Object in Cusco Quechua

Object in Cusco Quechua

Daisuke Ebina

Kobe Shukugawa Gakuin University

In Cusco Quechua, the object grammatical relation is defined by person marking on the verb. The marking does not truly agree with independent NPs, as preceding studies argue. Object marking and independent NPs have essentially distinct functions.

Key words: grammatical relations, object, person, accusative, Cusco Quechua

1. Introduction

In Cusco Quechua, persons of the participants of events, such as agent and patient, are shown on the verb.

(1) *Carlos   nuqa-ta   maqa-wa-ŋ.*
     PSN   1SG-ACC   hit-1.OBJ-3
     'Carlos hits/hit me.'

In (1), *Carlos* is the agent of 'hitting,' and its person is indicated on the verb by the person marker *-ŋ* (3rd person). The accusative NP *nuqa-ta* 'me' is the patient, and its person is indicated by the person marker *-wa* (1st person). These person markings seem to 'agree with' the independent NPs, and, at first, it seems that we can define grammatical relations subject and object in Cusco Quechua by these 'agreements.' However, if we look at the following examples, we soon find a problem.

209

(2) *Carlos   alqu-ta   maqa-ŋ.*
    PSN   dog-ACC   hit-3
    'Carlos hits/hit a dog/dogs.'

In (2), there is no marker on the verb that shows that the patient of 'hitting' is in the 3rd person, which means that there is no 'agreement' for object when it is in the 3rd person. Thus it is necessary to look for other evidence to define object, if we wish to take *alqu-ta* 'dog(s)' to be the object NP of the sentence.

There are other object-like NPs, as the following examples show.

(3) a. *Carlos   nuqa-maŋ   mikhuna-ta   qu-wa-ŋ.*
      PSN   1SG-DAT   food-ACC   give-1.OBJ-3
      'Carlos gives/gave me food.'

    b. *Carlos   wawa-ŋ-maŋ   mikhuna-ta   qu-ŋ.*
      PSN   child-3-DAT   food-ACC   give-3
      'Carlos gives/gave his child/children food.'

In (3a), the dative NP *nuqa-maŋ* 'to me' seems to agree with the person marker *-wa*. In (3b) there is no 'agreement' for object. There are two semantic (notional) objects in each sentence: the dative NPs *nuqa-maŋ* 'to me' and *wawa-ŋ-maŋ* 'to his child/children' (recipients), and the accusative NP *mikhuna-ta* 'food' (theme). The question is, are these NPs really 'objects'?

In Section 2, the nature of person marking is considered, and in Section 3, the relationship between person marking and independent NPs is considered.

2.   Person marking

2.1.   Determining grammatical relations

There are good reasons to define the grammatical relation subject in Cusco Quechua by person marking on the verb. Subject is neither a semantic nor a pragmatic relation.

(4) *Carlos   nuqa-ta   maqa-wa-ŋ.* (= (1))
    PSN   1SG-ACC hit-1.OBJ-3
    'Carlos hits/hit me.'

As I showed earlier, the person of the agent *Carlos* is shown on the verb by the person marker *-ŋ* (3rd person). That this marking is not pragmatically motivated (such as showing the topic of the sentence) can be seen by (5).

(5) **nuqa-ta=qa   Carlos   maqa-ni.*
    1SG-ACC=TOP PSN   hit-1
    'Me, Carlos hits/hit.' (attempted reading)

The enclitic =*qa* indicates the topic of the sentence. The person marker -*ni* is in the same paradigmatic relation to -*ŋ* '3rd person' and indicates the 1st person. Sentence (5) is ungrammatical: the marker -*ni* cannot agree with the topic *nuqa-ta=qa* 'me (ACC)' because it is the patient of 'hitting,' not the agent.

Further, that the marking is not semantically motivated, can be seen by (6).

(6) *alqu-y   wañu-ŋ.*
    dog-1   die-3
    'My dog dies.'

In (6), *alqu-y* 'my dog' is the patient but 'agrees' with the person marker -*ŋ* (3rd person), which is the same as what appears in (1), (2), and (3), and 'agrees' with the agents. Subject marking in Cusco Quechua follows an accusative pattern, i.e., the single argument of an intransitive verb and the agent of a transitive verb are treated the same. These arguments appear in zero case in finite clauses.

Moreover, these person markers are obligatory. Sentences such as (7) or (8) are ungrammatical.

