1 Introduction

This thesis describes the intonation of two varieties of Spanish and Quechua that are spoken by the same bilingual speaker community in Huari, Peru. Spanish and Quechua are generally seen to be typologically quite different and genetically unrelated, but in large parts of Latin America they have had a common history of being spoken by the same people, in some cases for centuries. In Huari, both Quechua and Spanish are spoken by nearly everyone and used daily in interaction. This means that for a lot of daily communicative functions, Huari speakers have (at least) two ways of putting them into language at their disposal. The thesis (and the research project out of which it has emerged) takes as its basis the assumption that using equivalent communicative interactions as a third of comparison provides a unique opportunity for studying how one way of putting things into language differs from another. This allows us to see what kind of constraints are specific to only one of those ways (linguistic variants or systems), and which are perhaps shared. Doing this across different types of communicative situations even allows us to see what kinds of interactive functions (meanings) are encoded in what way in these systems.

Intonation is particularly interesting in this regard, since in many languages including Spanish it has been found to convey a variety of interactional meanings that have to do with how a discourse progresses, how knowledge is negotiated by its participants and what their subjective takes on it are. For Quechua on the other hand, many similar meanings have been found to be encoded via morphology, yet the question whether this means that intonation/prosody plays no role for the expression of such meanings in Quechua has mostly not been addressed. In order to be able to say something about what kinds of meaning the prosody of a language encodes, its prosodic system first has to be described. Yet for this, it is important to know what meanings there are present in the interaction. This last part is luckily broadly dealt with via the general methodology of comparing the same kinds of interactions across both languages. Thus this thesis proposes to describe the intonational systems of Huari Quechua and Huari Spanish (both previously undescribed) from observing their uses by the same speakers in similar interactions, and in this way to learn something about how the interactional meanings that can be found to play a role are encoded. This fills a research gap in that no detailed intonational and prosodic descriptions exist of varieties of Quechua or Spanish that are geographically or typologically close to those of Huari, and almost no studies that relate prosody to discourse meaning in a pair of varieties of these languages spoken in the same speaker community.

Therefore the leading questions, subject to further expansion and refinement (in chapter 4), are:

(1) What are the relevant properties of the intonational systems of Huari Spanish and Huari Quechua?

(2) How and what kinds of interactional/discourse meaning do they encode?

(3) Which of these properties are specific to one language, and which are perhaps common to both?

The third question has a subquestion that will resurface from time to time throughout the thesis, namely whether certain kinds of intonational systems lend themselves better to the encoding of meaning than others.

To answer these questions, the thesis is structured as follows. Chapter 2 gives a short introduction to Huari and the general method. Chapter 3 provides a theoretical background for the analytical chapters, introducing the models of intonational and pragmatic analysis used and their assumptions, as well as setting out the dimensions along which intonational systems have crosslinguistically been shown to vary. This is done because the prosody of Quechua is largely undescribed and some of the existing descriptions are potentially influenced by the perceptual filters of linguists reared on European languages. Since I am also a European linguist (and many of my readers will be, too), I try to work against this bias by initially mapping out what options are known to be possible and thus to expand the expectational horizon. Based on the theoretical discussion in chapter 3, chapter 4 then provides further refined research questions. Answers to them are then sought in the analytical chapters on Huari Spanish (chapter 5) and Huari Quechua (chapter 6) intonation. Finally, chapter 7 first summarizes the results from the analytical chapters and then concludes the thesis on a discussion of how some of the results from the two languages can be brought together.

Before heading into the fray, I should address the elephant in the room. This thesis is not about language contact as such, even though its object are two genetically unrelated language varieties spoken by the same bilingual speakers. I subscribe to the view that language contact is ubiquitous even in speaker communities traditionally considered monolingual, and thus a fundamental component of variation, which the thesis is very much about (cf. Mufwene 2001; Enfield 2014; Otheguy et al. 2015; Höder 2018). I will however make no claim about the origin of variable features that turn out to be shared between the two languages. It seems to me that the logic of assuming that a feature observed in Huari Spanish and Huari Quechua "comes from" Quechua "into" Spanish because it is not known from other

descriptions of Spanish is faulty in the circumstances of this project. It might well have been in existence in Huari Spanish for several generations, in which case it is simply part of Spanish for the speakers, or actually part of their repertoire across both languages. It might also have "come" from an as yet undescribed neighbouring variety of Spanish. Language contact only really becomes a meaningful concept once larger populations are considered diachronically. This thesis is a very localized and synchronic endeavour. My focus is on describing features of the prosodic systems in both languages and then comparing them, plausibilizing what can be thought of as common and convergent, or specific and divergent, in this speaker community. In any case, a detailed and empirically grounded description of what multilingual speakers can be seen to actually do at a certain point in time and space may serve as a data point for future studies that are interested in the possibility of the propagation of features across longer spatial and temporal distances.