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Editor's Note

The papers in this volume are the result of linguistic field work carried on in Ecuador by members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. As Miss Peeke points out in her Introduction, there are only nine aboriginal languages spoken in Ecuador today, and articles on the phonemics or grammar of seven of these languages are presented here. The one comparative article lists the phonemes of an eighth language. Only a discussion of Ñivarò is lacking to make the volume touch upon each Indian language of the country.

Most of the articles were developed in linguistic workshops on the field supervised by Kenneth L. Pike. His influence is apparent in most of the articles in the volume, especially in the grammatical ones. Miss Orr's phonemic article was her Master's thesis at Indiana University, and Moore's article was worked on while he was in attendance there.

Miss Catherine Peeke, Chairman of the SIL Ecuadorian linguistic committee, served as assistant editor of the volume. Since she has been intimately associated with the project, I requested that she prepare an Introduction, giving a survey of the linguistic picture in Ecuador and pointing out items of particular interest about the articles, and a Bibliography of Ecuadorian Indian (and related) languages.

It is hoped that this volume will contribute substantially to the scanty information now available on South American Indian languages.
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Indian Languages of Ecuador
Introduction

This first of a series of studies in Ecuadorian Indian languages is a collection of articles concerning eight of the nine Indian languages found in present-day Ecuador (see map). While coverage of the eight languages is not uniform, in that a given language may be represented only by a comparative article or by an article on phonemics or on grammar, yet such articles describe structural types which are fairly representative of phonology and grammar of the nine languages.

Structural similarities and phenomena common to all of the languages do not necessarily indicate observable family relationships among the nine languages; on the contrary, present findings tend to confirm classification of the nine languages as belonging to seven different families or isolated classifications (McQuown, 1955; Mason, 1950).

Relationship of Cayapa and Colorado, of the Barbacoan Chibchan subfamily (Murra, 1948), is demonstrated in Moore's "Correspondences in South Barbacoan Chibcha," found in the present volume.

Siona and Secoya (McQuown's "Secoya-Gal" and "Sionf") are closely related members of the Western Tuca-
noan family. For phonology of a related dialect, in which tone is phonemic, see Velie and Brend (n.d.).

Our "Quichua" (Ecuadorian pronunciation and spelling) is the "Quechua" which is generally classified as part of the Quechumaran phylum. Lowland dialects of Quichua de-
scribed in this volume are not specifically indicated in any listing we have seen. Their existence attests to the success of efforts made by the Incas and others to impose the Quichua language upon all subject tribes, whose historical origin and
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aboriginal language have thus been effectively obliterated (Prescott, 1874:81–82).

Two further language families, the Jívaro and the Záparo have representatives in Ecuador. For grammar and phonology of the Macuma dialect of Jívaro, see Turner (1958a, 1958b). Other Jívaroan languages are Huambisa (Beasley and Pike, 1957) and Aguaruna (Larson, 1955, n.d.) in Peru, and Achuara or Achual in Ecuador. The Zaparoan language family includes Záparo in Ecuador, and in Peru the three languages: Shimigae (Peeke and Sargent, 1959), Iquitos (Eastman and Eastman, n.d.), and Arabella (Rich, n.d.)

Auca and Cofán, listed as "unclassified" by McQuown (1955), remain so in our judgment. While it is true that in a phyllum classification, more inclusive groupings may be made (Steward and Faron, 1959:22–23; Swadesh, 1959), yet present findings of our investigators give no indication as to the direction such grouping might take, with respect to the seven language families represented in Ecuador. It is hoped that this volume, as well as dictionaries soon to be published will contribute substantially to materials available for comparative work in this area of South America.

Phonological studies are included in the present volume for six of the nine languages. The phonemes of Colorado may be found in the comparative article in this volume and other publications by Moore. Studies of Záparo phonemes (Sargent, 1959) and the phonology of Jívaro (Turner, 1958) have been published elsewhere.

