A grammar of Ashéninka (Ucayali-Pajonal)

Pedrós Caballero, T.

7. Syntax

7.1. Dominant constituent order

Word order, or constituent order, is a subject that has received much attention from linguists; actually, it seems that it is important to put a label on a language such as SVO, SOV, etc. I use the term *dominant* as is defined by Dryer (2013): "either the only order possible or the order that is more frequently used". In this way, I avoid the term *basic order*, which might not be the more frequent due to pragmatic features. However, in a corpus with eleven texts of different genres (conversations, stories, tales), my opinion is that the basic order should also be the most frequent.

In a language as Ashéninka, in which the arguments are indexed in the verb, full pronouns are often not used, so that verbs without noun phrases are a common occurrence, yet there are many instances with them. I counted in my corpus every clause (transitives, ditransitives and intransitives) with a verb accompanied by at least one noun phrase, and the results are in Table 36. S is the subject of an intransitive verb, A is the agent (subject of a transitive or ditransitive verb), O is the object of a transitive verb, R is the recipient (indirect object) of a ditransitive verb, and T is the theme (direct object of a ditransitive verb).

Table 36. Number of occurrences of different constituent orders in my corpus

VO 85	SV 71	VA 35	AVO 27	OVA 4	AOV 0	VR 9	VRT 1
OV 0	VS 64	AV 25	VAO 7	VOA 3	OAV 0	AVR 2	VTR 1

Table 36 shows us that the dominant constituent order in a clause in which subject and object are noun phrases is AVO and that other orders are possible except the two with the verb at the end. There are zero occurrences of OV. Therefore, transitive verbs are never in clause-final position when the object is an NP. In clauses in which only the S or the A is an NP, we can see that both orders SV and VS, and also VA and AV, are frequent. If we put together transitive and intransitive clauses, SV plus AV have 96 occurrences, and VS plus VA, 99, which are very similar frequencies. Regarding the recipient, the occurrences as an NP are too scarce so as to draw definitive conclusions, but we can see that the beneficiary never precedes the verb.

The main conclusions to draw from Table 36 are basically three: 1) In clauses with only the S or the A as an NP (intransitive and transitive, respectively), the two possible orders SV and VS, and AV and VA occur with a similar frequency; 2) in transitive clauses with both A and O as an NP, the dominant order is AVO, and other orders are possible with the exception that 3) the verb can never have a final position in a clause with an NP with object function.

When subject and object are both 3rd person and have the same gender, the verbal affixes cannot indicate which participant is subject or object. In these cases, the constituent order plays a role in indicating the participants, but, when one participant is mentioned with their proper name and the other one with an NP referring to them, then the one mentioned by the proper name tends to be the subject. Also the context plays a role in the identification of subject and object. All this was found out through dedicated elicitations with different speakers. In (668) and (669), I gave a sentence in Spanish to obtain the Ashéninka translation. In (670) to (681), I proposed phrases in Ashéninka to the consultant and asked for the translation in Spanish; in these examples, I was changing the constituent order so as to know what the speaker would interpret. All the orders I proposed were considered grammatical except a sentence with the verb at the end, which was immediately rejected as having no meaning (i.e. being ungrammatical). Examples (668) to (681), which are commented on below, show all the results of these elicitations.

(668) Míshito rátsikàkiri ótsitzi.
míshito r–atsik–ak–i–ri ótsitzi
cat 3M.S–bite–PFV–FRS–3M.O dog
'The cat bites the dog.'

(669) Ótsitzi rátsikàkiri míshito.
ótsitzi r–atsik–ak–i–ri míshito
dog 3M.S–bite–PFV–FRS–3M.O cat
'The dog bites the cat.'

(670) Ichékakiri pawa maanke.
i–chek–ak–i–ri pawa[178] maanke
3M.S–cut–PFV–FRS–3M.O father.VOC snake
'Father cut (killed) a snake.'

(671) Ichékakiri maanke pawa.
i–chek–ak–i–ri maanke pawa
3M.S–cut–PFV–FRS–3M.O snake father.VOC
'Father cut (killed) a snake.'

(672) Pawa ichékakiri aari.
pawa i–chek–ak–i–ri aari[179]
father.VOC 3M.S–cut–PFV–FRS–3M.O brother.VOC.FE
'Father cuts brother.'

(673) Ichékakiri aari pawa.
i–chek–ak–i–ri aari pawa
3M.S–cut–PFV–FRS–3M.O brother.VOC.FE father.VOC
'Brother cuts father.'

(674) Aari ichékakiri pawa.
aari i–chek–ak–i–ri pawa
brother.VOC.FE 3M.S–cut–PFV–FRS–3M.O father.VOC
'Brother cuts father.'

(675) Ichékakiri pawa aari.
i–chek–ak–i–ri pawa aari
3M.S–cut–PFV–FRS–3M.O father.VOC brother.VOC.FE
'Father cuts brother.'

(676) Mariya okíshitziro ishinto.
Mariya o–kishi–t–zi–ro Ø–ishinto
María 3F.S–comb–&–REA–3F.O 3F–daughter
'María combs her daughter.'

(677) Okíshitziro Mariya ishinto.
o–kishi–t–zi–ro Mariya Ø–ishinto
3F.S–comb–&–REA–3F.O María 3F–daughter
'María combs her daughter.'

(678) Okíshitziro ishinto Mariya.
o–kishi–t–zi–ro Ø–ishinto Mariya
3F.S–comb–&–REA–3F.O 3F–daughter María
'María combs her daughter.'

---

[178] The vocative form is sometimes used between people who speak about a common relative (e.g. between brothers and sisters speaking about their father or mother) in the same way as, in English, brothers and sisters can refer to their father just as 'dad' instead of 'our father'.
[179] The female ego form is used because the consultant was a woman. The term for father (*pawa*) is the same for both sexes.

(679) Ishinto okíshitziro Mariya.
Ø–ishinto o–kishi–t–zi–ro Mariya
3F–daughter 3F.S–comb–&–REA–3F.O María
'María combs her daughter.'

(680) Ana okíshitziro Mariya.
Ana o–kishi–t–zi–ro Mariya
Ana 3F.S–comb–&–REA–3F.O María
'Ana combs María.'

(681) Okíshitziro iniro Ana.
o–kishi–t–zi–ro Ø–iniro Ana
3F.S–comb–&–REA–3F.O 3F–mother Ana
'Ana combs her mother.'

In examples (668), (669), (672) to (675) and (680), the constituent order determines who is subject and object: the first NP is subject and the second one is object. In these seven examples, both NPs have the same category, i.e. both are unpossessed common nouns or proper nouns in (680). In examples (676) to (679) and (681), one NP is a proper noun, and the other one is a possessed noun whose possessor is the proper noun. In these cases, we can see that the order does not matter: the possessor is always subject, so that there is a hierarchy in which the non-marked NP is always subject. In examples (676) to (679), if the expression had to be 'her daughter combs María', the proper name of the daughter should be uttered and one should say that 'PROPER NAME combs her mother'. The context decides which NP is subject or object in (670) and (671): a man can cut and kill a snake, but a snake cannot cut a man (here, cutting is meant by using a machete or a knife). Therefore, the context clearly indicates that the man has to be the subject because it is impossible for the snake to be the subject.

Summing up, we can see that UP Ashéninka has a dominant AVO constituent order, but different orders can be used, with the exception that a verb can never have a final position in transitive clauses with an NP as object. When the verbal affixes that cross-reference the subject and the object are ambiguous (with 3rd person and same gender referents), the context says who is subject or object. When the context allows both references to be subjects and both NPs have a possessive relation, the possessor is subject and the possessed is object. When both NPs are in the same category (e.g. both being uninflected nouns or both being proper nouns, etc.), the subject is the NP mentioned first.

7.2. Alignment

In linguistic descriptions, alignment is usually treated in syntax chapters because it involves the relation of subject and object with the verb, i.e. the relation between different clause constituents, but, in Asháninka, these relations are expressed through verbal affixes, so that the relation is always marked inside the same verbal word. Therefore, the study of alignment in Asháninka concerns the pronominal affixes, which belong to the realm of verbal morphology. Accordingly, the alignment is treated in Section 6.2, on pronominal affixes.

I present here a brief summary of alignment. UP Asháninka, like the other Campan languages, has a general nominative-accusative alignment with S (subject of an intransitive verb) and A (subject of a transitive verb) marked with prefixes, and O (object of a transitive verb) with suffixes. However, as in some other Campan languages, there is a special construction with S marked with a suffix, and even with A marked with a suffix in UP Asháninka and also in Caquinte (O'Hagan 2020:213) – at least, this is the only description of A marked with a suffix. This special construction is marked with no pronominal affixes in 3rd person. Therefore, UP Asháninka alignment can be considered nominative-accusative also in this special construction except for the 3rd person, in which the alignment is neutral only in this construction. However, since the A marked with a suffix is very rare, we can opt to consider it an exception or a rare departure from the general alignment and not take it into account so as to formulate a proposal for the alignment of the language. In this case, we would have that S is marked as A in general but as O in some cases. In Section 6.2.2, I study the semantic content of verbs with S marked as O and conclude that the alignment system of the language is what Dixon (1994:97-101) calls a "split conditioned by tense/aspect/mood", in this case by tense. All these features are analysed in detail in Section 6.2.2.

7.3. The simple clause

In Section 6.4, on mood and modality, I cite Dixon's (2010*b*:2) three mood values (declarative, imperative and interrogative) and say that these are clause types, which

will be studied in the syntax chapter. Thus, these three types form the subsections of this section, followed by another subsection on negation.

7.3.1. The declarative clause

A simple declarative clause can be formed only by a verb, as in (682), or by a verb and several constituents, as in (683), where the sentence has a temporal and a locative complement.

(682) Ohéekira.
o–heek–i=ra
3F.S–live–FRS=MED
'She lives there.' (CMM)

(683) Aréetapàkina iroñaaka haka pinámpiki Katsinkaari.
aree–t–ap–ak–i–na iroñaaka
arrive–&–ALL–PFV–FRS–1S now
ha=ka pi–nampi=ki Katsinkaari
LOC=PROX 2–community=LOC Chicosa
'I've just arrived now here at your community, Chicosa.' (CTK)

Nouns and adjectives can be predicates, so that they can build sentences. These occurrences are treated in the relevant sections on nouns (4.1.6) and adjectives (5.3).

7.3.2. The imperative clause

The imperative clause shows no difference with the declarative one, except that the imperative verb is always irrealis, if this can be considered a difference. When the RS suffix is fossilized, the same verbal form of an imperative clause can also be used in a declarative clause without any change, as *pikímiro* in (684), which might be used with the declarative meaning 'you taste it'. In (685), the RS is not fossilized and is in irrealis. The latter could be used in a declarative sentence only if it expressed an irrealis parameter (e.g. future).

(684) Pikímiro, ñani.
pi–kim–i–ro ñani
2S–feel–FRS–3F.O brother-in-law.VOC.ME
'Taste it, brother-in-law.' (TSJ)

(685) Piyótina, piyótina.
p–iyo–t–i–na
2S–know–&–IRR–1O
'Guess who I am, guess who I am.' (SCS)

There is a hortative inclusive word: *hame* or *thame* in free variation, although *hame* appears to be more frequent (7 occurrences in my corpus vs only 1 of *thame*). This word needs to be accompanied by a verb and is an inclusive imperative, i.e. the speaker exhorts his or her interlocutors to do something with him or her. Its use is illustrated in (686) and (687) with *hame* and in (688) with *thame*.

(686) Anámpikì **hame** ante…, **hame** akénkithawáeti.
a–nampi=ki hame Ø–ant–i
INCL–community=LOC HORT.INCL INCL.S–do–IRR
hame a–kenkitha–wae–t–i
HORT.INCL INCL.S–tell–DUR1–&–IRR
'In our community, we are going to do…, we are going to be talking.' (OS)

(687) **Hame** oshánkiri waaka.
hame Ø–oshank–i–ri waaka
HORT.INCL INCL.S–shoo–FRS–3M.O cow
'Let's shoo away the cows!' (SCFF)

(688) Eentyo, ee, tee okaméethatzi, **thame** ashiyi.
eentyo ee tee o–kameetha–t–zi thame a–shiy–i
sister.VOC.FE INTJ NEG.REA 3F.S–good–&–REA HORT.INCL INCL.S–run–IRR
'Hey, sister, it isn't good, let's get away!' (SFW)

Example (686) is better translated with the English future progressive, but the speaker is urging his interlocutors to do what he proposes to them together with him, the same as in (687) and (688), where the translation with English 'let's' fits better the statement. As can be expected from an exhortation, the verb combined with *hame/thame* is in irrealis, as can be seen in (686) and (688), where the RS suffix is not fossilized (*shiyaantsi* 'run' in (688) is one of the few verbs with the opposition realis *-a* vs irrealis *-i*; see Section 6.1 for more information on this feature).

7.3.3. The interrogative clause

Polar questions (*yes-no* questions) have the same form as declarative sentences. The difference lies in the intonation. Examples (689) and (690) could be declarative sentences with the same meaning if they had a declarative sentence intonation. In

(690), there is a verbal predicate; in (689), the existential predicate is expressed just by uttering the existing elements without any verb.

