



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Spanish expressions of direct evidentiality and affirmative validation? Searching for a linguistic reflex of Quechua -mi in rural Ecuadorian Highland Spanish

Olbertz, H.

Publication date

2008

Document Version

Author accepted manuscript

Published in

Dynamics of language contact in the twenty-first century

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Olbertz, H. (2008). Spanish expressions of direct evidentiality and affirmative validation? Searching for a linguistic reflex of Quechua -mi in rural Ecuadorian Highland Spanish. In C. Vergaro (Ed.), *Dynamics of language contact in the twenty-first century* (pp. 111-131). (Conversarii. Studi linguistici del CLA. Sezione ricerca; No. 2). Guerra.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

published in:
Carla Vergaro (ed.)
*Dynamics of language contact
in the twentyfirst century.*
Perugia: Guerra. 111-131.
(*Conversarii. Studi linguistici del CLA 2*)

SPANISH EXPRESSIONS OF DIRECT EVIDENTIALITY AND AFFIRMATIVE VALIDATION? SEARCHING FOR A LINGUISTIC REFLEX OF QUECHUA *-MI* IN RURAL ECUADORIAN HIGHLAND SPANISH

**Hella Olbertz
(University of Amsterdam)**

Spanish and Quechua have been in contact in the Andean region for almost 500 years. In the rural areas of the Andes, where Quechua is still spoken by a considerable number of people, the Spanish vernacular shows many traces of language contact. In the present paper, different varieties of monolingual and bilingual rural Ecuadorian Highland Spanish will be compared with each other and with standard Spanish in order to investigate a specific contact feature, i.e. a possible Spanish correspondence of the highly frequent Quechua evidential suffix *-mi*. When used in the context of observable events *-mi* expresses direct evidentiality, i.e. it indicates that the speaker has personally witnessed the event. In other contexts, *-mi* serves to express “affirmative validation”, i.e. the speaker’s conviction of the truth of what he is saying. In studies of Andean Spanish different proposals have been advanced about possible expressions of direct evidentiality and affirmative validation in contact Spanish, two of which will be presented here. According to the first, Quechua *-mi* might be paralleled by Spanish *es que*, and the second relates the idiosyncratic use of *pues* in Andean Spanish to Quechua *-mi*. After evaluating both proposals, an alternative explanation will be offered. *Keywords*: Spanish, Quechua, language contact, evidentiality, validation, semantic markedness

1. INTRODUCTION

When Pizarro and his men set foot on the ground of the Tawantinsuyo, the Inca empire, in 1531, the Inca culture was deemed to perish.¹ What the Spanish colonist brought the indigenous people instead was their European contagious diseases, their Medieval *encomienda* system of brutal exploitation, and their Catholic faith. While the former two led to a catastrophic decimation of the aboriginal population, the catechisation of the indigenous inhabitants and the establishment of the colonial rule in general are intimately related to the fate of the languages spoken in the area, with present day Quechua and modern Andean Spanish as a result. Only a short while before the Spanish invasion the Inca empire had been expanded to include what is now Ecuador and southern Colombia to the north and north-western Argentina and northern Chile to the south. By the time of the Spanish conquest only the nobility in these areas were fluent in Quechua, while the common people continued to use their native languages. In order to communicate with the indigenous Americans the Spaniards used a small number of indigenous languages, among which Quechua. However, due to its relatively wide spread, Quechua soon became the *lengua general*, the lingua franca for mutual communication. For the recently acquired areas of the Tawantinsuyo this meant

¹ For a more detailed description of the Quechua social history cf. Almeida (2005).

that during the colonial reign the people gradually abandoned their native languages to shift to Quechua, which was gradually simplified through massive second language acquisition. Two hundred years later Quechua had become the only indigenous language of any importance in the area (Muysken 1999: 89). Until the end of the 18th century most people were monolingual in either Quechua or Spanish, and bilingualism was basically restricted to the clergy and the indigenous elite.

This situation changed during the Bourbon reforms of the eighteenth century, which included the radical hispanisation of the colonies, prohibiting the catechisation in any indigenous language (Cerrón-Palomino 1989: 21-22) and ultimately aiming at the extinction of these languages (López Morales 1998: 67), a language policy that was continued after independence until the second half of the 20th century. As a result, Quechua lost its social status and turned into a vernacular, useless outside the Quechua culture. The consequence was a massive, largely unguided, acquisition of Spanish and the ever increasing abandonment of Quechua, which is still in process nowadays (cf. e.g. Cerrón-Palomino 1989).² The resultant interlanguage has been the input to monolingual and bilingual acquisition of Spanish over generations and has resulted in a contact vernacular, which has remained relatively stable in areas where there is little contact with other varieties of Spanish. This vernacular constitutes what I will refer to as rural Andean Spanish or contact Spanish.

In the present study, different varieties of bilingual and monolingual rural Spanish spoken in the Ecuadorian Andes will be compared with each other and general Spanish³ in order to investigate a specific interlanguage feature, i.e. a possible reflex in Spanish of Quechua *-mi*. Depending on the context this suffix serves to indicate either that the speaker has witnessed the event s/he describes or “that the speaker is convinced about what he is saying” (Adelaar 1977: 79). The former value corresponds to direct evidentiality, and the latter is what Quechuists refer to as “affirmative validation”. The suffix *-mi* forms part of a complex system of suffixes related to evidentiality and knowledge in general Quechua, called “validators”, the most important of which are *-mi* (direct evidentiality, affirmative validation), *-shi* (hearsay) and *-chi/cha* (conjecture) (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 210-211).⁴ The reason why one might expect the meaning of *-mi* to interfere in some way or other with contact Spanish, is twofold: firstly, there is clear evidence of a contact induced expression of hearsay in Andean Spanish, i.e. the highly idiosyncratic use of *dizque* (cf. e.g. Granda 2002; Olbertz 2005); secondly, the use of *-mi* is much more frequent in most varieties of Quechua than the expression of hearsay. Thus, if a less frequent subcategory of a semantic domain has an expression in contact Spanish, than the more frequent subcategory of this semantic domain may be expected to have an expression in contact Spanish as well. On these grounds, different theories have been presented on possible reflexes of *-mi* in rural or bilingual Andean Spanish, two of which will be presented and evaluated here; subsequently, an alternative explanation will be offered.

The paper will be structured as follows: in section 2, I will give a short overview of the functions of *-mi* in Ecuadorian Quechua (henceforward: EQ), in section 3, I will briefly deal with the corpora on which I will base my analysis, section 4 will be devoted to the two proposals concerning possible reflexes of *-mi* in Andean Spanish, and in section 5, I will present my own, much more modest, theory. I will end with my conclusions in section 6.