Auca, Cayapa, Cofán, Secoya, and Siona phonemic studies are presented here in a sufficiently uniform format to demonstrate the similarity of problems encountered in the area. Among these are problems related to phonemic nasalization of vowels in Cofán, Auca, Secoya, and Siona (although nasalization systems identical in Secoya and Siona are interpreted differently in the two descriptions). Common
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to the five languages are questions of phonetic vowel length versus vowel clusters, multiple-stress systems which pattern differently in each language, and general indeterminacy with respect to conditioning of vowel allophones. Designed specifically for pointing up the latter problem, the basic format used allows contrast between phonemes to be established, then describes variants in terms of a norm with a range of allophones subject, in many instances, to quasi-conditioning.

The Quichua phonology statement, on the other hand, is more comprehensive in its treatment of phonemes according to distinctive features, distribution, frequency, and dialect variations, the materials for the latter being excerpted from a fuller treatment by Orr, to appear in Ecuador.

Grammar articles are more varied: Siona morphology presentation relies on text materials and charts, with tagmemic structure implicit in the breakdown of the charting; the Cayapa presents a preliminary tagmemic description of the morphology and syntax from sentence to word, with illustrative text material; the Quichua article outlines broad syntactic relationships perceived through but not described in terminology of the tagmemic model; and finally, the Záparo, written four years earlier than the others, is designed explicitly to illuminate the model as it then stood.

A particular emphasis of that period of tagmemic development, and hence of the article cast in that model, was subordination of included tagmemes to the sentence as a convenient threshold. Multi-dimensional relationship between sentence types was demonstrated by cross-cutting distribution of certain tagmemes in various sentence types. These emphases of early tagmemics overlap somewhat with concepts seen recently in Transformational Grammar, as does also the formulaic device for provision of alternate choices. In retrospect, this particular description is recog-
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nized as being over-labelled and redundant, but it is presented without revision in order to point again to a priority of relevance and an extra dimension possibly obscured by recent widespread acceptance by those who use the tagmemic model of the concept of levels and its consequent simplicity of statement.

Of special theoretical interest, perhaps, is the final section of the article on Auca phonemics; here is an almost unique statement of, in the author's words, "dialect differences resulting from a case of extreme social isolation."

We offer, then, this contribution to linguistic studies, desiring to share data available peculiarly to us, to submit for consideration certain devices and concepts which have proved helpful to us, and to exhibit types of structure found in Ecuadorian languages.

Catherine Peeke
Bloomington, Indiana
December 20, 1961
Ecuador Quichua Clause Structure

by Carolyn Orr

0. Introduction.
1. Clause types.
2. Major parts of clause.
3. Expansions.
4. Illustrations.

0. Introduction. The clause structure of Quichua as spoken in the eastern jungles of Ecuador is readily adaptable in its initial analysis to description according to the tagmemic model. Quichua clauses are units of predication; their minimum form obligatorily includes some kind of predicate. The clause may occur as a complete sentence or as part of a complex sentence.

1. Clause types. Clauses are identified as either independent or dependent. Contrastive primary types of independent clauses are declarative, imperative and interrogative. Each of the above independent clause types, as

Data for the present paper were gathered at Limoncocha, on the lower Napo River in eastern Ecuador, during field trips 1959 – 1961.

See also "Ecuador Quichua Phonology" based on the Puyo dialect, present volume. Major differences between the two dialects are in the past tense markers -ra/-rka, purpose markers -nga/wa/-ngapa, location markers -i/-pi, possessive markers -wa/-pa, and in vocabulary.

The analysis and presentation of this material has been greatly facilitated by discussion with Kenneth L. Pike.
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well as dependent clauses, may be further subdivided into
intransitive and transitive clauses. Other minor classifi-
cations, which would yield still further layers of subdivi-
sion, are omitted from this description.

