

# Corpus Planning for the Southern Peruvian Quechua Language

Serafin M. Coronel-Molina

*University of Pennsylvania  
Graduate School of Education*

This paper presents a case study of corpus planning in a multilingual country. It begins with a discussion of multilingualism in general, and then moves to the specific case of Southern Quechua in Peru. The paper treats such issues as the graphization, standardization, modernization, and renovation of Quechua, in the face of ever-increasing domination by the Spanish language. I present outlines of the efforts of the three major groups of linguists and other national and international scholars working on corpus planning in Peru, and the successes and pitfalls these various groups have encountered and/or created in their work. I conclude with an argument for greater collaboration between these groups, and a reiteration of the need to revalorize the Quechua language both within the Quechua population which speaks it, and within the dominant Spanish speaking population.

*Kichwanchik pulun allpanawlaqmi kaykan.  
¿Imaylaqtra tuki talpuy traklaqnaw likalinga?  
"Our Quechua is still barren soil. When will it become  
a fertile land for sowing the seeds [of new knowledge]?"  
-R. Cerrón-Palomino*

Linguistic rights has become a focus of attention in recent years. For example, in the United States, there is a strong movement to legislate the country as "English-only." In Canada, on the other hand, much national legislation is produced not only in English and French, but in various indigenous dialects as well, due to the combined efforts of the multiple indigenous groups residing within that country's borders. In my native country, Peru, the legal status of my native language, Quechua, has fluctuated greatly depending on which political group is in power. The current government recognizes the fact that a large percentage of its population does not speak Spanish, and has, once again, instituted bilingual Spanish-Quechua education. However, this recent effort does not have much impact on the respective statuses of Spanish and Quechua, and so a

diglossic situation continues to exist in Peru. Because of my own desire to improve the present situation of Quechua in my home country, this paper will treat issues of corpus planning in Peru.

With corpus planning in a multilingual country as the main focus, it is perhaps warranted to define just what is meant by multilingualism, and to differentiate between a multilingual country versus multilingual speakers. David Crystal (1985) defines multilingualism in general as both the speech community in which more than one language is spoken, and the individual speakers themselves "who have multilingual ability" (p. 202). Regarding the idea of a multilingual country, Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino (1989) in particular makes an eloquent point concerning the linguistic status of Peru:

Multilingualism has been a constant feature of the sociocultural landscape of Peru throughout the course of its history. The Peruvian territory, full of contrasts, was an area where languages of different families and different historic roles converged.... The present linguistic map is a result of a series of displacements and superpositions of these languages; the number and nature of these occurrences are difficult to determine (particularly in the past), but their interaction—actually that of the speakers—undoubtedly established the multilingual nature of the country. (p. 11)

Cerrón-Palomino uses the term *multilingual* with respect to the nature of the country as a whole. This is borne out by census statistics on ethnicity and languages spoken. As of 1984, out of a population of 18,274,200 speakers, 72.64% spoke Spanish, 24.08% spoke Quechua, and 3.29% spoke all other indigenous Peruvian languages (Cerrón-Palomino 1989: 14). However, these numbers do not distinguish bilingual or multilingual speakers from monolingual speakers; both groups are lumped together in the statistics. In reality, as Cerrón-Palomino's quote makes explicit, Peru as a country is multilingual, in that a very large number of languages are spoken within the boundaries of the country. At the same time, individual speakers are much less likely to be multilingual themselves. Clearly, many Peruvians are at least bilingual, and some are multilingual. However, according to statistics, the vast majority of speakers in Peru are monolinguals, either of Spanish or of an indigenous language such as Quechua or Aymara. This monolingualism at the individual level is an important point to make because it has a great impact on the current situation of Quechua in Peru in regard to corpus planning.

In discussing the case of corpus planning in Peru, I will follow the model presented in Cooper's (1989) text, *Language planning and social change*. He details the following four areas which are integral to corpus planning:

graphization; standardization, in which Cooper includes the process of codification; modernization; and renovation.

