

Copyright  
by  
Cynthia Irene Anderson Hansen  
2011

The Dissertation Committee for Cynthia Irene Anderson Hansen certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**Expressing reality status through word order:  
Iquito irrealis constructions in typological perspective**

Committee:

---

Nora C. England, Supervisor

---

Patience L. Epps, Supervisor

---

Lev D. Michael

---

Stephen M. Wechsler

---

Anthony C. Woodbury

**Expressing reality status through word order:  
Iquito irrealis constructions in typological perspective**

**by**

**Cynthia Irene Anderson Hansen, B.A., M.A.**

**DISSERTATION**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
The University of Texas at Austin  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

May 2011

To the remaining speakers of Iquito for the knowledge they have shared and to the  
Thesis Fairy for getting me this far.

## Acknowledgments

I offer my thanks first to the Iquito Language Documentation Project *especialistas*: Ema Llona Yareja, Jaime Pacaya Inuma, Hermenegildo Díaz Cuyasa, and Ligia Inuma Inuma. They provided hours of patience and perspective to this *ájiiti*, and I thank them for their persistence and friendship. Without them, there would be no Iquito Language Documentation Project and thus no impetus for this dissertation.

I am also grateful to the entire ILDP team for their assistance and support as I collected my data and developed my analysis. I especially thank Chris Beier and Lev Michael for their endless encouragement in the field and back home. Project veterans Mark Brown, Lynda de Jong Boudreault, and I-wen Lai provided insight on both the analysis of Iquito and survival in the field for which I am truly grateful. I also thank Rosalba Solís and her family for receiving me in Lima at all hours of the day and night.

My dissertation committee co-chairs, Nora England and Pattie Epps, have provided steady guidance through this process, pointing me to references and challenging me to move beyond my process of discovery into a well-crafted analysis. I thank them for their kind words and willingness to push me forward, even when I felt like I wasn't making progress. My committee members, Lev Michael, Steve Wechsler, and Tony Woodbury, have each helped me to think about the Iquito reality

status alternation in a new way, and I thank them for their support and insights.

My undergraduate research assistant, Kelsey Neely, was an incredible help to me in managing my data. She spent hours annotating and cataloguing my field notes, typing up texts, and sifting through dictionaries and sketches. Her willingness to take on new tasks is astounding, and I appreciate the enthusiasm with which she approached our work together.

I also want to thank Martin Haspelmath, Masha Polinsky, Jeff Good, and Tom Ernst for taking the time to meet with me and offer their insights on word order alternations and syntax, and I thank Peter Austin for being generous with his Sasak data and analysis. My typological survey in Chapter 5 is stronger because of their contributions.

Jessica White-Sustaíta provided hours of accompaniment along this journey for which I am truly grateful. Words cannot express the value of her friendship over the course of our graduate careers, but especially over the past two years, as we wrote together and became intimately knowledgeable of each other's dissertation topics. I believe the areas where our work intersect are not coincidental, and I look forward to many more years of collaboration in the future.

Taryne Hallett has been a constant cheerleader and good friend since my first year of graduate school and our first trip to the jungle in 2004. She has provided a sympathetic ear whenever I needed it, been willing to make dinner when my workload was stressful, and helped me to keep things in perspective. Thank you for your stories, laughs, and encouragement along the way.

My other fellow dissertators, Kate Shaw, Sarah Wagner, and Sarah Kaufman, have also helped me stay on track, as have numerous friends who simply said “you can do it”. Thank you for having faith in me.

My family has been incredibly patient with me and I thank them for their love and understanding. My sister Linnea calmed me during many frantic and cranky phone calls and my dad continuously expressed his confidence in my ability to finish. This dissertation would not have happened without my husband Patrick and his immense support. He was willing to make finishing my dissertation our number one priority which meant he cooked more than his fair share of gourmet meals, washed enormous piles of laundry, dealt with my piles of papers and library books, cleaned, cheered me on, and disappeared when needed so that this dissertation could be completed. Thank you for everything. I am so blessed to have you in my life, and I am so happy to have you by my side on this journey.

And finally, I thank the late Dr. Leslie Jarmon for giving a workshop on her six-step method for academic writing. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

**Expressing reality status through word order:  
Iquito irrealis constructions in typological perspective**

Publication No. \_\_\_\_\_

Cynthia Irene Anderson Hansen, Ph.D.  
The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisors: Nora C. England  
Patience L. Epps

Iquito, a highly endangered Zaparoan language of the Peruvian Amazon, exhibits a typologically unusual word order alternation that marks the grammatical category of reality status (i.e. the distinction between realized (realis) and unrealized or hypothetical (irrealis) events). This alternation is the only reliable marker of the category; Iquito does not employ morphology to mark the realis/irrealis distinction. While the word order of Iquito realis constructions is reliably SVO, the word order of irrealis constructions does not fall into one of the canonical orders. It is characterized by an element (X) intervening between the subject and the verb, resulting in the order SXV.

In this dissertation, I provide a detailed description and analysis of the realis/irrealis word order alternation. Using data from both elicitation and texts that I collected while in the field, I describe the types of elements that occur in the preverbal position of the irrealis construction, determine what unifies these elements,



and establish which element of the sentence will occur in this position and what conditions this choice. Relying on the available data for the other languages in the family, I examine the expression of reality status in these languages and discuss how reality status comes to be associated with word order. I also provide a survey of other languages exhibiting similar word order alternations and discuss how they compare to the alternation we see in Iquito, concluding that Iquito is an example of an “ideal” word order alternation because word order is the *sole* indicator of the grammatical category with which it is associated.

# Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Chapter 1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Overview of the phenomenon . . . . .	1
1.2 Background on Iquito . . . . .	3
1.2.1 Sociolinguistic profile . . . . .	3
1.2.2 Typological profile . . . . .	5
1.2.2.1 Alignment and word order . . . . .	5
1.2.2.2 Tense and aspect marking . . . . .	7
1.2.3 Previous research . . . . .	8
1.2.4 Orthography . . . . .	14
1.3 Reality status . . . . .	14
1.3.1 Defining reality status as a grammatical category . . . . .	14
1.3.2 The expression of reality status in Iquito . . . . .	17
1.4 Sources of data for the current study . . . . .	20
1.4.1 Data from the text corpus vs. data from elicitation . . . . .	20
1.4.2 Methodology for collecting and presenting reliable and accurate data . . . . .	22
1.4.3 Source codes included with each example . . . . .	25
1.5 Outline of the dissertation . . . . .	26

<b>Chapter 2. What occurs in the irrealis position</b>	<b>27</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	27
2.2 The basics . . . . .	29
2.2.1 Objects . . . . .	30
2.2.1.1 Pronouns . . . . .	30
2.2.1.2 Bare nouns . . . . .	35
2.2.1.3 Possessed nouns . . . . .	41
2.2.1.4 Objects of nonfinite complements . . . . .	46
2.2.2 Predicate complements . . . . .	48
2.2.3 Postpositional phrases . . . . .	49
2.2.4 Orientational clitic phrases . . . . .	55
2.2.5 Adverbs . . . . .	60
2.2.6 Negation . . . . .	65
2.3 Adding modifiers . . . . .	71
2.3.1 Modified objects in the irrealis position . . . . .	73
2.3.1.1 Noun phrases modified by adjectives . . . . .	73
2.3.1.2 Noun phrases modified by quantifiers . . . . .	76
2.3.1.3 Noun phrases modified by multiple modifiers . . . . .	79
2.3.2 Modified postpositional phrases . . . . .	82
2.3.3 Modified orientational clitic phrases . . . . .	85
2.4 When the irrealis position is empty . . . . .	90
2.5 Speaker preferences for filling the irrealis position . . . . .	92
2.6 Summary . . . . .	96
<b>Chapter 3. Determiner behavior</b>	<b>99</b>
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	99
3.2 Background . . . . .	102
3.2.1 Terminology . . . . .	102
3.2.2 Iquito determiners: On the cline between demonstrative pro- nouns and definite articles . . . . .	104
3.3 Grammaticalization of demonstratives . . . . .	112
3.4 Split determiner behavior (outside of the irrealis position) . . . . .	118
3.4.1 Determiners split by postpositions and other clitics . . . . .	119

3.4.2	Determiners split within possessive phrases . . . . .	126
3.4.3	Determiners split by verbs . . . . .	131
3.5	Split determiner behavior in the irrealis position . . . . .	136
3.5.1	Determiner object phrases in the irrealis position . . . . .	138
3.5.2	Determiner postpositional phrases in the irrealis position . . .	144
3.5.3	Determiner possessive phrases in the irrealis position . . . . .	148
3.5.3.1	Possessive prefix strategy . . . . .	151
3.5.3.2	Noun juxtaposition strategy . . . . .	152
3.5.4	Complex determiner possessive/postpositional phrases in the irrealis position . . . . .	169
3.6	Conclusion . . . . .	174
<b>Chapter 4.</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>177</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	177
4.2	Information structure and the irrealis position . . . . .	178
4.2.1	Information structure is independent of reality status . . . . .	178
4.2.2	Interaction of focus with the irrealis position . . . . .	184
4.3	Analyzing the Iquito reality status alternation in terms of movement .	190
4.3.1	Verb movement . . . . .	191
4.3.2	“X” movement . . . . .	193
4.4	Comparative data . . . . .	194
4.4.1	Arabela . . . . .	196
4.4.1.1	Reality status marking in Arabela . . . . .	196
4.4.1.2	Word order in Arabela . . . . .	205
4.4.2	Záparo . . . . .	207
4.4.2.1	Reality status marking in Záparo . . . . .	207
4.4.2.2	Word order in Záparo . . . . .	207
4.4.2.3	A note about the Záparo future particles . . . . .	213
4.4.3	Summarizing the comparative data . . . . .	216
4.5	Historical origins of the Iquito alternation . . . . .	218
4.5.1	Phonological reduction as a trigger for word order shift . . . . .	219
4.5.2	Insubordination . . . . .	224
4.6	Conclusion . . . . .	231

<b>Chapter 5. Putting the Iquito reality status alternation in typological perspective</b>	<b>232</b>
5.1 Introduction . . . . .	232
5.2 Types of word order alternations . . . . .	233
5.3 Grammatical categories conveyed by word order alternations . . . . .	237
5.3.1 Reality status . . . . .	238
5.3.2 Negation . . . . .	242
5.3.3 Aspect . . . . .	245
5.3.4 Definiteness . . . . .	251
5.3.5 Problematic alternations . . . . .	255
5.3.5.1 Volitionality of subjects in Waurá . . . . .	255
5.3.5.2 Modality . . . . .	256
5.4 Conclusion . . . . .	258
<b>Chapter 6. Conclusion</b>	<b>261</b>
6.1 Major contributions of the dissertation . . . . .	263
6.2 Areas for future research . . . . .	265
6.3 Parting thoughts . . . . .	267
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>Appendix A. Introduction to the text collection</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>Appendix B. Amicaáca qui camíraata iícuarîî (AMC)</b> <b>‘Tomorrow I will go upriver’</b>	<b>271</b>
<b>Appendix C. Mi papá y las taricayas (MPT)</b> <b>‘My father and the taricaya turtles’</b>	<b>276</b>
<b>Appendix D. Quia núquiica niatíja cuúquima (NNC)</b> <b>‘You will become a mother’</b>	<b>287</b>
<b>Appendix E. Quí quia saquiîniî quí-maquîîni (QMJ)</b> <b>‘I will tell you my dream’</b>	<b>291</b>
<b>Appendix F. Quia-níyaaca (QNI)</b> <b>‘Your husband’</b>	<b>300</b>

<b>Appendix G. Queiicu (QUE)</b> <b>‘Queiicu’</b>	<b>312</b>
<b>Appendix H. Jiíticari táa suhuáani quia-níyaaca (SIC)</b> <b>‘When your husband is a good person’</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>Appendix I. Saáca qui–miihuaaja qui–canasiisacari umáata cuuríqui (UCU)</b> <b>‘What I would do if I won a lot of money’</b>	<b>318</b>
<b>Appendix J. Glossary</b>	<b>325</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>326</b>
<b>Vita</b>	<b>332</b>

## List of Tables

1.1	Iquito orthography . . . . .	15
2.1	Frequency of pronominal objects in the irrealis position (2006 text corpus) . . . . .	31
2.2	Possessive prefixes . . . . .	43
2.3	Oriental clitics . . . . .	56
2.4	Order of <i>ji-cao</i> negation in realis and irrealis clauses . . . . .	69
2.5	Agreement morphology used with adjectives and quantifiers . . . . .	72
2.6	Hierarchy of elements occurring in the irrealis position . . . . .	96
3.1	Demonstrative pronouns/determiners . . . . .	105
3.2	Oriental clitic demonstratives . . . . .	123
4.1	Irrealis morphemes in Arabela . . . . .	198
4.2	The marking of reality status (RS) in the Zaparoan languages . . . . .	217
5.1	Hopper and Thompson's (1980) Transitivity Scale . . . . .	236

## List of Figures

1.1	Peru, from <a href="http://www.utexas.edu/inside_ut/peru/maps.html">http://www.utexas.edu/inside_ut/peru/maps.html</a> . . . . .	4
-----	--	---



## List of Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABL	ablative
AD	addressee
AN	animate
ANT	anticipative
APPL	applicative
AUX	auxiliary
BEN	benefactive
CAU	causative
CF	counterfactual
CLAUSE.END	marker that indicates the end of a clause
COMP	complementizer
CONT	continuative
COP	copula
DEI	deictic perfective
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
DIM	diminutive
DISCOURSE.AN	discourse anaphor
DPST	distant past
E.C.TENSE	extended current tense
EXCL	exclusive
FOC	focus
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
HAB	habitual
IMPF	imperfective
INAN	inanimate
INCL	inclusive
INF	infinitive

INST	instrumental
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
MASC	masculine
MMT.PRF	momentary perfective
MUL	multiplicative (for actions or persons)
NASRT	non-assertive
NEG	negation
NEG.ADV	negative adverbial
NOM	nominalizer
NPST	non-past
OBJ	object
ORN	orientational clitic
PART	participle
PAT	patient
PERF	perfective
PL	plural
POSS	possessor
POT	potential mood
PROG	progressive
PROP	proposition
PST	past
Q	question marker
REC	reciprocal
REL	relative pronoun
REM.PRF	remote perfective
REP	reportative
RPST	recent past
SG	singular
SP	speaker
SUB	subordinator
SUBJ	subject marker

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Overview of the phenomenon

This dissertation looks at a typologically unusual word order alternation in Iquito, a moribund language of the Peruvian Amazon. This word order alternation is used to express the grammatical category of reality status, a notional distinction between the values of ‘realis’ and ‘irrealis’ (Elliott 2000, Mithun 1995, 1999). In realis clauses, which express realized or actualized events, the subject and the verb must be contiguous, and it is ungrammatical for any sentential element to occur between them. Thus, realis clauses are characterized by consistent SVX order,<sup>1</sup> as demonstrated by the realis clause in (1.1).

- (1.1) *Nu= raati-qui-∅ nuú.* (SVX order; realis)  
3SG= drink-PERF-E.C.TENSE 3SG  
‘She drank it.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 299)

In contrast, irrealis clauses, which express unrealized, hypothetical, or imagined events, are characterized by an SXV order, where the subject and verb must be

---

<sup>1</sup>Objects typically follow the verb, but may precede the verb in focused constructions. Other sentential elements may immediately follow the verb, such as adverbs and adverbial phrases, which is why I use the label SVX instead of the more canonical SVO.

separated from each other by an intervening element. These clauses are frequently SOV, as can be seen in the example in (1.2), but a number of different elements can occur in the position between the subject and the verb (as we will see in Chapter 2), such as object noun phrases, adverbs and adverbial phrases, the negation particle, and determiners. In all of these latter cases, the object follows the verb. Thus, it is inaccurate to consider this irrealis order as verb-final. Because of the variety of elements that occur between the subject and the verb, this order is referred to as SXV instead of SOV, and because this order only occurs in irrealis clauses, the position between the subject and the verb is referred to as the irrealis position.

- (1.2) *Quia*= *nu raati-qui-ϕ*. (SXV order; irrealis)  
 2SG= 3SG drink-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘You will drink it.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 252)

This word order alternation between SVX and SXV order occurs consistently in Iquito, and is the only reliable marker of reality status. It is thus typologically unusual on several grounds. First, reality status, when marked, is typically done so through morphology (Elliott 2000, Palmer 2001), not word order. Secondly, grammatical categories on the whole are rarely expressed through word order alternations (as we will see in Chapter 5). And finally, the variety of element types that alternate between the two Iquito constructions is rare; most word order alternations occur with arguments like subject or object, not a plethora of element types, like object phrases, adverbial phrases, and negation.

In this dissertation, I provide a detailed description and analysis of the realis/irrealis word order alternation in Iquito. Using data from both elicitation and

texts, as well as comparative data from other languages in the family and a survey of other languages exhibiting similar word order alternations, I describe the elements that occur in the preverbal position of the irrealis construction; determine what unifies these elements; establish which element of the sentence will occur in this position and what conditions this choice; examine the expression of reality status in other languages of the family; discuss how reality status comes to be associated with word order; and discuss how this alternation compares to other word order alternations cross-linguistically.

## **1.2 Background on Iquito**

### **1.2.1 Sociolinguistic profile**

Iquito is a member of the Zaparoan language family along with Andoa, Arabela, and Záparo.<sup>2</sup> Andoa is likely extinct, although C. Beier and L. Michael (personal communication, June 2006) have been informed of two living Andoa speakers in Peru.<sup>3</sup> Arabela, Iquito, and Záparo survive today, but are highly endangered. There are at most 75-100 speakers of Arabela, 25-35 speakers of Iquito, and fewer than ten speakers of Záparo.

Although Iquito was once spoken in a wide area of the northern Peruvian Amazon, it is now only spoken in four communities in the Peruvian state of Loreto:

---

<sup>2</sup>There is insufficient data to include Taushiro, Omurano, and Aushiri as members of the Zaparoan family (Michael 2009 and L. Michael, personal communication, April 2011), although other authors include them in their classification (e.g. Campbell 1997 and Wise 1999). Cahuarano, which is sometimes classified as a separate language, is considered by Iquito speakers to be a dialect of Iquito.

<sup>3</sup>Details about the extent of these speakers' language command remain unknown.

San Antonio del Pintuyacu, Atalaya, Saboya, and Nina Rumi. Research for the current study comes from the community of San Antonio, where the majority of the remaining speakers live. This community is located on the banks of the Pintuyacu River, about 120 km west of Iquitos (see Figure 1.1), and has approximately 310 residents. Less than ten percent of these residents are native speakers of Iquito, and all of these speakers are over the age of sixty (in 2011) and bilingual with Spanish.



Figure 1.1: Peru, from [http://www.utexas.edu/inside\\_ut/peru/maps.html](http://www.utexas.edu/inside_ut/peru/maps.html)

Like many of the other languages spoken in this region, including other members of the Zaparoan language family, Iquito is on the verge of becoming extinct. Speakers of Iquito are grandparents and great-grandparents. Their adult children have a passive knowledge of the language but rarely speak it, and younger generations have little, if any, knowledge of the language. Efforts to implement

language classes in the local school have been sporadic and largely unsuccessful. It is anticipated that the language will die with the current generation of speakers.

In recognition of the moribund status of Iquito, community members sought out help from a team of linguists to document the language before it was lost completely. The Iquito Language Documentation Project (ILDP) was established in 2002 as a collaborative effort between members of the community of San Antonio and linguists from The University of Texas at Austin as well as the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos in Lima, Peru, and was largely funded by the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme of the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project. Extensive linguistic fieldwork was conducted in San Antonio each summer from 2002 to 2006 by the team, working primarily with four speakers: Hermenegildo (Hermico) Díaz Cuyasa, Ligia Inuma Inuma, Ema Llona Yareja, and Jaime Pacaya Inuma. Because work was done as a team, a great deal of documentation was completed in a relatively short period of time. I have been a member of the ILDP team since 2004 and traveled to San Antonio in 2004, 2006, and 2008. (I provide more detail on these trips in Section 1.4.) For more information about the ILDP, visit <http://www.cabeceras.org/indexiquito.html>.

## **1.2.2 Typological profile**

### **1.2.2.1 Alignment and word order**

Iquito exhibits nominative-accusative alignment. Grammatical relations between arguments and the verb are determined by the position of arguments within the clause and not by case marking. Non-core arguments are marked by postposi-

tional enclitics that indicate their semantic relationship to their associated verbs. The language is mainly dependent-marking, but it displays some head-marking features, including two (rarely used) applicative suffixes and prefixal possessor-marking on possessums.

Word order is fairly fixed and predictable, although Iquito word order does not succinctly fit into the typological generalizations that have been made about word order. The most frequent and least marked word order in Iquito is SVO, and I maintain (along with Lai (2009: 46)) that this is the basic word order. This order can be seen in (1.3); the subject in this sentence is *icuáni* ‘man’ and the object is *pápaaja* ‘fish’.

- (1.3) *Icuáni asaa-∅ pápaaja maacuáarica.*  
 man eat.IMPF-E.C.TENSE fish slowly  
 ‘(A) man eats fish slowly.’ (E.LII.CIA.260704)

However, other constituent orders in Iquito do not consistently pattern like those found in ‘typical’ VO languages. For example, Comrie (1989: 95) points out that VO languages tend to have prepositions, whereas Iquito only has postpositions, and VO languages tend to exhibit Noun-Genitive order, whereas Iquito exhibits the reverse, as in (1.4). In this example, the object phrase *Massiela niyíni* ‘Massiela’s son’ occurs in the irrealis position and exhibits Genitive-Noun order.

- (1.4) *Amicaáca quí= Massiela niyíni cariínii-rii-∅.*  
 one.day.away 1SG= Massiela son take.care.of-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will take care of Massiela’s son.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2367)



Such variability is not completely unexpected for SVO languages. As Comrie (1989: 96) notes, “the existence of SVO word order does not seem to correlate particularly well with any other parameter. Knowing that a language is SVO, we can predict virtually nothing else.” Therefore, I do not consider it problematic that Iquito does not pattern exclusively like SVO languages.

In addition to the SVO word order discussed above, there are three other possible word orders found in Iquito. One is the SXV word order we see in irrealis clauses (an example of which is given above in (1.4)). This order is predictable in that it only occurs in the expression of the irrealis. Information structure is responsible for the other two word orders: focused NPs occupy a dedicated pre-subject focus position, and topicalized arguments occupy positions at the clause margins (with a preference for the left edge of the clause). When core arguments are topicalized, a resumptive pronoun occurs in the corresponding argument position.

#### **1.2.2.2 Tense and aspect marking**

Main clauses in Iquito are obligatorily marked for tense and aspect via verbal suffixes. Aspect morphemes follow the verbal root and any derivational morphology it might carry, and tense is marked after aspect. I refer the reader to Lai (2009) for a detailed description of the Iquito tense and aspect system. Here I summarize the components of that description that are relevant for the purposes of this dissertation.

Iquito makes a distinction between perfective and imperfective aspect. The general perfective is marked by *-qui* or by a null ( $-\emptyset$ ) allomorph if the verb stem

ends in a long vowel. The null allomorph is also found with the recent past tense suffix *-cura*. Iquito exhibits several additional aspectual morphemes that combine the perfective with other meanings, such as the deictic markers *-huii* (*-cuhuii* is an allomorph found in the irrealis) and *-cuaa*. These suffixes encode perfective aspect and motion towards the speaker and away from the speaker, respectively. Other perfective portmanteau morphemes include the momentary perfective *-rii*, the remote perfective *-maa*, and the ablative perfective *-(y)arii*. The imperfective is marked by lengthening the stem-final vowel (when that vowel is short) or by adding the suffix *-yaa* (when that vowel is long). It is marked by *-aa* when followed by the recent past tense suffix *-cura*.

There are three main tense categories in Iquito: the distant past, the recent past, and the extended current tense. The distant past is realized as a portmanteau morpheme that also expresses aspect; this morpheme is *-quiaqui* with perfective aspect and *-(y)aariqui* with imperfective aspect. The recent past tense is expressed by the suffix *-cura*. The extended current tense is realized by zero-marking ( $-\emptyset$ ) in all cases. It is described as a non-pre-hodiernal tense, placing events in a temporal span extending from dawn of the day into the indefinite future. In cases of extended current tense, reality status marking serves to distinguish between present and future temporal reference.

### **1.2.3 Previous research**

Very little documentation work existed on Iquito before the formation of the ILDP. Two linguists from the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) worked on Iq-

uito in the 1960s, but their work resulted in very few published resources. The most widely accessible of these resources is Eastman and Eastman (1963), a tagmemic analysis of Iquito totaling 47 pages. A brief mention of the reality status alternation is made in this work, but it is referred to (incorrectly) in terms of future-tense marking: “subject and predicate are interruptible in a future-tense clause. In fact, interruptibility of the subject-predicate nucleus is the marker of future tense; i.e. object or any optional tagmeme except negative, permissive, and apposition, when it occurs, normally occurs between subject and predicate” (Eastman and Eastman 1963: 159). While the Eastmans are correct in acknowledging that the “interruptibility” of the subject-predicate nucleus occurs with elements other than objects, they do not list what these elements are beyond “object or optional tagmeme.” Furthermore, the negative particle *caa* is in fact allowed in the irrealis position, as I will show in Chapter 2.

The examples that the Eastmans provide to illustrate this contrast are given below: the realis order can be seen in (1.5) and the irrealis order in (1.6). Their orthography and gloss is given in the first line. I normalize each example to the ILDP orthography in the second line and provide the interlinearized gloss in the third line with a free translation following that.

(1.5) nuusiwáán<sub>ARAA</sub> áákari (‘he-arrived today’)

*Nu= sihuaáni-rii-ø ácari.*  
 3SG= arrive-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE now  
 ‘He arrived today.’ (Eastman and Eastman 1963: 159)

(1.6) núú áámikááka siwáánΛΓΛΛ ('he tomorrow will-arrive')

*Nu= amicaáca sihuaáni-rii-φ.*

3SG= tomorrow arrive-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE

'He will arrive tomorrow.' (Eastman and Eastman 1963: 159)

Some other examples of the irrealis order found in the Eastmans' article are included below in (1.7) and (1.8), which both show an object in the irrealis position, and in (1.9), which shows an adverb in this position.

(1.7) kί kíaasaakáánii sákumatááni don robérto. ('I you-will-tell-a-story in-turn, Don Roberto.')

*Quí= quia saaquínii-φ-φ sacumatáani, Don Roberto.*

1SG= 2SG tell-PERF-E.C.TENSE opposite Don Roberto

'Then I will tell you a story, Don Roberto.' (Eastman and Eastman 1963: 150-2)

(1.8) kί kíaasíwΛΛrakúwΛΛ imΛΛrááni. ('I you-will-visit again.')

*Quí= quia síhuiira-cuhuii imiráni.*

1SG= 2SG visit-DEI.PERF again

'I will come and visit you again.' (Eastman and Eastman 1963: 153)

(1.9) kiááhana pÁÁ namíini namirΛΛkiáána ('you we first will-anoint')

*Quiáaja=na pi= namiini namii-rii-φ=quiaana.*

2SG=REP 1PL.INCL first reciprocate-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE=REP

'We will first anoint you.' (Eastman and Eastman 1963: 162)

Another work that draws from the Eastmans' data is Wise (2005), which discusses the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Záparo, Arabela, and Iquito. This survey is, however, very superficial, as examples from one language are used to be representative of the entire family, and none of the sentential examples come from Iquito. The reality status alternation is not mentioned in this article, although Wise (2005: 56) states that the word order in all three languages varies according to pragmatic factors as well as "other factors".

Since the formation of the ILDP in 2002, there has been considerable research conducted on Iquito. This work has resulted in five volumes of unpublished manuscripts titled: *Estudios del Idioma Iquito* (2003); *Estudios del Idioma Iquito 2004, Tomos I-II* (2004); and *Estudios del Idioma Iquito 2005, Tomos I-II* (2005). This work includes over 1,300 pages of language description and analysis (divided into 94 grammar modules), a dictionary consisting of roughly 3,500 words, numerous texts, and six chapters of pedagogical materials. A brief phonological and orthographic sketch, the 2006 version of the dictionary, and the 2006 text collection can be found online at [http://www.cabeceras.org/ildp06\\_product.html](http://www.cabeceras.org/ildp06_product.html).

These works serve as the basis for several Master's theses, three *Tesis de Licenciatura*, and one dissertation, and have been consulted for the present study as well. *Topics in Iquito Syntax: Word Order, Possession, and Nominal Discontinuity* by Mark C. Brown (2004), *Adverbs and phrase structure in Iquito* by Cynthia Hansen (2006), *Time in the Iquito Language* by I-wen Lai (2009), and *Exploiting word order to express an inflectional category: Reality status in Iquito* by Chris-

tine Beier, Cynthia Hansen, I-wen Lai, and Lev Michael (in press) exhibit the most overlap with the present study and are summarized below.

Brown (2004), a 175-page unpublished Master of Arts Thesis completed at The University of Texas at Austin, focuses largely on the distribution of nominal phrases, possessive constructions, and discontinuous determiner phrases. He does discuss the reality status alternation, but does so largely in terms of an SVO/SOV alternation, rather than an SVX/SXV alternation. He acknowledges that the term SOV is somewhat of a misnomer for the irrealis constructions (Brown 2004: 161), but does not provide much detail on the other element types that can occur in the irrealis position. He also argues that the two orders can be reconciled into one underlying order and claims that the irrealis position is also available in realis clauses immediately after the verb. I disagree with this latter statement, maintaining instead that the irrealis position, found between the subject and the verb in irrealis clauses, is unique to irrealis clauses. I do, however, believe that there is a relationship between irrealis and realis clauses, since the element types that can occur in the irrealis position are found post-verbally in corresponding realis clauses. This argument is explained in more detail in Beier et al. (in press).

Hansen (2006), a 92-page unpublished Master of Arts Thesis completed at The University of Texas at Austin, focuses on the distribution of adverbs in both realis and irrealis clauses and proposes a phrase structure analysis for Iquito based on these distributions. Hansen does not, however, elaborate on the full range of element types or discuss the limits of the irrealis construction.

Lai (2009), a 611-page unpublished dissertation completed at The Univer-

sity of Texas at Austin, presents a detailed account of the Iquito temporal system, looking at the structural and semantic characteristics of tense, aspect, and mood. Reality status is one component of this system, and while Lai does discuss the word order alternation in some detail, she does not test the limits of the construction, and refers the reader to previous analyses (i.e. Anderson et al. 2006, the precursor to Beier et al. (in press)) for more detail.

Finally, Beier et al.'s (in press) paper demonstrates that word order alone expresses the category of reality status. While the authors provide more detail on the element types found in the irrealis position and place the reality status alternation in a typological context, they do so in an abbreviated way. In contrast, the current study provides much more detail on the limits of the irrealis construction and speaker preferences for what can occur in this position. It also provides a more thorough survey of the typology of word order alternations as well as an analysis of reality status and word order in the sister languages of Iquito.

Other works on Iquito include *La Formación de Palabras Mediante la Derivación en Iquito* by Edinson Y. Huamancayo Curi (2005), *El acento y tono en la Lengua Iquito* by Karina N. Sullón Acosta (2005), *The Iquito clause: Simple and multi-verb constructions* by Lynda De Jong Boudreault (2006), *Fundamental aspects of the Iquito language* by I-wen Lai (2006), *A paradigm of event modality: The Iquito continuum* by Taryne Hallett (2007), and *Algunos aspectos discursivos de la coherencia funcional en los textos narrativos Iquito* by Sisi Bautista Pizarro (2007). Huamancayo Curi (2005), Sullón Acosta (2005), and Bautista Pizarro (2007) are *Licenciatura* theses completed at the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos

in Lima, Peru. De Jong Boudreault (2006), Lai (2006), and Hallett (2007) are Master's theses completed at The University of Texas at Austin. Additionally, Lev Michael (2009) has written an article entitled 'The semantics of clause linking in Iquito'.

#### **1.2.4 Orthography**

Iquito examples are presented in the orthography used by the ILDP, which is based on Spanish. The orthographic system and the IPA equivalents are given in Table 1.1. Additionally, Iquito exhibits lexical tone. The system is complex and still under analysis (see Michael, to appear). I have marked tone with an acute accent on lexical items wherever possible, following the analysis presented in the 2006 version of the Iquito dictionary.

### **1.3 Reality status**

#### **1.3.1 Defining reality status as a grammatical category**

Reality status is argued to be a viable grammatical category based on the notional distinction between 'realis' and 'irrealis', following analyses such as Michael (forthcoming), Elliott (2000), and Mithun (1995, 1999). The **realis** denotes realized or actualized situations (e.g. past temporal reference) and the **irrealis** denotes unrealized or unactualized situations (e.g. future temporal reference or counterfactual modality). Semantic contexts typically associated with the **realis** are positive indicative statements with non-future tenses and any event which is perceived as either having taken place or at least having been initiated (Elliott 2000: 68). The se-



Table 1.1: Iquito orthography

<b>Orthography</b>	<b>IPA</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Consonants</b>		
c	k	Used before <i>a</i> and <i>u</i>
hu	w	
j	h	
m	m	
n	n	
p	p	
qu	k	Used before <i>i</i> and <i>í</i>
r	r	
s	s, ʃ	Pronounced as [ʃ] before <i>i</i>
t	t	
y	j	
<b>Vowels</b>		
a	a	
i	i	
í	i	
u	u	
aa	a:	
ii	i:	
íí	i:	
uu	u	

mantic contexts that are commonly associated with the irrealis are potential events, conditionals, counterfactuals, epistemic and deontic modal categories, commands, negation, habituals, and interrogatives (Elliott 2000: 70). Descriptions of reality status systems are careful to note exactly which semantic contexts trigger the expression of realis or irrealis, since these contexts are largely language dependent.

Although reality status often overlaps with particular tenses, it should not be confused with the expression of temporal reference. It is possible to have realis clauses that express future temporal reference, such as cases where the event is certain to be realized. Similarly, it is possible to have irrealis clauses that express past temporal references, especially for events imagined to have happened in the past.

Not all languages make a reality status distinction. Because of this fact, and because the semantic contexts where the irrealis *is* found vary significantly cross-linguistically, some authors (e.g. Bybee et al. 1994 and Bybee 1998) have concluded that there is no realis/irrealis distinction, or at least that there is no universal category of reality status. Michael (forthcoming) provides a summary of this debate and presents a compelling argument for why reality status should in fact be accepted as a grammatical category, using data on reality status marking in Nanti, an Arawak language of the southern Peruvian Amazon. Nanti exhibits the characteristics of a “semantically self-consistent and structurally well-behaved” reality status system, making it an ideal example on the spectrum of reality status systems. While the Iquito reality status system is not as semantically consistent as Nanti, as it is possible to neutralize the distinction in some contexts, there is clear evidence that reality status is a viable grammatical category in Iquito, as it is the only explanation that consistently explains the semantic difference between SVX and SXV clauses. Thus, Iquito supports Michael’s (forthcoming) argument that reality status is a typologically valid grammatical category.

### 1.3.2 The expression of reality status in Iquito

As previously mentioned in Section 1.1, reality status is expressed in Iquito through a word order alternation. Using word order in this way is a typologically rare strategy for marking reality status, much less any grammatical category (as we will see in Chapter 5). When reality status is marked (and it is not marked in all languages), it is typically done so through (verbal) morphology (Elliott 2000, Palmer 2001).

Iquito realis clauses are expressed by a construction in which no element intervenes between the subject and the verb; the subject and verb are immediately adjacent to one another. This order is described as SVX. In contrast, the Iquito irrealis is expressed by a construction in which an element occurs between the subject and the verb, resulting in the order SXV. The element that occurs between the subject and the verb is not a syntactically unified category, which is why it is represented here as “X”. This element can be an object noun phrase, an adverb or adverbial phrase, a determiner, or a negation particle.

Minimal pairs, such as the one in (1.10), show that the alternation between SVX and SXV order is the sole marker of reality status in Iquito and that no other morphological marking is employed to convey whether a clause is realis or irrealis. In (1.10a), the determiner *ína* occurs immediately after the verb, whereas in (1.10b), this same determiner occurs immediately before the verb. In (1.10a), the sentence has a realis reading, whereas in (1.10b), the sentence has an irrealis reading. The verbal morphology and sentential arguments are identical in both sentences; the differing adverbs only serve to underscore the tense difference and force

the reality status alternation.

- (1.10) a. *Jaá nu= isíqui-ríi-ø ína iiyíí.*  
 already 3SG= break-PERF-E.C.TENSE DET rope  
 ‘S/he already broke the rope.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2451)
- b. *Amicaáca nu= ína isíqui-ríi-ø iiyíí.*  
 tomorrow 3SG= DET break-PERF-E.C.TENSE rope  
 ‘Tomorrow s/he will break the rope.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2451)

In Iquito, the irrealis construction appears in clauses that exhibit future temporal reference, as in (1.10b) above; counterfactual modality, as in (1.11) and (1.12); optative mood, as in (1.13) and (1.14); and in desiderative complements, as in (1.15) and (1.16). All other clauses are expressed via realis constructions. Many of the semantic parameters that trigger irrealis marking in other reality status systems, such as negation, conditional and interrogative modality, and imperative mood, do not do so in Iquito.

- (1.11) *Quí= tí= núquiica anitáaqui pani-ø-cura, quí= tí= nu*  
 1SG= CF= one peccary search-PERF-RPST 1SG= CF= 3SG  
*mii-yaa-ø.*  
 have-IMPF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘If I had searched for a peccary, I would have one (now).’ (Lai 2009: 158, example 256)

- (1.12) *Quí= tí= íiti iiqui-aa-cura, quí= tí= ína*  
 1SG= CF= here live-IMPF-RPST 1SG= CF= DET  
*niqui-ø-cura mîisáji.*  
 see-PERF-E.C.TENSE woman  
 ‘If I had been here, I would have seen that woman.’ (Lai 2009: 158, example 257)

(1.13) *Tácari yahuíini =jina quia= núquiica simiúmi*  
 other.indefinite day =LOC 2SG= one letter  
*nájuu-yaa-cuma.*  
 write-IMPF-POT  
 ‘(I hope) one day you will write a letter.’ (Lai 2009: 225, example 385)

(1.14) *Ca= quia= naámí cataa-cuma naji jíta cana=*  
 NEG= 2SG= leaves collect.IMPF-POT like.this how 1PL.EXCL=  
*sujurisii-yaa-φ.*  
 suffer-IMPF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘(I hope) you don’t have to collect (palm thatch) leaves like how we are  
 suffering now.’ (Lai 2009: 224, example 382)

(1.15) *Quí= nacarií-yaa-φ [Ima asúraaja asa-qui-φ].*  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE Ema yuca eat-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I want Ema to eat yuca.’ (Lai 2009: 159, example 260)

(1.16) *Saáca quia= nacarií-yaa-φ [quí= quia =íicu*  
 what 2SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 1SG= 2SG =BEN  
*mii-φ-φ?].*  
 do-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘What do you want me to do for you?’ (T.HDC.PNI.061212, lines 80 and  
 140)

The irrealis order is found with all tense markers. Lai (2009: 98) notes that clauses containing imperfective aspect always co-occur with realis order (SVX). However, she provides examples of imperfective aspect co-occurring with the irrealis order in clauses marked with the potential *-cuma*, such as (1.14) above. Thus, I conclude that while it is rare for the imperfective aspect to co-occur with the irrealis, it is in fact possible.

## **1.4 Sources of data for the current study**

My research draws on close to ten months of linguistic fieldwork that I conducted in San Antonio as a member of the ILDP. I worked with four speakers during the summer of 2004 (June-August), the summer and fall of 2006 (June-December), and the summer of 2008 (July-August). During this time, I collected over 250 hours of recorded elicitation sessions, produced over 1,600 pages of field notes, and recorded, transcribed, and translated twelve texts. These data serve as the basis for this dissertation, as do texts collected by other ILDP team members, the Iquito-Spanish dictionary compiled by the team, and analyses written by the team in the course of our fieldwork. In this section, I describe my approaches to text collection and elicitation, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of these two types of data, and I discuss my methodology for elicitation and for choosing examples for inclusion in this dissertation.

### **1.4.1 Data from the text corpus vs. data from elicitation**

Many of the texts in the ILDP corpus are historical narratives that heavily employ the realis. During the summer of 2008, I collected additional texts oriented towards the irrealis construction (e.g. non-past and hypothetical events) by asking speakers to recount their dreams, to talk about their plans for upcoming trips, and to explain the qualities of a good person/mother/husband. (These texts are included in the appendix.) I have used these texts, as well as others collected by team members, to identify the textual contexts where irrealis constructions are used.

Relying on the text corpus has both strengths and weakness. It represents

naturally occurring data that is (generally) not hampered by the researcher, and it exhibits a number of constructions that were never encountered in elicitation sessions. At the same time, some constructions rarely occur in texts, especially irrealis sentences with complex elements in the irrealis position. As a result, it is hard to determine from the text corpus alone which construction types are absent because of infrequency of use and which are absent because they are ungrammatical.

To supplement the text corpus, I also conducted elicitation sessions to probe into the limits of the irrealis construction. I use these data to describe the distribution of adverbs, complex noun phrases, and other elements allowed in the irrealis position.

My elicitation sessions were conducted in Spanish and Iquito and the degree of each language used depended on the task and my language proficiency at the time of conducting the task. Initially, I used only Spanish in my elicitation sessions, but as my proficiency in Iquito grew over time, I frequently used Iquito sentences that I had created or that other speakers had produced in prior sessions.

Elicitation is a useful methodology for testing what is possible, especially for constructions that are absent or rare in the text corpus. However, utterances collected using this methodology are more susceptible to researcher influence, as the speakers may be repeating what I am saying to validate me as a language learner, even if such utterances are not ones they would produce themselves. Speakers may also be calquing from Spanish, especially when the elicitation prompt was given in Spanish. Examples collected via elicitation are also more likely to be marginal or unnatural, even if they are grammatical, because the context of the surround-

ing utterances is frequently absent. To avoid these pitfalls, I strove for accuracy and reliability in all elicited examples by devising an elicitation methodology that avoided direct translation from Spanish. Furthermore, for presentation in this dissertation, I have selected only those examples that adhere to a fixed set of criteria. I describe my elicitation methodology and my process for selecting examples in the next section.

#### **1.4.2 Methodology for collecting and presenting reliable and accurate data**

Since many of my elicitation sessions relied on the use of Spanish, I was very aware of the possibility that Spanish could influence the examples I received from speakers, especially when eliciting word order. In order to reduce this possibility of calquing, I intentionally did not ask speakers to translate irrealis constructions from Spanish into Iquito. Instead, I asked speakers to repeat a sentence that I created in Iquito, or I asked for a sentence in the realis and then asked speakers how to say the same sentence using an irrealis-triggering adverb like ‘tomorrow’ or ‘maybe’.

I also used strategies like posing a question in Iquito and asking for speakers to tell me how they would answer it, and then ask them to rephrase the question in order to interrogate a different element. Another strategy is what I called the ‘contrarian game’: I would give speakers a sentence in Iquito and they were expected to give me a sentence that disagreed with the assertion I was making. For example, I might say ‘I am going to Iquitos tomorrow’ and the speaker would respond with ‘No, you are going to Santa Maria,’ or ‘No, you are staying here,’ or ‘Yes, and I am



going with you.’ Both the question/answer pairs and the contrarian game worked well for testing the effect of focus on the irrealis construction, but they also gave me reliable contexts for testing other aspects of the language, like possessive order, adjective order, and various verbal morphemes.

I tailored my elicitation sessions to the skills of each speaker. Hermico enjoyed sessions where we built up a dialogue, so I would give him a prompt and together we would come up with the sentences that formed a dialogue around that topic. Ema was particularly good at grammaticality judgments, so I would frequently work with her when I wanted to test the limits of a particular irrealis construction. Jaime has good metalinguistic intuitions, so I would work with him when there was a theory I wanted to test out. Ligia worked best when the topic changed frequently and she had freedom to imagine new scenarios, so I would often do the contrarian game with her.

After eliciting my examples, there were several steps I took to verify that they were in fact grammatical utterances. First, after each elicitation session, I would listen to the recording of the session and compare what I was hearing against my hand-written notes, making any necessary corrections. I checked questionable utterances with other speakers, and if there was a particular order I was trying to capture, like the order of possessive phrases with determiners, I would make sure to test this order with all of the speakers. I found Ema’s grammaticality judgments to be the most consistent and therefore reliable. Hermico was the most forgiving of my language teachers and would accept examples that I produced as a way to encourage me to speak more and improve my command of the language. As a result, I chose

not to rely on his grammaticality judgments unless he framed his response as a correction to something I had produced. In preparing this dissertation, I have also followed up on examples in my notes that now seem questionable by going back and re-listening to the recording for additional cues that I may have missed in the field. I recognize that the grammaticality judgments for some examples might be due to the nature of the elicitation setting, and I have tried to note those cases where I think elicitation is having an effect on the grammaticality of the example in the accompanying text for that example.

My criteria for selecting examples to be presented in this dissertation are as follows. I have accepted all examples that were produced without a prompt from me in Iquito. In other words, I did not say anything first in Iquito that could be responsible for the sentence from the speaker. I have accepted any example that was the result of a speaker correcting a sentence that I first said in Iquito. I have also accepted examples that exhibit identical word order to the two previous types of examples but that have different arguments, such as a different subject or object noun. Similarly, I have accepted examples that display identical word order to textual examples but that have different arguments.

I preferred examples that came from my 2008 or 2006 elicitation sessions (as opposed to 2004, my first time in the field). I also gave preference to examples from my own elicitation sessions (over elicitation sessions from other ILDP researchers), since I was able to review the recordings from these sessions more easily, and because I have a better sense of the degree of researcher bias.

I have thrown out examples where the speaker repeated what I said, unless

they were able to repeat it at least three times and with intervening content or if multiple speakers were able to verify the same example as acceptable.

I have provided English glosses with each example, based on my knowledge of Iquito as well as on the Spanish gloss provided by native speakers during elicitation sessions and text translation work. I have tried to stay true to the gloss that speakers provided without distorting the resulting English translation too much. As a result, some of the free translations are not as natural in English as they could be.

### **1.4.3 Source codes included with each example**

Each example includes a code indicating the source of that example, either from an elicitation session or a text. These codes can be found at the end of the example gloss in parentheses. Codes beginning with ‘E’ indicate that the example comes from an elicitation session; the ‘E’ is followed by the initials of the consultant, the initials of the investigator, and then the date of the elicitation session in DDMMYY format. For instance, the code (E.JPI.CIA.220704) indicates that the example comes from an elicitation session between Jaime Pacaya Inuma (JPI) and myself (CIA) on July 22, 2004. Codes beginning with ‘T’ indicate that the example comes from a text, and the ‘T’ is followed by the text code, the initials of the consultant, the line of the text that the example comes from, and the date the text was most recently reviewed (in YYMMDD format). For example, the code (T.PNI.HDC.414.061212) comes from a text labeled as PNI (Pi-caquiya niyini) from consultant Hermenegildo Diaz Cuyasa (HDC), line 414 of the version reviewed on December 12, 2006. I have relied heavily on a set of texts pub-

lished for the community and available online at [http://www.cabeceras.org/ildp06\\_textos.html](http://www.cabeceras.org/ildp06_textos.html). Additional texts that I collected as part of my fieldwork are included in the appendix to this dissertation.

## **1.5 Outline of the dissertation**

In Chapter 2, I present the majority of the elements that can be found in the irrealis position, discussing in detail the types of complements and adjuncts that occur there, as well as the limits of the construction and speaker preferences for which element to place in the irrealis position. The one element type I do not discuss in this chapter is the determiner, which I discuss in Chapter 3. I show why the determiner is problematic for making generalizations about the elements in the irrealis position and resolve this difficulty by appealing to a historical analysis of the determiner's development. In Chapter 4, I provide an analysis of how word order came to be associated with reality status from both a synchronic and diachronic perspective. I explain that the irrealis position is independent of the expression of information structure, and I discuss the alternation in terms of movement analyses. I also present comparative data from two other Zaparoan languages (Arabela and Záparo) and examine two historical processes described in the typological literature that may explain the development of the Iquito reality status alternation. Chapter 5 situates the Iquito word order alternation within a larger typology of word order alternations expressing grammatical categories. The major contributions of the dissertation and areas for future research are summarized in Chapter 6.

## Chapter 2

### What occurs in the irrealis position

#### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the realis/irrealis alternation, focusing on enumerating the types of elements that can occur in the irrealis position. I begin by looking at the most common element type, object nouns (in both pronominal and bare noun form) in Section 2.2.1, then move on to predicate complements in Section 2.2.2, postpositional phrases in Section 2.2.3, orientational clitic phrases (Section 2.2.4), adverbs (Section 2.2.5), and finally negation (Section 2.2.6). I exclude, however, a discussion of the demonstrative determiner, since I will discuss this element type at length in the next chapter. After outlining each of these basic element types, I discuss in Section 2.3 what happens with the addition of modifiers (i.e. quantifiers and adjectives) to each of these types. Then, in Section 2.4, I discuss what happens when there is no element available to intervene between the subject and the verb, as is the case with intransitive verbs consisting solely of a subject and a verb. I conclude the chapter by looking at speaker preferences for which element occurs in the irrealis position (Section 2.5).

We will see that the irrealis position occurs with verbs of all valencies and can be filled by a variety of different elements of various lengths and complexity.

I will argue that what unifies these elements is that they are all phrases. I will also show that only one phrase can occur in this position at a time.

Additionally, I address the claim made by Beier et al. (in press) that the element in the irrealis position must be able to occur immediately to the right of the verb of a corresponding realis clause, such that given an irrealis clause in which an element X is located in the irrealis position, there is a corresponding realis clause in which X is found immediately to the right of the verb, as illustrated by the diagram in (2.1). A few examples will be problematic for this analysis, namely indefinite/generic recipients of ditransitive verbs and *caa -ji caa* negation, which I discuss in Sections 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.6, respectively.

(2.1) *Irrealis* : *Realis*  
S X V : S V X

I have pulled my examples from texts whenever possible. I am drawing primarily from two text corpora. The first one is the 2006 text corpus consisting of 20 texts that were reviewed and edited by Chris Beier during the 2006 ILDP session. These are available online at [http://www.cabeceras.org/ildp06\\_textos.html](http://www.cabeceras.org/ildp06_textos.html). The second is a set of eight texts that I collected during my fieldwork in 2008. These texts are included in the appendix at the end of this dissertation.

Since a primary purpose of my research has been to test the limits of what can occur in the irrealis position, I have needed to rely on elicited examples as well. The examples from texts have mostly short, single word elements in the irrealis

position, and as such, they suggest what speakers' preferences are. But there are many more possibilities, as this chapter will show.

Many of these examples are hard to elicit because they are at the boundaries of what is possible for speakers. I have tried to be methodologically certain that they are grammatical, meaning that I am only including examples that fit my criteria, as outlined in Chapter One.<sup>1</sup> As a result, the examples are not presented in a paradigm format; they will have all types of verbal marking and I will not provide realis counterparts for most of them.

## **2.2 The basics**

The 2006 text corpus consists of 2,333 lines of text, and each line roughly corresponds to a clause. (There are some lines that have two clauses and others where the clause is split across two lines, and they essentially balance each other out.) In a survey of this corpus, I found 142 clauses that have the irrealis position filled by an element. If we assume that each line represents a clause, then the number of clauses that have an element in the irrealis position is about 6% of the corpus, making up a very small portion of the total number of clauses. In this section, I outline what these elements are, focusing on the basic and most frequent element types: objects, predicate complements, postpositional phrases, orientational clitic phrases, adverbs, and the negation particle.

---

<sup>1</sup>Chapter One also provides an explanation of the codes used for labeling the source of each example.

## 2.2.1 Objects

In the 2006 text corpus, the element type that occurs most frequently in the irrealis position is object noun phrases. In this section, I focus on the following object types: pronouns, bare nouns, possessive phrases, and objects of non-finite complements. There are two other object types that I will discuss later on: modified noun phrases in Section 2.3.1 and determiner noun phrases in Chapter 3.

### 2.2.1.1 Pronouns

In the 2006 text corpus, pronominal objects are overwhelmingly the most frequent element in the irrealis position, occurring in 93 clauses out of a total of 142 clauses (65%). All of the personal pronouns are represented, but the third person singular pronoun *nu* is by far the most frequent, with 51 occurrences. This figure represents more than a third (36%) of all of the element occurrences in the irrealis position in this corpus and more than half (55%) of all of the pronominal objects. These figures are summarized in Table 2.1, which also shows the figures for all of the pronominal objects.

Examples showing each of the personal pronouns occurring in the irrealis position are given below in (2.2) through (2.8), and the discourse anaphor is shown in (2.9).

#### First person singular

(2.2) *Quia= quí sthúira-cuaa-∅ amicaáca.*  
2SG= 1SG visit-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE one.day.away



Table 2.1: Frequency of pronominal objects in the irrealis position (2006 text corpus)

PRONOUN	# OF OCCURRENCES	% OF TOTAL PRONOUNS	% OF CORPUS
1SG	13	14%	9%
2SG	22	24%	15%
3SG	51	55%	36%
1PL.INCL	1	1%	<1%
1PL.EXCL	1	1%	<1%
2PL	2	2%	1%
3PL	2	2%	1%
DISCOURSE ANAPHOR	1	1%	<1%
TOTAL	93	100%	65%

‘You will visit me tomorrow.’ (T.PSV.HDC.061212, line 80, repeated in line 81)

### Second person singular

(2.3) *Quí= quia saaquínii-ø jíitarata quí-caquiija*  
 1SG= 2SG tell.IMPF-E.C.TENSE how 1SG-father  
*tarahuaájuu-yaáriqui.*  
 work-DPST.IMPF

‘I will tell you about how my father worked.’ (T.PSV.HDC.061212, lines 1-2)

### Third person singular

(2.4) *Quia= nu raati-qui-ø.*  
 2SG= 3SG drink-PERF-E.C.TENSE

‘You will drink it.’ (T.HM1.ELY.061212, line 22, repeated in line 24, similar sentence in T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 30)

### First person plural inclusive

- (2.5) *Tácari yahuíini=jina na= pi casticásii-φ-φ*  
other day=LOC 3PL= 1PL.INCL punish-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*nihua=íicu.*  
DISCOURSE.AN=BEN  
‘One day they will punish us (incl.) for that.’ (T.CJC.JPI.061212, line 71)

### First person plural exclusive

- (2.6) *Quia= cana miitií-φ-φ ájapaa núquiica...?*  
2SG= 1PL.EXCL give-PERF-E.C.TENSE NEG.ADV one  
‘You won’t give us (excl.) one...?’ (T.HMS.JPI.061212, line 118)

### Second person plural

- (2.7) *Quí= quina síhuíira-cuaa-φ tíira quina-iyiquiira.*  
1SG 2PL visit-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE there 2PL-living.place.towards  
‘I will visit you all there in your living place.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 494)

### Third person plural

- (2.8) *Pí= na pájuu-φ-φ nási míini.*  
1PL.INCL= 3PL show.how-PERF-E.C.TENSE *chacra* make.INF  
‘We will show them how to make a *chacra* (swidden field).’  
(T.CJC.JPI.061212, line 34)

### Discourse anaphor

- (2.9) *Na= níhua nacusi-qui-ϕ arihuatíini.*  
 3PL= DISCOURSE.AN know-PERF-E.C.TENSE obey.INF  
 ‘This (is what) they will have to know to obey.’ (T.CJC.JPI.061212, line 15)

The majority of the examples given above are clauses with transitive verbs, but (2.6) illustrates that it is possible for the object in the irrealis position to be the object of a ditransitive verb. Iquito is a primary object language, meaning that the objects of ditransitive verbs are not formally distinguished, and so I refer to them in terms of their semantic role instead of as direct or indirect objects. In (2.6), the object in the irrealis position is the recipient. Other examples of a recipient pronominal object occurring in the irrealis position of a ditransitive clause can be seen in (2.10) and (2.11). In (2.10), the recipient is the second person singular pronoun and in (2.11), it is the third person singular pronoun. Note that in each of these examples, the theme argument follows the verb.

