

# Some Intriguing Aspects of Quechua

*An overview of Quechua, the main native language of the Andes, including  
a general introduction to the language*

*and then (intended particularly for linguists)  
details on some particularly intriguing aspects of its  
historical phonology, contact phenomena, sociolinguistics, and agglutinating morphology.*

click to go straight to: [Contents](#)

*If you're not a linguist and not familiar with linguistic terminology,  
then the first few sections of what follows should be no problem,  
but thereafter things do get rather technical, and you might like to try  
the presentation of Quechua on Mark Rosenfelder's webpage at*

<http://www.zompist.com/quechua.html>

*which is a bit more layman-friendly than mine here.*

*Not that it is any the less informative for it - it's excellent and clear, highly recommended.  
(Note also that he presents the Ayacucho dialect, as opposed to the Cuzco-Bolivian one here.)*

*What follows here is the text of a presentation I gave  
at a linguistics seminar at the University of Cambridge (UK),  
which was aimed at linguists to give them an overview  
of a wide range of characteristics of Quechua  
which might be of particular interest to linguists.*

*This presentation discusses in detail mainly the  
**CUZCO-BOLIVIAN DIALECT** of Quechua,  
but covers also many general features which are common to all dialects.*

NOTE: All text in GREEN is in the International Phonetic Alphabet,  
and can be viewed with the SILDoulosIPA font,  
which can be downloaded free from the IPA webpage:

<http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/IPA/ipafonts.html>

[Back to Homepage](#)

## CONTENTS

**Contexts: Geographical, Historical and Social**

**What is Quechua Like?: A First Impression**

**Phonology**

**Morphosyntax**

**Agglutination**



The Modal SystemRelationships with Other Languages[Back to Homepage](#)[Back to Contents](#)

## 1. Contexts: Geographical, Historical and Social

In subtitling this talk I described Quechua as "the main native language of the Andes": I'll explain briefly why I chose each of these words.

### 'Andean'

Firstly, Quechua is far from restricted to one country: it is used in seven, though significant only in three, where it is spoken by around a quarter of the population in each: Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru.

Secondly, I say Andean not only to indicate the countries, but also the terrain. Wherever its origin lies, and whatever its original pre-Conquest coverage, it is now most definitely an Andean language (few outposts in the Amazon, but essentially a highland language).

### 'Main' and 'Native'

In calling it the 'main native' language, I want to stress it is 'big'. Estimates of the numbers of speakers vary from 5 to 12 million, though the only detailed one I've seen – Cerrón-Palomino (1987:76) – gives a total of 8,354,125 (!) speakers, broken down thus:

Peru	4,402,023	= 19%
Ecuador	2,233,000	= 23%
Bolivia	1,594,000	= 25%
Argentina	120,000	= 0.3%

(Colombia, Brazil and Chile barely exceed 5,000 speakers combined).

This in fact makes Quechua has a very strong claim to be THE biggest surviving native language not only of the Andes but of the New World – its only rivals being *Mayan* in S. Mexico and Guatemala, and – the only *de facto* as well as *de iure* official native language in the Americas – *Guarani* in Paraguay.

One has to be a little cautious, given that speaker figures are not too reliable and the question of dialect fragmentation is problematic. All the same, for such a significant language, astonishingly little work seems to be done on it, it would appear. If you think linguists have got over Eurocentrism, perhaps you should think again: I was taken aback to see it not in Comrie's The World's Major Languages – indeed not a single native language of the New World. I'll see if I can do something about that in the next 30 minutes!

### 1.1. History and Geography of Quechua

The history of Quechua, and its resulting dialect geography, is a bit of a mess. For those of us used to fairly straightforward Indo-European dialect geography, this is a bit of a puzzle, not

helped by the few details we have on the history of the peoples involved.

You might want at this point to view my [Map of Quechua Dialects](#) image.

Broadly, there is a major split between two groups of dialects: Quechua I and II (or, confusingly, B and A respectively). The A dialects are split north and south by the B dialects in the middle. Meanwhile a single southern dialect – Cuzco-Bolivian (or ‘Cuzco-Collao’) – is split again by Aymara, the language spoken in much of Bolivia, particularly around lake Titicaca, and parts of southern Peru (so you get places like the lakeside city of Puno which are trilingual with Spanish). Linguists looking for an idea of how different the dialects are from each other might like to see a [comparative table of phonological inventories of five main Quechua dialects](#).

No end of competing theories exist as to its place of origin, and as to a possible genetic relationship to Aymara. The one which seems most viable is an origin somewhere on the south-central Peruvian coast, with an early (first centuries A.D.) move north into the central regions, followed by a later (c. 1100 A.D.? – these are *very* approximate dates) two-pronged move into the N. (Ecuador and N. Peru) and S. (S. Peru).

Then came the Inca expansion, pretty short-lived in that it occurred over less than two centuries. Quechua might be seen as the Latin of the Inca Empire, and Cuzco its Rome. Though there are some big differences.

- Firstly, we have an interesting case of a superstrate *dialect* of the same language: many of the areas conquered were already speaking Quechua dialects. Some of these were very similar to the new Cuzco dialect lingua franca’s (those near Cuzco), some fairly different (Ecuador and N.Peru), and some very different (Central Peru). It appears that the *Cuzqueño* superstrate effects were more powerful in those areas where the dialects were already closer to it and thus required less adjustment.
- In other areas the conquest was into non-Quechua areas, particularly the Aymara one to the south. The Incas had a lot of mystical respect for Aymara-speakers (a bit like the Greeks for the Romans), so their language was ‘respected’.
- The Inca Empire was rather short-lived, offering comparatively little time (between two and one centuries) for Quechua to dominate native languages.
- However, Imperial Inca policy enforced major population movements to settle troublesome areas with ‘loyal’ Cuzco-region tribes. This is what is credited with the expanse of the Cuzco dialect to Bolivia. However, this only seems to have happened in the south of Bolivia, not in the Aymara areas in between.

So as you can see, it is as I said an area of very complex dialect geography (and we haven’t even got onto the Quechua-Aymara relationship yet).

Pre-conquest there was some oral literature, mostly in the form of ‘epic’ plays. A few of these were written down post-conquest, indeed Quechua even continued expanding in some areas (*e.g.* significantly at the expense of Aymara in Bolivia, and thence even into N. Argentina, as well as small to tiny incursions into the Peruvian Amazon, S. Colombia, Brazil and Chile). But by 18th century popular revolts saw it even banned by the Spanish in some periods, and by now it is very much in a rut as a very low prestige ‘endangered’ language.