Graphization is the development of a writing system for a previously unwritten language. Ferguson (1968a) states it quite simply: "graphization [is] reduction to writing" (p. 28). Standardization, according to Richards, Platt and Platt, is "the process of making some aspect of language usage conform to a standard variety," usually in connection with the written, rather than the oral, aspect of the language (p. 350). It is also normally implemented by government authority. Codification refers to the written rules of language use (Cooper 1989: 144-145), or making the unconscious process of language production conscious and explicit. Modernization, according to Cooper (1989) is "the process whereby a language becomes an appropriate medium of communication for modern topics and forms of discourse" (p. 149). While modernization is generally a literal attempt to bring a language up-to-date with current technologies and styles, renovation is more "an effort to change an already developed code, whether in the name of efficiency, aesthetics, or national or political ideology.... Whereas modernization permits language codes to serve new communicative functions, renovation permits language codes to serve old functions in new ways" (Cooper 1989: 154).

Having defined the parameters to examine, it might also be useful to have explicitly stated definitions of *language planning* and *corpus planning*. Tauli (1974) succinctly defines language planning as:

the higher and more difficult task of ... the methodical improvement of language, i.e. to eliminate inadequacies and inconveniences in the structure and vocabulary of a language, and to adapt the language for new needs and to make it more efficient. (p. 57)

Fishman (1973) specifies that such efforts usually are carried out at the national level (p. 24). According to Wiley (1996), the process of language planning involves two interrelated processes: *corpus planning*, whose definition very closely resembles that of language planning cited above, and *status planning* (p. 108). Richards, Platt and Platt (1992) define *corpus planning* as deliberately restructuring a language, usually by the government at the national level. This process can include increasing the range of the vocabulary, creating new grammatical structures, or even developing a new writing system or standardizing a current one (p. 88). Cooper (1989) amplifies this by stating, "it refers, in short, to the creation of new forms, the modification of old ones, or the selection from alternative forms in a spoken or written code" (p. 31).

In accordance with an assertion of Haugen's (1966), I would like to emphasize that in corpus planning and language planning the spoken word

is not the most important tool, but rather, the written word. Haugen states Bloomfield's position that writing is nothing more than a way to record the spoken word, and as such, is secondary to it (1933, cited in Haugen p. 53). At the same time, and contrary to Bloomfield, he points out that when an effort is being made to consciously transmit language from one population to another, writing does indeed become more important than speech: "The reason for the reversal [of the relative importance between writing and speech] is given by the function of writing as the medium of communication between speakers separated in time and space" (p. 53). Hence, in agreement with Haugen's argument that the graphic representation is more important than the oral in language planning, I will focus my attention on written form and function, rather than spoken.

In a later work, Haugen (1983) presents what he calls a four-fold model "as a framework for the starting points of language planners everywhere" (p. 269). The four "folds" of his model are: (1) selection of a norm; (2) its codification; (3) implementation of function; and (4) elaboration of the function (p. 270). Selection, of course, is deciding which code to use in the language planning effort. Haugen stresses that this is a societal decision, not an individual one; it is a policy decision of a society's leaders (p. 270-271). Needless to say, although it may be simple to state, it is not a simple decision to make.

Codification is the process of establishing written norms for the code chosen. Graphization is often the first step in the process of codification. This process, as opposed to selection, can be the work of an individual. Haugen makes an important point regarding selection and codification when he indicates that:

they both involve decisions on *form* and are part of what has been called *policy planning*.... *Selection* and *codification* remain mere paper exercises unless they are followed by *implementation* and *elaboration*, the former involving social status and the latter the linguistic corpus. (p. 272)

Implementation is the stage at which the decisions from above, as it were, are brought to the community and put into practice, through such devices as books, pamphlets, newspapers, and of course, educational textbooks; it could also include introduction via mass media such as radio and television. Finally, elaboration is, as Haugen (1983) phrases it, "in many ways simply the continued implementation of a norm to meet the functions of a modern world" (p. 273).

