

Syntactic borrowing as a function of register

Christopher J. Pountain
Queen Mary, University of London

[Pre-publication version: published in Anna Laura Lepschy & Arturo Tosi (eds), *Rethinking Languages in Contact. The Case of Italian*. (Oxford: Legenda, 2006), pp.99-111.]

Introduction

Syntactic borrowing has been much discussed in the literature on language contact, though chiefly from the point of view of the extent to which syntactic borrowing is possible: see, for example, Weinreich (1953:29) and Harris & Campbell (1995:120–2). There has accordingly been a concentration on what exactly is to be understood by syntactic borrowing: whether or not it is a function of other kinds of borrowing, especially lexical; whether it is true ‘borrowing’ or is better construed as ‘calquing’, ‘transfer’ or ‘interference’, and under what conditions it takes place. There is a surprisingly wide variety of views on these issues; but the genuinely differing nature of the conclusions reached is, I suggest, due to the fact that a number of different scenarios for borrowing have not been clearly distinguished.

Abstand and *Ausbau* languages

The nature of syntactic borrowing (I will continue to use this traditional term to signify all contact-induced syntactic phenomena) varies considerably according to circumstance, and a crucial variable involved in syntactic borrowing in at least some of these circumstances is that of register, a variable which is also associable with sociolectal variation. Register is closely connected with the fundamental distinction made by Kloss (1967:29) between *Abstand* and *Ausbau* languages. An *Abstand* language is ‘a linguistic unit which a linguist would have to call a language even if not a single word had ever been written in it’; an *Ausbau* language, by contrast, is a language which has been ‘reshaped [...] in order to become a standardized tool of literary expression’. A significant dimension of the history of the standard Romance languages is precisely that of the passage from *Abstand* to *Ausbau* status. An *Ausbau* language typically shows a proliferation of registers, as a written medium extends its use for different purposes in different contexts. And the evidence of Western European languages shows that *Ausbau* status has particular and far-reaching implications for syntax, although the precise mechanisms of syntactic ‘elaboration’ are not yet fully understood.¹ It has often been claimed, for example, that a very general feature of the development of formal written language is an increase in complex subordination at the expense of parataxis.² In an *Ausbau* language there is also a sense of normativism and precedent which often privileges obsolescent forms and thus increases variation, whilst acting as a brake on innovation at the popular level. Thus in modern Spanish, tenses which have universally disappeared in the spoken language (notably the past anterior and the future subjunctive) continue to be used in the written language and so remain a part of a literate speaker’s passive (and, in some registers, even active) competence. In both Catalonia and Galicia today, while there is a high degree of bilingualism which propitiates mutual borrowing, so severe are the purist strictures against what are perceived as ‘Catalanisms’ or ‘Galicianisms’ in Castilian that these features are avoided in cultured written and even some spoken registers. Blas Arroyo (1999:43–68) reports a study of the use of ‘agreeing’ forms of the existential verb *haber* which is a stereotype of Catalan/Valenciano speakers of Castilian (in the Catalan of many areas the

cognate verb *haure* agrees with a plural noun argument, although in standard Catalan, as in standard Castilian, the verb *haber* is invariable):

- (1) Cast. *En la calle había* / [Ⓢ]*habían cinco coches abandonados*
 Cat. *Al carrer hi avie* / [Ⓢ]*hi avien cinc cotxes abandonats*
 [In the street there were five abandoned cars]
 ([Ⓢ] indicates the puristically castigated form: see Seco, 1989, 215–6)

Blas Arroyo found that the frequency of the use of the plural form in Castilian was lower amongst speakers from upper classes and higher academic backgrounds, and that these speakers' attitudes towards the phenomenon were less positive.³ Broadly similar conclusions are reached by Urrutia Cárdenas (1995) for a number of features in the Spanish of the Basque Country. One feature of the Spanish of this area is that reflexive pronouns are 'overused', that is, are used with verbs which in standard Spanish are non-reflexive and also sometimes double an existing reflexive. This usage may correspond to the marking of object agreement in the Basque verb:

- (2) Basque Sp. [Ⓢ]*Ese se nació en Canarias* (standard: *Ese nació en Canarias*)
 Basque *Hori Canariasen jaio zen*
 DEM Canarias+LOC be-born was
 [He was born in the Canary Islands]
- (3) Basque Sp. [Ⓢ]*Se están quejándose* (standard: *Se están quejando* or *Están quejándose*)
 Basque *Kexatzen daude*
 complain+IMPERFECTIVE they-are
 [They are complaining]
 (Examples from Urrutia Cárdenas, 1995, 249; [Ⓢ] denotes a puristically castigated form.)