## 1.2. Sociolinguistics of Quechua

As you can see, modern political frontiers haven’t been to kind to Quechua. In no country is it a majority language (unlike *Guaraní* in Paraguay, but like the *Mayan* languages of

S.Mexico and Guatemala). It is generally a very low-prestige language, with – in Peru at least – no television, little radio and very very little written material published in it. It's only widespread broadcasting is in traditional *hauyno* and Andean music.

In Peru, at least, education is exclusively in Spanish – or at least in theory, for though many primary teachers who can will use it with Quechua monolingual pupils. As education and integration (*e.g.* military service) spreads, Quechua monolingualism is very rapidly declining.

Quechua is very much perceived as a 'country' language. In towns it is fast dying out: in Cuzco itself, for instance, we seem to be at the fatal turning point just now. Many *Cuzqueños* over 35 or so usually spoke it at home as children and are fluent, though use it little; of those under 35, many understand but are very reluctant to speak it.

One often comes across remarkable indications of just how low its prestige is: native speakers will, in towns, often deny point-blank that they speak Quechua: to do so would be an admission of undesirably low social background, and this even among very poor stallholders in markets, for instance. Yet having just pointedly denied it (especially in front of non-Quechua speaking Peruvians or gringos), the same people will then amongst themselves speak generally in Quechua!

Take them up on this and they will insist that they don't speak 'correct' Quechua – the self-important Quechua Academy has a lot to answer for in promoting itself as the authority on 'pure' Quechua.

In small towns and villages this is not so much the case, and the young do commonly speak Quechua. Generally, the more remote the settlement, the more it is spoken: in small, out-of-the-way villages in many parts it remains the everyday language, though anyone in a remotely formal context (stallholders, local officials, etc.) will be fluent in Spanish, and even most peasant farmers will have excellent to fair Spanish.

The situation looks bleak, then: despite the millions of speakers, extinction seems on the cards long-term if nothing changes soon. The ray of hope, however, is that things are starting to change. Indeed, the situation as I have described it prevails in Peru, but in Bolivia and Ecuador its status is much improved of late, thanks to the success of indigenous movements. Bilingual education is advancing in both these countries, at least at primary levels. And in Cochabamba, Bolivia's third city with over half a million inhabitants, Quechua is very common on the streets. Even in Peru, things finally seem to be turning a little more in Quechua's favour, though it is still too little, and will very soon be too late.

[Back to Contents](#)

## 2. "What is Quechua Like?"

To start with, a first impression of what Quechua looks and sounds like: two samples. Both are in the **CUZCO-BOLIVIAN DIALECT**, which is also the dialect discussed in the whole of this presentation, except where explicitly stated otherwise.

### 2.1. A Conquest-Era Play

Two samples, the first from a rare old (Conquest-era) play, "*Atau Wallpay p'uchukakuyninpa wankan*" – "Tragedy of the End of Atahualpa" – (see my bibliography page) the last Inca "Emperor" captured by the Spanish for ransom. This was his prison cell full once of solid gold and twice of silver, which his people duly paid, and the Spaniards then put him to death

anyway. What follows are his opening lines in the play.

They are written – sad, but typical, to say – according to just ONE of the competing orthographical norms for Quechua: the *Bolivian version* of the ‘pentavocalic’ orthography (back to this later).

### Pronunciation key:

NOTE: All text in GREEN is in the International Phonetic Alphabet, and can be viewed with the SILDoulosIPA font.

- <h> after voiceless stops denotes aspiration (phonemic)
- apostrophes denote ejectives
- <ch>, as in English and Spanish = [tʃ] – though note that this too can be aspirated:  
<chh> = [tʃʰ]
- the rest of the spelling is pronounced as is (Bolivian) Spanish, i.e.: <j> = [h], <ll> = [ʎ], <ñ> = [ɲ].

Sinchij munasqaykuna,	<i>Beloved and gentle,</i>
Wamra ñust'akunallay,	<i>My princesses,</i>
nanaj llakiypimin sunquy,	<i>My heart is in grievous pain,</i>
ukhuymín llajllapayasqa,	<i>My inside gnawed away,</i>
yuyayniymín chinkasqañña.	<i>My reason fled.</i>
Uj llakiytamin paqarini.	<i>I have woken to suffering.</i>
Imarayku kunan tuta	<i>For this night past</i>
muspayniypi yananchani	<i>In my sleep I was wracked</i>
llaki phutillatatajmi,	<i>By grievous affliction,</i>
musquyniypiri rikuni	<i>In my dreaming I have seen</i>
Inti, maillij Taytanchijta	<i>The Sun, our purifying Father,</i>
yana q'ushñinpi pakasqata,	<i>Hidden in black cloud,</i>
llapa janajpachatari	<i>While all the heavens,</i>
llapa urqukunatawanri	<i>All the mountains,</i>
puka puka raurasqajta	<i>Blazed so red</i>
pillkukunaj qhaqunta jina.	<i>Like the red in the breasts of the Pillkus.</i>

*The Inca 'Emperor's' name (hispanicised as Atahualpa) is in Quechua "Atau Wallpa", meaning more or less "maker of glory (in war)". Quechua is like Chinese or the North American Indian languages ("Raging Bull", "Dances with Wolves", etc.) in that all proper names mean something. Cuzco (Qosqo) = navel (of the world).*

*I've tried to capture a bit of the olde-world register in my translation, because as the second*

*example will show the Quechua spoken today is a bit different. This is in the same dialect, but with Cuzco pentavocalic orthography: where Bolivian spelling has <j>, Cuzco has <h> syllable-initially and <q> syllable finally).*

## 2.2. Modern Colloquial Quechua

*This is a transcription from an interview, taken from the Autobiography of Gregorio Condori Mamani (see my bibliography page). Borrowings from Spanish appear in bold.*

Chhaynan **vida** kashan. **Ignorancia**llaypin nini: chay Taytacha**q** **llagankunataq** chhayna niraq nak'ariypaq **causa**, tawa p'unchay **vidapaq** ... chayqa, imanaqtinmi mana maskhapachu hanpirunku? Ña watakunaña chhaynata warmiyta nirani, paytaqmi niran:

– Chaypaqsi **extranjero** mama Killata rin.

Chaypaq hinataqmi chay p'unchaykuna lliw **callekunapi** rimay kan, **gringokunas avionpi** **semanantin** purispa mama Killaman chayanku, nispa. Noqamanta rimayllachu **si no** kanman.

