Quechua Expressions of Stance and Deixis

Edited by

Marilyn S. Manley and Antje Muntendam

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

Figures

Notes on Contributors

Marilyn S. Manley

is an Associate Professor of Spanish at Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey. She is also a Fully Certified Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) Tester for Spanish through the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). At Rowan University, in addition to teaching Hispanic linguistics and Spanish language courses, she enjoys teaching basic Cuzco Quechua language within the context of two interdisciplinary Honors Program courses. Her recent publications include various journal articles and book chapters on Quechua language attitudes and maintenance, Quechua to Spanish cross-linguistic influence, and teaching Quechua as a less commonly taught language.

Antje Muntendam

is an Assistant Professor of Hispanic Linguistics in the Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics at Florida State University. Before joining Florida State University she was an Assistant Professor of Hispanic Linguistics at Middlebury College and an Assistant Professor of Linguistics at Radboud University Nijmegen. Her research focuses on language contact and bilingualism, in particular between Quechua and Spanish and Turkish and Dutch. Her research interests include information structure, the syntax-pragmatics interface and prosody. She has done fieldwork in Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru, and she has carried out research projects with heritage speakers of Turkish in the Netherlands.

Ellen H. Courtney

was an Associate Professor of Languages and Linguistics at the University of Texas at El Paso and is currently a Visiting Scholar at the University of Arizona. Her primary research interest is child acquisition of different varieties of Peruvian Quechua, with special focus on the development of morphosyntax. She has carried out fieldwork In the Peruvian Andes of Arequipa, Cuzco, and Ancash, including the collection of naturalistic speech samples as well as experimental data.

Susan E. Kalt

is Professor of Spanish at Roxbury Community College in Massachusetts and co-founder of Proyecto Yachay Q'ipi, a rural grassroots Andean curriculum initiative. Since 2008 she has received two National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships and a seed grant from the Foundation for Endangered

Languages to document child Quechua morphosyntax and support revitalization efforts. Her team's collection of over a hundred interviews of rural Bolivian and Peruvian children is found at the Archive of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas. In 2013 she taught Field Methods in Linguistics with emphasis on the Quechua language at Boston College.

Janis Nuckolls

is Associate Professor in the Department of Linguistics and English Language at Brigham Young University. Her research has focused on various subcomponents within the grammar of the Pastaza dialect of Ecuadorian Quichua. Her published work has featured original analyses of the significance of ideophones in grammar, discourse and for Pastaza Quichua linguaculture: *Sounds Like Life (1996), Lessons from a Quechua Strongwoman (2010).* She has also studied the evidential subsystem in Pastaza Quichua from an interactional, pragmatic perspective: *Evidentiality in Interaction (2014).*

Pieter Muysken

is Professor of Linguistics at Radboud University Nijmegen. His research focuses on the ways human languages interact and the contact-induced language change that results from this interaction. Muysken was one of the first to study these processes of contact through different formal models of language. He has done fieldwork in the Andes, the Caribbean, as well as with bilingual groups in the Netherlands. He has also been involved in a number of projects trying to communicate research to a wider audience, most recently through the website "Stemmen van Afrika". He was also involved in producing a four volume series of grammars in Spanish on the indigenous languages of Bolivia, www.ru.nl/lenguasdebolivia. For more information on Pieter Muysken, please visit www.ru.nl/linc.

Belinda Ramirez Spencer

received her BA in Sociocultural Anthropology at Brigham Young University in 2013. She is currently pursuing a Masters Degree and PhD in Sociocultural Anthropology at the University of California, San Diego. Her main interests are religion, semiotics, and ontology, with a particular focus on the Ecuadorian Amazon region.

Liliana Sánchez

is a Professor of Spanish at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. She has published two monographs on Quechua languages *The Morphology and Syntax*

of Topic and Focus: Minimalist Inquiries in the Quechua Periphery (2010) and *Quechua-Spanish Bilingualism. Interference and Convergence in Functional Categories* (2003) as well as articles on Quechua-Spanish bilingualism in journals such as *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, Lingua,* and *International Journal of Bilingualism,* among others. She has also co-edited the volume *Information Structure in Indigenous Languages of the Americas* (2010).

Tod Swanson

is Associate Professor of Religious Studies in the School of Historical, Philosophical, and Religious Studies at Arizona State University. His research uses Anthropological Linguistics to understand Andean/Amazonian philosophy of nature: *Singing to Estranged Relatives: Quichua Relations to Plants in the Ecuadorian Amazon* (2009). During the summer months he directs the Andes and Amazon Field School in Napo Province Ecuador where he is recording Amazonian Quichua oral tradition on plants and animals.

Introduction

Marilyn S. Manley, Antje Muntendam and Susan E. Kalt

The primary goal of the present volume is to explore the semantics and pragmatics of a variety of expressions in Southern Quechua and Ecuadorian Quichua[1] that are considered here to be markers of stance, following Du Bois' (2007) notion of the "stance triangle", and communicate what some have alternately referred to as deixis. All of the subsequent chapters of this work investigate these stance-marking expressions through original fieldwork and experimental studies, many of which employ original methodologies. The expressions examined within this volume include the Cuzco Quechua verbal derivation markers, *-yku, -rqu, -ku, -mu* and *-pu* (Chapter 2), the Pastaza and Tena Quichua demonstratives, *kay*, *chi* and *chay* (Chapter 3), the Cuzco Quechua evidential enclitics, *-mi/-n*, *-chá*, and *-si/-s*, as well as the past tense suffixes, *-r(q)a-* and *-sqa-* (Chapters 4 and 5), the Southern Quechua markers of topic and focus, *-qa*, and *-mi/-n*, respectively, as well as syntactic and prosodic strategies for topic and focus marking (Chapter 6), the Puno, Lampa and Ayaviri Quechua postposition, *hina* (Chapter 7), and Cuzco, Apurimac and Arequipa Quechua morphologically unmarked right dislocated constituents, which may be used to introduce an element that is not part of the current topic structure or disambiguate the reference of null subjects (Chapter 8).

Upon first inspection of the range of expressions studied here, it may not be obvious how or why all of these should be considered as markers of stance (or deictic elements). Since theoretical discussions of stance and deixis are beyond the scope of each of the individual chapters, whose main objective is to examine their respective expressions in Quechua and Quichua, this Introduction aims to outline some of the most relevant aspects of the theoretical underpinnings of stance and deixis, thereby serving as a broad background for the chapters to follow. The Introduction is organized in the following way. First, we address aspects of some of the most influential theories of stance and deixis today. This is followed by a general outline of expressions of stance and

---

[1] These languages form a large subgroup of the Amerindian languages spoken in the Andes, and are classified as QIIB-C or Chinchay Quechua (Torero 1964). Southern Quechua is also referred to as Cuzco-Collao Quechua.

deixis in Quechua. Finally, we provide information about the specific contributions in each chapter of this volume.

