Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2006) **26**, 177–194. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2006 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/06 $12.00

8. QUECHUA AS A LINGUA FRANCA

Kendall A. King and Nancy H. Hornberger

This article examines ideologies surrounding Quechua's use as a lingua franca and contrasts these ideologies with the historical and ethnographic record across pre-Colombian, colonial, and postcolonial times. Drawing from classic and recent research on Quechua sociolinguistics and comparatively on current work in the study of World Englishes and English as a lingua franca, we describe ways in which Quechua possibly served as a lingua franca, but also argue that Quechua's role and potential as lingua franca have often been misunderstood. We illustrate how these misunderstandings are intertwined with some of the myths and ideologies surrounding the Quechua language in particular and lingua francas more generally. Specifically, we argue that Quechua as lingua franca has been neither one stable, standardized variety nor a politically neutral communicative tool. Further, we highlight some of the overlooked ways in which local varieties and local speakers of the lingua franca have responded to, and in some cases resisted, the inequities and ideologies associated with the lingua franca.

Quechua and its role in the expansion of the Inca Empire are often likened to Latin in the Roman Empire. And indeed, over multiple centuries in Andean South America, Quechua has served a lingua franca role, that is, as a "language which is used habitually by people whose mother tongues are different in order to facilitate communication between them" (UNESCO, 1951, p. 689). This article examines ideologies surrounding Quechua's use as a lingua franca and contrasts these ideologies with the historical and ethnographic record across pre-Colombian, colonial, and postcolonial times. We describe ways in which Quechua likely served as a lingua franca, but also argue that Quechua's role and potential as lingua franca have often been misunderstood. We illustrate how these misunderstandings are intertwined with some of the myths and ideologies surrounding the Quechua language in particular and lingua francas more generally.

Much of the research on lingua francas in recent years has focused on the expanding role of English and the linguistic, educational, social and cultural impact of this expansion. Bolton (2004), in his review of English as a lingua franca,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

delineates several paradigmatic approaches to this research area, including those rooted in the sociology of language, features-based approaches, Kachru's "inner/outer/expanding circles" framework, pidgin and creole studies, lexicography, and critical linguistics. Although each of these is characterized by different aims and methodologies, a shared goal has been to bring to light the political, economic, and social inequities that are often part and parcel of the adoption of English as a lingua franca. Taken together, this work has highlighted the on-the-ground realities often masked by the widespread ideologies that English as a lingua franca (1) entails the use of one stable language or language variety, (2) is particularly well suited for such a role on purely linguistic grounds, and (3) serves as a politically neutral communicative tool which effectively promotes cross-group relationships.

As we shall see in the following discussion, these complexities, inequities, and ideologies are not limited to the case of English. Quechua as lingua franca has been neither one stable, standardized variety nor a politically neutral communicative tool, ideologies to the contrary notwithstanding. Furthermore, with Quechua as with English and other lingua francas, the ways in which local varieties and local speakers of the lingua franca have responded to and at times resisted the inequities and ideologies associated with the lingua franca have often been overlooked. In what follows, we draw on perspectives reflecting several of the paradigmatic approaches Bolton identifies and the themes emerging from research on English as lingua franca, as we explore Quechua and its role as lingua franca in the South American Andes and beyond.

Quechua: A Very Brief Overview

With speaker estimates hovering around ten million, Quechua is numerically the largest indigenous language in South America. Across multiple centuries and under Incan, Spanish, and nation-state rule, Quechua has served as an important lingua franca. Quechua's history as a lingua franca is complicated by the language's great diversity, which runs along at least three related lines: linguistic, geographic, and sociolinguistic (Hornberger & King, 2001; King & Hornberger, 2004); each source of diversity is briefly outlined next to provide a base for discussion.

Linguistically, Quechua has been characterized as "a group of varieties within a language family, but lacking the superstructure of parents and grandparents" (Gleich, 1994, p. 81). Most scholars recognize two branches of the language: Quechua I (spoken in the central Andean region) and Quechua II (found to the north and south, in Ecuador and southern Peru). Linguistic classification of Quechua is complicated by the fact that it is spoken across six countries, each of which has treated the language somewhat differently.

Quechua speakers reside in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, with smaller numbers in Argentina, Colombia, and Chile. Although the rural Andean highlands have been the traditional stronghold of the language, there are substantial numbers of Quechua speakers, and indeed, whole communities, who reside in a variety of different nonhighland, nonrural settings. Massive migration over the last 50 years

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has transformed all Andean countries, to a greater or lesser extent, from largely rural nations to primarily urban ones (Gleich, 1992). The geographic diversity of Quechua speakers and communities results in great variation in the amount, duration, and intensity of contact with speakers of indigenous languages such as Aymara and Guaraní, as well as with speakers of European languages such as Spanish and English.

The resulting sociolinguistic diversity means that the number of language contact scenarios is nearly as great as the number of Quechua-speaking communities. There are, for example, Quechua who live in major urban centers, interacting almost exclusively in Spanish; Quechua who live in large *pueblos jóvenes* or shanty towns surrounding major cities, whose traditional patterns of language use disappeared with their move and the loss of physical boundary domains and who increasingly use Spanish; Quechua who live in close contact with speakers of Aymara or other indigenous languages; and a diminishing number of Quechua who reside in remote, monolingual Quechua communities, with limited contact with non-Quechua (King & Hornberger, 2004).

