

REQUEST FORMATION IN ECUADORIAN QUICHUA

Joni Kay Hurley
Clemson University

This study analyzes request formation in Ecuadorian Quichua, focusing specifically on verb forms, morphological softeners, and lexical softeners. Perceptions of the degree of politeness conveyed by the various grammatical forms are presented, followed by a discussion of the influence of Spanish on Quichua. The findings will then be reviewed within the framework of language contact.

1. Introduction

The study of Quichua¹ has traditionally focused on the writing of grammar books and dictionaries (such as those of Catta Quelen 1987, Cordero 1989, Grimm 1896, Guzmán 1920, Leonardi 1966, París 1961, Stark and Carpenter 1973, and Vásquez 1990). Pragmatics, which studies language use to accomplish conversational goals such as requests, invitations, and offers, has apparently not been studied in Quichua. This paper is part of a larger research project to determine request formation in the Spanish and Quichua spoken in the Otavalo area of Ecuador, and how request formation in each of these languages may have been altered as a result of the language contact situation. The present study analyzes request formation in Quichua, the differing degrees of politeness conveyed by different grammatical structures, and possible Spanish influence.

2. Review of the literature: The study of requests

The study of requests originated with Austin 1962 and Searle 1976, 1979 and their Theory of Speech Acts. They were the first to relate grammatical form to the purpose of the utterance in the conversation. Originally they classified utterances into categories based upon the type of verb used. For example, *I request that you come* would be classified as a Directive in Searle's classification due to the presence of the verb *request*. The inherent defects in this classification system became apparent when Searle 1979 attempted to classify both direct and indirect speech acts. In direct speech acts there is a one-to-one correspondence between the syntactic form of a sentence and its illocutionary meaning. For example, if an utterance contains an imperative then it conveys a request. Indirect speech acts involve more than one possible interpretation. The syntactic form may convey one type of speech act, but the utterance is being used to execute a different speech act. Proper interpretation of the utterance is dependent upon background knowledge, the context in which the utterance is said, and the roles of the speaker and the hearer. The large number of utterances that Searle listed as forms of indirect speech acts caused him to label them as idiomatic since each conveys more than one meaning.

Language specific studies of request formation have been conducted on English (Searle 1976, Ervin-Tripp 1976, Wardhaugh 1985, Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989, Fraser and Nolen 1981), Portuguese (Koike 1986, 1989, Wheritt 1983), Athapaskan (Rushforth 1985), Tzeltal (Brown 1979), and Spanish (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989, Fraser and Nolen 1981, Haverkate 1979, Wilson 1965). The results of these studies show that different grammatical formations result in requests that are perceived by speakers of these languages to be more, or less, polite. (The concept of politeness has been elaborated at length by Brown and Levinson 1978). Politeness in requests is determined by a combination of grammatical/lexical form and patterns of use in a given language/culture.

Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989 have conducted an ambitious study of requests and apologies across five languages (Spanish, German, Hebrew, English, and French). They found that all the languages in question have direct and indirect request strategies, but that each language may form these strategies with different grammatical forms. In addition, perceptions of politeness² and patterns of use for the different request strategies can vary from language to language.

3. Study site

The research for this study was conducted in Otavalo and neighboring small towns in Ecuador over a period of seven months from 1989 to 1992. Otavalo is located about two hours north of Quito in the Andes mountains in the province of Imbabura. Residents of Otavalo speak either Spanish or Quichua as their maternal language. Many native Spanish speakers have some knowledge of Quichua since it is heard daily in the marketplace, but they do not normally acquire the ability to speak it. All Indians speak Quichua as their native language and most are also bilingual in Spanish to some degree.³ The only Indians who remain monolingual in Quichua are those who live in isolated areas.

4. The Quichua language

Quichua is a member of the Andean-Equatorial language family and may be closely related⁴ to the Aymara language which is spoken in areas of Peru and Bolivia (Escobar 1986). Quichua (Quechua) is spoken by some seven million people from Ecuador to northern Argentina (Fromkin and Rodman 1988). Quichua does not have a standardized orthography and has been declared an official language only in Peru. This language is largely connected with Indian culture and is therefore highly stigmatized in Andean countries.

Quichua is an agglutinating language in which the accumulation of suffixes conveys grammatical relations that are expressed in Indo-European languages by syntactic means. The following example illustrates the use of suffixes in Quichua:

- (1) Raimicunapica
 Raimi + cuna + pi + ca
 holiday / plural / in, on / topic marker
 'On holidays'

It is sometimes difficult to determine the meaning of a Quichua suffix, especially when it serves a function unknown in Indo-European languages, such as the topic marker *-ca* and the validation suffix *-mi*. These suffixes require further study.

5. Methodology and sample

Both elicited data and naturally-occurring requests were tape recorded in the Otavalo area. A questionnaire to elicit role-play (based upon the model of Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989) was developed in Quichua with the help of a bilingual Indian. Various situations were devised in which requests would commonly occur, such as:

- (2) Shuc mamaca, imashinata chungu ishcai huatata charic churita mañan, cuyman sarata jihuata carachun?

How does a mother ask her 12 year old son to give corn and grass to the guinea pigs?

- (3) Imashna shuc tiuca, quilcana cashpita, paipac mashita mañan?

How does a man ask his friend for a pen?

Seventeen such situations were developed, and were mixed with elicitations of thirteen other speech acts (greetings, offers, expressions of gratitude, complaints, etc.) so that the informants would not realize that requests were being solicited.

