

From Subordinate Marker to Discourse Marker: *que* in Andean Spanish

ANNA MARÍA ESCOBAR

Abstract

This paper proposes an analysis of a redundant use of que ('that') found in Andean Spanish as an expression which has undergone a grammaticalization process. Evidence suggests that the function of que as subordinate marker is much more generalized in this variety than in other dialects of Spanish. que is found to be used as a marker introducing both nominal and adjectival clauses, suggesting that adjectival subordinates behave as nominal subordinates in this variety of Spanish. An intrusive que appears in restricted syntactic and semantic contexts with clauses that have nominal and adjectival functions, and even appears replacing adverbial expressions in some adverbial subordinates (temporal, spatial, and manner). Furthermore, it is found to be sensitive to the degree of the argument's thematic/semantic function in the subordinate clause. In particular, it seems to occur more often with low-agency arguments in adjectival and nominal contexts, and, in nominal subordinates, tends to appear with a restricted set of epistemic and evidential main verbs (e.g. creer 'to believe', saber 'to know', decir 'to say'). The analysis suggests that que has developed a new function in this variety of Spanish, namely, one of indicating that the information contained in the subordinate clause does not constitute background information (as would be expected in non-contact varieties of Spanish) but instead contains information relevant to the discourse.

Introduction

Dialects which have developed in language contact situations are said to be prone to exhibit more linguistic diversification than do other dialects of the same language which have developed in non-contact regions (cf. Trudgill 2002). An example of a contact dialect is Andean Spanish, developed in a region where Spanish is in contact with Quechua (cf. Escobar 2000). This paper focuses on a feature which, while not reported for other varieties of

Spanish, is found in Andean Spanish: a redundant use of the expression *que* ('that'). This redundant use of *que*, which creates subordinate clauses is here suggested to function as a discourse strategy in Peruvian Andean Spanish. I will refer to this linguistic feature as intrusive *que*.

A close analysis of the spontaneous speech of native speakers of Peruvian Andean Spanish¹ reveals cases of an intrusive *que* in clauses with both adjectival (1) and nominal (2) functions, and which are considered redundant or 'odd' in non-contact dialects of Spanish.²

- (1) [a visitar a mi mamá] sí voy a cada año porque éste [año] que no he ido el único porque yo todos los años me voy al año / a veces al año / dos veces voy / sí yo me voy seguido a verla a mi mamá

'[to visit my mother] yes, I go every year because this one [this year] that I have not gone the only time because I go every year every year / sometimes in a year / I go twice / yes, I go often to visit my mother'

- (2) [sólo salgo] cuando voy hacer compras o hacer trámite a la municipalidad / al banco / sí no más sí acá estoy constante / estoy acá / raras veces que salgo ahora como estoy acá en la organización a veces hay que hacer algun documento

'[I only go out] when I go to buy or to do paperwork at the municipality / at the bank/ only then, yes, here I am always / I am here / few times that I go out now since I am here in the organization sometimes there is a document to work on'

In the literature on Spanish dialects, there is mention of frequent use of Spanish *que* constructions as a feature of oral speech in studies of contemporary monolingual varieties of Spanish (Kany 1976; Vaquero 1996), and of Old Spanish (Keniston 1937; Lapesa 1986:36₅).³ For modern Spanish, a preferential use of the expression *que* in adjectival contexts (e.g. *el cual* > *que*, *quien* > *que*) is suggested (Kany 1976:132-133; Vaquero 1996:38); while for Old Spanish, a preferential use of conjunction *que* instead of alternate forms (e.g. *porque*, *maguer*, *ca*) is described (Lapesa 1986:57₅, 98₁₀). Kany

¹ This study is based on data from 15 interviews of approximately 45 minutes each with female and male adults born and raised in the Andean region of Peru. All are native speakers of both Spanish and Quechua, and speakers of Andean Spanish. The conversations were recorded either in their place of origin in the Andean region, or in Lima, where they have migrated to.

² Other functions of *que*, e.g. conjunction, comparative, interrogative, are not considered in this study.

³ Kany calls it the 'superfluous *que*', and adds that the conjunction *que* is the function most widely used (1976:395).

mentions an intrusive *que* in Mexican Spanish which creates adjectival adjuncts, but then adds that it is losing ground (e.g. *flojita que te estás volviendo* 'somewhat lazy that you are becoming'; 1976:396). The intrusive *que* proposed in this paper appears with clauses that have nominal and adjectival functions, and appears in restricted syntactic and semantic contexts, as will be described. As a consequence, it is here proposed that in Peruvian Andean Spanish this intrusive *que* has developed from a generalized expression *que* that appears before nominal and adjectival subordinates in Andean Spanish, and even appears replacing adverbial expressions in some adverbial subordinates. It is further proposed that intrusive *que* seems to function as a discourse marker in this contact dialect of Spanish.

2. *que* as subordinate marker

The use of a general *que* as a subordinate marker introducing both nominal and adjectival clauses is reminiscent of analyses which have proposed that a sole expression introduces both adjectival and nominal subordinates (cf. Kayne's 1976 study of French *que*; Givón's 1991 study of the subordinate marker in Biblical Hebrew; and Donati's 1995 study of Spanish *que*). In standardized or general Spanish, however, the subordinate marker in adjectival subordinates can have alternate forms according to the function of the referent inside the subordinate clause, whether it is that of subject, direct object, indirect object, or other obliques (prepositional object), as exemplified in (3-6).