Moshe Nahir (1977 and 1984) offers a description of five aspects of language planning, which can work in conjunction with some of what Haugen describes. *Purification* is the first aspect, which he defines as "prescription of 'correct' usage so as to defend and preserve the 'purity' of the language"

(1977: 108). This process is concerned mainly with the standardization of the language, and thus has implications for corpus planning. *Revival* often functions in the formation of a national identity. "There have been some cases ... of old nations, newly aware of their national identity and heritage, forming movements with the aim of restoring old languages to their previous status" (1977: 110). Clearly, in this sense, Quechua has undergone revival at least officially or theoretically, if not in practice. With the government's one-time promotion of it to the status of one of Peru's official languages, it attempted to revive Quechua's importance in the formation of a national image. This point will be discussed further in a later section.

Revival ties into Haugen's classification in that it involves both codification and standardization: "revival = codification + standardization (+ reform)" (Nahir 1977: 111). Revival and purification are both motivated by ideological and emotional factors. *Reform*, however, which is the next level of Nahir's classification, is generally an attempt to make the language easier to use in actual communicative situations, whether through simplification of the lexicon, the orthography, or the spelling system. Needless to say, such reforms may be affected by ideology, politics, or emotion, but they are not necessarily based on them (Nahir 1977: 113).

*Standardization* is a process that falls under the reform movement. Garvin (1993) presents a very clear case for what it is and its importance in language planning in his discussion of its role in language planning, the purposes and functions it serves within society, and its frame of reference in the society. As an example of this, Ayacucho Quechua (a variety of Quechua II) is generally considered to be the best choice for a standardized written language, although there are varying opinions on all sides, as is only to be expected. I will discuss these arguments in more depth in the next section.

The final level which Nahir discusses is *lexical modernization*, which is the practice of bringing an old language up to date to be able to function in the modern world. This process includes inventing new terminology to express concepts not currently available in the language, such as creating words in Quechua to be able to talk about modern technology. It can be done either by adapting loan words into the language, or extending meanings of current words in the language to express new ideas.

Hornberger pulls together many of the concepts discussed above, and presents them in a concise table to show how they all interact. Below, I reproduce the portion of this table which summarizes corpus planning (1994: 78).

As can be seen in Table 1, corpus planning addresses both the form and the function of the language, through the approaches of Policy Planning (form) and Cultivation Planning (function). It then lists the goals of each approach: standardization and graphization are directly related to the form of a language, while modernization and renovation, and their respective subcategories, are related to a language's function.

Table 1  
Summary of Corpus Planning

<i>Approaches</i>	<i>Policy Planning (on form)</i>	<i>Cultivation Planning (on function)</i>
<i>Types</i>	<i>Goals</i>	<i>Goals</i>
Corpus Planning (about language)	Standardisation Corpus Auxiliary code	Modernisation Lexical Stylistic
	Graphisation	Renovation Purification Reform Stylistic simplification Terminology unification

Source: Hornberger 1994: 78. Based on Ferguson 1968a, Kloss 1968, Stewart 1968, Neustupny 1974, Haugen 1983, Nahir 1984, Cooper, 1989.

### Peru: A Case Study

Having discussed the theoretical basis for language and corpus planning in general, I will now give a short historical overview of the linguistic work done on the Quechua language over the last 33 years. Cerrón-Palomino (1987: 223-247) cites Parker (1963) and Torero (1964) as some of the first truly scientific studies completed in the area of Quechua historical linguistics. Both of these investigators did comparative and/or reconstructive studies, which helped to tentatively classify the various dialects of Quechua, many of which are nearly mutually unintelligible, according to phonological and morphological characteristics. In other words, they helped to prove that the various Quechua dialects derive from a common linguistic ancestor. As a result of these studies, Quechua was divided into two main branches: Central Quechua, also known as Huaihuash or Quechua I; and Southern Quechua, known as Huampuy or Quechua II (see Appendix A). This paper focuses on the latter branch.