Such features consistently characterize lower sociocultural levels, and are not accepted in educated usage. These phenomena also highlight another defining feature of an *Ausbau* language: it is by its very nature diasporic and hence exhibits much diatopic variation, often with several different local standards. Thus it is possible for certain features, as in these cases, to be confined to a particular geographical area without any prospect of impact on what may be regarded as an overall macrostandard, such a macrostandard usually being restricted to the cultured written register.

Ausbau languages cannot, therefore, be thought of as homogeneous entities; a feature of one variety is not necessarily shared with other varieties. As regards borrowing, we must correspondingly envisage scenarios in which a feature is borrowed into one variety but not into another, the permeability of a borrowing depending on the prestige of the host variety.

Syntactic borrowing today

In the Spanish-speaking world, there are currently observable two sharply contrasting scenarios for supposed syntactic borrowing.

The first scenario I will examine is borrowing within a bilingual community, illustrated not only by the Peninsular contact situations I have already cited, but much more

extensively in Latin America by communities which are bilingual in an Amerindian language and Spanish. One of the best known cases of borrowing as a result of such contact is the use of the gerund in the Ecuatorian and Colombian Andes (see Niño-Murcia 1995:90):

- (4) Andean Sp. [Ⓢ]*Dame trayendo el pan*
 Give-2sg-IMP+OBJECT-1sg bring-GERUND DEFINITE bread
 parallel to
 Quechua *Tanda-ta apamu-shpa cu-hua-i*
 Bread-OBJECT bring-GERUND give-BENEFACTIVE-IMPERATIVE
 [Bring the bread to me]

It is not my purpose here to go into the pros and cons of whether such a construction really is attributable to Quechua-Spanish bilingualism, though it must at the very least be a plausible candidate. I am interested primarily here in the social background of the speakers who use the gerund constructions and the registers in which they are found. It is worth bearing in mind that we have to do here with a feature that has achieved an advanced degree of embedding. It appears to have been a feature of the Spanish of this area since the early seventeenth century; it is used by monolingual speakers as well as bilingual speakers; it is regarded as stereotypical of the area, and Niño-Murcia goes so far as to claim that it forms part of a regional norm. However, even so, it is very restricted geographically, limited to informal spoken register, and does not seem to have migrated upwards into any cultured spoken or written register. This scenario seems to be typical of this kind of linguistic contact in which bilingual speakers occupy a position of low social prestige and the initial borrowing is into the uncultured spoken language, and there are many other syntactic features of Latin-American spoken Spanish which have not diffused even as far as this. Lipski (1994:82–9) summarizes the situation by saying that ‘syntactic transfer from indigenous languages to Spanish is usually confined to the non-native interlanguage of non-fluent bilinguals’. A possible exception to this is the doubling of direct objects by clitics, described in some detail by Lipski, a feature of many bilingual areas of Latin America, where an invariable *lo* is used with inanimate direct objects of either gender:

- (5) [Ⓢ]*Lo veo a la mujer* (bilingual speakers)
 OBJ(-masc) see-1sg OBJ-marker DEFINITE woman
 [I see the woman]

Exact parallels with Amerindian models are impossible to establish, and Lipski suggests that influence may at best be indirect: *lo* may parallel the direct object prefix of Nahuatl (6a) or the direct object inflection of Quechua (6b):

- (6) a. Nahuatl: *Ni-qui-tta in cihuatl*
I-OBJ-see DEF woman
[I see the woman]
- b. Quechua: *T'ika-ta kuchu-ni*
Flower-ACC cut I
[I cut the flower]
(The latter may originally be construed in a Spanish equivalent as
La flor+lo corto
DEF flower+OBJ I-cut
ultimately yielding, with a more usual word order,
Lo corto la flor)

