

# Command in Apurinã

Preliminary Version

By  
Wilbur N. Pickering

Associação Internacional de Linguística - SIL Brasil  
Anápolis – GO  
2009\*

\* The original version of this paper was made available in 1973 as No. 006 of the Arquivo Linguístico (Summer Institute of Linguistics, Brasília, DF). This is an edited version, modified in various ways to make it more readable and clearer; but the original data and analyses have been faithfully maintained.

## COMMAND<sup>1</sup> IN APURINÃ<sup>2</sup>

It may be well to start by illustrating the basic syntax of a transitive clause. The deep structure sentence, "I fetch pineapple" may be expressed by any of the following surface structures:

O	S	P			
anana	nota	apa			
O		s-P			
anana		n-apa			
O		s-P	S		
anana		n-apa	nota		nota - 'I' (free)
	S	P-o	O		
	nota	apa-ry	anana		anana - 'pineapple'
		s-P-o	O		
		n-apa-ry	anana		ny-/n- - 'I' (bound)
		s-P-o	O	S	
		n-apa-ry	anana	nota	
					apa - 'fetch'
O		P	s-#		
anana		apa	ny-txa		
					-ry - 'it' (m.) (bound)
v		P	s-#-o	O	
		apa	ny-txa-ry	anana	
					txa - (pro-verb)

These are all active independent clauses, close syntactic synonyms which have a single common English gloss, although each of them has an appropriate context in which it would preferentially occur and in such a context any of the other possibilities would be in some way marked.

Although most control of pronominalization comes from outside the sentence (in which a given pronoun occurs), the following syntax rules apply within the sentence, regardless (more or less): if the free form of the Subj. or Obj. has not preceded the verb the bound form must occur; if the free form has preceded the verb the bound form may not occur; in the event that both free forms either precede or follow the verb, the object precedes the subject; in a di-transitive clause there will be both a free and a bound object--the free form being the direct object and the bound the indirect.

I will list the subject prefixes<sup>3</sup> and object suffixes for possible future reference:

(1st sg)	ny-	-no	(1st pl)	a-	-wa
(2nd sg)	py-	-i	(2nd pl)	y-	-waka
(3rd m sg)	y-	-ry	(3rd pl)	y- -na	-wakana/-na
(3rd f sg)	o-	-ro	'reflexive'		-wa

Note that the reflexive marker is a filler in the bound object slot--presumably functions as an object pronoun, therefore.

From here on I will work through Langacker's article, "On Pronominalization and the Chain of Command", giving Apurinã examples step by step. To facilitate comparison I will number the Apurinã sentences with the number of the Langacker example to which they correspond.

### Conjoined Structures

It is not clear to me that Apurinã has conjoined sentences, in the usual sense. The following are the possible candidates:

- (1) a. Joao txita-ry Pedro i-jomaerekata-ry apaka  
 John insulted-him Peter he-slandered-him also  
 John insulted Peter (and) he also slandered him.
- b. Joao txita-ry Pedro jomaerekata y-txa-ry  
 John insulted-him Peter slander he-did-him  
 John insulted Peter; he slandered him.
- c. Joao txita-ry Pedro i-jomaerekata-ry  
 John insulted-him Peter he-slandered-him  
 John insulted Peter (and) he slandered him.
- d. ?Joao txita-ry Pedro i-jomaerekata-ry Pedro  
 John insulted-him Peter he-slandered-him Peter  
 John insulted Peter; he slandered Peter.
- e. \*Joao txita-ry Pedro Joao jomaerekata-ry (Pedro/apaka)  
 John insulted-him Peter John slandered-him  
 John insulted Peter; John slandered him.

The two halves of each example are juxtaposed and are semantically related, but each is an independent clause as it stands in the surface structure--in certain situations one gets a series of clauses some of which are not independent, but they fail to be independent just because they contain no pronouns and thus lie outside this study. Examples d and e are included to point out that the subject must be pronominalized in subsequent juxtaposed sentences, whereas the object may (rarely) be repeated (producing a somber emphasis).

- (2) \*Joao txita-ry i-jomaerekata-ry Pedro  
 John insulted-him he-slandered-him Peter  
 John insulted him; he slandered Peter.

This is ungrammatical unless Pedro has already been introduced.

