Grammaticalization in the Evidential pathway of the Andean Spanish Present Perfect: Language contact as a trigger for language change
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Abstract

This work examines the development of the Spanish Present Perfect (PP) in an excolonial region where Spanish is in contact with Amerindian languages and argues for the inclusion of linguistic factors connected to ‘subjectivity’ and ‘information structure’ in the study of the PP, alongside the traditional temporal and aspectual factors. Perfects in the world’s languages derive from three main sources (BE/HAVE, COME, FINISH, Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994), but HAVE perfects (e.g., Spanish) are considered the least common pattern (WALS, Dahl & Velupillai 2013; Drinka 2017). Bybee et al. (1994) posit that only the stative source branches into two distinct grammaticalization pathways of the PP: the temporal (towards past/perfective) or the evidential (leading to (in)direct
There are exceptions to the temporal pathway in Romance: Dac-Romanian (Drinka 2017), Judeo-Spanish (Varol 2006), and Andean Spanish varieties (Escobar & Crespo del Río 2021) are argued to follow the evidential path that is in each case triggered by contact with a language or languages of families (Turkic or Quechumaran) that have evidential markers. Through detailed grammatical analyses of data from semi-structured conversations, the effects of subjectivity and information structure on the grammaticalization pathway of the PP in Andean Spanish varieties are established.

**Keywords:** present perfect, evidentiality, grammaticalization, language contact, Quechua, Spanish, Andean.

1. Introduction

In their widely cited cross-linguistic study, Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994: Ch. 3) proposed different sources for the emergence of perfects and forwarded hypotheses for their respective trajectories. The proposals are based on the analysis of grammatical markers found in 80 languages, selected based on their differences regarding language families and region of use. Any of the three sources, FINISH/directional, COME, or BE/HAVE auxiliaries, can develop into a Present Perfect with a Perfective or simple past function. Only the stative BE/HAVE auxiliaries, however, can evolve into either a perfective/simple past or an evidential. We will call these pathways, as in Figure 1, for the stative auxiliaries, the Tempo-Aspectual (Aoristic Drift) and the Evidential (Evidential Drift) pathways, respectively.

**Figure 1.** Grammaticalization Pathways of the Perfect

While there are many studies of the shift from Resultative to Perfective in languages, the path from resultative to (in)direct evidence, the evidential pathway, is understudied. This paper explores the evidential pathway and explores initial proposals on how that pathway could be operationalized across several factors in an environment heavily influenced by language contact.

Following Dahl & Velupillai’s (2013) review of 222 languages in *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, they find that Perfects derived from...
the possessive HAVE auxiliary are found only in Europe (blue dots in Figure 2). Thus, they are not considered frequent in the languages of the world.

**Figure 2.** Perfects in The World Atlas of Language Structures


**Source:** Dahl & Velupillai (2013); Feature 68A, https://wals.info

Some languages follow a two-way system, using BE and HAVE auxiliaries in the formation of the Present Perfect, such as French, Northern Italian, German, and Dutch. Others follow a one-way system using the possessive auxiliary HAVE, such as Spanish, Catalan, English, or use the possessive auxiliary TER, as Portuguese (Bybee et al. 1994; cf. Harris 1982; Detges 2000; Detges & Hedin 2000; Squartini & Bertinetto 2000; De Acosta 2011; Rebotier 2017; Drinka 2017). Wide variation is found among Romance languages with respect to the auxiliaries used with the Present Perfect (cf. Harris 1982; Detges 2000; Detges & Hedin 2000; Squartini & Bertinetto 2000; De Acosta 2011; Drinka 2017; Rebotier 2017).

In a detailed study on the evolution of Perfects, Drinka (2017) proposes the Charlemagne Sprachbund Hypothesis as explanatory to the various Perfect systems found in languages in Europe. The Hypothesis proposes sociohistorical and language contact explanations for the linguistic differences found in Europe. She argues that regions central to the Charlemagne Sprachbund, with Paris as the focus, show a two-way system (e.g., French, Northern Italian, and German). Regions peripheral to the central region, on the other hand, use a one-way system, such as Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese, Galician, and Southern Italian. Drinka’s account includes Greek and, particularly, the role of Latin, as the learned language, before and after the 9th century. The discussion also includes other languages in the region, including Arabic in the South-West region (in the Iberian Peninsula) and Turkic languages in the South-Eastern region (where it was in contact with some Slavic and Romance languages). Notwithstanding, Drinka’s (2017) detailed account focuses on the Tempo-Aspectual Pathway (the Aoristic Drift). It provides sociohistorical and linguistic explanations for why the Present Perfect in the languages in the Central Region of the Sprachbund have developed perfective functions before the peripheral regions. Drinka (2017) does not discuss the Evidential pathway but mentions some European Romance Perfects that have developed evidential meanings. These include Judezmo-Spanish (cf. Borne-Varol 2001; Varol 2006; Romero 2012; Friedman 2018); Daca-Romanian (cf. Drinka 2017); Aromanian (cf. Friedman 2018); and Megleno-Romanian (cf. Friedman...
2018), which is spoken in the Istanbul region by Sephardic Jews who migrated to the region after being expelled from Spain in 1492.

In Latin America, some Spanish varieties are also described as being on the Evidential Pathway. These are found in the Andean region (for Peru, cf. Schumacher 1975, 1980; Escobar 1993, 1997, 2000; Jara Yupanqui 2006, 2011, 2013, 2017; Howe 2006; 2013, 2018; García Tesoro 2015, 2018; García Tesoro & Jang 2018; González et al. 2018; Escobar & Crespo del Río 2021; Bateman 2022; for Bolivia, cf. Herrero 1969; Martín 1981; Laprade 1981; Hardman 1982, 1986; Stratford 1989, 1991; Mendoza 1991a, 1991b, 1992; Coello Vila 2017; Dankel & Soto 2012; Quartararo 2017; Dankel et al. 2022; for Ecuador, cf. Bustamante 1991; Dumont 2013; Pfänder & Palacios 2013; for Northern Argentina, Aleza Izquierdo 2010; cf. Howe & Schwenter 2003; González et al. 2018). All the cited studies for the Andean region attribute the evidential function found in past forms in Andean Spanish varieties to contact with Quechumaran languages. However, an Evidential Perfect is also found in a Portuguese variety, spoken in the Vaupes region where Tucanoan and Arawakan languages with evidential systems are spoken (Aikhenvald 2004: 298). Although contact-induced language change is an areally confined process resulting from specific historical events, as Drinka’s (2017) study shows, linguistic features, such as grammatical evidentiality, can also have areal distribution (Aikhenvald 2004: 288, 303; de Haan 2013). Since cross-linguistic studies find that grammaticalization pathways are maintained in contact situations (Heine & Kuteva 2002, 2005; Kuteva et al. 2019), the present study searches to better understand and propose the grammaticalization process that leads to the Andean Spanish Evidential Present Perfect in this context of areal language contact.

The Andean region represents a linguistic area where Spanish has been in intense contact with Andean languages for almost five hundred years. Although a linguistic area, the Andean region does show some differences. While the Present Perfect in Peruvian and Bolivian Spanish can express direct evidence (1), the Present Perfect in Ecuadorian Spanish expresses reportative evidence (2). This paper focuses on the Evidential function that they all share and forwards a hypothesis for its emergence.