(689) Osheki thamiri?
osheki thamiri
many curassow
'Are there many curassows?' (CMM)

(690) Panáninkitàka?
p–ananink–it–ak–a
2S–get.up–ANT–PFV–REA
'Did you get up at dawn?' (CCPC)

However, I have an example of a polar question introduced by the interrogative word *íitaka* (691). It must be remarked that it is formally a polar question, but the sense is rhetoric.

(691) Íitaka róoteentsi noñáawaeti iñáaniki wirákocha?
iita=ka róoteentsi no–ñaawae–t–i i–ñaani=ki wirákocha
WH=INT already 1S–speak–&–IRR 3M–language=LOC non-indigenous
'Am I going to speak Spanish now?' (CMM)

The Spanish translation of (691) was *¿es que ya voy a hablar en castellano?*, and I have found difficult to translate in English the nuance introduced by Spanish *es que*, which can express an array of modal nuances, such as surprise, opposition, annoyance, etc. The context is that the speaker, while speaking in Ashéninka, did not remember a word, and maybe the Spanish word came to her head, so she uttered this question while laughing as a rhetorical question (this question appears in a conversation just following example (699) below and is uttered by speaker A). Therefore, this is formally a polar question, but its meaning is rhetorical. The interrogative *íitaka* may have the same function as Spanish *es que*.

Content questions (*wh*-questions) are introduced with an interrogative word (see comprehensive list of interrogatives in Table 10, Section 3.5). As explained in that section, Ashéninka interrogatives have the peculiarity that an interrogative can express several meanings and the same meaning can be expressed by different interrogatives. Examples (692) to (709) show every interrogative that occurs in my text corpus with every meaning with which they occur, so that these examples show how the interrogatives in Table 10 are used. The interrogatives in the following examples are *hempe, tsiká, íita(ka)/óeta(ka)* and a few with a form based on these.

In (692), (693) and (694), *hempe* has three different values: ‘where’, ‘how’ and ‘how many’, respectively.

(692) **Hempe** pipoñaka éeroka, Hamani?
hempe pi–poñ–a=ka éeroka Hamani
WH 2S–hail.from–REA=INT 2 Hamani[180]
‘Where do you hail from, Hamani?’ (CMH)

(693) **Hempe** okántyaka irika, árima ikántari irika ríraga, poñáachari henoki áatsimiyantàtsiri, árima ipánkinatakàe?
hempe o–kant–ya=ka i–ri=ka ari=ma i–kant–a–ri
WH 3F.S–COP–IRR=INT DEM–M=PROX AFF=DUB 3M.S–COP–REA–REL
i–ri=ka ri=raga poñ–acha–ri henoki
DEM–M=PROX M=CAT.DEM come.from–PTCP.IPFV–REL up
aatsimiy–ant–atsi–ri ari=ma i–pánkina–t–ak–ae
suck.to.cure–OCC–PTCP.IPFV–REL AFF=DUB 3M.S–make.love–&–PFV–INCL.O
‘How is it that this one, who maybe is the one who comes from heaven to suck to cure, maybe makes love to us?’ (SCS)

(694) **Hempe** ikaatzi pirentzi?
hempe i–kaa–t–zi pi–rentzi
WH 3M.S–COP.TOT–&–REA 2–brother.MP
‘How many brothers do you have?’ (CMH)

The meaning ‘where’ in (692) can be identified from the context of a verb that needs to refer to a location. In (694), the meaning ‘how many’ is logical, taking into account that one of the functions of the totalitative copula *kaataantsi* is to express a quantity.

In (695), (696) and (697), *tsiká* has the meanings: ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘how’, respectively. In (698), the form *tsikárika*, clearly based on *tsiká*, has the meaning ‘how’.

(695) **Tsiká** okántakañà?
tsiká o–kant–ak–a–ña
WH 3F.S–COP–PFV–REA–MIR
‘What happened?’ (SFW)

(696) **Tsiká** ihéekakika rirori mantsiyari?
tsiká i–heek–ak–i=ka rirori mantsiya–ri
WH 3M.S–be.in.a.place–PFV–FRS=INT 3M ill–M
‘Where is the ill one? (SCS)

[180] *Hamani* means ‘paca’ and is here used as the name of a person.

(697) **Tsiká** ikantya, ikántètziri…, rówaga…, irika rówamantyáriri manitzi?
tsiká i–kant–ya i–kant–e–t–zi–ri ro–raga
WH 3M.S–COP–IRR 3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3M.O F–CAT.DEM
i–ri=ka r–o–kam–ant–ya–ri–ri manitzi
DEM–M=PROX 3M.S–CAUS–die–RES–IRR–3M.O–REL jaguar
'How was it, how to say…, um…, so that this (squirrel) killed the jaguar?' (TSJ)

(698) **Tsikárika** ikàntakáakari rokíkirà rómahontyáantakariri?
tsikárika i–kant–aka–ak–a–ri r–oki=ki=ra
WH 3M.S–ser–CAUS–PFV–REA–3M.O 3M–eye=LOC=MED
r–o–mahontya–ant–ak–a–ri–ri
3M.S–CAUS–dumb–RES–PFV–REA–3M.O–REL
'How did he make him become dumb in his eyes (blind)?' (TSJ)

Examples (699) to (709) show different uses of *íita(ka)/óeta(ka)* and the derived forms *íitakya* (704), *íitarikya* (705) and *íitama* (709). The meanings expressed are 'what' in (699) to (702), 'why' in (703) to (706), 'how' in (710), and 'who(m)' in (707) to (709). I have glossed only the feminine version *óeta(ka)* with gender because *íita(ka)* is used in a general way, i.e. without any reference to gender, while the feminine *óeta(ka)* is only used when the referent is feminine.

(699) **A:** Íitiweero...?
iita i–weero
WH 3M–name
'What's his name…?' (she tries to remember the name of an animal) (CMM)
B: Owétaka.
o–eta=ka
F–WH=INT
'Of what?' (CMM)

Example (699) shows the use of *iita* and *oeta* without a verb. Speaker B asks what A's question is, and she uses the feminine *óetaka* even though the conversation is about animals. Probably, a more literal translation would be 'of what thing?', which would accord with the feminine prefix. In any case, this example shows that *íita(ka)/óeta(ka)* can be used without the presence of a verb.

(700) **Iita** pipánkitiri páashini?
iita pi–panki–t–i–ri páashini
WH 2S–sow–&–IRR–REL other
'What else you're going to sow?' (CMM)

(701) Ñani, ha, **íitaka** pántziri?
ñani ha iita=ka p–ant–zi–ri
brother-in-law.VOC.ME hey WH=INT 2S–do–REA–REL
'Hey, brother-in-law! What are you doing?' (TSJ)

(702) Okáatzira piheeki hanta pinámpiki, **óetaka** pipánkitzìri okaatzi pováyitari?
o–kaa–t–zi–ra pi–heek–i ha=nta pi–nampi=ki
3F.S–COP.TOT–&–REA–TEMP 2S–live–FRS LOC=DIST 2–community=LOC
o–eta=ka pi–panki–t–zi–ri
F–WH=INT 2S–sow–&–REA–REL
o–kaa–t–zi p–ow–a–yi–t–a–ri
3F.S–COP.TOT–&–REA 2S–eat–&–DISTR–&–REA–REL
'When you're there in your community, what's all you sow to eat?' (CMH)

Examples (700) to (702) show the use of *íita(ka)/óetaka* with the meaning 'what'. In the three examples, the question is about the object. It is interesting to observe that the interrogative enclitic *=ka* is absent in (700), and it does not seem that there is any structural difference from (701) and (702), so that its presence appears to be optional. It is also interesting that, in (700) and (702), the question is formed with the same verb (*pankitaantsi* 'sow'), but, in (702), the interrogative is inflected with the feminine prefix. In (702), the object is a bit more specified than in (700), given that the question in (702) is 'what you sow to eat' and, in (700), 'what else you're going to sow', and this fact may be a reason for the choice of the feminine, which is the gender of plants. Examples from texts and elicitations seem to point in this direction, but not conclusively. This difference is similar to the one between English 'what' (less specific) and 'which' (more specific), or between Spanish *qué* and *cuál*, respectively.

Examples (703), (704) and (706) show *iita* and the related forms *íitaka* and *íitakya* with the meaning 'why' in combination with the resultative suffix *-ant*, while (705) shows *íitarikya* meaning 'why' in isolation.

(703) Nokantzi: **íitaka** ohèekantapákari?
no–kant–zi iita=ka o–heek–ant–ap–ak–a–ri
1S–say–REA WH=INT 3F.S–live–RES–ALL–PFV–REA–REL
'I say: why does she live there?' (CMM)

(704) **Íitakya** kaari pamanta niha?
iita=kya kaari p–am–ant–a niha
WH=EMPH NEG.COP 2S–traer–RES–REA water
'Why didn't you bring water? (CCPC)

(705) Okantzi: "**Ítarikya**?"
o–kant–zi íitarikya
3F.S–say–REA WH
'She says: "Why?"' (SFW)

(706) **Iita** pàmonkowéetantàri?
iita p–amonko–wee–t–ant–a–ri
WH 2S–chew–SPE–&–RES–REA–REL
'Why do you chew coca? (CCPC)

Examples from natural texts and results from elicitations clearly show that the way to ask 'why' is with *iita* or one of its longer cliticized forms and the resultative suffix on the verb. The presence of the relative suffix *-ri* is governed by the rules applying to the resultative (see Section 6.7.2) (e.g. its absence in (704) is due to the negative polarity of the question). The form *íitarikya* meaning 'why' in isolation appeared only in this question.

Examples (707) to (709) show *iita* and the longer clitized forms *íitaka* and *íitama* with the meaning 'who(m)'.

(707) **Iita** pitsipáyarini?
iita pi–tsipa–aiy–a–ri–ni
WH 2S–accompany–PL–RS–REL–PL
'Whom (pl.) you're going to accompany?' (CMM)

(708) Ika, **íitaka** itháatàkiri?
ika iita=ka i–thaat–ak–i–ri[181]
SURP WH=INT 3M.S–bark–PFV–FRS–REL
'Listen! Who (an animal) has cried?' (SFW)

(709) **Ítama** matéroni pehátzini? Apáaniróeni.
iita=ma ma–t–i–ro–ni peh–atzi–ni apáaniróeni
WH=DUB can–&–IRR–3F.O–REL.IRR weed–PROG–REL.IRR alone
'Who might be weeding? (I) alone.' (CCPC)

Tsiká has also been used in elicitations to translate 'who', but only *iita* and its cliticized forms have appeared in natural texts with this meaning. In (709), the dubitative enclitic *=ma* is added to *iita* to reinforce the rhetoric question that the same speaker answers.

[181] The verb *thaataantsi* 'bark' can be used for animals different from a dog. In this case, the speaker has heard the cry of an unidentified animal.

In examples (700) to (703) and (706) to (709), the verb is inflected with the relative suffix (*-ri* and irrealis *-ni*), which shows that this is a typical occurrence with *íita(ka)*. However, the relative suffix does not occur in (704) and (710).

(710) **Iita** ráawàkiro?
iita r–a–aw–ak–i–ro
WH 3M.S–take–OM–PFV–FRS–3F.O
'How did he take her? (SFW)

In (704), the reason may be the negative polarity, similarly to what happens with the resultative *-ant* (see Section 6.7.2). In (710), there seems to be no special reason. Also in (707), the suffix *-ri* might be interpreted as the 3rd person masculine object suffix, in which case there would be no relative suffix, but I interpreted it as the relative suffix because its absence in questions with *íita(ka)* is an exception, while the absence of the object suffix is quite regular. More occurrences of *íita(ka)* in my corpus show that verbs in questions with this interrogative usually bear a relative suffix, but not always, so it seems that it can be optionally dropped.

The examples above appear to show no structural reason to interpret the presence of the interrogative enclitic *=ka*; thus, my opinion is that its use is optional for the speaker, which was confirmed with elicitations in which speakers mentioned no difference between questions with and without *=ka*. This enclitic can be attached to the interrogative word but also to the verb, which is the case in (692), (693) and (696). The interrogative *=ka* is not attested in polar questions.

In (692), (693), (694), (696) and (697), the subject is present with an NP and its position is always after the verb, and this is indeed the order in every instance in natural texts and elicitations: the verb is always placed immediately after the interrogative, and the subject (S or A) after the verb. In Section 7.1, I explain that, in clauses with only the subject occurring as an NP, both possible constituent orders (SV and VS, AV and VA) show a similar frequency, but, in interrogative clauses, the order is always VS or VA, with the interrogative word before the verb. However, in (691), the adverb *róotentsi* 'already' is placed between the interrogative and the verb, which shows that an adverb modifying the verb can occupy this position, although an adverb can also follow the verb, as in (711), where the adverb *páerani* 'long ago' follows the verbal form *owámetákimiri*.

(711) Íitaka owámetákimiri páerani?
iita=ka owame–t–ak–i–mi–ri páerani
WH=INT teach–&–PFV–FRS–2O–REL long.ago
'Who taught you long ago?' (CMH)

Also in indirect questions, the order is always VS/VA and the verb immediately follows the interrogative, as in (712), where the NP formed by the pronoun *éeroka* 'you' follows the verb.