1   Indexicality, Stance and Deixis

Both stance and deixis fall within the realm of indexicality and serve to anchor utterances to the context of speech. As described below, this work supports the unification of the concepts of stance and deixis and suggests that deixis should be considered as a subtype of stance that serves a specifically referential function. Careful examination of the groundbreaking work of Du Bois (2007) in his conceptualization of the stance triangle, together with Hanks' (2005, 2011) influential description of his practice approach to deixis, reveals striking similarities between these preeminent theories of stance and deixis, respectively.

While this work is not the first to propose the unification of the two concepts of stance and deixis, to our knowledge, it is the first to address this topic at a level of detail beyond a simple, brief mention. For example, in his work on deixis, Hanks (2005, 205) states, "Deictics index a Spr's (speaker's) stance relative to the Adr (addressee) and the object...". Additionally, in her study of Kalapalo epistemology, Basso (2008, 246) states, "An approach that considers deictic functions within a stance model thus seems particularly useful for asking new questions about epistemic marking..." Furthermore, in reference to the work of Hanks and Du Bois, Williams (2009, 7) states, "...a comparison and potential unification of these frameworks deserves much attention." We undertake this comparison and unification as follows.

Fundamentally, Du Bois describes stance as: (1) a property of utterances "inherently embedded in their dialogic contexts" (2007, 148), (2) "the smallest unit of social action" (2007, 173), and (3) necessarily invoking an evaluation, with evaluation defined as "the process whereby a stancetaker orients to an object of stance and characterizes it as having some specific quality or value" (2007, 143). Du Bois also provides the following definition (2007, 163):

> Stance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field.

This definition incorporates the three nodes of Du Bois' stance triangle, "the three key entities in the stance act, namely the first subject, the second subject, and the (shared) stance object" (2007, 164). Du Bois (2007, 163) further explains:

> The stance act thus creates three kinds of stance consequences at once. In taking a stance, the stancetaker (1) evaluates an object, (2) positions a subject (usually the self), and (3) aligns with other subjects.

Hanks' (2005, 205) statement mentioned above and repeated here, that "Deictics index a Spr's stance relative to the Adr and the object…" bears a striking resemblance to Du Bois' stance triangle.

Prior to drawing further parallels between Hanks' work on deixis and Du Bois' work on stance, some background information is in order regarding Hanks' theoretical position. Hanks presents his practice approach to deixis as an alternative framework to two contemporary theoretical traditions that he refers to as spatialist and interactionist. Hanks (2005, 196) describes these two traditions as "…two different background pictures of utterance context and particularly of deixis". According to the egocentric spatialist view, which Hanks (2005, 196) describes as "the standard default for most modern linguistic descriptions", "deictic acts take place when the Spr, the Adr, and the Object are physically copresent and perceptible". Furthermore, Hanks (2011, 319) explains that the spatialist view "…holds that relative contiguity (*this* = proximal, *that* = non-proximal and so forth) is fundamental…". Moreover, according to the spatialist position, "The situation may be interperspectival, but it is the Spr who produces the utterance and the Spr's body that serves as the anchor point…" (2005, 196).

Among Hanks' arguments against the egocentric spatialist view is the fact that it fails to account for the "many cases in which a deictic responds not to speaker accessibility, but to the addressee's access to the object, or to the relative symmetry of access between the co-participants" (2011, 320). Bühler (1934) was the first to describe this phenomenon, which he referred to as deictic transposition; rather than the speaker serving as the contextual anchor, the addressee, some other object or a narrative space may fulfill this function. Hanks additionally finds the spatialist view inadequate in that it "omits critical features of deictic practice, including the mutual orientation of interactants, all non-perceptual modes of access such as background knowledge, memory or anticipation, and all extra-physical aspects of social settings" (2011, 321). In other words, in addition to the fact that the speaker does not always serve as the deictic center in discourse practice, the spatialist view also falls short in that objects referenced by deictics need not always be physically present and perceptible.

According to the interactionist view of deixis, on the other hand, the emergent space of interaction serves as the core context for deictic expression, "and to study it, we must attend to sequential organization of talk, to situational

variation and to the micro-ethnography of everyday usage " (Hanks 2011, 322). Furthermore, this view proposes that "Utterance meaning must be 'negotiated' or worked out by the co-engaged parties. It is not given in advance, nor is it fixed by the intentions of the Spr" (Hanks 2005, 196). Additionally, Hanks explains that according to this view, "In the course of deictic practice, interactants must jointly establish and display the relevance of spatial perceptual, discursive or other contextual frames" (2011, 322).

Hanks' (2005, 200) primary argument against the interactionist picture is that it fails to grasp:

> . . . that the deictic field is partly structured by the *semantic field* of deixis, that is, the conventional linguistic array of oppositions and contrasts that defines the potentials of the forms for acts of referring.

Moreover, Hanks finds it "obviously implausible that. . . (deictic) meanings are entirely negotiated utterance by utterance" (2005, 200).

Drawing primarily from the work of Bühler, Goffman, and Bourdieu, Hanks' practice approach to deixis serves as a third, blended, compromise position between the spatialist and interactionist traditions. Hanks (2011, 323) explains, "We can grant interaction as the ordinary context of utterances, while still claiming that the semantics of deixis is egocentric and spatial." Hanks (2005, 197) further states, "the linguistic forms encode semantic values of the sort predicted by the spatialist picture (contiguity to ego), but the pragmatics is governed by interactional principles (including inference from relevance)." According to this alternative framework, the lexically encoded, default semantic values of deictic expressions are consistent with those proposed by the spatialist view, but the pragmatics of deictic expressions demonstrates the flexibility needed to shift the deictic center and refer to imperceptible objects located beyond the physical surround of the interactants.

An important way in which Hanks' practice approach to deixis theory differs from both the spatialist and the interactionist views is that according to Hanks' position (2005, 206), in order for interactants to interpret deictic meaning, in addition to having an understanding of the semantics of deictics and the local practical circumstances, they must also take into account the deictics' embedding in the broader social field. Hanks (2011, 323) explains that the broader social field, "includes the identities of participants, the genres of practice of which deixis is a part, the social definition of place and time and the values attaching to objects of reference." Hanks (2005, 211) further explains,

> . . . objects have value for the interactants and the social world around them. They are dirty, clean, evil, good, avoided, private, self-evident, secret, mine, yours, or someone else's. Such qualities and their evaluation may appear far removed from sheer indexicality, but they figure prominently in deictic practice. . . a Spr's evaluative stance in an utterance can help resolve the reference. At the same time, a Spr who refers to an object enters into a social relation with it and thereby engages with its value.

