3. Spanish infinitives borrowed into Zapotec light verb constructions[1]

Rosemary G. Beam de Azcona

Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia

Abstract

Spanish infinitives are commonly borrowed into Zapotec languages. The borrowed infinitive construction is here analyzed as a special type of light verb construction. In Southern Zapotec languages the construction occurs in a transitive version using 'do' and an intransitive version using 'become'. This chapter analyzes the syntax of these constructions in Southern Zapotec, including the lexical status of the borrowed infinitives and the argument structure of the different forms of the construction.

1. Introduction

Zapotec languages are left-headed and head-marking Otomanguean languages. They are commonly divided into 5 (Smith Stark 2007 with a modification suggested by Sicoli 2015) regional groupings that in some cases correspond to genetic divisions but in other cases may turn out to be diffusion zones. This paper will make some references to Zapotec at large but will mostly focus on the Southern group, with data from three languages (Coatec, Miahuatec, and Cisyautepecan) which represent the three genetic subgroups present in the Southern Zapotec area (Beam de Azcona 2014b and in preparation).

Zapotec languages have been in contact with Spanish for roughly 500 years. During this time native Spanish speakers have politically and economically dominated Zapotec speakers in their own homeland. Although some native Spanish speakers have learned Zapotec (Fray Juan de Córdova 1578 is a famous example), Zapotec-Spanish bilingualism is prevalent among native Zapotec speakers and rare among native Spanish speakers. Many originally Zapotec-speaking communities shifted entirely to Spanish during the twentieth century. No originally Spanish-speaking communities are known to have shifted to Zapotec. The linguistic repercussions of this situation follow predictable patterns (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37-45). Zapotec regional varieties of Spanish show substrate influences which alter Spanish phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics to conform to Zapotec patterns. In turn, Zapotec languages have undertaken numerous lexical borrowings from Spanish, and Zapotec speakers frequently code-switch with Spanish as an embedding language. In many Zapotec communities young

people have both languages as essential parts of their linguistic identities, and the rich and complex patterns that result from language contact are a testament to who these people are, what they and their ancestors have endured, and who they have become today.

The mixed cultural environment in which Zapotec speakers live is reflected linguistically through a parallel and symbolic mixture of native and borrowed vocabulary. Where verbs are concerned, there is a tendency to use borrowed infinitives to refer to activities associated with Hispanic culture or introduced through it. For example, in (1) and (2) from the Cisyautepecan variety of San Pedro Mixtepec, a native verb for 'select' is used to refer to the process of selecting grains of corn based on their color, but the Spanish verb *seleccionar* 'select' is borrowed to refer to the process of selecting text on a computer.

Cisyautepecan[2]

(1) **R-bé**   mé   x̌ǒb   nkíts   lo   xob   ngièts.
     HAB[3]-**select**   3LEJ   corn   white   face   corn   yellow
     'The white corn is separated out from the yellow corn.'

(2) R-ùn   mé   **sèlèksiònár** létr   nè   k-ié   ló   kòmpùtàdór
     HAB-do   3LEJ   **select**   letter REL   STAT-be face   computer
     'They **select** the text that's on the computer screen.'

This paper looks specifically at how Spanish infinitives are borrowed and used in Zapotec syntactic constructions, like that in (2), where *sèlèksiònár* occurs as a complement of the Zapotec verb 'to do'. An examination of (2) prompts questions about what lexical class *sèlèksiònár* might belong to as well as about the syntactic and semantic structure of the whole construction. In this paper I will argue that borrowed Spanish infinitives function as nouns in a special type of Light Verb Construction (LVC). In order to justify this analysis, I describe the most common patterns of argument order in §1.1 and identify wholly native LVC's in §1.2. A preliminary analysis of constructions like that in (2) as a type of LVC is presented in §1.3 before going into a more detailed analysis of the construction in §2. §3 considers some of the typological literature and proposes that while some speakers may view these borrowed infinitives as a contamination of their language, in fact the way that Spanish infinitives are employed in Zapotec syntax shows a great deal of adaptation to Zapotec grammatical patterns. Issues for future research are identified in §4 before concluding in §5.

1.1 Argument order

---

[2] Data appearing without a citation come from Pafnuncio Antonio Ramos for Cisyautepecan, Emiliano Cruz Santiago for Miahuatec, and from the author's fieldnotes on Coatec.

[3] Abbreviations: 1INCL = 1st person inclusive pronoun, 1S = 1st person singular pronoun, 2R = 2nd person respectful pronoun, 3H = 3rd person human pronoun, 3HD = 3rd person unknown human pronoun, 3HF = 3rd person human familiar pronoun, 3HL = 3rd person human distal pronoun, 3HR = 3rd person respected human pronoun, 3INAN = 3rd person inanimate pronoun, 3LEJ = 3rd person distant human pronoun, A = animal, AUX = auxiliary verb, BIC = Borrowed Infinitive Construction, CC = copula complement, CLF = classifier, CPL = completive aspect, DEM = demonstrative, DIST = distal, FAM = familiar, FOC = focus marker, FUT = certain future modal tense, HAB = habitual, INF = infinitive, INTE = interrogative, LVC = light verb construction, n/d = no date, NEG = negation, NMLZ = nominalizer, OBJ = object, p.c. = personal communication, POSS = possessive, POT = potential mood, PRED = predicate, REL = relative marker, SBJ = subject, STAT = stative, TAM = tense aspect mood, V = verb, VSO = verb subject object.

Zapotec languages typically display VSO order in transitive sentences, as in (3).

(3) Coatec Zapotec: The Tale of the Deer Hunter, line 4 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

Na[4]   [nduth=ká]V   [ár]SBJ   [má]O.
and   HAB:kill=always   3HF   3A
'And he always killed them.'

However, arguments can be fronted with respect to the verb in order to indicate that they are focused or topicalized, as the subject in (4).

(4) Coatec Zapotec: The Tale of the Deer Hunter, lines 256-257 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

[Leh'-m´]SUBJ   [níi=lá]V   [xta'   náa   gaák]O.
FOC=3HR   HAB:know=already what   REL   POT:become
'He already knew what would happen.'

Intransitive clauses, like transitive clauses, usually have the subject in post-verbal position unless focused or topicalized.

(5) Miahuatec Zapotec: The Tale of the Fisherman, line 16 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

Naza   dya-n   tzá   [ndeh]V   [thí   mbéhn]SBJ.
then   that.place   right.away STAT:come   one   cayman
'Then suddenly a cayman appeared there.'

Copula clauses typically occur with the subject following the copula, as in (6) and (7), though it can be fronted to mark focus or topic, as in (8). If there is a complement it usually occurs following the non-focused subject, as in (7), the same position as for objects of transitive verbs.

(6) Miahuatec Zapotec: The Tale of the Fisherman, line 199 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

Pero   mazií [gak]COP   [thíb ga'y   lí'n]SUBJ   zeh-ra'…
but   when   POT:become   one five   year   until.then
'But when some five years have gone by…'

(7) Coatec Zapotec: The Tale of the Deer Hunter, line 274 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

Na paá   [téyak]COP   [tá   wée]SUBJ   [xi]CC…
and where POT:AUX:INF:become   3INAN that   water-pourer
'And as if that thing is going to be a water-pourer…'

---

[4] The orthography here used to represent Coatec and Miahuatec includes a convention for indicating tonal contrasts such that high tone is spelled with an accented vowel <á>, low tone with an unmarked vowel <a>, falling tone with a sequence of marked and unmarked vowels <áa>, and rising tone with the reverse <aá>. In order to adapt to this useful convention Coatec examples have been altered from the way they appeared in publications cited. In Coatec glottalized syllables do not contrast pitch patterns, whereas in Miahuatec glottalized syllables can be either high or low. In both languages <eh> represents a lower mid front vowel that varies between [ɛ] and [æ]. Cisyautepecan examples are cited using the orthography used by Pafnuncio Antonio Ramos. Other languages are cited orthographically as in the sources.

