Subordination strategies in Ashéninka Perené (Arawak) from Central-Eastern Peru

Elena Mihas

Based on extensive fieldwork in Central-Eastern Peru, this paper surveys subordination in Ashéninka Perené, an Amazonian Arawak language. Analyzed within the functional-typological framework which treats subordination as a gradient phenomenon, Ashéninka Perené subordination essentially includes three types of subordinate clauses: (i) finite clauses, linked either asyndetically or by free-standing adverbial subordinators; (ii) finite clauses with a bound dependency marker (i.e., an affixed or cliticizing conjunction); and (iii) clauses which bear special verb marking on the morphosyntactically dependent verb. It is argued here that these subordinate clause types are associated with two major subordination strategies: juxtaposition and nominalization. Juxtaposition is attested with finite clauses, linked either asyndetically or by a (bound) adverbial subordinator which does not alter the structure of the subordinate predicate, whereas morphosyntactically dependent subordinate predicates are typically nominalized. Another common subordination strategy is serialization of verbs.

Keywords: Subordination strategy; Juxtaposition; Nominalization; Serialization; Ashéninka Perené; Arawak

1. Introduction

Speakers of the highly endangered Amazonian language Ashéninka Perené reside in thirty-six communities scattered along the Perené valley of Chanchamayo Province, Departamento Junín in Central-Eastern Peru.[1] When designating their ethnic affiliation, speakers call themselves *ashaninka* 'our fellowman'*, katonkosatzi* 'a person from upriver', or *parenisatzi* 'a river-dweller'. Recent field research has revealed that there are approximately 1,000 speakers left; from these, a little over three hundred people have full communicative proficiency whereas the rest are either semi- or passive speakers who do not use the language as a means of daily communication. The language is closely related to and has various degrees of mutual intelligibility with Kakinte and other Ashéninka/Asháninka varieties,

 (received June 2012)

notably Ashéninka Pichis, Ashéninka Pajonal, Ashéninka Ucayali, Ashéninka Apurucayali, and Asháninka Tambo-Ene, all of which constitute the Northern branch of the Kampan (Campa) subgrouping of Arawak (Michael 2008: 218). Apart from distinctive lexicons, the languages can be distinguished based on different systems of nominal classification, distinctive sets of applicative, augmentative and diminutive morphemes, ideophonic vocabulary, etc.

Data for this research come from the 2008-2011 field trips to the Chanchamayo Province of Peru, conducted as part of the Ashéninka Perené language documentation project. The collected materials include over twenty hours of my audio and video recordings of conversations, narratives, arguments, discussions, public speeches, songs, jokes, and incantations and over five hours of audio and video recordings by three primary language consultants, with approximately a third of all collected materials transcribed and translated.

This paper aims to contribute to the syntactic description of the Northern Kampan languages by providing a detailed account of Ashéninka Perené subordination, described in terms of gradience rather than in terms of the binary opposition between coordination and subordination (Lehmann 1988: 189; Payne 1997: 307; Thompson et al. 2007: 238). SUBORDINATION is treated here on the basis of

> a set of mutually independent and combinable features, which form a more or less articulated continuum. Each clause linkage type may be more or less coordinate-like or subordinate-like depending on the parameter taken into account. (Cristofaro 2003: 22-23)

In this analysis, the following criterial characteristics of subordination are considered, in line with van Gijn et al. (2011: 6). First, the traditional parameters of SYNTACTIC EMBEDDEDNESS, when a subordinate clause functions as core argument of a clause (complement clause) or as part of an NP which fills an argument slot (relative clause) (Dixon 2006: 4; see also Lehmann 2004), and MORPHOSYNTACTIC DEPENDENCE, i.e., an inability of the clause to occur in isolation (e.g., Payne 1997: 306; van Valin & La Polla 1997: 449). Apart from formal asymmetry, which differentiates subordination from coordination, this paper takes into account another fundamental criterion, associated with asymmetrical relations on the semantic level. In particular, SEMANTIC DEPENDENCE of the clause under consideration is revealed when reordering of the clauses results in a significant change of meaning of the whole sentence (Blühdorn 2008: 70; Cristofaro 2011: Chapter 126).