(1) Direct1 (Escobar 1997: 864)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Est-ve} & \text{un} & \text{mes} & \text{no} & \text{más} & \text{no} & \text{más} \\
\text{be-PST.PFV} & \text{DET.INDF.M} & \text{month} & \text{NEG} & \text{more} & \text{NEG} & \text{more} \\
\text{[en mi tierra]} & \text{después} & \text{me} & \text{regres-é} & / & \text{me} \\
\text{[in my native land]} & \text{later} & \text{REFL.1SG} & \text{return-PST.PFV.1SG} & \text{MID.1SG} \\
\text{enferm-é} & \text{[mientras allá]} & \text{mi} & \text{garganta} & \text{se} \\
\text{sick-PST.PFV.1SG} & \text{[while over there]} & \text{POSS.1SG} & \text{throat} & \text{MID.3SG} \\
\text{ha} & \text{cerr-ado} & \text{y} & \text{todo} & \text{me} & \text{ha} \\
\text{AUX.PRS.3SG} & \text{close-PST.PTCP} & \text{CONJ} & \text{all} & \text{MID.1SG} & \text{AUX.PRS.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

1 Verbs in the Preterite (PST.PFV) are underlined, and verbs in the Present Perfect (PRF) are bolded.
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Example (1) also illustrates the use of the Andean Spanish Present Perfect in narrative sequenced events. These contexts are characteristic of the Perfective Present Perfect found in Peninsular Spanish varieties that are more innovative (cf. Schwenter 1994; Howe 2013: 65-71). We will argue that the Andean Spanish examples do not have a tempo-aspectual function here.

This paper is part of a larger project to uncover semantic components that can be used in the study of any Present Perfect with the objective of helping determine whether the Present Perfect under study is following the tempo-aspectual or the evidential pathway. Other efforts to uncover semantic factors for the grammaticalization of the Spanish Present Perfect have focused mainly on tempo-aspectual factors (Schwenter 1994; Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2008), even when confronting evidentiality (Howe 2013).²

Studies on Romance languages (cf. Harris 1982; Detges 2000; Detges & Hedin 2000; Squartini & Bertinetto 2000; De Acosta 2011; Drinka 2017; Rebotier 2017), in particular, have assumed the tempo-aspectual pathway in historical studies of the Present Perfect. Research on Spanish or Portuguese in Latin America, however, cannot make that assumption due to the presence of numerous Amerindian languages with grammatical evidential systems in the region, as can be seen in Table 1, with examples of languages that have been studied.

² Howe (2013) approaches the possibility of evidentiality in the Peruvian Andean Present Perfect from a tempo-aspectual perspective.
### Table 1. Amerindian languages with evidential grammatical systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amerindian Language</th>
<th>Language Family</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amerindian Language</th>
<th>Language Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Mapudungun</td>
<td>Araucanian</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Warao</td>
<td>Warao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Selk’nam</td>
<td>Chonan</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Ika</td>
<td>Chibchan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Guarani</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Sanuma</td>
<td>Yanomam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Sirionó</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Yanomani</td>
<td>Yanomam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baure</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Camsá</td>
<td>Camá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itonama</td>
<td>Itonama</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Páez</td>
<td>Páezan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Araona</td>
<td>Tacanan</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Epena Pedee</td>
<td>Choco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacana</td>
<td>Tacanan</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Bora</td>
<td>Huitotoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ese Eja</td>
<td>Tacanan</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Tariana</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chácobo</td>
<td>Panoan</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Tucano</td>
<td>Tucanoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quechua</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Correguaje</td>
<td>Tucanoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aymara</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Retuáran</td>
<td>Tucanoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Quechua</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Carapana</td>
<td>Tucanoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aymara</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Tuyuca</td>
<td>Tucanoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaqi</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Barasano</td>
<td>Tucanoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipibo-Konibo</td>
<td>Panoan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Andoke</td>
<td>Andoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ese Eja</td>
<td>Tacanan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Hup</td>
<td>Nadahup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piro</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Tzotzil (S)</td>
<td>Mayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanti</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>Hokan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amuesha</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Quechán</td>
<td>Hokan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amahuaca</td>
<td>Panoan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Tarahumara</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cocama</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Nevome</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iquito</td>
<td>Zaparoan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsafiki</td>
<td>Piro</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Tepehuan</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siona</td>
<td>Nanti</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Guarajito</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kichwa</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Waorani</td>
<td>Ese Eja</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Purépecha</td>
<td>Tarascan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsafiki</td>
<td>Piro</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Otomi</td>
<td>Oto-Manguean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siona</td>
<td>Nanti</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Mixtec</td>
<td>Oto-Manguean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kichwa</td>
<td>Quechuanaran</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Chinantec</td>
<td>Oto-Manguean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** de Haan (2013); Aikhenvald (2004); Adelaar (2004); cf. Zúñiga (2000); Estrada-Fernández et al. (2015); Kuteva et al. (2019)

Aikhenvald (2004: 288, 303) reminds us that grammatical evidentiality has ‘areal distribution’ and is found mainly in Eurasia and the Americas. Spanish and Portuguese Latin American varieties, in an excolonial region,3 are thus of particular interest for studying the Present Perfect tempo-aspectual and evidential pathways since language contact might lead to some varieties of the same language following a different pathway (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2002, 2005).

The next section details the field of evidentiality and its pathway in the Present Perfect’s evolution. Three factors inter-connected with evidentiality are presented in separate sections and exemplified: subjectivity, the affected subject, and information structure. The data come from the Spanish-Quechua Diachronic Corpus of the Central Andes (SQDCCA), a modern corpus of Peruvian Spanish varieties. It comes from conversations with native speakers of Andean Spanish.

---

3 The term ‘excolonial’ is used intentionally to highlight social structures still present in the region due to its particular sociohistory (cf. Mufwene 2001, 2008).
from the central-south region of the Peruvian Andes, and represents life stories and speakers’ use of Quechua and Spanish. The speakers are all bilinguals who have used both languages since childhood. The data presented here were collected in the late 1980s and are part of a larger diachronic corpus spanning fifty years (1960s-2015). Transcriptions from six participants are used here.4

2. Evidentiality

Evidentiality is a verbal grammatical category that is found marked grammatically in 25% of languages of the world, including Andean languages (Aikhenvald 2004: 1; de Haan 2013). These grammatical markers express an obligatory category that has the whole speech event as its scope (Aikhenvald 2004: 96), is different from epistemic or any other modality (Aikhenvald 2004: 7), and is connected to what is being discussed and the Speech Act Participants (cf. Howard 2018). Their core meaning is making reference to the “source of information” (Aikhenvald 2004: 7). Boas calls it “expressing the source of subjective knowledge” (1911: 443), which highlights the perspective of the speaker in coding evidentiality in language. We argue here that in addition to subjectivity-related factors (Escobar & Crespo del Río 2021), variables connected to ‘information structure’ can help us better understand the grammaticalization of the Present Perfect from a broader perspective that includes the two grammaticalization pathways proposed in Bybee et al. (1994) for BE/HAVE perfects.

In a 1988 cross-linguistic study on grammatical evidentiality, Willett uncovers a complex set of semantic distinctions expressed in evidential systems, presented in Table 2. Depending on the language, these systems can vary from including only two to more than five distinctions, with the opposition between the direct and indirect source of knowledge being the most common (Aikhenvald 2004: Ch. 2; cf. Chafe & Nichols 1986; Aikhenvald & Dixon 2003; Aikhenvald 2018).

