



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Mochica: Grammatical topics and external relations

Eloranta-Barrera Virhuez, R.S.

Citation

Eloranta-Barrera Virhuez, R. S. (2020, May 12). *Mochica: Grammatical topics and external relations*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/87645>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/87645>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/87645> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Eloranta-Barrera Virhuez, R.S.

Title: Mochica : grammatical topics and external relations

Issue Date: 2020-05-12

*Part IV. Mochica and its external
relations*

*Chapter 9. Areal Relations: Language
contact across the Andes*

In order to shed light on the relations between the languages indigenous to the Americas one important step to perform is to search for possible language contact effects. This chapter is a brief study that proposes evidence of contact between genealogically unrelated and extinct Andean language groups: Mochica, and Hibito and Cholón, two related languages that were spoken on the eastern Peruvian slopes (9.1.) and Mochica and Quingnam, spoken on the northern coast of Peru (9.2.). In 9.3., I present the case of contact between Mochica and Quechua.

The cases of language contact Mochica-Quingnam and Mochica-Quechua get support from historical evidence of situations of domination. Cerrón-Palomino (1989¹⁵¹: 47-50) defines, in a precise and succinct way, the historical and cultural context that motivated a linguistic contact situation of Mochica with Quingnam first, then with Quechua, and finally with Spanish. During the 15th century, the Chimor kingdom attained its greatest territorial extension under the lead of Minchan Çaman, known also as Chimu Capac (or Chimo). Chimu Capac imposed his language, Quingnam¹⁵², on the dominated populations of the northern Peruvian coast (Calancha 1639: 549-550). The domination by Chimu Capac ended in 1470 when Inca Túpac Yupanqui forced him to submit. The Inca domination lasted around 60 years until the Spaniards conquered the zone and Spanish became the language of administration. The case of language contact with Cholón-Hibito and its probable contact scenario is discussed in 9.1.

¹⁵¹ Cerrón-Palomino (1989) publishes *Quechua y Mochica: lenguas en contacto* which is a revised version of *Quechuismos en el Mochica* (Cerrón-Palomino 1988).

¹⁵² Calancha (1639: 550) mentions explicitly that Quingnam was the name of the language spoken by this lord, Chimo.

9.1. Mochica in contact with Cholón-Hibito

Cholón is an extinct language that was spoken in a vast area of the Peruvian north-eastern slopes, specifically in the region of the Huallaga river valley and the surrounding mountains, in the modern-day Peruvian political regions of San Martín and Huanuco (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 33–34; Muysken [2004] 2007: 460).

In addition to this information and based on the information contained in Martínez Compañón (1783a: 107r, 128r) and the diaries of Sobreviela, Álvarez & Gómez ([1787] 1922: 134) one can include, as Hibito-Cholón territory, the eastern part of the modern-day Peruvian political region of La Libertad. In the above-mentioned documents, Pataz, Jucusbamba and Buldibuyo are mentioned as Hibito-Cholón territories (Eloranta 2012). Hibitos and Cholones inhabited the same area and it is difficult to make a strict geographical delimitation of their territories.

Cholón became extinct only during the last years of the 20th century and perhaps the beginning of the 21st century.¹⁵³ Cholón is mainly a prefixing and agglutinative SOV language. Nominal and verbal forms can be composed of a stem and several affixes (Alexander-Bakkerus 2002: 103) but person markers are prefixed (Alexander-Bakkerus 2002: 103; 2005: 129). Case markers, numeral classifiers, aspect markers and auxiliaries are suffixed (Alexander-Bakkerus 2002: 103). Cholón is also a gender determined language, whereby certain forms are determined by the gender of the singular addressee (Muysken ([2004] 2007: 462).

¹⁵³ Reportedly, linguist Sofía Latorre recorded Cholón material with the last speakers, but this material has not been published.

For the study of this language there are two colonial sources: a grammar written by Pedro de la Mata ([1748] 2007) and 43 Cholón words recorded by Martínez Compañón (1783b: E IV). During post-colonial times, Tessmann (1930: 547) collected 31 Cholón words and Alexander-Bakkerus recorded a few words and expressions during her visit to the Huallaga Valley in 1996 (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 21, 525–529).

It is well accepted that Cholón is closely related to a neighboring language called Hibito. Torero (1986: 533), among others, argues that Cholón and Hibito are in fact independent languages which only share lexicon due to prolonged language contact. Muysken ([2004] 2007: 461) proves convincingly, however, that the lexical correspondences support a genealogical relationship.

Concerning Hibito, the record of words is very limited: there is a list of 33 lexical items provided by Tessmann (1930: 458–459) and a list of 43 words by Martínez Compañón (1783b: E IV). Considering that some of these words contained in these two lists overlap, the amount of words for Hibito is very scarce. Despite the limitation of the data, it is possible to establish that Hibito has at least one attested numeral classifier as will be demonstrated in 9.1.1.2.1.

9.1.1. Shared lexical and grammatical items

9.1.1.1. *Shared lexical items*

As shown in Table 25 there are several words that Mochica and Cholón share. Among the shared lexical items, one particularly interesting word is the one for ‘manioc’. ‘Manioc’ is <err> in Mochica while it is <el> in Cholón. In addition to their phonological similarity, it is important to mention that manioc

was cultivated heavily in both areas and was therefore a culturally relevant item.