Direct object clitic doubling is quite widespread in monolingual Latin-American speech, especially in Argentina, where it is largely restricted in the usage of such speakers to definite personal direct object nouns, as in (7), with the appropriate gender agreement:

- (7) [Ⓢ]*Lo conozco a Juan* (monolingual Argentine speakers; standard: *Conozco a Juan*)
OBJ-masc. know-1sg. OBJ-marker Juan
[I know Juan]
(Example from Lipski, 1994, 173)

It is highly unlikely that this last construction is attributable to any substrate Amerindian contact; even if it had been induced by contact, its behaviour would have been substantially modified in order to conform with the standard language. Moreover, a more plausible internally-motivated scenario is to hand: the indirect object doubling by clitics which is a long-standing feature of standard Spanish:

- (8) *Le regalé un libro a Juan* (standard)
INDOBJ gave-1sg. INDEF book OBJ-marker INDOBJ-marker Juan
[I gave Juan a book]

Doubling of the direct object, especially doubling of the animate-referring direct object which, like the indirect object, is introduced by the preposition *a*, can be seen as an analogical extension of this.

The second scenario is borrowing by cultured speakers who, while not bilingual, have some knowledge of the lending language; this is amply exemplified today by the influence of English. The nature of such borrowings on the syntactic level has been obscured by the immoderate strictures and unrealistic forecasts of purists, who dramatically overestimate the power of such language contact on an *Ausbau* language. Some of the syntactic features attributed to the influence of English are:

1. The *ser*-passive (9a) (Lorenzo 1996:20), a special case of which is the progressive *ser*-passive, *estar siendo* + past participle (9b) (Pratt 1980:210 and Gómez Torrego 1991:22–3):

- (9) a. *Un trio de orientales fueron vistos subir al tren*
 [A group of three oriental people were seen getting on to the train]
 b. *El programa está siendo transferido a su sistema. Por favor, espere.*
 (<http://www.rae.es>)
 [The program is being transferred to your system. Please wait.]

2. The ‘adjectival’ use of the gerund (Sala 1998:198–9), also ascribed to French (and indeed Latin, see below). Although often referred to as ‘adjectival’, the use of the gerund as a simple adjective (10a) remains apparently unassailably restricted, and discussion really centres on the reduced relative construction (10b):

- (10) a. *agua hirviendo*
 ‘boiling water’
 b. *Ya había... faroles señalando hoteles de paso* (Isabel Allende, *Eva Luna*, 6th ed. (Barcelona: Plaza y Janés, 1987), p.106)
 [Already there were street lamps indicating travellers’ hotels]

3. The adjectival use of nouns (e.g. *coche patrulla* ‘patrol car’).

4. The use of the indefinite article in appositional phrases (Lapesa, 1963, 199; Pratt, 1980, 210):

- (11) “*La busca*”, una popular novela de Pío Baroja, se ha reeditado
 [*La busca*, a popular novel by Pío Baroja, has been republished]
 (Example from Álvarez Martínez, 1986, 95)

I have discussed the structural impact on Spanish of some of these structures in a number of places (Pountain 1994, 1999); but what I want to call attention to here is the general restriction of these structures to particular registers. Absence of the *ser*-passive from spoken register is well known; more specifically, Green (1975) showed that it was particularly associated with journalistic register. The ‘adjectival’ use of the gerund is so register-specific as to have been labelled accordingly (*gerundio curialense*, *gerundio del Boletín Oficial*); another register in which it is common today is that of personal advertisements (Pountain 1998:287). The adjectival use of nouns is more prone to downward migration, since some collocations are essentially lexical coinings for new notions which are the subject-matter of discourse in all registers (e.g. *hora punta* [rush hour], *fecha límite* [deadline], *tren TER* [TER train]); but the starting-point for borrowing is patently in many cases registers in which economy and eye-catching innovation are important, such as advertising and marketing (e.g. *guía ciudad* [city guide], *empresa fantasma* [dummy company], *máquina herramienta* [machine tool]). Apposition is a much more difficult phenomenon to quantify; though clearly not absent from the spoken language, it appears to be more typical of cultured registers (hence, incidentally, the difficulty in obtaining clearcut judgements from native speakers).⁴