(7) **Carlos   nuqa-ta   maqa-wa-.*
    PSN   1sg-ACC   hit-1.OBJ
    'Carlos hits/hit me.' (attempted reading)

(8) **alqu-y   wañu-.*
    dog-1   die-
    'My dog dies.' (attempted reading)

In the light of the above considerations, I take subject as a valid grammatical category in Cusco Quechua, which is primarily defined by person marking. Hereinafter, I will call these person markers 'subject markers.'

As regards object marking, the problem is, as shown earlier, that the 3rd person object is never marked.

(9) *Carlos   nuqa-ta   maqa-wa-ŋ.* (= (1))
    PSN   1SG-ACC   hit-1.OBJ-3
    'Carlos hits/hit me.'

(10) *Carlos   qaŋ-ta   maqa-su-ŋki.*
    PSN   2SG-ACC   hit-3>2
    'Carlos hits/hit you.'

(11) *Carlos   wawqi-ŋ-ta   maqa-ŋ.*
    PSN   brother-3-ACC   hit-3
    'Carlos hits/hit his brother.'

Table 1 Non-future Tense Transitive Verb Paradigm

S/O	1SG	1PL(EXCL)	1PL(INCL)	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
1SG				*-yki*	*-yki-chis*	*-ni*	*-ni*
1PL(EXCL)				*-yki-ku*	*-yki-ku* *-yki-chis*	*-y-ku*	*-y-ku*
1PL(INCL)						*-ŋchis*	*-ŋchis*
2SG	*-wa-ŋki*	*-wa-ŋki-ku*				*-ŋki*	*-ŋki*
2PL	*-wa-ŋki-chis*	*-wa-ŋki-ku* *-wa-ŋki-chis*				*-ŋki-chis*	*-ŋki-chis*
3SG	*-wa-ŋ*	*-wa-ŋ-ku*	*-wa-ŋchis*	*-su-ŋki*	*-su-ŋki-chis*	*-ŋ*	*-ŋ*
3PL	*-wa-ŋ(-ku)*	*-wa-ŋ-ku*	*-wa-ŋchis*	*-su-ŋki(-ku)*	*-su-ŋki-chis* *-su-ŋki-ku*	*-ŋ(-ku)*	*-ŋ (-ku)*

In (9) and (10), both the persons of the agent and the patient of 'hitting' are shown on the verbs. In (9), the patient is in the 1st person, and in (10) in the 2nd person. In (11), the person of the patient is not shown on the verb. The marking is asymmetrical between subject and object. As for the subject, person marking is obligatory regardless of the person of the subject. On the other hand, as for the object, only the 1st person or the 2nd person is marked. Although the marking is asymmetrical, it still forms one single system. The object marking cannot be treated separately from the subject marking. See Table 1.

Each form is seen as expressing the following meanings.

-y/-ni	1st person subject
-ŋki	2nd person subject
-ŋ	3rd person subject
-ŋchis	1st person plural inclusive subject
-wa	1st person object
-ku	additional 3rd person
-chis	additional 2nd person
-yki	1st person subject/2nd person object
-su-ŋki	3rd person subject/2nd person object (while the form is discontinuous, it is seen as consisting of only one morpheme)

One reason for considering both the subject and object markings as forming one single system is the existence of portmanteau morphs. The suffix *-yki* indicates that the subject is in the 1st person and the object is in the 2nd person. The form cannot be further analyzed. The same can be said for the suffix *-su-ŋki*.[1]

Another reason is the plural marking. There are two additional person markers in Cusco Quechua: *-ku* and *-chis*. The former indicates an additional 3rd person and the latter an additional 2nd person. These suffixes indicate either plurality of the subject or the object, or both, combined with a subject marker and/or an object marker.

(12) *maqa-wa-ŋ-ku.*
      hit-1.OBJ-3-[+3]
      'They hit me.' or 'S/he hits/hit us (EXCL).' or 'They hit us (EXCL).'

In (12), we cannot tell whether the additional 3rd person marker *-ku* refers to the person of the agent and/or the patient. What we know is that the speaker (1st person) is the patient (indicated by *-wa*), at least one 3rd person is the agent (indicated by *-ŋ*), and there is at least one other 3rd person involved in the 'hitting,' either as another agent or patient (indicated by *-ku*). The plural marking rule refers to both subject and object.

From the above considerations, I also take object as a valid grammatical category in Cusco Quechua, although its marking is limited only to the 1st or 2nd person.