Table 25. List of Mochica and Cholón shared lexical items

Mochica			Cholón		
<ùtzh>	‘big’	ADJ	<očo>	‘big’	ADJ
<lam->	‘die’	V	<lam(a)->	‘to kill’	V
<palæc>	‘hundred’	CLF	<lek>	‘ten’	CLF
<pong>	‘ten’	CLF	<pon>	‘herd, troop’	CLF
<err>	‘manioc’	N	<el>	‘manioc’	N
<ineng>	‘day’	N	<nem>	‘day’	N

In relation to a shared lexical item of Mochica and Hibito, one can observe the case of the word for ‘lizard’. The word meaning ‘lizard’ in Mochica, <ssantek> was first registered by Middendorf (1892: 60) and later on, <santek> and <šantek>, were registered by Brüning ([1905-1924] 2004: 105). This bisyllabic form is not prototypical of Mochica. On the other hand, it is remarkably similar to the Hibito word for ‘caiman’ <šonti>¹⁵⁴ (Tessmann 1930: 459).

The following pair of words, Mochica <lam-> ‘to die’ and Cholón <lam(a)-> ‘to kill’, also attracts attention. However, this connection may be less indicative of direct link between these two languages because similar forms are known to be widespread in a vast geographical area. For example, in Mapudungun, a language isolate spoken in south-central Chile and west-

¹⁵⁴ A word for ‘lizard’ or ‘caiman’ is not available for Cholón.

central Argentina, there are the lexemes [la] ‘to die’ (Augusta 1916: 247) and [laɲim-] ‘to kill’ (Augusta 1916: 235).

Moreover, in the list of 43 words compiled by Martínez Compañón that registers northern coastal languages (extinct nowadays), (Martínez Compañón 1783b: E IV) there are similar forms meaning ‘to die’ and ‘death’ in a number of other languages: Sechura <lactuc>, <lactucno>, Colán <dlacati>, <dlacati>, Catacaos <lacatu>, <ynataclacatu>. The widespread areal borrowings raise further questions about language contact, but they will not be dealt with in this dissertation.

9.1.1.2. Shared and reanalyzed numeral classifiers

9.1.1.2.1. ‘Stones’ and ‘eggs’ as counting devices: Shared numeral classifier between Hibito and Cholón

The register of the Hibito numerals (1, 2, 3) done by Tessmann (1930: 458) includes, by chance, relevant information about a Hibito numeral classifier. The numerals recorded by Tessmann are listed in Table 26. Note that another word in his list, the word for ‘stone’ is strikingly similar to the endings of all the numerals. There seems to be a connection between the final segments in the numerals and those in the word for ‘stone’ (see Table 26). This raises the possibility that the numerals listed by Tessmann (1930: 458) are in fact bimorphemic and contain a numeral classifier etymologically related to the word for ‘stone’.

Table 26. Numerals in Hibito

Hibito	Gloss
<etsí>	‘one’
<optšē>	‘two’
<útsi>	‘three’
<tšē>	‘stone’

Source: Tessmann (1930: 458)

This is all the more plausible if one considers that other languages, crucially including Mochica (see <pong> in this section) and Cholón (see <ta> in Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 180) use numeral classifiers with the original meaning ‘stone’. ‘Stone’ is also a frequent source for shape-based numeral classifiers in a number of Micronesian languages (Conklin 1981: 233, cited by Aikhenvald 2000: 446). For further discussion about ‘stones’ as counting devices, see Rojas-Berscia & Eloranta¹⁵⁵ (2019).

If indeed <tšē> was a numeral classifier,¹⁵⁶ it likely had the characteristics of a general numeral classifier. This conclusion can be drawn from the fact that crosslinguistically, general classifiers are commonly attached to the citation

¹⁵⁵ The unattested and recurrent grammaticalization path in the genesis of classifiers, numeral classifiers and numerals, namely stone/branch>classifier/numeral classifier>numeral, in two unrelated language families, namely Kawapangan and Cholón-Hibito, and one isolate, namely Muniche, is discussed in Rojas-Berscia & Eloranta (2019). In this article, the claim is, that stone classifier-based numeral systems in a number of unrelated North-western South American language families/languages emerged due to calquing or loan translation.

¹⁵⁶ Salas (2012a) inspects the Hibito numerals and comes to similar conclusion, namely, that Hibito had a numeral classifier. However, this author has a different interpretation about a corresponding cognate of this classifier in Cholón. Besides, Salas (2012a) does not see the presence of the numeral classifier in the body parts terms.

form of numerals, probably because speakers tend not to count in abstract terms but rather conceptualizing numbers as reckoned items or objects. Moreover, Conklin (1981: 261–232, cited by Aikhenvald 2000: 405) observes that ‘fruit’ or ‘stone’, in many cases, constitutes the semantic base of general classifiers.

In addition, if we inspect the lexical items for body parts recorded by Tessmann (1930: 458) in Table 27, a similar sequence of segments can be found. For illustrative purposes, Tessmann’s words are segmented into hypothesized morphemes in Table 27.

Table 27. Body parts in Hibito

Hibito	Gloss
<moal-tsü>	‘tongue’
<mon-tsá>	‘eye’
<o-tšĩ>	‘ear’
<só-tša>	‘head’

Source: Tessmann (1930: 458)

However, there is no evidence from Tessmann himself that these lexemes are segmentable. One explanation might be that the lexemes are not segmentable, but that they contain an already-lexicalized classifier. Nevertheless, similar pattern of register can be observed in the Cholón terms for body parts: <ñache> ‘eye’ (De la Mata [1748] 2007: 243), <kimonžéi¹⁵⁷> ‘tongue’, <kinjelšé¹⁵⁸> ‘eye’, <mutšitšé> ‘head’ (Tessmann 1930: 547) and [čegonče]

¹⁵⁷ <kimonžéi> can be segmented as <ki-mon-žéi> where <ki-> is the prefix for ‘our’.