1.1. Independent versus dependent. Features which
distinguish independent clauses from dependent clauses are:
(1) An independent clause may occur as a complete sentence,
whereas a dependent clause may never occur alone but must
always occur with an independent clause. (2) Within the
predicate margins of each clause markers occur which dif-
ferentiate between independent and dependent clauses. The
predicate of independent clauses includes obligatory tense-
aspect and person-subject markers. The predicate of de-
pendent clauses includes neither tense-aspect nor person-
subject markers, but instead indicates either (a) same or
different person-subject in relation to the subject of the in-
dependent predicate with which it is associated in the sen-
tence, or (b) purpose without regard to subject.

Same subject: Verb stem + -ša
Different subject: Verb stem + -hpí
Purpose: Verb stem + -ngapa

A very restricted type of dependent clause, which is not
based on the criteria above, is the relative clause. It is
an independent clause preceded by imasna 'how' and depen-
dent upon a preceding, fully independent clause which con-
tains verbs such as 'see', 'know', 'tell', etc. This clause
is not usually heard in conversations or texts and my re-
cording of it has been in a teaching context only. In check-
ing the examples, the informants would, in each case, not
repeat the clause as I had recorded it, but changed the de-
pendent clause to become the object of the verb which had
occurred in the independent clause. yačanči imasna buli-
var sucrindi ispañakunata binsirkű 'we know that Bolivar
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with Sucre the Spanish beat' -- builvar sucrindi ispáñaku-nata binsiškata yačandì 'Bolivar with Sucre the Spanish beat we know'.

1.2. Declarative versus interrogative versus imperative. Independent clause types are distinguished from one another by the verb margins. In declarative and interrogative clauses, the margins include obligatory separate tense-aspect and person-subject markers. In imperative clauses, both imperative aspect and person-subject are indicated by a special portmanteau list of imperative person markers. Interrogative clauses in contrast with declarative and imperative clauses, obligatorily include one of a list of interrogative markers which may be divided into two types: (1) a list of interrogative words such as pita 'who', maykanda 'which', etc.; and (2) the bound morpheme -ku which may occur on any head word of the sentence. Interrogative clauses are actually declarative clauses with the interrogative markers superimposed upon them. They are analyzed here as a separate clause type rather than as an expansion of the declarative clause type because of their occurrence in the question-response situation where a declarative clause would not ordinarily occur.

1.3. Intransitive versus transitive. Every clause, dependent or independent, must be further classified as intransitive or transitive. This distinction is based on the minimal construction of the clause, thus contrasting with the distinction between independent clause types in 1.2. which is based on the margin of the verb. The construction of the clause channels all verbs into one of two verb lists: intransitive or transitive.

In intransitive clauses the object is obligatorily absent; whereas transitive clauses include an obligatory direct object. Transitive clauses imply an object which must be ex-
pressed either in the nucleus of the clause or in the immediate environment, linguistic or nonlinguistic.

Chart 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Types</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>+Intr. Decl., Ptdocl., intr., v_x</td>
<td>+Orn., Tr. Decl., Ptdocl., tr., v_x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>+Intr. Inter., inter., word</td>
<td>+Intr. Inter., inter., word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration</td>
<td>+Intr. Inter., Cor., Baselo, intr., ocl.</td>
<td>+Tr. Inter., Cor., Baselo, tr., ocl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>+Intr. Imp., Primp., intr., v_x</td>
<td>+Orn., Tr. Imp., Primp., tr., v_x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dependent           |              |            |
| +Intr. Dep., Ptdep., intr., v_x | +Orn., Tr. Dep., Ptdep., tr., v_x |

2. **Major parts of clause.** Each clause contains a predicate which includes not only the verb as head of the verb phrase but its modifiers also. The object may also be composed of more than a single word. In this section each
of these major parts of the clause nucleus will be discussed, showing how each part helps identify a particular clause type, and showing some of the expansions within a given phrase.

2.1. Predicate.

2.1.1. Simple predicate constructions. There are no restrictions of occurrence of particular verbs on the basis of which the dependent/independent or the declarative/interrogative/imperative contrasts can be established. This is in contrast to the intransitive/transitive contrast which, among other things, demonstrates mutually exclusive lists of verbs which may function as predicate in each clause type.