This diversity, coupled with Quechua's numerical strength and historical position, has resulted in a significant body of applied linguistics scholarship on the language. Pioneers in work on multilingualism and education were Peruvian linguists Alberto Escobar (1972) and Inés Pozzi-Escot (1974), the vanguard of a generation of Andean linguists and sociolinguists active in research, policy, and practice on bilingual intercultural education beginning in the late 1970s and early 1980s (e.g., see authors in Cerrón-Palomino, 1982; Godenzzi, 1996; Hornberger, 1989, 1996; López, 1988). Anthropologically-oriented research in Quechua sociolinguistics has taken the form of historical and contemporary analyses of Quechua use, identity and linguistic ideology, often in relation to education (e.g., Dedenbach-Salazar, 1997; García, 2005; Hornberger, 1988a; Howard-Malverde, 1997; King, 2001; Luykx, 1998; Sichra, 2003; Zavala, 2001, 2002), whereas other lines of work have examined government language and education policy and politics (e.g., Cerrón-Palomino, 1989; de Vries, 1988; Godenzzi, 1992; Haboud, 1998; López, 1995, 1996; López & Moya, 1989; Mannheim, 1991).

Quechua is widely recognized within South America as an important lingua franca—imposed by the Incas, employed by the Spanish colonizers, and still used today for communication within and among indigenous groups. Recent research on Quechua has tended not to focus on its role as a lingua franca directly, but on Quechua's current position and status vis-à-vis Spanish; its expansion into new domains; its role and function in creating authentic indigenous or national identities; and its development as a language of literacy and education. Nevertheless, these research topics are directly relevant to Quechua's functional use and expansion as a lingua franca as well as to its rootedness in local communities. In the following, we draw from both classic and recent scholarship on Quechua in order to consider its real and imagined role as a lingua franca.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Quechua as a Lingua Franca: Ideological and Historical Perspectives

Pre-Colombian and Incan Periods

We have only limited information about the linguistic landscape of the pre-Colombian Andes. In reports by chroniclers such as Cieza de León (1550/1986) and Garcilaso de la Vega (1609/1961), large numbers of dialects or languages are mentioned, with estimates ranging from several hundreds to several thousands (Gleich, 1994). Shortly before the arrival of the Spanish invaders in 1532, the Andean region was unified under the Incan empire. The empire had grown from its base in the Cuzco region of what is now southern Peru rapidly over a period of about 80 years (1450-1532 C.E.). By the 1530s, the empire had expanded south from Cuzco into what is now Bolivia and northern Chile, and as far north as Quito into what is now Ecuador.

Quechua was used by the Inca court and as the lingua franca, or *lengua general* [general language], of the empire. The language likely spread through the Incan system of forced relocation of conquered peoples, that is, moving loyal subjects (known as *mítmac*) into recently captured areas. At the same time, the sons of regional rulers were sent to Cuzco to be schooled in the language and customs of the Incan court. These policies and their impact on the spread of Quechua are described by early chroniclers. For instance, Father Blas Valera wrote:

> The Inka kings, from antiquity, as soon as they subjected any kingdom or province, would…order their vassals to learn the courtly language of Cuzco and to teach it to their children. And to make sure that this command was not vain, they would give them Indians native to Cuzco to teach them the language customs of the court. To whom, in such provinces and villages, they would give houses, lands, and estates so that, naturalizing themselves there, they should become perpetual teachers and their children after them. And the Inca governors preferred in the offices of the state, in peace as in war, those who best spoke the *lengua general*. On these terms, the Incas ruled and governed their whole empire in peace and quiet, and the vassals of various nations were like brothers, because all of them spoke one language. (Blas Valera, quoted by Inca Garcilaso, *Commentarios Reales*, Part I, vii., 3, cited in Ostler, 2005, pp. 357–360)

Garcilaso de la Vega described a process whereby:

> Those kings also sent their heirs of the lords of the vassals to be educated at the court and reside there until they came into their inheritance, to have them well taught and to accustom themselves to the condition and customs of the Incas, treating them kindly, so that afterwards, on the strength of their past communion and familiarity they should love them and serve them with affection: they called

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> them *mítmac*, because they were newcomers. . . This injection made it easier for the *lengua general* to be learnt with more enjoyment and less effort and grief…Whenever they returned to their lands they took something they had learnt of the courtly language, and spoke it with such pride among their own people, as the language of people they felt to be divine, that they caused such envy that the rest would desire and strive to learn it…In this manner, with sweetness and ease, without particular effort of schoolmasters, they learnt and spoke the *lengua general* of Cuzco in the domain of a little less than 1,300 leagues [4,000 kilometers] extent which those kings had won. (de la Vega 1609, cited in Ostler, 2005, p. 360)

Yet the process of language spread was considerably more complex than these chronicles suggest. For instance, the part of the empire that is now northern Bolivia was in fact Aymara speaking in the pre-Incan period, and largely remained so under Incan rule. Furthermore, in many regions, Quechua did not arrive only with the Incas; rather, it had been introduced and adopted long prior: whereas the Incas seem to have brought Quechua to what is now southern Bolivia and northern Argentina (Quechua II areas), the Quechua (I) of central Peru long pre-dates the Incas. Finally, as noted above, Quechua varieties are quite distinct, and it is very likely that at least some of the different *languages* reported by early chroniclers as spoken in the region, were in fact different *varieties* of Quechua; thus, the Incan expansion in many instances introduced a new *variety* or *dialect* of Quechua rather than a new language (see Cerrón-Palomino 1987, 2000 for more details).