While the most subordinate-like clause is embedded and syntactically and semantically dependent, the weakened instances of sub-

ordination are non-embedded clauses and those which structurally resemble independent clauses. For example, the ubiquitous Ashéninka Perené paratactic subordinate clauses, which cover a range of complement, relative, and adverbial relations, are syntactically adjoined and grammatically independent, as in *they inject us with medicine, we die* [when/if/after/ because they inject us with medicine, we die]. Such examples are identified as instances of subordination largely on the basis of semantic analysis. It is argued here that subordination is a gradient category in Ashéninka Perené, the most subordinate-like forms being represented by embedded nominalized relative and complement clauses and less subordinate-like forms by apposed complement and finite adverbial clauses marked by a (bound) subordinator.

Another goal of this paper is to give an overview of Ashéninka Perené SUBORDINATION STRATEGIES. The term 'strategies' is interpreted here in line with Dixon's definition of complementation strategies as being distinct from complement clauses, notably as some sort of grammatical mechanism used to encode the complement clause function, for example, via a serial verb construction strategy, a relative clause strategy, a nominalization strategy, apposition, clause chaining, etc. (2006: 33-40). Within this framework, subordination strategies in Ashéninka Perené are understood as means of encoding subordinate events and fulfilling semantic functions of temporal, purposive, conditional, complement, and other relations. Taking stock of those strategies, this analysis relates them to cross-linguistic studies of subordination patterns in South American native languages. In particular, these studies argue that the most common subordination strategies are (i) grammatically integrated predicative elements such as serial verb constructions and verbal compounds, (ii) combination of [...] finite structures, often with a (bound) dependency marker, and (iii) nominalization (van Gijn et al. 2011: 10).

The paper will proceed as follows: §2 is a typological overview of Ashéninka Perené; §3 provides an outline of complex predicates and clause linking types; §4 discusses subordination strategies, followed by the concluding remarks in §5.

2. Typological overview

The language is highly polysynthetic, incorporating, agglutinating, mainly suffixing, and head-marking. The basic constituent order is VOA and VS but it exhibits fluidity due to pragmatic reasons. Open classes are nouns, verbs and derived adjectives; underived adjectives form a small class of thirteen members.

Verbal categories include number, valence adjusting/changing, manner, direction, degree, aspect, reality status, mood and modality, locality, and tense categories. In addition, there are slots for person and subordination marking, as well as for pragmatic enclitics. Verbs are divided into transitive and intransitive and minimally have a person marker and a reality status suffix (or a stative aspect suffix which is reality status-neutral). There is a group of irregular 'light' verbs which include positive polarity existential/possessive verbs *tzimatsi* and *ainiro* and a negative polarity existential/possessive verb *tekatsi*. The existential copulas *na* 'to be' and *kaari* 'negative existential', copula of naming *pait*, copula of location *saik*, copula of capacity *kara* have limited morphological possibilities in that they don't occur with most verbal categories. The ubiquitous multifunctional verb *kant* 'to happen', 'to do', 'to say', 'to be', 'to be able' is frequently found in the auxiliary function, encoding stative, non-dynamic events.[2]

Verb arguments are commonly encoded by pronominal affixes as well as by demonstratives, personal pronouns, or nouns. Nouns occur infrequently, either to introduce a new referent or to express focus. There is no case marking on core constituents A, S, O; the only peripheral case marker *–ki* has a diffuse locative meaning.[3] Person-encoding prefixes are generally obligatory while suffixes are optional.

The language has a largely nominative-accusative system of grammatical alignment, evidenced by the consistent appearance of personal markers in A/S function to the left of the verb stem and of the arguments in O function in the post-stem slot. The morphological encoding of intransitive subjects may pattern according to ergative/absolutive alignment, when subjects are expressed by O person markers and occupy the post-stem slot on the verb. In such situations, first and second person intransitive subjects receive the coding properties of transitive objects, whereas third person singular actors are encoded by zero, as seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of personal markers.