Following the work of Parker and Torero, Taylor (1984) contributed new details which further clarified the classification system, and many others have continued their investigations. Among the well-known linguists studying the Quechua language, Cerrón-Palomino himself has been actively working in the field since 1973, producing everything from dictionaries and grammars to studies on language planning and language loss.

All these studies provide a theoretical linguistic basis for the ultimate work of corpus planning. Without such pure linguistic studies, we would

not have the knowledge of structure and variation to be able to plan the most effective and efficient ways to standardize the written language. With this foundation, we can now turn to the actual planning of a corpus. As I mentioned earlier, I am following Cooper's (1989) model for organizing my discussion, which incorporates the following foci: graphization, standardization, modernization, and renovation. These are the topics which I will examine in relation to the Quechua situation for the remainder of my paper. I will also look at various related issues which are specifically relevant to Quechua corpus planning.

One of the most critical and confounding of these issues is the fact that there are three distinct groups working on corpus planning in Peru, and these three groups are not necessarily working together in a coordinated effort, as Hornberger (1995) points out. Each group has its own agenda and its own ideologies which influence the differing approaches they take.

The first of these is a group of "Peruvian linguists/bilingual education specialists [who] affirm that they seek the standardization of that authentic Quechua; that is, not the Quechua of the bilingual *mestizo*, but the Quechua of the rural sector, the monolingual *campesinos*" (Hornberger 1995: 198). For the sake of brevity, I will refer to this group as the Peruvian linguists. This group, as Hornberger mentions, consists primarily of linguists who have a profound knowledge of Quechua, and who have a history of production based at San Marcos University, "the oldest and most prestigious of Peru's universities" (p. 198).

These linguists have organized and instituted a number of bilingual education projects, the most notable of which are the Experimental Quechua-Spanish Bilingual Education Program of Ayacucho, and the Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno (1995: 192). Unfortunately, in 1994, the bilingual education programs which were organized and maintained at the federal level were terminated due to the government's changing priorities (R. Cerrón-Palomino, personal communication, April 27, 1996). Bilingual education is no longer a government priority, and any such programs that are still in effect are not linked in any systematic way to either each other or to the government.<sup>1</sup> According to Luis Enrique López Quiroz, an internationally known scholar who promotes maintenance programs in bilingual Quechua-Spanish education, there are currently 18 different bilingual education projects ongoing in Peru, either through the efforts of non-governmental organizations, or through private organizations (Hornberger, personal communication, April 30, 1996).

---

<sup>1</sup> In a later communication, after this paper was first submitted, I was informed that the government had reinstated a national bilingual education program, which it is still in the process of implementing (H. Rosales Alvarado, personal communication, September 2, 1996). This sudden about-face in policy is just one more manifestation of how rapidly situations can change in Latin American politics.

The second group working on bilingual education is the Peruvian Academy of the Quechua Language, based in Cuzco<sup>2</sup> and with a primary objective of establishing and disseminating Quechua not just as a colloquial or vernacular language, but also as a literary and intellectual one. Faustino Espinoza Navarro is the founder of this organization, and has contributed greatly to Quechua's use as a literary language, both by producing literature in Quechua, and by establishing the National Cuzco Prize for a Quechua Novel, Poem, Story and Drama, among other activities promoted by the Academy (Hornberger 1995: 193). The primary ideological focus of this institution is the linguistic purity of Quechua:

The majority of their works ... are composed in a Quechua which is not the spoken language, but rather one that attempts to be 'pure,' 'classical,' 'authentic,' 'legitimate' and uncontaminated by the loan words that characterize the 'mixed,' 'adulterated,' or 'vulgar' Quechua used daily by its speakers.... The revindicated Quechua is supposedly that of the Incas, but in no sense that of the 'Indians.' (Godenzzi 1992: 26-27; translation mine)

The Peruvian Academy has close working connections with the third group, in the sense that they connect in the same geographical sphere and share some of the same resources. However, it seems to me that their ideologies are different enough that they do not generally collaborate successfully on the same projects.