In addition to phenomena such as the above, there are also less well embedded, and probably transient, syntactic anglicisms, which again are restricted to a particular register. Estrany (1970:201–2) called attention to anglicized syntax in dubbed Spanish versions of English-language TV programmes, typical of which are constructions such as

- (12) a. [Ⓢ]*o como se llamen a sí mismos*
 (standard *o como se llamen*)
 [whatever they call themselves]
 (In Spanish, *a sí mismos* is used only for emphasis or distinction; *se* is the unmarked reflexive and hence sufficient in this context. The use of *a sí mismos* therefore seems to be motivated by imitation of English *themselves*.)
- b. [Ⓢ]*jugué tenis*
 (standard *jugué al tenis*)
 [I played tennis]

Syntactic borrowing in the past: two case studies

Can such present-day evidence illuminate our understanding of processes of syntactic borrowing in the past? A considerable practical problem here is the absence of reliable evidence of the differentiation of register, and crucially of examples of spontaneous speech: even texts which purport to represent spoken register may not be exactly what they seem, given that they are generally written (or dictated) by cultured people in a careful way (Pountain 2001:98). There is clearly a formidable philological problem to be overcome here. None the less, there are indications that syntactic borrowing follows the same kind of pattern as that which we can observe in the present day.

Arabic

Part of the process of Castilian becoming an *Ausbau* language was the adaptation into the language of written sources in other *Ausbau* languages. Galmés de Fuentes (1955) analyses in minute detail what he labels the influence of Arabic on Castilian prose on the basis of a detailed study of the language of an episode of *Calila e Dina*, which is a translation from Arabic of an anthology of stories apparently made on the orders of the future Alfonso X. The main features he attributes to Arabic influence are:

1. A range of phenomena related to the clear differences in the syntax of relative constructions in Arabic and Castilian: (a) relative constructions which contain a resumptive pronoun or possessive (see below), (b) use of neologistic adjectives rather than relative clauses to render Arabic present participles, and (c) use of personal pronouns in place of relatives.
2. Use of tonic pronouns in place of or in addition to atonic clitics, in place of Old Castilian *ende* and *y*, with *de* in place of or in addition to possessive adjectives.
3. Use of demonstratives instead of neuter personal pronouns.
4. Expression of the literal reflexive by a paraphrase.
5. Expression of an indefinite subject by the second person singular and the third person plural.
6. Use of nominal constructions in place of verbal constructions.

7. Use of participles and infinitives with nominal value.

8. Use of *ser* + an agentive adjective in *-dor* in place of a verb.

It is clear that these phenomena are transitory and in the first place restricted to translations from Arabic. We are therefore looking at modelling in a quite specific new written register of the language, a process which was probably in type not unlike the modelling of English constructions into Spanish journalistic register today, where, for example, the English *be*-passive is often translated at some speed and so encourages the use of the nearest structural Spanish equivalent. And as with syntactic anglicisms today, none is totally innovatory: indeed, Galmés speaks repeatedly of such ‘borrowings’ extending the native possibilities of Castilian — in just the same way, as I have argued (Pountain 1994), as the model of English leads to the extension of pre-existing syntactic patterns of Spanish. This point is, however, important, because Galmés suggests that some of these Arabic-inspired features underwent downward migration into popular registers from which they resurfaced in Golden Age literature. However, if they were present all along in the spoken language, such a downward migration did not need to take place. The degree to which these features were already present in the spoken language is of course difficult to resolve, given the lack of evidence of the spoken language of the thirteenth century. A particularly interesting issue in this respect is the use in a relative clause of a ‘resumptive’ pronoun or possessive expressing the case-function of the relative pronoun, the latter being rendered by the case-neutral *que* (13). In Arabic, the relative pronoun is similarly not inflected for case; its case-function is marked by the use of a third-person pronominal affix in the relative clause which is cliticized to the verb if the relative is a direct object and to a noun or preposition if it is an indirect or prepositional object (14).