---

4 The SQDCCA includes data sets collected in the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and in 2015. It includes recordings from native speakers of Quechua (1960’s), as well as from second language (1960s, 1980s) and native speakers of Andean Spanish (1960s and 1980s). Additional data from highly educated speakers born in the capital (considered the Peruvian norm) include speakers with three-generations (1980s; cf. Caravedo 1989) and first-generation (2015) born in Lima. The corpora includes over 200 speakers. For purposes of this preliminary study, we focus on data (24,970 words) from six native speakers of Andean Spanish (1980s), and the 920 past-tense verbal tokens found in the recordings. There are 155 Present Perfect tokens, and 334 Preterite tokens. The first six transcriptions were chosen.
Table 2. Evidentiality: source of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Sources of Information</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>Auditive</td>
<td>Other sensory</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.1 Evidentiality in Amerindian Languages

Evidentials in Andean languages were first mentioned in grammars written by clergy in the early colonial period, in the 16th century, as efforts to evangelize the Indigenous communities (e.g., Santo Tomás 1560). However, it is not until the late 20th and early 21st centuries when Quechumaran evidentials are studied more extensively (e.g., Cusihuamán 1975; Soto Ruiz 1975; Hardman 1986; Weber 1986, 1996; Cerrón-Palomino 1987, 2008; Wölck 1987; Faller 2002, 2004, 2017, 2020; Diane Hintz 2007; Daniel Hintz 2011, 2017; Hintz & Hintz 2017). Andean languages distinguish between two to more than five evidential meanings, depending on the dialect. The Peruvian and Bolivian varieties show a minimum of three distinctions. In some Peruvian varieties of Central Quechua, evidential markers can be more specific and encode whether the knowledge is just of the speaker or if it is shared with the interlocutor. It also has a separate marker for traditional/folklore stories (Diane Hintz 2007; Daniel Hintz 2011, 2017; Hintz & Hintz 2017; Howard 2018). In Peruvian and Bolivian Andean Spanish varieties, the Present Perfect is used with a direct evidence function, and it contrasts with the Pluperfect that expresses reported evidence. In Ecuadorian Andean Spanish, the Present Perfect is used with reportative function, and it contrasts with the Preterite (Bustamante 1991; Dumont 2013).

In Table 3, we find the Quechua evidential markers found in all the Peruvian and Bolivian varieties. These discourse-level markers interact with a set of past verbal-markers, as shown in (3) and (4). Quechua evidential markers do not occur post-verbally (Muysken 1995: 383, 385).

Table 3. Quechua evidential markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Marker</th>
<th>Imatatak ruwachkan</th>
<th>‘What is Felipe doing?’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct knowledge –m(i)</td>
<td>Papata-m rantichkan.</td>
<td><em>(I know/I saw) He is selling potatoes</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reportative –s(i)</td>
<td>Papata-s rantichkan</td>
<td><em>(I was told) He is selling potatoes</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjecture –ch(i)</td>
<td>Papata-ch rantichkan</td>
<td><em>(I gather that) He is selling potatoes</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(3) Reportative

Pay-si sacha-sacha-pi puri-chka-sqa-Ø
3-EV.REP tree-tree-LOC walk-PROG-PST.REP-3
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Machaqway-ta saru-yku-\texttt{sqa}\texttt{-Ø}. serpent-ACCUS step-PFV-PST.REP-3

Machaqway chanka-n-pi kachu-rqu-\texttt{sqa}\texttt{-Ø}. serpent leg-3.POSS-LOC bite-PFV-PST.REP-3

'(I was told) She/he was walking in the forest. She/he stepped unexpectedly on a serpent. The serpent bit his leg'.

(4) Witnessed

\texttt{Ñoqa-m} sacha-sacha-pi puri-chka-\texttt{rqa}-ni.
1SG-EV.DIR tree-tree-LOC walk-PROG-PST-1SG

Machaqway-ta saru-yku-\texttt{rqa}-ni. Machaqway chanka-y-pi
serpent-ACCUS step-PFV-PST-1 serpent leg-1.POSS-LOC

kachu-rqu-\texttt{rqa}-ni.
bite-PFV-PST-1

'(direct knowledge) I was walking in the forest. I stepped unexpectedly on a serpent. The serpent bit my leg.'

Narrative (3) is an example of indirect evidence, and (4) of direct evidence. Note that in both examples, the evidential markers appear after the first element in the discourse. They do not need to be present at the start of each subsequent sentence since their scope is the narrative and recoverable from the context (Weber 1986; Soto Ruiz 1975; Cusihuamán 1975; Cerrón 1986; Faller 2002, 2004, 2017, 2020; Diane Hintz 2007; cf. Aikhenva\textsubscript{ld} 2004: 79). Notice, as well, that each evidential marker interacts with specific past-aspectual affixes.\textsuperscript{5} The narratives also exemplify Quechua as a predominantly SOV language.

2.2 Connecting Evidentiality and the Present Perfect

Evidentiality marking in Quechua is described as a ‘social interactive phenomenon’ between the speaker and its interlocutor (Nuckolls & Michael 2012; Howard 2018). As such, grammatical evidential markers encompass information about the discourse, and with respect to the speech-event participants, all from the narrator’s point of view (Howard 2018; Nucholls 2018). The communicative and social components of Quechua evidentiality have led researchers to describe evidentiality as pervasive in Quechua face-to-face communication (Hardman

\textsuperscript{5} While reportative evidential $s(i)$ interacts with past reportative affix $sqa$ (3), the direct evidential $m(i)$ interacts with the past tense suffix $rqa$ (4). Notice, as well, that perfective suffixes $yku$ and $rqu$ can appear with either past tense markers: $sqa$ (3) and $rqa$ (4) (cf. Daniel Hintz 2011, 2017). Thus, evidentiality is expressed in different types of markers, and can derive different nuances depending on what other aspectual markers appear in the sentence. Notice the combination of $yku + sqa/rqu$ in (3) and (4) which provide nuanced readings of mirativity and/or unexpectedness.
1986; Weber 1986; cf. Aikhenvald 2004: 297; Diane Hinton 2007; Nuckolls & Michael 2012; Howard-Valverde 2018; Nuckolls 2018). The perspective of the speaker is, then, fundamental to understanding Quechua evidentials, which leads us to propose our first set of semantic components under the concept of subjectivity.

3. Subjectivity

Benveniste defined subjectivity as the speaker’s ability to refer to herself as the ‘subject’ of the sentence using the first-person pronoun ‘I’ (Benveniste 1958: 224-5). The use of the first-person in combination with evidential markers of direct evidence has been called the first-person effect (Aikhenvald 2004: 220), highlighting the deictic function of references to the speaker in the discourse (e.g., Howard 2018: 4). Aikhenvald (2004: 297) defines it as a basic semantic universal found in even “small evidential systems” with only direct/non-direct distinctions. The ‘first-person effect’ highlights the fact that the first-person is relevant in all participant roles (Aikhenvald 2004: 154-159, 217-8) and that the high presence of verbs of cognition, perception, and emotion, particularly in the first-person, is a consequence of this effect (Aikhenvald 2004: 155, 159; cf. Escobar & Crespo del Río 2021).

In an earlier study, Escobar & Crespo del Río (2021) found that the first-person favored the Peruvian Andean Spanish Present Perfect in any participant role, particularly in the subject role. Other factors connected to subjectivity included the tendency to favor subject pronoun expression (SPE), in a Spanish variety found to use SPE at the lower end of frequencies in monolingual varieties, 15.1% (Cerrón-Palomino 2019). An additional favoring factor was the presence of a non-agentive subject,\(^6\) which emerged as significant with Present Perfect verbs. These four factors, in Table 4, define the first group of semantic components under the umbrella of ‘subjectivity’. It will be argued that these factors help favor the grammaticalization ‘process of subjectification’ (Traugott 2010; Traugott & Dasher 2005: 19ff) of the Peruvian Andean Spanish Present Perfect towards its evidential function for direct evidence.

