

A Linguistic Analysis of Quechua Borrowings in Matto de Turner's *Aves sin nido*: National Ideology Seen through Linguistic Incorporation

Brendan Regan
Texas Tech University

Abstract

The current study qualitatively and quantitatively analyzes the Quechua borrowings in the discourse of the characters in Clorinda Matto de Turner's *Aves sin nido* (1889). Drawing on concepts and findings from the subfield of contact linguistics, the work examines the types of lexical and structural borrowing from Quechua that is reflected in the text as well as the frequency of this borrowing between distinct social groups. The findings point to a use of Quechua forms that is consistent with contact linguistics's borrowability scales of susceptibility. More importantly, the amount of Quechua is not equally used among the three social groups of the novel. The educated protagonists, *los forasteros*, incorporate significantly more Quechua borrowings than the corrupt *notables*. I propose that this is an ideological move by Matto de Turner to demonstrate that the future of Peru is one of linguistic (in addition to cultural and racial) incorporation. Additionally, the analysis provides an innovative perspective of using a quantitative linguistic approach to support an ideological literary analysis.

I. Introduction

One of the objectives of Clorinda Matto de Turner's seminal novel *Aves sin nido* (1889) is to imagine a Peruvian nation in which there is an incorporation of the indigenous people and a rejection of unjust practices towards this population. The novel decries the social injustices of the political, judicial, and ecclesiastical powers against the indigenous peoples in Peru, particularly in the Andean regions (Carrillo 1967: 32; Cornejo Polar 1992: 330). In fact, in the preface, Matto de Turner (viii) states,

Amo con amor de ternura a la raza indígena, por lo mismo que he observado de cerca sus costumbres, encantadoras por su sencillez, y la abyección a que someten esa raza aquellos mandones de villorrio, que, si varían de nombre, no degeneran siquiera del epíteto de tiranos. No otra cosa son, en lo general, los curas, gobernadores, caciques y alcaldes. [...] la autora de estas páginas habrá conseguido su propósito, recordando que en el país existen hermanos que sufren, explotados en la noche de la ignorancia, martirizados en esas tinieblas que piden luz; señalando puntos de no escasa importancia para los progresos nacionales y haciendo, a la vez, literatura peruana.

I love with a tender love the indigenous race, as I have closely observed their customs, enchanting people by their simplicity, and

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

the abomination to which the powers of the one-horse towns suppress that race, that, while their names vary, they never fail to live up to the epithet of tyrants. No other things they are, in general, the priests, the governors, the caciques, and the mayors. [...] The author of these pages will have reached her purpose, reminding that in this country there exists brothers and sisters who suffer, exploited in the night of ignorance, martyred in that darkness that pleads for light; signaling points of no small importance for the nation's progress, and creating, at the same time, Peruvian literature.

The story at the center of *Aves sin nido* takes place in the town of Killac in the Andean region of Peru. The protagonists in the novel, Fernando and Lucía Marín, originally from Lima, clash in beliefs and morals with the local town powers of Priest Pancorbo, Governor Sebastián Pancorbo, and Judge Hilarión Verdejo. The Marín family protests the abuse of the indigenous peoples by the town powers, such as the kidnapping of Rosalía, the daughter of Juan and Marcela Yupanqui, in order to extract an unlawful debt from her indigenous parents. In addition to the Marín family, Manuel, the son of Doña Petronila, who is studying law in Lima, but has returned home temporarily, vocally expresses his contempt towards the treatment of the indigenous peoples of the town. In an attempt to kill the Marín family, the local powers mount an attack on the Marín house; Juan is killed, Marcela is fatally injured, and the Marín family subsequently adopts their daughters, Rosalía and Margarita. The town powers continue their abuse of indigenous residents, such as Isidro and Martina Champi by unfairly imprisoning Isidro until payment of a fabricated tax is made. Once again, the Marín family, with the help of Manuel, protests the unfair treatment. The Marín family eventually decides to return to Lima with their two adopted daughters, and Manuel also follows, as he is in love with Margarita. The novel ends in despair as Manuel and Margarita learn that they are both illegitimate children of the Priest Pancorbo, further highlighting the corruption and injustices of the town powers.

Given the social importance of the novel, scholars from various theoretical backgrounds have analyzed the work (Vargas Yábar 2013: 27)¹. There is much literature devoted to Matto de Turner's national project of Peru (Cornejo Polar 1992: 55-74, 1994a; Peluffo 1998; Ward 2002, 2012), its social critique (Berg 2010, 2012), its role as a feminist novel (Berg, 1990; Degeneri 2004; Peluffo 1998, 2005; Reisz 1992), and its polemic categorization as *indianismo* or *indigenismo/indigenista* (Carrillo 1967; Commetta Manzoni 1939, 1960; Cornejo Polar 1977, 1980, 1992, 1994b; Escajadillo 2004; García 1991; Kristal 1987; Moraña 1998; Rodríguez Luis 1980; Tauro 1976; Vargas Yábar 2013). While Aída Cometta Manzoni (1939, 1960) is credited with defining the distinction between these two classifications, in which an *indigenista/indigenismo* novel portrays the indigenous peoples as characters from a realistic perspective, while an *indianismo* novel portrays indigenous peoples as exotic or folkloric (Manzoni 1939: 20), this debate is no longer relevant ever since Cornejo Polar (1994) proposed that most literary works have a double sociocultural statute. That is to say, such a dichotomous categorization is not a fruitful approach as many works contain aspects from each category. Regardless of the type of literary or cultural analysis, many of these works have mentioned the use of Quechua in the novel. However, these previous studies have generally referenced the Quechua use without quantitative analysis. There are several critiques of the

¹ For a comprehensive review see Vargas Yábar (2013).

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

Quechua use in the novel by scholars such as Carrillo (1967: 48),

Al indio lo amó y defendió sin observar su psicología, sin penetrar en su alma, y, a pesar de haber vivido cerca de él, ni en sus diálogos puede dar muestras de autenticidad [...] Con poner unas palabras quechuas, con describir algunas de sus costumbres, cree presentarlos con realismo convincente. Y es que en el fondo, Clorinda no pudo desprenderse de su carácter romántico, de su sentido melodramático [...].

She loved and defended the *indio* without observing his psychology, without penetrating his soul, and, in spite of having lived near him, not even in his dialogues can she give samples of authenticity [...] With putting a few Quechua words, with describing some of his customs, she believes to present them with convincing realism. And in the end, Clorinda wasn't able to detach herself from her romantic character, of her melodramatic feeling [...].

Similarly, García (1991: 71) also critiques the use of Quechua,

Hay, al parecer, un desinterés por reproducir o representar con cierta veracidad el habla indígena: no hay en la novela intentos serios de aproximarse a las construcciones sintácticas ni particularidades fonéticas propias de las formas de habla de la población indígena peruana, que, como sabemos, es en su enorme mayoría quechua-hablante. La interpenetración lingüística queda reducida, en este caso, a la mera inclusión de algunas palabras de origen quechua que, más que representar una eficaz aproximación a lo indio, apenas logran dar al discurso un cierto matiz costumbrista, exotista.

There is, it appears, a disinterest in reproducing or representing with certain veracity the indigenous speech: in the novel there are no serious attempts at approximating the syntactic constructions nor typical phonetic particularities of the forms of speech of the indigenous Peruvian population, that, as we know, is in their enormous majority Quechua-speaking. The linguistic interpenetration remains reduced, in this case, to the mere inclusion of a few words of Quechua origin, that, more than representing an effective approximation of the *indio*, hardly achieves giving the discourse a certain costumbrist exotic touch.

However, the lack of linguistic analysis of the Quechua use in the novel has allowed these claims to remain under explored and under theorized. The present study specifically aims to contribute to the extensive body of literary work surrounding Clorinda Matto de Turner's novel *Aves sin nido* with a particular focus on language practices in the discourse. I aim to show that Matto de Turner skillfully incorporates selective properties of Quechua lexical and structural material into the novel, not for the purposes of folklorization, but rather for ideological aims of promoting a Peruvian nation of linguistic and cultural incorporation. In this sense, I manifest that Matto de Turner's protagonists, *los forasteros*, who incorporate Quechua and are open to

Andean people and culture, serve as model citizens of Peru, while the corrupt characters, *los notables*, those who categorically omit Quechua from their speech and reject Andean people and culture, are excluded from her national project.

1.1. Clorinda Matto de Turner: Life, language, and nation

Clorinda Matto de Turner was born in 1852 in Cuzco, Peru. Her family lived in both Cuzco as well as the Hacienda Paullu-Chico outside the city (Pinto 2008: 415). As a child in Paullo-Chico, she routinely played with the indigenous children of the town and “*dominó el quechua del indio común*” ‘dominated Quechua of the common indigenous person’ (Carrillo 1967: 19). She saw Quechua as “*nuestra lengua madre*” ‘our mother tongue’ (Matto de Turner 1888a: 303c). In 1871 Matto de Turner married Joseph Turner, an Englishman, and they moved to Tinta, a small town in the province of Canchis, which later inspired the model for Killac, the imaginary town in *Aves sin nido* (Pinto 2008: 415). Besides incorporating Quechua into her novels, Matto de Turner also translated Spanish works such as *Evangelio de Lucas* and *Hechos de los apóstoles* into Quechua (Vargas Yábar 2013: 90). It is no surprise, then, that she was reported to have had a strong interest in Quechua philology (Vargas Yábar 2013: 90). In fact Peluffo (2005: 56, *my translation*) claims that her Quechua abilities “separated her from an intellectual community that worshiped the criollo or european part of the nationality.” Matto de Turner saw Quechua as and a means of connecting the modern Republic to its Incan past; and consequently, any Peruvian history without Quechua would not be authentically Peruvian (Matto de Turner 1888a, 1888b, 1893, 1902; Ward 2002, 2012).

The importance of Quechua in a Peruvian identity is seen in several of her writings. As Ward (2002: 405, *my translation*) indicates, a series of essays in 1888 in *El Perú Ilustrado* “celebrated the Incan past and recognized the philological importance of Quechua in the realization of the national project.” Perhaps the most important of these was “*El qquechua*”, which was originally presented at the *Sociedad Arqueológico-Lingüística* in Cuzco. In this essay, Matto de Turner argues that “*el qquechua*” is essential as a historical foundation to the Peruvian nation. She states,

Los que hemos nacido en las faldas del Sacsai Huamán [...] sentimos atrofiarse el corazón, al considerar que nuestra lengua madre se pierde y ver la poca estima que hoy se hace del qquechua; ese idioma dulce que debiera ser el vínculo imperecedero de unión para la raza peruana (Matto de Turner 1988a: 303c [1893: 99]).

Those of us that were born in the hillsides of *Sacsai Huamán* [...] we feel the heart atrophy, at considering that our mother tongue is being lost and at seeing the little esteem that today one makes of qquechua; that sweet language que should be the everlasting bond of union for the Peruvian race.