- (2.10) *Na= quia miitíi-ϕ-ϕ itti ína mucusari.*  
 3PL= 2SG give-PERF-E.C.TENSE here DET *pucunucho*  
 ‘They will give you a *pucunucho* (a type of spicy chili pepper).’  
 (T.HDC.SA2.061212, line 151)

- (2.11) *Quí= nu jicúnii-ríi-ϕ carta.*  
 1SG= 3SG send-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE letter  
 ‘I will send a letter to her.’ (T.LII.CSE.040703, line 46)

In the text corpus, there are very few examples of themes occurring in the irrealis position and none of these examples are pronominal. I was, however, able

to elicit pronominal themes; an example can be seen in (2.12). The previous sentence in this elicitation was ‘The man will sell his canoe to the woman,’ so the first pronoun in the sentence, the subject pronoun, refers to ‘the man’ and the second pronoun, the theme, refers to his canoe. The recipient pronoun follows the verb.

- (2.12) *Nu= nu masiiti-rii-ø quiija.*  
 3SG= 3SG sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 1SG  
 ‘He [the man] will sell it [his canoe] to me.’ (E.LII.CIA.080808, p. 2239)

Finally, it is possible for the pronominal object in the irrealis position to be a resumptive pronoun associated with topicalization. In (2.13), the phrase *ína canuú* ‘this *chambira*’ occurs at the right edge of the clause. A resumptive pronoun *nu*, coreferential with *ína canuú*, occurs in the irrealis position. The phrase *ína canuú* is not an additional argument, but the sole object of the verb, and so this is an example of right-edge topicalization. (Further evidence that the resumptive pronoun in the irrealis position must be coreferential with the object is the fact that the irrealis position can never be filled by subjects.)

- (2.13) *Atiíjija quia= nu<sub>i</sub> turutií-ø [ína canuú]<sub>i</sub>.*  
 from.there 2SG= 3SG make.dry-E.C.TENSE DET *chambira*  
 ‘From there you dry this *chambira* (palm threads used for weaving).’  
 (T.ELY.JCI.061212, line 4)

Another example of right-edge topicalization where the resumptive pronoun occurs in the irrealis position can be seen in (2.14). The possessive phrase *ína mutúuru icuáni* ‘this man’s motor’ that occurs at the right edge of the clause is not

an additional argument, but the object of the verb, and is coreferential with the resumptive pronoun that occurs in the irrealis position.

- (2.14) *Quí= nu<sub>i</sub> masií-rií-∅ amicaáca [íina mutúuru*  
 1SG= 3SG buy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE one.day.away DET motor  
*icuáni]<sub>i</sub>.*  
 man  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy this man’s motor.’ (E.LII.CIA.140808, p. 2325)

It is also possible for the resumptive pronoun to be associated with left-edge topicalization, as shown in (2.15). In this example, both the object and the subject are topicalized, and the resumptive pronoun that occurs in the irrealis position is coreferential in number and animacy with the object *íina nisicáti* ‘this *aguaje*’.

- (2.15) [*Iina nisicáti*]<sub>i</sub> [*ipí mirajaárica*]<sub>j</sub> *na<sub>j</sub> nu<sub>i</sub>*  
 DET *aguaje* DET.PL.AN child.PL.DIM 3PL 3SG  
*miití-rií-∅ Marii.*  
 give-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE Maria  
 ‘This *aguaje* (type of palm fruit) these children will give to Maria.’  
 (E.JPI.TMH.080704) (E.LII.TMH.120704) (E.ELY.TMH.140704)

### 2.2.1.2 Bare nouns

The irrealis position can also be filled by a bare noun, which is any noun that occurs independently, without a possessor, modifier, or determiner. Bare nouns appeared in the irrealis position fairly infrequently in the 2006 text corpus, but they are relatively frequent in my elicitation sessions. A textual example is given in (2.16). The element in the irrealis position of this example is *íita* ‘house’, the object of the verb.

- (2.16) *Quí= íta mii-rii-ø íti.*  
 1SG= house make-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE here  
 ‘I will make a house here.’ (T.QCC.LII.061212, line 46)

I include compounds in my treatment of bare nouns, since they behave like a single phonological unit, and thus are identical to bare nouns with respect to their syntax. Examples (2.17) and (2.18) show a compound in the irrealis position. In both examples, the compound is the object of the verb.

- (2.17) *Amicaáca quí= acaayi ihuaasi tani-rii-ø.*  
 one.day.away 1SG= manatee tail weave-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will weave a manatee tail (type of fan).’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1547)

- (2.18) *Amicaáca quí= amuuni íraana*  
 one.day.away 1SG= to.kill for.NOM (*chacruna*)  
*nata-rii-ø.*  
 plant-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will plant *chacruna* (type of plant).’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1547)

In my elicited examples, bare nouns tend to have a non-specific reading. Some examples are given below. It is possible that this tendency is influenced by my elicitation prompts, in that I frequently use generic nouns when creating sentences. To determine whether or not there is in fact an influence, I would want to check their relative frequency within a larger text corpus where there are more bare nouns occurring in the irrealis position. This is not possible with the current text corpus. It is, however, common for speakers to insert a determiner when repeating a prompt

that includes a bare noun in the irrealis position, suggesting that there is a specificity issue with those elicited sentences.

(2.19) *Quí= pápaaja asa-rii-ø amicaáca.*  
 1SG= fish eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE one.day.away  
 ‘I will eat fish tomorrow.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260808, p. 2593)

(2.20) *Amicaáca pi= itíniija mii-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1PL.INCL= manioc.beer make-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*úna=jinacuma íta.*  
 DET=INSIDE house  
 ‘Tomorrow we will make manioc beer inside this house.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.080808, p. 2249)

When bare nouns are not generic, they are typically interpreted as indefinite, as in (2.16) above. I have chosen to use the term bare noun rather than indefinite noun because proper nouns, which are inherently definite, can occur in the irrealis position as well, as shown in (2.21), (2.22), and (2.23).

(2.21) *Amicaáca Pedro María quihuácuu-rii-ø.*  
 one.day.away Pedro María hug-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow Pedro will hug Maria.’ (E.HDC.CIA.180604,  
 E.JPI.MCB.310703)

(2.22) *Huaarta amicaáca quí= Jaime masiitii-rii-ø nuú.*  
 day after tomorrow 1SG= Jaime sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 3SG  
 ‘The day after tomorrow I will sell it to Jaime.’ (E.HDC.CIA.070808, p.  
 2231)

- (2.23) *Amicaáca*                      *quí=* *Ima* *miitíí-cuaa-ø*                      *ína*  
 day after tomorrow 1SG= Ema give-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE DET  
*cuuhuaá.*  
 meat  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go and give this meat to Ema.’ (E.HDC.CIA.180808, p. 2383)

Examples (2.22) and (2.23) also show that the irrealis position can be filled by a bare noun that is the recipient of a ditransitive verb. In the previous section on pronominal objects, we saw that it is possible for either a theme or a recipient pronoun to occur in the irrealis position of a ditransitive clause (although pronominal themes were absent from the text corpus). This behavior is also found with bare nouns in irrealis ditransitive clauses; either the recipient or the theme can occur in the irrealis position. If the recipient is in the irrealis position, then the theme will follow the verb and vice versa. It is ungrammatical for both arguments to occur together in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.24).

- (2.24) \**Amicaáca*    *quí=* *pápaaja Pedro* *miitíí-ø-ø.*  
 one.day.away 1SG= fish Pedro                      give-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will give fish to Pedro.’ (Brown 2004: 128, example 5.29)

Examples (2.25) and (2.26) show a bare noun recipient that is not a proper noun in the irrealis position. In both of these examples, the theme follows the verb.

- (2.25) [*Ína icuáni*]<sub>i</sub> *nu<sub>i</sub>=* *íitimira*    *miitíí-rii-ø*                      *masiána*  
 DET man                      3SG woman.PL give-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE many  
*pápaaja.*  
 fish



‘This man will give a lot of fish to the women.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2211)

- (2.26) *Amicaáca*      *quí=* *míisáji*    *masíitíi-rii-ø*                      *ína* *mutúuru*.  
 one.day.away 1SG    woman    sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE    DET    motor  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell this motor to a woman.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2169)

It is possible that the speaker chooses to put the recipient in the irrealis position because it is shorter than the theme (the theme in (2.25) is modified, consisting of a quantifier plus noun, and the theme in (2.26) consists of a determiner plus noun), but it is not clear from the elicitation context if this is in fact the case. I return to this topic of speaker preferences for phrase length in the irrealis position in Section 2.5.

In (2.27) and (2.28), the arguments are reversed. The theme is the bare noun in the irrealis position, and the recipient follows the verb. Again, it may be possible that the speaker is choosing to place the theme in the irrealis position for reasons of length; in these examples, the theme is shorter than the recipient.

- (2.27) *Amicaáca*      *quí=* *sahuíti*    *masíitíi-rii-ø*                      *íipi*  
 One.day.away 1SG= *uvilla*    sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE    DET.PL.AN  
*mirajaárica*.  
 child.PL  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell *uvilla* (Pourouma sp.) to those children.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.070808, p. 2231)

- (2.28) *Amicaáca*      *quí=* *itíniija*              *miitíi-rii-ø*  
 One.day.away 1SG= *manioc.beer*    give-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*quí-máaya*.  
 1SG-child

‘Tomorrow I will give manioc beer to my child.’ (E.LII.CIA.050808, p. 2189)

The variable ordering of themes and recipients is also seen in realis ditransitive clauses. In these clauses, the order of objects after the verb can be either THEME – RECIPIENT, as shown in (2.29), or RECIPIENT – THEME, as in (2.30).

(2.29) *Núquiica miisáji masiitii- $\phi$ - $\phi$  núriyi quiíja.*  
One woman sell-PERF-E.C.TENSE *tamishi* 1SG  
‘One woman sold me *tamishi* (twine used in weaving thatch).’  
(E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2173)

(2.30) *Jaá nu= masiitii- $\phi$ - $\phi$  quiíja nu-samúcuati.*  
already 3SG= sell-PERF-E.C.TENSE 1SG 3SG-banana  
‘S/he already sold me her/his banana.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2183)

There is, however, one exception. I was unable to elicit a realis example where the order of post-verbal objects is RECIPIENT – THEME and the recipient is indefinite or generic. Following Beier et al.’s (in press) analysis, we would not expect an indefinite/generic recipient to be able to occur in the irrealis position if it does not occur in the immediately post-verbal position of a corresponding realis clause. But it is possible for a recipient that is indefinite or generic to occur in the irrealis position (see (2.25) and (2.26)). I conclude that my inability to elicit a realis example with RECIPIENT – THEME post-verbal objects is likely due to pragmatic factors, and not because it is ungrammatical for an indefinite/generic recipient to occur in the immediately post-verbal position of a realis clause.

An object is not the only element that can occur in the irrealis position of a ditransitive clause. Other elements (such as an adverb, see Section 2.2.5, or a postpositional phrase, see Section 2.2.3) can occur in this position, in which case the order of the objects after the verb is either THEME – RECIPIENT or RECIPIENT – THEME as we saw to be the case in realis clauses. In (2.31), for instance, an adverb occurs in the irrealis position and the order of the objects after the verb is THEME – RECIPIENT.<sup>2</sup> I will discuss speaker preferences for which element will occur in the irrealis position when there is more than one option available in Section 2.5.

- (2.31) *Quí= saaminijuu–yaa–∅* [*nu cuuta masiiti–rii–∅*  
 1SG= think–IMPF–E.C.TENSE 3SG maybe sell–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*núriyí quiíja.*]  
*tamishi* 1SG  
 ‘I am thinking that s/he might sell me *tamishi*.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2173)

### 2.2.1.3 Possessed nouns

Possessed nouns are another object type that can occur in the irrealis position. There are two strategies for forming possessive phrases in Iquito, and both strategies can be used with both inalienable and alienable nouns. The first strategy is to juxtapose two noun phrases; possession in this case is not indicated via morphology, but rather by word order. There is no formal marker of possession on either noun; rather, it is the juxtaposition of the two nouns and the relative order of these nouns that convey the possessive relationship. The first noun corresponds

---

<sup>2</sup>Brown (2004: 163) indicates that the order of the objects after the verb is invariable when there is an adverb in the irrealis position, and that this order must be THEME – RECIPIENT.

to the possessor, and the second noun corresponds to the possessum. This order is the same whether the possessive construction occurs in the irrealis position, as in (2.32a), or elsewhere in the sentence, as it does in the realis clause in (2.32b).

- (2.32) a. *Amicaáca* *quí=* **samúcuami íniisi**  
 one.day.away 1SG= *sacha platanillo* flower  
*pani-rii-∅*.  
 look.for-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will look for *sacha platanillo* flower(s).’  
 (E.LII.CIA.050808, p. 2195)
- b. *Quí=* *panii-∅* **samúcuami íniisi.**  
 1SG= look.for.IMPF-E.C.TENSE *sacha platanillo* flower  
 ‘I am looking for *sacha platanillo* flower(s).’ (E.LII.CIA.050808, p. 2195)

Another example of the noun juxtaposition strategy is given in (2.33). In this sentence, the possessor is a proper name.

- (2.33) *Iína icuáni<sub>i</sub>* *amicaáca* *nu<sub>i</sub>* *Leo ííta* *tinii-rii-∅*.  
 DET man one.day.away 3SG *Leo ííta* roof-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow this man will roof Leo’s house.’ (E.HDC.CIA.150808, p. 2357;  
 E.ELY.CIA.260708, p. 2025)

The other strategy for forming a possessive phrase is to add a possessive prefix to the possessed noun, resulting in a head-marked pattern. The possessive prefixes are given in Table 2.2, and example (2.34) shows this type of possessive phrase within a realis clause. In this example, the possessor is indicated by the first person possessive prefix *quí-*, which is bound to the possessum *níyaaca* ‘husband’. Because the possessive phrase is an object in a realis clause, it follows the verb.

Table 2.2: Possessive prefixes

1 SG	<i>quí-</i> or <i>cu-</i>	1 PL (INCL)	<i>pi-</i>
		1 PL (EXCL)	<i>cana-</i>
2 SG	<i>quia-</i>	2 PL	<i>quina-</i>
3 SG	<i>nu-</i>	3 PL	<i>na-</i>

- (2.34) *Quí= paríjataáriqui quí-níyaaca tarahuajúuni.*  
 1SG= help.DPST.IMPF 1SG-husband work.INF  
 ‘I was helping my husband work.’ (T.VRA.ELY.061212, line 12)

Since the possessive prefixes are identical to the subject and object pronouns used with verbs (compare Table 2.2 to the examples given in Section 2.2.1.1), it is possible to argue that the possessive prefix strategy is identical to the noun juxtaposition strategy. Such an argument would assume that the possessive prefix strategy is still the juxtaposition of two nouns, but the possessor is expressed as a pronoun instead of as a bare noun. However, phonological processes that apply at morpheme boundaries but not word boundaries occur with these prefixal possessors, suggesting that the possessive prefix is in fact a bound morpheme and not a juxtaposed noun. For instance, in (2.35), the possessive phrase *cu-áaja* ‘my leg’ exhibits a morphophonological process that happens with the first person singular before words beginning with *a* or *aa*: instead of *quí*, it is pronounced as [k<sup>w</sup>] (represented by *cu-* orthographically).

- (2.35) *Quí= nacarii-yaa-∅* [quia **cu-áaja** *ina-qui-∅*].  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG 1SG-leg put-PERF-E.C.TENSE

‘I want you to attach my leg.’ (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 141)

Additionally, adjectives cannot occur between the possessive prefix and the possessum, but can occur between a nominal possessor and the possessum (see Section 2.3.1.1), further suggesting that the possessive prefix is a bound morpheme. A third reason for treating the two strategies as distinct is that they behave differently with the introduction of a determiner, which I discuss in detail in Chapter 3.

Both possessive strategies are found in the irrealis position. We have already seen examples of the noun juxtaposition strategy in (2.32a) and (2.33). The possessive phrase in the irrealis position in (2.35) above is formed via the prefix strategy. Additional examples of this type of possessive phrase occurring in the irrealis position can be seen in (2.36) through (2.39). The examples in (2.36) and (2.37) are transitive clauses, whereas the examples in (2.38) and (2.39) are ditransitive clauses, with (2.38) showing that the element in the irrealis position can be the theme and (2.39) showing that the element in the irrealis position can be the recipient.

(2.36) *Quia= quia-miyíti mii-φ-φ aasámu iyáaji.*  
 2SG= 2SG-*tambo* make-PERF-E.C.TENSE stream edge  
 ‘You will make your *tambo* (temporary hut) at the edge of the stream.’  
 (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 29)

(2.37) *Iipi itimira<sub>i</sub> na<sub>i</sub>= na<sub>i</sub>-mira pájuu-φ-φ...*  
 DET.PL.AN women 3PL= 3PL-children teach-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*nási=jina ihuáani*  
 swidden=LOC go.INF

‘The women should show their children how to go to the swidden field.’  
(T.CJC.JPI.061212, lines 39-40)

(2.38) *Iína miísáji nu= nu-núriyi masiitii-rii-ø ína*  
 DET woman 3SG= 3SG-*tamishi* sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE DET  
*icuáni.*  
 man

‘This woman will sell the man her *tamishi*.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2175)

(2.39) *Amicaáca quí= cu-atamajati miitii-rii-ø asúraaja.*  
 one.day.away 1SG= 1SG-sister give-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE manioc  
 ‘Tomorrow I will give manioc to my sister.’ (E.LII.CIA.050808, p. 2191)

Recursive possessive phrases can also occur in the irrealis position. For example in (2.40), the element in the irrealis position (*qui-niatija isiicu íta* ‘my mother’s friend’s house’) has three embedded possessive phrases: my mother, mother’s friend, and friend’s house.

(2.40) *Amicaáca quí= qui-niatija isiicu íta*  
 one.day.away 1SG= 1SG-mother friend house  
*iricatájuu-rii-ø.*  
 tidy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE

‘Tomorrow I will straighten up the house of my mother’s friend.’  
(E.ELY.CIA.020808, p. 2125)

The examples of possessive phrases in the irrealis position given in this section show that it is possible for an entire phrase to occur in the irrealis position and that the position is not limited to a single word. So far, I have focused solely on objects. We will see in future sections that it is possible for phrases of other types (e.g. adverbial phrases) to occur in the irrealis position.

#### 2.2.1.4 Objects of nonfinite complements

Before closing this discussion on objects in the irrealis position, I will discuss several examples found in texts where the object of a nonfinite complement clause occurs in the irrealis position of the main clause verb, such as example (2.9) above, where the discourse anaphor *nihua* is actually the object of the non-finite verb *arihuatíini* ‘obey’ and not the finite main verb *nacusiqui* ‘know’.

Beier et al. (in press) claim that the element that occurs in the irrealis position must be able to occur in the immediately post-verbal position of a corresponding realis clause. In realis clauses, the object of a nonfinite complement precedes the nonfinite verb, which means that it often immediately follows the main verb, displaying the order  $SV_{finite}[OV_{non-finite}]$ . Examples of this realis order can be seen in (2.41) and (2.42).

(2.41) *Nfinaqui nu= pica-rii-∅* [nu itipíini].  
night 3SG= finish-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 3SG chew.INF  
‘At night she finished chewing it.’ (T.PSV.HDC.061212, line 46)

(2.42) *Caa quia= pajii-∅* [quí niquíini ihuaárica].  
NEG 2SG= be.able.to.IMPF-E.C.TENSE 1SG see.INF now.and.again  
‘You are not able to see me ever again.’ (T.HMS.JPI.061212, line 197)

In irrealis main clauses, the object of the *complement* clause occurs in the irrealis position of the main clause. For example, in (2.43), the element in the irrealis position is the third person singular pronoun *nu*. It occurs before the main finite verb *piicarii* ‘finish’, but it is the object of the non-finite verb *taníini* ‘to weave’.



(2.43) *Jíticarii quia= nu pñca-rñ-ø taníni...*  
 once 2SG= 3SG finish-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE weave.INF  
 ‘Once you finish weaving it...’ (T.ELY.JCI.061212, line 9)

Similarly, in (2.44), the element in the irrealis position is the object of the non-finite verb *cuaráani* ‘to cultivate’, but it occurs before the main finite verb *apáraqui* ‘begin’.<sup>3</sup>

(2.44) *Huaari quia= nu apára-qui-ø cuaráani=jina.*  
 then 2SG= 3SG begin-PERF-E.C.TENSE cultivate.INF=LOC  
 ‘Then you will begin to cultivate it [manioc].’ (T.ELY.CHC.061212, line 15)

In (2.45), the main finite verb is *parii* ‘able to’ and its non-finite verb complement is *amuuni* ‘to kill’. The element in the irrealis position is *quí*, the first person singular pronoun, which is the object of the non-finite verb complement ‘to kill’, but it occurs before the main finite verb *parii*.

(2.45) *Ca-quiija na= quí parii-ø-ø amuuni.*  
 NEG-but 3PL= 1SG be.able.to-PERF-E.C.TENSE kill.INF  
 ‘But they won’t be able to kill me.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 506)

Example (2.46) shows that this phenomenon does not just occur with pronominal objects, but also with bare noun objects.

(2.46) *Amicaáca anuu naamí nacusi-rñ-ø taniini.*  
 one.day.away 3SG leaves know-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE weave.INF  
 ‘Tomorrow he will know how to weave leaves.’ (Lai 2009: 322-3, example 625)

---

<sup>3</sup>Nonfinite verb complements of the verb *aparaani* ‘to begin’ always occur with the clitic *=jina*.

Brown (2004: 131) indicates that it is possible for the infinitival verb to occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.47). In this example, the nonfinite complement is intransitive, and so there is no other material available to occur in the irrealis position.

(2.47) *Amicaáca*    *quí=*    *maquíini*    *nacarií-rií-ø*.  
 one.day.away 1SG= sleep.INF want-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will want to sleep.’ (Brown 2004: 131, example 5.37)

What is interesting to note is that it is unattested for the entire non-finite complement clause, consisting of the object *and* the non-finite verb, to occur in the irrealis position, even though the entire clause is the complement of the main verb.<sup>4</sup> Thus, it is not the complement of the main verb that occurs in the irrealis position, but the object of the *non*-finite verb. The resulting irrealis order,  $SOV_{finite}V_{non-finite}$ , breaks up the non-finite complement: the object of the non-finite complement is separated from the non-finite verb by the main finite verb. This is not the only scenario where we see constituents broken up by the verb. Determiners are separated from their associated nouns, which will be discussed at length in Chapter 3.

### 2.2.2 Predicate complements

Another element type that can occur in the irrealis position is a predicate complement, which typically occurs with a stative verb. Predicate complements do

---

<sup>4</sup>I have not explicitly tested for this possibility ( $S[OV_{non-finite}]V_{finite}$ ), but I expect it to be ungrammatical.

not behave like grammatical objects, which is why I treat them separately: they cannot be replaced by pronouns, nor can they become the subject of a passive sentence, as object NPs can. They are, however, semantically selected by the verb and obligatorily expressed.

Examples of a predicate complement occurring in the irrealis position can be seen in (2.48) and (2.49). In both of these examples, the predicate complement occurs with the verb *cuhuíini* ‘to become’ and is in fact a predicate adjective.<sup>5</sup> In (2.48), the predicate adjective is *amátanana* ‘strong’, and in (2.49), the predicate adjective is *ísacuana*.

(2.48) *Quia= amátanana cuúqui-ríi-ø* *quia= cuhuíini*  
 2SG= strong become–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE 2SG= become.INF  
 =íira curáaca  
 =in.order.to chief  
 ‘You need to be strong in order to become chief’ (T.JPI.CJC.061212, line 10)

(2.49) *Jíiticari nu= ísacuana cuúqui-ríi-ø=na,*  
 when 3SG sweet become–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE=CLAUSE.END  
*huaari quí= nu quiica-ríi-ø*  
 then 1SG= 3SG spit.out–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Once it’s sweet, then I will spit it out.’ (E.ELY.CIA.071106, p. 1520)

### 2.2.3 Postpositional phrases

The previous sections discussed complements that can occur in the irrealis position. I now turn to discuss adjuncts that occur in this position, focusing first on

---

<sup>5</sup>The verb *cuhuíini* ‘to become’ can also take a predicate nominal, as can be seen in the subordinate clause in (2.48), where the noun *curáaca* is the predicate complement.

postpositional phrases.

Postpositions in Iquito are clitics that attach to the last lexeme of a noun phrase, and as a result can cliticize to a noun or an adjective.<sup>6</sup> In the realis example in (2.50), for instance, there are two postpositional phrases and the postposition cliticizes to the end of the noun phrase in both cases. In the first postpositional phrase (*núquiica ajiriina=jata* ‘with one chair’), the object of the postposition is modified by the quantifier *núquiica* ‘one’, and the postposition *=jata* ‘with’ cliticizes to the noun, which occurs at the end of the noun phrase. In the other postpositional phrase (*nu-curica=jina* ‘in his hand’), the postposition cliticizes to a possessive phrase and once again it is found at the end of the phrase.

- (2.50) *Nu= jicati-rii-∅*                      *núquiica ajiriina=jata*  
3SG= leave-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE    one          chair=with  
*nu-curica=jina.*  
3SG-hand=LOC  
‘He left with one chair in his hand.’ (E.JPI.CIA.250708, p. 2007)

In example (2.51), the object of the postposition is a noun phrase that includes a phrase-final adjective; this adjective is what the postposition cliticizes to. (See also (2.137) and (2.138) later in this chapter for additional evidence that postpositions cliticize to the last lexeme of the noun phrase. In these examples, there are multiple modifiers, and the postposition cliticizes to the last lexeme, whether it is an adjective (as in (2.137)) or a noun (as in (2.138)).)

---

<sup>6</sup>When the noun is preceded by a determiner, the postposition cliticizes to the determiner, a phenomenon which I discuss in Chapter 3.

- (2.51) *Qui= muusii- $\phi$  tïra cacúti musuti-na=jina.*  
 1SG= swim.IMPF-E.C.TENSE there beach white-SG=LOC  
 ‘I am going to swim over there at the white beach.’ (E.ELY.CIA.300906)

A postpositional phrase can occur in the irrealis position of an irrealis clause. The object of the postposition can be a pronoun, as in (2.52), a bare noun, as in (2.53), a compound, as in (2.54), or a possessed noun, as in (2.55). These examples also show that the position is not limited to one postposition type: a variety of postpositions can occur in the irrealis position.

- (2.52) *Saáca quia= nacariï-yaa- $\phi$  [quí quia=íicu*  
 what 2SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 1SG 2SG=BEN  
*mii- $\phi$ - $\phi$ ]?  
 do-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘What would you like me to do for you?’ (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 80,  
 repeated line 140)*

- (2.53) *Quí= avio=jina íicua-rïï- $\phi$  quí-niiya=jina.*  
 1SG= airplane=LOC go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 1SG-country=LOC  
 ‘I will go in an airplane to my country.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1527)

- (2.54) *Amicaáca quí= anapa anácaari=jata capi-rïï- $\phi$ .*  
 one.day.away 1SG= huitina=with cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cook with *huitina* (tannia or yautia, *Xanthosoma* sp.).’  
 (E.LII.CIA.131106, p. 1587)

- (2.55) *Nu= natamajati=jata íicua-rïï- $\phi$  Iquito=jina.*  
 3SG= 3S.POSS.sister=with go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE Iquitos=LOC  
 ‘She will go with her sister to Iquitos.’ (E.ELY.CIA.090808, p. 2267)

Postpositions are noun phrase clitics, and so they occur together with their objects in the irrealis position. It is not attested for the object of a postposition to occur in the irrealis position and for the postposition to attach to the verb, as shown in (2.56).<sup>7</sup>

- (2.56) \*Nu= Iquito ícuá-ríi-ø =jina.  
 3SG= Iquitos go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE =LOC  
 TARGET: ‘She will go to Iquitos.’

In my elicitation sessions and in the text corpus, postpositional phrases commonly occurred with intransitive verbs. However, it is possible for the irrealis position of a transitive verb to be filled by a postpositional phrase, as shown in (2.57). In this example, the postpositional phrase *quia=jata* ‘with you’ occurs in the irrealis position and the object occurs at the end of the sentence. An adverb intervenes between the verb and the object.

- (2.57) Quí= quia=jata cuata-ríi-ø amicaáca  
 1SG= 2SG=with cultivate-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE one.day.away  
*quí-nási.*  
 1SG-*chacra*  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cultivate my *chacra* with you.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2197)

Longer postpositional phrases can also occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.58). In this case, the object of the postpositional phrase is a modified

---

<sup>7</sup>I have not explicitly tested the grammaticality of this construction, which is why no speaker code is provided, but I am confident that all of the speakers would deem this example ungrammatical.

noun, and the entire phrase functions as a temporal adverbial meaning ‘all the time’ or ‘every day’. An adverb intervenes between the verb and the object, and the object occurs at the end of the sentence. I will discuss modified postpositional phrases in more detail in Section 2.3.2, and in Section 2.5, I provide more detail about which element occurs in the irrealis position when there are multiple elements to choose from.

- (2.58) *Narata*      *quí=*    *piyíini yahuíini=jina*    *íri-qui-∅*                      *ácari*  
 in.this.way 1SG= all/every day=LOC      bring-PERF-E.C.TENSE      now  
*ína tímaaca.*  
 DET agouti  
 ‘In this way every day I will bring this agouti.’ (T.HMS.JPI.061212, line 100)

There is one postposition that is not a noun phrase enclitic but that instead cliticizes to other postpositions and adverbs: *=ji*. In fact, it is ungrammatical for this postposition to cliticize to nouns, as shown in (2.59).

- (2.59) \**Pi=*              *ícuaa-∅*                      *pi-nási=ji.*  
 1PL.INCL= go.IMPF-E.C.TENSE    1PL.INCL-*chacra*=from  
 TARGET: ‘We will go from our *chacra*.’ (E.HDC.CIA.061106, p. 1491)

In order for the sentence to be grammatical, another postposition must intervene between the noun and *=ji*, as shown in (2.60).

- (2.60) *Pi=*              *ícuaa-∅*                      *pi-nási=jina=ji.*  
 1PL.INCL= go.IMPF-E.C.TENSE    1PL.INCL-*chacra*=LOC=from  
 ‘We will go from our *chacra*.’ (E.HDC.CIA.061106, p. 1491)

The postposition =*ji* can also occur in the irrealis position as part of a postpositional phrase, as shown in (2.61), (2.62), and (2.63). These examples show that multiple clitics are possible in this position and that the element that occurs here can be fairly complex.

(2.61) *Quí= taquína=siricuma=ji itcua-rii-ø.*  
 1SG= lake=along.the.side=from go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will go around the (edge of the) lake.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1525)

(2.62) *Quí= íta=jinacuma=ji jimati-yaarii-ø.*  
 1SG= house=inside=from leave-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will leave from inside the house.’ (E.HDC.CIA.180808, p. 2389)

(2.63) *Quia= quí masiitii-rii-ø gasolina [jiiticari quia*  
 2SG= 1SG sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE gasoline when 2SG  
*Iquito=jina=ji miyiqui-cuaa-ø.]*  
 Iquitos=LOC=from return-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘You will sell me gasoline when you return from Iquitos.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.060808, p. 2221)

One could treat the postposition host plus the clitic =*ji* as a new postposition altogether, especially in example (2.61) where the meaning of the composite postpositions (‘around’) changes slightly from their individual meanings (‘along the side’ and ‘from’), but I continue to treat =*ji* as a postpositional clitic because it occurs in other contexts, namely with adverbs, as shown below in (2.64), (2.65), and (2.66). In these examples, =*ji* is the only postposition present, and the composite meaning is clearly derived from the individual meanings.



(2.64) *Jiiticari nu= tíra=ji ani-aarií-ø?*  
 when 3SG= there=from come-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘When will s/he come from there?’ (E.HDC.CIA.270708, p. 2053)

(2.65) *Quí= íti=ji miyíqui-yaarií-ø núquiica*  
 1SG= here=from return-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE one  
*casiiri=jina=ji.*  
 month=LOC=from  
 ‘In a month’s time I will come back here.’ (E.JPI.CIA.010808, p. 2107)

(2.66) *Jiiticari Leo sihuaáni-maa-ø [jahuaari quí cáami=ji*  
 when Leo arrive-REM.PRF-E.C.TENSE then 1SG upriver=from  
*ani-maa-ø Ataraya=jina=ji Leo niqiini=anuura].*  
 come-REM.PRF-E.C.TENSE Atalaya=LOC=from Leo see.INF=in.order.to  
 ‘When Leo arrives, then I will come from upriver, from Atalaya, in order to  
 see Leo.’ (E.HDC.CIA.110808, p. 2275)

#### 2.2.4 Orientational clitic phrases

In addition to the postpositions, Iquito has a set of orientational clitics, given in Table 2.3, that are also used to form adverbial phrases. The orientational clitics are so named because they provide orientational information about a noun (i.e. its orientation with respect to the river, interior/exterior, or up/down in the vertical plane). These clitics have different hosts from postpositions, as evidenced by the fact that: 1) they are more restricted than postpositions in that they do not attach to pronouns or determiners, 2) there is a set of nouns that must take orientational clitics in order to be well-formed, such as *curí-* ‘port’, *iyi-* ‘living place’, and *niicu-* ‘path’,<sup>8</sup> and 3) they can cliticize to adjectival roots, something postpositions cannot

<sup>8</sup>Examples with these nouns can be seen in (2.7) and (2.76).

do. (I discuss the behavior of postpositions and orientational clitics with modifiers in detail in Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3, respectively.) For our purposes in this section, they behave very similarly to each other.

Table 2.3: Orientational clitics

CLITIC	SEMANTICS
= <i>cu</i>	‘upriver, up, outside’
= <i>ma</i>	‘downriver, down, inside’
= <i>cúura</i>	‘perpendicular to the river’
= <i>úra</i>	allomorph of = <i>cúura</i> , occurs with nouns ending in - <i>qui</i>

Like postpositional phrases, when orientational clitic phrases occur in the irrealis position, they frequently do so with intransitive verbs. Examples (2.67), (2.68), and (2.69) show the orientational clitics attached to bare nouns.

(2.67) *Nu= cacúti=cu ícua-rii-ø.*  
 3SG= beach=ORN:UPRIVER go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘S/he will go to the beach (upriver).’ (E.ELY.CIA.190808, p. 2409)

(2.68) *Amicaáca quí= cacúti=ma ícua-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG= beach=ORN:DOWNRIVER go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*naámi.*  
 downriver  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to the beach (downriver).’ (E.ELY.CIA.071106, p. 1517)

(2.69) *Amicaáca quí= taquína=cuura musi-cuaa-ø.*  
 one.day.away 1SG= lake=ORN:TOWARDS swim-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go swim in the lake (located perpendicular to the river).’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1525)

Example (2.70) shows an orientational clitic attached to the compound *amátana aatiaaqui* ‘river current’ (lit. place where it flows quickly).

- (2.70) *Amicaáca*     *quí*     *amátana aatiaaquiira*  
one.day.away 1SG river current.ORN:TOWARDS  
*musi-cuaa-φ*.  
swim-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
‘Tomorrow I will go to swim in the river current.’ (E.JPI.CIA.111106, p. 1569)

Oriental clitics can also occur with possessive phrases. Example (2.71) shows an orientational clitic attached to a possessive phrase formed via the possessive prefix strategy, and example (2.72) shows an orientational clitic attached to a possessive phrase formed via the noun juxtaposition strategy. Example (2.73) shows a possessive phrase with multiple possessors, again illustrating that long, complex phrases can occur in the irrealis position.

- (2.71) *Quí=*     *quí-nási=cu*                                     *iícua-ríi-φ*.  
1SG= 1SG-*chacra*=ORN:UPRIVER go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
‘I will go to my (upriver) *chacra* (swidden field).’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1551, E.ELY.CIA.260808, p. 2591)

- (2.72) *Amicaáca*     *quí=*     *nunaani cacúti=cuura*  
one.day.away 1SG= river beach=ORN:TOWARDS  
*iícua-ríi-φ*.  
go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
‘Tomorrow I will go to the river’s beach.’ (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p. 1589)

- (2.73) *Amicaáca* *quí= nu-isíicu íta=cuura*  
 one.day.away 1SG= 3SG-friend house=ORN:TOWARDS  
*ícuu-ríi-ø.*  
 go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to her friend’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2369)

Like we saw with postpositional phrases, it is possible for the postposition =*ji* to cliticize to the orientational clitics, again demonstrating that fairly complex phrases can occur in the irrealis position.

- (2.74) *Amicaáca* *nu= cacúti=cu=ji*  
 one.day.away 3SG= beach=ORN:UPRIVER=from  
*ani-aaríi-ø.*  
 come-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow s/he will come from the beach (upriver).’ (E.ELY.CIA.190808, p. 2409)

- (2.75) *Amicaáca* *pí= maniini nási=cuura=ji*  
 one.day.away 1PL.INCL= young.man *chacra*=ORN:TOWARDS=from  
*sirita-cuaa-ø* *asúraaja.*  
 harvest-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE manioc  
 ‘Tomorrow we will go and harvest manioc from the young man’s swidden field.’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1563)

- (2.76) *Amicaáca* *cana= curima=ji*  
 one.day.away 1PL.EXCL= port.ORN:DOWNRIVER=from  
*jimati-aaríi-ø.*  
 leave-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow we will leave from the port (downriver).’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2459)

However, there is a tendency to fill the irrealis position with a single adverb that conveys the same direction as the orientational clitic phrase and to place the orientational phrase after the verb. For example, after I elicited (2.77), where nothing occurs in the irrealis position, Ligia repeated it by choosing to insert the adverb *naámi=ji* ‘from downriver’ into the irrealis position rather than putting the orientational clitic phrase there, as shown in (2.78). (Ema also produced this sentence after saying the one in (2.76). She also preferred for the adverb to occur in the irrealis position over the orientational clitic phrase in (2.68), even though she produced this example and considered it to be grammatical.)

(2.77) *Amicaáca*    *cana=*            *jimati-aarĩ-ø*  
           one.day.away 1PL.EXCL= leave-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
           *curima=ji.*  
           port.ORN:DOWNRIVER=from  
           TARGET: ‘Tomorrow we will leave from the port (downriver).’ (Example elicited by CIA, 210808, p. 2483)

(2.78) *Amicaáca*    *cana=*            *naámi=ji*            *jimati-aarĩ-ø*  
           one.day.away 1PL.EXCL= downriver=from leave-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
           *curima=ji.*  
           port.ORN:DOWNRIVER=from  
           ‘Tomorrow we will leave from the port (downriver).’ (E.LII.CIA.210808, p. 2483, E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2459)

Using an adverb instead of an orientational clitic phrase is also found with longer orientational clitic phrases having modifiers and/or possessive phrases, as I will show in Section 2.3.3.

I will discuss this strategy for avoiding long phrases in the irrealis position in more detail in Section 2.5.

### 2.2.5 Adverbs

Postpositional phrases and orientational clitic phrases both function as adverbial phrases within the clause. In addition to these two element types, it is also possible to have an adverb in the irrealis position, as I will show in this section. (Recall from Section 2.2.3, that adverbs can occur with the postposition =*ji* and that this entire phrase can occur in the irrealis position. I have chosen to treat those phrases as postpositional phrases rather than discuss them here.)

I discuss the distribution of adverbs in both realis and irrealis clauses at length in Hansen (2006). Here, I summarize that discussion, focusing primarily on the examples where adverbs occur in the irrealis position, and add to it based on my research since then.

In the syntactic literature, adverbs are considered to be adjuncts that can adjoin to various positions within the clause (see, for example, Iatridou (1990), Cinque (1999), and Ernst (2002)). In Iquito, it seems that adverbs can adjoin to various positions but not to the irrealis position. Rather, adverbs *fill* this position, as evidenced by the fact that it is ungrammatical for an adverb to appear between the subject and the verb of a realis clause, but it is grammatical for an adverb to appear between the subject and the verb of an irrealis clause. This is true for both temporal and manner adverbs, as shown in the ungrammatical realis clauses in (2.79) and (2.80), respectively, and the grammatical irrealis clauses in (2.81) and (2.82). These

examples suggest that the irrealis position is not available in realis clauses.

(2.79) \**Iína icuáni nu= amicaáca jicata- $\phi$ -cura nu-náana.*  
DET man 3SG= one.day.away remove-PERF-RPST 3SG-timber  
TARGET: ‘That man, he removed his wood yesterday.’ (E.JPI.CIA.220704)

(2.80) \**Iína icuáni nu= maacuáarica asa- $\phi$ -cura iína pápaaja.*  
DET man 3SG= slowly eat-PERF-RPST DET fish  
TARGET: ‘That man, he slowly ate the fish.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210704)

(2.81) *Acámi=ji cana= taaríqui ani-aarií- $\phi$*   
upriver=from 1PL.EXCL= early.morning come-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*iíti=ánuura.*  
here=towards  
‘From upriver we will come in the early morning to here.’  
(T.AMC.HDC.080804, line 32)

(2.82) *Quí= suhuaata tani-rii- $\phi$  quí-canuu.*  
1SG= well weave-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 1SG-*chambira*  
‘I will weave my *chambira* (palm threads) nicely.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260808, p. 2601)

Adverbs can occur in the irrealis position of verbs of all valencies. In texts, they occur primarily with intransitive verbs. Some examples are given in (2.83) and (2.84).

(2.83) *Jaátarata quí= iíti tiqui-qui- $\phi$ ?*  
how 1SG= here enter-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
‘How will I enter here?’ (T.HMS.JPI.061212, line 56)

- (2.84) *Quí= ihuĩĩrĩ-saa-ø-cari, quí-nahuiyĩni cáami*  
 1SG= die-NASRT.IMPF-E.C.TENSE-NASRT 1SG-spirit upriver  
*íqui-qui-ø.*  
 live-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘If I were to die, my spirit would live there (upriver).’ (T.QCC.LII.061212,  
 line 40)

When an adverb occurs in the irrealis position of a transitive verb, the object follows the verb, as shown above in (2.82), or in the clause-initial focus position, as shown below in (2.85).

- (2.85) *Cuuhuaá nu= amicaáca asa-rĩ-ø.*  
 meat 3SG= one.day.away eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Meat s/he will eat tomorrow.’ (Response to: What will s/he eat tomorrow?)  
 (E.JPI.CIA.250708, p. 2011)

Similarly, when an adverb occurs in the irrealis position of a ditransitive clause, both objects must follow the verb, or alternatively, one object can occur in the clause-initial focus position and the other follow the verb. The key point is that it is ungrammatical for an adverb to occur with an object in the irrealis position. Thus, while either an object NP or an adverb may appear in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.86a) and (2.86b), respectively, they are prohibited from occurring together in this position, regardless of the ordering of the two elements, as shown in the ungrammatical examples in (2.87). These data suggest that in irrealis clauses, the adverb fills the irrealis position rather than adjoining to it.

- (2.86) a. *Amicaáca icuáni nu-náana jimata-rĩ-ø.*  
 One.day.away man 3SG-timber remove-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow a man will remove his timber.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210704)



- b. *Iína icuáni nu= iyarácata jimata-ríi-ø*  
 DET man 3SG= rapidly remove-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*nu-náana.*  
 3SG-timber  
 ‘That man, he will remove his timber rapidly.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260704)

- (2.87) a. \**Iína icuáni nu= nu-náana iyarácata*  
 DET man 3SG= 3SG-timber rapidly  
*jimata-ríi-ø.*  
 remove-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘That man, he will remove his timber rapidly.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.260704)
- b. \**Iína icuáni nu= iyarácata nu-náana*  
 DET man 3SG= rapidly 3SG-timber  
*jimata-ríi-ø.*  
 remove-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘That man, he will remove his timber rapidly.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.260704)

That said, there are a few examples from texts where the adverb *jaá* meaning ‘already’ occurs in the irrealis position with another element. For example, in (2.88), *jaá* occurs with an object pronoun, and in (2.89) and (2.90) it occurs with a postpositional phrase. These examples do not necessarily pose a problem for my analysis that an adverb cannot co-occur with another element in the irrealis position because the ‘already’ sense does not appear in the gloss, so this *jaá* may be functioning as something else, possibly the evidential =*ja*. It is interesting that in (2.88) and (2.89), the preceding noun ends in *ja*, so this could also be a transcription error since *ja* is sometimes hard to hear.

(2.88) *Aquíraja jaá quia iri-rii-∅.*  
 wind already 2SG carry-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘The wind could grab you.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 234)

(2.89) *Atíji qui-caquiija jaá nu=jina tiitii-∅-∅ nuú.*  
 from.there 1SG-father already 3SG=LOC put-PERF-E.C.TENSE 3SG  
 ‘Then my father put it (manioc beer) into it (a container).’  
 (T.PSV.HDC.061212, line 66)

(2.90) *Nahuaáca jaá qui=jata iícua-rii-∅.*  
 3PL already 1SG=with go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘They will go with me.’ (T.AMC.HDC.080804, line 28)

Another example of an adverb co-occurring with another element in the irrealis position comes from one of the texts I elicited in 2008, given in (2.91). It has a long postpositional phrase in the irrealis position plus an adverb, *camíjiita* ‘upriver (dim.)’. It is unexpected for *camíjiita* to occur in the irrealis position with the postpositional phrase since we saw that it is ungrammatical for an adverb to occur together with an object in (2.87). I hypothesize that it is allowed in this example because the adverb is modifying the postpositional phrase as opposed to the action of the verb. As a result, we could treat this as a single adverbial phrase, in which case it would not be surprising that it is occurring in the irrealis position, since other phrases with modifiers are allowed in this position. This phenomenon is something to test more explicitly in future research.

(2.91) *Cana= camíjiita cacúti ánaca=ijinaji*  
 1PL.EXCL= upriver.DIM beach head=at.the.tip.of  
*ajatíii-∅-∅*  
 tie.up-PERF-E.C.TENSE

‘We tied up at the tip of the beach (upriver).’ (T.MPT.ELY.080809, line 25)

### 2.2.6 Negation

Another element type found in the irrealis position is the negative particle *caa*. Before turning to examples of how negation occurs in this position, I provide a brief summary of the way that negation is marked in Iquito.

There are two types of clausal negation in Iquito. The first type, termed *caa* negation, occurs in independent or main declarative clauses and finite complement clauses. It is found in both realis and irrealis constructions and is characterized by the negative particle *caa* immediately preceding the subject. *Caa* will follow the topic phrase (if there is one overtly expressed in the topic position). For example, in the realis clause in (2.92), *caa* (indicated in boldface) occurs between the topic phrase *íina icuáni* and the resumptive pronoun *nu*, which is in the subject position of the sentence. The same is true of the irrealis clause in (2.93); *caa* occurs between the topic phrase *íina miisáji* and the resumptive subject pronoun *nu*.

(2.92) *Iína icuáni **caa** nu= casiita-qui- $\emptyset$  pápaaja.*  
DET man NEG 3SG= catch-PERF-E.C.TENSE fish  
‘The man did not catch fish.’ (E.JPI.CIA.110804)

(2.93) *Iína miisáji **caa** nu= asúraaja saqui-rii- $\emptyset$*   
DET woman NEG 3SG= manioc chew-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*amicaáca.*  
one.day.away  
‘The woman will not chew manioc tomorrow.’ (E.ELY.CIA.090808, p. 2261)

When the topic position is empty, *caa* occurs sentence-initially, as in the realis clause in (2.94), and the irrealis clause in (2.95).

(2.94) *Caa nu= pajii simiúmi pajini.*  
 NEG 3SG= be.able.to.IMPF-E.C.TENSE book study.INF  
 ‘S/he is not able to read the book.’ (E.JPI.CIA.110804)

(2.95) *Caa pi= Iquito=jina ícua-rii-ø.*  
 NEG 1PL.INCL= Iquitos=LOC go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘We will not go to Iquitos.’ (E.HDC.CIA.220805, p. 2523)

*Caa* arguably occurs in the same sentential position as focus; in fact, *caa* is in complementary distribution with focused phrases, meaning that it is not possible for an element to occur in the focus position of a sentence negated via *caa* negation.<sup>9</sup>

The other clausal negation type, called *ji-caa* negation, occurs with interrogatives and subordinate clauses. It can be found with verbs of all valencies: intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive. I initially discussed *ji-caa* negation in Anderson (2004) and this discussion is elaborated upon in Lai (2009). This type of negation is characterized by a negative morpheme *-ji-* being marked on the verb. This morpheme can be the sole negation marker within the clause, as shown in the realis clause in (2.96) and the irrealis clause in (2.97).<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup>A cleft construction is employed in cases where an element is focused and negated; this is illustrated by Lai (2009: 57).

<sup>10</sup>Ligia exhibits more variation in her negated constructions than the other speakers, and is the only speaker that used *-ji* as the sole negative marker in an irrealis clause. However, since Hermico and Jaime both used *-ji* as the sole negative marker in realis clauses, I do not find Ligia’s example to be unusual.

(2.96) *Cániica nítí-**ji**-qui- $\emptyset$  iyacumata?*  
 who run-NEG-PERF-E.C.TENSE fast  
 ‘Who didn’t run fast?’ (E.HDC.CIA.270704, E.JPI.CIA.240704)

(2.97) *Cániica nísicáti miití-**ji**-rii- $\emptyset$  ína máaya?*  
 who *aguaje* give-NEG-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE DET child  
 ‘Who will not give *aguaje* to this child?’ (E.LII.CIA.100804-2)

When the negative particle *caa* is used in *ji-caa* negation, its position is sensitive to whether the clause is realis or irrealis. In realis clauses, *caa* follows the verb. This can be seen in (2.98) and (2.99), where the dependent clause (indicated by square brackets) is negated using *ji-caa* negation.

(2.98) [*Jiíticari quia=nacusi-**ji**- $\emptyset$  caa nu*  
 when 2SG=know-NEG.IMPF-E.C.TENSE NEG 3SG  
*siiyaniini=na*], *nu= quia amuu- $\emptyset$ - $\emptyset$ .*  
 do.sth.for.medicinal.diet.INF=CL.END 3SG= 2SG kill-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘When you don’t know how to diet, it [siusihuasi] will kill you.’  
 (T.SA2.HDC.061212, lines 190-1)

(2.99) *Ína miísáji caa nu= masí- $\emptyset$ - $\emptyset$  arroz [iyami-ácuji*  
 DET woman NEG 3SG buy-PERF-E.C.TENSE rice because  
*nu= mii-**ji** caa cuuriqui].*  
 3SG= have-NEG NEG money  
 ‘The woman is not buying rice because she does not have money.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.110804)

There are several forms that *ji-caa* negation can take in irrealis clauses. One way is for *caa* to occur in the irrealis position, as illustrated in (2.100) and (2.101). In these examples, the negated clause is the relative clause indicated by square brackets.

(2.100) *Jana tii ína paráatu* [ $\phi$  *nu= caa*  
 which COP DET plate REL 3SG= NEG  
*siquita-ji-ríi- $\phi$* ?  
 wash-NEG-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Which is the plate she will not wash?’ (E.LII.CIA.100804)

(2.101) *Iína icuáni* [ $\phi$  *quí caa sihuira-ji-cuaa- $\phi$*   
 DET man REL 1SG NEG visit-NEG-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*amicaáca=na*] *nu= nu-nási*  
 one.day.away=CLAUSE.END 3SG= 3SG-*chacra*  
*cuata-ríi- $\phi$* .  
 cultivate-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘The man who I will not visit tomorrow will cultivate his *chacra*.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.120804-5)

The order in the previous two examples, where *caa* is in the irrealis position, demonstrates a one-to-one correspondence between *ji-caa* negated realis clauses and *ji-caa* negated irrealis clauses that mirrors the SVX/SXV alternation found with other element types. The realis order is S V-*ji-caa* and the irrealis order is S *caa* V-*ji*, as summarized in Table 2.4. Since *caa* immediately follows the verb in realis clauses (as we saw in (2.98) and (2.99)), this order is the expected order, because it supports the generalization made by Beier et al. (in press) that whatever occurs immediately to the right of the verb in a realis clause will occur immediately to the left of the verb (i.e. in the irrealis position) of an irrealis clause.

However, it is not required that *caa* occur in the irrealis position of irrealis clauses negated via *ji-caa* negation; other elements can occur in this position, in which case *caa* follows the verb. This can be seen in (2.102), an irrealis interro-

Table 2.4: Order of *ji-caa* negation in realis and irrealis clauses

REALIS	IRREALIS
S V X	S X V
S V- <i>ji caa</i> ...	S <i>caa</i> V- <i>ji</i> ...

ative clause, where the object phrase *nu-nási* ‘his/her *chacra*’ occurs in the irrealis position and *caa* follows the verb.

- (2.102) *Cániica nu-nási cuara-ji-rii-ø caa?*  
 who 3SG-*chacra* cultivate-NEG-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE NEG  
 ‘Who will not cultivate his/her *chacra*?’ (E.JPI.CIA.110804-4)

The order exhibited in this example (SOV-*ji caa*) is somewhat expected, since the object in the irrealis position occurs post-verbally in realis clauses and is occurring pre-verbally in this irrealis clause. But this order contradicts the claim that the *immediately* post-verbal element of a realis clause occur in the irrealis position of an irrealis clause. If that were to hold, we would expect it to be ungrammatical for an object to occur in this position when there is *ji-caa* negation in the clause because *caa* would have to occur there. This problem is resolved by the generalization as stated by Beier et al. (in press) that the element that occurs in the irrealis position either occur in the immediately post-verbal position of a corresponding realis clause or *be able to* occur there, then this order supports it, since objects are *able to* occur in the immediately post-verbal position of a realis clause.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup>The unexpected order in this example may also be due to the extraction of the subject for the

Finally, it is possible for *caa* to occur in the irrealis position *and* occur after the verb; an example of *caa -ji- caa* negation is given in (2.103). In the subordinate clause of this sentence (indicated by square brackets), the verb is marked by the negative morpheme *-ji-* and the negative particle *caa* occurs in the irrealis position. A second *caa* occurs immediately after the verb. The object follows this second negative particle.