(8) Miahuatec: Legend of the Swimming Hole, line 118 (Cruz Santiago, forthcoming)
Naza [jwá'n   ña]SBJ   [ngóok]COP [thí   yalké]CC   loó   xa'.
then thing   DEM.DIST CPL:be   one   fault   face   3H
'Then for him that represented a great fault.'

Zapotec languages display a great deal of noun incorporation. Would-be copula complements can be incorporated to form stative verbs, as in (9). A would-be complement that occurs in between the copular verb and its subject can be assumed to be incorporated.

(9) Miahuatec
Mazií nlyá   guí   bweén [ndxáakyop]V   [neéd   le'n   guéz]SBJ.
when HAB:fall rain well   HAB:become:mud road   belly   town
'When it rains the roads inside the town become muddy.'

NP's can also predicate without a copula, as in (10). In this case an NP in initial position will be the predicate and the subject will follow it.

(10) Miahuatec: The Tale of the Deer Hunter, line 28 (Beam de Azcona 2013)
…pero   [thí   líiz   mén]PRED-[a] SBJ.
but   one   home   human=3INAN
'…but it was someone's home.'

The different possible positions of arguments within a clause as shown in this section will be important in considering the syntactic status of borrowed Spanish infinitives in Zapotec languages.

1.2 Zapotec languages have light verb constructions

Zapotec languages often use a semantically light verb meaning 'do' or 'make' with an object that defines the activity. These are light verb constructions (LVC's). Examples are provided from Central Valley Zapotec in (11-12) and Southern Zapotec in (13-15). 'Punishment' in (12) is a loan noun from Spanish. 'Work' in (13) is a native noun with no known relationship to any verb. (14) and (15) both have objects with the nominalizer *yéhl*. In (14) *yéhl* is added to a word that on its own is already a noun, 'possum', but by adding *yéhl* a new (almost slang) noun associated with the possum's behavior is derived. In (15) *wa'n* is a word meaning 'thief'. It has been derived from a verb 'to steal', which still exists in other languages but has been lost from the Coatec Zapotec language cited. With the addition of *yéhl* the combined form can mean 'thief' or 'thievery'.

(11) Mitla Zapotec: The Rabbit and the Coyote, line 3 (Stubblefield & Stubblefield 1994:62)
sas   **behN**tini   **šigab**…
and   **made**-just-he **thought**
'Well then he **thought** to himself…'

(12) Mitla Zapotec: First Man, Woman, and Children, line 89 (Stubblefield & Stubblefield 1994: 21)

n̠ah	**jyen**nu	**kastiigw**	rebuužre
now	will-**do**-we	**punishment**	children-this

'Now we will **punish** these children.'

(13) Coatec

Guún	nhó	**ti'n**	a las nueve.
POT:do	1INCL	**work**	at 9

'We're going to **work** at 9.'

(14) Coatec

Ndun	meé	**yéhlndeéz**.
HAB:do	3HR	**NMLZ:CLF:possum**[5]

'She **lies**.'

(15) Coatec

Mbiíth	náa	xa'	byíi	kénáa	leh'-x	ndée**yun**	**yéhlwa'n.**
CPL:kill.1s	1s	3HD	male	because	FOC=3HD	**HAB:AUX:INF:do**	**NMLZ:thief**

'I killed the men because they were **stealing** (lit. 'they were doing thievery').'

In Southern Zapotec languages and perhaps elsewhere these LVC's have intransitive versions using the copula 'become'. Compare (16a-b). The object of (16a) is the subject of (16b).

(16) Cisyautepecan

a.

Bè'n	mé	lní
CPL-do	3HL	party

'They had a party.'

b.

Gòk	lní
CPL-become	party

'There was a party.'

'Become' is a copula (Dixon 2002). In Coatec *gàk* 'become' and *găk* 'be' form a derivationally related pair that only differ tonally while in Miahuatec both semantic instantiations are accomplished with the same verb form. This/these verbs in some languages (including Spanish) are related to 'do' (cf. Spanish *hacer* 'do' vs. *hacerse* 'become'). The form of the verb 'do' in examples (18), (20), and (22) from three different languages in the next section is cognate to Southern Zapotec 'become', *-ak*. Thus, the existence of intransitive LVC's using 'become' as a counterpart to transitive LVC's using 'do' should not be entirely surprising.

1.3 Spanish infinitives appear to be borrowed into these LVC's

Borrowed Spanish infinitives are in use in every regional grouping of Zapotec: Central (17-19), Papabuco (20), Western[6] (21), Northern (22), and Southern (2).

---

[5] This informal term for a 'lie' is based on the possum's behavior of pretending to be dead. A synonym is *yéhlkwi'n*, derived from the verb 'to lie'. In both cases the word is clearly a noun because of the presence of the nominalizer *yéhl*.

(17) Chichicapan Zapotec (Benton n/d)

gu-dahbii　　　　　tuhbi bween　na'h.　B-**wi'hnn**-a'hn　　　**agwantahr**
CPL-swallow　　　　one　cayman　1S　　CPL-**do**=1S　　　　　**put.up.with**
'...a cayman swallowed me. I withstood it.'

(18) San Dionicio Ocotepec Zapotec (Aaron Broadwell, p.c.)

máásrù　　guéèn íítyrúzá　　　　gá'nbà　　　　yé'nní té　**gáác**ní　　　**reforestar**
more=more good　NEG=more=also POT:plough=3R　stay　　so.that POT:**do**=3INAN　**reforest**
'It's better to not plough again. Let it stay so that the forest can grow again.'

(19) Mitla Zapotec: The Lion meets a man, line 16 (Stubblefield & Stubblefield 1994: 106)

per nani laa　　nigii kosroru　　　**ruhN**ni　**dominaar** kwantimaaz　　　　luh
but that　name.is　man　thing-big-more　**doing**-he　**dominate** how.much-just-more　you
'…but the one called man is very great to dominate, much more than you.'

(20) Texmelucan Zapotec (Speck 1998: 71)

Ru　**bicy**　　　　　ru　**mandaar** loñ　　nu　gyed　　　ñi.
2　**CPL-do**　　　　2　**send**　　face?　3?　POT-come　DEM?
'You sent for him/her to come.'

(21) Lachixío Zapotec (Mark Sicoli, p. c.)

o-**ri7i-ih**　　　　**takár**　　　lo　　balón
CPL-**do**=3M　　　　**attack**　　face　ball
'He attacked the ball.'

(22) Choapan Zapotec (Erin Donnelley, p. c.)

r**aka**-bi7　　　　**pensar**
HAB-**do**=3　　　　**think**
'S/he thinks.'