Another bilingual Indian tape-recorded the interviews and answers to informant profile questions (age, occupation, education, language ability, etc.) with 75 Quichua-speaking males between the ages of 20 and 50.⁵ Each interview lasted from 20 to 45 minutes.

Six and a half hours of natural conversations were recorded in a store in downtown Otavalo that sells ponchos, blouses, and blankets to the Indians. At least 56 different speakers were represented.

6. Corpus

A total of 1,873 requests were recorded in Quichua, of which 1,803 were produced in interviews and 69 occurred in natural conversations. The small number of requests in natural conversations is due to the extensive use of Spanish in commerce transactions (Hill and Hill 1986).

7. Data analysis

Native speakers of Quichua listened to the tapes and transcribed what was said. These data were then entered into LOTUS 123 spreadsheet computer programs which contained columns dedicated to the interview number, the number of the question, and the utterance. All the data were coded for grammatical and lexical forms that would have a bearing on the politeness of the requests.⁶ This allowed the data to be sorted in a variety of ways to determine patterns. In a follow-up study, Quichua speakers ranked a series of requests (selected from the interviews) from least to most polite.⁷

8. Findings

This analysis of Quichua requests will be divided into verb forms (modal verbs, imperatives, and other verb forms) and morphological and lexical softeners (diminutives, politeness suffixes, courtesy expressions, interjections, and vocatives). This will be followed by a discussion of the perception of politeness in Quichua, and possible Spanish influence on the Quichua language.

8.1 Verb forms

8.1.1 Modal verbs— *carana* 'to give'

The only modal verb in this study is *carana* 'to give', which is used with the gerund to convey softened requests.⁸ This structure translates as *do me the favor of* or *please* and can only be used with transitive verbs (i.e. verbs that permit a direct object) that do not clearly indicate benefit to the speaker.⁹ As a result, *carana* as a softener is of low frequency, occurring in 11.2 percent (n=209) of the elicited data, and did not occur in the natural conversations due to the scarcity of transitive verbs. An example of this structure is:

- (4) Papaguta randishpa carahuay.
 Papa + gu + ta randi + shpa cara + hua + y
 potato / dim.¹⁰ / acc. / buy / -ing / give / me / imp.
 'Do me the favor of buying (me) some potatoes.'

In a few cases (4 out of 209 occurrences) another verb meaning 'give', *cuna*, is used in the same way:

- (5) Ashtahuan, ribajashpa cuhuay.
 Ashtahuan ribaja + shpa cu + hua + y
 too much / reduce / -ing / give / me / imp.
 (That's) too much, do me the favor of reducing (the cost).

Both these verbs are used in Ecuadorian Quichua with the meaning of 'to give' and are used as softeners with the gerund *-shpa* (-ing) (Albor 1973, Catta Quelen 1987, Toscano Mateus 1953). Studies of the Cuzco dialect of Quechua describe the verbal suffix *-cu* as conveying cordiality and personal interest when used with imperatives (Gutiérrez 1990, Solá and Yupanqui 1970). However, the meaning added by *-cu* is not translated in their examples,¹¹ such as:

- (6) Kapuliyta ranticuhuay.
 Kapuli + y + ta ranti + **cu** + hua + y
 cherry / my / acc. / buy / me / imp.
 Buy from me my cherries.

As this example illustrates, *cuhuay* could easily have been separated from the verb *ranticuhuay* 'buy from me' and used as a separate verb, equivalent in form to 'give me', *cuhuay*. This usage has apparently been transferred to the other verb for 'to give', *carana*, in Ecuadorian Quichua.

8.1.2 Imperatives (Commands)

8.1.2.1 Present imperatives

Present imperatives, formed in Quichua by suffixing *-y* to the verb root as in *shamuy* 'come', were the most common means of conveying requests in Quichua. They occurred in 73.4 percent (n=1,325) of the elicited requests and in 52.2 percent (n=36) of the naturally-occurring requests. These commands are used when the addressee is expected to carry out the request immediately (Leonardi 1966). An example of such a command is:

- (7) Mañachiy lapizguta escribingapac.
 mañanchi + y lapiz + gu + ta escribi + ngapac
 lend / imp. / pencil / dim. / acc. / write / in order to
 Lend (me) a pencil in order to write.

8.1.2.2 Future imperatives

The future imperative (formed by suffixing *-ngui* to the verb root) was used in 10.6 percent (n=192) of the elicited data and in 29 percent (n=20) of the naturally-occurring data. The future imperative is used for commands that are to be executed at a time subsequent to *right now* (Leonardi 1966, Mugica no year).¹² This can be clearly seen in the data in which two commands occur together, as in:

- (8) Shamuy, randipangui, caipi yapachishpa cusha.
 Shamu + y randi + pa + nguicai + pi yapachi + shpa
 come / imp. / buy / please / fut.imp. / this / in / to give one extra / -ing /
 cu + sha
 give / I will
 Come (pres. imp.), please buy (fut. imp.) here, I will give (them to you)
 giving (you) one extra.

As this example illustrates, a present imperative command to come (*shamuy*) is followed by a command in the future imperative, *randipangui* 'please buy' conveying what is to be done after the addressee comes.

The future imperative is also used to convey politeness (Carpenter 1982). This was supported by research conducted by the author of this paper in 1990, in which the average ranking of various request structures by forty-eight Quichua Indians indicated that requests in the future imperative are considered to be more polite than requests in the present imperative.