- (2.103) *Iína mĩsáji nu= Iquito=jina úcua-rii-ø*  
 DET woman 3SG= Iquitos=to go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 [*nihua acuji nu= **caa** siquita-**ji**-rii-ø **caa***  
 for.that.reason 3SG= NEG wash-NEG-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE NEG  
*nu-sinaaquĩ*].  
 3SG-clothes  
 ‘The woman will go to Iquitos and that is why she won’t wash her clothes.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2207)

This doubling of *caa* seems to be Ema’s preferred strategy for marking *ji-caa* negation, since she used it in my elicitation sessions in 2004, 2006, and again in 2008. It is produced by all the other speakers as well, but not with the same consistency.

Since *caa* is the element that immediately follows the verb in the realis clause, we expect *caa* to occur in the irrealis position of an irrealis clause. However, we do not expect for the same element to be repeated again after the verb. In the realis counterpart given in (2.104), *-ji-* is marked on the verb and *caa* follows the verb, but there is no additional *caa* in the clause that is free to appear in the irrealis

---

purpose of question formation. This is an area that merits further research.



counterpart. Thus it appears that the *caa* in the irrealis position in (2.103) is being doubled or inserted; this sentence does preserve or maintain all of the elements of its realis counterpart.

- (2.104) *Iína miisáji nu= ícua- $\phi$ -cura Iquito=jina [nihua acuji nu  
 DET woman 3SG= go-PERF-RPST Iquitos=LOC for.that.reason 3SG  
 siquita-**ji**-cura **caa** nu-sinaaqui].  
 wash-NEG-RPST NEG 3SG-clothes  
 ‘The woman went to Iquitos and that is why she didn’t wash her clothes.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2207)*

I do not have an explanation for why the negative particle is being doubled in this context. Perhaps *caa* originally had an argument function and became a negative intensifier, like French *pas*, but unfortunately, the comparative data that exists for the other Zaparoan languages is not useful for testing this hypothesis; there is no discussion of negation in Peeke (1991) for Záparo and the negative morpheme *maja* described for Arabela in Rich (1999) is not cognate with any of the negation markers we see in Iquito. There is, however, one other context in Iquito where we see element doubling; the determiner *iína* is sometimes doubled when it occurs with possessive phrases. I will discuss this in more detail in the next chapter.

### 2.3 Adding modifiers

Now that I have listed the variety of elements that can occur in the irrealis position, I turn to look at what happens when modifiers, namely adjectives and quantifiers, are added to each of these element types. Before doing so, though, I

provide an overview of the characteristics that define the adjective and quantifier word classes.

Iquito adjectives form a distinct word class that adheres to Dixon’s (2004: 44) definition of the adjective word class: they exhibit numerous syntactic and morphological characteristics that are not shared with nouns or verbs, they include terms from all of the prototypical adjective semantic types, and they function as copula complements and as noun modifiers. A key characteristic that distinguishes adjectives from other Iquito word classes is the fact that Iquito adjectives exhibit syntactic number and animacy agreement with the noun they modify. This agreement morphology, given in Table 2.5, is added in accordance with the number and animacy of the modified noun.<sup>12</sup> A thorough description of the Iquito adjective class can be found in Hansen (2007).

Table 2.5: Agreement morphology used with adjectives and quantifiers

SINGULAR/GENERAL	PLURAL INANIMATE	PLURAL ANIMATE
- <i>na</i> (default)	- <i>mi</i>	- <i>pí</i>

Adjectives in Iquito may precede or follow the noun in both realis and irrealis clauses. This ordering is linked to whether or not the adjective is focused. The

---

<sup>12</sup>There are a few exceptions to this generalization. The singular/general adjective formed from the root *suhuaa* ‘good, pretty’ is one: it is *suhuáani* instead of the expected \**suhuáana*. However, the plural forms of this adjective (*suhuáami* ‘good (inanimate)’ and *suhuápí* ‘good (animate)’) are as expected. There are two other known exceptions: *cumácu* ‘old’ and *tasíta* ‘legitimate; authentic’. These basic adjectives do not take any number/animacy agreement morphology in the singular or plural.

default order is for the adjective to precede the noun. When the adjective follows the noun, there is contrastive focus on the adjective.

I consider quantifiers to be a subclass of the adjective class. They also take the number/animacy agreement morphology given in Table 2.5,<sup>13</sup> but they differ from adjectives in that their position with respect to the noun is fixed; quantifiers must precede nouns. This generalization holds in realis and irrealis clauses.

### 2.3.1 Modified objects in the irrealis position

As we saw with possessed nouns in Section 2.2.1.3, it is possible for an entire noun phrase to occur in the irrealis position. In this section, I show that modified noun phrases can also occur in the irrealis position, showing that phrases of various lengths, including fairly complex phrases, can occur between the subject and the verb of an irrealis clause.

#### 2.3.1.1 Noun phrases modified by adjectives

As mentioned above, an adjective may precede or follow the noun. Both orders are possible when an adjective-modified noun phrase occurs in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.105) and (2.106). In (2.105), the adjective precedes the noun, and in (2.106), the adjective follows the noun.

(2.105) *Amicaáca*      *quí*      *ísacuana itíniija*      *raati-rii-ø*.  
one.day.away    1SG    sweet manioc.beer    drink-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE

---

<sup>13</sup>The exceptions are *piyíini*, meaning ‘all’ or ‘every’, the numeral one *núquiica*, and the numerals for five and higher.

‘Tomorrow I will drink sweet manioc beer.’ (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1485)

- (2.106) *Amicaáca*    *quí*    *itñiija ipana*            *raati-rii-ø*.  
one.day.away 1SG    manioc.beer strong    drink-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
‘Tomorrow I will drink strong manioc beer.’ (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1485)

An adjective can also modify a compound, as shown in (2.107). In this example, the adjective precedes the noun.

- (2.107) *Amicaáca*    *quí*    *taríjana anapa anácaari*  
one.day.away 1SG    tasty *huitina*  
*capi-rii-ø*.  
cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
‘Tomorrow I will cook tasty *huitina*.’ (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p. 1595)

Example (2.108) shows that a modified object can occur in the irrealis position of a ditransitive clause. In this example, the recipient is in the irrealis position and the theme follows the verb. The recipient is modified by the adjective *umáana* ‘big’, which follows the noun, and this entire phrase occurs in the irrealis position.

- (2.108) *Quí*    *icuáni umáana*    *masiññi-rii-ø*                    *ína simiúmi*.  
1SG    man big                    sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE    DET book  
‘This book I will sell the fat/big man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2309)

With possessive phrases, the ordering of the adjective depends on the scope of the adjective. The adjective modifies the noun that it is closest to. In (2.109) and (2.110), both of which are formed via the noun juxtaposition strategy, the adjective follows the possessive phrase and modifies the possessum.

(2.109) *Amicaáca pi m̄isáji nási umáana*  
 one.day.away 1PL.INCL woman *chacra* big  
*niqui-cuaa-∅.*  
 see-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow we will go see the woman’s big *chacra*.’ (E.HDC.CIA.200808,  
 p. 2449)

(2.110) *Amicaáca quí asúraaja tja umáana*  
 one.day.away 1SG manioc root big  
*pani-rii-∅.*  
 look.for-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will look for thick manioc roots.’ (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p.  
 1595)

In (2.111), the adjective precedes the possessive phrase and modifies the possessor.

(2.111) *Amicaáca quí umáana icuáni iúmina iricatájuu-rii-∅.*  
 one.day.away 1SG big man canoe repair-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will fix the canoe of the fat man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p.  
 1595)

It is possible for the adjective to occur between the possessor and the possessum, as shown in (2.112), in which case it modifies the possessor.

(2.112) *Amicaáca quí icuáni umáana sáhuiri*  
 one.day.away 1SG man big machete  
*cuucuu-rii-∅.*  
 sharpen-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sharpen the machete of the big man.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.121106, p. 1583)

### 2.3.1.2 Noun phrases modified by quantifiers

Recall that quantifiers differ from adjectives in that they must precede the noun; an example of a quantifier-modified noun phrase in the irrealis position can be seen in (2.113).

- (2.113) *Pi= cuhuíini =íira curáaca, quia piyíini saacáaya*  
 1PL.INCL= become =in.order.to chief 2SG all things  
*saminíjuu-ø-ø, iimi taa suhuáa-mi*  
 think–PERF–E.C.TENSE REL.PL.INAN COP good–PL.INAN  
 ‘In order to become chief, you will think about all things that are good.’  
 (T.CJC.JPI.061212, lines 5-7)

The quantifier *piyíini* is somewhat different from the rest of the quantifiers because it is lexicalized from an infinitival verb; the verb *piyíini* means ‘to finish’. This quantifier does not take number/animacy agreement and can occur by itself as a noun, as it does in (2.114).

- (2.114) *Quí= nacarii-yaa-ø [quia piyíini nacusi-qui-ø].*  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG all know–PERF–E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I want you to know everything.’ (T.CJC.JPI.061212, line 3)

There are other examples of quantifiers occurring independently of a noun in texts, but the associated noun is always recoverable from the discourse context.

Examples (2.115) and (2.116) show other quantifiers occurring with nouns in the irrealis position. In (2.115), the quantifier *masiáana* ‘many, a lot’ occurs with a bare noun and in (2.116), the numeral *núquiica* ‘one’ occurs with a compound.

(2.115) *Nu= masiáana taquína síhúira-rii-ø.*  
 3SG= many lake visit-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘S/he will visit various lakes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1533)

(2.116) *Amicaáca quí= núquiica acaayi ihuaasi*  
 one.day.away 1SG= one manatee tail  
*tani-rii-ø.*  
 weave-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will weave one manatee tail (type of fan).’ (E.JPI.CIA.111106,  
 p. 1567)

The quantifier *masiáana* does take number/animacy agreement marking, but speakers do not apply it consistently, as evidenced by the singular/general marking employed in example (2.115) above. Example (2.117) shows a case where *masiáana* does exhibit number/animacy agreement; this agreement is marked on both the quantifier and the noun.

(2.117) *Amicaáca quí masiaa-mi simiimí-ya masii-rii-ø.*  
 one.day.away 1SG many-PL.INAN book-PL buy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy many books.’ (E.HDC.CIA.220808, p. 2523)

The quantified noun can occur in the irrealis position of a ditransitive clause as well. Example (2.118) shows an irrealis ditransitive clause with the theme in the irrealis position and the recipient following the verb. The theme argument is modified by the quantifier *núquiica* ‘one’, and it occurs with the noun in the irrealis position. As was the case with adjectives, the entire object phrase occurs in the irrealis position.

- (2.118) *Qui núquiica núriyi masiitii-rii-ø ína miisáji.*  
 1SG one *tamishi* sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE DET woman  
 ‘I will sell one ball of *tamishi* (twine used in weaving thatch) to the woman.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2171)

It is possible, but rare, for a quantifier to be split from the noun that it modifies in the irrealis context. In example (2.119), *taana* ‘other’ is split from the noun it modifies (*quí-itníija* ‘my manioc beer’) by the verb.

- (2.119) ...*huári quí taana mii-rii-ø quí-itníija*  
 then 1SG other make-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 1SG-manioc.beer  
 ‘Then I will make another manioc beer.’ (T.QCC.LII.061212, line 82)

It is interesting that the modified noun in this example is a possessive phrase, since there seems to be a general preference to keep the possessive phrase out of the irrealis position when it is quantified. For example, in (2.120), the element in the irrealis position is a quantified noun. Following the verb is a possessive phrase (*icuáni ímina* ‘man’s canoe’) which is in essence modifying the noun phrase; it is not introducing a new argument.

- (2.120) *Amicaáca quí cuúmi ímina iricatájuu-rii-ø icuáni*  
 one.day.away 1SG two canoe repair-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE man  
*ímina.*  
 canoe  
 ‘Tomorrow I will repair two canoes belonging to the man.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p. 1592)

A similar example can be seen in (2.121). In fact, Jaime considers it ungrammatical for the entire modified possessive phrase to occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.122).



(2.121) *Amicaáca* *quí* *cuúmi sáhuiri* *cuucuu-ríi-ø* *Leo*  
 one.day.away 1SG two machete sharpen–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE Leo  
*sáhuiri.*  
 machete  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sharpen two machetes, Leo’s machetes.’  
 (E.JPI.CIA.081106, p. 1535)

(2.122) \**Amicaáca* *quí* *cuúmi Leo sáhuiri* *cuucuu-ríi-ø*.  
 one.day.away 1SG two Leo machete sharpen–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will sharpen Leo’s two machetes.’  
 (E.JPI.CIA.081106, p. 1535)

This tendency for speakers to put the possessive phrase after the verb rather than in the irrealis position may be due to processing constraints or scope. By placing the possessive phrase at the end of the clause, it makes it clear what the object of the verb is and that the quantifier is modifying the possessum, as opposed to possibly the possessor. In these examples, it seems likely that the possessive phrase is occurring in the position used for right-edge topicalization. I discuss this phenomenon further in Section 2.5.

### 2.3.1.3 Noun phrases modified by multiple modifiers

A noun phrase can also occur with multiple modifiers in the irrealis position. Lev Michael (personal communication, July 8, 2008) found that the order preference for multiple modifiers is QUANTIFIER NOUN SIZE COLOR QUALITY. I have found some variation in this order which is likely due to the pragmatics of the elicitation context and which modifier is in focus.

Example (2.123) shows a noun modified by a quantifier and an adjective, and the entire phrase occurs in the irrealis position. The quantifier *cuúmi* ‘two’ precedes the noun, and the adjective *saamina* ‘new’ follows it. Note that number and animacy agreement are not strictly marked in this example. The noun does not have a plural marker, despite being quantified as plural by the numeral *cuúmi* ‘two’, and the adjective does not take plural animacy marking as we would expect, but rather singular/general marking, evidenced by the suffix *-na*. This lack of agreement is consistent with speakers’ behavior more generally; speakers show a tendency to omit number marking if number can be determined elsewhere in the clause, as it can in this example because of the overt quantifier *cuúmi* ‘two’.

- (2.123) *Quí cuúmi ímína saamina iricatájuu-rii-ø.*  
 1SG two canoe new repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will repair two new canoes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.090808, p. 2263)

In example (2.124), the modifiers are both adjectives (one expressing color and the other quality), and they both follow the noun. Again, the entire phrase occurs in the irrealis position.

- (2.124) *Quí mutúuru mínana saamina masii-rii-ø.*  
 1SG motor black new buy–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will buy a black new motor.’ (E.ELY.CIA.270708, p. 2075)

At a certain point, though, speakers will put additional adjectives after the verb, as shown in (2.125), (2.126), and (2.127). This point is not fixed, however,

given that (2.125) has only one quantifier in the irrealis position, (2.126) has a quantifier and one adjective in the irrealis position, and (2.127) has a quantifier and two adjectives in the irrealis position, but all three examples have an additional adjective after the verb. It seems to be difficult for speakers to juggle several modifiers at a time, suggesting that this strategy stems from processing constraints and not structural ones.

(2.125) *Amicaáca quí núquiica simíimi masii-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG one book buy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*quinana.*  
 thin  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy one thin book.’ (E.HDC.CIA.220808, p. 2521)

(2.126) *Quí cuúmi ímina umáana iricatájuu-rii-ø saamina.*  
 1SG two canoe big repair-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE new  
 ‘I will repair two new big canoes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.090808, p. 2263)

(2.127) *Amicaáca quí núquiica simíimi umáana niyajatina*  
 one.day.away 1SG one book big blue-ish  
*masii-rii-ø quinana.*  
 buy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE thin  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy one big blue-ish thin book.’ (E.HDC.CIA.220808, p. 2521)

This splitting of the adjective from the rest of the noun phrase is likely related to givenness because we also see splitting with single adjectives in contexts where the adjective is already given from the context. For instance, after Ema gave me the example in (2.105), repeated below as (2.128), I asked her how the sentence

would be if we changed it to be about drinking sweet honey instead of sweet manioc beer. She gave me the sentence in (2.129). The noun, which is new information, occurs in the irrealis position, and the adjective, which is already given from the context, occurs after the verb.

(2.128) *Amicaáca quí isacuaana itñiija raati-rii-ø.*  
 one.day.away 1SG sweet manioc.beer drink-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will drink sweet manioc beer.’ (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1485)

(2.129) *Amicaáca quí ihuaana aaca raati-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG *colmena* water drink-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*isacuaana.*  
 sweet  
 ‘Tomorrow I will drink sweet *colmena* (type of bee) honey.’<sup>14</sup>  
 (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1485)

### 2.3.2 Modified postpositional phrases

Modifiers can occur with nouns in postpositional phrases as well. The entire postpositional phrase occurs in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.130) and (2.131). In these examples, the object of the postposition is modified by an adjective. In (2.130), the adjective precedes the noun, and in (2.131), it follows the noun.

(2.130) *Amicaáca quí umáana itta=jina samaráata-rii-ø.*  
 one.day.away 1SG big house=LOC relax-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will relax in the big house.’ (E.JPI.CIA.111106, p. 1567)

---

<sup>14</sup>In San Antonio, *colmena* can refer to a type of bee, its honey, or a beehive, not just to beehive as it does in other varieties of Spanish.

- (2.131) *Amicaáca* *quí* *aasámu isitina=iyáaji*  
 one.day.away 1SG stream deep=at.the.edge.of  
*samaráata-rii-ø*.  
 relax-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will relax at the edge of the deep stream.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106,  
 p. 1527)

Examples (2.132), (2.133), and (2.134) show the object of the postposition modified by a quantifier.

- (2.132) *Amicaáca* *quí* *cuúmi taquína=siricuma*  
 one.day.away 1SG two lake=along  
*niti-rii-ø*.  
 run-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will run along two lakes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1533)

- (2.133) *Quí* *cuúmi amariaana=jina* *ani-aarii-ø*.  
 1SG two year=LOC come-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will come in two years.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1529)

- (2.134) *Amicaáca* *quí* *masiáana cusi-ca=jina* *ina-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG many pot-PL=LOC put-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*nuú*.  
 3SG  
 ‘Tomorrow I will put it [manioc beer] in various pots.’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106,  
 p. 1551)

Example (2.135) shows that the object of the postposition can be a compound. In this example, the object is also modified by a quantifier.

- (2.135) *Amicaáca quí masiáana anapa anácaari=jata*  
 one.day.away 1SG many *huitina*=with  
*capi-rii-ø.*  
 cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cook with a lot of *huitina*.’ (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p. 1593)

The object of the postposition can also be a modified possessive phrase, as shown in (2.136). In this example, the adjective precedes the possessive phrase and modifies the possessor.

- (2.136) *Amicaáca nu umáana mîsáji íta=jinacuma=ji*  
 one.day.away 3SG big woman house=inside=from  
*jimati-arii-ø.*  
 leave-ABL.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow she will leave from inside the fat woman’s house.’  
 (E.LII.CIA.230808, p. 2565)

It is possible for the postpositional phrase to have multiple modifiers, as is the case in (2.137). In this example, a quantifier precedes the noun and an adjective follows it.

- (2.137) *Cana cuúmi ítmina umáana=jina iicua-rii-ø.*  
 1PL.EXCL two canoe=LOC go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘We will go in two big canoes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1533)

Jaime allows for both the quantifier and the adjective to precede the noun, as shown in (2.138), but he also considers the order given in (2.137) to be grammatical.

(2.138) *Amicaáca na masiáana cumacu-ca íta-ca=jina*  
 one.day.away 3PL many old-PL house-PL=LOC  
*raati-rî-ø.*  
 drink-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow they will drink in various old houses.’ (E.JPI.CIA.081106, p. 1541)

We saw with quantified object phrases that speakers exhibit a preference to avoid possessive phrases in the irrealis position. A similar preference is found with postpositional phrases where the object of the postpositional phrase is a possessive phrase. For example, in (2.139), the element in the irrealis position is a quantified noun plus a postposition. Following the verb is a possessive phrase (*icuáni ímina* ‘man’s canoe’) which modifies the noun phrase; it is not introducing a new argument.

(2.139) *Amicaáca pi cuúmi ímina=jina ícua-rî-ø*  
 one.day.away 1PL.INCL two canoe=LOC go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*icuáni ímina.*  
 man canoe  
 ‘Tomorrow we will go in two canoes belonging to the man.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p. 1593)

### 2.3.3 Modified orientational clitic phrases

In this section, I discuss the behavior of modified orientational clitic phrases in the irrealis position, but first I discuss the ways in which modifiers occur with orientational clitic phrases more generally.

As I mentioned in Section 2.2.4, the key difference between postpositions and orientational clitics is the type of host they cliticize to. Orientational clitics

can cliticize to adjective roots in addition to nouns and inflected adjectives, and they are the only morphemes available to adjective roots that also occur on nouns. When the order of the noun phrase is adjective-noun, animacy/number agreement is marked on the adjective and the clitic attaches to the noun, as can be seen in the realis example in (2.140). This behavior is identical to what we saw with postpositions; number/animacy agreement is marked on the adjective and the postposition cliticizes to the noun, as in (2.130) above.

- (2.140) *Pi=*                    *ícuaa-∅*                    *caami-raata*                    *saami-na*  
           1PL.INCL= go.IMPF-E.C.TENSE upriver-ORN:towards new-SG  
*pí-nási=cu.*  
           1PLI-*chacra*-ORN:upriver  
           ‘We are going upriver to our new *chacra*.’ (E.HDC.CIA.021006)

When the order of the adjective and noun are reversed, and the adjective follows the noun, the orientational clitic attaches to the adjective root and the animacy/number agreement that would normally occur with the adjective is absent, as demonstrated in the realis examples in (2.141). This behavior does not happen with postpositions: postpositions cliticize to the adjective with animacy/number agreement in tact, as can be seen in example (2.51) in Section 2.2.3 and example (2.131) in the previous section. The orientational clitics thus override the need to mark animacy/number agreement on the adjective, but only when they cliticize to the adjective itself; number/animacy agreement is marked on the adjective when the orientational clitic occurs on the noun, as in (2.140). That said, it is also possible for the orientational clitic to cliticize to an inflected adjective, as I will show in some of



the examples below. I think this variation is a result of lack of use; speakers seemed to avoid modified orientational clitic phrases whenever possible in my elicitation sessions, and there are only a few instances of these phrases in the text corpus.

- (2.141) a. *Quí= muusii- $\phi$  t́ira cacúti musuti=cuura.*  
 1SG= swim.IMPF-E.C.TENSE there beach white=ORN:there  
 ‘I am going to swim there to the white beach.’
- b. *Quí= muusii- $\phi$  naámi cacúti*  
 1SG= swim.IMPF-E.C.TENSE downriver beach  
*musuti=ma.*  
 white=ORN:downriver  
 ‘I am going to swim downriver to the white beach.’
- c. *Quí= muusii- $\phi$  cáami cacúti musuti=cu.*  
 1SG= swim.IMPF-E.C.TENSE upriver beach white=ORN:upriver  
 ‘I am going to swim upriver to the white beach.’ (E.ELY.CIA.300906)

Adjective roots with orientational clitics continue to behave like adjectives, as evidenced by the fact that they can occur in comparative constructions, as in (2.142) below. In this example, *isitima* ‘deep=ORN:interior’ is the quality being compared.

- (2.142) *Iína huaarti anuu=jinacuma taa juura **isiti=ma***  
 DET bucket 3SG=inside COP really deep=ORN:interior  
*iinajinaji taana huaarti.*  
 in.comparison.to other bucket  
 ‘That bucket, its interior is deeper than the other bucket.’  
 (E.JPI.CIA.111006)

Modified orientational clitic phrases can occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (2.143) below. In this example, the adjective follows the noun and the orientational clitic =*ma* occurs on the adjective root. The noun *curima* belongs to the set of nouns that must take an orientational clitic, which is why it too is marked with =*ma*.

- (2.143) *Amicaáca pî*  
 one.day.away 1PL.INCL  
*curima samii=ma*  
 port.ORN:DOWNRIVER new=ORN:DOWNRIVER  
*sihuaáni-rî-ø*.  
 arrive-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow we will arrive in the new port (downriver).’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1561)

Example (2.144) shows a modified possessive phrase with an orientational clitic in the irrealis position; again, the adjective follows the noun and the orientational clitic attaches to the adjective root.

- (2.144) *Amicaáca quí quí-nási jahua=cu*  
 one.day.away 1SG 1SG-*chacra* dry=ORN:UPRIVER  
*íicua-rî-ø*.  
 go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to my dry *chacra* (upriver).’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1551)

It is possible for the orientational clitic phrase to have multiple modifiers, as is the case in (2.145). This example also shows that a very complex phrase can occur in the irrealis position, as this phrase includes a possessive phrase, two

adjectives, and an orientational clitic. Note that the orientational clitic attaches to the inflected adjective in this example and not to the adjective root.

- (2.145) *Quí quí-nási samii-na umaa-na=cu*  
 1SG 1SG-*chacra* new-SG big-SG=ORN:UPRIVER  
*íicua-rii-ø.*  
 go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will go upriver to my big new swidden field.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260808, p. 2593)

As I mentioned in Section 2.2.4, there is a tendency for speakers to place long orientational phrases after the verb and to instead fill the irrealis position with a single adverb that conveys the same orientation. This tendency is also found with multiple modifiers in orientational clitic phrases. For example, I elicited the sentence in (2.146) with an orientational clitic phrase involving multiple modifiers in the irrealis position. Ligia says the sentence is acceptable, but repeats it with an adverb in the irrealis position and the orientational clitic phrase following the verb, as shown in (2.147).

- (2.146) *Amicaáca quí nási=cu saamina umáana*  
 one.day.away 1SG *chacra*=ORN:UPRIVER new big  
*íicua-rii-ø.*  
 go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will go to the new big *chacra* (upriver).’ (Example elicited by CIA, 210808, p. 2481)

- (2.147) *Amicaáca quí cáami íicua-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG upriver go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*nási=cu saamina umáana.*  
*chacra*=ORN:UPRIVER new big

‘Tomorrow I will go to the new big *chacra* (upriver).’ (E.LII.CIA.210808, p. 2481)

This example is interesting in that the orientational clitic attaches to the noun and the adjectives follow with no orientational clitics; this might be due to my elicitation prompt (which has the same order) or possibly to the fact that the orientational clitics are not used very often, resulting in variability in the way they are cliticized.

## 2.4 When the irrealis position is empty

So far, all of the examples presented in this chapter have assumed that there is an element available to intervene between the subject and the verb. But intransitive clauses consisting of only a subject and a verb have no element available to occur in the irrealis position. As a result, the marking of the reality status distinction is neutralized, meaning that the clause is ambiguous with respect to reality status, and speakers rely largely on context to determine whether the sentence is to be interpreted as realis or irrealis.

There are certain phonological conditions that help resolve the ambiguity in Iquito, but they only occur in very careful speech: irrealis intransitive clauses exhibit a phonological gap that is absent in realis clauses.<sup>15</sup> Lai (2009: 74-5; 149-51) and Beier et al. (in press) describe this gap strategy in detail; I summarize their

---

<sup>15</sup>The disambiguation of reality status neutralization under certain phonological conditions is also attested in Terêna, an Arawak language of Brazil (Elliott 2000: 62). However, this disambiguation strategy involves vowel harmony and not a phonological gap.

analyses below.

In realis clauses, pronominal subject pro-clitics attach to the verb, forming a phonological word with the verb. Since all of the subject person markers end in vowels, vowel hiatus (the vowel equivalent of a consonant cluster) occurs with vowel-initial verbs, as in (2.148). In this example, the vowel hiatus in the form *pi=iícuaa* is resolved by lengthening the vowel of the subject pronoun and deleting the initial vowel of the verb, such that /ii:/ becomes [i:].

(2.148) [pi:k<sup>w</sup>aki]

*Pi= iícua-qui-φ.*  
1PL.INCL= go-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
'We went.' (Beier et al. in press, example 59)

In irrealis clauses, the vowel hiatus resolution pattern is blocked; both the vowel of the subject pronoun and the verb-initial vowel are preserved. For instance, the underlying form in the irrealis clause in (2.149) exhibits the same /ii:/ vowel hiatus as the realis clause in (2.148), but the surface form of (2.149) preserves the vowel hiatus, rather than resolving it.

(2.149) [pii:k<sup>w</sup>aki]

*Pi= iícua-qui-φ.*  
1PL.INCL= go-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
'We will go.' (Beier et al. in press, example 60)

Vowel hiatus resolution is blocked only when the irrealis position is empty; when subject pronouns cliticize to a vowel-initial element in the irrealis position, we see the same vowel hiatus resolution patterns that occur in realis clauses with vowel-initial verbs.

Beier et al. (in press) argue that the blocking effect is a consequence of the unfilled irrealis position, stating that the formation of phonological words is blocked by the empty syntactic position. As a result, the word-internal vowel hiatus does not occur, nor does the triggering environment for the vowel hiatus resolution process. Alternatively, one could view this blocking effect as evidence that a phonological element has been lost. I will explore this argument in Chapter 4.

## **2.5 Speaker preferences for filling the irrealis position**

In this section, I examine speaker preferences for filling the irrealis position, and I propose a hierarchy to capture these data.

We have seen throughout this chapter that speakers exhibit a preference for short items to occur in the irrealis position. The most common element type found in this position in texts is the third person pronoun *nu*, a phonologically short element. Additionally, speakers exhibit a number of strategies for avoiding long phrases in the irrealis position, especially possessive phrases and modified orientational clitic phrases.

One strategy for avoiding long phrases in the irrealis position is to insert an adverb. There are four main adverbs used for this purpose: *naámi*, meaning

‘downriver’, ‘down’, or ‘inside’, depending on the context, *cáami*, meaning ‘upriver’, ‘up’, or ‘outside’, depending on the context, *tíira*, meaning ‘perpendicular to the river’ or ‘there’ (when the orientation is not clear or relevant), and *ííti* ‘here’. *Naami* is also used with orientational clitic phrases involving =*ma*, *cáami* is used with =*cu*, and *tíira* is used with =*cuura*.

I elicited the sentence in (2.150), which has a long postpositional phrase (Pr Pm Adj PostP) in the irrealis position. Ema was able to repeat this sentence, but then she gave me another version, provided in (2.151), which fills the irrealis position with an adverb instead of the longer postpositional phrase.

- (2.150) *Nu m̄iisáji ííta umáana=jinacuma=ji jimata-rii-ø.*  
 3SG woman house big=inside=from exit-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘S/he will leave from inside of the woman’s big house.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2453)

- (2.151) *Nu naámi=ji jimata-rii-ø m̄iisáji ííta*  
 3SG inside=from exit-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman house  
*umáana=jinacuma=ji.*  
 big=inside=from  
 ‘S/he will leave from inside of the woman’s big house.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2455)

The insertion of the adverb *naámi=ji* retains the meaning of ‘from inside’ which is then elaborated on by the full postpositional phrase after the verb. The inserted adverb acts as a pronoun that is coreferential with the longer adverbial phrase.

As we saw in Sections 2.2.4 and 2.3.3, this strategy is quite common with orientational clitic phrases. Speakers exhibit a tendency to fill the irrealis position with a single adverb that conveys the same direction as the orientational clitic phrase and to place the orientational phrase after the verb. In fact, speakers will choose to place an adverb in the irrealis position over an orientational clitic phrase when possible. Using an adverb instead of an orientational clitic phrase is also found with longer orientational clitic phrases having modifiers and/or possessive phrases.

Another strategy for avoiding long noun phrases in the irrealis position is to insert the determiner *íina*. I acknowledge that this strategy may also result from pragmatic factors inherent to the elicitation context, but given the frequency with which speakers inserted a determiner into irrealis constructions, I suspect these pragmatic factors are not the only factors at work. I discuss the behavior of the determiner *íina* in more detail in Chapter 3.

In (2.152), a bare noun occurs with a postposition in the irrealis position. Immediately following this sentence, I prompted Ema to tell me what the sentence would be if the house was blue. In creating her response, she inserts *íina*, as can be seen in (2.153). The determiner *íina* occurs in the irrealis position with the postposition, and the noun and adjective follow the verb. As a result, she avoids putting a long noun phrase in the irrealis position.

- (2.152) *Amicaáca quí íita=jinacuma iricatájuu-ríi-ø.*  
 One.day.away 1SG house=inside straighten.up-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will straighten up inside the house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1531)



(2.153) *Amicaáca*      *quí*    *íina=jinacuma*    *iricatájuu-ríi-ø*  
 One.day.away 1SG    DET=inside      straighten.up-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*ííta*    *níyana*.  
 house    blue  
 ‘Tomorrow I will straighten up inside the blue house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106,  
 p. 1531)

Since adding an adjective to a bare noun increases the length of the noun phrase that would occur with the postposition in the irrealis postposition, and using a determiner means that the noun and adjective will follow the verb, the insertion of the determiner can be viewed as a strategy for avoiding putting a long noun phrase in the irrealis position, although it is also possible that she inserts *íina* because once we talk about the house being blue, it has to be definite and not indefinite.

I propose that the element types we see in the irrealis position follow the hierarchy presented in Table 2.6. This hierarchy captures speaker preferences for short elements to occur in the irrealis position and can be elaborated as follows: 1) if the clause is negated with *ji-caa* negation, then *caa* is the preferred element for the irrealis position 2) when choosing between multiple elements, consider which element is the shortest and where it falls on the hierarchy. Shorter elements are preferred over longer ones. 3) items lower on the hierarchy will be replaced with an item higher up on the hierarchy when possible. For instance, long noun phrases will likely be replaced by a pronoun or a determiner, and long adverbial phrases will likely be replaced with a single adverb. These preferences for short elements are likely due to processing constraints of the sort described by Hawkins (2007: 88), who states that “grammars have conventionalized syntactic structures in proportion

to their degree of preference in performance.”

Table 2.6: Hierarchy of elements occurring in the irrealis position

ELEMENT TYPE		COMMENTS
<b>NEGATIVE PARTICLE</b>	NEGATIVE PARTICLE	
<b>OBJECT NOUN PHRASE</b>	PRONOUN DETERMINER BARE NOUN POSSESSIVE PHRASE - with a pronominal possessor - with a nominal possessor MODIFIED NOUN MULTIPLY MODIFIED NOUN	Not available in intransitive clauses
<b>ADVERB</b>	ADVERB	
<b>ADVERBIAL PHRASE</b>	POSTPOSITION ORIENTATIONAL CLITIC	Noun phrase complement follows object noun phrase hierarchy

In Chapter 4, I will show that extraction operations like focus and question formation trump this hierarchy, meaning that if an element has been fronted for either of these purposes, it cannot occur in the irrealis position.

## 2.6 Summary

In this chapter, I have shown that a number of element types of various lengths and complexities can occur in the irrealis position, that is, between the subject and the verb of an irrealis clause, and that the irrealis position is found with all verb valencies. The element types I have presented are: pronouns, bare nouns, pos-

sessed nouns (formed via the possessive prefix strategy and the noun juxtaposition strategy), objects of nonfinite complements, predicate complements, postpositional phrases, orientational clitic phrases, adverbs, and the negation particle. When there is no element available to intervene between the subject and the verb, the reality status distinction is neutralized, but it is possible to see a difference between the two clauses in certain phonological contexts.

When modifiers are introduced, they too occur with the noun they modify in the irrealis position. I have shown that there is no length constraint on the elements that occur in this position; a noun can occur with multiple modifiers, as can entire phrases.

Although fairly complex phrases can occur in the irrealis position, there do seem to be some processing constraints which come into play with the longer complex phrases. There is a preference for short elements to occur in this position; in the text corpus, pronominal objects are overwhelmingly the element type that occurs the most frequently in the irrealis position, especially the third person singular pronoun. There is also a preference for adverbs to occur in the irrealis position over orientational clitic phrases and for possessive phrases to follow the verb when they are quantified.

I have also demonstrated that it is ungrammatical for two elements to occur together in the irrealis position, such as both arguments of a ditransitive verb or an adverb and an object. Splitting up of phrases is, however, allowed, as we saw with quantified possessive phrases and phrases with multiple modifiers. Clitics, such as postpositions and the orientational clitics, must occur with their hosts in the irrealis

position.

Based on the data I have presented in this chapter, I argue that what unifies the elements in the irrealis position is that they are all phrases. However, the behavior we see with determiners causes problems for this claim. I address this behavior, and resolve the problems it raises, in the next chapter.

## Chapter 3

### Determiner behavior

#### 3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I enumerated the types of elements that occur in the irrealis position: pronominal objects, bare nouns, modified nouns, possessive phrases, predicate complements, adverbs and adverbial phrases such as postpositional phrases and orientational clitic phrases, and negation. I showed that the position is not limited to a single word and can be filled by a variety of different elements of various lengths and complexity. I argued that what unified these elements is that they are all phrases and that only one phrase can occur in this position at a time.

In this chapter, I introduce another element type that can occur in the irrealis position: the determiner. This element type is challenging from an analytical standpoint because it is not considered to be a phrase on its own. Rather, the determiner together with its associated noun form a phrase. Based on the evidence presented in Chapter 2, we would predict that they would be able to occur together in the irrealis position. But, in fact, a determiner and a noun cannot occur together in this position, as shown in the ungrammatical examples in (3.1a) and (3.2a). Instead, the determiner occurs in the irrealis position and its associated noun immediately

follows the verb, as shown in the grammatical versions given in (3.1b) and (3.2b).

(3.1) a. \**Nu iína pápaaja asa -rii -ø.*  
 3SG DET fish eat -MMT.PRF -E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘S/he will eat this fish.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2205)

b. *Nu iína asa -rii -ø pápaaja.*  
 3SG DET eat -MMT.PRF -E.C.TENSE fish  
 ‘S/he will eat this fish.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2205)

(3.2) a. \**Quí iína ajrina miitii-ø-ø quiáaja.*  
 1SG DET chair give–PERF–E.C.TENSE 2SG  
 TARGET: ‘I will give this chair to you.’ (E.JPI.CIA.250708, p. 2003)

b. *Quí iína miitii-ø-ø ajrina quiáaja.*  
 1SG DET give–PERF–E.C.TENSE chair 2SG  
 ‘I will give this chair to you.’ (E.JPI.CIA.250708, p. 2003)

As we will see throughout this chapter, determiner phrases exhibit obligatory discontinuous constituency in the irrealis position.<sup>1</sup> In addition to occurring by itself, the determiner can also occur in the irrealis position with a postposition if it is part of a postpositional phrase, as I will show in Section 3.5.2. It can occur with a possessum if it is part of a possessive phrase or with a possessum and a postposition if it is part of a possessive phrase that is also the object of a postpositional phrase; both of these orders are discussed in Section 3.5.3.2. In all of these cases, the associated noun immediately follows the verb.

---

<sup>1</sup>I am using the term *determiner phrase* to refer to any phrase that includes a determiner plus a noun. I avoid calling them definite phrases since it is possible to have definite phrases without a determiner (e.g. personal names and other proper nouns).

Although there were a few examples of discontinuous constituency triggered by the irrealis position presented in Chapter 2 (e.g. adjectives separated from the rest of the noun phrase by the verb), the syntactically unified correlate was also possible, meaning that whichever element followed the verb could also occur with the rest of the phrase in the irrealis position. The discontinuous constituency was therefore not obligatory, and even when there was discontinuous constituency, the element in the irrealis position was considered a phrase in its own right. This begs the question: since the determiner can occur by itself in the irrealis position, does that suggest that it too is a phrase? Although syntactic theories take different approaches to determiners (some treating them as phrasal heads and others treating them as noun phrase specifiers), these theories do not traditionally treat determiners as phrases in their own right. As a marker of definiteness, a determiner must occur with a noun. How, then, do we address the claim made in the previous chapter that the element in the irrealis position is a phrase? We either need to say that the element in the irrealis position is not a phrase or figure out a way to treat the determiner as a phrase.

To resolve these issues, I look at the historical development of the determiner. Its origin as a demonstrative pronoun helps to explain the behavior we see in the irrealis position. I will argue that the determiner functions as both a definite article and a demonstrative determiner synchronically but that it has historically functioned solely as a demonstrative pronoun and thus was once analyzable as a phrase. During the grammaticalization process from pronoun to determiner, the syntactic distribution of the pronoun has been preserved, which is how it is possible for the

determiner to occur in the irrealis position independent of its associated noun. This analysis also allows us to uphold the generalization that the element in the irrealis position is a phrase, by saying that there was once a point in the language’s history when all the elements in the irrealis position were phrases.

In the next section, I provide a summary of what the determiners are. In Section 3.3, I discuss the grammaticalization process that the determiners participate in. From there, I present split determiner behavior outside of the irrealis position (Section 3.4), and then examine the ways in which the determiner occurs in the irrealis position (Section 3.5).

## 3.2 Background

### 3.2.1 Terminology

The term *determiner* is used by Lyons (1999: 15) to refer to “non-adjectival noun phrase modifiers such as *this*, *several*, *our*, *all*.” I use the term a bit more narrowly to refer to three sets of noun phrase modifiers that are found in Iquito and summarized in Table 3.1: *íina/íimi/íipi*, *quiina/quiimi/quiipi*, and *iinatiira/iimitiira/iipitiira*. I show that these terms are identical in form to the set of demonstrative pronouns and can function as demonstrative determiners, but that they are increasingly used as definite articles, especially the former set (*íina/íimi/íipi*). I do not include possessive prefixes, possessors, or quantifiers in my definition.

I use the term *determiner phrase* to refer to any phrase that has a determiner and an associated noun. There are three determiner phrase types: a *determiner noun phrase*, which is a determiner plus a noun (the noun may or may not be modified



by adjectives or quantifiers); a *determiner possessive phrase*, which is when a determiner occurs with a possessive phrase; and a *determiner postpositional phrase*, which is used for postpositional phrases where the object of the postposition is a determiner noun phrase.

I am relying largely on Diessel's (1999: 2) definition of *demonstratives*: they are "deictic expressions serving specific syntactic... and pragmatic functions. They are primarily used to focus the hearer's attention on objects or locations in the speech situation (often in combination with a pointing gesture), but they may also function to organize the information flow in the ongoing discourse." Diessel (1999: 4) distinguishes between four different demonstrative types, based on the syntactic distribution they exhibit. Pronominal demonstratives are independent pronouns that occur in the argument position of verbs and adpositions. Adnominal demonstratives accompany a cooccurring noun. Adverbial demonstratives are usually locative (such as English *here* and *there*) and different in form from pronominal and adnominal demonstratives. Finally, identificational demonstratives are special demonstrative forms used in copular and non-verbal clauses. These demonstrative types may overlap in form, meaning that the same form may be used for two or more distributions. In order to distinguish between demonstratives that are formally distinct from each other, Diessel introduces a set of categorial terms: demonstrative pronoun, demonstrative determiner, demonstrative adverb, and demonstrative identifier. A language may have four sets of forms, one for each of these categories, or it may have a smaller subset in which one form is used for two (or more) distributions. For instance, some languages have a demonstrative pronoun, whose distribu-

tion is pronominal and adnominal, and some languages do not have a demonstrative pronoun, in which case a demonstrative determiner is used in combination with a pronoun or classifier for the pronominal distribution.

A *definite article* is a formal marker of definiteness. While definite articles may derive historically from demonstratives, one indicator that a demonstrative has become a definite article is that the deictic function is lost (Diessel 1999: 129, see also Lyons 1999: 116). Stress can also be used to distinguish definite articles from demonstratives: demonstratives “are almost invariably stressed” whereas definite articles are not (Lyons 1999: 116).

### **3.2.2 Iquito determiners: On the cline between demonstrative pronouns and definite articles**

In this section, I will show that Iquito determiners function as both demonstrative pronouns and definite articles synchronically. When the determiners function as demonstrative determiners, they (together with the demonstrative pronouns) make up part of the spatial deictic system along with locative adverbs (e.g. *íiti* ‘here’, *tíira* ‘there’, *cáami* ‘upriver, up, outside’, and *naámi* ‘downriver, down, inside’), the orientational clitics discussed in Chapter 2, and a set of verbal affixes that indicates spatial deixis: *-huii* (for motion towards the deictic center) and *-cuaa* (for motion away from the deictic center). As demonstrative determiners, they are used to focus the hearer’s attention on a particular object in the speech situation and are in fact identical in form to the demonstrative pronouns.

The Iquito demonstrative pronouns and determiners, also called spatial demon-

stratives, form a three-term system that is considered to be person oriented (following the definition given by Anderson and Keenan (1985: 282)), since demonstrative usage is determined by the orientation of the referent with respect to both discourse participants. These terms are given in Table 3.1. The term *íina* is used for items close to the speaker, the term *quíina* is used for items close to the addressee, and the term *iinatiira* is used for items that are outside of the reach (but not necessarily sight) of both the speaker and addressee. Each term can be realized in three different ways, depending on the number and animacy of the referent (although animacy is only distinguished in the plural form). The singular/general term includes the singular/general morpheme *-na* (which is also found with adjectives), and it is used for both animate and inanimate referents. In many ways, this form is a default and can be used with plural nouns if the plurality is made explicit in other ways (e.g. through a numeral or a quantifier term). The plural inanimate form includes the morpheme *-mi* and the plural animate form includes the morpheme *-pi*. These morphemes are also used with adjectives to mark plural/animacy agreement.

Table 3.1: Demonstrative pronouns/determiners

ORIENTATION	SG	PL (INANIMATE)	PL (ANIMATE)
SPEAKER-PROXIMAL	<i>íina</i>	<i>íimi</i>	<i>íipi</i>
ADDRESSEE-PROXIMAL	<i>quíina</i>	<i>quíimi</i>	<i>quíipi</i>
SPKR/ADR-DISTAL	<i>iinatiira</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>iimitiira</i>	<i>iipitiira</i>

<sup>2</sup>The speaker/addressee distal demonstrative *iinatiira/iimitiira/iipitiira* is a composition of the speaker proximal demonstrative *íina/íimi/íipi* and the locative adverb *tiira* ‘there’. This form behaves as a lexicalized unit; it is otherwise ungrammatical for an adverb to appear between a determiner and its complement noun. Diessel (2003: 636) notes that “there is no evidence from any language that

An example of each demonstrative is given below: the speaker proximal demonstrative is given in (3.3), the addressee proximal demonstrative in (3.4), and the speaker/addressee distal demonstrative in (3.5). These three examples show that each term can be used independently as a pronoun (see the (a.) examples) or together with a noun (see the (b.) examples) and that the actual form of the demonstrative is identical in both contexts. In all of these examples, the speakers were gesturing to the object they were referring to, making these particular examples clear illustrations of the demonstrative function of these terms in both their pronominal and adnominal forms.

(3.3) a. *Iína* *ricuu-yaa-ø*.  
 DEM (sp. proximal) hurt-IMPF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘This one hurts.’ (In response to the question, “Which tooth hurts you?”) (E.HDC.CIA.021106)

b. *Quia= nacarií-yaa-ø* *iína* *cúsi?*  
 2SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE DEM (sp. proximal) pot  
 ‘Do you want this pot?’ (that I am holding in my hand)  
 (E.HDC.CIA.021106)

(3.4) a. *Saáca tíí quiína* *túíí-yaa-ø*  
 what COP DEM (adr. proximal) to.be.stuck-IMPF-E.C.TENSE  
*quia=jina?*  
 2SG=LOC  
 ‘What is that that is stuck on you?’ (E.HDC.CIA.021106)

---

a new demonstrative or interrogative developed from a lexical source (unless the lexical source first functioned to reinforce a genuine demonstrative or interrogative).” Although the speaker/addressee distal demonstrative is derived in part from a lexical source, namely the locative adverb *tiira* ‘there’, it fits Diessel’s typological generalization since the lexical source combines with and reinforces a genuine demonstrative.

- b. *Capísi iiqiii-∅* *quiína=jina*  
 wound exist.impf-E.C.TENSE DEM (adr. proximal)=LOC  
*quia-túucu.*  
 2SG-ear  
 ‘There’s a sore on that ear (of yours).’ (E.HDC.CIA.021106)

- (3.5) a. *Iinatiira* *turutaa-∅.*  
 DEM (sp./adr. distal) dry.IMPf-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘That one there is drying.’ (referring to a blouse on a clothesline that is visible but far from both speaker and addressee) (E.HDC.CIA.061106)

- b. *Sisaanurica tíí iinatiira* *cúsi.*  
 small COP DEM (sp./adr. distal) pot  
 ‘That there pot is small.’ (referring to a pot in another building)  
 (E.ELY.CIA.041106)

These examples also illustrate some of the syntactic distributions of each of these types. The pronominal form can occur in the subject position, as it does in (3.3a) and (3.5a), or as part of a cleft construction, as it does in (3.4a). Although not illustrated here, it is also possible for the pronominal form to occur in copular constructions. The adnominal form must precede the associated noun. It can be contiguous with the noun, as shown in (3.3b) and (3.5b), but it does not have to be. In (3.4b), for example, the postposition cliticizes to the adnominal demonstrative term, separating it from its associated noun. I will discuss this discontinuous behavior in more detail in Section 3.4.1.

It is common cross-linguistically for demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative determiners to have the same form within a language. Anderson and Keenan

(1985) often treat them as a single unit, referring to them as demonstrative adjectives<sup>3</sup>/pronouns. Diessel (1999: 59) states that the majority of languages in his typological survey of 85 languages use the same demonstrative form for independent pronouns and for noun modifiers, and notes that for most of these languages, there is no evidence that the pronominal and adnominal demonstratives actually belong to different categories (Diessel 1999: 60). He argues that the adnominal demonstrative can be analyzed as an independent pronoun that is adjoined to a neighboring noun in some kind of appositional structure. However, he also indicates that adnominal and pronominal demonstratives are categorially distinguished in English based solely on syntactic properties (since pronominal and adnominal *this* and *that* are not morphologically or phonologically distinguished) (Diessel 1999: 68). I argue that the Iquito pronominal and adnominal demonstratives can also be categorially distinguished from each other even though they are morphologically and phonologically the same.

One reason Diessel groups adnominal demonstratives in the same category as pronominal demonstratives is because of the observation that in several languages, when a demonstrative occurs with a noun, it is only loosely combined with that noun. This is evident in languages such as Tuscarora, Dyirbal, Nunggubuyu, Wardaman, Oneida, West Greenlandic, and Karanga, where adnominal demonstratives behave as follows: 1) both the noun and the demonstrative can represent the

---

<sup>3</sup>While the number/animacy markers (*-na*, *-mi*, and *-pî*) used with the Iquito determiners are the same ones that are used with adjectives, I do not consider these terms to be demonstrative adjectives and reject Anderson and Keenan's (1985) use of the term demonstrative adjective in lieu of demonstrative determiner. We will see that Iquito determiners and adjectives have different syntactic distributions with respect to the noun, especially in the irrealis position.

entire NP without the other element, 2) their position with respect to each other is flexible, and 3) they are often separated by an intonational break. An additional criterion which is evident in several Australian languages is that it is possible for adnominal demonstratives to be separated from their noun by an intervening constituent.

Some of these criteria partially hold for Iquito. It is true that the noun or the demonstrative can stand alone without the other element, but it is not true that either element can semantically represent the entire NP without the other element. For instance, the interpretation of the noun is different if the demonstrative is absent; instances of bare nouns in texts are typically interpreted as indefinite nouns or proper nouns. Nor do demonstratives represent the entire NP on their own; personal pronouns are typically used to fill in for the entire NP. In the following lines from a text about how to weave hammocks, there are two indefinite bare nouns in (3.6a): *iníisi* ‘hammock’ and *canuú* ‘*chambira*’. The introduction of a determiner in (3.6b) singles out the palm (*canuú*) as the topic. The noun palm (*canuú*) in (3.6a) is not interchangeable with the entire NP in (3.6b), nor is a demonstrative used in subsequent lines to represent the entire NP. Instead, the third person singular pronoun *nuú* represents the NP in the lines that follow.

- (3.6) a. *Iníisi tanúini=úra, quia=saji-qui-∅ canuú.*  
 hammock weave.INF=BEN 2SG=cut-PERF-E.C.TENSE *chambira*  
 ‘To make a hammock, you cut *chambira* (type of palm).’
- b. *Atíi=ji=ja quia=nu<sub>i</sub>=turutíi-∅-∅ ína canuú<sub>i</sub>.*  
 there=from= 2SG=3SG=dry-PERF-E.C.TENSE DET *chambira*  
 ‘From there you will dry out this *chambira*.’

- c. *Atíí=ji=ja jíticarii taa turúuja nuú<sub>i</sub>=na,*  
 there=from= when COP dry 3SG=CLAUSE.END  
 ‘From there, when it’s dry,’
- d. *huári quia=inii-∅ nuú<sub>i</sub>.*  
 then 2SG=twist.IMPF-E.C.TENSE 3SG  
 ‘then you twist it.’ (T.JCI.ELY.061212, lines 3-6)

Another criterion that partially holds for Iquito is the one that addresses discontinuous constituency. It is possible in Iquito for an adnominal demonstrative to be separated from its noun by an intervening constituent. This behavior is found with some regularity and in several contexts. We have already seen that an adnominal demonstrative must be separated from the noun by the verb when it occurs in the irrealis position in (3.1b) and (3.2b), and I discuss this behavior in more detail in Section 3.5. But an adnominal demonstrative is also separated from the noun by the postposition in postpositional phrases and by the possessum in possessive phrases. It is also possible for an adnominal demonstrative to be separated from the noun when it is the subject of the verb. I discuss this split determiner behavior in more detail in Section 3.4.

However, there are also instances in the syntax where the determiner and noun cannot be separated from each other. The clearest examples are topicalized noun phrases. In these cases, the determiner and noun occur together in the topic position and a resumptive pronoun representing the entire noun phrase and coreferential with the entire noun phrase occurs in the relevant argument position, showing that the determiner and noun form a constituent. For instance, in (3.7), the subject (*ína genio* ‘the genie’) is topicalized, and the resumptive pronoun (*nu*) occurs in



the subject position before the verb. In the ditransitive example in (3.8), the direct object (*íina simiími*) is topicalized, and the resumptive pronoun *nuú* occurs after the verb and after the indirect object, a position where a direct object could occur when not topicalized. This resumptive pronoun, and not a demonstrative, represents the entire noun phrase that is in the topic position. Furthermore, it is not possible for the determiner to occur in the topic position and for the noun to occur in some other sentential position.

(3.7) [*Íina genio*]<sub>i</sub> *nu<sub>i</sub>=iyuujuu tíira naqui=cuura.*  
 DET genie 3SG=wait there forest=ORN:perpendicular  
 ‘The genie waited there in the forest.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 404)

(3.8) [*Íina simiími*]<sub>i</sub> *jaá quí=masiitii- $\phi$ -cura íina icuáni nuú<sub>i</sub>.*  
 DET book already 1SG=sell-PERF-RPST DET man 3SG  
 ‘This book, I already sold it to this man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2309)

Another context where the determiner is not separated from its noun is when the two follow the verb as the object of a realis clause, as in (3.6b) above and (3.9) below. The recipient *íina icuáni* that follows the verb in (3.8) is also an illustrative example; it has a determiner that is not separated from its noun. In fact, the determiner and noun of an object phrase must be contiguous in this example for the clause to be interpreted as realis. If the verb were to intervene between these two elements, then the clause would be interpreted as irrealis, as I will show in Section 3.5. Example (3.9) also shows a contiguous determiner plus noun in subject position.