Thus, in his practice approach, Hanks recognizes that evaluation is central to deictic expression. As such, in recognizing that evaluation is unavoidable in deixis, Hanks' practice approach allows deictics to satisfy Du Bois' definition of stance, listed above and repeated here, as "an act of evaluation owned by a social actor" (2007, 173). Furthermore, within Hanks' practice approach, deictics are described in a way that is consistent with Du Bois' stance triangle, in which a stancetaker "(1) evaluates an object, (2) positions a subject (usually the self), and (3) aligns with other subjects" (Du Bois 2007, 163). For these reasons, it is proposed here that deixis should be considered as a subclass of stance.

If deictics are, in effect, markers of stance, the question arises as to what should distinguish deictics as a subclass within the larger category of stance. While the broad literature on deixis to date includes a variety of subtypes, including but not limited to, spatial deixis (*here, there*), temporal deixis (*now, later*, tense), personal deixis (pronominals), discourse deixis (reference to prior talk), and social deixis (honorifics), this work proposes that, within a model where deixis is considered as a subtype of stance, it would be terminologically useful to classify only referential deixis as "deixis" and to consider what has been called nonreferential deixis as "stance". In his work, Hanks (2011, 315) describes his focus on referential deixis as follows:

> . . . those forms whose primary function is to individuate objects of reference (including events, material things, talk itself or any individuated concept). Referential deixis is found in all human languages and includes at least demonstratives, person markers, locative, directional and temporal markers, but excludes much 'social deixis' such as honorification (where social status is indexed but usually not singled out for comment) and standard sociolinguistic markers (where social factors are indexed but not singled out for comment).

Furthermore, Hanks (2005, 195) distinguishes referential deixis from nonreferential deixis as follows:

> The fact of referentiality distinguishes these forms (referential deictic forms) from nonreferring indexicals such as regional or other accents, speech levels, or stylistic variants. All of these may index features of context, but they do so without shifting the reference. Second, deictics can usually be lexically expanded with further descriptors that characterize the object. Hence one could say simply 'this' or 'this old table with the broken leg,' . . . 'here' or 'here in the East Bay,' 'you' or 'you my friend,' and so on.

Distinguishing referential deixis from nonreferential stance may prove difficult in practice due to the multidimensional nature of deictics and other markers of stance. Hanks (2005, 212) describes his concept of the deictic field as "a space of positions and position taking in relation to objects and their values in the embedding social field"; however, in his analysis of Yucatec Mayan examples, he finds that "there are multiple deictic dimensions in play in the actual field of utterance" (2005, 207). Hanks (2005, 207) sees the "multi-stranded makeup" of the deictic field to be problematic for deictic construal, since:

> At any moment in interaction, multiple dimensions of access (among participants, objects, and settings) are simultaneously available for interactants. The selection and understanding of deictics relies on the simultaneous articulation of space, perception, discourse, commonsense and mutual knowledge, anticipation, and the framework of participation in which Sprs and Adrs orient to one another. Any one of these factors can provide the basis for deictic construal according to the demands of the ongoing relevance structure in which it is produced.

Hanks (2005, 209) also finds that it is precisely this "simultaneity of alternate framings in the deictic field" that accounts for the variation that he has observed in Yucatec Mayan linguistic practice.

As Hanks has found for Yucatec Maya, the contributors to the present volume have also found rich variation in practice for Quechua expressions of stance and deixis. Since the primary focus of the chapters included here is on the semantics and pragmatics of Quechua expressions and not on theoretical considerations of stance and deixis, each chapter alternately refers to either "deixis" or "stance", following literary tradition. As further background for the chapters to come, the next section outlines categories of stance and deixis in Quechua as they have been described in the literature to date.

2 Quechua Stance and Deictic Categories

The goal of this section is to provide a broad outline of the major stance/deixis categories in Quechua, including what has been referred to in the literature as person deixis, place deixis, time deixis, social deixis, discourse deixis and epistemological/evidential deixis/stance. All examples are presented in Southern Quechua, as it is the most-often studied in the present volume. The examples are by no means complete or exhaustive, serving only to provide illustrations of a portion of the deictic systems discussed in subsequent chapters of this volume.

2.1 *Person Deixis in Quechua*

The elements of person deixis outlined here include pronominals and inflectional marking. In marking person, languages generally distinguish between Speaker (S), Addressee (A) and other, based on the participants' roles in the speech event (Levinson 2004). Quechua marks person in pronouns and in inflectional marking. The Quechua pronominal system is provided in table 1.1.

TABLE 1.1 *Quechua pronominal system*

Singular		Plural	
+S, -A	*ñuqa*	+S, +A	*ñuqanchis*
		+S, -A, +AUG	*ñuqayku*
-S, +A	*qan*	-S, +A	*qankichis*
-S, -A	*pay*	-S, -A	*paykuna*

In singular, Quechua distinguishes between first person (+S, -A), second person (-S, +A) and third person (-S, -A). Regarding plural pronouns, a distinction is made between 'first person inclusive' (+S, +A) and 'first person exclusive' (+S, -A, +AUG). First person exclusive does not include the addressee, but it may include other individuals (AUG) (Levinson 2004, 113). Second person plural is (+A, -S) and third person plural is (-S, -A). Quechua pronouns are gender neutral and are frequently dropped, given that Quechua is a pro-drop language.

The following sentences adapted from Plaza (2005, 15) illustrate the exclusivity distinction for first person plural subjects. In (1) the first person plural

exclusive is used, meaning that the addressee is not considered a participant, whereas in (2) the inclusive is used.

(1) *Ñuqa-yku-qa*   *jaqay*   *mayu-pi*   *llamk'a-chka-yku.*
     1-PL.EXCL-TOP   yonder   river-LOC   work-PROG-1.PL.EXCL
     'We (not including you) are working over yonder in the river.'

(2) *Ñuqa-nchik-qa²*   *jaqay*   *mayu-pi*   *llamk'a-chka-nchik.*
     1-PL.INCL-TOP   yonder   river-LOC   work-PROG-1.PL.EXCL
     'We (including you) are working over yonder in the river.'

