lingüística hispánica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1986. Models of the interaction of language and social life. *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*, ed. John H. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 35-71. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland. 2001. *The discourse reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, J.C. 1994. Anthropological contributions to the study of social networks: a review. *Advances in social network analysis: research in the social and behavioral sciences*, 113-151. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Kattán-Ibarra, Juan. 1997. *Persepctivas culturales de España*. Chicago: NTC Publishing Group.
- Kattán-Ibarra, Juan, and Christopher Pountain. 1997. *Modern Spanish grammar: A practical guide*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Klein-Andreu, Flora. 1991. Losing ground: A discourse-pragmatic solution to the history of *-ra* in Spanish. *Discourse-pragmatics and the verb: the evidence from Romance*, eds. Suzanne Fleischman and Linda R. Waugh, 164-178. London: Routledge.
- Knouse, Stephanie. 2008. Variation of tense/aspect of stative verbs in Madrileño Spanish. Paper presented at New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 37, Rice University.
- Labov, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. 1972a. The study of language in its social context. *Sociolinguistic patterns*, 183-259.

- Labov, William. 1972b. The logic of nonstandard English. *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, 200-240. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 1984. Field methods of the project on linguistic change and variation. *Language in use: Readings in sociolinguistics*, ed. J. Baugh and J. Sherzer, 28-54. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Labov, William. 1990. The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. *Language Variation and Change* 2.205-254.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of linguistic change. Volume I: Internal factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of linguistic change. Volume II: Social factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lafford, Barbara. 1982. Dynamic synchrony in the Spanish of Cartagena, Colombia : the influences of linguistic, stylistic and social factors on the retention, aspiration and deletion of syllable and word final /s/. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.
- Lafford, Barbara. 1996. The development of tense/aspect relations in L2 narratives: Evidence to test two competing theories. Paper presented at the *Second Language Research Forum*, Tucson, AZ.
- Langacker, Roger. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Roger. 1999. *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin: Werner Hildebrand.
- Langacker, Roger. 2000. A dynamic usage-based model. *Usage-based models of language*. ed., Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer, 1-61. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Lavandera, Beatriz. 1978. Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society* 7.171-138.
- Levelt, W. J. M., and S. Kelter. 1982. Surface form and memory in question answering. *Cognitive Psychology* 14.78-106.
- Li, Ping, and Shirai, Yasuhiro. 2000. *The acquisition of lexical and grammatical aspect*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Liskin-Gasparro, Judith. 1996. Narrative strategies: A case study of developing story-telling skills by a learner of Spanish. *Modern Language Journal*, 80.271-286.

- Liskin-Gasparro, Judith. 2000. The use of tense-aspect morphology in Spanish oral narratives: Exploring the perceptions of advanced learners. *Hispania*, 83.830-844.
- López-Ortega, Nurcia. 2000. Tense, aspect, and narrative structure in Spanish as a second language. *Hispania* 83.488-502.
- Macaulay, Ronald. 2002. Discourse variation. *The handbook of language variation and change*, ed. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 283-306. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, Leslie. 1987a. *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, Leslie. 2002. Social networks. *The handbook of language variation and change*, eds. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 549-572. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Paolillo, John C. 2002. *Analyzing linguistic variation: Statistical models and methods*. Stanford: Center for Study of Language and Information.
- Pharies, David. 2007. *Breve historia de la lengua española*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. The notion of plural in Puerto Rican Spanish: Competing constraints on (s) deletion. *Locating language in time and space*, ed. William Labov, 55-67. New York: Academic Press.
- Poplack, Shana. 2000. *The English history of African American English*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Poplack, Shana. 2001. Variability, frequency, and productivity in the irrealis domain of French. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, ed. Joan Bybee and Paul J. Hopper, 405-29. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Poplack, Shana, and Sali A. Tagliamonte. 1989. There's no tense like the present: verbal –s inflection in Early Black English. *Language Variation and Change* 1.47-84.
- Poplack, Shana, and Sali A. Tagliamonte. 1991. African American English in the diaspora: evidence from old-line Nova Scotians. *Language Variation and Change* 3.301-39.
- Poplack, Shana, and Sali A. Tagliamonte. 1994. –S or nothing: marking the plural in the African American diaspora. *American Speech* 69.227-59.
- Poplack, Shana, and Sali A. Tagliamonte. 2001. *African American English in the diaspora*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Poplack, Shana, and Daneille Turpin. 1999. Does the FUTUR have a future in (Canadian) French? *Probus* 11.133-64.
- Quesada Pacheco, Miguel Ángel. 2003. El sistema verbal del español de América: de la temporalidad a la aspectualidad. *Español Actual* 7.5-26.