² At present Quechua monolingualism is extremely infrequent and is restricted to isolated rural areas in the Andes; most Quechua speakers are bilinguals with varying degrees of competence in Spanish (Pereira V. 1996).

³ What I mean by “general Spanish” is a geographically relatively unmarked version of Spanish spoken by educated speakers.

⁴ The form *-cha* corresponds to Ecuadorian Quechua. There is much more allomorphic dialectal variation than indicated here; for more details cf. Cerrón-Palomino (1987).

2. EVIDENTIALITY AND AFFIRMATIVE VALIDATION IN ECUADORIAN QUECHUA

The Quechua suffix *-mi* is a non-obligatory element, which appears in word-final position. In the many studies dedicated to *-mi* and related suffixes, *-mi* has been claimed to be (i) an expression of direct evidentiality, indicating that the speaker has witnessed the state-of-affairs s/he describes (Weber 1986), (ii) an expression of affirmative validation, i.e. the speaker's conviction of the truth of the propositional contents (Adelaar 1997; Nuckolls 1993), (iii) or an expression of both (Faller 2002).⁵ Before deciding on this issue, let us consider a few examples of the way *-mi* is used in EQ:

(1) *kan-paj ushi-wan Agato-pi-mi tupari-rka-ni*
 you-GEN daughter-COM Agato-LOC-AFF meet-PAST-1SG
 'I met your daughter in Agato' (Cole 1982: 164)⁶

(2) *Cai llama rutu-shca-mi.*
 DEM sheep shear-PERF-AFF
 'This sheep has been shaven.' (Catta 1994: 81)

In examples (1) and (2) *-mi* clearly expresses direct evidentiality: in (1) the speaker is the primary participant in the event described, which implies that s/he has eyewitnessed this event, and in (2) the speaker describes what s/he sees, namely a shorn sheep.

In (3) and (4) the situation is different:

(3) *Pai-mi Apu-nchic-ta cri-c-ca mana huiñai-pac huañu-nga.*
 s/he-AFF lord-our-ACC believe-NOM-TOP not forever-GOAL perish-3FUT
 'Who believes in God will not forever perish.' (Catta 1994: 217)

(4) *Pai-mi ñuca pani.*
 s/he-AFF my sister
 'She is my sister.' (Catta 1994: 216)

The state-of-affairs described in (3) concerns an event related to religious faith and as such cannot be eyewitnessed. Similarly, an evidential interpretation of *-mi* in (4) is impossible because it is an identifying predication, i.e. a state-of-affairs that cannot be eyewitnessed either. What *-mi* expresses in cases as (3) and (4) is the strong conviction or certainty of the speaker that the propositional content is true.

On the basis of these facts, it seems to me that neither the evidential nor the modal value is more basic than the other. I therefore follow Faller (2002) in that the function of *-mi* should be related to the context in which it occurs: whenever this is the description of an observable state-of-affairs, *-mi* will be read as an expression of direct evidentiality, otherwise it will be interpreted as an expression of affirmative validation.

In addition to the validators mentioned above, Cole (1982) takes the negative and interrogative marker *-chu* and *-ma(ri)*, an emphatic variant of *-mi* (cf. section 4.2. below), to be validators in EQ. Moreover, in EQ, the hearsay meaning has come to be expressed by the verbal form *nin* 's/he says, they say', while the meaning of *-shi* has shifted to a conjectural meaning, and *-cha* has come to express doubt (Cole 1982: 163-165). These validators form part of a larger set of so-called

⁵ A further study worth mentioning is Floyd (1999), who takes a cognitive grammar approach to *-mi*, considering the evidential value as the prototype, from which other uses derive. For reasons to be given below, I find this approach unconvincing for a synchronic analysis. However, such an approach could be appropriate in a diachronic account of the semantic development of *-mi*. For a detailed critical assessment of Floyd's work see Hannß (2004).

⁶ Although EQ orthography was standardized in 1980, there is a considerable spelling variation in the examples, which I refrain from unifying. The abbreviations that are used in the glosses can be found at the end of this paper.

independent suffixes, which can occupy the word-final position of any part of speech, as opposed to specifically verbal or nominal suffixes. Let us now consider a number of structural properties of *-mi*, most of which it shares with other validators.

First, as a corollary of this positional flexibility, validators have an additional focus marking function (Cole 1982: 165). The following example shows that by shifting *-mi*, the focus of the utterance shifts from the object-constituent *alpa-ta* ‘the land’ in (5a) to the subject-constituent *ñuka tayta* ‘my father’ in (5b):

- (5) a. *ñuka tayta-ka alpa-ta-mi yapu-n*
 my father-TOP land-ACC-AFF plow-3
 ‘my father plows THE LAND’
 b. *ñuka tayta-mi alpa-ta-ka yapu-n*
 my father-AFF land-ACC-TOP plow-3
 ‘MY FATHER plows the land’ (Cole 1982: 95-96)

A further typical example is the position of *-mi* in question/answer-pairs, where it invariably marks the information the question focuses on:

- (6) *-may-man-taj ri-ju-ngui*
 where-DIR-INTER go-PROG-2SG
-Utavalu-man-mi ri-ju-ni
 Otavalo-DIR-AFF go-PROG-1SG
 ‘-Where are you going?
 -I’m going to Otavalo’ (Cole 1982: 29)

Secondly, when used in copula-constructions, the presence of a validator allows for the omission of the copula in 3rd person present tense contexts, as can be seen in example (4) above, where due to the presence of *-mi* no copula is expressed (Cole 1982: 67). Example (7) illustrates the absence of the copula with the interrogative and negative validator *-chu*.

- (7) *Pai mana alli runa-chu.*
 s/he not good person-NEG
 ‘S/he is not a good person.’ (Catta 1994: 218)

However, the copula can only be omitted, when there is no aspect marking; otherwise the presence of the copula is obligatory (Cole 1982: 67), as is shown in example (8), which contains the progressive marker *-ju*:

- (8) *Juzi-ka Utavalu-pi-mi ka-ju-n*
 José-TOP Otavalo-LOC-AFF COP-PROG-3
 ‘José is in Otavalo’ (Cole 1982: 67)

Thirdly, validators appear only in main clauses, i.e. the use of *-mi* is ungrammatical in the following example:

- (9) a. **kwitsa-ta juya-ni Juan-wan-mi tushu-shka ka-shka-ta*
 girl-ACC love-1SG Juan-COM-AFF dance-NOM be-NOM-ACC
 b. *kwitsa-ta juya-ni Juan-wan tushu-shka ka-shka-ta*
 girl-ACC love-1SG Juan-COM dance-NOM be-NOM-ACC
 ‘I love the girl Juan had danced with’ (Cole 1982: 166)

Fourthly, according to Adelaar (1977: 80) “[v]alidational suffixes are never used in sentences with imperatives”. This is confirmed by Floyd (1999: 83-84), who shows that, although *-mi* can in fact occur in directive speech acts, these do not have an imperative form.