The inflectional system spells out discourse roles through suffixes on nominal and verbal roots. Quechua verbal inflection marks the speaker and addressee roles more explicitly than it marks third persons, as shown in tables 1.2 and 1.3 below, in which English equivalents are included for comparison and ease of interpretation. Subject inflection is shown in table 1.2:

TABLE 1.2   *Subject-verb agreement in English and Quechua present or unmarked tense*

Person	Discourse role	English		Quechua	
		Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
1	+S, -A	-∅	-∅	*-ni*	*-nchis* (+S, +A)
					-yku (+S, -A, +AUG)
2	-S, +A	-∅	-∅	*-nki*	*-nkichis*
3	-S, -A	-s	-∅	*-n* (optional)	*-nku*

Object inflection suffixes and their pronominal English equivalents are shown in table 1.3; only singular forms are included since the plural forms introduce unnecessary complexity:

2   *-nchis* and *-nkichis* are phonological and orthographic variants of *-nchik* and *-nkichik* in Cuzco-Collao Quechua (Howard 2013, 3–5).

TABLE 1.3   *Object agreement in Quechua* (*singular forms only*)

Discourse role (Person)	English	Quechua
+S, -A	me	*-wa*
-S, +A	you	*-yki* 1 > 2 'I to you'
		-sunki 3 > 2 'he/she to you'
-S, -A	him, her, it	*-∅*

As is evident in table 1.3, subject and object person features are morphologically fused in the second person object suffixes. This is illustrated in the following examples from Plaza (1987, 195):

(3)   *Tapu-yki.*
       ask-1S2O
       'I ask you.'

(4)   *Tapu-sunki.*
       ask-3S2O
       'He asks you.'

Third person objects of transitive verbs are marked with a phonetically null inflectional affix, as argued in Plaza (1987, 202–203). These contrast with sentences in which the verb is used intransitively, as noted in examples (5) and (6), respectively (*ibid.*).

(5)   *Riku-ni.* (intransitive use)
       see-1
       'I see.'

(6)   *Riku-∅-ni.* (transitive use)
       see-3OBJ-1
       'I see him/her/it.'

Notice that the object in (6) can optionally have definite, specific anaphoric reference, which must be resolved in the discourse. First and second person objects, on the other hand, are always definite and specific, based on their correspondence to participant roles in the speech act. The presence or absence of third person objects is crucial to understanding the argument structure of verbs marked with directional morphemes, as noted by Torero (2005, 72–75).

2.2   *Place Deixis in Quechua*

Quechua examples of place deixis outlined here include demonstratives and directional morphemes. Bátori (1984) and Levinson (2004, 3) note that many of the world's languages have the option of placing both the speaker and addressee at the center of the deictic field. As shown above, the inflectional system in Quechua does this by marking first and second persons more explicitly than it does third persons. The option of emphasizing the addressee role is also seen in the fact that demonstrative elements may be indexed to proximity or perceptual availability to the addressee as well as the speaker, depending on the context of use. In Quechua, *kay* and *ankay* are equivalent ways of expressing proximity to the spatial or temporal deictic center 'here/now'; *chay, anchay* are distal demonstratives meaning roughly 'there/then'; and *haqay* plus its allomorphs means 'over yonder' or outside the perceptual field (Calvo 1993, 57–62).[3] Demonstrative pronouns are sometimes accompanied by gesture and the particle *aqna* 'like this' in order to identify the deictic center or establish shared attentional focus with the speaker.

The directional morpheme most frequently noted for its spatial deictic properties is the suffix *-mu*, which when added to a verb of motion indicates movement toward the speaker and/or hearer:

(7)   *T'anta-ta*   *apa-**mu**-nqa.*
       bread-ACC   carry-CIS-3FUT
       'He will bring the bread.'

(8)   *T'anta-ta*   *apa-nqa.*
       bread-ACC   carry-3FUT
       'He will take the bread.' (Bills 1972, 1, glosses ours)

---

3   According to an anonymous reviewer, demonstrative systems in the broader Quechua language family include two-term systems, three-term systems and, in a single case, a six-term system.

When suffixed to a non-motion verb, *-mu* "indicates movement to a location distant from the speaker and hearer where the verbal action or concept takes place" (Bills, 1972, 2).

(9) *T'anta-ta*   *ranti-**mu**-nqa.*
     bread-ACC   buy-TRANS-3FUT
     'He will go buy some bread.'

(10) *T'anta-ta*   *ranti-nqa.*
     bread-ACC   buy-3FUT
     'He will buy some bread.'

A more comprehensive discussion of the properties of *-mu* and other directional morphemes is found in chapter 2.

2.3   *Time Deixis in Quechua*

In Quechua, time deixis is encoded in adverbs and is reflected in the tense system by suffixation. To express "a general truth, simple present tense, and in some contexts a recent past" (Howard 2013, 42), the person markings of the unmarked tense in table 1.2 are used. Two ways to express the past are by adding *-r(q)a-*[4] or *-sqa-*[5] immediately before the tense markings in table 1.2.[6] To express the future tense, the markings in table 1.4 are used.

As should be evident from this brief discussion of tense marking, the expression of tense is sometimes morphologically fused with the expression of verbal argument structure, verbal aspect, mood and evidentiality.

Time deixis is also marked in free-standing adverbs such as *kunan* 'now', *qhipaman* 'later' and *ñawpaqta* 'before' (Godenzzi & Vengoa 1994, 40). These interpretations are indexed to the deictic center. Demonstratives such as *chay* 'there', alone or in combination with numerous suffixes such as reportive *-si* (*chaysi* 'then they say') or adposition *-manta* 'from' (*chaymanta* 'from there, after that') can also serve a discourse deictic function, marking temporal sequence within a narrative.

------

4 In chapter 5 of the present volume, Manley finds *-r(q)a-* to be utilized as an evidentiality strategy to communicate direct information source and also with epistemic extension to indicate certainty.

5 In chapter 5 of the present volume, Manley analyzes *-sqa-* as an evidentiality strategy used to communicate indirect information source, with epistemic extension to indicate doubt, and as a mirativity strategy, indicating surprise and newsworthiness.