Here one observes the use of “mother tongue” to invoke an inherently natural connection towards Quechua for all Peruvians and the horror she feels at the thought of losing one’s heritage. Also, of note is the explicit reference to Quechua serving as a national unifier of one Peruvian race. Ward claims (2012: 365, *my translation*) that this essay, “is essentially a defense of Quechua and an affirmation of its importance for the Peruvian nation”. In the same essay, Matto de Turner concludes in a call for those who still know *qquechua* to save the language and incorporate it into

the true Peru,

los que aún quedamos con el caudal de nuestro idioma, legado de reyes, es preciso que sepamos repartirlo entre nuestros hermanos, sin permitir que desaparezca... A la importante Sociedad Arqueológico-Lingüística le está reservado ser el arca santa donde se salve el idioma propio y verdadero del Perú, y con él sus más queridos recuerdos y sus interesantes tradiciones (Matto de Turner 1988a: 303c [1893: 100]).

those of us that still remain with the riches of our language, legacy of kings, it is essential that we know how to distribute it among our siblings, with out permitting that it disappears... To the important *Sociedad Arqueológico-Lingüística* it is reserved to be the sacred ark which saves Peru's own and true language, and with it its most dear memories and interesting traditions

Here Matto de Turner manifests the importance of reincorporating “our language,” the “true language” of Peru, back into the Peruvian nation. This article served as a call to action to reincorporate Quechua and cultural traditions associated with its speakers into the nation.

In another essay from *El Perú Ilustrado* titled “*El qquechua y su utilidad para los americanistas*,” Matto de Turner argues the need for Quechua in both Peruvian history and literature. She states, “*no es posible escribir historia peruana que merezca el nombre de tal sin conocer el idioma*” ‘it is not possible to write Peruvian history worthy of such name without knowing the language’ (Matto de Turner 1988b: 331b [1893: 107]). Again, Quechua is seen as the origin of the nation, and without it, one cannot know the true history of Peru. Similarly, she views the lack of Quechua as a loss to literature as well. “*¿Por qué han ignorado su idioma? ¿Por qué no pueden cantar en la lengua de su madre patria? Esto significa simplemente una pérdida para la literatura americana. Desventura nacional...*” ‘Why have they ignored their language? Why are they not able to sing in the language of their motherland? This simply means a loss for the American literature. National misfortune...’ (Matto de Turner 1988b: 331b [1893: 109]). Thus, for Matto de Turner, Quechua is essential to the Peruvian national identity; past, present, and future.

Similar to other authors of her time, Matto de Turner sought to use literature as a means to promote a national project; one that encouraged the use of Quechua. According to Ward (2002: 406, *my translation*), the prologue of *Aves sin nido* suggests that “literature has a regenerative role in the society”. During this nation-building period, such literary projects, referred to as “foundational fictions,” served as a strategy “to contain the racial, regional, economic, and gender conflicts that threatened the development of new Latin American nations” (Sommer 1991: 29). Novels such as *Aves sin nido* provided glimpses of an “imagined community” of what the nation could be (Anderson 1983). Matto de Turner saw Peru as a sick organism with a particular maltreatment of the indigenous people and women (Ward 2002: 406). In order to heal the nation, Matto de Turner recommended three means to bring about social change: “*la prensa, el púlpito y la cátedra universitaria*” ‘the press, the pulpit and the university podium’ (1902: 14). As Ward indicates, to promote her national project, Matto de Turner used various tools including “the language, literature, culture, and justice” (2002: 404, *my translation*). Matto de Turner’s project included “making public and incorporating the Andean world into the nation” (Ferreira 2005: 28, *my translation*). Matto de Turner defended Quechua as a link to unify all Peruvians in her national project (Ward 2012: 375). In this sense, Ward states that for Matto de Turner, biculturalism,

“represents a model to emulate. This idea of mutual cultures appears also in the conclusions of *Aves sin nido*” (Ward 2002: 409, *my translation*). Ward (2002: 410, *my translation*) claims that Matto de Turner believed in “*mestizaje*, for which both Castilian and Quechua are equally necessary” in which both ethnicities and languages need each other. Given the importance of Quechua in Matto de Turner’s national ideology of cultural, racial, and linguistic incorporation (Matto de Turner 1888a, 1888b, 1893, 1902; Ward 2002, 2012), the present endeavor examines the use of Quechua in her novel *Aves sin nido*. While Quechua was explicitly part of her national project, a question remains as to the extent of Quechua incorporation (and its speakers) into the nation. This will be explored following the analysis.

My aim herein is threefold: (i) to qualitatively and quantitatively analyze the types of Quechua borrowings in the novel using concepts from the subfield of *contact linguistics*; (ii) to quantitatively analyze the borrowings by social group as an ideological move by the author as related to her national ideology; and finally, (iii) to demonstrate, in line with the subfield of literary linguistics, that a linguistic analysis can be fruitfully employed to strengthen a literary analysis. Section 2 reviews relevant literature and terminology on language contact. Section 3 explains the research questions and methodology. Section 4 presents the results; the types of borrowings (§4.1) and the distribution of borrowings by social group (§4.2). Section 5 discusses the findings. Finally, Section 6 briefly concludes the study.

2. Language contact: Linguistic concepts and sociohistorical considerations

Language contact refers to “the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time” (Thomason 2001: 1). Of interest to linguists are the contrasts that arise from the social processes of conquest and immigration (Sankoff 2002). Although each situation is a particular case, research in contact linguistics has revealed several important patterns of processes and results in language contact. The ensuing paragraphs review essential concepts and terminology related to crosslinguistic influence, directionality of borrowing and types of borrowing, as well as the sociohistorical factors of importance in evaluating contact outcomes.

2.1. Linguistic concepts

There is a great deal of variation and lack of consensus in terminology, even for the label for crosslinguistic influence². Weinreich (1953: 1) proposed the term *interference* to account for “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language, which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact.” Thomason and Kaufman (1988), and later Thomason (2001), continued to use the terminology, while Van Coetsem (1988) and others (Winford 2003, 2005) began to use the term *transfer*. As Sankoff (2002: 639) notes, researchers in second language acquisition thought that interference carried the negative connotation of implying that a bilingual is unable to separate languages. In order to avoid such confusion, and given the continued use of *borrowing* in popular and scholarly discourse, the current study follows Haspelmath (2009: 37) in referring to all crosslinguistic influence as borrowing.³

Despite differences in nomenclature, the seminal works of both Thomason and Kaufman

² For a review on crosslinguistic influence terminology see Sankoff (2002) and Winford (2005).

³ Haspelmath (2009: 37) acknowledges the problematic metaphor of *borrowing*, but given its use since the 18th century to refer to crosslinguistic influence, he opts for the terminology.

(1988) and Van Coetsem (1988) have signaled the importance of making the distinction in the directionality of crosslinguistic influence. We adopt the concepts and terminology of Van Coetsem in distinguishing *source language* (SL) from *recipient language* (RL), in which the direction of borrowing (*transfer* to use his terminology) is always from SL to RL. Van Coetsem (1988: 3) also distinguishes situations in which the RL speaker is the agent and transfers material or structure from the SL (also *recipient language agentivity*) and situations in which the SL language speaker is the agent and transfers material or structure from their SL into the RL (also *source language agentivity*) (1988: 3). As Winford (2005) remarks, Van Coetsem's schema gives more agentivity to the speakers themselves without having to dichotomously place them as native or non-native speakers and allows for each speaker to naturally fall on the bilingual continuum. In the present analysis, we utilize the term *adoption* to substitute for Van Coetsem's *borrowing*. Additionally, Van Coetsem (1988), among others (Guy 1990; Winford 2003, 2005), distinguishes between two types of borrowing in order to account for the agentivity of the speaker: that of *adoption* (RL agentivity) and that of *imposition* (SL agentivity).

In addition to the direction of influence, scholars have looked at different types of borrowing in contact situations. Haspelmath (2009) promotes the distinction between *material* borrowing and *structural* borrowing (also known as *matter borrowing* and *pattern borrowing* [Matras 2007; Matras & Sakel 2007]). Material borrowing refers to "borrowing of sound-meaning pairs (generally lexemes)," such as loanwords (Haspelmath 2009: 39). In contrast, structural borrowing refers to the "copying of syntactic, morphological or semantic patterns" (Haspelmath 2009: 39). Most linguists agree that material borrowing is more widespread and easier than structural borrowing (Haspelmath 2009; Matras 2007; Sankoff 2002; Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010; Thomason 2001; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Van Coetsem 1988; Winford 2003, 2005). Scholars have also proposed scales of borrowability. For example, Thomason and Kaufman's widely-cited borrowing scale (1988: 74) proposes a scale of borrowability based on the degrees of contact and linguistic typology, with lexical material as the most easily borrowed and grammatical borrowing as the most difficult. Similarly, Van Coetsem (1988: 25) refers to a "stability gradient" in which vocabulary is less stable than phonology and grammar; i.e. the latter are less resistant to change.

While studies that furnish borrowability scales have made general claims of the permeability of the lexicon compared to phonology and morphosyntax, other studies have revealed differential borrowability of different lexical categories. The most widely known hierarchy is that of Muysken (1981):

nouns > adjectives > verbs > prepositions > co-ordinating conjunctions > quantifiers > determiners > free pronouns > clitic pronouns > subordinating conjunctions

Matras (2007: 61) further refines the lexical hierarchy, based on a frequency hierarchy of 27 sample languages:

nouns, conjunctions > verbs > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, adpositions > numerals > pronouns > derivational affixes > inflectional affixes

While there are some differences, Matras (2007: 62) contends that the larger trends are still

found, with nouns as the most borrowed⁴, and with unbound vocabulary being more accessible than bound grammatical vocabulary. Matras does advise, however, that it may be more important to assess “the susceptibility of category values to borrowing” (that is, within a category), as comparison between categories can depend greatly on the type of language contact situation.

Given the high accessibility of nouns, scholars have split this lexical category into smaller sub-divisions, as not all nouns are borrowed equally. Weinreich (1953: 55-56) established a difference between “loanwords with entirely new content” and those that affect existing vocabulary due to their semantic similarities. In turn, Myers-Scotton (2002) divides loanwords into *cultural* and *core* borrowings, a division we adopt here. Scholars have argued that core items are much less susceptible than cultural items (Campbell 2004; Greenberg 1953; Haspelmath 2009; Haugen 1950; Myers-Scotton 2002; Swadesh 1955; Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010; among others). This is supported by the Loanword Typology Project (Haspelmath 2009; Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009; Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010), a quantitative study of loanwords in 41 languages. In terms of morphological categories, Tadmor et al. (2010) found that nouns are borrowed significantly more than either verbs or adverbs/adjectives. In terms of *content* words versus *functional* words, they found that functional words are significantly more difficult to borrow, supporting previous research (Haugen 1950; Poplack et al. 1988; van Hout & Muysken 1994). Additionally, in examining nouns by semantic category, they found that *cultural* items were borrowed significantly more than *cultural-free* (or core) items (Tadmor 2009: 64; Tadmor et al. 2010: 232). For example, within the twenty different semantic fields, *cultural* items included borrowings in the fields of *religion and belief, clothing and grooming, the house, law, social and political relations, agriculture and vegetation, and food and drink*; while *core* items included those borrowed into the semantic fields of *sense perceptions, spatial relations, the body, kinship, and motion*.