### Phonemic Transcription

The main allophonic variation (not shown in this phonemic transcription) to be aware of is that: final stops are fricativised; /n/ before velars is [N] like English "ng"). Also, [e] and [o] are best analysed in "pure" Quechua as allophones of /i/ and /u/ respectively, and there are fierce (often not very informed) arguments about their status as allophones or independent phonemes. As is pointed out in more detail below, you can see that the only occurrences of [e] and [o] in this text are in borrowings from Spanish.

NOTE: All transcriptions are given in the International Phonetic Alphabet.

/tʃʰajnan 'bida 'kashan. ignoransja'ʎajpin 'nini tʃaj taj'tatʃa  
'tʃʰajna 'niraq nak'a'rijpaq 'kawsa, 'tawa 'p'untʃaj bi'dapac  
'tʃajqa, imanaq'tinmi 'mana maskʰa'patʃu hanpi'runku.  
na wataku'najna tʃ'aj'nata 'warmijta ni'rani, paj'taqmi 'nira  
tʃaj'paqsi ekstran'xero 'mama ki'ʎata rin  
'tʃajpaq hina'taqmi tʃaj p'untʃaj'kuna ʎiw kaʎeku'napi 'rin  
gringo'kunas 'avjonpi sema'nantin pu'rispa 'mama ki'ʎama  
nuqa'manta rimaj'ʎatʃu si no 'kanman /

The version below in GREEN can be viewed with the SILDoulosIPA font.,  
which can be downloaded free from the IPA webpage:  
<http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/IPA/ipafonts.html>

/ÈtSHajnan Èbida ÈkaSan. ignoransjaÈ' ajpin Ènini tSaj tajÈtatSaq ' agankuÈnataq ÈtSHajna  
Èniraq nak'aÈrijpaq Èkawsa, Ètawa Èp'untSaj biÈdapaq. ÈtSajqa, imanaqÈtinmi Èmana  
maskHaÈpatSu hanpiÈrunku. ø a watakuÈnaø a tSÈajÈnata Èwarmijta niÈrani, pajÈtaqmi  
Èniran

tSajÈpaqsi ekstranÈxero Èmama kiÈ' ata rin

ÈtSajpaq hinaÈtaqmi tSaj p'untSajÈkuna ' iw ka' ekuÈnapi Èrimaj kan, gringoÈkunas  
Èavjonpi semaÈnantin puÈrispa Èmama kiÈ' aman tSaÈjanku, Ènispa. nuqaÈmanta rimajÈ'  
atSu si no Èkanman/

### Showing Morphological Structure and with English Translation (mine).

Chhay-na-n vida ka-sha-n. Ignorancia-lla-y-pi-n  
that-simil-foc:dir life be-ipve-3<sup>rd</sup> ignorance-dim-psve:1<sup>st</sup>-loc-foc:dir  
*Such is life. In my ignorance*

ni-ni: chay Tayta-cha-q llaga-n-kuna-taq chhay-na  
say-1<sup>st</sup>:sg that father-dim-gen wound-psve:3<sup>rd</sup>-pl-rel:ctv that-simil  
*I say: if the wounds of this God*

ni-ra-q nak'ari-y-paq causa, tawa p'unchay vida-paq ...  
say-past-agentive suffer-1<sup>st</sup>:Sg-dat cause, four day life-dat ...  
*are the cause of so much suffering, for four days of life...*  
chay-qa, imana-qtì-n-mi mana maskha-spa-chu hanpiru-n-ku?  
that-top, be so-ppl:ds-3<sup>rd</sup>-foc:dir not cure-ppl:ss-foc:neg seek-3<sup>rd</sup>-pl  
*Why don't we look for him and treat him?*

Ña wata-kuna-ña chhay-na-ta warmi-y-ta ni-ra-ni,  
already year-pl-discont that-simil-acc woman-psve:1<sup>st</sup>-acc say-past-1<sup>st</sup>:sg  
*That's what I said to my wife years ago,*

pay-taq-mi ni-ra-n:  
3<sup>rd</sup>:sbg:pron-rel:ctv-foc:dir say-past-3<sup>rd</sup>  
*and she replied:*

- Chay-paq-si extranjero mama Killa-ta ri-n.  
- that-dat-top:ind foreigner mother moon-acc go-3<sup>rd</sup>  
- *They say, that's why the foreigners went to the Mother Moon.*

Chay-paq hina-taq-mi chay p'unchay-kuna lliw calle-kuna-pi  
that-dat thus-rel:ctv-foc:dir that day-pl all street-pl-loc  
*In fact, just in those days, in all the streets*

rima-y ka-n, gringo-kuna-s avion-pi semana-nti-n

say-nom'ser be-3<sup>rd</sup>, gringo-pl-foc:ind aeroplane-loc week-inclusive-psv:3<sup>rd</sup>  
*there was talk of how the gringos, travelling for a week in a plane,*

puri-spa mama Killa-man chaya-n-ku, ni-spa.  
 walk-ppl:ss mother moon-ill arrive-3<sup>rd</sup>-pl, say-ppl:ss.  
*had reached the Mother Moon.*

Noqa-manta rima-y-lla-chu si no kan-man.  
 1<sup>st</sup> pron-abl say-nom'ser-dimin-foc:neg yes no be-condit.  
*All that sounds like just tall stories to me though.*

#### KEY to ABBREVIATIONS

foc:dir focus & direct evidential (speaker knows fact he relates from direct person experience)

foc:ind focus & indirect (or 'hearsay') evidential (fact related has been reported to speaker by others)

foc:neg focus & negative evidential

rel:ctv 'continuative' discourse function clitic (class of relating clitics)

ppl:ss participle – same subject

ppl:ds participle – different subject

psve:1<sup>st</sup> possessive marker, first person

nom'ser 'nominaliser' derivational suffix

ill illative case marker

simil 'similarity' marker: generally translates English 'like': *warmi-hina – like a woman*.  
 Disputed status (also called 'comparative'), sometimes taken as a case.

Now you've seen and heard it, I'll try to run through some of the more unusual and interesting aspects of Quechua. There are quite a lot of them! So I'll have to deal fairly briefly with most of them – indeed what I'm aiming to do in particular is just to let you know about them in case any of them are issues which may provide some of you with interesting data for your own fields – and in the questions session we could go into them in a bit more detail.