Nevertheless, Quechua long has been imagined to have spread throughout the Andes as part of the expansion of the Incan empire. Correspondingly, Cuzco, the Incan capital, is popularly considered to be the epicenter, homeland, and genesis of all varieties of the Quechua language. Early scholarship on the origins of Quechua also supported this view (e.g., Mason, 1950; McQuown, 1955; Rowe, 1950 all cited in Adelaar, 2004, p. 180), a misconception that can be traced back to the earlier chroniclers of the Spanish conquest discussed earlier. Scholarship from the 1960s, which focused less on the chroniclers' accounts and more on analysis of Quechua dialectology, depicts a very different history of the expansion of Quechua. Parker's (1963) and Torero's (1964) studies identify two major branches of Quechua (Quechua I [Huaihuash] and Quechua II [Huampuy]) and indicate that these two branches (and their waves of geographic expansion) significantly pre-date the Incan empire. According to this work, the greatest dialectal complexity and the homeland of Quechua is found in Central Peru, in the area surrounding the present-day capital city of Lima (Adelaar, 2004, p. 181). On these grounds, Torero (1970, 1984) and others now believe the dialect split and first wave of expansion likely occurred at least 500 years before the rise of the Incan empire.

Yet the story of Quechua spreading out from Cuzco, not Lima, fits better with popular ideologies concerning language, culture, and geography in Peru and the Andes. Cuzco, a UNESCO World Heritage site, is a cultural center of Andean *indigenismo* (Tamayo Herrera, 1980); Lima, in contrast, was the seat of the Spanish

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

colonial powers, and post-independence, of the national government (Niño-Murcia, 1997). Although Lima is the economic and political center of the country, Cuzco is the site of important cultural and intellectual activity (Garcia, 2005). Thus, to suggest that Quechua emanated from Lima is, for many, counterintuitive. It is also antithetical to the position of the Cuzco Academy of the Quechua Language (*Academia de la lengua quechua)*, which maintains that the Cuzco variety of Quechua (which they describe as *quechua legítimo* [legitimate Quechua]) is the most pure, least degenerate, and the legitimate heir of the Inca language (Niño-Murcia, 1997; Adelaar 2004, p. 181). Yet even these guardians of Cuzco Quechua recognize the diversity of local Quechua varieties and their functional uses, beginning from precolonial times. In the words of Espinoza Navarro (1993, in Niño-Murcia, 1997), one of the founders of the Academy:

> *Runasimi* was the language used by the common people, or *runa*, who lived throughout the Inca empire, and who learned their language only at home and through social contacts, with the language being passed on from parents to children; and *Qhapaj'simi* was Quechua as it evolved and was taught at centers of learning, or *yachawasi*, which existed in this city [Cuzco] for use by all members of the royal family. (p. 139)

To attempt to succinctly summarize then: Quechua very likely did play an important lingua franca role in pre-Colombian Andean South America, and indeed, a variety of Quechua was used and spread by the Incan elite as they expanded their empire. However, contrary to popular imagination, Quechua did not originate in the Incan center of Cuzco and was not introduced to all regions and populations only by the Incas. Furthermore, dialectal differences were pervasive before, during and after Incan rule; thus, the notion that Quechua served as one, unified pan-Andean lingua franca appears to be more rooted in regional ideologies than in historical records.

Colonial Period

The colonial period witnessed the rapid expansion of Quechua as a lingua franca, particularly in religious domains, as well as its contraction at the end of this period. Correspondingly, this period also saw intense debate concerning the linguistic, religious and political appropriateness of the use of Quechua as a lingua franca.

As the Spanish solidified their control of the New World they had multiple reasons for continuing to promote the use of Quechua as the lengua general. On practical grounds, the Spaniards remained greatly outnumbered and Quechua was a useful tool for communicating with their many subjects. Quechua was also important on symbolic grounds. As Urban (1991) writes:

> By conquering the Incas and establishing a domination relationship between Spanish and Quechua, the Spanish could be viewed as liberating the other American languages from their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> oppression by Quechua. . . In order to maintain the symbolism of linguistic control, therefore, the Spanish had to first ensure that Quechua remained in place as a *lengua general del Peru.* (p. 312)

Thus, the Spanish colonizers, in establishing Quechua as a lingua franca, capitalized on the "linguistic symbolism of domination already in place during the late pre-Colombian period" (Urban, 1991, p. 313), simultaneously subverting Incan power while maintaining control of the empire.

Parallel social policies helped Quechua to continue to expand as a lingua franca, and to replace Aymara in many areas. One factor was the Spanish policy of enforcing their version of the Inca *mítmac* system, which required adult indigenous males to spend a portion of their time engaged in various industries, including mining, dispersed around Peru. Thus, the "retention of large portions of the Incan administrative structure and personnel helped spread Quechua in commercial and political affairs as Spanish dominion spread far beyond the area of original Incan influence" (Heath & Laprade, 1982, p. 124).

Another important area of expansion of Quechua as a lingua franca was in Catholic religious settings as well as in schools and universities and as a language of literature. This move was in direct conflict with dominant ideology of the Spanish Empire that "the spread of Castilian culture and Christianity was to be achieved in and through the Castilian tongue" (Heath & Laprade, 1982, p. 121). Yet as the realities of running the New Empire and the widening gaps between stated policy and everyday practice at the local level began to gain the attention of the Spanish Crown, official decrees gradually shifted. For instance, the Council of Trent (1563) provided for the explanation of religious sacraments to indigenous parishioners in their native tongues and the Second Council of Lima (1567) instructed priests to learn the indigenous languages of their congregations (Heath & Laprade, 1982, p. 121).