With respect to grammatical (structural) borrowing, several studies have shown that semantic and structural transparency and similarities ease morphological borrowing (Field 2002; Matras 1998, 2007; Winford 2003, 2005). Bound morphemes in general are more resistant to borrowing than free morphemes (Matras 2007: 44; Winford 2005: 386). However, bound morphemes, as long as they are “semantically and structurally congruent,” can be borrowed (Winford 2005: 386). In addition, derivational morphology is easier to borrow than inflectional morphology, accounting for the borrowing of affixes such as diminutives and augmentatives, but not case and gender markers (Matras 2007: 44). These consistent findings with respect to structural borrowing can be summarized in the following implicational hierarchies: (i) free morphemes > bound morphemes; (ii) derivational morphemes > inflectional morphemes.

2.2. Sociohistorical considerations

Prior to Thomason and Kaufman, researchers devoted little attention to the extra-linguistic factors implicated in language contact outcomes. But Thomason and Kaufman argue that social factors are able to overcome large structural differences. They state, “it is the social context, not the structure of the languages involved, that determines the direction and the degree of interference” (1988: 19).⁵ They point to two major social factors: the “intensity of contact”, which refers

⁴ As compared to other lexical categories, Winford (2003: 51) claims that nouns and adjectives are borrowed more often due to the fact that they “form less tightly knit subsystems of the grammar than functional morphemes do.”

⁵ Such an approach is not without critique as Sankoff (2002: 640-641) believes that while the revival of the importance of sociohistorical factors in Thomason and Kaufman’s work has greatly enriched the field, their lack of quantitative perspective and not giving proper weight to linguistic factors does not provide the full picture of

to how much speakers of the different languages interact, and “cultural pressure”, which indicates how much socioeconomic- or prestige-based incentives exist for one group to adopt the language of the other. Of course, in linguistic terms, there is no inherent difference between the languages, but most contact situations have occurred in contexts of social inequality (Sankoff 2002), and hence, there are political and socioeconomic differences between the speakers of the languages.

Scholars have generally labeled the language of the speakers with more power and prestige as the “superstrate”, while labeling the language of the speakers with less power and prestige as the “substrate” (Holm 2000: 5). During colonialism in Latin America the superstrate was generally considered a European language. In the current example of *Aves sin nido*, it is Spanish in Peru. The substrate during this period was generally considered to be the indigenous languages. In the current study, it is Quechua.⁶ Scholars have noted that during the contexts of colonization, there are attested periods of bilingualism in which the substrate is maintained, and there is also attested language shift of the substrate towards the superstrate, affected by cultural pressure (Thomason 2001; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Winford 2003).

3. Current study

With the foregoing review of linguistic and social concepts relevant to the study of situations of language contact, we can turn to the analysis of Quechua borrowings in *Aves sin nido*. As stated, *Aves sin nido* has received a great deal of attention in literary theory and criticism (Berg 1990, 2010, 2012; Carrillo 1967; Cornejo Polar 1977, 1980, 1992, 1994a, 1994b; Degeneri 2004; Escajadillo 1971, 1994, 2004; Ferreira 2005; García 1991; Kristal 1987; Moraña 1988; Peluffo 1998, 2005; Reisz 1992; Rodríguez-Luis 1980; Tauro 1976; Vargas Yábar 2013; Ward 2002, 2012) with general references to language practices, but without any quantitative analysis. Given the underexplored language claims, a linguistic approach aims to provide complementary insight to literary analysis.

3.1. Research questions

The current study brings a contact-linguistic lens to focus on the discourse represented in Matto de Turner’s novel, with a threefold aim of qualitatively and quantitatively analyzing the types Quechua borrowings in *Aves sin nido*; quantitatively examining and comparing the language practices between the three social groups in the novel in relation to Matto de Turner’s national ideology; and finally, demonstrating how a linguistic approach can be used to complement and strengthen a literary analysis; that is, how the language patterns reflect Matto de Turner’s ideological national project. Towards that end, the study pursues three specific research questions:

1. What types of borrowings are present in *Aves sin nido* (i.e. lexical/material borrowing vs. grammatical/structural borrowing)?
2. Are there differences in the types and quantity of Quechua borrowings between the three social groups in the novel?
3. If so, how do these differences relate to Matto de Turner’s national ideology?

For the first research question, in light of borrowability scales (Matras 2007; Muysken 1981;

language change.

⁶ Quechua was the official language of the Incas throughout their Andean kingdoms (Cerrón-Palomino 1987).

Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Van Coetsem 1988; Winford 2003), it is hypothesized that most borrowings will be lexical, with a majority of *cultural* noun loanwords as these are the most common types of borrowing in contact situations. Given the fact that we do not have access to 19th century language norms of the town of Killac/Tinta, these results are analyzed with caution. For the second research question, the null hypothesis states that all three social groups (*los indios*, *los forasteros*, *los notables*) will demonstrate equal amounts and types of borrowings. A chi-square test of goodness-of-fit was performed to determine whether the three social groups used equal amounts of Quechua borrowings. For each specific test (lexical borrowings, grammatical borrowings, overall borrowings), the null hypothesis indicates that the Quechua borrowings are equally distributed between the three different social groups so that the *p*-value is above 0.05. However, if the *p*-value is less than 0.05, we can safely reject the null hypothesis and assume that the Quechua borrowings are not equally distributed between groups. Thus, a *p*-value less than 0.05 indicates that there are significant differences between social groups in terms of the number of Quechua borrowings. Differences cannot be assumed a priori as the reader is not given explicit information as to the bilingual abilities of any of the members of the three groups. In this sense, differences in language practices between the groups must emerge from the discourse itself. However, if differences do arise from the discourse, we can reasonably claim that speakers with more grammatical borrowings will demonstrate a greater influence from Quechua as the borrowability scale (Matras 2007) posits that grammar is less susceptible to borrowing than lexicon. Additionally, any differences in Quechua borrowings between the *forasteros* and the *notables* could reveal differences in social psychological approaches towards Andean languages and peoples. Finally, in regards to the third research question, if differences between groups are found, we can interpret this in relation to Matto de Turner's national ideology of the incorporation of Andean people, language, and culture (Matto de Turner 1988a, 1988b, 1893, 1902; Ward 2002, 2012).

3.2. Methodology

The present analysis of a literary text is based on concepts and findings from the subfield of contact linguistics. This type of analysis is commonly referred to as *literary linguistics*, which Fabb (2001: 446) defines as “the application of linguistic theory to literature.” Azevedo (2009) claims that there is a great similarity between literary *close reading* and linguistic *discourse analysis*, but the focus is quite different. Specifically, Azevedo claims that “literary linguistic analysis involves a kind of close reading that pays attention to language details- phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical and so on” (2009: 4). In line with this approach, here we pay particular attention to the lexical and morphological borrowings in the discourse of the characters of *Aves sin nido*. Each lexical and morphological borrowing was considered as one token for a frequency count of borrowings in the discourse. In addition, each lexical borrowing was coded for grammatical category (nouns, verbs, adjectives/adverbs, interjections) as well as for semantic field following the Loanword Typology Project (see Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009). Furthermore, each morphological suffix was classified by meaning (possessive or diminutive). Finally, each Quechua borrowing was coded for individual speaker as well as social group (*indios*, *forasteros*, *notables*). Section 4.1 provides the descriptive statistics of the types of borrowings with examples from the novel. Section 4.2 uses chi-square analyses to compare statistical differences in quantity and types of borrowings between social groups.

4. Results

4.1. Analysis of types of Quechua borrowings

We now analyze the Quechua borrowings (lexical and structural) in the discourse of *Aves sin nido* by Matto de Turner. Recall that discourse refers to the characters' discourse, and not the narration of the author. Overall there were 159⁷ Quechua borrowings in the discourse. Due to lack of social information of certain speakers, 9 tokens were eliminated from the analysis, yielding a total of 150 tokens (91 lexical, 59 grammatical). Without entering into the debate of when a lexical borrowing becomes part of the recipient language (particularly in the case of words without a Spanish equivalent such as *quena*, *choclo*, *alpaca*, and *puna*), I intentionally kept these words in the analysis, as the main point is to quantify the borrowings based on social groups. Thus, I included any Quechua borrowing⁸ to see if there were group differences. This of course has its own limitations, but is a more objective analysis than arbitrarily deciding when a word became a part of the Spanish lexicon. In this light, it is important to include all borrowings in order to demonstrate overall differences based on social groups.

4.1.1. Lexical (material) borrowing⁹

As discussed, lexical borrowing is the incorporation of lexicon from one language into another. Both indigenous and non-indigenous characters in the novel utilize borrowings. However, in colonial language contact, lexical borrowing alone does not entail extensive bilingualism by both groups, but only by one group, or particularly members of such a group (Escobar 2007; Sankoff 2002; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Winford 2003). Escobar (2011: 329) notes, "Quechua cultural borrowings commonly found in the Andes refer to the flora and fauna of the region as well as to local social organization, food, agriculture, clothing, folklore, and religion (cf. Mejías 1980: 22-23; Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 590-591)." Most of these loans were incorporated into Spanish during the colonial period (Escobar 2007: 240, 2011: 329; Mejías 1980).¹⁰ Consequently, "Quechua served Spanish to describe with better precision the nature and the things of the Andean world" (Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 131, *my translation*).

As Haspelmath (2009: 42) notes, orthographic changes, or *loanword adaptation*, occur when differences exist between the two languages. Given that Quechua and Spanish do not share the same orthographic norms, Matto de Turner uses Spanish orthography to capture the pronunciation of certain words. For example, as orthographic <w> does not exist in Spanish orthography, she uses <hu> to represent this sound. This is seen in the example <wawa> 'child' written as <huahua>. Additionally, as <k> is not native to Spanish orthography, Matto de Turner uses <c>

7 There were five {-y} tokens (first-person possessive marker) uttered by Doña Melitona (pp. 53-55) that were excluded from this analysis given the lack of social information about the speaker. There were four additional lexical borrowings excluded from the analysis including "¡Súhua!" <suwa> 'thief' (p.53) it was shouted by a chorus of unidentifiable speakers during the attack on the Marín house (p. 46) and "taita" 'sir' (p.123) as it came from a chorus of people.

8 As one reviewer observed, loanwords such as *soroche* or *huahua* may be more common among monolingual Spanish speakers in the Andes, while other loanwords such as *chaco* or *allpa* are more common among Quechua-Spanish bilinguals. Here, however, all loanwords are included in order to examine how they vary per social group.