¹⁵⁸ <kinjelšé> can be segmented as <ki-njel-šé> where <ki-> is the prefix for ‘our’.

‘testicles’, [čuče] ‘head’ and [nyače] ‘eye’ (from the lists of words recorded by Alexander-Bakkerus in 1996, Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 525, 528). All of these lexemes appear to share an ending similar to the Cholón numeral classifier for round objects <chê>.

Returning to Cholón, the similarity of Hibito <tšē> ‘stone’ and Cholón <chê> ‘grain’ / ‘egg’ (De la Mata 1748] 2007: 127) should be noted. These two lexemes are functional elements in both languages, and they both act as numeral classifiers. The Cholón numeral classifier <chê> transcribed as [če] by Alexander-Bakkerus (2005) is used to count “round objects and all kinds of birds, fruits, etc”¹⁵⁹ (De la Mata [1748] 2007: 109). Following from this, these two classifiers can be related not only because of their similar form (<tšē>, <chê>) but also the round objects they denote ‘stone’ and ‘egg’ or ‘grain’ can be used to count. In several languages, ‘fruit’, ‘stone’, ‘egg’ and ‘seed’ are typical sources for classifiers for round objects, for example in Micronesian and Western Austronesian languages (Aikhenvald 2000: 446).

9.1.1.2.2. Counting “group of tens” with Mochica <pong> and “group of living beings” with Cholón <pon>

Numeral classification is generally not present in Andean languages (Aikhenvald 2000: 123; Gil 2013a). For this reason, one of the salient typological features of Mochica, which distances it from the Andean languages, is its peculiar numeral classifier system. As seen in Chapter 8, Mochica has a special numeral classifier system that can be analyzed as a system in transition from a specific counting system into a numeral classifier system.

¹⁵⁹ “Para contar cosas redondas y todo genero de aves, frutas &c. es el siguiente...” (De la Mata 2007 [1748]: 109).

The attested classifiers for ‘tens’ are <pong>, <ssop>, <cuo(quixll)> and <cæss> (see Chapter 8). The classifier for ‘ten’ <pong> has a clear etymology in the Mochica word <pong> ‘stone’. According to Carrera (1644: 183) <pong> serves to count people, horses, goats, canes and everything else which is not coins or fruits.

As stated in Chapter 8, some numeral classifiers of Mochica, the ones concerning powers of ten, can easily be called “power classifiers”, like in the literature on Polynesian languages in which “power terms are typically considered as a particular type of numeral classifiers” (Benton 1968; Harrison & Jackson 1984 cited in Bender & Beller 2007a: 821). Mochica power classifiers are forms that serve to count specific items in tens and multiples of tens. The classifier <pong> behaves like a general classifier in Mochica. Carrera (1644: 183) explains the use of this classifier: it is a unit to count groups of ten that include “persons, horses, goats, canes and everything else except coins or fruits”.¹⁶⁰

Cholón is another Andean language which exhibits a numeral classifier system but in comparison to Mochica the system is reminiscent of a more standard numeral classifier system in which the classifiers categorize items according to specific characteristics. Among these classifiers <pon> is used to count “groups of living beings” (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 180). In his grammar of Cholón, De la Mata ([1748] 2007) explains that <pon> is used to count “troops, companies, armies, herds”.¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ “... es para contar hombres, caualllos, cabras, cañas y todo lo de mas que no fuere moneda ni frutas...” (Carrera 1644: 183).

¹⁶¹ “Para tropas, compañías, exercitos, manadas” De la Mata ([1748] 2007: 110).

Examples (252) and (253) show the use of Mochica <pong> and Cholón <pon>, respectively:

(252) <çoc pong cʉelû> (Carrera 1644: 186)

çoc	pong	cʉelû
three.BOUND	CLF.ten	hawk
'thirty hawks'		

(253)

<Annapongam quetâ â mipoichi?> (De la Mata [1748] 2007: 129)

anna	ponḡ ¹⁶² am	quetââ	mi-	poi-chi
how.many	CLF.ten QUESTION MARKER	wild pig	2SG-	see-DUB

'How many herds of wild pigs have you seen?'¹⁶³

Mochica <pong> and Cholón <pon> are similar in form and function. Besides, both are means to count groups and both are numeral classifiers. The conclusion is that [pon] might be a shared numeral classifier.

9.1.1.2.3. Counting "tens" with Cholón <lec> and "many tens" with Mochica <palæc>

The Mochica classifier <palæc> is recorded by Carrera (1644: 184–185) in a list of numerals going from 100 to 1000. The only comment that the missionary makes is that this classifier means 'a hundred'. Its use is clear: it behaves the same way as the Mochica numeral classifiers, that is, in combination with the bound form of the numeral. As for the Mochica numeral

¹⁶² The Cholón numeral classifier <pon> appears written here as <ponḡ>.

¹⁶³ <Annapongam quetâ â mipoichi?> Quantas manadas ô tropas de jabalies has visto?

classifiers for hundreds there is also a set of two classifiers. Carrera (1644: 186) does not explain the one that is used to count “fruits, etc”.¹⁶⁴ For <palæc> Carrera fails to provide information on what kind of items are counted with.