- (3) **Subject**⁴
ese hombre [que / quien vino ayer]
'that man that came yesterday'
- (4) **Direct Object**
a. ese paquete [que / el cual te entregué ayer]
'that package that I handed to you yesterday'
b. el hombre [al que / al cual / a quien vi ayer]
'that man that I saw yesterday'
- (5) **Indirect Object**
el hombre [al que / al cual / a quien le dimos el paquete]
'the man to whom we gave the package'

⁴ *Quien* can only be used as an option in non-restrictive relative clauses (cf. Zagona 2002:57-58).

- (6) **Other obliques / Prepositional object**
 el avión en el que / en el cual llegamos anoche]
 ‘the plane in which we arrived last night’

While in subject and direct object functions *que* can appear alone, in the other functions it appears combined with other expressions. In Old Spanish, the preposition could be omitted at times. Lapesa explains that it occurred with causal (*porque* > *que*), final (*para que* > *que*), and even with concessive (*aunque* > *que*) structures (1986:57₅) not considered adjectival. Some varieties of modern Spanish use *que* alone in indirect object contexts after the verb *ser* ('to be') (Kany 1976:132). In prepositional contexts, reduction to *que* is also possible in some oral varieties of Spanish, but seems to be restricted to temporal and spatial structures (Real Academia Española 1989:529), although Kany mentions other prepositions as well (e.g. *con* 'with'; 1976:373).⁵ A preference for *que* alone in adjectival contexts has been described for some non-contact varieties of modern Spanish, such as in Argentina, the Caribbean, Chile, Santo Domingo and Venezuela (Kany 1976:373; Alvar 1996; and Vaquero 1996:34).

In Peruvian Andean Spanish, however, there seems to be a tendency to use *que* as the sole expression introducing adjectival subordinates, regardless of the function of the referent either in the subordinate clause or in the main clause. That is, the expressions underlined in (3-6) for adjectival contexts are all reduced to *que* in Peruvian Andean Spanish, similar to the use of *que* found in nominal subordinates in standardized Spanish.⁶

A single *que* introducing adjectival subordinates suggests that the function of this introductory expression is not pronominal, as could be argued for the expressions used in other varieties of Spanish, but instead is that of a subordinate marker, i.e. here *que* has a syntactic function. In my data, I find *que* as the sole expression for adjectival contexts, but it also appears in subordinates which require an adverbial expression. In these adverbial contexts, *que* is used to introduce some temporal, spatial, and manner adverbial subordinates which in other native varieties of Spanish would appear with adverbial expressions such as *cuando*, *donde*, and *como*, as seen in examples (7) through (9).⁷

⁵ Kany mentions a use of *que su* (< *cuyo*) in genitive contexts as well. However, no examples were found in the data from the Andean Spanish speakers.

⁶ Other Romance languages which seem to have one same form for adjectival (relative) and nominal (complement) subordinates are Occitan (Wheeler 1988:275), and Sardinian (Jones 1988:343).

⁷ Kany notes that *como* > *que* is found in some regions of Argentina, Ecuador, and Guatemala (1976:399). Examples similar to those presented in this section are also found in my data from native speakers of Quechua who speak Spanish as a second language.

- (7) **cuando > que** (*when > that*)
 hubo una cosa que yo me pregunto y nunca creo me voy a dar respuesta // al separarse mi papá de mi mamá / precisamente cuando nosotros veníamos [a Lima] / era [cuando >] que dijo “bueno Berta” le dijo mi papá / “a tus hijos no los vas a ver hasta que ellos tengan mayoría de edad”
 ‘there was something that I ask myself and never think that I will be able to answer // when my father separated from my mother / precisely when we came [to Lima] / it was [when >] that he said “well Bertha”, my father said to her / “you will not see your children until they are adults”
- (8) **donde > que** (*where > that*)
 pero con los [quechuas] que he tenido dificultad es con el quechua de Huánuco / sí / no tanto porque e.. de por medio está Junín / [en donde / donde >] que está el Huanca / muy pocas palabras del Huanca entiendo yo /
 ‘but with the ones [types of Quechua] that I have had difficulty is with the Quechua of Huanuco / yes / not so much [though] because eh in between is Junin / [where >] that there is Huanca [variety of Quechua] / very few words of Huanca I understand’
- (9) **como > que** (*since > that*)
 no solamente ahora / sino desde antes [ella] es así [como >] que mi abuela ha sido educada
 ‘not only now / but since before she is that way [since] that my grandmother has been educated’

It should be clarified that although these constructions with *que* were found in the data, constructions with *cuando*, *donde*, and *como* were also present. While these adverbial constructions (those with *cuando*, *donde*, *como*) do not take *que* in standard Spanish, Spanish does have instances of overlap of function of the expressions *cuando* ('when') and *donde* ('where') with temporal and spatial functions in adjectival contexts, as exemplified in (7') and (8').

- (7') en la casa donde / en la que vivimos
 'in the house where we live'
- (8') en las tardes cuando / en las que nos llama
 'in the afternoons when he calls us'

The analysis of *que* in these adverbial contexts suggests, then, that the function of *que* as subordinate marker is much more generalized in Peruvian Andean Spanish than in other dialects of Spanish, since *que* can be used in place of adverbial expressions as well.

Also in the data is one example of an intrusive *que* accompanying *donde* (10), which might suggest a separate function for *que*.