The verb 'do' seen in non-Southern languages in (17-22) is the prototypical verb used in LVC's worldwide. All the examples of borrowed infinitives found thus far in Zapotec but outside of the Southern Zapotec region occur with 'do'. Note the similarity in the order of constituents between (17-22) and the LVC's in (11-16) in the previous section. In each case there is the verb 'do' followed by its subject (unless the subject has been fronted, as in 15, where it occurs with the focus/topic marker) and then either a noun that denotes an event or action (11-16) or a borrowed infinitive (17-22).

It seems likely that Spanish infinitives were borrowed into an existing Zapotec structure. In (23) a borrowed infinitive 'to think' occurs following the subject as complement to the verb 'do'. In (24) in a different Zapotec language we find another expression meaning 'to think' in which a morpheme which is probably nominal has been incorporated into the verb 'to do' to form a new verb 'do-thought'. This example of object incorporation suggests the previous existence of a

---

[6] Sicoli (2015) has been able to conflate Smith Stark's (2007) Soltec and Western Zapotec into a single grouping.

LVC in which 'thought' served as object to 'do'. Such a structure would be strikingly similar to that of the borrowed infinitive construction in (23) and it is easy to imagine speakers borrowing infinitives and placing them into the previously existing structure of the LVC.

(23) Cisyautepecan:

Bè'n	x̱á	**pènsár**
CPL-**do**	3HR	**think**

'He thought.'

(24) Coatec: Difuntos, line 73

Zi'lta'	nd**unbe'y**	xa'…
early	HAB:**do:thought**	3HD

'Early in the morning they were thinking…'

Both 'do' and 'become' appear to be typologically common in light verb constructions (cf. Japanese *suru* 'do' and *naru* 'become', Sakai et al. 2004). In the three Southern Zapotec languages surveyed in this paper, both 'do' and 'become' occur with borrowed infinitives to form transitive and intransitive constructions respectively. This mirrors transitive and intransitive versions of the LVC in Southern Zapotec as seen above in (16). The meaning of the (main) verb is more important than the form, as Coatec and Cisyautepecan indicate the notion of 'do' with cognate verbs *guún* while Miahuatec instead uses the non-cognate verb *lií,* also meaning 'do'.

Although it is easy to demonstrate that Zapotec languages have light verb constructions and that borrowed infinitives fit neatly into the NP object slot in those constructions, it is also the case that these LVC's with borrowed infinitives correspond to the overwhelmingly most common pattern of verb borrowing in the typology of language contact. The Zapotec strategy conforms to the global strategy on three fronts: the use of an LVC, the selection of 'do' as the main verb, and the borrowing of a non-finite form rather than an inflected one. Regarding the use of a LVC with 'do', Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008) observe:

> Cross-linguistically, a common form of light verb is 'to do', and it has been observed that one of the major functions of 'do'-periphrasis cross-linguistically is precisely to integrate loan verbs (Jäger 2004; cf. also Van der Auwera 1999).

Myers-Scotton & Jake (2013) examine bilingual clauses in a code-switching context and note the overwhelming use of the infinitive as *the* form to use from an embedded language, whether inserting it into a LVC with 'do' or whether adding derivational and inflectional morphology from the matrix language directly to it. They offer a psycholinguistic argument that speakers are able to code-switch effortlessly by following a division of labor in which the matrix language is used for all the grammatical operations and the embedded language simply supplies semantic content:

> The basic claim is that the limited structural role and the nonfinite nature of EL [embedded language] verbs that appear in bilingual clauses prevent costly competition with the ML [matrix language] in these clauses. Not just EL nouns, but also nonfinite verbs, carry desired meanings without impinging on the ML's grammatical procedures. That is, nonfinite verbs differ from finite verbs, whose

levels of predicate-argument structure and morphological realization patterns are always available to participate in the grammatical frame. Those levels are not salient in nonfinite verbs…That is, EL finite verbs do not occur, and the role of indicating dependency relations is reserved for the ML. (Myers-Scotton & Jake 2013: 12)

Of the construction with 'do' specifically they say:

It is found in many data sets across typologically diverse languages… This construction consists of an ML verb form that encodes the meaning 'do', but is largely bleached of any meaning; the critical meaning in the clause comes from a nonfinite verb, often the infinitive, in the predicate called by the 'do' verb. (Myers-Scotton & Jake 2013: 11)

To illustrate this construction type, Myers-Scotton and Jake offer the following Turkish-Dutch example, among others. Note the similarity to the Zapotec construction under investigation here. All inflectional marking is found on the native 'do' verb in the matrix language while the verb supplying the semantic content is in the infinitive form from the embedded language. I have placed the Dutch words in italics. In this case Turkish is the matrix language of the larger context and Dutch is embedded.

(25) Turkish-Dutch (Backus, 1996: 238, cited by Myers-Scotton & Jake 2013: 12)
Ja   maar   toch, millet *kijken*   yapiyor
yeah   but   still people *watch*-INF   do-PROG-3S
'Yeah, but still, everybody is watching you.'

The Zapotec phenomenon being investigated is an example of borrowing rather than code-switching because the infinitives are adapted to Zapotec phonology and, while they may occur together with code-switching, these constructions with borrowed Spanish infinitives can occur in otherwise all-Zapotec utterances. In any case, one can recognize that the two phenomena are related. If typologically LVC's are a common strategy for inserting foreign vocabulary, this convention might be followed in both code-switching and borrowing contexts.

Having introduced the general notion that Spanish infinitives borrowed into Zapotec are placed into the basic structure of native LVC's, we can now examine these structures in more detail in the following section.

2. Syntactic analysis of borrowed infinitive constructions

As can be seen in the examples already shown, 'do' and 'become' are semantically light and carry out grammatical functions. Specifically, the light verb serves to bear TAM marking, and the choice between these two verbs indicates differences in argument structure (a subject to be further explored in §2.2). For example in (16a-b) the object of the transitive LVC is the subject of the intransitive LVC. According to Romero Méndez (2005: 20), "LVCs are different from auxiliary verbs mainly because LVCs take NPs as arguments". 'Do' and 'become' could be

considered either auxiliary verbs or light verbs depending on the status of the borrowed infinitives. If borrowed infinitives function as verbs in Zapotec, 'do' and 'become' are auxiliary verbs, but if they function as nouns then 'do' and 'become' are properly considered "light verbs". Part of the evidence for analyzing borrowed infinitives as nouns is the similar constituent order seen in the previous section, with borrowed infinitives occurring in object position, but the argument will be further bolstered in §2.1.

2.1 Syntactic status of borrowed infinitives

Infinitives tend to exist on a continuum between nouns and verbs. In both English and Spanish infinitives can take objects, like verbs (although it is not unknown for nouns to also have complements). Other verbal properties, such as inflection, are lacking on infinitives in Spanish and English. Both English and Spanish infinitives can serve as subjects of copula clauses, e.g. *to err is human.* Spanish infinitives have more nominal properties than English ones, however, since Spanish infinitives can be modified by determiners and adjectives, e.g. *un ser humano* ('a human being', literally 'a human to-be'). The fact that Spanish infinitives are further along the continuum towards nouns in the lending language could be a factor in their being treated as nouns in the recipient language, but the only evidence that is truly relevant is evidence from the recipient language(s) showing how the borrowed words function in that language's own syntax.

