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Chapter 6

Ecuadorian Quechua

Ecuadorian Quechua (henceforth Quichua)\(^1\) belongs to the northern branch of the Quechua family. Therefore, it is part of Quechua IIB in Torero’s classification (1964), which is the one I follow here. Quechua II B includes the Ecuadorian dialects spoken in the Andean Highlands and the Amazon Lowlands plus several Peruvian dialects such as Chachapoyas or Loreto spoken also in the Amazon basin. Ecuadorian Quechua is broadly divided in Highland Quichua (Quichua de la Sierra) and Lowland Quichua (Quichua del Oriente). According to Knapp (1991), the Highland Quichua population includes all the speakers of Quichua with the exception of those who live at less than 2000 meters above the sea level. The number of Highland Quichua speakers is considerably larger than the number of Lowland Quichua speakers. If the geographical distribution of both dialects is considered however, their respective spheres of influence\(^2\) are closely similar (cf. Map 6.1).

Highland Quichua is spoken in nine provinces of the Ecuadorian Andes, namely: Imbabura, Pichincha, Cotopaxi, Tungurahua, Chimborazo, Bolivar, Cañar, Azuay and Loja.\(^3\) Although many studies report that the province of Carchi is Spanish monolingual, the 1990 census showed a number of Quichua speakers scattered in few parishes, who use the language exclusively in domestic settings (Buttner 1993: 23). Quichua speakers are unevenly distributed in the aforementioned provinces.\(^4\) Central Cotopaxi, Tungurahua, Chimborazo and Bolivar represent two

---

\(^1\) Proto-Quechua vowels included: unrounded front /i/, rounded back /u/ and low central /a/. The first two were realized as [e] and [o] when preceded by uvular /q/, and as [i] and [u] when preceded by velar /k/ (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 197). Unlike Peruvian and Bolivian varieties, which preserve the uvular-velar distinction, Ecuadorian Quechua keeps only the velar consonant. In this way the unrounded front and rounded back vowels are realized always as [i] and [u]. Accordingly, Quechua speakers in Ecuador refer to their language as ‘Quichua’ and not ‘Quechua’ as in Peru and Bolivia.

\(^2\) Knapp identifies three types of social space in the following terms: “El núcleo en el caso típico es el área donde una cultura tiene su más densa población e instituciones políticas claves, culturales y económicas. El dominio es donde la cultura presenta predominio numérico. La esfera es donde la cultura ejerce alguna influencia sin llegar a ser dominante” (Knapp 1991: 16) This classification can be viewed as an extension of our definition of ‘social space’ in section 2.1.

\(^3\) Notice that Ecuadorian dialects hardly overlap with district borders. According to SIL (2005) there are only four dialects in the Highlands vis-à-vis nine Quichua-speaking provinces. Further explanation is provided in the dialect section.

\(^4\) Lowland Quichua speakers live mainly in the provinces of Napo and Pastaza. Their number is even harder to estimate since there is a large number of second-language speakers who identify themselves ethnically as Quichua. For a discussion of Quichua-centered ethnogenetic
thirds of the entire Highland Quichua population. Because censuses do not provide specific ethnolinguistic information,\(^5\) it is difficult to know the exact number of Quichua speakers and their overall percentage of the national population. Sociopolitical interests from national and local governments and Indian organizations prevent an impartial consideration of the actual indigenous population.

The first census (1950) gave a number of 320,056 speakers of Highland Quichua out of a total population of 3,202,757 inhabitants. Highland Quichua speakers represented 10% of the country’s population. Buttner (1993: 19f) notes that the census had a number of shortcomings which influenced its output. The most important of them was that nearly 20% of the censed population did not specify their linguistic background. Knapp introduced some corrections to these figures and gave a number of 440,994 speakers of Highland Quichua representing 14% of the country’s population in 1950. Forty years later, the 1990 census gave an approximate number of 340,000 Quichua speakers in the Highlands, representing 3.5% of the national population (9,696,979). Again, deficiencies in the collection of data influenced decisively the output (Buttner 1993: 22f). The last national census conducted in 2001 gave a number of 595,798 indigenous speakers\(^6\) for the Highlands, who represent nearly 5% of the national population (12,156,608). For the same census indigenous speakers in the country represented 7% (830,418). This percentage differs considerably from those provided by ONGs and several Indian organizations including CONAIE. The latter considers that only the speakers of Highland Quichua count above one million. Similarly, the Instituto Indigenista Interamericano gave an estimate of 2,634,494 speakers of indigenous languages in Ecuador for 1993. This number represented one quarter of the total population (cf. Adelaar 1999: 11). Taking the percentage from the 2001 census for the entire indigenous population (7%) as a baseline and the percentage from Instituto Indigenista (25%) as a threshold, we calculate a reasonable estimate of Amerindian speakers in the country around 16%. Considering that Ecuador’s population in 2005 was estimated in 13,363,593 (CEPAL 2005), the above percentage corresponds to some 2,100,000 indigenous speakers. Excluding the population of other ethnolinguistic groups in the Pacific Coast and the Amazon Lowlands, which represent 29% in the last census, we have an approximate number of 1,500,000

---

\(^5\) On the one hand, most censuses do not include questions about the ethnolinguistic background of respondents. On the other hand, indigenous speakers usually hide their ethnolinguistic identity for sociocultural reasons. Moreover, Indian organizations have boycotted censuses in response to the neglect of administrations in the hard conditions of Quichua speakers.

\(^6\) The number corresponds to respondents who gave any Indian language as their mother tongue. The vast majority of those who do not speak Spanish in the Highlands as their first language are Quichua speakers.
speakers of Highland Quichua. Without any reliable figures available, this number is a reasonable estimate of the overall number of Highland Quichua speakers.

The issue of the size of the Highland Quichua population is closely related to the issue of its linguistic vitality. Studies on the vitality of Quichua in Ecuador are scarce. Buttner (1993) is the most important sociolinguistic survey of Quichua. Different from most censuses, the main conclusion of this survey is that Quichua is still vital in Highland Ecuador, even though vitality is not uniform across provinces. Based on the data from Buttner (1993: 48), the following table gives the percentages of native Quichua speakers, native Spanish speakers and bilingual speakers among the indigenous population. These percentages are an average of the number for individual communities in each province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Quichua</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imbabura</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pichincha</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotopaxi</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungurahua</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimborazo</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolívar</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañar</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azuay</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loja</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Buttner 1993: 48

