

Complex Clauses in Chipaya: Main Strategies of Complementation, Relativization and Adverbial Subordination*

Jaime Peña

University of Oregon
jpena3@uoregon.edu

Palabras Claves: morphology, clause combining, complementation, relativization, adverbial subordination, nominalization, switch-reference, typology.

1. Introduction

When discussing complex syntactic constructions that involve the combination of verbs and clauses, a number of authors (Silverstein, 1976; Payne, 1997; Givón, 1985, 2001; Haiman, 1985; Haiman and Thompsom, 1988) have called attention to the more than apparent interaction between semantics and syntax, paying special consideration to the degree of integration between the syntactic coding of two different (but somehow related) events. From a functional/cognitive view, linguists looking at this phenomenon, such as Givón (1985, 2001) and Haiman (1985), for example, have claimed that clause-combining constructions may be considered examples of iconicity and non-arbitrary structures in language under the general assumption that “information chunks that belong together conceptually are kept in close spatio-temporal proximity” (Givón, 2001: 35, v.1). According to Haiman, the integration of two clauses, including their morphological reduction, is motivated by their conceptual closeness with the main clauses in which they occur.¹ In complex sentences, there is always one independent or main clause and one dependent or subordinate (in a broad sense) clause. According to T. Payne, an independent clause is a clause that is fully inflected and capable of being integrated into discourse on its own, whereas a dependent clause is a clause that depends on some other for at least part of its inflectional information (1997: 306). There is a correlation between the degree of finiteness and a verb being dependent or independent, although it is better to understand this correlation as a continuum rather than as a strict division. In this continuum, different types of constructions are arranged in terms of the grammatical integration between the two verbs: at one end of the continuum there are constructions

* I am grateful to Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino for his suggestions and for disinterestedly sharing his own data on Chipaya and allowing its use for analysis. I also thank Doris Payne, Rosa Vallejos and Spike Gildea for their help and suggestions. Hopefully their ideas have been well implemented in this paper.

¹ “Clause incorporation, a property which is often confused with, or simply misnamed, “subordination”, is primarily an index of conceptual closeness between clauses. The more they share, the easier it is to incorporate one within the other” (Haiman, 1985: 228)

that code two (or more) events as one clause; at the other end, as two different clauses. Thus, under the general assumption that “information chunks that belong together conceptually are kept in close spatio-temporal proximity”, combination of clauses may be regarded in terms of how they are viewed and thus coded (as integrated or not). As Korman points out “fruitful ideas [...] can be learnt about conceptual structure via the analysis of linguistic structure, especially, of course, when comparing data from a wide range of languages” (1997: 14-15). In this respect, this paper is related to the relation between form and function in Chipaya subordinate constructions.²

Throughout this paper I will offer a description of complete, relative and adverbial subordinate clauses in Chipaya. In the final section, I will also suggest some areal considerations by comparing Chipaya to other Andean languages (Quechua and Aimara). Further, having in mind the framework detailed in the precedent paragraphs, I will try to address especially two questions regarding the typological ideas delineated before:

- . How well do these ideas account for Chipayan complex structures?
- . Which is the place of Chipaya with regards to typological predictions about event and clause integration?

2. Information on Chipaya

Chipaya is a language spoken by around 1,500 speakers in Santa Ana de Chipaya and Ayparavi, department of Oruro, Bolivia. It belongs to the Uru-Chipayan family that once was spoken across a territory that went from the Desaguadero river around the Peruvian-Bolivian border to the lake Poopo in Bolivia, but nowadays it has been reduced to Chipaya only. Another surviving member of this family, Iruwito or Uchumataqu, has recently become (or is nearly) extinct. The Uru-Chipaya people have been object of general anthropological research (Vellard, 1957-1958). This is a social group in change in which tradition and new foreign influence are still “carving” the social space and interaction (Wachtel, 1994). However, as Adelaar and Muysken have pointed out, “unfortunately, the description of their languages has not fared nearly so well. So far, there is no published grammar, nor a dictionary of any of the Uru-Chipayan languages” (2004: 362).³ Nevertheless, there is documentation on this language, due mainly to the fieldwork of A. Metraux (1934), Ronald Olson (1964, 1965, 1966, 1967) and Porterie-Gutierrez (1990). Most recently, scholars R. Cerrón-Palomino and Peter Muysken – especially in Uchumataqu (cf. 2006, for example)– have conducted research on the language.

Chipaya has a copious phonological inventory which includes stops, affricates and fricatives with aspirated, glottal and retroflex series (in the case of the sibilants and

² I will refer to *subordination* in a general sense as a type of clause combination in which there is a main/independent clause and a ‘subordinate’/dependent clause, and to *adverbial subordination* as a specific type of construction. Several scholars have called attention to the inadequacy of the term ‘subordination’ with this broad sense (see Haiman, 1985 –see footnote 1; Matthiesen and Thompson, 1988), but since it has no major effect for the purpose of this paper, I will keep this traditional use for now.