Borrowed Spanish infinitives in Zapotec do not take Zapotec inflectional markers. This might be one (morphological) argument in favor of their status as nouns rather than verbs, but it is not the kind of proof we need, since loanwords could be treated differently, and even native verbs have non-finite forms which are (relatively) unmarked. The main evidence for their status as nouns is syntactic. In §2.1.1 we can look in more detail at how borrowed infinitives occur in the same position within the clause as nominal complements, and in §2.1.2 I show that borrowed infinitives do not occur in the same syntactic position as native verbal complements. In effect, borrowed infinitives behave like (deverbal) nouns and unlike native verbs. The implication is that if they are nouns, then 'do' and 'become', when in combination with borrowed infinitives, are in fact light verbs.

2.1.1 Borrowed infinitives occur in the same position as nominal complements
Borrowed infinitives occur post-subject, in the same position as direct objects and copula complements. For comparison, consider the position of the object in the transitive sentence in (26) and compare it to the position of the borrowed infinitive in (27).

(26) Cisyautepecan: Antonio Ramos (2008)
    [Gǒn]_V   [jèʔ]_{SUBJ}   [nàʔ]_O
    CPL-see   3HF   1S
    'S/he saw me.'

(27) Coatec: Difuntos, line 47
    Teh'l   wê   [ndéeyun]_V   [xa']_{SUBJ}   **bélár**   gaán.
    night   DEM.DIST   HAB:AUX:INF:do   3HD   **keep.vigil.over**   deceased
    'That night they were staying up to watch over the deceased.'

56

Since the verb 'become' is a type of copula and not a transitive verb, the intransitive LVC with become should be compared to other copula clauses. In (28) a relativized noun phrase occurs as the copula complement. It follows the subject, which in turn follows the copula. The order thus mirrors the order of VSO in a transitive clause. In (29) there are actually two copula clauses, but the one that interests us is the second one, in which a borrowed infinitive serves as complement, following the subject, in the same position as the NP which serves as copula complement in (28).

(28) Coatec: The Tale of the Deer Hunter, line 83 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

Pér ná [nǎk]COP [nâ]SBJ [mě nâ nza' beh'l]CC
but NEG STAT:COP 1S 3HR REL HAB:give meat
'But I am not the one who gives away the meat.'

(29) Coatec:

Nàt ndàk-é dûb tidâ li'n [ngòk]COP-[é]SUBJ **suceder**.
now HAB:become=3INAN one fourteen year CPL:become=3INAN **happen**
'It's been 14 years now since it happened.'

Phrases headed by borrowed infinitives thus appear in the same syntactic position as native noun phrases. This can in turn be compared to the syntactic position of native verbs used as complements.

2.1.2 Borrowed infinitives do not occur in the same position as native verbal complements
In Spanish, a common strategy for using a verb as a complement of another verb is to use an infinitive, e.g. *quiero bailar* 'I want to dance', i.e. a form of the verb with nominal properties. In Southern Zapotec languages there are multiple strategies, still under investigation. In (30-32) I show three strategies from Coatec, all taken from "The Tale of the Deer Hunter" (Beam de Azcona 2013).

In (30) the deverbal noun *go'z* 'hunt', is related to the verb *-a'z* 'pierce'. In this case the deverbal noun maintains its own complement the same as if it were a verb. The agent of the action described by the deverbal noun is understood as the same person as the subject of the main verb 'go'.

(30) Line 80

"**Ndǎ-**ká nâ **go'z** mbzhîn", ndàb ár.
HAB:go\1S=always 1S **hunt** deer CPL:say 3HF
'"I always go to hunt deer," he said.'

(31) is an example of a strategy in which an inflected verb, usually in the potential mood, immediately follows the first/main verb and shares a subject with it. The subject occurs only once, following the second verb. In (31) it is apparent that the second verb semantically completes the notion of the first verb. It is a semantic complement, yet morphologically it is inflected the same as a main verb would be. The fact that the two verbs are not compounded is clear in (31) from the fact that the adverbial clitic *ta'* attaches outside the first verb and not the second.

(31) Line 176

Nà ná-**gǎk**-ta'   **lyâ**   ár ndô beh' zhówê.
and NEG=**POT:be.able**=still **POT:get.down**3HF face sky   then
'Now he wouldn't be able to get down from the sky.'

However, in most cases when one verb serves as complement to another verb, at least in Coatec and Miahuatec, it appears in a non-finite form and is incorporated into the verbal complex. For example, in (32) the infinitive, which is basically an unmarked form, of the verb 'walk' is added directly to the main verb 'go away'. That this is a type of compounding is indicated by the placement of the adverbial clitic 'already', a second position clitic. That it is added following 'walk' indicates that 'walk' is part of the same word as 'go away'.

(32) Line 213
   Nzhâzèh-la'   wìzh   mbi'n   fált   lô.
   HAB:go.away:INF:walk=already   sun   CPL:do   lack   2FAM
   'Days have passed since you've been gone.'

Looking at these three strategies here exemplified in Coatec, the position of borrowed infinitives seen throughout this paper, for example in (27), is closest to the position of the deverbal noun in (30), which follows the subject. Compare the borrowed infinitive in (27) and the deverbal noun in (30), to the verbal complements in (31-32) which precede the subject. This difference in order suggests that borrowed infinitives do not act analogously to native verbs but rather to native nouns. Nevertheless, this generalization may not hold for all varieties of Southern Zapotec languages. Quiegolani (Black 1994), which is another variety of Cisyautepecan, can have unmarked verbs, similar to the Coatec "infinitive" form in (32), occurring following the subject, as in (33).

(33) Quiegolani variety of Cisyautepecan Zapotec (Black 1994:271)
Ts-a   noo   **wii** gyoow   roo.
POT-go   1EXCL[7]**see**   river   big
'I'll go see the big river.'

Perhaps because of this Black (1994) analyzes borrowed infinitives as verbs. In Quiegolani, where they also occur with the cognate verb 'do' -*un*, Black goes so far as to gloss this form not as the verb 'do' but simply as a "loan marker" because it always occurs with borrowed verbs. Without undertaking a fuller study of Cisayautepecan morphosyntax it is hard to know whether forms like *wii* in (33) are really most akin to Coatec infinitives as in (32) because of their apparent morphological dearth, or whether they are actually more like deverbal nouns, as in (30). Deverbal nouns would also lack TAM-marking inflection, and the position of *wii* in (33) corresponds to the position of deverbal noun *go'z* in (30). While I suspect that the Quiegolani data could be reanalyzed, for the time being it is reasonable to assume that the analytic proposals put forth here apply to the varieties being looked at most closely but not necessarily every variety of these and other Southern Zapotec languages.

2.2 Argument structure of Borrowed Infinitive Constructions

---

[7] In at least some other Southern Zapotec languages like Coatec and probably Coatecas Altas, the first person exclusive can be used with either singular or plural reference, as seems to be the case here in Quiegolani also.

The Borrowed Infinitive Construction (BIC) occurs in transitive (headed by 'do') and intransitive (headed by the copula) versions, as shown in (34) and (35). According to Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008) "the light verb strategy most often involves a verb meaning 'to do' for the integration of loan verbs" and "sometimes a motivation for using a light verb other than 'do' relates to transitivity". This is exactly what we find in Southern Zapotec languages. When the same borrowed infinitive occurs with 'do' and with 'become', as in (34) and (35), this results in changes in argument structure. The subject of the intransitive construction is a patient that corresponds to the complement of the borrowed infinitive in the transitive construction.[8]

Miahuatec
(34) Mblí   xa'   salbaár   **xa'**
      CPL-do   3H   save   **3H**
      'He saved him.'