- (10) por ejemplo ahí tengo un familiar que es un padre M. R. / quien él ahí cerca de donde que enseña a hablar [quechua] así / porque hay muchas personas que desean aprender y saber mismo qué es el quechua

‘for example there I have a relative who is a priest / who he there close to where that he teaches to speak [Quechua] like that / because there are many people who want to learn and know truly what Quechua is’

Kany mentions the use of (*d*)*onde que* in Mexico to introduce non-restrictive clauses as explanations or afterthoughts (1976:391). Although example (10) is of this type, more examples are needed in order to extract a generalization for Andean Spanish. Additional examples of the sequence (*d*)*onde que* were also present in data I have from native Quechua speakers who are second language speakers of Andean Spanish (see note 7), and has been reported to me to be present in the Spanish of bilinguals in Potosí, Bolivia as well (Fátima Laredo of the University Tomás Frías of Potosí, Bolivia, pers. comm.).⁸ More data would be needed, however, for a detailed analysis of the function of (*d*)*onde que*.⁹

The data from the second language speakers also include cases of conditional *si* > *que* ('if > that') (11a), interrogative *cómo* > *que* ('how > that') (11b), and comparative *como* > *que* ('as > that') (11c), all further suggesting a generalization of the function of *que*.

⁸ Examples of (*d*)*onde que* in L2 Spanish or Bilingual Spanish (a socio-ethnic variety of Spanish spoken by native speakers of Quechua who speak Spanish as a second language) are the following:

(a) fíjase que parece mentira / eso onde que vivía yo [en] esa parte no había colegio ... entonces ese pueblito se quedó muy atrasado / atrasado / claro onde que entraban colegio onde que había que daba clases claro
'take a look that it seems untrue / that where that I lived [in] that place there was no school ... so that small town was left very behind / behind / of course where that they would go to school where that there would be class of course'

⁹ Jones mentions that Sardinian does tend to use *inve* 'where' in locative relatives instead of the general *ki* 'that' (1988:343).

(11) a. **si > que** (*if > that*)

un montón de dinero para poder comprar / y nosotros casi generalmente no podemos encontrar ni préstamos porque le tenemos la casa / de qué sirve que nos ponen un montón de obstáculos para darnos presta'o / po' eso ya no hacemos / se ne'sita bastante platita

'a lot of money to be able to buy / and we almost generally cannot find loans because we have a house / what is the use that they put lots of obstacles to give us the money / for that reason we do not do [it] / one needs a lot of money'

b. **cómo > que** (*how > that*)

son chiquillos ... pucha más ... más traviesos no? / cuando hay / que fastidian

'they are kids ... wow! more ... more mischievous no? / when they are there / that they bother'

c. **como > que** (*as > that*)

no pueden ni tomar agua / porque la gente en Urubamba está acostumbrado tomar bastante chicha / seran raras personas que nosotros no podemos tomar chicha pero el que menos se muere de la chicha /

'they cannot even drink water / because people in Urubamba are used to drinking lots of *chicha* (alcoholic drink made from corn) / it must be few people that we (we) cannot drink *chicha* but others die for *chicha*

The Andean Spanish corpus used in this study contains more than 20,000 words, which include 591 cases of nominal and adjectival *que*. Of the 591 cases of *que* considered in the study, 121 are cases of intrusive *que*. Table 1 shows more cases of intrusive *que* in nominal subordinates (25%), than in adjectival subordinates (14%).

Table 1: Cases of intrusive *que* in the Andean Spanish data

	Non-intrusive <i>que</i>		Intrusive <i>que</i>		Total n
	%	n	%	n	
Nominal	75%	(274)	25%	(90)	364
Adjectival	86%	(196)	14%	(31)	227
Total	80%	(470)	25%	(121)	591

While intrusive *que* is found in both adjectival and nominal subordinates in our data, the syntactic contexts in which they appear within each context are restricted, as described in the following section. In this contact dialect of Spanish *que* has extended its use to all subordinate contexts, thereby developing the function of a syntactic marker introducing a subordinate clause.¹⁰

3. *que* as a discourse marker

3.1. Adjectival subordinates

A detailed analysis of intrusive *que* in adjectival subordinates shows that its presence correlates with the function of the referent in the subordinate and not with the grammatical function of the relativized noun phrase in the main clause. In these contexts, 36% of the cases of intrusive *que* appear when the referent has spatial or temporal function in the subordinate (as in example 12), 48% when it is the subject of an intransitive verb (as in 13), and 13% when it is a patient or direct object in the subordinate (as in 14).

- (12) ella [mi madre] por ejemplo también habla quechua / y lo habla muy bien / y habían oportunidades / por ejemplo / *en la casa* / que comunicaban con mi papá / hablaban en quechua / en voz alta

‘she [my mother], for example, also speaks Quechua / and she speaks it very well / and there were instances / for example / *at home* / that they communicated with my father / the would speak in Quechua / in loud voice’

- (13) *una gran parte de su población* / son procedentes de las provincias altas / Espinar / Chumbivilca / Santo Tomás / no? / que por su negocio / por la profesión que desempeñan se han venido a establecer aquí a Sicuani

‘a great number of the population / are from the high provinces / Espinar / Chumbivilca / Santo Tomás / no? / that because of his business / because of their profession they have they have come to settle here in Sicuani’

¹⁰ This reanalysis of the pronominal to a complementizer is also attested for other languages, e.g. German and Greek (Roberts and Roussou 2003).

- (14) porque [mi papá] no quería que aprendemos [quechua] no sé no a veces nosotros le remedamos / que están hablando mal decimos no? no eso no hablan pe ustedes no no sé / pero sí comprendo yo comprendo con mi mamá hablaba [quechua]

'because [my father] did not want us to learn [Quechua] I do not know [it], no, sometimes we would imitate them / that you are speaking bad we would say no?, no, that [language] you do not speak, no, I do not know / but I do understand, I understand, with my mother I would speak [Quechua]'

Only 3% of the cases represented an agent-subject, as can be seen in Table 2, in which the argument functions are listed in their traditional order.