In contrast with other Mochica numeral classifiers, <palæc> is not etymologically transparent. It could be analyzed as <pal-Vc>, a noun with a probable suffix for nominal classification. As shown in 7.1.1.4., the suffix <-Vc> is a nominalizer, this way, the classifier could be a nominalization derived of a verb whose meaning we do not know. Although no assumptions can be made based on the semantics of <palæc>, it does share phonological similarities to Cholón <lec>, which means ‘ten’.

Alexander-Bakkerus (2005: 179–181), in her analysis of the numeral classifiers of Cholón, does not consider <lec> as a numeral classifier, nor does Salas (2012a). In my analysis of Cholón numeral classifiers (Eloranta 2012), I consider <lec> an ideal numeral classifier in the function of a “power classifier”. With that in mind, this might be another case of shared numeral classifiers between Mochica and Cholón. Again, form and content are similar.

9.1.1.2.4. The nominalizer <-Vc>: a shared morphological evidence between Mochica and Cholón

As seen in Chapter 7, Mochica is very rich in nominalizations, presenting both lexical and grammatical types of nominalizations. As for lexical nominalizations, Mochica presents five attested nominalizers. One of them is the Mochica (a) <-Vc> nominalizer (see 7.1.1.4.), which in addition to other functions is used to create both deverbal location/place, agentive and instrumental nominalizations. Hence <manic>, derived by means of this suffix

¹⁶⁴ “Y para decir ciento en este modo de contar frutas & c. dizen nachæng” (Carrera 1644: 186).

from <man-> ‘to drink, to eat’ can either refer to a drinking or eating vessel or a dining room or a place to drink. According to Alexander-Bakkerus’ (2005) analysis, eighteenth century Cholón also has both lexical and grammatical nominalizations (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 251–267). At least one lexical nominalizer is described by Alexander-Bakkerus (2005: 263), i.e. the agentive nominalizer [-(w)uč]¹⁶⁵ as in [kot- uč]¹⁶⁶ ‘the one who is’.

According to my own analysis, this nominalizer is also a deadjectival nominalizer as in <zaluch> (De la Mata [1748] 2007: 48). According to De la Mata’s own translation, <zaluch> means ‘Ethiopian black’¹⁶⁷ where <zal> means ‘black’ and <-uch> is the nominalizer which would derive ‘the one who is black’. Furthermore, I propose at least another lexical nominalizer in Cholón which could be interpreted as a resultative or event nominalizer (b) <-Vc>,¹⁶⁸ as can be seen in <sep-ec> ‘lie’ derived from <sep-> ‘to lie’. See example (254).

- (254) <sepec> (De la Mata [1748] 2007: 126, 248)
- | | |
|------|------------|
| sep- | ec |
| lie- | EVENT.NMLZ |

The Cholón suffix (b) <-Vc> is reminiscent of the Mochica nominalizer (a) <-Vc>. The discussed nominalizing suffixes in Mochica and Cholón are

¹⁶⁵ Interpretation by Alexander-Bakkerus (2005), my representation is orthographic.

¹⁶⁶ Interpretation by Alexander-Bakkerus (2005), my representation is orthographic.

¹⁶⁷ During colonial times the black slaves were called ‘Ethiopians’ and the denomination ‘Ethiopian black’ meant that the person was ‘very black’.

¹⁶⁸ Other examples of this suffix: <somec> ‘wound’, <pitec> ‘truth’, etc.

similar in form and function, hence I propose that they can be analyzed as a shared nominalizer.

9.1.2. Probable contact scenarios between Mochica and Cholón

Mochica and Cholón are languages without written tradition. Therefore, we do not have direct evidence to indicate how and when a contact situation between these two languages might have arisen. This is the case when linguists have “to make an educated guess” (Thomason 2001: 16) and, in this sense, “archaeological evidence is sometimes useful for unraveling the contact histories” (Thomason 2001: 16). In what follows, I will try to provide some pertinent information of archaeological, anthropological and ethnohistoric investigations in the regions of the languages involved.

9.1.2.1. Pre-Hispanic and colonial contact beyond the eastern slopes

As mentioned in 9.1., Cholón was spoken in a vast area of the Peruvian north-eastern slopes. The forested eastern slopes have been seen as an impenetrable separating barrier between the Amazonian and Andean populations in Peru (Church 1996: ii). In his dissertation, Church (1996) demonstrates, after excavations in the Manachaqui cave and other localities on the eastern slopes, “that rather than a remote frontier, the montane forest was the locus of intense boundary interaction” (Church 1996: ii).

Throughout his dissertation, Church covers many aspects and time frames of intercultural exchange, traded items and routes of communication between the foothills and the Andes (Church 1996: 141). The time frames go back to even pre-ceramic periods in the prehistory of the populations of the region. Church provides enough anthropological, ethnohistorical and archaeological evidence

to affirm that, even in prehistoric and pre-Hispanic times, the contact, trade and exchange relations were intense.

Evidence of intense trading during colonial time is provided by Alexander-Bakkerus (2005: 32–33), who observes that missionaries motivated Cholones and Hibitos to trade. It is also known that Cholones were very good navigators and mastered the waters of the Huallaga River and its tributaries, which were their main trade routes.

9.1.2.2. The Sicán¹⁶⁹ culture

With regards to the prehistoric communication between Mochica speakers and the surrounding peoples of the foothills, one has to acknowledge the importance of the Sicán culture. In the literature dealing with the Mochica language there has been constant confusion establishing a strict correlation between a specific language and a specific society or culture discovered in the northern coast. It is clear to archaeologists that Middle Sicán was able to construct a far-reaching intensified trade network that extended all the way to coastal Ecuador, where ritual shells *Spondylus princeps* (Shimada 2009: 28) were obtained and to Colombia, where green transparent emeralds were probably extracted (Shimada 2009: 26).