- (3.9) *Iína genio parijataariqui iína caáya.*  
DET genie help.DPST.IMPF DET person  
'The genie helped the person (man).' (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 400)

Diessel's remaining criteria do not hold for Iquito. The position of the demonstrative is fixed with respect to the noun: it must precede the noun (even in contexts where it is separated from the noun). Additionally, the demonstrative and the co-occurring noun are not typically separated by an intonational break, especially when they are adjacent to each other. Even when they are separated from each other by the verb or a postposition, there is no clear intonational break before the noun.

The fixed position of the determiner, the lack of intonational break between the determiner and the noun, and the contexts where the determiner and noun must be contiguous provide sufficient grounds for treating the adnominal demonstrative as its own category independent of the pronominal category. What remains to be explained is why the determiner can be separated from its associated noun in so many contexts. I argue that the answer lies in a grammaticalization process that is currently underway: the demonstrative determiner once functioned in an appositional structure but it is now in the process of becoming a definite article.

### **3.3 Grammaticalization of demonstratives**

I propose that the discontinuous constituency behavior that we see with the Iquito determiners can be explained by their historical development from demonstrative pronouns. I consider the Iquito determiners to be in the process of gram-

matalizing from demonstrative pronouns to definite articles, a grammaticalization process that is well attested cross-linguistically by Diessel (1999) and Lyons (1999), among others.

Diessel (1999: 128) in particular summarizes the key findings of several studies that describe the historical development of definite articles from adnominal demonstratives, pointing out that it is typically *anaphoric* adnominal demonstratives that serve as the historical source for definite articles. The first stage of the process involves an extension in the way that anaphoric adnominal demonstratives are used:

The use of anaphoric demonstratives is usually confined to non-topical antecedents that tend to be somewhat unexpected, contrastive or emphatic. When anaphoric demonstratives develop into definite articles, their use is gradually extended from non-topical antecedents to all kinds of referents in the preceding discourse. In the course of this development, demonstratives lose their deictic function and turn into formal markers of definiteness. (Diessel 1999: 128-9)

Evidence that the Iquito determiners are developing into definite articles can be seen in the following lines from a text about making *masato* (manioc beer). The manioc beer is the established topic, as evidenced by the first mention of it in (3.10b) and by the use of the third person singular pronoun to refer back to it in the lines that follow. When the determiner phrase *ína itíniija* is repeated in (3.10e), it is still the topic and is not unexpected, contrastive, or emphatic (what we would expect if it was functioning as an anaphoric demonstrative). This example also

illustrates that the deictic function is lost; there is no inherent expression of speaker or addressee proximity in these examples. Thus, it is an example of a referent that is not found with anaphoric demonstratives but is found with definite articles.

- (3.10) a. *Jííticarii nu=sapucuú-yaa-φ=na,*  
 when 3SG=froth-IMPf-E.C.TENSE=CLAUSE.END  
 ‘When it froths,’
- b. *huaari taa suhuáani ína itíniija.*  
 then COP good DET manioc.beer  
 ‘then that manioc beer is good.’
- c. *Caa nu=ajacusiíjaa quia-marasi.*  
 NEG 3SG=spoil.PART 2SG-gut  
 ‘It doesn’t upset your stomach.’
- d. *Iyami ácuji taa ipana nuú.*  
 because COP strong 3SG  
 ‘Because it is strong (good).’
- e. *Naji cana=mii-yaa-φ ína itíniija.*  
 like.this 1PL.EXCL=make-IMPf-E.C.TENSE DET manioc.beer  
 ‘In this way we make the manioc beer.’ (T.JCI.HM2.061212, lines 21-25)

Another part of the grammaticalization process is that adnominal demonstratives often lose the ability to inflect when they grammaticalize as definite markers (Diessel 1999: 129). Diessel talks about this explicitly in the context of European languages, where demonstratives are significantly more often inflected than articles, but this finding also holds in Iquito. Animacy and number agreement are not always marked on the determiner to the extent that *ína* seems to be becoming

the default article, even with plural (animate or inanimate) nouns. Ema is particularly prone to using *ína* as a default article, despite the fact that her grammaticality judgements with respect to animacy and number agreement are frequently the most reliable of all the speakers.

For instance, I elicited the example in (3.11) by stating the sentence in Iquito but using the plural inanimate determiner *iimi*. Ema repeated the sentence as it is given in (3.11), replacing *iimi* with the singular determiner *ína* even though both of the nouns in the possessive construction are plural. Upon further questioning, Ema allowed *iimi* to occur in the irrealis position, but not *ipi*. This latter judgement is in line with my predictions; since the determiner occurs by itself in the irrealis position, it should be grammatical with the possessum, not the possessor (see Section 3.5.3.2). However, Ema seems to prefer putting *ína* in this position over any other choice, which is unexpected based on the agreement phenomena we see with possessive phrases in the irrealis position. It is not, however, unexpected if the determiner is losing its ability to inflect.

- (3.11) *Amicaáca*      *quí*      *ína*      *siquita-rii-∅*                      *mírajaárica*  
           one.day.away 1SG DET wash-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE child.PL.DIM  
           *títíhua*.  
           foot.PL  
           ‘Tomorrow I will wash the children’s feet.’ (E.ELY.CIA.230808, p. 2537)

A similar example can be seen in (3.12). When I worked with Ema on this example, she did not like either of the plural determiners in the irrealis position despite the fact that both the possessor and the possessum are overtly marked as plural.

- (3.12) *Amicaáca*     *quí*   *íina*   *niqui-rii-ø*                     *icuani-huíya*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET see–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE man-PL  
*íimina-ca*.  
 canoe-PL  
 ‘Tomorrow I will see the men’s canoes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2309)

Example (3.13) also shows *íina* functioning as a default determiner but with a different possessive strategy than the previous two examples. But again, both the possessor and possessum are explicitly marked as plural, and so we would expect the determiner to agree in terms of number and animacy.

- (3.13) *Amicaáca*     *quí*   *íina íimina-ca*   *iricatájuu-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET CANOE-PL repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*maniini-cura*.  
 young.man-PL  
 ‘Tomorrow I will fix the young men’s canoes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2369)

The definite article grammaticalization process is usually accompanied by formal changes. In becoming definite articles, adnominal demonstratives lose some of their phonological substance and cliticize to an element in their environment (Diessel 1999: 129). The only formal change that might be happening in Iquito is that the demonstrative pronoun seems to have a different pitch contour than the adnominal demonstrative and definite article use. This is an area that merits further exploration. Otherwise, the determiners have not lost any of their phonological substance, nor can they be analyzed as clitics: it is still possible for them to be separated from their nouns and to occur as independent pronouns. We would expect to see formal changes to arise as the grammaticalization process continues.

Since articles are generally syntactically dependent, we would also expect that at some point during the grammaticalization process, adnominal demonstratives would lose their status as free nominals (Diessel 1999: 129). It seems that Iquito is in the middle of this process. Although it is possible for the determiner to be separated from its associated noun, as I will illustrate in detail in Sections 3.4 and 3.5, the order of the determiner with respect to the noun in these contexts is fixed and not flexible (flexible ordering with respect to the noun is one of the characteristics of demonstrative pronouns, but not definite articles). And as was discussed in Section 3.2.2, there are contexts where the determiner and the noun must occur contiguously, e.g. in topic position and as objects of realis clauses. Furthermore, there are very few instances of demonstrative pronouns in texts; most examples of the determiners functioning as independent pronouns can be analyzed as relative pronouns (another common grammaticalization cline that demonstrative pronouns participate in).

Diessel (1999: 129) notes that once grammaticalization is complete, and the adnominal demonstratives have turned into definite markers, their use may spread from definite nouns to nouns expressing specific indefinite information. At this point, articles occur with every noun, definite and indefinite, unless the noun is non-specific (i.e. generic), inherently definite (e.g. proper names), or otherwise marked for definiteness (e.g. by a demonstrative). This process is likely underway in Iquito and *núquiica* (the numeral term for ‘one’) is emerging as an indefinite article. In texts, *núquiica* is sometimes used to introduce characters. The emphasis in these contexts is not that there is only one character in the numeral sense, but

that there was *a* character, indicating the noun is indefinite. This is best illustrated in (3.14), where it is clear that there is only one person because he is named, but *núquiica* is used to indicate what type of person this man is (an old man like the speaker Hermico).

- (3.14) *Eliseo, Eliseo Sinchija, núquiica maana, jïita quïja ácari*  
Eliseo Eliseo Sinchija one/a older.person like 1SG now  
'Eliseo, Eliseo Sinchija, an old man like me right now'  
(T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 275)

The grammaticalization process of definite article from demonstrative pronoun is well underway in Iquito but is not yet complete. There are several contexts where the determiner can be split from its associated noun, which I attribute to its origins as a demonstrative pronoun. I turn now to look at these contexts, starting with the cases outside of the irrealis position and then turning specifically to the behavior that is seen within the irrealis position.

### **3.4 Split determiner behavior (outside of the irrealis position)**

In this section I discuss all but one of the contexts in which the determiner can be split from its associated noun by an intervening constituent, saving the irrealis position for the next section. I start with postpositional phrases and the behavior of other clitics (Section 3.4.1), then look at possessive phrases (Section 3.4.2), and then look at the subjects of both intransitive and transitive verbs in realis clauses (Section 3.4.3). Although these contexts suggest that the determiner is not a bound morpheme and that it does not form a strict constituent with its associated noun, I



will illustrate that these examples of discontinuous constituency are quite regular and predictable.

### 3.4.1 Determiners split by postpositions and other clitics

Postpositions cliticize to the end of noun phrases, following the noun and any modifiers the noun may take. An example of a postposition cliticizing to a bare noun can be seen in (3.15a) and to a modified noun phrase in (3.15b). With a noun phrase that includes a determiner, the postposition cliticizes to the determiner, and the noun follows the postposition, resulting in a discontinuous constituent. The resulting order, illustrated in (3.15c), is always DETERMINER=POSTPOSITION NOUN. It is ungrammatical for the postposition to cliticize to the noun when a determiner is present, as illustrated in (3.15d).

- (3.15) a. *cúsi=jina*  
pot=LOC  
'in a pot (indefinite)'
- b. *cúsi umáana=jina*  
pot big=LOC  
'in a big pot (indefinite)'
- c. *íina=jina cúsi*  
DET=LOC pot  
'in the/this pot (definite)'
- d. \**íina cúsi=jina*  
DET pot=LOC

Examples (3.15c) and (3.15d) show that the discontinuous constituent order, where the determiner is separated from its associated noun by the postposition, is required and that the continuous correlate is ungrammatical. This behavior differs from other reported cases of discontinuous constituency. In these cases, the continuous correlate is possible in addition to the discontinuous form. For example, Dahlstrom (1987: 60) presents a similar phenomenon in Fox (Algonquian), where the object of a postposition can appear as a discontinuous NP. The resulting order is the same as what we see in Iquito (DETERMINER POSTPOSITION NOUN) as shown in (3.16a) and (3.16b), but the syntactically unified NP (DETERMINER NOUN POSTPOSITION) is also possible, as shown in (3.16c).

- (3.16) a. *ayo-h=oči mi-ša-meki*  
           this-LOC=from sacred-pack-LOC  
           ‘from this sacred pack’ (Dahlstrom 1987: 60, example 34)
- b. *ayo-h=iši wi-ki-ya-peki*  
           this-LOC=to house-loc  
           ‘to this house’ (Dahlstrom 1987: 60, example 35)
- c. [*i-ya-h=meko we-ta-paki*] *oči*  
           there=emph where-it-is-east in-direction-of  
           ‘at the east end’ (Dahlstrom 1987: 60, example 33)

In Chapter 2, I showed that the orientational clitics behave similarly to postpositions but not identically. They can cliticize to a bare noun phrase in the same way that postpositions do but they do not cliticize to adjectives in the same way. Another way that orientational clitics are distinguished from postpositions is that they do not occur with determiner noun phrases. This is true whether the determiner and

noun are contiguous, as demonstrated by the ungrammatical example in (3.17), or if the determiner is separated from the noun by the orientational clitic, as shown in the ungrammatical example in (3.18). In the latter example, the determiner and cliticized orientational clitic occur in the irrealis position and the rest of the noun phrase follows the verb. Although this is a grammatical construction with postpositions, as we will see in Section 3.5.2, it is ungrammatical with the orientational clitics, as shown in this example.

(3.17) \**Quí= ícuaa-∅*                      *cáami ína cacúti musuti=cu.*  
 1SG= go.IMPF–E.C.TENSE upriver DET beach white=ORN:UPRIVER  
 TARGET: ‘I am going upriver to that white beach.’ (E.ELY.CIA.071106, p. 1515)

(3.18) \**Nu= ína<sub>i</sub>=cuura=ji*                      *ani-aari<sub>i</sub>-∅*  
 3SG= DET=ORN:PERPENDICULAR=from come-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*nási<sub>i</sub> suhuaani.*  
*chacra nice*  
 TARGET: ‘S/he will come from the nice *chacra* (swidden field).’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.190808, p. 2405)

Ema corrects the sentence in (3.18) by turning the object of the postposition into a possessive construction, as shown in the grammatical example in (3.19). It is grammatical for an orientational clitic to occur as part of a determiner possessive phrase, but the orientational clitic must occur on the possessum and the determiner with the possessor. As long as this is the case, the orientational clitic is not occurring with a determiner noun phrase, and the generalization that determiners do not occur with orientational clitics is not violated. I talk more about this phenomenon, as

well as possessive phrases within postpositional phrases as they occur in the irrealis position more generally in Section 3.5.4.

- (3.19) *Nu= ína<sub>i</sub> íjinaji=cuura=ji*  
 3SG= DET point=ORN:PERPENDICULAR=from  
*ani-aarií-∅ suhuaani nási<sub>i</sub>.*  
 come-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE nice chacra  
 ‘S/he will come from the point of the nice *chacra* (swidden field).’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.190808, p. 2404)

An example of the possessive order with an orientational clitic outside of the irrealis position can be seen in (3.20). In this example, the determiner modifies the possessor (which is clearer in the Spanish gloss *Voy a la casa de su hijo de esa mujer* ‘lit. I am going to the house of the son of this woman’). As a result, the noun that occurs with the orientational clitic is a bare noun and again, the generalization that orientational clitics and determiner noun phrases do not co-occur is upheld.

- (3.20) *Quí= ícuaa-∅ ína íta=cuura miisáji niyíni.*  
 1SG= go.IMPF-E.C.TENSE DET house=towards woman son  
 ‘I am going to this woman’s son’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2369)

That said, there are a set of demonstratives that incorporate the orientational clitic, namely *iima*, *iicu*, *iicúura*, *quínima*, *quinícu*, and *quinicuura*.<sup>4</sup> These demonstratives are summarized in Table 3.2. I have only found these terms to be used adverbially, as shown in examples (3.21) – (3.26) below. Even in example (3.21),

<sup>4</sup>I have not tested to see how the orientational clitics might be incorporated into the *iinatiira* set of demonstratives.

where the demonstrative occurs immediately before a noun, I do not consider it to be an adnominal demonstrative. The Spanish gloss includes the adverb *acá* ‘here’, which is absent when one of the Iquito determiners is used with the postposition =*jinacuma* ‘inside’. Furthermore, if *iima* were functioning as an adnominal demonstrative in this sentence, I would expect the postposition to cliticize to it instead of the noun *iíta*. I have very few examples of these orientational clitic demonstratives in my elicitation sessions, so whether or not these terms can be used as noun modifiers is an area that merits future research.

Table 3.2: Orientational clitic demonstratives

FORM	DEMONSTRATIVE SEMANTICS	ORIENTATIONAL SEMANTICS
<i>iicu</i>	speaker proximal	‘upriver, up, outside’
<i>iima</i>	speaker proximal	‘downriver, down, inside’
<i>iicúura</i>	speaker proximal	‘perpendicular to the river’
<i>quinícu</i>	addressee proximal	‘upriver, up, outside’
<i>quínima</i>	addressee proximal	‘downriver, down, inside’
<i>quinicuura</i>	addressee proximal	‘perpendicular to the river’

(3.21) *Amicaáca quí suhuaata capi-rii-∅*  
 one.day.away 1SG well cook=MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*ii=ma iíta=jinacuma iína cuuhuaá.*  
 DEM:SP.PROXIMAL=ORN:INSIDE house=inside DET meat  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cook well this meat here inside the house.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.260808, p. 2599)

(3.22) *Aní-maa í=cu.*  
 Come-REM.PRF DEM:SP.PROXIMAL=ORN:UP  
 ‘Come up here.’ (Dictionary entry for *ícu*)

- (3.23) *Ináta-qui-∅*                      *ii=cúura*  
 put-PERF-E.C.TENSE DEM:SP.PROXIMAL=ORN:PERPENDICULAR  
*quia-íimina.*  
 2SG-canoe  
 ‘Put your canoe up higher.’ (Dictionary entry for *iicúura*)
- (3.24) *Quini=ma*                                      *quia=ináta-qui-∅*  
 DEM:AD.PROXIMAL=ORN:DOWN 2SG=put-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*níya=ma*                      *nuú.*  
 ground=ORN:DOWN 3SG  
 ‘Put it down there on the ground [from up above].’ (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1471)
- (3.25) *Quini=cu*                                      *quia=ináta-qui-∅*                      *níicu*    *nuú.*  
 DEM:AD.PROXIMAL=ORN:UP 2SG=put-PERF-E.C.TENSE up.high 3SG  
 ‘Put it up there [on the ledge above us].’ (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1471)
- (3.26) *Quini=cuura*  
 DEM:AD.PROXIMAL=ORN:PERPENDICULAR  
*quia=ináta-huii-∅*                      *nuú.*  
 2SG=put-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE 3SG  
 ‘Go and put it up higher [refers to placing a canoe up higher on the river bank].’ (E.ELY.CIA.041106, p. 1473)

Other noun phrase clitics in Iquito are able to cliticize to the determiner when one is present in the phrase. For example, the reportative evidential cliticizes to the determiner of the noun phrase in (3.27).

- (3.27) *Iína=na*    *caáya<sub>i</sub>*    *nu<sub>i</sub>=ajácumi-∅-quiaqui*                      *namíraata,*  
 DET=REP person 3SG=bend.down-PERF-DPST down  
*caranaquúini*    *ácuji.*  
 embarrassment MOTIVE

‘This man was crouched down due to embarrassment.’ (T.CAS.JPI.061212, line 37)

Example (3.28) shows several clitics attached to the determiner: a postposition =*jata* ‘with’, the adversative conjunction =*quija* ‘but’, and the reportative evidential =*na*. These clitics all intervene between the determiner and its associated noun.

(3.28) *Iína=jata=quija=na miisáji, juú! nu=ámuu-φ-quiaqui=na*  
DET=with=but=REP woman wow 3SG=kill-PERF-DPST=REP  
*tímaaca.*  
agouti.paca

‘But with this woman, wow, he killed agouti paca.’ (T.HMS.JPI.061212, line 94)

The obligatory split determiner behavior that we see with postpositions and other clitics is explained by the grammaticalization process that the determiner has undergone. If we consider that the determiner was once a pronoun that occurred with a coreferential noun in apposition, then it was at that time grammatical for *íina* and its related forms to be the host for noun phrase clitics such as postpositions, evidentials, and the adversative conjunction. The appositional noun occurred as close to the demonstrative as possible, which was after the relevant clitic. Over time, the demonstrative pronoun transitioned towards a definite article, but the structure remained the same, and DETERMINER=CLITIC NOUN became the fixed order.

### 3.4.2 Determiners split within possessive phrases

I turn now to split determiner behavior in possessive phrases, which mirrors the behavior we saw with postpositions. Recall that Iquito has two strategies for marking possession: adding a possessive prefix to the possessed noun or juxtaposing two nouns. Determiners occur with both strategies, and in both cases the determiner precedes the possessor and the possessum.

When the determiner occurs with the possessive prefix strategy in realis constructions, the order is DETERMINER POSS.PREFIX-POSSESSUM, as shown in (3.29). This order does not result in discontinuous constituency. It is also the expected order since it mirrors what we see with the addition of a determiner to other noun phrases, such as bare nouns and compounds, in that the determiner immediately precedes the noun phrase.

- (3.29) ...*huári quia-asaa-∅*                      *ína quia-asúraaja...*  
later        2SG-eat.IMPF-E.C.TENSE    DET    2SG-manioc  
'...later you eat your manioc...' (T.CHC.ELY.061212, line 24)

The addition of a determiner to a possessive phrase formed via the noun juxtaposition strategy does result in discontinuous constituency. Ordinarily, when two nouns are juxtaposed, they are interpreted as POSSESSOR POSSESSUM (e.g. *icuáni ímina* 'man's canoe' (*lit.* man canoe)). When a determiner occurs with the noun juxtaposition strategy, the order of the possessor and possessum is flipped, resulting in the order DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR, as shown in the realis clause in (3.30). This behavior is similar to what we see with postpositions, in that the possessum takes the same position within the phrase that a postposition would.



- (3.30) *Quí= siquitaa-∅ [ípi<sub>i</sub> titíhua mirajaárica<sub>i</sub>]*  
 1SG= wash.IMPF-E.C.TENSE DET.PL.AN foot.PL child.PL.DIM  
 ‘I am washing the children’s feet.’ (E.ELY.CIA.230808, p. 2537)

Furthermore, the determiner is co-referential with the possessor and not the adjacent possessum. The coreferentiality in example (3.30) is made clear by the plural animate agreement marking on the determiner, which agrees with the animate possessor *mirajaárica* ‘children’ and not the inanimate possessum.

Discontinuous constituency within possessive phrases is described in other languages (e.g. Fox (Dahlstrom 1987: 60)), but in these languages the syntactically unified correlate is also grammatical. It is debatable whether the syntactically unified correlate is possible in Iquito. There were several instances in my elicitation sessions where Hermico and Jaime produced sentences where the determiner was coreferential with the *possessum*, making the determiner coreferential with the noun adjacent to it. For example, in (3.31), the plural inanimate determiner is used and agrees with the adjacent plural inanimate possessum, not the singular animate possessor.

- (3.31) *Quí=iricatájuu-yaa-∅ [ími<sub>i</sub> ímina-ca<sub>i</sub> maniini]*  
 1SG=repair-IMPF-E.C.TENSE DET.PL.INAN canoe-PL young.man  
 ‘I will fix the canoes of this young man.’ (E.HDC.CIA.150808, p. 2337)

However, these utterances always occurred with other similar utterances in which the determiner was coreferential with the possessor, and therefore these speakers might have been influenced by the elicitation context. Jaime in particular seems to overcompensate marking the plural on the determiner; he seemed to

be influenced by the need to mark plurality on the determiner if the possessum was plural. When both nouns were plural, he chose to make the determiner coreferential with the possessor, as shown in (3.32), suggesting that this is in fact the preferred order. This coreferentiality matches what we saw in (3.30) and is in line with what I would expect.

- (3.32) *Quí=cuucuu–yaa–∅*                      *íipí<sub>i</sub>*                      *sahuri-ca*    *icuaní-huíya<sub>i</sub>*.  
 1SG=sharpen–IMPF–E.C.TENSE    DET.PL.AN    machete-PL    man-PL  
 ‘I am sharpening the men’s machetes.’ (E.JPI.CIA.220808, p. 2501)

Ema, whose grammaticality judgements seem to be the most reliable, finds it ungrammatical for the determiner to agree with the possessum, as shown in the ungrammatical example in (3.33). She requires that the determiner be coreferential with the possessor, as shown in the grammatical correlate given in (3.34).

- (3.33) \**Quí=cariínii–yaa–∅*                      *íipí<sub>i</sub>*                      *míra<sub>i</sub>*    *míisáji*.  
 1SG=watch.s.o.–IMPF–E.C.TENSE    DET.PL.AN    child.PL    woman  
 ‘I am watching the woman’s children.’ (E.ELY.CIA.230808, p. 2537)

- (3.34) *Quí=cariínii–yaa–∅*                      *ítá<sub>i</sub>*    *míra*    *míisáji<sub>i</sub>*.  
 1SG=watch.s.o.–IMPF–E.C.TENSE    DET    child.PL    woman  
 ‘I am watching the woman’s children.’ (E.ELY.CIA.230808, p. 2537)

Based on this evidence, I conclude that in possessive constructions with a determiner, the determiner should be coreferential with the possessor and not the possessum. Brown (2004: 88) asserts the same conclusion. The fact that this means that there is no way for the determiner to occur with the possessum is not

problematic; Haspelmath (1999) argues that possessed NPs are very likely to be definite, making it redundant to encode definiteness of the possessed noun since the possessive relationship already does so.<sup>5</sup>

There are a few cases where the order of the possessor and possessum are not flipped within the determiner possessive phrase, i.e. where the order DETERMINER POSSESSOR POSSESSUM is possible. This usually happens in inalienable possession constructions where the possessor can be interpreted as modifying the possessum, making it likely that these constructions are lexicalized as compounds. A clear example can be seen in (3.35). The order of the elements in the object noun phrase is DETERMINER POSSESSOR POSSESSUM, but the possessor is modifying the possessum, explaining what kind of eggs the speaker wants to look for as opposed to explicitly expressing a possessive relationship.

- (3.35) “*Pi=pani=quiáana imiráani ína m̃it̃ija naáqui.*”  
 1PL.INCL=look=REP again DET *taricaya* egg  
 ‘Let’s look again for *taricaya* eggs.’ (T.MPT.ELY.100327, line 43)

A similar example can be seen in (3.36), where the possessor *íita* ‘house’ occurs immediately after the determiner. The possessor is followed by the possessum *acumari* ‘owner’. It is best to analyze this as a compound, much like the English *homeowner*.

- (3.36) *Ína íita acumari nu=sihuaáni-rii-ø.*  
 DET house owner 3SG=arrive-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE

---

<sup>5</sup>This also supports the argument that the determiner is grammaticalizing towards a definite article.

‘The owner of the house arrived.’ (T.PSV.HDC.061212, line 265)

Some speakers consider the order DETERMINER POSSESSOR POSSESSUM to be ungrammatical, as shown in (3.37). The grammatical version is to have the order DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR, as shown in (3.38).

(3.37) \**Jaá* *quí=ima–quí–ø* *ína nisicáti íniija.*  
already 1SG=eat–PERF–E.C.TENSE DET *aguaje* fruit  
TARGET: ‘I already ate the *aguaje* fruit.’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

(3.38) *Jaá* *quí=ima–quí–ø* *ína íniija nisicáti.*  
already 1SG=eat–PERF–E.C.TENSE DET fruit *aguaje*  
‘I already ate the *aguaje* fruit.’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

Possessive constructions seem to be problematic for speakers more generally, as we will see in later sections. I maintain that the preferred order for possessive phrases with determiners is DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR, and that although some speakers allow the determiner to be coreferential with the possessum, the more consistent judgement is for the determiner to be coreferential with the possessor. The order DETERMINER POSSESSOR POSSESSUM is more likely to be a compound than a strict possessive relationship. Determiner possessive phrases can thus be described as DETERMINER<sub>i</sub> POSSESSUM POSSESSOR<sub>i</sub>, exhibiting obligatory discontinuous constituency, just as we saw to be the case with postpositional phrases.

### 3.4.3 Determiners split by verbs

It is also possible for the determiner to be separated from its associated noun by a verb, in which case the determiner will precede the verb and the noun will follow it. This can happen when the two function as the subject of an intransitive verb, as shown in (3.39), (3.40), and (3.41). In these examples, we see the determiner *ína* preceding the verb and the associated noun following the verb. The subject is glossed as a single noun phrase, meaning that *ína* is not glossed as its own pronominal entity but rather as a modifier of the noun phrase. It can function as both a demonstrative determiner (as shown in (3.39) and (3.40)) and as a definite article (as shown in (3.41)).

(3.39) *naji j̄h̄ta ín<sub>i</sub> ajit̄i-∅ quitáaca<sub>i</sub>*  
like how DET sit.IMPF-E.C.TENSE young.woman  
‘like how this young woman is sitting’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 292)

(3.40) *Amicaáca ín<sub>i</sub> maqui-r̄i-∅ icuáni<sub>i</sub>*  
one.day.away DET sleep-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE man  
‘This man will sleep tomorrow.’ (E.JPI.LDM.030704)

(3.41) *jaari ín<sub>i</sub> ani-∅-quiaqui=na icuáni<sub>i</sub>*  
already DET come-PERF-DPST=REP man  
‘The man had already come.’ (T.CAS.JPI.061212, line 19)

The determiner can also be separated from its associated noun when the two function as the subject of a transitive verb, however this seems to happen most frequently with verbs that are less transitive on Hopper and Thompson’s (1980)

transitivity scale. It is thus not surprising that they mirror the determiner behavior that is possible with intransitive verbs. For example, in (3.42), the determiner of the subject phrase is split across the verb, with the determiner occurring before the verb and the associated noun occurring immediately after the verb. The verb *cariniini* ‘to look at’ is low on the transitivity scale, especially on the parameters of kinesis (there is very little action involved in looking), punctuality (there is no clear start and stop to looking), and affectedness of the object (the object is not that affected by the act of being looked at).

- (3.42) *Iína<sub>i</sub> carinii–yaa–∅ caáya<sub>i</sub> nuú.*  
 DET look.at–IMPF–E.C.TENSE person 3SG  
 ‘The man was looking at him.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 386)

Similarly, the verb *inaani* ‘to lay’ in (3.43) and the verb *miini* ‘to cause to suffer’ in (3.44) can be considered to be less transitive. There is a small set of objects that can occur with ‘lay’ (i.e. eggs) and a small set of subjects that can occur with ‘cause to suffer’ (this verb is used primarily with illnesses), and in both cases the agency and volitionality of the agent is low. Again, we see that the determiner is split from its associated noun by the verb, with the determiner occurring before the verb and the noun immediately following it.

- (3.43) *tíí ína<sub>i</sub> inaáriqui=na mitiija<sub>i</sub> nu-naaqui*  
 where.REL.PN DET lay.DPST.IMPF=REP *taricaya* 3SG-egg  
 ‘where the *taricaya* (type of turtle) lays its eggs’ (T.MCS.JPI.061212, line 3)

- (3.44) *Quí=tárii-ø nu=íicu, iyami ácuji ína;*  
1 SG=be.sad.IMPF-E.C.TENSE 3 SG=BEN because DET  
*mii-yaa-ø ihuaariíni; nuú.*  
cause.to.suffer-IMPF-E.C.TENSE illness 3 SG  
'I am sad for him because he has this illness' (*lit.* this illness is making him suffer). (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 95)

Verbs of speaking, which are also arguably lower on the transitivity scale, also allow split determiner behavior with their subjects. In fact, this is the context where transitive verb subjects exhibit split determiner behavior the most frequently in texts. For example, in (3.45), the subject is *ína caáya* 'the person', but *ína* occurs before the verb *ariini* 'to say', and *caáya* occurs immediately after it.

- (3.45) "*Cuasija=na,*" *ína aáti-ø-cura=ána caáya nuú.*  
good-REP DET say-PERF-RPST=REP person 3 SG  
'"Good," the man said to him.' (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 233-4)

This split determiner behavior with subjects can be explained by assuming that the determiner has grammaticalized from a pronoun and could at one point occur with a coreferential noun in apposition. At that point in the language's history, it was grammatical for *ína* and its related forms to be the sole subject of a verb.<sup>6</sup> The appositional noun occurred as close to the demonstrative as possible, which was after the verb. Over time, as the demonstrative pronoun transitioned towards a definite article, the structure remained the same, even though it was no longer interpreted pronominally. DETERMINER VERB NOUN became the fixed order. That

---

<sup>6</sup>This is a plausible scenario since it is synchronically grammatical for *ína* to be the sole subject of a verb when it is functioning as a demonstrative pronoun, as we saw in (3.3).

said, the degree of transitivity that is exhibited by the verb seems to have an effect on the split determiner behavior and is an area that merits further investigation.

Split determiner behavior with subjects also occurs in contexts where the object has been extracted from its postverbal position. In example (3.46), the object *masiáana nási* ‘several swidden fields’ is extracted to the focus position, and the determiner of the subject phrase *íina mii-sáji* ‘this woman’ is split from its associated noun by the verb.

- (3.46) *Masiáana nási íina<sub>i</sub> mii-yaa-∅ mii-sáji<sub>i</sub>.*  
 a.lot chacra DET have-IMPF-E.C.TENSE woman  
 ‘This woman has several swidden fields.’ (E.ELY.CIA.190808, p. 2405)

In (3.47), the object is interrogated and as a result is extracted out of its postverbal position, and the determiner of the subject phrase is split from its associated noun by the verb.

- (3.47) *Saáca íina<sub>i</sub> iricatájuu-yaa-∅ icuáni<sub>i</sub>?*  
 what DET fix-IMPF-E.C.TENSE man  
 ‘What will this man fix?’ (E.HDC.LDM.300604, E.JPI.LDM.030704)

It is not clear why object extraction would trigger split determiner behavior. Perhaps it is a means for signaling that both arguments are occurring before the verb and functions as a way for disambiguating which argument is which.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Alternatively, Michael (2004) indicates that ‘locally monovalent’ predicates, namely possessives in possessive constructions and intransitive verbs, exhibit split determiner behavior. Transitive verbs whose subjects have been extracted can also be considered to be locally monovalent since



A final example of subject split determiner behavior can be seen in (3.48). This example shows split determiner behavior that extends the length of the entire clause. The determiner of the subject phrase *íina mîísáji* ‘this woman’ occurs before the transitive verb *siquitaani* ‘to wash’, but the associated noun occurs at the very end of the clause, after the verb, an adverb, and the object. This is an unusual example because of the number of constituents that intervene between the determiner and its associated noun, the fairly high degree of transitivity exhibited by the verb, and because the object has not been extracted. I do not have any other examples that show this type of extreme separation; in all other cases of split determiner behavior, the noun immediately follows the verb, and so the acceptability of this construction is something that merits further study.

- (3.48) *Íina<sub>i</sub> siquitaa-∅ iyarácata nu-sinaáqui mîísáji<sub>i</sub>.*  
 DET wash.IMPF-E.C.TENSE quickly 3SG-clothes woman  
 ‘This woman is washing her clothes quickly.’ (E.JPI.CIA.270808, p. 2635)

There are far fewer contexts where the object of a transitive verb may exhibit split determiner behavior. One context where this is evident is when the object occurs in a non-finite complement clause, as it does in (3.49). In this example, the main verb is *aparaani* ‘to begin’, and it takes as a complement the clause indicated by square brackets. Within this non-finite complement clause, *íina* precedes the

---

only one argument remains in situ after the extraction operation, which in turn makes this argument eligible for split determiner phenomena. Object extraction may result in a similar effect in that only one argument remains and this argument is subject to splitting. However, this argument does not account for the data we see in (3.42) and (3.44), which both exhibit split determiner behavior with transitive verbs, but no extraction has occurred.

non-finite verb *sajjīnuuni* ‘to cut repeatedly’ and its associated noun *pīsiqui* ‘tapir’ follows the verb.

- (3.49) *Atii nu=apára-φ-quiaqui [ína<sub>i</sub> saji-nuu-ni=jina*  
 there 3SG=begin-PERF-DPST DET cut-repeatedly-INF=COMP  
*pīsiqui<sub>i</sub>].*  
 tapir  
 ‘There he began to hack at the tapir.’ (T.PSV.HDC.061212, line 181)

In Chapter 4, I discuss how this order in non-finite complement clauses might be the origin for the irrealis order in Iquito. But now I turn to the split determiner behavior in the irrealis position, the other context where the object of a transitive verb exhibits split determiner behavior.

### 3.5 Split determiner behavior in the irrealis position

Another instance of obligatory discontinuous determiner behavior can be seen with determiner phrases of all types in the irrealis position. We saw in (3.1) and (3.2) above that with object phrases, the determiner occurs by itself in the irrealis position and its associated noun follows the verb. In this section, I illustrate what happens with each of the element types when they occur with determiners in the irrealis position, focusing on objects (Section 3.5.1) and postpositional phrases (Section 3.5.2). I treat possessive phrases in their own section (3.5.3) since they behave differently from other objects, and possessive phrases that occur within postpositional phrases are discussed in Section 3.5.4. Element types such as adverbs and negation do not include nouns, and therefore do not take determiners, and it

is ungrammatical for orientational clitic phrases to occur with determiners, so they are excluded from this section (except for when they occur with definite possessors, see Section 3.5.4).

The generalization that captures the behavior of the determiner in the irrealis position is as follows: the determiner will occur in the irrealis position with any clitics it may be hosting, and the rest of the phrase will immediately follow the verb. With object phrases, this means that the determiner occurs by itself in the irrealis position and the rest of the noun phrase follows the verb. With postpositional phrases, the determiner and the postposition occur together in the irrealis position, since the determiner is a host to the postposition (which is a clitic). The determiner cannot occur by itself in this context, and the noun object of the postpositional phrase follows the verb. Possessive phrases are a bit more complex in that there are three ways in which they can occur in the irrealis position. These three orders correspond to three different interpretations and depend on which noun or nouns of the possessive construction is treated as definite. First, it is possible for the determiner to occur in the irrealis position by itself and for the rest of the possessive phrase to follow the verb. This order is used with definite possessums. Second, it is possible for the determiner and the *possessum* to occur together in the irrealis position, and for the possessor to follow the verb. This order is used with definite possessors. Third, the determiner can occur by itself in the irrealis position and be repeated again after the verb with the rest of the possessive phrase. This order is used when both the possessor and possessum are definite. For added complexity, when the element in the irrealis position is a postpositional phrase and

the object of the postposition is a definite possessive phrase, then the determiner, the possessum, *and* the postposition occur together in the irrealis position, and the possessor follows the verb.

### 3.5.1 Determiner object phrases in the irrealis position

In this section, I will show what happens when an object phrase that includes a determiner occurs in the irrealis position, looking specifically at bare nouns, compounds, and modified noun phrases. Possessive phrases are discussed in Section 3.5.3.

When a determiner object phrase occurs in the irrealis position, it is actually only the determiner that occurs in this position; the rest of the noun phrase follows the verb. This split determiner behavior is evident with all types of transitive verbs, unlike the split determiner behavior we saw with verbs in the previous section.

The determiner is not considered to be a pronoun; speakers gloss the determiner noun phrase as a single unit, with the determiner functioning as a demonstrative determiner ('this'/'that') or a definite article ('the'), and there is no intonational break between the determiner and the verb or between the verb and the rest of the noun phrase. For example, in (3.50), the object of the verb consists of a determiner plus a noun: *íina asúraaja* 'that manioc', which is treated as a unit in the gloss. The determiner occurs in the irrealis position, and the noun follows the verb.

- (3.50) *Jiiticari quia íina capi-qui-∅ asúraaja?*  
when 2SG DET cook-PERF-E.C.TENSE manioc  
'When will you cook that manioc?' (E.ELY.CIA.071106, p. 1521)

This order is not possible in realis constructions, as we can see in the ungrammatical example given in (3.51a). In realis constructions, the determiner must occur together with its associated noun, as shown in the grammatical counterpart given in (3.51b).

- (3.51) a. \**Quí ína asaa-∅ pápaaja.*  
 1SG DET eat.IMPF-E.C.TENSE fish  
 TARGET: ‘I am eating the fish.’ (E.JPI.LDM.030704)
- b. *Cu=asaa-∅ ína pápaaja.*  
 1SG=eat.IMPF-E.C.TENSE DET fish  
 ‘I am eating the fish.’ (E.JPI.LDM.030704)

Nor is the syntactically unified correlate grammatical; the determiner cannot occur in the irrealis position together with the noun, as was shown in (3.1a) and (3.2a) at the start of this chapter.

With compounds, the behavior of the determiner is the same as what we saw with other nouns: the determiner occurs in the irrealis position and the entire compound follows the verb, as shown in (3.52).

- (3.52) *Amicaáca quí ína capi-rîi-∅*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*anapa anácaari cu=asaani=iira nuú.*  
 macaw head.? (*huitina*) 1SG=eat.INF=GOAL 3SG  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cook this *huitina* in order to eat it.’ (E.LII.CIA.131106, p. 1587)

The determiner that occurs in the irrealis position agrees in number and animacy with the noun that follows the verb. For example, in (3.53), the determiner

in the irrealis position is the plural inanimate form *íimi*, and it agrees with the plural inanimate noun *itaaríhua* ‘thatch (pl.)’ that follows the verb.

- (3.53) *Amicaáca* *quí* *íimi<sub>i</sub>* *masii-rii-∅* *itaaríhua<sub>i</sub>*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET.PL.IN buy–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE thatch.PL  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy these thatch (panels).’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2145)

Similarly, in (3.54), the determiner in the irrealis position is the plural animate form *íipi*, and it agrees with the plural animate noun *mirajaárica* ‘children (dim.)’ that follows the verb.

- (3.54) *Saacaya* *Maria* *íipi<sub>i</sub>* *miitii-rii-∅* *mirajaárica<sub>i</sub>?*  
 what Maria DET.PL.AN give–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE children.DIM  
 ‘What will Maria give to these children?’ (E.ELY.CIA.210604-7)

With the introduction of modifiers, we still see the determiner occurring by itself in the irrealis position and the rest of the modified noun phrase following the verb. The adjective can precede the noun, as shown in example (3.55), or follow it, as shown in (3.56), but in both cases it occurs with the noun after the verb.

- (3.55) *Iína* *máaya* *nu* *íína* *iricatájuu-rii-∅* *umáana* *íimina*.  
 DET child 3SG DET repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE big canoe  
 ‘The child will fix this big canoe.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260708, p. 2040)

- (3.56) *Amicaáca* *quí* *íína* *masii-rii-∅* *mutúuru* *saámina*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET buy–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE motor new  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy this new motor.’ (E.JPI.CIA.010808, p. 2093)

The determiner phrase may also include a quantifier, as shown in (3.57). Again, the determiner occurs in the irrealis position, the rest of the noun phrase follows the verb, and the determiner agrees with the noun after the verb. The only difference from what we saw with adjective phrases is that the quantifier must precede the noun.

- (3.57) *Amicaáca*    *quí=* *íími*    *cuucúu* *-rii*    *-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET.PL.IN sharpen -MMT.PRF -E.C.TENSE  
*cuúmi*    *sáhuiri*.  
 two.PL.IN machete  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sharpen these two machetes.’ (E.JPI.CIA.081106, p. 1537)

It is also possible for the noun to be modified by multiple modifiers as shown in (3.58) and (3.59). Still, the determiner is in the irrealis position and the rest of the phrase follows the verb.

- (3.58) *Amicaáca*    *quí* *íina* *masii-rii-ø*    *umáana* *mutúuru*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET buy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE big motor  
*saamina*.  
 new  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy this big new motor.’ (E.JPI.CIA.010808, p. 2093)

- (3.59) *Amicaáca*    *quí* *íina* *iricatájuu-rii-ø*    *umáana* *íimina*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET repair-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE big canoe  
*saamina*.  
 new  
 ‘Tomorrow I will fix this big new canoe.’ (E.ELY.CIA.090808, p. 2263)

With ditransitive verbs, the determiner of only one of the objects occurs in the irrealis position, the rest of that object follows the verb, and the other object

follows that. For example, (3.60) shows a ditransitive verb, where the determiner of the direct object phrase occurs in the irrealis position, and the rest of the direct object phrase (a modified noun phrase *umáana mutúuru* ‘big motor’) immediately follows the verb. The definite indirect object *íina icuáni* ‘the man’ occurs at the end of the sentence.

- (3.60) *Amicaáca qui íina masiitii-rii-ø umáana mutúuru*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE big motor  
*íina icuáni.*  
 DET man  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell this big motor to the man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2171)

In (3.61), the determiner in the irrealis position belongs to the indirect object phrase. As we would expect, the rest of the phrase *míisáji* ‘woman’ immediately follows the verb, and the direct object *pápaaja* ‘fish’ occurs after this noun at the end of the sentence.

- (3.61) *Iína máaya nu íina miitii-rii-ø míisáji pápaaja.*  
 DET child 3SG DET give-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman fish  
 ‘The child will give fish to the woman.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2210)

Note that the reverse order, where the direct object is in the irrealis position and the indirect object follows the verb, is also possible, as shown in (3.62). This example illustrates that the determiner phrase does not *have* to be the element in the irrealis position (although there is a preference for the determiner to occur in this position; see Chapter 2).



- (3.62) *Iína máaya nu pápaaja miiti-ríi-ø ína mĩsáji.*  
 DET child 3SG fish give-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE DET woman  
 ‘The child will give fish to the woman.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2211)

The ditransitive examples also illustrate the relative position of the noun within the clause. In examples (3.60) and (3.61), the noun associated with the determiner is found immediately after the verb. It does not occur after the other object, demonstrating that the associated noun must follow the verb as opposed to occurring at the end of the sentence. This is further demonstrated by the fact that it is ungrammatical for an adverb to intervene between the verb and the corresponding noun, as shown in (3.63). The ungrammaticality of this example indicates that the determiner and noun form a unit which can be separated by one constituent (namely the verb) but no more than one constituent.

- (3.63) \**Iína icuáni nu ína asa-ríi-ø maacuárica*  
 DET man 3SG DET eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE slowly  
*pápaaja.*  
 fish  
 TARGET: ‘That man, he will eat fish slowly.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260704)

Following the argument laid out in Section 3.3, the split determiner behavior in the irrealis position can be explained by the grammaticalization process that the determiner has undergone. Assuming that the determiner was once a pronoun that could occur with a coreferential noun in apposition, then it would have been grammatical for *ína* (or one of its related forms) to occur by itself in the irrealis position as the sole object of the verb. The appositional noun would have occurred as close to the demonstrative as possible, which would have been after the verb.

Over time, as the demonstrative pronoun transitioned towards a definite article, the structure remained the same (even though it is no longer interpreted pronominally), and the order DETERMINER VERB NOUN became the required, fixed order.

In the next section, I look at postpositional phrases whose object is a determiner noun phrase and discuss how these phrases behave in the irrealis position.

### 3.5.2 Determiner postpositional phrases in the irrealis position

Recall that when postpositional phrases include determiners the resulting postpositional phrases exhibit required discontinuous constituency. The postposition cliticizes to the determiner, resulting in the order DETERMINER=POSTPOSITION NOUN. This relative order is preserved when a postpositional phrase involving a determiner occurs in the irrealis position, but there is an additional level of obligatory discontinuous constituency that happens with the verb. Instead of the determiner occurring by itself in the irrealis position, as we saw with object phrases, the determiner and the postposition occur together in the irrealis position and the noun follows the verb. This behavior follows the generalization made at the beginning of Section 3.5: the determiner occurs in the irrealis position with any clitics it may be hosting, and the rest of the phrase immediately follows the verb. This generalization holds with bare nouns, as shown in (3.64), with compounds, as shown in (3.65), and with modified nouns, as shown in (3.66) and (3.67).

- (3.64) *Amicaáca*      *quí* *iína=jina*      *muusi-ríi-ø*      *taquína*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET=LOC swim-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE lake  
 ‘Tomorrow I will swim in this lake.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1525)

(3.65) *Amicaáca* *quí* *ína=jata* *capi-ríi-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET=with cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*anapa anácaari.*  
 macaw head.? (*huitina*)  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cook with this *huitina*.’ (E.LII.CIA.131106, p. 1587)

(3.66) *Amicaáca* *quí* *ína=jina* *íicua-ríi-ø* *umána*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET=LOC go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE big  
*íimina.*  
 canoe  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go in this big canoe.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1531)

(3.67) *Amicaáca* *quí* *ína=jinacuma* *iricatájuu-ríi-ø* *íta*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET=inside tidy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE house  
*níyana.*  
 blue  
 ‘Tomorrow I will straighten up inside this blue house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106,  
 p. 1531)

These last two examples show that either order of the noun and adjective is possible; the adjective precedes the noun in (3.66) and follows the noun in (3.67). The object of the postposition can also be modified by multiple modifiers, as shown in (3.68), where the noun is modified by a quantifier and an adjective.<sup>8</sup> Still, the generalization holds: only the determiner and postposition occur in the irrealis position, and the noun with both of its modifiers follows the verb.

---

<sup>8</sup>It is common for the components of a noun phrase to lack number agreement if it is clear from the sentence what the number is, as is the case in this example because of the overt numeral *cuúmi* ‘two’. It is therefore not surprising that the determiner, noun, and adjective all lack plural marking.

- (3.68) *Amicaáca*    *cana*    *íina=jina*    *íicua-ríi-ø*    *cuúmi*  
 one.day.away 1PL.EXCL DET=LOC go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE two  
*íimina umáana.*  
 canoe big  
 ‘Tomorrow we will go in these two big canoes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.081106, p. 1531)

It is also possible for the postposition =*ji* ‘from’ to cliticize to the determiner and postposition and for this entire unit to occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (3.69). In this example, the determiner *íina* occurs in the irrealis position with the two clitics that it hosts, the postposition =*jinacuma* ‘inside’ and the postposition =*ji* ‘from’. The rest of the phrase (*ííta umáana* ‘big house’) follows the verb.

- (3.69) *Amicaáca*    *nu*    *íina=jinacuma=ji*    *jimati-aarii-ø*  
 one.day.away 3SG DET=LOC=from leave-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*ííta umáana.*  
 house big  
 ‘Tomorrow s/he will leave from inside this big house.’ (E.HDC.CIA.180808, p. 2387)

The only exception to the generalization occurs when the object of the postpositional phrase is a possessive phrase, in which case it is possible for the determiner, possessum, and postposition to occur together in the irrealis position. I discuss this phenomenon in detail in Section 3.5.4.

Example (3.70) shows that the relative position of the rest of the postpositional phrase is immediately after the verb. In this example, the determiner and the postposition occur together in the irrealis position and the rest of the postpositional phrase (the noun *íimina* ‘canoe’) immediately follows the verb. The object phrase

has been topicalized, and a resumptive pronoun *nuú*, coreferential with the object phrase, occurs at the end of the sentence, after the rest of the postpositional phrase. Note that the determiner in this example is the speaker/addressee distal form *iinati-ira*.

- (3.70) [*Itna papaaja*]<sub>i</sub> *qui iinatiira=jinacuma asa-rii-∅*  
 DET fish 1SG DET.DISTAL=inside eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*iimina nuú*<sub>i</sub>.  
 canoe 3SG  
 ‘I will eat this fish inside the canoe (that’s far from us).’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2203)

As we saw with object phrases, the determiner agrees with the noun in number and animacy. This is illustrated by example (3.71). In this example, the determiner in the irrealis position is the plural animate form. It agrees with the plural animate noun *caayaáca* ‘people’ that follows the verb. The postposition is cliticized to the determiner in the irrealis position.

- (3.71) *Quíija, caquíija, quíija, ípi<sub>i</sub>=iyicúura*  
 1SG father 1SG DET.PL.AN=on.behalf.of  
*jimati-qui-∅ caayaáca<sub>i</sub> [∅ quia=ámuu-yaa-∅]*  
 leave-PERF-E.C.TENSE people REL 2SG-kill-IMPF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I, Father, I will go out on behalf of these people you are killing.’  
 (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 18)

As was also the case with object phrases, it is ungrammatical for the entire phrase to occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (3.72).

- (3.72) \*Amicaáca *quí= íina=jinacúma íta maqui -rii - $\phi$ .*  
 one.day.away 1SG= DET=inside house sleep -MMT.PRF -E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I am going to sleep inside the house.’ (Lai 2009: 149, example 239)

In fact, when I elicited the sentence in (3.73) from Ema, her repair strategy was to make it a possessive construction. She turned it into a grammatical sentence by adding a possessor after the verb (given in (3.74)).

- (3.73) \*Amicaáca *qui íina íta=cuura ícua-rii- $\phi$ .*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET house=towards go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will go to this house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2371)

- (3.74) Amicaáca *qui íina íta=cuura ícua-rii- $\phi$*   
 one.day.away 1SG DET house=towards go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*icuáni.*  
 man  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to this man’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2371)

I talk more about possessive phrases with postpositional phrases in the irrealis position in Section 3.5.4, but first I address how determiner possessive phrases (without postpositions) occur in the irrealis position.

### 3.5.3 Determiner possessive phrases in the irrealis position

As I discussed in Section 3.4.2, determiners can occur with both of Iquito’s strategies for marking possession: the possessive prefix strategy and the noun juxtaposition strategy. When possessive constructions formed via the possessive prefix

strategy occur in the irrealis position with a determiner, they follow the generalization made for object phrases at the beginning of Section 3.5; that is, the determiner occurs by itself in the irrealis position and the rest of the possessive phrase follows the verb. It is not so straight-forward with possessive constructions formed via the noun juxtaposition strategy. There are three ways in which these determiner phrases can occur in the irrealis position, depending on which noun or nouns of the possessive construction is treated as definite. I discuss the possessive prefix strategy in Section 3.5.3.1 and the noun juxtaposition strategy in 3.5.3.2.

But before turning to each of these strategies in more detail, I argue that it is ungrammatical for the entire determiner possessive phrase to occur in the irrealis position, based on the behavior we saw with other objects in Section 3.5.1 and with postpositional phrases in Section 3.5.2. These sections showed that it is ungrammatical for an entire determiner phrase to occur in the irrealis position. This argument aligns with Brown's (2003: 5) statement that it is ungrammatical for both the determiner and the nouns of a possessive phrase to occur in the irrealis position. The example he provides to illustrate this is given below in (3.75).

- (3.75) \**Amicaáca* *quí* *ína caniisi miisáji* *masii-rii-ø*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET *jicra* woman buy-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 TARGET: 'Tomorrow I will buy this woman's *jicra* (bag woven from *chambira* palm).' (E.JPI.MCB.040803)

However, Brown (2003: 4) also presents two examples of an entire possessive phrase (DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR) occurring in the irrealis position, given in (3.76) and (3.77). Example (3.76) is treated as fully grammatical

and example (3.77) is marked as questionable. In these examples, the element in the irrealis position is identical in form to the element in the irrealis position of the ungrammatical sentence in (3.75). Neither of these two examples is discussed in the body of the text, and so it is not clear how these examples fit in his analysis of the construction.

(3.76) *Amicaáca* *quí* *ína* *ímina* *icuáni* *iricatájuu-ríi-ø*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET canoe man repair-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will fix this man’s canoe.’ (E.ELY.MCB.050803)

(3.77) *?Amicaáca* *quí* *ína* *simiími* *icuáni* *jiqui-aaríi-ø*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET book man send-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Tomorrow I will send this man’s books.’ (E.JPI.MCB.020803)

I consider these examples to be anomalous, especially since both of these speakers are able to provide pretty strong grammaticality judgments, but I have not explicitly tested their grammaticality, and so I include them because they merit further investigation. Determiner possessive phrases in the irrealis position are difficult for speakers, in part because there are three ways in which a determiner possessive phrase formed via the noun juxtaposition strategy can occur in the irrealis position (compared to the one option we have seen with all other element types). It is likely that in 2003, when speakers were in the process of reclaiming the use of the language, they were still navigating what they considered grammatical and ungrammatical with respect to this construction. If I were to test these examples with speakers today, I would predict that they would be judged as ungrammatical.



### 3.5.3.1 Possessive prefix strategy

The generalization made for determiner object phrases holds with possessive phrases formed via the possessive prefix strategy: the determiner occurs in the irrealis position and the rest of the phrase follows the verb. For instance, in examples (3.78) and (3.79), the determiner occurs in the irrealis position and the possessive phrase, consisting of a possessive prefix attached to a noun (the possessum), follows the verb.