The central Highlands and the province of Imbabura are the strongest Quichua areas. The southern Highlands are less vigorous in terms of native speakers and language maintenance. The most densely populated provinces in the Highlands (Pichincha and Azuay) show the highest percentage of Spanish as a first language. Loja in the southern Highlands and Chimborazo in the central Highlands mark the sharpest contrast between traditional Quichua areas: the former shows the highest degree of Hispanicization while the latter shows the highest degree of Quichua maintenance. As for the number of people who have Quichua and Spanish as their first languages (coordinate bilinguals) percentages do not differ significantly across provinces. This does not mean that levels of bilingualism are uniform however. A fine-grained classification of bilingualism (Buttner 1993) shows crucial differences. The survey identified nine levels of monolingualism-bilingualism, namely: Quichua monolingualism; Spanish monolingualism; rudimentary Quichua-Spanish bilingualism (where Quichua is dominant); rudimentary Spanish-Quichua bilingualism (where Spanish is dominant); advanced Quichua-Spanish bilingualism...
The following table shows the distribution of ethnic monolinguals and bilinguals in the Quichua communities of the nine highland provinces.\(^7\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quichua monolingualism</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish monolingualism</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudimentary Q-Sp bilingualism</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudimentary Sp-Q bilingualism</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Q-Sp bilingualism I</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Q-Sp bilingualism II</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Sp-Q bilingualism I</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Sp-Q bilingualism II</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Spanish-Quichua bilingualism</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Buttner 1993: 69*

Quichua native speakers with an advanced level of bilingualism (I) represent the largest group. Rudimentary bilinguals whose mother tongue is Quichua are the second group in size. The percentages of rudimentary and advanced bilinguals are not considerably different from each other. Quichua monolingualism (8.7%) is slightly lower than Spanish monolingualism (10.4%). The number of coordinate bilinguals is very small if compared to the other groups. In general, the figures show two parallel processes: on the one hand, a steady process of Hispanicization; on the other, the maintenance of Quichua. While these percentages suggest that a complete shift to Spanish will not take place in the medium term in the Highlands, at a local level there are communities which were bilingual thirty years ago but now are Spanish monolingual (e.g. González Suárez, Imbabura). Table 6.3 shows the percentages of Quichua monolingualism and illiteracy according to age groups:

\(^7\) There are cases of communities which identify themselves ethnically as Quichua but some or most of their members are not native speakers of the language or speak Spanish only (e.g. San Isidro, Loja).
Table 6.3 Quichua monolingualism and illiteracy by age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Illiteracy (%)</th>
<th>Q-monolingualism (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Buttner 1993: 54

Two straightforward correlations are observed: one between age group and illiteracy (the younger the speaker, the less monolingual in Quichua); and another between age group and Quichua monolingualism (the older the speaker, the more illiterate). Both correlations demonstrate that Hispanicization goes hand in hand with formal schooling. Buttner (1993: 34) notices two gaps in schooling levels: one between the last two generations (14-30) and the rest; the other between the last three generations (41+) and the younger ones. The first gap results from a wider access by speakers up to thirty years to secondary education and a limited access to it by the rest of speakers. The second gap results from the lack of access by speakers from forty years onwards to elementary education and the access to it by younger speakers. Retrospectively, these tendencies correspond to two major developments in the social structure of the countryside in the last fifty years. The first is the Agrarian Reform initiated in the early 1960s, which resulted in a more extensive coverage of elementary education in rural areas. The second is the application of Bilingual Education Programs and the extension of secondary education to rural areas since the late 1980s. The great majority of Quichua monolinguals above fifty years did not go to elementary school. In addition, it is possible to trace a further correlation between Quichua monolingualism and gender. Women make up the largest group of Quichua monolinguals and the smallest group of bilinguals. Thus, the higher the level of bilingualism, the lower the percentage of bilingual women. Table 6.4 shows this correlation with respect to the types of Quichua-dominant bilingualism.

Table 6.4 Levels of bilingualism by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Quichua Monolingualism</th>
<th>Rudimentary Quichua-Spanish Bilingualism</th>
<th>Advanced (I) Quichua-Spanish Bilingualism</th>
<th>Advanced (II) Quichua-Spanish Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process of Hispanicization intensified in Ecuador during the second half of the twentieth century through a wider coverage of formal schooling in rural areas and higher rates of Indian migration to the cities. The last enclaves of Quichua monolingualism in the Highlands are isolated communities in the central provinces located on bleak plateaus or páramos at an altitude higher than 3,200 meters. These communities usually do not have access to schooling and their contact with the mainstream society is limited by a lack of roads and transportation. In general, however, the advanced process of Hispanicization reflected in higher levels of bilingualism does not imply the loss of the native language at individual or collective levels. Quichua often coexists with Spanish in different social spaces, albeit one language is preferred to the other depending on the situation.

The survey provides additional information about the differential use of Quichua and Spanish in various socio-communicative spaces. Given the prevailing diglossic situation in the Highlands, both languages are expected to be in complementary distribution across social spaces. Let us see if this is the case. As regards the preferred language in the family, 78% of those whose first language is Quichua prefer this language at home while 15.6% prefer both Quichua and Spanish. On the contrary, 87% of the indigenous speakers whose first language is Spanish prefer this language at home, but only 9.8% prefer both languages. This distribution differs from province to province but is consistent with the data in Table 6.1 about the vitality of Quichua. For example, 66% of the indigenous families from Chimborazo – a traditionally Quichua-speaking province – use exclusively Quichua at home while only 5.5% use Spanish. Conversely, 78% of the indigenous families from Pichincha – a traditionally Spanish-speaking province – use Spanish at home while only 2.7% use Quichua. The distribution of the preferred language in the socio-communicative space of the community is closely similar to the distribution in the domestic space. Quichua is preferred in 81.6% of the indigenous communities of Chimborazo while Spanish is preferred in 87.8% of the indigenous communities of Pichincha (Buttner 1993: 63). Other socio-communicative spaces include collective work parties (mingas), community meetings (asambleas), parish centers (cabeceras parroquiales), open-air markets (ferias) and churches. Table 6.5 below shows the usage of Quichua in these spaces for the nine provinces.

Chimborazo is the province with the highest percentage of Quichua usage in the five settings. Pichincha and Azuay are the provinces with the lowest percentage. The percentages of Quichua usage are remarkably lower in parish centers and open-air markets. While these spaces are traditionally Spanish speaking, the dominance of this language is less important in Chimborazo, if compared to Azuay or Pichincha. In contrast, mingas and meetings are predominantly Quichua-speaking settings because they are located in the broader space of the community. Finally, the socio-communicative setting of the church is a public, originally Spanish speaking space. However, it has been increasingly appropriated by Quichua speakers in the central
Highlands and Imbabura. On the contrary, Pichincha, Azuay and Loja still prefer the use of Spanish in the church. This is explained by the higher levels of Hispanicization among indigenous speakers in these provinces and the closeness of mestizo churches of towns and cities.

Table 6.5 Uses of Quichua by socio-communicative per settings and province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Minga</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Urban center</th>
<th>Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imbabura</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pichincha</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotopaxi</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungurahua</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimborazo</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolívar</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañar</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azuay</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loja</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the status of the Quichua language in Ecuador is one of relative maintenance accompanied with higher levels of bilingualism. In the central provinces the native language remains strong in most communicative spaces, especially in the household and the community. In the rest of the Highlands, Quichua speakers are rapidly shifting to Spanish, and this shift will be complete in one or two generations.