6 Cole (1982) includes an in-depth discussion of tense and aspect in Imbabura Quechua, an Ecuadorian variety.

TABLE 1.4   *Chinchay Quechua intransitive future tense marking*

		Ecuador	Bolivia/Peru
Singular	1	*-sha*	*-saq*
	2	*-ngi*	*-nki*
	3	*-nga*	*-nqa*
Plural	1 INCL	*-shun*	*-sun* or *-sunchik*
	1 EXCL		*-sqayku* or *saqku*
	2	*-ngichi*	*-nkichik*
	3	*-nga*	*-nganku*

(Hermon 1985, 22 for Ecuador; Howard 2013, 150–1 for Cuzco-Collao)

2.4   *Social Deixis in Quechua*

Social deixis is defined as the linguistic expression of the speech community's relationships, which Levinson (2004, 51) organizes along four axes:

Axis	*Honorific Types*	*Other encodings*
(1) Speaker to referent	Referent honorifics	Titles
(2) Speaker to addressee	Addressee honorifics	Address forms
(3) Speaker to non-addressed participant	Bystander honorifics	Taboo vocabularies
(4) Speaker to setting	Formality levels	Register

Examples from axes (1–2) in Cuzco-Collao Quechua are the honorific titles and forms of address, which include terms based on ritual relationships of friendship, such as *cumpariy*, '$godfather,[7] buddy' as well as those based on family roles such as *taytay* 'Sir (lit. father)', *mamay* 'Ma'am (lit. mother)', *wayqiy, turay* 'brother', uttered by males and females respectively, and *panay, ñañay* 'sister', uttered by males and females respectively. An example from axis (3) is the suppletive *na-*, which may substitute for almost any taboo word known to the interlocutors but unspoken (Hipólito Peralta, pers. comm.). *Na-* can also be used anaphorically, or to refer to an entity for which the speaker cannot immediately access the name. An example from axis (4) is the diminutive

---

7   Throughout this volume, the "$" symbol is used to represent Spanish borrowings.

suffix, *-cha*, as in *mamacha* (lit. little mother), indicating informality. There are no formality distinctions in the Cuzco Quechua inflectional system.

Cuzco Quechua depends heavily on the directional markers, *-yku, -rqu, -ku* and *-pu*, in composition with the elements above, to fulfill social deictic functions, many of them as nuanced as the subjective evaluations that these suffixes have come to mean. *-Yku* (and its allomorph *-yu*) forms compositional meanings with imperative voice, which express politeness and affection:

(11)   *T'ika-yki-ta*   *raki-yu-wa-y.*
       flower-2POSS-ACC   share-INT-1OBJ-IMP
       'Share some of your flowers with me please.' (Cusihuamán 1976, 206)

When the verb is marked imperative, *-rqu* interacts with the addressee honorific system and with the formality register to express nuances of social relationship between speaker and hearer, for example, courtesy and respect:

(12)   *Allichu,*   *mamá-y,*   *yanapa-rqu-ku-wa-y!*
       please   ma'am-VOC   help-DYN-REFL-1OBJ-IMP
       'Please, ma'am, kindly help me!' (Cusihuamán 1976, 208)

It also expresses the priority and urgency with which an action should be realized:

(13)   *Kuti-mu-na-yki-paq*   *papa-ta*   *wayk'u -rqu-chka-saq.*
       return-CIS-NOM-2POSS-GEN   potato-ACC   cook-DYN-PROG-1FUT
       'I'll be cooking potatoes for your return.' (Cusihuamán 1976, 207)

Similarly, reflexive *-ku* interacts with other softening elements such as the second person irrealis affix to produce meanings of "affection, courtesy or care in the realization of an action" (Cusihuamán 1976, 212).

(14)   *Lliklla-ta*   *ranti-ku-waq-chu?*
       shawl-ACC   buy-REFL-IRR-INTR
       'Would you like to buy yourself a shawl?' (*ibid.*)

Finally, benefactive *-pu* combines with first person object *-wa* to form the meaning 'for me' which is often used to mean 'please':

(15)   *Ni-pu-wa-y*   *waqya-mu-wa-chun.*
       say-BEN-1OBJ-2IMP   call-CIS-1OBJ-3IMP
       'Tell her to call me please/for me.' (Martín Castillo, pers. comm.).

In summary, speakers of Cuzco Quechua use the suffixes *-yku, -rqu* and *-ku* in combination with social deictic markers such as imperative voice to add social nuances to their requests such as affection, formality, politeness and urgency, as well as to indicate the degrees of attention, intention, intensity, affection, emotion or energy with which requested actions should be carried out. Additionally, the benefactive marker *-pu* acquires a social deictic function of request when combined with the first person object marker.

2.5 *Discourse Deixis in Quechua*

Discourse deixis refers to the use of expressions that signal a relationship between a specific utterance and the prior or subsequent discourse (Levinson 1983, 2004). There is a rich inventory of morphemes by which a Quechua speaker can encode reference to previously or subsequently expressed elements within a discourse. Many of these morphemes are independent suffixes or enclitics, which Cusihuamán (1976) groups in the following ways: topic markers, focus markers, relational markers and specification markers.

The topic marker in Quechua is *-qa*, which can either be used to refer to the topic of the sentence, or the topic of the larger discourse. By relating the element to the preceding or following discourse, *-qa* has a discourse deictic function. For example, it appears that the sentence below is a response to a comment asserting or implying that it snows in Chinchero. Both the verb and the place name are topicalized with the enclitic *-qa* here:

(16) *Mana-n   rit'i-mu-n-chu-qa   Chinchero-ta-qa.*
     no-DIREV   snow-CIS-3SUBJ-NEG-TOP   Chinchero-ACC-TOP
     'But it doesn't snow in Chinchero.' (Cusihuamán 1976, 238, gloss and
     translation ours)

In the next example, we see the interrogative conjunction *-ri*, which Cusihuamán also considers a topic marker. Here it seems that the conjunction makes a discourse link to a previous assertion on the part of the speaker.

(17) *Pi-taq   qan-ri   ka-sha-nki?*
     who-DISC   you-INTR   be-PROG-2SUBJ
     'And who are you?' (*ibid.*)

According to Levinson (1983, 88), morphological topic markers can be classified as discourse deictic elements, as

> . . . a major function of topic marking is precisely to relate the marked utterance to some specific topic raised in the prior discourse, i.e. to perform a discourse-deictic function.

Another group of enclitics considered by Cusihuamán is what he calls the focus markers, which include the evidential suffixes. These suffixes can be used to draw the attention to the new or non-presupposed information in a sentence, and are discussed in a separate section below.

Quechua speakers also have a variety of syntactic and prosodic means to mark information as new (focused) or presupposed (topic). Peruvian Southern Quechua speakers may use the evidential markers to mark new information on elements *in situ* or those that are fronted, and they use prosodic means to mark presupposed information that has been displaced to the right periphery (Sánchez 2010).

The third type of enclitics considered by Cusihuamán (1976, 249) is what he calls relational enclitics, which:

> . . . mark one or more elements of a complementary utterance, be it declarative, imperative or interrogative, for the purpose of indicating that the references made by these elements maintain a tight relationship with the information contained in a previous utterance.

These include additive *-pis/-pas*, which have the meaning 'also, as well', and the contrastive *-taq,* which translates roughly as 'instead, in contrast'.