(712) Nokoyi niyoti hempe pihéekayìni éeroka haka.
no–koy–i n–iyo–t–i hempe pi–heek–aiy–i–ni éeroka ha=ka
1S–want–FRS 1S–know–&–IRR WH 2S–live–PL–FRS–PL2 LOC=PROX
'I want to know how many of you live here.' (CTK)

7.3.4. Negation

Different negators have been described in previous sections (*tee*, *eero*, *tekira*, *tera* and *téemáita* in Section 3.7), the negative existential *tekatsi* in Section 6.9.4, and the negative copula *kaari* in Section 6.10.4. In these sections, there are several examples showing the different negation strategies. Therefore, at this point, it suffices to say that the verbal negators *tee*, *eero*, *tekira* and *tera* are preposed to the verb to build a negative clause. More detailed information can be found in the referred sections. Here I just show examples with the clause types discussed in the previous sections: declarative (713), imperative (714) and interrogative (715). In imperative clauses, the irrealis negator *eero* is always used because imperative clauses are irrealis.

(713) Tee àapátziyawakyàari iroka tsinani.
tee Ø–aapatziy–awak–ya–ri i–ro=ka tsinani
NEG.REA 3F.S–accept–DES–IRR–3M.O DEM–F=PROX woman
'This woman didn't want to accept him.' (SCS)

(714) Eero páminana, páminiro *cacao*, ari.
eero p–amin–a–na[182] p–amin–i–ro cacao[183] ari
NEG.IRR 2S–look–REA–1O 2S–look–FRS–3F.O cacao thus
'Don't look at me, look at the cacao, that way.' (CCPC)

[182] The I-class verb *aminaantsi* 'look, see' has here A-class inflection because the RS suffix precedes the 1st p. suffix *-na* and the verb is in realis. See Section 6.1.5.1 for more information on this kind of RS suffix variations.
[183] *Cacao* is a Spanish loan.

(715) Aha, éeroka, tee pikoyi pimiri?

aha	éeroka	tee	pi–koy–i	pi–mir–i
INTJ	2	NEG.REA	2S–want–FRS	2S–be.thirsty–FRS

'Hey, you, don't you want to drink?' (CCPC)

7.4. The complex sentence

This section describes how clauses combine to form sentences with more than one clause. The main division of the section is between coordination (Section 7.4.1) and subordination (Section 7.4.2), and the subordination section is divided into adverbial (Section 7.4.2.1), relative (Section 7.4.2.2) and complement (Section 7.4.2.3) clauses. For the section on subordination, I have drawn heavily on Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:238), who define these three types of subordinate clauses thus: complement clauses "function as noun phrases", relative clauses "function as modifiers of nouns", and adverbial clauses "function as modifiers of verb phrases or entire clauses". This definition can be roughly paraphrased by saying that complement clauses function as nouns, relative clauses as adjectives and adverbial clauses as adverbs. These definitions are further refined in the corresponding sections.

7.4.1. Coordination

Haspelmath (2007:1) defines coordination as "syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements". Haspelmath (2007:1-2) divides coordination into four types: conjunctive, disjunctive, adversative and causal, which are exemplified by the English conjunctions 'and', 'or', 'but' and 'for', respectively. These four types are the subsections in which this section is divided. For the sake of clarity, the coordinated clauses are between square brackets. Coordination between nouns and between adjectives is described in sections 4.1.7 and 5.8, respectively.

7.4.1.1. Conjunctive coordination

Conjunctive coordination is most times expressed through the juxtaposition of different clauses, as is shown with three clauses in (716) and with two in (717).

(716) [Ráakiro], [inóshikàkiro], [rómpohàkiro kameetha mapíkira].
r–a–ak–i–ro i–noshik–ak–i–ro r–ompoh–ak–i–ro
3M.S–take–PFV–FRS–3F.O 3M.S–pull–PFV–FRS–3F.O 3M.S–hit–PFV–FRS–3F.O
kameetha mapi=ki=ra
well stone=LOC=MED
'He takes it, pulls it and hits it well on that stone.' (TSJ)

(717) [Ráawàkiro], [rowáwakàwo].
r–a–aw–ak–i–ro r–ow–aw–ak–a–ro
3M.S–take–OM–PFV–FRS–3F.O 3M.S–eat–OM–PFV–REA–3F.O
'He (a jaguar) captures her and eats her (a woman).' (SFW)

In these two examples, the verbs are juxtaposed without the need for any coordinating conjunction, and all of them have a full inflection, i.e. there is no dominant verb that receives more inflection. This is the usual way of clause conjunctive coordination, but the conjunctive coordinator *éehatzi* can also be used, as in (718), with two clauses, and in (719), with three. In (719), *éehatzi* is inserted only between the two last verbs, in the same way as in the English translation with 'and'.

(718) [Nowámetantatzìri] nokáatèyini **éehatzi** [nowéthatàri] Toni[184].
n–owame–t–ant–atzi–ri no–kaa–t–eey–i–ni
1S–teach–&–OCC–PROG–3M.O 1S–COP.TOT–&–PL–FRS–PL
éehatzi n–owetha–t–a–ri Toni
also 1S–greet–&–REA–3M.O Toni
'We are teaching and greet Toni.' (OS)

(719) Árika athónkanàkiro, [apíyanaki], [akáwoshitanàki] **éehatzi** [ate owántyari hanta].
ari=rika a–thonk–an–ak–i–ro
AFF=COND INCL.S–finish–ABL–PFV–FRS–3F.O
a–piy–an–ak–i a–kawoshi–t–an–ak–i éehatzi
INCL.S–come.back–ABL–PFV–FRS INCL.S–bathe–&–ABL–PFV–FRS also
Ø–a–t–i Ø–ow–ant–ya–ri ha=nta
INCL.S–go–&–IRR INCL.S–eat–RES–IRR–REL LOC=DIST
'When we finish, we will come back, bathe and go there to eat.' (CMH)

In any case, most clause coordinations are expressed through juxtaposition without *éehatzi*, whose actual meaning is 'also', but can be used as a coordinator

[184] *Nokáatéyini* and *Toni* are outside the brackets because they are subject and object, respectively, of both coordinated clauses, i.e. *nokáatéyini* is subject of both clauses and *Toni* is object of both clauses.

equivalent to ‘and’. Examples (718) and (719) were uttered by younger speakers, so it is possible that the use of *éehatzi* might be favoured by the influence of Spanish.

7.4.1.2. Disjunctive coordination

The Spanish disjunctive conjunction *o* ‘or’ is extensively used in UP Ashéninka. An example of its use is in (720).

(720) [Éenitatsi pipáapate iheeki] ***o*** [pokaki haka]?
eeni–t–atsi pi–paapa–ti[185] i–heek–i
EXI–&–PTCP.IPFV 2–father–POSS 3M.S–live–FRS
o pok–ak–i ha=ka
or come–PFV–FRS LOC=PROX
‘Does your father live (there), or has he come here?’ (CMH)

I was told that the Ashéninka word for Spanish *o* is *ama*, but this word is composed of the dubitative enclitic *=ma* and a support (epenthetic) vowel, so that its actual meaning is ‘maybe, perhaps’. When I was transcribing example (720), I asked the translating consultant how he would utter this question in a more genuine Ashéninka way, and he uttered the sentence in (721), where the speaker expresses the disjunctive relation by attaching the dubitative enclitic *=ma* to the second verb.

(721) [Éenitatsi piri hanta] [pokákima haka]?
eeni–t–atsi p–iri ha=nta pok–ak–i=ma ha=ka
EXI–&–PTCP.IPFV 2–father LOC=DIST come–PFV–FRS=DUB LOC=PROX
‘Is your father there, or has he come here?’

Disjunctive coordination can also be expressed through juxtaposition, as in the elicited example (722), where the context allows only a disjunctive interpretation.

(722) [Pipoki], [piheeki]?
pi–pok–i pi–heek–i
2S–come–FRS 2S–stay–FRS
‘Are you coming (with me) or staying (here)?

The conjunction *téerika* ‘otherwise’ is formed by the realis negator *tee* and the conditional enclitic *=rika*, and forms a disjunctive relation between two elements. Unfortunately, I do not have an example with two clauses, but just an example from

[185] *Paapa* is a Spanish loan from *papá* ‘father’, and is used as an alienable noun (with the possessive suffix), while all kin terms are inalienable. This word shows that borrowed nouns go to the alienable category even though they should be inalienable because of their semantic content. The genuine Ashéninka word is the inalienable (without the possessive suffix) *piri* (p-iri, 2-father, ‘your father’).

Casique's (2012:108) textbook coordinating two adverbial phrases (723), which I checked with speakers. The coordinated adverbial phrases are between square brackets.

(723) Ashitowáeyanakìni [iroñaaka sháawiteni] téerika [inkámani kapìchokitéheri].
a–shitow–aiy–an–ak–i–ni iroñaaka sháawiteni
INCL.S–go.out–PL–ABL–PFV–FRS–PL today afternoon
tee=rika inkámani kapicho–kitéheri
NEG.REA=COND tomorrow little–day
'We'll leave this afternoon, otherwise/or early tomorrow.' (Casique 2012:108; glosses, translation and stress placement mine)

Even though I cannot claim that disjunctive coordination with *téerika* can occur between clauses because of the lack of an example, we can guess that the sentence in (723) might be formulated as 'we'll leave this afternoon or/otherwise we'll leave early tomorrow'. Actually, we cannot consider the adverbial phrase *inkámani kapìchokitéheri* a predicate, but it might be admitted that its predicate is omitted to avoid a repetition and the underlying proposition is 'we'll leave this afternoon or we'll leave early tomorrow'. The literal meaning of *téerika* is 'if not' according to its two components (*tee* and =*rika*).

7.4.1.3. Adversative coordination

Adversative coordination is infrequent. Actually, I have found only one instance in my text corpus, which is shown in the long sentence in (724), with the clauses that form the adversative coordination in bold in the Ashéninka text and the English translation.

(724) [Rámatawitakìri meiri irika manitzi], [**yàtharékitho ikìmitakáantawitakàwo [róotaki, rowa…, ikántètziro…, róoperotàki kameetha iyátharèkitho]**], [**káarimáita**]: [ishèmyakotáshitawo iyétakite].

r–amatawi–t–ak–i–ri méyiri i–ri=ka manitzi
3M.S–cheat–&–PFV–FRS–3M.O squirrel DEM–M=PROX jaguar

i–yatharékitho i–kimi–t–aka–ant–a–wi–t–ak–a–ro
3M–testicle 3M.S–seem–&–CAUS–RES–&–FRU–&–PFV–REA–3F.O

roo–t–ak–i ro=ra i–kant–e–t–zi–ro roo–pero–t–ak–i
3F–&–PFV–FRS F=MED 3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3F.O F–VER–&–PFV–FRS

kameetha i–yatharékitho kaari=maita
good 3M–testicle NEG.COP=COEXP

i–shemy–ako–t–ashi–t–a–ro i–ketaki–ti
3M.S–crush–APPL–&–NPURP–&–REA–3M.O 3M–forest.peanut–POSS

'The squirrel has cheated this jaguar, given that **he has made it seem (being false) that it is, um…, how to say…, that his testicle was really good (tasty)**, **but it wasn't**: he was crushing forest peanuts.' (TSJ)

In this long sentence, there is a clause whose head is the verb *rámatawitakìri*, which is coordinated (causal coordination) with the clause whose head is the verb *ikìmitakáantawitakàwo*, which has a complement clause whose head is *róoperotàki*. The clause formed only by *káarimáita* expresses the opposite of what might be expected from *ikìmitakáantawitakàwo* 'he has made it seem' (the translation between parentheses 'being false' tries to express the meaning of the frustrative *-wi*), i.e. 'he has made it seem, but it wasn't'. *Káarimáita* 'but it wasn't' cannot be considered a clause dependent of the previous one because it is not a part of it. In any case, since coordination and subordination form a continuum (Thompson, Longacre & Hwang:237-38), this example may be considered to be near the fuzzy border between both concepts, so that *káarimáita* may be close to being a subordinate concessive clause. The last clause with *ishèmyakotáshitawo* as head may be considered an independent sentence given the lack of linking elements with the previous clauses, yet it is logically linked as the explanation of what the previous clauses convey.

Another example of adversative coordination is in (725) from an elicitation, where the counter-expectative suffix *-imae* expresses an outcome different from what might be expected in the clause with head in *niyówitawo*. Also this clause might be considered to be near the fuzzy border between adversative coordination and concessive subordination.

(725) [Tee niyówitawo awotsi], [arèetzimáetàkina].
tee n–iyo–wi–t–a–ro awotsi
NEG.REA 1S–know–FRU–&–REA–3F.O way
aree–tz–imae–t–ak–i–na
arrive–&–COEXP–&–PFV–FRS–1S
'I didn't know the way, but I arrived.'

An adversative clause can be introduced with the counter-expectative conjunction *omaanta/imaanta* (f./m.) with the meaning 'but only', as in (726).

(726) [Tekatsi tsiyároki], [omaanta shewo].
tekatsi tsiyároki o–maanta shewo
NEG.EXI urucuri.palm F–COEXP shebón[186]
'There are no urucuri palms, but only *shebones*.' (CMM)

The conjunction *omaanta/imaanta* is mainly used in subordinate concessive clauses, so it is described in more detail in Section 7.4.2.1.4.

