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1. **Introduction: three groups of Quechuan clitics**

(1) Nonfactual marker in Ayacucho Quechua (Southern; Parker 1969)

   a. *Mana=m* ri-nqa=chu.
      NEG=DIR.EVID go-3.FUT=NFAC
      ‘S/he will not go.’

   b. *Ayacuchu-ta=chu paqarin ri-nqa-ku?*
      A.-ACC=NFAC tomorrow go-3.FUT-PL
      ‘Will they be going to Ayacucho tomorrow?’

(2) Evidentials in Huallaga Quechua (Central; Weber 1989)

   a. *Ñoqa=mi chaya-a-man away-r=qa.*
      1SG.PRO=DIR.EVID arrive-1-COND go-ADV=TOP
      ‘I would arrive, if I were to go.’

   b. *Llapan=shi chay kasta ka-q=qa wanu-n.*
      all=INDIR.EVID DEM family be-SUB=TOP die-3
      ‘All of that family dies if they do so.’

      die-3FUT-FUT=CONJECT
      ‘It might die / Perhaps it will die.’

(3) Emphatic markers in Cajamarca Quechua (N Peruvian; Coombs et al. 2003)

   a. *Ama=raq mikuy=chu chay timbuchi rupaqta=qa!*
      NEG=yet eat.2SG=NFAC DEM boiling soup=TOP
      ‘Don’t eat that hot soup yet!’

   b. *Ch’ayamuy=ri!*
      get.here=EMPH
      ‘Get here already / get here please!’

(4) The sample used in this study

   a. Central (Q-I): Ancash, Huallaga, Wanka
   b. Northern Peruvian (Q-IIa): Cajamarca
   c. Northern (Q-IIb): Ecuadorian, Inga
   d. Southern (Q-IIc): San Martín, Ayacucho, Cuzco

---

1 With special thanks to Florian Matter for his term paper (Matter 2015).
2. The nonfactual

- It is present in all Quechuan groups.
- It appears uniformly in polar questions and somewhat less so in negated statements (usually with *mana* or some other negative particle) and negated subordinate clauses (only in some varieties, e.g. Ayacucho). Cf. Pineda-Bernuy (2014) for a pan-Quechuan survey of negation. The constituent taking the clitic is usually focused.
- It can be combined with the evidentials in several varieties (e.g. Cuzco and Ayacucho; Wanka =*chun* ‘Q’ < *="ču=mí*).

(5) Two different markers in Ancash Quechua (Central; Pineda-Bernuy 2014, Sánchez 2010)

- *Ancash Q =*tsu ‘NEG’ is cognate with other Quechuan =*chu* ‘NFAC’ (regular *ts – ch* correspondence)
- Where does Ancash Q =*ku* ‘Q’ come from?
  - Pineda-Bernuy (2014:122) mentions two (hypothetical) possibilities: phonological change and borrowing. Her potential sources are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aymara</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>‘still, yet’</td>
<td>Puquina</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>Q (in WH-words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iquito</td>
<td>kaa</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Puquina</td>
<td>-y</td>
<td>Q in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguaruna</td>
<td>-ki/-ka</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Asháninka</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>Q (in WH-words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuar</td>
<td>-ki(i)</td>
<td>neglected action</td>
<td>Mapudungun</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>IMPER only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>Q (in WH-words)</td>
<td>Tehuelche</td>
<td>k’om</td>
<td>NEG verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The clitic =*ku* combines with contrastive =*taq* for emphatic negation without *mana*.
- But the clitic =*ku* does not exclusively appear in polar questions:

(6) More on =*ku* in Ancash Quechua (Central; Parker 1976)

- There does not seem to be a strong case in favor of reconstructing two nonfactuals for the whole family. I would therefore propose:

(7) *=ču* ‘NONFACTUAL’, marked on focus

  - Ancash distinguishes =*tsu* ‘NEG’ < *=ču* ‘NFAC’ from =*ku* ‘Q+’ (of unknown origin).

3. The evidentials

3.1 The direct and indirect evidentials

- They are present in all Quechuan groups.
- They show phonologically / morphologically conditioned allomorphy: =*mi* ~ =*m* (~ =*n*), =*shi* ~ =*sh* (~ =*s(i)*).
• They have phrasal scope (NP/VP); =mi can invariably occur on the negation particle (=shi seems to be able to do so in most varieties as well).
• They typically occur on the focused constituent / new information / comment.

(8) Cuzco Quechua (Southern; Faller 2003, 2007)

a. Yunka-pi=n k’usillu-kuna=q a ka-n.  
   rainforest-LOC=DIR.EVID monkey-PL=TOP be-3SG  
   ‘There are monkey in the rainforest.’

b. Pay-kuna=s ñoqa-man=q a quqí-ta muntu-ntin-pi saqiy-wa-n.  
   3-PL=INDIR.EVID 1SG-ALL=TOP money-ACC lot-INCL-LOC leave-1OBJ-3  
   ‘They (allegedly / apparently) leave me a lot of money.’

• In Ecuadorian Quechua, =shi seems to have taken over the function of =cha (i.e. conjectural) (Cole 1982:165).

3.2 The conjectural

• It has phrasal scope (NP/VP/NEG).

(9) Evidentials in questions in Wanka Quechua (Central; Floyd 1999)

a. Imay=mi Wankayuu-pi kuti-mu-la?  
   when=DIR.EVID W.-ABL return-TRANS-PST  
   ‘When did he come back from Huancayo?’ (default — through ascription to addressee)

b. Pero ima-nuy-pa=tr walmi-i daañu-kaa-chi-la?  
   but what-like-GEN=CONJECT woman-1SG.PSR damage-PASS-CAUS-PST  
   ‘But I wonder how my wife let them damage [the field].’ (non-commitment > rhetorical)

• It normally occurs on the focused constituent / new information / comment.