³ A grammar by Cerrón-Palomino has been recently published in 2006.

affricates) as well as nasals, laterals, and a flap.⁴ There are two semivowels and ten vowels which distinguish between five short and five long vowels. In some environments vowels have voiceless realizations (R. Olson 1967: 301). Phonetic variation of these vowels used by women alone has been reported (R. Olson 1967, Porterie-Gutiérrez 1990). Chipaya is a nominative-accusative SOV type language with a relatively free word order. It is an agglutinating language with suffixes in the same way as better known languages as Aimara and Quechua are. In general terms, the dependent element precedes the head. The object may move in certain cases; if moved, the object may receive the topic marker *-ki*. In (1) for example, the object is out of its position (after the verb), thus it receives *-ki*.⁵

- (1) qiti ana-ş lul-i ata-t-ki-êa [nii zerwi-ki]
 fox neg-CL.3.SG eat-CO can-PT.I-REP-DEC the.M carrion-TOP
 ‘the fox could not eat the carrion’

2.1. Data

The data used in this paper comes from different sources. Apart from my own data, documentation about the language was provided by Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino during the Seminar on Grammar Topics (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2003), in which additionally we worked with two speakers of Chipaya. Thereafter, the same scholar has generously provided us with more material. I am also using narratives from a book of short stories published by Ronald Olson (1966). For the latter case, I have reinterpreted the notational system of the phonology represented in the authors’ orthography as well as re-analyzed the morphology which many times is not clear in these materials. For this purpose, I have followed Cerrón-Palomino’s phonological analysis and his proposed orthography (2003, Manuscript (MS b)) as well as a draft version of a Chipaya-Spanish dictionary that he and Enrique Ballón Aguirre have been preparing.

3. The nominalization pattern: complementation and relativization

3.1. Chipaya nominalizers

The syntactic coding of clause union has at least four devices in a scale: 1. co-lexicalization, 2. case-marking and grammatical relations, 3. finite verbal morphology, 4. Inter-clausal gap (use of subordinator/complementizer morpheme). Though not all of the

⁴ I will use a phonemic transcription for the examples presented here. The following convention is used to represent some special segments: glottalized *p'*, palatal *ç*, palatal retroflex *ê*. There is an apico-dental fricative here represented as *ş* in contrast to the alveolar *s*. The rest follows the typical IPA representation.

⁵ The following abbreviations have been used to gloss the examples: ABL=ablative, ACC=accusative, AD=additive, AF=affirmative, AG=agentive, BEN=benefactive, CAT=categorical, CAU=causative, CL=clitic, CO=concretive, DAT=dative, DEC=declarative, DS=different subject, EXC=exclusive, F=feminine, GEN=genitive, HAB=habitual, IMP=imperfective, INC=incompletive, INCL=inclusive, INF=infinitive, M=masculine, PF=perfective, PL=plural, POS=possessive, POT=potential, PP=past participle, PR=present, PREV=previous action, PT=past, REF=reflexive, REL=relative clause, REP=reportative, SG=singular, SIM=simultaneous action, SS=same subject, SUB=subordinator, TOP=topic.

elements mentioned above are represented in the data, I will use these basic notions to identify, describe and analyze complement and relative clauses in Chipaya. In effect, this language could be described specially in terms of the third of said strategies. Thus, the description of complementation and relativization has to do with the finite status of the dependent clause in a scale that according to Givón (2001: 68) runs between the finite verbal prototype and the non-finite (nominal) prototype; in other words, I will pay attention to the degree of nominalization to which the subordinate verb is ‘reduced’ according to certain devices that show non-finiteness in the verb: a. reduced Tense-Aspect (TA) marking; b. reduced pronominal agreement marking; c. derived nominal form of the verb.

The main device used in complement and relative clauses in Chipaya is nominalization. Chipaya has six main suffixes used to derive deverbal nouns: the infinitive *-s*, the concretive *-i*, the agentive *-ñi*, the resultative *-č*, the participial *-ta*, and the potential *-čuka*. The infinitive derives a stem that expresses a verbal process in abstract form. The concretive *-i* creates nominal themes that are related to the verbal process but in a concrete or tangible way. The agentive *-ñi* derives a noun that is the undergoer or bearer of the verbal process. The resultative *-č* and the participial *-ta* take similar functions: both of them express the result of the verbal process as a finished action. The alternation among these suffixes derives from the fact that *-ta* is a non-patrimonial form, but a loan from Aimara.⁶ These suffixes are used to form the past tense.⁷ Finally, the potential *-chuka* derives nominal forms that express the verbal process conceived as potential, possible or inclusive possible with a certain sense of future-ness. Here is a paradigm for the verb *tsat* ‘dance’ to illustrate the used of these suffixes:

⁶ Aimara and Quechua have been, for centuries, the most spread languages in the Andes, and they still have a consistent presence in the Southern Andes of Peru and Bolivia. The other language that was considered “lengua general” (general language) by the Spanish in colonial times in this region was Puquina, which is already extinct. A wide range of languages were spoken apart from these ‘general languages’, but most of them have disappeared in colonial and republican (independent) times or had disappeared before the arrival of the Spanish conquerors. This explains why Chipaya shows lexical and grammatical forms that are borrowed from Quechua and Aimara, especially from the latter. In addition, Chipaya has taken many loans from Spanish. It is an interesting fact how they have managed to survive in spite of the difficult habitat and through successive dominations to maintain their own traditions and language (Vellard 1957-58; Metraux 1934, 1935a,b,c), even in a present time where their socio-cultural organization seems to be undergoing important changes (Wachtel 1994). Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar believes that “it is possible that their inferior status and relatively little involvement in mainstream –indigenous and Spanish– society was a factor in maintaining their language” (2006: 4); this statement, however, does not explain why the other ‘minority’ languages did disappear neither why the Chipayan people continue to maintain their traditions today. As far as I know, their identification and commitment to their traditions is laudable.

⁷ Cerrón-Palomino (MS 2003) signals that these forms are in complementary distribution with respect to the passive construction: *-ta* is used in passive sentences, whereas *-č* is not.

tsat	
tsat-ş	‘to dance’
tsat-i	‘dance’
tsat-ñi	‘dancer’
tsat-çi/ta	‘danced’
tsat-čuka	‘dance-able’

Having described Chipaya’s nominalizers as a preamble, in what follows I will describe the main patterns of complementation and relativization that take place with the participation of the primary nominalizing particles of this language.

3.2. Complementation

A complement clause is a clause that functions as an argument (subject or object) of another (main) clause. Chipaya is a language with an SOV order; the complement clauses in the data will also reflect the order of a simple clause as the basic order.⁸ In fact, as pointed by Givón (2001, Chap. 12), the resemblance between verbal complements and nominal arguments is often parallel, assertion that is true for Chipaya as evidenced by example (3), in which the verbal complement behaves similarly as the nominal object in (2). In both cases, they follow the same pattern in that they are not marked for case (accusative case in Chipaya is a ‘zero form’), and also in terms of the unmarked word order, where the object comes right before the verb:

- (2) Luwisitu-ki t’anta lul-ñi-ča
 Luisito-TOP bread eat-PR.HAB-DEC
 ‘Luisito usually eats bread’
- (3) Luwisitu-ki [t’anta lul-ş] pek-ča
 Luisito-TOP bread eat-INF want-DEC
 ‘Luisito wants to eat bread’

Complement clauses may be arranged in a *continuum* defined in terms of non-finite and finite complements. This continuum facilitates the description of a typology of complement clauses so I will try to apply it to Chipaya. On one hand, non-finite complements are less independent from the main clause; lacking tense and aspect (the complement verb is non-finite) and the identity of the subject being very constraint. On the other hand, finite complements are independent from the main clause; carrying tense and aspect and having no mayor constraints for the subject. In turn, this correlates with the conceptualization of event integration and clause-union, which can be paraphrase as follows: the stronger the semantic bond of two events, the more likely there will be syntactic integration of the two clauses into one clause. In terms of finite/non-finite continuum, that means that when the semantic relation of two events is strong, the complement clause is likely to appear coded as non-finite (that is, it will appear as more

⁸ Certainly, in Chipaya constituents may move around but this fact is mostly due to pragmatic reasons that I will not cover here.

clause-union) –and vice versa, the weaker the semantic bond, the more likely the complement clause will appear as a finite clause (i.e. lower in the scale of clause-union).

Thus, we will notice that in terms of the variation in nominalized structure –i.e. the typology of a language in a continuum of nominalizing vs. finite languages (Givon 2001: 26)– Chipaya is a highly nominalizing language. As it is the case with the other two major Andean languages, Quechua and Aimara (Cerrón-Palomino 1987: 295; 2000: 215-217), Chipaya uses strategies of nominalization to form complement (and, as we will see afterwards, also relative) clauses.

3.2.1. Complementation with the infinitive -ş

The infinitive suffix -ş is generally used for sentences where the action is the direct complement of the main verb. Notice that complementation with the infinitive -ş is consistently dependent on verbs of desire or cognition. The subjects of the subordinate and the main clauses are coreferential:

- (3) qiti-ki [ancha uu□i tan-ş] pek-at-ki-ča
fox-TOP many sheep catch-INF want-PT.IMP-REP-DEC
'The fox wanted to catch many sheep'
- (4) [q^huya paa-ş] ana-l şış-u-ča
house build-INF neg-CL know-INC-DEC
'I don't know how to build a house'
- (5) wer-ki [oq^h-lay-ş] pek-u-ča
I-TOP walk-LAY-INF want-INC-DEC
'I want to wander around'
- (6) [nii oč q^hol-ş] pinsi-či-ki-ča
that jar break-INF think-PT.PF-REP-DEC
'he thought about breaking that jar'

The infinitive may appear with perception verbs as well as *verba dicendi* as long as the subjects are coreferential:

- (7) qiti-ki_i [PRO_i "nuk atip-ş"] khi-či-pan-ki-ča
fox-TOP "anyhow win" say-PT.PF-CAT-REP-DEC
'the fox said "I'm going to win anyhow"'

3.1.2. Complementation with the conretive -i

As we saw previously, the suffix -i is a nominalizer that derives concrete referents from verbal themes. This suffix may also be used to nominalize a subordinate verb. However, unlike the infinitive complements, the suffix -i is attached to the subordinate verb chiefly in two cases: a) when the dependent verb is governed by the verb 'can', in which case it marks purpose of the action; and b) when the dependent verb is governed

by a verb that implies and inchoative movement; in which case it marks immediate goal. In both cases, the subject is co-referent and agentive.