FUNCTION	1SG	2SG	3SG.m	3SG.N-M	1INCL.PL
A, S	*n(o)-*	*p(i)-*	*i(r)-*	*o(Ø)-*	*a(Ø)-*
O(S)	*-na*	*-mi*	*-ri* (Ø)	*-ro* / *-ni* (Ø)	*-ai*

The intransitive split is basically grammatically conditioned.[4] It is observed with dynamic and non-dynamic verbs, explicitly marked for stativity by suffixes *-atsi~-acha* 'imperfective stativity' or *-aintsi* 'perfective stativity', as seen in (1a). The ergative/ accusative align-

ment also occurs with dynamic verbs marked for perfective aspect by the suffixes *-ak* 'perfective' or *-a(h)* 'terminative /regressive', and with the basic motion verb *ha* 'go' marked by the manner suffix *-ite* 'quickly', as seen in (1b-c), respectively.

(1) a. Saikachana novankoki.
saik-acha-na no-panko-ki
be.at-STAT.IPFV-1SG.O 1SG.POSS-house-LOC
'I am at my house.'
b. Te inyaavakiro iravo, pyaanaka.
te i-ni-av-ak-i-ro ir-avo
NEG.REAL 3M.A-see-DIR-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O 3M.POSS-trail
pi-an-ak-a-Ø
disappear-DIR-PFV-REAL-3.O
'They didn't see it, his trail, he disappeared.'
c. Haitetzi yaminaitero.
ha-ite-tz-i-Ø y-amin-a-it-e-ro
go-quickly-EP-REAL-3.O 3M.A-see-EP-ICPL-IRR-3N-M.O
'They hurried to see it.'

There are two types of predicates, verbal and non-verbal. Non-verbal predicates include predicate nominals and adjectives, used to express equative and attributive relations respectively. In addition, ideophones may function as 'uninflected predicates' carrying a full semantic load (Creissels 1999). Examples of non-verbal predicates are given in (2).

(2) a. Antaro omotonkanive.
antaro o-motonka-ni=ve
big.N-M 3N-M.POSS-whirlpool-POSS=G.FOC
'The whirlpool is really big.'
b. Kyaatsi aahatzi irirori.
kyaatsi aahatzi irirori
mythical.river.creature also he.FOC
'He is a kyaatsi.'
c. Isaikashitapaka, pak pak pak.
i-saik-ashi-t-ap-ak-a pak pak pak
3M.S-be.at-APL.INT-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL IDEO IDEO IDEO
'He was there with the intention to bludgeon people with his club.'

There are participant (agent, object, instrument, and place), state, product, and quality NOMINALIZATIONS. Participant nominalizations in (3) are derived from verbs with the help of the nominalizing/ relativizing suffix *-ri*.

(3) *Participant nominalizations*
a. ar-atsi-ri
fly-STAT.IPFV-NMZ
'flier (who flies)'
b. amet-apint-a-ri
be.accustomed.to-HAB-REAL-NMZ
'custom (what we're accustomed to)'
c. saik-imo-tz-i-ro-ri
be.at-APL.PRES-ER-REAL-3N-M.O-NMZ
'roommate (in whose presence one lives)'
d. a-tsink-ant-a-ro-ri
1PL.A-pound-APL.INS-REAL-3N-M.O-NMZ
'pounding stick (with which we pound it)'
e. n-ov-ant-apint-a-ri
1SG.S-eat-APL.INS-HAB-REAL-NMZ
'dining space (that for eating)'

State nominalizations in (4) are derived from verbs via the suffix *-(i)nka* and are generally marked for possessor, with possessor marking being formally identical to the marking of participants in A/S function on verbs.

(4) *State nominalizations*

a. i-shintsi-nka	b. o-sheni-nka
3M.POSS-be.strong-NMZ	3N-M.POSS-be.same-NMZ
'his strength'	'its sameness'

Product nominalizations in (5a-b), mostly manufactured household items, are formed with the suffix *–mento*. Quality nominalizations in (6a-b) which describe human attributes, e.g., a hard worker, a beauty, a skilled fisherman, etc., are derived from deverbal adjectives or nouns, with the help of the suffixes *-ntzi* (M)*-nto* (N-M) or *-tzinkari* (M) *-tzinkaro* (N-M), showing sensitivity to the referent's gender. The following templates are generally observed in the formation of quality nominalizations.