- (3) Joao txita-ry Pedro ywasaaky y-manapare akory mony  
 John insulted-him Peter then his-inlaw group to  
 i-janapokota nynoa mony i-jomaerekata-ry Pedro  
 he-visited them to he-slandered-him Peter  
 John insulted Peter; then he visited his inlaws; he slandered Peter to them.
- (4) Joao txita-ry Pedro ywasaaky y-manapare akory mony  
 John insulted-him Peter then his-inlaw group to  
 i-janapokota apotoyta y-txa-na nynoa mony i-jomaerekata-ry  
 he-visited gather he-did-them them to he-slandered-him  
Pedro  
Peter  
 John insulted Peter; then he visited his inlaws; he gathered them together; he slandered Peter to them.

Because of the change in location and the introduction of other participants the referent, Pedro, is repeated.

- (5) Paymaty-ry Pedro #-apietako  
 Smart-he Peter he-excel-will  
 Peter is smart. He will excel.
- (7) O-mokytaaryta oje syto O-anikini-ry metakãi p-awiritynia  
She-almost-blind this woman she-driving-it car you-allow-if  
 na-ereka-no-ko  
 not-good-I-will (be)  
 This woman is almost blind; if you allow her to drive the car, I won't feel good.
- (9) Maria pitxoka-ry Pedro o-txita-ry y-karota-kary  
 Mary kissed-him Peter she-insulted-him his-wound-er (m)  
 Mary kissed Peter; she insulted his wounder (m).
- (11) Pedro sytore y-mojenaro pakyny nejenãta-kaka  
Peter's wife his-mistress sum are-fighting-(each other)  
 Peter's wife and his mistress are fighting each other.

The corresponding sentences, (6), (8), (10), and (12), are ungrammatical, as in English. Noun phrase conjunction occurs, but neither verb phrase nor sentence conjunction occurs except as juxtaposed independent clauses. In any case, NP<sup>a</sup> must precede NPP in order to pronominalize it.

## Reflexivization

Reflexivization appears to be straightforward.

- (15) Pedro nejeta-wa / y-nejeta-wa Pedro  
Peter fight-self / He-fights-self Peter  
Peter is angry. / Peter is angry.

Since subject and object are coreferential the reflexive pronoun may represent either, so to speak. For reflexivization to occur the coreferential subject and object must be attached to the same verb. I'm not sure how a sentence like (17) would be expressed, but it would not be reflexivised--my guess is that it would be:

- (17) Maria sāpireta-ry Pedro y-kamakyty  
Mary told-him Peter his-deeds  
Mary told Peter (about) his deeds.

## Non-conjoined Structures

Sentences like (22)-(26) would present no problem since the referents precede the pronouns. Sentences like (27)-(31) would be ungrammatical, as in English. But, sentences like (32)-(34) are ungrammatical in Apurinã, unlike English.

- (32) \*Ātokory taka-ro-ko ynekary janapokotaka-ro-ko Maria katana  
The youth marry-her-will he-who visit-her-will Mary tomorrow  
The youth who will marry her will visit Mary tomorrow.
- (34) \*Ātokoro y-nyrekakakaro-na apakapa-na-ko pixena anakory  
The girl their-wanter receive-them-will cat litter  
The girl who wants them will receive the kittens.

To be grammatical they would have to be recast as:

- (39) Ātokory Maria takako ynekary janapokotaka-ro-ko katana  
The-youth Mary marry-will he-who visit-her-will tomorrow  
The youth who will marry Mary will visit her tomorrow.
- (41) Ātokoro pixena anakory nyrekakakaro apakapa-na-ko  
The-girl cat litter wanter (desirer) receive-them-will  
The girl who wants the kittens will receive them.

Sentences like (35)-(45) would work because NP<sup>a</sup> precedes NPP, although assuming quite different shapes.

- (36) Pixena anakory ny-syka-ro-ko âtokoro "nota nyrekaka-na"  
Cat litter I-give-her-will the-girl "I want-them"  
 sâkiretakaro  
 said-who  
 I will give the kittens to the girl, the one who said "I want them".

(But, since NPP is in a direct quote, it is controlled by the previous context and not by the NP<sup>a</sup> in this sentence.)

Langacker opines that sentences (46)-(48) "are perfectly acceptable". Since such sentences are crucial to his case for "command" I will pause to suggest that a native speaker of English would utter them only if presupposing some common knowledge of NP<sup>a</sup> in the audience. Their Apurinã equivalents are ungrammatical.

- (46) \*Âtokoro mony y-monÿkakaro mony ma-ereka-to o-txa-wa  
 The-girl to his-lover to not-good-(f) she-makes-self  
Pedro okakaro  
Peter's killer(f)  
 To (the mind of) the girl, his lover, Peter's killer is an evil person(f).