- (8) wilt nuški□ [k^hiwi lul-i] wakinti-či-ki-ča
 again then kiwi eat-CO start-PT.PF-REP-DEC
 ‘again they started to eat kiwi’
- (9) wer-naka [kula lul-i] yanap-či-nĉum-ča
 1.PL.INCL quinoa eat-CO help-PT.PF-1.PL.INCL-DEC
 ‘we helped eat the quinoa’
- (10) ponawi-ki [k^haş k^hur-i] waqinti-či-ki-ča t^hapa k^hutñi
 sparrow-TOP water look.for-CO begin-PT.PF-REP-DEC all around
 ‘the sparrow began looking for water all around’
- (11) Nii ş^hoñi-ki ana [luş-i] at-ki-ča
 that.M man-TOP neg eat-CO can-REP-DEC
 ‘that man could not eat’
- (12) qiti ana-ş [lul-i] ata-t-ki-ča [nii zerwi-ki]
 fox neg-CL.3.SG eat-CO can-PT.IMP-REP2-DEC that.M carrion-TOP
 ‘the fox could not eat the carrion’
- (13) ana wira [q^haş mir-i] at-či-ki-ča qiti-ki
 neg in fact water drink-CO can-PT.PF-DEC cat-TOP
 ‘that cat in fact could not drink water’

The examples show how the temporal reference implied by the complement clause is that of an action which is imminent (and thus posterior) with respect to the action of the main clause. Notice that in these cases the subjects are coreferential such as in the case of the infinitive suffix *-ş*; therefore it is the semantics of the verbs which determine the use of either one or another.

3.1.3. Complementation with the agentive *-ñi*

As we can see in the examples below, agentive complement clauses add a sense of past or simultaneous action with regards to the action of the main clause, but never a posterior action. Thus, consider the following sentences:

- (14) wer-ki [am kis-ñi] čer-či-in-ča
 ‘1.SG-TOP 2.SG steal-AG see-PT.PF-1.SG-DEC
 ‘I saw that you stole’ (lit. ‘I saw you (being) a stealer’)
- (15) am noon-či-am-ča [wer kampana xwat-ñi]
 you hear-PT.PF-2.SG-DC 1.SG bell play-AG
 ‘you heard that I played the bell’

- (16) wer-ki [hwuan oq^h-ñi] pek-u-ĉa
 1.SG-TOP Juan come-AG want-INC-DEC
 ‘I want Juan to come’
- (17) [am uuʃi lul-ñi] t^hew-ĉi-ki-ĉa
 2.SG sheep eat-AG wait-PT.PF-REP-DEC
 ‘he waited that you eat rabbit’ (lit. ‘that you be a rabbit eater’)
- (18) wer-ki ana ʃiʃ-u-ĉa [nii ok^hala uuʃi lul-ñi]
 1.SG-TOP neg know-INC-DEC that young man sheep eat-AG
 ‘I do not know if that young man eats sheep’

The concretion *-i* is used with desiderative, will or cognition verbs when the subjects of the completive and main clauses are different.

3.1.4 Participial complementation with *-ĉi/(-ta)*

The complement clause with *-ĉi* and *-ta* implies a previous temporal reference than the verb of which it is the complement. These suffixes are used mostly with cognition and perception verbs, as the next examples show:

- (19) wer-ki [am tsat-ĉi] ʃiʃ-ĉa
 1.SG-TOP 2.SG come-PP know-DEC
 ‘I know that you came’
- (20) nii-ki [wer uuʃi lul-ĉi] ĉer-ĉi-ĉa
 3.sg-top 1.sg sheep eat-PP see-PT.PF-DEC
 ‘he saw I ate the sheep’
- (21) wer-ki [am-t Huwan-kiʃ t^hon-ta] k^hun-u-ĉa
 1.SG-TOP 2.SG-GEN Juan-DAT visit-PP remember-INC-DEC
 ‘I remember that you visited John’

Adelaar and Muysken (2004: 373) point that an interesting difference between *-ĉi* and *-ta* is that the agent of the clause can take genitive case, as shown in (21). This is proper of the morphology of Aimara (remember that *-ta* is an Aimaran participial).

3.1.5. Complementation with *-ĉuka*

The complementation with *-ĉuka* indicates a future or potential action with respect to that of the main verb.