[Back to Contents](#)

## 3. Phonology

### 3.1. Phonological Inventory

Here's the phonological inventory for Cuzco/Bolivian Quechua (all other dialects have no



ejectives, and barring some in Ecuador, no aspirated stops either):

		bilabial	dental	palatal	velar	uvular
<b>STOPS / AFFRICATE</b>	voiceless	p	t	tS	k	q
	ejective	p'	t'	tS'	k'	q'
	aspirated	pH	tH	tSH	kH	qH
<b>FRICATIVES</b>	voiceless		s	(S ?)		
<b>LATERALS</b>			l			
<b>FLAP</b>			r			
<b>GLIDES</b>		w		j		
<b>VOWELS:</b>	i, u, a					

### 3.2. Stress: Constant, Wholly Irrespective of Morphology

The first thing to note in the transcription is that stress is always on the penultimate syllable, wholly irrespective of morphology. Add a suffix and the stress moves forward by the same number of syllables, jumping from morpheme to morpheme as it goes. There are some rare cases of final syllable stress, always with modal (doubtful) and discourse value.

### 3.3. Syllable Structure

No diphthongs, and vowel hiatus is not possible, a glide must intervene. Rather restricted syllable-structure: only syllables permitted: V VC CV CVCV and VC can only be word initial. All word-internal and final syllables must start with a consonant.

### 3.4. A Three or a Five-Vowel System?

Note in the phonemic transcription above: the only /e/ and /o/s are in the words borrowed from Spanish.

Quechua had historically, and still has today essentially, a 3-vowel system, with lowering of /i/ and /u/ in the context of (and that is irrespective of intervening continuants) uvular /q/, and of a few less obviously phonetically motivated clusters.

Spanish, however, has a 5-phoneme system (/a e i o u/). And with very widespread bilingualism, Spanish influence may be thought now to be introducing phonemic /e/ and /o/ to Quechua.

Hence the existence of two competing orthographies for Quechua: the trivocalic (phonemic) and *pentavocalic* orthography. (The fact that for native Quechua words in my second pentavocalic text above I only needed one <o> in <noqa> /nuqa/ [noqa] and no <e>s at all is numerically illustrative in itself of how little they really occur in Quechua, and it is here in its context of /q/.)

Whether they are in the language or not as phonemes is in fact not the point, however. If you want to enter this debate in Peru, go prepared for a heady mixture of invective, impetuosity

and above all ignorance the like of which you'll never have seen before.

The real point is one of psychological awareness of phonemic contrast and allophonic variation. For Quechua is in the odd situation that anyone educated enough to be in the Academy is of course overwhelmingly accustomed to Spanish, and its phonemic system and corresponding orthography. They are now incapable of seeing an allophone as an allophone, because in Spanish it's a phoneme and a different letter, and would go to the stake before they write an [o] as /u/ – and this despite producing the allophonic variation perfectly in their Quechua when they're not thinking about it.

Indeed, try as they might, none of the pentavocalists could ever supply me with a single minimal pair (they just gave me thousands of counterexamples, demonstrating the /q/ - /k/ distinction, the very context which drives the allophonic variation in the first place. The closest they (inadvertently) got was *shepherd* vs the genitive of *cat*: *michi* + *-q* both give *micheq*. Informants with no axe to grind assured me it was identical pronunciation.

Whatever, it was comforting in one sense: linguistics suddenly came alive as I'd never seen it do before, with total uproar in the Academy on a regular basis. And all because of the difference between phoneme and allophone! It was quite heartening, really, making up for all those times when linguistic debate seems a bit too ivory-towered.

And if ever anyone wants a demonstration of the psychological awareness status of allophonic vs phonemic distinctions and influence of other languages on this, and of the prestige of the written (spelling) over the spoken, here's some subject-matter.

### 3.5. Ejectives and Aspirates

Some very odd behaviour here – lots of data for essays on why the pulmonic egressive airstream could be regarded as more standard than others like ejective. Firstly, the restrictions on their behaviour:

- only one ejective or aspirate per word;
- only occur in roots, *i.e.* in lexical not grammatical morphemes;
- only syllable-initial;
- always are the first stop in the word – alternatively put: they may not be preceded by stops (approximants and fricatives may precede them).

Now some of these are not too surprising, after all similar restrictions are posited for *pie* under the glottalic hypothesis. Only it goes beyond this – there is a very strange relationship of mutual exclusivity and yet complementarity between these two classes of glottalised and aspirates, together with their related 'fuller', 'free-standing' articulations of glottal stop and /h/.

- only one of **either** class per word (p.184);
- a word with an *ejective* may not begin with vowel: must have a *preposed /h/* (compare German /ʔ/ before otherwise word-initial vowels). In dialects without ejectives, the correlates to these words remain with initial vowel and *no /h/*; words that do have initial /h/ in these dialects correspond to those in Cuzco Quechua which have initial /h/ but no ejective;
- conversely, any word containing an *aspirated* stop and starting with a vowel may (this time this is optional) have a *preposed glottal stop*.

A further very interesting example can be illustrated from the texts above:

- *hina*, the last word in the first text, is a (debatably) free word normally translatable as 'like', thus, or more commonly a suffixed form sometimes analysed as a case (it has a

verbal derivation *hina-y* meaning 'to do thus').

- *chay* means *that*, and thus the two combined can have the sense of 'like that', 'thus', or an often semantically bleached as in English 'so', 'well'.

*hina-taq-mi*. Here we have an intervening *-paq* splitting the words up. Compare this to the very first word in that text: *chhayna-n*. It derives directly from the two words coming together, *chay hina*, and contracting very strangely. The final /j/ of *chay* merges with the (initial) /i/ of *hina*, as the initial /h/ of *hina* attaches itself to ... the initial affricate /tS/ of *chay* to make it an aspirate /tSH/.

*chhayna* < *chay hina* /tSHajna/ < /tSaj hina/

Odd things are going on with these sounds historically too (see below), and in borrowing and onomatopoeia. May I wonder aloud if this behaviour is anything to do with questions of articulatory 'settings'?

[Back to Contents](#)

## 4. Sketch of Morphosyntax

- Word Order = SOV, Adj-Noun, Dependent-Head
- No gender, not even on pronouns: *pay* is *he/she/it*; *pay-kuna* is *they*.
- Inclusive and exclusive *we*: structure is fairly transparent:
- *nuqa* ('I') + 2<sup>nd</sup> person pluraliser *-chis* → hearer-INclusive *we*: *nuqa-n-chis*
- *nuqa* + 3<sup>rd</sup> person pluraliser *-ku* → hearer-EXclusive *we*: *nuqa-y-ku*
- Marker on the verb of person of subject is very often segmentable from the marker of number.
- Personal possessive markers on nouns are mostly identical to person subject markers on verbs (entirely so on participles).
- Person and number of the object are included in verb (interestingly for question of the ordering of grammatical information in terms of position of relative closeness to the root, the object marking can be found both closer to and further from the root than the subject marking, varying by person).
- Unmarkedness of 3<sup>rd</sup> person: 3<sup>rd</sup> person *to be* is regularly omitted, and 3<sup>rd</sup> person object cannot be marked on verb (while others must be), and is very usually simply omitted (explicit 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun in acc or dat can be used if deemed necessary).
- The noun vs verb distinction: Quechua also is one of those languages where noun and verb roots are very interchangeable, though in the sentence the endings they take do mark pretty unequivocally how they are being used.
- Subordination is overwhelmingly by participles, which are pretty 'finite' to say they're supposed by definition to be non-finite. They carry marking for the same or different subject, and if the subject is different to that of the main verb, also carry explicit person and number marking. They differ from main verbs only in that they cannot mark absolute (in Comrie's sense) tense, but can mark tense relative to the main verb. Most of our conjunctions (time, conditions) are not explicit, but understood with the use of participles, e.g. literally: *His coming* (, *I will leave*) is translatable as either *if he comes* or *when he comes*.