In the same line, Hovdhaugen (2000: 134) refers to the trade contact on the Pacific Coast, citing Bawden (1996) and states that, amongst others, the most convincing archaeological evidence of pre-Hispanic contact between the Peruvian northern coast and Chile is the presence of lapis lazuli, extracted exclusively in the Chilean Andes. Moreover, diagnostic Middle Sicán pottery has been found in Marañón drainage on the eastern slopes (Shimada 1994a,

¹⁶⁹ The Sicán culture is also known as Lambayeque culture.

1995 cited by Shimada et al. 2007: 350) where Sicanes probably obtained gold¹⁷⁰ (Shimada et al. 2007: 350).

Contact, trade and exchange, and cultural and religious power constitute fundamental factors that could have offered a context for linguistic borrowings to occur between the northern coast and the eastern slopes throughout history.

9.2. Mochica in contact with Quingnam

During the late 19th century there were scholars trying to understand and propose groups of peoples and language families. In this respect, probably the earliest attempt of classifying Mochica is Brinton's (1891: 224-226; [1891] 1946: 207-209), who proposes Mochica's relationship with other northern Peruvian languages, all together conforming his so called "Yunca linguistic stock". This linguistic stock was formed by the following languages: Catacaos, Chancos, Chimus, Chinchas, Colanes, Etenes, Mochicas, Morropes and Sechuras (Brinton 1891: 226; [1891] 1946: 209). In fact, there is no linguistic evidence for such a proposal. Moreover, with only some references to places provided by Brinton, one cannot dare to suggest which languages all these names refer to. Nevertheless, one can identify the names of Catacaos, Colán, Mochica and Sechura, which correspond to the names of ancient, all now extinct languages of northern Peru. The name Chimu may refer to the Quingnam language that was definitely in narrow contact with Mochica but

¹⁷⁰ Híbito-Cholón territories Pataz, Parcoy and Buldibuyo (seen in 9.1.) were and still are very important gold mining zones in the northeastern slopes (Haeberlin et al. 2002: 41). The so-called Marañón-Pataz gold belt that "covers at least a 160 km-long region" is located exactly in that region (Haeberlin et al. 2002: 43).

most probably not in a genealogical relationship. In this section, I explore briefly the contact relation between Mochica and Quingnam.

According to Calancha (1639: 549-550), Chimo (also known as Chimu Cápac), lord of the Pacasmayos, dominated the Yunga Indians, obliging them to pay tribute in clothes, food, gold, silver, *chaquiras* ‘beads’ and copper. This way, he became opulent and gained vassals, he introduced Quingnam, his own language, as part of his domination policy. His vassals started speaking his language, to the south (Calancha speaks of Lima) the language presented “some corrupted” forms. The Indians from the other valleys of the plains spoke Mochica, Sec and Olmos, which means that there were several northern languages co-existing in the same territory. This fact motivated Calancha to refer to this multilingual scenario as “Babilonia’s punishment”.

Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 48) believes that Chimu Capac’s domination did not last long enough to influence the other languages on the northern Peruvian coast. However, Calancha reports that Mochica was in contact with several languages and that the relation with Quingnam existed prior to Chimu Capac’s conquest. Shimada et al. (2005: 75) claim, after investigations of mitochondrial DNA, that the Sicán society was, in fact, multiethnic and most probably multilingual. The period during which Chimu Capac became ruler and imposed his language on his Mochica vassals meant probably only continuity of the pre-existing bilingual situation made only then official and mandatory. The linguistic information on Quingnam is extremely limited and therefore one cannot be sure how much was actually shared between these two languages.

Torero (1986: 541) offers three criteria to distinguish between Mochica and Quingnam territory via toponyms: Mochica place names exhibit the presence

of the voiced alveolar trill /r/ (represented as <rr>), the presence of the voiceless labiodental fricative /f/ (represented as <f>), and the absence of the voiced labio-velar approximant /w/ (represented as <ao> or <au>). I personally consider that final accent should be utilized as a fourth criterion to distinguish Mochica words. In this respect, I wish to call attention to some words recorded as Mochica, namely <lapà>, <munà>, <patà> and <Guatan>. Considering two diagnostic criteria at identifying features atypical of Mochica, I suggest that one can determine the foreign origin of some words. These features are final accent and the presence of the voiced labio-velar approximant /w/.

The words with final accent that appear in the *Arte* are: <lapà> ‘calabash food container’ (Carrera 1644: 104), <yanà> ‘servant’ (Carrera 1644: 144) and <munà> ‘mummy ancestor’ (Carrera 1644: 13). To this short list of words with final syllable accent, Salas (2012b: 49) adds <patà> ‘Orion’s Belt asterism’¹⁷¹. The final accent is not typical in Mochica at all, its presence in these assumed Mochica words makes me think that they are foreign words and that they could be of Quingnam origin except for the term <yanà> which is a clear Quechua borrowing discussed by Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 51).

In relation to <munà>, the earliest evidence is attested in 1593, in the name of Cristóbal Saguanchi Munao, cacique of Moche (Zevallos Quiñones 1992: 144). Moche in the modern region of La Libertad was a Quingnam territory. The name <munao> suggests, anyhow, a highly probable Quingnam origin. Cerrón-Palomino (1995: 40) taking into account the labio-velar approximant presence /w/, spurious to Mochica, determines that <munà>, <munao> is indeed Quingnam. Salas (2008: 211-222, 2012b: 123-129) has another

¹⁷¹ Registered in Calancha (1639: 554), ‘Las Tres Marías’ in Spanish.

interpretation, he believes that term has a Mochica origin, which I question here based on the reasoning proposed by Cerrón-Palomino and supported by the early evidence of the patronym provided by Zevallos Quiñones.