- (13) a. *como el agua salada_i, que_{REL} cuanto más el omne beve della_i, tanto más sed mete (Calila e Dina)*
[like salt water_i, which the more a man drinks of it_i, the more thirsty it makes him]
- b. *la estrella_i que_{REL} tú quisieres saber su_i lugar (Libros de astronomía)*
[the star whose place you want to know; lit. the star_i which you want to know its_i place]
(Examples from Galmés, 1955, 436)

- (14) a. Ar. *al-muqābalatu_i llatī ḥaḍarahā_i*
DEF+meeting REL attended+he+it
[the meeting_i which he attended (it_i)]
- b. Ar. *al-rajulu_i llaḍī ’af’ālu_i tasbiq*
DEF+man REL DEF+actions+his_i DEF+words+his_i
[the man_i whose actions precede his_i words]
(Examples from Badawi, Carter & Gully, 2004, 498)

Yet such constructions as (13) are far from uncommon in the spoken register of modern Spanish (15) (Brucart, 1999, 405–8); and are also attested in several other western European languages (16):

- (15) *yo es que no estoy plenamente convencida que a la persona_i que le_i sacan el corazón, al donante_i, no creo que esté muerta...*
 I it-is that NEG I-am fully convinced that INDOBJ-marker the person REL to-him/her take-3pl. the heart INDOBJ+the donor, NEG believe-1sg. that is-3sg. dead
 [I'm not convinced that the person whose heart they're removing, the donor, I don't think they're dead]
 (Example from Esgueva & Cantarero, 1981, 76)
- (16) Fr. *La gosse_i que je lui_i ai parlé chez toi hier, elle s'appelle comment?*
 [lit. The chick_i that I spoke to (her_i) yesterday at your place, what's her name?]
 It. *Questo incarico_i che non sapevo la novità che lo_i evrebbero affidato a te*
 [lit. This task_i which I did not know the news that they had entrusted it_i to you]
 Cat. *L'home a qui creus que li han donat un llibre és aquí*
 [lit. The man_i to whom you believe that they gave him_i a book is here]
 Rom. *Om_{ul} pe care l-am văzut*
 Man+DEF OBJ-MARKER REL him+I-have seen
 [The man whom I saw]
 (Examples from Smits, 1989, 56–7)

(In Romanian, resumptive clitics are part of the standard language in a large number of contexts; in Spanish and Catalan, they are preferred in informal language with relativized indirect objects; in French and Italian, resumptive clitic constructions are more unequivocally non-standard in any circumstances.)

It seems more realistic, therefore, to assume that such relative structures were already present in spoken Castilian and would have provided the translators of *Calila e Dina* and other Arabic texts with a suitable parallel for the Arabic relative construction. The provisional conclusion must be that these constructions are not borrowings as such; but amongst written registers of early Castilian, they appear to be typically associated with translations from Arabic, where they are the more noticeable because subsequent written registers exploited more extensively the relatives *cuyo* and *el qual*, which, like the Latin relative *qui*, indicated number, gender and case-function (the latter via combination with prepositions in the case of *el qual*); the subsequent purist castigation of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses was no doubt due to a preference for *cuyo* and *el qual* (and later *el que*) and their typological affinity with Latin in this respect.⁵

Latin

I now turn to the most significant source of possible syntactic borrowing into Spanish as an *Ausbau* language: Latin. The number of syntactic constructions attributable to the imitation of Latin is very high: a list put together on the basis of Blatt (1957) and Alvar and Mariner (1967) includes:

1. Complex syntax with a high incidence of subordination, particularly nested constructions: relative clauses involving the more 'exact' relatives *el cual* and *cuyo* (see above), the

‘transitional relative’ construction, the use of a participle for a relative construction and the use of ‘precise’ subordinating conjunctions.

2. *Cum inversum*.

3. Apposition.

4. Absolute constructions: with participles, sometimes introduced by a preposition.

5. Infinitive constructions: ‘accusative and infinitive’ with verbs of saying and thinking and, particularly in Spanish, the ‘nominative and infinitive’.

6. Word order, especially positioning of the verb at end of sentence and the infinitive before the main verb.

7. Positioning of a descriptive adjective (epithet) before noun.

8. Increased use of the gerund.

9. The passive: also the passive infinitive and the use of *de* as the agentive preposition.

10. Use of the subjunctive in causal clauses, when the opinion not the author’s, and as an optative form.

Not all these features survive equally in the modern language. The infinitive constructions and the placing of the verb in final position are relatively rare today, even in highly formal register. On the other hand, several features have become frequent in the formal written language (subordinating conjunctions, apposition, prenominal descriptive adjectives, the gerund and the subjunctive uses) and others are features of what might be described as culturally elevated prose (*cum inversum*, absolute constructions and the passive). The relatives *cuyo* and *el cual*, etc., especially the former, are infrequent in speech, although *el que*, etc., as noted above, has been developed as an ‘exact’ relative.⁶ Insofar as the formal written language is paralleled in cultured speech, there appears to have been a downward migration of some of the former features into some spoken registers.