8.1.3 Other verb forms

The remaining 15.4 percent of the elicited requests and 18.2 percent of the naturally-occurring requests were formulated with six other grammatical strategies. The frequencies of these strategies are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. FREQUENCIES OF OTHER VERBAL STRATEGIES

Grammatical Structure	Frequency of Occurrence in Elicited Data	Frequency of Occurrence in Natural Data
1. Questions ¹³	6.8% (n=122)	8.7% (n=6)
2. Statements (not 'need')	2.3% (n=42)	5.8% (n=4)
3. <i>-shun</i> 'let's'	4.2% (n=76)	2.3% (n=2)
4. 'Need' statements	1.8% (n=33)	0%
5. <i>-chun</i> (subjunctive) ¹⁴	.3% (n=5)	0%
6. Softener only	0%	1.4% (n=1)

An example of each of these request structures is provided below.

a. Questions

- (9) Nachu chai puchata charingui?

Na + chu chai pucha + ta chari + ngui

neg. / quest. / that / yarn / acc. / have / 2nd pers.

Don't you have that yarn (that I am wanting to borrow)?

b. Statements other than *need*

- (10) Pero chai preciapacca na ushani.

Pero chai preciu + pac + ca na usha + ni

but / that / price / for / topic / neg. can / 1st pers.

But for that price I can't (buy it, so reduce the price).

c. 'Let's' ...

- (11) Jacu futbulta puclashun.

Jacu futbul + ta puclla + shun

let's go / soccer / acc. / play / let's

Let's go, let's play soccer.

d. 'Need' statements

- (12) Por Diosmanda, sacota ahuangapac, trabajangapac munani.

Por Dios + manda saco + ta ahua + ngapac trabaja + ngapac muna + ni

Please / by / sweater / acc. / weave / to / work / to / need/want / 1st pers.

Please, I need to work, (I need) to weave sweaters.

e. Subjunctive

- (13) Ricungui, cunan charini shuc carruguta, cunan como can yachanguí manejanaca, munani que can trabajachun ñuca carrupi.¹⁵

Ricu + ngui cunan chari + ni shuc carru + gu + ta cunan como can

look / fut.imp. / now / have / 1st pers. / a / car / dim. / acc. / now / since / you /

yacha + ngui maneja + na + ca muna + ni que can trabaja + chun

know / 2nd pers. / drive / inf. / topic / want / 1st pers. / that / you / work / subj. /

ñuca carru + pi

my / car / in

Look, I have a car now, and since you know how to drive, I want you to work (for me) in my car.

f. Softener only

- (14) Por Dios, cumari.
 Por Dios, cumari
 please / godmother
 Please, godmother (sell it to me cheaper).

8.2 Morphological softeners

8.2.1 Diminutives

There is much variation in the diminutives used in the various dialects of Ecuadorian Quichua, and they include *-hua*, *-cu*, and *-lla* (Jara [no year]). Diminutives were used in 61 percent ($n=1,101$) of the elicited requests, and in 24.6 percent ($n=17$) of the naturally-occurring requests, and were found primarily on direct objects (55.6 percent [$n=612$] of the diminutives) and on vocatives (14.2 percent [$n=156$] of the diminutives). Three diminutives were used in this sample of Otavalo Quichua: *-cu* (and its voiced variant *-gu*), *-lla*, and the Spanish diminutive *-ito*.

The most common diminutive was *-cu/-gu*, representing 84.7 percent ($n=932$) of all diminutives in the elicited data, and 41.2 percent ($n=7$) of the diminutives in the naturally-occurring data. Examples include:

- (15) *esferucuta*
 esferu + cu + ta
 pen / dim. / acc.
 a pen (**dim.**)
- (16) *tandagu*
 tanda + gu
 bread / dim.
 a **little** bread

There appears to be no difference in meaning or usage between *-cu* and *-gu*, and the voiced variant is not due to the phonological environment. Catta Quelen 1987 reports the distribution to vary according to geographic region. In the present study, usage could be closely linked to town of residence. For example, all informants from Peguche used only *-gu*, except on the word *taita* 'father, sir', which always contained the diminutive *-cu*. Informants residing in Otavalo used only *-cu*. The only informants who would use both diminutives had been born in one town and were now living in another. It is not clear why the variant *-cu* is the only one used on *taita* 'father, sir' regardless of the diminutive used in a particular informant's town of residence.

The diminutive *-lla* was much less common, representing 10 percent ($n=110$) of the diminutives used in the elicited data, and 41.2 percent ($n=7$) of the diminutives used in the naturally-occurring data. The use of this diminutive is largely restricted to specific lexical items, especially the Spanish loanwords *barato* 'cheap', *tío* 'uncle, sir' and *amo* 'master'. An example is:

- (17) **baratulla**
 baratu + lla
 cheap / dim.
 a **little** cheap

The two diminutives *-cul-gu* and *-lla* can be combined on the same word to strengthen the minimizing effect:

- (18) **ratugulla**
 ratu + gu + lla
 while / dim. / dim.
 a **very little** while

Forty Quichua-speaking Indians ranked nouns with diminutives as more polite than nouns without diminutives, but there was little difference in perceived politeness between *-cul-gu* and *-lla*.

The last diminutive found in this sample was the Spanish *-ito*, which represented 5.4 percent (n=59) of the diminutives used in elicited requests, and 17.6 percent (n=3) of the diminutives used in naturally-occurring requests. A careful analysis of the use of this diminutive reveals that it occurred only on Spanish loanwords, principally vocatives. For example:

- (19) **amiguito**
 amigo + ito
dear friend

8.2.2 The suffixes *-pa*, *-lla*, and *-ya(ri)*

The suffix *-pa* is attached to verb forms to convey courtesy and respect on the part of the speaker toward the addressee (Quintero and Cotacachi 1986, Carpenter 1982) and is often loosely translated as 'please' (Jara [no year], Catta Quelen 1987). This suffix occurred in 25.4 percent (n=458) of the elicited requests, and in 11.6 percent (n=8) of the naturally-occurring requests. An example is:

- (20) Ñucapac carrupi trabajangapac shamupay.
 Ñuca + pac carru + pi trabaja + ngapac shamu + pa + y
 I / of / car / in / work / to / come / please / imp.
Please come to work in my car.