(35) Ngóok   **xa'**   salbaár
      CPL-become   **3H**   save
      'He was saved.'

While it is common for the borrowed infinitive to have an NP complement in the transitive BIC, as in (36), this is prohibited in the intransitive version, as in (37).

Miahuatec
(36) Mblí   xa'   eskanyaár   gue'tz
      CPL-do   3H   scan   paper
      'S/he scanned the document.'

(37) *Ngóok   xa'   eskanyaár   gue'tz
      CPL-become   3H   scan   paper

The last sentence was not only ill-formed because of the presence of an infinitive complement, but because its would-be subject was the same as the subject of the transitive sentence. The 'do'-headed BIC takes agents for subjects, while the copula-headed BIC takes patients and themes as subjects. For example, (38) is also ungrammatical, in this case not because of the presence of a complement for the infinitive but because the intended subject is an agent.

(38) Cisyautepecan

---

[8] It is likely that the subject of the transitive construction can be expressed in the intransitive construction as an oblique, as this happens with native intransitive verbs, though to date I have not seen an example of this with a BIC. This oblique would probably look something like *ya' Béd* in the following intransitive construction from Coatec:

    Ngwâzèh   Jwánh-é   ya˺   Béd.
    CPL:go:M:walk   Juan=3INAN   hand   Pedro
    'Juan was hit by Pedro.'

*gòk	x̱á	pènsár
CPL-become	3HR	think

The difference between the BIC and a regular LVC appears to be the optional addition of an extra NP. Comparing intransitive BIC's to copula clauses the obligatory presence of a borrowed infinitive in the former contrasts with the optional nature of the copula complement in the latter. Transitive LVC's express the semantics of the action or state described through an NP that serves as direct object. This NP can easily consist of a single noun or pronoun. Transitive BIC's likewise express a state or action through a borrowed infinitive which occurs in complement position the same as a direct object. This borrowed infinitive is not required to take an NP complement of its own, but frequently does. Figure 1 shows the minor differences between BIC's and LVC's.

Typical Transitive Zapotec LVC:	VERB	SUBJECT	NP
Trans. Borrowed Infinitive Construction:	VERB	SUBJECT	INFINITIVE (NP)
Typical Zapotec copula clause:	COPULA	SUBJECT	(COMPLEMENT)
Intrans. Borrowed Infinitive Construction:	COPULA	SUBJECT	INFINITIVE

FIG. 1—Differences between BIC's and LVC's

Transitive BIC's could still be regarded as having an identical structure to transitive LVC's. Just as borrowed infinitives in transitive BIC's can take NP complements, NP's in regular LVC's could potentially contain more than one internal NP. It is common for deverbal nouns in Zapotec to take NP complements. For example, Coatec *gòn* refers to the act of 'clearing' but its meaning should be completed with an NP complement, as in *gòn yèhl* 'the clearing of the cornfield' and *gòn yìx* 'the clearing of brush'. In the transitive BIC, the borrowed infinitive and its optional complement form a noun phrase. Its structure would thus be like that of other (deverbal) NP's.

The existence of an intransitive version of the BIC in Southern Zapotec languages stands out. It is difficult to find such a construction in the literature on other Zapotec languages. The only exception I'm aware of is in San Lucas Quiaviní (Central Zapotec) the verb 'become' being used with a loan infinitive, *cayac mna diborsyar* 'the woman is getting divorced' (Munro et al. 2008). Figure 1 shows that a copula clause in Southern Zapotec, including what could be considered an intransitive version of the LVC in (16b), obligatorily consists of a copula and a subject, with a copula complement being frequent but optional. By contrast, the intransitive version of the BIC obligatorily has a borrowed infinitive in object position. So, although the transitive BIC is not significantly different from the transitive LVC, the intransitive BIC differs from the full inventory of intransitive LVC's in that an optional element becomes obligatory. The presence of the infinitive in copula complement position in the intransitive BIC does not violate the generalization about the structure of copula clauses, including intransitive LVC's, but considering that there are two types of copula clauses, with and without complements, the intransitive BIC always takes one form and never the other.

Note that in Spanish the distinction between active clauses and passive or middle voice clauses is indicated through pronouns (*Jaime se cortó,* 'Jaime cut himself' which has grammaticalized to also mean 'Jaime was cut', vs. *Jaime lo cortó* 'Jaime cut him/it') while in Zapotec voice is indicated by selection of the verb. Myers-Scotton & Jake (2013) suggest that the

strategy of using borrowed nonfinite verbs in a construction with native 'do' may "occur where mapping of predicate-argument structure and inflections, such as case, would be problematic". Spanish verbs without their accompanying object pronouns lack an indication of voice. In Zapotec voice is indicated mainly through lexical selection. Morphologically Zapotec voice distinctions are indicated through irregular and often opaque derivational processes (see Operstein and Sonnenschein 2015 for these processes across Zapotec and Beam de Azcona 2015 looking specifically at Coatec and Miahuatec) which are difficult to imagine applied to loanwords. For these reasons a borrowed infinitive could not dictate the argument structure of the clause and the selection of either 'do' or 'become' is crucial not only for bearing the inflectional marking but also for making voice distinctions.

3. The level of integration of Spanish infinitives in Zapotec grammar

Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008) propose a hierarchy according to how well loan verbs are integrated into the grammar of the recipient language. The most basic strategy in the hierarchy is a light verb strategy, typically native 'do' plus a borrowed infinitive, as here. Of the four strategies observed by Wichmann and Wohlgemuth two borrow verbs as verbs and two borrow verbs without specifying the lexical class. The strategy they call "indirect insertion" involves adding a verbalizing morpheme to the loanword, essentially treating it as a native noun. This can be seen on English verbs borrowed into Spanish, to which an *-e* suffix is often added before the inflectional suffixes of the first conjugation, e.g. *cliqu-e-a-r* 'to click', *parqu-e-a-r* 'to park', *chequ-e-a-r* 'to check'. This same suffix is added to native nouns and adjectives to derive verbs, e.g. *turist-e-a-r* 'behave like a tourist', *taqu-e-a-r* 'eat tacos', *chul-e-ar* 'admire something as cute'. Essentially English verbs are turned into Spanish verbs via the same strategy usually used to turn other parts of speech into verbs, ergo English verbs are not really verbs in Spanish until they undergo this native derivational process. The strategy of indirect insertion is contrasted with the strategy of "direct insertion" in which native inflectional marking is added directly to the loan morpheme without any derivational processes. For example, two of the Spanish verbs just cited, *cliquear* and *chequear*, have regional variants, *clicar* and *checar*, which lack the derivational morpheme *–e-*. In this case the English verbs *click* and *check* have been treated the same as native Spanish verb roots and the inflectional morphology has been added directly to them. At the opposite end of the hierarchy from the light verb strategy is paradigm transfer, in which verbs are borrowed complete with the inflectional morphology of the lending language.