Again, finding evidence of the early progress of such borrowings into the spoken language is not easy, since we have little documentation of this register. One interesting text in this regard, from fifteenth-century Spain, is Alfonso Martínez de Toledo’s *Arcipreste de Talavera o Corbacho*, which purports to contain a significant corpus of direct speech. I have looked at the first 10 books of the Second Part, a sample of some 14,000 words (for a more detailed study of this text, see Pountain, forthcoming). I divided the text into narrative and dialogue and examined the frequency of some of the ‘Latinated’ features. The statistics obtained clearly differentiate these registers. The narrative section contains 8,993 words and 375 sentences while the dialogue contains 4,984 words and 455 sentences, showing the expected difference in average sentence length. The dialogue is characterized by exclamations, questions, verbless sentences and use of first and second person forms, while the narrative contains mainly ‘full’ declarative sentences and third person forms (not exclusively, since the writer often addresses his readership in the second person). Figures for the various Latinated features identified are given in the following table:

	Narrative	Dialogue
No of words	8,993	4,984
No of sentences	375	455
Av. sentence length	29.98 words	10.95 words
'Latinate' features: no of sentences containing		
absolute constructions	10	1
gerund (excluding progressive constructions)	53	13
<i>ser</i> passive	32	16
prenominal descriptive adjective	12	3
marked word order (verb or auxiliary last)	14	2
'accusative and infinitive'	5	0
'nominative and infinitive'	9	0

Features of different registers in Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, *El Corbacho* (mid fifteenth century)

Even allowing for the difference in the number of words between the narrative and dialogue material (and in some ways the number of sentences is the more important statistic), it seems clear that the dialogue has a significantly lower incidence of these features. The infinitive constructions, a well-known feature of this text (see González Muela, 1954), are not attested at all in the dialogue. Verb-last or auxiliary-last word order is significantly more frequent in the narrative, as is the use of absolute constructions and prenominal descriptive adjectives. While use of the gerund in an adverbial clause function is attested in the dialogue, it similarly is substantially more frequent in the narrative. For the *ser*-passive, which does at first sight seem to be more comparable, these raw statistics need some nuancing, since I have counted among the *ser* passives all instances where the past participle is not obviously being used adjectivally. If we restrict our count to true dynamic passives, we find a sharper contrast between the two registers, since there are 26 instances in the narrative as against five in the dialogue.⁷ Moreover, in the dialogue, some of these dynamic passives are used to form a contrast with the corresponding active, a context which might be expected particularly to encourage use of the passive, even in spoken register, e.g., *¡Quién me la furtó, furtada sea su vida!* [May the one who stole it from me have his life stolen!]

The two registers are therefore reasonably clearly differentiated with respect to such Latinate features, even though the methodology used here, based on a rather uncritical assumption that the narrative and spoken sections of the *Corbacho* will each be homogeneous with regard to register, is relatively crude. More detailed analysis might reveal that further subcategorizing of register was possible: differences between male and female speech, for example, or between true narrative (storytelling) and commentary (moral observations). We also need to bear in mind that the dialogue, though it purports to be spontaneous speech, is a planned and conventionalized representation of speech by Martínez de Toledo into which some migration of 'cultured' features had taken place; conversely, the Archpriest was probably taking care to use —indeed, overuse— stereotypical features of the spoken language. But the general conclusion seems clear: that Latinate borrowings are predominantly a feature of written register at this time. We might add that the range of Latinate features evidenced in Martínez de Toledo's prose is inferior to that of the fifteenth-century Latin

poets Juan de Mena and the Marqués de Santillana (see Lida de Malkiel, 1950), from which we might conclude once again that the nature and degree of borrowing is a function of different written registers. It appears that the more distant the literary register is from speech, the more borrowing can be exploited and the autochthonous structure of the spoken language distorted; while the nearer the literary register is to speech, the more readily can downward migration take place.