- (3.78) ...*atíra quia ína amítata-cuaa- $\emptyset$  quia-táasa*  
 there 2SG DET open-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE 2SG-basket  
 ‘There you will open your basket.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 436)

- (3.79) *Jíiticari quia ína iquica-qui- $\emptyset$  quia-itipiaaca?*  
 When 2SG DET spit.out-PERF-E.C.TENSE 2SG-chewed.up.manioc  
 ‘When will you spit out your chewed up manioc?’ (E.ELY.CIA.071106, p. 1520)

The determiner agrees with the possessum, as illustrated by the example in (3.80). In this example, the determiner is the plural animate form *íipi*, which agrees with the plural animate possessum *cujímaca* ‘companions’.

- (3.80) *Anihua nu íipi pájuu- $\emptyset$ - $\emptyset$*   
 DISCOURSE.AN 3SG DET.PL.AN show-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*pí-cujímaca.*  
 1.PL.INCL-companion.PL  
 ‘These are the things he should show our companions.’ (T.CJC.JPI.061212, line 77)

Example (3.81) shows that the possessed phrase after the verb can include a compound, and example (3.82) shows that the same possessed phrase can be modified. In both examples, the first person singular possessive prefix *cu-* is attached to the compound *anapa anácaari* ‘*huitina*’.

(3.81) *Amicaáca*    *quí*    *íña*    *cuaata-ríi-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET cultivate–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*cu-anapa anácaari.*  
 1SG-macaw head.? (*huitina*)  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cultivate my *huitina*.’ (E.JPI.CIA.111106, p. 1567)

(3.82) *Amicaáca*    *quí*    *íña*    *cuaata-ríi-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET cultivate–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*cu-anapa anácaari*                    *sisanuríca.*  
 1SG-macaw head.? (*huitina*) small  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cultivate my little *huitina*.’ (E.JPI.CIA.111106, p. 1567)

This type of determiner behavior is expected based on what we have seen so far with other definite objects. The determiner occurs in the irrealis position and the rest of the noun phrase follows the verb. Let us turn now to the noun juxtaposition strategy, which is not so clear-cut.

### 3.5.3.2 Noun juxtaposition strategy

Determiner phrases involving possessive constructions formed via the noun juxtaposition strategy do not behave as we would expect in the irrealis position. There are actually three options for what can occur in this position, as opposed to the one option we have seen with other element types (except negation, which also

exhibited three types). All three of these options pose problems for the analysis established so far, but I maintain that they can be explained by appealing to the same grammaticalization process I have referenced for all of the other cases of split determiner behavior. Additionally, I hypothesize that each option corresponds to a different definiteness interpretation: one is used with definite possessums, one is used with definite possessors, and one is used when both the possessor and possessum are definite. It is interesting that they correspond to different interpretations of definiteness, since this distinction is not available in realis constructions, but ultimately these interpretations align with the grammaticalization argument proposed in this chapter.

**DETERMINER<sub>i</sub> V POSSESSOR POSSESSUM<sub>i</sub>** The first option is for the determiner to occur by itself in the irrealis position and for the rest of the possessive phrase to follow the verb. This option follows the generalization made for object phrases except that the order of the elements after the verb does not follow our expectations.

In order to preserve the order seen in other contexts, we would expect for the determiner to occur alone in the irrealis position and for the order of elements after the verb to be POSSESSUM POSSESSOR, preserving the order we ordinarily see with determiner possessive phrases (which is DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR, an example is given in (3.83)).

(3.83) *Jaá*      *quí=masiï-ø-ø*                      *ína mutúuru icuáni.*  
 already 1SG=buy-PERF-E.C.TENSE DET motor man

‘I already bought this man’s motor.’ (E.LII.CIA.050808, p. 2193)

Instead, what we find is that the determiner does occur alone in the irrealis position, but that the order of elements after the verb is POSSESSOR POSSESSUM, as shown in (3.84). This order is the reverse of what we would expect.

- (3.84) *Amicaáca* *quí* *íña* *masii-ríi-ø* *icuáni* *mutúuru*.  
one.day.away 1SG DET buy–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE man motor  
‘Tomorrow I will buy this man’s motor.’ (E.LII.CIA.050808, p. 2193)

The expected order is in fact ungrammatical, as shown in (3.85).

- (3.85) \**Quí* *íña* *niqui-cuaa-ø* *mutúuru* *icuáni*.  
1SG DET see-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE motor man  
TARGET: ‘I will see this man’s motor.’ (E.LII.CIA.140808, p. 2335)

A similar ungrammatical example can be seen in (3.86); the grammatical version is given in (3.87).

- (3.86) \**Amicaáca* *quí* *íña* *ima-ríi-ø* *íniija* *nìsicáti*.  
One.day.away 1SG DET eat–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE fruit *aguaje*  
TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will eat this *aguaje* (type of palm) fruit.’  
(E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

- (3.87) *Amicaáca* *quí* *íña* *ima-ríi-ø* *nìsicáti* *íniija*.  
One.day.away 1SG DET eat–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE *aguaje* fruit  
‘Tomorrow I will eat this *aguaje* (type of palm) fruit.’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

The order is the same in ditransitive clauses. For example, in (3.88), the possessive phrase is the direct object of a ditransitive verb. Again, only the determiner occurs in the irrealis position, and the possessor and possessum follow the verb. The indirect object follows the possessive phrase.

- (3.88) *Amicaáca*    *qui*    *iína*    *masiitii-rii-∅*                      *miisáji*    *mutúuru*  
 One.day.away 1SG DET sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman motor  
*iína*    *icuáni*.  
 DET man  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell the motor of the woman to the man.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2171)

This order, which I abbreviate as  $\text{Det}_i\text{VPrPm}_i$ , is used with definite possessums, as evidenced by the fact that the determiner agrees with the possessum. For instance, in (3.89), the plural animate determiner *íipi* occurs in the irrealis position and the rest of the possessive phrase follows the verb. The determiner agrees with the plural animate possessum *míra* ‘children (dim.)’ and not the singular possessor *miisáji* ‘woman’.

- (3.89) *Amicaáca*    *quí=*    *íipi<sub>i</sub>*                      *síhuuira-cuaa-∅*                      *miisáji*  
 one.day.away 1SG= DET.PL.AN visit-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE woman  
*míra<sub>i</sub>*.  
 child.PL  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go there to visit the woman’s children.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.040808, p. 2161; E.HDC.CIA.150808, p. 2339)

In (3.90), the plural inanimate determiner *íimi* occurs in the irrealis position and the rest of the possessive phrase follows the verb. In this example, the deter-

miner agrees with the plural inanimate possessum *itaaríhua* ‘thatch (pl.)’ and not the singular animate possessor *miisáji* ‘woman’.

- (3.90) *Amicaáca qui ími masí-ríi-∅ miisáji*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET.PL.IN buy–MMT.PERF–E.C.TENSE woman  
*itaaríhua.*  
 thatch.PL  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy the woman’s thatch.’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2145)

It is ungrammatical for the determiner to agree with the possessor, as shown in (3.91). In this example, the plural animate determiner occurs in the irrealis position, agreeing with the number and animacy of the possessor. Since the possessum is plural and inanimate, this sentence is ungrammatical. In the grammatical version given in (3.92), the determiner in the irrealis position is plural and inanimate, just like the possessum.

- (3.91) \**Quí ípi<sub>i</sub> cuucuu-ríi-∅ icuani-huíya<sub>i</sub>*  
 1SG DET.PL.AN sharpen–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE man-PL  
*sahuri-ca.*  
 machete-PL  
 TARGET: ‘I will sharpen the men’s machetes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2463)

- (3.92) *Quí ími<sub>i</sub> cuucuu-ríi-∅ icuani-huíya*  
 1SG DET.PL.IN sharpen–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE man-PL  
*sahuri-ca<sub>i</sub>.*  
 machete-PL  
 ‘I will sharpen the men’s machetes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2463, E.HDC.CIA.150808, p. 2339)

When modifying possessive constructions of this type, the position of the adjective with respect to the possessive phrase determines which noun is modified by that adjective. When the adjective precedes the possessive phrase, it modifies the possessor, as can be seen in (3.93). This is also demonstrated in (3.94); the adjective *suhuaani* ‘good, nice, pretty’ precedes the possessive phrase and modifies the possessor *quitáaca* ‘young woman’. When the adjective follows the possessive phrase, as can be seen with the adjective *namiisaana* ‘new, whole’ in (3.94), it modifies the possessum.

- (3.93) *Amicaáca*      *quí* *ína* *masii-ríi-ø*                      *suhuaani*  
 One.day.away 1SG DET buy–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE pretty  
*quitáaca*      *mutúuru*.  
 young.woman motor  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy this pretty young woman’s motor.’  
 (E.LII.CIA.020808, p. 2135)

- (3.94) *Amicaáca*      *quí* *ína* *masii-ríi-ø*                      *suhuaani* *míisáji*  
 One.day.away 1SG DET buy–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE pretty woman  
*mutúuru* *namiisaana*.  
 motor new  
 ‘Tomorrow I will buy this pretty woman’s new motor.’ (E.LII.CIA.020808,  
 p. 2135)

The  $\text{Det}_i \text{VPrPm}_i$  order has the potential to be ambiguous with ditransitive constructions. It is possible for a ditransitive verb to have the determiner of an object phrase occur in the irrealis position, the associated noun follow the verb, and a bare noun functioning as the other object follow that noun, which results in the same order as possessive phrases: SUBJECT DETERMINER VERB NOUN NOUN.

For example, in the irrealis ditransitive clause in (3.95), the direct object is a determiner phrase, and the determiner occurs in the irrealis position. The associated noun follows the verb, which is then followed by the (indefinite) indirect object. The resulting order is SUBJECT DETERMINER VERB NOUN NOUN. The first noun is part of the direct object phrase and the second noun is the indirect object. This example is similar in form to a determiner possessive phrase occurring in the irrealis position, where the order would also be SUBJECT DETERMINER VERB NOUN NOUN, but the first noun would be the possessor and the second noun would be the possessum. Since a motor is not generally a possessor, the sentence in (3.95) is interpreted as ditransitive (as opposed to the pragmatically odd reading ‘I will sell the motor’s woman’). If the direct object and the indirect object were reversed, however, this sentence could potentially be interpreted as ‘I will sell the woman’s motor’. The valency of the verb alone is not sufficient for disambiguating the two possible constructions, and it is necessary to rely on the context for the more likely reading.

(3.95) *Amicaáca qui ína masiitií-rii-ø mutúuru miisáji.*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE motor woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell this motor to the woman.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2169)

As evidence that this construction might be ambiguous, Ema provided example (3.96) as an alternative to (3.95). In this example, the indirect object occurs in the irrealis position and the definite direct object follows the verb (the reverse ordering of objects that we saw in (3.95)). This sentence cannot be interpreted as



possessive, so perhaps she gave me this alternative to avoid the potential ambiguity, making it clear that the sentence is ditransitive and not transitive with a possessed object.

- (3.96) *Amicaáca* *qui* *m̄iisáji* *masiiti-r̄i-∅* *ína* *mutúuru*.  
 one.day.away 1SG woman sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE DET motor  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell this motor to the woman.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2169)

The ambiguity of this structure might contribute to why there are three possible orders for how possessive determiner phrases occur in the irrealis position. It also sheds light on how speakers choose which element will go in the irrealis position of a given clause, a topic I turn to in more detail in Chapter 4.

**DETERMINER<sub>i</sub> POSSESSUM V POSSESSOR<sub>i</sub>** The second option for how a determiner possessive phrase occurs in the irrealis position is for the determiner and the possessum to occur together in the irrealis position and for the possessor to follow the verb, as shown in (3.97) and (3.98).

- (3.97) *Amicaáca* *qui* *ína mutúuru* *masiiti-r̄i-∅* *m̄iisáji*.  
 one.day.away 1SG DET motor sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell the woman’s motor.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2169)

- (3.98) *Quí* *ína niyíni* *cariini-r̄i-∅* *m̄iisáji*.  
 1SG DET son take.care.of-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman  
 ‘I will take care of the woman’s son.’ (E.LII.CIA.140808, p. 2335)

With ditransitive verbs, only one of the objects occurs in the irrealis position, but it is still possible for that object to be a possessive construction and for the determiner and possessum to occur together in the irrealis position. For example in (3.99), the element that occurs in the irrealis position is part of the direct object. The determiner and the possessum occur together in the irrealis position, and the possessor of the direct object immediately follows the verb. The indirect object then follows this noun. This order illustrates that the noun associated with the determiner must immediately follow the verb rather than occur at the end of the sentence.

- (3.99) *Amicaáca*      *qui*    *íina mutúuru*    *masiiti-ríi-ø*                      *miisáji*  
 One.day.away 1SG DET motor    sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman  
*íina icuáni.*  
 DET man  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sell the woman’s motor to the man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2171)

It is ungrammatical for the determiner to occur with the possessor, as shown in (3.100). The grammatical version of this sentence, where the determiner occurs with the possessum, is given in (3.101).

- (3.100) \**Amicaáca*    *quí=*    *íina miisáji*    *síhuíira-ríi-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG= DET woman visit-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*niyiti.*  
 daughter  
 TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will visit the woman’s daughter.’  
 (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

- (3.101) *Amicaáca* *quí=* *ína niyiti* *síhuíira-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG= DET daughter visit-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*miisáji.*  
 woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will visit the woman’s daughter.’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

The ordering of the possessive phrase elements in the irrealis position and after the verb preserves the relative ordering of elements seen in other positions: DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR. However, in other contexts, it is ungrammatical for the determiner to occur with another noun in the irrealis position. This order is similar to what is seen with postpositional phrases, where the determiner and the postposition occur together in the irrealis position, and the accompanying noun follows the verb. The similarity suggests that perhaps the possessum is acting as a clitic.

This order, which I abbreviate  $\text{Det}_i\text{PmVPr}_i$  is used with definite possessors, as evidenced by the fact that the determiner is coreferential with the *possessor*. This is clearly demonstrated in (3.102), where the plural animate determiner is coreferential with the plural animate possessor that follows the verb, not the inanimate possessum that occurs with the determiner in the irrealis position.

- (3.102) *Amicaáca* *quí=* *ípi<sub>i</sub> sinaáqui* *siquita-rii-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG= DET.PL.AN clothes wash-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*mirajaárica<sub>i</sub>.*  
 child.PL.DIM  
 ‘Tomorrow I will wash those children’s clothes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808)

Similarly, in (3.103), both of the nouns are plural, and the determiner agrees with the animate possessor that follows the verb and not the inanimate possessum

that occurs with the determiner in the irrealis position.

- (3.103) *Amicaáca*      *quí=* *ípi<sub>i</sub> sahuiri-ca*  
one.day.away 1SG= DET.PL.AN machete-PL  
*cuucuu-ríi-ø*                      *icuani-huíya<sub>i</sub>.*  
sharpen-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE man-PL  
'Tomorrow I will sharpen those men's machetes.' (E.JPI.CIA.220808, p. 2501)

Although it could be argued that the determiner is in apposition to the possessor, and potentially functioning pronominally in this context as evidenced by the fact that it is coreferential with the possessor and not the possessum to which it is adjacent, it is not synchronically possible for the order DETERMINER NOUN to be interpreted as a possessive relationship outside of this context. That said, I would argue that historically it was possible and that the appositional noun would occur as close to the pronominal demonstrative as possible, which in this construction would be after the verb. Over time, the pronominal qualities of the demonstrative were lost, but this order became the fixed order nonetheless.

**DETERMINER<sub>i</sub> V DETERMINER<sub>j</sub> POSSESSUM<sub>i</sub> POSSESSOR<sub>j</sub>** The third option is for the determiner to occur by itself in the irrealis position and be repeated again after the verb with the rest of the possessive phrase. For example, in the transitive clauses in (3.104) and (3.105), the object of the verb is a possessive phrase with a determiner. The determiner occurs in the irrealis position as we would expect, but it is repeated again after the verb. Interestingly, the order of the nouns after the verb matches what we see for determiner possessive phrases outside of

the irrealis position (DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR) and not what we see for determiner possessive phrases where the determiner is in the irrealis position (POSSESSOR POSSESSUM).

- (3.104) *Iína máaya nu iína iricatájuu–rii–ø iína iúmina*  
 DET child 3SG DET repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE DET canoe  
*icuáni.*  
 man  
 ‘The child will repair this canoe of this man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260708, p. 2041)

- (3.105) *Amicaáca qui iína iricatájuu–rii–ø iína iíta*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE DET house  
*miisáji.*  
 woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will repair this house of the woman.’ (E.HDC.CIA.040808, p. 2161)

Another example can be seen in (3.106). Again, the determiner occurs in the irrealis position and is repeated after the verb, and the order of the nouns in the possessive phrase after the verb matches what we see for determiner possessive phrases outside of the irrealis position.

- (3.106) *Amicaáca quí iína síhiiira–rii–ø iína niyiti*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET visit–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE DET daughter  
*miisáji.*  
 woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will visit the woman’s daughter.’ (E.JPI.CIA.040808, p. 2149)

This type of determiner doubling seems to only happen with possessive constructions. Brown (2003: 4) points out that it is in fact ungrammatical to have de-

terminer doubling when the object phrase is not a possessive one, as illustrated in (3.107).

- (3.107) \**Amicaáca* *quí* *ína* *capi-ríi-ø* *ína* *papaaja*.  
one.day.away 1SG DET cook–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE DET fish.PL  
TARGET: ‘Tomorrow I will cook this fish.’ (E.JPI.MCB.040803)

Furthermore, determiner doubling is not required, but functions as an alternative to other possessive strategies. Hermico gives the sentence in (3.108) (without determiner doubling) right before uttering the sentence in (3.105).

- (3.108) *Amicaáca* *quí* *ína* *iricatájuu-ríi-ø* *miísáji* *íta*.  
one.day.away 1SG DET repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE woman house  
‘Tomorrow I will repair this house of the woman.’ (E.HDC.CIA.040808, p. 2161)

I hypothesize that this order is used when both the possessor and possessum are definite. In (3.109), the possessor is singular and the possessum is plural. Ema makes the determiner in the irrealis position coreferential with the possessum and the determiner after the verb coreferential with the possessor. This is the agreement phenomenon I would expect if both arguments are to be interpreted as definite. The determiner that occurs by itself in the irrealis position agrees with the possessum, just as we saw with the  $Det_i VPrPm_i$  order. The determiner that occurs with the possessive phrase after the verb agrees with the possessor, which mirrors the order and agreement phenomena that we see with determiner possessive phrases outside of the irrealis position.

- (3.109) *Amicaáca*      *quí*    *ípi<sub>i</sub>*              *cariinii-rii-∅*                      *ína<sub>j</sub>*  
           one.day.away 1SG DET.PL.AN care.for–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE DET  
*mira<sub>i</sub>*    *miisáji<sub>j</sub>*.  
           child.PL woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will care for the woman’s children.’ (E.ELY.CIA.230808, p. 2537)

Example (3.109) was spontaneously produced by Ema (after my elicited prompt, where the two determiners were identical) but she says it with some difficulty. This difficulty suggests that this is not a common construction for speakers, which is further evidenced by the way other speakers mark agreement with this construction. For instance, when Jaime produces the construction, both determiners are coreferential with the possessum, as shown in (3.110) and (3.111). This agreement phenomenon only partially matches my expectations; the agreement of the determiner after the verb does not mirror what we see in realis clauses, where the determiner is coreferential with the possessor. It is possible that Jaime is influenced by the need to mark plurality and that trumps agreement, as was true of some of his examples in Section 3.4.2.

- (3.110) *Amicaáca*      *quí*    *ími<sub>i</sub>*              *cuucuu-rii-∅*  
           one.day.away 1SG DET.PL.IN sharpen–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*ími<sub>i</sub>*              *sahui-ri-ca<sub>i</sub>*    *icuáni*.  
           DET.PL.IN machete-PL man  
 ‘Tomorrow I will sharpen the man’s machetes.’ (E.JPI.CIA.220808, p. 2501)

- (3.111) *Amicaáca*      *quí*    *ípi<sub>i</sub>*              *pájuu-rii-∅*  
           one.day.away 1SG DET.PL.AN teach–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*ípi<sub>i</sub>*              *mira<sub>i</sub>*    *miisáji<sub>j</sub>*.  
           DET.PL.AN child.PL woman

‘Tomorrow I will teach the woman’s children.’ (E.JPI.CIA.220808, p. 2501)

A different type of doubling occurs with possessive constructions with other modifiers (e.g. quantifiers, adjectives). In these cases, the possessum occurs in the irrealis position as the sole object (the possessor is not stated) and then the entire possessive construction is stated after the verb, as illustrated by example (3.112). There is a pause between the first mention of the possessum and the possessive construction. This strategy may be another way for marking both noun phrases as definite that is clearer for speakers. However, this strategy can also be used when there is no determiner present, as shown in (3.113).

(3.112) *Amicaáca qui iína iricatájuu–rii–ø umáana*  
one.day.away 1SG DET repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE big  
*íimina... iína íimina icuáni.*  
canoe DET canoe man  
‘Tomorrow I will repair this big canoe, the canoe of this man.’  
(E.JPI.CIA.081106, p. 1545)

(3.113) *Amicaáca qui cuúmi íimina iricatájuu–rii–ø*  
one.day.away 1SG two canoe repair–MMT.PRF–E.C.TENSE  
*umaami icuáni íimina.*  
big.PL.IN man canoe  
‘Tomorrow I will repair two big canoes of the man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.131106, p. 1593)

Another element that we see doubled is the negative particle *caa* in irrealis *ji caa* negation. Again, it occurs in the irrealis position and after the verb. What these two constructions have in common is that they are components of a larger



set of elements that *must* occur together. The negative particle *caa*, when it is not clause-initial, must occur with the verbal morpheme *-ji-*. The determiner *ína* must occur with an associated noun. But this does not seem like a sufficient reason for explaining why speakers would double the determiner, since it occurs with an associated noun in non-possessive constructions, but it is ungrammatical to have doubling in those contexts (see, for example, (3.75)).

To conclude, each of the possessive orders evident in irrealis constructions corresponds to a different interpretation with respect to definiteness.<sup>9</sup> When the determiner alone occurs in the irrealis position, the possessum is interpreted as definite, and when the determiner and possessum occur together in the irrealis position, the possessor is considered definite. When the determiner occurs in both the irrealis position and after the verb, then both the possessor and the possessum are interpreted as definite. This hypothesis is supported by the agreement marking we see on the determiner. When the determiner agrees with the possessum, as in (3.89), it is the possessum that is interpreted as definite, and similarly, when the determiner agrees with the possessor, as in (3.102), then the possessor is interpreted as definite. With determiner doubling, the agreement marking is not as clear, but it is possible to consider that the determiner in the irrealis position agrees with the possessum and the determiner after the verb agrees with the possessor.

One problem with this hypothesis is that it does not address why there is only one determiner possessive order and therefore only one definite interpretation

---

<sup>9</sup>Alienability does not explain the difference between the two orders; both orders are allowed for both alienable and inalienable possession.

outside of the irrealis position. In Section 3.4.2, I claimed that DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR was the primary possessive order and that the order where the possessum and possessor were reversed was possible, but represented a compound relationship over a true possessive relationship. An alternative analysis would be to consider the order DETERMINER POSSESSOR POSSESSUM as a grammatical means for expressing a definite possessum in which case  $\text{Det}_i \text{VPrPm}_i$  would be its irrealis counterpart. The order  $\text{DetPm}_i \text{VPr}_i$  would be the irrealis counterpart to the DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR order. This account does not provide a way to account for both nouns as definite, though, since there is no realis counterpart to the determiner doubling strategy.

The more likely reason that there is only one determiner possessive order outside of the irrealis position is because definite articles are more useful when the hearer does not have information about the definiteness of the possessum, as in constructions where the possessor is postposed, i.e. follows the possessum (Haspelmath 1999: 235). When a determiner occurs by itself in the irrealis position, the hearer cannot presuppose a possessive relationship will follow the verb, and so it is possible for the possessum to be marked as definite in this construction but not in other contexts.

Each of these orders can also be attributed to the grammaticalization process mentioned throughout this chapter. If we consider the determiner to have once been a pronoun that occurred with a coreferential noun in apposition, then each order corresponds to a different type of appositional noun phrase. In the order  $\text{Det}_i \text{VPrPm}_i$ , the appositional noun phrase would have been a possessive phrase, consisting of a

possessor and a possessum. A demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with that possessive phrase in number and animacy, would have occurred in the irrealis position. The possessive phrase would occur as close to the demonstrative as possible, which would have been after the verb. This possessive phrase would exhibit the order POSSESSOR POSSESSUM, the grammatical order for bare noun possessive phrases. In the order  $Det_i P_m V Pr_i$ , the appositional noun phrase would have been the possessor only. The elements in the irrealis position would have been a demonstrative pronoun (agreeing in number and animacy with the possessor) and the possessum. Together, the demonstrative and possessum would have formed a grammatical possessive phrase. The possessor would have occurred as close to the demonstrative as possible, which would have been after the verb. Over time, the demonstrative pronoun transitioned towards a definite article, but each of these structures remained the same, and eventually became the fixed order for possessive constructions in the irrealis position. The order where the determiner occurs twice, once before the verb and once after the verb, might be interpreted as a pronoun–appositional noun phrase synchronically. The determiner in the irrealis position is coreferential with the entire possessive phrase following the verb, and the determiner after the verb is coreferential with the possessor only.

#### **3.5.4 Complex determiner possessive/postpositional phrases in the irrealis position**

When a determiner possessive phrase is the object of a postposition, there are two ways in which this postpositional phrase can occur in the irrealis position. One way is for the determiner to occur with the postposition in the irrealis position.

In this case, the possessor and possessum follow the verb, and the order of the nouns after the verb is POSSESSOR POSSESSUM. This strategy mirrors what we saw with other postpositional phrases; the determiner occurs in the irrealis position with the postposition cliticized to it, and the rest of the postpositional phrase follows the verb. It is also very similar to one of the strategies we saw with object possessive phrases in that the determiner occurs in the irrealis position and the rest of the possessive phrase follows the verb. The order of the nouns after the verb mirrors the order we saw with object possessive constructions as well. Some examples can be seen in (3.114), (3.115), and (3.116). This strategy seems to only be employed when the possessum is modified.

(3.114) *Amicaáca*    *quí*    *íina=jina*    *samaraata-rii-∅*    *icuáni*  
           one.day.away 1SG DET=LOC relax-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE man  
           *ííta*    *umáana*.  
           house big  
           ‘Tomorrow I will relax in this man’s big house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1561)

(3.115) *Amicaáca*    *cana*    *íina=jina*    *nata-rii-∅*  
           one.day.away 1PL.EXCL DET=LOC plant-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
           *miisáji*    *nási*    *umáana*.  
           woman *chacra* big  
           ‘Tomorrow we will plant in this woman’s big swidden field.’  
           (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1561)

(3.116) *Amicaáca*    *pí*    *íina=jina*    *capi-rii-∅*  
           one.day.away 1PL.INCL DET=LOC cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
           *miisáji*    *cúsi*    *umáana*.  
           woman pot big

‘Tomorrow we will cook in this woman’s big pot.’ (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1561)

The postposition =*ji* ‘from’ can cliticize to the determiner and postposition and occur in the irrealis position, as shown in example (3.117). The rest of the postpositional phrase follows the verb. Again, the order of the elements after the verb is POSSESSOR POSSESSUM.

- (3.117) *Amicaáca nu iína=jinacuma=ji jimati-aarií-ø*  
 one.day.away 3SG DET=LOC=from leave-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*miisáji íta umáana.*  
 woman house big  
 ‘Tomorrow s/he will leave from this woman’s big house.’  
 (E.HDC.CIA.180808, p. 2386)

The other way in which a postpositional phrase with a determiner possessive phrase for an object can occur in the irrealis position is for the determiner *and the possessum* to occur together with the postposition in the irrealis position, and for the possessor to follow the verb. This order mirrors the second order we saw with object possessive phrases, the Det<sub>i</sub>PmVPr<sub>i</sub> order, where the determiner and possessum occurred together in the irrealis position and the possessor followed the verb. An example of this order with a postposition can be seen in (3.118). In this example, the determiner occurs with the possessum *nási* ‘swidden field’. The postposition =*jina* cliticizes to *nási*, and all three of these elements occur in the irrealis position. The possessor *miisáji* ‘woman’ follows the verb.

- (3.118) *Amicaáca cana ína nási=jina*  
 one.day.away 1PL.EXCL DET *chacra*=LOC  
*nata-ríi-∅ miisáji.*  
 plant-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman  
 ‘Tomorrow we will plant in the woman’s swidden field.’  
 (E.ELY.CIA.101106, p. 1561)

Another example can be seen in (3.120). In this example, the orientational clitic =*cuura* cliticizes to the possessum *íta* ‘house’, and these elements, along with the determiner, occur in the irrealis position. The possessor *miisáji* ‘woman’ follows the verb. It is grammatical for the orientational clitic to occur with a determiner phrase in this example only because the determiner modifies the possessor and not the possessum to which the orientational clitic is cliticized.

- (3.119) *Amicaáca qui ína íta=cuura ícua-ríi-∅*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET house=towards go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*miisáji.*  
 woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to this woman’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2371)

As has been the case with all other postpositional phrases, the postposition =*ji* ‘from’ can cliticize to the postposition and occur with the determiner and the possessum in the irrealis position, as shown in example (3.120). The rest of the postpositional phrase follows the verb. Again, the order of the elements after the verb is POSSESSOR POSSESSUM.

- (3.120) *Amicaáca qui ína íta=cuura=ji miyiqui-aaríi-∅*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET house=towards return-ABL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*miisáji.*  
 woman

‘Tomorrow I will go to this woman’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2371)

When the possessive phrase is modified, the position of the adjective within the phrase depends on which noun is being modified. If the possessum is modified, as it is in (3.121), then that modifier occurs with the possessum in the irrealis position. If the *possessor* is modified, then that modifier occurs with the possessor after the verb, as shown in (3.122).

(3.121) *Amicaáca*     *qui*     *íina umáana íta=cuura*     *íicua-ríi-∅*  
one.day.away 1SG DET big house=towards go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*míisáji*.  
woman  
‘Tomorrow I will go to this woman’s big house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2371)

(3.122) *Amicaáca*     *qui*     *íina íta=cuura*     *íicua-ríi-∅*  
one.day.away 1SG DET house=towards go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*míisáji umáana*.  
woman big  
‘Tomorrow I will go to this big woman’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p. 2371)

More complex possessive phrases can also occur as the object of the postposition. Example (3.123) shows a complex possessive phrase with two possessive relationships: *isíicu* ‘friend’ is both a possessor (of *íta* ‘house’) and a possessum (of *míisáji* ‘woman’). Both of the possessums, *isíicu* ‘friend’ and *íta* ‘house’, occur with the determiner and the postposition in the irrealis position, and *míisáji* ‘woman’, which is the only noun that is strictly a possessor, follows the verb.

(3.123) *Amicaáca qui ína isíicu íta=cuura*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET friend house=towards  
*ícuá-ríi-ø miisáji.*  
 go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE woman  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to this woman’s friend’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808,  
 p. 2371)

It is also possible for the noun that is strictly a possessum to occur in the irrealis position with the determiner and the postposition and for the other possessive relationship to follow the verb, as in (3.124).

(3.124) *Amicaáca qui ína íta=cuura ícuá-ríi-ø*  
 one.day.away 1SG DET house=towards go-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*miisáji niyíni.*  
 woman son  
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to this woman’s son’s house.’ (E.ELY.CIA.160808, p.  
 2369)

I do not have any examples of the determiner doubling possessive strategy occurring with a postposition in the irrealis position. I would expect this strategy to exhibit the following order: DETERMINER=POSTPOSITION VERB DETERMINER POSSESSUM POSSESSOR.

### 3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown four additional element types that can occur in the irrealis position: a determiner, a determiner plus postposition, a determiner plus possessum, and a determiner plus possessum plus postposition. I generalized this behavior as follows: the determiner occurs in the irrealis position with any clitics



it may be hosting, and the rest of the phrase immediately follows the verb. This generalization holds for single-noun object phrases and postpositional phrases but not for all possessive phrases, since a determiner can occur with a possessum in the irrealis position or be repeated with a possessive phrase after the verb.

The determiner data is problematic for analyzing the element in the irrealis position as a phrase, because determiners on their own are not generally treated as phrases. This problem can be resolved by taking the historical development of the determiner into account.

The determiner is participating in a common grammaticalization process, where a demonstrative pronoun shifts to becoming a definite article. The first step in this grammaticalization process was for the demonstrative to occur in apposition to the noun. In Iquito, there were several contexts where this resulted in the demonstrative and appositional noun being separated by an intervening constituent. Over time, the demonstrative pronoun shifted to an adnominal demonstrative that had to occur with a noun, but was not necessarily bound to that noun. Currently, the demonstrative is losing its deictic qualities entirely, as well as its ability to inflect, indicating that the demonstratives are turning into formal markers of definiteness. Syntactic changes, where the demonstrative loses its status as a free nominal, are also clearly underway. However, the discontinuous structure persists, even though the demonstrative is no longer interpreted pronominally.

We are seeing a stage in the grammaticalization process where the determiner still has residual nominal properties, and these nominal processes account for its behavior in the irrealis position. It is expected for there to be variation and

optionality as the loose construction transforms into a fixed construction with increasingly obligatory elements and rules (e.g. Haspelmath 1999: 237) and so it is not surprising that the constructions are not fully consistent.

## Chapter 4

### Analysis

#### 4.1 Introduction

How does reality status come to be associated with word order? In this chapter, I look at four possible analyses. I begin by addressing the possibility that the irrealis position is correlated with the expression of information structure in Section 4.2. I will show that information structure, namely topic and focus, is expressed independently of the irrealis position, but that focus and other extraction operations like question formation do have an indirect effect on what can occur in this position. I then discuss movement as a possible analysis for the Iquito reality status alternation in Section 4.3. I choose, however, not to dwell on this line of argumentation and spend the remainder of the chapter discussing possible historical origins for the alternation. In Section 4.4, I look at word order and the expression of reality status in two other Zaparoan languages, Arabela and Záparo, and in Section 4.5, I examine two historical processes found elsewhere in the world that may explain the development of the Iquito alternation: phonological reduction of a morphological element and insubordination.

## **4.2 Information structure and the irrealis position**

Information structure is expressed via a word order alternation in many languages, including Iquito. As a result, a possible explanation for the SVX/SXV alternation in Iquito is to argue that “X”, the position found between the subject and the verb of irrealis clauses, is not an irrealis position but a position for expressing information structure. Brown (2004: 151), for instance, takes this stance, speculating that the Iquito irrealis position may be a grammatical focus position. In this section, I will show that the marking of information structure in Iquito is independent of reality status marking, and that the irrealis position cannot be a focus position. Focus does, however, play an indirect role on what can occur in the irrealis position.

### **4.2.1 Information structure is independent of reality status**

Minimal pairs, such as the near minimal pair in (4.1), demonstrate that the semantic difference between the SVX and SXV orders is correlated with reality status and not with an information structure category like topic or focus. The two sentences in (4.1) differ in word order. In (4.1a), the sentence exhibits SVX order and conveys the meaning that the action has been realized; in (4.1b), the sentence exhibits SXV order and conveys the meaning that the action has not been realized. Otherwise, the sentences are the same: they have the same verb morphology and object pronoun, and while the subjects are not identical, they are both pronominal and their difference does not contribute to the reality status reading. Rather, it is the word order that conveys the reality status reading in each of these clauses.

- (4.1) a. *Nu= raati-qui- $\phi$  nuú.* (SVX order; *realis*)  
 3SG= drink-PERF-E.C.TENSE 3SG  
 ‘She drank it.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 299)
- b. *Quia= nu raati-qui- $\phi$ .* (SXV order; *irrealis*)  
 2SG= 3SG drink-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘You will drink it.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 252)

Both of these sentences come from a text about a remedy made from the *siusihuasi* tree. Example (4.1a) comes from a part of the story describing someone who took the remedy and example (4.1b) comes from the instructions on how to take the remedy. Neither of these sentences exhibit a contrast in terms of information structure. The word order does not highlight the pronominal object in any way, and so we can conclude that the meaning conveyed by the word order alternation is independent of information structure.

Other minimal pairs like the examples in (4.2) and (4.3) show that the alternation is not specific to a certain kind of verbal morphology; in these examples, we see the alternation occur with the momentary perfective *-rii* (as opposed to the general perfective *-qui* found in (4.1)). Yet, the semantic difference exhibited by each pair continues to be related to reality status and not to information structure.

- (4.2) a. *Jaá nu= isiqui-rii- $\phi$  ína iiyíí.* (SVX; *realis*)  
 already 3SG= break-PERF-E.C.TENSE DET rope  
 ‘S/he already broke the rope.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2451)
- b. *Amicaáca nu= ína isiqui-rii- $\phi$  iiyíí.* (SXV; *irr.*)  
 tomorrow 3SG= DET break-PERF-E.C.TENSE rope  
 ‘Tomorrow s/he will break the rope.’ (E.ELY.CIA.210808, p. 2451)

- (4.3) a. *Nu= najuu-rii-∅* *núquiica simiími.* (SVX; *realis*)  
 3SG= write-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE one letter  
 ‘He wrote a letter in passing (today).’ (Lai 2009: 305, example 569)
- b. *Nu= núquiica simiími najuu-rii-∅.* (SXV; *irrealis*)  
 3SG= one letter write-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘He will write a letter.’ (Lai 2009: 322, example 621)

Other evidence that the Iquito SVX/SXV alternation is not correlated with information structure is the fact that topic and focus have dedicated sentential positions in Iquito, and these positions are distinct from the irrealis position. Topicalized elements occur at the clause margins, either at the left or right edge, and when a core argument is topicalized, a resumptive pronoun appears in the expected argument position. In the realis examples in (4.4) and (4.5), the subject is topicalized, and a resumptive pronoun occurs in the subject position immediately to the left of the verb. No element occurs between the subject and the verb. An example of left-edge topicalization can be seen in (4.4) and right-edge topicalization in (4.5).

- (4.4) [*Taána mitiíja míra*]<sub>i</sub> *na<sub>i</sub>= musii-∅* *áaca sirícucu.*  
 other turtle children 3PL= swim.IMP-E.C.TENSE water edge  
 ‘More baby turtles are swimming at the edge of the water.’  
 (T.MPT.ELY.100327, line 36)

- (4.5) *Jííticarii nu<sub>i</sub>= cuúqui-rii-∅* *aacana [iína*  
 when 3SG= become-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE watery DET  
*saquíica]*<sub>i</sub> *=na...*  
 manioc.beer.mixture =CLAUSE.END  
 ‘Once the manioc beer mixture has become watery...’ (T.HM1.ELY.061212,  
 line 11)

Focused elements occur in a dedicated syntactic position to the left of the subject, and to the right of the topic position, although the two rarely occur in the same sentence. Resumptive pronouns are not used in focus constructions. An example of a realis focus construction can be seen in (4.6b), which is in response to the question asked in (4.6a). The object *pápaaja* ‘fish’ is focused and occurs before the first person singular subject pronoun *cu=*.

- (4.6) a. *Saáca quia= asa- $\phi$ -cura amicaáca?*  
 what 2SG= eat-PERF-RPST one.day.away  
 ‘What did you eat yesterday?’ (E.ELY.CIA.260708, p. 2023)
- b. **Pápaaja** *cu= asa- $\phi$ -cura amicaáca.*  
 fish 1SG= eat-PERF-RPST one.day.away  
 ‘I ate **fish** yesterday.’ (E.ELY.CIA.260708, p. 2023)

A variety of elements can be focused, such as the object in (4.6b) above and in (4.7) below, an adverb as in (4.8), or a postpositional phrase as in (4.9). In each of these realis clause examples, the focused element precedes the subject, and no element occurs between the subject and the verb. Thus, we can conclude that focus does not trigger an element to occur between the subject and the verb or that an element in the irrealis position is required to express focus.

- (4.7) *Cájapaqui, cúuriqui cana= mii-yaáriqui*  
 fortunately money 1PL.EXCL= have-DPST.IMPF  
*cana-bolsillo=jina.*  
 1PL.EXCL-pocket=LOC  
 ‘Fortunately, we had money in our pocket.’ (T.VPI.ELY.061212, lines 19-20)

(4.8) **Acámi** *cana= cujii-yaáriqui nuú.*  
 upriver 1PL.EXCL= accompany-DPST.IMPF 3SG  
 ‘Upriver we accompanied him.’ (T.PVY.ELY.061212, line 7)

(4.9) **Lancha=jina** *cana-cúuriqui ani-ϕ-quiaqui.*  
*lancha=LOC 1PL.EXCL-money arrive-PERF-DPST*  
 ‘Our money had arrived in the *lancha* (motorboat).’ (T.VPI.ELY.061212,  
 line 15)

We can see from these examples that neither topicalizing nor focusing an element in a realis clause results in the appearance of an element in the irrealis position. We see the same to be true in irrealis clauses; topicalized and focused elements occur in their respective positions even when the irrealis position is filled, meaning that the marking of topicalization and focus is independent of an element occurring in the irrealis position. It is possible to have both a topicalized argument in topic position and an element in the irrealis position, as can be seen in (4.10). It is also possible to have both a focused argument in the focus position and an element in the irrealis position, as in (4.11).

(4.10) [*Iína miisaji*]<sub>i</sub> *nu<sub>i</sub>= iimi siquita-ríi-ϕ mirajaárica*  
 DET woman 3SG= DET wash-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE children.DIM  
*sinaáqui.*  
 clothes  
 ‘This woman, she will wash the children’s clothes.’ (E.HDC.CIA.220808, p. 2529)

(4.11) *Pápaaja nu= amicaáca asa-ríi-ϕ*  
 fish 3SG= tomorrow eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘S/he will eat fish tomorrow.’ (E.JPI.CIA.250708, p. 2011)



Question-answer pairs are a good test for determining focus because the interrogated element is by definition focused. In Iquito interrogative clauses, the interrogated object is fronted to the left edge with no additional marking, and the answer will typically have the interrogated element in the focus position as well. In my elicitation sessions, I used question-answer pairs to test the interaction of focus with the irrealis position. In the examples in (4.12) and (4.13), I asked Ema a series of questions about shopping, trying to focus on where it would take place, and changing the object that would be purchased each time. In each answer, the item being interrogated (the location) occurred in the sentence-initial focus position and not in the irrealis position, showing that the expression of focus is independent of the irrealis position.

(4.12) a. *Tiiti quia= quia-sinaáqui masii-cuaa-φ?*  
 where 2SG= 2SG-clothes buy-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Where will you buy your clothes?’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2321)

b. *Iquito=jina quí= qui-sinaáqui masii-cuaa-φ.*  
 Iquitos=LOC 1SG= 1SG-clothes buy-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will buy my clothes in Iquitos.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2321)

(4.13) a. *Tiiti quia= quia-cusi-ca masii-cuaa-φ?*  
 where 2SG= 2SG-pot-PL buy-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Where will you buy your pots?’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2321)

b. *Santa Maria=jina quí= qui-cusi-ca masii-cuaa-φ.*  
 Santa Maria=LOC 1SG= 1SG-pot-PL buy-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will buy my pots in Santa Maria.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2321)

Since topicalized and focused arguments occupy the *same positions* in realis and irrealis clauses, and these positions do not coincide with the irrealis position, the realis and irrealis word orders are not a product of information-structural processes.

Finally, recall from Chapter 2 that pronominal objects are the most common element type found in the irrealis position. As a result, we might speculate that this position is for given or presupposed information and not for focus. However, the negation particle can also occur in the irrealis position, and negation is considered to have inherent focus (see e.g. Güldemann 2007). Therefore, if negation has inherent focus and pronominal objects do not, then the fact that both can occur in the irrealis position suggests that this position is independent of the expression of information structure.

#### 4.2.2 Interaction of focus with the irrealis position

Focus, however, does have an indirect effect on what can occur in the irrealis position. For instance, if there is more than one element eligible to occur in the irrealis position, and one of them is focused, then one of the others will occur in the irrealis position instead. In (4.14), the object is focused, occurring to the left of the subject. It is therefore not available to occur in the irrealis position, but a postpositional phrase describing the location of the action is available and occurs in the irrealis position.

- (4.14) *Iína pápaaja quí úmina=jinacuma asa-rii-ø.*  
 DET fish 1SG canoe=inside eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘This fish I will eat inside the canoe.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2203)

When I explicitly tested for focus in my elicitation sessions, speakers consistently used the pre-subject position for the focused element and not the irrealis position. When Ema gave me the sentence in (4.15), we had been talking about all the kinds of things that could be purchased downriver (as opposed to in the community of San Antonio). When I asked her how to emphasize that they would be buying *clothes* specifically, she responded with the sentence in (4.16). These two sentences form a minimal pair for expressing focus; in (4.15) the adverb is focused and the object occurs in the irrealis position, and in (4.16), the object is focused and the adverb occurs in the irrealis position. The operation of extracting an element for the purposes of focus does not cause an element to appear in the irrealis position (the expression of the irrealis does), but it does indirectly affect which element will occur in this position.

(4.15) *Naámi*     *na=*     *sinaáqui*     *masii-cuaa-ø*.  
 downriver 3PL=     clothes     buy-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Downriver they will go and buy clothes.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2319)

(4.16) *Sinaáqui*     *na=*     *naámi*     *masii-cuaa-ø*.  
 clothes     3PL=     downriver     buy-DEI.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘Clothes they will go and buy downriver.’ (E.ELY.CIA.140808, p. 2319)

With ditransitive verbs, if one object is focused, then the other object will typically occur in the irrealis position. In (4.17), the theme is focused and occurs before the subject. The determiner of the recipient occurs in the irrealis position and the corresponding noun immediately follows the verb. Again, the focused element

is not occurring in the irrealis position, further indicating that the irrealis position is not a focus position.

- (4.17) *Núquiica mutúuru umáana quí= iína masiitii-rii- $\phi$*   
 One motor big 1SG= DET sell-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*icuáni.*  
 man  
 ‘One big motor I will sell to this man.’ (E.ELY.CIA.050808, p. 2171)

That said, the object does not have to be focused for something other than the object to occur in the irrealis position, as shown in (4.18). In this example, a postpositional phrase occurs in the irrealis position and an adverb and the object follow the verb.

- (4.18) *Quí= quia=jata cuata-rii- $\phi$  amicaáca*  
 1SG= 2SG=with cultivate-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE one.day.away  
*qui-nási.*  
 1SG-*chacra*  
 ‘Tomorrow I will cultivate my *chacra* with you.’ (E.ELY.CIA.060808, p. 2197)

In examples where the object is focused and there is no other material available to intervene between the subject and the verb, the resulting sentence will have an empty irrealis position, as in the textual example in (4.19) below.

- (4.19) *Núquiica tahuaacuca nu= masii- $\phi$ - $\phi$ .*  
 one tobacco 3SG= EMPTY ask.for-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘He will ask for a cigarette.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 284)

Similarly, if the verb is intransitive and is modified by only one adverb or adverbial phrase that is focused, then the irrealis position will be empty. In (4.20), a postpositional phrase is focused.

- (4.20) *Aaca=jina quia= iti-huii-ø.*  
 water=LOC 2SG= EMPTY fall-DEL.PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘In the water you will throw yourself.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 154)

Interrogative clauses are another context that can result in an empty irrealis position. If the interrogated element is the only material available to intervene between the subject and the verb, it will remain in the sentence-initial position and the irrealis position will be empty. For instance, in (4.21), the object is interrogated and occurs before the subject, leaving the irrealis position empty. (The phrase *cú-árata iyáana* ‘person like me’ is a vocative expression indicating the person who is being addressed and is not eligible to occur in the irrealis position.)

- (4.21) *Saáca quia= mii-rii-ø, cú-árata iyáana?*  
 what 2SG= EMPTY do-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE 1SG-like *paisano*  
 ‘What will you do, my countryman?’ (T.PSV.HDC.061212, line 19)

A similar question can be seen in (4.22a). Again, the object is interrogated and occurs before the subject, and the irrealis position is empty. The answer to the question provided in (4.22b) shows the object in focus position and the irrealis position empty.

- (4.22) a. *Saáca quia= asa-rii-ø?*  
 what 2SG= EMPTY eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘What will you eat?’ (E.HDC.CIA.200808, p. 2443)

- b. *Pápaaja* *cu=* *asa-ríi-ø*.  
 fish 1SG= EMPTY eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I will eat **fish**.’ (E.HDC.CIA.200808, p. 2443)

Negated examples can also show that an element has been focused. During the elicitation session in (4.23), Jaime would say a sentence in Iquito and then negate it in the next turn. In the negated version, he would change one element in the sentence, which would result in that element occurring in the focus position. In (4.23a), the object occurs in the irrealis position, but in (4.23b), it is focused and occurs before the subject, leaving the irrealis position empty.

- (4.23) a. [*Iína icuáni*]<sub>i</sub> *nu<sub>i</sub>=* *nu<sub>i</sub>-íimina* *iricatájuu-ríi-ø*.  
 DET man 3SG= 3SG-canoe fix-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘The man will fix his canoe.’ (E.JPI.CIA.270808, p. 2639)
- b. *Caa. Nu-iita* *nu=* *iricatájuu-ríi-ø*.  
 No 3SG-house 3SG= EMPTY fix-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘No, he will fix **his house**.’ (E.JPI.CIA.270808, p. 2639)

Recall from Chapter 2 that in certain phonological contexts, vowel hiatus resolution processes can be blocked when the irrealis position is empty. Whether or not the phonological gap strategy is evident in irrealis clauses where an element has been extracted for focus or question formation is an area for future research. The gap is very hard to elicit as it is only audible in very specific vowel contexts and in very careful speech, so a study of this type would most likely involve the collection of several tokens from several speakers that would then be analyzed using spectrogram tools.

The examples presented in this section have demonstrated the effect that focusing an object can have on what occurs in the irrealis position, but the focusing of other elements can also have an effect. In (4.24a), the adverb *iyarácata* ‘quickly’ occurs in the irrealis position. This adverb is the element that gets changed in the negated example in (4.24b); Jaime replaces it with *maacuárica* ‘slowly’ and puts it in the focus position. Rather than leaving the irrealis position empty, Jaime says the sentence with a determiner in the irrealis position. The element in the irrealis position is thus there as an indirect result of focus, but we cannot argue that this position is a focus position.

- (4.24) a. [*Iína miísáji*]<sub>i</sub> nu<sub>i</sub>= *iyarácata* *capi-rii-∅*  
 DET woman 3SG= quickly cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*pápaaja*.  
 fish  
 ‘The woman will quickly cook fish.’ (E.JPI.CIA.270808, p. 2639)
- b. *Caa*. *Maacuárica* nu= *ína* *capi-rii-∅*  
 No slowly 3SG= DET cook-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*pápaaja*.  
 fish  
 ‘No, slowly she will cook the fish.’ (E.JPI.CIA.270808, p. 2639)

It seems that extraction of the subject to the focus position also has an indirect effect on what occurs in the irrealis position, as was suggested for the unexpected order found in example (4.25), repeated from Chapter 2. In this example, the subject is extracted for the purposes of question formation, and the object occurs in the irrealis position. Recall that the expected order for this example was for the negative particle *caa* to occur in the irrealis position.

- (4.25) *Cáñica nu-nási cuara-ji-rii-ø caa?*  
 who 3SG-*chacra* cultivate-NEG-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE NEG  
 ‘Who will not cultivate his/her *chacra*?’ (E.JPI.CIA.110804-4)

However, it is possible for the negative particle *caa* to occur in the irrealis position when the subject has been extracted, as can be seen in (4.26). As in the previous example, the subject has been extracted for the purposes of question formation. The effect that subject extraction has on the irrealis position is an area that merits further research.

- (4.26) *Cáñica caa jicata-ji-rii-ø caa nu-náana?*  
 who NEG remove-NEG-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE NEG 3SG-timber  
 ‘Who will not remove his/her timber?’ (E.JPI.CIA.100804-7)

### 4.3 Analyzing the Iquito reality status alternation in terms of movement

Another way to explain the association between word order and reality status is to argue for a movement analysis where the verb (or alternatively, the element in the irrealis position) moves from its position in one clause type to its position in the other clause type. There are two possible ways to account for the SVX/SXV alternation via movement: positing movement of the verb or positing movement of “X”. For each type of movement, there are two directions to be considered: either the element raises (moves to the left) or lowers (moves to the right). In this section, I present a summary of the ways that movement has been addressed in previous analyses of Iquito and discuss the challenges the data pose for each of these analy-



ses. I also discuss whether the Iquito realis order can be considered an example of the verb-second (V2) phenomenon found in several Germanic languages.

#### 4.3.1 Verb movement

Verb movement analyses largely assume that the verb raises for the purposes of inflection. Brown (2004) argues for verb-raising in Iquito, claiming that in the SXV word order, the verb remains *in situ*, but in the SVX word order, the verb moves to an inflectional head position that follows the subject, causing it to precede the object.<sup>1</sup> I make a similar argument in my Master's Thesis (Hansen 2006: 81), except that I argue that the verb moves to the specifier of VP instead of to an inflectional head.

A verb-raising analysis assumes that the irrealis SXV order is somehow basic and that movement occurs as a means of marking the realis, making realis clauses derived from irrealis ones. This assumption is problematic for two reasons. First, the basic word order of Iquito is SVO and the SXV order is considered to be highly marked (Lai 2009: 46, 49). Secondly, as Elliott (2000: 57) notes, it is much more likely for the realis to be unmarked and for the irrealis to be the marked form, making movement for the purposes of marking the realis highly unmotivated.

Another approach would be to argue that the verb lowers. In such an analy-

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown's analysis is somewhat confusing, because he starts his discussion by saying he will reconcile the SOV and SVO orders into one underlying SVO word order (Brown 2004: 151) but concludes by saying that the verbs in SOV constructions are not moving to a new position, whereas verbs in SVO constructions are (Brown 2004: 172), suggesting that the underlying order is in fact SOV.

sis, the SVX order would be basic, and the verb would move to the right to derive the SXV irrealis order. While this type of analysis addresses the problems identified above since the basic SVX realis order is no longer being derived, this type of movement analysis is contrary to the direction of movement typically described in the syntactic literature which holds that verbs *raise* to acquire inflectional morphology, not lower. Furthermore, reality status has clausal scope, and so it seems unlikely that the verb would move to a lower position in the clause in order to express this type of inflection, since inflectional positions with clausal scope occur higher in the clause.

A verb-lowering analysis is also complicated by the discontinuous constituency evident in irrealis constructions. Examples like the ones we saw in Chapter 3 are particularly problematic, since the determiner in each of these cases is separated from its complement noun. A verb-lowering analysis would have to allow for the verb to move to some position between the determiner and its complement noun. This does not seem to be a plausible or elegant solution, because it does not account for other element types; a different position would need to be posited for adverbs and the negation particle.

A verb movement analysis that exhibits similarity with the Iquito reality status alternation is the verb second phenomenon that we see in several Germanic languages (English being an exception). These languages exhibit a word order alternation where the position of the verb corresponds to clause type: main clauses exhibit verb second (V2) behavior, whereas subordinate clauses are typically verb-final. Wechsler (1991), using data from Swedish, argues that the verb position

in Germanic indicates illocutionary force, where V2 clauses are direct or indirect assertions and non-V2 clauses are non-assertions.