9 Quechua definitions are from *Diccionario Quechua-Español* (Yaranga Valderrama 2003). Due to space limitations, the Spanish definitions have been translated into English.

10 Aymara loanwords were also incorporated into Spanish during this time in Peru.

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

where Quechua uses <k> as seen in <lliklla> ‘knitted wool blanket’ written as <lliclla>.

The 91 lexical borrowings in the discourse were classified with within multiple morphological categories and semantic categories, arranged with hierarchies. In terms of morphological category of lexical loanwords (Table 1), we see an overwhelming incorporation of nouns, no verbs or adjectives/adverbs, and a few interjections. These findings support previous research that nouns are the most borrowed category (Haspelmath 2009; Haugen 1950; Matras 2007; Muysken 1981; Poplack et al. 1988; Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010; van Hout & Muysken 1994).¹¹

Table 1

Lexical borrowings by morphological category

	Tokens	% of total
Nouns	85	93.41%
Verbs	-	-
Adjectives/Adverbs	-	-
Interjections	6	6.59%

Recall that loanwords have been traditionally divided into *cultural* versus *core* vocabulary (Myers-Scotton 2002). In Table 2, one can see that when the 91 borrowings are classified within semantic fields, they fall within the fields closer to the top, which are more *cultural*, or those “domains which have typically been most affected by intercultural influences” (Tadmor 2009: 64), while fewer fall within fields closer to the bottom, or *core* vocabulary, which are typically more resistant to borrowing.

Table 2

Lexical borrowings by semantic category (following Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010)

Semantic Field	Tokens	Loanwords as % of total
Religion and belief	27	29.67%
Clothing and grooming	1	1.10%
The house	4	4.40%
Law	-	-
Social and political relations	26	28.57%
Agriculture and vegetation	8	8.79%
Food and drink	13	14.29%
Warfare and hunting	1	1.10%
Possession	-	-
Animals	2	2.20%
Cognition	-	-
Basic actions and technology	-	-
Time	-	-
Speech and language	-	-
Quantity	-	-
Emotions and values	6	6.59%
The physical world	-	-
Motion	-	-
Kinship	2	2.20%
The body	-	-

¹¹ Similarly, in his study of indigenous languages (Quechua, Taino, and Nahuatl) in 17th century Spanish documents, Mejías (1980: 24) also found nouns (95.7%) to be the most overwhelmingly borrowed, followed by verbs (2.3%), and adjectives (2%). Given the analysis of written documents, he claims that there are many interjections that were not included.

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

Semantic field	Tokens	Loanwords as % of total
Spatial relations	-	-
Sense perceptions	1	1.10%

In terms of specific semantic field, religion and belief (29.67%) and social and political relations (28.57%) were the most borrowed, followed by food and drink (14.29%), agriculture and vegetation (8.79%), and emotions and values (6.59%) (these were the six interjections). With the exception of the interjections, nearly all nouns fell into the typical categorization of *cultural* borrowings (those semantic fields¹² closer to the top of Table 2) as compared to *core* borrowings. We now consider examples of each of these categories.

Examples (1, 2, 3) show the various uses of the borrowing *Wiracocha*, or <*Wiracucha*>. In example (1) it expresses the original semantic meaning of ‘the God, the creator, the beginning’, exclaimed by Juan and Marcela.

(1) ¡*Wiracocha!*¹³ (p. 25)
Dear **God!**

In situations of language contact, SL loanwords can shift from their original semantic meaning, particularly if the RL already has a semantic equivalent (Haugen 1950; Winford 2003). Examples (2) and (3) demonstrate that *Wiracocha* has extended its original semantic meaning of ‘God’ into meaning either ‘Spaniards that came to Peru to whom were given the name by believing they were sent by divine principle’ or ‘gentleman, white man. Title of esteem’. In example (2) Marcela is speaking to her daughter Rosalía about how the *notables* would have kidnapped her had it not been for the help of Don Fernando, or as she refers to him, this “*wiracocha*”.

(2) ¡*Ay!* ¡*Ay!*, *dónde te hubiesen llevado, hija mía, sin la caridad de esta señora y este wiracocha* (p. 34).
Ay! Ay! Where would they have taken you, my daughter, without the benevolence of this lady and this **gentleman**.

In example (3) Martina uses *wiracocha* as a title of esteem such as *señor/don* ‘Mr.’

(3) *El Wiracocha* *Fernando no nos persigue, es mentira* (p. 144).
Sir/Mr. Fernando does not pursue us, it’s a lie.

It appears Matto de Turner was well aware of this semantic extension in meaning as in a footnote she defines *Wiracocha* as “*Dios de los incas, hijo del sol. Nombre que los indios dieron a los españoles de la Conquista. La autora lo emplea con el significado de caballero*” ‘God of the Incas, son of the sun. Name que the *indios* gave to the Spaniards of the Conquest. The author employs it with the meaning of gentleman’ (p. 25). Most of the novel uses *Wiracocha* such as *caballero* ‘gentleman’ as seen in examples (2) and (3), but there a few examples such as (1) in which its meaning is that of *Dios* ‘God.’

In a different borrowing of religion and beliefs, Gabino, the servant helping the Marín fam-

¹² Similarly, Mejías (1980: 22) found the three most common semantic fields (his categories were slightly different) in his analysis were flora, social organization, and fauna.

¹³ For the benefit of the reader, all Quechua borrowings in the textual examples are bolded.

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

ily on their move from Kíllac to Lima, uses the word *supay*, “*demonio*” ‘demon,’ as he is seeing a train for the first time:

(4) *¡Santísima Trinidad! ¡Allí va el diablo! ¿Quién otro puede mover esto? ¡Supay! ¡Supay!* (p. 160)
Holy Trinity! There goes the devil! Who else could move this? **Demon! Demon!**

In examples (5) and (6), we observe several linguistic borrowings relating to the household, clothing, and grooming. While speaking with his mother Doña Petronila about a clay vase in their house Manuel uses several linguistic borrowings such as *huaco*, *lliclla* and *ccoya*. *Huaco*, <*waco*> in Quechua orthography, means “utensils and ceramics found in the pre-Hispanic tombs.” *Lliclla*, <*lliklla*> in Quechua orthography, refers to “knitted blanket of wool thread and alive colors, used as a blanket by the farmers in the mountains”. Finally, *ccoya*, <*qoya*> in Quechua orthography, in this context refers to “Queen, princess, spouse of the Inca.”

(5) *Este debe ser un huaco de mucha importancia: qué tierra tan fina... y estos dibujos tan admirablemente ejecutados, qué bien hechas las labores de la Lliclla de la ccoya* (p. 61).
This must be a **ceramic** of a lot of importance: what fine land... and these drawings so admirably executed, how well done the labors of the **knitted wool blanket** of the **Incan princess**.

In example (6), Martina’s lament to Isidro includes the term *quena*, also written as <*gena*>, meaning “musical air instrument, native of the Andean culture made”, which is a type of flute.

(6) *¡La tumba debe ser tranquila como la noche de la luna en que se oye la quena del pastor!* (p. 170)
The tomb should be as tranquil as night of the moon in which one hears the **flute** of the shepherd.

In example (7) Marcela is speaking to her husband Juan about the priest. She utilizes the word *tata* “don/señor” ‘sir’. Matto de Turner’s footnote explains that “*tata o taita se emplean como tratamiento de respeto*” ‘*tata* or *taita* is employed as a form of respect’ (p. 5), i.e., it marks a social political relation:

(7) *¿acaso no te acuerdas que cuando el tata cura llega a su casa con los bolsillos llenos con la plata de los responsos de Todosantos [...]* (p. 16)
Perhaps you don’t remember when the **sir** priest arrives to his house with his pockets filled with silver from the prayer of All Saints [...]

There are also loans for agriculture and vegetation manifested in the text. As is well attested, flora and fauna loans are common for new concepts that do not exist in RL and are consequently passed from the indigenous SL to the colonial RL (Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 590; Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 131; Escobar 2011: 329; Heliodoro-Valle 1953: 53; Mejías 1980: 22; Rivarola 1995: 154;

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

Sebba 1997: 11). In example (8) governor Pancorbo uses the terminology *puna*, which is the “high part of the mountain range”. In example (9) Martina in an argument with her husband uses the word *molle*, an indigenous tree to the region. And in example (10) Isidro laments to Martina about their hardships and uses the term *allpa* which means “dust; arable land/earth.”

(8) *Adiós, pues, mi cura, es hora de retirarse, y francamente que la noche está friecita como puna* (p. 41).

Goodbye, well, my priest, it's time to retire, and frankly the night is as chilly as the **high part of the Andean mountain range**.

(9) *¡Tú te estás poniendo amargo como la corteza del molle!* (p. 131)

You are becoming bitter like the bark of the **molle tree**.

(10) *¡Allpa mama!* (p. 169)

Mother **earth/land!**

The next set of examples relate to food and drink (and animals). In example (11), Don Fernando is speaking with his wife Lucía about what they are going to eat for dinner. He mentions that there is still a little bit of *quinua* left over. Here there are two loan words being used. *Chichi*, or <ch'chi>, means “sprout, shoot.” *Quinua*, written in Quechua as <kinua> or <kiwina>, is a modern loan that is still used today.

(11) *Voy a molestarte, hija; creo que hay un poco de chichi de quinua con arroz; dame un vaso* (p. 57).

I'm going to bother you, young lady; I believe that there is a little bit of a **sprout of quinoa** with rice; give me a glass.

In example (12) Doña Petronila is speaking with her son Manuel about what she is going to make him for dinner. Here she uses the loan *suches*. *Suche*, also written as <suchi>, is a “fish that abounds in Lake Titicaca”.

(12) *¡Manuelito, cómo te gustaban los suches asados al horno!* (p. 59)

Little Manuel, oh how you used to like the oven-grilled **suches!**

In example (13) in a conversation between Doña Petronila and her son Manuel about what types of resources they have, Doña Petronila uses several food loanwords such as *choclo*, or <choqullo>, “corn on the cob,” as well as some animal (food) loanwords such as *alpaca* <allpaqa>.

(13) *Tenemos buenos topes de terrenos que producen maíz, trigo, cebada, ocas, habas, papas, choclos y quinua; tenemos algunos cientos de ovejas, vacas, alpacas y yeguas cerreras que trillan la cosecha [...]* (p. 107)

We have good plots of terrain that produce corn, wheat, barley, **goose**, beans, **potatoes**, **corn on the cob** and **quinoa**; we have some hundred goats, cows, **alpacas** and wild mares that thresh the harvest [...]

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

In example (14) Marcela invokes Quechua terms for hunting when speaking with Lucía about the priest. She uses the word *chaco*, which given the orthographic differences is normally written in Quechua as <*chaku*> or <*chaqu*>, which means “hunt”.¹⁴

(14) *Así es, niñay, pero la muerte también le puede jugar chaco al tata cura* (p. 26).

That’s how it is my lady, but the death can also play **hunt** to the **sir** priest.