Wichmann and Wohlgemuth hypothesize that less intense contact situations only make use of strategies like indirect insertion and light verb constructions, where borrowed verbs are not treated as verbs and that direct insertion and paradigm transfer are only found in situations when there is more stable, intense, long-term etc. bilingualism. It is hard to know how to characterize the history of Zapotec-Spanish bilingualism. Certainly these languages have been in contact for a long time, and today the nature of this contact is intense with a high degree of bilingualism. However, there are even today communities where a significant percentage of the elderly are monolingual Zapotec speakers, especially the women. This shows that the bilingualism is not stable but something that has been steadily increasing over the last few generations. Wichmann and Wohlgemuth do not suggest that situations of intense, long-term contact have to produce strategies like direct insertion and paradigm transfer, only that where these strategies are found the situation is likely to be one of long-term bilingualism.

In Mesoamerica another case that we might apply this hypothesis to is that of Central Mexican Nahuatl. Kartunnen and Lockhart (1976: 29-35) account for various strategies for borrowing Spanish verbs over time. They describe that from the late 17th century until the present day the standard way of borrowing a Spanish verb is to apply the verbal suffix –*oa* to a Spanish infinitive. However, in the 16th century Kartunnen and Lockhart describe two strategies that avoid borrowing Spanish verbs as verbs. In one strategy, Nahuatl speakers would borrow Spanish nouns that were derived from verbs and then add a Nahuatl verbalizing suffix –*tia*. So, given the Spanish forms *firmar* 'to sign' and *firma* 'signature', in the 16th century a verb 'to sign' is created *firma-tia* but after the late 17th century the form *firmar-oa* also appears. Secondly, (pp. 31-32, my bolding of Spanish infinitives):

> The 16th-century strategy with greatest implications for the future was to treat a Spanish infinitive as a noun…Spanish verbs were rendered by the use of the verb *chiua* "to make" in the construction "(Spanish infinitive) *quichiua"* (in either order), meaning "to make (the action) happen".

quichiua **apelar** (1553)	"he appeals"
apelar quichioaz (1557)	"he will appeal"
confirmar quichiuh (1572)	"he confirmed"
colmugar mochihuaya (c. 1620)	"communion was received"

> …Though the construction seems to have remained a productive derivational process in areas of the peripheral far south as late as the 18th century, the above are all the examples we have seen for the Central Mexican region. The significance relies in the very reluctance to incorporate verbs, and in the nominal interpretation of the infinitive, which seems to have played a role in the evolution of the later method of incorporation. As far as we know, the unadorned Spanish infinitive was not used after the early 17th century in Central Mexico.
>
> By 1700, the standard incorporation convention, not to change thereafter, was to attach the verbal suffix –*oa* to Spanish infinitives, yielding verbs which formed straightforward indicatives in all tenses with reverential, applicative, direct and indirect object markers all incorporated, as with native verbs.

tic**firmar**ohua (=oa) (1736)	"we sign it"
onic**firmar**o (< oa) (1747)	"I signed it"
qui**bisitar**oz (< oa+z) (c. 1700)	"he will inspect it"
omo**cobrar**o (< oa) (1679)	"it was collected"

This passage provides us with several possible comparisons: Nahuatl vs. Zapotec, Central Nahuatl vs. Southern Nahuatl, and 16th century Nahuatl vs. later Nahuatl. Viewing Kartunnen

and Lockhart's evidence in light of Wichmann and Wohlgemuth's hypothesis, we see that in the early contact period Spanish verbs are either avoided or else treated as nouns whereas later, when there was a longer period of sustained contact and presumably greater bilingualism than in the early days, Spanish infinitives are conjugated like Nahuatl verbs (even though, as Kartunnen and Lockhart point out, the fact that the Spanish infinitive is the form at the heart of these agglutinative words alludes to an earlier history in which Spanish loan verbs were treated as nouns). Comparing Central Mexican Nahuatl to the authors' remarks about the "peripheral far south", which is closer to the Zapotec area, and indeed comparing Central Mexican Nahuatl to the facts about Zapotec shown in the present paper, we can consider the fact that the Nahuatl-speaking region of Central Mexico is the epicenter for the Spanish conquest and presumably received the most intense and sustained contact with Spanish, compared with Zapotec languages and Nahuatl varieties further south, where the nature of contact with Spanish may have been relatively less intense and more sporadic.

It is also possible that the nature of contact can change over time and that speakers preserve patterns that attest earlier sociolinguistic situations (with either more or less bilingualism) more so than current ones (see Adamou & Granqvist 2014 on "arrested matrix language turnover" in Thrace Romani and Finnish Romani, as an example of how languages can preserve earlier patterns when the sociolinguistic situation has significantly changed).

Another factor that may explain why Spanish infinitives borrowed into Zapotec only occur in a LVC and never have Zapotec inflectional morphology added has to do with Zapotec grammar itself. Verbs are a closed class in Zapotec. Native verbal neologisms are compounds and idioms, not novel roots. It seems to be a tendency in Otomanguean languages that verbs constitute a closed class (see, for example, Palancar 2009: 144 on Otomí). A language that doesn't even create its own new verb roots is probably even less likely to treat borrowed roots as inflectable verbs.

Speakers (of perhaps all languages) often have prescriptive attitudes about loanwords. At an early presentation on this topic in Oaxaca, a Zapotec speaker in the audience asked the author and her co-presenters how in the future the use of borrowed infinitives could be avoided in Zapotec. Despite the common attitude that these borrowings are lazy and somehow contaminate the language, when one considers all the typological possibilities for adapting loan verbs, these borrowed infinitives cede the privilege of grammatical distinctions to native verbs. They respect the Zapotec prohibition on new verbs. They display a pattern associated with lower levels of contact and bilingualism. They conform to a pattern of LVC that is already common in these languages with native nouns. As far as loanwords go, they are actually the least intrusive. They contribute new semantic content to the language without altering Zapotec grammar in any significant way. If anything, the way borrowed Spanish infinitives are treated attests to the dominance and vibrancy of Zapotec grammar.

4. Unresolved issues for future work

In working out the analysis presented thus far, some additional data have turned up which should be investigated further. Research questions to be further explored include the possible incorporation of borrowed infinitives (§4.1), the borrowing of phonologically reduced Spanish verbs without the infinitival suffix (§4.2), and the possible existence of other light verbs in Zapotec besides 'do' and 'become'.

4.1 Can borrowed infinitives be incorporated?

Recall that copula complements normally follow the subject, as in (7), but that it is possible for complements to be incorporated into the copula, as in (9) (repeated here for clarity).

(7) Coatec Zapotec: The Tale of the Deer Hunter, line 274 (Beam de Azcona 2013)
Na paá   [téyak]COP   [tá   wée]SUBJ   [xi]CC…
and where POT:AUX:INF:become   3INAN that   water-pourer
'And as if that thing is going to be a water-pourer…'

(9) Miahuatec
Mazií nlyá   guí bweén [ndxáakyop]V   [neéd   le'n   guéz]SBJ.
when HAB:fall rain well HAB:become:mud road   belly   town
'When it rains the roads inside the town become muddy.'

When a would-be complement is incorporated, forming a new compound verb together with the copula root, the proof of this is that the subject follows the compound string, whereas usually a subject would precede a verbal (or copula) complement. In the intransitive BIC it is possible for the subject to follow the borrowed infinitive instead of the copula. This suggests that borrowed infinitives, at least in the intransitive construction, may be forming compounds with native roots that serve as hosts for inflection. Examples (39-41) are written with spaces as if the copula and the borrowed infinitive are separate words, but it is possible that they ought to be written together as compound words.