6.1. The History of Quichua in Ecuador

One puzzling question for those who study the history of Quechua in the northern Andes is how this language – which became the official language of the Inca Empire - managed to take firm root in this part of the Cordillera in scarcely sixty years of Inca domination from the conquest by Huaina Capac around 1470 to the fall of the Inca Empire in 1532. The question becomes even more problematic, because the Incas never sought to replace the vernacular languages of their conquered territories nor reduce the linguistic variety of the Empire by imposing Quechua (Mannheim 1991: 36ff). In trying to answer this question, Torero proposed that Quechua was spoken in the present territory of Ecuador well before the Inca invasion: long-distance traders or mindaláes introduced Chinchay Quechua in the late fourteenth century and speakers of different linguistic backgrounds began to use it as a lingua franca (Torero 2003: 93-105). From Jijón y Caamaño (1940, 1941) and Paz y Miño

---

8 Others have explained the early presence of Quechua in the northern Andes by assuming that the language originated in the Ecuadorian Amazon Lowlands. Lathrap (1970: 176ff) and
(1940, 1941, 1942) we know that Pre-Inca languages in the northern Andes included Pasto, Cara, Panzaleo, Puruhá, Cañari and several Jivaroan languages spoken in the southern part of the highlands and the eastern slopes. Nothing of these languages is known except for the lists of toponyms and anthroponyms collected by Jijón y Caamaño and Paz y Miño. The Quito Synod of 1593 ordered the preparation of catechisms and confessionaries in these languages but they are reported lost to date (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 392). Residual evidence of pre-Inca languages can be traced in the form of substrata in the variety of Ecuadorian Quichua spoken today in their former area of influence. Adelaar and Muysken (2004) suggest, for example, “that a possible substratum from Cara preserved in modern Imbabura Quechua is the use of a labial f” (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 394). It is generally assumed that pre-Inca languages survived throughout the sixteenth century to be finally replaced by Quichua around the second half of the seventeenth century. There are no available sources that help us establish an exact date, but it is evident that the shift to Quichua did not take place overnight.

The Quichuization of native populations in the northern Andes was not the direct result of Inca occupation. It was the Spaniards who realized the potential of Quechua as a lingua franca not only for inter-ethnic communication but, most importantly, for the evangelization of indigenous peoples. Given the large number of vernaculars spoken in the Inca Empire at the time of the Spanish conquest, the evangelization of ethnic groups in their own languages was in principle unfeasible. While pre-Inca languages were promoted as a means of instruction in the first decades of colonization, it became soon obvious that using them for evangelization was rather unrealistic.

But the adoption of Quechua for indoctrination was not exempt from disagreement. Crown officials and members of the clergy viewed the use of an indigenous language with suspicion and resistance. For them Quechua could not transmit theological concepts and therefore could not function properly as an effective vehicle for evangelization. This position was politically motivated. The new rulers were afraid that Quechua might become an agglutinating factor in the promotion of ethnic awareness. The ambivalent position between the use of Quechua and the use of Spanish in evangelization continued until the Bourbon reforms in the second half of the eighteenth century. As a result, a coherent language policy could not be implemented in colonial times. Mannheim (1991) explains the ups and downs of language planning in the Spanish colonies in the following terms:

Hartmann (1979: 287ff) are the advocates of this theory, which is not accepted in today’s scholarly circles however.
“Language policy in the Spanish empire was molded by competing interest groups, each of which staked its claim before the Council of the Indies (Heath 1976: 50; Rivarola 1985: 26-27). As a result, the council frequently shifted back and forth between radically different approaches depending upon which pressure group was able to gain its attention. The extent to which the council’s policies were actually implemented was similarly determined by competing interests, this time at a local level” (Mannheim 1991: 64)

The use of Quechua for evangelization received partial support from the language policies of three Councils held in Lima between 1551 and 1583. Clergymen implemented these policies in different areas of the Empire, including the eastern Lowlands. From the last quarter of the sixteenth century a number of clergymen studied Quechua and wrote grammars (Artes), dictionaries (Vocabularios) and primers for catechization (Cartillas) in different varieties of the language. Several courses opened for this purpose in Lima (1550) and Quito (1570). Similarly, efforts were made to standardize the language in order to make its learning easier for priests and facilitate the printing of materials in Quechua. The basis for the standardization was Cuzco Quechua, a variety directly associated with the Inca. Cuzco Quechua presented several phonetic intricacies such as the velar-uvular distinction and the ejective-aspirated distinction of stops (Mannheim 1991: 142). These particularities were eventually omitted in the standardized version and resulted in a language closely resembling the Quechua variety spoken in the northern Andes because of its simplified phonetics. This standard was used until the first half of the seventeenth century (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 183). Some scholars maintain that the use of standardized Quechua by missionaries influenced decisively the development of Ecuadorian Quichua, particularly in the Amazon Lowlands (Oberem and Hartmann 1971; but see Muysken 2000 for an evaluation of this hypothesis). Still, the influence of standardized Quechua may have not been as decisive as generally assumed, but its use by missionaries fostered the expansion of the language in the northern Andes at the expense of pre-Inca languages.

Because Quechua was not the mother tongue of the peoples of the northern Andes until their native languages were eventually replaced, it is not possible to speak of Ecuadorian Quechua as a distinct variety before the end of the seventeenth century. It is only from the moment that these native peoples abandoned their pre-Inca language (Cara) and adopted Quechua that something like an Ecuadorian variety of Quechua emerged. The historical record shows that the replacement of pre-Inca languages with Quechua was a gradual process that lasted over a hundred years. The question is what Quechua dialect became the basis for Ecuadorian Quechua. By studying early grammatical descriptions Muysken (forthcoming) shows that Quechua in Ecuador kept many features of Peruvian dialects in the
seventeenth century\textsuperscript{9}, but that these features were replaced by those typical of present-day Quichua over the next centuries. The following is a summary of Muysken’s findings about the process of formation of Ecuadorian Quichua.

The first known source of Ecuadorian Quichua is an anonymous grammar dating back to the late seventeenth century – the exact date is unknown. The manuscript was published by Dedenbach-Salazar (1993), who calculated its time of writing through the loss of phonological distinctions and the replacement of markers characteristic of Quechua-I varieties (central Peru and Bolivia). The most important of these changes are: the lack of distinction between inclusive and exclusive pronouns; the loss of possessive pronominal forms and their replacement by pronoun-genitive constructions; and the loss of verb-object agreement markers. Posterior to this anonymous grammar is the catechism prepared by the Quitonian bishop Francisco Romero in 1725. Romero does not make any use whatsoever of inclusive and exclusive pronouns. He does not use Peruvian benefactive –\textit{pu} either. Furthermore, Romero uses very frequently the subordinating suffixes–\textit{cpi}, –\textit{spa}, –\textit{ngapa} and impersonal –\textit{ri} in intransitive verbs, as is characteristic of present-day Ecuadorian Quichua. From the lower occurrence of the reflexive -\textit{ku} and the use of comparative constructions with \textit{yalli}-, Muysken concludes that Romero’s catechism was written after the anonymous manuscript analyzed by Dedenbach-Salazar.