Most famously, the Third Council of Lima (1582–1583) decreed that indigenous languages should be used in religious teaching and that religious texts should be translated into Quechua and Aymara. The Council was presided over by Toribio Mogrovejo, who gained King Phillip II's permission to print the catechism in Aymara and Quechua and to establish a school for the sons of Indian nobles so that they could eventually convert the wider indigenous population (Heath & Laprade, 1982). As a result of the Third Council, committees were established for the translation of materials and for the creation of a standard Quechua orthography and vocabulary (Adelaar, 2004; Niño-Murcia, 1997). This process resulted in a new standardized form of Quechua, which remained in use well into the 17th century, and "in which certain phonetic complications of the southern Peruvian dialects were disregarded in order to gain wider acceptance" (Adelaar, 2004, p. 183; Mannheim 1991, p. 142). These decisions were critical in both spreading Quechua as a lingua franca and in establishing a linguistic hierarchy of status within Quechua dialects, a point developed further in the following paragraphs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The late 17th century through the beginning of the 18th century was also a period of growth and expansion, particularly for Southern Peruvian Quechua, although different factors were at play here. As Niño-Murcia (1997) writes, "by this time the religious and secular leaders had lost their previous zeal for producing religious materials in Quechua, but for the provincial petite bourgeoisie Quechua had come to represent both symbolic and cultural capital" (p. 141). Through use of Quechua, this regional landowning class simultaneously "attempted to present proof of their Inca ancestry and to establish a position in the social hierarchy higher than that held by the Spaniards" (p. 141). Ostler (2005) similarly observes that Quechua:

> was also taken up by the *criollo* land owning class, not themselves descendants of Indians, as a symbol of local legitimacy; at once it distinguished them from the Spanish-speaking urban elite in Lima, but also denied the country people a linguistic means to keep their landlords at a distance. (2005, p. 369)

A series of indigenous rebellions against the Spanish in the last half of the 18th century brought this period of expansion and use of the language as a lingua franca to a close. The fatal blow came in 1780-1781 when Tupac Amaru, allegedly a descendant of Incan royalty, united with other indigenous leaders to rebel against the Spanish (Adelaar, 2004). With the putting down of this revolt and execution of its leaders, Quechua and all other indigenous languages were suppressed and official use was banned (Adelaar, 2004; Mannheim, 1991).

The colonial period thus saw the rise of Quechua as a lingua franca as a useful communicative and symbolic tool in different ways for different groups: For Spanish elites, Quechua served as a means of maintaining symbolic authority and practical control; for priests and missionaries, Quechua was a tool for educating or proselytizing indigenous populations; whereas for indigenous populations, Quechua served as a means of organizing resistance and rebelling against Spanish rule. These varied and at times conflicting uses and meanings of Quechua, and Quechua as a lingua franca, continued into the postcolonial period and, indeed, up to the present day.

Postcolonial Period

Indigenous groups played marginal roles in the military and political campaigns for national independence from Spain in the following decades. These efforts were led by two nonindigenous leaders, Simón Bolivar and José de San Martín (although San Martín likely had indigenous ancestry; see Adelaar, 2004). The lives of most indigenous people changed relatively little as a result of independence and, indeed, by some accounts, their lot worsened. Adelaar (2004) argues, for instance, that:

> Whatever protection the Indians and their culture may have received from the Spanish colonial system, most of it was lost once the Andean nations were independent. The role of Quechua as a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> means of communication fell back to local purposes, its prestige lower than it had ever been before. (2004, p. 183)

Furthermore, the newly independent Andean countries tended to follow European models of nation-state construction, establishing Spanish as the official language, and positioning it as central both practically and symbolically. For the national elites, who held visions of a modern and unified nation-state, the cultures, histories and languages of the Andes were viewed as a significant roadblock on the path towards progress. As Garcia and others before her summarize, "Indians represented a problem to be solved" (2005, p. 64). Not surprisingly, as Adelaar (2004) notes, during this period Quechua lost ground to Spanish as there was little symbolic or practical space for linguistic or cultural diversity.

Yet, as was the case in previous periods, and consistent with the kinds of postcolonial linguistic and cultural collusions and hybridizations found elsewhere in the world (cf. Lin & Martin, 2005), the position of Quechua after independence was more complicated than generally portrayed. For instance, while Quechua and Quechua speakers are accurately described as oppressed within the newly formed Andean republics and up to the present (Albó, 1977), Quechua simultaneously also endangered numerous minor languages of the Andes, many of which neared extinction or were lost altogether in this period. For instance, speakers of Jaqaru, Puquina, and Uro-Chipaya languages, as well as many other undocumented languages or language varieties, switched to Aymara, Spanish, or Quechua during this period. Thus, Quechua is most accurately framed not only as an oppressed language, but also in some sense as an oppressor language in the Andean ecology of languages.

Recent decades have seen renewed interest in Quechua as a formative part of national identity for Andean countries, as an important educational and communicative tool, and as a threatened language in need of protection and support. This period of renewed interest began with the radical (although short-lived) 1975 reforms of Peruvian president Juan Velasco Alvarado. As part of a dramatic, and at least partly symbolic, reform package, "the glorious Incan past" was proclaimed in official literature and government documents, and Quechua was decreed a national language with equal status to Spanish (Godenzzi, 1992; Hornberger, 1988b; Klarén, 2000). In other terms: officially, Quechua was promoted to a *de jure* lingua franca for the country, similar to Spanish. While this policy was soon reversed, it enhanced Quechua's status and initiated discussions and experimental programs concerned with the function and future of the language in Peru and indeed throughout the Andean region (Hornberger & López, 1998; López, 1996; López & Küper, 2004).