(39) Miahuatec: Legend of the Swimming Hole, line 92 (Cruz Santiago forthcoming)
Pero después ngóok   desapareseér-á.
but   after   CPL:be(come)   disappear=3INAN
'But afterwards s/he/it disappeared.'

(40) Miahuatec: Founding of San Bartolomé Loxicha, line 72 (Cruz Santiago forthcoming)
Noó*desde* ña   ngóok   *desaparecer*[9]xa'goxa-n   gueh'l   ña.
and since DEM.DIST CPL:become   disappear   3H:old:DEM water.hole DEM.DIST
'…and since then the old man disappeared from that swimming hole.'

(41) Cisyautepecan
Gòk   èskànéar   gíts
CPL-become   scan   paper
'The document was scanned.'

It should be determined whether adverbial enclitics would follow the copula or the borrowed infinitive in sentences in which the subject follows the borrowed infinitive. If these enclitics would follow the borrowed infinitive this would be definitive evidence of incorporation.

_____

[9] I am following the transcription in the original source, which treats (39) as an example of borrowing and (40) as an example of code-switching, though they are most likely the same phenomenon.

4.2 Comparison of reduced loanwords and other forms vs. borrowed infinitives

Myers-Scotton & Jake (2013), cited above, found that in code-switching corpora the embedded language (equivalent to the lending language in a borrowing context) typically contributed non-finite forms of verbs. Oftentimes this non-finite form was a form identified as the "infinitive" in the embedded language. In all the cases shown thus far the Spanish infinitive is the form borrowed into various Zapotec languages. However, it seems that another nonfinite Spanish borrowing which occurs sometimes is a bare verb root absent any (post-tonic) inflectional suffixes, including the infinitive marker, and for that matter the thematic vowel which forms the stem by which verb class is determined in Spanish.

   Examples (42-44) all come from a single speaker of Northern Coatec. The other Coatec examples that appear in this paper come from a single speaker of Southern Coatec, so it is possible that this reflects a regional or even a personal variation. In these three examples the loans are adapted to Coatec phonology by the acquisition of either high or rising tone. Segmentally the forms look like the Spanish verb root without any suffixation. *Abís* is from Spanish *avisar* 'advise, notify'. *Gán* is from Spanish *ganar* 'win, earn, achieve'. *Preést* is from Spanish *prestar* 'loan'.

   (42) Coatec: Compadre Possum and Compadre Puma, line 48

Lá	guún	náa	**abís**	ndóo	mbál.	Díib	ná	gaá-n
NEG	POT-do	1S	notice	face	compadre	one	1S	1S.go-1S

     'I'm not going to let the compadre know. I'm going alone.'

   (43) Coatec: Compadre Possum and Compadre Puma, line 52

Ké	sun	ndeéz	wze'	**gán**	guúth	bák.
that	FUT-do		possum	male	achieve	POT-kill	cow

     'That he would be able to kill the cow.'

   (44) Coatec: Rabbit wants to be a Godfather but doesn't have any Money, line 10

Á	lá	guún	lóo	**preést**	timíi	guúnti'n	náa
INTE	NEG	POT:do	2FAM	lend	money	POT:use	1S

     'Won't you lend me some money? I'm going to make use of it.'

In (42-44) the loanword was segmentally identical to the bare Spanish verb root, i.e. the form that remains after subtracting the thematic vowel and the infinitival suffix *-r*, e.g. the verb *prest-a-r* was borrowed as *prest*. In (45) from Miahuatec, a speaker who used the usual form of the BIC in the same recording here uses another form of the Spanish verb, *syeént* from the verb *sentir* 'feel'. Spanish generally has penultimate stress and since inflectional suffixes may be one or more syllables, a given syllable in the verb root is stressed in some paradigmatic forms and not in others. Many Spanish verbs undergo stem alternations such that a given syllable contains a diphthong when stressed and a simple vowel when unstressed. For example, the verb *sentir* has forms like *siento, sientes, siente* when the syllable that is equivalent to the verb root is penultimate and stressed, *sentimos* when it is antepenultimate and unstressed, and *sentí* when the word has final stress and the verb root, albeit a penult, is unstressed. The basic verb root is *sent-* but there are alternating paradigmatic stems, here *sent-* and *sient-*. In (45) the speaker borrows a bare verb stem that is not identical to the underlying root. This is perhaps based on frequency

since forms based on the stem *sient-* may occur more often in Spanish than forms with the stem *sent-*. We can still consider this to be a non-finite form since it lacks any inflectional suffix.

(45) Miahuatec: The Tale of the Fisherman, lines 124-125 (Beam de Azcona 2013)

Nak-za	lú	lií	**syeént**	thí	yáa	ndó	ró	líiz-la
STAT:become=NEG	2FAM	POT:do	feel	one	tree	STAT:is	mouth	house=2FAM

'You're not going to feel a tree that's by the entrance to your house'

As stated earlier, intransitive BIC's with 'become' are rare in the Zapotec literature outside of the Southern Zapotec area, but in (46) a borrowed Spanish participle is used this way in Lachixío Zapotec. The order there also suggests incorporation. Similarly, a speaker of Isthmus Zapotec whom I interviewed rejected the use of borrowed infinitives with 'become' nevertheless offered an equivalent example with a nominalized form (*impresión* 'printing, printed image' rather than *imprimir* 'to print').

(46) Lachixío Zapotec (Mark Sicoli, p.c.)

Ongo-aka	**konfondído**	bétoh
CPL-become	**confused**	Pedro

'Pedro was confused.'

The selection of Spanish forms to use with Zapotec light verbs should be further examined. In this short survey we have seen infinitives, bare roots, bare stems, adjectives derived from verbs in Spanish, and nouns derived from verbs in Spanish, all borrowed and used with Zapotec light verbs. There may be regional variation as to the preference to borrow one form over another. There may also be semantic generalizations to make here.

4.3 Can other verbs function as light verbs with borrowed nouns?

In (47-48), the same Northern Coatec speaker who used bare Spanish verb roots with 'do' in (42-44) here uses a borrowed root *koóbr* (cf. Spanish *cobr-a-r* 'charge money') not with 'do' or 'become' but instead with motion verbs. There is a special non-finite form of Coatec (and Miahuatec) verbs that occurs as complement to a motion verb. It might be most accurate to consider that this form is used to create a compound together with the motion verb as it occurs following the motion verb and preceding the single overt subject which both verbs share. It is difficult to tell whether the same thing might be happening here with *koóbr* because in both (47) and (48) the subject is focused and therefore occurs preceding the verb. This makes it impossible, based on these examples alone, to know whether *koóbr* is forming a compound with motion verbs the same as native non-finite forms do, or whether, when not focused, the subject would usually intervene between the motion verb and the borrowing, the same as in the BIC with 'do' and 'become'. Elicitation of similar clauses with unfocussed subjects and/or adverbial enclitics could provide some answers.

(47) Coatec: Rabbit wants to be a Godfather and doesn't have any Money, lines 27-29

Nzháa	primer	**zhi'n**	**nzháa**	**koóbr**,	ndab	zhi'n,
HAB:go	first	**cockroach**	**HAB:go**	**charge**	HAB:say	cockroach

66

koóbr tanáa   nza'b   lóo
charge 3INAN:REL HAB:owe   2FAM
'First Cockroach went to collect (his money). Says the cockroach, "(I came) to collect what you owe".'