While Iquito may look like it is exhibiting V2 phenomena in realis clauses because the subject and verb must be contiguous, focused clauses like the ones discussed in Section 4.2 above show that although the verb has to immediately follow the subject, it does not have to be in second position. Furthermore, while interrogatives and imperatives trigger the irrealis in some languages, illocutionary force is independent of reality status in Iquito. Questions can be realis or irrealis (compare, for example, (4.6a) and (4.12a)), and imperatives display characteristics of both the realis and irrealis (Lai 2009: 142). Therefore, it is not the case that the word order alternation we see in Iquito mirrors V2 phenomena in Germanic.

#### **4.3.2 “X” movement**

Alternatively, we could posit that “X” moves instead of the verb. In order to take this approach, we need to articulate what moves and to where. Since the elements that occur in the irrealis position are not consistently single phonological words, it is not possible to explain the phenomenon as movement of a phonological word from one side of the verb to the other. Nor can we explain the movement in terms of constituency type, e.g. move the object or move the adverb, since a variety of other element types can occur in the irrealis position besides objects and adverbs, such as negation and postpositional phrases. In Chapters 2 and 3, I demonstrated that the element in the irrealis position can be analyzed as a phrase, including determiners if we take their historical origins into account. Thus, we could argue that

a phrase moves from a post-verbal to a pre-verbal position, or vice versa.

An “X”-lowering analysis is problematic because there is no clear structural position for the “X” to lower to. It is also problematic because it presumes that the irrealis SXV order is basic and that X moves to create the realis SVX order. This is the same problem that we saw with verb-raising above.

An “X”-raising analysis solves the basic word order dilemma: under this analysis, SVX is basic and the SXV order is derived. “X” most likely moves to an irrealis position that exists between the subject and verb of an irrealis clause, but that is absent in realis clauses (as evidenced by the adverbial data presented in Chapter 2).

Anderson et al. (2006) propose an “X”-raising analysis where these elements move to the irrealis position for phonological reasons, namely to realize a phonologically null irrealis morpheme. In Section 4.5.1, I discuss the possibility of a historical development that might in fact support this type of movement. But first, I present a description of reality status marking and word order in two other languages of the Zaparoan family: Arabela and Záparo.

#### **4.4 Comparative data**

There are two other Zaparoan languages that are still spoken today: Arabela and Záparo. As discussed in Chapter 1, these languages are highly endangered, with Arabela having roughly 75 speakers remaining in Peru and Záparo having less than ten speakers remaining in Ecuador. Some language documentation work has

been conducted on both of these languages by members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, but for the most part, they remain largely undocumented, although fieldwork on Záparo has been recently undertaken (January 2011) by fieldworkers with Cabeceras Aid Project.

In this section, I turn to look at data from these other Zaparoan languages to see what insights they provide into the origin of the Iquito reality status alternation. I have not conducted primary research on these related languages, as they are fairly hard to access, and so I rely on the two primary sources that exist: a 643-page dictionary of Arabela (Rich 1999) that includes an 88-page grammatical sketch, and a 72-page grammatical sketch of Záparo (Peeke 1991) which includes a word list with 140 words and a text of 104 lines. There are a handful of articles on the languages of the Zaparoan family that I have also consulted, namely Peeke (1959a) and Peeke (1959b) on Andoa, Sargent (1959) on Záparo, and Wise (2005) on the Zaparoan family, but none of these articles provide a sufficient analysis of word order or reality status to be particularly useful.

My goal in this section is to examine if and how reality status is marked in the other Zaparoan languages and to determine whether or not the reality status word order alternation that we see in Iquito is found in the other languages of the family. What I present here is my best effort based on my knowledge of Iquito and what is available in the existing literature. More research needs to be conducted on these sister languages before reliable generalizations can be made. As a result, my findings are tentative, as there is little discussion of reality status in the literature on Arabela and Záparo, and there is not enough data to draw clear conclusions about

word order in either of these languages. That said, there is sufficient data to show that Arabela marks the irrealis through a set of verbal morphemes. The data also suggest that both Arabela and Záparo allow an SXV order that differs from what is described to be the basic word order for each of these languages, so the word order that we see in Iquito irrealis clauses is attested elsewhere in the family. It is not clear, however, that this SXV order corresponds with irrealis marking in either Arabela or Záparo. The Arabela irrealis morphemes do not seem to correlate with a specific word order, and it appears that Záparo marks reality status via word order but that the semantic contexts that trigger the irrealis are not the same as what we see in Iquito. Thus, while it can be argued that reality status marking is found in all three languages, the formal mechanisms and semantic triggers of irrealis marking vary for each of the three languages.

#### 4.4.1 Arabela

##### 4.4.1.1 Reality status marking in Arabela

Arabela is described as having a realis/irrealis distinction that is morphologically marked in a variety of ways. Rich (1999: 64) describes a set of irrealis morphemes that occur as verbal suffixes: they are *-re/-ri/-ru*. An example of these suffixes in use can be seen in (4.27). It appears that it is also possible for *-ro* to occur as an irrealis morpheme, as evidenced by the example in (4.28), even though this morpheme is not explicitly mentioned as an allomorph in the grammatical sketch.

- (4.27) *Niya quia nujua-re narashi mariqui tohuata-maa-ri.*  
 here 2SG stop-IRR collared.peccary lest leave-toward.spkr-IRR  
 ‘Stop here lest the collared peccary gets away.’ (Rich 1999: 64)

(4.28) *Quio-cua na soote-ya-ro-hua.*

2SG-POT 3SG bear-CONT-IRR-RETURN

‘You can support the weight returning home.’ (Rich 1999: 61)

Rich (1999: 11) also indicates that the irrealis can be marked by shortening a long final vowel. This process seems to only occur with two verbal morphemes, namely the imperfective *-riquiaa* and the deictic marker *-maa*, and arguably results in a portmanteau morpheme that encodes both the irrealis and either the imperfective or deictic reading. Additionally, there are two other deictic markers that can also be considered to be portmanteau morphemes; they encode the irrealis without a change in vowel length: *-see/-shii* and *-coo/-quioo*. Elliott (2000: 65) points out that portmanteau affixes to the verb are a “very common form of marking reality status,” although she indicates that reality status is frequently fused with the person and number of the subject or with a transitivity marker and does not mention aspect or deixis as possible hosts.

Finally, I will make a case later in this section that what is analyzed as an infinitive marker in Rich (1999) may in fact also function as an irrealis marker. The Arabela irrealis morphemes are summarized in Table 4.1.<sup>2</sup> Although not explicitly mentioned by Rich (1999), I am assuming based on the description and glosses he does provide that the realis is not overtly marked.

Irrealis marking in Arabela is triggered by several semantic contexts. One context where the irrealis is found is with the potential mood (Rich 1999: 64),

---

<sup>2</sup>Rich (1999) does not discuss what factors condition the allomorphs, although it appears that the allomorphy of the infinitive markers is conditioned by the final vowel of the verb root. The *-niu* allomorph occurs when the final vowel of the verb root is [i].

Table 4.1: Irrealis morphemes in Arabela

	MORPHEME	GLOSS
DEFAULT	<i>-re/-ri/-ru/-ro</i>	irrealis
PORTMANTEAU MORPHEMES	<i>-riquia/-riquio</i> <i>-coo/-quioo</i> <i>-ma/-mia/-mo</i> <i>-see/-shii</i>	irrealis + imperfective irrealis + go doing and return irrealis + towards the speaker irrealis + go and do
POSSIBLE IRREALIS MARKER	<i>-nu/-niu</i>	infinitive; irrealis?

which is marked by a suffix (*-cua* or *-ma*) that occurs on the first element of the sentence. The potential mood is used to indicate polite requests (4.29), warnings (4.30), permission (4.31), and obligation (4.32).

(4.29) *Quio-cua cua mueya cojua-re.*

2SG-POT 1SG child take.care.of-IRR

‘Please take care of my child.’ (*lit.* ‘You can/You will take care of my child.’) (Rich 1999: 65)

(4.30) *Quio-cua ti-ya-re.*

2SG-POT fall-CONT-IRR

‘You will fall!’ (Rich 1999: 65)

(4.31) *Po-cua Soledad tia-ca-jinia coque-too-ma-ni.*

1PL.INCL-POT Soledad house-PL-in meet-REC-towards.IRR-1SG

‘Let’s meet in the town of Soledad (to continue the trip).’<sup>3</sup> (Rich 1999: 65)

<sup>3</sup>The word for town in Arabela is *tiaca*, even though the interlinear gloss provided by Rich (1999) suggests otherwise. I have chosen to maintain the interlinear gloss and the free translation as they are presented in the original example.



- (4.32) *Nojori-cua niya-ja cua coque-see.*  
 3PL-POT here-FOC 1SG join-go.and.do.IRR  
 ‘They should come meet me here.’ (Rich 1999: 65)

The irrealis marking is also found with wishes (desideratives and optatives), as in (4.33):

- (4.33) *Maninia-ra juhuanojuaja jiyate-riquia cua casa-mi-ni.*  
 good-PROP still exist-IRR.IMPF 1SG thing-PL-1SG  
 ‘(Hopefully) my things are still okay.’ (Rich 1999: 65)

Imperative constructions also take irrealis marking, as can be seen in (4.34) and (4.35).

- (4.34) *Quia caji-ri.*  
 2SG sit-IRR  
 ‘Sit down.’ (Rich 1999: 88)

- (4.35) *Nequeru nia niqui-ri.*  
 deer 2PL look-IRR  
 ‘Y’all look at the deer.’ (Rich 1999: 89)

Interestingly, the irrealis is not marked in any of the clauses provided by Rich (1999) that have an overt future tense morpheme. Instead the verb is marked with what is analyzed as an infinitive marker *-nu* along with the future marker *-taniya*, as shown in (4.36) and (4.37).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>The allomorphy of the infinitive and future markers in (4.37) is likely conditioned by the high front vowel at the end of the verb root *cami-*.

(4.36) *Pa jiyaso pa niquitio-nu-taniya na taani-tiaja.*  
 1PL.INCL grandfather 1PL.INCL give-INF-FUT 3SG shoot-INST  
 ‘Our grandfather will give us his shotgun.’ (Rich 1999: 42)

(4.37) *Quiaa-te cuno maaji cami-niu-taniya?*  
 2SG-Q this woman marry-INF-FUT  
 ‘Will you marry this woman?’ (Rich 1999: 77)

There is one example in Rich (1999) where the the future marker appears to occur without the infinitive marker (see (4.38) below), but elsewhere this same sentence is glossed with the infinitive marker, as in (4.39). Thus, every example with the future marker *-taniya* co-occurs with this infinitive marker *-nu*.

(4.38) *Taacari nia quianu-taniya-ni?*  
 when 2PL go-FUT-Q  
 ‘When will you all go?’ (Rich 1999: 86)

(4.39) *Taacari nia quia-nu-taniya-ni?*  
 when 2PL go-INF-FUT-Q  
 ‘When will you all go?’ (Rich 1999: 63)

It seems unlikely, and in fact problematic, that nonfinite marking (i.e. the infinitive marker *-nu*) would co-occur with finite future tense marking. Because future tense frequently overlaps with irrealis marking and because this infinitive marker is also a verbal suffix like the irrealis *-re/-ri/-ru* set, it seems possible that this morpheme is an irrealis marker that has been mis-analyzed as an infinitive marker in this context.

Further evidence that this infinitive marker might be an irrealis marker is the fact that it also occurs in negative clauses. Although it is not universal for negation to trigger the irrealis, it is possible, especially in languages where negation only has scope over the action being proposed by the predicate, as opposed to the entire clause (Elliott 2000: 78, see also Mithun 1995: 385-6). In the Arabela data, the so-called infinitive marker *-nu* is found in clauses negated with the negative marker *maja*, which can negate actions or states (Rich 1999: 90). This marker is found with basic negative clauses, like (4.40) and (4.41), negative questions (4.42), and negative imperatives (4.43). In all of these examples, *-nu* is the only marking on the verb. As was the case in the future clauses, this marker occurs as a verbal suffix just like the irrealis *-re/-ri/-ru* set, making it possible that it is functioning as an irrealis marker in this context as well. It could, however, be a nonfinite, nominalized form; Miestamo (2005) notes that it is possible for negation to trigger nominalization of the negated predicate. Unfortunately, Rich (1999) does not provide any examples of this negative marker occurring with overt tense/aspect morphology,<sup>5</sup> which would be helpful for determining whether *-nu* is obligatory in these negative clauses and whether *-nu* is a nonfinite marker or something else. If *-nu* could co-occur with tense/aspect morphology in negative clauses, then it is likely not a nonfinite marker.

- (4.40) *Maja cua niishi-niu.*  
 NEG 1SG know-INF  
 ‘I don’t know.’ (Rich 1999: 90)

---

<sup>5</sup>Arabela also has a negative verbal suffix *-yaqui/-aqui/-uqui*, which is found with overt aspect morphology (see Rich (1999: 60-1)). This suffix also negates actions or states, but it does not co-occur with *-nu*.

(4.41) *Quia mueya maja canaa jiya-co na qui-niu.*  
 2SG child NEG 1PL.EXCL house-in 3SG to.be-INF  
 ‘Your child is not in our house.’ (Rich 1999: 38)

(4.42) *Maja-te quia niishi-niu can-te nojuaja-ni?*  
 NEG-Q 2SG know-INF who-Q he-Q  
 ‘You don’t know who he is?’ (Rich 1999: 86)

(4.43) *Maja quia quia-nu!*  
 NEG 2SG go-INF  
 ‘Don’t go!’ (Rich 1999: 90)

If the verbal morpheme *-nu* is in fact an allomorph of the irrealis, it is homophonous with a true infinitive marker, as this morpheme is also found in contexts where an infinitive verb is expected. In (4.44), a verb marked with *-nu* is the complement of *naata* ‘to be able to’, in (4.45), a verb marked with *-nu* is the complement of *cotee* ‘to begin’, and in (4.46) and (4.47), a verb marked with *-nu* is the complement of *pani* ‘to want’. Verbs like ‘to be able to’, ‘to begin’, and ‘to want’ are ones that typically take nonfinite complements cross-linguistically.

(4.44) *Cua naata namitia-nu.*  
 1SG be.able.to cultivate-INF  
 ‘I am able to cultivate.’ (Rich 1999: 92)

(4.45) *Niaa-ri canaa cotee-ta-quiaa miaque-nu.*  
 2PL-SUBJ 1PL.EXCL begin-APPL-HAB eat-INF  
 ‘You all always begin to eat before us.’ (Rich 1999: 55)

(4.46) *Miaque-nu pani-ya-nijia.*  
eat-INF want-CONT-1SG  
'I want to eat.' (Rich 1999: 50)

(4.47) *Janiya quia-ta quia-nu pani-ya-ni.*  
1SG 2SG-with go-INF want-CONT-1SG  
'I want to go with you.'<sup>6</sup> (Rich 1999: 91)

Alternatively, we could consider the main clause uses of *-nu* that we see in the future clause examples in (4.36) through (4.39) and the negative clause examples in (4.40) through (4.43) to be examples of insubordination, i.e. “the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (Evans 2007: 367, see also Mithun 2008). Under this analysis, *-nu* would be analyzed as a nonfinite marker in all contexts. Its use in main clauses would be explained by saying that these clauses were once subordinate clauses, and the main clauses they occurred with have since been elided.

An insubordination analysis would explain the use of the infinitive in negative examples, since Evans (2007: 410) proposes that in languages where negatives display formal similarities with subordinate forms (e.g. nonfinite morphology), these negatives “were originally subordinated to main clauses bearing the main assertion”. However, an insubordination analysis does not solve the problem posed by the nonfinite marker co-occurring with finite future tense marking. One

---

<sup>6</sup>Wise (2005: 66) glosses *-ni* in this example as an irrealis morpheme. I believe that this is an inaccurate representation of Rich’s original gloss (1R), which is described as being coreferential with the first person singular. This is, however, an area that merits further research, as Wise may be relying on additional analyses (or personal communication) not found in Rich (1999).

could take the stance that the finite future tense marking was added to these in-subordinated clauses long after they became conventionalized as main clauses (and presumably after some semantic bleaching of the nonfinite marker),<sup>7</sup> except for the fact that we also see this morphological combination in *subordinate* clauses. Examples (4.48) and (4.49) both show the infinitive marker occurring with the finite future marker in a subordinate clause. These examples are problematic because we would expect either nonfinite morphology or finite morphology to occur on the verb, but not both, particularly in a subordinate clause where nonfinite marking is more common.

(4.48) *Quia maca-ta-re* [tee pa quia-**nu-taniya-ni**].  
 2SG climb-APPL-IRR where 1PL.INCL go-INF-FUT-SUB  
 ‘Climb (the tree in order to know) where we have to go.’ (Said in the context of being lost.) (Rich 1999: 56)

(4.49) *Saaja quia niishi-riojo-re cutara* [taa quia cojua-**nu-taniya**  
 only 2SG know-MUL-IRR better how 2SG take.care.of-INF-FUT  
*quia mueya-ni*].  
 2SG baby-SUB  
 ‘It’s better to think about how you will take care of your baby.’ (Rich 1999: 69)

It is also interesting to note that both of these subordinate clauses occur with an irrealis main clause. If we compare these examples to example (4.27), repeated

---

<sup>7</sup>Evans (2007: 377) notes, “As the independent use of erstwhile subordinate clauses becomes increasingly conventionalized, the relevant constructions may exhibit a mix of subordinate and main clause features.”

below as (4.50), which also consists of an irrealis main clause followed by a subordinate clause, but that does not use the infinitive marker within the subordinate clause, we see that it is plausible that the subordinate clauses in (4.48) and (4.49) could be interpreted as irrealis and therefore should bear an irrealis morpheme of some sort. The *-nu* morpheme may be fulfilling this function rather than functioning as an infinitive marker.<sup>8</sup>

(4.50) *Niya quia nujua-re narashi mariqui tohuata-maa-ri.*  
 here 2SG stop-IRR collared.peccary lest leave-toward.spkr-IRR  
 ‘Stop here lest the collared peccary gets away.’ (Rich 1999: 64)

Thus, while insubordination may explain the origin of the nonfinite marker occurring in main clause future and negative constructions, *-nu* cannot be analyzed synchronically as a nonfinite morpheme in future contexts. More research needs to be conducted on Arabela to confirm this assertion.

#### 4.4.1.2 Word order in Arabela

The basic word order in Arabela is SOV, but there are a few examples in Wise (2005) that resemble the SXV order we see in Iquito. For instance, in the Arabela example given in (4.51), the postpositional phrase *po-kuahi* ‘for us’ occurs

---

<sup>8</sup>I do not consider the interrogative marker *-ni* found in (4.38) and (4.39) or the subordinate marker *-ni* in (4.48) to be a possible allomorph of the irrealis, despite its potential phonological similarity to the irrealis morpheme *-ri*, because *-ni* does not occur with all instances of the future morpheme, as *-nu* does (see for example (4.36) and (4.37) which have *-nu* but not *-ni*). Also, the portmanteau irrealis morpheme *-riquia* shown in (4.33) could be analyzed as the irrealis morpheme *-ri* with the habitual morpheme *-quiaa*, which would suggest a morpheme order of irrealis before tense/aspect marking. This morpheme order further supports the claim that the morpheme *-nu*, which occurs before the future tense marker *-taniya*, is analyzable as an irrealis marker.

between the subject and the verb, and the object *kuaneeka* ‘plantains’ follows the verb.

- (4.51) *pueya po-kuahi kapi-kiu-rii kuaneeka.*  
people 1PL.INCL-for cook-MUL-PERF plantains  
‘The people cooked plantains for us.’ (Wise 2005: 65, example 28)

Example (4.52) also exhibits a postpositional phrase occurring between the subject and the verb.

- (4.52) *kua hi na nanu-ta ki-hia.*  
1SG grandmother 3SG brother-with be-NOM  
‘My grandmother lives with her brother.’ (Wise 2005: 65, example 29)

A similar example, given in (4.53), has the postpositional phrase following the verb, so it is not the case that postpositional phrases must occur between the subject and the verb.

- (4.53) *na pi-rii mueruu-ta.*  
3SG cut-PERF machete-with  
‘S/he cut it with a machete.’<sup>9</sup> (Wise 2005: 65, example 30)

There is nothing about the sentences in (4.51) and (4.52), however, to suggest that the SXV order they exhibit somehow conveys an irrealis reading, nor does

---

<sup>9</sup>This example is a little confusing because the translation suggests there are two arguments but the gloss lists only one. I suspect that the third person singular pronoun at the beginning of the sentence is the subject, and the object is not overtly expressed.



the contrast with the SVX example in (4.53) suggest the existence of any kind of reality status alternation. Therefore, while it is evident that the SXV order is attested in Arabela, it does not seem to be the case that this order correlates with an irrealis interpretation. Rather, irrealis marking in Arabela is done solely through verbal morphology.

#### **4.4.2 Záparo**

##### **4.4.2.1 Reality status marking in Záparo**

There is no mention of a realis/irrealis distinction existing in Záparo in Peeke (1991). In reviewing the data, however, it appears that Záparo exhibits a word order comparable to the Iquito irrealis word order that may correlate with the expression of the irrealis.

##### **4.4.2.2 Word order in Záparo**

Záparo's basic word order has been described as SVO (Peeke 1991, Wise 2005), and this order is evident in past tense clauses, as in examples (4.54) and (4.55) below.

(4.54) *noka-ká-na acá no.*  
DEM-PL-REP eat 3SG.OBJ  
'They ate it.' (Peeke 1991: 25, example 99)

(4.55) *na ámo-wara tama n-áno.*  
3PL kill-PST same 3SG-mother  
'They killed their own mother.' (Peeke 1991: 45, example 209)

SVO order is also found in present tense clauses, as in examples (4.56) and (4.57):

(4.56) *ko ahaatatá-ka ko níá-no.*  
1SG throw.out-CONT 1SG child-MASC.SG  
'I am throwing out my son.' (Peeke 1991: 8, example 4)

(4.57) *samičá-ha naw masÁkΛ naw napáha.*  
new-FOC 3SG pursue 3SG knife  
'He is looking for his NEW knife.' (Peeke 1991: 10, example 14)

The basic SVO order is also evident in future tense clauses. The future is marked in Záparo via a pre-verbal particle *na* that co-occurs with a verbal suffix *-ha/-ho*<sup>10</sup> in declarative clauses. This marking, as well as the SVO order, can be seen in the transitive example in (4.58) and the ditransitive example given in (4.59).

(4.58) *kána-ha na aca-há noka.*  
1PL.EXCL-FOC FUT eat-FUT DEM  
'WE will eat it.' (Peeke 1991: 47, example 218)

(4.59) *kána-ha na ináw-ha noka no.*  
1PL.EXCL-FOC FUT give-FUT DEM 3SG.OBJ  
'WE will give it to him/her.' (Peeke 1991: 10, example 15)

The fact that the same SVO order is found in both future and past tense declarative clauses suggests that Záparo does not have a reality status distinction

---

<sup>10</sup>The *-ho* allomorph is used with verbs that end in *o*.

that correlates with word order, or at least that the future tense does not trigger such a word order alternation as it does in Iquito. However, since past and future tense do not always perfectly align with realis and irrealis cross-linguistically, this is an area of Záparo that merits further research. There are not enough transitive examples in Peeke (1991) to conclusively argue for or against a realis/irrealis alternation triggered by the future tense.

Záparo, however, does exhibit an SXV order in interrogative and imperative clauses, both of which are semantic contexts that are associated with the irrealis (Elliott 2000). An example of this alternative order can be seen in the interrogative clause given in (4.60). In this example, the object precedes the verb. This order directly contrasts with the order we saw in the future declarative sentence in (4.58), where the demonstrative object follows the verb. (Note that the marking of future is different in interrogative clauses than it is in declarative clauses. There is a portmanteau particle *-ma* that attaches to the subject and functions as both an interrogative marker and a future marker, and the particle *na* is not used in this context.)

- (4.60) *tia ča-ma noka iyahya?*  
 when 2SG-FUT.Q DEM learn  
 ‘When will you learn it?’ (Peeke 1991: 12, example 27)

This alternative order is also found in interrogatives without explicit future tense marking (but that still exhibit a future interpretation), as shown in (4.61), and in non-future clauses with continuative aspect, as in (4.62).

- (4.61) *ča-tá kaca-ka ináw kwi?*  
 2SG-Q something-SG give 1SG.OBJ

‘Will you give me something?’ (Peeke 1991: 22, example 82)

- (4.62) *maha-ká ča-tΛ áwΛro-ka acá-ka-ʔʔ*  
raw-SG 2SG-Q beetle-SG eat-CONT-ANT  
‘Are you eating a RAW beetle?’ (Peeke 1991: 13, example 30)

While reality status works independently of interrogative mood in the majority of languages, in some languages, the interrogative mood may condition the choice between realis and irrealis (Elliott 2000: 80). Examples (4.60) through (4.62) suggest that Záparo is one of these languages where the interrogative mood conditions the choice for irrealis. There is, however, an example in Peeke (1991) of an interrogative clause that exhibits SVO order. One of the arguments in this clause is assumed but not explicitly stated. I speculate that it might be possible for this argument to occur between the subject and the verb if it were to be overtly expressed.

- (4.63) *pa-tÁ ota-tΛ-ká noka?*  
1PL.INCL-Q finish-CAU-CONT DEM  
‘Are we making it so that (someone) can finish it?’ (Peeke 1991: 40, example 185)

The majority of the imperative clauses given in Peeke (1991) also exhibit the alternative SXV order. There are several examples where the object precedes the verb, as can be seen in (4.64) and (4.65).

- (4.64) *ča noká táši.*  
2SG DEM wait.for  
‘Wait for it.’ (Peeke 1991: 20, example 68)

- (4.65) *ča ko onía-tΛ-ʔ.*  
 2SG 1SG cross-CAU-ANT  
 ‘Make me cross.’ (Peeke 1991: 15, example 41)

It is also possible for elements other than the object to occur between the subject and the verb, showing that the SXV order present in Iquito irrealis clauses is also attested in Záparo. In the imperative sentence in (4.66), a postpositional phrase occurs in this position (the object is focused and occurs sentence-initially).

- (4.66) *moríča-ha ča ko-íra takí-kwa.*  
 water-FOC 2SG 1SG-for carry-go  
 ‘Go and get WATER for me.’<sup>11</sup> (Peeke 1991: 16, example 47)

There are very few imperative examples where the subject and verb are contiguous. Most of these examples are intransitive clauses that do not have an element to intervene, as in (4.67), or are intransitives with a focused adverbial, as in (4.68).

- (4.67) *ča ikó-ʔ.*  
 2SG sit-ANT  
 ‘Sit.’ (Peeke 1991: 14, example 36)

- (4.68) *anáyča ča asáma.*  
 quickly 2SG run  
 ‘Run QUICKLY.’ (Peeke 1991: 15, example 45)

---

<sup>11</sup>The morpheme *-kwa-* is glossed by Peeke (1991) as the verb ‘go’, but it is probably a directional marker, cognate with the directional verbal affix *-cuaa* that we see in Iquito, meaning downriver or away from the speaker (Lai 2009: xvii).

In (4.69), the subject and verb are contiguous, but there are two possible elements that could intervene between the subject and the verb: the adverb *konokí* ‘there’ and the phrase *ko ratá* ‘like me’. If imperatives are correlated with an SXV word order, as they seem to be based on the previous examples, we would expect one of these phrases to occur between the subject and the verb.

(4.69) *konokí ča ikó ko ratá.*  
 there 2SG sit 1SG like  
 ‘Sit there like me.’ (Peeke 1991: 31, example 135)

It is possible that phrases with *ratá/arata* ‘like’ are barred from occurring between the subject and the verb. Compare (4.69) with (4.70) below. Both examples have a phrase with *ratá/arata* ‘like’, but in neither case does that phrase occur between the subject and the verb. Additional research is needed in order to verify this hypothesis.

(4.70) *kina áno arata kiná noka mÁA-RA.*  
 2PL mother like 2PL DEM do-ANT  
 ‘Do it like your mother.’ (Peeke 1991: 31, example 134)

In addition to interrogatives and imperatives, there is one other context where the SXV order is evident in Peeke’s (1991) Záparo data. The modal adverb ‘maybe’ occurs between the subject and the verb of the indicative sentence in (4.71). This sentence is unusual in that it is neither an imperative nor an interrogative, but the addition of the adverb does convey an irrealis sense. Furthermore, this word order, S Adv V, is an SXV type that is also allowed in Iquito irrealis clauses,

suggesting that this example may be an irrealis clause marked as such via word order.

- (4.71) *ko nía-no atána ata-ká-aaaa.*  
1SG child-MASC maybe fly-CONT-INTONATION  
'Maybe my son is flying.' (Peeke 1991: 52, text line 37)

Very little discussion is provided by Peeke (1991) and Wise (2005) on the alternative SXV word order; Wise (2005: 56) says that the word order varies according to pragmatic factors as well as “other factors”. Irrealis marking may be one of these “other factors” since SXV order is found in Záparo in potentially irrealis contexts (interrogatives, imperatives, and with the adverb ‘maybe’). That said, Záparo does not seem to have a realis/irrealis alternation identical to the one seen in Iquito. The Záparo alternation is found in the interrogative and imperative, but these contexts do not trigger the irrealis in Iquito,<sup>12</sup> and the Záparo alternation is not found with the future tense, which is a trigger for the irrealis in Iquito. More data is needed before a true comparison can be made.

#### 4.4.2.3 A note about the Záparo future particles

In addition to exhibiting a word order alternation that may correlate with reality status marking, Záparo also exhibits a pre-verbal future particle that may provide insight into the origins of this word order alternation in both Záparo and Iquito.

---

<sup>12</sup>Iquito interrogative clauses can be either realis or irrealis, and Iquito imperative clauses “show structural characteristics of both realis and irrealis mood” (Lai 2009: 142).

Tense and aspect marking in the Zaparoan languages is marked via verbal suffixes (see Rich (1999: 61-64) for Arabela, Lai (2009: 69-71) for Iquito, and Peeke (1991: 40-43) for Záparo). The sole exception to this generalization is the Záparo pre-verbal future particle *na* (and a related portmanteau future and interrogative marker *-ma*). As mentioned above in Section 4.4.2.1, the particle *na* co-occurs with a future verbal suffix *-ha/-ho* in declarative clauses, as can be seen in (4.58) and (4.59) above and in (4.72) and (4.73) below.

(4.72) *ása n-íko-ha ča na inaw-tá-ha kwi.*  
 only 3SG-egg-FOC 2SG FUT give-PAT-FUT 1SG.  
 ‘You will give me JUST ITS EGG.’ (Peeke 1991: 9, example 9)

(4.73) *ča na itá-kwa-ha.*  
 2SG FUT fall-go-FUT.  
 ‘You will fall.’<sup>13</sup> (Peeke 1991: 19, example 61)

In imperative clauses, the future is marked by just the pre-verbal particle *na*; there is no verbal suffix, as shown in (4.74).

(4.74) *kawirá-ha nákona-hina ča na ikó.*  
 all-FOC trees-LOC 2SG FUT sit  
 ‘Sit in all of the (felled) trees.’ (Peeke 1991: 47, example 219)

Nor is there a future verbal suffix in interrogative clauses, as can be seen in (4.60) above and (4.75) below. The future marker in interrogative clauses is a portmanteau morpheme (*-ma*) that also functions as a question marker.

---

<sup>13</sup>The morpheme *-kwa-* is glossed by Peeke (1991) as the verb ‘go’, but it is probably a directional marker, cognate with the directional verbal affix *-cuaa* that we see in Iquito, meaning downriver or away from the speaker (Lai 2009: xvii).



- (4.75) *ča-ma oko?*  
 2SG-FUT.Q walk  
 ‘Will you walk?’ (Peeke 1991: 11, example 24)

The position of these future particles is noteworthy for two reasons. First, this position differs significantly from the position of other tense morphology in Záparo as well as in Iquito and Arabela, suggesting that these particles might not be tense markers after all. Second, these particles occur pre-verbally, a position that is reserved for marking the irrealis in Záparo’s sister language Iquito. Whether the Záparo future particle is correctly analyzed can only be determined through more research on the language.

I do, however, think it is possible that this particle could be a morpheme that correlates with an irrealis reading, especially since it is analyzed as marking the future, a semantic context that triggers the irrealis in other languages, including Iquito. Also, Iquito has a subject clitic =*tí*/=*ití* that occurs before the verb to mark the counterfactual, and the counterfactual is a semantic context that triggers the Iquito irrealis word order. Evidence that this morpheme is a subject clitic can be seen in (4.76); rather than attaching to the verb, this morpheme occurs immediately after the subject and before the element in the irrealis position.

- (4.76) *Quí= =tí núquiica anitáaqui pani-φ-cura, quí= =tí nu*  
 1SG= =CF one peccary search-PERF-RPST 1SG= =CF 3SG  
*mii-yaa-φ.*  
 have-IMPF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘If I had searched for a peccary, I would have one (now).’ (Lai 2009: 158, example 256)

The Záparo future particle is most likely also a subject clitic, especially considering that the future morpheme found in interrogatives attaches to the subject and that objects can occur between this particle and the verb (see example (4.60)).

If the Záparo future particles trigger an irrealis reading much like the Iquito counterfactual morpheme does, then this, together with the Iquito irrealis position, suggests that there is a pre-verbal (or subject-final) position for irrealis-related categories in both Záparo and Iquito. A morpheme in this position may have been the way that the irrealis was morphologically marked at an earlier stage of each of these languages or possibly when these languages formed a single branch of the family. Unfortunately, the post-verbal position of the irrealis morphology in Arabela does not allow us to make a similar claim for the family as a whole. If a pre-verbal irrealis morpheme did exist in Záparo and Iquito, it has since been lost. However, it may have triggered the word order alternation we see in Iquito and Záparo (assuming the SXV order we see in Záparo corresponds to an irrealis reading). A process of this sort is attested in Halkomelem by Shaw et al. (2008), and I will discuss this process as well as the possibility that it occurred in Iquito in Section 4.5.1.

#### **4.4.3 Summarizing the comparative data**

I have shown that a reality status distinction is marked in Arabela and possibly Záparo, but that the way the distinction is realized in each language varies considerably. Arabela has a set of verbal morphemes that mark the irrealis, summarized in Table 4.1 above. Záparo does not mark reality status morphologically, but may mark the distinction through word order as Iquito does. There is certainly

evidence to indicate that a post-subject/pre-verbal position is significant for irrealis marking in both Iquito and Záparo. The SXV order that we see in Iquito irrealis clauses is attested in both Arabela and Záparo, but this order does not correlate with the marking of the irrealis in Arabela. It may correlate with the marking of the irrealis in Záparo, although more research is needed to be certain. Finally, the semantic contexts that trigger the irrealis do not fully overlap for each of these languages, as can be seen in Table 4.2, further indicating that reality status marking varies across the family.

Table 4.2: The marking of reality status (RS) in the Zaparoan languages

	IQUITO	ARABELA	ZÁPARO
Is RS marked?	Yes, by word order	Yes, by an irrealis morpheme	Maybe by word order?
Irrealis triggers			
FUTURE	Yes	Likely	No
COUNTERFACTUAL	Yes	No	No data
DESIDERATIVE	Yes	Yes	No data
OPTATIVE	Yes	Yes	No data
IMPERATIVE	No	Yes	Likely
INTERROGATIVE	Not exclusively	Likely	Likely
NEGATION	Not exclusively	Likely, but only with <i>maja</i>	Not enough data

Since Iquito and Arabela clearly mark reality status and Záparo also appears to mark this category, I assert that reality status marking is a characteristic of the Zaparoan family as a whole. However, because the semantic triggers differ for each of the languages, and because the type of marking differs as well, I cannot ascertain whether or not reality status reconstructs for the Zaparoan family. Furthermore,

there is no data about reality status marking in the other languages of the family (i.e. Andoa, Aushiri, Cahuarano, and Omurano) and because these languages are extinct, it is unlikely that we will ever be able to determine what reality status looked like in Proto-Zaparoan.

In the next section, I examine two possible explanations for how the association between reality status and word order might have arisen historically in Iquito.

#### **4.5 Historical origins of the Iquito alternation**

By considering the comparative data presented in the previous section, as well as historical processes that are attested in other languages, I propose that there are two likely hypotheses that might explain the historical development of the Iquito irrealis alternation. The first hypothesis is that Iquito once had an overt irrealis morpheme that was either subject-final or pre-verbal and eroded over time as a result of independent phonological processes. Something was still needed, however, to mark the irrealis, and ultimately, other sentential elements took the place of the irrealis morpheme to convey the irrealis. The second hypothesis claims that Iquito irrealis clauses were once subordinate clauses and that over time, the associated main clauses were elided for pragmatic reasons. As a result, subordinate clauses (exhibiting a subordinate clause-specific order) slowly began to function as main clauses. Eventually, the elided main clauses were no longer recoverable from context, and the subordinate order became an acceptable main clause order for irrealis clauses.

These two proposals differ from the two historical explanations provided in

Lai (2009: 165) for the irrealis order, which both presume that Iquito was once SOV and that the SVX order is a recent innovation, possibly via calquing from Spanish. The explanations I provide allow for SVO order to be basic and treat the irrealis order as the result of language internal processes.

#### **4.5.1 Phonological reduction as a trigger for word order shift**

In this section, I discuss the possibility that the Iquito reality status alternation resulted from an overt reality status morpheme eroding to nothing, leading to a word order reanalysis that then spurred the alternation we now see between Iquito realis and irrealis clauses.

Recall from Chapter 2 that Iquito exhibits a phonological gap in intransitive irrealis clauses consisting of solely a subject and a verb; vowel hiatus resolution patterns found in realis clauses are blocked in these irrealis clauses. This blocking effect may be evidence that a phonological element has been lost.

Mateo Toledo (1999) makes this claim for a gap strategy evident in Q'anjob'al (Mayan). A common phonological process in Q'anjob'al is for a glottal stop to be inserted before word-initial vowels. However, in the varieties of Q'anjob'al spoken in Santa Eulalia, Santa Cruz Barillas, San Pedro Soloma, and San Juan Ixcoy, this phonological process is blocked in vowel-initial nouns that have a second person singular possessor. In other words, unpossessed forms have an initial glottal stop, as in (4.77a), but second person singular possessed forms do not, as in (4.77b). (Note that orthographically, an initial vowel implies [ʔ]-insertion, whereas *h* indicates the absence of an initial [ʔ].) Thus, the blocking of glottal stop insertion conveys the

second person singular possessor, much like the blocking of vowel hiatus resolution in Iquito marks the irrealis.

- (4.77) a. *on*  
[ʔon]  
'avacado' (in all varieties) (Mateo Toledo 1999: 59)
- b. *hon*  
[on]  
'your avacado' (in Santa Eulalia, Santa Cruz Barillas, San Pedro Soloma, and San Juan Ixcoy) (Mateo Toledo 1999: 59, 79)
- c. *hawon*  
[awon]  
'your avacado' (in Acatán and San Rafael) (Mateo Toledo 1999: 59, 79)

Additionally, Mateo Toledo (1999: 78) shows that in two other varieties of Q'anjob'al (Acatán and San Rafael), the second person singular possessive morpheme is [aw-] (orthographically *haw-*) before vowels, as in (4.77c). He argues that this form is being minimally preserved in the other varieties as the absence of a glottal stop. Thus, the second person singular possessive morpheme has essentially been phonologically reduced to zero in Santa Eulalia, Santa Cruz Barillas, San Pedro Soloma, and San Juan Ixcoy, but it is still preserved in a way; it is "pronounced" in these varieties as evidenced by the blocking of glottal stop insertion. We could in turn argue that in Iquito, there was an irrealis morpheme that occurred between the subject and the verb but that has since been phonologically reduced to zero. Like the second person singular possessive morpheme in Q'anjob'al, this irrealis

morpheme has been minimally preserved as the blocking of vowel hiatus resolution in irrealis clauses where there is nothing available to intervene between the subject and the verb.

We have evidence from elsewhere in the family of an overt irrealis morpheme: Arabela has an overt irrealis morpheme that appears as a verbal suffix. We also have support for an irrealis-like morpheme occurring between the subject and the verb in Záparo. While not described as having an overt realis or irrealis morpheme, Záparo does have a post-subject/pre-verbal future particle, and the future is a context that typically triggers the irrealis cross-linguistically. Iquito counterfactual clauses, which also trigger the irrealis, provide additional supporting evidence: they have a counterfactual marker that is a subject enclitic. Thus, it is possible that Iquito had an overt irrealis morpheme that occurred between the subject and the verb. While there is insufficient data to suggest what this morpheme might have been, it most likely eroded via independent phonological processes (currently unknown).

The loss of an overt morpheme seems to be a trigger for a reanalysis of sentential elements that then results in a word order alternation and eventually a word order shift. A connection between morphological loss and changes in word order has been noted by Hawkins (1985: 215), who considers the loss of case markers in English to be a phonological change that led to fixed word order and put other word order changes in motion:

The historical trigger that set in motion the extensive changes in the history of English ... has been argued to be case syncretism, an ulti-

mately phonologically conditioned change. The absence of overt morphological case in English automatically reduces the expressive power of the morphology itself, freezes many word order options of earlier English, creates more semantically diverse subjects and objects, and permits more raisings, extractions, and deletions.

Shaw et al. (2008) describe a word order change that is occurring in the upriver dialect of Halkomelem, a Central Salishan language, that appears to be due to the phonological erosion of an auxiliary. The canonical word order of Salishan languages is verb-initial (VSO), but the upriver dialect of Halkomelem is shifting to a subject-initial (SVO) order, as evidenced by the grammatical example given in (4.78). Examples of this type are not uncommon in the Galloway corpus (the primary source of data for Shaw et al. 2008), but most of the sentences in this corpus show the traditional Salish verb-initial order (Shaw et al. 2008: 6), and a comparable sentence from the downriver dialect known as *hən'q'əmin'əm'* is ungrammatical because it is not verb-initial, as shown in (4.79).

(4.78) *cəl*            *í'm*        *tə*        *sk<sup>w</sup>ólməx<sup>w</sup>*  
           1SG.SUBJ picking DET blackberries  
           'I'm picking blackberries.' (Shaw et al. 2008: 1, example 1, Upriver dialect of Halkomelem)

(4.79) *\*cən*            *t<sup>θ</sup>í:m'*        *tə*        *sq<sup>w</sup>i:l'məx<sup>w</sup>*  
           1SG.SUBJ picking DET blackberries  
           (Shaw et al. 2008: 1, example 2, Downriver dialect of Halkomelem)

The authors demonstrate that the subject-initial order found in the Galloway corpus is restricted to utterances where the subject is expressed as a pronominal



clitic (as it is in (4.78)) and that every instance where these subject pronouns appear sentence-initially is arguably an example where the auxiliary verb /ʔi/ (meaning ‘be here’) once occurred but has since been phonologically eroded. The auxiliary has eroded as part of a larger phonological process that erodes open syllables with /ʔ/ and an unstressed initial vowel; it is still evident when it is part of a closed syllable, as is the case when it is marked with the past tense marker /-ɬ/, shown in (4.80).

- (4.80) ʔíɬ        cəl        léɱ  
 AUX.PST 1SG.SUBJ go  
 ‘I went.’ (Shaw et al. 2008: 5, example 17a, Upriver dialect of Halkomelem)

Thus, the subject-initial order derives from the verb-initial (and synchronically attested) Aux SubjectPronoun V O order. As a result of the phonological erosion that the auxiliary has undergone, the subject pronoun occurs in what appears to be sentence-initial position. The Galloway corpus was collected from 1970-1980, and at that time, the subject-initial order was only found with subject pronominal clitics. The subject-initial order has since extended to include full lexical noun phrases, as evidenced by more recent examples from Wiltschko (2000, 2002), such as (4.81).

- (4.81) tə    John    k<sup>w</sup>ɛ-l-əx<sup>w</sup>    tə    pək<sup>w</sup>-s  
 DET John find-TR-3OBJ DET book-3POSS  
 ‘John found his book.’ (Shaw et al. 2008: 11, example 36c, Upriver dialect of Halkomelem)

Shaw et al. (2008) argue that the original pattern, where just the subject pronoun is allowed utterance-initially, may have influenced or even initiated “the

more major shift to full lexical NP/DP phrases in initial position” (Shaw et al. 2008: 11), further illustrating that the loss of a phonological element can be responsible for a word order shift.

A similar process may have occurred in Iquito: an overt irrealis morpheme that phonologically reduced to zero could be responsible for triggering the SXV order we see marking irrealis clauses. However, there is no clear reanalysis that points to how the Iquito SXV order might have come about after the loss of an irrealis morpheme. In Halkomelem, the loss of the auxiliary creates the possibility for syntactic reanalysis. Losing the auxiliary from the order Aux S V O makes it seem like the subject is sentence-initial and explains the shift in word order from VSO to SVO. In Iquito, we do not have such a clear explanation. Losing a particle from the order S particle V O does not explain the emergence of SXV order.

In the next section, I discuss a historical process that accounts for the word order more successfully.

#### **4.5.2 Insubordination**

Another explanation for how the marking of irrealis in Iquito came to be associated with word order is through a process called insubordination (Evans 2007, Mithun 2008). Insubordinated clauses are defined as the conventionalized independent use of a formally subordinate clause (Evans 2007: 377) and arise largely for pragmatic reasons. Essentially, a subordinate clause, which is recognizable as such because of formal subordinate markers like nonfinite morphology or subordinate-specific word order, begins to function as a main clause until eventually it is no

longer recognizable as having once been a subordinate clause (except for still exhibiting at least one formal subordinate marker).

We saw a possible example of insubordination occurring in Arabela in Section 4.4.1.1. The key piece of evidence that indicates insubordination may have occurred in Iquito as well is that the majority of subordinate clauses exhibit the same SXV word order found in main clause irrealis constructions. Constructions with verbs that take clausal complements illustrate this SXV word order most clearly and will be the focus of this section. But first I provide an overview of complement clauses.

If the subject of the complement clause is the same as the subject of the main clause, then the subject is not overtly expressed in the complement clause, as evidenced by the example in (4.82). In this example, the first person singular is the subject of both clauses, but is only expressed in the main clause. Nonetheless, the determiner of the object noun phrase occurs before the verb of the complement clause, a grammatical expression of the (S)XV order. We will see that the SXV order is more clearly evident when the subject of the complement clause differs from the subject of the main clause because then the subject is overtly expressed.

- (4.82) *Cu= apara- $\phi$ -cura [i $\acute{n}$ a rariini=jina siusihu $\acute{a}$ asi].*  
1SG= begin-PERF-RPST DET drink.INF=COMP *siusihu $\acute{a}$ asi*  
'I began to drink the *siusihu $\acute{a}$ asi* (type of remedy).' (T.SA2.HDC.061212,  
line 69)

Clausal complements can be finite or nonfinite. Both complement types exhibit the SXV order that we see in irrealis constructions. For instance, the verb

*nacariini* ‘to want’ can take either a nonfinite or a finite complement. An example of a nonfinite complement occurring with this verb can be seen in (4.83); the complement clause is marked with square brackets. The verb in this complement clause is ditransitive; the recipient *quí* ‘1SG’ occurs between the third person singular subject *nu=* and the verb *jicuníini* ‘to send’, and the theme *nu-nahuiyíni* ‘her photo’ occurs immediately after the verb. This order (SUBJECT RECIPIENT VERB THEME) is the same order we see in finite irrealis ditransitive clauses, an example of which can be seen in (4.84). The primary difference between these two examples is the marking on the verb. In (4.83), the verb of the complement clause carries the nonfinite marker *-ni*, whereas in (4.84), the verb carries finite tense/aspect morphology.

- (4.83) *Quí= nacari-i-yaa-∅*                    [*nu= quí jicuníini nu-nahuiyíni*  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 3SG 1SG send.INF 3SG-photo  
*tíira=ji*].  
 there=from  
 ‘I want her to send me her photo from there.’ (T.CSE.LII.061212, line 37)

- (4.84) *Nu= quí jicuníi-ri-i-∅*                    *tíira=ji naá.*  
 3SG= 1SG send-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE there=from 3PL  
 ‘She will send me them (the photos) from there.’ (T.CSE.LII.061212, line 45)

Finite complements more closely resemble irrealis main clauses since the verbs in these complements are inflected for tense and aspect. Examples of finite complements occurring with *nacariini* ‘to want’ can be seen in (4.85) and (4.86). Again, the complement clause is marked by square brackets. Both of the complement clauses exhibit SXV order. In (4.85), the element before the verb is a

postpositional phrase; in (4.86), it is a possessive phrase. However, instead of carrying nonfinite morphology like the complement clause in (4.83), the verb in each of these complements is marked with finite tense and aspect morphology.

- (4.85) *Saáca quia= nacariï-yaa-∅* [ *quí= quia=iúcu*  
 what 2SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 1SG 2SG=BEN  
*mii-∅-∅*?  
 do-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘What do you want me to do for you?’ (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 140)

- (4.86) *Quí= nacariï-yaa-∅* [ *quia= cú-áaja ina-qui-∅*?  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG 1SG-leg put-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I want you to attach my leg.’ (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 141)

The finite complement can be marked with a variety of aspect morphemes: the general perfective can be seen in (4.85), (4.86), and (4.87); the momentary perfective can be seen in (4.88); and the remote perfective can be seen in (4.89). Additionally, the tense and aspect marking of the main clause verb can vary; in (4.90), the main clause verb is marked with perfective aspect and the recent past, whereas in the previous examples it was marked with imperfective aspect and the extended current tense.

- (4.87) *Quí= nacariï-yaa-∅* [ *quia= iúna ima-qui-∅*  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG DET eat-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
*maraniu*].  
 cashew  
 ‘I want you to eat this cashew (soon or later today).’ (Lai 2009: 216, example 364)

(4.88) *Quí= nacarií-yaa-∅* [quia= *ína ima-ríi-∅*  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG DET eat-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*maraniu*].  
 cashew  
 ‘I want you to eat this cashew (in a few days).’ (Lai 2009: 216, example 365)

(4.89) *Quí= nacarií-yaa-∅* [quia= *ína asa-maa-∅*  
 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG DET eat-REM.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
*asúraaja*] *jíiticari nu= núquiica amariaana*  
 yuca when 3SG= one year  
*mii-maa-∅*.  
 have-REM.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘I want you to eat this yuca when it is one year old.’ (Lai 2009: 216,  
 example 366)

(4.90) *Iína=jina yahuiini qui= nacarií-∅-cura* [quia= *ína*  
 DET=LOC day 1SG= want-PERF-RPST 2SG= DET  
*raati-qui-∅ té*].  
 drink-PERF-E.C.TENSE tea  
 ‘On that day, I wanted you to drink tea.’ (Lai 2009: 217, example 368)

Finite complements occur with other verbs as well. In (4.91), the verb *nacusiini* ‘to know’ takes a finite complement (indicated within square brackets). This finite complement exhibits SXV order; the third person singular object pronoun *nu* occurs between the subject *quí* ‘1SG’ and the finite verb of the complement *ampísii* ‘heal, cure’. A very similar complement clause can be seen with the verb ‘to want’ in example (4.92).

(4.91) *Ca= quí nacusii-∅* [saáca=jata quí= *nu*  
 NEG= 1SG= know-IMPF-E.C.TENSE what=with 1SG= 3SG  
*ampísii-∅-∅*].  
 heal-PERF-E.C.TENSE

‘I don’t know what I will cure him with.’ (T.PNI.HDC.061212, line 96)

- (4.92) *Sisiija*, *quí= nacarií-yaa-∅* [*quia= cu*  
grandfather 1SG= want-IMPF-E.C.TENSE 2SG= 1SG  
*ampísii-∅-∅*].  
heal-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
‘Grandfather, I want you to cure me.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 279)

The complements in both of these examples exhibit SXV order; the element before the verb is a pronominal object. This same order is evident in the main irrealis clause in (4.93), which has the same finite verb and very similar pronominal arguments as the complement clauses in (4.91) and (4.92).

- (4.93) *Anuuja<sub>i</sub>*, *nu<sub>i</sub>= quia ampísii-∅-∅*, *suhuaa ampísiija*.  
3SG 3SG= 2SG heal-PERF-E.C.TENSE well heal.PARTICIPLE  
‘This will cure you, (you will be) well cured.’ (T.SA2.HDC.061212, line 86)

These examples clearly show that the order evident in subordinate complement clauses is identical to the order found in irrealis main clauses.<sup>14</sup> If the Iquito irrealis main clauses are derived through insubordination, which is likely, especially given the similarity between the two constructions shown above, then I consider them to be sufficiently conventionalized that they no longer retain an affinity with a main clause. While it is plausible to consider the irrealis clauses as once being complements of verbs like *nacariíni* ‘to want’, there is no hint that hearers

---

<sup>14</sup>It is not clear whether subordinate clauses exhibit the phonological gap strategy found in SV irrealis clauses. If they do, then they would further support an insubordination analysis. If they do not, then an explanation for how this strategy arises would need to be explored.

are ‘reconstructing’ these main clauses each time an irrealis clause is uttered, as Evans (2007) suggests is possible before insubordinated clauses become fully conventionalized.<sup>15</sup> Rather, irrealis clauses function as fully independent clauses with semantic specificity (i.e. the irrealis) that is not present in the traditional subordinate use.

Furthermore, the purposes and functions that Evans (2007) describes as being connected with insubordination show clear overlap with the semantic contexts that trigger the irrealis, making it plausible that insubordinated clauses could have taken on or be associated with an irrealis reading. For example, Evans (2007: 387) considers the most common type of insubordination to be found in clauses concerned with interpersonal control, such as imperatives, hints, requests, permissives, warnings, and threats. Another widespread use is the expression of modal meaning, both epistemic and deontic. These same categories are presented by Elliott (2000: 74) as being semantic contexts associated with reality status; she notes that both epistemic and deontic modal categories are likely candidates for irrealis marking, as are imperatives and speaker attitudes such as possibility, necessity, intention, desire, permission, obligation, or ability.

Evans (2007: 405) also discusses how insubordinated clauses can develop into having a future reading: “given the cross-linguistic tendency for obligation to develop into future tense it is not surprising that there should be constructions

---

<sup>15</sup>Mithun (2008: 107) argues that insubordination is possible without a main clause ever having been omitted, showing that insubordinated clauses in Navajo and Y’upik originated as adverbial (adjunct) constructions rather than complements.



which develop from (subordinate) purpose clause to (insubordinated) deontics with meanings of obligation or intention and on to (insubordinated) markers of futurity.” Because future tense is also a trigger for irrealis marking, it seems likely that insubordinated clauses could become associated with an irrealis reading. Additionally, an insubordination analysis supports a historical trajectory where an irrealis interpretation develops without the language ever exhibiting overt reality status morphology.