VERB ROOT+ADJECTIVIZER *-ri*+ EPENTHETIC *-a*+ NMZ *-ntzi /-nto*
NOUN ROOT + NMZ*-ntzi/-nto* OR *-tzinkari/-tzinkaro*
VERB ROOT +APL.INST *-ant* + NMZ *-tzinkari/-tzinkaro*

Nominalizations take the marker of plural number *-paye*, demonstrative-locative enclitics *=ka* 'proximal', *=ra* 'medial', *=nta* 'distal', and can be modified by demonstratives, numerals, and adjectives, e.g., *antaro vatsa-nto* [big flesh-NMZ.N-M] 'a big fatso', *antaro*

n-ov-ant-apint-a-ri [big 1SG.S-eat-APL.INS-EP-HAB-REAL-REL] 'a spacious dining area'.

(5) *Product nominalizations*

a. i-maa-mento	b. ov-ant-a-mento=ra
3M.POSS-sleep-NMZ	kill-APL.INS-EP-NMZ=DEM
'his bed'	'that killing club of hers'

(6) *Quality nominalizations*

a. antavai-ri-a-nto	b. sheri-a-tzinkari-paye=ra
work-ADJ-EP-NMZ.N-M	tabacco-EP-NMZ.M-PL=DEM
'a hard worker'	'those smokers of tabacco'

3. Complex predicates and clause combining

This section provides a general outline of Ashéninka Perené clause combinations. By definition, clause combining involves serialization (which is the tightest form of 'grammatical integration' when serialized verbs are fused into a monopredicative unit; Payne 1997: 307), subordination, where one clause shows some sort of dependency on another clause, and coordination, characterized by lack of a dependency relation between the two elements (Haspelmath 2007: 5).[5]

Single, multi-verb predicates in Ashéninka Perené are represented by serial verb constructions (SVCs). Following Aikhenvald's diagnostics (2006: 1), the fully inflected verbs typically share mood and reality status values, have co-referential subjects and may share other argument(s), lack markers of clausal linkage or syntactic dependence, describe a single, often culturally recognized event, and form a single prosodic unit. Serial verbs are neither members of verb compounds nor coordinands (Payne 1997: 307). Note that morphological compounding in Ashéninka Perené includes both VERB-NOUN (noun-incorporation) combination and VERB-VERB compounding.

Clues that we are not dealing with coordination but rather with a complex predicate are signaled by a number of formal constraints attested with serial verb constructions. First, all components of SVCs, as shown in (7a-c), are required to share subjects. Also, when a SVC is a predicate of the subordinate condition clause, as seen in (7a), only one verb in this complex structure is marked by the bound subordinator =*rika* 'if'. In addition, when occurring with the first person cohortative marker *tsame* 'let's do it', each verb component in (7b) falls within the scope of this morpheme. In a similar vein, only one negator *te* 'negative realis' is used in the serial verb construction in (7c).

Another important clue which makes serialization distinctive is its 'single-event' packaging function (Aikhenvald 2006: 10). As (7) demonstrates, a conventionalized way of describing foraging, e.g., going fishing, hunting, gathering nuts, fruit or mushrooms, and even stalking humans, is expressed by a combination of GO+ LOOK.FOR+ VERB of fishing/hunting/gathering. In summary, similarly to paratactic subordinate clauses in which the component verb phrases can function in isolation, each verb in a serial verb construction can also be integrated into discourse. However, in contradistinction to paratactic verb components, each representing a separate assertion, serial constructions contain just one assertion (Noonan 2007: 88). Serialization as a subordination strategy is discussed at length in §4.1.