[Back to Contents](#)

## 5. Agglutination

Quechua is very highly agglutinating. Verbs for example, are structured thus:

[http://www.cus.cam.ac.uk/~pah1003/Quechua/i\\_ABOUT.HTM](http://www.cus.cam.ac.uk/~pah1003/Quechua/i_ABOUT.HTM)

14.12.1999

ROOT + derivational + grammatical + clitics (generally discourse function)

## 5.1. The Distinction Between Inflection and Derivation

But above all, being agglutinating, Quechua has a mass of suffixes, and is usually characterised as having a very rich derivational morphology – which indeed it has, as the following examples will demonstrate.

### 5.1.1. Clear Cases of Derivation

Some of these one would have little doubt as classifying as derivational or lexical. Very powerful means of deriving new word of a different part of speech.

N → V *wasi* + *cha* ‘factive’ → *wasi-cha-[y]* house → [to] build a house  
*aycha* + *naya* ‘desiderative’ → *aycha-naya-[y]* meat → [to] fancy, feel like eating some meat

A → V *wira* + *ya* ‘autotransformative’ → *wira-ya-[y]* fat → [to] get fat, put on weight

The final [-y] here is the infinitive marker; the stem without it is verbal and takes normal verb endings.

V → N *tiya-* + *na* ‘obligative’ (?) → *tiya-na* sit → seat, chair

*puñu-* + *na* ‘obligative’ (?) → *puñu-na* sleep → bed

V → A *riku-* + *na* ‘obligative’ → *riku-na* see → worth seeing, that should be seen

There are a large number of such derivational suffixes, including diminutives, augmentatives, pejoratives, and the peculiarly Quechua ‘shading’ suffixes, most commonly used to express one’s politeness, respect or ‘camaraderie’ with the hearer. Finally, my favourite derivational morpheme, which is:

-*yoq* the ‘possessive’, meaning a person who ‘has’ or ‘owns’ the root noun, thus:

*wasi-* + *yoq* → *wasi-yoq* house → householder

*warmi-* + *yoq* → *warmi-yoq* woman → married man

*tawa wata-* + *yoq* → *tawa wata-yoq* four years → a four-year old

### 5.1.2. Debatable Cases

The cases we’ve seen so far, while demonstrating perhaps some of the flexibility and power of QUECHUA morphology, are fairly clearly instances of derivation.

Others, however, the status of suffixes as derivational or inflectional is much more debatable (good ammunition for your Linguistics Papers essays on the difficulty of establishing criteria for the distinction).

#### 5.1.2.1. Aspectual Suffixes

Quechua has a clearly grammatical progressive (-*sha-* infix), but also suffixes usually classed as derivational, but with aspectual meanings: perdurative -*raya-*; frequentative -*paya-*; continuative -*nya-*.

### 5.1.2.2. Auxiliary Suffixes and the Field of Voice

More debatable still is the status of a whole class of suffixes which the grammar books usually consider derivational, but which are called the 'auxiliaries'. These include inchoative and assistive; but most questionable of all is the status of the suffixes in the field of voice: middle / passive / reflexive.

#### 5.1.2.2.1. Reflexive -ku-

*kusi-y to make (sb) happy (tr)*

*kusi-ku-y to be happy (itr)*

*ranti-y to buy*

*ranti-ku-y to buy for oneself (ethic dative reflexive)*

This reflexive is, moreover, the usual way of forming equivalents to the passive:

*triyu-manta-n t'anta-qa ruwa-ku-n bread is made from flour*

*riku-ku-n it is seen (or: it seems)*

#### 5.1.2.2.1. Causative -chi-

*waqa-chi-y to make sb cry*

seems fairly obviously inflectional, but take a form like

*puma-waqa-chi-y makes-the-puma-cry* (= a vicious biting gnat found in the canyons of SE Peru).

and it seems derivational (as well as challenging the noun-verb distinction...). At what point do we consider it lexical rather than grammatical (derivational rather than inflectional)?

*llank'a-chi-y to have sb work*

*reqsi-na-chi-y to have two people meet each other, to introduce*

*qo-chi-ku-y to ask for* (= have given to/for yourself)

*yacha-chi-y to teach* (= make know)

*riku-chi-y to show* (= make see)

*wañu-chi-yto kill* (= make die).

It would be nice and neat to say that diachronically such suffixes are *in the process of lexicalising* ... but aside from some lexemes which seem more or less fixed, that just doesn't seem accurate in most cases. As far as I can find, the grammar has no other means of making the 'chi' causative construction, for instance.

Quechua offers examples of a different kind than English can with participles such as *written* and *heated* in Prof. Matthew's book. Different, and for making the point of the difficulty of the distinction, perhaps better.

For English can allow differing contexts which can help establish the status of the forms in certain cases: *a well heated vs \*very heated room* implies *heated* here is verbal and therefore an **inflectional** form; in *\*well*

*heated vs very heated argument* implies it is adjectival and therefore **derivational**. One can thus establish two homophonous forms of *heated*, one derivational, the other inflectional.

In Quechua, the same tests don't seem to be available: its agglutinating structure, and the flexibility of the noun vs verb distinction aren't very co-operative. While agglutinating languages may be ideal for exemplifying the concept of the morpheme, they can be very troublesome for the inflectional vs derivational distinction.

To Indo-European languages, half the time the same suffix seems clearly inflectional, while the other half of the time it is deriving words to produce translational equivalents for the most basic of lexemes in Indo-European languages (*kill, show*). It really does make one wonder if there is any way to draw the distinction.

Moreover, these suffixes, while they do have extremely wide use, are subject to greater or lesser restrictions: you can't necessarily make a -ku-form for every verb you might expect. None of them seem quite as flexible as inflectional status would 'demand'; yet they are far freer and more productive than 'lexical'. Are they very productive derivational suffixes? Or somewhat lexically restricted grammatical suffixes? Whatever, there seems to be no criterion which lets us decide. I can't find one, and Quechua grammars are similarly equivocal and undecided.