The suffixes *-lla* and *ya(ri)* are placed on imperatives to achieve opposite effects. The suffix *-lla* is used to soften verbs and is usually translated as 'just' (Mugica [no year], Quintero and Cotacachi 1986, Carpenter 1982, Stark and Carpenter 1973). It was used in only .1 percent (n=2) of the elicited requests, and in 10.1 percent (n=7) of the naturally-occurring requests. An example of this suffix is:

- (21) Shamuyllá.¹⁶
 Shamu + y + lla
 come / imp. / just
Just come (on over).

It is possible that this is simply the diminutive suffix *-lla* placed on verb forms. Further support for this idea is found in the use of *nomás* 'just' in Andean Spanish, which serves as a softener for both nouns and imperatives (Naula Gaucho 1975, Stratford 1989). It is claimed that this use of *nomás* in Spanish is due to the influence of the Quichua suffix *-lla* (Quintero and Cotacachi 1986, Catta Quelen 1987). In many instances there were strong parallels in the data gathered in this study between the use of *-lla* in Quichua and *nomás* in Spanish, as is illustrated in the following examples:

(22) Compadrito, caiman shamuyllá.

Compadre + ito cai + man shamu + y + lla
godfather / dim. / this / to / come / imp. / just
Godfather, **just** come (on) over here.

(23) Ya, ya, bueno, bueno, vendrá **nomás**.

Okay, okay, fine, fine, **just** come (on) (fut. imp.).

When *-lla* is used in commands there is a distinctive intonational contour that is not found when it is placed on nouns. The pitch rises suddenly to a higher level on the suffix *-lla*, and then drops off rapidly.

The suffix *-ya(ri)*, also translated as 'just' or 'come on' (Gutiérrez 1990), is attached to commands to make them more emphatic (*Centro de Investigaciones para la Educación Indígena* 1983). The longer form, *-yari*, is considered to be more emphatic than the shorter form *-ya* (Catta Quelen 1987, Quintero and Cotacachi 1986). Gutiérrez 1990 reports that *-yari* can also serve to emphasize pleading, as in *come on* in English or *ya pues* in Spanish. The suffix *-yari* was used in 1.5 percent (n=26) of the elicited requests, and in 10.1 percent (n=7) of the naturally-occurring requests. For example:

(24) Cuatrupac cuhuayyari.

Cuatro + pac cu + hua + y + yari
four / for / give / me / imp. / just (emphatic)
Come on, give (it) to me for four (thousand sucres).

This suffix serves as the pattern for the use of *pues* 'just, come on' as a suffix in Andean Spanish, which emphasizes utterances (Quintero and Cotacachi 1986). As is true for the suffix *-lla* in Quichua, *pues* is placed after the word or words that the speaker wishes to emphasize:

(25) Venderáme¹⁷ a 50 **pues**.

Sell (future imperative) (it) to me for **just** 50 (sucres).

In this example, *pues* is placed after *50* conveying that what is being emphasized is the reduced price of 50 sucres, compared to the asking price.

8.3 Lexical softeners

8.3.1 Courtesy expressions

The sample gathered in this study contains six expressions that convey 'please' and all are either borrowed directly from Spanish, translated from

Spanish, or a combination of both. These expressions were used in 24.8 percent ($n=448$) of the elicited requests, and in only 1.4 percent ($n=1$) of the naturally occurring requests. The lexical items and their frequencies are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. LEXICAL SOFTENERS AND THEIR FREQUENCIES

Courtesy Expression	Frequency of Occurrence in Elicited Data	Frequency of Occurrence in Natural Data
<i>Por dios(manda)</i> 'By God'	20.2% ($n=364$)	1.4% ($n=1$)
<i>Ama shinagu cashpa</i> 'Don't be that way'	3.0% ($n=55$)	0%
<i>Favor</i> 'Please'	.2% ($n=4$)	0%
<i>Por favor</i> 'Please'	.4% ($n=7$)	0%
<i>Favorta rashpa</i> 'Doing the favor'	.7% ($n=12$)	0%
<i>Favorta shinashpa</i> 'Doing the favor'	.3% ($n=6$)	0%

The first expression, *por Dios(manda)* 'by God', was used in Old Spanish and is presently the most frequent means of conveying 'please' in the Quichua spoken in Otavalo. In many cases the Quichua suffix for 'by' is added, forming *por Diosmanda* 'by God by'. *Ama shina cashpa* 'don't be that way',¹⁸ is the translation of the Spanish politeness expression *no sea(s) malito* 'don't be bad' which has been documented in Ecuador, Bolivia, and Mexico. Both *favor* and *por favor* 'please' have been borrowed directly into Quichua, and the last two expressions listed in Table 2 are loanblends, combining the Spanish word *favor* with the Quichua verbs (*ru*)*rana* and *shinana* meaning 'to do'. The resulting expressions are equivalent to the Spanish *hága(me) el favor de...* 'do (me) the favor of...'