Verbs functioning as predicate in a dependent clause occur with -ša suffixed to the stem when the subject of the dependent clause is the same as that of the independent clause. kantaša šamurkanī 'I singing, I came', paktaša lumuta pilarkanī 'I arriving, I dug manioc'. When the subject of the dependent clause is different from the subject of the independent clause, -hpi is suffixed to the verb stem to form the dependent clause predicate. kaparihpi řuka mas karapirkanī 'When (he) shouted, I shouted more', wawata sakihpi wakangami 'If (I) leave the baby, he will cry'.

When -ngapa is suffixed to the verb stem, such a predicate makes no distinction which helps to correlate the subjects in the two clauses. When the subjects of the two clauses are different, an independent subject is usually expressed in the dependent clause. hambita randingapa šamunin 'I come in order to buy medicine', sačama rirka ayčata maskangapa 'He went to the jungle in order to hunt meat', pay rangapa sakirirkanin 'I stayed so he could go', kulata randirkanin paykuna uplyangapin 'I bought the Colas for them to drink'.

In contrast to verbs which function as predicates in
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dependent clauses, verbs which function as predicates in independent clauses occur with obligatory person-subject and tense-aspect markers. The person-subject markers -ni '1st sing.', -ngi '2nd sing.', -n '3rd sing. present tense', -nči '1st pl.', -ngiči '2nd pl.', -mu- '3rd pl.' help to identify declarative and interrogative clauses. The obligatory tense-aspect markers are -rka 'past tense', -# 'present tense', and -ška 'completive aspect'. First and third singular future person-subject markers are -ša '1st sing.' and -nga '3rd sing.' Second singular and all plural future person-subject markers are the same as those used in all other tenses.

In addition to the endings listed above, the interrogative clause is identified by one of two classes of interrogative-clause markers. For a clause which requires a yes-or-no answer, the interrogative marker consists of the morpheme -ču suffixed to any head word on which the center of attention in the clause is being focused. kayá ringiču 'Are you going tomorrow?', kayaču ringi 'Is it tomorrow that you go?', kanču ringi 'Are you the one who is going?', kan ringiču 'Are you going (instead of staying)?'. For a clause which requires other than a yes-or-no answer an interrogative word or expression suffixed by -ta introduces the interrogative clause and constitutes the interrogative marker. maymata rihungi 'Where are you going?', imapata kasna ranurka 'Why did they do that?', pipata čayta randihungi 'For whom are you buying that?'.

Predicates of imperative clauses are identified by occurrence of verbs having a special list of imperative person-subject markers suffixed to the verb stem but with very few intermediary optional suffixes included. Imperative person-subject markers are -y '2nd sing.', -yči '2nd pl.', -ču '3rd person', and -šun '1st pl.'. puñuy 'sleep!', wasima
2.1.2. **Expanded predicate constructions.** Expansions of the verb functioning as predicate in any clause type include optional phrase-level constructions having such semantic components as: intensity, sinči 'hard', ukta 'fast', etc.; similarity, kasna 'like this', šina 'thus', etc.; negation, mana 'no, not', ama 'don't' (occurs with imperative clauses only, and requires an obligatory -ču suffixed to the head verb); onomatopoetic modification, tas 'fast', hanga hanga 'limping', etc. These optional constructions may occur singly or in combinations, preceding the predicate-functioning verb. Illustrations: ukta šamurkani 'I came fast', mas sinčita kaparirkani 'I called louder', pulūk pulūk pulūk timbun 'It boils (making this sound)', yapa alinlYa hanga hanga purimun 'He comes walking with a slow limp'.