All cases of borrowings from the field of emotions and values (6 total) are interjections, which are commonly borrowed for pragmatic reasons in language contact situations (Andersen 2014). In example (15) Doña Petronila is speaking with Manuel about their savings. She uses the interjection “*guá*,” which given the orthographic differences between Quechua and Spanish is normally written as <*wa*> in Quechua meaning “interjection of admiration, pity.” Following Matras’ (2007: 61) borrowability hierarchy, interjections are commonly borrowed in contact situations.

(15) *¿No te tengo a ti para cuidar tu porvenir? ¡Guá! ¡Guá! Yo... he ahorrado una mitad* (p. 107).

Do I not have you to care for your future? **Pff! Pff!** I... have saved a half.

In example (16) we observe a borrowing in the category of kinship. Marcela, in referring to her child to priest Pascual, says *huahua*, written <*wawa*> in Quechua, meaning “son/daughter in relation to the mother”, but can also pragmatically mean “little girl, little boy affectionate.”

(16) *Es que vengo poco a estancia por no haber cumplido con nuestra deuda, y por esto no la reconoces, tata curay, a la huahua* (p. 31).

It’s that I come little to the estate for not having fulfilled our debt, and for this you do not recognize, sir priest, the **little child** (feminine).

Finally, in (17) we have examples relating to sensorial perception. Don Fernando is speaking with his wife Lucía and his two stepdaughters, Margarita and Rosalía. He wants them to avoid *soroche*, “sickness of the Andes that consists in a strong headache and general physical discomfort,” known today as altitude sickness.

(17) *Hay que llevarla a la mano, porque es importante para precaverse del mareo y el soroche* (p. 160).

One has to carry it by hand, because it’s important to avoid the dizziness and the **sickness of the Andes (altitude sickness)**.

¹⁴ In a footnote in the novel it is defined as “*forma de encerrona practicada por los indios para cazar*” ‘form of trap practiced by the indigenous peoples for hunting’ (p.26). Additionally, as one reviewer pointed out, this can mean to herd or bring together a large group of alpacas or vicuñas for shearing. The reviewer suggests that this is perhaps in reference to the unfair wool prices that the *indígenas* in the novel are being paid by the corrupt middlemen.

4.1.2. Grammatical (structural) borrowing

A common example of grammatical (or structural) borrowing seen throughout the novel is the aggregation of a Quechua suffix onto a Spanish lexical morpheme. The novel presents many cases of the two Quechua suffixes of {-y} and {-cha}. Below are some examples from the text in which a Spanish noun is used with Quechua suffix {-y}, a first person possessive suffix (Escobar 2000: 167, 2011: 330; Páez 1970: 24). Previous research has stated that either semantic or structural transparency (Matras 2007; Matras & Sakel 2007; Winford 2003) facilitates morphological borrowing. In Spanish, possession is not shown with a suffix, but with a stand-alone adjective in pre-noun position such as *mi* in the case of *mi niña* ‘my girl’ or in post-noun position as *mío/a* such as in the case of *niña mía* ‘my girl.’ In terms of semantics, it appears that the Quechua and Spanish first-person possessive are quite similar. But structural realizations of such possession are quite different. However, the fact that Spanish allows for other types of derivational suffixes, such as diminutives, could account for its borrowability, as in example (18).

(18) ¿Recuerdas, *tatay*? (p. 59)
 Do you remember *my* sir?

Escobar (2011: 330) indicates that {-y} is now common in Andean Spanish. As Escobar (2011: 326) suggests that the dialect of Andean Spanish emerged in the 20th century¹⁵, this perhaps reflects the beginning of such borrowings that possibly entered in through the lexicon. In fact, Matras (2007) argues that much structural borrowing is brought in through the lexicon such as in example (18) in which Doña Petronila is speaking to her son Manuel. The following two examples demonstrate the original semantic meaning of {-y} as a first person possessive, in combination with *cura* ‘priest’ and *compadre* ‘masculine friend’.

(19) Ave María Purísima, *tata curay* (p. 31).
 Purest Ave María, sir *my* priest.

(20) Sí, *compadrey*, *Wiracocha* (p. 109).
 Yes, *my* friend (male), sir.

The next three examples, however, demonstrate a type of lexicalization, in which the possessive {-y} attached to particular words is being used for pragmatic reasons. In example (21) we see the combination of Spanish *niña* ‘girl’ and Quechua {-y} ‘my’. In a footnote Matto de Turner indicates that *niñay* is “*aplicado a señoritas de clase alta*” ‘applied to young women of high class’ (p. 5). Instead of truly serving as a possessive, it is a lexicalized vocative.

(21) Como tú no eres de aquí *niñay*, no sabes los martirios que pasamos con el cobrador, el cacique y el tata cura, ¡ay!, ¡ay! (p. 5)
 As you are not from here *my* lady, you don’t know the martyrdom that we pass with the collector, the cacique, and the sir priest, ay!
 ay!

¹⁵ This claim is based on Escobar’s (2007) analysis of historical documents, which does not support the presence of Andean Spanish during the colonial period, and consequently proposes that it developed later.

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

Similar to *niñay*, we observe lexicalized vocatives in example (22) and (23) with *comadrita* and *Wiracocha*, used semantically as *sir/gentleman*, combined with {-y}.

(22) *¿Cómo no, comadritay?* (p. 109)
And how not?, **my** little (diminutive) godmother.

(23) *Sí, Wiracochay, también ahorita se han llevado todos nuestros ganados* (p. 136).
Yes, **my** sir, also now they have taken all our cattle.

In addition to the borrowing of the first person possessive {-y} suffix, the characters' discourse also presents the incorporation of a separate suffix, that of Quechua {-cha}, a familiar diminutive (Escobar 2011: 330; Yaranga Valderrama 2003: 32). Escobar (2011: 328) indicates that the use of {-cha} with Spanish lexicon is also common today in Andean Spanish. Thus, similar to {-y}, its presence in the text is perhaps a reflection of its presence in the 19th century. Diminutive forms in Spanish are expressed through the suffixes {-ito/a}, {-ico/a}, {-illo/a}, and {-ín/a} with various degrees of geographic and social variation. Thus, different from possession, the diminutive in Spanish and Quechua is both semantically and structurally similar, allowing for facilitation of borrowing (Matras 2007; Matras & Sakel 2007; Winford 2003). Below are several examples of a Spanish noun, being modified by the Quechua diminutive {-cha} in place of a Spanish diminutive such as {-ito/a}. As in Spanish, it appears as though {-cha} is used for affective meaning and not an actual diminutive. In example (24) we see the combination of *señora* 'Mrs.' or 'ma'am' with {-cha}, a combination that is used several times throughout the novel. Here in its first use, Matto de Turner defines *señoracha* in a footnote as a "*modismo quechizado [sic], diminutivo de señora*" 'Quechua-ized [sic] idiom, diminutive of Mrs./ma'am' (p. 4).

(24) *En nombre de la Virgen, señoracha, ampara el día de hoy a toda una familia desgraciada.* (p. 4)
In the name of the Virgin Mary, **dear** lady, protect the day of today for an entire miserable family.

In example (25) we see the combination of a Spanish name *Isidro* with {-cha}, and in example (26) we note the use of similar affixation with the name of *Martina*.

(25) *¡Isidro, Isidrocha! ¿dónde te veo?* (p. 131)
Isidro, **dear** Isidro, ¿where will I see you?

(26) *¡Acaso, acaso, Martinacha!* (p.144)
Perhaps, perhaps, **dear** Martina!

In example (27) we observe one of the few times that {-cha} is used as an actual diminutive, as *Rosalía* is the small younger daughter. However, within the same conversation, we see the affectionate use of {-cha} with *señora*.

(27) *Yo me quedé llorando cerca de Rosacha que duerme junto al fogón*

de la choca y de repente mi corazón me ha dicho que tú eres buena; y sin que sepa Juan vengo a implorar tu socorro, por la Virgen, señoracha, ¡ay ay! (p. 4).

I remained crying near little Rosalía who sleeps next to the fireplace and all of the sudden my heart has told me that you are good; and without knowing Juan, I come to implore your help, by the Virgin Mary, dear lady, oh my!

Onysko and Winter-Froemel (2011: 1555), following Levinson's (2000: 373) theory of presumptive meanings, suggest that the borrowing of a semantic (near-) equivalent demonstrates pragmatic markedness. That is to say, speakers use these borrowings not for their original semantic value, as they have equivalents in the other language, but as a means of expressing or implying some type of non-referential meaning. In the examples above, several instances of {-y} indicate a pragmatic vocative while examples of {-cha} indicate a pragmatic affection beyond the literal semantic meanings. Here this may serve to mark the speech of the *indios*, especially the use of {-cha} as they are the only group to use it. In this sense, the pragmatic markedness of {-cha} may be used by the author here as an ethnic marker. Additionally, as this is a grammatical borrowing, it could also indicate that these speakers are more influenced by Quechua than the other two groups.

4.2. Types of borrowings by social group

Having examined the types of lexical and structural borrowing in *Aves sin nido*, we now analyze the incorporation of these borrowings as a function of social group. In the case of *Aves sin nido*, Quechua, the SL, is being borrowed into Spanish, the RL. As discussed, it is important to distinguish between *adoption* (RL agentivity) and *imposition* (SL agentivity). Given that the reader is not explicitly privileged to know which speakers are native Spanish speakers, native Quechua speakers, or (balanced) bilinguals, we can only rely on the linguistic analysis of the discourse of the novel rather than making a priori assumptions based on race or ethnicity. For the purposes of the current work, as all characters are speaking primarily in Spanish with Quechua borrowings, the directionality is that of *adoption* (RL agentivity); that is Quechua, the SL, is being borrowed into Spanish, the RL. Linguistic attitudes have a large role in the *adoption* (RL agentivity) of borrowings. Thomason (2001: 85) states, "attitudes can be either barriers or promoters of change." In the novel, attitudes vary by social groups. Here we investigate how language reflects bilingual abilities as well as group ideologies towards indigenous people and culture.

There are three distinct social groups throughout the novel. The first group is that of the indigenous people, or as they are referred to in the novel, *los indios*. This group includes Marcela and Juan Yupanqui, Margarita, Rosalía, Isidro and Martina Champi, a few nameless *pongos* 'servants,' and Escobedo. While Escobedo is more aligned with the corrupt powers of the town, the little social information we have about him suggests that he is of indigenous descent as he is the neighbor of the Champi family.