This third group which is involved in promoting the Quechua language is the North American-based international Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), which is a missionary body whose primary purpose is to translate the Bible into all languages of the world. Because many of the world's languages are still unwritten, this also means that SIL has been involved in developing writing systems for these languages (Hornberger 1995: 192).

---

<sup>2</sup> In an effort to maintain consistency in this work, I will follow R. Cerrón-Palomino's spelling convention for the city of Cuzco throughout my paper, despite variations in spelling among the different authors whom I cite. He notes, "We write Cuzco (and derivatives) with z, and not *Cusco*, because of our loyalty to orthographic tradition. It was written thusly not only by the first scholars of the Quechua language, but also by the Inca Garcilaso himself, who was fond of saying that he had 'suckled' Quechua 'with his mother's milk.' Those who would happily propose the change from Cuzco to *Cusco* do not know—or do not care—that until the end of the 17th century, Cuzco Quechua (not only the Chinchaysuyu variety) distinguished between two types of sibilants (a coronal and an apical: the first was represented by z and the second by s), and if Garcilaso writes *Cozco* it is because the sibilant in question was dorsal and not apical. Therefore, to want to change z to s is an attempt against the etymological integrity of the word." (Cerrón-Palomino 1994: 13; translation mine).



Having three such diverse groups trying to work on the same basic process—corpus planning—from three different directions and with three different agendas makes the ultimate achievement of a successful corpus very problematic. At each stage of the process outlined by Cooper (1989), each of these groups has a differing stance. And since each group has its political agenda, none is willing to sacrifice its position for the sake of the final goal. So instead of unification, the result is ideological schisms and separation within the ranks of language planners. These gaps become apparent when we discuss the various stages of corpus planning, so I will briefly return to these groups in discussing each stage, to illustrate some of the difficulties inherent in trying to transfer theory to practice.

### *Graphization*

The first effort in corpus planning, according to Cooper, should be directed toward graphization. Cerrón-Palomino (1988) also maintains that graphization is fundamental in the codification of a previously unwritten language, and asserts that some form of graphization of Quechua, planned or not, has been undertaken ever since the Spanish Conquest of the Americas, mostly directed towards the effort to subjugate the native population. He points out that early attempts at graphization were far from consistent, for the simple reason that “the described variet[ies] presented exotic sounds to the ears of the Europeans. In these cases, the proposed solutions could not but vary according to the degree of fidelity with which the grammarians tried to represent them” (p. 80; translation mine). As we shall see shortly, such conflicts and difficulties in developing an orthographic system still have not been entirely overcome in the case of Quechua today, at a time when it has been the subject of much debate and careful consideration.

As early as 1954, at the III Congreso Indigenista Interamericano [Third Interamerican Indigenist Congress], efforts were being made to develop an alphabet that would suffice to express both Quechua and Aymara phonemes. This alphabet was known as the *Sistema Unico de Escritura para las Lenguas Quechua y Aymara* [the unified writing system for Quechua and Aymara]. This was the alphabet eventually adopted by the Peruvian Academy of the Quechua Language (Hornberger 1993: 239).

In 1975, during Velasco Alvarado’s administration, Quechua was made an official language of Peru, “coequal with Spanish, and ... taught at all levels of education beginning in 1976 and used in all court actions involving Quechua speakers beginning in 1977” (Hornberger 1995: 189).<sup>3</sup> This, of course, made it necessary to have a written Quechua alphabet, a task un-

---

<sup>3</sup> It is significant to note that the Peruvian government later retracted this law in their 1979 constitution, during the administration of Morales Bermúdez, in which Spanish is designated as the only official language, with Quechua and Aymara having “official use zones” (Hornberger 1995: 189).

dertaken by the commission whose duty it was to implement the law. At the same time, they also commissioned the development and publication of dictionary-grammar sets to correspond to each of the six main Quechua dialects in Peru, which were elaborated under the direction of Alberto Escobar. The six dialects for which these sets were produced are Ancash-Huailas, Ayacucho-Chanca, Cajamarca-Cañaris, Cuzco-Collao, Junín-Huanca, and San Martín Quechua. The group contracted to do this work was the group of Peruvian linguists mentioned earlier; therefore, it was their particular ideological influence which colored the format of the alphabet used.