Table 2: Argument functions of the referent in the subordinate in adjectival subordinates with intrusive *que*

	Percentage	(n)
Agent-Subject	3%	(1)
Patient-Direct object	13%	(4)
Subject of Intransitive	48%	(15)
Spatial / Temporal	36%	(11)
Total	100%	(31)

It should be noted that in Table 2, subjects of intransitives should be grouped with patient-direct objects. After all, subjects of intransitives are considered similar in function to patient arguments, since from a semantic perspective, patients and subjects of intransitives are marked the same in some languages of the world (cf. Dixon 1994:24; Givón 1984:154). Moreover, it should be noted that arguments which appear with intrusive *que* tend to be non-agent, recalling Givon's Argument Structure Hierarchy (1984:89, 134, 139), reproduced in (15).

- (15) Givón's Argument Structure Hierarchy (1984:89, 134, 139)
agent > dative > patient > locative/temporal > other obliques

This suggests that intrusive *que* is sensitive to the degree of the argument's thematic/semantic function in the subordinate clause (cf. Givón 1984:139). In particular, intrusive *que* seems to occur more often with low-agency

arguments. Moreover, while subordinates are usually described as containing background information (cf. Lunn 1995; Bybee 2002), intrusive *que* seems rather to highlight the information contained in the subordinate. That is, *que* as a syntactic marker has the whole subordinate in its scope, but as a marker that highlights the content of the subordinate in the whole utterance, it is displaying an additional function, namely a discourse function. This might explain why intrusive *que* appears mainly with arguments low in Givón's hierarchy.¹¹ In this contact variety of Spanish, adjectival subordinates seem to behave as nominal subordinates. The examples with intrusive *que* in nominal subordinates seem to support this analysis as well, as described in the following section.

3.2. Nominal subordinates

The cases of intrusive *que* in nominal subordinates also appear preferentially with arguments with low agency (cf. Givón 1984:89, 134, 139) (Table 3).

Table 3: Argument functions of the nominal subordinate with intrusive *que* in the main clause

	Percentage	(n)
Subject	1%	(1)
Patient/Direct object	40%	(36)
Nominal Adjuncts	29%	(26)
Equational clauses (after <i>ser</i>)	12%	(11)
Prepositional clauses	10%	(9)
Ojalá / Other	8%	(7)
Total	100%	(90)

The arguments in Table 3 include mainly subordinates with object-patient function (40% of the cases) as in (16), and those functioning as nominal adjuncts (29% of the cases) exemplified in (17).¹²

¹¹ It should be mentioned that in Andean Spanish there is a tendency to move spatial and temporal prepositional phrases of the main clause to the beginning of the sentence with the purpose of focussing/highlighting them in the discourse (Escobar 2000). Here, however, the word order strategy is not used to highlight the content of the subordinate, but instead *que* is being used with that function.

¹² In only one of the cases did the nominal subordinate have subject function, and in that case the main verb was a movement verb. It should be mentioned that in

- (16) si yo tendría que opinar algo del castellano de ellos / que es un poco
dificultoso para comunicarse / se entienden más / claro

'if I had to give an opinion of their Spanish / that it is somewhat
hard to communicate [for them] / they understand more / of course'

- (17) con los que saben quechua converso / por ejemplo que con los
muchachos del servicio sí o con el señor C. mismo / o con F.

'with those who speak Quechua I speak to [in Quechua] / for
example that with the janitors yes or with Mr. C. himself [the boss]
/ or with F.'

A closer analysis of the subordinates with intrusive *que* in object-patient function shows that they appear mainly with either cognitive/evaluative/perception (60%) or communication (34%) verbs in the majority (94%) of cases (cf. Table 4).¹³

Table 4: Linguistic characteristics of verbs with intrusive *que* in subordinate arguments with object/patient function

TYPE OF MAIN VERB		
Cognitive / Evaluative / Perception		60%
Verbs of <i>saying</i>		34%
Other		6%

SUBJECT PERSON	1s	3s
Main Verb	30%	70%
Subordinate Verb	14%	85%

Quechua, nominal subordinates with subject function are rarely used (Cerrón, 1987:315).

¹³ Cognitive verbs, e.g. *saber* 'to know', *creer* 'to believe', *pensar* 'to think'; evaluative verbs, e.g. *parecer* 'to seem'; perception verbs, e.g. *ver* 'to see', *oir* 'to hear'; communication verbs, e.g. *decir* 'to say', *contar* 'to tell', *reportar* 'to report'.

As can be seen in the lower half of Table 4, verbs in the main clause are conjugated in third person in 70% of the cases, and in first person in the remaining 30%. The subordinate subject is also in third person in 85% of the cases (and in first person in 14% of the cases). That is, there appear to be restrictions as to the types of verbs with which intrusive *que* can be used.

Nominal subordinates with intrusive *que* appear, then, not only in restricted syntactic contexts, i.e. where the argument is of low agency, but also accompanying a small set of main verbs, predominantly in the third person.¹⁴ Again, the analysis suggests that *que* has developed a new function in this variety of Spanish.

In example (18), the nominal subordinate clause preceded by intrusive *que* contains information that is relevant to the discourse, and not repeated in any other argument in the discourse unit.