An adversative clause can be introduced by the conjunction *róokantácha/róokantàencha*[187]. The first term occurs in my text corpus and the second one in Cacique & Zerdin's (2016:89) unpublished textbook. The latter is in (727) with a slight correction by a consultant and my glosses.

(727) [Ikówawita ikáemakáantina], [róokantàencha tee nokoyi niyaati].
i–kow–a–wi–t–a i–kaem–aka–ant–i–na
3M.S–want–&–FRU–&–REA 3M.S–call–CAUS–RES–IRR–1O
róokantàencha tee no–koy–i n–iyaa–t–i
however NEG.REA 1S–want–FRS 1S–go–&–IRR
'He wanted to invite me, but I didn't want to go.' (Casique 2012:108; unpublished revised version with some corrections from my consultant; glosses and stress placement are mine)

In this example, the two clauses that build an adversative coordination are present, and *róokantàencha* introduces the second clause. It is worth remarking that the verb *ikáemakáantina* bears a resultative suffix and no relative suffix, which indicates that it is expressing a cause. Actually, a hypothetical interpretation would be that the invitation is the cause of the speaker's not wanting to go ('just because you invite me, I don't want to go').

[186] *Shebón* is the local Spanish name for the palm *Attalea butyracea*.
[187] According to Fernández (2011:80-81), based on fieldwork in the Gran Pajonal, there are several additional forms of this conjunction.

The instance of *róokantácha* in my corpus (728) introduces an adversative clause for which its coordinate clause is absent. Therefore, the adversative relation is with the context of what was being said in this conversation, so it should not be formally considered a coordinate clause.

(728) **Róokantàcha** nàmonkowéetatzi.
róokantàcha n–amonko–wee–t–atzi
however 1S–chew–SPE–&–PROG
'However, I'm chewing coca.' (CCPC)

In this conversation, the adversative context cannot be clearly seen, but the translation of *róokantácha* with Spanish *sin embargo* 'however' offers little doubt about its meaning. We must infer that the speaker understands the adversative relation according to his own thoughts about the situation in which the conversation takes place.

7.4.1.4. Causal coordination

Haspelmath (2007:2) exemplifies causal coordination with English 'She died, **for** the apple was poisoned'. In the previous section, I mentioned that adversative coordination may be close to concessive subordination. In the same fashion, causal coordination is close to reason subordination (as I call it in this thesis, following Thompson, Longacre & Hwang [2007:243]), but there are some examples in my corpus that I consider rather independent clauses than dependent upon the adjoining clause. An example is in (724) in the previous section, where *ikìmitakáantawitakàwo* 'given that he had made it seem' introduces the reason why the squirrel cheated the jaguar, stated in the previous clause (*rámatawitakìri meiri irika manitzi* 'the squirrel has cheated this jaguar').[188] Another example of causal coordination is in (729).

[188] In the discussed example, *yàtharékitho* 'his testicle' and *róotaki* 'that is' next to *ikìmitakáantawitakàwo* can be considered unfinished utterances because the next clause utters them as a correction, so that the whole finished fragment (without fillers) should be *ikìmitakáantawitakàwo róoperotàki kameetha iyátharèkitho* 'given that he has made it seem that his testicle was really good (tasty)'.

(729) [Naréetapaka chapinki], [nokémakiri pikàemakàantákina].
n–aree–t–ap–ak–a chapinki
1S–arrive–&–ALL–PFV–REA yesterday
no–kem–ak–i–ri pi–kaem–aka–ant–ak–i–na
1S–hear–PFV–FRS–3M.O 2S–call–CAUS–RES–PFV–FRS–1O
'I arrived yesterday, given I've heard you had me called.' (CTK)

In this example, the two clauses appear to be rather coordinated than the second subordinated to the first. The resultative suffix *-ant* on *pikàemekàantákina* 'because you had me called' expresses the cause of the speaker's arriving yesterday. The remarkable feature of this clause is that the resultative is not on *nokémakiri* 'I have heard them', of which *pikàemakàantákina* is a complement clause. Thus, the resultative suffix is on the verb that most directly expresses the cause ('you had me called') of the speaker's arrival, even though it forms a dependent clause.

7.4.2. Subordination

As said in the introduction of this section on complex sentences, this subsection is divided into three subsections describing adverbial, relative and complement clauses following Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:238), who say that:

> "[…] complement clauses and relative clauses usually represent an embedding structure at the subordinate end of the continuum […] Adverbial clauses, however, are viewed as (hypotactic) clause combining with respect to the main clause since they relate to the main clause as a whole […] Thus while the term *subordination* includes all three types in its broad sense, adverbial clauses are in some sense 'less subordinate' than the prototypes of the other two types on the continuum."

Since the previous section was about coordination, I start this section on subordination with adverbial clauses as a way to follow the coordination-subordination continuum in the order of the sections. For the sake of clarity, subordinate clauses are between square brackets.

7.4.2.1. Adverbial clauses

Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:243) divide adverbial clauses into two big groups: "clauses which can be substituted by a single word" and "clauses which cannot be substituted by a single word". The first group is divided into time, location and manner clauses; and the second group into purpose, reason, circumstantial, simultaneous, conditional, concessive, substitutive, additive and absolutive clauses. I

have found in my text corpus instances of eight of these classes: all except simultaneous, substitutive, additive and absolutive. Therefore, the next subsections are named after these eight classes, with purpose and reason clauses in the same subsection due to their obvious relation.

Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:244-45) say that time, location and manner clauses "tend to take the form of, or share properties with, relative clauses". This is indeed the case in Ashéninka. Therefore, I describe these three classes at the end of the section because the section on relative clauses will follow. In this way, the clause classes more similar to each other are also closer in the succession of sections.

7.4.2.1.1. Purpose and reason clauses

Most purpose and reason clauses are formed by attaching the resultative suffix *-ant/-anant* to the verb. The different functions of this suffix are described in Section 6.7.2, where I argue that, when the verb bears the relative suffix *-ri*, it can express goal, consequence, outcome or final event of a series of events, all of which belong to the realm of purpose clauses; when the verb with the resultative *-ant* does not bear the relative suffix *-ri*, then it expresses cause. It bears the relative suffix neither with negative polarity nor when *-ant* is triggered by the discourse connector *róohatzi*. More detailed information on the different nuances expressed by the resultative *-ant* can be found in Section 6.7.2.

While purpose clauses are clearly dependent on a main clause, clauses expressing reason are difficult to classify as subordinate reason clauses or coordinate causal clauses, given that their relation to other clauses usually is in the fuzzy border between coordination and subordination. Clauses introduced with the conjunction *teema* 'because' are the only ones in my corpus introducing a cause that can be clearly considered subordinate. An example is in (730), where the head of the cause clause is an adjective acting as a predicate.

(730) Ari owàperowáetakya, [**teema** antawo].
ari Ø–ow–a–pero–wae–t–ak–ya teema anta–ro
thus INCL.S–eat–&–VER–DUR1–&–PFV–IRR because big–F
'In that way, we are going to eat more, because it is big.' (TSJ)

As pointed out, most purpose clauses are built with the resultative *-ant* and the relative *-ri* attached to the verb. Since the resultative suffix triggers A-class inflection, the RS suffix is never fossilized –unless an object suffix triggers I-class inflection–, and the RS suffix is irrealis. An example of this strategy to form a subordinate purpose clause is in (731).

(731) Pikañáshityàwo pishémyero [òshitowantapákyari kaméethèni].
pi–kañashi–t–ya–ro pi–shemy–e–ro
2S–hit.strongly–&–IRR–3F.O 2S–crush–FRS–3F.O
o–shitow–**ant**–ap–ak–ya–ri kameetha–ni
3F.S–get.out–RES–ALL–PFV–IRR–REL well–ADJ
'Hit it strongly and crush it so that it gets out good (tasty).' (TSJ)

As said above, in negative purpose clauses with the resultative *-ant*, the verb does not bear the relative *-ri*. Thus, the strategy in (732) is the same as in (731), only the irrealis marking is on the negator (*eero* instead of the realis *tee*) and the relative suffix is absent. The verb of the main clause is elided and there are two purpose clauses.

(732) Koka, [eero owanta intsipaeti], [eero akémantawo atashe].
koka eero Ø–ow–**ant**–a intsipaeti
coca NEG.IRR INCL.S–eat–RES–REA immediately
eero a–kem–**ant**–a–ro a–tashe
NEG.IRR INCL.S–feel–RES–REA–3F.O INCL–hunger
'Coca (is used) not to be constantly eating, not to be hungry.' (CCPC)

Another strategy to form a purpose clause is also with the resultative and the relative suffixes, but with the verb in realis and preposing the subordinate to the main clause. An example of this peculiar construction is in (733).

(733) [Nokáemantzimìri] nokoyi nohámpitimi hempe pikanta pihéekàyini hanta éeroka pinámpikì.
no–kaem–**ant**–zi–mi–ri no–koy–i no–hampi–t–i–mi
1S–call–RES–REA–2O–REL 1S–want–FRS 1S–ask–&–IRR–2O
hempe pi–kant–a pi–heek–aiy–i–ni ha=nta éeroka pi–nampi=ki
WH 2S–COP–REA 2S–live–PL–FRS–PLLOC=DIST 2 2–community=LOC
'I have called you because I want to ask you how many of you live there in your community.' (CTK)

The English translation yields a cause clause ('because I want…') whose main clause is 'I have called you'. However, in the Ashéninka sentence, the clause that receives subordinate markers (resultative and relative suffixes) is *nokáemantzimìri*, i.e. the one expressing the consequence (I want to ask you, ergo I call you), while the clause

expressing cause (*nokoyi nohámpitimi…*) has no special marking. Therefore, the clause morphologically marked as subordinate is *nokáemantzimìri*.

Purpose clauses are much more frequent than reason clauses, even counting subordinate reason clauses and coordinate causal clauses together. Most purpose clauses are formed with the strategy shown in (731) and (732), with the resultative and the relative suffixes and the verb –or the negator– in irrealis, but, besides the other strategy with these suffixes and the verb in realis shown in (733), there exist other strategies that do not use these suffixes. In (734), the only marker that the purpose clause receives is the irrealis inflection and the absence of a subject prefix on the verb *ante*.

(734) Máaweni ashéninka héekatsiri hanta, hátanaki rirori [ante ipánkopáeni ótsipaki nampitsi].
máaweni a–shéninka heek–atsi–ri ha=nta
all INCL–fellow.person live–PTCP.IPFV–REL LOC=DIST
ha–t–an–ak–i riroriant–i i–panko=paeni o–tsipa=ki nampi–tsi
go–&–ABL–PFV–FRS 3M make–IRR 3M–house=PL F–other=LOC place–ALI
'All the Ashéninka who lived there, they went in order to make their houses in another place.' (OS)

Another strategy is used in (735), where the two verbs forming two consecutive purpose clauses are marked with the future and the relative suffixes.

(735) Hame, hame rowa..., hame onkótsiti rowa..., niha, [atàatyéeriri ishìyatyéeri, waaka]".
hame ro=ra hame Ø–onkotsi–t–i ro=ra niha
HORT.INCL F=MED HORT.INCL INCL.S–cook–&–IRR F=MED water
a–ta–**atyee**–ri–**ri** i–shiy–**atyee**–**ri** waaka
INCL.S–burn–FUT–3M.O–REL 3M.S–run–FUT–REL cow
'Let's, let's, um…, let's cook, um…, water, to burn the cows so that they run.' (SCFF)

This example can be considered to have two purpose clauses because of the two different verbs. For *atàatyéeriri*, *waaka* 'cows' is object; and for *ishìyatyéeri*, *waaka* is subject, so both verbs share the same word as one of their arguments, although it is a different argument for each verb.

7.4.2.1.2. Circumstantial clauses

Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:253) define circumstantial clauses as "clauses expressing the circumstances by which a given state of affairs comes to be". I have

only one clause in my corpus that may qualify for this category, which is in (736). The strategy used is to introduce the clause with the interrogative word *iita*.

(736) Iyótàkiro, antaki antaki, [iita ohaki, ohaki, ohaki].
Ø–iyo–t–ak–i–ro Ø–ant–ak–i
3F.S–know–&–PFV–FRS–3F.O 3F.S–do–PFV–FRS
iita o–h–ak–i[189]
WH 3F.S–beat.masato.inside.a.canoe–PFV–FRS
'She knows it (how to prepare it), prepares, prepares, by beating *masato* inside a canoe-like container, beats, beats.' (SFW)

7.4.2.1.3. Conditional clauses and the conditional *=rika*

Conditional clauses are usually formed with the conditional enclitic *=rika*, which, in most cases, is attached to the multifunctional word *ari*, forming the word *arírika* 'if/when' (sometimes phonetically reduced to *árika*), which can also have the meaning 'whether' to introduce complement clauses, as is shown in (743) at the end of the section. In *arírika*, *ari* has a positive polarity value, and the negative counterpart of *arírika* is *éerorika*, formed with the irrealis negator *eero*. Both conditional conjunctions occur in (737).