Finally, the specific properties of *-mi* as used in Ecuadorian Quechua need to be considered in some more detail. The suffix *-mi* can appear both in negative contexts and in questions, but only under very specific conditions. As regards the former, Jake & Chuquín (1979: 174) argue that *-mi* cannot occur within the scope of negation, i.e. it can modify a constituent that precedes the negative particle *mana* ‘not’, but it can never follow *mana*.⁷ Consider (10a), where instead of *-mi* the negative suffix *-chu* must follow *mana*, versus (10b), where *-mi* precedes *mana* focalizing the constituent to which it is attached:

- (10) a. *huarmi-ca anacu-ta mana randi-rca-*mi/chu*
 woman-TOP skirt-ACC not buy-PAST-AFF/NEG
 ‘the woman did not buy the skirt’
 b. *huarmi-ca anacu-ta-mi mana randi-rca*
 woman-TOP shirt-ACC-AFF not buy-PAST
 ‘the woman did not buy THE SKIRT’ (Jake & Chuquín 1979: 174-175)

With respect to the latter, *-mi* is ungrammatical in yes/no questions, but it can appear in question-word questions, where the unmarked choice would be the suffix *-tac* (also written *-taj*). Example (11) is illustrative of the use of *-mi* in interrogative contexts: there is only very little insecurity (Catta 1994: 59), or as Cole puts it, “the questioner already knows the answer to the question” (1982: 108).⁸

- (11) *may-pi-mi pundaniki inga-ka kawsa-rka*
 where-LOC-AFF first Inca-TOP live-PAST
 ‘Where did the first Inca live?’ (Cole 1982: 18)

To sum up, the use of *-mi* or any other validator is not compulsory. The suffix *-mi* functions as a direct evidential whenever such a reading is possible, and it is an expression of affirmative validation in all other cases. In analogy to the other validators, *-mi* (i) has an additional focus-marking function, (ii) can occur without a copula in 3rd person present tense non-verbal predications, (iii) can be used in the main clause only, and (iv) does not occur in imperatives. As the use of *-mi* in negative contexts and questions is severely constrained, we can conclude that, as a general rule, the use of *-mi* in EQ is restricted to affirmative declarative utterances in the form of main clauses.

3. THE CORPUS

My research is based on a corpus of rural Ecuadorian Highland Spanish (henceforward: EHS) compiled by Pieter Muysken (Salcedo corpus, SC). The Salcedo corpus contains data from four different speaker groups from the small mestizo town of Salcedo (Cotopaxi province) situated at an altitude of approximately 2800 metres. The four groups consist of Quechua-dominant bilinguals (BQ), Spanish-dominant bilinguals (BS), lower-class monolinguals in Spanish (M1), and middle-class monolinguals in Spanish (M2). The group of Quechua dominant bilinguals (BQ) consists of (i)

⁷ Interestingly, there is no such restriction in both distantly (cf. Adelaar 1977 on Tarma, and Floyd 1999 on Wanka Quechua, Hannß 2004 on Cuzco Quechua) and closely (cf. Coombs *et al.* 1976 on San Martín Quechua) related dialects of Quechua.

⁸ In his study of Wanka Quechua, a dialect spoken in the Peruvian department of Junín, Floyd (1999: 85-92) argues that the use of *-mi* in interrogative contexts implies that the speaker expects the addressee to know the answer. Even if Floyd is right, it is possible that the pragmatics of such marked usage are highly idiosyncratic in different dialects.

loadbearers from isolated Quechua speaking mountain regions, who have only a very rudimentary knowledge of Spanish, and of (ii) weavers and peasants from the nearby indigenous communities, who usually are somewhat more fluent in Spanish, but speak Quechua at home. The Spanish dominant bilinguals (BS) are native speakers of Quechua who have had the opportunity to work in Quito and have returned to their communities with some money and fluency in (urban) Spanish; they speak Quechua only incidentally. The lower class monolingual group (M1) basically consists of Indians adapted to mestizo lifestyle, who had shifted to Spanish one or more generations ago. The people who belong to the middle class monolinguals (M2) are small landowners and civil servants, which constitute the local elite and whose speech is representative of the local standard.⁹

The corpus consists of 32 hours of informal conversations and oral narratives recorded in natural settings. For the purpose of this study I will use only the non-narrative sections of the corpus, and, from these, only those parts in which the speakers can be unequivocally associated to one of the four groups specified above, which amounts to a total of 109,252 words. The examples quoted from the corpus will sometimes be highly marked or even clearly ungrammatical; however, for practical reasons, I will refrain from indicating such cases by means of “[sic]”.

General Spanish will be documented by means of a representative selection (188,074 words) of the *Macrocorpus* (MC), consisting of informal interviews taken in a formal setting with academics in 12 big cities of Spain and Spanish America.¹⁰ Both corpora have been analysed with the concordance program MonoPro.

4. TWO PROPOSALS: *ES QUE* AND *PUES*

In the literature, two proposals on possible reflexes of *-mi* in Andean Spanish have been put forward, the petrified expression *es que* ‘(literally:) (it) is that’, ‘as a matter of fact’ (Muysken 1987: 391), and the discourse marker *pues* ‘(literally:) because’ (Zavala 2001). The former proposal has not been elaborated in any detail, but Muysken just mentions in passing that, given the semantic analogy between the two, there could be a relation between the use of *es que* in rural EHS and the use of *-mi* in EQ. Zavala, on the other hand, argues more strongly for her case. What both proposals have in common is that neither of the two authors claims that there is a direct, one to one relation between the Quechua and the Spanish expressions. In the following I will examine both proposals in detail, providing evidence that there is probably no relation at all between *-mi* and *es que*, and that *pues* may be somehow related to *-mi* but may also have a different source.

4.1. *ES QUE*

In the Salecedo corpus, there are a few speakers who use the petrified expression *es que* ‘(literally:) (it) is that’ with a relatively high frequency: PC, a male Spanish dominant speaker uses it 10 times in about 1,800 words, i.e. there are 5.5 occurrences per 1000 words (=0.55 %), and JJ, a female Spanish dominant speaker uses it 6 times in 800 words (=0.75%). This frequency is so high that one might be inclined to assume that there is indeed a relation between *es que* on the one hand and *-mi* on the other, since the frequency of *-mi* is probably similar. However, the quantitative data from the corpus as a whole show that these speakers are not representative:

⁹ This description is based on personal information provided by Pieter Muysken and draws on Muysken 1984: 106-107; cf. also Muysken 2005: 36-38.