- (18) mi hermano mayor que estaba acá en Lima / él me dijo pué que me iba ayudar así y vine pué yo a estar con él / o sea a vivir con él / pero tuve problemas que la esposa de mi hermano no me entendía / claro al comienzo cuando llegué nomás estudiaba no? estaba en una academia de preparación

'my older brother was here in Lima / he told me that he would help me so then I came to be with him / that is to live with him / but I had problems that the wife of my brother did not understand me / well, at the beginning when I arrived I was only studying no? I was in a preparatory institute [to enter the university]'

The proposition *la esposa de mi hermano no me entendía* ('the wife of my brother did not understand me') in example (18) is brought to the attention of the hearer as important in understanding the speaker's experience when he first arrived in the capital to live with his brother. This information contained in the clause introduced by intrusive *que* could have been brought to the foreground by presenting it as a separate main clause, especially since subordinates in Spanish are considered to contain background information while main clauses are described as containing foreground information (cf. Lunn 1995).¹⁵ However, in these examples, speakers seem to fulfill this function of bringing the content of the proposition to the foreground of the discourse or highlighting it by marking it with an intrusive *que*.

Other cases where a foregrounding effect occurs are those in which an intrusive *que* appears with verbs of saying or communication. In general

¹⁴ Roehrs and Labelle (2003) also find an intrusive *que* in the speech of French children, which tends to appear with the verb *être* (similar to Spanish *ser* 'to be'), and verbs of perception.

¹⁵ This is the case in spite of the fact that subordinates in Spanish have finite-verbs and other characteristics similar to main clauses (cf. Bybee 2002)

Spanish, verbs of saying use *que* to introduce indirect discourse (cf. Reyes 1995). In Andean Spanish, an intrusive *que* appears with verbs of saying with direct discourse of the speaker him/herself (19) or a direct quote of someone else to the speaker him/herself (20). That is, in both cases the subordinate clause contains assertions and not hearsay.

- (19) también mi abuela sí [habla quechua] / perfectamente / claro con / un poco con nosotros no? / pero incluso te voy a decir / que todos mis tíos hablan quechua / todos / y ellos en estos momentos son profesionales como yo / y no tenemos recelo de hablar el quechua cuando es necesario

‘my grandmother also [speaks Quechua] yes / perfectly / of course with / a little with us no? / but I will also tell you / that all my uncles speak Quechua / all of them / and at this time they are professionals like I [am] / and we are embarrassed of speaking Quechua when it's necessary’

- (20) mis hermanos están ya ... / por ejemplo lo que sigo yo a su atrás / él ya se ha recibido ya este año que sigue / me han hecho llamar pa su graduación que s'iba recibir que pa contador de una ... / todititos tán estudiando en la universidad de Huánuco todititos /

‘my siblings are already ... / for example, the one I follow / he has already graduated this year that follows / they had somebody call me for his graduation that he was going to graduate that to be an accountant of a / all of them are studying in the university of Huanuco all of them’

In examples (19) and (20), intrusive *que* precedes a subordinate which again contains information crucial to the main point of the whole discourse. Notice that in (19), although a pause occurs before the subordinate suggesting that direct speech will follow, it is preceded by *que*. In example (19), the speaker wants to highlight that all his uncles speak Quechua, that is, not only his grandmother. In example (20), intrusive *que* highlights information that was given orally to the speaker himself and that he seems proud of, namely, that his brother was graduating from the university, and that he was graduating as an accountant.¹⁶

Similar examples are found in the data of native speakers of Quechua who speak Spanish as a second language (L2 speakers). Examples (21a) and (21b) contain direct discourse in the embedded clause, both preceded by *que*.

¹⁶ A related discourse function is found in Bearnese (a Gascon or Occitan dialect) where *que* can have enunciative function (Hetzron 1977; Wheeler 1988; Campos 1992). However, it is not clear from the Bearnese examples how similar or different it is to Andean Spanish *que*.

- (21) a. [la chicha] saludable dicen [que es] pero no sé señorita a mí no me gusta la chicha / le diré la verdad que no me gusta la chicha no puedo tomar / yo puedo tomar un vaso / dos vasos es suficiente lo que puede tomar chicha / más me tomo un mate cualquiera cosa

'[chicha] they say that it is healthy, but I do not know Miss, I do not like *chicha* / I will tell you the truth that I do not like *chicha* I cannot drink [it] / I can drink one glass / two glasses is enough what I can drink *chicha* / I drink *mate* more than anything else'

- b. [Entrevistador: ¿en qué trabajas?] este ... lustro / lustro zapatos / de que a los clientes les digo / que les pue.. lo puedo lustrar zapato? / y ... hay otros que no quieren / hay otros que si quieren / pero 'sí / hay veces / hay veces hay / hay veces no hay

'[Interviewer: What is your job?] well ... I shine / I shine shoes / to the clients I say to them that I can... can I shine your shoes? / and ... there are other who do not want / there are others who do want / but like that / sometimes / sometimes there is / sometimes there is not'

In example (21b), the speaker starts the embedded clause of a verb of saying with what appears to be indirect discourse, but corrects himself and presents direct discourse *¿lo puedo lustrar zapato?* ('can I shine your shoes?').