The second social network is comprised of the non-indigenous protagonists, referred to as *los forasteros* 'the outsiders'. These members are educated, openly oppose the abuse of the indigenous people, and demand justice. This group includes Fernando and Lucía Marín, Manuel, Doña Petronila, as well as Gaspar and his daughter Teodora. These characters actively protect the indigenous people from the abusive powers of the town. In addition to their networks in

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

Kíllac, Fernando, Lucía, and Manuel have contacts in the capital city of Lima. From the first description of Lucía¹⁶ Marín, that which stands out is her “*belleza peruana*” ‘Peruvian beauty’ (p.3). Additionally, in her first dialogue, one notes that Lucía “*está vivamente interesada en conocer a fondo las costumbres de los indios*” ‘is vividly interested in knowing in depth the customs of the *indios*’ (p.5). In fact, she initiates the adoption of Margarita and Rosalía. Towards the end of the novel Lucía indicates her desire to better the future of the indigenous people, “*¡Pobre raza! ¡Si pudiéramos libertar a toda ella [...]*” ‘Poor race! If we were able to set all of them free [...]’ (p.158). Similar to Lucía, Don Fernando also admires the indigenous peoples and desires to better their future. He states, “*Para mí, no se ha extinguido en el Perú esa raza con principios de rectitud y nobleza*” ‘For me, that race with principles of rectitude and nobility, has not extinguished in Peru’ (p.58). Manuel, in spite of being a native of Kíllac, has been educated in Lima. He is a Law School sophomore in Lima and throughout the novel his intelligence, education, and desire for equality and justice are evident. He refers to Kíllac as “*un pueblo bárbaro*” ‘a barbarian town’ due to the unjust and illegal atrocities committed towards the indigenous peoples (p.54). Similar to the Marín family, he has a sincere interest in the indigenous people of the novel. He desires to marry Margarita until they both realize it is an impossible love due to the Priest Pascual being their illegitimate father. Doña Petronila, similar to her son Manuel, in spite of being married to one of the corrupt powers, also demonstrates virtue, education, and an appreciation of the indigenous people and culture. She has an “*educación esmerada [...y] era una joya valiosa perdida en los peñascales de Kíllac*” ‘painstaking education [...and] was a valuable jewel lost in the rocky hills of Kíllac’ (p.30). As Ferreira (2005: 40, *my translation*) notes, the *forasteros* are “representatives of an erudite, progressive, and modern bourgeoisie that cannot tolerate the situation of exploitation of the *indios* and that opposes the archaizing ideology of the ‘*notables*’”. This group is referred to as the *forasteros*, as the principal characters, the Marín family, is labeled as such in the novel.

The third group is that of the corrupt powers that exploit the indigenous people, which includes Governor Sebastián Pancorbo, priest Pascual, judge Hilarión Verdejo, and Estéfano Benites. This group converses principally among themselves, and only in moments of exploitation do they communicate with the *indios* or the *forasteros*. They are the epitome of all that is wrong with the *viollorios* ‘one-horse towns’ in the Andean regions of Peru. They refer to themselves as “*dueños del suelo*” ‘owners of the land’ and “*peruanos legítimos*” ‘legitimate Peruvians’ in comparison to both the *forasteros* and the *indios* (p. 23). They see outsiders as a threat to their rule in the town. In fact, Don Sebastián Pancorbo explicitly warns Don Fernando, “*Francamente, yo aconsejo a usted no apoyar a estos indios*” ‘Frankly, I advise you to not support these *indios*’ (p.28). In their meeting where they discuss what to do about the issue of the Marín family aiding and protecting the indigenous people, Governor Sebastián says, “*De una vez por todas debemos poner remedio a esas malas enseñanzas; es preciso botar de aquí a todo forastero que venga sin deseo de apoyar nuestras costumbres; porque nosotros, francamente, somos hijos del pueblo*” ‘Once and for all we should put remedy to these bad teachings; it’s necessary to eliminate from here all outsiders that come without desires to support our customs; because we, frankly, are sons of the town’ (p. 23). Manuel refers to this group as *los notables* in which he says “*los notables no acatan la ley, no conocen la religión*” ‘the *notables* do not respect the law, do not know religion’ (p. 126). Thus, the *notables* represent a closed-minded network that is averse to both the indigenous peoples as well as any *forastero* who advocates for the rights of the *indios*. Ferreira (2005: 39, *my translation*) states, “the ‘*notables*’ are immoral, thieves, drunks, womanizers due to their lack of education [...]” This

¹⁶ The name *Lucía* is symbolic as the verb *lucir* means ‘to shine’. Thus, *Lucía* serves as a name, but also as the third person singular imperfect conjugation of *lucir*, meaning ‘she/he shined’.

group represents the corruption within the political, judicial, and ecclesiastical powers in Peru.

Given the labeling of *indios*, *forasteros*, and *notables* in the novel, as well as by predominant literary critics of the novel (Cornejo Polar 1977, 1992: 42), I refer to these three social groups as such. Now that we have a basic understanding of the differences between the social groups, here we analyze and differences between social groups in regards to the types and frequency of Quechua borrowings.

4.2.1. Lexical (material) borrowings

In terms of lexical borrowings, the *indios* realized 57 borrowings (62.64%), the *forasteros* 29 (31.87%), and the *notables* 5 (5.49%); see Table 3. Statistical analysis was conducted using R (R Core Team 2015). A chi-square test of goodness-of-fit was performed to determine whether the three social groups used equal amounts of Quechua lexical borrowings. The production of Quechua lexical borrowings was not equally distributed in the population, $X^2(2, N = 91) = 44.659$, $p < .001$. As the *indios* demonstrated by far the most lexical borrowings, a follow-up chi-square test looked specifically at any differences between the *forasteros* and the *notables*. The production of Quechua lexical borrowings was not equally distributed in the population, $X^2(1, N = 34) = 16.941$, $p < .001$, indicating significantly more lexical borrowings by the *forasteros* ($N = 29$) than the *notables* ($N = 5$).

4.2.2. Grammatical (structural) borrowings

In terms of grammatical borrowings, the *indios* realized 56 borrowings (94.92%), the *forasteros* 3 (5.08%), and the *notables* 0 (0%); see Table 3. A chi-square test examined whether the three social groups used equal amounts of Quechua grammatical borrowings. The production of Quechua borrowings was not equally distributed in the population, $X^2(2, N = 59) = 100.915$, $p < .001$, indicating significantly more grammatical borrowings by the *indios* ($N = 56$), than the *forasteros* ($N = 3$) or the *notables* ($N = 0$). Given the *notables* did not produce one grammatical borrowing; a follow-up analysis between the *forasteros* and *notables* was not possible as this violates a sample size assumption.

4.2.3. Overall borrowings

In terms of overall borrowings, the *indios* realized 113 borrowings (75.33%), the *forasteros* 32 (21.33%), and the *notables* 5 (3.33%); see Table 3. A chi-square test examined whether the three social groups used equal amounts of overall Quechua borrowings (lexical and grammatical grouped together). The production of Quechua loanwords was not equally distributed in the population, $X^2(2, N = 150) = 125.36$, $p < .001$. As the *indios* demonstrated by far the most overall borrowings, a follow-up chi-square test looked specifically at any differences between the *forasteros* and the *notables*. The production of Quechua borrowings was not equally distributed in the population, $X^2(1, N = 37) = 19.703$, $p < .001$, indicating significantly more overall borrowings by the *forasteros* ($N = 32$) than the *notables* ($N = 5$).

Table 3
Quechua borrowings by social group

	<i>Indios</i>	<i>Forasteros</i>	<i>Notables</i>	Total per domain
Lexical	57 (62.64%)	29 (31.87%)	5 (5.49%)	91
Grammatical	56 (94.92%)	3 (5.08%)	0 (0%)	59
Overall borrowings	113 (75.33%)	32 (21.33%)	5 (3.33%)	150

Note: Percentages represent the percent of borrowings by each social group per linguistic domain.

5. Discussion

The current study has analyzed the Quechua borrowings in the discourse of Matto de Turner's seminal novel *Aves sin nido*. With regards to the analysis of types of borrowings, overall there were more lexical (material) borrowings than grammatical (structural) borrowings, which is consistent with previous findings that point to the susceptibility of lexicon versus the relative impermeability of structure (Haspelmath 2009; Matras 2007; Matras & Sakel 2007; Sankoff 2002; Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010; Thomason 2001; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Van Coetsem 1988; Winford 2003, 2005). Of the lexical borrowings, nearly all were nouns, with the exception of a few pragmatic interjections, in line with hierarchical scales of borrowings (Matras 2007; Muysken 1981; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Van Coetsem 1988; Winford 2003). By reference to the specific semantic fields of the Typological Loanword project (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009), we observed that most borrowings are drawn from *cultural* semantic fields as opposed to more *core* or *culture-free* fields (Campbell 2004; Greenberg 1953; Haspelmath 2009; Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009; Haugen 1950; Myers-Scotton 2002; Swadesh 1955; Tadmor 2009; Tadmor et al. 2010; Weinreich 1953). In terms of structural borrowing, only derivational Quechua suffixes {-y} and {-cha} were found throughout the characters' discourse. Given the semantic and structural similarity between these derivational suffixes of both languages, they are easily borrowed and used for non-referential pragmatic purposes as compared to the more impermeable inflectional suffixes. These findings indicate that Matto de Turner's use of Quechua in *Aves sin nido* was perhaps not as folkloric or exotic as claimed by previous scholars (Carrillo 1967; Escajadillo 2004; García 1991). However, as the current analysis does not make a direct comparison of the discourse of the novel to 19th century data (the time period of the novel), such comparisons of the discourse to modern linguistic theory should be taken with caution. Notwithstanding, the results of Section 4.1 demonstrate that the borrowings in the novel follow general tendencies in borrowing typology found in situations of language contact, indicating that Matto de Turner's literary representation of language contact was not simply a folkloric touch.

The analysis of the Quechua borrowings by social categories is even more interesting as it allows us to make some inferences into the language abilities of characters, as well as each group's openness towards the Andean people and language. As seen in Table 3, analyzing the Quechua borrowings by social group indicates that the three groups are not equally using overall amounts of borrowings, as well as types of borrowings. The *indios* produced 75.33% of the overall Quechua borrowings (62.64% of the lexical borrowings; 94.92% of the structural borrow-

ings), the *forasteros* produced 21.33% of the overall Quechua borrowings (31.87% of the lexical borrowings; 5.08% of the structural borrowings), while the *notables* produced a mere 3.33% of the total Quechua borrowings (5.49% of the lexical borrowings; 0% of the structural borrowings). Here we observe that the *indios* demonstrate significantly higher amounts of lexical borrowings, grammatical borrowings, and consequently overall Quechua borrowings, suggesting a greater knowledge of Quechua compared to the other groups. Additionally, given the overall group differences in borrowings, particularly with the incorporation of the grammatical (structural) features, this could indicate that the Spanish language competency of the *indios* may be more limited than the other two groups as these borrowings occur in discourse when the interlocutor is also part of the *indios* group or a member of the other two groups. As mentioned previously, given the lack of description of the bilingual abilities of speakers, we cannot assume based on ethnicity that these speakers are in fact bilingual. However, the data reveals that high borrowing of grammatical features indicates that their knowledge of Quechua is significantly higher than the other two groups, which could also indicate, as stated above, that their Spanish is in turn more limited than the other two social groups.