- Reid, Wallace. 1976. The quantitative validation of a grammatical hypothesis: the passé simple and the imparfait, Paper presented at the North Eastern Linguistic Society 7.315-33.
- Salaberry, M. Rafael. 1999a. The development of past tense verbal morphology in classroom L2 Spanish. *Applied Linguistics*, 20.151-78.
- Salaberry, M. Rafael. 2005. Evidence for transfer of knowledge of aspect from L2 Spanish to L3 Portuguese. *Tense and aspect in Romance languages*, eds., Dalila Ayoun and M. Rafael Salaberry, 179-210. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sankoff, David. 1988a. Sociolinguistics and syntactic variation. *Linguistics: the Cambridge Survey*, ed. F.J. Newmeyer, 140-61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sankoff, David. 1988b. Variable rules. In *Sociolinguistics: an international handbook of the science of language and society*, ed. U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, and K.J. Mattheier, 140-61. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sankoff, David, and Sylvie Dubois. 2001 *The handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton, 282-302. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sankoff, David, Sali A. Tagliamonte, and Eric Smith. 2005. GoldVarb X: A multivariate analysis application for Macintosh and Windows. Department of Linguistics—University of Toronto and Department of Mathematics—University of Ottawa. Available at <[http://individual.utoronto.ca/tagliamonte/Goldvarb/GV\\_index.htm](http://individual.utoronto.ca/tagliamonte/Goldvarb/GV_index.htm)>.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1993. Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26.139-53.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1996a. Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: contingency in action, interaction, and co-participant context. *Computational and conversational discourse*, eds. Eduard H. Hovy and Donia R. Scott. New York: Springer.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1996b. Turn organization: one direction for inquiry into grammar and interaction. *Interaction and grammar*, eds. Elinor Ochs, Emanuel Schlegoff, and Sandra A. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheibman, Joanne. 2001. Local patterns of subjectivity in person and verb type in American English conversation. Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure, eds. Joan L. Bybee and Paul J. Hopper, 61-90. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Scherre, Maria Marta Pereria. 2001. Phrase level parallelism effect on Noun Phrase number agreement. *Language Variation and Change* 13.91-107.
- Scherre, Maria Marta Pereria, and Anthony J. Naro. 1991. Marking in discourse: ‘Birds of a feather’. *Language Variation and Change* 3.23-32.

- Scherre, Maria Marta Pereria, and Anthony J. Naro. 1992. The serial effect on internal and external variables. *Language Variation and Change* 4.1-13.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1997. Theory and method in discourse analysis: What context for what unit? *Language & Communication* 17.75-92.
- Schilling-Estes, Natalie. Investigating stylistic variation. *The handbook of language variation and change*, ed. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 375-401. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schwenter, Scott. 1994a. The grammaticalization of an anterior in progress: Evidence from a Peninsular Spanish dialect. *Studies in Language* 18.71-111.
- Schwenter, Scott and Chad Howe. 2003. Present perfect for preterite across Spanish dialects. *PennWorking Papers in Linguistics: Selected Papers from NWAV-31*, eds. Tara Sanchez and Uri Horesh 9.61-76.
- Schwenter, Scott and Rena Torres Cacoullous. 2008. Defaults and indeterminacy in temporal grammaticalization: The 'perfect' road to perfective. *Language Variation and Change* 20.1-39.
- Scovel, Thomas. 2000. A critical review of the critical period research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 20.213-23.
- Serrano, María José. 1994. Del pretérito indefinido al pretérito perfecto: Un caso de cambio y gramaticalización en el español de Canarias y Madrid. *Linguística española actual* 16.37-57.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1983. Tense and aspect in oral Spanish narrative: Context and meaning. *Language* 59.760-80.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1986. Bilingualism and language change: The extension of *estar* in Los Angeles Spanish. *Language* 62.587-608.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994a. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2001. *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*. Georgetown University Press.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Smith, Carlota S.. 2002. Tense and aspect. *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, ed., Lynn Nadel, 361-66. London: Nature Publishing Group