(7) a. Impyaashitya, ihaterika eentsi inkinavaite yaminavaite kito.
i-N-pi-ashi-t-ia [i-ha-t-e=rika eentsi
3M.S-IRR-disappear-APL.INT-EP-IRR 3M.S-go-EP-IRR=COND child
i-N-kin-a-vai-t-e y-amin-a-vai-t-e] kito
3M.S-IRR-walk-EP-DUR-EP-IRR 3M.S-look.for-EP-DUR-EP-IRR shrimp
'If the child goes [to the river] to catch shrimp, he will disappear.'

b. Tsame ahatapainte aminaite ankonataite shiva.
tsame [a-ha-t-apaint-e amin-a-it-e
let's.do.it 1PL.S-go-EP-ONCE-IRR look.for-EP-ICPL-IRR
a-N-konat-a-it-e] shiva
1PL.S-IRR-poison-EP-ICPL-IRR fish.sp.
'Let's go and stupefy fish shiva with vegetal poison konyapi.'

c. Te ihate yaminavaite.
te [i-ha-t-e y-amin-a-vai-t-e]
NEG.REAL 3M.S-go-EP-IRR 3M.S-look.for-EP-DUR-EP-IRR
'He didn't go [to the jungle] to look for food.'

As seen in Table 2, there are two basic types of clause linkage in Ashéninka Perené, coordination and subordination, the latter broadly divided into embedded and non-embedded instances of subordination (cf. Dixon 2006: 2-3; Matthiessen & Thompson 1988: 317; Thompson et al. 2007: 238). COORDINATION is realized either as asyndetic or syndetic juxtaposition of clauses, the latter linked with preposive coordinators *iro*/*iroma* 'but', 'in contrast', *kantzimaitacha* 'nevertheless', *terika* 'if not', 'or'. The ordering of coordinands (or conjuncts) is described as *A co-B*, where *A* and *B* are coordinands and *co-* stands for the coordinating connective (Haspelmath 2007: 6). Examples of coordinated clauses are given in (8a-c).

(8) a. Yaapaki kompiroshi, yantaki ivankoshi.
y-a-ap-ak-i kompiro-shi y-ant-ak-i
3M.S-take-DIR-PFV-REAL palm.species-leaf 3M.S-make-PFV-REAL
i-panko-shi
3M.POSS-house-leaf
'He took palm leaves and made a hunting shack.'

b. Irotaki yameetantari, iro itsonkakeri maaroni.
irotaki y-amee-t-ant-a-ri iro
3M.FOC 3M.A-cut-EP-APL.INS-REAL-3M.O but
i-tsonk-ak-i-ri maaroni
3M.A-finish-PFV-REAL-3M.O all
'With this he cut his hair, but he finished it all [cut his hair completely].'

c. Okantaka aka osaiki, otashitakotziro oshitovite, kantzimaitacha kamaki.
okantaka aka o-saik-i o-tashi-t-ako-tz-i-ro
3N-M.S.AUX here 3N-M.S-be.at-REAL 3N-M.A-roast-EP-G.APL-EP-REAL-3N-M.O
kantzimaitacha kam-ak-i-Ø
nevertheless die-PFV-REAL-3.O
'She was sitting here and roasting her mushrooms, nevertheless she was dead.'

As shown in Table 2, Ashéninka Perené subordinate clauses are broadly divided into non-embedded and embedded types. NON-EMBEDDED subordinate clauses include, on the one hand, paratactic complement, relative, and some adverbial clauses, and on the other, adverbial clauses, modifying the main clause as a whole, without being its constituent, whose semantic relation to the main clause is expressed by a (bound) subordinator. Non-embedded subordinate clauses, linked by the juxtaposition strategy, either bear a formally expressed bound subordinator on the verb predicate or remain formally unmarked. The label 'unmarked' is sometimes used for juxtaposed subordinate clauses, characterized by the absence of different or reduced marking on predicates and by syntactic independence of the clauses (e.g., Danielsen 2011:86-87). Alternatively, such clauses are said to be in apposition or linked by the paratactic strategy (Dixon 2006: 38). The terms 'paratactic' or 'apposed' are preferred in this analysis due to their notional transparency.[6]

Paratactic subordinate constructions are used to express causal, consequence, relative, and complement relations as well as events occurring in succession or happening at the same time. Examples of the paratactic subordination strategy, fulfilling temporal succession

and complement functions, are given in (9a-b), respectively. The meaning of the semantic relation of one clause to another in (9a) can range from temporal overlap (‘*when they inject us*’), to temporal sequencing (‘*they inject us, then we die*), to condition (‘*if they inject us*’), to cause (‘*because they inject us’*).

