4 Refined research questions

Before moving on to the actual analyses of Huari Spanish and Quechua intonation, this interim chapter serves to refine and expand the research questions based on the background provided in the two previous chapters. In the introduction, three broad leading questions (1), (2) and (3) were given, here repeated as (34)-(36) with their subquestions.

In large parts, this is an exploratory study on the prosody of two undescribed varieties of Spanish and Quechua, so even broad answers to these two questions should fill a research gap. However, based on the preceding theoretical discussion, all three of them can be further refined. Specifically, we can ask the expanded version of (1), (34), of both Huari Spanish and Quechua.

(34)   What are the relevant properties of the intonational systems of Huari Spanish and Huari Quechua?
    a.   What is their tonal inventory? Are tones only edge-seeking or can some be identified as pitch accents associated with a metrically strong position as well? How many options are available at each position?
    b.   What evidence is there for which levels of prosodic structure?
    c.   How are tones distributed across the units of the prosodic structure?

In particular for Quechua, one very important question regarding word prosody needs answering, without which the other questions cannot fully be answered. In the previous chapter, we saw that the evidence for word stress in Ancash Quechua varieties is mixed at best (section 3.3.3), especially when adopting a definition of word stress as culminative and obligatory, following Hyman (2014). Based on this discussion, the following question can be asked:
    d.   What evidence is there that pitch events in Huari Quechua are affected by a metrically strong position at the word level that falls under Hyman's definition of word stress? In particular, can stress-sensitive pitch events be disentangled from edge-seeking ones based on evidence from tonal alignment?

This is a question tailored to Huari Quechua, but it will be useful to compare Huari Quechua here to Huari Spanish, for which the assumption of word stress is much less controversial.

Regarding (2), it is in a sense itself a subquestion to (1), so its expanded questions (35) also can be brought to bear on answering the overall question which

prosodic properties are relevant. In section 3.7 the scope of this question was restricted in that mostly, only those kinds of discourse meanings that are collected under the header of information structure are in focus here. However, other kinds of discourse meanings and their cues also have to be taken into consideration to some extent in order to disentangle the cues for information structural meanings from them.

(35) How and what kinds of interactional/discourse meaning do they encode?
   a. To what extent are paradigmatic tone contrasts (different boundary tones and/or pitch accents, different nuclear configurations) used to encode discourse meanings?
   b. To what extent are syntagmatic tonal devices (phrasing via edge tones, deaccentuation/dephrasing etc.) used to encode discourse meanings?
   c. Are prosodic cues used on their own, or in conjunction with, or vicariously for, other cues to discourse meanings (word order, morphology, particles)?
   d. Can the role of tonal scaling be shown to be restricted to a "phonetic" scalar encoding of "emphasis"? Does it contribute to the paradigmatic tonal inventory, or is it used nonlocally to cue prosodic structure and discourse meaning, as described for a number of languages (cf. section 3.6)? What does this mean for whether the prosodic structure itself is recursive or not?

Along more theoretical lines, answering these questions will also shed light on a question that emerged in section 3.7.3, but whose complete answer this thesis cannot provide.
   e. Do the identified cues exhibit a direct or even biunivocal relation to the proposed categories of information structure and other discourse meanings, or is it more intermediate and distributional, like discussed in section 3.7.3? Does this have effects on the conception of these categories themselves, and what role does context play?

Finally, (3) can also be expanded, as (36).

(36) Which of these properties are specific to one language, and which are perhaps common to both?
   a. Based on the answers to (1)/(34), do the differences between Huari Spanish and Quechua occupy neatly definable positions along the typological dimensions laid out in section 3.4?
   b. Do their variation spaces overlap and how can this be shown?

    c.   Especially assuming that a considerable amount of variation will be found, what does this mean for prosodic typologies and their proposed objects, languages?

Not all of these questions will be answered to equal degrees of depth across both languages. (34)d is clearly more aimed at Huari Quechua. In contrast, (35)d will be more thoroughly explored for Huari Spanish than for Quechua. As the whole study employs various methods, the type of evidence brought to bear on each individual question also varies. Broadly speaking, sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2, and 6.1 aim at answering the first group of questions (34) for Huari Spanish and Quechua, respectively, with 6.1.6 particularly concerned with answering (34)d via a quantified comparison of peak alignment in Huari Quechua and Spanish. Sections 5.1.3 and 5.2, and 6.2 and 6.4, respectively, seek to provide answers to the second group of questions (35) for Huari Spanish and Quechua, with 5.2 and 6.4 both also particularly concerned with (35)d, but using different methods. I'm using the Spanish and Quechua OT-analyses in sections 5.3 and 6.3, respectively, as well as the concluding section 7.4, to tackle the third group of questions interested in the interrelationship of the prosodic systems (36). However, since the overarching goal of the study is to provide descriptions of the prosodic systems of the two languages, not each question has its own section where it is answered. Rather, the answers to the individual questions will result from the analyses as a whole.