¹⁰ The *Macrocorpus de la norma lingüística culta de las principales ciudades del mundo hispánico* has been compiled by Samper Padilla et al. (1998) and comprises a total of 746,931 words.

	Words	Tokens	%
BQ	25,976	30	0.115
BS	22,420	38	0.169
M1	39,611	35	0.088
M2	21,245	22	0.104
Total Salcedo	109,252	125	0.114
Macrocorpus	188,074	188	0.097

TABLE 1: THE FREQUENCY OF PETRIFIED *ES QUE*

As can be gathered from table 1, the overall frequency of *es que* in the conversations of the Salcedo corpus is somewhat higher than in the Macrocorpus. But, although there is also some variation between the individual speaker groups with respect to the frequency of *es que* per hundred words, this variation is contrary to what one would expect if the use of *es que* were related to Quechua: *es que* is almost equally frequent in Quechua dominant bilingual speech, i.e. 1.15 tokens per thousand words (0.115%) as in middle class monolingual speech (1.04 tokens per thousand words, i.e. 0.114%).

As regards the distribution and function of *es que* there is no big difference between Salcedo Spanish and general Spanish: in each variety *es que* generally occupies either clause-initial or second position, where it fulfils a function similar to English *in fact*. Examples (12) and (13) illustrate *es que* in clause-initial position in the Macrocorpus and the Salcedo corpus, respectively:

(12) *–Y claro, todo eso ha desaparecido. Ahora, cuando hay ópera, [...] la mayor parte de la gente va con traje de calle. [...]*

–Es que ahora se siente de otro modo la ópera. (MC, Madrid 13)

‘–And of course, all this has disappeared. Nowadays, when there’s an opera on [...] most people just wear simple clothes [...]

–Es que nowadays people deal with opera in a different way.’

(13) [interviewer is suffering from flu, and speaker offers help]

Eso le doy que se tome [...] una cucharita al tomar café no más ese jarabe [...]. Es que es bueno.

(M1 21a)

‘I give you this so that you take [...] just one spoonful of this syrup when you are having coffee [...]. *Es que* it’s good.’

In both of these examples *es que* serves as a focalizing device which introduces an explanation to what has been said earlier, either by the speaker him- or herself, as in (13), or by the addressee, as in (12) (cf. Fernández Leborans 1999: 2405-2406).¹¹ The function of *es que* is similar when preceded by an adverb such as reason-giving as *así*, reinforcing the explanatory value of the utterance. We find instances of this type both in the Macrocorpus and in the Salcedo corpus:

¹¹ The pragmatic function of petrified *es que* is very similar to that of pseudo-cleft constructions like *lo que pasa es que* ‘what happens is that’, in which *es que* functions just as a 3rd person singular present tense copula plus a subordinating conjunction. In fact, petrified *es que* basically is a truncated form of this type of pseudo-cleft construction, from which it may even have developed diachronically (Moreno Cabrera 1999: 4253). *Lo que pasa es que* is highly frequent in the Macrocorpus (14 tokens in 188,074 words) and it occurs once in each speaker group of the Salcedo corpus, with the exception of BQ, where exclusively petrified instances of *es que* occur.

- (14) *Era normal... entraba en la... en la vida de uno, así es que no... no había ningún... motivo para quejarse* (MC, Caracas 13)
 ‘It was normal... it formed part of one’s life, therefore *es que* there was no... no reason to complain’
- (15) <Int.> *¿Y los animales? ¿Siguen bien?*
 <MCH> *Sí, sí siguen bien [...] también tenemos una cahuitas así [par]a los puerquitos gorditos. Así es que sí seguimos bien con los animales* (BS 1a)
 ‘<Int.> And the animals? They are still fine?
 <MCH> Yes, they are fine indeed [...] we also have some mash for the fat piggies. Therefore *es que* we are fine indeed with the animals’

To conclude, neither the quantitative nor the qualitative data suggest that the use of *es que* in rural EHS could be due to contact with Quechua, since it largely parallels the way in which *es que* is used in general Spanish. Put differently, there is no indication of any possible link between the use of *es que* in contact Spanish with the use of *-mi* in EQ. In fact, this conclusion confirms the reserve with which Muysken (1987) presents this hypothesis.¹²

4.2. PUES

The case of *pues* is quite distinct from that of *es que*. The following two examples may serve to give a first impression of the analogies and differences of the ways in which *pues* is used in general Spanish and in EHS, respectively:

- (16) *–¿cómo... cómo viste tú la diferencia en... en el tipo de vida que se vive allá y el que vivimos acá?*
–Pues en realidad, el mundo se ha ido unificando en... en modos de vida, en... tipo de construcción, en muchas cosas. (MC, Bogotá 09)
 ‘–how... how did you view the difference in... in the ways that people live there and we live here?
–Pues in fact, the world has been gradually unifying in... the ways of life, in... the ways of constructing buildings, in many things.’
- (17) [discussion with a Dutchman, F, who pretends to be a native Ecuadorian]
 <F> *Francamente vivo justo entre dos pueblos. [...] Bonito.*
 <RGM> *Vive sí, pero no es usted de ahí nativo pues.* (M1 1b)
 ‘<F> Honestly, I live in between two villages. [...] Nice.
 <RGM> You live there, yes, but you are not a native from there *pues*.’

These examples illustrate that in both general and Ecuadorian Highland Spanish *pues* is a discourse marker.¹³ This means (i) that it does not form part of the syntactic structure of the clause, but it either precedes, interrupts or follows the clause proper, and (ii) that it has a procedural rather than conceptual meaning (Fraser 1999). The most obvious difference between general Spanish *pues* and Salcedo-*pues* is its position, which corresponds to a functional difference: while in general Spanish

¹² In addition to pointing at the lack of formal correspondence between *-mi* and *es que*, Muysken (1987: 391) also mentions the use of *es que* outside contact with Quechua.

¹³ Zavala (2001) is mistaken when she claims that the development of the erstwhile causal conjunction *pues* into a discourse marker is exclusive to American Spanish.

pues serves as an introductory device for a new argument in a conversation,¹⁴ EHS *pues* has the function of reinforcing the communicative point of the utterance. The way *pues* is used in the Salcedo corpus is representative of its use in other variants of Andean Spanish (Soto Ruiz 1978, Zavala 2001, Paul Heggarty pers. com. on Peruvian Spanish, Muntendam pers. com. on Bolivian Spanish).