(48) Coatec: Rabbit wants to be a Godfather and doesn't have any Money, line 56
   Náa   **nda'l**   **koóbr**   tá   nza'b   lóo
   1S   **HAB:come.1S** **charge** 3INAN HAB:owe   2FAM
   'I came to collect what you owe.'

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have described how Zapotec languages at large employ the typologically most common strategy for borrowing verbs by taking Spanish infinitives and incorporating them into native LVC's. I showed how Southern Zapotec languages use the copula 'become' to form a intransitive version of the construction. The lack of further integration of Spanish verbs into Zapotec grammar, e.g. by the addition of Zapotec morphology to Spanish roots, is determined to be both prevented by Zapotec grammar (e.g. the nature of verbs as a closed class) and also perhaps indicative of the fact that current levels of bilingualism in Zapotec and Spanish are a relatively recent phenomenon and before the twentieth century there was a long period where bilingualism occurred at much lower levels than what is seen today. The use of these Spanish borrowings by today's Zapotec speakers, taking into consideration the meanings of the types of verbs prone to borrowing as well as the grammatical structures that they occur in within Zapotec, tell the story of a people who have survived an invasion and now live in a multicultural society in which they still manage to preserve their native system of indicating inflection and argument structure.

References

Adamou, Lila & Granqvist, Kimmo. 2014. Unevenly mixed Romani languages. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. doi: 10.1177/1367006914524645

Antonio Ramos, Pafnuncio. 2008. Los posesivos atributivos en el zapoteco de San Pedro Mixtepec (ZSPM). In *Memorias del IX Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noroeste*, Zarina Estrada Fernández & Ana Lidia Munguía Duarte (eds), vol. 1, 443-461. Hermosillo: Unison.

Backus, Ad M. 1996. *Two in one: Bilingual Speech in Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands.* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. In preparation. *El zapoteco de la Sierra Sur: Estudios diacrónicos y comparativos.*

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2015. "Valency-changing devices in two Southern Zapotec languages" in Natalie Operstein and Aaron Huey Sonnenschein, eds. *Valence Changes in Zapotec: Synchrony, Diachrony, Typology.* John Benjamins.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2014a. Algunos rasgos lingüísticos del zapoteco sureño. In *Estructuras, lenguas y hablantes. Estudios en Homenaje a Thomas C. Smith Stark*, Rebeca

Barriga Villanueva & Esther Herrera Zendejas (eds). México: Colegio de México.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2014b. Algunas isoglosas de la Sierra Sur. Paper presented at the Coloquio de Lenguas Otomangues y Vecinas VI in honor of Mario Molina Cruz. Oaxaca: Biblioteca de Investigación "Juan de Córdova". Powerpoint available at https://www.academia.edu/6872282/Algunas_isoglosas_de_la_Sierra_Sur.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2013. El hombre que conoció a Cocijo. *Tlalocan* 19: 93-223.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2009. Clasificación de verbos en el zapoteco miahuateco de San Bartolomé Loxicha. *Cuadernos del Sur* 28: 59-70.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2004. A Coatlán-Loxicha Zapotec Grammar. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. & Luna, Mario et al. In preparation. La posesión en el zapoteco de la Sierra Sur.

Benton, Joseph. n.d. 7 Rivers (a transcribed text in Chichicapan Zapotec). Unpublished Manuscript, Summer Institute of Linguistics International.

Black, Cheryl A. 2000. *Quiegolani Zapotec Syntax: A Principles and Parameters Approach*. Arlington: SIL Internacional & University of Texas at Arlington.

Black, Cheryl A. 1994. Quiegolani Zapotec Syntax. PhD dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Córdova, Juan de. 1987. [1578]. *Vocabvlario en lengva çapoteca*. México: Ediciones Toledo & Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

Cruz Santiago, Emiliano. Forthcoming. *Moód kéh' mén noó tixu't mén dí'z déh noó na'r kwent Para leer y escribir el zapoteco de San Bartolomé Loxicha con cuentos*. Edición a cargo de Rosemary G. Beam de Azcona.

Dixon, R.M.W. 2002. Copula clauses in Australian languages: a typological perspective. *Anthropological Linguistics* 44: 1-36.

Jäger, Andreas. 2004. The cross-linguistic function of obligatory 'do'-periphrasis. Paper presented at the 2004 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society. <http://66.249.93.104/search?q=cache:xcVAbVnhYrEJ:dspace.library.usyd.edu.au:8080/bitstream/123456789/111/1/ALS-20050630-AJ.pdf+loan verbs&hl=en>

Kartunnen, Frances E. and James Lockhart. 1976. *Nahuatl in the Middle Years: language contact phenomena in texts of the colonial period*. University of California Publications in Linguistics No. 85. Los Angeles: UC Press.

Long C., Rebecca & Cruz M., Sofronio. 1999. *Diccionario zapoteco de San Bartolomé Zoogocho, Oaxaca*. México: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Munro, Pamela, Brook Danielle Lillehaugen and Felipe H. López. 2008. *Cali Chiu? A Course in Valley Zapotec,* Volume 3.

Myers-Scotton, Carol & Jake, Janice L. 2013. Nonfinite verbs and negotiating bilingualism in codeswitching: implications for a language production model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 13: 511-525.

Nellis, Neil & Goodner de Nellis, Jane. 1983. *Diccionario zapoteco de Juárez*. México: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Operstein, Natalie y Aaron Huey Sonnenschein. 2015. *Valence changes in Zapotec: synchrony, diachrony, typology*. John Benjamins.

Pickett, Velma. 1978. *Vocabulario zapoteco del Istmo*. 4th ed. Mexico: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Romero Méndez, Rodrigo. 2005. Spanish light verb constructions: co-predication with

syntactically formed complex predicates. Paper available at:
 <http://linguistics.buffalo.edu/people/faculty/vanvalin/rrg/Romero-%20Light%20Verbs.pdf>.

Sakai, Hiromu, Ivana, Adrian, & Zhang, Chao, 2004. The role of light verb projection in transitivity alternation. *English Linguistics* 21: 348-375.

Sicoli, Mark A. 2015. Agency and verb valence in a West Zapotec language. In *Valence Changes in Zapotec: Synchrony,Diachrony, Typology*, Natalie Operstein & Aaron Huey Sonnenschein (eds), 191-212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smith Stark, Thomas C. 2007. Algunas isoglosas zapotecas. In *Clasificación de las lenguas indígenas de México. Memorias del III Coloquio Internacional de Lingüística Mauricio Swadesh*, Cristina Buenrostro et al. (eds), 69-133. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México & Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas.

Speck, Charles. H. 1998. *Zapotec Oral Literature; El folklore de San Lorenzo Texmelucan*. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Stubblefield, Morris & Miller de Stubblefield, Carol. 1991. *Diccionario zapoteco de Mitla, Oaxaca*. México: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Stubblefield, Morris & Miller de Stubblefield, Carol. 1994. *Mitla Zapotec Texts*. Dallas: Summer Institute International.

Thomason, Sarah Grey & Kaufman, Terrence. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Van der Auwera, Johan. 1999. Periphrastic 'do': typological prolegomena. In *Thinking English Grammar: To Honour Xavier Dekeyser*, Guy A. J. Tops (ed), 457-470. Leuwen: Peeters.

Wichmann, Søren & Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2008. Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In *Aspects of Language Contact. New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*, Thomas Stolz, Rosa Salas Palomo & Dik Bakker (eds), 89-121. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.