Additional examples of intrusive *que* in my data from Quechua speakers who speak Spanish as a second language are exemplified in (22).¹⁷

- (22) a. yo he pasado un momento difícil [cuando vine a la ciudad] / y yo no quiero que ellos [mis hermanos] también que *pasan así*

'I had a difficult time [when I came to the city] / and I do not want that they [my siblings] also that they experience the same'

- b. [el castellano] es que me pareció una palabra bonita / una palabra que *muy fácil de pronunciarlo*

'it is that [Spanish] seemed to be a pretty word / a word that is very easy to pronounce'

¹⁷ L2 data is taken from interviews with male and female adults who are native speakers of Quechua and second language speakers of Spanish. This variety of second language is also called Peruvian *Bilingual Spanish* (cf. Escobar 2000) and is defined as an L2 variety which is also a socio-ethnic variety in Peruvian society.

- c. [el kerosene] sí es más barato [como fuente de luz] pero / dice que el kerosene *que* hace dolor de cabeza me han dicho / el humo *que* da dolor de cabeza / y por eso ya no uso

‘[kerosene] yes it is cheaper [as source for light] but / it is said that kerosene that it gives headaches they have told me / the smoke that it gives headaches / and for this reason I do not use it anymore’

Out of a total of 787 cases of *que* (without including interrogative, comparative and conjunction *que*), only 61 cases (8%) of intrusive *que* were found in the speech of L2 speakers.¹⁸ Of these, 39 (64%) were in adjectival contexts, and the remaining 22 (36%) were in nominal contexts. The use of intrusive *que* in this L2 variety, however, does not seem to have syntactic or semantic restrictions, though this may have more to do with the small size of the data set than with a true absence of such restrictions.

The analysis of intrusive *que* suggests that while subordination is a syntactic recourse used in non-contact dialects of Spanish for background or less-relevant information, in Peruvian Andean Spanish, subordination with intrusive *que* seems to be used as a strategy to bring the information contained in the subordinate clause to the foreground of the discourse. Moreover, the fact that intrusive *que* does appear in restricted syntactic and semantic contexts in Andean Spanish, and that these contexts are also found in L2 varieties of Spanish in contact with Quechua, suggests that Quechua may play a role in the further grammaticalization of *que* in Peruvian Andean Spanish. Although Spanish is usually described as having a syntactically-based marking in the functions of subordinates in the sentence, Andean Spanish seems to use a semantically-based marking (cf. Dixon 1994:28ff.) which allows for an intrusive *que* to develop, and to function as a discourse marker.

Van Valin and LaPolla suggest that the possibility of a subordinate clause being focussed (a strategy similar to highlighting) is related to having *independent* illocutionary force, as is the case of object complements (1997:485). Some languages cannot focus subordinates, whereas others have no such restrictions. While Spanish focusses arguments in the main clause (cf. Zagana 2002:208ff.) or within the subordinate clause if it contains an assertion (cf. Zagana 2002:252), Quechua can focus nominalized subordinates by attaching the focus marker *-qa* at the end of the subordinate (cf. Muysken 1995). These characteristics of Quechua and Spanish syntax suggest again Quechua's role in the emergence of intrusive *que* in Andean Spanish.

¹⁸ The total number of words in the corpus is approximately 35,000.

4. Quechua

Quechua is described as a language with syntactically-based marking, as is Spanish, but also as a language with a complex discourse-marking system (cf. Wölck 1987; Calvo 1995; Weber 1996). Furthermore, Quechua does not have relative clauses, but rather uses nominalizations extensively as subordinates. Nominalization of subordinates is marked with the suffixes *-q*, *-shqa* (or *-nqa*) and *-na*. These clauses do not have temporal or aspectual marking, they contain a non-finite verb, and they behave like any other argument in the main clause (Cerrón 1987:310) (23-24).¹⁹

- (23) kuchi-ta tari-shqa-y kurral-ta qacha-shqa-n.
cerdo-OBJ hallar-PERF-1 el corral-OBJ ensuciar-SUB-3POS

'I found the pig that had dirtied the pen.'

- (24) Miku-shqa-y t'anta-qa ch'aki-ña-m ka-sqa
comer-SUB-1POS pan-FOC seco-LIM-EV ser-PAS
'The bread that I ate was already dry.'

OBJ=object, PERF=perfective, SUB=subordinator, POS=possessive, FOC=focus, LIM=limitative, EV=evidential, PAS=past, 1=first person, 3=third person

The characteristics of these nominalized subordinates in Quechua, which function like any other argument of the main clause, suggest that the relationship between main and nominalized subordinate clauses in this language is stronger and closer than the relationship between main and finite-verb subordinate clauses in Spanish (cf. Lehmann 1988:193-200), and therefore that subordination in Quechua has a very different status in the discourse than in Spanish. While subordinate nominalizations are generally considered to be linked more strongly to the main clause, subordinates with finite verbs are considered to have weaker links to the main clause (cf. Van Valin and LaPolla 1997:477ff.). This strong clause linkage characteristic of Quechua discourse seems to be underlying the grammaticalization of *que* in Andean Spanish.