Turning to the quantitative data, we can see that *pues*, as well as its allomorphs *ps*, *pes*, *pu*, is frequent in the Salcedo corpus, but neither its absolute frequency in comparison with general Spanish nor its internal distribution within the different speaker groups shows any significant variation:

	Words	Tokens	%
BQ	21,245	69	0.32
BS	39,611	184	0.46
M1	22,420	152	0.67
M2	25,976	132	0.51
Total Salcedo	109,252	537	0.49
Macrocorpus	188,074	903	0.48

TABLE 2: THE FREQUENCY OF *PUES*

As we can gather from table 2, *pues* is even a bit more frequent in the monolingual than in the bilingual varieties. However, if we consider the position of *pues* within the utterance, the results are quite different. In table 3, I distinguish between (i) an absolute initial position, at the beginning of the utterance, (ii) a post-initial position, i.e. either following some other introductory item or interrupting the utterance proper, and (iii) an utterance-final position. The instances of *pues* in the different positions are given in absolute numbers, followed in each case by the percentages in relation to the total number of occurrences:

	Total <i>pues</i>	Initial		Post-initial		Final	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
BQ	132	0	0.0	55	41.7	77	58.3
BS	151	3	2.0	70	46.4	78	51.6
M1	184	3	1.6	97	52.7	84	45.7
M2	69	4	5.8	58	84.1	7	10.1
Total Salcedo	536	10	1.9	280	52.2	246	45.9
Macrocorpus	903	33	3.7	856	94.8	14	1.6

TABLE 3: THE POSITION OF *PUES* WITHIN THE UTTERANCE

Table 3 shows that the unmarked position of *pues* in general Spanish is post-initial, a position which is also highly frequent in the rural monolingual and bilingual varieties of EHS. The data for the other two positions indicate that the position of *pues* is related to the contact with Quechua, in the sense that the more direct the contact to Quechua, the more rare the cases of *pues* in initial position and the more frequently its occurrence in utterance-final position. This means that the quantitative data support Zavala's (2001) claim to the extent that there probably is some relation between Quechua usage and the use of *pues*.

¹⁴ This is not the only but definitely the most frequent function of *pues* in general Spanish. There is a tendency of generalizing *pues* to such a degree that it turns into an empty, exclusively phatic device. Less frequently, *pues* serves as a connector (Dorta Luis & Domínguez García 2001: 45-49).

In order to see if there are actually parallels between *-mi* and *pues*, I will now come back to the semantic and syntactic properties of *-mi* mentioned in section 2 above. Let us first consider a number of formal differences which are due to the fact that *pues* is a discourse marker and *-mi* is affixed to a constituent.

First, the focus-marking function of *-mi* as illustrated in example (5) of section 2, is not available for *pues*, given the fact that, as a discourse marker, *pues* cannot operate on the level of the constituent. Secondly, in a similar vain, the restriction to the main clause that holds for validators (cf. example (9) above) is not applicable to *pues* either, since *pues* does not form part of any clause at all. Thirdly, the use of *pues* in contact Spanish does not affect the obligatoriness of the copular verb, as does the use of validators in Quechua (cf. examples (4) and (7) above).

Turning to the semantics and pragmatics of *pues* in comparison with *-mi*, I will successively discuss the cases of evidentiality and focus-function, and the use of *pues* vs. *-mi* in contexts other than affirmative declaratives.

Let us first consider direct evidentiality. Example (18) shows that in EQ using *-mi* is ungrammatical in a description of an observable event that was not eyewitnessed:

- (18) *pay-ca tuqui-lla micu-rca-mi, *mana ricu-rca-ni-chu*
 s/he-TOP all-LIM eat-PAST-AFF not see-PAST-1SG-NEG
 ‘s/he ate it all up, *I didn’t see it’ (Jake & Chuquín 1979: 173)

However, such a restriction does not hold for the use of *pues*: the speaker of the second utterance in (19) says he has not eyewitnessed an observable event described in the first, and nevertheless he uses *pues*:

- (19) –*En la votación, en la votación ganó él, entonces mete... metieron a mi Vicepresidente [...]*
 –*Cierto sería pes, como yo no estuve presente* (BS 12a)
 ‘–During the elections, during the elections, he won, so they made me Vicepresident [...]
 –Maybe it’s true *pues*, since I wasn’t there’

This example shows that *pues* does not express direct evidentiality.

Turning to focalisation, it has been observed above that *-mi* typically occurs in question-answer pairs, marking the information in focus (cf. example (6) of section 2). Conversely, *pues* is not systematically used in question-answer pairs, as can be gathered from the following dialogue, which centres around the description of a picture by an incipient bilingual:

- (20) <Int.> *¿Y qué se hace con este juego? ¿Cómo se juega?*
 <FVT> *Aportando con la plata. El que se gana se lleva la plata, pues.*
 <Int.> *¿Has ganado a veces?*
 <FVT> *Sí. Cuántas [=bastantes] veces tengo ganado jugando.*
 <Int.> *¿Qué hay aquí?*
 <FVT> *¿Los de, los de Salasaca, serán?*
 <Int.> *¿Y quiénes están en el árbol?*
 <FVT> *Los pajaritos.* (BQ 3a)
 ‘<Int.> And what do you do with this play? How do you play it?
 <FVT> Bringing in money. The one who wins takes the money, *pues*.
 <Int.> Have you ever won?
 <FVT> Yes. Many times I have won when playing.
 <Int.> And what is this?
 <FVT> The people from Salasaca perhaps?’

<Int.> And what is there in the tree?
<FVT> Little birds.'

In this dialogue, *pues* is used in an answer only once, where it serves to reinforce the point the speaker wishes to make.

In section 2, I concluded that the default use of *-mi* concerns affirmative declaratives. This situation is very different with *pues*, which can be used in virtually any context. In the following two examples, we can see that *-mi* is disallowed in yes/no questions (cf. section 2) and the affix *-chu* must be used instead, whereas *pues* can be freely used in yes/no questions:

(21) *jari-ca huagra-ta michi-n-*mi/chu*
man-TOP cow-ACC herd-3- AFF/INTER
'Does the man herd the cow?' (Jake & Chuquín 1979: 177)

(22) –¿*Iría* pues?
–*Sí, fue.* (BS 29a)
'–Would he go *pues*?
–Yes, he went'

As we saw in section 2, validators do not occur in imperatives; however, such a restriction does not hold for the use of *pues* in EHS:

(23) [about a radio]
–*Vamos a poner, ¿sí quiere música usted?*
–*Sí ponga pues.* (M1 08b)
'–Let's turn it on, you'd like to listen to music indeed?
–Yes, turn it on *pues*.'

While in EQ *-mi* cannot occur in the immediate contact with the negation particle *mana* (cf. section 2), there is no such restriction on the use of *pues* in EHS:

(24) –¿*Pero no habían arreglado el precio antes?*
–*No pes. Por eso... por eso lo que digo [...]* (BS 29a)
'–But hadn't you agreed on the price beforehand?
–No *pues*. That's why... that's why as I said [...]