Beginning in Peru in the 1970s, in Ecuador in the 1980s, and in Bolivia in the 1990s, major new national educational policies evidenced a shift in societal discourse with respect to indigenous languages and groups, away from the openly racist ideology of the past and toward a more inclusive, intercultural one. These policies introduced bilingual intercultural education into the schools, first experimentally, and later as mandated regional or national curricular and pedagogical

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practice. Through these policies, Quechua and other indigenous linguistic, communicative, and cultural practices have increasingly found their way into formal education in both rural and urban contexts. There are inevitably tensions and contradictions inherent in transforming the school, traditionally a tool for standardization and national unification, into simultaneously a vehicle for diversification and emancipation (Hornberger, 2000). Yet, it is also true that the local educational practices unleashed by these policies in Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia, although certainly contentious in their implementation, have endowed Quechua with new formal and literate functions, and have also afforded Quechua learners voice in unprecedented ways (Hornberger, 2006). Thus, the national promotion of Quechua's status (and implicitly, its potential to serve as national lingua franca) has been critical in enriching and expanding Quechua's use in local communities.

Since 1996, and in the context of Bolivia's 1994 National Education Reform, PROEIB Andes (the Program for Professional Development in Bilingual Intercultural Education for the Andean Region) has offered a master's program in bilingual intercultural education, known as the "PROEIB Maestría," at University of San Simón in Cochabamba, Bolivia, in an internationally-sponsored consortium arrangement involving Ministries of Education, universities, and indigenous organizations of six Andean countries—Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. Currently, forty indigenous educators from all six countries participate in the fourth cohort of the program, a 30-plus month intensive academic experience involving coursework and fieldwork components in the areas of culture, education and indigenous languages. Prerequisites for the program include knowledge of an indigenous language and support from an indigenous organization. Two features of the program are significant for our purposes here. First, the use and study of a variety of indigenous languages, including Quechua, Aymara, and Amazonian languages, is supported and encouraged through both coursework and fieldwork in ways that not only extend the students' knowledge of their own language, but also involve them in pan-indigenous dialogue with their peers. Second, students' regular and in-depth fieldwork research experiences in local indigenous communities (in all six countries) have emerged as the sine qua non for the program's and students' academic success (cf. López, 2004). Thus, the program has successfully negotiated a path that meaningfully grounds practices in local communities and through local languages (including Quechua varieties) within the context of a Pan-Andean indigenous exchange experience.

Accompanying the increased use of Quechua in formal education (status and acquisition planning), there have also been ongoing attempts to develop and establish a standard or several standards that can act as a lingua franca for use among speakers of different Quechua dialects (corpus planning). This has been particularly important in Peru, where dialect differences are the most significant. Efforts to address this issue followed immediately upon the 1975 officialization of Quechua with the establishment of six regional standards: Ancash, Ayacucho, Cajamarca, Cuzco, Huanca, and Lamas/San Martín (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989, 1992; Godenzzi, 1992; Hornberger, 1988b). This decision was rather artificial or arbitrary as there is extensive dialect diversity within each of these regions (especially for Cajamarca,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cuzco, and Huanca varieties) (Adelaar, 2004); however, it did mark an early attempt to facilitate communication across different Quechua communities. Later efforts toward standardization, including agreement on a unified alphabet for Quechua in Peru, became stymied by debates around authority, authenticity, and autonomy—that is, the basis of authority on the language, and the defense of its authenticity and autonomy. In this debate, a general consensus emerged around the locally based Quechua speaker as authentic, but whether this was the idealized, rural and uneducated speaker with minimal exposure to Spanish or if it could also include the urban bilingual Quechua speaker, and whether this authentic Quechua was one variety or many locally-rooted varieties each symbolizing ethnic solidarity in a particular context, remained contentious issues (Hornberger, 1995; Hornberger & King, 1998).

Similar standardization efforts have been undertaken in Ecuador and Bolivia in later decades. For instance, in Ecuador, the process of establishing one Quechua for national use was formally initiated in 1981 when representatives of the different Ecuadorian varieties of Quechua agreed upon a unified variety. Indigenous leaders agreed on a unified writing system, and attempted to modernize and "purify" the lexicon. These decisions were codified in subsequent dictionaries and grammars (CONAIE, 1990) and this variety became known as *Quichua Unificado*. This process was intended to facilitate the development of materials, and to enhance and promote written communication in the language across the country. In practice, however, these goals have proved elusive. For example, as Quichua Unificado materials were introduced into bilingual communities in the southern highlands, two distinct varieties emerged (King, 1999, 2000): the nationally standardized variety (Quichua Unificado) and the local community variety, *Quichua auténtico*, spoken by elderly and more rural dwellers. Because children and young adults studying Quichua Unificado had not mastered the phonological system or the lexicon of the local variety, they learned not only to read but to speak Quichua Unificado. Although the varieties are mutually intelligible to most, there were clashes and gaps in communication between the older and younger Quichua speakers, which undermined Quichua use and exacerbated generational and social divisions.