- (22) wer-ki [am t^hon-ĉuka] pek-u-ĉa
 1.SG-TOP 2.SG come-POT want-INC-DEC
 ‘I want you to come’ (lit. I want you to be able to come)

3.2. Relative clauses

A relative clause is a clause that functions as a nominal modifier in which it describes the referent of a head noun or pronoun and restricts its reference (Comrie, 1989). In Chipaya, relative clauses follow the pattern of other noun modifiers and thus the unmarked order, as predictable from OV languages, follows the same dependent-head pattern as Adj-N = REL-N.

Chipaya uses a nominalization strategy to code complement and relatives clauses. According to Givón (2001: 190, v.2), in many languages REL-clauses are all part of a nominalization process in which only the main clauses remain fully finite. Such languages, according to said author, often distinguish morphologically between subject and object nominalizations, and this distinction may well serve as a case-recoverability strategy in relativization. However, rather than a subject/object distinction,⁹ the logic that underlies Chipaya nominalization strategy for relative clauses seems to be a distinction between the agentive/stative (or patient-ness) nature of the subject of the relativized verb. Besides, it also has to do with the temporal reference of the relative clause in relation to the verb of the main clause. In general, a relative clause in Chipaya may be described according to the following characteristics: 1) the head is a nominal phrase that is modified by a nominalized relative clause; 2) the relative clause is a restrictive clause; 3) the relativized NP is in the restrictive clause and it is co-referent with the nominal head; 4) usually, the subordinate verb precedes the relativized noun phrase; and 5) the subordinate verb is non-finite.

3.2.1. Relativization with the agentive *-ñi*

The agentive marker indicates a neutral action of the relative clause with respect to the temporal reference expressed by the main verb. Here are some examples of this:

- (23) [walja lik-ñi] šoñi-ki šel-at-ki-ča
 much drink-AG man-TOP be/have-IMP-REP-DEC
 ‘there was a man who drink a lot’ (lit. who was a drinker)
- (24) [Nii suma lay-ñi] škiča škut-či-ki-ča
 that.M very jump-AG frog tie-PT.PF-REP-DEC
 ‘He tied that very jumping frog’
- (25) wer-ki [awtu q^hay-ñi] šoñi čer-š-l pek-u-ča
 1.SG-TOP car buy-AG man see-INF-CL.1.SG want-INC-DEC
 ‘I want to see the man that buys cars’

In these examples, we can observe that the subject of the relative clause is co-referent with the object of the main verb. The temporal reference of the relative clause is

⁹ Many languages distinguish between nominalizers for subject relative clauses and nominalizers for object relative clauses (as is the case in Uto-Aztecan languages (Langacker, 1977)), but this is not the case for Chipaya.

neutral –i.e. it does not occur before or after the action of the main verb; and the subject of the relative clause is the agent or undergoer of the action of the relative clause.

3.2.2. Relativization with *-či* and *-ta*

The participial morphemes *-či* & *-ta* allow different subjects in the subordinate clause and the main clause. They are used to mark a concluded or previous action with regards to the action of the main verb. The subject of the relative clauses, in this cases, acquire a more stative condition (and therefore they are more patient-like), as in (26), in which the subject has no control over the action (the man is drunk); or in (28) where the boy ‘feels tickles’. As we can see, in these cases the subjects are recipients of the action rather than agents.

- (26) wer-ki [lik-či] šoñi-l q^hor-u-ča
 1.SG-TOP drink-PP man-CL.1.SG search-INC-DEC
 ‘I search for the man who is drunk’
- (27) am kula [lul-či] ana wali-ča
 you quinoa eat-PP not good-DEC
 ‘The quinoa you have eaten is not good’
- (28) [[č^hilin-či] talaqu_i] čipay šmir-u-qal-ča
 be.ticklish-PP spoiled.boy Chipaya know.to.speak-INC-CAT-DEC
 ‘the spoiled boy that feels tickles speaks Chipaya’
- (29) [misa [asa-ta-ki]] wali-ča
 Mass pass-PP-REP good-DEC
 ‘the Mass that finished was good’

3.2.3. Relativization with *-čuka*

In this case, the action acquires a tone of future or potentiality. Unlike the other types of relativization, here the referent can be +/- stative and +/- agentive, as in (30) where it is agent of a non-stative verb or in (31) where ‘quinoa’ is the object (patient) of the verb:

- (30) [awtu q^hay-čuka] t^howa kučawambi-kiştan-ča
 car buy-POT young man Cochabamba-ABL-DEC
 ‘the young man that is going to buy the car is from Cochabamba’
- (31) [kula lul-čuka] ana wali-ča
 quinoa you eat-POT not good-DEC
 ‘The quinoa that you can eat is not good’

4. The switch-reference pattern: adverbial subordination

In the traditional conception of switch-reference, it can be described as a verbal inflection that indicates whether a referent is the same or different from a referent in an adjacent clause; that is, if a subject of the verb is coreferential or not with the subject of another verb. In Chipaya, a switch-reference system is used as a subordinating inflection which is overtly marked in the subordinate verb in cases that may be described as adverbial subordination. Adverbial subordinate clauses are not really an argument of the main verb, but they add some kind of information to the proposition.