In terms of grammatical features, it is worth mentioning that the *forasteros* only demonstrated 3 tokens of first person possessive suffix {-y} and zero tokens of {-cha}. It should be noted that it was the same token *tatay* 'my/dear sir' on three different occasions (p. 59, 94, 123), further supporting the notion that structural borrowing occurs by way of lexical borrowing (as seen in example 18). Given the small number of grammatical borrowings by the *forasteros* and absolutely none by the *notables*, this suggests that these groups are borrowing more accessible features such as the lexicon, indicating rather low levels of Quechua proficiency.

In focusing on the difference in borrowings between the *forasteros* and the *notables*, we find perhaps the most interesting and important result of the present study. The *forasteros* produced significantly more lexical borrowings and overall borrowings¹⁷ than the *notables*. I propose that favorable attitudes by the *forasteros* towards the *indios* appear to promote their *adoption* of Quechua borrowings while the negative attitudes by the *notables* towards the *indios* appear to prohibit their *adoption* of Quechua loanwords. This is not without surprise as in bilingual situations it has been found that social solidarity towards other groups can lead to linguistic accommodation (Giles et al. 1973; Giles et al. 1987; Giles et al. 1991), as in the case here with the *forasteros*. In fact, Giles et al. (1973: 186) found that bilingual speakers who accommodate more to their interlocutors, "were perceived to be more considerate, and more prepared to bridge the cultural gap than a non-accommodating" speaker. In this sense, one motive of linguistic accommodation is to seek the approval of the interlocutor. This does not imply that one will converge fully on another's exact language patterns, but rather that "accommodation is often cognitively mediated by our stereotypes of how socially categorized others will speak" (Giles et al. 1991: 16). Thus, interpersonal communication, especially in bilingual situations, is heavily influenced by social psychology, that is, one's attitudes and perceptions of the other. In comparing the *forasteros* to the *notables*, we see that attitudinal differences towards the *indios* is reflected in differences in quantity of borrowings. The *notables* view the *indios* negatively and consequently rarely adopt any Quechua. The *forasteros*, however, actively seek to protect the *indios* from the *notables*, and are open to learning their customs and this allows for borrowing, or linguistic incorporation. This finding demonstrates the importance of the extra-linguistic factors that can vary per contact situation (Thomason 2001; Thomason & Kaufman 1988) as well as the importance of social

¹⁷ As mentioned previously, a statistical comparison the grammatical borrowings between the *forasteros* and *notables* could not be completed as the *notables* had none.

psychological interpersonal relationships and their effect on accommodation (Giles et al. 1973; Giles et al. 1987; Giles et al. 1991). Conversely, the *notables* uttered a mere 5 Quechua borrowings throughout the entire novel. Of these borrowings, 3 of them came from Governor Sebastián Pancorbo, who is married to Doña Petronila (who is part of the *forasteros*). Consequently, of all the *notables*, Sebastián Pancorbo is the most likely to be exposed to more Quechua words than other members of his social group given Doña Petronila's linguistic behavior and her positive attitude toward the *indios*. He uses the lexical borrowings of *puna* 'high altitude', *pongo* 'servant' (most likely indentured), and *huahua* <wawa> 'child'. The differences in linguistic practices between the *forasteros* and the *notables* demonstrates the importance of linguistic attitudes in the incorporation of non-native features into one's native language (Haspelmath 2009; Thomason 2001; Thomason & Kaufman 1988).

While these results align nicely with tendencies found in social psychology and contact situations, for the current purpose, it is also essential to enter into a critical ideological interpretation. From Matto de Turner's writings (1988a, 1988b, 1893, 1902) we know that she believed in the incorporation of the indigenous people, culture, and language, with a particular emphasis on Quechua as a national unifier. Her own work and that of other scholars (Ward 2002, 2012) indicate that her national project should accomplish such inclusion through *mestizaje*. In this regard, we see linguistic incorporation representing her national ideology. The actions and language practices of the *forasteros*, represents the model process. In addition to their morality and education, they seek to protect and incorporate the *indios*. In particular, the Marín family adopts Rosalía and Margarita into their family. Furthermore, Manuel desires to marry Margarita, although this of course cannot occur as they learn that they are both the illegitimate children of Priest Pascual. However, the idea of racial mixing is still suggested. In several parts of the novel, Matto de Turner emphasizes the beauty of Margarita, who is half indigenous and half *criolla*, further emphasizing the ideology of *mestizaje*. When Lucía first sees Margarita, she thinks, "*su belleza era el trasunto de esa mezcla del español y la peruana que ha producido hermosuras notables en el país*" 'her beauty was the copy of that mix of the Spaniard and the Peruvian that has produced notable beauty in the country' (p.19). And later in the novel, Manuel also emphasizes the beauty of the racial mixture of Margarita, "*¡Oh! ¿Cómo no pensar en la hermosura peruana de Margarita?*" 'Oh! And how not to think of the Peruvian beauty of Margarita' (p.177). The novel appears to suggest that those who are opposed to linguistic (and cultural/racial) incorporation, such as the corrupt *notables*, are excluded from the national ideology of Matto de Turner. They represent the backward and incorrect assumptions that true Peruvians are the *criollos* who abuse the Andean peoples and reject their culture and language. As Matto de Turner (1888a: 303c) indicates strongly that Quechua is "*nuestra lengua madre*", those who do not incorporate Quechua language (and its speakers and culture) are not in fact part of her authentic Peru.

However, the novel does not necessarily indicate a full incorporation of the *indios* or of Quechua. One interpretation of the novel would suggest only a partial incorporation. As Cornejo Polar (1977: 19) indicates, the hopeless lamentation from Isidro Champi (p.170), "*Nacimos indios, esclavos del cura, esclavos del gobernador, esclavos del cacique [...] ¡Indios sí! ¡La muerte es nuestra dulce esperanza!*" 'We were born *indios*, slaves of the priest, slaves of the governor, slaves of the chief [...] *Indios* yes! Death is our sweet hope!' is somewhat confirmed through the death of Juan and Marcela Yupanqui and the misery of the Champi family. In this sense, there appears to be a partial (or limited) incorporation of the *indios* through adoption by the *forasteros* in line with urban progressive educational values (Cornejo Polar 1977; Ferreira 2005). Only Margarita and Rosalía are incorporated into the national project through the *forasteros*, with the importance of

their education signaled several times throughout the novel. One could argue that the partial incorporation of Quechua, primarily lexicon by the *forasteros*, reflects this partial incorporation. Thus, while Matto de Turner's national project as seen in *Aves sin nido* excludes the *notables*, who lack education, morals, and any desire to incorporate any Quechua or indigenous culture, it does not necessarily suggest a full incorporation of Quechua or Andean peoples. Consequently, while there is an incorporation of Quechua and its speakers, this inclusion may be limited.

While the findings are noteworthy, there are several limitations to the current analysis. One limitation of the linguistic scenario that is not without criticisms (García 1991: 71; Rodríguez-Luis 1980: 30) is that Clorinda Matto de Turner does not give many phonetic/phonological depictions of the Spanish or Quechua in the novel, with the exception of a few moments in the speech of *los notables*, particularly between judge Hilarión Verdejo and priest Pascual where Matto de Turner depicts the following phonetic features of Verdejo's speech (p.80-81): elision of word final coda /d/ (*usté*), elision of /ra/ in *para* 'for' (*pacá, pallá*), *seseo* pronunciation (*jués, sinco*), and elision of intervocalic /d/ (*ocupao, pensao*). Beyond these few phonetic examples, the novel does not present any more phonetic realizations, particularly among *indios* or the *forasteros*. For example, one might expect to see the raising of the mid-vowels /e o/ to the high vowels /i u/ due to cross-linguistic differences in vocalic systems. I suggest that Matto de Turner, recognizing her Spanish speaking audience, decided that this was not a worthwhile endeavor. While most readers can identify a loanword in the text (there are many didactic footnotes from the author), she may have decided that the phonetic differences seemed less important or would be distracting in written form. In addition to the phonetic critique, several scholars also comment on the lack of Quechua syntax (Escajadillo 2004; García 1991). In line with scales of borrowability, we know that syntax, particularly embedded structures that bear no semantic or structural transparency, are very difficult to borrow, and given the limited morphological borrowings, this would indicate that this particular situation did not yet have the intensity of contact needed for borrowing of such difficult structures. With regards to the critique of the lack of Quechua in the novel (Carrillo 1967; Escajadillo 2004; García 1991), one must remember the directionality of the borrowing, from the source language (Quechua) to the recipient language (Spanish). If Matto de Turner wrote a novel where the directionality was from Spanish to Quechua, consequently there would be more Quechua present.

6. Conclusion

The current study qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed the Quechua borrowings in the novel's discourse by type (lexical vs. grammatical) and by social group (*indios, forasteros, notables*). The most common borrowings were that of lexicon, specifically nouns from cultural semantic fields. In terms of grammatical borrowings, only derivational suffixes were found. There were statistically significant differences between the three social groups. The *indios* demonstrated the highest amount of lexical and grammatical borrowings (and consequently overall borrowings), indicating a greater knowledge of Quechua and perhaps that their Spanish is more limited than the other two groups. The *forasteros* demonstrated significantly higher Quechua borrowings than the *notables*, who demonstrated virtually no borrowings throughout the entire discourse. This difference in language practices indicates a social accommodation towards the Andean people and language on behalf of the *forasteros*. As the *forasteros* represent the educated and moral future of the nation, I propose that the difference in Quechua borrowings between the *forasteros* and *notables* is a reflection of Matto de Turner's national ideology. Given the impor-

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

tance of Quechua as a national unifier for Matto de Turner, I propose that these language practices reflect her imagined Peruvian nation. That is, the ideal citizen is one who is educated and moral, and incorporates Quechua. In turn, her ideal Peruvian nation excludes the corrupt and backwards powers who reject Quechua language (people and culture). With reference to Quechua use in the novel, what may appear to previous commentators as an exotic or folkloric touch, when observed through a linguistic lens in fact demonstrates the type of tendencies and hierarchies found in contact situations as well as the role of linguistic attitudes. Contrary to previous critiques of Matto de Turner's use of Quechua in the novel, I propose that, given her immense knowledge of the Quechua language and Andean culture and people, her use of Quechua here is by no means folkloric, but rather a well-informed use of Quechua to further her ideological national project of an incorporation (at least partial) of Andean people, culture, and language. While many previously works have alluded to language practices in *Aves sin nido*, I hope to have shown the importance of quantifying such variation for a more comprehensive analysis. Additionally, this study has shown not only that a linguistic approach to a novel is a fruitful one, as many have done in the subfield of literary linguistics, but also has provided an innovative perspective on using a linguistic analysis to complement a literary analysis.