Following the same principle, that is, the presence of the labio-velar approximant presence /w/, I wish to comment about the term <Guatan> ‘stone idol’ or ‘whirlwind’ recorded in Oviedo y Valdés ([1492-1549]1855: 225). Brüning includes this word in his manuscript list of Mochica vocabulary Brü¹⁷² 1.34 as <Huatan>. Salas edits Brüning’s dictionary *Mochica Wörterbuch - Diccionario Mochica* in 2004 and includes this term in it. In the entry, there is a call to the reader to compare this term related to the ancient religion with <munaos> ‘mummy ancestor’ (Brüning [1905-1924] 2004: 18).

It is speculative to suggest that it may be another Quingnam term, but at least one thing is for sure: it is not originally Mochica. Another word that could maybe be considered of Quingnam origin based on the presence of the labio-velar approximant presence /w/ is the word that Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 54) initially considered only of coastal origin <guaxme> ‘fisherman’ registered in the vocabulary of coastal Quechua by Santo Tomás (1560b: 85r, 136r). Cerrón-Palomino considers that it could be of Quingnam origin, I consider this assumption likely because, due to the presence of /w/, a Mochica origin seems ruled out.

9.3. Mochica in contact with Quechua

In what follows, I present the Quechua loans found in Mochica. I classify these loans into two groups: Quechua loans into Colonial Mochica (9.3.1.), and

¹⁷² Brü 1.34 stands for Brüning 1905-1929a, Brü 1.35 for 1905-1929b.

Quechua loans into Republican Mochica (9.3.2.). The classification is based on the date of the source text in which each Quechua loan is first attested.

9.3.1. Quechua loans in Colonial Mochica

After an analysis of Carrera ([1644] 1939), Cerrón-Palomino (1989) discovers the presence of some Quechua borrowed items in Colonial Mochica, see Table 28. Cerrón-Palomino compares the Mochica terms with the Proto-Quechua forms and explains that some adaptation processes were applied according to the Mochica phonological system. The changes a., b. and c. that I present below are the changes that occurred to adapt Quechua words into the Mochica system according to Cerrón-Palomino (1989).

- a. The absence of a voiceless uvular stop /q/ in the Mochica system forces the adaptation of it to a voiceless velar stop /k/. Cerrón-Palomino exemplifies this adaptation with the case of the Quechua entry *qatu entering Mochica as <catu> ‘market’, ‘plaza’, ‘square’.
- b. The absence of the voiced labio-velar approximant /w/ in the Mochica system forces the replacement of /w/ with a voiceless bilabial fricative /f/. Cerrón-Palomino exemplifies this adaptation following, first, the case of the Quechua reconstructed word *ĭlawtu which enters Mochica as <llaftus>. The term *ĭlawtu refers to the imperial tassel that hung from the crown of the Inca or other royal member. Secondly, Cerrón-Palomino examines the Quechua term *wakča, which enters Mochica as <faccqa> meaning ‘poor’ ‘orphan’.
- c. The Quechua voiceless palato-alveolar affricate gets accommodated to the Mochica voiceless palatal stop /c/. Consider the Quechua verb *muča entering Mochica as <mæcha> ‘to adore’.

The Quechua borrowings that Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 51) identifies in Colonial Mochica are listed in Table 28. In the same table, I include these borrowings' corresponding citation references in the *Arte*.

Table 28. Possible Quechua loans in Colonial Mochica

Mochica	Quechua	Gloss
<yanà> (Carrera 1644: 144)	*yana	'servant'
<catu> (Carrera 1644: 127)	*qatu	'market', 'plaza', 'square'
<faccqa> (Carrera 1644: 43)	*wakča	'poor'
<llaftus> (Carrera 1644: 6)	*ławtu	'imperial insignia', 'imperial diadema'
<mæcha> (Carrera 1644: 164)	*muča	'kiss', 'adore'
<opa(izti)> (Carrera 1644: 44)	*upa	'silly'

Source: Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 50-52)

In contrast to the cases of *yana> <yanà>; *qatu> <catu>; *wakča> <faccqa>; *ławtu> <llaftus>; *muča> <mæcha> (Table 28), where the Mochica words seem indeed adapted forms from Quechua, the case of <opaizti> appears problematic because even though the segment <opa> is reminiscent of *upa 'silly', explaining the segment <-izti> turns complicated. Moreover, such a long word as <opaizti> does not correspond either to the Mochica tendency of monosyllabic words.