Another early source of Ecuadorian Quichua is the grammatical sketch by Nieto Polo (1753). The author says explicitly in the title of his sketch that it deals specifically with the Quechua language spoken in the Province of Quito. This implies that the differences between this variety and Peruvian dialects were not unimportant. By the time Nieto Polo wrote his sketch the Peruvian inclusive-exclusive forms and the suffixes for the benefactive and dative cases had almost completely disappeared from Ecuadorian Quichua, while others such as the transitional pronominal form (1>2) and nominal possessive markers were disappearing gradually. This suggests that Nieto Polo is dealing already with a distinct Ecuadorian variety, and indeed he often compares this variety with Peruvian dialects in order to point out differences. The brief grammatical remarks in Velasco’s \textit{Vocabulario de la Lengua Indica}, published in the same year as the work by Nieto Polo (1753), report the same morphological developments in Quichua. More than a century later, in 1884, Cordero published a Quichua grammar in which the transitional pronominal form –\textit{wa} is preserved as an optional marker of first and second person object. Cordero also has as optional the use of possessive marking on nouns instead of genitive constructions – in full use by the end of the nineteenth

---

\textsuperscript{9} Muysken assumes that Peruvian Quechua (specifically, Cuzco Quechua) was, in the early decades of colonization, a model for the description of Ecuadorian Quichua, and that reference was often made in grammars to (Peruvian) forms that were not used in Ecuador anymore.
Ecuadorian Quechua

century. Cordero’s grammar proves archaic in some respects – a feature that becomes clear in his later dictionary (1905), where the occurrence of obsolete forms is frequent – but it certainly describe a distinct Ecuadorian variety of Quechua. In all, the aforementioned changes reflect a gradual restructuring of Ecuadorian Quechua in the lapse of two centuries, from the late seventeenth to the late nineteenth. The coexistence of alternative Ecuadorian and Peruvian forms that disappeared over the years confirms the gradual nature of the process. According to Muysken, this process continues today with the loss of the remaining transitional marker (-wa) in modern dialects of the central Highlands.

In fact, changes in Ecuadorian Quechua continue to date, but they are largely motivated by language contact with Spanish. The influence of Spanish on the lexicon of Quechua includes basic and non-basic vocabulary and involves practically every semantic field, from kinship and household to religion, education and administration (Gómez Rendón and Adelaar, forthcoming). It should be noted, however, that borrowing is not the same across dialects and idiolects. Generally speaking, the dialects of distant areas with less contact with urban centers show lower levels of borrowing. In a similar way, the idiolects of older generations show much less influence than those of younger bilinguals. On the other hand, an increasing bilingualism among Quichua speakers and the use of Quichua in atypical communicative settings such as radio broadcasting have induced a number of structural changes in the language (Fauchois 1988). Grammatical changes in Ecuadorian Quechua as a result of contact with Spanish have been analyzed elsewhere (Gómez Rendón 2007a). As a result, strongly Hispanicized varieties of Quechua continue to emerge as adaptations to the new communicative settings of modern society. Contemporary Quichua is a living language after four centuries of contact because it succeeded in making a compromise between the communicative needs imposed by the official language and the cultural needs of their speakers to preserve their linguistic identity.

6.2. The dialects of Quichua in Ecuador

Ecuadorian Quechua can be classified in two distinct varieties, Highland Quechua and Lowland Quechua. Each corresponds to a specific geographical area: the Andean

10 While the Quichua-Spanish contact increased dramatically in the last century as a result of the expanding national society and the diffusion of media in rural areas, the contact itself dates back to the early years of the European conquest. The existence of loanwords in Quechua which have long disappeared from modern Spanish dialects (e.g. parlar ‘speak’) demonstrates how old the Spanish-Quechua contact is in the northern Andes.

11 In some cases borrowing became massive and produced mixed lects (Media Lengua) as described by Muysken (1978; 1996) and Gómez Rendón (2005; 2008b) for the Ecuadorian Andes of Ecuador.
Highlands and the Amazon lowlands. Further divisions can be made on the basis of phonetic, morphosyntactic and lexical criteria. For example, Highlands Quichua distinguishes between northern varieties and central-southern varieties. A similar distinction for Lowland Quichua separates northern (Napo) from southern (Pastaza) varieties. Northern Highland Quichua includes the varieties of Imbabura and Pichincha. Central-Southern Highland Quichua include the varieties of Cotopaxi, Tungurahua, Chimborazo, Bolívar, Cañar, Azuay and Loja. Quichua dialectal areas are shown in Map 6.1.

Map 6.1 Map of Quichua Dialects in Ecuador

12 While in Imbabura the indigenous language is widely distributed over the whole province, in Pichincha it is spoken only in suburban Calderon (inside the metropolitan area of Quito).
Dialectal differences in Quichua involve regions and provinces alike. From the information of individual entries (Haboud de Ortega et al. 1982) it is possible to trace these differences. For example, the verb ‘to collapse’ is tuñurina in highland and lowland varieties but tularina for Pichincha. In this case both words are phonologically similar. In other cases words under the same entry have different phonetic forms, although their origin is still Quichua. The verb ‘to chew’ is kashuna in the Highlands but mukcuna in the Lowlands. The same holds for ‘old’, which is rucu ‘old’ in Highland Quichua but paya in Lowland Quichua. Most lexical differences noted in the dictionary make a distinction between highland and lowland dialects. But highland varieties, too, show differences in the lexicon. The word chamcha ‘flavorless’ occurs in Chimborazo and Tunguragua (central) but its equivalent is chamuk in Imbabura (northern), Cañar and Azuay (southern). In a few cases words occurs only in one province. This is the case of ñusta ‘princess’ in Imbabura or zacziquina ‘spread, said of lianas or pumpkins’ in Bolivar. Finally, there is a large number of local names for endogamic animals plants (e.g. tauri ‘lupin’, only in the Highlands; or sicu ‘kind of rodent’, only in the Lowlands).

The most noticeable differences in the Ecuadorian dialects are phonetic in nature. To give an idea of dialect variation in Quichua, consider the different pronunciations of patsac ‘hundred’ which, according to the aforementioned dictionary, has as many as sixteen different pronunciations: [patsax, patsak, patsag, patsa, p'atsak, p'atsa, patsux, patsuk, patsu, patsix, patsik, patsug, pati, fatsax, fatsak, fatsa]. This variation is not restricted to lexical items. The most important differences concern the morpho-phonological processes that have affected the affixes (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 237). The case of the genitive-benefactive suffix –pac is illustrative in this respect. According to Caimi Nucanchic Shimiyuc-Panga (1982), this bound morpheme may be realized in nineteenth different allomorphs depending on the dialect: [-pak, -pax, -pa, -bak, -bax, -bag, -ba, -buk, -bux, -bug, -bu, -wak, -wax, -wag, -wa, -k, -x, -g, -w]. Similarly, the affirmative –tac has as many as 26 allomorphs. In broad terms, northern and central dialects are more innovative than southern ones (e.g. Cañar) in that the latter have not undergone the aforementioned morpho-phonological processes nor other developments that affect the syntax of the language. In what concerns the dialects of Bolivar and Imbabura, they show differences as well, with the former being generally more conservative. Bolivar Quichua is the least innovative of the central dialects and therefore is much closer to Cañar Quichua than to the Cotopaxi or Chimborazo dialects. In the

---

13 Muysken’s study Syntactic developments in the Verb Phrase of Ecuadorian Quichua (1977) is illuminating in this respect.
following I discuss some of the phonetic particularities of Imbabura Quichua in contrast with other highland dialects.

