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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

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 completive, 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. 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:

(1) qiti ana-ş lul-i ata-t-ki-ĉa [nii zerwi-ki]
fox neg-CL.3.SG eat-CON 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. colexicalization, 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 ć, palatal retroflex ĉ. 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=adjective, AF=affirmative, AG=agentive, BEN=benefactive, CAT=categorical, CAU=causal, 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=infinite, 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=subject, SUB=subject, 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 –š, 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 –či 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 –čuka 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 –či is not.
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:

\[\text{(2)} \quad \text{Luwisitu-ki } t'anta \text{ lul-ñi-}ča \]
\[\quad \text{Luisito-TOP bread eat-PR.HAB-DEC} \]
\[\quad \text{‘Luisito usually eats bread’} \]

\[\text{(3)} \quad \text{Luwisitu-ki } [t'anta \text{ lul-}ş] \text{ pek-}ča \]
\[\quad \text{Luisito-TOP bread eat-INF want-DEC} \]
\[\quad \text{‘Luisito wants to eat bread’} \]

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 şiş-u-ča
house build-INF neg-CL know-INC-DEC
‘I don’t know how to build a house’

(5) wer-ki [oqh-lay-ş] pek-u-ča
I-TOP walk-LAY-INF want-INC-DEC
‘I want to wander around’

(6) [nii oč q ol-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 [PROi “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 concretive –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 [kʰiwi 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-nēum-ča
1.PL.INCL quinoa eat-CO help-PT.PF-1.PL.INCL-DEC
‘we helped eat the quinoa’

(10) ponawi-ki [kʰaš kʰur-i] waquinti-či-ki-ča tʰapa kʰutni
sparrow-TOP water look.for-CO begin-PT.PF-REP-DEC all around
‘the sparrow began looking for water all around’

(11) Nii šbõñi-ki ana [luš-i] at-ki-ča
that.M man-TOP neg eat-CO can-REP-DEC
‘that man could not eat’

(12) qiti ana-š [lul-i] at-tki-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 [qʰaš 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 -š; therefore it is the semantics of the verbs which determine
the use of either one or another.

3.1.3. Complementation with the agentive --nil

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-nil] 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-nil]
you hear-PT.PF-2.SG-DC 1.SG bell play-AG
‘you heard that I played the bell’
(16) wer-ki [hwuan oqʰ-ñi] pek-u-ča
1.SG-TOP Juan come-AG want-INC-DEC
‘I want Juan to come’

(17) [am uuşi lul-ñi] tʰew-či-ki-ča
2.SG sheep eat-AG wait-PT.PF-REP-DEC
‘he waited that you eat rabit’ (lit. ‘that you be a rabit eater’)

(18) wer-ki ana šiş-u-ča [nii okʰala uuşi 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 concretive –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 –či (–ta)

The complement clause with –či 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-či] šiş-ča
1.SG-TOP 2.SG come-PP know-DEC
‘I know that you came’

(20) nii-ki [wer uuşi lul-či] čer-či-ča
3.sg-top1.sg sheep eat-PP see- PT.PF-DEC
‘he saw I ate the sheep’

(21) wer-ki [am-t Huwan-kiš tʰon-ta] kʰun-u-ča
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 –či 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 –čuka

The complementation with –čuka indicates a future or potential action with respect to that of the main verb.

(22) wer-ki [am tʰon-čuka] pek-u-ča
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, 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-ĉa
    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-ĉa
    that.M very jump-AG frog tie-PT.PF-REP-DEC
    ‘He tied that very jumping frog’

(25) wer-ki [awtu qʰay-ñi] šoñi ěr-ş-l pek-u-ĉa
    1.SG-TOP car buy-AG man see-INF-CL.1.SG want-INC-DEC
    ‘I wan 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 –ći and –ta

The participial morphemes -ći & -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-ći] šoñi-l qʰor-u-ća
1.SG-TOP drink-PP man-CL.1.SG search-INC-DEC
‘I search for the man who is drunk’