Table 4. Factors favoring the Present Perfect grammaticalization process of subjectification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Favoring Values for Evidential Present Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Person</td>
<td>1st Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker expressed in the sentence</td>
<td>70%+ Subj role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Pronoun Expression</td>
<td>54% SPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentivity of Subject</td>
<td>[- agentive]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Escobar & Crespo del Río (2021); cf. Traugott (2010)

\(^6\) Following Van Valin (2005: 53-54), we use the terms ‘agentive’ and ‘non-agentive’ subjects to refer to the thematic roles of the subject. We define an ‘agentive subject’ as having the thematic role of ‘agent.’ ‘Non-agentive subjects’ can have any of the other thematic roles, e.g., experiencer, recipient, patient. They constitute the category of ‘affected subjects’.
Certain verbs take a non-agentive subject, depending on the semantic class of the verb (Van Valin 2005: Chapter 2). These include the verbs listed in Table 5, known as unaccusatives (Perlmutter 1978), cognitive, perception, and the different types of emotive verbs, following Ganeshan (2015). Other verbs in this group are statives, uncontrolled activities, and semelfactives.

Table 5. Verbs with a non-agentive subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaccusatives</td>
<td>morir</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>creer</td>
<td>‘think’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>ver</td>
<td>‘see’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive 1 (Nominative Experiencer)</td>
<td>querer</td>
<td>‘love/want’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive 2 (Dative Experiencer)</td>
<td>gustar</td>
<td>‘like/please’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive 3 (Accusative/Dative Experiencer)</td>
<td>preocuparse</td>
<td>‘worry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statives</td>
<td>vivir</td>
<td>‘live’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semelfactives</td>
<td>estornudar</td>
<td>‘sneeze’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Van Valin (2005: Ch. 2); cf. Perlmutter (1978); Ganeshan (2015)

In Quechua, subject agentivity differences can be coded grammatically. The same root can assign a different semantic role to the subject, depending on the grammatical marker that accompanies the lexical-base expression, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Quechua agentive grammatical markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Quechua</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb + Subject [-agentive]</td>
<td>wañu</td>
<td>‘to die’</td>
<td>‘morir’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + Subject [+agentive]</td>
<td>wañu-chi-</td>
<td>‘to kill’</td>
<td>‘matar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>wañu-q</td>
<td>‘dead (person)’</td>
<td>‘muerto’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wañu-chi-q</td>
<td>‘killer (person)’</td>
<td>‘asesino’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Soto Ruiz (1975); Cusihuamán (1975); Weber (1996); Itier (2013)

The presence of the speaker in the subject role also suggests the pre-verbal position as a focal position for an affected participant. Moreover, the sentence-initial position is described as the focal position in Quechua (cf. Muntendam 2009) and is the preferred focal position in Andean Spanish varieties (Escobar 2000: Chap. 4; Muntendam 2009). In a study on (Conchucos) Quechua evidentiality, Diane Hintz (2007: 112) finds that subject affect and the narrative structure are intrinsically linked. Therefore, Subject-Verb word order and the role of one-argument constructions are considered in the analysis, as seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Factors favoring the affectedness of the syntactic subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Favoring Values for Evidential Present Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>[-agentive] Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences with one argument</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Verb Word Order</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Escobar (2000); Muntendam (2009); Diane Hintz (2007)
Affectedness is analyzed in this study from the perspective of the subject of the construction. Thus, the focus differs from work by Tsunoda (1985) and von Heusinger & Kaiser (2011), who focus on the affectedness of objects in transitive sentences. In the next section, we center on the affected subject to uncover further factors that can be used to track the development of the evidential perfect.

4. Affected Subject

In Escobar & Crespo del Río (2021), PP and PRT forms had similar telic and atelic verb percentages. In studies of the Present Perfect following the Temporal-Aspectual pathway, a similar result is interpreted as evidence for the emergence of a Perfective function in the Present Perfect, as is for Peninsular Spanish (Schwenter & Torres Caccoullos 2008) and Porteño Spanish (Rodríguez-Louro 2016). However, this high presence of telic verbs in the PP is interpreted here as additional evidence for favoring non-agentive subjects relevant to an evidential function. Thus, a closer look at the verbs that appear with the Present Perfect is required.

Since non-agentive (or affected) subjects can be found in transitive or intransitive constructions, we analyze all subjects in our corpus. In cross-linguistic studies, the Unaccusative-Unergative Hierarchy is used to determine intransitive systems (Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000). However, since intransitives in Spanish can have an agentive or non-agentive subject, in order to better operationalize the relationship between the telicity of the verb and the affectedness of the subject in intransitives, we use the Unergative-Unaccusative Hierarchy, proposed by Perlmutter (1978), as a starting point to differentiate verbs, as in Table 8. This scale is also used to study two-auxiliary systems of the present perfect (e.g., Drinka 2017).

Table 8. The Unergative-Unaccusative Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Unergativity</th>
<th>Controls of Non-Motional Activity: hablar ‘talk’, comer ‘eat’, trabajar ‘work’, dormir ‘sleep’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Non-Motional Activity</td>
<td>corre ‘run’, caminar ‘walk’, nadar ‘swim’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Motional Activity</td>
<td>estornudar ‘sneeze’, temblar ‘tremble’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrolled Process (Activity)</td>
<td>ser ‘be’, estar ‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a state</td>
<td>sobrevivir ‘survive’, vivir ‘live’, quedarse ‘remain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Motion</td>
<td>subir ‘go up’, bajar ‘descend’, trepar ‘climb’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally-caused change of state</td>
<td>florecer ‘bloom’, crecer ‘grow’, podrirse ‘decay’, morir ‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally-caused change of state</td>
<td>romper ‘break’, cerrar ‘close’, hervir ‘boil’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of location</td>
<td>llegar ‘arrive’, caerse ‘fall’, venir ‘come’, ir a ‘go to’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Perlmutter (1978); McKoon (2000); Sorace (2000); Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000); Van Valin (2005); Drinka (2017)

7 Escobar & Crespo del Río (2021) focus on linguistic factors that help define subjectivity. This diachronic study contrasts verbal patterns found in narratives from native Andean Spanish speakers from the 1960s and 1980s, with speakers from the capital, Lima (considered the Peruvian Spanish norm), who in addition are either third-generation (1980s) or first-generation (2015) born in Lima.
Unergative verbs (with a white background) are described as having a ‘deep agent subject’. In contrast, unaccusative verbs (with a dark green background) have a ‘non-agentive subject’, described as a ‘deep patient subject’ (Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach 2016: 392). These verbs represent the extreme ends of the Unaccusative-Unergative Hierarchy (Table 8). In addition to these verbs, in our analysis, we also consider cognitive (saber ‘know,’ pensar ‘think’), perception (ver ‘see,’ escuchar ‘hear,’ tocar ‘touch’), communication (decir ‘say’), and adative (ir ‘go’) verbs, which have been found to grammaticalize to evidential markers in some languages of the world (Kuteva et al. 2019). The adative verb ir ‘go’ is already included under the Unaccusative-Unergative Hierarchy because of its telic status, under change of location. Many of these verbs can also be transitive or intransitive and will be coded in the analysis as such. Emotive verbs, mentioned earlier, are also coded in the data.