The fourth type of enclitics we are considering as encoders of discourse reference are what Cusihuamán (1976, 254–5, translation ours) calls the 'specification' enclitics, which "specify the state or frequency of the action, the actor or other element that intervenes in the realization of an action." For example, the limitative *-lla*, when attached to a noun, signifies that the effect of the action was limited to the noun mentioned:

(18) *Kuka-cha-**lla**-ta-n*   *hallpa-ku-sha-ra-ni.*
      coca-DIM-LIM-ACC-DIREV   chew-REFL-PROG-PST1–1SUBJ
      'I was only chewing coca, or (It was only coca that I was chewing)' (*ibid.*)

Another apparently discourse-relevant enclitic is the definitive *-puni* when used to specify that the person marked is 'precisely' the person one means to indicate as the actor, for example:

(19) *Kiki-nchis-**puni***   *ruwa-ku-nchis*   *chay-mi*   *ima-pis*
      same-1INCL-CERT   do-REFL-1INCL   that-DIREV   what-ADD

      ati-ku-n.
      accomplish-REFL-3SUBJ
      'We accomplish that very thing we hope to when we do it ourselves.'
      (Cusihuamán 1976, 257)

Another such discourse specifier is the continuative morpheme *-raq*:

(20) *Para-sha-lla-n-**raq**-mi.*
      rain-PROG-LIM-3SUBJ-CONT-DIREV
      'It still keeps on raining.' (*ibid.*)

A final specifier is the discontinuative *ña*:

(21) ***Ña**-n*   *paqari-mu-sha-n-**ña**.*
      DISC-DIREV   dawn-CIS-PROG-3SUBJ-DISC
      'The day is already dawning.' (Cusihuamán 1976, 260)

The enclitics in the specifier class are discourse referent in the very narrowest sense; in the two examples above they function to specify reference of attributes within words and clauses rather than outside of them.

2.6   *Epistemological and Evidential Deixis/Stance in Quechua*

In the case of Quechua language varieties, there has been ongoing debate regarding: (1) which linguistic elements should be considered as communicating evidentiality, epistemology and mirativity, and (2) whether the relevant morphemes should be considered to be primarily evidential, epistemic or mirative in nature. Also, Quechua scholars have alternately referred to the evidential enclitics, *-mi/-n*, *-chá*, *-si/-s* and the past tense suffixes, *-r(q)a-* and *-sqa-*, as marking either evidential or epistemic deixis or stance. According to Mushin (2001, 33):

> Evidential markers are deictic because they index information to the conceptualiser who makes an epistemological judgment. In context, the choice of evidential categories (eg. witness or report) serves to select the deictic origin—the one from which all temporal, spatial and identifying information can be calculated.

In other words, the choice of evidential markers helps identify what has been referred to here as the deictic center.

There is general consensus in the literature that Cuzco Quechua *-mi/-n* expresses that the speaker has direct evidence for the information content, or believes it is highly reliable; in contrast, it is generally accepted that the marker *-si/-s* expresses that the speaker has indirect evidence for the information content, or feels less certain of its reliability. While some have found *-r(q)a-* and *-sqa-* to carry similar evidential connotations to *-mi/-n* and *-si/-s*, respectively, Manley (this volume) is the first to claim epistemic extensions for *-r(q)a-* and *-sqa-*, indicating certainty and doubt, respectively.

Additional senses for these markers, and their role in deictic transposition or shifts in perspective within narratives, have been developed for Ecuadorian Quichua and Central Peruvian Quechua by Nuckolls (2008) and Howard (2012) respectively. They show that deictic markers like *-mi/-m* and *-rqa-* are used in narratives to denote "the assertion making function of the speaking self" (Nuckolls 2008, 83), which can either be part of the story or observing the story, onstage or offstage in the sense of Langacker (1985, 121) and Mushin (2001, 8). Nuckolls (2008, 83) notes that "this assertion-making function may also mark such pragmatically significant notions as focus and illocutionary modifications of propositional content (promising, warning, and threatening)."

On the other hand, markers like *-si/-s* and *-sqa-* are often used in narratives for information or perspectives from which the narrator would like to distance himself. This distance can be for any number of reasons, including stylistic, such as the following (Nuckolls 2008, 83):

> assuming the voice of a traditional storyteller,. . . to express conventional wisdom (or). . . puzzled ruminations that have an otherness because they are represented as outside of the speaking self's capacity for resolution.

In summary, evidential markers with epistemic meanings are used in oral narratives to distinguish between content with which speakers wish to identify themselves or from which they distance themselves and serve an important function in identifying shifts in the deictic center established by the speaker as a story progresses.

3   The Contributions of this Work

As stated above, the primary goal of the present volume is to investigate examples of stance/deictic phenomena in Southern Quechua and Ecuadorian

Quichua. Additionally, beyond providing a background context for the chapters to come, this Introduction has sought to make a meaningful contribution to the study of stance and deixis in general, in proposing that deixis should be considered as a subtype of stance, supported by a comparison and unification of Du Bois' (2007) stance triangle and Hanks' (2005, 2011) practice approach to deictic theory. To continue, this section includes additional details regarding each of the individual chapters and concludes by describing additional ways in which this volume serves as a valuable contribution to the field beyond what has already been mentioned above.

Kalt's work in Chapter 2 examines the encoding of person, place and time deixis through an investigation of the use of the Cuzco-Collao Quechua verb derivation suffixes, *-yku, -rqu, -ku, -mu* and *-pu*. Kalt explains that these five morphemes currently or historically express directional movement denoting that the verb's action moves toward, away from, inside/downward, and outside/upward in relation to either the speaker, hearer or a verbal argument. In addition to spatial and temporal/aspectual meanings, she also finds these morphemes to carry psychological (manner) and social (mood) meanings. Kalt's work is the first to document Quechua-speaking children's use of these morphemes through a unified discourse-level approach. She finds that children five to eleven years old from the rural highland communities of Ccotatóclla and Jayubamba in Cuzco, Peru demonstrate evidence of mastery of the full semantic range of uses for the directional markers as they are used productively within short narratives, in complex combinations with other affixes on a variety of types of verbal roots.

In Chapter 3, Nuckolls, Swanson and Ramirez Spencer also investigate place and time deixis, as they propose that a three-way contrast exists among the demonstratives of the Pastaza and Tena varieties of Ecuadorian Quichua, *kay* 'here', *chi* 'there' and *chay* 'way over there'. Their claim stands in opposition to the general consensus among grammarians of Ecuadorian dialects of Quichua that there is a two-way contrast between proximal and distal demonstratives. The authors hypothesize that, similar to the findings of some scholars of Peruvian Quechua varieties (e.g. Guardia Mayorga 1973, 103; Parker 1969, 36; Weber 1989, 38), the two forms *chay* and *chi* are not exact synonyms, but rather, one of them, *chay*, communicates a greater degree of spatial distance. In order to test their hypothesis, in addition to examining the distributions of the three demonstratives in narratives and informal conversations, the authors utilized sentence judgment tasks designed to elicit choices between the forms, observed naturally occurring speech, and analyzed metalinguistic comments made by speakers. Their data shows evidence for the hypothesized three-way

contrast among the demonstratives. Furthermore, their results reveal different discourse functions for the three demonstratives.