(737) [**Árika** ótsipani **éerorika** nokoyi nantawaetzi], náanàkiro notónkamènto, nokìnawáetzi.
ari=rika o–tsipa–ni eero=rika no–koy–i n–antawae–t–zi[190]
AFF=COND F–other–RMPST NEG.IRR=COND 1S–want–FRS 1S–work–&–REA
n–a–an–ak–i–ro no–tonk–amento
1S–take–ABL–PFV–FRS–3F.O 1–shoot–NMLZ.INS
no–kinawae–t–zi
1S–go.hunting.in.the.forest–&–REA
'If some day I didn't want to work, I took my rifle and went hunting in the forest.' (CCPC).

The English translation uses 'if' as an introduction to the protasis, but the Ashéninka clause uses the positive and negative conditional conjunctions (*arírika* and *éerorika*,

[189] *Masato* is traditionally prepared inside a small canoe. The verb *haantsi* denotes the act of whipping the masato inside the canoe.
[190] Although this verb is a complement clause in a construction with *kowaantsi* 'want', it is marked realis due to the doubly irrealis construction described in Section 6.1, given that two irrealis parameters coincide in *nantawaetzi*: negation and volition.

respectively): the positive conjunction introduces *ótsipani* referring to ‘another/some day’, and the negative conjunction introduces the negative clause.

In the long sentence in (738), the positive *arírika* introduces a clause, and the conditional enclitic *=rika* is also attached to the negative existential *tekatsi* introducing a second conditional clause. Differently from (737), the two conjunctions in (738) introduce each a different clause with a different condition (it dawned early, there was nothing to eat).

(738) Shirámpari páerani, [**arírika** okìtehíityamanàki] [**tekátsika** oyari], ráakiro ichékopiti éehatzi itónkamènto, riyaate rowáshitantawáetya, riyaate ithóotyáakotíri tsimeri, rámiri apánkoki, rówakayityáriri itomi.
shirámpari páerani ari=rika o– kitehiity–aman–ak–i
man long.ago AFF=COND 3F.S–dawn–EARLY–PFV–FRS
tekatsi=rika ow–ya–ri r–a–ak–i–ro i–chekopi–ti
NEG.EXI=COND eat–IRR–REL 3M.S–take–PFV–FRS–3F.O 3M–arrow–POSS
éehatzi i–tonk–amento r–iyaa–t–i
also 3M.S–shoot–NMLZ.INS 3M.S–go–&–IRR
r–owashitant–a–wae–t–ya r–iyaa–t–i
3M.S–make.maspute–&–DUR1–&–IRR 3M.S–go–&–IRR
i–thootyaako–t–i–ri tsimeri r–am–i–ri a–panko=ki
3M.S–search–&–IRR–3M.O animal 3M.S–bring–FRS–3M.O INCL–house=LOC
r–ow–aka–yi–t–ya–ri–ri i–tomi
3M.S–eat–CAUS–DISTR–&–IRR–3M.O–3M.O 3M–son
‘Long ago, men, if it dawned early and there was nothing to eat, they took their arrows and their rifle, went to make their *maspute*, went to look for animals and brought them to our houses to make their children eat them (the hunted animals).’ (CTK)

The enclitic *=rika* can be attached directly to the verb, as in (739) in speaker B’s answer. The main clause is the one uttered by speaker A, so that the whole sentence would be ‘I do it that way if they bring me (coca)’.

(739) **A:** Ari pikántapíinta, ari pikántapíinta.
ari pi–kant–apiint–a
thus 2S–do–HAB–REA
‘Normally, you do it that way.’

B: [Ámenarìka].
am–i–na=rika
bring–IRR–1O=COND
‘If/when they bring me (coca).’ (CCPC)

Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:257) say that "in some languages, including Indonesian and certain languages of Papua New Guinea, there is no distinction between 'if' and 'when' clauses". Ashéninka is indeed one of these languages. Actually, the conditional clause in (739) can be translated in English both with 'if' and 'when'.

Instead of the conditional enclitic *=rika*, the counterfactual suffix *-mi* can also be used to express the condition, as in (740).

(740) [Niyótiromi], ari nokántimi.
n–iyo–t–i–ro–mi ari no–kant–i–mi
1S–know–&–IRR–3F.O–COFA FUT 1S–say–IRR–2O
'If I knew (singing), I would tell you.' (CMM)

The counterfactual suffix *-mi* can be combined with the conditional *=rika* when the condition is unreal (i.e. counterfactual), as in example (741) from an elicitation.

(741) [Arírika niyótakimi], eero nopoki.
ari=rika n–iyo–t–ak–i–mi eero no–pok–i
AFF=COND 1S–know–&–PFV–FRS–COFA NEG.IRR 1S–come–FRS
'If I had known (it), I wouldn't have come.'

A conditional clause can also be formed without being introduced with *=rika* or *-mi*, as in (742), where the conditional clause has no special marking.

(742) [Amákotapáki], aaki sheri.
a–mako–t–ap–ak–i Ø–a–ak–i sheri
INCL.S–get.tired–&–ALL–PFV–FRS INCL.S–take–PFV–FRS tobacco
'If we get tired, we take tobacco.' (CCPC)

The conditional enclitic *=rika* can also be used with the meaning 'whether'. In this case, the *=rika*-clause is actually a complement clause rather than conditional, given that no condition is expressed. An example of *=rika* as 'whether' is in (743), where *=rika* is on the adjective *kyaario* 'true' acting as a predicate and on the verbalized 3rd person masculine pronoun *ríitaki*, both introducing the same clause, which has the function of object of the verb *náminawàkiríita* 'I want to check'.

(743) Náminawàkiríita [**kyáaryoperòrika ríitakirìka** rira…, ikántètziri…, poñínkari henoki].
n–amin–awak–i–ri–ita kyaaryo–pero=rika rii–t–ak–i=rika
1S–look–DES–FRS–3M.O–ROPT true–VER=COND 3M–&–PFV–FRS=COND
ri=ra i–kant–e–t–zi–ri poñ–inka–ri henoki
M=MED 3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3M.O hail.from–ADJZ–M up
'I want to check whether it is true that he, um…, how to say…, comes from heaven.' (SCS)

Regarding the reality status of the verbs in sentences with conditional clauses, the fact that the RS suffix is fossilized in roughly half of all verbs makes it difficult to make clear generalizations. In principle, since both protasis and apodosis denote unrealized situations, the semantics of reality status implies that both should have their verbs in irrealis. This is the case in both protasis and apodosis in (740), in the protasis in (739), and in the irrealis negators in the protasis in (737) and the apodosis in (741). Fossilized RS suffixes occur in both protasis and apodosis in (742) and in the protasis in (741) and (743) (in (743), there is no apodosis). In (738), in the clause *tekátsika oyari* 'if there is nothing to eat', the verb is in irrealis although two irrealis elements (negation and conditionality) meet, and the non-fossilized RS suffixes in the verbs of the clauses that form the apodosis are in irrealis, but this must be due to their expressing habituality. The rest of the examples are the apodosis in (737) in realis, which expresses an actualized situation (something the speaker did in the past when meeting the condition of the protasis), and the apodosis in (739) also in realis, which is actually a question in a declarative clause uttered by the interlocutor of the speaker, who utters the protasis as an answer. This brief study of the examples in this section makes it difficult to draw a conclusion about the RS in conditional sentences. However, an inspection of several examples from elicitations, with clauses more straightforwardly conditional (i.e. with a simple formulation 'if X, then Y') than those of examples from natural texts, shows that both protasis and apodosis have their verbs in irrealis when the RS suffixes are not fossilized, as it would be expected from the semantics of these clauses. However, the more complex situations in examples from natural texts show that the RS of verbs in conditional constructions may be influenced by different parameters.

7.4.2.1.4. Concessive clauses and the counter-expectative *omaanta/imaanta*

A usual way to form a concessive clause is with the counter-expectative conjunction *omaanta/imaanta* (f./m.). The feminine variant *omaanta* is the default form, and the masculine *imaanta* is only used when a masculine element is involved and the speaker wants to remark it. An example of *omaanta* introducing a concessive clause is in (744).

(744) [**Omaanta** nashi naaka oryápetyanikìni okáachanchéeñakitzìni nowatharékitho], ari rowa, ikántètziro rowa, pòshíni.
o–maanta n–ashi naaka o–rya–petyani–ki–ni
F–COEXP 1–POSS 1 F–small–table-like–FORM–ADJ
o–kaa–chancheeña–ki–t–zi–ni no–yatharékitho
3F.S–COP.TOT–ovoid–FORM–&–REA–ADJ 1–testicle
ari ro=ra i–kant–e–t–zi–ro ro=ra poshi–ni
AFF F=MED 3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3F.O F=MED tasty–ADJ
'Although mine is small, table-like and ovoid, my testicle, um…, how to say…, um…, is tasty.' (TSJ)

A different strategy to form a concessive clause is in (745), from an elicitation carried out separately with two different speakers, and both used the same strategy: they used the frustrative suffix and the verb in irrealis.

(745) Ari niyáataki [oparyáwitya inkani].
ari n–iyaa–t–ak–i o–pary–a–wi–t–ya inkani
FUT 1S–go–&–PFV–FRS 3F.S–fall–&–FRU–&–IRR rain
'I'll go although it rains.'

The counter-expectative *omaanta/imaanta* can also introduce a coordinate adversative clause, which is shown in Section 7.4.1.3 with example (726). This word can introduce a simple clause and express contrast. In this case, its meaning is similar to English 'however' (746) or 'but then/so then' (747). This function of *omaanta/imaanta* enters the realm of modality, and its description might be included with the counter-expectative suffix *-imae* (Section 6.4.2.7) or in the adverbs section (3.6); yet I think that it is better to describe it together with its function introducing a concessive clause because of the practically identical meaning.

(746) **Omaanta** tsinani, antziri roori antawáerontsi, okiwáantziro kòtsironáaki, onkótsitzi payantzi, kaniri, opíshitziro opanko.
o–maanta tsinani Ø–ant–zi–ri roori antawae–rontsi
F–COEXP woman 3F.S–do–REA–REL 3F work–NMLZ
o–kiwaant–zi–ro kòtsironáaki Ø–onkotsi–t–zi payantzi kaniri
3F.S–polish–REA–3F.O pot 3F.S–cook–&–REA banana cassava
o–pishi–t–zi–ro o–panko
3F.S–sweep–&–REA–3F.O 3F–house
'However, women, the work they do is polishing pots, cooking banana and cassava and sweeping their house.' (CTK)

(747) **Imáantakya** riintzi rira..., konoya?
i–maanta=kya ri–intzi ri=ra konoya
M–COEXP=EMPH M–REST M=MED yellow-footed.tortoise
'But then, are there only yellow-footed tortoises?' (CMM)

In (746), the speaker had been talking about the usual occupations of men in his community; now he talks about the women's occupations, and he introduces it with *omaanta* in order to stress the difference from men's occupations. In (747), the counter-expectative meaning implies that the speaker wants to contrast the existence of yellow-footed tortoises with the non-existence of other animals –although this contrast is difficult to find in the conversation–; the masculine version is used because animals are involved.

7.4.2.1.5. Time clauses

A typical way of forming a temporal subordinate clause is with the temporal subordinator suffix *-ra*. An example is in (748), where *-ra* is attached to the totalitative copula *-kaa-* to yield the meaning 'when you are'.

(748) [**Okáatzira** piheeki hanta pinámpiki], óetaka pipánkitzìri okaatzi pováyitari?
o–kaa–t–zi–ra pi–heek–i ha=nta pi–nampi=ki
3F.S–COP.TOT–&–REA–TEMP 2S–live–FRS LOC=DIST 2–community=LOC
o–eta=ka pi–panki–t–zi–ri
F–WH=INT 2S–sow–&–REA–REL
o–kaa–t–zi p–ow–a–yi–t–a–ri
3F.S–COP.TOT–&–REA 2S–eat–&–DISTR–&–REA–REL
'When you are there in your community, what's all you sow to eat?' (CMH)

The conditional enclitic *=rika*, described above in Section 7.4.2.1.3, can acquire the meaning 'when'; in this case, it introduces a temporal clause instead of a conditional clause, as in (749).

(749) Ari máaweni, rowa…, rapàtowáeyani; éehatzi [**arírika** otzimi apatotaantsi ikántzirìri, rowa…, hewari haka nampitsi].
ari máaweni ro=ra r–apato–wae–eey–a–ni éehatzi
thus all F=MED 3M.S–meet–DUR1–PL–RS.REFL–PL also
ari=rika o–tzim–i apato–t–aantsi i–kant–zi–ri–ri
AFF=COND 3F.S–EXI–FRS meet–&–INF 3M.S–say–REA–3M.O–REL
ro=ra hewa–ri ha=ka nampi–tsi
F=MED first–REL LOC=PROX community–ALI
'In this way everyone, um…, meets each other; and also when there is a meeting called by, um…, the chief here, of the community.' (CTK)

In this example, the clause introduced by *arírika* delimits the time when they meet each other: when the community chief calls a meeting. Actually, the main clause on which the subordinate is dependent is elided (to avoid the elision, the verb *rapàtowáeyani* 'they meet each other' should be repeated after *éehatzi* 'also'). As said above (Section 7.4.2.1.3), Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:257) say that some languages make no distinction between 'if' and 'when' clauses, and Ashéninka is one of them. These authors add that "in many of these languages, the neutralization holds, however, only for *predictive* conditionals and *future* time clauses". This is not the case in Ashéninka, given that the temporal subordinate in (749) expresses what happens habitually in the speaker's community.