Figure 3 shows the percentage of Present Perfect with non-agentive (or affected) subjects within each type of verb appearing below. The total percentage of Present Perfect verbs that appeared with an affected subject was 86%. PPs with activity and communication verbs appeared mainly with an agentive subject.

**Figure 3.** Percentage of Present Perfect with an affected subject within each type of verb

![Graph showing percentage of Present Perfect with affected subjects](image)

**Source:** Data extracted from SQDCCA

*Activity* verbs with an affected subject appeared in passive constructions (5) or had an inanimate subject as in (6).

(5) *Activity* verb with [-agentive] subject in a passive construction (SQDCCA.EA.803.140)\(^8\):

```
Por ejemplo, conoc-iendo el evangelio, por quién
```

for example  know-GER DET.DEF.M gospel  by who.Q

---

\(^8\) The code appearing before each example represents information on the origin of the example, referring to corpus, subcorpus, recording, and line in the transcript. The present perfect under discussion appears bolded in the example, and underlined in the transcription.
ha  s-ido  escri-t-o,  cómo  ha
AUX.PRS.3SG  be-PST.PTCP  write-PST.PTCP-M  how.Q  AUX.PRS.3SG
tien-e  para  nosotros
have-PRS.3SG  for  1.PL-M-PL

‘For example, knowing the Gospel of Saint John, by whom it has been written, how it has been written, and what messages it has for us.’

(6) Activity verb with a [-agentive] subject (SQDCCA.EA.803.438):

ha-y  much-a-s  cos-a-s  en  es-a
have-PRS.3SG  many-F-SG  thing-F-PL  in  that.DEM-F
cultura,  por  ejemplo.  Bueno,  me  [ha]
culture  for  example  well  MID.1SG  AUX.PRS.3SG

agarr-ado  l-a  pregunta…
catch-PST.PTCP  DET.DEF-F  question

‘There are many things in that culture [the Quecha], for example. Well, the question has caught me … [= I cannot think of examples right now]’

Some communication and cognitive verbs appeared with an agentive subject. In the case of the communication verbs, the contrast suggests a lexical distinction between verbs that appeared with the agentive versus the non-agentive (or affected) subject. Within communication verbs, the verb contar as in ‘tell a story’ or llamar ‘call’, in (7), were used with an agentive subject. The verb hablar ‘speak, talk’, on the other hand, as in ‘to speak Quechua’ was used with a non-agentive (or affected) subject, with a meaning closer to ‘to know Quechua’, as in (8).

(7) Communication verb with [+agentive] subject: contar ‘to tell’ (SQDCCA.EA.806.158)

ha-y  otr-a-s  emple-ad-a-s  que  me
exist-PRS.3SG  other-F-PL  work-PST.PTCP-F-PL  REL  DAT.1SG

ha-n  cont-ado  que  le-s  grit-a,
AUX-PRT.3-PL  tell-PST.PTCP  REL  DAT.3-PL  shout-PRS.3SG

le-s  hace  vida  imposible
DET.3-PL  make-PRS.3SG  life  impossible
‘there are other female workers that have told me that (she) shouts at them, that (she) makes life impossible’

(8) *Communication* verb with [-agentive] subject: *hablar* ‘to speak’ (SQDCCA.EA.806.36)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{algun-a-s} & \quad \text{cuant-a-s} & \quad \text{palabra-s} & \quad \text{le} & \quad \text{contest-ab}a \\
\text{some-F-PL} & \quad \text{few-F-PL} & \quad \text{word-PL} & \quad \text{DAT.3SG} & \quad \text{answer-IPFV.3SG} \\
\text{en quechua.} & \quad \text{Sí, } & \quad \text{he} & \quad \text{lleg-ado} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{aprend-er} \\
\text{in Quechua} & \quad \text{yes} & \quad \text{AUX.PRS.1SG} & \quad \text{arrive-PST.PTCP} & \quad \text{to} & \quad \text{learn-INF} \\
\text{un} & \quad \text{poc-o,} & \quad \text{como} & \quad \text{tod-o,} & \quad \text{no} & \quad \text{no} \\
\text{DET.INDF.M} & \quad \text{little-M} & \quad \text{as} & \quad \text{everything-M.SG} & \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{NEG} \\
& \quad \text{[he]} & \quad \text{habl-a[d]o} & \quad \text{[quechua]}. & \quad \text{AUX.PRS.1SG} & \quad \text{speak-PST.PTCP} & \quad \text{Quechua} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘a few words I answered to her in Quechua. Yes, I have gotten to learn some, in all [in spite of everything], I have not spoken [Quechua].’

Whether there is a lexical preference in contrasting verbs according to the subject agency in Andean Spanish remains to be studied. In Quechua, these distinctions are mainly done with enclitics, as seen earlier.\(^9\)

With cognitive verbs, clearer lexical distinctions were found, similar to what we find in English, between *aprender* ‘to learn’, with a non-agentive subject, as in (9), and *enseñar* ‘to teach’, with an agentive subject, as in (10).

(9) *Cognitive* verb with [-agentive] subject: *aprender* ‘to learn’ (SQDCCA.EA.803.235)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{siempre} & \quad \text{ha} & \quad \text{est-ado} & \quad \text{rode-ado} & \quad \text{de} \\
\text{always} & \quad \text{AUX.PRS.3SG} & \quad \text{be-PST.PTCP} & \quad \text{surround-PST.PTCP} & \quad \text{of} \\
\text{quechua,} & \quad \text{pero} & \quad \text{no} & \quad \text{ha} & \quad \text{aprend-ido.} \\
\text{Quechua} & \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{AUX.PRS.3SG} & \quad \text{learn-PST.PTCP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘[she, the young daughter] has been surrounded by Quechua but has not learned.’

(10) *Cognitive* verb with [+agentive] subject: *enseñar* ‘to teach’ (SQDCCA.EA.808.167)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[mi mamá]} & \quad \text{es} & \quad \text{un-a} & \quad \text{mujer} & \quad \text{que} \\
\text{POSS.1SG mother be.3SG DET.INDF-F woman REL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^9\) Such as with the verbal base *wañu*- ‘to die’, which with the causative enclitic –*chi* becomes *wañu-chi*- ‘to kill.’ See further examples in Table 10.
se ha desarrollado en zona muy difícil es, en zona rural. Ha enseñado donde

develop-PST.PTCP in region very difficult-PL in region rural AUX.PRS.3SG teach- PST.PTCP

en donde tenía que ir a caballo.

in where have-PST.IPFV COMP go-INF on horse-M

'[my mother] is a woman who has grown in a very difficult region, in rural areas. [She] has taught where she had to go on a horse.'

All the other verbs that appeared with the Present Perfect had an affected (or non-agentive) subject, characteristic of their semantic class. These included emotive verbs, as in (11), and perception verbs, as in (12). Stative and unaccusative verbs showed the highest percentages with a Present Perfect. Examples are found in (13), for statives, and in (14) and (15) for unaccusatives. Example (14) includes a verb of change of state, and example (15) a verb of change of location.

(11) *Emotive* verb (SQDCCA.EA.808.162):

Aparte de que yo ... desde secundaria, yo siempre me ha gustado ser líder.