From the above it follows that the domain of applicability of *pues* is much wider than that of *-mi*, while the semantico-pragmatic function of *pues* is much less specific than that of *-mi*: whereas *-mi* expresses either first hand information or the speaker's commitment to the truth of the propositional content, *pues* expresses general emphasis, which in many cases may be a linguistic reflex of impatience on the part of the speaker.¹⁵ In her detailed study of the pragmatics of *pues* in conversations with bilingual male rural political leaders in the Peruvian province of Ayacucho, Zavala finds that the role of *pues* is "that of a clarification and confirmation device" (2001: 1021). She defines the relation of Spanish *pues* with Quechua *-mi* in terms of "semantic overlap": "[t]he speaker attaches *pues* to his utterance and with it, the sentence acquires a connotation of conviction, certainty, and assurance toward what he is saying" (2001: 1017). This is indeed true for the use of

¹⁵ In example (17) the speaker is tired of the claims of F to be a native Ecuadorian, which he obviously is not, witness his strong foreign accent; in (20) FVT probably thinks that it is logical that the winner takes the money; in (23) the speaker wants the addressee to turn on the radio immediately and in (24) the speaker wonders why the addressee asks him questions to which he should have known the answer. Zavala (2001: 1009) observes similar motivations for the use of *pues* in some of her own data.

pues in affirmative declarative contexts, but how to account for the remaining cases where there is no such overlap? It is theoretically possible that the use of *pues* did actually originate from *-mi* in the past and came to be generalized independently of *-mi* as part of a language-internal development of Andean Spanish, but evidence of such a development would be difficult if not impossible to obtain.

Zavala is aware of the fact that her explanation is not all-encompassing, i.e. that there are cases where *-mi* in Quechua is used differently from *pues* in Andean Spanish and vice versa (2001: 1018-1019). In this context she briefly discusses emphatic markers in Quechua, referring to a study by Soto Ruiz (1978), but unfortunately she refrains from pursuing this point any further. In my view, if the idiosyncrasies of Andean *pues* can be explained through language contact at all, emphatic markers in Quechua are the most obvious candidates. Apart from Quechua emphatic markers, such as *-tac* (e.g. Cusihamán 2001: 240-242) and *-puni* (e.g. Dedenbach-Salazar Saéñz *et al.* 2002: 117-118),¹⁶ Soto Ruiz (1978) refers to *-a*, a suffix that occurs in combination with validators (Dedenbach-Salazar Saéñz *et al.* 2002: 110) adding emphasis to their original meanings. In Ecuadorian Quechua there are similar combinations of suffixes with the affirmative particle *ari* ‘yes’ that have an additional emphatic value and may be related to the use of *pues* in rural EHS: in addition to *-mari*, mentioned in section 2 above, *-yari* is an emphatic imperative suffix (Catta 1994: 194-195), which could be related to the use of *pues* in imperatives. Although highly interesting, this point is beyond the scope of this paper, and I will therefore not pursue it here.

In sum, although it cannot be excluded that *pues* in rural EHS is related in some way to *-mi*, it is more probable that there are other factors involved.

4.3. CONCLUSION

It will have become obvious from the above that *-mi* has a highly complex function and that it is therefore difficult and probably impossible to find one single linguistic item in contact Spanish that would correspond to this entire semantic complex. Therefore, it is probably more fruitful to consider if some specific use of *-mi* within a restricted context may have influenced Spanish. In section 5, I will examine such a case.

5. NON-VERBAL PREDICATIONS

In section 2, I mentioned the fact that the use of validators in 3rd person present tense non-verbal predications renders the copula redundant, so that it is normally omitted. Let us consider two more examples:

(24) *Ñuka shuti-ka Jorge-mi.* (Gómez Rendón 2004)
 my name-TOP Jorge-AFF
 ‘My name is Jorge.’

(25) *Juzi-ka mayistru-mi.*
 José-TOP teacher-AFF
 ‘José is a teacher.’ (Cole 1982: 67)

¹⁶ I would like to thank Willem Adelaar and Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Saéñz for drawing my attention to this point.

In example (24) the subject referent is identified, and in example (25) a property is assigned to the subject referent *Juzi*. It is with respect to this type of predications that we can see an interesting parallel in rural Ecuadorian Highland Spanish.

Rural EHS has a remarkable way of using the 3rd person present tense forms of the copula *ser*. This phenomenon occurs both in the singular and in the plural, but given the fact that *ser* occurs about ten times more frequently in the 3rd person singular than the 3rd person plural, I will concentrate on the singular. Consider the following examples, in which data from the Salcedo corpus are compared with analogous data from the Macrocorpus:

- (26) a. *Sí, mi nietito ... es.* (M1 6b)
 ‘Yes, he is ... my grandson.’
 b. *[...] es mi nieto Ricardo* (MC, México 13)
 ‘he is my grandson Ricardo’
- (27) a. *Sí, gratuita es.* (BE 1a)
 ‘Yes, it’s free.’
 b. *me parece que son gratuitos.* (MC, Santiago de Chile 9)
 ‘I think they are free’
- (28) a. *Mentira es.* (BQ 22b)
 ‘It’s a lie.’
 b. *... entonces la mujer es sensible, es mentira.* (MC, Caracas 10)
 ‘... so women are sensitive; its a lie.’

In these identifying (26) and property assigning (27-28) predications, rural EHS deviates from general Spanish with respect to the mutual order of the lexical predicate and the copula in declarative utterances: whereas in general Spanish the order is *es+pred(icate)* the order in rural EHS tends to be *pred+es*.¹⁷

Before going into more detail, let us consider the quantitative distribution of this phenomenon:

	total <i>es</i>	pred+ <i>es</i>	%
BQ	233	71	30.4
BS	228	29	12.7
M1	387	67	17.3
M2	265	10	3.8
Total Salcedo	1,113	177	15.9
Macrocorpus	2,590	0	0.0

TABLE 4: THE FREQUENCY OF PRED+ES

These data indicate that the order *pred+es* must be related to the contact with Quechua, since the frequency of this marked word order is extremely high in the speech of Quechua dominant bilinguals and is relatively low only in middle class monolingual speech.¹⁸

¹⁷ Note that I refer to lexical predicates only, i.e. I exclude pro-forms such as *así* ‘like that’ or *eso* ‘that’, which are usually preposed in general Spanish as well, such as e.g. *Eso es* ‘That’s it’.