A less usual way of forming a time clause is with the rather rare time suffix *-ant*. The only example in my corpus is in (750), where the verb with the time suffix forms the subordinate temporal clause.

(750) [Niyáatantanakàri] nònthapákari.
n–iyaa–t–ant–an–ak–a–ri n–onth–ap–ak–a–ri
1S–go–&–TIME–ABL–PFV–REA–REL 1S–find–ALL–PFV–REA–3M.O
'When I went, I ran into him.' (CMM)

Another way to build a time clause is with the past existential *éeniro*, as in (751). The use of *éeniro* combined with the remote past suffix *-ni* is a usual way to form a time clause when one speaks about the remote past.

(751) Ñáakiro, aníryò, cháantakotàki [éeniro newánkaritzìni].
ña–ak–i–ro aniryo
see–PFV–FRS–3F.O niece.sister's.daughter.VOC.ME
chaant–ako–t–ak–i[191] éeniro n–ewanka–ri–t–zi–ni
work–APPL–&–PFV–FRS EXI.PST 1S–young–M–&–REA–RMPST
'You see them (cacao pods), niece (sister's daughter), I worked in this when I was young.' (CCPC)

7.4.2.1.6. Locative clauses

The usual way to build subordinate locative clauses is with the enclitic demonstratives, as in (752). The locative clause is formed only by the verb *ikáatziyawitàga*, which, with the medial demonstrative enclitic *=ra*, yields the meaning 'where he was staying'.

(752) Ikántaka ikoyi ihápokanèemi, ráashiràtantanakàwo rowa…, inchato, [ikáatziyawitàga], tzìroryáanaki: hapo.
i–kant–ak–a i–koy–i i–hapok–an–a–e–mi
3M.S–COP–PFV–REA 3M.S–want–FRS 3M.S–jump–ABL–REG–FRS–COFA
r–aashira–t–ant–an–ak–a–ro ro=ra inchato
3M.S–slip–&–RES–ABL–PFV–REA–3F.O F=MED stake
i–kaatziy–a–wi–t–a=ra tzirorya–an–ak–i hapo
3M.S–stay–&–FRU–&–REA=MED trip–ABL–PFV–FRS IDEO:jump
'So he wanted to jump again, that is why he slipped, um…, towards the stake, where he was staying, he tripped: *hapo*.' (SCS)

The medial is the enclitic demonstrative most frequently used as a locative subordinator, but also others can be used, as the distal *=nta* in *nohéekinta* 'where I live' in (753).

[191] The root *-chaant-* is a loan from Spanish *chambear* 'work', a word used only in some American countries.

(753) Nimaeka nokoyi nokántimi [haka **nohéekinta** haka, rowa..., *comunidad* Katsinkaari], rowa..., nohéekayíni kameetha máaweni, máaweni haka, …
nimaeka no–koy–i no–kant–i–mi ha=ka no–heek–i=nta
now 1S–want–FRS 1S–say–IRR–2O LOC=PROX 1S–live–FRS=DIST
ha=ka ro=ra comunidad[192] Katsinkaari no–heek–aiy–i–ni
LOC=PROX F=MED community Chicosa 1S–stay–PL–FRS–PL
kameetha máaweni ha=ka
well all LOC=PROX
'Now I want to tell you that here, where I live, here, um…, in the community Chicosa, um…, we are all well, everyone here,…' (CTK)

In (754), the locative clause *tsikárika rowapíintziro* 'where they usually eat' is introduced by the interrogative *tsikárika*.

(754) Aréetapaka ítsipa, amitákotirìni áakotànakiròni hanta, [tsikárika rowapíintziro].
aree–t–ap–ak–a i–tsipa amitako–t–i–ri–ni
arrive–&–ALL–PFV–REA M–other help–&–IRR–3M.O–REL.IRR
a–ako–t–an–ak–i–ro–ni ha=nta
bring–APPL–&–ABL–PFV–FRS–3F.O–REL.IRR LOC=DIST
tsikárika r–ow–apiint–zi–ro
WH 3M.S–eat–HAB–REA–3F.O
'Another one arrives, who is going to help him and bring them (fruits) there, where they usually eat.' (PV)

This clause resembles a relative clause, which is a property of time, locative and manner clauses, as was pointed out at the beginning of this section on subordination. The same strategy with an interrogative introducing the locative clause is used in the elicited example (755), but with *hempe*.

(755) Nantákiro [hempe pikántakina].
n–ant–ak–i–ro hempe pi–kant–ak–i–na
1S–do–PFV–FRS–3F.O WH 2S–say–PFV–FRS–1O
'I did it where you told me (to do it).'

Also in (756), the clause whose head is *othátakota* 'she makes her bed' resembles a relative clause in which *hanta* 'there' would take the function of a relative pronoun.

[192] *Comunidad* 'community' is a Spanish word. It refers to an indigenous community, a legally recognised institution in Peru.

(756) Riyáatàshitziro raniro, [hanta othátakota omáapìintzi].
r–iyaa–t–ashi–t–zi–ro r–aniro
3M.S–go–&–PURP–&–REA–3F.O 3M–niece.sister's.daughter.MP
ha=nta o–thatako–t–a o–mag–apiint–zi
LOC=DIST 3F.S–make.bed–&–REA 3F.S–sleep–HAB–REA
'He goes to look for his niece (sister's daughter), there where she makes her bed to sleep.' (SCS)

7.4.2.1.7. Manner clauses

Adverbial clauses that express manner are infrequent and are not expressed in a particular way. Eliciting a translation from Spanish *lo hice como me dijiste* 'I did it the way you told me', I got answers rather saying 'I did what you told me'. The clearest example of a manner clause from a natural text in my corpus is in (757).

(757) [Éehatzìita ikímita chapinki], owákirani riraki iyamarámpiti, éehatzi…
éehatzi–ita i–kimi–t–a chapinki
also–ROPT 3M.S–be.similar–&–REA yesterday
owákira–ni r–ir–ak–i i–kamarampi–ti éehatzi
new–INTS 3M.S–drink–PFV–FRS 3M–ayahuasca–POSS also
'Also in the same way as yesterday, again he drinks his ayahuasca, and…' (SCS)

The head of the manner clause is the verb *ikímita* 'he is similar', and *ikímita chapinki* means here 'in a similar way as he did yesterday'. The clause indicates the manner in which the action expressed in the main clause (*riraki* 'he drinks') is carried out, and the adverbial subordination relation is evident because the subordinate clause modifies the verb of the main clause (*riraki* 'he drinks'), but there is no subordinating strategy, i.e. the clause could be a main clause if it were isolated and the context were suitable.

In (758), the subordinate clause explains how the action expressed by the main clause is carried out, so it can be considered a manner clause. In this case, the manner clause receives no special marking and is simply juxtaposed to the main clause.

(758) Antawaétatzi [owámetatzìri iryániériki].
Ø–antawae–t–atzi Ø–owame–t–atzi–ri i–rya–ni–eriki
3F.S–work–&–PROG 3F.S–teach–&–PROG–3M.O M–small–ADJ–DIM.PL
'She's working teaching small children.' (CMH)

7.4.2.2. Relative clauses, and the relative *-ri* and the irrealis relative *-ni*

Andrews (2007:206) defines a relative clause (RC) as "a subordinate clause which delimits the reference of an NP by specifying the role of the referent of that NP in the situation described by the RC". This somewhat complex definition can be summarized with the one mentioned above by Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007:238): relative clauses "function as modifiers of nouns", so that it might also be said that they function as adjectives, at least with the typical semantic adjectival function of denoting properties of nouns. In this section, I describe the clauses that meet these definitions.

Relative clauses are usually formed with the relative suffix *-ri* on the verb. A typical example is in (759), where the relativized verb *oñáashirènkanàri* modifies the noun *kooko* 'maternal uncle'.

(759) Naaka…, ríitaháantakìma rira kooko [oñáashirènkanàri].
naaka rii–t–ahaant–ak–i=ma ri=ra kooko
1 3M–&–LAM–PFV–FRS=DUB M=MED maternal.uncle.VOC.FE
oñaashirenk–a–na–ri
annoy–REA–1O–REL
'I…, so this is the uncle (maternal) who annoyed me (lamenting herself).' (SCS)

In (760), there are two relative clauses, one embedded inside the other one.

(760) Awihéeyèni ríraga, [**amitákotakirìri** inkáganki [**paryákotéentsiri**] awótsikì].
awih–eey–i–ni ri–raga
pass–PL–FRS–PL M–CAT.DEM
amitako–t–ak–i–ri–ri inkáganki pari–ako–t–eentsi–ri awotsi=ki
help–&–PFV–FRS–3M.O–REL before fall–APPL–PTCP.PFV–REL path=LOC
'Those pass by, who helped before the one who had an accident on the path.' (PV)

The clause with *amitákotakirìri* as head modifies the NP formed by the cataphoric demonstrative *ríraga* 'those', and the clause formed only with the verb *paryákotéentsiri* modifies the object of *amitákotakirìri*, which is omitted and can be seen in the English translation as 'the one'. *Paryákotéentsiri* is formed with the perfective participle suffix *-eentsi*, which is a common way to build relative clauses (with both perfective and imperfective participle suffixes, which are described in detail in Section 6.3.6). According to Andrews (2007:222), omission is a very common occurrence in NPs modified by relative clauses. The omission of the referent

NP of *paryákotéentsiri* occurs in a clause with a verb with a participle suffix, but this is not a necessary condition, as can be seen in (761), where the referent NP of the relative clause formed only with *piñáathari* 'the one you love (boyfriend)' is not mentioned (the referent would be 'the man' or 'the one') and the verb has no participle suffix.

(761) Haka pihéekaki éenitatsi [piñáathari] *o* tekatsi?
ha=ka pi–heek–ak–i eeni–t–atsi
LOC=PROX 2S–be.in.a.place–PFV–FRS EXI–&–PTCP.IPFV
pi–ñaath–a–ri o tekatsi
2S–love–REA–REL or NEG.EXI
'Do you have here a boyfriend or not? (CMH)

In (762), two relative clauses form a copular relation. Both might be considered nominalized verbs. Actually, the relativized verb *owámetàntatsìri* is a neologism that means 'teacher' and whose literal meaning is 'the one who teaches', so it is fully used as a noun.

(762) [**Owámetakinàri**] [**owámetàntatsìri** poñínkari hanta kirinka].
owame–t–ak–i–na–ri owame-t–ant–atsi–ri
teach–&–PFV–FRS–1O–REL teach–&–OCC–PTCP.IPFV–REL
poñ–inka–ri ha=nta kirinka
hail.from–ADJZ–M LOC=DIST downriver
'The one who taught me is a teacher (one who teaches) who hails from there downriver.' (CMH)

Examples (761), (762) and the second clause of (760) are what Andrews (2007:213) calls "free RCs", which lack what he calls a "domain nominal", which is the modified NP, which is present in (759) and the first clause of (760).

An example of a negated relative clause is in (763), where the negative copula is used to negate the relativized verb.

(763) Haka nopókapàki nìyotapákiro osheki [kaari **niyótziròri** hanta nonámpiki].
ha=ka no–pok–ap–ak–i n–iyo–t–ap–ak–i–ro osheki
LOC=PROX 1S–come–ALL–PFV–FRS 1S–know–&–ALL–PFV–FRS–3F.O much
kaari n–iyo–t–zi–ro–ri ha=nta no–nampi=ki
NEG.COP 1S–know–&–REA–3F.O–REL LOC=DIST 1–community=LOC
'I've come here and I've learnt many things that I didn't know there at my community.' (CMH)

The relativized verb *niyótziròri* cannot be negated with the realis negator *tee*, and this is consequent with the semantic similarity of relativized and nominalized verbs, given that a noun has to be negated by a negative copula and not by the realis negator.

As said in Section 5.3, the relative suffix is a common occurrence in many adjectives, so that they may be viewed as a sort of relative clause. Besides adjectives that usually bear a relative suffix, such as the one in (764) (marked with square brackets, as an RC), other adjectives can also bear it, as in (765), where the adjective *mantsiyari/mantsiyawo* (m./f.), one of the few that is inflected with gender, bears the imperfective participle and the relative suffixes, thus clearly forming a relative clause modifying the noun *ashéninka*.

(764) Irika [tháyirikà] sheripyari tee ikoyi ishitoyi.
i–ri=ka thayi–ri=ka sheripyari
DEM–M=PROX cheating–REL=PROX shaman
tee i–koy–i i–shitoy–i
NEG.REA 3M.S–want–FRS 3M.S–go.out–FRS
'This cheating shaman doesn't want to go out.' (SCS)

(765) Éehatzi tzimatsi mántsiyàri, [mántsiyàritátsiri] ashéninka.
éehatzi tzim–atsi mantsiya–ri
also EXI–PTCP.IPFV ill–M
mantsiya–ri–t–atsi–ri a–shéninka
ill–M–&–PTCP.IPFV–REL INCL–fellow.person
'There were also ill people, Ashéninka who were ill.' (SCS)

The fact that many adjectives have a relative suffix is quite logical if we consider that adjectives can function like verbs forming a predicate, so that the translation in (764), instead of 'this cheating shaman', might be 'this shaman who is cheating'.

