

Alternative-sensitive enclitics and focus in Cuzco Quechua

Martina Faller, The University of Manchester

Cuzco Quechua has a number of enclitics which interact with information structure. This paper studies the interaction of the exclusive and additive enclitics with evidential focus enclitics.

Prosody does not play a major role in the marking of information structure in Quechua (O'Rourke 2005; van Rijswijk and Muntendam 2014), which instead relies on the use of enclitics and word order. Most prominently in the literature have featured evidential enclitics, which have been assumed to have a second function of marking focus (Cusihuaman 2001; Weber 1986; Muysken 1995; Faller 2002; Sánchez 2010; Tellings 2014). For example, in (1) and (2), the best possible grounds evidential =*mi* (allomorph *-n*) (Faller 2002) appears on the constituent that provides the answer to a *wh*-question, as well as on the *wh*-phrase itself.¹

- (1) A: Pi=**n** ka-nki-chis. B: Mariano Phuturi-q wawa-n=**mi** ka-yku.
who=BPG be-2-PL Mariano Phuturi-GEN child-3=BPG be-1.EXCL
'Who are you?' 'We are Mariano Phuturi's sons.' (Espinoza 1997: 16)
- (2) [Question under discussion: Where are your parents?]
Mama-y=qa qheswa-ta=**n** ri-n; tayta-y=taq chakra-ta.
mother-1=TOP valley-ACC=BPG go-3; father-1=CONTR field-ACC
'My mother went to the valley; my father to the field. (Cusihuaman 2001: 240)

In addition to evidentials, there are enclitics which correspond to focus-sensitive particles or adverbs in other languages. (3a, b) illustrate the exclusive =*lla* and the additive =*pas*.

- (3) a. Domingu-**lla** descanso ka-q.
Sunday-EXCL rest be-AG
'Only Sundays were rest.' (Espinoza 1997: 38)
- b. Inka=**pas** ayllu-pi tiya-ra-n-ku ari
inca=ADD community-LOC sit-PST-3-PL yes
'The Incas, too, lived in a community, yes.' (Espinoza 1997: 60)

Focus-sensitive particles operate on a set of alternatives to their *associate*, which for the Cuzco Quechua exclusive and additive enclitics is determined structurally, namely as the constituent (or a subconstituent) they attach to (Tellings 2014). The exclusive =*lla* requires its associate to be the only individual that has the relevant property, whereas the additive =*pas* requires there to be at least one alternative that has the property in addition to its associate. Note that no additional focus marking is necessary.

Evidentials are not obligatory, but when present, one might expect them to attach to the same constituent as an exclusive or additive enclitic in sentences with a single focus constituent. This is indeed the case with the exclusive, as shown in (4).

- (4) Llaqta-y-pe=qa away puskey oficio=qa warmi-**lla**-paq=**mi** ka-ra=n
village-1-LOC=TOP weave spin job=TOP woman-EXCL-DAT=BPG be-PST-3
'In my village, the job of weaving and spinning was only for women.' (Valderrama and Escalante 1982: 56)

¹The data come from published sources augmented with data elicited by the author with speakers of Cuzco Quechua. Abbreviations used in glosses: 1, 2, 3: first, second, third person, ACC: accusative, ADD: additive, AG: agentive, BPG: best possible grounds, CONTR: contrastive, DAT: dative, EXCL: exclusive, GEN: genitive, INF: infinitive, LOC: locative, PL: plural, PST: past, TOP: topic.

However, an evidential never occurs on the same constituent as the additive. Attaching *=mi* after *=pas* on the subject constituent in (5B), for example, would be ungrammatical.

(5) [Question under discussion: Who speaks Aymara?]

- A: Noqa=**n** yacha-ni aymara rima-y-ta=qa.
 I=ADD know-1=BPG Aymara speak-INF-ACC=TOP
 ‘I can speak Aymara.’ (elicited)
- B: Noqa=**pis** yacha-ni=**n** aymara rima-y-ta=qa.
 I=ADD know-1=BPG Aymara speak-INF-ACC=TOP
 ‘I, too, can speak Aymara.’ (Cusihuaman 2001: 95)

In the given context for (5B) only the subject’s denotation is new information. Why then does *=mi* appear on the verb? Muysken (1995) and Sánchez (2010) have noted that the default position for evidentials is the first constituent, and that in this position they do not necessarily mark focus. I suggest that the *=mi* in (5B) is in fact such a non-focussing use, but that it has been “bumped” onto the next constituent due the first constituent being the focus. (The reverse order of *=mi* and *=pas* is also possible.) That *=mi* cannot be used as a focus marker in (5B) will then have to be explained as an incompatibility with the additive *=pas*.