¹⁸ It may seem curious that the frequency of clause-final *es* is lower in the speech of Spanish dominant bilinguals (BS) than in that of lower class monolinguals (M1), a difference that can be seen with respect to other data, too (cf. e.g. Muysken 2005: 45). On the one hand this difference is related to personal history of the member of this specific group (see section 3), but on the other hand it may be related to language attitudes of Spanish dominant bilinguals in general, who have liberately chosen to abandon Quechua and to speak Spanish instead. As such they will probably more consciously try to avoid “Indian” linguistic features in their speech than the lower class native speakers (cf. Muysken 1984).

The question that might arise in this context is, why should one assume this word order to be related to *-mi* or other validators? Quechua is an SOV language, and according to Cole (1982: 68) verb final order is “considerably more pronounced” in copula constructions than elsewhere. Therefore, the frequent copula-final order seems to be nothing but a syntactic calque of Quechua word order. However, it turns out that copula-final order is much less frequent in the forms other than 3rd person singular (and plural) present tense.¹⁹ For instance with the 1st person form *soy* there is one clause-final instance in every speaker group: Quechua dominant speakers have 1 in 21 tokens (4,7%), this value is the same for the Spanish dominant bilinguals, lower class monolinguals have 1 in 16 tokens (6,5%) and the middle class monolinguals have 1 in 12 tokens (8,3%). There is no clause final copula use with the 1st person plural form *somos*. Given the disparateness of these data, we may safely assume that the relation between *pred+es* and Quechua non-verbal predications goes beyond word order proper.

Most of the cases of *pred+es* in the Salcedo corpus concern affirmative declarative utterances, like the ones illustrated in (26)-(28) above. However, out of the total of 1,113, there are 8 instances of yes/no questions²⁰ and 2 negative affirmatives, such as (29) and (30) respectively:

(29) <MAG> *¿Ha sentado usted en buque?*

<Int.> *Sí, lindo es.*

<MAG> *¿Bonito es?* (BE 10b)

‘<MAG> Have you done a trip by boat?’

<Int.> Yes, it’s nice.

<MAG> Is it beautiful?’

(30) <Int.> *¿A usted no le hace daño el frío así?*

<Sra. T> *No, nosotros ya somos enseñados. Oh, aquí nada no es.* (M1 6b)

‘<Int.> Don’t you suffer from the cold?’

<Sra. T> No, we are used to it. Oh, here it is nothing.’

As we saw in section 2, the omission of the copula in Quechua is not tied to the presence of *-mi*, but of a validator of any kind. Therefore, the use of *pred+es* in the examples (29) and (30) above is not analogous the use of *-mi* but to that of *-chu*. The following instances with *-chu* are analogous to (29) and (30), respectively:

(31) *Pay awadur-chu?*

he weaver-INTER

‘Is he a weaver’ (Chuquín *et al.* s.d.: 38)

(32) *Pay mana Agato runa-chu*

he not Agato person-NEG

‘He is not from Agato’ (Chuquín *et al.* s.d.: 45)

Somewhat more problematic are 5 instances, all uttered by FPB, a Quechua dominant speaker, in which the clause final copula is preceded by *dizque*, an adverb that indicates that the speaker has obtained his information from a secondary source.

(33) *Después hay que pagar el banco. El interés dizque es* (BQ 9a)

‘Then you have to pay the bank. The interest they say it is’

¹⁹ It has been checked that *es* in the data presented in table 4 has indeed 3rd person reference rather than 2nd person polite reference.

²⁰ There are also many cases of *pred+es* in question-word questions, but these are not relevant to our case given the fact that the verb final order is obligatory in Spanish question-word questions.

- (34) *Para fortalecer bien dizque es.* (BQ 9a)
'To fortify you they say it is.'

In spite of the idiolectal character of these utterances, the apparent semantic incompatibility contained in (33) and (34) calls for an explanation: the combination of what I claim to correspond to Quechua *-mi* with an expression of reportative evidentiality seems to be contradictory. However, there is not really a semantic conflict. Given the fact that both (33) and (34) present non-observable states-of-affairs, *pred+es* does not express evidentiality but affirmative validation, i.e. the speaker presents information from a secondary source and at the same time expresses his belief that this information corresponds to the truth.

To sum up, I have shown that the marked word order in Spanish copula constructions in affirmative declarative utterances parallels the use of *-mi* in identifying and property assigning constructions. What is expressed morphosyntactically in Quechua comes to be expressed through syntax in contact Spanish.

6. CONCLUSION

In the introduction to this paper, I argued that it would be no less than logical if the meanings of *-mi* had some expression in contact Spanish, given the fact that *-mi* is used more frequently than is *-shi* or *nin* for reportative evidentiality, which does have an expression in contact Spanish (i.e. *dizque*). However, I have shown that there is only a small functional overlap between *-mi* and *pues*, which may be coincidental, and that copula-predicate inversion in contact Spanish parallels *-mi* only in a small section of its functional domain.

Although perhaps disappointing at first sight, this result is not really surprising when we consider this matter from a wider perspective. As regards validation, the affirmative is an unmarked modal value as opposed to e.g. conjecture. While the latter semantic concept is highly relevant to the cross-linguistic study of epistemic modality (cf. e.g. Van der Auwera & Plungian 1998), affirmative validation is not, because in most languages asserting some propositional content is taken to be equivalent to committing to its truth. This may be the reason why the concept of "affirmative validation" is relatively unknown outside Quechua linguistics. The same holds, although to a somewhat lesser extent, for direct evidentiality. Grammatical expressions of direct evidentiality are cross-linguistically less frequent than are expressions of indirect evidentiality (cf. De Haan, 2005). This difference can be explained through the markedness of the indirect value as opposed to the direct value. Put differently, direct evidentiality is a kind of default value, whereas indirect evidentiality is not.²¹

For the transference of first language semantic features in general their markedness may play a role of some importance. I believe that it is probable that the speakers tend to transfer only those first language semantic and pragmatic concepts into their second language that are highly relevant for the communicative goals they want to achieve.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study is based on a paper read at the International Roundtable of the European Network for the Study of Andean Languages (REELA) at Newcastle University in June 2007; I gratefully

²¹ Interestingly, this point is confirmed by data from a dialect of Bolivian Quechua: in Cochabamba Quechua *-mi* is no longer used, while indirect evidentiality is expressed frequently (Antje Muntendam and Simon van de Kerke pers. com.).

acknowledge the comments and suggestions I was given on this occasion. Furthermore, I would like to thank Carmen Chuquín for serving me as a native informant of Ecuadorian Quechua, Anna Jagtman for her generous technical help, Carla Vergaro for inviting me to contribute to this volume, and Evelien Keizer, Leo Lemmers, Antje Muntendam, Sijmen Tol, Rolandt Tweehuysen and Gerry Wanders for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper. The responsibility for the remaining errors is mine.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE GLOSSES