A relative suffix on the verb is the normal way to build a relative clause, but it can also be built without this suffix, as in the free RC in (766) or the RC modifying a demonstrative in (767).

(766) Aurencio, ríitaki [riyómetàki naari mampaantsi].
Aurencio rii–t–ak–i r–iyome–t–ak–i naa–ri mamp–aantsi
Aurencio 3M–&–PFV–FRS 3M.S–teach–&–PFV–FRS 1–TOO sing–INF
'Aurencio, he is the one who taught singing also to me.' (CMH)

(767) Ikantzi: "Irira [ròmaryáaka]".
i–kant–zi i–ri=ra r–o–maryag–ak–a
3M.S–say–REA DEM–M=MED 3M.S–CAUS–lie–PFV–REA
'They say: "That one whom they've laid down". (SCS)

While an RC without the relative suffix is unusual, these examples show that the suffix can be omitted and the clause continues to be grammatical.

In all the examples above, the relative clauses meet the definition given at the beginning of this section in that they delimit the reference of an NP. Andrews (2007:207) mentions the so-called *non-restrictive relative clauses*, which do not meet this definition because they make a comment "about an NP or other constituent". He adds that these clauses in English differ from true relative clauses "in a variety of respects, such as having pauses to set them off from their surroundings. But in some other languages, such as Japanese, the same construction seems able to function as both a relative clause and a non-restrictive relative". Non-restrictive relatives in Ashéninka show no morphological nor syntactic difference with true relatives, yet the existence of differences in pauses similarly to English would need a detailed study of prosody that is beyond the goals of this thesis. In (768), the relative clause is a non-restrictive relative formed with the verb *amitákotirìni* 'who is going to help him', with the relative irrealis suffix *-ni*, and a complement clause.

(768) Aréetapaka ítsipa, [amitákotirìni [áakotànakiròni hanta, tsikárika rowapíintziro]].
aree–t–ap–ak–a i–tsipa amitako–t–i–ri–ni
arrive–&–ALL–PFV–REA M–other help–&–IRR–3M.O–REL.IRR
a–ako–t–an–ak–i–ro–ni ha=nta
bring–APPL–&–ABL–PFV–FRS–3F.O–REL.IRR LOC=DIST
tsikárika r–ow–apiint–zi–ro
WH 3M.S–eat–HAB–REA–3F.O
'Another one has arrived, who is going to help him to bring them (fruits) there, where they usually eat.' (PV)

This relative clause is non-restrictive because it is an addition to the statement of the main clause: saying that *another* one has arrived delimits the arriving person in that he is different from the one that has appeared till now in the story, and the relative clause describes this person. Considering that the relative clause is restrictive would imply that the restricted NP is *ítsipa* 'another one', and the meaning would be that someone who is going to help has already arrived and now another one who is going to help arrives (compare the translation in the example with 'another one who is going to help […] has arrived'). The irrealis relative suffix in the two verbs in (768) has the same function as the relative *-ri*, albeit in an irrealis situation (future in this case).

The previous examples show that relative clauses can modify any constituent: in (759), the copula complement (*kooko* 'maternal uncle'); the first clause of (760) modifies the subject (*ríraga*, cataphoric demonstrative), and the second, the omitted object; in (761) and (765), the subject of an existential; the two clauses of (762) are both free RCs forming a copular relation, so that one is the copula subject and the other one the copula complement; in (763), the object (*osheki* 'many things') is modified; in (766), the RC is a free RC in the function of a copula complement, and, in (767), the modified element is an NP in a verbless clause that can be considered a copula complement ('it is that one', and 'it is' is omitted) –I have not mentioned (764) because it is a typical adjective.

As the previous examples in this section show, the usual position of a relative clause is following the NP that it modifies, but, in a few cases in my corpus, relative clauses have occurred before the modified NP. One of them is in (765), where the RC is formed by an adjective acting as a predicate and with full verbal inflection (participle besides the relative suffix), but I also have two occurrences of RC before the modified NP with verbs in my corpus. One is in (769), where the RC formed only by the verb *ayíitapákiri* modifies the demonstrative *irika* 'this one (m.)'.

(769) [Ayíitapàkiri] irika, ikántètziri…, inintakòri…
ayiit–ap–ak–i–ri i–ri=ka
go.down–ALL–PFV–FRS–REL DEM–M=PROX
i–kant–e–t–zi–ri i–nintakori
3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3M.O 3M–follower
'This one who has come down, how to say…, his follower…' (SCS)

As was explained in Section 7.3.3, questions with the interrogative *íita(ka)* usually trigger the relative suffix on the verb. An example is in (770).

(770) Ñani, ha, íitaka **pántziri**?
ñani ha iita=ka p–ant–zi–ri
brother-in-law.VOC.ME hey WH=INT 2S–do–REA–REL
'Hey, brother-in-law, what are you doing?' (TSJ)

These verbs with *íita(ka)* and the relative suffix can be considered to form a free RC, so that the more literal translation of the question in (770) would be 'what is what you're doing?', where *pántziri* 'what you are doing' is the free RC.

In (771), *iita* is used in a series of indirect questions, and the clauses that it introduces have a clearer relative character, as the English translation shows: while,

in English, these clauses are formed differently from direct interrogatives, in Ashéninka, their form is the same.

(771) Ótsipa iita..., ótsipa pikántinàri, rowa..., [iita **rowari**], [iita **rantéyirini** shirámpari], [iita **antéyirini** tsinani].
o–tsipa iita o–tsipa pi–kant–i–na–ri ro=ra iita r–ow–a–ri
F–other WH F–other 2S–say–IRR–1O–REL F=MEDWH 3M.S–eat–REA–REL
iita r–ant–eey–i–ri–ni shirámpari
WH 3M.S–do–PL–FRS–REL–PL man
iita Ø–ant–eey–i–ri–ni tsinani
WH 3F.S–do–PL–FRS–REL–PL woman
'What else…, what else that you tell me…, um…, what they eat, what the men do, what the women do.' (CTK)

As described in Section 6.7.2, the resultative suffix *-ant* triggers the relative suffix on the verb. In the example with the time suffix in (750), the verb carries the relative suffix, so it is likely that the time suffix also triggers a relative suffix, although I do not have data to state it with certainty. As *owámetàntatsìri* 'teacher' in (762) shows, the relative suffix is used in words that may be viewed as nominalizations: *owámetàntatsìri* is a relativized verb that literally means 'the one who teaches', but it is a neologism devised to be the translation of the Spanish noun *maestro/profesor* 'teacher'. Example (735), repeated here for convenience as (772), shows a way to build a purpose clause without the resultative suffix *-ant*, but with the future suffix *-atyee* and the relative *-ri*. Since the resultative *-ant* triggers the presence of a relative suffix, it might happen that the replacement of *-ant* with the future *-atyee* to express purpose also triggers the relative *-ri*, but I have not researched this possibility, so it is only a tentative deduction of the construction in (772).

(772) Hame, hame rowa..., hame onkótsiti rowa..., niha, [atàatyéeriri ishìyatyéeri, waaka]".
hame ro=ra hame Ø–onkotsi–t–i ro=ra niha
HORT.INCL F=MED HORT.INCL INCL.S–cook–&–IRR F=MED water
a–ta–**atyee**–ri–**ri** i–shiy–**atyee**–**ri** waaka
INCL.S–burn–FUT–3M.O–REL 3M.S–run–FUT–REL cow
'Let's, let's, um…, let's cook, um…, water, to burn the cows so that they run.' (SCFF)

7.4.2.3. Complement clauses

Noonan (2007:52) defines complement clauses (CC), which he calls "sentential complementation", as "[…] the syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate. For our purposes, a predication can be viewed as an argument of a predicate if it functions as the subject or object of that predicate." In this section, I describe the Ashéninka clauses that fit Noonan's definition.

It is no wonder that there are in my corpus many complement clauses with object function and only one with subject function, which is the only argument of an existential. Only by checking Noonan's (2007:52-150) long book chapter on complementation can we see that all examples of complement clauses with subject function are in English except two in Irish, while the rest of the examples in several different languages show complement clauses with object function. This implies that Noonan may not have been able to find complement clauses with object function in languages different from English and Irish.

Roughly half of all complement clauses in my text corpus are objects of the modal verb *kowaantsi* 'want', as in (773), where the CC with *piyótiro* as head has in turn a CC, which is an indirect interrogative clause.

(773) Haa, pikoyi [piyótiro [hempe noheeki nonámpiki]].
hee pi–koy–i p–iyo–t–i–ro
AFF 2S–want–FRS 2S–know–&–IRR–3F.O
hempe no–heek–i no–nampi=ki
WH 1S–live–FRS 1–community=LOC
'Yes, you want to know how we live in our community.' (CMH)

The verb *pikoyi* has a CC with the verb *piyótiro* as head, which in turn has a CC with the verb *noheeki* as head.

Ashéninka CCs usually need no complementizer, [193] except in indirect interrogative clauses, as the second CC in (773), and in clauses introduced with *arírika* with the meaning 'whether' (776); complement clauses are juxtaposed to the main clause and the verb of the CC keeps its full inflection. This kind of CC without a

[193] Noonan (2007:55) defines *complementizers* as words, particles, clitics or affixes "one of whose functions it is to identify the entity as a complement".

complementizer is what Noonan (2007:59) calls "sentence-like complement types", defined as "one that without its complementizers has roughly the same syntactic form as a main clause". Indeed, all CCs in this section could be main clauses if their complementizers were removed, in the few cases in which these are used. The only difference is the irrealis inflection in CCs that are the object of the verb *kowaantsi* 'want'. In the rest of CCs, when the RS suffix is not fossilized, the RS inflection depends on the RS semantic situation. All CCs with the verb *kowaantsi* represent an irrealis situation because they express a desire. Noonan (2007:146) says that "all languages have an S-like [sentence-like] indicative complement type, and all languages have some sort of reduced complement type in opposition to the indicative". Regarding Ashéninka, the irrealis inflected CCs might be considered this complement type in opposition to the indicative according to Noonan's (2007:61-65) description of the difference between indicative and subjunctive sentence-like complements. However, the non-existence of RS opposition in roughly half of the verbs and the fact that only a suffix is the difference between realis and irrealis complements makes that the Ashéninka complement clauses call into question Noonan's generalization for *all* languages, given that, when the RS suffix is fossilized, Ashéninka lacks the reduced complement alleged by him.

Besides *kowaantsi* 'want', there is the other modal verb, *mataantsi* 'can' (see Section 6.4.1), which can also have a CC, as in (774), where the CC is formed only by the verb *iñáathèyani*.

(774) Tee imátanàhe máaweni [iñáathèyani].
tee i–ma–t–an–ah–a máaweni i–ñaath–eey–a–ni
NEG.REA 3M.S–can–&–ABL–REG–REA all 3M.O–play–PL–RS–PL
'No one can go on playing.' (CTK)

An example with a complement clause that functions as an object of a non-modal verb is in (775) with the verb *kemaantsi* 'feel, hear'. The complement clause has the adjective póshini 'tasty' as head, verbalized with the perfective and the RS suffixes.

(775) Ikématzìro manitzi [póshinitàki yatharékitho].
i–kem–atzi–ro manitzi poshi–ni–t–ak–i i–yatharékitho
3M.S–feel–PROG–3F.O jaguar tasty–ADJ–&–PFV–FRS 3M–testicle
'The jaguar is feeling that his testicle (the squirrel's) is tasty.' (TSJ)

As was mentioned in Section 7.4.2.1.4 and illustrated with example (743), a complement clause with object function can be introduced with the conditional enclitic *=rika* with the meaning 'whether'. Another example is in (776), where the NP *oshékitapàe tsimeri* 'abundant animals' is the predicate of the CC introduced by *arírika* with the meaning 'whether'. Actually, this CC is the referent of *roori* 'something', which is the object of *nokántimi*, which in turn is a CC of the modal verb *nokói*.

(776) Éehatzi roori nokói nokántimi, [arírika oshékitapàe tsimeri].
éehatzi roori no–koy–i no–kant–i–mi
also 3F 1S–want–FRS 1S–say–IRR–2O
ari=rika osheki=tapae tsimeri
AFF=COND many=ABUND animal
'I also want to ask you something, whether there are abundant animals.' (CMM)

An existential verb can also have a CC, as is shown in (777), where the verb *nóokanahi* is fully inflected.

(777) Tekatsi [nóokanahi].
tekatsi n–ook–an–ah–i
NEG.EXI 1S–leave–ABL–REG–FRS
'I have no one to leave (looking after her house).' (CMM)

In turn, an existential clause can also be a complement clause, as in (778).

(778) Noshíyakàwita [tekatsi hanta].
n–oshiy–aka–wi–t–a tekatsi ha=nta
1S–seem–CAUS–FRU–&–REA NEG.EXI LOC=DIST
'It seemed to me (erroneously) that there aren't there (any animals). (lit.: I made it seem that…)' (CMM)

In this example, the verb of the main clause has a causative suffix, and the resulting state of the causative relation[194] is expressed through a complement clause with the negative existential *tekatsi* as predicate. In the long example (724) above, of which the relevant fragment is reproduced in (779), the complement expresses the resulting state of the causitivized verb *ikìmitakáantawitakàwo*.