2.2. 3rd person
Is there a 'zero' 3rd person object marker? The answer is no, as can be seen from the plural marking. See the rightmost column in Table 1.

(13) a. *paykuna-ta   maqa-nki.*
         3PL-ACC   hit-2
         'You hit them.'

      b. **paykuna-ta   maqa-nki-ku.*
         3PL-ACC   hit-2-[+3]

In (13), the subject is in the 2nd person singular and the object in the 3rd person plural. If there were a 'zero' 3rd person object marker, (13b) would be grammatical (i.e., the additional person marker *-ku* '3rd person' would mark the plurality of the object together with the 'zero' object marker). However, this is not the case. Therefore, we can conclude that there is no 3rd person object marker in Cusco Quechua.

2.3. The motivation behind object marking
When the verb is semantically ditransitive, the object marker refers to the recipient or source, rather than the theme, as the following examples show.

(14) *Carlos   nuqa-maŋ   mikhuna-ta   qu-wa-ŋ.* (= (3a))
      PSN   1SG-DAT   food-ACC   give-1.OBJ-3
      'Carlos gives/gave me food.'

(15) *nuqa-maŋta   qulqi-ta   suwa-wa-ŋ-ku.*
      1SG-ABL   money-ACC   give-1.OBJ-3-[+3]
      'They steal/stole money from me.'

Thus, the object in Cusco Quechua resembles the so-called 'P(rimary) O(bject)' of Dryer (1986): the notional D(irect) O(bject) of a semantically monotransitive verb is treated the

same as the notional I(ndirect) O(bject) of a semantically ditransitive verb.

(16) a. *tayta-yki-*waŋ *mama-yki-*waŋ nuqa-*maŋ* qaŋ-*ta* *qu-wa-ŋqa*
    father-2-COM   mother-2-COM   1SG-DAT   2SG-ACC give-1.OBJ-3.FUT
    'Your father and mother will give you to me.'

    b. **tayta-yki-*waŋ *mama-yki-*waŋ nuqa-*maŋ* qaŋ-*ta* *qu-su-ŋki.*
    father-2-COM   mother-2-COM   1sg-DAT   2sg-ACC give-3>2

(17) a. *tayta-y-*waŋ   *mama-y-*waŋ qaŋ-*maŋ* nuqa-*ta* *qu-su-ŋki.*
    father-2-COM mother-2-COM 2SG-DAT   1SG-ACC give-3>2
    'My father and mother will give me to you.'

    b. **tayta-y-*waŋ   *mama-y-*waŋ qaŋ-*maŋ* nuqa-*ta* *qu-wa-ŋqa.*
    father-2-COM   mother-2-COM 2SG-DAT   1SG-ACC give-1.OBJ-3.FUT

As is clear from the above examples, the object marker refers to the recipient, and not to the theme. Example (16b) is ungrammatical because the portmanteau marker *-su-ŋki* indicates the person (2nd person) of the theme, not the recipient. Equally, (17b) is ungrammatical because the marker *-wa* indicates the person (1st person) of the theme, not the recipient.

However, when the recipient is 3rd person, the theme can be shown by an object marker.

(18) *huq* *runa-maŋ=mi* qaŋ-*ta* *qu-sayki*
    some person-DAT=AFF 2SG-ACC give-1>2.FUT
    'I am going to give you to someone else.'

Dryer (ibid: 842) also says, 'And it is quite possible that some of the languages ... as of PO type are really languages in which rules refer to human objects or non-3rd person objects, rather than PO objects.' Object in Cusco Quechua seems to be an example. However, there is a clear tendency to prefer recipient rather than theme, when either marking is logically possible. It is quite natural that the object markers are likely to refer not to theme but to recipient or source in a system where only non-3rd person objects are marked, as themes are generally non-human while recipients or sources are almost always human. (See also LaPolla (1992) for consideration of Primary Object in Tibeto-Burman languages.)

As we have seen, the system of person marking in Cusco Quechua is asymmetrical between subject and object regarding its person: i.e., 3rd person is never marked if it is an object. However, in subject marking too, we find some cases where the 3rd person is not overtly marked.

(19) a. *macha-sqa-ni.*
    be.drunk-PHS-1
    '(They say that) I was drunk.'

b. *macha-sqa-nki.*
   be.drunk-PHS-2
   '(They say that) you were drunk.'

c. *macha-sqa.*
   be.drunk-PHS.3
   '(They say that) s/he was drunk.'