Chipaya follows the typological patterns of OV languages in that the switch-reference is marked by contrastive suffixation on the verb of the dependent clause which in turn precedes the controlling clause (Stirling 1993: 23), although the order of the clauses may vary in Chipaya in some cases because of pragmatic factors. Another important aspect of this kind of construction in Chipaya is that the subordinate verb becomes less finite: it loses its TA features since the inflection is just marked in the main clause.

According to Givón,
 “participial ADV-clauses are tightly integrated with their main clause. Functionally first, this integration involves two major components of coherence:

- . **Referential coherence:** Participial ADV-clauses tend to have the *same-subject* as their main clause.

- . **Temporal coherence:** Participial ADV-clauses tend to exhibit rigid tense-aspect-modal restrictions vis-à-vis their clause, most commonly either:

- . **Simultaneity:** imperfective aspect
- . **Anteriority:** perfect aspect” (2001: 338)

In general, subordination inflection in Chipaya distinguishes four suffixes to mark the subordinate character of a verb with regards to the main verb in the sentence. These suffixes are: *-ku*, *-kan*, *-tan* and *-an*.

To analyze these suffixes following the basic notions presented above, I will take into consideration the axis of time and switch-reference. Thus, this section is concerned to the functional values of these suffixes in terms of previous/simultaneous action (with reference to the action of the main verb) and subject coreference.

By way of introduction, I present here a table with the values of the suffixes used for switch-reference, and then present examples of their use:

Table 1. Switch-reference suffixes in Chipaya

	<i>Same Subjects</i>	<i>Different Subjects</i>
<i>Previous Action</i>	-ku	-tan
<i>Simultaneous Action</i>	-kan	-an

4.1. Subordination with *-ku*

The suffix *-ku* is used when the subject of the subordinate sentence is the same as the main sentence. The verb to which this suffix is attached to indicates an action that is previous to that of the main verb:

- (32) [Anča kuntintu q^hoya irxat-*š-ku*] t^huana-kiz kwint'in-či-ki-ča
 Very happy house arrive-REFL-SS.PREV wife-DAT tell-PT.PF-REP-DEC
 'Having arrived at home {the man}, he told her wife'
- (33) [Ni: sqara tan-a-ku tan-a-*ku*] tan-či-ča
 that.M hat catch-IN- SS.PREV catch-IN- SS.PREV catch-PERF.PT-DEC
 'catching, catching the hat, {he} caught it' (=trying to catch the hat, he finally caught it)

4.2. Subordination with *-kan*

This suffix points an action that is simultaneous with respect to the action of the main verb. As with *-ku*, the subject of the subordinate sentence is the same as the main sentence. The following examples show how it works:

- (34) [“Loj Loj” k^hi-*kan*] ni: Apara puxki šel-či-ki-ča
 “loj loj” say-SS.SIM that.M Ayparavi river be-PT.PF-REP2-DEC
 “loj loj” was saying the Ayparavi river'
- (35) [č^hişwi lul-*kan*] tik-či-ki-ča
 meat eat-SS.SIM die-PT.PF-REP-DEC
 'he died while eating meat'

4.3. Subordination with *-tan*

The suffix *-tan* is used when the subject of the subordinate verb is different than the subject of the main verb. Apart from that, it indicates that the action is previous than the action of the main clause:

- (36) [ni:-ki t^hax-*tan*] č^hiy-či-am-ča
 3.SG-TOP sleep-DS.PREV speak-PT.PF-2SG-DEC
 'When he got asleep, you spoke'
- (37) [wer-t q^huya-š p^hal-š-*tan*] Ururu oqh-či-n-ča
 1.SG-GEN house-GEN fall-REF-DS.PREV Oruro go-PT.PF-1SG-DEC
 'When my house fell down, I went to Oruro'

4.4. Subordination with *-an*

This suffix indicates that the action of the subordinate verb and the main verb is simultaneous. It indicates as well that the subject of the subordinate sentence and the main sentence are distinct. The next examples show its function:

- (38) Neqştanaki qiti-ki şqara çer-çi-êa [ketwana lul-*an*]
 Then fox-TOP falcon see-PT.PF-DEC rabbit eat-DS.SIM
 ‘then the fox saw the falcon eating the rabbit’
- (39) [am-iş kişu at-*ana*-ki] liçi thaqw-çi-êa
 you-2 cheese prepare-DS.SIM-REP milk fall-PT.PF-DEC
 ‘while you prepared the cheese, the milk fell down’

5. Further discussion and conclusion

5.1. Towards an areal typology

In this paper, I have looked at different complex constructions that can take place in Chipaya. In general terms, we can say that one of the most important criteria to be used for determining Chipaya typology is the inflection system affected by the dominant subordination strategy –finite vs. non-finite clauses– (cf. Kortman 1993).¹⁰