8.3.2 Interjections and vocatives

Interjections were used in 6.4 percent ($n=116$) of the elicited requests, and in 4.3 percent ($n=3$) of the naturally occurring requests. Only two interjections, *jala* 'look' and *jaica* 'take', are purely Quichua. The others were either borrowed or translated from Spanish, such as: *bueno* 'well', *oye* 'listen', *uyay* (from the Spanish *oye*, 'listen'), and *ricuy* 'look'. The most common interjection was *jala* 'look', representing 59.5 percent ($n=69$) of the interjections in the elicited data, and 66.6 percent ($n=2$) of the interjections in the naturally occurring data.

The vocatives that occurred in the corpus were primarily terms of family relationship or friendship, and 75 percent were of Spanish origin. They were used in 26.2 percent ($n=472$) of the elicited requests, and in 20.3 percent ($n=14$) of the naturally-occurring requests. Vocatives in this sample included: *compadre* 'godfather', *comadre* 'godmother', *pana* 'sister', *guanbra* 'guy', *taita* 'father/sir', *amigo* 'friend', and *señor* 'sir'.

8.4 Request strategies and perceptions of politeness

Forty-eight Quichua-speaking Indians were asked to rank a series of requests to *come* in order of politeness (without considering factors of the situation). Their ranking is presented in Table 3. The resulting scale demonstrates that: the future

imperative is more polite than the present imperative, the future imperative is more polite than the suffix *-pa* 'please', *por Diosmanda* 'by God' is the strongest courtesy expression, and the most polite request formation consists of the future imperative, *-pa*, and *por Diosmanda* 'by God'. Gutiérrez 1990 reports that the first example, *shamuy* 'come', is a command, and that the most polite request, *Por Diosmanda, shamupangui* 'By God, please come [future imperative]', conveys almost pleading.

TABLE 3. RANKING OF QUICHUA REQUEST FORMS IN ORDER OF POLITENESS (least polite to most polite)

<i>Shamuy.</i>	Come (pres. imp).
<i>Shamuyllá.</i>	Just come (pres. imp.).
<i>Shamupay.</i>	Please come (pres.imp.).
<i>Shamungui.</i>	Come (fut. imp).
<i>Shamupangui.</i>	Please, come (fut. imp.).
<i>Por Diosmanda, shamuy.</i>	Please, come (pres. imp.).
<i>Por Diosmanda, shamupay.</i>	Please, please come (pres. imp.).
<i>Por Diosmanda, shamungui.</i>	Please, come (fut. imp.).
<i>Por Diosmanda, shamupangui.</i>	Please, please come (fut. imp.).

A similar ranking of requests to buy potatoes demonstrates that *carana* 'to give' makes requests more polite and that *por favor* is the least polite expression for 'please', with *por Diosmanda* being considered the most polite. This ranking is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4. POLITENESS RANKING INVOLVING THE VERB *CARANA* 'TO GIVE' (least polite to most polite)

Papaguta randihuay. Buy me potatoes (dim.).
Papaguta randishpa caray. Do (me) the favor of buying (me) potatoes (dim.).
Papaguta randishpa carahuay. Do me the favor of buying (me) potatoes (dim.).
Por favor, carahuay randishpa papaguta. Please, do me the favor of buying (me) potatoes (dim.).
Ama shinagu cashpa, papaguta randishpa carahuay. Don't be that way, do me the favor of buying (me) potatoes (dim.).
Por Diosmanda, papaguta randishpa carahuay. By God, do me the favor of buying (me) potatoes (dim.).

Finally, forty Quichua Indians ranked vocative terms with diminutives as more polite than vocatives without diminutives, but there was very little difference in politeness noted between *-lla* and *-cu*.

8.5 The influence of Spanish on Quichua

In the elicited data the most obvious influence of Spanish on Quichua is the large percentage of loanwords, which represent from 7 to 49 percent of the vocabulary used, depending upon the informant. However, a careful analysis of the words themselves reveals that the 2,828 occurrences of Spanish words represent only 300 different words. The majority refer to items and concepts brought by the Spanish such as *carro* 'car', *trabajar* 'to work for money', *llamada* 'telephone call', and *bautizar* 'to baptize'. Also frequently borrowed are connecting words and phrases such as *pero* 'but', *y* 'and', *o sea que* 'or rather', and *entonces* 'then' which often replace the Quichua suffixes with similar meanings. In addition, the only lexical items (as opposed to suffixes) that are used to soften requests in these data are apparently all of Spanish origin.

Spanish influence is also seen in the borrowing of one, and possibly two, suffixes into Quichua. The Spanish suffix *-dor* 'the person who' is occasionally used with this meaning on Quichua words, replacing the Quichua equivalent *-c*. Examples include *pucllador* 'ball player' and *ahuador* 'weaver'. It is also possible that the Quichua diminutive suffix *-cu/-gu* is from the Spanish diminutive *-ico*, although this has not been documented in any of the Quichua grammars. Support for this idea is found in Bolivian varieties of Quechua, which use the Spanish diminutive *-ito* as the primary diminutive, as in *jamp'aitu* 'little toad' (Urioste 1955:21). In the Otavalo area, *-ito* is used only on Spanish loanwords.