(9) a. Isatakoitakai, kamanakai.
i-sat-ako-it-ak-ai kam-an-ak-ai
3M.A-poke-G.APL-ICPL-PFV-1PL.O die-DIR-PFV-1PL.O
‘When they inject us [with western medicine], we die.’

b. Okimatziri ikaimi hoo, hoo.
o-kim-atz-i-ri i-kaim-i hoo hoo
3N-M.A-hear-PROG-REAL-3M.O 3M.S-call.out-REAL IDEO IDEO
‘She heard him call out *hoo hoo*.’

Clause combinations of two finite structures, one of which carries a bound subordinator on the verb, are found with adverbial relations of locality, purpose, result, temporal overlap, possible condition, counterfactual condition, and undesirable possible consequence. These semantic relations are specified on the verbal predicates by mood or subordination enclitics. Examples of subordinate clauses with an overtly expressed bound subordinator are shown in (10a-b), encoding adverbial relations of locality (by the locality enclitic *=nta*) and result (by the combination of the applicative of instrument/reason *-ant* and the relativizer *-ri*), respectively. An overview of the juxtaposition subordination strategy which involves combinations of finite verbal structures is presented in §4.2.

(10) a. Ari ivaryantzi ironyaaka, okanta okovenkatzinta.
ari i-varyant-tz-i okanta o-kovenka-tz-i=nta
PP 3M.S-make.fall-EP-REAL 3N-M.S.AUX 3N-M.S-danger-EP-REAL=ADV.LOC
‘He made people fall where it was dangerous.’

b. Te inintahe ashimatahya, irotaki avantariri maaroni ipamantaitziri.
te i-nint-ah-e a-shima-t-ah-ia
NEG.REAL 3M.S-want-REGR-IRR 1PL.S-fish-EP-REGR-IRR
irotaki a-v-ant-a-ri-ri maaroni
3N-M.FOC 1PL.A-eat-APL.REAS-REAL-3M.O-REL all
i-pamant-ai-tz-i-ri
3M.A-buy-IMP.P-EP-REAL-3M.O
‘They don’t want us to fish [in the river], that’s why everything we eat is bought [in a store].’

EMBEDDED clauses are identified as such on the basis of the traditional morphosyntactic criteria: dependency (that is, impossibility for a clause to occur in isolation) and embedding (that is, a clause is functioning as a constituent of another clause). Embedded clauses in Table 2 are represented by the relative clause, with the function of a syntactic modifier of an NP which fills an argument slot in a clause (Dixon 2010: 314), and by the complement clause which functions as an argument of the main clause verb (Noonan 2007: 52). Embedded relative clauses are marked by the nominalizing/relativizing suffixes *-ri* or *-ni* on the dependent verb. The nominalizer *-ri* also marks predicates of embedded complement clauses introduced by the interrogative quantifier *tsika ikaratzi*/*okaratzi* 'how much/many' and the interrogative manner form *tsika ikanta*/*okanta* (or *paita)* 'how', combined with the instrumental/reason applicative suffix *-ant.* Examples of embedded relative and complement clauses are seen in (11a-b) and (11c), respectively. Nominalization as a subordination strategy is dealt with in §4.3.

(11) a. Kaminkaraiyini saikatsiri anta henoki anyaatsi irirori.
kaminkaraiyeni [saik-atsi-ri anta henoki]$_{RC}$
dead.PL be.at-STAT.IPFV-REL there on.top
anyaa-atsi-Ø irirori
be.alive-STAT.IPFV-3M.O he.FOC
'Dead people, who are up there, they are alive.'

b. Ontzimatye ankaimakanteri iriri paitarika yantapainteri.
ontzimatye a-N-kaim-ak-ant-e-ri
be.necessary 1PL.A-call.out-APL.COM-SOC-APL.REAS-IRR-3M.O
iriri paita=rika [y-ant-apaint-e-ri]
his.father what=COND 3M.S-do-once-IRR-REL
'We will have to inform his father [on the phone] about whatever [mischief] that he [the child] will commit.'

c. Noyotziro tsika okanta onyaatsatantyaari.
no-yo-tz-i-ro [tsika okanta o-nyaatsa-t-ant-ia-ri]
1SG.A-know-EP-REAL-3N-M.O WH 3N-M.S.AUX 3N-M.S-play-EP-APL.REAS-IRR-REL
'I know how females play volleyball.'