Graphization is not simply a matter of creating a symbol, such as a letter, to represent any given sound. For example, it shouldn't really be necessary to have a different symbol for two allophones of the same phoneme. At the start of their effort, however, these Peruvian linguists utilized some strategies that did just this. They represented allophones of the vowels /i/ and /u/ with separate letters /e/ and /o/, creating an apparent five-vowel system. In Quechua, /i/ is pronounced /e/ and /u/ is pronounced /o/ when they are in contact with the uvular consonant /q/ or its counterparts /q<sup>h</sup>/ (aspirated) and /q'/ (glottalized). The Peruvian linguists also separated the different Quechua dialects into individualized, region-specific books, as stated earlier. In this case, the variants of /q/ mentioned above play a role. The aspirated and glottalized versions of /q/ are found in distinct dialects of Quechua, and it was felt necessary to make these distinctions visible in writing (Hornberger 1995: 195). Hence, this initial effort was still not a unifying one.

Over time, more and more problems were encountered with trying to apply the official Quechua alphabet. Finally in 1983, a special workshop, *El Primer Taller de Escritura en Quechua y Aymara* (the First Workshop on Quechua and Aymara Writing), was held to try to address these problems. Some of the results of this workshop included formation of orthographic rules, how to deal with Spanish loan words, and the use of only three vowels (a, i, u) in both the Quechua and Aymara official alphabets.

This would have seemed to settle the question of the number of vowels in Quechua, except that there were still two other professional groups working on graphization. In 1987, the Peruvian Academy of the Quechua Language decided by a majority vote to institute a five-vowel system, which once again opened the debate. However, apparently the SIL was quite active in this meeting, and many non-SIL members of the Academy were opposed to their influence. These dissidents claimed that the SIL approach was ultimately disunifying, since it emphasized the surface differences between the dialects rather than their deep-structure similarities (Hornberger 1995: 191). This incident illustrates how important and yet how divisive politics and ideologies can be in establishing a policy. Also, we will see how these same groups continue to work at cross purposes

throughout the planning process.

These conflicting ideas became reflected in the alphabets put forward by each group. (See Appendix B for a schematic presentation of some of the ideological differences between the groups, and the respective alphabets that they proposed.) After many years of discussion and argument by the various groups, finally in 1985, the Pan-Quechua alphabet was proposed by the Peruvian linguists as a fair and accurate representation of the various sounds of the Quechua language. This alphabet is the one that was used in the bilingual education programs and the elaboration of textbooks. However, it has not been universally accepted by either the Peruvian Academy or by SIL, who each have their own proposed alphabets which are similar to each other, so the issue is still not completely settled.

Returning to a more theoretical perspective from this field-based ideological issue, I would like to address some of the strictly linguistic matters that are generally thought to be important in planning an alphabet. There can be political, cultural, or even very practical reasons to choose something other than a Latin-based alphabet; for instance, in certain languages, a syllabary might make more sense than an alphabet, since a one-to-one correspondence between a single phoneme and a letter might be impossible. Tonal languages are an example of this (Cooper 1989: 126), since it is very hard to indicate tonal variations with one-to-one phoneme-to-letter alphabetic correspondences. A syllabary can have as many characters as it needs, which may represent whole words or even phrases, but each character also includes some element which indicates proper intonation.