2.2. **Direct object.** The direct object which identifies transitive clauses may be manifested by a pronoun or noun suffixed by -ta. A noun in any position may be preceded by one or more modifiers which, in their most frequent order, are: specifier, kay 'this', čay 'that', ſukapa 'my', etc.; number, šuk 'one, another', aška 'many', etc.; color, yana 'black', puka 'red', etc.; or another noun, luluš kara 'eggshell', siriš limon 'the lemon which is lying (there)'. The object expression most frequently occurs preceding the verb. Čunga wagrata šarin 'He has ten cows', iškay ičilYa kaspita apamurka 'He brought two small sticks', paypa yapa hatun kanuwata šuwarka 'She stole his very large canoe'.

3. **Expansions.** Each clause type may be expanded by subject, time and location as optional components; the im-
perative clause, however, occurs with very few expansions. Of 400 clauses studied, the clause nuclei occurred alone in 171; 179 occurred with the clause nucleus plus one expansion; 46 occurred with the nucleus plus two expansions; and only four included all the possible expansions. Although the order of occurrence varied for these different components, the most frequent order is subject, time, location, nucleus (i.e. predicate or expanded predicate). Each of the expansions will be discussed separately in this section.

3.1. Subject. As in the object (see 2.2.) the subject may be expressed by a pronoun or a head noun preceded by one or more modifiers. The subject is identified not by any particular suffix but by position, context and the personal endings of the verb. iškay čurungu wawa kışpinurka 'Two monkey babies escaped', šuka aparšani 'I took it', čay šuk hatun yana sirih ałyku kaniwarka 'That big black dog lying there hit me', mikuš pasaška 'Eating is finished'.

3.2. Time. Time is expressed by temporals kayna 'yesterday', čišita 'afternoon'; or by temporal expressions made up of two temporals kaya čišita 'tomorrow afternoon', tuta punčayanata 'at early daybreak'; or by temporals formed by a demonstrative pronoun or a derived noun plus waša 'after, later, behind'. This latter expression is often used as a connector between sentences. kayna čišita paypa wasimanda šamurka 'Yesterday afternoon he came from his house', kuna rintmi 'I'm going now', humuta takarka. takaška waša aswata mangapi hundaširka. čay waša upir-kanč. 'She mashed the manioc. After mashing it she filled the container with manioc. Then we drank it.'

3.3. Location. Location is expressed by demonstrative adjectives, nouns or noun phrases with the locational markers -pi 'in', -ma 'to', -manda 'from', suffixed to the head word.
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kaypi ëuray 'Put it here!', karu urku partima pušarka 'To
the far hill place he took him!', ñukanëi pušuna wasipi pak-
tamurkanëi 'At our sleeping house we arrived', yakumanda
šamuška 'He has come from the water'.

3.4. Manner. Manner is expressed by the manner
marker -wa suffixed to nouns or noun phrases. paypa
ilëpapawa wančirkani 'I killed (it) with his gun,' rukukanawa
rinurka 'They went with the older people', čai hatun kas-
piwa wahtay 'Hit (it) with that big stick!'

3.5. Second object. In clauses which might be con-
sidered referent or benefactive because of the occurrence
of an indirect object or a benefactive have been set up here
as a second object expansion due to the identical phonologi-
cal form which occurs on both the object, the referent and
the benefactive. The -ta object marker, when identifying
the referent, may occasionally be substituted for -ma of
the locationals. imapata čay mušuh kilykata rikucirkangí
wawakunata 'Why did you show the new book to the chil-
dren?', rirkani hambita randingapa wawapaha 'I went to
buy medicine for the child'.

4. Illustrations. In this section examples are given of
each of the varied clause types, in both minimal and expand-
ed constructions. When the dependent clause is in focus it
is underlined.

4.1. Dependent clauses.

4.1.1. Dependent intransitive clause. Minimal: čim-
baša runata makanata munarka 'Crossing over he wanted to
hit the man', pak tamušpi ninawata apičirkangí 'When he ar-
rived we started the fire'. Expanded: šukma wamburiša
mana tigrarka 'Flying to another, he didn’t return', čay
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waša kasna tukuhpi hatun Yaktapi pay wañurka 'Then, that happening, in the big town he died', pay kaya avionbi šamungapa pagarkani 'So he could come in the airplane tomorrow, I paid'.