The suffix *-sqa* in (19) is the past hearsay tense suffix. When the subject is in the 1st or 2nd person, its person is overtly marked as in (19a) and (19b). When the subject is in the 3rd person, the person is not overtly marked as in (19c). The same thing can be said for verbs that are inflected for past habitual tense.

(20) a. *macha-q*[2)]   *ka-ni.*
         be.drunk-HAB   be-1
         'I used to be drunk.' (habitual reading)

      b. *macha-q*   *ka-nki.*
         be.drunk-HAB   be-2
         'You used to be drunk.' (habitual reading)

      c. *macha-q*
         be.drunk-HAB.3
         'S/he used to be drunk.' (habitual reading)

In (20c), too, the 3rd person subject is not overtly marked as opposed to the 1st and 2nd person in (20a) and (20b).

From the above examples, we can see a higher regard for the non-3rd person in both subject and object. The essential motivation behind person marking in Cusco Quechua seems to be that of marking speaker and hearer overtly as participants of events and distinguishing their different roles.[3)]

3.   Independent NPs and 3rd person

As we saw in Section 2, person marking in Cusco Quechua is asymmetrical between subject and object. A 3rd person object is not marked. What about independent NPs? Is there any evidence in the morphosyntactic behavior of independent NPs that support the existence of a 3rd person object?

patient/accusative
(21) a. *Carlos   nuqa-ta   maqa-wa-ŋ.*
         PSN   1SG-ACC   hit-1.OBJ-3
         'Carlos hits/hit me.'

b. *Carlos   wawqi-ŋ-ta   maqa-ŋ.*
     PSN   brother-3-ACC   hit-3
     'Carlos hits/hit his brother.'

recipient/dative

(22) a. *nuqa-maŋ   qu-wa-y   qulqi-ta.*
          1SG-DAT   give-1.OBJ-IMP   money-ACC
          'Give me money.'

b. *wawqi-ŋ-maŋ   qu-y   qulqi-ta.*
     brother-3-DAT   give-IMP   money-ACC
     'Give his brother money.'

source/ablative

(23) a. *nuqa-maŋta   qulqi-ta   suwa-wa-sqa-ku.*
          1SG-ABL   money-ACC   steal-1.OBJ-PHS.3-+3
          '(I didn't notice that) they stole me money.
          Lit. (I didn't notice that) they stole me money.'

b. *wawqi-ŋ-maŋta   qulqi-ta   suwa-sqa-ku.*
     brother-3-ABL   money-ACC   steal-PHS.3-+3
     '(I heard that) they stole his brother money.
     Lit. (I didn't notice that) they stole his brother money.'

beneficiary/benefactive

(24) a. *Carlos   nuqa-paq   llank'a-pu-wa-ŋ.*
          PSN   1SG-BEN   work-ASP-1.OBJ-3
          'Carlos works/worked for me.'

b. *Carlos   wawqi-ŋ-paq   llank'a-pu-ŋ.*
     PSN   brother-3-BEN   work-ASP-3
     'Carlos has worked for his brother.'

There are 4 different case-marked independent NPs that correspond to object marking on the verb: i.e., accusative, dative, ablative, and benefactive. The corresponding semantic roles are patient, recipient, source, and beneficiary, respectively.

These NPs are no different from other case-marked NPs, such as locatives, in their syntactic behavior—although accusative NPs show somewhat different behavior (see Section 4)—in that word order is free, and voice alternation is not applied to these NPs.[4] That they are syntactically no different from other 'peripheral' case-marked NPs, such as locatives, suggests that they are not syntactically core arguments and thus not object NPs.

One may still want to argue that at least the 1st person pronouns in (21a), (22a), (23a), and (24a) should be treated as object NPs, as there is 'agreement' with the 1st person object marker *-wa*. However, this seeming 'agreement' is not true agreement, for two reasons. One reason is that benefactive sentences such as (24a) do not have corresponding benefactive

sentences for the 3rd person. In (24a), the verbal derivational suffix *-pu* has benefactive meaning combined with the object marker *-wa* 'for me.' In (24b), the same suffix *-pu* does not have a benefactive meaning but has an aspectual meaning 'perfect,' supposedly because there is no object marker. Example (24b) does not correspond to (24a) in its meaning. The benefactive meaning of the sentence only comes from the benefactive NP *wawqi-ŋ-paq* 'for me.' The following pairs are the closest in their meanings.