Another significant point in planning an orthography is the consideration of such characteristics as ease of learning, writing, reading, transference between languages, and so forth. However, Cooper (1989) points out that even these apparently reasonable criteria can conflict with each other: "What is easy to read is not necessarily easy to write and print. What is easy to learn is not necessarily easy to use" (p. 126). Once one has identified the characteristics which are most important or relevant to a given linguistic situation, one then has to be concerned with *how* to achieve these goals. For instance, as Cooper questions, is it more effective to plan for a learner to match specific written symbols with individual oral sounds, or does it make more sense to assume a "correspondence between symbol and meaning" (p. 127)? In the first case, one might design a graphical representation system that differentiates between the final sounds of the words *cats* and *\*horsez*, although in both cases the final sound represents the pluralization of the word. However, in the second case, it would be this plural morpheme function that would be emphasized, and thus both words would end with the same symbol, /s/.

Social concerns are also very important. Regardless of any technical considerations, if the people for whom the alphabet is designed decide for whatever reason that it is not acceptable to them, it will fail. In this instance, Cooper (1989) cites the example of one language, Serbo-Croatian,

being written in three different scripts by three different subgroups, depending on their religious affiliations: Catholic Croats use Latin script, Orthodox Serbs write in a Cyrillic script, and Bosnian Muslims formerly used an Arabic writing system (pp. 128-29).

Quechua itself has not escaped from many of these problems throughout the ages. Of course, with the Spanish written tradition well established by the time of the conquest, the Spaniards felt an almost immediate need to transfer the Quechua oral traditions into written texts. Since their alphabet was not adequate to represent all the sounds present in Quechua, their efforts had very limited success. Attempts to create a standardized alphabet have continued since then, with reasons for failures ranging from not taking the Quechua phonological system into account to attempting to use alphabets that were so complex they were nearly impossible to manage (Cerrón-Palomino 1988: 80-81).

Also, as I discussed earlier, the three primary groups promoting a Quechua alphabet play their part in this ultimate failure of a unified alphabet. However, at the very least, they have produced a considerable amount of written material in Quechua, across a wide variety of genres: educational texts, dictionaries and grammars, transcriptions of stories and myths from the oral tradition, translations of Spanish literature into Quechua, and of course, the Bible. Despite the fact that all these works were generated in at least three different alphabets, their production has not been wasted effort; rather, such a production is very valuable because it demonstrates the utility of Quechua beyond just the home or the local community.

### *Standardization*

The search for a unified alphabet is ultimately a search for standardization. This is not to say that standardization is only concerned with a uniform alphabet, however. Cooper (1989) refers to Rubin's (1977) discussion of the matter, pointing out "that all human interaction requires some degree of standardization, i.e., some degree of shared expectations and shared understanding" (p. 132). This is not normally a problem within a given community, but when the sphere is enlarged to include an entire region or even the whole country, regional variations in pronunciation, in lexemes, or in entire phrases, can become problematic and interfere with the capacity to communicate. It is at this extra-community level that standardization becomes important.

However, this does not mean that the aim of standardization is to eliminate variations from a language. Again, social factors play as important a role as technical ones in trying to standardize language. As Cooper (1989) writes, "when linguistic variants serve as markers of our identity, we may be loath to abandon them, particularly in the name of a soulless efficiency" (133). He goes on to quote Ferguson, who says that "ideal standardization refers to a language which has a single, widely accepted norm which is felt to be appropriate with only minor modifications or variations for all pur-

poses for which language is used" (1962: 10, cited in Cooper: 134).

I would also like to re-emphasize here that in the case of Quechua, the effort at standardization is only in the written language, not in the spoken. No one is denying any native speaker's right to continue to speak as s/he has always spoken; the main purpose of written standardization is to be able to provide a more or less uniform education to all Quechua speakers in their native tongue. Indeed, Cooper (1989) also makes reference to the difference between written and spoken standardization. He indicates that it is generally easier and more successful to standardize the written than the spoken, for a number of reasons:

The need for a single standard written variety is greater than that of a single standard spoken variety; it is probably easier to impart, via schooling, a standard literary variety...; and writers can usually exercise more control over their writing than speakers can exert over their speech (138).