[194] As Noonan (2007:76) points out, "causative predicates like *force* are understood to have three arguments: an agent, a patient and a resulting state".

(779) … yatharékitho ikìmitakáantawitakàwo [róotaki, rowa…, ikántètziro…, róoperotàki kameetha iyátharèkitho], …
i–yatharékitho i–kimi–t–aka–ant–a–wi–t–ak–a–ro
3M–testicle 3M.S–seem–&–CAUS–RES–&–FRU–&–PFV–REA–3F.O
roo–t–ak–i ro=ra i–kant–e–t–zi–ro roo–pero–t–ak–i
3F–&–PFV–FRS F=MED 3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3F.O F–VER–&–PFV–FRS
kameetha i–yatharékitho
good 3M–testicle
'… given that he has made it seem (being false) that it is, um…, how to say…, that his testicle was really good (tasty), …' (TSJ)

The complement clause starts with *róotaki*, then the speaker utters two fillers and then he replaces *róotaki* with *róoperotàki* and forms the clause, where *róoperotàki* acts as a copula linking *iyátharèkitho* 'his testicle' and *kameetha* 'good'. This complement clause is the object of the factitive object[195] of the causative relation, which I illustrate with its translation in English and the syntactic function of each constituent in the subscript: 'He$_S$ made it$_O$ [seem [that his testicle was really tasty]$_O$]$_{FACTITIVE\ OBJECT}$'.

There is no instance of a complement clause in subject function in my corpus, but, when I asked how to say to someone 'I'm pleased to have met you', the translation was a sentence with a complement clause with subject function, which is shown in (780).

(780) Ónimotàkina [niyótakimi].
o–nimo–t–ak–i–na n–iyo–t–ak–i–mi
3F.S–like–&–PFV–FRS–1O 1S–know–&–PFV–FRS–2O
'I'm pleased to have met you.'

The verb 'like' in English has as subject the individual who likes, but, in Ashéninka, as in Spanish, the individual who likes is the object (cf. English 'I like Peru' with Spanish *me gusta el Perú*, where the subject is *el Perú* and the 1st person object is *me*). In this way, the subject in (780) is the complement clause *niyótakimi*, cross-referenced in the verb of the main clause with the 3rd person feminine subject prefix *o-*, and the object is indexed with the 1st person object suffix *-na*.

[195] Noonan (2017:83) defines factitive objects by saying that they "are found with three-place, manipulative predicates, where they represent the state or action brought about by the subject's activity on the direct object".

7.5. Discourse connectors

Fernández (2011), in her Master's thesis based on fieldwork in the Gran Pajonal, makes a detailed study of several discourse connectors:[196] *omaanta*, *róomache*, *kantzimáitacha*, *opoñaaka*, *róhatzi*, *iróotaki* and *éehatzi*. *Omaanta* (*o-maanta*, F-COEXP) and *éehatzi* 'also' have been analysed in sections 7.4.2.1.4 and 3.9 of this thesis, respectively. *Róohatzi* (with long /o/ according to my fieldwork) 'and then' is described in this section. *Róotaki* (*roo-t-ak-i*, F-&-PFV-FRS) is the form in my corpus for Fernández's *iróotaki*, and it is also analysed in this section. Regarding the other three (*róomache*, *kantzimáitacha* and *opoñaaka*), they do not occur exactly with this form in my text corpus, but some related forms do occur, and they and their relation to Fernández's connectors are studied in this section. The verbal copula *kantaantsi*, not mentioned in Fernández (2011), often plays the role of discourse connector, which is described in Section 6.10.1.

Of the words mentioned above, *róohatzi* is the one that has a sole discourse connector function without an additional function, and its meaning can be translated as 'and then', so that it is used to link the parts of a story. Examples (781) and (782) from the same story are shown with their respective previous utterance so as to appreciate its linking function.

(781) Ráatsimiyapàakiri, ráatsimiyàkiri, ráatsimiyàkiri. **Róohatzi** ipíyantàna. Hápokana: hapo.
r–aatsimiy–apa–ak–i–ri[197] r–aatsimiy–ak–i–ri
3M.S–suck.to.cure–ALL–PFV–FRS–3M.O 3M.S–suck.to.cure–PFV–FRS–3M.O
róohatzi i–piy–ant–an–a hapok–an–a hapo
and.then 3M.S–come.back–RES–ABL–REA jump–ABL–REA IDEO:jump
'He sucks him to cure him (as he arrives), sucks him to cure him, sucks him to cure him. And then he goes back. He jumps: *hapo!*' (SCS)

In this example, a shaman is curing people by sucking the part of their bodies where their alleged illness is. Immediately after he finishes, he returns to the place he came from (allegedly from heaven) by jumping. The connector *róohatzi* gives the story agility in that it expresses the uninterrupted continuity of both events.

---

[196] All words from Fernández (2011) in this section are adapted to the orthography used in this thesis.

[197] A shaman cures by sucking the damaged part of a sick person's body. The stem *-aatsimiy-* expresses this way of sucking.

(782) Apátziro áakiro. Pokaki okáakìni. **Róohatzi** òntsirokapáakari, ròntsirokapáakawo, **Róohatzi** ohéetàntawakàri anákira, máaweni ipooki, ohéetakiri: shaau.
apátziro a–ak–i–ro pok–ak–i okáakini róohatzi
only take–PFV–FRS–3F.O come–PFV–FRS close and.then

Ø–ontsirok–apa–ak–a–ri r–ontsirok–apa–ak–a–ro
3F.S–approach–ALL–PFV–REA–3M.O 3M.S–approach–ALL–PFV–REA–3F.O

róohatzi o–hee–t–ant–aw–ak–a–ri ana–kira máaweni
and.then 3F.S–throw–&–RES–OM–PFV–REA–3M.O genipap–LIQ all

i–poo=ki o–hee–t–ak–i–ri shaao
3M–face=LOC 3F.S–throw–&–PFV–FRS–3M.O IDEO:liquid.falling
'She has only taken it (genipap). He comes close. And then she approaches him, he approaches her. And then she throws him the genipap paste, on his whole face, she throws it to him: *shaau*!' (SCS)

Róohatzi appears twice in the account of this series of events that take place immediately after each other, and this is precisely the function of *róohatzi*: it makes clear that the events happen immediately after each other, and this gives the story a certain pace, so that it becomes more interesting and thrilling for the listener. *Róohatzi* can be abbreviated to *rooha* (783) and even to *roo* (784). Fernández (2011:96, 99) also shows examples with the abbreviated *rooha*.

(783) Ikantzi: "Náakataki". **Rooha** ràwihántanàka.
i–kant–zi naaka–t–ak–i rooha r–awih–ant–an–ak–a
3M.S–say–REA 1–&–PFV–FRS and.then 3M.S–pass–RES–ABL–PFV–REA
'He says: "I am". And then he passes.' (SCS)

(784) Hàtáki ráatsimiyìri mantsiyari. **Roo** ithónkanàkiro. Hápokanàka.
ha–t–ak–i r–aatsimiy–i–ri mantsiya–ri
go–&–PFV–FRS 3M.S–suck.to.cure–FRS–3M.O ill–M

roo i–thonk–an–ak–i–ro hapok–an–ak–a
and.then 3M.S–finish–ABL–PFV–FRS–3F.O jump–ABL–PFV–REA
'He goes to suck the ill to cure them. And then he finishes. He jumps.' (SCS)

The examples above show that *róohatzi* and *rooha* usually trigger the resultative suffix on the following verb, except for the first *róohatzi* in (782). It is remarkable that, in three instances of the abbreviation *roo* in my text corpus, none of them triggers the resultative suffix on the following verb.

Although Fernández (2011:101-10) names a chapter of her thesis "Iróotaki", she says that its realization is *róotaki* (p. 101), and this is indeed the form that occurs in all instances in my corpus. The initial *i* occurs in other Ashé-Ashá varieties that do

not allow words with initial *r* (see Section 2.7.7). This word is segmented *roo-t-ak-i* (3F-&-PFV-FRS), so it is a verbalization of the 3rd person feminine pronoun *roori*, and its meaning is the one that its parts express: 'that is'. This meaning favours its use as a discourse connector. One example of this use is in (785), while a use more representative of its verbal nature is in (786).

(785) Ikantzi: "Irira ròmaryáaka". **Róotaki** ràwihántaka.
i–kant–zi i–ri=ra r–o–maryag–ak–a
3M.S–say–REA DEM–M=MED 3M.S–CAUS–lie.down–PFV–REA
roo–t–ak–i r–awih–ant–ak–a
3F–&–PFV–FRS 3M.S–pass–RES–PFV–REA
'They say: "That one who is lying down". Right away he passes.' (SCS)

(786) Nopánkitzìri kaniri, payantzi..., **róotaki** nopánkitzìri hanta nonámpiki.
no–panki–t–zi–ri kaniri payantzi
1S–sow–&–REA–3M.O–REL cassava banana
roo–t–ak–i no–panki–t–zi–ri ha=nta no–nampi=ki
3F–&–PFV–FRS 1S–sow–&–REA–REL LOC=DIST 1–community=LOC
'What I sow is cassava, banana…, this is what I sow there in my community.' (CMH)

Róotaki in (785) was translated with Spanish *con la misma*, a colloquial expression which can be roughly translated in English with 'right away'. In this case, *róotaki* has the function of a discourse connector, but, in (786), its meaning is the literal translation of its parts, i.e. 'it is'. The masculine version is *ríitaki*, which is used with the meaning 'he is', as in (787), where *ríitaki* has the conditional enclitic *=rika* attached to yield the meaning 'whether he is'.

(787) Náminawàkiríita kyáaryoperòrika **ríitakirìka** rira…, ikántètziri…, poñínkari henoki.
n–amin–awak–i–ri–ita kyaaryo–pero=rika rii–t–ak–i=rika
1S–look–DES–FRS–3M.O–ROPT true–VER=COND 3M–&–PFV–FRS=COND
ri=ra i–kant–e–t–zi–ri poñ–inka–ri henoki
M=MED 3M.S–say–IMPS–&–REA–3M.O hail.from–ADJZ–M up
'I want to look (check) whether it is really true whether he is, um…, how to say…, coming from heaven.' (SCS)

The feminine version *róotaki* is much more frequent because it can denote a neuter subject, i.e. 'it is' or 'that is'.

Fernández's (2011:72-79) *róomache* does not occur with this form in my corpus, but the reduced form *rooma* does occur, as well as *-mache*, one of the two morphemes of which *róomache* is composed (the other morpheme is the 3rd person feminine

roo-). Fernández's interprets (2011:73) *róomache* as denoting contrast, but I disagree with this interpretation. Mine is explained in Section 6.11.

Fernández's (2011:85-94) *opoñaaka* is an inflected form of the verbal root *-poñ-* 'hail from'. Payne's multidialectal dictionary (1980:107) shows the verb *poñaantsi* with the meaning 'hail from', but also with "acontecer, suceder" 'happen', which is the one proner to function as discourse connector. I have many instances of *poñaantsi* with the meaning 'hail from', but none with 'happen', or, at least, this is my interpretation, although there is a dubious occurrence, shown in (788).

(788) **Opoñáshitaka** paata thonkánaka iroka kenkitharentsi.
o–poñ–ashi–t–ak–a paata thonk–an–ak–a
3F.S–happen–PURP–&–PFV–REA later finish–ABL–PFV–REA
i–ro=ka kenkitha–rentsi
DEM–F=PROX tell–NMLZ
'It happened later that this meeting finished.' (OS)

The form similar to Fernández's *opoñaaka* is the bold-marked *opoñáshitaka* (pronounced [opoˈŋaʃtaka]). When I was transcribing and translating this story with a speaker, I asked him whether this *opoñáshitaka* was the same as *opoñaka*, thinking that the purposive *-ashi* might be included in this verb, but he said that *opoñaka* has a different meaning. That is why I have considered *-poñashi-* a single stem. No definitive conclusions can be drawn from only one instance, but it might be the case that *opoñaka* as discourse connector has evolved to *opoñáshitaka* in the Ucayali by adding the purposive suffix and freezing it, so that *-poñ-* 'hail from' and *-poñashi-* would be two stems with different meanings.

Regarding Fernández's *kantzimáitacha* (2011:80-84), she cites Payne (1989:375), who divides this word as "cant(z)-imai(t)-ach-a-Ø". I would divide it and gloss it as *kant-imai-t-acha* (COP-COEXP-&-PTCP.IPFV). Payne translates it as "pero sin embargo sucedió" 'but, however, it happened'. Fernández (2011:80-81) shows several alternative forms with the same meaning: *rókantzimáitacha*, *kantzimaeta*, *rókantachári*, *kantacha* and *kantachari*. Moreover, she cites Kindberg (1980:46) to show the Tambo-Ene form *iro kantaincha*. I have attested in my text corpus the form *róokantácha*, which is described in Section 7.4.1.3, on adversative clauses. Indeed, this conjunction introduces an adversative clause, and their different forms must reflect local or even personal variations.

Summing up, of all the discourse connectors treated in Fernández (2011) and in this section, the one that has a more purely discourse connector function without any additional meaning is *róohatzi*, given that it just introduces the following clause and gives the story agility, while the others link clauses but have some particular meaning, that is why I have included them in other sections in which their particular meanings are described.