This idea can be extended to other languages of the Andean area. For instance, Lefebvre and Muysken (1988) consider that in Quechua, another SOV suffixing language of this area, different types of clauses may be described in terms of their morphology as [+Main Tense] and [-Main Tense]. Adverbial and nominalized clauses are classified as [-Main Tense]. [+Main Tense] clauses are, for example, single main clauses like (40)¹¹:

- (40) Pay-mi hamu-nqa
 he-AF come-3.FUT
 ‘He will come’

[-Main Tense] clauses are adverbial and nominalized clauses like (41), where the suffix –*spa* marks co-referential subjects between the adverbial clause and the main clause. Notice that here the main verb has its Tense/Aspect inflection ‘complete’:

- (41) [Lisas-ta alla-chi-*spa*-qa] bindi-pu-saq-mi
 potato-ACC dig-CAU-SUB-TOP sell-BEN-3.FUT-AF
 ‘after having made them dig the potatoes, I will sell them’

Lefebvre and Muysken continue to offer a brief typology of Quechua clauses, reproduced here:

Table 2. Lefebvre and Muysken’s classification of Quechua clauses

¹⁰ “the five most important syntactic properties of languages relevant for the aims of this study are (i) the dominant (i.e. most frequent) word order, (ii) the dominant type of adposition (preposition or postposition), (iii) the dominant subordination strategy (finite vs. nonfinite), (iv) the position of adverbial clauses (fixed or variable), and (v) the dominant position of adverbial subordinators (clause-initial vs. clause final)” (Kortman, 1997: 214)

¹¹ These examples in Quechua are taken from Lefebvre & Muysken’s cited book.

	Main Clause	Adjunct position	Argument position	Case
a. Main tense (main verb morphology)	+	+ with complementizer	-	+/_
b. Adverbial (- <i>spa</i> , - <i>pti</i> , - <i>stin</i>) ¹²	-	+	-	-
c. Nominalized (- <i>na</i> , - <i>sqa</i> , - <i>y</i> , - <i>q</i>) ¹³	-	+	+	+

This is, in general terms, the same way Aimara (Cerrón-Palomino 2000) and Jaqaru, a language closely related to Aimara, behave. Here are some examples for Quechua and its Aimiran counterpart, showing similar distributions for completive (38), relative (39) and switch-reference (40) clauses:¹⁴

- (38) [ñuqa-wan ri-na-yki-ta] muna-ni (Quechua)
I-INST go-CO-2-AC want-1
- [naya-imp sara-ña-ma] mun-th-wa (Aimara)
I-INST go-CO-2 want-1-REP1
'I want you to come with me'
- (39) [tusu-q] runa-qa tiyu-y-mi (Quechua)
dance-AG man-TOP uncle-2.POS-REP1
- [thuq-uri] jaqi-xa tiyu-ja-wa (Aimara)
dance-AG man-TOP uncle-2.POS-REP1
'the person that dances is my uncle'
- (40) [puklla-spa]-m kuti-mu-nqa (Quechua)
play-SUB-REP1 return-CIS-3.FUT
- [anata-sina]-wa kuti-ni-ni (Aimara)
play-SUB-REP1 return-CIS-3.FUT
'after playing, he will return'

Leaving aside the adjunct clause, that I have not studied here, we can notice that Chipaya matches the Quechua and Aimara classification of clauses. Adverbial

¹² These suffixes, as in *Chipaya*, form the switch-reference system of *Quechua*. Aimara also has a similar set of suffixes.

¹³ These suffixes are very similar in function to the ones that we have seen for *Chipaya*: -*na* is the concreative, -*sqa* the participial, -*y* the infinitive and -*q* the agentive. This is also true for Aimara that has a similar set of suffixes having the same functions.

¹⁴ The examples 38-40 are taken from Cerrón-Palomino (1994).

subordinations and nominalized clauses do not show [Main Tense] (i.e. they are non-finite), thus they cannot appear in main clauses, but may appear as adjuncts of the verb. Adverbial subordination may neither take an argumental position nor be inflected for case, unlike nominalized complements. Thus we would have:

Table 3. Chipaya clause types

	Main Clause	Adjunct position	Argument position	Case
a. Main tense (main verb morphology)	+		-	+/_
b. Adverbial <i>-ku</i> , <i>-kan</i> , <i>-tan</i> and <i>-an</i>)	-		-	-
c. Nominalized (<i>-□</i> , <i>-i</i> , <i>-ñi</i> , <i>-č</i> , <i>-ta</i> , <i>-čuka</i>) ¹⁵	-		+	+

[-Main Tense]

I think this may constitute a good basis to explore syntactic typology in the Andean area and figure out classifications regarding the type of complex clauses that languages in this area may have. Further research may prove to be fruitful and much more detailed than the present paper. It may also be worth to compare the different clause-types in other geographically close languages, especially in the southern Peruvian and Bolivian eastern slope, where languages have been in contact with Quechua and Aimara for centuries, if not millennia.

In making this statement, I am bearing in mind that this classification works in such a general level as shared abstract features like [+/- Main Tense]; however, there are of course differences in the way how these three languages structure their own clauses (in this sense, Quechua and Aimara are much alike, with a more permissive case-marking for nominalized clauses; whereas Chipaya seems to keep particular patrimonial constructions).