In phonetics, the main difference between Imbabura Quichua and other highland (but also lowland) dialects is the fricativization of stops /p/ and /k/ in all positions except after a nasal. The resulting allophones [f] and [j] differ in word initial position from their counterparts in the rest of Ecuadorian dialects, be they aspirated ([pʰ] and [kʰ]), or non-aspirated ([p] and [k]). Imbabura fricativized occlusives differ also from non-aspirated realizations in word-medial or word-final position in most dialects. Some examples are *pucuna* ‘to blow’, realized as [fukuna] in Imbabura but [pʰukuna] in central dialects (e.g. Bolivar) and [pukuna] in southern dialects (e.g. Loja); *upiana* ‘to drink’, realized as [ufiana] in Imbabura but [upʰiana] in Cotopaxi and Tungurahua (central dialects) and [upiana] in Azuay (southern dialect); *cari* ‘male’, [jari] in Imbabura, but [kʰari] in Chimborazo (central). Grammatically, the reciprocal -naku- is realized as [-naju-] in Imbabura but [naku] in all other provinces. A further phonetic process in Imbabura is the voicing of [t] after nasals and other environments (Fauchois 1988: 62), although a similar phenomenon is reported also for Salasaca (central). In contrast, the voicing of stops is less widespread in Imbabura. According to Adelaar and Muysken (2004: 242) Salasaca and central dialects show the following processes, which are very infrequent or nonexistent in Imbabura: the raising of /a/ to [i] or [u]; the frequent deletion of the final stop or the nasal in affixes such as -pak or -man; consonant cluster simplification in the affixes -kpi (>-ki) or -şpa (>-şa); vowel cluster simplification (e.g. wira > ira); and pronunciation of palatal /l/ as a palatal affricate [č] before voiceless stops (e.g. kužki > kučki). In general, these morpho-phonological processes make central dialects distinct from their northern and southern counterparts. Explanations for the above distribution of features are largely language-internal, but several nonlinguistic motivations can be identified as well. These have to do with geographical and demographical factors and the related sociolinguistic conditions. I discuss some of them for Imbabura Quichua and Bolivar Quichua.

In 2001 the number of Imbabura Quichua speakers was twice as large as the number of Bolivar Quichua speakers (86,986 vs. 40,094).14 The distribution of Quichua speakers in both provinces is different too. Quichua is spoken in four of the six cantons of the Imbabura province. In contrast, Quichua is spoken only in one of the six cantons of the Bolivar province. Many Quichua communities in Imbabura are

---

14 These numbers are very probably underestimated, as explained in the introduction to section 6.2. A more reasonable number is around 150,000 speakers. Ethnologue gives a number of 300,000 speakers in 1977, which is obviously an exaggeration considering that the whole population of Imbabura (i.e. Mestizos and Indians) reached only 250,000 in 1982 (INEC 2001). There being no census information for the Quichua-speaking population of Imbabura other than the 2001 census, I have preferred to use these figures.
close to urban centers, in particular Otavalo, Cotacachi and Ibarra (province capital). Consequently, the access to the communities is easier thanks to an extensive system of roads. Differently, most Quechua communities in Bolivar are distant from the only urban center of the province (Guaranda) and therefore less accessible. Differences in accessibility are reflected in the supply of facilities such as drinking water, electricity and telephone (cf. Figure 6.1). Nearly three quarters of the indigenous population in Imbabura have access to electricity, while only thirty percent have this supply in Bolivar. Notice that electricity implies access to radio and television broadcasting in Spanish and better communication with the mainstream society. In general, Bolivar Quechua communities are more isolated and more conservative.

Figure 6.1 Access to basic facilities in two Quechua-speaking highland provinces

As for the number of Quechua native speakers both provinces do not differ much (81.9% in Imbabura vs. 78.5% in Bolivar, see Table 6.1). There is a noticeable difference between both provinces with respect to the use of Quechua in socio-communicative settings (cf. Table 6.5). Imbabura Quechua is used with higher frequency in all settings except for the market. These data contradict the above statement about the higher degree of isolation and conservatism of Bolivar Quechua. However, other factors must be considered for a comprehensive evaluation. Quechua is stronger in Imbabura not only on account of its larger number of speakers but also because their attitude is one of deep ethnic awareness and positive identification with the native language. Positive attitudes towards Quechua and the use of the indigenous language in public spaces are less noticeable in Bolivar. These facts explain why despite being relatively more conservative, Bolivar Quechua is less used across social spaces. In support of this explanation two anecdotic but illuminating
facts can be added. In 2005 the municipal council of Otavalo – the second biggest city of Imbabura and the one with the largest number of Quichua speakers in the province – ordered their officials to take courses in Quichua so as to provide better services to Quichua users. No similar decision is reported for Bolivar. Also, Imbabura Quichua has been often a model for other dialects and comparatively numerous materials for teaching have been used this variety, with the opposition of other Quichua communities (cf. Buttner 1993: 195).

In short, Imbabura Quichua speakers are increasingly bilingualism but maintain their language while Bolivar Quichua speakers are less bilingual and tend to shift to Spanish rather rapidly. As a result, Imbabura Quichua is more innovative and most of its lexical and structural changes are induced by contact with Spanish. In contrast, Bolivar Quichua is generally more conservative and therefore less hispanicized.

6.3. Quichua: a typological characterization

Quichua has differently evolved as a result of its geographical expansion. Quichua dialectalization has produced remarkable differences across varieties such that “many linguists now prefer to speak of ‘Quechuan languages’ rather than of ‘Quechua dialects’” (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 168). Still, Quechua varieties – including Ecuadorian Quichua – remain essentially uniform in their typological character. The following typological description of Quichua is based on the assumptions that Quichua is typologically similar to other Quechua languages, and that Ecuadorian varieties show similar typological features.

Quichua belongs to Quechua IIB in Torero’s classification (Torero 1964). The branch covers an extensive area including “the dialects of the Ecuadorian highlands and Oriente (the eastern lowlands); the Colombian Quichua dialect usually called Inga or Ingano (Caquetá, Nariño, Putumayo); the dialects spoken in the Peruvian department of Loreto in the Amazonian lowlands (which are, in fact, extensions of the varieties spoken in the Amazonian region of Ecuador); the Lamista dialect spoken in the area of Lamas (department of San Martin, Peru); and that of Chachapoyas and Luya (department of Amazonas, Peru)” (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 186f). Quechua IIB differs from the Quechua I spoken in central Peru but show certain resemblance to varieties outside this area (e.g. Santiagueño Quichua in Argentina). Notwithstanding the existence of a dialectal continuum between Quechua varieties, a major split exists between central Quechua and the other varieties. For Adelaar and Muysken (2004: 188) this split reflects an initial diversification in Proto-Quechua.