4.1.2. Dependent transitive clause. Minimal: lumuta čuraša čaparkani 'Putting the manloc down, I waited', wa-wata tupahpi kušiyarkani 'When he found the child I was happy', nikuñgapa randirkani 'I bought it in order to eat it'. Expanded: mama wašuška waša anahma pušahpi čaypi kaw-sarka 'After his mother died he took him upriver and there he lived', pilashka waša ašangapi čuraša apamurkanı 'After harvesting it, putting it in the basket, I brought it', apamih-pi mama šigramanda ayčata Yuhšiša nınapi čuraša rupačin If he brings it, mother taking the meat from the bag, putting it on the fire, she sings it'.

4.2. Independent clauses.

4.2.1. Independent intransitive clauses.

Declarative. Minimal: šayahun I'm standing', ša-muškanı 'We've come', tamyahun It's raining'. Expanded: pay yakupi puhlyan 'He's playing in the water', tukuy uras yapa karuta purinçi 'All the time we walk very far', kaya čišita paypa wasimanda alinľa šamurka 'Yesterday afternoon he came slowly from his house'.

Interrogative with interrogative word. Minimal: may-mata ričhungi 'Where are you going?', imapahta kaparirka 'Why did it cry out?', maykanda wakahun 'Which one is crying?'. Expanded: imahta kuna šitu rinun 'Why are they going at this moment?', maykanda Tenamanda šamurka 'Which one came from Tena?'.

Interrogative with interrogative suffix. Minimal: piliriškašu 'Has it pulled apart?', puhlyangišču 'Are you (pl.) playing?', šamunču 'Is he coming?'. Expanded: kuči wasi-
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manda lyuhšiškašu 'Has the pig left the pen?', kunalYa ćay-
manda šamunglču 'Right now did you come from there?'.

**Imperative.** Minimal: čapay 'Walt!', ukta kalypay
'Run fast!', ama šamuyču 'Don't come!'. Expanded: kayma
šamuy 'Come here!', pahlyama riy 'Go outside!'.

4.2.2. Independent transitive clauses.

**Declarative.** Minimal: unguyta aličin 'It heals the
sickness', yandata čurarka 'He put down the firewood',
palandatas lumutas muyukunatas mikun 'He eats bananas,
manioc and fruits'. Expanded: čay čurikunamanda šułyata
mas yalyl yákirka 'Of all his sons he loved one more than
all', hayakta wawakuna unguskapi uplčinči 'When children
are sick we make them drink bitter medicine', kayna pistapi
paypa wawk id payta wahtarla 'Yesterday on the airstrip his
brother hit him'.

**Interrogative with interrogative word.** Minimal: ima-
tata apamurka 'What did he bring?', pita kay muyuta munan
'Who wants this marble?', ima urasta lyuštirka 'When did
she peel it?'. Expanded: imayta čurarka ŋuka kučilyuta
'Where did he put my knife?', imapata yapa tutamandata
lyuhšinurka 'Why did they leave so early in the morning?'.

**Interrogative with interrogative suffix.** Minimal: ay-
čata tuparkangiču 'Did you find meat?', mangata maylya-
šaču 'Shall I wash the cooking pot?'. Expanded: kuna alYa-
pata alyaču 'Is he digging the dirt now?', kančama lyacapan-
pata warkušaču 'Shall I hang the clothes outside?'. kuna-
lyataču wančirkangči 'Just right now did you kill it?'

**Imperative.** Minimal: kučilyuta apamuy 'Bring the
knife!', wawata kuyučiy 'Swing the baby!', makita ukta
maylay 'Hurry and wash your hands!'. Expanded: kaypi
pitlyči 'You (pl.) cut it here!', kuna urmačiy 'Now drop
it!'.