Widespread acceptance of a national standard remains elusive in all of the Andean nations, but an even more ambitious goal set by some is the establishment of a pan-national Quechua orthography. Such an alphabet, it is argued, would facilitate the development of literature and education materials (allowing them to be shared across countries without modification, for instance) and potentially contribute to ethnic solidarity across nation-state lines. However, the value of such efforts has been challenged by those who question whether standardization would in fact facilitate Quechua's elaboration and expanded use. Luykx (2004), for instance, maintains that in practice the emphasis on standardization tends to shift resources away from those domains that are Quechua's stronghold, toward those where its disadvantage relative to Spanish is greatest; to prioritize concerns of linguists over those of most Quechua speakers; and to link dialectal variation with status and class hierarchies. Thus, from this perspective, standardization—and the broader aim of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

promoting a widely used and official lingua franca, potentially undermines, rather than supports, meaningful local use of indigenous languages in many communities.

Concluding Discussion

We close by considering the connections between the Quechua case and language situations in other parts of the world. In particular, how do Quechua's role as a lingua franca, and Quechua language ideologies more generally, intersect with the current work on English as a lingua franca? As noted at the outset of the paper, an important strand of current research has highlighted the widespread ideologies that English as a lingua franca refers to one stable language or language variety, that English is particularly well suited for this role on linguistic grounds, and that it can serve as a politically neutral communicative tool thus effectively promoting cross-group relationships. We suggest here that similar ideologies, which have tended to mask likewise similar on-the-ground inequities, are at play in the Quechua case.

Perhaps most importantly, although Quechua is often referred to as *a language*, it is most accurately described as *a family of language varieties*. As detailed prviously, misunderstandings about dialect differences date back to chroniclers' early accounts of the linguistic terrain at the time of their arrival. As is the case in the debates surrounding standards and *world* varieties of English, documentation of the different varieties of Quechua is on-going work and, concomitantly, a point of contention and debate. While for English this debate has focused on the importance of a common standard to promote "intelligibility" (also see Pickering, this volume), for Quechua, the issue of dialectal variation is critical both to the misunderstandings about the origins of the language and its spread, as well as on-going disagreements related to standardization efforts. For both languages, however, these discussions are shaped in large part by the hierarchical status relationships among the different varieties, with high status corresponding to speakers' proximity to the language's center (be it the city of Cuzco in the Quechua case or the United States or United Kingdom in the English case).

As with English (and many other languages), there is a tendency to view those varieties that differ from the standard as deficient, and thus to marginalize individuals that do not happen to speak the preferred, general, or in other ways "correct" variety, as in the case of Ecuadorian speakers of authentic Quichua. Thus, in English as in Quechua, there are multiple varieties of the language, all of which are linguistically equal but sociolinguistically unequal in terms of the status of their speakers; establishment of one of these varieties as the lingua franca inevitably creates, reifies, or exacerbates these existing status hierarchies. For instance, in debates about the appropriate standard and role of Quechua as a lingua franca, it is sometimes suggested that certain varieties, in particular the Cuzco variety, are better suited for this role on purely linguistic grounds. There is a parallel here with Kachru's inner/outer/expanding circles of English (see Canagarajah; Elder & Davies; and Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, & Pitzl, this volume), wherein Cuzco Quechua would be placed firmly within the inner circle, the other Andean regions as part of the outer circle, and the expanding circle would perhaps be made up of the urban

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

destinations, both in the Andes and worldwide, of the many migrant highlanders. Just as with Kachru's circles for English, these Quechua circles refer not only to geography, but also to inequalities of power and status, with the inner circle positioned as bearer of the standard and of prestige, whereas those in the outer and expanding circles remain dependent, lower-status, and marginalized. And just as scholars on postcolonial English language varieties argue that the ownership of English is changing as English becomes increasingly a language "used mainly in multilingual contexts as a second language and for communication between non-native speakers" (Graddol, 1999, p. 57, cited in Canagarajah, 2005 p. xxiii), so too ownership of an idealized, Cuzco-centered Quechua is increasingly elusive in light of the multiple Quechua varieties and orthographies locally employed across diverse Andean national, regional, and community contexts.

Furthermore, also parallel to English, recent work has highlighted how Quechua as a lingua franca has not served as a politically neutral communicative tool, but instead has privileged certain speakers and accentuated inequalities of power in face-to-face interactions. In Incan times, a particular variety of Quechua was imposed as the *lengua general* on those recently conquered. Local nobility were given greater access to this general language, and thus were likely more able to maintain their positions of privilege. The Spaniards expanded and capitalized on this arrangement, keeping Quechua as an "intermediate" language of power for communications between Spaniards and indigenous groups. In both periods, those with better command of the "right" variety of Quechua were advantaged and better able to hold onto their positions of power, while at the same time, the prominence and importance of Quechua in colonial and postcolonial times meant that other languages fell into disuse.

One important difference between Quechua and English as lingua francas concerns their status and position as world languages, and in particular their contrasting roles as second language varieties. Although the number of speakers of English as a second or foreign language surpasses 350 million across more than 100 countries, relatively few have learned Quechua as second or foreign language, particularly in formal contexts. However, important exceptions have developed in recent years; these include Bolivia's recent educational reforms which mandate that all students (including nonindigenous Spanish-speaking monolinguals) study an indigenous language in elementary school (Benson, 2004), efforts to revitalize Quechua in indigenous communities which entail formal instruction of the language to Spanish-dominant indigenous students (King, 2001), and an expanding number of Quechua courses available at international universities and through the internet (Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004).

Perhaps quite paradoxically, this recent trend toward formal acquisition of Quechua as a second language holds the greatest promise for helping to shore up use of Quechua as a mother tongue. Increased visibility of Quechua as a second language is a reflection of its greater status within Andean nations as well as internationally, and concomitantly, a clear sign for speakers of its value outside of their home communities. To the extent that Quechua's use as a lingua franca is a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reflection of its high status and communicative utility, its continued acquisition and use for this function bodes well for its maintenance and even revitalization.