The phonological inventory of Ecuadorian Quichua includes three vowels (/a/, /i/, /u/) and sixteenth consonants (/p/, /t/, /k/, /ts/, /g/, /ʃ/, /s/, /x/, /ž/, /m/, /n/, /l/, /r/, /ɾ/, /w/, /y/). These segments occur phonologically in Ecuadorian Quichua but their
realization differs across dialects. Differences consist mainly in the aspiration or glottalization of stops (cf. *supra*). Thus, /p/ is realized as aspirated in most central dialects ([pʰ]) but non-aspirated in southern dialects ([p]) and fricativized in Imbabura ([f]). This variation may be understood more clearly by assuming that varieties of Ecuadorian Quichua form a diasystem. In this perspective, the phonological inventory consists of diaphones condensing equivalences between sounds of different dialects. For the stop /p/ the equivalences are represented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Imbabura:} & p \sim /\Phi/ \\
\text{Bolivar:} & p \sim p^h
\end{array}
\]

In this representation the sign \(\sim\) stands for phonetic contrast at dialect level while upper-case /P/ represents the diaphone. Other phonetic details of Imbabura and Bolivar Quichua were discussed in section 6.2. Syllables in Ecuadorian Quichua are basically open (CV) but CVC syllables are common as well. Consonant clusters are permitted in onsets but not in coda position. Word-final clusters are absent. Stress is assigned to the penultimate syllable by default, with only few instances of last-syllable stress (Adelaar and Muysken 2004: 206).

The entrance of Spanish loanwords to the core vocabulary of Quichua has enriched the native inventory with the consonants /b/, /d/, /g/, /β/, /z/ and the medial vowels /e/ and /o/. These sounds show a high degree of integration in Quichua and may be considered part of the phonological inventory of the language (Cole 1982: 199). The integration of these sounds has been facilitated in part by the fact that except for /β/, they all have counterparts in native allophones: [b] is an allophone of /p/, and so is [d] of /t/ and [g] of /k/, in nasal environments. The same holds for [e] and [o] in relation to /i/ and /u/.

From a morphological point of view, Quichua is a typically agglutinative language, with a rich and very regular morphology. Compared to Peruvian Quechua, Ecuadorian varieties have experienced a simplification involving two changes: the loss of verb-object agreement and the loss of possessive nominal suffixes. For comparison Cole (1982:6) gives the following examples of second person object agreement in San Martin Quechua (Peruvian) and Ecuadorian Quichua.

---

15 This inventory differs from the one given by Cole for Imbabura Quichua (Cole 1982: 199) which consists of five vowels including Spanish-borrowed /e/ and /o/ plus twenty-two consonants including Spanish-borrowed /hl, /d/, /g/, /βl, /z/ but also /f/, /b/ and /f/. In addition, Cole postulates the phoneme /t/ instead of two phonemes /t/ and /h/. The inclusion of the Spanish-borrowed vowels and consonants is fully justified by the abundance of loanwords with these sounds. In contrast, the inclusion of /f/ and /f/ is less substantiated, because they are allophones of /sl, /p/ and /ul/ in Imbabura and do not occur in other Ecuadorian varieties.
San Martín Quechua  |  Ecuadorian Quichua
---|---
1)  |  
| a. Ñuka-ka maka-yki | b. Ñuka-ka kan-ta maka-ni |
| 1SG-TOP hit-1S.2OBJ | 1S-TOP 2S-ACC hit-1S |
| ‘I hit you’ | ‘I hit you’ |

The gradual loss of person agreement markers in Quichua started in the late sixteenth century (cf. 6.2). The second change consists in the loss of possessive nominal suffixes. Consider the following examples from Cerrón-Palomino (1987:200).

Junin Quechua  |  Ecuadorian Quechua
---|---
2)  |  
| a. maki-yki | b. kan-pak maki |
| hand-2S.POSS | 2S.GEN hand |
| ‘your hand’ | ‘your hand’ |

The loss of possessive nominal suffixes has encouraged a tendency present in Quichua towards higher levels of analyticity. Such tendency contrasts with the great degree of synthesis of Peruvian dialects. Additionally, the extensive use of pronominal roots in Quichua seem to have induced a more frequent use of personal pronouns in subordinate and main clauses, where other varieties use them basically for emphasis.

Contact with Spanish has induced further changes. One of them involves the use of Quichua kikin ‘proper’ as a polite second-person pronoun on the model of the Spanish polite form usted ‘2S.HON’. Arguably, this form developed as a pronoun relatively early, when social relations between Spaniards and Indians were based on caste hierarchies. Nowadays kikin is falling into disuse, being preserved only in conservative varieties. But the influence of Spanish on the pronominal paradigm extends to the subset of interrogative pronouns in most Hispanicized varieties. Also, Ecuadorian dialects have incorporated a few bound Spanish morphemes through the borrowing of words from this language. These belong to nominal morphology and include agentive -dur as in ñaupa-dur ‘spokesman’, diminutive -itu as in waw-itu ‘little child’. In case marking contact-induced changes include (i) the lack of distinction between inalienable and alienable possession; (ii) the loss of different forms for comitative and instrumental cases; (iii) the frequent drop of the obligatory accusative marker on direct objects; (iv) the increasing tendency to use the plural marker on nouns after numeral modifiers; and (v) the use of Spanish lexical borrowings to express local or spatial relations.16 These changes have been discussed elsewhere (Gómez Rendón 2007a).

---

16 Other developments in Quichua verbal morphology are less clearly assigned to contact-induced change. These include a) the use of reciprocal -naku- as a verbal plural marker on
Morphologically, Quichua do not have gender markers nor definiteness markers such as articles. In general terms, Quichua morphology is based on inflectional and derivational suffixes. The only exception is the prefix la- ‘in-law’, albeit it does not occur in all Ecuadorian varieties. Case suffixes like -manta in the following example have been considered by some linguists as true postpositions.

3)  **Otavalo-manta**  **shamu-ni**  
    Otavalo-ABL  come-1S
    ‘I come from Otavalo’

The order of constituents in the noun phrase is fixed in Quichua, with modifiers preceding noun heads (30a-b). The order in possessive constructions is possessor-possessed, even if pronominals are involved (cf. 28b).