Table 2. Summary of clause linking types.

SYNTACTIC CONNECTION		SEMANTIC LINKING	MARKER OF CLAUSE LINKING
COORDINATION		addition	apposition
		contrast	*iro(ma)* 'but' *kantzimaitacha* 'nevertheless
		disjunction	*terika* 'or'
SUBORDINATION NON-EMBEDDED	formally unmarked on the verb predicate	complement	apposition
		relative	apposition
		temporal/condition/ cause	apposition
		temporal (brief) overlap/ condition	*aririka* / *arika* 'if, when'
		negated possible condition	*airorika* 'if not'
		temporal (prolonged) overlap	*ovakera* 'when'
		temporal (prolonged) overlap /cause	*o* / *ikanta* 'in the meantime', 'because'
		temporal anteriority	*tekira* 'before' *irohatzi* 'until'
		cause	*tema* / *kama* 'because'
		purpose	*onkantya* 'so that' *-ashi* MC 'with the intent to'
	formally marked on the verb predicate	purpose	*-ant …-ri* 'in order to'
		result	*iro(taki)* + *-ant…-ri* 'that's why'
		locality	*=ka, =ra,=nta* 'where'
		temporal overlap	*=ra* 'when'
		possible condition	*=rika* 'if'
		counterfactual condition	*=mi*
		undesirable possible consequence	*=kari* 'lest'
EMBEDDED		relative	*-ri* / *-ni*
		complement	*-ant …-ri*

4. Subordination strategies

This section focuses on subordination strategies in Ashéninka Perené.[7] In this presentation, three subordination strategies are distinguished: (i) serialization, (ii) clause combinations of finite structures, paired with a bound or free subordinator, and (iii) nominalization.

4.1. Serialization strategy

As pointed out in §3, verb serialization is a common subordination strategy in Ashéninka Perené. A distinctive feature of Ashéninka Perené SVCs is that they are largely asymmetrical, that is one verb comes from an open class ('major' verb) and another from a closed class ('minor' verb) (Aikhenvald 2006: 21). The verbs tend to occur in the fixed order, first 'minor' V_1, then 'major' verb(s) V_{2+} $V_{3....}$However, there are two attested instances of symmetrical serial verb constructions found with the speaking verb *kant* 'say' and the motion verbs *ha* 'go' and *kin~ken* 'pass', which show a propensity for combining with the members of their own class. Serial verbs tend to be adjacent, although the shared argument in the subject function may intervene. 'Minor' verbs occur in the following situations types:

(i) direction (motion verbs *ha* 'go', *kin* 'walk', 'pass');
(ii) aspect (phasal verbs *int* 'begin', *tsonk* 'stop altogether', *apii* 'repeat'; and imperfective aspect verb *kant* 'be');
(iii) comparison (comparative verb *kimi* 'resemble', 'be like')
(iv) association (comitative verb *tsipa* 'accompany');
(v) utterance verb *kant* 'say'.

Based on the collected corpus, complement and purpose functions are frequently realized via serialization of verbs. Complementation strategy, employed by phasal, comparative, and motion verbs, is a typical strategy for 'secondary' verbs, providing semantic specification of a 'primary' verb which refers directly to an activity or state (Dixon 2006: 9-14; 2010: 399). The first-slot phasal verbs *tsonk* 'reach an endpoint of an action', 'stop altogether' and *int* 'begin' in two-verb serialized sequences in (12) are used to encode the complement function.