- (47) \*O-potorokini atoko ymarotapeêka Pedro txitiniry  
Her-leaving after it-was-known Peter's insulting-him  
kasarojâkokero mÿkary  
the-blond's bringer  
 After she left it was known that Peter insulted the blond's bringer(m).

- (48) \*Âty kariwa o-ymaty ymarotakary amotary Maria kamakyty kopiti  
 A brazilian her-skill knower bought-it Mary's product a-bowl  
 A Brazilian who knew her skill bought a bowl that Mary made.  
 (I had to recast (48) since a passive verb may not have an expressed agent.)

The grammatical form of (46)-(48) may be had by switching the underlined elements in each case. It appears that 'precedes' is the only relation in operation in relative structures, regardless of the echelon of NP<sup>a</sup>.

### Rule ordering

Langacker urges the advisability of ordering the rules for passivization and adverbial clause preposition before pronominalization. When an Apurinã verb is passivized the agent cannot be specified. Thus the ordering of passivization relative to pronominalization is inconsequent in Apurinã. (52) can not be used to illustrate pronominalization--it would be:

- (52') Anio Pedro jorotakaro okapeēka  
 The-mosquito Peter's biter was-killed  
 The mosquito, which bit Peter, was killed.

With preposed adverbial clauses a preposing rule would have to come before pronominalization.

- (57) Pedro maetakanysaaky anāpa akatsatapiketapy-ry  
Peter not-looking-while a-dog bit-leg-him  
 While Peter wasn't looking a dog bit him in the leg.
- (58) \*Anāpa akatsatapiketapy-ry Pedro naetakanysaaky  
 A-dog bit-leg-him, Peter not-looking-while  
 A dog bit him in the leg while Peter wasn't looking.
- (55') Anāpa akatsatapiketapy-ry Pedro y-maetakanysaaky  
 A-dog bit-leg-him Peter, he-not-looking-while  
 A dog bit Peter in the leg while he wasn't looking.
- (59) \*y-maetakanysaaky anāpa akatsatapiketapy-ry Pedro  
He-not-looking-while a-dog bit-leg-him Peter  
 A dog, while not looking, bit Peter in the leg.

(The last sentence is grammatical, but with a quite different meaning from that required.)

### Primary relations

- (60) Maria n-apokaerekata-ry Pedro o-ynoro omanata-ry  
 Mary not-like-him Peter her-mother hates-him  
 Mary dislikes Peter; her mother hates him.
- (61) Pedro omanata-ro syto y-maapakapakato  
Peter hates-her the-woman his-not-receiver  
 Peter hates the woman, the one who didn't receive him.
- Since a passive verb does not take an agent, (62) and (63) are not relevant here.
- (64) \*#-omanata-ro syto Pedro maapakapakato  
He-hates-her the-woman Peter's not-receiver  
 He hates the woman, the one who didn't receive Peter.
- (65) Syto Pedro maapakapakato omanata-ry  
 The-woman Peter's not-receiver hates-him  
 The woman who didn't receive Peter hates him.

- (66) \*Syto            y-maapakapakato   omanata-ry   Pedro  
The-woman   his-not-receiver       hates-him       Peter  
The woman who didn't receive him hates Peter.

I take it that there is no motivation in Apurinã for the notion 'primacy relation' since the linear ordering of constituents appears to be the only relevant structural relation.

### Conclusion

All the data considered in this paper suggests the following constraint on pronominalization for Apurinã: NP<sup>a</sup> may be used to pronominalize NPP unless NPP precedes NP<sup>a</sup>. This constraint obtains not only within sentences but between sentences and through a string of sentences. It thus appears that for Apurinã the relation 'precedes' is sufficient--there is no motivation for a relation 'commands'.

## REFERENCES

1. "Command" is used herein as defined in Ronald W. Langacker, "On Pronominalization and the Chain of Command," in David A. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane eds., Modern Studies in English, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969).
2. Apurinã (Ipuriná) is generally assigned to the Pre-Andine branch of the Arawak language family. There are around 1,000 speakers of Apurinã who are presently scattered along 1,500 kilometers of the Purus River in the state of Amazonas, Brazil.
3. The forms given are representative only: (1st sg) and (2nd sg) come in 3 phonetic shapes each, (3rd m sg) and (3rd pl) come in 4 phonetic shapes each, (3rd f sg) and (1st pl) come in 6 shapes each, and (2nd pl) comes in no less than 25 phonetic shapes!