Nevertheless, in the search of an explanation of the nature of this segment one can turn toward the “deferential verbal suffix *-ste*”, derived from the full Spanish personal pronoun *usted* that refers to the second person formal. In his study of the Andean Spanish of the northern Peru, Andrade Ciudad (2012: 196-200; 2016: 247-252) coined and described the term deferential verbal suffix *-ste*. According to Andrade Ciudad's study (2012: 197; 2016: 248), the

marker *-ste* appears attached to the imperative, to the indicative and to the subjunctive showing in this way the spreading of the morpheme to different verb forms. Along the same lines, but from a historical viewpoint, Marquez Arnao (2017: 219) recognizes this verbal morpheme's robust presence in the early 20th century northern Peruvian Andean Spanish expressed in the narrative by the well-known Peruvian novelist Ciro Alegría. The segment <-izti> is reminiscent of *-ste*. The difference lies in the fact that *-ste* attaches to verb stems, while in the case of <opaizti>, the morpheme <-izti> appears attached to a nominal form that could either be a noun 'the fool' or an adjective 'silly'. The suffix <-izti> would then have a more promiscuous nature behaving more like a clitic. I strongly suspect that suffix <-izti> is the same as the suffix called deferential verbal suffix *-ste* by Andrade Ciudad. In the case of Andrade Ciudad's analysis, *-ste* would have deviated from the personal pronoun *usted* in a structure with a verb in imperative. In the case of <opaizti>, I suggest that the suffix <-izti> deviates also from *usted* but the use might be a bit different for the whole structure would correspond more to an insult such as 'silly you', 'you are silly'.

9.3.2. Quechua loans in Republican Mochica

Quechua loan words in Republican Mochica are also identified by Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 52-53; personal communication, September 7, 2018), see Table 29. In Table 29, I add the information about the source where the terms appear, such as Middendorf or Brüning. There is no doubt of the Quechua origin of most of the terms, however, it is necessary to say that the fourth word <umu> in the table, recorded as Mochica by Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 52) is not available in any Mochica source. The word <chichu>, present in Middendorf (1892: 59) is recorded also by Carrera (1644: 178) but only registered as Republican Mochica loan by Cerrón-Palomino (1989).

The case of <fak> gets the attention of Cerrón-Palomino who contemplates two scenarios where Mochica could have taken Quechua *waka as <faka> into its inventory. First, following the Mochica principle of not accepting /w/ would have allowed it to enter into Mochica inventory only as /f/. Following the same principle, Salas adds another case with a similar change: *willka* ‘holy’, ‘semi-god’ > <fixllca> ‘gentleman’ (Carrera 1644: 45). The second scenario implies that the option of Spanish *vaca* would have entered straight into Mochica (Cerrón-Palomino 1989: 53), this option is the one adopted by Salas (2012b: 76).

Cerrón-Palomino recently identified another Quechua term in Republican Mochica: <jujuna> ‘tablecloth’. Cerrón-Palomino (personal communication, September 7, 2018) refers to this term registered in some sources that are not yet available to anyone. Nevertheless, I consulted the ethnographic dictionary by Brüning [1920] 2017: 57) and found the register of <jujuna>. Cerrón-Palomino explains that <jujuna> ‘tablecloth’ is a hispanicized form of the Quechua word *shuyshuna, meaning ‘sifter’, ‘sieve’, referring to a piece of cloth used for sieving the fermented alcoholic beverage called *chicha*. This piece of cloth is also used as tablecloth, which explains that use in Mochica. The change of the Quechua voiceless palato-alveolar fricative /ʃ/ into /x/ is normal in the Quechua borrowings in Spanish.

Table 29. Quechua loans in Republican Mochica according to Cerrón-Palomino

Mochica	Quechua	Gloss
<pampa> (Middendorf 1892: 99)	*pampa	‘pampas’
<toko> (Middendorf 1892: 62)	*tuqu	‘window’, ‘hole’
<mocko> (Middendorf 1892: 59)	*muqu	‘bump’, ‘knot’
<umu ¹⁷³ > (?)	*umu	‘priest’
<papa> (Middendorf 1892: 61)	*papa	‘potato’
<llella> (Middendorf 1892: 62)	*likla	‘blanket’
<chichu ¹⁷⁴ > (Middendorf 1892: 59)	*čuču	‘breast’
<koch koch> (Middendorf 1892: 61) <kōts kōts> (Brü. 1.35)	*quča-quča	‘seaweed’
<fak> (Middendorf 1892: 54)	*waka (Spanish ‘vaca’?)	‘ox’
<jujuna> (Brüning [1920] 2017: 57)	*shuyshu-na	‘tablecloth’

Source: Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 52-53; personal communication, September 7, 2018)

Besides these Quechua loans in Colonial and Republican Mochica identified by Cerrón-Palomino, I have identified three more Quechua borrowings in Republican Mochica, namely, <cunti>, <kélyka> and <pŭrr> / <perr> that I include in Table 30.

¹⁷³ I could not find this term in any Mochica source.

¹⁷⁴ Cerrón-Palomino (1989) did not report this term for the Colonial Mochica, even though Carrera (1644: 178) reports it.

Table 30. Quechua loans in Republican Mochica

Mochica	Quechua	Gloss
<kónti> (Brü 1.34) <kánti> (Brü 1.35: 36) <cunti> (Villarreal 1921: 125)	<cunti> (Garcilaso de la Vega [1609] 1800: 17v, 37r-38v, 220r)	‘person from the highlands’, ‘serrano’
<kélyka> (Brü 1.34. Brü 1.35: 44)	<quillca> (DST ¹⁷⁵ 1560b: 170r) <quellcca> (DGH 1608: 299)	‘paper’, ‘book’, ‘letter’, ‘script’
<pürr>/<perr> (Middendorf 1892: 61) <përr>/<përr> (Brü 1.34 /Brü 1.35: 5)	<ppuru> (DGH 1608: 296)	‘feather’

The word /kunti/ finds its origin in the name of a specific province located west from Cuzco called *Cunti* (Garcilaso de la Vega [1609] 1800: 38v). According to this author, all the territories in that area to the west of Cuzco, conformed a region called *Cuntisuyu* ‘the Cunti region’ or ‘the West region’. He even specifies that seamen called this area Southwest taking Cuzco as reference (Garcilaso de la Vega [1609] 1800: 220r).