Conclusion

What I hope to have shown in this paper is that in an *Ausbau* language it is naïve to talk simply about borrowing ‘into the language’ and that syntactic borrowing is a function of register in the sense that syntactic calques and transfers take place initially in well-defined circumscribed areas of a language. The scenarios which I have distinguished are (a) interference which leads to transfer in the case of bilingual speakers operating outside the ambit of *Ausbau* control, (b) interference in the language of cultured bilinguals which in an *Ausbau* language tends to be puristically prevented from further migration and (c) the possibility of syntactic borrowing into cultured written register for what we might call *Ausbau* purposes. This last scenario is the one which provides the best chance of a feature being adopted more widely, through downward migration into the cultured spoken language.

Notes

1. Cano Aguilar (2001:133–51) shows that the syntax of the *Libro de Alexandre* and Berceo, whilst not especially complex, does not display features normally associated with spoken language and so cannot be neatly situated on a continuum of development from ‘primitive’ to ‘elaborated’; it nevertheless represents the development of a textual tradition the antecedents of which are not clear.
2. Kabatek (2001) traces the apparent evolution of written Castilian through three kinds of text which show increasing exploitation of subordinating syntax: the *Fazañas de Palenzuela* (late twelfth century), the *Fuero de Madrid* (late twelfth century with thirteenth-century additions) and the *Siete Partidas* (late thirteenth century). He argues that each text belongs to a different discourse tradition: the *Fazañas* are the simple recording of legal precedents with only incidental mention of juridical institutions, the *Fuero* reflects the legal system of the time, and the *Siete Partidas* themselves create and define a new legal system; it is for this reason that they differ in lexical and syntactic sophistication. Kabatek maintains that the subordinating technique observable in the *Fuero* and the *Siete Partidas* already existed at the time of the *Fazañas*, though they were only realized in Latin, the traditional written language: what changes is not the system, but the norm.
3. This is, as Blas Arroyo makes clear, a case of convergence rather than borrowing, since the phenomenon is far from unknown in monolingual Castilian areas; however, it is thought of as ‘sumamente característico del catalán’.
4. Nieves de Paula Pombar (1981:81): Nieves in the end retreats to the position that the use or non-use of a determiner in appositional phrases is ‘stylistic’.

5. *Cuyo* is not attested at all in a number of early texts, including the *Cantar de mio Cid* and the *Santa María Egipcíaca*. *El qual* as a relative first achieves significant frequency in the *Fueros de Aragón* (data taken from ADMYTE 0 (Madrid: Micronet SA, 1992).

6. In the corpus of cultured Madrid speech (Esgueva and Canturero, *El habla*), a corpus of some 134,000 words, *cuyo*, etc., appears just twice, and one of these instances is an intertextual reference to the opening sentence of *Don Quijote* ('de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme' [the name of which I do not wish to remember]). There are 24 instances of *el cual*, etc.

7. The common formulaic exclamation *¡maldito/a sea!* and similar expressions account for five examples in the dialogue. A number of examples, one in the dialogue and two in the narrative, are the stative passives of a lexically dynamic stem (*perdido so* = MSp. *estoy perdido* [I'm done for]) which would today be rendered by *estar* + past participle, a construction which is not uncommon in spoken register. Four others in the dialogue and four others in the narrative are the passives of stative verbs for which combination with *estar* is still precluded in modern Spanish, e.g., *fuera más honrada y en mayor estima tenida* [I would be more honoured and held in greater esteem].