In naturally-occurring conversations the most obvious influence of Spanish on Quichua is language mixing: either code-switching between Quichua and Spanish, or *media lengua* 'middle language' - Quichua syntax with approximately 90 percent Spanish vocabulary (Muysken 1981). *Media lengua* has been reported by Muysken 1981 in the southern dialects of Ecuadorian Quichua. This mixed language is described as a combination of the Quichua grammatical system with the majority of the lexicon of Spanish origin. *Media lengua* occurs to a limited extent in the Otavalo area. In the example provided below, the vocabulary of Spanish origin is written in capital letters, and Quichua words and suffixes are written in lower case letters:

- (28) CUCINA URA ISQUINAcupi; VINTANAcuna, SILLAcuna, tianmi.
 CUCINA URA ISQUINA + cu + pi; VINTANA + cuna
 kitchen / now / corner / dim. / in / window / pl.
 SILLA + cuna tia + n + mi
 chair / pl. / exist / 3rd pers. / validator
 The kitchen now (is) in the corner (diminutive); there are windows and chairs.

In this example, all the vocabulary except *tian* 'there are' is of Spanish origin. Word order and grammatical relations are completely Quichua.

9 Conclusions

The grammatical strategies used in the formulation of requests in the Quichua data recorded for this study are summarized in Table 5. The elicited data is characterized by more extensive use of softeners than is the case in the naturally-

occurring conversations. This is most likely due to the fact that the interview situation is more formal and there is no true relationship between the people in the hypothetical situations. In addition, the natural conversations dealt with commerce, in which the banter between the customer and the vendor is relatively direct and to the point. In both types of data the primary verb form is the imperative, both present (-y) and future (-ngui). Elicited speech contained many Spanish loanwords (ranging from 7 to 50 percent of the vocabulary used by each individual), whereas the naturally-occurring conversations were characterized not only by many loanwords but by code-switches to Spanish as well.

TABLE 5. SUMMARY OF QUICHUA REQUEST STRATEGIES

Strategy	Frequency of Occurrence in Elicited Data	Frequency of Occurrence in Natural Conversations
Modal verbs:		
Carana 'to give'	11.2% (n=209)	0%
Verb forms:		
Present imperative	73.4% (n=1,325)	52.2% (n=36)
Future imperative	10.6% (n=192)	29.0% (n=20)
Questions	6.8% (n=122)	8.7% (n=6)
-shun 'let's'	4.2% (n=76)	2.3% (n=2)
Statements (not 'need')	2.3% (n=42)	5.8% (n=4)
'Need' statements	1.8% (n=33)	0%
Softener only	0%	1.4% (n=1)
-chun (subjunctive)	.3% (n=5)	0%
Morphological softeners:		
-cu/-gu	51.7% (n=932)	10.1% (n=7)
-lla (added to nouns)	6.1% (n=110)	10.1% (n=7)
-ito (from Spanish)	3.3% (n=59)	4.3% (n=3)
-pa (politive)	25.4% (n=458)	11.6% (n=8)
-lla (added to verbs)	.1% (n=2)	10.1% (n=7)
Lexical softeners:		
Courtesy Expressions:		
<i>Por Dios</i> manda 'By God'	20.2% (n=364)	1.4% (n=1)
<i>Ama shinagu cashpa</i>		
'Don't be that way'	3.0% (n=55)	
<i>Favor</i> 'please'	.2% (n=4)	
<i>Por favor</i> 'please'	.4% (n=7)	
<i>Favorta rashpa</i>		
'Doing the favor'	.7% (n=12)	
<i>Favorta shinashpa</i>		
'Doing the favor'	.3% (n=6)	
Interjections	6.4% (n=116)	4.3% (n=3)
Vocatives	26.2% (n=472)	20.3% (n=14)

When the data collected in Quichua is compared to that collected for Spanish in the Otavalo area (Hurley 1992), important observations can be made concerning language contact and request formation. Both data sets support the idea that indirect request strategies in Quichua and Spanish have been greatly reduced (as compared to other varieties of these languages) and replaced with a higher frequency of direct strategies that translate easily from one language to another, specifically present and future imperatives softened with lexical expressions and diminutives. This shared pragmatic system can be clearly seen in Table 6.

Table 6. REQUEST STRATEGIES IN THE SPANISH AND QUICHUA OF OTAVALO, ECUADOR

Grammatical Form	Frequency in Spanish	Frequency in Quichua
<i>¿Puede..?</i> 'Can you..?'	2.2% (n=63)	0%
Present imperative	61.9% (n=1,807)	72.7% (n=1,361)
Future Imperative	7.7% (n=226)	11.3% (n=212)
'Give' as a softener	10.2% (n=298)	11.2% (n=209)
Diminutives	36.8% (n=1,133)	59.7% (n=1,118)
Lexical softeners	23.2% (n=714)	24.0% (n=449)
Interjections	20.1% (n=618)	6.4% (n=119)
Vocatives	28.4% (n=875)	25.9% (n=486)

To reach this point of shared pragmatics, the following changes have apparently occurred in Otavalo Quichua: a decreased reliance on the use of politeness suffixes and the borrowing of Spanish lexical courtesy expressions, word order changes so that softening suffixes in Quichua (such as *-lla*) occupy the same syntactic slot as their Spanish equivalents, the adoption of at least one (*-ito*) and possibly all three Spanish diminutives (*-lla* [from the Spanish *-illo*?] and *-cu/-gu* [from the Spanish *-ico*?]), and a preference for direct verbal request strategies (i.e. imperatives). Changes in Otavalo Spanish (as compared to the findings of Blum-Kulka 1989) include: the virtual abandonment of *poder* 'to be able' as a request softener, an increased use of imperatives, the adoption of both a present and a future imperative, the use of the future imperative to signal compliance at a future time or increased politeness, the loan translation of the Quichua modal verb *carana* 'to give', and the use of *nomás* 'just' and *pués* (emphatic) to express shades of meaning that are conveyed in Quichua through suffixes.