It is undeniably the case that Quechua and English as lingua francas differ in one very fundamental way in the present—English is a language of power and Quechua is not. Five centuries ago, Quechua began its decline as a language of empire at just about the same time that English began its rise propelled by the expansion of the British Empire—in a newly globalizing world (cf. Bolton, 2004; Canagarajah, 2005, p. xiii). Both languages have served powerful lingua franca roles, facilitating communication for speakers of different mother tongues, and fomenting cultural, technological and economic development across vast empires. Both languages live today by dint of their usefulness to speakers, globally, but perhaps more importantly, locally. Canagarajah has recently reminded us how the local is shortchanged in current applied linguistics discourses about globalization by, on the one hand encouraging the spread of homogeneous codes, discourses and communicative practices as universally relevant, and on the other, exaggerating the democratic nature of globalization and assuming that local empowerment is guaranteed by the new modes of social relations and communicative interaction that accompany globalization (2005, pp. xiv-xv). Paradoxically, as the experience of the PROEIB Andes Master's program exemplifies, it is local languages and identities that inform and sustain our participation in globalized, intercultural contexts, and give it meaning. Perhaps what the case of Quechua as a lingua franca has to teach us is that, ultimately, it is local speakers and writers in local communities with local identities that sustain the use of a lingua franca, or indeed any language.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelaar, W. F. H. (in collaboration with P. C. Muysken) (2004). *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

This is the first book written in English to provide a detailed overview of all of the indigenous languages of the Andes. The authors provide linguistic and sociolinguistic descriptions of these languages as well as overviews of their historical and current positions.

Garcia, M. E. (2005). *Making indigenous citizens: Identity, development and multicultural activism in Peru*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

This book examines the relationships between indigenous activists, nongovernmental organizations, state officials and local communities. The tensions and conflicts between these actors are set against the backdrop of the development of bilingual intercultural education policy and practice.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

King, K. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.) (2004). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 167* (Special issue on Quechua sociolinguistics).

This special bilingual issue of the journal focuses on the current status and future prospects of Quechua. The lead article, by Nancy Hornberger and Serafín Coronel-Molina, offers a broad overview, followed by comments, critiques, and reflections from Quechua experts from Bolivia, Argentina, Ecuador and beyond.

OTHER REFERENCES

Albó, X. (1977). *El futuro de los idiomas oprimidos en los Andes*. Lima: Centro de Investigación de Linguistica Aplicada.

Benson, C. (2004). Bilingual schooling in Mozambique and Bolivia: From experimentation to implementation. *Language Policy, 3*(1), 47–66.

Bolton, K. (2004). World Englishes. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 367–396). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Canagarajah, A. S. (this volume). *Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca*.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (Ed.). (1982). *Aula quechua*. Lima: Signo Universitario.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1987). *Lingüística quechua*. Cusco, Peru: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de las Casas."

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1989). Language policy in Peru: A historical overview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 77*, 11–33.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1992). Standardization in Andean languages. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 8*(1), 31–44.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (2000). *Lingüística aimara*. Cusco, Peru: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de las Casas."

Cieza de León (1550/1986). *Crónica del Peru, 3 Vols*. Lima, Peru: Fondo Editorial Pontificia Universidad Católica del Peru.

CONAIE. (1990) *Ñucanchic Shimi 1*. Quito, Ecuador: MEC; DINEIIB; CONAIE.

De la Vega, Garcilaso. (1609/1961). *The Incas* (A. Gheerbrant, Ed. & M. Jolas, Trans.). New York: Avon.

Dedenbach-Salazar, S. (1997). Point of view and evidentiality in the Huarochiri texts. In R. Howard-Malverde (Ed.), *Creating context in Andean cultures* (pp. 149–167). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

de Vries, L. (1988). *Política lingüística en Ecuador, Peru y Bolivia.* Quito: Proyecto EBICEDIME.

Elder, C., & Davies, A. (this volume). *Assessing English as a lingua franca.*

Escobar, A. (Ed.). (1972). *El reto del multilingüismo en el Peru*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gleich, U. von (1992). Changes in the status and function of Quechua. In U. Ammon & M. Hellinger (Eds.), *Status changes in languages* (pp. 43–64). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Gleich, U. von (1994). Language spread policy: The case of Quechua in the Andean republics of Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 107,* 77–113.

Godenzzi, J. C. (Ed.). (1992). *El Quechua en debate: Ideología, normalización y enseñanza*. Cusco, Peru: "Centro Bartolomé de Las Casas."

Godenzzi Alegre, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Educación e interculturalidad en los Andes y la Amazonía*. Cusco, Peru: Centro "Bartolomé de Las Casas."

Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. In D. Graddol & U. H. Meinhoff (Eds.), *English in a changing world* (pp. 57–68; AILA Review 13). Guildford, England: AILA.

Haboud, M. (1998). *Quichua y castellano en los Andes ecuatorianos: Los efectos de un contacto prolongado.* Quito, Ecuador: Abya-Yala.

Heath, S. B. & Laprade, R. (1982). Castilian colonization and indigenous languages: The cases of Quechua and Aymara. In R. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Language spread: Studies in diffusion and social change* (pp. 119–134). Washington: CAP.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988a). *Bilingual education and language maintenance: A southern Peruvian Quechua case*. Berlin: Mouton.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988b). Language planning orientations and bilingual education in Peru. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 12*(1), 14–29.

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (1989). Bilingual education and language planning in indigenous Latin America. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 77*, special issue.