References

- ADMYTE, 1992. (Madrid: Micronet SA).
- Alvar, Manuel & Sebastián Moliner, 1967. 'Latinismos', in M. Alvar, A. Badía, R. de Balvín & F. Lindley Cintra (eds), *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica*, II, pp.3–49.
- Álvarez Martínez, María Ángeles, 1986. *El artículo como entidad funcional en el español de hoy* (Madrid: Gredos).
- Badawi, Elsaid, M. G. Carter & Adrian Gully, 2004. *Modern Written Arabic. A Comprehensive Grammar*. (London: Routledge)
- Blas Arroyo, José Luis, 1999. *Lenguas en contacto* (Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert).
- Blatt, Franz, 1957. 'Latin influence on European syntax', *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*, 11, 33-69.
- Brucart, José María, 1999. 'La estructura del sintagma nominal: las oraciones de relativo', in Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I, pp.395-522.
- Cano Aguilar, Rafael, 2001. 'La construcción del discurso en el siglo XIII: diálogo y narración en Berceo y el Alexandre', in Jacob & Kabatek (eds), pp.133-51.
- Esgueva, M. & M. Cantarero, 1981. *El habla de la ciudad de Madrid* (Madrid: CSIC)
- Estrany, Manuel, 1970. 'Calcos sintácticos del inglés', *Filología Moderna*, Madrid, 38, 199-203.
- Galmés de Fuentes, A., 1955-56. 'Influencias sintácticas y estilísticas del árabe en la prosa medieval castellana', *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 35, 213-75, 415-51; 36, 65-131, 255-307.
- Gómez Torrego, L., 1991. 'La lengua española hoy' in Antonio Ramos Gascón (ed), *España hoy: Cultura*, (Madrid: Cátedra), pp.9-37.
- González Muela, Joaquín, 1954. *El infinitivo en 'El Corbacho' del Arcipreste de Talavera* (Granada: Universidad de Granada).
- Green, John N., 1975. 'On the Frequency of Passive Constructions in Modern Spanish', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 52, 345-62.

- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell, 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Jacob, Daniel & Johannes Kabatek (eds), 2001. *Lengua medieval y tradiciones discursivas en la Península Ibérica. Descripción gramatical-pragmática histórica-metodología*. (Madrid: Iberoamericana).
- Kabatek, Johannes, 2001. '¿Cómo investigar las tradiciones discursivas medievales? El ejemplo de los textos jurídicos castellanos', in Jacob & Kabatek (eds.), pp.95–132.
- Kloss, Heinz, 1967. 'Abstand-Languages and Ausbau-Languages', *Anthropological Linguistics*, 9.7, 29–41.
- Lapesa, Rafael, 1963. 'La lengua desde hace 40 años', *Revista de Occidente*, Madrid, 3, 193–208.
- Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa, 1950. *Juan de Mena, poeta del prerrenacimiento español* (México: Colegio de México).
- Lipski, John M., 1994. *Latin American Spanish* (London: Longman).
- Lorenzo, Emilio, 1996. *Anglicismos hispánicos* (Madrid: Gredos).
- Nieves de Paula Pombar, María, 1981. *Contribución al estudio de la aposición en español actual. Verba, Anexo 20*. (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela).
- Niño Murcia, Mercedes, 1995. 'The Gerund in the Spanish of the North Andean Region', in Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), pp.83–100.
- Pountain, Christopher J., 1994. 'Syntactic anglicisms in Spanish: innovation or exploitation?', in M.M. Parry, W.V. Davies & R.A.M. Davies (eds), *The Changing Voices of Europe* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press/MHRA), pp.109–24.
- Pountain, Christopher J., 1998 'Gramática mítica del gerundio castellano', in Aengus M. Ward (ed), *Actas del XII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas, Birmingham 1995. I. Medieval y Lingüística* (Birmingham: University Press), pp.284–92.
- Pountain, Christopher J., 1999 'Spanish and English in the 21st Century', *Donaire*, 12, 33–42.
- Pountain, Christopher J., 2001. *A History of the Spanish Language through Texts* (London: Routledge).
- Pountain, Christopher J., forthcoming. 'Towards a history of register in Spanish', to appear in *Spanish in Context*.
- Pratt, Chris, 1980. *El anglicismo en el español peninsular contemporáneo* (Madrid: Gredos).
- Sala, Marius, 1998. *Lenguas en contacto*, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Gredos).
- Seco, Manuel, 1989. *Diccionario de dudas*, 9th ed. (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe).
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen (ed.), 1995. *Spanish In Four Continents. Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press).
- Smits, R. J. C., 1989. *Eurogrammar. The Relative and Cleft Constructions of the Germanic and Romance Languages*. (Dordrecht/Providence RI: Foris).
- Urrutia Cárdenas, Hernán, 1995. 'Morphosyntactic features in the Spanish of the Basque Country', in Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed), pp.243–59.
- Weinreich, Uriel, 1953. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. (New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York).