4)  a.  **turu pilchi**  
    clay  bowl
    ‘bowl of clay’
  b.  **sumac huasi**  
    nice  house
    ‘nice house’

The Quichua noun phrase has experienced two noticeable changes as a result of contact with Spanish: the use of determiners shuk ‘one’ and kay ‘this’ to replace the native topicalizer -ka; and the occurrence of Spanish diminutive and augmentative endings in borrowed and native lexemes (cf. supra). Apart from Spanish numerals, which are ubiquitous, Ecuadorian Quichua has borrowed several Spanish quantifiers. Unlike numerals, Spanish quantifiers have not replaced their native counterparts but co-occur with them in duplets with emphatic purposes. The most frequent are **tuditu** ‘all’ and **algunu** ‘some’.

The influence of Spanish extends also to the verb phrase. TMA structures influenced by contact with Spanish include the replacing of -ngapak with purposive -chun in co-referential constructions on the model of the Spanish subjunctive; (ii) the use of Spanish *dizi-* ‘say’ in reportatives and quotatives; and (iii) the use of Spanish modal verbs. Spanish loan verbs are borrowed as verb roots without their infinitive endings and any extra marking. Certain verbal roots from Spanish are subject to further morpho-phonological changes such as syllabic elision (cf. Chapter 10). At sentence level Quichua shows a fixed (S)OV word order, as shown in (5).

5)  **ñuka-ka ishkai churi chari-ni**  
    1S-TOP  two  son  have-1S
    ‘I have two sons’

---

intransitive verbs; b) the extension of reflexive -ri- to cover reciprocal meaning (cf. supra); and c) the use of reflexive -ri- on the model of Spanish impersonal passive *se*. For an argumentation of these changes as induced by contact, see Gómez Rendón (2007a).
Traditionally Quechua uses a nominalization strategy for clausal subordination (32). However, there is a tendency towards the replacement of nominalization with finite subordination on the model of Spanish subordinate clauses. The results are independent clauses linked by Spanish connectors. The subordination strategy makes use of Spanish subordinators such as the relativizer *que* ‘that’ (after *verba dicendi*), the relative pronoun *lo que* ‘that (which)’, and a few conjunctions such as *purki* ‘because’ or *si* ‘if’. Compare the nominalization in (6) with the subordination by means of Spanish *lo que* in (7).

6) chaya-shpa paikuna muna-shka-ta apa-shka-n
   arrive-GER 3.PL want-PTCP-ACC take-PRF-3

7) chayashpa paykuna apa-shka-n lo-que muna-shka-n
   arrive-GER 3.PL take-PRF-3 that-which want-PRF-3

‘Upon their arrival, they took what they wanted’

The affluence of Spanish vocabulary in Quechua goes hand in hand with less visible changes at clausal and sentential levels. The co-occurrence of Spanish loanwords and syntactic calquing on the model of Spanish suggest some kind of correlation between both phenomena, so that a cause-effect chain between lexical borrowing and syntactic borrowing may be hypothesized. Other, less frequent syntactic changes induced by contact with Spanish include: i) Spanish SVO word order in declarative sentences; ii) Spanish SVO word order in non-verbal predicative constructions involving a copula; iii) shift from RelN to NRel with native interrogative pronouns used as relative pronouns; iv) question formation through Spanish interrogative intonation contours on unmarked declarative sentences; and v) replacement of nominalized clauses with adverbial subordinated clauses by means of Spanish subordinators. In addition, several Spanish connectors are used in Quechua, such as additive *y* ‘and’, contrastives *o* ‘or’ and *díno* ‘if not’ (Sp. *de no*) and disjunctive *pero* ‘but’. Spanish time adverbs are used as discourse markers (e.g. *aura* ‘nowadays’ (< Sp. *ahora*); *intonses* ‘then’ (< Sp. *entonces*); and *siempre* ‘always’ (< Sp. *siempre*). The days of the week and the times of the day are Spanish but co-occur with native items in loan blends.

*The System of Parts of Speech in Quechua*

In this section I substantiate my classification of Quechua as a flexible language (type-2) in Hengeveld’s classification. Type-2 languages have two lexical classes. One lexical class corresponds to heads of predicate phrases (verbs). The other class includes items that may be used in any syntactic position except as head of predicate phrases. The following examples from Peruvian Quechua (Schachter 1985: 17) support this claim.
8) a. *chay* hatun runa
DEM big man
‘that big man’

b. *rikashaka:* hatun-ta
see:PST:1S big-ACC
‘I saw the big one’

9) a. *chay* alkalde runa
DEM mayor man
‘That man who is mayor’

b. *rikashaka:* alkalde-ta
see:PST:1S mayor-ACC
‘I saw the mayor’

In these examples *hatun* is both a referential-phrase modifier (8a) and a referential-phrase head (8b). Similarly, *alkalde* is both a modifier in (9a) and a head in (9b).

Evidence against this classification has been presented by Beck (2002: 144ff). According to Beck, the lack of a noun-adjective distinction in Quechua is not thorough because only the adjectives can be modified by adverbs like *maymi* ‘very’, as shown in (10):

10) *chay* warmi maymi sumak-mi
DEM woman very pretty-FOC
‘That woman is very pretty’

Noun modification with *maymi* is ungrammatical, as illustrated by Cole (1985: 99-100) in (11) below. Still, when asked about the grammaticality of this sentence, however, several Quichua speakers in Imbabura and Bolivar considered (11) perfectly possible:

11) *chay* warmi maymi duktur-mi
DEM woman very doctor-FOC
‘That woman is a real doctor’

While a semantic distinction between property concepts and entity concepts underlies the argument, Beck himself admits that “the existence of a semantic distinction of this type is in itself not enough to establish that there is a parts-of-speech distinction between nouns and adjectives in the lexicon” (2002:144). The theory of parts of speech by Hengeveld *et al* (2004) does not exclude such a distinction. Rather, it argues for the existence of a non-specialized lexical class for both concepts.

Beck’s second argument maintains that noun-noun constructions should be treated as compounds because nouns acting as attributes of other nouns cannot occur more than once in the same noun phrase – as opposed to adjectival modifiers which may be recursive. As additional evidence, Beck mentions that noun-noun constructions may be attributives of other nouns, as shown in example (12) from Cerrón-Palomino (1987: 300).
12) *hara chakra rumi*
   corn field stone
   ‘stone of the cornfield’

Readings of (12) such as ‘field stone of corn’ or ‘cornfield of stone’ are not possible. In fact, *hara* and *chakra* form an attributive compound that modifies *rumi*. The resulting interpretation of (12) is closely similar to English ‘stone of cornfield’. According to Quichua phonology, *hara chakra* should be realized as a compound if the main stress falls on the first syllable of *rumi*. However, I have not conducted a phonological analysis of these structures in order to know which stress pattern obtains.

Beck’s third argument against the typological classification of Quichua as a type-2 language states that property-concept words used as heads of referential phrases (13) are actually adjectives standing for deleted heads in elliptical constructions. A conclusive proof of this would be, for Beck, “their reliance on context to supply the identity of a nominal head” (2002: 145). Therefore, sentences like (39) are ungrammatical if out of context.