## 5.2. Order of Component Suffixes

ROOT + derivational + grammatical + clitics (generally discourse function)

There are of course sub-hierarchies within each group:

For **derivational** morphemes:

= verbalising + modifying + auxiliary + directional

- To an extent the expected hierarchy of relative position is observed, derivational nearer the root. Though aspectual ones are considered modifying suffixes, and directional suffixes are arguably more lexical than auxiliaries like -chi.
- Generally, the further to the right, the freer the use (less lexically restricted).

Within **inflectional** morphemes, we have, for instance for finite verbs:

= obj:1st + prog. + past + fut:1st + imperative + subj:3rd + obj:2nd + fut:3rd +obj/subj:pl + condit.

- Note here that the position of suffixes in terms of relative closeness to the root is ... pretty haywire
- The plural is often ambiguous as to whether the subject or object is being marked as plural. Though in any case the plural ending is not compulsory, and frequently omitted in the 3rd person.

Finally for the (mainly discourse function) **clitics**, you have: specification, relational, focus/evidentials, topic

### 5.3. How Far Can You Go? A Sample Agglutinative Word!

So you can see how the long words come about. The longest I came across – and admittedly this was a bit of a concocted one by a member of the Academy, but it obeys the rules:

*Much'ananayakapushasqakupuniñataqsumamariki*

(very) freely translatable as something like:

*As far as I know they've always been petting each other, wouldn't that be right?*

The root is: *much'a-*, kiss. the rest is all suffixes, thus:

*Much'a-na-naya-ka-pu-sha-sqa-ku-puni-ña-taq-suma-ma-ri-ki*

according to the schema above, this is:

*ROOT-D-D-D-D-G-G-G-C-C-C-C-C-C-C*

root: the only stand-alone lexical word:

*much'a = kiss*

stem: root + lexical derivational suffixes:

*-na-naya-ka-pu-*

*-[obligative]-[desiderative]-[diminutive]-[reflexive]-*

grammatical suffixes:

*-sha-sqa-ku-*

*-[progressive]-[non-directly experienced past]-[3<sup>rd</sup> person plural]-*

clitics (discourse functions: topic, rheme/focus):

*-puni-ña-taq-suma-ma-ri-ki*

*-[definitive]-[discontinuative]-[contrastive]-[dubitative]-[impressive]-[responsive]-[?]*

Sorry to disappoint, but I haven't managed to identify the very last one! the labels are anglicised forms of the Spanish ones given in the grammars ('obligative' is particularly misleading here).

I was asked whether all of these really were bound morphemes. As far as I know, only *ña* can stand alone, with the meaning 'already'.

### 5.4. Reduplication

Quechua makes considerable use of reduplication:

We have also seen *puka puka* (*red red*) in first sample text above. This might not seem very impressive or out of the ordinary, after all reduplication of adjectives is found in many languages, but Quechua goes further with other parts of speech:

A → A *llañuy* → *llañuy llañuythin* → *very thin*

N → N *mallki* → *mallki mallki* *tree* → *clump of trees, wood*

*wasi* → *wasi wasi* *house* → *settlement, collection of houses*

*rumi* → *rumi rumi* *stone* → *rocky ground, rocky*

N → A *rumi* → *rumi rumi stone* → *rocky*

Moreover, their status is far less 'marginal' than it often appears in other languages. The stems formed by reduplication are quite able to be used normally as any other stem:

*Taq sound of a hammer blow*

*Taq-taq-ya-y to hit with a hammer*

*Taq-taq-ya-chi-y to hit something repeatedly*

[Back to Contents](#)

## 6. The Modal System

### 6.1. The Dividing Line Between Tense and Modality

One comes across cases problematic for the tense/modality distinction very often in the future, with examples of futures derived from verbs of wanting/wishing, as in English. Quechua offers a rather different case.

Quechua has a verb form (affix in *-sqa-*) generally referred to as the "pluperfect", or "narrative past" (a slight improvement). This is used for past events but with a rather unusual time-frame reference: any event before the speaker was born. Alongside this it is the standard 'tense' for relating history, legends and myths.

Well, that is how it's easiest to describe it, although there are some refinements. The tense is also used for events when one was a baby or young child. And events when one was drunk. And for relating the customs of other peoples. And for events – including the very recent – that came as a surprise.

A bit of an unusual collection, one might think. The way round this, I would think, is to accept that here we have not primarily a tense but a modal form.

It is used for events of which the speaker had no direct, conscious experience. This includes drunkenness and early childhood before the ability to 'reason', and of course by definition, all events occurring before one's birth are out of one's direct experience. Moreover, this modal value of things outside one's own reason (and with it expectation) would account for its use as a 'surprise tense', and in describing alien customs.

Indeed as we shall see, it is related closely to the 'hearsay' modal clitic in use and form. Note that it is NOT the same as the clitics, though: it must occur on the verb, it is a 'grammatical' suffix and internal to the verb (before other affixes of person, object, etc.), and has no discourse function.

I would rather see this form's time-reference as merely a logical consequence of the modal value, not as a tense at all. The question remains, of course, of how far this has now been reanalysed as a tense now too. In Quechua there is no obligatory, grammaticalised 'pluperfect': no distinction of past relative to past as opposed to pure past. In fact, though, it seems more as though bilinguals have brought this modal sense into their Spanish 'pluperfect' with *había* + past participle than *vice versa*.



## 6.1. The Modal Focus Clitics

Quechua has a host of clitics for discourse functions, including topic and focus (some prefer to call it rheme) particles, the rules for whose interreaction are extremely complex. Some grammars just resort to the explanation 'euphony'. They are a fascinating area, and the most difficult thing for me in learning Quechua, but I'd like to look at just one group of them, the 'evidential' focus clitics.

### 6.1.1. As 'Evidential'

There are various 'evidential' clitics, all of which mark focus but with it a particular modal value. Essentially, Quechua grammar demands that you give the authority on which you have the statements you make.