## **4.6 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have presented four possible analyses for explaining the correlation between reality status and word order in Iquito. I have shown that an information structure-based analysis is insufficient for explaining the semantic difference we see between SVX and SXV clauses, but that focus plays an indirect role in determining which element occurs in the irrealis position (“X”). I presented four ways to analyze the alternation in terms of movement, namely verb-raising, verb-lowering, “X”-raising, and “X”-lowering, and I claimed that “X”-raising was the most plausible of the four scenarios. I then turned to look at reality status marking and word order in the related Zaparoan languages and used that data as a foundation for exploring two possible historical explanations for the reality status alternation: the phonological reduction of an overt irrealis morpheme and insubordination. I concluded that while both of these historical explanations are plausible given the comparative data, an insubordination analysis accounts for the word order we see in Iquito irrealis clauses more successfully.

## Chapter 5

### Putting the Iquito reality status alternation in typological perspective

“With more typological research, it should eventually be possible not only to specify what grammatical properties can and cannot be signaled by the order of predicates and their arguments, but perhaps also to explain why certain properties are signaled in this way. But we are rather far from that goal at the present time.” (Thompson 1978: 24)

#### 5.1 Introduction

Cases where word order directly signals grammatical properties or other semantic distinctions are rare in South America and in the world’s languages more generally (Payne 1993: 281). Iquito is one of these rare cases; word order and only word order correlates with the expression of the realis/irrealis distinction. In this chapter, I situate the Iquito reality status word order alternation within a larger typology of word order alternations by presenting several other examples of grammatical categories that are expressed via word order alternations: negation in several West African languages, progressive aspect in Tikar (Benue-Congo; Cameroon) and Kokama-Kokamilla (Tupí-Guaraní; Peru, Brazil, Colombia), and definiteness in Puare (Macro-Skou; New Guinea) and K’iche’ (Mayan; Guatemala). Descrip-

tions of individual word order alternations are scattered throughout the literature, but no comprehensive list exists (cf. Payne (1993) who lists a few, Donohue (2008) who lists a few as examples of what he is *not* talking about, and Güldemann (2007) who lists examples in West African languages). Therefore, in pulling together these examples, I present a survey of word order alternations that does not currently exist in the typological literature. I also demonstrate that the Iquito alternation in particular is typologically unusual, since it does not rely on additional marking and has a widespread distribution.

My aim is to specify the grammatical properties that can be signaled by the order of predicates and their arguments, focusing specifically on those properties that are inflectional, getting us closer to the goal outlined by Thompson (1978) stated at the beginning of this chapter. I show that what unites these categories is that they are all parameters on the Transitivity scale defined by Hopper and Thompson (1980), and I argue that this scale is predictive for future research, meaning that other word order alternations yet to be encountered will correspond to parameters on this scale.

## **5.2 Types of word order alternations**

The linear order of sentential elements is exploited for several purposes. Thompson (1978) divides these purposes into two primary categories: pragmatic and grammatical. In languages on the pragmatic end of the spectrum, predicate-argument order is determined by whether the information is old or new (information structure). In languages on the grammatical end of the spectrum, word order

signals a grammatical property. Thompson (1978: 23) states that “there is a rather small number of grammatical properties which languages may choose to signal by predicate-argument order,” and lists argument structure, question formation, exclamations, whether a clause is main or subordinate, and negation as examples. I propose to separate these grammatical properties into three further categories: argument structure, sentence/clause type, and grammatical inflection.

In argument structure alternations, the syntactic role of an argument is dependent on its position within the clause. This alternation type is evident in several languages, English and Iquito being but two examples. In alternations that convey sentence/clause type, the word order conveys information about whether the clause is declarative, interrogative, or exclamatory, or main or subordinate. English subject-auxiliary inversion is an example of this type: S Aux V order is used with declaratives and Aux S V is used with interrogatives. Verb position in German and Swedish is another example: main clauses exhibit V2 behavior, whereas subordinate clauses are typically verb-final.

Grammatical inflection alternations will be the focus of this chapter: these are alternations that convey a grammatical category that is typically conveyed by morphology, such as aspect, definiteness, negation, or reality status. I will present examples of the known examples of this alternation type in Section 5.3.

I specifically focus on alternations that occur in languages without case-marking that otherwise have relatively fixed word orders. My primary goal is to identify “ideal” cases where the word order alternation is the *sole* indicator of the grammatical category, and this task is easier in languages where word order is quite

fixed and less susceptible to other factors, like information structure. That said, as we will see throughout Section 5.3, most examples of word order alternations are accompanied by some sort of additional marking.

The quote from Thompson (1978) presented at the beginning of this chapter poses two questions: what grammatical properties can and cannot be signaled by the order of predicates and their arguments, and why are certain properties signaled in this way? The answer to the first question can be found in Hopper and Thompson's (1980) Transitivity scale (see Table 5.1), which lists ten components (or parameters) that allow clauses to be characterized as more or less transitive based on the effectiveness or intensity with which an action is transferred from one participant to another (Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252-3). Actions that are highly effective and/or intense are considered to be more transitive than actions that are not effective and/or low in intensity. Each parameter on the scale has a more transitive (high) and a less transitive (low) value.

As we will see in the sections that follow, each of the grammatical categories expressed by word order alternations can be placed on this Transitivity scale. For instance, the reality status alternation that we see in Iquito falls under the mode parameter: Hopper and Thompson explicitly state that this parameter refers to the distinction between realis and irrealis. The irrealis value is considered to be the less transitive one: "actions which did not occur or only hypothetically occurred are less effective than ones corresponding directly with a real event" (Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252). This alternation is also an ideal alternation, in the sense that a change in word order corresponds to a change in meaning without any additional

Table 5.1: Hopper and Thompson's (1980) Transitivity Scale

	HIGH	LOW
A. PARTICIPANTS	2 or more participants, A and O	1 participant
B. KINESIS	action	non-action
C. ASPECT	telic	atelic
D. PUNCTUALITY	punctual	non-punctual
E. VOLITIONALITY	volitional	non-volitional
F. AFFIRMATION	affirmative	negative
G. MODE	realis	irrealis
H. AGENCY	A high in potency	A low in potency
I. AFFECTEDNESS OF O	O totally affected	O not affected
J. INDIVIDUATION OF O	O highly individuated	O non-individuated

marking, as I will show in Section 5.3.1.

As for the question of why these properties are signaled in this way, Hopper and Thompson (1980: 277) argue that “the O[bject] of a clause which is imperfective, negated, inactive, or irrealis is somehow less of an O than in the perfective, affirmative (etc.) clause; and it is marked as such in the morphosyntax.” In other words, objects are affected by the transitivity of the clause, and objects of less transitive clauses will be more marked than objects of more transitive clauses. While the authors are referring specifically to overt marking on the object, I think this statement can be expanded to encompass what we see with word order alternations. Instead of a change in morphological marking, objects in word order alternations are differentiated by a change in position, but the purpose remains the same and

that is to indicate that the object is somehow less affected by the clause.

The Transitivity scale can also be used to determine which order will occur with each value. I hypothesize that in languages that exhibit a word order alternation, the more transitive value will align with the language's more frequent, default, or basic word order, and the less transitive parameter will correlate with the word order that is considered to be more marked in the language. This hypothesis bears out for Iquito: the basic word order is SVO (Lai 2009: 46) and this order aligns with the realis, which is the more transitive value of the realis/irrealis parameter. SXV is an alternative, more marked order and aligns with the expression of the irrealis, the less transitive value of the realis/irrealis parameter. This hypothesis will be difficult to prove in the languages where limited data is available and merits further investigation as more data becomes available.

### **5.3 Grammatical categories conveyed by word order alternations**

In this section, I present data from languages that exhibit a word order alternation that conveys a grammatical category (or inflection). I begin by discussing the reality status alternation in Iquito and argue that it is an ideal alternation because word order is the *sole* indicator of the grammatical category of reality status. I then discuss other categories conveyed by alternations, such as negation, aspect, and definiteness. Even though most of these latter alternations are accompanied by some sort of additional marking within the clause, thereby distinguishing them from the Iquito reality status alternation, a word order alternation is still necessary

for conveying the grammatical category.

### 5.3.1 Reality status

As we have seen throughout the preceding chapters, Iquito reality status is expressed by an alternation between two constructions that are distinguished by the position of elements immediately adjacent to the verb. The irrealis is expressed by a construction in which an element occurs *between* the subject and the verb (SXV), and the realis is expressed by a construction in which no element intervenes between them, and the subject and verb are immediately adjacent to one another (SVX).

(5.1) *Ima asúraaja capi-qui-∅.* (SXV; irrealis)  
Ema manioc cook-PERF-E.C.TENSE  
'Ema will cook manioc.'

(5.2) *Ima capi-qui-∅ asúraaja.* (SVX; realis)  
Ema cook-PERF-E.C.TENSE manioc  
'Ema cooked manioc.'

In true minimal pairs such as the pair given above in (5.1) and (5.2), all components of the sentence remain the same. There is no *morphological* difference between the two examples, nor does the interpretation of the arguments change. Nonetheless, there is a difference in meaning between the two sentences. Example (5.1), exhibiting SXV 'irrealis order', yields a future reading, while (5.2), exhibiting SVX 'realis order', yields a non-future reading. This alternation occurs with other aspectual morphemes, such as the remote perfective illustrated by examples (5.3) and (5.4) and the momentary perfective illustrated by the near minimal pair in (5.5)



and (5.6). In all of these examples, the change in order results in a change in meaning. The SXV clauses express an unrealized (irrealis) event, whereas the SVX clauses express a realized (realis) event.

(5.3) *Nu= núquiica simiími najuu-maa-φ. (SXV; irrealis)*  
 3S one letter write-REM.PRF-E.C.TENSE  
 ‘S/he will write a letter.’ (Lai 2009: 340, example 674)

(5.4) *Nu= najuu-maa-φ núquiica simiími. (SVX; realis)*  
 3S write-REM.PRF-E.C.TENSE one letter  
 ‘S/he wrote a letter (in the morning).’ (Lai 2009: 330, example 638)

(5.5) *Amicaáca anuu= naami nacusi-ríi-φ taniini.*  
 one.day.away 3S leaves know-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE weave.INF  
 (SXV; irrealis)  
 ‘S/he will know how to weave leaves.’ (Lai 2009: 322-3, example 625)

(5.6) *Nu= nacusi-ríi-φ naami taniini. (SVX; realis)*  
 3S= know-MMT.PRF-E.C.TENSE leaves weave.INF  
 ‘S/he now knows how to weave leaves.’ (Lai 2009: 290, example 536)

Based on these minimal pairs, the reality status alternation can be generalized as follows: given an irrealis clause in which an element X is located in the irrealis position, there is a corresponding realis clause in which X is found immediately to the right of the verb. This generalization is summarized in (5.7).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Note that this generalization is not bidirectional, meaning that for every realis clause, there isn’t necessarily a corresponding irrealis clause. For example, realis clauses with imperfective aspect do not have an irrealis counterpart.

(5.7) *Irrealis* : *Realis*  
S X V : S V X

The alternation between the realis construction (SVX) and the irrealis construction (SXV) is the only distinction between realis and irrealis clauses. Word order is thus the sole indication of reality status in Iquito, making the Iquito reality status alternation an “ideal” word order alternation. Reordering the sentential elements results in a meaning change that is representative of a grammatical category, and there is no additional marking that occurs in tandem with the change in word order to indicate the grammatical category.

There is one other attested case of reality status being expressed via a type of word order alternation: Sasak, a Western Malayo-Polynesian language of the Austronesian family (Austin 1996). Sasak has a set of pronominal clitics that optionally attach to the verb to mark the agent of the clause. With certain verbs, the position of these clitics determines whether the clause is interpreted as realis or irrealis. When the pronominal clitic is a proclitic, the clause is interpreted as irrealis, as in (5.8a), and when it is an enclitic, the clause is interpreted as realis, as in (5.8b).<sup>2</sup> (In the following examples, the pronominal clitic is the first person singular *ku*.)

(5.8) a. *Balé ku=beli.* (*proclitic; irrealis*)  
house 1S=buy  
'I want to/will buy a house.' (Austin 1996: 7, example 9)

---

<sup>2</sup>The *-ng* in (5.8b) is the result of a phonological process and not a marker of reality status: “when the root ends in a vowel[,] a homorganic nasal appears before the enclitic,” glossed here as ‘link’ (Austin 1996: fn 5).

- b. *Balé beli-ng=ku.* (*enclitic; realis*)  
 house buy-link=1S  
 ‘I have bought a house.’ (Austin 1996: 8, example 10)

A near minimal pair is given in the relative clauses presented in (5.9) below. Again, when the pronominal clitic is a proclitic, the clause is interpreted as irrealis, as in (5.9a), and when it is an enclitic, the clause is interpreted as realis, as in (5.9b).

- (5.9) a. *Buku si mèq=beli inó* (*proclitic; irrealis*)  
 book REL 2S=buy that  
 ‘That book which you intend to buy.’ (Austin 1996: 13, example 36)
- b. *Buku si beli-n=ne inó* (*enclitic; realis*)  
 book REL buy-link=3S that  
 ‘That book which he bought.’ (Austin 1996: 14, example 37)

The Sasak reality status alternation is, however, more restricted than what we see in Iquito. It only occurs with two-place (i.e. transitive) “zero” verbs,<sup>3</sup> whereas in Iquito the alternation can occur with all valencies. Additionally, Sasak clauses are not obligatorily marked for reality status. The pronominal clitics optionally attach to the verb and reality status is not marked with two-place nasal verbs, one-place verbs, or in clauses without a pronominal clitic (P. Austin, personal communication, January 2011). This is a significant difference from Iquito, which does exhibit obligatory reality status marking (Beier et al., in press). Nonetheless, the

---

<sup>3</sup>Sasak verbs are categorized as one-place (intransitive) or two-place (transitive), and two-place verbs are further divided into zero-verbs or nasal verbs. Nasal verbs differ from zero verbs in that they bear a nasal prefix, realized as either a homorganic nasal or as the velar nasal *ng*, depending on phonological context (Austin 1996: 6).

existence of the Sasak alternation suggests that the alternation found in Iquito may not be an anomaly.

Working with the hypothesis that the more transitive value correlates with the more basic or common word order, we would expect the realis order to correlate with the language's basic order and for the irrealis order to be an alternative or marked word order. We have seen that this is in fact the case in Iquito: the basic word order aligns with the realis value, and the alternative SXV order aligns with the expression of the irrealis. It is not as clear in Sasak. I would predict enclitics to be more common since they correlate with the expression of the realis, but enclitics and proclitics seem to be equally frequent. Furthermore, the enclitic is also found with modal and clausal particles that are arguably irrealis in interpretation, such as 'not', 'not yet', 'will', 'want', and 'if'.

### **5.3.2 Negation**

Several West African languages exhibit a word order alternation associated with the affirmation parameter of the Transitivity scale. In these languages, affirmative sentences exhibit SVO order and negative sentences exhibit SOV order. They are thus comparable in form to the alternation found in Iquito in that a particular order correlates with a particular sentence meaning. However, all of these alternations are accompanied by some sort of negation marking in addition to the change in word order. As a result, these word order alternations differ from Iquito in that they are not the *sole* expression of negation in these languages, but rather one component of the way negation is marked.

In some languages, the overt marking is a change in tone, which is a common means of marking negation in this region (Good, p.c., July 2008; see also Ndimele 2009 and Vydrine 2009). For example, in Leggbó (Niger-Congo; Nigeria), a change in tone occurs on the third person singular prefix; in the affirmative example, this prefix carries a mid-tone, and in the negative example, it carries a low tone.<sup>4</sup>

- (5.10) a. *Wàdum sé e-dzi lídzil.* (SVO; affirmative)  
 man the 3S-eat food  
 ‘The man ate food.’ (Good 2003: 111, example (1a))
- b. *Wàdum sé lídzil eè-dzi.* (SOV; negative)  
 man the food 3S.NEG-eat  
 ‘The man didn’t eat food.’ (Good 2003: 112, example (2))

Kwaa (Niger-Congo; Liberia), exhibits a similar alternation. Affirmative sentences are SVO, as can be seen in example (5.11a), and negative sentences are SOV, as can be seen in example (5.11b). The word order alternation in Kwaa is also accompanied by a change in tone, mirroring what we saw with Leggbó, except that the change is marked on the object rather than on the verbal prefix. The post-verbal object in (5.11a) has a low tone, whereas the pre-verbal object in (5.11b) has a high tone.

- (5.11) a. *Mà tǐbá wǎ.* (SVO; affirmative)  
 1S hit 3S  
 ‘I hit him.’ (Welmers 1973: 412)

---

<sup>4</sup>The vowel is also lengthened in the negative example, but it is the tone that Good considers to be the salient feature of negation, not the vowel lengthening (p.c., July 2008).

- b. *Mà wó tǐbá.* (SOV; negative)  
 1S 3S hit  
 ‘I didn’t hit him.’ (Welmers 1973: 412)

In other West African languages, the word order alternation is accompanied by a negative morpheme as well as a change in tone. For example, in Bafut (Bantoid, Grassfields), the affirmative sentence, given in (5.12a), has SVO order and a high tone on the verb. The negative sentence, given in (5.12b), has SOV order, mid tone on the verb, and two negation morphemes, one before the subject and one before the pre-verbal object.

- (5.12) a. *Sùù kì kó mbà.* (SVO; affirmative)  
 Suh TENSE/ASPECT catch animal  
 ‘Suh killed an animal.’ (Chumbow and Tamanji 1994: 224, cited in Güldemann 2007: 7, example 12a)
- b. *kāā Sùù kì wā’à mbà kō.* (SOV; negative)  
 NEG Suh TENSE/ASPECT NEG animal catch  
 ‘Suh did not kill an animal.’ (Chumbow and Tamanji 1994: 224, cited in Güldemann 2007: 7, example 12b)

Güldemann (2007) lists other West African languages that exhibit a word order alternation that is tied to the expression of negation: Vute (Bantoid), Lokaa (Upper Cross), Nweh (Bantoid, Grassfields), and Mbili (Bantoid, Grassfields). In these languages, as in the other West African languages presented in this section, the object (or objects) precede the verb in negative clauses and follow the verb in affirmative clauses. Since the basic word order for these languages is considered to be VO (Güldemann 2007), these alternations support my prediction regarding

transitivity: the more transitive parameter (affirmative) aligns with the basic word order (SVO) and the less transitive parameter (negative) aligns with an alternative order (SOV).

### 5.3.3 Aspect

There are two attested cases of aspect being expressed by a word order alternation: Tikar (Benue-Congo; Cameroon) and Kokama-Kokamilla (Tupí; Peru, Brazil, Colombia). The values for the aspect parameter on the Transitivity Scale are telic and atelic. A telic action, or an action that is viewed from its endpoint or completed, is considered more transitive than an atelic one (an action that is progress, not completed).

Tikar, a Benue-Congo language spoken in Cameroon, exhibits a word order alternation that distinguishes between progressive and habitual aspect (Stanley 1991: 114). While both the progressive and the habitual are considered to be imperfective (atelic) aspects, if we think of the values on the scale as gradient, rather than absolute, then we can consider habitual aspect to be more transitive than progressive aspect, even though they are both less transitive than perfective aspect. Although a habitual action does not have a fixed end point, it does imply that the action has been carried out to its completion at least once, something that cannot be presumed for progressive sentences.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>For example, in the habitual sentence *John rides motorcycles*, it is presupposed that John has ridden a motorcycle before. In the progressive sentence *John is riding a motorcycle*, no such presupposition can be made.

The Tikar progressive/habitual alternation only occurs with semi-intransitive verbs, which are intransitive verbs that take a locative complement. When the locative complement follows the verb, as in (5.13a), the clause has a habitual reading, and when the locative complement precedes the verb, as in (5.13b), the clause has a progressive reading. The verbs in both of these examples are marked with the imperfective non-past, but the author notes that the same changes occur throughout the imperfective (Stanley 1991: 114).

(5.13) a. *à tǎ kèn fumban* (SVLoc; habitual)  
 3S IMPF.NPST leave Foumban  
 ‘He is in the habit of leaving for Foumban.’ (Stanley 1991: 114, example 500)

b. *à tǎ fumban kènni* (SLocV; progressive)  
 3S IMPF.NPST Foumban leave  
 ‘He is in the process of leaving for Foumban.’ (Stanley 1991: 114, example 500)

Transitive verbs do not participate in the word order alternation. For example, the transitive sentence in (5.14) has SOV order. On analogy with the locative examples in (5.13), we might expect this sentence to have a progressive reading, but in fact, it has both a habitual reading and an in-process reading, which is disambiguated by context and not by a word order alternation.

(5.14) *à tǎ hwum bo*  
 3S IMPF.NPST drum beat  
 ‘He is in the process of beating the drum’ or ‘He (habitually) beats the drum.’ (Stanley 1991: 115, example 501)



The limited context and distribution of this alternation differentiates it significantly from the Iquito alternation. The Iquito alternation occurs with all complement types and valencies, not just locative complements of intransitive verbs. Furthermore, there is an additional marker on the verb (*-ni*) in the progressive example in (5.13b) that may also convey the progressive reading in Tikar, but unfortunately, no explanation is given in Stanley (1991) for this particular morpheme.<sup>6</sup> If it does convey the progressive, then this word order alternation is further distinguished from the Iquito alternation by having additional morphology that occurs in conjunction with the alternation.

However, this alternation does support my hypothesis regarding which order will correspond with which transitivity value. Because I consider the habitual to be the more transitive parameter, I would predict that the order it exhibits (SVLoc) would correspond to the language's basic order and that the progressive would correspond to an alternative order. Tikar seems to have a broader alternation between the perfective and the imperfective; Stanley (1986: 90) describes perfective clauses as having the order SVO whereas imperfective clauses have the order SOV. The perfective and imperfective are overtly marked on the verb, so this alternation does not convey aspect more generally. However, these word orders mirror what we see

---

<sup>6</sup>Stanley (1991: 462-464) describes the suffix *-ni* as an allomorph of the imperfective marker, but the examples that she provides in which this marker is present all include verbs with object complements, and the intransitive counterparts do not have this morpheme. There are no examples of semi-intransitive verbs in this section and it is not clear whether the interpretation of these sentences is progressive or not. The fact that *-ni* only occurs with verbs that take complements causes me to hypothesize that it is either some sort of object agreement marking or a transitivizer that co-occurs with the imperfective and not a marker of the progressive, but it may serve to further disambiguate the progressive from the habitual since it is absent from the ambiguous transitive sentence in (5.14).

with the habitual/progressive alternation: the more transitive value (perfective) is SVO and the less transitive value (imperfective) is SOV.

Another example of word order correlating with the progressive aspect can be found in Kokama-Kokamilla, a Tupí language spoken in the Peruvian Amazon as well as by a few small groups in Brazil and Colombia. Word order in this language is conditioned by tense-aspect marking, particularly whether or not the verb is marked with a progressive aspect marker (Vallejos 2004: 45; see also Vallejos 2010).

Tense-marking on the verb is discourse dependent and not obligatory, but progressive aspect is obligatorily marked by the suffix *-ri*. In clauses marked for tense (either explicitly with a VP enclitic or implicitly via discourse context) but not marked for the progressive, the most frequent word order is SVO with the tense enclitic following the object, an example of which can be seen in (5.15a). In clauses with the progressive marker, which is always marked on the verb, the most frequent word order is SOV, as shown in (5.15b).

- (5.15) a. *mijiri kurata uni=uy* (SVO)  
Miguel drink water=PST  
'Miguel drank water.' (Vallejos Yopán 2004: 46, example 42a)
- b. *mijiri uni kurata-ri* (SOV)  
Miguel water drink-PROG  
'Miguel is drinking water.' (Vallejos Yopán 2004: 47, example 44a)

It is ungrammatical for a tense-marked clause to exhibit SOV order, as in (5.16a) and questionable as to whether a progressive-marked clause can exhibit

SVO order (the order is unattested in texts, but accepted by some speakers in elicitation), as in (5.16b). The examples in (5.16), in tandem with the examples in (5.15), show that the order that is possible in tense-marked clauses is ungrammatical (or at least questionable) in progressive-marked clauses and vice versa.

- (5.16) a. *\*mijiri uni kurata=uy* (\*SOV)  
 Miguel water drink=PST  
 TARGET: ‘Miguel drank water.’ (Vallejos Yopán 2004: 46, example 42c)
- b. *?mijiri kurata-ri uni* (?SVO)  
 Miguel drink-PROG water  
 TARGET: ‘Miguel is drinking water.’ (Vallejos Yopán 2004: 47, example 44c)

Focus is expressed via object fronting, and the alternation persists in these types of constructions. In tense-marked clauses, the order is OSV, with the tense enclitic following the verb, as in (5.17a). In progressive-marked clauses, the order is OVS, as in (5.17b).

- (5.17) a. *uni mijiri kurata=uy* (OSV)  
 water Miguel drink=PST  
 ‘Miguel drank water.’ (Vallejos Yopán 2004: 46, example 42b)
- b. *uni kurata-ri mijiri* (OVS)  
 water drink-PROG Miguel  
 ‘Miguel is drinking water.’ (Vallejos Yopán 2004: 47, example 44b)

When both tense and progressive aspect are marked within the clause, the two orders possible in tense-marked clauses (SVO and OSV) and the two orders

possible in progressive-marked clauses (SOV and OVS) are all possible. Thus, the alternation only occurs between clauses that are marked for tense alone and clauses that are marked for the progressive alone.

The aspect parameter distinguishes between telic and atelic actions, but it is not clear whether Kokama-Kokamilla tense-marked clauses are always telic. If they are, this suggests that tense-marked clauses may have some sort of unmarked perfective aspect that would make them the more transitive clause type.<sup>7</sup> Working with this assumption, I would predict the tense-marked order (SVO in non-focused clauses) to be the one that is basic and progressive-marked clauses to represent an alternative, more marked order (SOV in non-focused clauses).

This alternation differs from the Iquito alternation in that there are overt markers of tense and aspect that co-occur with the word order alternation, and so word order is not the sole mechanism for indicating the grammatical category. It also varies significantly from the other alternations presented in this section because of the variable orders possible. However, I think it is still worthy of note because of its geographical proximity to Iquito and because it involves the progressive (one of the parameters on the Transitivity scale). The data from Kokama-Kokamilla also suggests that languages described as having “free” word order might in fact be subject to constraints, and that these constraints might just align with one of the parameters on the Transitivity scale.

---

<sup>7</sup>Vallejos (2010: 478) acknowledges a possible allomorph for the remote past tense marker that also encodes perfective aspect, but she states that this perfective aspect marker is not available for other tenses.

### 5.3.4 Definiteness

Definiteness is another category that can be expressed via a word order alternation. Definiteness falls under the object individuation parameter on the Transitivity scale, along with other individuating properties such as animacy, concreteness, number, proper vs. common nouns, and count vs. mass nouns. Definite nouns are more highly individuated, and thus fall under the more transitive value than indefinite nouns. In this section, I present data from two languages that exhibit a word order alternation associated with definiteness: Puare (Macro-Skou; New Guinea) and K'iche' (Mayan; Guatemala).<sup>8</sup>

Other than the two reality status alternations we saw in Section 5.3.1, Puare, a Macro-Skou language from north-central New Guinea, is the closest candidate to an ideal word order alternation. As with many of the other examples presented in this chapter, this word order alternation involves the positioning of the object with respect to the verb. SOV is the dominant clausal order, but SVO order is found with objects that are indefinite or nonspecific (Donohue 2008: 39). For example, the two sentences in (5.18) have identical components, but the definiteness reading of the object depends on whether it precedes or follows the verb. In (5.18a), *[ku* 'egg' follows the verb and is interpreted as indefinite. In (5.18b), *[ku* 'egg' precedes the verb and is interpreted as definite. Thus, word order is used as a mechanism for conveying definiteness, and more specifically, the pre-verbal position is associated

---

<sup>8</sup>Definite effects are widespread throughout the world's languages and contribute to word order phenomena in a variety of ways. The examples I choose to highlight here most closely align with the alternation we see in Iquito.

with a definite reading, whereas the post-verbal position is associated with an indefinite reading. This observation supports my hypothesis regarding the correlation of word order with transitivity: the dominant clausal order (SOV) is used for the more transitive parameter (definite), and an alternative order (SVO) is used for the less transitive parameter (indefinite).

- (5.18) a. *N-ae|e n-ua|a |ku.*  
 1S-go 1S-search.for egg  
 ‘I went to look for eggs.’ (Donohue 2008: 39, example 57a)
- b. *N-ae|e |ku n-ua|a.*  
 1S-go egg 1S-search.for  
 ‘I went to look for the egg.’ (Donohue 2008: 39, example 57b)

This marking of definiteness via word order is very similar to what we have seen for Iquito. The category of definiteness is being conveyed solely via word order in (5.18). However, it is possible to have an overt marker of definiteness accompanying the word order alternation as we see in (5.19a). Thus, the word order alternation is not the sole indicator of definiteness in all cases and therefore not *identical* to what we see with Iquito.

That said, there is evidence to suggest that the post-verbal position is reserved solely for indefinite objects. Even when there is an overt demonstrative with the object, clearly marking it as definite, only SOV order is allowed, as can be seen in (5.19a). SVO order is ungrammatical with these sentential elements, as shown in (5.19b).

- (5.19) a. *N-ae*[e] [ku pende n-ua]a.  
 1S-go egg that 1S-search.for  
 ‘I went to look for that egg.’ (Donohue 2008: 39, example 57d)
- b. \**N-ae*[e] n-ua]a [ku pende.  
 1S-go 1S-search.for egg that  
 (Donohue 2008: 39, example 57c)

Several Mayan languages exhibit a word order preference similar to what is found in Puare. There are overt definiteness and indefiniteness markers, but word order correlates with the definiteness of the subject and object: “the general rule is that VOS is used when the S is definite and the O indefinite, while VSO is used when both S and O are definite. Other possibilities (such as S indefinite and O definite or indefinite) are often not permitted or not permitted in any V-initial order” (England 1991: 464).

These orderings are evident in example (5.20) from K’iche’. Both VSO and VOS are possible orders in this language, and both are permitted in basic word order contexts (England 1991: 454), but only one interpretation is allowed when overt markers of definiteness are used. When both arguments are definite (marked by *le*), as in (5.20a), only the VSO interpretation is possible; VOS is ungrammatical. But when one argument is indefinite (marked by *jun*) and the other is definite, VSO is either ungrammatical or questionable. The order of constituents in (5.20b) must be interpreted as VOS and not VSO because of the position of the definite argument. Reordering the elements so that the definite argument immediately follows the verb results in a questionable interpretation, as shown in (5.20c). When both the subject and object are indefinite, neither VOS nor VSO is acceptable. The order is instead

SVO, as shown in (5.20d). These interpretations are complicated by the fact that indefinite subjects are not allowed in verb-initial clauses, but they seem to indicate a preference for indefinite objects to occur immediately after the verb, suggesting that VOS would be the alternative order and VSO would be the more basic order. However, since both VOS and VSO are permitted in basic word order contexts, it is difficult to test my hypothesis regarding word order and transitivity in K'iche'.

While word order is correlated with definiteness, it does not explicitly convey definiteness since overt markers of definiteness co-occur with the change in word order. Thus, this alternation differs from the Iquito alternation. It also differs from the other alternations presented so far because the alternation occurs between the subject and the object rather than between an argument and the verb.

- (5.20) a. *xuq'aluj le achi le ala* (VSO)  
 hugged the man the youth  
 'The man hugged the youth.' \*VOS (England 1991: 466, example 26b)
- b. *xuq'aluj jun achi le ala* (VOS)  
 hugged a man the youth  
 'The youth hugged a man.' \*VSO (England 1991: 466, example 26d)
- c. *?xuq'aluj le ala jun achi* (VSO)  
 hugged the youth a man  
 'The youth hugged a man.' (judged "not very good") \*VOS (England 1991: 466, example 26e)
- d. *jun achi xuq'aluj jun ala* (SVO)  
 a man hugged a youth  
 'A man hugged a youth.' \*VOS, \*VSO (England 1991: 467, example 26i)



### 5.3.5 Problematic alternations

In the process of collecting word order alternations for this chapter, I identified two alternations that are on the margins of my definition. I include them here in the hopes that as more data becomes available, it will be clearer whether or not these alternations fit in the category of grammatical alternations.

#### 5.3.5.1 Volitionality of subjects in Waurá

In Waurá (Arawakan; Brazil), the order of the subject and the verb in intransitive clauses alternates between SV and VS, depending on the semantics of the verb (Derbyshire 1986: 494; data comes from Richards 1977: 7). Volitional nominal subjects occur before the verb, as in (5.21a); if the subject is non-volitional, it follows the verb, as in (5.21b).

- (5.21) a. *wekíhi katumala-pai.* (SV; volitional)  
owner 3SG.work-STAT  
'The owner worked.' (Richards 1977: 7, example 16 cited in  
Derbyshire 1986: 494, example 102)
- b. *usitya ikítsii.* (VS; non-volitional)  
3SG.burn *sapé*  
'The *sapé* grass caught fire.' (Richards 1977: 7, example 18 cited in  
Derbyshire 1986: 494, example 103)

Because volitionality is dependent on the semantics of the verb, the verb will determine the order of sentential elements. There is not enough data to determine whether or not there is a verb that can have both a volitional subject and a

non-volitional subject, so there is no scenario where the sentential elements are presented as identical between the two word orders. For this reason, I do not consider the Waurá alternation to be a true word order alternation, even though volitionality is a parameter on the Transitivity scale.

However, this alternation does seem to fit my hypothesis that the more transitive value will correspond to the language's default word order. SVO is the default order for transitive clauses in Waurá, and SV is the order found with volitional agents, the more transitive value for the volitionality parameter.

### 5.3.5.2 Modality

Manfredi (1997: 99) describes a word order alternation in two varieties of Ìgbo (Èchìè-Igbo and Àvụ-Igbo) that is correlated with a change in modality. The alternation occurs between what is labeled the “ordinary” future and an “(epistemic or deontic) obligative future” (Manfredi 1997: 99). An example of the alternation as it occurs in Èchìè-Igbo is given in (5.22), and an example of the alternation from Àvụ-Igbo is given in (5.23).

In both languages, the word order of the ordinary future is S AUX V O, as in (5.22a) and (5.23a). The word order of the (epistemic or deontic) obligative future is S AUX O V. This latter order is given in (5.22b) and (5.23b). This alternation is limited to constructions that have an auxiliary (future tense *gà* in these examples), which tend to occur with verbal nouns as opposed to finite verbs.

In Èchìè-Igbo, there is also a change in tone indicated on the object. Manfredi (1997: 99) suggests that this change in tone is indicative of the genitive and

not related to the change in modality.

- (5.22) a.  $\acute{o}$   $g\grave{a}$   $a-t\acute{a}$   $ak\grave{h}\acute{u}$ . (SAuxVO; ordinary)  
3S AUX NOM-chew palm.kernel.GEN  
'S/he is going to chew palm kernels.' (N'diméle 1993: 73, cited in Manfredi 1997: 99, example 39b)
- b.  $\acute{o}$   $g\grave{a}$   $\acute{a}k\grave{h}\acute{u}$   $a-t\acute{a}$ . (SAuxOV; obligative)  
3S AUX palm.kernel NOM-chew(?).GEN  
'S/he must (certainly) chew palm kernels.' (N'diméle 1993: 73, cited in Manfredi 1997: 99, example 39a)

In Àvụ-Igbo, the word order alternation is accompanied by a change in tone on the object, as well as a different nominalizer on the verb. There is no indication as to whether or not this additional marking is responsible for the change in meaning and is an area that merits further investigation.

- (5.23) a.  $\acute{o}$   $g\grave{a}$   $e-r\acute{í}$   $rin$   $ah\grave{u}$ . (SAuxVO; ordinary)  
3S AUX NOM-eat food that  
'S/he is going to eat that food.' (Éménanjo 1981: 198, cited in Manfredi 1997: 99, example 38b)
- b.  $\acute{o}$   $g\grave{a}$   $r\acute{in}$   $ah\grave{u}$   $\acute{n}-ri$ . (SAuxOV; obligative)  
3S AUX food that NOM-eat  
'S/he must (certainly) eat that food.' (Éménanjo 1981: 198, cited in Manfredi 1997: 99, example 38a)

This alternation differs from Iquito in that it only occurs in constructions with an auxiliary. It is not clear whether the additional marking works in tandem

with the word order alternation to convey the change in modality, but if it does, then the alternation is further distinguished from what we see in Iquito.

I consider this alternation to be problematic because it does not clearly fall under any of the parameters on the Transitivity scale. Although reality status has long been considered to fall under modality, Elliott (2000) makes a clear case for why it should not, so I am hesitant to treat it as part of the mode parameter. Güldemann (2007: 93) considers the subtle change in meaning to be related to a difference in information structure, where the obligative future construction is “a future with focus on the truth value of the proposition; from this configuration the modal reading of obligation can be derived.” If this is in fact driven by information structure and not expression of the grammatical category, then it does not fit the criteria for being included in this survey.

## **5.4 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I focused on a specific type of word order alternation that is correlated with the expression of a grammatical category. I delineated this word order alternation type from other word order alternations conveying grammatical properties, such as argument structure and sentence/clause type.

I presented several grammatical categories that are conveyed by such an alternation: reality status in Iquito and Sasak, negation in several West African languages, aspect in Tikar and Kokama-Kokamilla, and definiteness in Puare and K’iche’. The majority of the alternations involved reordering the verb and its object, but the Sasak alternation reordered a subject clitic with respect to the verb, and in

K'iche' the alternation occurred between the subject and the object. I discussed how each of these alternations is similar to and different from the Iquito case, which I consider to be an example of an "ideal" alternation because word order is the *sole* indicator of the grammatical category.

The examples that most closely resemble what we see in Iquito are reality status marking in Sasak, aspect marking in Tikar, and definiteness marking in Puare. However, the alternations in Sasak and Tikar are more limited in distribution than the Iquito alternation, only occurring with specific verb valencies or complement types. Puare along with other alternations such as negation in several West African languages (Leggbó, Kwaa, and Bafut), the progressive in Kokama-Kokamilla, and definiteness in K'iche' are accompanied by other markers of the grammatical category in addition to a change in word order. The Iquito word order alternation is not accompanied by additional tone or morphological marking and is not as restricted as other word order alternations, making it unique in the set of possible word order alternations associated with a meaning shift.

I also argued that the grammatical categories expressed by word order alternations correspond to the parameters on Hopper and Thompson's (1980) Transitivity scale, and I predicted that the more transitive value of each parameter would exhibit the more canonical order and vice versa. This hypothesis holds in Iquito, where the basic word order (SVO) aligns with the more transitive value of the realis/irrealis parameter (realis), and the alternative, more marked order (SXV) aligns with the expression of the less transitive value of the realis/irrealis parameter (irrealis). The hypothesis also holds for the expression of negation in the West African

languages: the more transitive value (affirmative) aligns with the basic word order (SVO), and the less transitive value (negative) aligns with the more marked order (SOV). It also seems to be true of the alternations involving aspect, but was more difficult to prove with the available data. The hypothesis seemed to hold for definiteness as well, but again was more difficult to support. In Puare, for instance, the basic order is SOV and this is the order that corresponds to the more transitive parameter (definite).

This work might provide insight into languages that have been previously labeled as having free word order. The data from Kokama-Kokamilla in particular suggested that languages with variable word order might in fact be subject to constraints, and that these constraints may align with one of the parameters on the Transitivity scale.

Both Thompson (1978: 23) and Payne (1993: 281) underscore that the exploitation of word order to convey a grammatical property is rare cross-linguistically. I would predict that other examples of word order alternations will be found as we continue to collect and analyze data from the world's endangered languages and that the parameters of the Transitivity scale can be used as a starting point for where to look.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Conclusion**

This dissertation has examined the word order alternation associated with the expression of reality status in Iquito. This word order alternation is typologically unusual not only because it is unusual for reality status to be marked via word order, but because it is unusual for such a diverse array of elements to be employed in the word order alternation. A variety of element types occur between the subject and the verb to express the irrealis value of the reality status distinction, and these same element types occur immediately after the verb of a corresponding realis clause.

Chapters 2 and 3 outlined the various element types that can be found in the irrealis position: object noun phrases, namely pronouns, bare nouns, possessed nouns (formed via the possessive prefix strategy or the noun juxtaposition strategy), and modified nouns, objects of nonfinite complements, predicate complements, postpositional phrases, orientational clitic phrases, adverbs, the negation particle, and determiners (on their own or with a postposition, possessum, or possessum and postposition). It was concluded that each of these element types can be analyzed as a phrase, including the determiners if we take their historical development from demonstrative pronouns into account. Chapter 2 also presented a hierarchy to capture speaker preferences for which element occurs in the irrealis position.

In Chapter 4, I considered four analyses for how reality status might have come to be associated with word order: an information structure analysis, a movement analysis, and two historical analyses (phonological reduction of an overt morpheme and insubordination). Information structure was quickly ruled out as responsible for the alternation, since the irrealis position exists independently of information structure positions. However, it was shown that focus and other extraction operations like question formation can have an indirect effect on the element in the irrealis position. Verb movement and “X” movement were presented as possible ways to explain the word order alternation synchronically, but these movement analyses did not sufficiently capture the data and only “X” raising was the most plausible of the four options presented. This chapter also included a survey of the existing literature on the other languages of the Zaparoan family and presented a cohesive description of reality status marking and word order in Arabela and Záparo. This survey was necessary for discussing how reality status marking in Iquito may have developed historically and suggested the possibility that Iquito may have once had an overt irrealis morpheme.

The Iquito reality status alternation is situated within a larger typology of word order alternations in Chapter 5. Several word order alternations were examined in this chapter: reality status marking in Iquito and Sasak (Indonesia), negation in several West African languages, aspect in Tikar (Cameroon) and Kokama-Kokamilla (Peru, Brazil, Colombia), and definiteness in Puare and K’iche’. Iquito continues to be a unique word order alternation in that it is the *sole* indicator of a grammatical category, and that it is widespread throughout the grammar and not



accompanied by any additional marking. Interestingly, the grammatical categories expressed by word order alternations cross-linguistically all correspond to parameters on Hopper and Thompson's (1980) Transitivity scale, and it was suggested that this scale may be a useful predictor for finding other word order alternations going forward.

In this concluding chapter, I discuss the major contributions of the dissertation as well as summarize the areas that I have identified as needing further research.

## **6.1 Major contributions of the dissertation**

While previous works on Iquito, e.g. Brown (2004), Hansen (2006), Lai (2009), and even Beier et al. (in press) have described the existence of a word order alternation employed to convey reality status, this dissertation is the first work to provide a thorough description of the types of elements that are able to occur in the irrealis position. This description is based on a comprehensive review of irrealis clauses occurring in the Iquito text corpus as well as elicitation sessions designed to test the limits of the construction. This dissertation is also the first description that addresses the complexity of elements that occur in the irrealis position, as it discusses the behavior seen with multiple modifiers and various clitic types. As a result, it makes a significant contribution to the typological literature on word order by demonstrating with great detail what is and is not possible.

In addition to describing the elements that occur in the irrealis position, I have discussed speaker preferences for what actually occurs in this position and organized these preferences in terms of a hierarchy, where short elements are pre-

ferred over longer ones, most likely for reasons of processing constraints. I have also analyzed the interaction of the irrealis construction with extraction operations, such as focus and question formation, and shown that these operations can trump the hierarchy by causing the irrealis position to be empty.

This work has also contributed to our understanding of Iquito word classes, especially determiners, adjectives, and quantifiers. We have seen that determiners behave differently from adjectives and quantifiers in that they can be predictably separated from their complement noun (although some quantifiers, e.g. *piyiini*, seem to be able to be separated as well). Additionally, adjectives and quantifiers behave differently from each other with respect to their relative order, their order in the irrealis construction, and their behavior with the orientational clitics.

The split determiner behavior we see throughout Iquito may be the result of the determiner undergoing grammaticalization from a demonstrative pronoun. Assuming this analysis helps to unify the elements that occur in the irrealis position and allows them all to be classified as phrases.

The review of word order and reality status marking in Arabela and Záparo in Chapter 4 is one of the first comparative undertakings involving languages of the Zaparoan family. The results of this review allowed me to entertain the possibility that Iquito may have once had an overt irrealis morpheme, the loss of which may have contributed to the Iquito reality status alternation and irrealis word order.

The insubordination analysis that I presented for both Iquito and Arabela broadens the source of data for typological studies of insubordination, an area that

Evans (2007: 369-70) identifies as currently biased towards Australian and Indo-European languages.

This work also broadens our understanding of the expression of reality status in Amazonia, by looking at a language family not presently described in the reality status literature. Previous works that mention reality status marking in Amazonian languages, namely Elliott (2000) and Michael (forthcoming), have presented data from only one Amazonian language family: Arawak.

Finally, the survey of word order alternations that I present in Chapter 5 is a significant contribution to the typological literature; nowhere else is there such a thorough discussion of word order alternations that express grammatical categories. Connecting these alternations to Hopper and Thompson's (1980) Transitivity scale is also a new insight and may in fact be predictive for finding other word order alternations in languages yet to be described or in languages described as having free word order.

## **6.2 Areas for future research**

There are three main areas of future research that I have identified in this dissertation. The first area deals with the Iquito irrealis position itself. While I conducted a thorough analysis of the existing text corpus to determine what could and could not occur in this position, I uphold the adage that there is no data like more data, and believe that my analysis would be bolstered by additions to the text corpus and further elicitation. Specifically, a larger text corpus would help illuminate the extent that bare nouns in the irrealis position must be general nouns

(as I alluded to in Chapter 2). Additional elicitation might provide more insight into the circumstances under which an adverb can co-occur with an element in the irrealis position, and if it is in fact possible, or if the examples I have found of this phenomenon are the result of mis-transcription and/or mis-analysis. Also, there are parts of my analysis that would be bolstered by additional phonological studies, such as a thorough acoustic analysis of the phonological gap strategy (especially to determine whether or not this strategy occurs in subordinate clauses and clauses that have undergone extraction), and a study to determine if *íina* exhibits pitch contour differences when it is used as a demonstrative pronoun as opposed to a definite article.

The second area that would benefit from further research is my comparative analysis. I have raised several questions regarding reality status marking and word order in both Arabela and Záparo that can only be answered by conducting additional fieldwork.<sup>1</sup> The first question is whether or not the Arabela infinitive marker *-nu* can be analyzed as an irrealis morpheme, especially when used in combination with the future tense and with negation, and whether the SXV order we see in Arabela can be correlated with some sort of reality status marking. Based on the existing data, it seems that it cannot, but more data is needed to be sure. For Záparo, it seems that word order does correlate with reality status marking, but this is an area that needs to be explicitly tested. If there is a correlation, what are the semantic contexts that trigger the marking of irrealis? Does future tense function as an irre-

---

<sup>1</sup>Fieldwork on Záparo has been recently undertaken (January 2011) by fieldworkers with Cabeceras Aid Project.

alis trigger? Are interrogatives and imperatives functioning as triggering contexts? Finally, is the Záparo pre-verbal future particle correctly analyzed? Could it be an irrealis morpheme of some sort?

The third area relates to the historical development of the Iquito reality status alternation. Can we find sufficient evidence to prove that Iquito once had an overt irrealis morpheme? Is it more likely that the reality status alternation developed through insubordination? Unfortunately, given the status of Iquito and its sister languages, this may be an area for which no answers will be found.

### **6.3 Parting thoughts**

Kaufman (1990: 52) urges “comparativists in South America to carry out detailed reconstructions of protolanguages for those families with meaningful amounts of diversification; only in that way will we have the means of comparing one family with another and with the numerous isolates of South America.” He lists the Zaparoan family as one of the families where “the comparative efforts of South Americanist linguists should be concentrated over the next twenty or so years.” Comparative efforts on the Zaparoan family have been minimal since Kaufman made this statement twenty years ago; the most substantial contribution has been the documentation and description conducted by the Iquito Language Documentation Project. In this dissertation, I have examined one aspect of the Iquito grammar, the expression of reality status through a word order alternation, in great detail, and I looked for evidence of this alternation in two other languages of the family and found only glimmers of similarity. I hope that the work presented in this dissertation

moves us closer to the goal of understanding the variation evident in the Zaparoan family, and that I have inspired others to continue this much needed research.

## **Appendices**

## **Appendix A**

### **Introduction to the text collection**

In the Appendices that follow (B through I), I include the texts that I collected in the summer of 2008. I have provided the Iquito transcription along with the speakers' translation into regional Spanish. At the end of each text, I provide a free translation in English.

Material in square brackets is on the recording but was asked to be removed by the speaker as we were reviewing the text. Material in parentheses is not on the recording but was added by the speaker for clarity. My own commentary is provided in the footnotes.

Appendix J provides a glossary of the regional Spanish terms used in the dissertation.



## Appendix B

### Amicaáca qui camíraata ícuariî (AMC) 'Tomorrow I will go upriver'

Told by Hermenegildo Díaz Cuyasa, August 4, 2008

(B.1) CIAH: Saáca quia amicaáca miirîi?

*Qué vas a hacer mañana?*

(B.2) HDC: Quíjja?

*Yo?*

(B.3) Camíraata quí-ícuariî Nîicamúumu-jina.

*Voy a ir por arriba al Río Chambira.*

(B.4) Acámi quí-ícuariî amicaáca taaríqui.

*Allá voy a irme mañana de mañanita.*

(B.5) A las ocho quí íti-jî ícuariî.

*A las ocho voy a irme de aquí.*

(B.6) Naníhua-ánuura jaá siyuuni,

*A ese mismo a anzuelear,*

- (B.7) [quí-si...] quí cáami síyuucuhii.  
*por arriba voy a irme a anzuelear.*
- (B.8) Acámi pápaaja jimaa túu.  
*Arriba sí jala peje.*
- (B.9) [Jííta] Quí-íicuaa cáami  
*Voy por arriba*
- (B.10) jííta yána huirantona quí-irri cáami.  
*como ir a traer blandona (un envase para turar la masa para hacer fariña).*
- (B.11) Quí-nacariiyaa huarfina miini.  
*Quiero hacer fariña.*
- (B.12) Nu-ánuura quí-íicuaa.  
*Por eso me voy.*
- (B.13) Ína cu-acúumi Jorge Rivera  
*Mi suegro Jorge Rivera*
- (B.14) anúu miiyaa suhuáani huirantona.  
*él tiene una linda blandona.*
- (B.15) Anúu quí-nacariiyaa nuú masiini  
*Eso quiero pedirle*
- (B.16) quí-miini-íira quí-huarfina.  
*para hacer mi fariña.*

(B.17) Anúu-ánuura cu-amicaáca ícuariî cáami.

*A eso voy a irme mañana arriba.*

(B.18) Caa quija aritáhui-jata

*Pero no con remo*

(B.19) muturu-jina quí-ícuariî.

*a motor voy a irme.*

(B.20) îjîî.

*Sí.*

(B.21) Jaá quí-cuhasitaqui cu-acúumi

*Ya le he conversado a mi yerno*

(B.22) [nu-mu...] nu-miitîini-íira nu-muturu quíja

*para que me dé su motor*

(B.23) quí-ihuaani-íira nu-jina.

*para irme en eso.*

(B.24) Másiicu huaatiruú-jina.

*En su bote de Marcelo.*

(B.25) Anúu-jina quí-ícuariî amicaáca.

*En eso voy a irme mañana.*

(B.26) Quí-ícuariî quíja,

*Voy a irme yo,*

- (B.27) cu-ájinani Saul, cu-ájinani Rodolfo,  
*mi nieto Saul, mi nieto Rodolfo,*
- (B.28) nahuaáca jaa quí-jata ícuarîi  
*ellos van a ir conmigo*
- (B.29) cana-siyuuni-íira níinaqui.  
*para anzuelear en la noche.*
- (B.30) Cáami taquína-cu yáana-jina tircuscanayumu-jina.<sup>1</sup>  
*Arriba en la cocha de Cashirimu.*
- (B.31) Acámi cana-síyuurîi níinaqui.  
*Allí arriba vamos a anzuelear en la noche.*
- (B.32) [Acámi-ji] Acámi-ji cana taaríqui aniaarîi íiti-ánuura.  
*De allá arriba vamos a venir de mañanita acá.*
- (B.33) îjîî.  
*Sí.*
- (B.34) Nuúrica-ánuura quí-ícuaqui yáaja  
*A eso no más estoy yendo me*
- (B.35) iriini íina cu-átuuyaa quiáaja huirantona  
*a traer eso lo que te estoy avisando blandona*

---

<sup>1</sup>Hermico describes this cocha as bigger than the one in San Antonio but like it in terms of how it was formed. It is about 15 minutes downriver from Jorge Rivera's house. It has a wide entrance and there is a boat right at the river's edge. Hermico says the cocha is 3 *vueltas*.

(B.36) j̄iita siyuuni–jata.

*como ir anzuelear.*

(B.37) Nuúrica yáaja.

*Eso no más.*

Cynthia begins by asking Hermico, “what will you do tomorrow?” Hermico responds: “Me? I will go upriver to the Chambira River in the early morning. I will leave from here at 8 in the morning to go fishing. There are lots of fish up there. I am going to get a *blandona* (a container used for making *fariña*, a type of toasted manioc cereal). I want to make *fariña*, so that’s why I’m going. My father-in-law Jorge Rivera has a nice *blandona*. I want to ask him for it for making my *fariña*. That’s why I’m going upriver tomorrow. But not rowing, by motor I will go. I’ve already talked to my son-in-law about him giving me his motor so that I can go in his boat, Marcelo’s boat. That’s what I’ll go in tomorrow. I will go with my grandson Saul and my grandson Rodolfo. They will go with me to fish at night upriver in Cashirimu Lake. From there we will come here. That’s the reason I’m going, to get the *blandona* I was telling you about, and to fish, that’s it.”

## Appendix C

### **Mi papá y las taricayas (MPT) 'My father and the taricaya turtles'**

Told by Ema Llona Yareja, August 9, 2008

(C.1) Quí–saaquíniiyaa quiáaja Señora,

*Te voy a contar Señora,*

(C.2) jítarata quí-caquíja cuminiija táa canáaja.

*como nos ha criado mi padre.*

(C.3) Nu–iriaariqui canáaja camíraata Anatímu–jinacúcu.

*Nos llevaba por arriba por alto Pintuyacu.*

(C.4) Cana–maquiiyaariqui núquiica cacúti–jina umáana.

*Dormíamos en una playa grande.*

(C.5) “[Pi...] Ácari–na<sup>1</sup> pi–tasiita–quiáana mitíjja–na,”

*“Hoy vamos a cuidar taricaya,” (lit. esperar en emboscada)*

(C.6) nu–aátiaariqui canáaja.

---

<sup>1</sup>The author indicated that *ácari* refers to night, as this is the time that one waits for *taricayas* to come out.

*él nos decía.*

(C.7) “Cuasií.”

*“Bien” (decíamos nosotros).*

(C.8) Quí-niatíja...

*Mi madre...*

(C.9) “Pi-maquii-quiáana íti cacúti-jina-na,

*Vamos a dormir, dice, acá en la playa,*

(C.10) “íti-na naquicuúja<sup>2</sup> ina-quiáana,

*aquí ponen el motelo,*

(C.11) “mitíja ina-quiáana.”

*la taricaya ponen” (dijó mi madre).*

(C.12) Atíji-na cana-cutítiyaariqui.

*De ahí amanecíamos.*

(C.13) Cana-ícuaariqui camíraata imiráani ... umáana ímina-jina.