The solution to cross-cultural communication problems in a language contact situation lies in the development of a shared set of pragmatic strategies. In order to reach this point, strategies that are used by both linguistic groups are used with greater frequency (such as imperatives in Quichua and Spanish), and those which are not shared are either borrowed (such as the borrowing of *give* as a modal verb into Spanish and of lexical courtesy expressions into Quichua) or discarded (such as the modal verb *poder* 'to be able' in Spanish). Since the shared pragmatic system used in the Quichua and Spanish spoken in Otavalo is based upon direct request strategies (present and future imperatives plus softeners) which can be used in all conversational situations, there is very little possibility of being misunderstood.

NOTES

¹ Quichua is referred to as Quechua outside of Ecuador.

² There have been many studies on the concept of politeness, beginning with Goffman 1967 and Brown and Levinson 1978. They determined the basic principles of politeness, which are considered universal, such as 'saving face'. However, each language and culture possesses a variety of linguistic forms that are considered more, or less, polite by members of that culture. There may be some overlap between cultures in the grammatical structures and the relative degree of politeness they are perceived to convey. Many language-specific studies have been conducted on request formation and perceived politeness (such as Searle 1976, Fraser and Nolen 1981, Koike 1986, 1989 and Brown 1979). In order to determine which grammatical structures are considered more polite by speakers of a given language, they are commonly asked to rank a series of requests that vary in grammatical/lexical choice from least to most polite (such as Fraser and Nolen 1981 and Koike 1986, 1989). While this method does not associate grammatical structure with actual patterns of use, it does shed light upon what linguistic features convey increased politeness.

³ Bilingualism is regarded as a continuum, ranging from knowing a few words and phrases in the second language to being a fluent speaker of two languages.

⁴ There is disagreement among linguists as to whether or not Quichua/Quechua and Aymara are genetically related.

⁵ Only males were used due to the limited amount of time spent in Ecuador and the desire to have as homogeneous a group as possible.

⁶ The determination of what grammatical/lexical categories are important in request formation was based upon the coding manual developed by Blum-Kulka (1989:273). As proposed by Blum-Kulka, a request can contain the following components: the head act (the minimal requesting unit), alerters (vocatives, interjections), the directness of the request (grammatical moods such as the imperative, 'want' statements, hints, etc.), syntactic downgraders (interrogative form, tense, and aspect), and lexical and phrasal downgraders (politeness expressions such as 'please', hedges, cajolers, etc.).

⁷ A set of eight index cards were presented to each informant. Each card contained the same request, but worded differently. They were asked to order them from least to most polite. A similar ranking process was used by Koike (1989:195) for Portuguese and by Fraser and Nolen (1981:106) for Spanish.

⁸ This structure is not found in Southern Peruvian varieties of Quechua (Gutiérrez 1990).

⁹ The use of *give* as a modal verb has been translated into the Spanish spoken in the Ecuadorian Andes, and is used like its Quichua counterpart. An example would be: *Dáme abriendo la ventana* 'Do me the favor of opening the window'.

¹⁰ The abbreviations in this paper are the following:

dim.	diminutive
acc.	accusative case, marking the direct object
imp.	imperative, or command form
pres.	present
fut.	future
neg.	negative
quest.	question
pers.	person, as in the form of the verb
inf.	infinitive ending
subj.	subjunctive mood
pl.	plural

¹¹ Gutiérrez 1990 reports that the suffix *-cu* in Peruvian Quechua is used instead of the words *allichu* and *ichu*, which are commonly used to soften requests. She provides the following example: *Allichu tantata ruwapuway?* 'Would you please make bread for him/her?'. In this case, *allichu* is translated by 'would you please...?'.

¹² The same tense usage was observed in the Spanish sample from the Otavalo area. An example is: *Deja por ahora - buscarás algún rato* 'Leave (it) (present imperative) for now, look for (it) (future imperative) some other time'.

¹³ Questions are commonly used to convey requests, especially questions of ability and availability. In this study, questions are considered requests when they are generated in response to a stimulus using the requesting verb *mañana* 'to ask' in the elicited data. In naturally-occurring conversations, questions are considered requests when they expect the hearer to comply by performing an action.

¹⁴ This strategy was only used by one informant whose speech was highly influenced by Spanish.

¹⁵ This example also shows the heavy syntactic influence of Spanish in this speaker's Quichua. The word order is completely Spanish (subject, verb, object) and this sentence could be translated into Spanish merely by substituting Spanish vocabulary (with the exception of the final preposition *-pi* 'in').

¹⁶ Gutiérrez 1990 reports that in Southern Peruvian Quechua *-lla* is affixed to words before the tense/aspect marker *-y*, as in *shamulláy* 'Just come on'. This was also reported for the Quichua spoken in the Ecuadorian jungle (Catta Quelen 1987). The positioning of *-lla* in word final position is apparently typical of the Quichua spoken in Imbabura (Stark and Carpenter 1973). It could be theorized that *-lla* was moved to word final position in this area to "match" the equivalent structure in Spanish: *Venga nomás* 'just come', *Shamuyllá* 'Just come'.

¹⁷ The future tense is used in the Spanish of Otavalo to formulate requests that are to be executed at a time subsequent to the present. This is the same tense usage as in Quichua.

¹⁸ In Southern Peruvian Quechua the equivalent expression is *ama hina kaychu* (Gutiérrez 1990).