I'll quote from Weber (1989: 420):

*The evidential suffixes are testimony to the caution a Quechua speaker exercises with respect to information. The following are – I believe – true of Quechua culture (and perhaps they are to some extent universal):*

1. *(Only) one's own experience is reliable.*
2. *Avoid unnecessary risk, such as by assuming responsibility for information of which one is not absolutely certain.*
3. *Don't be gullible. (Witness the many Quechua folk tales in which the villain is foiled because of his gullibility.)*
4. *Assume responsibility only if it is safe to do so...*

*The use of =mi/-shi/-chi is in allowing the Quechua speaker to handily assume or defer responsibility for the information he conveys... With –mi the speaker assumes responsibility; with –shi, he diverts it (to someone else); and with –chi he indicates that it is not the sort of information for which anyone should be held responsible.*

Weber (1989: 421) gives the following example of their contrastive use (Hualлага dialect):

die-3<sup>rd</sup>:fut-fut-x

*Wañu-nqa-paq-mi.* (I assert that) it will die. said by the diviner

*Wañu-nqa-paq-shi.* (I was told that) it will die said by someone bringing the diviner's prediction

*Wañu-nqa-paq-chi.* (Perhaps) it will die. or: Might it die?

*Note that in fact the coverage of the 'reportative' –shi form goes far beyond just second-hand information. It includes many of the cases covered by the so-called 'narrative past', where one does not want to assume responsibility, including drunkenness (quite common in Quechua culture and state-sponsored under the Incas an inherent part of sacred festivals).*

In any case, if you accept that Quechua culture places a special premium on avoiding gullibility (and my own impression would be that this is true enough), then this might be an interesting case of languages' grammar being in response to its speakers' culture.

### 6.1.2. As 'Validational'

As well as 'evidential' they have been claimed to be 'validational': how convinced the speaker is about the truth of what he is saying (though it would seem that this is more an assumption from the 'evidential' values): *-mi* for convinced, *-shi* for unconvinced, *-chi* for pure speculation.

This is also interesting, since one should add to the three we've met so far another, *-chu*. This has two uses:

- Alone, it forms questions: on the verb (mainly) for validation (yes/no) questions, and for content ("wh-") questions on the word in doubt (here one clearly sees the parallel function of focus marking).
- Secondly, all negative statements with the negator word *mana* or imperative/emphatic *ama* must have *-chu* added to the word negated.

So how do you form a negative question? Well, quite neatly of course: if you'll pardon the pun, you simply *-chu* the *mana*: *mana-chu*.

This then gives:

*Wañu-nqa-paq-chu?*      *Will it die?*

*Mana wañu-nqa-paq-chu.* *It will not die.*

*mana-chu wañu-nqa-paq?* *Won't it die?*

There are also more complex structures for combined negation and evidentials (e.g. to negate the fact that you were told something) which use more than one of these forms together. Indeed, in *Mood and Modality* Palmer (1986: 69) argues for two different modal parameters (both validational and evidential):

*"Positive/negative is thus a sub-system within 'visual' or 'witnessed'"*

(for Ecuadoran Imbabura dialect). He also notes a further possibility of a 'deduced' value in another dialect (Inga, Colombia). Indeed, there is no end of shading in the different uses and combinations for these modal clitics among the wealth of Quechua dialects – though the profusion can make things a little hard to pin down: Palmer himself at one point says Inga is from Guatemala!

[Back to Contents](#)

## 7. Relationships with Other Languages

*Contact and Possible Genetic Relationships*

## 7.1. Contact with Spanish

### 7.1.1. Spanish Influence on Quechua

It must be said that there has been heavy Spanish influence on Quechua:

- In lexis (where influence is heaviest): see the second of the two passages above, and consider the following phrase which cropped up in a Quechua conversation I overheard in a train:  
*Las once de la mañanakama until eleven o'clock in the morning.*  
pure Spanish bar the *-kama* suffix meaning until.
- In phonetics / phonology:
- [e] and [o] are now vying for phonemic status.
- Voiced stops also seem to be entering Quechua, particularly via Spanish corruptions of Quechua toponyms and other proper nouns.
- In syntax: subordinate clauses are making an entry in place of participles, along with associated conjunctions such as *si-chu-s* (Cuzqueño): Spanish *si* ('if') + *chu* (interrogative clitic) + *s* (indirect evidential clitic).

### 7.1.1. Quechua Influence on Spanish

I am indebted to Mark Rosenfelder (see his excellent Quechua website on my links page) and his wife Lida for many of these examples.

- Use of Spanish pluperfect for instances of surprise: ¡*Qué grande había sido!*
- Very common use of phrases such as *no más* and *pues* (or *pue*, or *-ps*), presumably to translate Quechua shading suffix *-lla-* for politeness.
- Use of *papá*, *papito* and *mama*, *mamita* as a standard mode of address
- Use of *diz*, *dizque* or *dice* – corresponding to the ‘hearsay’ evidential: *Zapatudo ya dice*. 'Wearing shoes, are you?' for *Así que usas zapatos*. *Flaquita ya dice*. 'So you're thin now.'
- Use of participles for subordination: this example is from San Martín, and describes a preacher who was sleeping with a girl:  
*a la chica rampando el predicador diz que iba*.  
compare standard Spanish *El predicador se acercó a la chica rampando*.
- Word order:  
*El arroz mi prima está trayendo* for standard Spanish *Mi prima está trayendo el arroz*.  
*Mansión don Nico tiene*. 'Don Nico has a big house.'
- Word order: sentence-initial adjectives (starting the sentence with an adjective).  
Instead of *Ese hombre es rico*, you say *Rico ese hombre es*.  
*Grande el pueblo*, 'the town [was] big.'  
*Hondo el pozo, hijitos*. 'the well [was] very deep, children.'  
*Grande papada la señora*. 'Big double-chin, the lady.'
- Omission of 3<sup>rd</sup> singular of to be (see examples for starting sentences with an adjective).
- Reduplication: *Perro perro esta gelatina está*. 'This jelly tastes of dogs.'  
Compare such Quechua expressions as *wira wira* 'fatty', *sara sara* 'very starchy corn'.
- Articles: often missing, sometimes used with proper names.
- Possessives on the model of: *de mi padre su casa* 'of my father his house'.
- Failure to make proper agreements in number and especially gender.
- *Añallu puro* (lit. 'ant pure') – 'It's covered in ants.'
- Phonology: use of [S]: Iquitos Spanish has a number of words with [S], borrowed either from Quechua (whose northern dialects have a [S]) or other

## 7.2. The Relationship with Aymara

Certainly the most confusing case I've come across so far in deciding whether or not two languages are genetically related or not. Intriguing methodology put to use in elucidating the question.

When I first had a look at the two languages, my first impression was that they must be related.