(27) am kula [lul-ći] ana wali-ća
you quinoa eat-PP not good-DEC
‘The quinoa you have eaten is not good’

(28) [[čʰi-ći] talaqu,] čipay şmir-u-qal-ća
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-ća
Mass pass-PP-REP good-DEC
‘the Mass that finished was good’

3.2.3. Relativization with –ćuka

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 qʰay-ćuka] tʰowa kučawambi-kiştan-ća
car buy-POT young man Cochabamba-ABL-DEC
‘the young man that is going to buy the car is from Cochabamba’

(31) [kula lul-ćuka] ana wali-ća
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Switch-reference suffixes in Chipaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 indicates an action that is previous to that of the main verb:

(32) [Anča kuntintu qʰoya irxat-š-ku] t’uana-kiz kwint’in-či-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” kʰ-i-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 Aypravi river’

(35) [čʰišwi lul-kan] tik-či-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 tʰax-tan] čʰiy-či-am-ča
    3.SG-TOP sleep-DS.PREV speak-PT.PF-2SG-DEC
    ‘When he got asleep, you spoke’

(37) [wer-t qʰuya-š pʰal-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:
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. Korman 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 Lefevbre & Muysken’s cited book.
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 Aimaran counterpart, showing similar distributions for completive (38), relative (39) and switch-reference (40) clauses:\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{12} These suffixes, as in Chipaya, form the switch-reference system of Quechua. Aimara also has a similar set of suffixes.
\textsuperscript{13} These suffixes are very similar in function to the ones that we have seen for Chipaya: -na is the concretive, -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.
\textsuperscript{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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Clause</th>
<th>Adjunct position</th>
<th>Argument position</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Main tense</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(main verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Adverbial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–ku, –kan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–tan and –an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Nominalized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–, –i, –ńi,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–č, –ta, –č</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–uka)15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 concretive, -sqa the participial, -y the infinitive and –q the agentive.
The upper part of the graphic shows the scale of integration provided with different strategies used cross-linguistically; the bottom part shows a version for Chipaya strategies of subordination. As we can see, the morphological causative represent the highest degree of integration since it is incorporate in the verb itself and therefore it represents just one clause. Nominalization and switch-reference are lower in the scale but still showing a degree of integration. Both of them are the basic patterns for subordination in Chipaya that I have argued for and have tried to describe.

For the most part, Chipaya is a nominalizing language, areal feature shared with neighbor languages such as Quechua and Aimara. Typologically, it follows the basic characteristics of OV languages in the order of constituents: the unmarked complement and relative clause place is before the head, although the language allows a relative free movement of these constituents. The pragmatics (or maybe even syntactic?) motivations for these relative free word order are yet to be studied.

With regards to relativization, the distinction between agentivity/patientivity and action versus stative verbs in addition to the temporal reference frame seems to be more important for understanding and describing the data rather than just the syntactic/morphological distinction between subject/object and the marking of grammatical relations for case recoverability problem.

The adverbial subordinators may be classified as mono-functional (Kortman 1997: 3, 224); i.e. they are only used in their subordinating functions, unlike the nomilazers (for example, the participial -ći and –ta, as in most languages, are in fact past tense markers and thus are used with the verb). However, the semantics of the adverbial subordinators is complex in that not only they mark coreference but also co-temporality (simultaneous or previous action).

References

---

16 This is based on T. Payne (1997: 307). Chipaya also has a morphological causative –qat. Morphological causatives may be considered as suffixes that mark the maximum degree of integration since they appear fused with the verb. An example of the causative construction in Chipaya follows below:

```
khjuy pjit-naka-mi calamina-naka-mi lay-qat-ni-pani-kaza-ća
house draw-PL-AD tiles-PL-AD fly-CAUS-CL.1.SG-CAT-INCL-DEC
‘I make fly even houses with draw and tiles’
```


Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo and Enrique Ballón Aguirre. Vocabulario chipaya-castellano (draft version).
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