ACC – accusative
AFF – affirmative validation/direct evidentiality
COM – comitative
COP – copula
DIR – directional
FUT – future
GEN – genitive
INTER – interrogative
LIM – limitative
LOC – locative
NEG – negation
NOM – nominalizer
PERF – perfect
PROG – progressive
SG – singular
TOP – topic
1 – 1st person
2 – 2nd person
3 – 3rd person

REFERENCES

- ADELAAR, WILLEM F.H. (1977). *Tarma Quechua. Grammar, texts, dictionary*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.
- ADELAAR, WILLEM F.H. (1997). Los marcadores de validación y evidencialidad en quechua: ¿automatismo o elemento expresivo? *Amerindia* 22, 3-13.
- ADELAAR, WILLEM F.H. with PIETER MUYSKEN (2004). *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ALMEIDA, ILEANA (2005) *Historia del pueblo kechua*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- CATTA, JAVIER (1994). *Gramática del quichua ecuatoriano*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- CERRÓN-PALOMINO, RODOLFO (1987). *Lingüística quechua*. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.
- CERRÓN-PALOMINO, RODOLFO (1989). Language policy in Perú: a historical overview. *International journal of the sociology of language* 77, 11-33.
- CHUQUÍN, CARMEN ET AL.(s.d.). *Elementary Quechua*. Unpublished University of Wisconsin reader.
- COLE, PETER (1982). *Imbabura Quechua*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- COOMBS, DAVID, HEIDI COOMBS & ROBERT WEBER (1976). *Gramática quechua: San Martín*. Lima: Ministerio de Educación.

- CUSIHUAMÁN, ANTONIO (2001). *Gramática quechua: Cuzco Collao*. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.
- DEDENBACH-SALAZAR SAÉNZ, SABINE, UTTA VON GLEICH, ROSWITH HARTMANN, PETER MASSON, CLODOALDO SOTO RUIZ (2002). “*Rimaykullayki*” *Unterrichtsmaterialien zum Quechua Ayacuchano*. Berlin: Reimer.
- DORTA LUIS, JOSEFA & M. NOEMI DOMÍNGUEZ GARCÍA (2001). Polifuncionalidad discursiva y comportamiento prosódico prototípico del marcador *pues*. *Español actual* 75, 45-53.
- FALLER, MARTINA (2002). The evidential and validational licensing conditions for the Cusco Quechua enclitic *-mi*. *Belgian journal of linguistics* 16, 7-21.
- FERNÁNDEZ LEBORANS, M. JESÚS (1999). La predicación: las oraciones copulativas. In Bosque, Ignacio & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, Vol. 2, 2357-2460.
- FLOYD, RICK (1999). *The structure of evidential categories in Wanka Quechua*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics; Arlington: University of Texas.
- FRASER, BRUCE (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of pragmatics* 31/7, 931-952.
- GÓMEZ RENDÓN, JORGE (2004). The interpersonal component in Imbabura Quechua. Lecture held at the *Functional grammar colloquium*.
- GRANDA, GERMÁN DE (2002). Un proceso de transferencia bidireccional sucesiva en el área andina. Evidenciales reportativos entre quechua y español. In Granda, Germán de, *Lingüística en contacto: español y quechua en el área andina suramericana*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 123-133.
- HAAN, F. de (2005). Semantic distinctions in evidentiality. In Haspelmath, M., M. Dryer, D. Gil & B. Comrie (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 314-317.
- HANNSS, KATJA (2004). *Beitrag zur Untersuchung der Evidenzsuffixe des Quechua Cuzqueño*. Unpublished M.A. thesis.
Downloadable at <http://www.iae-bonn.de/iae/fileadmin/assest/pdf/hannss.pdf>.
- JAKE, JANICE & CARMEN CHUQUÍN (1979). Validation suffixes in Imbabura Quechua. *CLS* 15, 172-184.
- LÓPEZ MORALES, HUMBERTO (1998). *La aventura del español en América*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- MORENO CABRERA, JUAN CARLOS (1999). Las funciones informativas: las perífrasis de relativo y otras construcciones perifrásticas. In Bosque, Ignacio & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, Vol. 3, 4245-4302.
- MUYSKEN, PIETER (1984). The Spanish that Quechua speakers learn: L2 learning as norm-governed behaviour. In Andersen, Roger W. (ed.), *Second languages: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 101-119.
- MUYSKEN, PIETER (1987). Contactos entre castellano y quechua en el Ecuador. In Moreno Yanez, Segundo (ed.), *Memorias del 1er simposio europeo sobre antropología del Ecuador*. Quito: Abya-Yala, 377-451.
- MUYSKEN, PIETER (1999). Fuentes misioneras del quichua ecuatoriano: evidencia para su desarrollo histórico. In Dedenbach-Salazar Saénz & Lindsay Crickmay (eds.), *La lengua de la cristianización en américa: catequización e instrucción en lenguas amerindias*. Bonn: Sauerwein, 89-113.
- MUYSKEN, PIETER (2005). A modular approach to sociolinguistic variation in syntax: the gerund in Ecuadorian Spanish. In Cornips, Leonie & Karen P. Corrigan (eds.), *Syntax and variation: reconciling the biological and the social*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 31-53.
- NUCKOLLS, JANICE B. (1993). The semantics of certainty in Quechua and its implications for a cultural epistemology. *Language in society* 22, 235-255.

- OLBERTZ, HELLA (2005). *Dizque* en el español andino ecuatoriano: conservador e innovador. In Olbertz, Hella & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Encuentros y conflictos: bilingüismo y contacto de lenguas en el mundo andino*. Frankfurt a. M.: Vervuert; Madrid: Iberoamericana, 77-94.
- PEREIRA V., JOSÉ (1996). Algunos factores sociales del bilingüismo quichua-castellano. In Ileana Almeida (ed.), *Temas y cultura quichua en el Ecuador*. Quito: Banco Central, 43-74.
- SAMPER PADILLA, JOSÉ ANTONIO, CLARA EUGENIA HERNÁNDEZ CABRERA & MAGNOLIA TROYA DÉNIZ (eds.) (1998). *Macrocorpus de la norma lingüística culta de las principales ciudades del mundo hispánico*. CD-ROM. Las Palmas, Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.
- SOTO RUIZ, CLODOALDO (1978). La interferencia quechua-español: una doble perspectiva. *Actas del IV congreso internacional de la ALFAL*. Lima: Universidad de Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 619-626.
- VAN DER AUWERA, JOHAN & VLADIMIR PLUNGIAN (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology*, 2 /1, 1998, 79-124
- WEBER, DAVID (1986). Information perspective, profile, and patterns in Quechua. In Chafe, Wallace & Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- ZAVALA, VIRGINIA (2001). Borrowing evidential functions from Quechua: the role of *pues* as a discourse marker in Andean Spanish, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 999-1023.