- Smith, Carlota S. 2003. *Modes of discourse: The logical structure of texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Carlota S.. 2005. Aspectual entities and tense in discourse. *Aspectual inquiries*, eds. Paula Kempchinsky and Roumyana Slabakova, 223-38.
- Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Squartini, Mario. 2004. La compatibilidad aspectual de los predicados estativos intrínsecamente delimitados. *El pretérito imperfecto*, eds. Luis García Fernández and Bruno Camus Bergareche, 317-45. Madrid: Gredos.
- Squartini, Mario, and Pier Berntinetti. 2000. The Simple and Compound Past in Romance languages. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, ed. Östen Dahl, 403-440.
- Szmrecsanyi, Benedikt. 2005. Persistence phenomena in the Grammar of Spoken English. Doctoral dissertation, University of Freiburg.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2006. *Analysing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A., and Shana Poplack. 1993. The zero-marked verb: testing the creole hypothesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 8.171-206.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1982 (ed.). *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Théberg-Rafal, Christine. 1999. Preterite had + verb-ed in the narratives of African American preadolescents. *African American vernacular English*, ed. John Rickford, 34-60.
- Thelin, Nils B. 1990. Verbal aspect in discourse: on the state of the art. *Verbal aspect in discourse*, ed. Nils B. Thelin, 3-90. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. Object complements and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26.125-164.
- Thompson, Sandra A., and Paul J. Hopper. 2001. Transitivity, clause structure, and argument structure: evidence from conversation. In *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, ed. Joan L. Bybee and Paul J. Hopper, 27-60. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Travis, Catherine E. 2005b. *The yo-yo effect: Priming in subject expression in Colombian Spanish: A study of Polysemy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Travis, Catherine E. 2007. Genre effects on subject expression in Spanish: Priming in narrative and conversation. *Language Variation and Change* 19.101-135.
- Torres Cacoullos, Rena. 2001. From lexical to grammatical to social meaning. *Language in Society* 30.443-478.

- Torres Cacoullous, Rena and James Walker. 2009. On the persistence of grammar in discourse formulas: a variationist study of *that*. *Linguistics* 46.1-43.
- Uber, Diane Ringer. 1985. The dual function of *usted*: Forms of address in Bogotá, Colombia. *Hispania* 68.388-92.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. Verbs and times. *Linguistics in Philosophy*, ed. Zeno Vendler, 97-121. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Vet, Co. 1991. The temporal structure of discourse: setting, change, and perspective. *Discourse, Pragmatics and the verb: evidence from Romance*, ed. Suzanne Fleischman and Linda R. Waugh 7-26.
- Waugh, Linda R. 1990. Discourse functions of tense-aspect in French: Dynamic synchrony. *Verbal aspect in discourse*, ed. Nils B. Thelin, 159-91. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Waugh, Linda R., and Monique Monville-Burston. 1986. Aspect and discourse function: The French simple past in newspaper usage. *Language*. 62.846-77.
- Weiner, E. Judith, and William Labov. 1983. Constraints on the agentless passive. *Journal of Linguistics* 19.29-58.
- Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov and Marvin Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*, ed. W.P. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel, 95-188. Austin: University of Texas.
- Wolfram, Walter. 1969. *A sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro speech*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram, Walter. 1993. Identifying and interpreting variables. *American dialect research*, ed. Dennis Preston, 193-221. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Woollbert, Robert Gale, and Joaquin Esteban Perruca. 1997. Salamanca. *Colliers Encyclopedia* 20.371.
- Young, Richard, and Robert Bayley. 1996. VARBRUL analysis for second language acquisition research, *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Variation*, ed. Robert Bayley and Dennis Preston, 253-306. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Zagona, Karen. 2002. *Spanish syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zayas-Bazán, Eduardo, Susan Bacon, and Dulce García. 2006. *Conexiones*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Stephanie M. Knouse is from Ellicott City, MD. In 2000, she received a BA in Spanish and Mass Communications from Towson University. Later, she studied at the C.V. Starr-Middlebury School in Madrid, Spain from 2002-2003, where she earned a MA in Spanish. Before coming to the University of Florida in 2005 to pursue her PhD in Hispanic Linguistics, she taught high school Spanish in her hometown. During her time at the University of Florida, she has taught Spanish language classes, as well as Introduction to Hispanic Linguistics and Trade and Investment in Latin America. Stephanie will begin a position as Assistant Professor of Spanish at Furman University in Greenville, SC in the fall.