REFERENCES

- ALBOR, Hugo. 1973. *Da + gerundio, ¿un quechuismo?* Hispania 56.316-318.
- AUSTIN, John. 1962. *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- BLUM-KULKA, Shoshona, Juliane House, & Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- BROWN, Penelope. 1979. *Language, interaction, and sex roles in a Mayan community: A study of politeness and the position of women*. University of California Ph.D. dissertation.
- , & Stephen Levinson. 1978. *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. Questions and politeness, ed. by E. Goody, 56-288. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- CARPENTER, Lawrence. 1982. *Ecuadorian Quichua: Descriptive sketch and variation*. University of Florida Ph.D. dissertation.
- CATTA QUELEN, Javier. 1987. *Gramática del quichua ecuatoriano*. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Abya-Yala. Centro de investigaciones para la educación indígena.
- CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES PARA LA EDUCACIÓN INDÍGENA. 1983. *Ñucanchic llactapac shimi*. Vol. 1. Quito, Ecuador.
- CORDERO, Luis. 1989. *Diccionario quichua*. Quito, Ecuador: Corporación Editora Nacional.
- ERVIN-TRIPP, Susan. 1976. *Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives*. *Language in Society* 5:1. 25-66.
- ESCOBAR, Alberto. 1986. *Types and stages of bilingual behavior: A sociopragmatic analysis of Peruvian bilingual Spanish*. State University of New York at Buffalo Ph.D. dissertation.
- FRASER, Bruce, and Nolen, William. 1981. *The association of deference with linguistic form*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 27.93-103.
- FROMKIN, Victoria, & Robert Rodman. 1988. *An introduction to language*. Fourth edition. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- GOFFMAN, Irving. 1967. *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.
- GRIMM, Juan. 1896. *La lengua quichua: dialecto de la República del Ecuador*. Quito, Ecuador: Proyecto de educación intercultural.
- GUTIÉRREZ, Salomé. 1990. *Personal communication*.
- GUZMÁN, Manuel. 1920. *Gramática de la lengua quichua*. Quito, Ecuador: Prensa católica.
- HAVERKATE, Henk. 1979. *Impositive sentences in Spanish*. New York: North-Holland Publishing Co.
- HURLEY, Joni K. 1992. *A cross-cultural pragmatic study of Spanish and Quichua request strategies as influenced by language contact in Otavalo*. Ecuador. University of Pittsburgh Ph.D. dissertation.
- HILL, Jane, & Kenneth Hill. 1986. *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of syncretic*

- language in central Mexico. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- JAKE, Janice. 1979. Validation suffixes in Imbabura Quechua. Papers from the fifteenth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, ed. by P. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer, 172-184.
- JARA, Fausto. No year. Morfología quichua. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Mundo Andino.
- KOIKE, Dale. 1986. Differences and similarities in men's and women's directives in Carioca Brazilian Portuguese. *Hispania* 69:2.387-394.
- . 1989. Requests and the role of deixis in politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 13.187-202.
- LEONARDI, P. José. 1966. Lengua quichua (dialecto del Napo) gramática y diccionario. Quito, Ecuador: Editora 'Fénix'.
- MUGICA, P. No year. Aprende el quichua: Gramática y vocabularios. Quito, Ecuador: CICAME.
- MUYSKEN, Pieter. 1981. Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: the case for relexification. *Historicity and variation in creole studies*, ed. by A. Highfield & A. Valdman, 52-78. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers Inc.
- NAULA GAUCHO, Juan. 1975. Bosquejo gramatical del quichua de Chimborazo. Quito, Ecuador: Universidad Central.
- Ñucanchic llactapac shimi. Vol. 1.1983 Quito, Ecuador.
- ORR, Carolyn. 1981. Algunos rasgos característicos del discurso en el quechua del Napo. *Revista latinoamericana de estudios lingüísticos* 1.135-175.
- PARÍS, J. 1961. Gramática de la lengua quichua. Quito, Ecuador: Editorial Santo Domingo.
- PARKER, Gary. 1964. Gramática del quechua ayacuchano. Lima, Perú: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- QUINTERO, María, & María Cotacachi. 1986. Quiquinllatac quichua shimita yachacupai. Vol. 4. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- RUSHFORTH, Scott. 1985. Some directive illocutionary acts among the Bear Lake Athapaskans. *Anthropological Linguistics* 27:4.387-411.
- SALOMON, Frank. 1983. El quichua de los Andes ecuatoriales: algunos aportes recientes. *Revista Andina* 1:2.393-405.
- SEARLE, John. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5.1-23.
- . 1979. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- SOLÁ, Donald, & D. Yupanqui. 1970. *Quechua hablado*. New York: Cornell University.
- STARK, Louisa, & Lawrence Carpenter. 1973. *El quichua de Imbabura: Una gramática pedagógica*. Otavalo, Ecuador: Instituto Interandino de Desarrollo.
- STRATFORD, Billie. 1989. *Structure and use of Altiplano Spanish*. University of Florida Ph.D. dissertation.
- TOSCANO MATEUS, Humberto. 1953. *El español en el Ecuador*. Madrid, Spain.
- URIOSTE, Jorge. 1955. *Gramática de la lengua quechua y vocabulario*. La Paz, Bolivia: Editorial Canata.

- VÁSQUEZ, P. Victor. 1990. *Runa shimita yachacushun: Aprendamos quichua*. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- WARDHAUGH, Ronald. 1985. *How communication works*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- WHERRITT, Irene. 1983. Directives in Brazilian Portuguese: Mother-child interaction. Spanish and Portuguese in social context, ed. by J. Bergen & G. Bills, 105-118. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- WILSON, Robert. 1965. Polite ways to give orders. *Hispania* 48:1.