13) *puka-ta ri-ka*
   red-ACC see-PST
   ‘he sees the red one’

The claim that contextual reference is required for the correct interpretation of (13) is not conclusive either. Color terms are universally associated to objects and do not exist independently, being to this extent context-dependent in any human language and irrelevant for a noun-adjective distinction.\(^\text{17}\) On the other hand, it is not relevant that lexemes like *puka* in (13) are context-dependent, but that they occupy the syntactic position of referential heads without further measures and take nominal morphology (e.g. accusative markers).

Additional evidence for the classification of Quichua as a type-2 language comes from the fact that many lexical items used as referential-phrase heads and referential-phrase modifiers can be used as predicate-phrase modifiers too. *Yanka* ‘useless’ occupies the position of referential phrase modifier in (14) but also the position of predicate phrase modifier in (15) without any morphological derivation.

14) *kai-ka yanka yura ka-n-mi*
   that-TOP useless plant be-3-AFF
   ‘That is a useless plant’

---

\(^{17}\) Typically, dictionaries define colors with reference to physical objects. The Webster Dictionary, for example, defines ‘white’ according to metaphors such as intensity of light, racial groups and the like.
Similarly, utka ‘speed’ functions as head of the referential phrase in (16) and modifier of the predicate shamui ‘come’ in (17).

16) utka-ka rura-shpa alli-mi ka-n
   speed-TOP work-GER good-AFF be.3
   ‘quickness is good in working’

17) utka huasi-man shamu-i
   speed house-ALL come-IMP
   ‘come home quickly’

The arguments against the classification of Quichua as a flexible language are insufficient. I propose therefore to classify Quichua as a language which makes no distinction between nouns, adjectives and adverbs. This classification is corroborated in part by Adelaar and Muysken (2004), who state that “adjectives are similar to nouns in their syntactic behavior [and] it is not always easy to distinguish between the two categories” (2004: 208), although for both authors adjectives are different from nouns in that they cannot stand alone as subjects except if followed by ka-q ‘the one that is’. While this condition holds for subjects, it does not for adjectives in other syntactic positions, as shown by (13) above.

From the examples of Ecuadorian and Peruvian Quechua discussed above it is clear that lexical flexibility is characteristic of Quechua and thus must be consider one of its intrinsic typological features. The functional adaptation of Spanish borrowings provides additional support to this classification (cf. Chapter 10).

Ecuadorian Quichua remains typologically identical to other Quechua languages in agglutination, suffixation and verb-final word order, but differ from them in (pro)nominal morphology due to simplification. Spanish influence on Quichua consists in the addition of sound segments to the phonological inventory, the incorporation of function words such as determiners, quantifiers, connectors and adverbs, and the replacement of nominalization by relativization on the model of Spanish subordinate sentences. Albeit prominent, these changes have not modified the inherent typological character of Quichua.

6.4. Borrowing Hypotheses for Quichua

The language-specific hypotheses developed in the following will be tested in Chapters 10 and 11 on the corpus of Imbabura and Bolívar. The hypotheses involve
predictions about frequencies, types and functions of Spanish borrowings in the corpus. They are based on the hierarchies discussed in section 4.3 concerning a) the principle of functional explanation; b) the principle of system compatibility; c) the scales of borrowability; and d) the theory of parts of speech. The numeration corresponds to that followed in section 4.3.

Hypothesis from the Principle of Functional Explanation

**H.1** Quichua will borrow Spanish discourse items easier than non-discourse items.\(^{18}\)

**H.1.1** Quichua will borrow Spanish discourse elements such as topic and focus markers but also evidentials and connectors.

Predictions from the principle of system compatibility

**H.2** Quichua (agglutinative) will borrow from Spanish (fusional) free words and roots, but less likely clitics (e.g. pronominal proclitics) and bound morphemes (e.g. plural markers, gender markers, etc.).

Predictions from the scales of borrowability

**H.3** Quichua will borrow Spanish lexical items easier than grammatical ones.

**H.3.1** Quichua will borrow items from open lexical classes (e.g. nouns) easier than items from half-open classes (e.g. prepositions) and closed classes (e.g. pronouns).

**H.3.2** Quichua will borrow Spanish lexical items in the following order of frequency: nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Adpositions (i.e. prepositions) will be borrowed, if at all, with less easily because Quichua (postpositional) does not have a syntactic slot for them. Function words such as conjunctions and pronouns will be borrowed only seldom. The pro-drop character of Spanish will disfavor the borrowing of Spanish pronouns in Quichua. Articles will not be borrowed at all.

Predictions from the theory of parts of speech

**H.4** The typological distance between Spanish (source language) and Quichua (recipient language) is bridged in the borrowing process following the hierarchy of parts of speech: head of predicate phrase > head of referential phrase > modifier of referential phrase > modifier of predicate phrase.

**H.4.1** Accordingly, Spanish forms that function as heads of phrases (i.e. verbs and nouns) will be borrowed easier than forms that function as modifiers (i.e. adjectives and adverbs). Also, Spanish forms that function as heads of predicate phrases (i.e. verbs) will be the most easily borrowed lexical class; forms that function as modifiers of predicate phrases (i.e. manner adverbs) will be the hardest class to be borrowed. While **H.4.1** contrasts with **H.3.2** above, both hypotheses will be tested.

---

\(^{18}\) Easier borrowability implies precedence in time and dominance in frequency.
H.4.2 If Quichua borrows items from one lexical class, it will borrow items from previous lexical classes in the hierarchy. Accordingly, if Quichua borrows modifiers of referential phrases (Spanish adjectives), it will borrow heads of referential and predicate phrases (Spanish nouns and verbs) but not necessarily modifiers of predicate phrases (Spanish manner adverbs).

H.4.3 As a flexible language, Quichua will borrow more easily lexemes from the lexical class immediately following the last differentiated lexical class in its system of parts of speech. Therefore, Quichua will borrow nouns more easily, because nouns are the lexical class that follows the last differentiated class (verbs) in its system.

H.5 The syntactic distribution of borrowed lexemes in Quichua will follow the same distribution of native lexical classes (functional adaptation hypothesis). Accordingly, if Quichua borrows Spanish adjectives, it will use them as heads of referential phrases but also as modifiers of referential and predicate phrases, which corresponds to the distribution of native Quichua non-verbs). Therefore, Spanish borrowing will thus not modify the system of parts of speech in Quichua.

H.6 The distribution of borrowed lexemes will follow the same distribution of their lexical classes in Spanish (functional specialization hypothesis). Accordingly, if Quichua borrows Spanish adjectives and adverbs, it will use them only in their original positions of modifiers of referential and predicate phrases but not interchangeably as if they formed one lexical class. The functional specialization of Spanish borrowings will thus result in a gradual differentiation of the parts-of-speech system of Quichua. While H5 and H6 make opposite predictions, both hypotheses will be tested.

H.7 No predictions can be made from the lexicalization hypothesis because it applies only to rigid languages, and Quichua is flexible (cf. supra).

The foregoing hypotheses will be tested systematically on the Quichua corpus of Imbabura and Bolivar in the light of linguistic and nonlinguistic factors influencing the borrowing process (Chapters 10 and 11).