The meaning ‘serrano’ understood as ‘person from the highlands’, seems to be original regarding its use in Mochica. Interestingly, one of the successors of the mythical <Ñaimlap> is <Cuntipallec>. There is only a single mention of this name in the list of dynastic successors in Cabello Valboa ([1586] 2011), but despite the fact that one cannot know about his origin, one could still posit the question whether <Cuntipallec> may have had a foreign origin, coming from the highlands.

¹⁷⁵ DST stands for Domingo de Santo Tomás (1560b) and DGH for Diego González Holguín (1608).

The word <kélyka> (Brü 1.34. Brü 1.35: 44) ‘paper’ is a clear case of borrowing from Quechua. The term <pŭrr> / <perr> ‘feather’ in Mochica is registered by Middendorf (1892: 61) and <pěrr> / <pěrr> by Brüning (Brü 1.34 /Brü 1.35: 5). Interestingly, in my search for possible external or contact relations between Mochica and other languages, I compared Mochica and Candoshi and found that the Candoshi word *poro* ‘feather’ (Tuggy [1966] 2008: 62) looked similar to <pŭrr> / <perr> in Mochica. This can only be explained understanding that *poro* ‘feather’ in Candoshi is the same Quechua loan present in both languages.

9.4. Coastal loan terms in Quechua

9.4.1. The case of <tumi> ‘sea lion’

As mentioned in 9.3. in relation to Mochica borrowings into Quechua, Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 54) cautiously talks about littoral elements. In this section, I present one of the so-called littoral loans proposed by Cerrón-Palomino, namely, <thome> ‘sea lion’ (Santo Tomás 1560: 71r). The other littoral element <guaxme> ‘fisherman’ was presented in 9.2. as a probable Quingnam loan. The suggestion of a coastal origin of <thome> (Santo Tomás 1560b: 71r) proposed by Cerrón-Palomino gets supported by the register of <tumi> by Calancha (1639: 379) about hundred years later. Middendorf and Brüning also record forms similar to <thome> as can be seen in Table 31. The coastal Quechua registered by Santo Tomás (1560a, 1560b) may have adopted a term foreign to Quechua <thome>. In the Cuzco Quechua variety account of ‘sea lion’ by González Holguín (1608: 9) one finds two options, namely, <açuca> or <cchochapuma>. The latter term <cchochapuma> seems to be a calque, a translation of ‘sea lion’ into Quechua. This way, one could segment

<cchochapuma> into two Quechua words <cchocha-puma> literally meaning ‘puma of the sea’.

Table 31. The term for ‘sea lion’ as a coastal loan present in Quechua

Mochica	Quechua	Gloss
<tumi> (Calancha 1639: 379)	<thome> (DST 1560b: 71r)	‘sea lion’
<chommi> (Middendorf 1892: 60)		
<tšūmi> (Brü. 1.34)		
<tšömi> (Brü. 1.34)		

Source: Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 54)

9.4.2. The case of <apichu> ‘sweet potato’

The Mochica term for sweet potato is registered as <opæn> (Carrera 1644: 116) as shown in example (255). When inspecting the term <opæn> the suffix marking plural <-æn> can be identified. This way, the form for sweet potato registered by Carrera would be a plural form where <op-> would mean ‘sweet potato’ (in singular).

(255)

<Pedrong opæn maix meterædo mo opæn> (Carrera 1644: 116)

Pedro-	ng	o	pæn	ma-	ix	met-	er-	ædo	mo
Pedro-	OBL	REL ₁	DAT	OPT-	1PL	bring-	VAL _{ER} -	PCTP	DET.PROX
op-									
sweet potato									PL

‘We may have brought these sweet potatoes for Pedro’

First noted by Ballón Aguirre & Cerrón-Palomino (2002: 38)¹⁷⁶, the term <apichu> appears in the Aimara vocabulary by Bertonio (1612: 345), who claims that “the most known and best potatoes in this land are, Puma coyllu, Amajaa, Ahuachucha, Ppatticalla, Navrappoco, vlla talla Allca hamacorani; Allca phiñu; Kusku, Vila kapi, Huatoca, *Apichu*¹⁷⁷, Ccullukauna”. González Holguín (1608: 58, 74) records <apichu> ‘sweet potato’ in his Cuzco Quechua dictionary.

The term <apichu> includes in its form the suffix <-chu>, which seems to be recurrent in plant names like *ichu* ‘Andean bunch grass’, *uchu* ‘chili pepper’, *ch’uchu* ‘seed of the fruit of *Sapindus saponaria*’ and *ulluchu* which is defined by Bussmann & Sharon (2009) as a ceremonial plant that was used in northern Peru as a hallucinogen and during sacrifice rituals. When segmenting <apichu> into <api-chu> segment <api-> is reminiscent of <op-> after segmenting <op-æn> into two morphemes. One cannot know the semantics of this Quechua suffix *-chu* but it appears to be a former productive suffix that is present in several Quechua plant names. Following this, one can suggest that <apichu> may be a Mochica loan that entered Quechua vocabulary when <-chu> was still productive.

¹⁷⁶ “Papas las mas conocidas y buenas en esta tierra sō, Puma coyllu, Amajaa, Ahuachucha, Ppatticalla, Navrappoco, vlla talla Allca hamacorani; Allca phiñu; Kusku, Vila kapi, Huatoca, *Apichu*, Ccullukauna”.

¹⁷⁷ My own emphasis.