Courtney's work in Chapter 4 sheds light on children's acquisition (starting at age two) of the Cuzco Quechua evidential enclitics, *-mi/-n* (DIRECT EVIDENCE), *-chá* (CONJECTURE), and *-si/-s* (REPORTATIVE) as well as the past tense suffixes, *-r(q)a-* and *-sqa-*, which Courtney classifies as 'experienced' and 'non-experienced' respectively. Based on the analysis of naturalistic data from recorded conversations between mothers and their children, results from an experimental comprehension task and data obtained through story retellings, she finds that the ability to understand and evaluate information source develops over time. As regards the evidential enclitics, she argues that children first reveal an understanding of these morphemes in focusing and establishing epistemological stance. In the case of the past tense inflections, she discovers that these are used first to distinguish between dynamic events (with *-r(q)a-*) and end states (with *-sqa-*). She concludes that it is not until the age of four years that children begin spontaneous production of the enclitics in their evidential function and the past-tense inflections to distinguish experience/ perception and lack of experience. Furthermore, in the story retelling task, Courtney found that the four-year-olds had clearly learned to make use of the enclitics and past-tense inflections to shift the deictic center back and forth from the real world of the narrator and audience to the characters in the story world. Courtney's work, like Kalt's, also serves as a valuable contribution to the field of Quechua first language acquisition.

In Chapter 5, Manley employs recent conceptualizations of evidentiality, epistemics and mirativity, especially as proposed by Aikhenvald (2004) and Aikhenvald and Storch (2013), in order to propose a new, multifaceted analysis of the semantics and pragmatics of the Cuzco Quechua enclitics, *-mi/-n*, *-chá* and *-si/-s*, and past tense morphemes, *-r(q)a-* and *-sqa-*. Her results are from an investigation of how these morphemes were used by two bilingual Quechua/Spanish communities in Cuzco, Peru in spontaneous conversation and in response to two elicitation tasks, role-playing and a certainty-ranking exercise. Based on a review of the relevant literature as well as her original data and analyses, she finds: (1) *-mi/-n* is a direct evidential which may be utilized with epistemic extension to indicate certainty, (2) *-chá* is a conjecture evidential which may be utilized with epistemic extension to communicate doubt, (3) *-si/-s* is an indirect evidential which may be utilized with epistemic extension to indicate doubt, (4) *-r(q)a-* may be utilized as an evidentiality strategy to communicate a direct information source and also with epistemic extension to indicate certainty, and (5) *-sqa-* may be utilized as an evidentiality strategy

to communicate an indirect information source, with epistemic extension to indicate doubt, and as a mirativity strategy, indicating surprise. As such, she offers a coherent and inclusive compromise to the debate regarding the semantics and pragmatics of these morphemes that is long overdue in the case of Cuzco Quechua.

Muntendam, Muysken and Sánchez each investigate the communication of discourse deixis. In Chapter 6, Muntendam, presenting the results of a picture-story task and an elicitation study on topic and broad and contrastive focus, finds that although topic and focus are morphologically marked in some varieties of Quechua (-*qa* TOPIC and -*mi/-n* FOCUS) (see Muysken 1995, Sánchez 2010), in the Quechua spoken in the department of Cochabamba, Bolivia, the topic marker is less frequent and the focus marker has been lost. These aspects of discourse deixis are primarily encoded instead through syntax (marked *in situ* and fronted) and to some extent in prosody. Specifically, contrastive focus is correlated with a more prominent peak on the focused element. Also, some speakers infrequently use differences in Fo, intensity and duration to convey contrastive focus. No differences were found between focus conditions for the alignment of peaks; that is, the majority of peaks were aligned within the stressed syllable, regardless of focus type. Individual differences in morphological, syntactic and prosodic strategies to mark focus are addressed. In all, this chapter contributes to the understanding of topic and focus marking in Quechua and shows differences among Quechua varieties.

In his examination of data from Puno, Lampa and Ayaviri, Peru in Chapter 7, Muysken finds that the postposition, *hina*, has undergone distributional and grammatical changes and may now be used to mark discourse deixis. Beyond being a postposition used with nouns, Muysken observes that *hina* has also developed into a clausal complementizer with nominalized clauses, a postposition with finite clauses, a highlighter with adverbial (switch reference) clauses, a highlighting complementizer with some finite clauses, a verbal element, an independent adverbial element and a prepositional conjunction. In addition to outlining these uses for *hina*, he explores the possibility that its changes in distribution are due to Aymara substrate influence and compares *hina* with the Cuzco Quechua complementizer/highlighter, *chayqa*.

Finally, in Chapter 8, Sánchez examines the distribution of morphologically unmarked right dislocated constituents (RDCs) and their interaction with antecedents in the picture-based narratives of adult speakers of Southern Quechua. She finds that unlike their left peripheral counterparts that are morphologically marked for topic, focus or evidentiality, some RDCs are not marked for these features in Southern Quechua discourse. Following Sánchez (2010) and previous proposals on deixis (Cornish 2008, 2011), she analyses her

data as representing two basic types of unmarked RDCs: (1) RDCs with a deictic function that introduce new objects in discourse and (2) RDCs that reintroduce referents that are not part of the main topic structure of discourse. Furthermore, she argues that unmarked RDCs are the result of a strategy that allows for the construal of deictic relations outside the scope of the narrow syntax and that both types may be used to introduce an element that is not part of the current topic structure or disambiguate the reference of null subjects.

As is clear from the above descriptions of the individual chapters contained within this volume, in addition to what has been presented above, this volume is significant in that, while the majority of existing cross-linguistic studies on deixis in both Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages (i.e. Weissenborn and Klein 1982) focuses on the three most traditional types of deixis as outlined by Bühler (1934), person, place and time deixis, this work includes chapters that go beyond these to include significant work on discourse deixis (coined by Fillmore 1975), epistemological/evidential stance/deixis (Mushin 2000) and mirative stance.

Furthermore, while the majority of existing work on deixis across languages has examined free morphemes without meaningful consideration of the surrounding discourse environment, this volume primarily addresses the way in which bound morphemes embedded in discourse function strategically to communicate stance/deictic meaning as manifested through phonology, morphology and syntax.