Another characteristic of Quechua syntax related to the linguistic phenomenon described in this paper is the discourse focus marker *-qa*. Although phonologically close to *que*, it is a suffix which can have either argument or propositional scope when appearing on the first argument of the

¹⁹ These suffixes have a temporal relationship with the main verb. Suffix *-q* is used as the unmarked form. It can made reference to a past, present or future event. Suffix *-shqa* (or *-nqa*) is used when the event is perfective. Suffix *-na* is used when the event has not happened yet (Cerrón 1987:310).

utterance (Muysken 1995:377, 385; Cerrón 1987:288). When *-qa* appears attached to the first argument of the sentence, it is in the unmarked position for focus, and has propositional scope (Muysken 1995:385). In all other positions inside the utterance the focus marker has contrastive function, that is, argument scope (Muysken 1995:380-381). Since *-qa* has propositional scope when attached to the first argument of the utterance, evidential suffixes (*-mi*, *-si*, *-cha*) cannot appear with the focus marker (Muysken 1995:377; Cerrón 1987:288). However, while each utterance can contain only one evidential marker, it can have several focus markers (Weber 1996:514-515).²⁰ Suffix *-qa* can also have other functions in Quechua discourse in addition to the focus and evidential functions. It can function as a connector and to reinforce the conditional (Cerrón Palomino, pers. comm.) and to limit the scope of negation (Weber 1996:519-520). The complex discourse functions of *-qa*, which is commonly known as the focus (or topic) marker in Quechua linguistics, need to be further studied from a perspective which goes beyond the utterance or sentence level.²¹ For the purposes of this study, the point to be emphasized is that Quechua has a complex discourse structure which, together with the syntactic and discourse characteristics of Spanish, seems to promote the grammaticalization of *que* in Andean Spanish.

Final discussion

Evidence has been presented in this paper that suggests that, in Peruvian Andean Spanish, *que* has grammaticalized into a generalized syntactic marker, specifically a subordinate marker. In this contact dialect of Spanish, the expression *que* is the sole form used to introduce adjectival and nominal subordinate clauses. That is, this generalized *que* is found introducing all types of adjectival and nominal subordinates. The fact that its use has been extended to adverbial constructions, where it can replace the adverbial expression introducing the adverbial subordinate, when in other varieties of Spanish a dedicated adverbial form is employed, suggests that it is more grammaticalized as a syntactic marker in Peruvian Andean Spanish than in other dialects of Spanish. The loss of restrictions in the use of an expression, that is, the extension of the range of syntactic contexts in which a form can appear, is characteristic of grammaticalizing expressions (cf. Heine, Claudi and Hünnemeyer 1991; Traugott and Heine 1991; Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994; Heine and Kuteva 2005).

Additional evidence has been presented of an intrusive *que* in Peruvian Andean Spanish, and that is the use of an unexpected *que* with the consequent creation of subordinate clauses. The analysis suggests that the information

²⁰ But only in the main clause, not inside the subordinate.

²¹ Weber (1996:5521-543) offers a pragmatic analysis of *-qa* in Huallaga Quechua which shows some of its discourse complexity.

contained in this subordinate does not constitute background information, as would be expected in non-contact varieties of Spanish, but, instead, contains information relevant to the discourse. The manner in which new meanings develop from new contexts is not clear (Heine and Kuteva 2005:59), but the fact that intrusive *que* appears in restricted syntactic and semantic contexts in this dialect of Spanish suggests that it has grammaticalized. These restricted contexts are shown here to be those arguments that are low on Givón's Argument Structure Hierarchy and low in agency content, and tend to appear with a restricted set of epistemic and evidential main verbs (e.g. *creer* 'to believe', *saber* 'to know', *decir* 'to say'). These syntactic and semantic restrictions suggest that intrusive *que* in Peruvian Andean Spanish serves to highlight the information contained in the subordinate as relevant to the interpretation of the whole discourse. That is, the subordinate preceded by intrusive *que* seems to be closer semantically to its main clause than subordinates in other, non-contact, varieties of Spanish. This closer relationship between the intrusive *que* subordinate and its main clause can in turn be seen as a consequence of the further grammaticalization of *que* in this variety of Spanish (cf. Givón 1979:ch. 5; Lehmann 1988; Hopper and Traugott 1993:186-172). Consequently, it is here proposed that intrusive *que* has a discourse function in Peruvian Andean Spanish, which consists of marking its subordinate as salient in the discourse; where *que* has grammaticalized toward marking stronger clause integration between the subordinate it precedes and its main clause, a case of clause linkage (cf. Foley and Van Valin 1984; Lehmann, 1988; Matthiessen and Thompson, 1988).

It has also been proposed in this paper, that in Spanish in contact with Quechua, discourse characteristics of Quechua seem to have enabled the appearance of *que* as a discourse marker to highlight information. The question arises, however, of why *que* is employed in this contact variety as the expression to serve this discourse function. The fact that there is a phonological resemblance between the Quechua focus marker *-qa* and the Spanish *que* cannot be ignored, but is not sufficient evidence. The syntactic characteristics of Spanish *que*, on the other hand, seem to contribute to its ability to assume this role. For example, in general Spanish, in addition to finite subordinates, *que* can introduce infinitival phrases (25-26) (examples from Donati 1995: 569).

(25) Quedan varios puntos que tratar.
'There are still several points to discuss.'

(26) una cama en que dormir
'a bed in which to sleep'

It has been postulated that a semantic closeness exists between complementizers, nominalized clauses, infinitival constructions, relative

clauses, and adverbial clauses, which behave similarly in some languages (cf. Frajzyngier and Jaspersen 1991; Hennesy and Givón 2002, for Turkish). Work in the typology of clause linkage suggests that there is a general tendency to move from a lower to a higher clause integration (cf. Ohori 1994, on TE and BA in Japanese).²² That is, *que* in Andean Spanish seems to be an example of a syntactic marker becoming a discourse marker.²³

It should be noted as well that the intrusive *que* subordinates in Andean Spanish appear in utterance-final position. This position, which coincides with the focal position of simple sentences in Spanish (Gutiérrez 2000), has been known to develop discourse function in other languages as well (Lambrecht 2003:176). Finally, although intrusive *que* can be considered to be an extension of the frequent *que* found in modern varieties of Spanish, characteristics of Quechua discourse, combined with Spanish linguistic characteristics and general tendencies in the grammaticalization of clause linkage seem to help explain the character of the intrusive *que* that has developed in Peruvian Andean Spanish.