(10) But the conjectural-marked element can be topicalized in Wanka Quechua (Floyd 1999)

Ya’a trabaju-u-ta=tra=a upya-ka-mu-u.  
1SG work-1SG.PSR-ACC=CONJECT=TOP drink-REFL-TRANS-1SG.PSR  
‘(I suppose) I drink what I earn (lit. my work.)’

(11) Formal variation:

a. Central (Q-I): Ancash, Huallaga (=cha); Wanka (=tra ~ =tri)

b. Northern Peruvian (Q-IIa): Cajamarca (=ch’i)

c. Northern (Q-IIb): Ecuadorian (=chari), Inga (=char)

d. Southern (Q-IIc): San Martín (=chá), Ayacucho (=cha ~ =chá), Cuzco (=chá and =chari)

3.3 Reconstruction

(12) Nothing is known about the prehistory of =mi, =shi and their allomorphs:

*=mi   ‘DIRECT KNOWLEDGE’, marked on focus

*=ši   ‘INDIRECT KNOWLEDGE’, marked on focus
(13) The conjectural seems to have more interaction with a further element =ari (cf. Section 4):

* = ča ‘CONJECTURAL’, marked on focus

- Vowel(s): Central varieties have i (Wanka has both i and a); so do some Northern Peruvian varieties (Cajamarca and Lambayeque, Vilcabana Sánchez et al. 2007: 128); all other varieties have a
- Ancash still distinguishes č from ċ but has č in the clitic
- Wanka/Cajamarca = ci < *=ri < *=ča=ari
- Wanka = ča < *=ča + analogy to = či
- Northern = čari / = čar < *=ča=ari
- Southern = chá / = chari < *=ča=ari

4. The emphatics

4.1 The marker =qa

- It is present in all Quechuan groups, but its characterization is heterogeneous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic</th>
<th>subordinate VP</th>
<th>“connective” / new topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancash</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huallaga</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanka</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( + -kaq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador (= ka)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inga (= k(a))</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Martín</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayacucho</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( + =ri e.g. in Q)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 (Almost) all things ri

- There are aspectual verbal suffixes that take this form: punctual (Ancash, Huallaga, Cuzco), punctual/inchoative (Inga, San Martín, Ayacucho), iterative (Cajamarca), and reflexive/reciprocal (Ecuador, Inga). In Ayacucho, -ri also marks politeness and “emphasis.”
- The element *ari ‘yes’ appears to reconstruct without any problems.
- This ari and its allomorphs denote emphasis.
- Several reflexes are straightforward:
  - Ancash: = ri ‘EMPH’
  - Huallaga: ari ‘EMPH’, also compound as = mari < = mi= ari and = chari < = chaq= ari
  - Wanka: (=) ari ‘EMPH’
  - Cajamarca: = ri ‘EMPH’ or politeness (cf. Ex. (3b) above)
  - Ecuador: = má(ri) and = chá(ri) are the emphatic markers
  - Inga: = kar ‘EMPH; new/unexpected referent’ < *= qa = ari
Other cases are less clear:

- Ayacucho: =á ‘EMPH’ ("stressed evidentials" that convey emphasis: =má, =sá, =chá) (and further independent final stress as emphatic/polite marker in general)
- San Martín: (=rá ~ =rî expresses doubt in questions)
- Cuzco: =rî ‘TOP’ (=charî South of Cuzco)
  (cf. also contradictory =má and obvious =yá)
- S Bolivia: =rî ‘please, nicely, with delight’!

(14) Interesting combination in Wanka Quechua (Central; Cerrón-Palomino 1976)

\begin{verbatim}
Alman=tr=ari puli-yka-n.
soul=CONJECT=EMPH come-DUR-3
\end{verbatim}

‘So his soul is probably coming.’

4.3 Reconstruction

(15) *qa ‘TOPIC’

*aři ‘yes’ > emphatic (> ‘TOPIC.Q’ in Cuzco)

5. Conclusions

- From a diachronic perspective, most clitics are formally and functionally stable within Quechuan. The loci of variation are (predictable) phonology and, for =rî in some southern varieties, function.
- Due to this high stability, not much can be said about development paths.
- Northern Quechua, possibly under the influence of contact with non-Quechuan languages, shows significant variation in other areas of grammatical structure when compared to non-Northern Quechuan; this area does not seem to be one of them.
- Still unclear: Ancash =tsu ‘NEG’ vs. =ku ‘Q+’; whether subordinate topic-marked VPs were original or extensions. It is unclear how much contact-sensitivity must be postulated in this particular case.
- Quechuan studies have traditionally used the term “independent suffix” for most of these clitics and have tended to neglect the study of their formal properties until relatively recently (with notable exceptions, e.g. Adelaar 2004), but their “special status” has largely been acknowledged.
Abbreviations
ABL ablative, ACC accusative, ADV adverbial, ALL allative, CAUS causative, COND conditional, CONJECT conjectural, DEM demonstrative, DIR direct, DUBIT dubitative, DUR durative, EMPH emphatic, EVID evidential, FUT future, GEN genitive, IMPER imperative, INCL inclusive, INDIR indirect, LOC locative, NEG negation, NFAC nonfactual, OBJ object, PASS passive, PL plural, PRO pronoun, Q question, REFL reflexive, SG singular, SUB subordinate, TOP topic, TRANS translocative
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