Moreover, while this work is not the first to investigate stance and deixis in Quechua, unlike the existing literature, cited throughout this volume, this is the first to study a broad range of stance/deictic phenomena in Quechua and Quichua in-depth with examples that have been elicited as well as captured from natural discourse.

Finally, this volume stands as an important contribution to the study of an endangered language. Quechua language varieties are spoken today in regions of Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Argentina, Colombia and Brazil (FUNPROEIB ANDES 2009), nations whose territory includes land that once belonged to the Inca Empire. Despite being the most widely-spoken among the indigenous languages of the Americas, with over six million speakers (FUNPROEIB ANDES 2009, 517), Quechua is endangered, as Quechua speakers increasingly shift toward Spanish. Pastaza Quichua is listed in UNESCO's *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* as "definitely endangered", meaning that "children no longer learn the language as mother tongue in the home" (Moseley 2010). Quechua in Bolivia and Peru is listed as "vulnerable", meaning that "most children speak the language, but it may be restricted to certain domains (e.g., home)" (*ibid.*). Such factors as prevalent negative attitudes toward Quechua

and the migratory trend of Quechua speakers from rural, Quechua-dominant areas to urban, Spanish-dominant areas, threaten the future of Quechua as a living, widely-spoken language. Our hope is that this volume serves to document the nuances of Quechua expressions of stance and deixis for those who value the language today and in the future.

Appendix A

$	borrowing from Spanish	INT	intensifier
1	first person subject	INTR	interrogative
2	second person subject	IRR	irrealis
3	third person subject	LIM	limitative
ACC	accusative	LOC	locative
ADD	additive	NEG	negative
BEN	benefactive	NOM	nominalizer
CERT	certainty	OBJ	object
CIS	cislocative	PL	plural
CONT	continuative	POSS	possessive
DIM	diminutive	PROG	progressive
DIREV	direct evidential	PST1	simple past
DISC	discontinuative	REFL	reflexive
EXCL	exclusive	SUBJ	subject
FUT	future	TOP	topic
GEN	genitive	TRANS	translocative
IMP	imperative	VOC	vocative
INCL	inclusive		

Bibliography

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Anne Storch, eds. 2013. *Perception and cognition in language and culture*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Basso, Ellen B. 2008. "Epistemic deixis in Kalapalo." *Pragmatics* 18(2): 215–252.

Bátori, Istvan. 1984. "On verb deixis in Hungarian." In *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Demonstration,* edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. 155–165. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bills, Garland Dee. 1972. "The Quechua Directional Verbal Suffix." *Papers in Andean Linguistics* 1 (1): 1–15.

Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie.* Jena-Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer.

Calvo, Julio. 1993. *Pragmática y gramática del quechua cuzqueño*. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Cole, Peter. 1982. *Imbabura Quechua.* Amsterdam: Lingua Descriptive Series 5.

Cornish, Francis. 2008. "How indexicals function in texts: Discourse, text, and one neo-Gricean account of indexical reference." *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 997–1018.

———. 2011. "'Strict' anadeixis, discourse deixis and text structuring." *Language Sciences* 33: 753–767.

Cusihuamán G., Antonio. 1976. *Gramática quechua: Cuzco-Collao.* Lima: Ministerio de Educación.

Du Bois, John W. 2007. "The stance triangle." In *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, edited by Robert Englebretson. 139–182. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1975. *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis* (delivered 1971). Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Fundación para la Educación en Contextos de Multilingüismo y Pluriculturalidad (FUNPROEIB ANDES). 2009. *Atlas sociolingüístico de pueblos indígenas en América Latina*. Cochabamba, Bolivia: FUNPROEIB ANDES.

Godenzzi, Juan Carlos and Vengoa Zúñiga, Janett. 1994. *Runasimimanta yuyaychaku-sun: manual de lingüística quechua para bilingües.* Cuzco: Asociación Pukllasuchis and Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos Bartolomé de las Casas.

Guardia Mayorga, Cesar A. 1973. *Gramática Kechwa.* Lima: Ediciones Los Andes.

Hanks, William F. 2005. "Explorations in the deictic field." *Current Anthropology* 46(2): 191–220.

———. 2011. "Deixis and indexicality." In *Foundations of Pragmatics*, edited by Wolfram Bublitz and Neal R. Norrick. 315–346.

Hermon, Gabriella. 1985. *Syntactic modularity*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Howard, Rosaleen. 2012. "Shifting voices, shifting worlds: evidentiality, epistemic modality and speaker perspective in Quechua oral narrative." *Pragmatics and Society* 3 (2): 246–269.

———. 2013. *Kawsay Vida. A Multimedia Quechua Course for Beginners and Beyond.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1985. "Observations and speculations on subjectivity." In *Iconicity in Syntax: Proceedings of a symposium on iconicity in syntax*, Stanford, June 24–26, 1983, edited by John Haiman. 109–150. Palo Alto, Stanford University.

Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2004. "Deixis." In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by Laurence Horn. 97–121. Oxford: Blackwell.

Moseley, Christopher, ed. 2010. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd edition. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages/atlas

Mushin, Ilana. 2000. "Evidentiality and deixis in narrative retelling." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 927–957.

———. 2001. *Evidentiality and Epistemological Stance: Narrative Retelling.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Muysken, Pieter. 1995. "Focus in Quechua." In *Discourse Configurational Languages*, edited by Katalin É. Kiss. 375–393. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nuckolls, Janis. 2008. "Deictic Selves and Others in Pastaza Quichua Evidential Usage." *Anthropological Linguistics* 50 (1): 67–89.

Parker, Gary J. 1969. *Ayacucho Quechua grammar and dictionary*. The Hague: Mouton.

Plaza Martínez, Pedro. 1987. "Objetos Pronominales del Quechua" *Allpanchis* 29 (30): 179–226. Sicuani, Cuzco.

———. 2005. *Qallarinapaq: curso básico de quechua boliviano.* Unpublished manuscript, Cochabamba: ProEIBAndes, Universidad Mayor San Simón.

Sánchez, Liliana. 2010. *The morphology and syntax of topic and focus: Minimalist inquiries in the Quechua periphery*. Linguistik Aktuell Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Torero, Alfredo. 1964. "Los dialectos quechuas." *Anales Científicos de la Universidad Agraria* 2: 446–478.

Weber, David. 1989. *A grammar of Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weissenborn, Jürgen and Wolfgang Klein (eds.). 1982. *Here and there: Cross-linguistic studies on deixis and demonstration*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Williams, Nicholas. 2009. "Toward a linguistic anthropological account of deixis in interaction: *ini* and *itu* in Indonesian conversation." *Colorado Research in Linguistics* 22: 1–23.