

Review by Chad Howe

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

This paper does indeed make a novel contribution, bringing together insights from a number of different domains to explain the use of the Present Perfect (PP) in Andean Spanish. The specific advantages of this analysis have been described in my reviewer form (attached).

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

The methods used in this study are not particularly well explained. This, as pointed out in my comments, is perhaps a function of the amount of space allowed for this article. Nevertheless, some additional attention the specifics of the corpus and the methods used to analyze the data would be helpful for the reader.

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

I have provided some discussion and comments related to the shortcomings of the current manuscript in my reviewer comments. Overall, the theoretical arguments are indeed coherent and sound, though the brevity of the article makes it difficult for the ideas to coalesce in the way intended by the authors.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

Bateman, Bethany. 2022. Contact-induced subjectivization in the compound past: an examination of PP/PRET variation in Cusco Spanish. University of Georgia, Doctoral Dissertation.

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

No.

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

The authors should provide more detail regarding the corpus and quantitative analyses. If possible, additional space should be provided so that the authors can elaborate on the proposals presented in this paper. If this is not possible, the authors should make it clear that this work serves as an initial approach/sketch of this proposal.

General comments:

This paper explains the development (i.e. grammaticalization) of the Present Perfect (PP) in Andean Spanish through the lens of language contact, primarily discussing the effects of contact with Quechua. The discussion is situated within the broader context of changes other

“pathways” of linguistic change outlined in Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca’s (1994) well-known study of cross-linguistic patterns of grammaticalization.

Within this system, the authors distinguish two developments with periphrastic forms in Romance languages: Tempo-Aspectual and Evidential. The authors propose, following the previous literature, that the development of the PP in Andean Spanish is argued to reflect the latter, providing a discussion of the evidential features that are said to be expressed by this form in Andean Spanish. The primary argument advanced in this analysis concerns the interaction between, on the one hand, the well-studied set of evidentials attested in different varieties of Quechua and, on the other, the features related to valency and information structure. Data from the corpus Spanish-Quechua Diachronic Corpus of the Central Andes (SQDCCA) is presented with accompanying quantitative analyses that suggest interactions between PP usage and, for example, verb type and subject agentivity. Overall, the analysis provides a novel perspective on the issue of PP usage in Andean Spanish, one that (a) involves a thoughtful discussion of the role of argument structure in the process of language change (specifically with the PP) and that (b) is informed by typological generalizations regarding valency and subject type.

There are a few shortcomings of this paper that should be addressed. First, the details regarding the corpus analysis are sparse and do not allow the reader to gain a full understanding of how this method was used in analyzing the data. The subsequent discussion of these results is equally brief. This brevity is perhaps a function of the length restrictions imposed by the journal. Similarly, the authors introduce a wide range of concepts and terminology in explaining PP usage in Andean Spanish. The result, for the most part, is a compelling suggestion about what motivates the use of the PP in this particular context of language contact. However, the length of the manuscript makes it difficult for the reader to gain a full understanding of how all these components (i.e. evidentiality, subjectivity, valency, animacy, etc.) interact to produce the specific patterns of usage attested in Andean Spanish.

Perhaps one way to address these (and other) concerns is to make it more explicit to the reader that this manuscript is intended to serve as a state-of-the-art comment, or roadmap of sorts, concerning the issue of PP evolution in Andean Spanish. The limitations of the current format for this work, as it were, appear to preclude a more in-depth discussion of how the different components interact in light of the proposed revision presented in Figure 8 (page 22). The main impact of the proposal would be better understood with more room to discuss the implications. However, assuming this isn’t possible, tempering the readers’ expectations at the beginning of the analysis is also a viable alternative.

It may also be of interest to the authors to consult a newly completed dissertation on this very topic that engages closely with notions of subjectivity to explain the PP in Andean Spanish. The reference is provided below and the direct link is [here](#). One interesting finding concerns the role of the grammatical subject, where 1st person subjects are found to condition the use of the PP based on a corpus of interview data (Spanish).

Detailed comments:

1. P. 2, penultimate paragraph: “Wide variation is found among Romance Languages...”

Presumably, the reference here to "wide variation" concerns the variation between auxiliaries.

A brief clarification would be helpful, especially since several of these studies address alternation between simple and periphrastic past forms.

2. P. 3, 1st paragraph: "...before the peripheral ones..." The expression "peripheral ones" is a little vague. It appears to refer to peripheral meanings (i.e. not perfective meanings) but could also be understood as referring to regions. If it's the former (i.e. meanings), which meanings are considered peripheral?

3. P. 4, final paragraph: "Studies on Romance Languages, in particular, have assumed..." Provide examples of these studies.

4. P. 5, first paragraph: "...interacts with specific past-aspectual affixes." What exactly does "interact with" mean in this context? To my knowledge, it is not the case that the evidential markers are required to co-occur with the two past markers. That is, use of -sqa- is not ungrammatical without the presence of -s(i). This interaction does, however, vary across varieties, as is pointed out in the text.

5. P. 9, table 9: The use of the term "agentive" here is a little confusing. I could be mistaken, but I don't believe that speakers are precluded from using 'agentive' (i.e. animate capable of volition) subjects with the causative marker -chi: e.g., Wayra wawata wañuchin 'The wind kills/killed the child' (i.e. referring perhaps to an accident or a cause of a fatal illness). If agentive is understood in the traditional, semantic roles sense, then it would be understood that the subject would be understood as acting with volition, which I don't believe is required by the suffix -chi.

6. P. 12, first paragraph: "...was used with a non-agentive subject." Some additional explanation of how the distinction was made between an agentive and a non-agentive subject would be helpful. The description of (8) as meaning something more like "to know Quechua" (which would indeed suggest a non-agentive subject) makes sense. But, how was this distinction made specifically when analyzing the data?

7. P. 12, second paragraph: "...mainly done with enclitics..." Is this a reference to the suffix -chi? Or does this reference the evidential markers -mi/-n, -s(i), -ch(i)?

8. P. 14, second paragraph: "...regardless of the semantic class..." The typology of semantic classes assumed here requires some additional clarification. For instance, the verb 'gustar' is characterized here as emotive, but it also belongs to the class of atelic verbs, namely statives. Is the label 'stative' being used here distinct from its use in the traditional Vendlerian sense (i.e. as a subclass of atelics)?

9. P. 16: The numbers in Figure 4 should be listed as percentages. Also, Ns should be provided.

10. P. 16: The numbers in Figure 5 should be listed as percentages. Also, Ns should be provided.

11. P. 18, first full paragraph: "Within these, subordinates and coordinates are closely..." This observation is unclear. What does "closely represented" mean in this context?

12. P. 19, first paragraph: "This type of languages, as is Quechua,..." The wording in this part of the sentence is a bit awkward. Revise.

13. P. 19, second paragraph: "...was to lexicalize actions or states of humans as primary..." It's not entirely clear what this statement means. What does "primary" refer to according to Nichols et al.?

14. P. 19, third paragraph: What does it mean to be "prototypically animate"?

15. P. 20, final paragraph: "...has been motivated by language contact." This is also, essentially, the claim made by Howe (2013) in Chapters 4 & 5, right?

16. P. 21, first paragraph following Table 12: The first sentence of this paragraph is quite important. However, the wording makes it difficult to parse. It should be revised for clarity.