Besides, I, since high school, I, always, being a leader has pleased me’

(12) *Perception* verb (SQDCCA.EA.808.90):

pero mi-s abuel-o-s para hac-er-se entender ten-ía-n que habl-ar-le-s en quechua. Sí, ha escuchado quechua no

but my grandparents, to make themselves be understood, [others] had to speak to them in Quechua. Yes. Have you heard [Quechua], no?’

(13) *Stative* verb (SQDCCA.EA.807.225):

un-o-s ha-n continuado su educación

some-M-PL AUX.PRS.3-PL continue-PST.PTCP POSS.3 educate-NMLZ
Some have continued their education here, others, no. [They] have stayed with what they learned over there.

(14) **Unaccusative** verb - change of state (SQDCCA.EA.801.273):

```
he ten-idó desde chiqu-it-a así [ mi
AUX.PRS.1 have-PST.PTCP since little-DIM-F like this POSS.1
]

peló ] o sea ten-fá más crespo pero me
hair that is have-PST.PFV.3 more curly but MID.1SG

[ he ] cort-ado varia-s vec-es
AUX.PRS.1 cut-PST.PTCP many-PL time-PL
```

‘I have had [my hair] since little like this / that is I used to have more curls, but I have cut [my hair ‘to myself’] several times.’

(15) **Unaccusative** verb - change of location (SQDCCA.EA.801.37):

```
a Lima yo he ven-idó todavía a
SBJ.1SG AUX.PRS.1 come-PST.PTCP not yet at

l-o-s diec-i-ocho año-s un-a vez
DET.DEF-M-PL ten-and-eight year-PL DET.INDF-F time

que termin-é l-a secund-aria
COMP finish-PST.PFV.1SG DET.DEF-F second-NOMLZ
```

‘to Lima, I have come only at eighteen years of age / once that I finished high school’

The distribution of the Present Perfect and the Preterite by the semantic class of the verb is similar in our data. In the case of communication verbs, a minor difference suggests the lexical distinction found in the data, as illustrated in (7) and (8). Notwithstanding, all PP and PRT verbs, regardless of the semantic class they appear with, behave similarly. This suggests that their presence in the narrative responds to discourse strategies connected to the *information structure* (Aikhenvald 2020) and not to the verb’s semantic class.
5. Information structure

Earlier studies on Andean Spanish have shown that pre-verbal and sentence-initial positions are favored in Andean Spanish as focal positions (Escobar 2000: Chap. 4; Muntendam 2009). We argue here that subject position, as well as pre-verbal and sentence-initial positions, all relevant in Andean Spanish, seem to respond to the discourse strategy that we call the pre-verbal position effect in Andean Spanish. We hypothesize that this is an encompassing focal position used in Andean Spanish to highlight information relevant to the narrative and, thus, is connected to the dynamics of the narration and the speech participants.

We first look at intransitives and transitives to find further evidence, as they are two universal verb types that take various types of constructions (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000; Haspelmath & Müller-Bardey 2008; Zúñiga & Kittalä 2019). Moreover, research shows that valency alternation (between one- and two-argument constructions) has been found to have pragmatic functions and can be used as a narrative strategy in languages of the world (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000: 17-38; Nichols et al. 2004; cf. Zúñiga & Kittalä 2019). Since the corpora used in this study come from natural speech, we follow the recommendations found in the literature for defining intransitives for the analysis, particularly those found in reference to Transitivity, Valency, and Grammatical Voice (Hopper & Thompson’s classic 1980 study; Dixon & Aikhenvald’s 2000 book on Valency; and Zúñiga & Kittalä’s book 2019 on Grammatical Voice). The coding of the constructions in the data, as intransitive or transitive, followed the guidelines presented in Table 9. The main criterion for the distinction is based on the number of participants expressed in the sentence and the thematic roles of the subject and the object.

Table 9 includes verb-types presented earlier and adds constructions that have one or two participants, as defined previously. Constructions that were either passive, made use of Spanish middle-*se*, impersonal, or had a transitive verb with a null direct object were all classified under ‘intransitives.’ Constructions with an expressed direct object, ditransitives, and causatives were all classified under ‘transitive’. Attributive constructions were not included in the analysis. The standing hypothesis for our study is that the favoring of intransitives, i.e., of one-participant constructions (only the subject), by the Present Perfect would further suggest the favoring of a syntactic context where the subject is more salient.10

---

10 Because most verbs under the ‘intransitive’ column in Table 9 have an ‘affected subject’ (or non-agentive subject), the thematic role of the subject of these intransitives would be congruent with the ‘subjectivity effect’ discussed in section 3, and the ‘affected subject’ discussion in section 4.
Table 9. Valency coding: intransitive and transitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRANSITIVE</th>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unergative-unaccusative hierarchy (includes statives, uncontrolled activity) communication cognitive emotive (I, II, III) perception</td>
<td>stative controlled activity communication cognitive emotive (I) perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle se</td>
<td>ditransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive + null-DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Hopper & Thompson (1980); Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000); Zúñiga & Kittalä (2019); cf. Hopper & Thompson (1980); Van Valin (2005); Drinka (2017); Ganeshan (2015); Kuteva et al. (2019)

The corpus has 61% intransitive constructions, represented in the green dotted line, as shown in Figure 4, and representing the corpus norm, as reference. Regarding the Present Perfect and the Preterite, while 75% of the Present Perfect verbs appear in intransitive constructions, only 63% of the preterites appear in these constructions as well. While the Preterite follows the corpus norm, the Present Perfect exceeds it. Regarding the affected (non-agentive) subjects with the Present Perfect and the Preterite, the Present Perfect exceeds the corpus norm, with 85 percent, while the Preterite follows the corpus norm (with 71 percent). These results suggest that the Present Perfect has a preference for intransitive constructions and affected subjects. This high presence of one-argument constructions suggests a detransitivizing preference for the Andean Spanish Present Perfect, as has been argued for Quechua (Nichols et al. 2004; Zúñiga & Kittalä 2019; Molina-Vital, in progress).

Figure 4. Distribution of past verbal forms within intransitive constructions, and in constructions with an affected subject

Source: Data extracted from SQDCCA
Figure 5. Expressed subjects by past verbal form, word order, and valency

Source: Data extracted from SQDCCA

With respect to intransitives with the Subject-Verb word order, both the Present Perfect and the Preterite seem to follow the corpus norm closely, as seen in Figure 5, at 71% to 73%. This is revealing, considering that sentences with agentive subjects in Spanish tend to favor the Subject-Verb position, while intransitive verbs with affected subjects are described as favoring the postverbal subject position, as with unaccusatives (indeterminate and non-specific, Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach 2016: 392ff). In the data, however, Andean Spanish intransitives seem to follow similar word order patterns as the Preterite in intransitive constructions, i.e., the Subject-Verb order. This preference further supports the \textit{pre-verbal position effect} Hypothesis. The favoring of the Present Perfect in Subject-Verb order and in intransitives (as low-transitivity constructions, cf. Hopper and Thompson 1980) suggests a strong connection between the Present Perfect and information structure.

In the Hispanic Linguistics literature, the relationship between the Present Perfect and information structure is described as a verbal form more proper of subordinates and background information (Weinrich 1968). Moreno de Alba (2000) explains that this function of the PP was already present in \textit{El Cid}, the earliest written document in the Spanish language, from between the 10th and 12th centuries. In a study of the Spanish Present Perfect, Howe (2013: 71-72) analyzes relative clauses in Mexican and Peninsular Spanish, where the Present Perfect functions as an Anterior or Perfective, respectively. Howe finds that while the Mexican Spanish Present Perfect has a backgrounding function in relative clauses, the Peninsular Spanish Present Perfect has a foregrounding function (connected to its perfective function).

With respect to Evidentiality, Aikhenvald (2004: 9) explains that “Evidentiality choices [in languages of the world] can correlate with backgrounding, or foregrounding”, allowing the speaker to create “multiple perspectives [in the narrative] by highlighting multiple information sources” (Aikhenvald 2018: 31). In Quechua narrative discourse, evidentials are an essential grammatical resource for signaling the emergence of a storyline. In Pastaza Quichua, for example, Nuckolls (2018) explains that the evidential
marker for direct evidence –mi can be used to ‘spotlight’ the perspective of the speaker in the narrative. Aikhenvald (2004: 220) further explains that the first-person effect can provide “overtones of new information” to the speaker’s discourse.

Quechua has been described as a detransitivizing language, i.e., that it favors one-argument structures (Nichols et al. 2004; Zúñiga & Kittalä 2019; Molina-Vital, in progress). Since argument structure is connected to information structure, this linguistic composite can reveal another aspect of the Andean Spanish Evidential Present Perfect grammaticalization. If Andean Spanish Present Perfect favors the following features: affected subjects, one-argument constructions, and pre-verbal position, altogether these features are to be understood as discourse strategies to highlight focal information in the discourse. The analysis of clause types, particularly of subordinates, is then of interest as well.

Relative Clauses, in particular, have been extensively studied in languages of the world as a context that favors background information, after Keenan & Comrie (1977) and Comrie & Keenan’s (1979) articles proposing the ‘Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy’. The hierarchy differentiates arguments according to whether they can be relativized in a specific language. If a language can only relativize one type of noun phrase, it will be the subject. On the other hand, if it can relativize an argument further down the hierarchy, such as an oblique, then it can also relativize an indirect object, a direct object, and a subject.

(16) Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie 1977)

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique

In her response to Comrie & Keenan’s articles, Fox (1987) called attention to different results with conversational data. She found that relative clauses in oral language can be used to highlight information. A hypothesis that emerges from our previous findings for Andean Spanish is that if the Andean Spanish PP is used to highlight information, then the type of relative clause should not be restricting.

To operationalize the semantic components under the umbrella of information structure, we include factors that heighten discourse prominence. These factors include the valency of the sentence, already explored, and next, the complexity of the constructions. Following Chafe & Danielwicz’ (1987) seminal study on spoken and written language, we also include coordinate clauses in the analysis since they are highly favored in conversations, in contrast to formal speech and written language. The data show 62% of complex constructions (which includes subordinate and coordinate constructions). Within subordinates, relative clauses represent 32% of the total. Figure 6 shows that the Present Perfect behaves similarly in simple and complex constructions, different from the Preterite.
**Figure 6.** Distribution of Present Perfect and Preterite in simple and complex constructions

![Bar chart showing distribution of Present Perfect (PP) and Preterite (PRT) in simple and complex constructions.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of construction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>PP 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRT 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>PP 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRT 58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data extracted from SQDCCA

Moreover, both verbal forms display opposite patterns concerning the subordinates, which are favored by the Present Perfect, and the coordinates, which are favored by the Preterite (Figure 7). These results signal subordinates as contexts for highlighting information in the discourse.

**Figure 7.** Distribution of Present Perfect in complex constructions

![Bar chart showing distribution of Present Perfect (PP) and Preterite (PRT) in subordinates and coordinates.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of complex construction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates</td>
<td>PP 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRT 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>PP 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRT 62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data extracted from SQDCCA

The Present Perfect is less restrictive with respect to the relative clauses, as hypothesized. The data show that it can also appear in temporal, location, and manner clauses.
6. Language contact as a trigger of language change

Valency is a grammatical category that interacts with the subject's agentivity, the verb's semantic class, and its Akstionsart (Hauspelmuth 1993; Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000; Nichols et al. 2004; Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019). Its semantic reach encompasses different levels of language, from the verb and its participants to the information structure and the intersubjectivity between the speaker and its interlocutor (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000). Moreover, valence orientation is known to interact with sentential alignment: accusative or ergative. Although Quechua, as Spanish, has been described as an accusative alignment language, it favors one-argument sentences, and for this reason, is described as a detransitivizing language (Nichols et al. 2004; Molina-Vital, in progress). These types of languages are described as having a preference for an affected subject.

6.1. Andean Ontology

Following its agglutinative typology, Quechua verbal roots can be transitive or intransitive depending on the derivational markers that accompany the base. Similar to the well-known Noun-Adjective derivations in Romance languages (cf. Rainer 1999; Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach 2016), cross-linguistic studies have focused on valency contrasts in different languages (cf. Hopper & Thompson 1980; Shibatani 1988, 2006; Hauspelmuth 1993; Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000; Nichols et al. 2004; Tsunoda & Kageyama 2006; Hauspelmuth & Müller-Bardey 2008; Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019). Typological surveys find that languages use different strategies to differentiate events such as *matar/morir* ‘kill/die’ or *enseñar/aprender* ‘teach/learn’. In their cross-linguistic study, Nichols et al. (2004: 166) find that languages with high morphological complexity, as Quechua, favor reduction or tendency to intransitivize, although it represented only 12.5% of their sample (Nichols et al. 2004: 171). In contrast, the most common strategy for languages in their study to contrast events such as ‘kill/die’ or ‘teach/learn’ was by expressing actions or states of humans lexically (Nichols et al. 2004: 172).

Table 10 highlights another layer of the semantic analysis of the Quechua verb. Some verbs are understood as having a prototypical type of subject. While the subjects of transitives and causatives tend to be prototypically animate, some intransitive verbs are also understood in Quechua as having a prototypical animate or inanimate subject. Although this contrast is not always expressed, the relevance of animacy in Quechua and its dynamics with valency emerges from the examples in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans / Caus Verb</th>
<th>Intransitive Verb</th>
<th>Intransitive Subject Animacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject [+ agentive]</td>
<td>Subject [- agentive]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to lose/get lost’</td>
<td>chinka-chi-y</td>
<td>chinka-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘kill/die’</td>
<td>wañu-chi-y</td>
<td>wañu-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘break’</td>
<td>paki-y</td>
<td>paki-ku-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘open’</td>
<td>kicha-y</td>
<td>kicha-ku-y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Cusihuaman (1976); Soto Ruiz (1976); Cerrón-Palomino (1987, 2008); Wölk (1987); Weber (1996); Itier (2013)
It further suggests a strong correlation between Valency and the Animacy of the subject in Quechua. In the next section, we argue that the semantic features of Quechua grammar, connected to Evidentiality, Valency, and Animacy, have influenced the use of the Andean Spanish Present Perfect. We propose a first draft of the contact-influence grammaticalization process to explain how the Present Perfect developed evidential meaning in the Andean region.

6.2. Semantic Components and Pragmatic Forces

First, we summarize the semantic components (Table 11) that have been found as relevant to the analysis. They pertain to the two macro-categories that have been introduced, subjectivity and information structure. It is argued here that factors under the Subjectivity umbrella do not work in isolation. They represent a group of factors that are strongly interconnected and represent a ‘pragmatic force’ under what Aikhenvald calls the First-Person Effect. A similar phenomenon is argued for the factors under the Information Structure umbrella. They do not work in isolation. They are strongly interconnected as different versions of the same pragmatic force that we call the Macro-Pre-Verbal Position Effect.