5.2. Conclusion

As a closure, I will point out some basic ideas that have been underlined in this paper. Clausal integration and semantic bond as a way to explore iconicity of language in complex constructions are well supported by Chipaya data. In this language, the grammatical integration comes by means of non-finite clauses. In a scale of event/grammatical integration, we may have this graphic to illustrate the different degree of non-finiteness in subordination:

Table 4. Degree of event/grammatical integration for Chipaya

¹⁵ These suffixes are very similar in function to the ones that we have seen for Chipaya: *-na* is the concreative, *-sqa* the participial, *-y* the infinitive and *-q* the agentive.

- Adelaar, Willem and Pieter Muysken. (2004). *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. (1987). *Lingüística Quechua*. Cusco: CERA Bartolomé de las Casas.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. (2000). *Lingüística Aimara*. Cusco: CERA Bartolomé de las Casas
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. (2003). “Procesos morfofonémicos del Chipaya”. Lecture given in the Simposio ALL-15 of the 51 Congreso Internacional de Americanistas.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. (1994). *Quechumara. Estructuras paralelas de las lenguas Quechua y Aimara*. La Paz: CIPCA.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. (2006). *El chipaya o la lengua de los hombres del agua*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- MS a, *Seminar on Grammar Topics (fieldwork material on Chipaya)* at the MA Linguistics Program, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2003.
- MS b, “Propuesta de Alfabeto Chipaya”.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo and Enrique Ballón Aguirre. *Vocabulario chipaya-castellano* (draft version).
- Comrie, Bernard. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2nd edition.
- Dedenbach-Salzar, Sabine. (2006). “The Andean Uru-Chipaya Language” (State of research 2005), electronic version available at <http://www.bas-bonn.de/>
- Haiman, John. (1983). “Iconic and economic motivations”. *Language* 56: 781-819.
- Haiman, John. (1985). *Natural syntax: iconicity and erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haiman, John and Sandra Thompson (ed.). (1988). *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (1985). “Iconicity, isomorphism and non-arbitrary coding in syntax”, in Haiman, John, *Inconicity in syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, v.1&2.
- Kortman, Bernd. (1997). *Adverbial subordination. A typology and history of adverbial subordinators based on European languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R. (1977). *An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar*. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 1, SIL and UTA.
- Lefebvre, Claire and Pieter Muysken. (1988). *Mixed Categories. Nominalizations in Quechua*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Matthiessen, Christian and Sandra Thompson. (1988). “The structure of discourse and ‘subordination’”, in Haiman and Thompson (ed.).
- Metraux, Alfred. (1934). “L’organisation sociale et les survivances religieuses des indiens uru-čipaya de Carangas (Bolivie)”. *Actas y Trabajos Científicos del XXVº Congreso Internacional de Americanistas*, La Plata 1932, tomo I: 191-213. Buenos Aires. (Kraus Reprint, Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1968.)
- Metraux, Alfred. (1935a) “Contribución à l’ethnographie et à la linguistique des indiens uro d’Ancoacqui (Bolivie)”. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, t. 27: 75-110. Paris.

- Metraux, Alfred. (1935b). "Les indiens uro-čipaya de Carangas: Avant-propos". *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, t. 27: 111-128. Paris.
- Metraux, Alfred. (1935c). "Les indiens uro-čipaya de Carangas: La religion". *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, t. 27: 325-415. Paris.
- Muysken, Pieter and Katjia Hannss. (2006). "Verbs in Uchumataqu", in Rowicka, G. and E. Carlin, *What's a verb?* Utrech: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap; electronic version available at <http://lotos.library.uu.nl/publish/issues/Rowicka-cs/index.html>
- Olson, Ronald. (1964). "Mayan affinities with Chipaya of Bolivia I", *International Journal of American Linguists* 30 (4): 313-324.
- Olson, Ronald. (1965). "Mayan affinities with Chipaya of Bolivia II", *International Journal of American Linguists* 31 (1): 29-38.
- Olson, Ronald. (1966). *Quintunaca Liyaquičha*. Cochabamba: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Olson, Ronald. (1967). "The syllable in Chipaya", *International Journal of American Linguists*, 33: 300-305
- Payne, Thomas. (1997). *Describing Morphosyntax. A guide for field linguists*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Porterie-Gutierrez, Liliana. (1990). "Documentos para el estudio de la lengua Chipaya", *Amerindia* 15; posthumous draft version of an article, published by Rosaleen Howard-Valverde.
- Silverstein, M. (1976). "Hierarchy of features and ergativity", en Dixon, R.M.W (ed), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Stirling, Lesley. (1993). *Switch reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vellard, Jehan. (1957-58). "Études sur le lac Titicaca: les Ourous Chipayas". *Travaux de l'Institut Français d'Etudes Andines* 6: 51-94. Lima.
- Wachtel, Nathan. (1994). *Gods and vampires. Return to Chipaya*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Department of Linguistics
1290 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
USA