References

- Alvar, M. (1996) *Manual de dialectología hispánica: El español de América*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, S. A.
- Bybee, J. (2002) Main clauses are innovative, subordinate clauses are conservative: Consequences for the nature of constructions. Complex discourse in grammar and discourse: Essays in honor of Sandra Thompson, edited by Joan Bybee & Michael Noonan, 1-17. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, J; Revere P., & Pagliuca, W. (1994) *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Calvo, J. (1995) *De acá para allá: Lenguas y culturas amerindias*. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Campos, H. (1992) *Los bearneses que quequean, ¿y nosotros, qué?* Hispanic Linguistics 4, 2. 329-349.
- Cerrón Palomino, R. (1987) *Lingüística quechua*. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

²² This new function of Spanish *que* in Andean Spanish is also found in other languages. Gelderen explains it in generative terms when she analyzes *that* in modern English (e.g. *which* > *that*) moving to positions higher in the tree (2004). Italian *che* also moves from lower positions in the tree to higher ones ('upward reanalysis', from D to C to higher C; Roberts and Roussou 2003). Roberts and Roussou explain that while standard Italian has *che* for all nominal complements, southern Italian dialects have two forms, *ca* with verbs such as 'to think', and *chi* (and variants) with verbs such as 'to want' (2003:88). Bearnese enunciative *que* is described as converting the subordinate clause into a main clause (Wheeler 1988:274).

²³ In this paper, the type of change that I refer to is a change in function related to the syntactic and semantic/pragmatic scope of the expression *que*.

- Donati, C. (1995). Il *que* relativo spagnolo. *Lingua e Stile* XXX, 3, 565-595.
- Escobar, A.M. (2000) *Contacto social y lingüístico*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Foley, W. & Van Valin, R.D. (1984) *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frajzyngier, Z. & Jasperson, R. (1991) *That*-clauses and other complements. *Lingua*, 83, 133-153.
- Givón, T. (1979) *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, T. (1984). *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*, Volumes I and II. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (1991) The evolution of dependent clause morpho-syntax in Biblical Hebrew. *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Vol. II, edited by Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine, 257-310. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gutiérrez Ordóñez, S. (2000) *Temas, remas, focos, tópicos y comentarios*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Heine, B.; Claudi, U. & Hünnemeyer, F. (1991) *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2005) *Language contact and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hennesy, P. & Givón, T. (2002) Note on the grammar of Turkish nominalizations. Complex discourse in grammar and discourse: Essays in honor of Sandra Thompson, edited by Joan Bybee and Michael Noonan, 125-144. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hetzron, R. (1977) The enunciative particle *que* in Gascon. *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica e applicata*, 6, 1-2. 161-221.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott, E.C. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, M. (1988) *Sardinian. The Romance languages*, edited by Martin Harris & Nigel Vincent, 314-350. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kany, C. (1976) *Sintaxis hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Kayne, R.S. (1976) French relative *que*. *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*, edited by Marta Luján and Hensey Fritz, 255-299. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Keniston, H. (1937) *The syntax of castillian prose: The Sixteenth Century*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lambrecht, K. (2003) Topic, Focus and secondary predication: The French presentational relative construction. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001*, edited by Josep Quer, Jan Schroten, Mauro Scorretti, Petra Sleeman & Els Verheugh, 171-212. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lapesa, R. (1986) *Historia de la lengua española*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Lehmann, C. (1988) *Towards a typology of clause linkage. Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, edited by John Haiman and Sandra Thompson, 181-225. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lunn, P. (1995) *The evaluative function of the Spanish subjunctive. Modality in grammar and discourse*, edited by Joan Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman, 429-449. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Mathiessen, C. & Thompson, S. (1988) *The structure of discourse and 'subordination'. Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, edited by John Haiman and Sandra Thompson, 275-329. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Muysken, P. (1995) Focus in Quechua. *Discourse configurational languages*, edited by Katalin E. Kiss, 373-393. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ohuri, T. (1994) *Diachrony of clause linkage. Perspectives on grammaticalization*, edited by William Pagliuca, 135-149. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Real Academia Española (1989) *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Reyes, G. (1995) *Los procedimientos de cita: estilo directo y estilo indirecto*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. (2003) *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roehrs, D. & Labelle, M. (2003) The left periphery in child French: Evidence for a simply-split CP. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001*, edited by Josep Quer, Jan Schrotten, Mauro Scorretti, Petra Sleeman & Els Verheugh, 279-294. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E.C. & Heine, B. (1991) *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Vol. I and II. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Trudgill, P. (2002) *Sociolinguistic variation and change*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- van Gelderen, E. (2004) *Economy against prescriptivism*. Plenary paper presented at LASSO (The Linguistic Association of the Southwest), New Orleans, September 10-12, 2004.
- van Valin, R.D. & LaPolla, R. (1997). *Syntax: Structures, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vaquero de Ramírez, M. (1996). *El español de América II: Morfosintaxis y léxico*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Weber, D.J. (1996) *Una gramática del quechua de Huallaga*. Lima, Perú: Ministerio de Educación / Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Wheeler, M. (1988) *Occitan. The Romance languages*, edited by Martin Harris & Nigel Vincent, 246-278. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wölck, W. (1987) *Pequeño breviario quechua*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Zagona, K. (2002) *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anna María Escobar

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign