

Review by Anna Babel

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

Yes. The semantics of the Andean Spanish perfect systems are under-studied, and this article makes a valuable contribution and proposal for integrating the Andean Spanish past perfect system into the better-studied semantics of Spanish/Romance.

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 empirical content is sound. I would like to know more about how the subset of data were selected from the corpus. Statistics have not been provided. I would recommend providing statistics, particularly for the data reported in Figs. 4, 5, and 6. Regarding 4 and 5, the x axis needs to be more clearly labeled; these might be better presented as bar graphs, if I'm reading them right.

There are no spelling mistakes that I was able to find.

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]*

The argument is coherent and sound with no major flaws and/or shortcomings. However, the paper is extremely dense. I believe it might have more impact if it were simplified and streamlined somewhat to make it more readable. For example, do we really need Figure 3 and the foregoing explanation? Could this be reported with a sentence or two instead?

Likewise, around p. 16, I got rather lost. The claim is made that the data in Fig 4 (or maybe Fig 5?) support the "macro pre-verbal position hypothesis." By this point, as a reader, I had to flip back to see what that hypothesis was, and I'm still not sure how the data are supposed to support it. It would be helpful to slow down a bit and walk the reader through the argument.

Regarding the rest of the paper, the author should clarify whether they are claiming that *sqa/rqa* is the source of the evidential feature, or whether it's *mi/si/chi*, or perhaps both (p. 8)? Various authors have argued that the verbal tenses in Spanish/Quechua are more properly characterized as mirative or something else rather than evidential; would that make a difference to the author's argument?

Finally, given the emphasis on discourse strategies, I wonder whether there are any style/formality/register effects that should be dealt with in the data? If subjectivity and intersubjectivity are important effects here, should we be thinking about context and interlocutor as well as the bare linguistic data?

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

Adelaar, W.F., 2012. Modeling convergence: Towards a reconstruction of the history of Quechuan–Aymaran interaction. *Lingua*, 122(5), pp.461-469.

Babel, A. and Pfänder, S., 2014. Doing copying: Why typology doesn't matter to language speakers. Congruence in contact-induced language change. *Language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity*, pp.239-257.

Baptista, M., 2020. Competition, selection, and the role of congruence in Creole genesis and development. *Language*, 96(1), pp.160-199.

Dankel, P. and Soto Rodríguez, M., 2012. Convergencias en el área andina: la testimonialidad y la marcación de la evidencialidad en el español andino y en el quechua. *Neue Romania*, 41, pp.89-120.

Faller, M., 2004. The Deictic Core of 'Non-Experienced Past' in Cuzco Quechua. *Journal of semantics*, 21(1), pp.45-85.

Palacios, A. and Pfänder, S., 2018. El pretérito pluscuamperfecto con valor (ad) mirativo. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, 16(2), pp.119-134.

Soto Rodríguez, M., 2013. Gramática bilingüe en interacción: expresar la causa en el quechua y español bolivianos (Doctoral dissertation, Dissertation, Universität Freiburg, 2013).

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]

- Need to detail how the six participants were selected from the larger corpus (p. 6)
- Recommend providing statistical analysis
- Recommend revising for readability