López Quiroz (*Normalización del lenguaje* 1989) emphasizes the importance of a "supradialectal norm," arguing for making indigenous languages into "vehicles of knowledge, empowering their expressive repertoire and standardizing them through the establishment of a supradialectal variety" (p. 30; translation mine). One example of how this applies to Quechua is in deciding which variety to use as the basis for the "norm."

According to one argument made by the Peruvian Academy, Cuzco Quechua is the logical choice for the standard "norm" since Cuzco is widely known to be the seat of the "original" Quechua spoken by the Incas. Their argument is based on their belief that "the purity and authenticity of Quechua have more to do with freedom from contamination from Lima and fidelity to Cuzco norms than with freedom from Spanish influence and bilingual speakers, or with fidelity to the various local varieties of Quechua" (Hornberger 1995: 200).

Others, such as Chuquimamani (*Normalización del lenguaje* 1989), argue that Ayacucho Quechua is a more reasonable choice, for a few reasons. In general, this variety is considered to be a more lexically and morphologically conservative dialect. In addition, perhaps the strongest reason to choose Ayacucho Quechua is that Cuzco Quechua has been influenced by contact with Aymara, which has contributed not only to phonological change but also to lexical change. For example, the word for water in Cuzco is "unu," the same as in Aymara. In all the other dialects of Quechua, which have not been in contact with Aymara, this word is "yaku." Another example, from phonology, is the presence of glottal and aspirated consonants in Cuzco, characteristics which are prevalent in Aymara but which do not appear in other dialects of Quechua.

Chuquimamani (*Normalización del lenguaje* 1989) makes a strong argument for the standardization of Quechua, and proposes the adoption of Ayacucho Quechua as the standard variety, when he emphasizes, “[We must] pursue standardization to avoid ‘Quechuicide’ and to make possible the communication among all Quechua speakers via the introduction of these languages in school as an instrumental language and as languages [sic] as an object of study, that is, via bilingual education” (p. 32-33; translation mine).

A third possibility for standardization has been proposed by Cerrón-Palomino (1994). In the introduction to his *Quechua sureño diccionario unificado*, he proposes using a combination of Cuzco and Ayacucho Quechua. He bases this reasoning, which he actually elaborates for the first time in an earlier work (1991), on considerations of differences in pronunciation between the two varieties, some of which I present below:

(a) The current method of representation in Cuzco-Puno Quechua does not reflect the existence of abstract, deep-structure morphological segments which might not be reflected in surface-structure pronunciation, notably in syllable-final occlusive consonants. By looking at the newer linguistic research, a deep-structure morpheme can be graphized which will reflect a wide variety of pronunciations.

(b) He discusses resolving cases of polymorphism by postulating a single graphic form to represent all oral variations; for example, the suffix *-chka*, which is prone to wide differences in pronunciation. Deciding on a single, preferably more conservative, form to represent all pronunciations will greatly ease the process of standardizing the writing system. “Otherwise, it will be simply impossible to normalize the writing system: each writer will keep writing as he wishes” (35).

(c) Regarding the highly conflictive problem of whether to represent the vowel sounds with three or five distinct letters, which is discussed elsewhere in this paper, Cerrón-Palomino asserts that it is necessary to make a stand once and for all, even if that means resorting to “counting ... votes among the members of the committee in charge of the normalization process” (35).

(d) Certain graphemes which were rejected, with lamentable consequences for the written unification of Panquechua, need to be reconsidered, and perhaps (re)included in the orthographic system; for example, *h*, *k*, and *w*, which are sounds which exist in Quechua, should not be excluded from the orthographic system simply because they are not normally included in Spanish spellings.

(e) Finally, there is extreme variation in the use of laryngeal phonemes (aspirated and glottalized consonants) in the so-called Inca Quechua. For instance, the same phoneme may or may not be either aspirated or glottalized, depending on what region the speaker is from. Therefore, to normalize the orthography, a single representation needs to be chosen to represent the variety of pronunciations (Cerrón-Palomino 1991: 34-36).