The main question for this paper then is what causes this incompatibility of the focus use of an evidential and the additive. Additives are standardly analyzed as presupposing that there exists an alternative to the focus constituent that makes the sentence true (König 1991), for (5B), this is speaker A. From a discourse perspective, additives can be thought of as marking that the current QUD has already been partially answered (Beaver and Clark 2008: 74). Given that evidentials are compatible with focus constituents that contain the exclusive *=lla*, which marks its associate as the complete answer, I hypothesize that this is the relevant property.

In particular, I propose that when used as a focus marker, an evidential marks the focus constituent as an exhaustive/complete answer as far as the speaker’s evidence goes. Muysken (1995) uses *it*-clefts to translate the examples he provides to illustrate the focus-function of *=mi*. While *it*-clefts are not always appropriate translations, including for (5A), this nevertheless lends support to the idea that the evidential focus markers are exhaustive.

Further evidence in support of this hypothesis is the observation that the additive can attach to contrastive topics, as shown in (6), a variant of (2). The semantic effect of an additive with contrastive topics is to lift the requirement that their foci be distinct (Krifka 1999; Büring 2016).

(6) [Question under discussion: Where are your parents?]

- Mama-y=qa chakra-ta=n ri-n; tayta-y=**pas** chakra-ta ri-n.
 mother-1=TOP field-ACC=BPG go-3; father-1=ADD field-ACC go-3
 ‘My mother went to the field; my father also went to the field.’ (elicited)

In contrast, evidentials cannot combine with contrastive topics, even when *=pas* is absent. As shown in (2), non-additive contrastive topics are marked with the dedicated contrastive enclitic *=taq*; adding *=mi* to it would result in ungrammaticality. This can also be explained by assuming that the evidential focus enclitics require their associate to constitute a complete answer to the QUD, whereas contrastive topics imply partiality (Constant 2014; Büring 2016).

Similar incompatibilities between focus markers and additives have been described for other languages. For example, the additives of Ngamo and Bura cannot associate with focus-marked subjects. Grubic and Zimmermann (2011) and Hartmann and Zimmermann (2008) argue respectively that this is due to the Ngamo focus marker presupposing maximality, and the Bura additive associating with contrastive topics rather than focus. Thus, the discussion of the Cuzco Quechua data contributes to a better understanding of a wider cross-linguistic pattern.

References

- Beaver, David I., and Brady Z. Clark. 2008. *Sense and sensitivity: How focus determines meaning*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Büring, Daniel. 2016. (Contrastive) topic. In *The Oxford handbook of information structure*, ed. Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara, 64–85. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Constant, Noah. 2014. Contrastive topic: Meanings and realizations. Doctoral Dissertation, UMass Amherst. <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations2/171>.
- Cusihuaman, Antonio. 2001. *Gramática Quechua: Cuzco-Collao*. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos “Bartolomé de las Casas”, second edition.
- Espinoza, Darío. 1997. *Tanteo puntun chaykuna valen*. Lima: CHIRAPAQ-Centro de Culturas Indias.
- Faller, Martina. 2002. Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Grubic, Mira, and Malte Zimmermann. 2011. Conventional and free association with focus in Ngamo (West Chadic). In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15*, ed. Ingo Reich, 291–305. Saarbrücken: Saarland University Press.
- Hartmann, Katharina, and Malte Zimmermann. 2008. Not only ‘only’, but ‘too’, too: Alternative-sensitive particles in Bura. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 12*, ed. Atle Grøn, 196–211. Oslo: ILOS.
- König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1999. Additive particles under stress. In *SALT VIII*, ed. Devon Strolovitch and Aaron Lawson, 111–128. Cornell: CLC Publications.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1995. Focus in Quechua. In *Discourse configurational languages*, ed. Katalin Kiss, 375–93. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O’Rourke, Erin. 2005. Intonation and language contact: a case study of two varieties of Peruvian Spanish. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- van Rijswijk, Remy, and Antje Muntendam. 2014. The prosody of focus in the Spanish of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals: A case study on noun phrases. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18:614–632. DOI: 10.1177/1367006912456103.
- Sánchez, Liliana. 2010. *The morphology and syntax of topic and focus. minimalist inquiries in the Quechua periphery*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tellings, Jos. 2014. Only and focus in Imbabura Quichua. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. Herman Leung et al., 523–544. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Valderrama, Ricardo, and Carmen Escalante. 1982. *Gregorio Condori Mamani, autobiografía*. Cusco: Centro de Estudios Rurales Andinos “Bartolomé de Las Casas”, 2nd edition.
- Weber, David J. 1986. Information perspective, profile, and patterns in Quechua. In *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, ed. Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols, 137–155. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.