Table 11. Semantic components and pragmatic forces in the grammaticalization of the Evidential Andean Spanish Present Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRAGMATIC FORCES</th>
<th>SEMANTIC COMPONENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjectivity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grammatical First Person</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First-person Effect, Aikhenvald 2004)</td>
<td><strong>Subject Pronoun Expression</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+animate] subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker in any syntactic role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-agentive] subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre-verbal position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Macro Pre-Verbal Position Effect)</td>
<td><strong>Sentence-initial position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subject-Verb word order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>One-argument structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Relative Clauses: Patient, Obliques</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We argue that these two pragmatic forces, the first-person effect and the macro- pre-verbal position effect, underlie the grammaticalization of Andean Spanish Present Perfect towards the evidential pathway.\(^{11}\) These semantic components of the evidential pathway would complement the tempo-aspectual factors that have been put forward in the literature for the tempo-aspectual pathway (cf. Schwenter & Torres Cacoullos 2008; Howe 2013; Rodríguez-Louro 2016) to help differentiate pathways and stages in the development of the Present Perfect, particularly in contact situations.

\(^{11}\) In the next stage of our study, both effects will be tested statistically with data from more participants.
7. Conclusion

The contribution of this paper is fully summarized in Table 12, which illustrates how the Evidential grammaticalization of the Andean Spanish Present Perfect has expanded the scope of the Present Perfect from the verb semantics and sentence levels to the discourse and the Speech Act participants levels. While an appeal to the role of language contact in the emergence of the Andean Spanish Evidential Present Perfect is widespread in the Andean literature, we have presented detailed hypotheses for the evidential pathway of the Andean Spanish Evidential Present Perfect. This pathway entails the successive processes of ‘subjectivization’ and ‘intersubjectivization’, using Traugott’s terminology (1989, 2003, 2010; cf. Narrog 2005, 2012). We argue that the contact-induced influence has taken place through the reanalysis of the semantic components presented here, connected to the verbal semantic class, the argument/thematic structure, the discourse, and the pragmatics found in the data. The semantic components constitute two constellations of factors that fall under the macro categories of Subjectivity and Information Structure, and represent two pragmatic forces that we have named the ‘first-person effect’ (following Aikhenvald 2000) and the ‘macro-pre-verbal-position effect’. The impact and trajectories of these pragmatic forces are represented in Table 12. Stages 1-4 represent a hypothesis of how the transition between the anterior and evidential present perfect could occur. While previous work had asserted a pathway from anterior to evidential (Bybee et al. 1994), our paper expands concretely on how that transition could have taken place. Linguistic inertia is not enough to have affected that change in Andean Spanish, but only through sustained historical contact with the robust evidential system in the Amerindian languages of the region does the fully articulated pathway from anterior to evidential proposed here become possible.

Table 12. Andean Spanish Present Perfect evidential grammaticalization process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL/STAGES</th>
<th>Change of State (Unaccusatives)</th>
<th>Telic event (Affected Subject)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lexical – Aktionsart</td>
<td>Telic event (Affected Subject)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Argument/Thematic</td>
<td>Valency</td>
<td>One-argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Cognitive, Perception,</td>
<td>Affect Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotive V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Animacy</td>
<td>Animate Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject 1s / SPE /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker in sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Discourse level /</td>
<td>Affected Subject &gt;</td>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
<td>Affected Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject-Verb word order</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-verbal position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subordinates, Relative Clauses (P, X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpersonal /</td>
<td>Speech Act</td>
<td>Evidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the center is the affected subject (stages 1 and 2) present in the Present Perfect since its resultative stage. Dahl & Hedin (2000: 390), Detges (2000), Drinka (2017), and others explain that verbs of change of state were favored during this
stage. However, as passive readings and transitive verbs appear with the Present Perfect, Detges (2000) reminds us that a realignment of focus takes place. The focus changes to the *past event with present relevance*, which is called the Anterior stage, using Bybee et al.’s terminology. That is, the resultative focus on *the result of a past event that affected the subject* becomes the focus on *the past event that affected the subject*, where the event can still continue until the speech event and/or has relevance in the speech time. This contrasts with variationist studies that have only used grammatical person as an operationalized diagnostic of subjectivation.

We claim here that the focus on *the affected subject* is maintained throughout the Resultative and Anterior stages, albeit from different perspectives and ranges, and that this affected subject is reanalyzed to focus on *the speaker* (stages 2 and 3) and then on to the *speaker as a participant in the Speech Act* (stage 4). Thus, the Andean Spanish Evidential Present Perfect exemplifies a case of grammaticalization that falls under Traugott’s ‘process of intersubjectivization’, illustrated in Figure 8.

**Figure 8.** (Inter)Subjetivization grammaticalization process of the Andean Spanish Evidential Present Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on</th>
<th>Focus on</th>
<th>Focus on</th>
<th>Focus on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
<td>SPEECH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjetivization > InterSubjectivization


The contact-induced influence involves grammatical meanings that are reinterpreted in the receiving language through the reanalysis of the semantic properties of the Present Perfect in its grammaticalization process. Following Heine et al. (1991: 215-20), reanalysis accompanies processes of semantic change, such as grammaticalization processes, although these are less studied. We argue that in the case of the Andean Spanish Present Perfect, semantic features found in the Resultative and Anterior stages of the Present Perfect have been reinterpreted to apply to a broader scope, particularly those connected to the discourse and the speech act. This type of contact-induced influence falls under what Heine & Kuteva (2005) have called conceptual or functional transfer.
**Figure 9.** Proposal for revision of the Bybee et al. (1994) *evidential pathway*: Andean Spanish Present Perfect

![Diagram of the Evidential Pathway](Image)

In Figure 9, we present our proposal for the revision of the Evidential pathway for Present Perfect proposed in Bybee et al. 1994’s study. In the case of the Peruvian Andean Spanish Present Perfect, the analysis suggests that the direct evidence function emerges from the Anterior stage. Whether the Indirect Evidence found in Ecuadorian Andean Spanish also emerges from the Anterior stage is still to be researched since Bybee et al. (1994) find other languages that have an indirect evidential Present Perfect that seems to have emerged from a resultative. Lindstedt (2000) suggests that understanding ‘inference’ might help understand languages like Macedonian that present three different expressions for resultative, anterior, and evidential. Whether evidential Present Perfect can develop from either path, Anterior or Resultative, is still to be researched. Heine & Kuteva (2005: 75) remind us that “the transfer of grammatical information from one language to another without involving any linguistic forms is perhaps more widespread than previously thought”. Therefore, the study of Present Perfect in Latin American Spanish varieties is a fruitful area of research. What is also apparent from Figure 9 is that a single language can be represented in all the possible outcomes of the **BE/HAVE** Present Perfect. Although we understand the temporal pathway better in Romance linguistics, we hope to have shown why it is also essential to better understand the evidential pathway from a cross-linguistic perspective.
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List of abbreviations

| 1 | first-person | NEG | negative |
| 3 | third-person | NMLZ | nominalizer |
| ACC | accusative | PFV | perfective |
| AUX | auxiliary | POSS | possessive |
| COMP | complementizer | PP | present |
| CONJ | conjunction | PRF | perfect |
| DEF | definite | PRS | present |
| DET | determiner | PRT | preterite |
| F | feminine | PST | past |
| IPFV | imperfective | PTCP | participle |
| INDF | indefinite | REFL | reflexive |
| INF | infinitive | REL | relative |
| M | masculine | SBJ | subject |
| MID | middle | SG | singular |
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