(25) a. *Carlos   nuqa-paq   llank'a-pu-wa-ŋ.*
       PSN   1SG-BEN   work-ASP-1.OBJ-3
       'Carlos works/worked for me.'

     b. *Carlos   wawqi-ŋ-paq   llank'a-ŋ.*
       PSN   brother-3-BEN   work-3
       'Carlos works/worked for his brother.'

Further, that the suffix *-pu* in (25a) does not have the aspectual meaning 'perfect' is also suggested by the fact that the following sentence without *-pu* is ungrammatical.

(26) **Carlos   (nuqa-paq)   llank'a-wa-ŋ.*
      PSN   (1SG-BEN)   work-1.OBJ-3

Thus, the independent pronoun and the person marker on the verb seem to have different functions. This fact suggests that the person marker *-wa* in (24a) is not truly agreeing with the benefactive NP *nuqa-paq* 'for me.' In addition, the 1st person or 2nd person independent pronouns rarely appear in natural utterances. They only appear when the speaker intends to emphasize a reference to the speaker or the hearer. As regards (25a), the sentence without the independent benefactive NP *nuqa-paq* 'for me' is much more natural. From these facts, independent pronouns and object markers seem to have different functions and there is no agreement between the two.[5,6)]

4. Accusative NPs

We saw in Section 3 that independent case-marked NPs do not qualify as objects. However, one thing has to be said about accusative NPs: they behave differently compared with other case-marked NPs in corresponding nominalized clauses.

(27) a. *Carlos   kay-pi   wawqi-ŋ-ta   maqa-ŋ.*
       PSN   this-LOC   brother-3-ACC   hit-3
       'Carlos hits/hit his brother here.'

     b. *Carlos-pa   kay-pi   wawqi-ŋ   maqa-sqa-ŋ*[7)]
       PSN-GEN   this-LOC   brother-3   hit-REAL.NZER-3
       'that Carlos hits/hit his brother here'

Morphological and syntactic differences between the locative NP *kay-pi* 'here' and the accusative NP *wawqi-ŋ-ta* 'his brother (ACC)' in (27a) are as follows. A locative NP in finite clauses appears in the locative form in nominalized clauses, whereas an accusative NP usually appears in zero case form in nominalized clauses, as in (27b). This zero case NP has to appear directly before the nominalized verb,[8)] while the locative NP does not have such a constraint. The other case-marked NPs behave the same as the locative NP in (27). Thus, in nominalized clauses, original accusative NPs are more closely tied to the verb than are other case-marked NPs.

We find cases where adverbial NPs also appear in the accusative, as in (28).

(28) a. *wasi-ta*   *sumaq-ta*   *allicha-ŋ*.
       house-ACC   beautiful-ACC   clean.up-3
       'S/he cleans/cleaned up the house beautifully.'

   b. [*sumaq*   *allicha-sqa*]   *wasi*
       beautiful   clean.up-REAL.NZER   house
       'the beautifully cleaned up house'

In (28a), the morpheme *sumaq* 'beautiful' appears in the accusative case and modifies the verb *allicha-* 'clean up.' The accusative NP appears in zero case form in a corresponding nominalized NP (28b), just as in (27). Additionally, when the verb is a motion verb, the goal NP may appear in the accusative, as in (29).

(29) *Carlos*   *qusqu-ta*   *ri-nqa*.
       PSN   PLN-ACC   go-FUT.3
       'Carlos will go to Cusco.'

In other languages, there are cases where adverbials and goal NPs show syntactic similarity to object NPs, as in (30).

(30)   He walked the streets and alleys. (Sanders 1984: 233)

Although it seems plausible to say that there are no language-specific grounds to treat accusative NPs in Cusco Quechua as objects, we can still say that these accusative NPs show some similarity to what are seen as objects in other languages. The important thing in Cusco Quechua is that these accusative NPs and object marking on the verb are not correlated with each other: person markers are not agreement markers of independent NPs. Object marking and accusative 'semantically object' NPs have very different natures. The former constitutes the system of person marking along with subject marking, while the latter are purely semantic and behave the same as some adverbials and goal NPs. It seems that the major motivation behind person marking is 'special regard for the speaker and hearer, and identifying their roles in the event.' On the other hand, the syntactic behavior of accusative NPs seems to be motivated by their semantic nature, i.e., they are the ones that are semantically most closely

related to the verb. This semantic closeness is reflected in their behavior in nominalized clauses: they have to appear directly before the verb without any case marking.[9]

5. Conclusion

In Cusco Quechua, the grammatical relation object is defined by person marking on the verb. There is no 3rd person object marker and we find no evidence for the existence of a 3rd person object.