Acknowledgments

I am greatly indebted to Almeida Jacqueline Toribio for instrumental feedback on previous versions of this article as well as to Joshua Frank and Valeria Rey de Castro for additional feedback. I am grateful to the members of the Language Contact and Representation in Latin American Literature panel at the 44th Annual NeMLA Convention, particularly the organizer, Gerardo Augusto Lorenzino, for insightful comments. I would also like to thank Hiram Aldarondo for introducing me to the foundational fictions of Latin America. Finally, I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for providing invaluable input on this article. All errors remain my own.

HISPANIC STUDIES

review

Works Cited

- Adelaar, Willem, with the collaboration of Pieter Muysken (2004). *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Andersen, Gisle (2014). Pragmatic borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 67, 17-33.
- Azevedo, Milton (2009). Literary Linguistics in the Context of a Literature Department. In J. Collentine, M. García, B. Lafford y F. Marcos Marín (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, pp.1-8. Somerville, MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Berg, Mary G. (1990). Feminism and Representation of the Feminine in the Novels of Clorinda Matto de Turner (Peru, 1852-1909). *Phoebé: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Feminist Scholarship, Theory and Aesthetics* 1,3, 10-17.
- Berg, Mary G. (2010). Clorinda Matto de Turner (1852-1909): Una vida de lucha contra la injusticia. In Silvia Serafin (Ed.), *Más allá del umbral: Autoras hispanoamericanas y el oficio de la escritura*, pp.15-33. Sevilla: Renacimiento.
- Berg, Mary G. (2012). La novela como espacio de crítica y transformación: Herencia de Clorinda Matto de Turner. In Sara Beatriz Guardia (Ed.), *Escritoras del siglo XIX en América Latina*, pp.56-66. Lima: Centro de Estudios La Mujer en la Historia de América Latina (CEMHAL).
- Carrillo, Francisco (1967). *Clorinda Matto de Turner y su indigenismo*. Lima: Editorial Jurídica S.A.
- Campbell, Lyle (2004). *Historical linguistics: An Introduction*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo (1987). *Lingüística quechua*. Cuzco: Bartolomé de las Casas.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo (2003). *Castellano andino: Aspectos sociolingüísticos, pedagógicos y gramaticales*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Cometta Manzoni, Aída (1939). *El indio en la poesía de la América español*. Buenos Aires: Joaquín Torres Editor.
- Cometta Manzoni, Aída (1960). *El indio en la novela de América*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Futuro.
- Cornejo Polar, Antonio (1977). *La novela peruana: siete estudios*. Lima: Editorial Horizonte.
- Cornejo Polar, Antonio (1980). *Literatura y sociedad en el Perú: la novela indigenista*. Lima: Lasontay.
- Cornejo Polar, Antonio (1992). *Clorinda Matto de Turner, novelista: Estudios sobre Aves sin nido, Indole y Herencia*. Lima: Lluvia Editores.
- Cornejo Polar, Antonio (1994a). *Aves sin nido* como alegoría nacional. Prólogo. *Aves sin nido*. Por Clorinda Matto de Turner. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, ix-xxv.
- Cornejo Polar, Antonio (1994b). *Escribir en el aire: ensayo sobre la heterogeneidad socio-cultural en las literaturas andinas*. Lima: Lluvia Editores.
- Degeneri, Francesca (2004). *El Abanico y la Cigarrera: La primera generación de mujeres ilustradas en el Perú*. Lima: Centro de la Mujer Peruana Flora Tristán,
- Escajadillo, Tomás G. (1971). *La narrativa indigenista: un planteamiento y ocho incisiones*. Lima, Perú: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- Escajadillo, Tomás G. (1994). *La narrativa indigenista peruana*. Lima, Perú: Amaru Editores.
- Escajadillo, Tomás G. (2004). *Aves sin nido ¿Novela indigenista?* *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 59, 131-154.
- Escobar, Anna María (2000). *Contacto social y lingüístico: el español en contacto con el quechua en el Perú*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Escobar, Anna María (2007). On the development of contact varieties: the case of Andean Spa-

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

- nish. In Kim Potowski & Richard Cameron (Eds.), *Spanish in contact. Policy, social, and linguistic inquiries*, pp. 191-209. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Escobar, Anna María (2011). Spanish in Contact with Quechua. In Manuel Díaz-Campos (Ed.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, pp.323-352. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fabb, Nigel (2001). Linguistics and Literature. In Mark Aronoff & Janie Rees-Miller (Eds.), *The Handbook of Linguistics*, pp. 446-465. Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Ferreira, Rocío (2005). Clorinda Matto de Turner, novelista y los aportes de Antonio Cornejo Polar al estudio de la novela peruana del siglo XIX. *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, Año XXXI, No 62, pp. 27-51.
- Field, Fredric (2002). *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- García, Fernando Arribas (1991). 'Aves sin nido': ¿Novela indigenista? *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 17.34, 63-79.
- Giles, H., Taylor, D.M., & Bourhis, R. (1973). Towards a Theory of Interpersonal Accommodation through Language: Some Canadian Data. *Language in Society*, 2.2, 177-192.
- Giles, H., Mulac, A., Bradac J., & Johnson, P. (1987). Speech accommodation theory: the first decade and beyond. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 10, pp. 13-48. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (Eds.) (1991). *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph (1953). *Essays in Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guy, Gregory (1990). The Sociolinguistic Types of Language Change. *Diachronica* 7.1, 47-67.
- Haspelmath, Martin (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and Issues. In Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, pp.35-54. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2009. 35-54.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Tadmor, Uri (Eds.) (2009). *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Haugen, Einar (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26.2, 210-231.
- Heliodoro-Valle, Rafael (1953). El español de la América española. *Hispania* 36.1, 52-57.
- Holm, John A. (2000). *An Introduction to Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Kristal, Efraín (1987). *The Andes Viewed from the City: Literary and Political Discourse on the Indian in Peru 1848-1930*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge, MA/London: The MIT Press.
- Matras, Yaron (1998). Utterance modifiers and universal of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36.2, 281-331.
- Matras, Yaron (2007). The borrowability of structural categories. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (Eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, pp. 31-73. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron, & Sakel, Jeanette (2007). Investigating the mechanisms of pattern-replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31.4, 829-865.
- Matto de Turner, Clorinda. (1888a). "El qquechua" [Estudios Históricos]. *El Perú Ilustrado* Año 2.69, 1 Septiembre 1888: 302c-303c [reprinted in Matto de Turner, Clorinda. (1893). *Leyendas y recortes*. Lima: "La equitativa.", pp. 91-110].
- Matto de Turner, Clorinda. (1888b). "El qquechua y su utilidad para los americanistas" [Estudios Históricos]. *El Perú Ilustrado* Año 2.71, 15 Septiembre 1888: 330b-331c [reprinted in Matto de Turner, Clorinda. (1893). *Leyendas y recortes*. Lima: "La equitativa.", pp. 101-111].

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

- Matto de Turner, Clorinda (1889 [2004]). *Aves sin nido*. Buenos Aires: Stockcero.
- Matto de Turner, Clorinda (1893). *Leyendas y recortes*. Lima: "La equitativa."
- Matto de Turner, Clorinda (1902). *Boreales, miniaturas y porcelanas*. Buenos Aires: Juan A. Alsina.
- Mejías, Hugo A. (1980). *Préstamos de lenguas indígenas en el español americano del siglo XVII*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Moraña, Mabel (Ed.) (1998). *Indigenismo hacia el fin del milenio: Homenaje a Antonio Cornejo Polar*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh/ Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter (1981). Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: The case for relexification. In Arnold Highfield & Albert Valdman (Eds.), *Historicity and Variation in Creole Studies*, pp. 52-78. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Onysko, Alexander, & Winter-Froemel, Esme (2011). Necessary loans- luxury loans? Exploring the pragmatic dimension of borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1550-1567.
- Páez, Rafael Aguilar (1970). *Gramática quechua y vocabularios*. Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- Peluffo, Ana (1998). El poder de las lágrimas: Sentimentalismo, género y nación en *Aves sin nido* de Clorinda Matto de Turner. In Moraña Mabel (Ed.), *Indigenismo hacia el fin del milenio: Homenaje a Antonio Cornejo Polar*, pp. 119-138. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh/ Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana.
- Peluffo, Ana (2005). *Lágrimas andinas: sentimentalismo, género y virtud republicana en Clorinda Matto de Turner*. Pittsburgh: Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana.
- Pinto, Magdalena García (2008). Matto de Turner, Clorinda (1852-1909). In Jay Kinsbruner & Erick D. Langer (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Latin American History and Culture* 2nd ed. Vol. 4, pp.415-416. Detroit: Charles Scribner's Sons. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*.
- Poplack, Shana, Sankoff, David, & Miller, Christopher (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26, 47-104.
- R Development Core Team (2015). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <www.R-project.org>. Software program.
- Reisz, Susana (1992). When Women Speak of Indians and Other Minor Themes... Clorinda Matto's *Aves sin nido*: An Early Peruvian Feminist Voice. *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 35, 75-94.
- Rodríguez-Luis, Julio (1980). *Hermenéutica y praxis del indigenismo: La novela indigenista de Clorinda Matto a José María Arguedas*. México: Tierra Firme.
- Sankoff, Gillian (2002). Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In Jack K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, pp. 638-668. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sebba, Mark (1997). *Contact languages: Pidgins and Creoles*. NY: Palgrave.
- Sommer, Doris (1991). *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Swadesh, Morris (1955). Towards greater accuracy in lexicostatistic dating. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21.2, 121-137.
- Tadmor, Uri (2009). Loanwords in the world's languages: Findings and results. In Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*,

HISPANIC STUDIES

r e v i e w

- pp.55-75. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Tadmor, Uri, Haspelmath, Martin, & Taylor, Bradley (2010). Borrowability and the notion of basic vocabulary. *Diachronica* 27.2, 226-246.
- Tauro, Alberto (1976). *Clorinda Matto de Turner y la novela indigenista*. Lima, Perú: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- Thomason, Sarah G. (2001). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Kaufman, Terrence (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ward, Thomas (2002). La ideología nacional de Clorinda Matto de Turner. *Neophilologus* 86, 401-415.
- Ward, Thomas (2012). La lectura de Clorinda Matto de Turner del Inca Garcilaso y Blas Valera: Cuando lengua, espacio doméstico y estado-nación coinciden. *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, Año 38, 75, 363-380.
- Weinreich, Uriel (1953 [Reprinted in The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1974]). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Winford, Donald (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Winford, Donald (2005). Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22.2, 373-427.
- Yaranga Valderrama, Abdón (2003). *Diccionario Quechua-Español, Runa Simi-Español*. Biblioteca Nacional del Perú: Fondo Editorial: Lima.
- Van Coetsem, Frans (1988). *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Van Hout, Roland & Muysken, Pieter (1994). Modeling lexical borrowability. *Language Variation and Change* 6.1, 39-62.
- Vargas Yábar, Miguel (2013). *Las empresas del pensamiento: Clorinda Matto de Turner (1852-1909)*. Grupo Pakarina: Lima.