Hornberger, N. H. (1995). Five vowels or three? Linguistics and politics in Quechua language planning in Peru. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 187–205). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (1996). *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up*. Berlin: Mouton.

Hornberger, N. H. (2000). Bilingual education policy and practice in the Andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 31*(2), 173–201.

Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Voice and biliteracy in indigenous language revitalization: Contentious educational practices in Quechua, Guaraní, and Maori contexts. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *5*(4).

Hornberger, N. H., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2004). Quechua language shift, maintenance and revitalization in the Andes: The case for language planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 167*, 9–67.

Hornberger, N. H., & King, K. A. (1998). Authenticity and unification in Quechua language planning. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 11*(3), 390–410.

Hornberger, N. & King, K. (2001). Reversing Quechua language shift in South America. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 166–194). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H., & López, L. E. (1998). Policy, possibility and paradox: Indigenous multilingualism and education in Peru and Bolivia. In J. Cenoz

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

& F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 206–242). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
Howard-Malverde, R. (Ed.) (1997). *Creating context in Andean cultures.* New York: Oxford University Press.
King, K. A. (1999). Inspecting the unexpected: Language corpus and status shifts as aspects of language revitalization. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *23*(2), 109–132.
King, K. A. (2000). Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(3), 167–184.
King, K. A. (2001). *Language revitalization processes and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Klarén, P. F. (2000). *Peru: Society and nationhood in the Andes.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Lin, A., & Martin, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-Education policy and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
López, L. E. (Ed.). (1988). *Pesquisas en lingüística andina*. Lima-Puno, Peru: CONCYTEC/Universidad Nacional del Altiplano-Puno/GTZ.
López, L. E. (1995). Sigue el debate sobre educación bilingüe. *Cuarto Intermedio, 36*, 79–100.
López, L. E. (1996). Donde el zapato aprieta: Tendencias y desafíos de la educación bilingüe en el Perú. *Revista Andina, 14*(2), 295–342.
López, L. E. (2004, Mayo). Las tesis de maestría del PROEIB Andes: Un aporte concreto a la educación. *La EIB en Bolivia Suplemento Bimensual,* pp. 6–7.
López, L. E., & Küper, W. (2004). *La educación intercultural bilingüe en América Latina: Balance y perspectivas* (2nd ed.). La Paz-Cochabamba, Bolivia: Cooperación Técnica Alemana (GTZ)-PINSEIB-PROEIBAndes.
López, L. E., & Moya, R. (Eds.). (1989). *Pueblos indios, estados y educación*. Lima, Peru: PEB-Puno/Proyecto EBI-MEC-GTZ/Programa ERA.
Luykx, A. (1998). *The citizen factory: Schooling and cultural production in Bolivia*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Luykx, A. (2004). The future of Quechua and the Quechua of the future: Language ideologies and language planning in Bolivia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 167*, 147–158.
Mannheim, B. (1991). *The language of the Inka since the European invasion.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
Mason, J. A. (1950). The languages of South American Indians. In R. M. W. Dixon and A. Y. Aikhenvald (Eds.) *The Amazonian languages* (pp. 251–267). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McQuown, N. A. (1955). The indigenous languages of Latin America. *American Anthropologist, 57,* 510–570.
Niño-Murcia, M. (1997). Linguistic purism in Cuzco, Peru: A historical perspective. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 21*, 134–161.
Ostler, N. (2005). *Empires of the word: A language history of the world.* New York: Harper Collins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Parker, G. (1963). La clasificación genética de los dialectos quechuas [The genetic classification of Quechua dialects]. *Revista del Museo Nacional, 32*, 241–252.

Pickering, L. (this volume). *Current research on intelligibility in English as a lingua franca*.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1974). Las lenguas vernaculas en la educación escolarizada. *Educación, Año V*, 70–75. Lima, Peru.

Rowe, J. H. (1950). Sound patterns in three Inca dialects. *International Journal of American Linguistics, 16* (3), 137–148.

Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A., & Pitzl, M.-L. (this volume). *English as a lingua franca in Europe: Challenges for applied linguistics.*

Sichra, I. (2003). *La vitalidad del Quechua: Lengua y sociedad en dos provincias de Cochabamba*. La Paz, Bolivia: Plural Editores.

Tamayo Herrera, J. (1980). *Historia del Indigenismo Cuzqueño*. Lima, Peru: Instituto Nacional de Cultura.

Torero, A. (1964). Los dialectos quichuas. *Anales Científicos de la Universidad Agraria, 2,* 446–476.

Torero, A. (1970). Lingüística e historia de la sociedad andina. *Anales Científicos de la Universidad Nacional Agraria, 8,* 231–264.

Torero, A. (1984). El comercio lejano y la difusión del quechua: El caso del Ecuador. *Revista Andina 2(2),* 367–402.

UNESCO (1951/1968). The use of vernacular languages in education: The report of the UNESCO meeting of specialists, 1951. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), (1968), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 689–716). The Hague: Mouton. (Report later published in 1953 by UNESCO, Paris).

Urban, G. (1991). The semiotics of state-Indian linguistic relationships: Peru, Paraguay, and Brazil. In G. Urban & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Nation-states and Indians in Latin America* (pp. 307–330). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Zavala, V. (2001). *To walk with sight and defend ourselves: Literacy and schooling in the Peruvian Andes.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington DC.

Zavala, V. (2002). *(Des)encuentros con la escritura: Escuela y comunidad en los Andes peruanos*. Lima, Peru: Red para el Desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Perú.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000092 Published online by Cambridge University Press