The reason for the asymmetry between subject marking and object marking in terms of person is not clarified in this paper. The reason could be historical, or due to the different natures of the subject and object, or both. However, in subject marking too, there are cases where overt 3rd person markings are absent. We can see that 1st person and 2nd person are regarded as being ranked higher than 3rd person.

Although there are no language-specific grounds to treat accusative NPs as objects, it is worth mentioning that they show some resemblances to what are treated as objects in other languages. The resemblance seems to be due to their semantic closeness to the verb.

When defining grammatical relations in a particular language, we usually define them by their morphosyntactic behavior. At the same time, however, it seems important to clarify the motivations behind the behavior. In this way we will be able to better comprehend grammatical relations in general.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	ACC	accusative	AFF	affirmative
ASP	aspect(ual)	BEN	benefactive	COM	comitative
DAT	dative	EXCL	exclusive	FUT	future
GEN	genitive	HAB	habitual	IMP	imperative
INCL	inclusive	NMLZ	nominalizer	OBJ	object
PHS	past hearsay	PL	plural	PLN	place name
PSN	person name	REAL	realis	SG	singular
TOP	topic	+	additional person		

Notes

1) There are studies in which these portmanteau morphs are further analyzed (e.g., Milliken (1984)). However, the analyses seem to be ad hoc because it is difficult to find a consistent one for all inflectional paradigms. Although a one-to-one relationship between the form and the meaning in the inflectional paradigms might be found, if any existed, in an earlier stage of the language, the present paradigms show a somewhat fusional nature. See Ebina (1998) for details.

2) The habitual suffix *-q* is almost certainly a grammaticalized version of the agentive nominalizer *-q*.

3) I posited a slightly different view in Ebina (2006), where the existence of a person hierarchy is argued.

4) Cusco Quechua does not seem to have real syntactic voice alternation. See Ebina (2007) and Ebina (2011).

5) Some earlier studies have argued in favor of object agreement. For example, Weber (1989: 179) says, '... both [indirect and direct objects] trigger verbal agreement marking' for Huallaga Quechua. As explained above, I do not take this position for Cusco Quechua.

6) One may go as far to say that in terms of subject, too, there is no true agreement, as subject NPs are not at all obligatory. I would like to leave this question open for now. However, it is worth mentioning that subject NPs always appear in zero case form in finite clauses, in contrast to 'object' NPs that carry accusative case marking. There are no instances of 'less typical subject' NPs, such as dative subjects.

7) The realis nominalizer -*sqa* has the same form as the past hearsay tense suffix -*sqa*. It seems that the tense suffix was originally a nominalizer. Synchronically, they are analyzed as different morphemes.

8) This is the position of nominal modifiers.

9) They can also appear in the accusative case in nominalized clauses; in this case, there is no constraint requiring that they appear directly before the verb. Nevertheless, their appearing without the accusative case marker -*ta* is certainly preferred.

References

Dryer, Matthew S.

    1986   Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative. *Language* 62(4): 808–845.

Ebina, Daisuke

    1998   Verb inflection in Cuzco Quechua. M.A. thesis, University of Tokyo.

    2006   Person marking of object and animacy hierarchy in Cusco Quechua. In *Animacy in languages*. ed. by Hiromi Yoshida and Yasuhiro Kojima, 15–28. Tokyo: 21st Century COE Program DALS, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, University of Tokyo.

    2007   Kusuko kechua-go. [Cusco Quechua]. In *Grammatical sketch 2*, ed. by Toshihide Nakayama and Yasuhiro Yamakoshi, 63–97. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. [In Japanese]

    2011   Cusco Quechua (English revised version of Ebina 2007). In *Grammatical sketches from the field*, ed. by Yasuhiro Yamakoshi, 1–39. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

LaPolla, Randy J.

    1992   'Anti-ergative' marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman* Area 15(1): 1–9.

Milliken, Margaret W.

    1984   Quechua person reference. *Cornell University Working Papers* 5: 158–178.

Sanders, G.

    1984   Adverbials and objects. In *Objects: Towards a theory of grammatical relations*, ed. by Frans Plank. London: Academic Press.

Weber, David

    1989. *A grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*. Berkeley: University of California Press.