*Surcamos por arriba otra vez (durante el día) en canoa<sup>3</sup> grande.*

(C.14) Cáami cana-ícuaa.

*Por arriba estamos surcando.*

---

<sup>2</sup>The author acknowledged that she should have said *mitíja ‘taricaya’* here instead of *naquicuúja ‘motelo’*.

<sup>3</sup>The author describes the canoe as an *ovada*: it’s not very open, long and straight, didnt have good balance, had a roof.

(C.15) Nu aátii,

*Él (mi papá) dice,*

(C.16) “Cariiri–quiáaja íina mitííja míra

*“Más miran esas crías de taricaya*

(C.17) yáana mitííja míra.”

*esas crías de taricaya.”*

(C.18) Aáca–jina na–muúsii cacúti–sirícucu

*En el agua están nadando por canto de la playa (durante el día)*

(C.19) naji jííta iicu.

*así como aquí.<sup>4</sup>*

(C.20) “Ácari–na pi–juntasiiyaa–quiáana nuú.”

*“Ahora vamos a juntarles” (dice mi papá).*

(C.21) Nu–casiítaariqui nuú.

*Le agarraba.*

(C.22) Nu–inaariqui huaantija–jinacuma nuú.

*Le ponía dentro de la bandeja.*

(C.23) Umáapíjaarica naji<sup>5</sup> jaa mitííja míra.

*Ya eran grandecitos ya esas crietas de taricaya.*

---

<sup>4</sup>Ema motions to the edge of the table which is slightly curved, indicating they were right at the edge of the beach.

<sup>5</sup>Motions with hand that they could fit in her hand.



(C.24) Imiráani cana–ícuariqui.

*Otra vez nos íbamos.*

(C.25) Cana camíjiita cacúti ánaca íjinaji ajatíiti

*Atracamos en la punta de la playa*

(C.26) “Cuúquisaacari–na nu–íquí–quíána imiráani,

*“Tal vez hay otra vez (su huevo),” (dice mi papá)*

(C.27) “tíi–na nu–inacura.”

*“donde que ha puesto.”*

(C.28) Nu–náana–jata nu–siquiaariqui nají<sup>6</sup> cacúti–jina.

*Así picaba con su palo en la playa.*

(C.29) Nu–siquiaariqui

*Él picaba*

(C.30) “Íina taá–na taána nu–naáqui!”

*“Aquí hay más huevo!”*

(C.31) [Umána nu...] masiána nu–nu juntasii samácu–jina.

*Harto le juntaba en el pate.*

(C.32) Cana–miiyaariqui taasuu tarií–yaajaa–na samácu

*Acá teníamos tazón antes si no pate.*

---

<sup>6</sup>Ema takes her index finger and gestures poking holes in the sand. She noted that the stick was small and thin.

(C.33) Nu–jina nu nu juntasii íina mitííja naáqui.<sup>7</sup>

*En eso va a juntar ese huevo de taricaya.*

(C.34) Imiráani cana–íícuaqui.

*Otra vez surcamos.*

(C.35) Taána cacúti–jina cana–sihuaániríi imiráani,

*Llegamos en otra playa otra vez,*

(C.36) taána mitííja míra na–muúsii áaca sirícucu.

*otra cría de taricaya están nadando en canto de la playa.*

(C.37) “Pi–juntasiiyaa–quiáana imiráani nuú.”

*“Vamos a juntar otra vez,” (dice mi papá).*

(C.38) Nu–inaariqui cusi–jinacuma nuú,

*Le ponía (las crías) dentro de la olla,*

(C.39) umáana cusi.<sup>8</sup>

*olla grande.*

(C.40) Anámi nu–inaariqui nuú.

*Adentro le ponía*

(C.41) Anámi na–naraa.

*Allí adentro se bañaba*

---

<sup>7</sup>While reviewing the text, Ema wanted to change this sentence to: *Nu–jina nu íina juntasii mitííja naáqui*. She was, however, able to repeat the order given on the recording twice.

<sup>8</sup>Motions a size of about 3 feet off the floor.

(C.42) Cana imiráani ícuaqui.

*Surcamos otra vez.*

(C.43) “Pi–pani–quiáana imiráani ína mitíja naáqui.”

*“Vamos a buscar otra vez huevo de taricaya,” (dice mi papá).*

(C.44) Nárica cana–juntasiiyaariqui cana-mitíja naáqui,

*Poco a poco juntamos nuestros huevos de taricaya,*

(C.45) umáana cusi amíyaja mitíja naáqui.

*una olla grande lleno de huevos de taricaya.*

(C.46) Tii cana–sihuaániyaariqui–na,

*Donde que llegamos nosotros,*

(C.47) atí cana–miiyaariqui cana-miyíti

*allí hacemos nuestro tambo (de huasá)*

(C.48) cana–iyujuuni–íira

*para quedar*

(C.49) tarhuaajuuni–íira huaráata.

*para trabajar balata.*

(C.50) “Pi–iriini–íira–na pi–íyama–na ína mitíja naáqui,

*“Para llevar a la casa ese huevo de taricaya,*

(C.51) “pi nu turii–quiána.”

*“le vamos a ahumar,” (dice mi papá).*

(C.52) Quí-caquíja masícuuyaariqui naji umáana masícu jííta íina.

*Mi papá hacía su barbacoa así (en el día) como éste.<sup>9</sup>*

(C.53) Nu–masícuuyaariqui nuú,

*Ha hecho menudo*

(C.54) naji<sup>10</sup> miija jííta íina pi-ahuasicáca,

*así como nuestros dedos,*

(C.55) [tíi quia...] tíi quí-niatíja turuniiyaariqui nuú.

*donde que mi mamá le ahumaba.*

(C.56) Atíi nu íina inaqui mitíja naáqui naji.

*Así<sup>11</sup> le va a poner ese huevo de taricaya.*

(C.57) Piyíini.

*Todos (los huevos).*

(C.58) Jíiticari [nu] nu–cuúquiríi irísina jaári–na,

*Cuando ya se va a hacerse duro (los huevos),*

(C.59) huári nu–inaariqui naámi–jina nuú,

*(mi mamá) le va a poner en la hoja (de bijao),*

(C.60) nu–sucuutaani–íira tíi.

*para que se enfría allí (encima de la hoja).*

---

<sup>9</sup>Motions to the table, indicating that it's long and wide.

<sup>10</sup>Motions to her outstretched fingers.

<sup>11</sup>Ema indicates that the eggs went in between the sticks.

(C.61) Naji cana–iriaariqui ína mitíjja naáqui

*Así he traemos los huevos de taricaya*

(C.62) cana–sihuaanitaani–fira íti cana–íyiqui nuú.

*para hacer llegar acá en nuestra casa.*

(C.63) Suhuaá turiíja.

*Bien ahumado.*

(C.64) Jíiticari quia–nacariíji caa nuú capiini–na,

*Cuando no lo quieres cocinar,*

(C.65) quia nu inaquí cacúti–jina.

*le pones en la playa.*

(C.66) Naji jííta na–miicura tíra.<sup>12</sup>

*Así como han hecho allá.*

(C.67) Quia nu inaquí cacúti–jina naji,

*Le pones en la playa así,*

(C.68) táasa–jina taniíja naji,

*en panero tejido así,*

(C.69) umáana táasa.

*un panero grande.*

---

<sup>12</sup>Ema is referring to the *taricaya* demonstration that happened in San Antonio a few days prior, and points to the port.

(C.70) Anámi quia nu inaquí ína-jina cacúti,

*Allí adentro pones (los huevos) en esa arena*

(C.71) caa isája-jata.

*sin sal.*

(C.72) [Anúu-jina nu]

*En eso no se...*

(C.73) Ájapaquí nu-mucuuni ína-jina cacúti

*En esa arena no se pudre*

(C.74) quia-iriini-íira náaja íti-ánuura íta-jina nuú.

*también para que traigas acá en la casa (los huevos).*

(C.75) Naji cana-caquíja cuminiyaariquí canáaja.

*Así nuestro padre nos ha criado.*

(C.76) Jaá nu-pííquiríi jaá.

*Ya se ha terminado.*

(C.77) CIA: Cuasíí.

*Bueno.*

I will tell you *Señora*, how my father raised us. He took us upriver along the Upper Pintuyacu. We slept on a big beach.

“Today we will wait for *taricaya* turtles,” he said to us.

“Good,” we said.

My mother said, “Let’s sleep here on the beach. This is where the *taricaya* lays its eggs.”

Then we woke up. We went further upriver in a big canoe.

My father said, “Look at these baby *taricayas*.”

They were swimming in the water on the edge of the beach.

“Let’s gather them up,” my father said.

He grabbed them and put them inside a basket. The baby turtles were already big.

Again we went. We tied up at the head of the beach.

“Maybe there are eggs,” my father said.

He poked into the sand with his stick.

“Here there are more eggs!”

He gathered up a lot in a gourd container.

Then we went again. We arrived in another beach and more baby *taricayas* were swimming along the edge of the beach.

“Let’s gather up some more,” my father said.

He put them inside of a big pot. They swam in there.

We went again.

“Let’s look again for *taricaya* eggs,” my father said.

Little by little we gathered our *taricaya* eggs, a big pot full of *taricaya* eggs. Where we arrived, there we made a hut in order to stay and work *balata*.

“In order to take these eggs home, we will smoke them,” my father said.

My father made his grill like this. He laid out the sticks, like outstretched fingers, where my mother could smoke them. We put all the eggs on top of these sticks. When the eggs were hard, my mother put them on top of leaves to cool. That’s how we carried the eggs back to our house, well smoked.

When you don’t want to cook them, you put them in sand. That’s what they did there.<sup>13</sup> You put them in sand in a big woven basket. You put the eggs in this sand without salt. They don’t rot in this sand.

That’s how our father raised us. Now (my story) has ended.

---

<sup>13</sup>There had been a demonstration of how to collect *taricaya* eggs in the community a few days prior.



## Appendix D

### Quia núquiica niatíja cuúquima (NNC) 'You will become a mother'

Told by Ema Llona Yareja, July 26, 2008

(D.1) Cynthia,

*Cynthia,*

(D.2) jíticarií quia-míriima-na,

*cuando vas a tener hijos,*

(D.3) quia quia-maáya nacusiqui.

*tu vas a conocer a tu hijo.*

(D.4) Quia nu carínii suhuaáta

*Le cuidas bonito*

(D.5) caa nu-ihuariini-iira.

*para que no se enferma.*

(D.6) Quia núquiica niatíja cuúquima,

*Tu vas a estar madre,*

- (D.7) jíticarií quia-niyíni íquiríi.  
*cuando tu vas a tener tu hijo (lit. cuando tu hijo exista).*
- (D.8) Quia nu caríni.  
*Le cuidas.*
- (D.9) Jíticarií nu-taquísii-na,  
*Cuando tiene hambre,*
- (D.10) quia nu ásuu.  
*le das a comer.*
- (D.11) Jíticarií nu-nacariiyaa rariini-na,  
*Cuando quiere tomar,*
- (D.12) [quia nu] quia nu raritíi.  
*le haces tomar.*
- (D.13) Caa quia ijíhuitacuma nuú,  
*No le riñas,*
- (D.14) cuminiiqui suhuaáta nuú.  
*cría le bonito.*
- (D.15) Naji jíta [quia-nacariiyaa]  
*Así como [quieres]*
- (D.16) quia-nacariicura míriini.  
*has querido tener hijo.*

(D.17) Quia nu cuminiiqui (suhuaáta).

*Le vas a criar (bien).*

(D.18) Náqui quia paríjataqui [nu cuminiiquiaaqui] nu cuminiini.

*Su padre te va a ayudar a criarle.*

(D.19) Quia nu cuminiiqui suhuaáta,

*Le crías bonito,*

(D.20) caa quia ijíhuitacuma nuú.

*no le reñas.*

(D.21) Nu-sájiri nu nacarií.

*Su abuela le va a querer (al niño).*

(D.22) [Nu] Niyasúuja nu nacarií.

*Su abuelo le va a querer (al niño).*

(D.23) CIA: Cuasií. Cuasií. Jaári tíí?

*Bueno. Bueno. Es todo?*

(D.24) ELY: Jaári tíí.

*Es todo.*

Cynthia, when you will have children, you will get to know your child. You will care for it so that it doesn't get sick. You will be a mother once you have your child. You will take care of it. When it is hungry, you will feed it. When it wants to drink, you will make it drink. You won't scold it, you will raise it well. Its

father will help you raise it. You will take care of it well, you won't scold it. Its grandmother will love it. Its grandfather will love it.

## Appendix E

### Quí quia saquiini quí-maquiini (QMJ) 'I will tell you my dream'

Told by Hermenegildo Díaz Cuyasa, August 7, 2008

(E.1) [Quí quia...] Quí quia saquiini níhua?

*Te voy a contar eso?*

(E.2) Cuasí.

*Bueno.*

(E.3) Ácari quíija, Señorita Cynthia,

*Ahora yo, Señorita Cynthia,*

(E.4) quí-saquiiniyaa quiáaja quí-maquiini

*te voy a contar mi sueño*

(E.5) [íina] íina quí-maquiini ácari níinaqui pi-íiqui.

*lo que he soñado hoy de noche que hemos estado.*

(E.6) Quíija amicaáca... maquiini iriaacura quíija

*Yo ayer... el sueño me vencía*

- (E.7) iyami ácuji quí maquiicura caa.  
*porque no he dormido.*
- (E.8) Huáarta amicaáca niníini quí-síyuucura.  
*Anteayer por la noche he anzueleado (todo la noche).*
- (E.9) Níhua ácuji ácarí nínaqui pi-ííquiui,  
*Por eso esta noche que ha pasado,*
- (E.10) quí-maquiui, tariíja quí-maquiui.  
*dormí, rico he dormido.*
- (E.11) Quí-tiquiaariicura quí-maquiucura.  
*He entrado a mi cama.*
- (E.12) Cu-apáraqui maquiini-jina niníini ácuji.  
*He empezado a dormir tardecito (como las 7 de la noche).*
- (E.13) Ína niníini quí-maquiui.  
*Todito la noche he dormido.*
- (E.14) Íiya ína-na quíija ita-amíyaaquii-quiáana núquiica íimina-jina.  
*Total yo estaba andando en mi sueño en una canoa.*
- (E.15) Núquiica íimina saámina.  
*Una canoa nueva.*
- (E.16) Anúu-jina quí-ta-amíyaaquii quí-maquiini-jina.  
*En eso estaba andando en mi sueño.*

(E.17) Suhuaaniica ímina.

*Una linda canoita.*

(E.18) Suhuaramaajitáami metiru nu–miiyaa quí–maquiini–jina.

*Cuatro metros tenía en mi sueño.*

(E.19) Suhuaáta amítataaja.

*Bien abiertito.*

(E.20) Nu–jina cu–amíyaaquii quí–maquiini–jina.

*En eso he andado en mi sueño.*

(E.21) Quí–icatii núquiica curíma naji jíita íti San Antuniu–jina.

*He atracado a un puerto como aquí en San Antonio.*

(E.22) Íiya íina núquiica señora tacuúyaa cáami iijácu [... íti ...]

*Total una señora estaba parado allá en la loma [... allí ...]*

(E.23) Nu–aniinii quí–maquiini–jina quíija,

*Me ha llamado en mi sueño,*

(E.24) “Don Hermicu, Don Hermicu!”

*“Don Hermico, Don Hermico!”*

(E.25) “Saáca tíi Señora?”

*“Qué es Señora?”*

(E.26) cu–aátii nuú.

*le digo.*

- (E.27) “Quiáaja–na quia–nuucua–quíáana quí–ímina,”  
*“Usted me ha robado mi canoa,”*
- (E.28) nu–aátiqui quí–maquiini–jina quíija.  
*me ha dicho en mi sueño.*
- (E.29) “Quia–nuucua–quíáana quí–ímina.”  
*“Me ha robado mi canoa.”*
- (E.30) “Saáca ácuji quia–iniíyaa ímina nucuáana quíija Señora?”  
*“Porque me dice que soy ladrón de canoa, Señora?”*
- (E.31) [cu–a...] quí–imatíiríi nuú.  
*le he contestado.*
- (E.32) “Íina–jina quia–amíyaaquii–na,  
*“En esa canoa que estás andando, dice,*
- (E.33) quí–ímina táa–na.”  
*es mi canoa, dice.”*
- (E.34) Quí–imatíiríi quí–maquiini–jina nuú,  
*Le he contestado en mi sueño,*
- (E.35) “Caa tíi quia–ímina!  
*“No es tu canoa!*



(E.36) Quíina–jina cu–amíyaaquii–na quí–ímina tíi.<sup>1</sup>

*En la canoa que ando es mi canoa.*

(E.37) Quíija masíija tíi.

*Comprado por mí es.*

(E.38) Nu–icuraaniiyaa–na quí–cuuríqui quíija.”

*A mí me cuesta mi dinero.”*

(E.39) “Caa–na quí–ímina táa–na.”

*“No, dice, mi canoa es, dice.”*

(E.40) Nu–nitima cu–ánuura cáami–ji iijácu,

*Ha venido corriendo a mí de allá arriba de la loma,*

(E.41) tíi nu–ta–tacuúyaa naámi–ánuura curíma.

*donde que estaba parado hasta abajo al puerto.*

(E.42) Nu–nacarií cu–amaniquiini quí–maquiini–jina.

*Me ha querido palear en mi sueño.*

(E.43) Núquiica náana–jata,

*Con un palo,*

(E.44) iitinuríca náana naji.

*con esa tamañito.<sup>2</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup>The author notes that the use of ‘quíina’ here is a mistake and should be ‘ína’ because the canoe is closer to Hermico than it is to the woman.

<sup>2</sup>Hermico shows a length of about 1 foot with his index fingers.

- (E.45) Nu-jata nu-cantaquii quíja,  
*Con eso me ha amenazado a mí,*
- (E.46) “Quí-quia-amaniquii-quiáana  
*Yo te voy a palear*
- (E.47) iyami ácuji-na quia-nuucua-quiáana quí-ímina.”  
*porque Usted está robando mi canoa.”*
- (E.48) Cu-aátii nuú,  
*Le he dicho,*
- (E.49) “Caa tíi quia-ímina, señora.  
*No es tu canoa, Señora.*
- (E.50) Taamaá quia-miiyaa.  
*Estás engañando.*
- (E.51) Icuamiiyáana tíi quiaája,”  
*Mentirosa eres,”*
- (E.52) cu-aátii quí-maquiini-jina nuú.  
*le he dicho en mi sueño.*
- (E.53) “Ína ímina quia-aátii naji-na,  
*Esa canoa que dices así,*
- (E.54) ‘Quí-ímina táa-na,’  
*es mi canoa,’*

(E.55) Quí-ímina tíi.

*Mi canoa es.*

(E.56) Quí masiija tíi.

*Yo lo he comprado.*

(E.57) Quia nacariisaacari,

*Si quieres,*

(E.58) quí-quia-ihuataqui íina tíira iyiquíira caáya

*yo te voy a llevar a la persona*

(E.59) íina masiíticura íina íimina quíija,”

*él que me ha vendido la canoa,*

(E.60) cu-aátiqui quí-maquíini-jina nuú.

*le he dicho en mi sueño.*

(E.61) Jííticarií nu-nacarií [quí...]

*Cuando me ha querido*

(E.62) cu-ánaca-jina amuuni-na,

*golpear en mi cabeza,*

(E.63) cu-atatarií cu-ánaca.

*he jalado mi cabeza.*

(E.64) Atíí quí-inícaríi.

*Allí me he recordado.*

(E.65) Atíí cu–aátii naji,

*Allí digo así,*

(E.66) “saáca quí–maquiitaa?

*“qué cosa estoy soñando?”*

(E.67) Jiítarata quí–maquii?

*Cómo estoy dormiendo?*

(E.68) Núquiica miisáji nacariiyaa quííja amaniquiini.”

*Una mujer está queriendo palearme.”*

(E.69) Aníhua táaja.

*Eso es.*

I will tell you my dream that I dreamt this past night. Sleep came to me yesterday because I had not slept. The night before last I went fishing the entire night and so last night I slept really well. I got in my bed. I fell asleep early and slept the entire night. I was traveling in my dream in a canoe. A new canoe. A beautiful little canoe. It was four meters long and well dug out. I stopped at a port like the one here in San Antonio. There was a woman standing there on the hill. She yelled to me in my dream, “Don Hermico! Don Hermico!”

“What is it, *Señora?*” I said to her.

“You stole my canoe,” she said to me in my dream.

“Why are you saying I’m a canoe thief, *Señora?*” I answered.

“This canoe that you’re using is my canoe!”

I said to her, “it’s not your canoe! This is my canoe. I bought it. It cost me money.”

“No, it’s my canoe!”

She started running towards me from the hill down towards the port. She wanted to hit me with a stick.

She threatened me, “I will hit you because you stole my canoe.”

I said to her, “it’s not your canoe, *Señora*. You’re tricking me. You’re a liar. This canoe that you say is yours, it is my canoe. I bought it. If you like, I will take you to the person that sold me the canoe.”

When she wanted to hit me in the head, I pulled away. That’s when I woke up. I said, “what was I dreaming? How am I sleeping? A woman wanted to hit me.”

So it is.

## Appendix F

### Quia-níyaaca (QNI) 'Your husband'

Told by Hermenegildo Díaz Cuyasa, July 25, 2008, and July 30, 2008

#### Part I, Recorded July 25, 2008

(F.1) Ácari quí–huirítaa quiáaja, Señorita Cynthia,

*Hoy te pregunto, Señorita Cynthia,*

(F.2) Jiíticari quia-níyaaca quia-quini–ji ícuarií?

*Cuándo va a viajar tu esposo de tu lado?*

(F.3) Saacáaya yahuíini–jina nu íti–ji ícuarií quia-quini–ji, ... quia-níyaaca?

*Qué día va a viajar de aquí de tu lado, tu esposo?*

(F.4) CIA: Cuasií.<sup>1</sup>

*Bueno.*

(F.5) HDC: iijíí.

*Sí.*

---

<sup>1</sup>I should have said 'Juevesa–jina nu–ícuarií.' *Va a viajar el jueves.*

- (F.6) [Quiarica nu–] Quiarica iyuújurii quiiya íiti cana–jata,  
*Usted va a quedar sola aquí con nosotros,<sup>2</sup>*
- (F.7) iyami ácuji quia-níyaaca quia-quini–ji íicuaríi.  
*porque tu esposo va a ir de tu lado.*
- (F.8) Nu–ícuuaa quina-níya–jina–ánuura.  
*Va a viajar a sus país.<sup>3</sup>*
- (F.9) [Nurica yaaja nu–anicura nurica]  
 [Solamente ha venido]
- (F.10) Nurica–ánuura nu–anicura quia inaani–ánuura íiti,  
*Solamente ha venido a dejarte acá,*
- (F.11) quia cujiini–ánuura,  
*a acompañarte*
- (F.12) nu–nacusiini–iira [tíiti] tíiti–ánuura quia–anii.  
*para que conocer adonde vienes.*
- (F.13) Nihua taa iina–ánuura quia-níyaaca anicura quia–jata.  
*Por eso es que tu esposo ha venido con Usted.*
- (F.14) [Acarií acarií] Acarií yájaari íina semana anii, nu quia-quini–ji íicuaríi.  
*Esta semana que viene, va a viajar de tu lado (dejándote).*

---

<sup>2</sup>lit. Usted no más queda aquí con nosotros.

<sup>3</sup>alt: su país de ustedes

(F.15) Nu–miyíquii imiráani quina-níya–jina–ánuura.

*Va a regresar otra vez a sus país.*

Interlude for Spanish translation

(F.16) Iyami ácuji nu–tarahuaájuuyaa cúuta najáaja tíra quina-níya–jina.

*Porque quizás el también trabaja allá en sus país.*

(F.17) Anihua ácuji nu–miyíquii quia-quini–ji.

*Por eso vuelve de Usted.*

**Part II, Recorded July 30, 2008**

(F.18) CIA: Juevesa–jina qui-níyaaca Iqitu–jina ícuarii.

*Jueves mi esposo va a ir a Iquitos.*

(F.19) Saáca nu tíra miirîi?

*Qué va a hacer allá?*

(F.20) HDC: Saáca nu tíra miirîi cúuta,

*Qué quizás va a hacer allá,*

(F.21) caa qui–nacusii nuú.

*eso no sé.*

(F.22) CIA: Saáca quia...

*Qué tú...*

(F.23) [Interlude for me to elaborate on my question.]



(F.24) HDC: Atiiji nu quia-níya-jina ícuariï Iqitu-jinaji.

*De allí va a ir a tu tierra de Iquitos.*

(F.25) CIA: ïjïí. Atiiraja saáca nu-miiriï?

*Sí. De allá que va a hacer?*

(F.26) HDC [tells me what to say]: Iqitu-jinaji nu qui-níya-jina ícuariï.

*De Iquitos va a ir a mi tierra.*

(F.27) [Interlude for me to explain what I'm looking for.]

(F.28) HDC: [Qui quia...] Qui-huirítaa quiáaja,

*Te estoy preguntando,*

(F.29) quia-níyaaca íti-ji ícuariï juevesa-jina

*de aquí de tu esposo va a viajar el jueves*

(F.30) CIA: ïjïí.

*Sí.*

(F.31) HDC: Iqitu-jina-ánuura.

*a Iquitos.*

(F.32) Caa qui-nacusii saáca-ánuura nu quia-quini-ji ícuariï íti-ji

*Iqitu-jina-ánuura.*

*No sé para que se va de tí, de aquí, a Iquitos.*

(F.33) Iqitu-jinaji nu-ícuariï Rima-jina-ánuura.

*De Iquitos va a ir a Lima.*

- (F.34) Rima-jinaji, nu tíra síhuaánirih,  
*De Lima, al llegar allá (en Lima),*
- (F.35) atiraji nu-ícuariih quia-níya-jina-ánuura,  
*de allá va a ir a tu tierra,*
- (F.36) CIA: ihjii.  
*Sí.*
- (F.37) HDC: Estados Unidos-jina-ánuura.  
*a los Estados Unidos.*
- (F.38) Nu tíra síhuaánirih quia-níya-jina.  
*Va a llegar allá en tu país.*
- (F.39) Caa qui-nacusii saacáaya nu tíra miisahuih.  
*Yo no sé que va a hacer allá (en tu país).*
- (F.40) CIA: ihjii.  
*Sí.*
- (F.41) HDC: Íina-ánuura nu-ícuaa,  
*A que hacer se va,*
- (F.42) nu-ícuaa cúuta tarahuaajuuni-ánuura,  
*se va quizás a trabajar,*
- (F.43) Cuúquisacari caa.  
*O quizás no.*

(F.44) Caa qui–nacusii nuú.

*No sé.*

(F.45) Anihua taa qui–huirítaa quiáaja.

*Eso es lo que te pregunto.*

(F.46) CIA: [Nu tíra tarahuaájuuyaa computadora–jata.]<sup>4</sup>

(F.47) HDC: Cuasií.

*Bueno.*

(F.48) Anuu taa íina ánuura nu–ícuua.

*A eso él está yendo.*

(F.49) Anuu taa íina ánuura nu–ícuua.

*A eso él está yendo.*

(F.50) CIA: iíjií.

*Sí.*

(F.51) HDC: iíjií.

*Sí.*

(F.52) CIA: iíjií.

*Sí.*

---

<sup>4</sup>I should have said ‘Nu tarahuaájuuyaa tíra computadora–jata.’ *Él trabaja allá con computadoras.* or ‘Atiiraja nu–tarahuaájuuyaa, anuu–ánuura nu–ícuua.’ *Él trabaja allá, por eso se va.*

(F.53) Nu cana-ííta...

*Él va a nuestra casa...*

(F.54) HDC: quia-ííta–cuura.

*a tu casa.*

Interlude while I try to remember the word for fix.

(F.55) CIA: Nu cana-ííta iricatájuurii.

*Va a arreglar nuestra casa.*

(F.56) HDC: Cuasií.

*Bueno.*

(F.57) CIA: Cana-ííta...

*Nuestra casa...*

(F.58) HDC: [Quina- cana-] Quina-ííta nu–iricatájuuyaa.

*Su casa de ustedes él va a arreglar.*

(F.59) CIA: ììjìí.

*Sí.*

(F.60) HDC: Cuasií.

*Bueno.*

(F.61) CIA: ììjìí. Tíira qui-níya–jina.

*Sí. Allá en mi tierra.*

(F.62) HDC: Tíira quia-níiya-jina. Cuasií.

*Allá en tu tierra. Bueno.*

(F.63) Anuu taa íina-ánuura nu-ícuua?

*A hacer eso está yendo?*

(F.64) CIA: iijíí.

*Sí.*

(F.65) HDC: Cuasií.

*Bueno.*

(F.66) Atijihua?

*Y después?*

(F.67) Nu-tarahuaájuuyaa-quija najáaja?

*Pero trabaja también aparte (de la casa)?*

(F.68) CIA: iijíí.

*Sí.*

(F.69) [Nu-tara...] Nu-tarahuaájuurii.

*Él va a trabajar.*

(F.70) Nu cana-íta iricatájuurii.

*Él va a arreglar nuestra casa.*

(F.71) HDC: iricatájuurii

*va a arreglar*

(F.72) CIA: Nu...

*Él...*

(F.73) Caa qui–nacusii.

*No sé.*

(F.74) Caa qui–nacusii nuú.

*No sé eso.*

(F.75) HDC: Caa.

*No.*

(F.76) CIA: Najáaja.

*También.*

(F.77) Caa quia–nacusii nuú.

*Tú no sabes eso.*

(F.78) Caa qui–nacusii nuú najáaja.

*Y no sé eso también.*

(F.79) HDC: Najáaja. Najáaja quíija.

*También. También yo.*

(F.80) Atiira–quiija nu quia tásiirii?

*Pero allá te va a esperar?*

(F.81) Tíira quia–níya–jina.

*Allá en tu país.*

(F.82) CIA: *ijjií.*

*Sí.*

(F.83) HDC: *Atiira nu quia tásiiríi,*

*Allá te va a esperar,*

(F.84) CIA: *Saáca tíi tásiiríi?*

*Qué es 'tásiiríi'?*

(F.85) HDC: *Jííticari quia íiti–ji ífcuarii nu-nihuaji.*

*Cuando vas a ir por su tras.*

#### Part I

Now I ask you, *Señorita* Cynthia, when will your husband leave your side?  
What day will he travel from here?

You will stay by yourself here with us, because your husband is leaving. He will go to your country. He only came to leave you here, to accompany you, in order to get to know where you are. That is why your husband came with you.

This week he will go from your side. He will go back to your country. Because perhaps he works there in your country. That's why he's returning.

#### Part II

CIA: On Thursday my husband will go to Iquitos. What will he do there?

HDC: What he will do there, that I don't know. From there he will go to your country.

CIA: Yes, and from there, what will he do?

HDC: I am asking you, your husband will travel from here on Thursday.

CIA: Yes.

HDC: To Iquitos. I don't know why he is going from here to Iquitos.

From Iquitos he will go to Lima. From Lima he will go to your country.

CIA: Yes.

HDC: To the United States. He'll arrive there in your country. I don't know what he will do there. He goes perhaps to work or perhaps not. I don't know. This is what I am asking you.

CIA: He will work with computers there.

HDC: Good. That is what he is going to do.

CIA: He is going to fix our house.

HDC: Good, he will fix up your house.

CIA: Yes, there in my country.

HDC: There in your country. Good. To do this he is going?

CIA: Yes.

HDC: Good. And then? Will he work on anything else?

CIA: I don't know.

HDC: I don't either. But there he will wait for you? There in your country?

CIA: Yes.



HDC: There he will wait for you.

## Appendix G

### Queiicu (QUE)

#### ‘Queiicu’

Told by Ligia Inuma Inuma, July 26, 2008

(G.1) Níínaqui quí–maquitaqui yáana Jenny cájinani íina sírucu.

*De noche le he soñado su choro de la Jenny.*

(G.2) Anúu quí–maquitaqui quí–maquiini–jina.

*Eso he soñado en mi sueño.*

(G.3) [Na–mi...] Na–miitíihuii–quiáana quíija nuú.

*Me han venido darlo a mí.*

(G.4) “Jaári–na [Queiicu] Queiicu ihuiri–quiáana!”

*“Ya se ha muerto, dice, Queiicu.”*

(G.5) Quí–carii nu–jina ihuarija íina Queiicu sírucu, sírucu niyíni.

*Yo le he mirado a Queiicu esa choro muerto, cría de choro.*

(G.6) Queiicu taariqui nu–íyaaca.

*Queiicu era su nombre.*

(G.7) Íiya íina–na Queiicu saanirii–quiáana,

*De allí, dice, Queiicu se ha levantado,*

(G.8) piyíini nu-namíya,

*todo su cara,*

(G.9) yaana itíniija iyuu nu-namíya íina Queiicu.

*puro masato era su cara (tostada).*

(G.10) Cu–aátii naji,<sup>1</sup>

*Yo digo así,*

(G.11) “Queiicu ihuarija–na tiirajaa<sup>2</sup>–na.”

*“Queiicu está muerto.”*

(G.12) Íiya íina saanirii–quiáana.

*Se ha levantado.*

(G.13) Nu–apáraquií tatií arícuma asúraaja apísicaca juntasiini–íira.

*Ha tocado rendija de la pona para juntar champito de yuca.*

(G.14) Taána ihuiíyaa iníisi–jina caáya.

*Otro hombre estaba echado en la hamaca.*

(G.15) [Anúu naji] nu–aátii quíija,

*Está diciendo me,*

---

<sup>1</sup>It sounds like she is saying something between the verb and naji, especially when we go over the text together. Could it be *aatiija*? That doesn't seem right in this context.

<sup>2</sup>I'm not sure what this word is.

(G.16) “Taqiisiini–acuji–na nu–ihuiiricura–ána ína sírucu.”

*“Ese choro se ha muerto de la hambre.”*

(G.17) Quí–saanirii tí–ji tíi quí–ta–ajítii quí–maquiini–jina.

*Yo me he levantado de allí en que estaba sentado en mi sueño.*

(G.18) Quí–ícuahui cúšana–cúura asúraaja iriini–ánuura.

*Yo me he ido a la cocina a traer yuca.*

(G.19) Jaá nu–asaqui ína yána asúraaja ína Queiicu.

*Ya ha comido esa yuca ese Queiicu.*

Last night I dreamt about Jenny’s monkey. This is what I dreamt in my dream.

They came to give (the monkey) to me.

“Now Queiicu has died.”

I looked at Queiicu, this dead monkey, this baby monkey. (Its name was Queiicu.) From there, Queiicu got up. All of his face was covered in *masato*.

I said, “Queiicu is dead.”

But he got up. He was picking at the cracks in the floor to get manioc strings. Another man was lying in a hammock. He said to me, “this monkey died of hunger.”

I got up from where I was sitting in my dream. I went to the kitchen to get manioc, but Queiicu had eaten it all.

## Appendix H

### **Jiíticari táa suhuáani quia-níyaaca (SIC) ‘When your husband is a good person’**

Told by Ema Llona Yareja, August 14, 2008

(H.1) Quí–saaquíniiyaa quiáaja Señora,

*Te voy a contar Señora,*

(H.2) jiíticari táa suhuáani quia-níyaaca–na,

*cuando es bueno tu esposo,*

(H.3) ájapaqui quia–saminijuuni quia–quiija,

*no pienses en tu padre*

(H.4) Ájapaqui saminijuuni quia–áni,

*No pienses en tu madre,*

(H.5) iyami ácuji íina quia-níyaaca nu–nacariiyaa umáata quiáaja.

*porque tu esposo te quiere mucho.*

(H.6) Naji tíi jiíticari táa suhuáani icuáni.

*Así es cuando es bueno hombre.*

- (H.7) Tíi nu–amiyaquitaa quiáaja–na  
*Donde te hace andar*
- (H.8) Ájapaqui nu–ijihuirani quiáaja.  
*no te está reñendo.*
- (H.9) Nu nacariiyaa quiáaja.  
*Te quiere.*
- (H.10) Naji tíi jíticari táa suhuáni ína icuáni.  
*Así es cuando el hombre es bueno.*
- (H.11) Saáca tíi quia–saminíjuu quiáaja.  
*Que vas a pensar*
- (H.12) Súhuua nu–amiyaquitaa saána quiáaja  
*él te hace andar bien*
- (H.13) tíi nu–irii quiáaja–na,  
*donde que te lleva,*
- (H.14) ájapaqui nu–ijihuirani quiáaja.  
*no te riñas.*
- (H.15) Níhua ácuji quia–pajii ína icuáni  
*Por eso te acostumbre con el hombre*
- (H.16) iyami ácuji nu–ijihuiraji caa quiáaja.  
*porque no te está reñendo.*

(H.17) Suhuáani miisáji cuúquisaacari quiáaja

*Cuando eres buena mujer*

(H.18) quia-níyaaca nacariiyaa quiáaja.

*tu marido te quiere.*

(H.19) Caa quia iyájasitiiyaa nuú

*No le haces aburrir*

(H.20) iyami ácuji táa suhuáani nu-majáana quiáaja.

*porque eres una mujer buena para él.*

(H.21) Jaá nu piíquirii.

*Ya se ha terminado.*

I will tell you, *Señora*, when your husband is good, you don't think about your father, you don't think about your mother, because your husband loves you a lot. This is when he is a good man.

Wherever he makes you go, he is not chastising you. He loves you. This is when the man is good. What you will think is that he leads you well, wherever he takes you, he doesn't chastise you. You get used to this man because he is not chastising you.

When you are a good woman, your husband will love you. You don't bore him because you are a good woman for him.

That is the end.

## Appendix I

### Saáca quí–miihuaaja quí–canasiisacari umáata cuuríqui (UCU) ‘What I would do if I won a lot of money’

Told by Hermenegildo Díaz Cuyasa, August 15, 2008

(I.1) Quí quia saaquínii ácarí

*Hoy te voy a contar*

(I.2) íina quia–huirítaa quíija, Cynti.

*lo que me estás preguntando, Cynthia.*

(I.3) [Quia–huirítaqu...]

*Estás preguntando...*

(I.4) Quiáaja quia huirítaqui quíija,

*Tú me has preguntado,*

(I.5) saáca–na quí–miihuaaja

*qué pudiera hacer*

(I.6) quí–canasiisacari umáata cuuríqui.

*si ganaría mucho dinero.*



- (I.7) [Saáca...] Saáca quí íina–jata miihuaaja cuuríqui  
*Qué pudiera hacer con ese dinero*
- (I.8) quí–niquisacari quí–curíca–jina nuú.  
*si habido ver lo en mis manos.*
- (I.9) Níhua táa íina quia–huirítaqui quíija.  
*Eso es lo que me has preguntado.*
- (I.10) Níhua ácuji quí quia saaquínii  
*Eso te voy a contar*
- (I.11) saacáaya quí nu–jata mii  
*que hiciera con el (dinero)*
- (I.12) quí–casiisacari umáata cuuríqui.  
*si habido agarrar mucho dinero.*
- (I.13) Quí–casiisacari siquiera mil quinientos,  
*Si habido agarrar mil quinientos,*
- (I.14) [de repe...] cuúquisacari dos mil soles.  
*o de repente dos mil soles.*
- (I.15) Quíija quí–saminíjuuyaa,  
*Yo estoy pensando,*
- (I.16) ácari yáaja jíita quí–íiquii íiti  
*ahorita como estoy aquí*

(I.17) naji jiīta quī-saaqūiniiyaa (quiáaja)

*como te estoy contando*

(I.18) [quī-saminíjuuyaa quiáaja].

*[estoy pensando a Usted].*

(I.19) Quī saminíjuuyaa quíija

*Yo estoy pensando*

(I.20) tíi miitíiríi ína cuuríqui quíija

*me diera esa dinero*

(I.21) ína quī saminíjuuyaa

*lo que yo pienso*

(I.22) cu-aátii naji.

*así digo.*

(I.23) Quī saminíjuuyaa cu-ánaca-jina nuú.

*Lo pienso en mi cabeza.*

(I.24) Saáca-íira-huaja?

*Para qué (quisiera tener el dinero)?*

(I.25) Caa quī-nacariiyaa saacáaya masiini

*No quiero comprar*

(I.26) jiīta ratio-na,

*como rádio,*

- (I.27) cuúquisacari sáhuiri,  
*ni machete,*
- (I.28) cuúquisacari... saacáaya íina  
*nada compraría (ni cosas lo que hay)*
- (I.29) íina quí cuu masii quí-miisacari cuuríqui.  
*eso compraría teniendo plata.*
- (I.30) Caa.  
*Pero no.*
- (I.31) Caa quí-nacariiyaa saáca masiini.  
*No quiero comprar nada.*
- (I.32) Quíija quí-saminíjuuyaa  
*Yo pienso*
- (I.33) quí casiisacari íina cuuríqui  
*si habida agarrar dinero*
- (I.34) íina quí-saminíjuuyaa nuú  
*eso lo que pienso*
- (I.35) cuúquisacari mil quinientos o dos mil soles.  
*siquiera mil quinientos o dos mil soles.*
- (I.36) Anúrica quí-nacariiyaa masiini quí-mutuuru.  
*El único que quiero comprar es mi motor.*

*Alternative gloss: Solo mi motor quiero comprar.*

(I.37) Caa júura umáana.

*No muy grande.*

(I.38) Un cinquita no mas.

*5 HP no más.*

(I.39) Núrica yáaja cu–amiyaquitaaja

*Eso no más para hacer andar*

(I.40) tíiti quí–nacariiyaa ihuaani

*por donde que yo quiero irme*

(I.41) iyami ácuji quíija,

*porque yo,*

(I.42) jíticari quina–ícuuaa cana–quiniiji íiti–ji–na

*ustedes cuando se van de nosotros de aquí*

(I.43) caa cana–íquii íiti.

*no estamos (los 4 especialistas) aquí (en San Antonio).*

(I.44) Cana–ícuuaa tíira.

*Nos vamos allá.*

(I.45) Quíija túu.

*Yo sí (no me meto en ningún proyecto).*

- (I.46) Tíini caa quí–nacusii  
*Yo no sé*
- (I.47) jíitarata cuáarta caáya íiquii  
*cómo viven otros personas*
- (I.48) saacáaya nu–miiyaa  
*que hará (debe hacer los otras personas)*
- (I.49) iyami ácuji quíija caa quí–tarahuaájuuyaa... íiti  
*porque yo no trabajo aquí*
- (I.50) jíita íipi tarahuaájuuyaa taápi,  
*como los demas trabajan,*
- (I.51) cariirií Doña Ligia, Don Jaime, Doña Ema.  
*mira Doña Ligia, Don Jaime, Doña Ema.*
- (I.52) Na–tarahuaájuuyaa taámi  
*Ellos trabajan otro*
- (I.53) Taámi tarahuaájuu na–miiyaa  
*Otro trabajo se hacen*
- (I.54) jíiticari quina–íicuaa.  
*cuando ustedes se van.*

Now I will tell you that which you are asking me, Cynthia.

You are asking... you asked me, what I would do if I won a lot of money. What I could do with this money if I were to see it my hands. This is what you have asked me. I will tell you what I would do with it if I were to get a lot of money. If I were to get perhaps fifteen hundred, or maybe two thousand *soles*.

I am thinking now as I am telling you. I am thinking if you gave me this money, what would it be for?

I don't want to buy something like a radio, or a machete. I don't want to buy stuff. I think if I had money, perhaps fifteen hundred or two thousand *soles*, the only thing I want to buy is my motor. Not very big. A five horsepower, no more. This so I can go wherever I want to go because I...

When you leave us, we don't stay here (in San Antonio). We go away. Me too. I don't know how the others live, what they do, because I don't work here like the others work, like Doña Ligia, Don Jaime, and Doña Ema. They do other jobs when you all leave.

## Appendix J

### Glossary

<i>chacra</i>	swidden field
<i>chacruna</i>	type of plant used for shamanistic purposes
<i>chambira</i>	palm threads used for weaving
<i>colmena</i>	type of bee, its honey, or beehive
<i>huitina</i>	tannia or yautia, <i>Xanthosoma</i> sp.
<i>lancha</i>	motorboat
<i>masato</i>	manioc beer
<i>pucunucho</i>	a type of spicy chili pepper
<i>sacha platanillo</i>	a plant similar to <i>Heliconia</i>
<i>siusihuáasi</i>	a remedy made from a type of tree bark
<i>tambo</i>	temporary hut
<i>tamishi</i>	twine used in weaving thatch
<i>uvilla</i>	purple grape-like fruit, <i>Pourouma</i> sp.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, Cynthia. 2004. Posiciones sintácticas de negación: *caa* y *-ji- caa*. In Christine Beier and Lev Michael (eds.), *Estudios del idioma Iquito (Versión de agosto 2004)*. Unpublished manuscript of the Iquito Language Documentation Project.
- Anderson, Cynthia, Christine Beier, Lev Michael, & I-wen Lai. 2006. SOV vs. SVO constituent order in Iquito (Zaparoan): A phonological explanation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas (SSILA); Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Anderson, Stephen R. & Edward L. Keenan. 1985. Deixis. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 3, 259-308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, Peter. 1996. Clitic pronouns and ergativity in Bahasa Sasak. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bautista Pizarro, Sisi. 2007. *Algunos aspectos discursivos de la coherencia funcional en los textos narrativos Iquito*. Lima, Perú: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos Tesis de Licenciatura.
- Beier, Christine, Cynthia Hansen, I-wen Lai, & Lev Michael (in press). Exploiting word order to express an inflectional category: Reality status in Iquito. *Linguistic Typology* 15.1.
- Brown, Mark. 2003. El orden SOV. In Lev Michael (ed.), *Estudios del idioma Iquito (Versión de agosto 2003)*, module 33. Unpublished manuscript.
- Brown, Mark C. 2004. *Topics in Iquito syntax: Word order, possession, and nominal discontinuity*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin Master's thesis.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1998. "Irrealis" as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40. 257-71.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1997. *The American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of native America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chumbow, Beban, and Pius N. Tamanji. 1994. Bafut. In Peter Kahrel and René van den Berg (eds.), *Typological studies in negation* (Typological Studies 29), 211-236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.



- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. 2nd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1987. Discontinuous constituents in Fox. In P.D. Kroeber and R.E. Moore (eds.), *Native American languages and grammatical typology*, 53-73. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- De Jong Boudreault, Lynda J. 2006. *The Iquito clause: Simple and multi-verb constructions*. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin Master's thesis.
- Derbyshire, Desmond C. 1986. Comparative survey of morphology and syntax in Brazilian Arawakan. In Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian languages (Vol. 1)*, 469-566. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: form, function, and grammaticalization*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2004. Adjective classes in typological perspective. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Adjective classes: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1-49. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Donohue, Mark. 2008. Semantic alignment systems: What's what, and what's not. In Mark Donohue & Soren Wichmann (eds.), *The typology of semantic alignment*, 24-75. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eastman, Robert & Elizabeth Eastman. 1963. Iquito syntax. In Benjamin Elson (ed.), *Studies in Peruvian Languages: I*, 145-192. Norman, Oklahoma: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Oklahoma.
- Elliott, Jennifer. 2000. Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalisation of reality. *Linguistic Typology* 4. 55-90.
- Éménanjo, E. 'N. 1981. *Auxiliaries in Ìgbo syntax*. Ìbàdàn University dissertation, published by I.U.L.C., Bloomington, Ind.
- England, Nora C. 1991. Changes in basic word order in Mayan languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 57.4. 446-486.
- Ernst, Thomas. 2002. *The syntax of adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366-431. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Good, Jeff. 2003. When arguments become adjuncts: Split configurationality in Legbo. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 39. 110-29.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2007. Preverbal objects and information structure in Benue-Congo. In Enoch O. Aboh, Katharina Hartmann, and Malte Zimmermann

- (eds.), *Focus strategies in African languages: The interaction of focus and grammar in Niger-Congo and Afro-Asiatic*, 83-111. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hallett, Taryne. 2007. *A paradigm of event modality: The Iquito continuum*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin Master's thesis.
- Hansen, Cynthia I. A. 2006. *Adverbs and phrase structure in Iquito*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin Master's thesis.
- Hansen, Cynthia I. A. 2007. Uncharacteristic characteristics of the Iquito adjective class. Proceedings of the Conference on Indigenous Languages of Latin America III (CILLA III); Austin, TX.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Explaining article-possessor complementarity: Economic motivation in noun phrase syntax. *Language* 75.2. 227-243.
- Hawkins, John A. 1985. *A comparative typology of English and German*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hawkins, John A. 2007. Processing typology and why psychologists need to know about it. *New Ideas in Psychology* 25.2. 87-107.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56.2. 251-299.
- Huamancayo Curi, Edinson Y. 2005. La formación de palabras mediante la derivación en Iquito. Lima, Peru: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos *Tesis de Licenciado*.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1990. About Agr(P). *Linguistic Inquiry* 21. 551-577.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1990. Language history in South America: What we know and how to know more. In Doris L. Payne (ed.), *Amazonian linguistics: Studies in lowland South American languages (1st ed.)*, 13-73. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lai, I-wen. 2006. *Fundamental aspects of the Iquito language*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin Master's thesis.
- Lai, I-Wen. 2009. *Time in the Iquito language*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin doctoral dissertation.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Manfredi, Victor. 1997. Aspectual licensing and object shift. In Rose-Marie Déchaine & Victor Manfredi (eds.), *Object positions in Benue-Kwa: Papers from a workshop at Leiden University, June 1994*, 87-122. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Mateo Toledo, Eladio. 1999. *La cuestión akateko-q'anjob'al, una comparación gramatical*. Guatemala City: Universidad Mariano Gálvez de Guatemala undergraduate thesis (*Licenciatura en Sociolingüística*).

- Michael, Lev. 2004. Frases determinantes discontinuas. In Christine Beier & Lev Michael (eds.), *Estudios del idioma Iquito 2004, Tomo II*, module 12 (30 June 2004). Unpublished manuscript.
- Michael, Lev. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in Iquito. In R.M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.), *The semantics of clause linking: A cross-linguistic typology*, 145-166. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Michael, Lev (forthcoming). The Nanti reality status system: Implications for the cross-linguistic validity of the realis/irrealis contrast. *Linguistic Typology*.
- Michael, Lev (to appear). The interaction of tone and stress in the prosodic system of Iquito (Zaparoan). *Amerindia*.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1995. On the relativity of irrealis. In Joan L. Bybee & Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 367-388. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1999. *The languages of Native North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. *Language*, 84.1. 69-119.
- Ñdjméle, Ozo-mekuri. 1993. *The parameters of universal grammar: A government-binding approach*. African Educational Series, Òweré.
- Ndimele, Ozo-mekuri. 2009. Negation marking in Igbo. In Norbert Cyffer, Erwin Ebermann, & Georg Ziegelmeyer (eds.), *Negation patterns in West African languages and beyond* (Typological Studies in Language 87), 121-137. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Palmer, F.R. 2001. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, Doris L. 1987. Information structuring in Papago narrative discourse. *Language* 63.4. 783-804.
- Payne, Doris L. 1993. Meaning and pragmatics of order in selected South American Indian Languages. In W. A. Foley (ed.), *The role of theory in language description*, 281-314. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Peeke, Catherine. 1959. Shimigae, idioma que se extingue. In SIL (ed.), *Estudios acerca de las lenguas Huarani (Auca), Shimigae y Zapara*, 18-28. Quito, Ecuador: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano and University of Oklahoma.
- Peeke, Catherine & Mary Sargent. 1959. Pronombres personales en Shimigae. In SIL (ed.), *Estudios acerca de las lenguas Huarani (Auca), Shimigae y Zapara*, 29-42. Quito, Ecuador: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano and University of Oklahoma.

- Peeke, M. Catherine. 1991. *Bosquejo gramatical del Záparo*. Cuadernos Etnolingüísticos, 14. Quito: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Rich, Rolland. G. 1999. *Diccionario Arabela-Castellano*. Lima, Peru: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Richards, Joan. 1977. Orações em waurá. *Série Lingüística* 7. 141-184.
- Sargent, Mary. 1959. Vocabulario Zaparo. In SIL (ed.), *Estudios acerca de las lenguas Huarani (Auca), Shimigae y Zapara*, 43-48. Quito, Ecuador: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano and University of Oklahoma.
- Shaw, Patricia, Jill Campbell, & Larry Grant. 2008. Word order change in Central Coast Salish. Paper presented at the International Conference on Continuity and Change in Grammar, University of Cambridge, 20 March.
- Stanley, Carol. 1986. *Description Morpho-syntaxique de la langue Tikar (parlée au Cameroun)* [A morpho-syntactic description of the Tikar language (spoken in Cameroon)]. Societe Internationale de Linguistique.
- Sullón Acosta, Karina N. 2005. El acento y tono en la lengua Iquito. Lima, Peru: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos Tesis de Licenciado.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1978. Modern English from a typological point of view: Some implications of the function of word order. *Linguistische Berichte* 54. 19-35.
- Vallejos Yopán, Rosa. 2004. *Basic clauses in Kokama-Kokamilla*. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon doctoral dissertation.
- Vallejos Yopán, Rosa. 2010. *A grammar of Kokama-Kokamilla*. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Masters Thesis.
- Vydrine, Valentin. 2009. Negation in Southern Mande. In Norbert Cyffer, Erwin Ebermann, & Georg Ziegelmeyer (eds.), *Negation patterns in West African languages and beyond* (Typological Studies in Language 87), 223-260. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wechsler, Stephen. 1991. Verb second and illocutionary force. In Katherine Leffel & Denis Bouchard (eds.), *Views on phrase structure*, 177-191. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Welmers, William Everett. 1973. *African language structures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wiltschko, M. 2000. The syntax of transitivity and its effects: Evidence from Halkomelem Salish. In *WCCFL 20 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Wiltschko, M. 2002. The syntax of pronouns: Evidence from Halkomelem Salish. *Natural language and linguistic theory*. 157-195.
- Wise, Mary Ruth. 1999. Small language families and isolates in Peru. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The Amazonian languages*, 307-340. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wise, Mary Ruth. 2005. Apuntes sobre las lenguas Záparos - familia que se extingue. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Etnolingüísticos*, 11, 51-69.

## Vita

Cynthia I. A. Hansen was born in New Jersey, the daughter of John and Maureen Anderson. She attended public school in Summit, New Jersey and later in Barrington, Illinois. She graduated from Barrington High School in June of 1995. From September of 1995 to June of 1999, she attended Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, where she received her A.B. in Linguistics on June 13, 1999. There she met Patrick Hansen, whom she later married. Following graduation from college, she worked in Boston, Massachusetts as an Associate Speech Scientist with SpeechWorks International (now Nuance). She left SpeechWorks to volunteer with Caminamos Juntos Para Salud y Desarrollo in Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico and Tlamacazapa, Guerrero, Mexico. She entered The Graduate School at The University of Texas at Austin in August of 2003 and completed her Master's degree there in May of 2006.

Permanent address: 5306 Halwill Place  
Austin, Texas 78723

This dissertation was typeset with  $\text{\LaTeX}^\dagger$  by the author.

---

<sup>†</sup> $\text{\LaTeX}$  is a document preparation system developed by Leslie Lamport as a special version of Donald Knuth's  $\text{\TeX}$  Program.