### 7.2.1. Evidence For

#### 7.2.1.1. Phonological Systems

Here's the phonological system for Aymara:

		bilabial	dental	palatal	vel
<b>STOPS / AFFRICATE</b>	voiceless	p	t	tʃ	k
	ejective	p'	t'	tʃ'	k
	aspirated	p <sup>h</sup>	t <sup>h</sup>	tʃ <sup>h</sup>	k <sup>l</sup>
<b>FRICATIVES</b>	voiceless		s		x
<b>LATERALS</b>			l		
<b>FLAP</b>			r		
<b>GLIDES</b>		w		j	

<b>VOWELS:</b>	i, u, a, ī, à
----------------	----------------

Now the information I've been able to find on exactly what the <ī> and <à> represent is not convincing. I've variously read they are long versions (note central Quechua has phonemic length on its three vowel qualities) or 'as in French à', which doesn't help much.

#### 7.2.1.2. Morphosyntax

- Both are near-perfect SOV languages.
- Both very highly agglutinating (though Aymara has some more polysynthetic features).

#### 7.2.1.3. Sound to Meaning Correspondences

- Many clear correspondences in **lexis**: e.g. numerals one to ten:

	Quechua (Cuzco)	Aymara
1	hoq	mayá
2	iskay	paya
3	kinsa	kimsa
4	tawa	pusi
5	pisqa	phisca
6	soqta	suxta
7	qanchis	paqalqu
8	pusaq	kimsa-paqalqu
9	isqon	lla-tunka
10	chunka	tunka

- correspondences also in many **core grammatical** suffixes (Quechua first, Aymara second where given):
  - topic: -qa -xa
  - hearsay: -shi / si -chi
  - emphatic: (puni)
  - subordinator: -spa -sa
  - concretiser: -na (-ña) -na
  - derivational suffixes: distributive (pura), factitive (cha), repetition (paya), mutiple repetition (rpaya), etc.
  - cases: ablative (man-ta), limitative (kama), causal (rayku), similarity (hina)
  
- Some **regularity** in correspondences: *e.g.*: Quechua – Aymara: /tS/ – /t/ (*e.g.* numeral 10).

## 7.2.2. Evidence Against

### 7.2.2.1. General Pointers

But look a little closer, and things start getting suspicious:

- How much one should read into agglutination and word order? The great majority of Amerindian languages are agglutinating.
- Sound-to-meaning correspondences aren't the consistent enough: more consonant with borrowing at various diachronic stages and subsequent divergent phonetic changes.
- Much of core lexis actually offers few correspondences where one would expect (*e.g.* kinship terms, pronouns) and for the erratic number correspondences below 5, an explanation of Aymara's 5-based system being superseded by borrowing the Quechua decimal one (a bit like Celtic counting in 20s vs Latin 10s).
- While the phonological *inventories* are very similar, the phonotactics of the two languages differ considerably (Aymara allows more varied syllable structures).

### 7.2.2.2. Aspirates and Ejectives

These much talked-about sounds offer a very interesting resolution of the issue.

#### 7.2.2.2.1. First Thoughts on for and Against

Two **whole classes** of sounds, not the sort of thing you'd expect to be borrowed lightly, perhaps.

Look at the **dialect geography**.

- Only Cuzco/Bolivian dialect has ejectives: and it is the one bordering on Aymara.
- However, one other variety alongside Cuzco/Bolivian does have aspirates, though somewhat marginally. And this is Ecuadoran: thousands of miles from Aymara.
- However, the lexemes with aspirates in the Ecuadoran variety do not correspond particularly well with the lexemes which have them in Cuzco/Bolivian.
- The normally conservative central dialects have neither aspirates nor ejectives, and apparently no trace of them.
- However, there are some claimed correspondences of other sounds with Cuzco ejectives and aspirates – proposed as reflexes of common phonemes in the proto-language.

Still, an explanation in terms of loss of original phonemic distinctions using 'unusual' sound classes might appear more intuitive than their creation in two distant varieties.

#### 7.2.2.2.1. An Interesting Methodology

Given these contradictory signals from the various criteria, an interesting methodology was put to use to elucidate the question.

Stark took corpus of 300 lexemes from Cuzco-Bolivian which included an ejective or aspirate (remember, can't have both in the same word), and 300 lexemes which did NOT include one. Then compared with Oruro Aymara.

- lexemes with ejective or aspirate: 67% show form and meaning correspondences;
- lexemes without ejective or aspirate: 20% show form and meaning correspondences.

#### Implications:

- So, words with an ejective or aspirate show much higher correspondence rating than words without.
- It seems hard to explain under the common origin thesis why this type of cognate is particularly favoured for survival.
- Indeed, that the selection of words with ejective or aspirate turns up a much higher proportion of correspondences can

only be logically explained by the hypothesis that these sounds came into Quechua via words borrowed from Aymara. (The direction of borrowing being clear from the distribution of them only in S. varieties of Quechua in contact with Aymara). So in selecting 300 words with these sounds, we are selecting words borrowed from Aymara, hence the abnormally high correspondence rating.

Next Sharp asked a more unusual question: whether the words were perceived as onomatopoeic.

– of the remaining (33%) words **with** ejective or aspirate which failed to show a correspondence:

66% interpreted by Quechua informants as onomatopoeic;

– of the remaining (80%) **with no** ejective or aspirate which failed to show a correspondence:

2.5% interpreted by Quechua informants as onomatopoeic.

### **Implications:**

- Firstly, that where not borrowed (figures for where are borrowed not given in Cerron-Palomino) Quechua speakers use ejectives and aspirates for a strongly perceived **onomatopoeic effect: 66% vs 2.5%**.
- Secondly, that this phenomenon of the use ejectives and aspirates for onomatopoeic effect was then **extended** from borrowings to non-borrowed lexicon: existing non-ejective, non-aspirate words, or newly coined words, now accounting for 33% of words with ejectives and aspirates which yet seem not to be borrowed from Aymara.

This still leaves the problem of aspirates in Ecuador Quechua, but these are interpreted as:

- remnant of contact with Aymara before moved N.;
- and/or superstrate influence of prestige Cuzco dialect in the Imperial period.

### **Final Interpretation:**

Massive borrowing over centuries (historical evidence of Aymara presence far further north), both ways.

Sound to meaning correspondences that do exist arose after borrowing.

### **Significance:**

What all this is saying, then, is that the **features** of glottalic egressive airstream mechanism and of phonemic aspiration were

borrowed, but not necessarily with specific lexical items if the two languages do share a common use of this feature, it is not lexical but 'onomatopoeic', or a form of sound symbolism, if you wish.

#### 7.2.4. The Aymara - Quechua Relationship as Evidence of the Power of Contact

On a much wider level, if anyone is looking for a demonstration of just how powerful and wide-ranging the **impact of contact** can be, then Quechua and Aymara offer a perfect example.

[Back to Contents](#)

[Back to Homepage](#)