(12) a. Otsonka okaatanakiro iraanive.
o-tsonk-a o-kaa-t-an-ak-i-ro
3N-M.S-stop-REAL 3N-M.A-bathe-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O
iraa-ni=ve
her.blood-POSS=G.FOC
'The blood stopped bathing her [body].'

b. Nintakiro nokotsitakiro.
n-int-ak-i-ro no-kotsi-t-ak-i-ro
1SG.A-begin-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O 1SG.A-cook-EP-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O
'I began cooking it.'

Another distinct asymmetrical SVC variety involves the comparison verb *kimi* 'resemble', 'be like' which takes a complementation strategy, as illustrated by (13). The comparison verb *kimi* 'be like' shows signs of morphological irregularity, frequently found without subject participant marker. This tendency is also observed with phasal and other 'minor' verbs.

(13) a. Kimitaka ashitsatantapiintariranki nairotsa.
kimi-t-ak-a a-shitsa-t-ant-apiint-a-ri=ranki
be.like-EP-PFV-REAL 1PL.A-vine-EP-APL.INS-HAB-REAL-3M.O=PST
nairotsa
nylon.thread
'They resemble [those] with which we used to make nylon threads.'

b. Ikimitari isatekayetakari.
i-kimi-t-a-ri i-satek-a-ye-t-ak-a-ri
3M.A-be.like-EP-REAL-3M.O 3M.A-place.in-EP-DISTR-EP-PFV-REAL-3M.O
'They resembled the ones they put inside it [the cave].'

Serialized predicates with the deictic path verb *ha* 'go' and some other motion verbs such as *anii* 'walk', 'go down', *ken~kin* 'pass' take a purposive complementation strategy, as seen in (14).

(14) a. Haitetzi isaikashivaitzi.
ha-ite-tz-i-Ø i-saik-ashi-vai-tz-i
go-quickly-EP-REAL-3.O 3M.S-be.at-APL.INT-DUR-EP-REAL
'He went to set traps for the animals.'

b. Ohatatzi oshimata.
o-ha-t-atz-i o-shima-t-a
3N-M.S-go-EP-PROG-REAL 3N-M.S-fish-EP-REAL
'She went to fish.'

c. Nohateta nonyaakiterota nanaini.
no-ha-t-e=ta no-ni-ak-it-e-ro=ta nanaini
1SG.S-go-EP-IRR=OPT 1SG.A-see-PFV-ICPL-IRR-3N-M.O=OPT 1SG.POSS.aunt
'I wish to go and see my aunt.'

In addition, the basic motion deitic path verbs *ha* 'go' in (15a), and *kin~ken* 'pass' in (15b) are found in symmetrical 'manner' SVCs, with the leftmost verb expressing a particular manner of motion, e.g., 'fly' or 'run', and the rightmost verb having a directional sense of moving away from the deictic center.

(15) a. Aranaki haitetzi.
ar-an-ak-i-Ø ha-ite-tz-i-Ø
fly-DIR-PFV-REAL-3.O go-quickly-EP-REAL-3.O
'She flew away [she went away flying].'

b. Shiyanaka ikinanaki ivankoki.
shiy-an-ak-a-Ø i-kin-an-ak-i i-panko-ki
run-DIR-PFV-REAL-3.O 3M.S-pass-DIR-PFV-REAL 3M.POSS-house-LOC
'He ran away in the direction of his house [he went away running].'

In a similar vein, the basic utterance verb *kant* 'say' in (16a), expressing generic verbal action, follows another utterance verb with more specific semantics. This semantic interpretation is suggestive of a manner serial verb construction. Language consultants translate such two-member utterance verb structures as 'he said responding' or 'she said calling out', as if describing "the way in which the action of the other verb is performed" (Aikhenvald 2006: 29). The aspect verb *kant* 'be' fulfills the grammatical function of an imperfective auxiliary when found with stative verbs derived from nouns or adjectives, as well as with activity verbs, as seen in (16b-c), respectively. The comitative verb *tsipa* 'accompany' in (16d) occupies the second verb slot and also functions as a grammatical device, a sort of valence-increasing sociative-comitative marker.

(16) a. Yakanakiro ikantzi: "He, ari nopoki."
y-ak-an-ak-i-ro i-kant-tz-i he ari
3M.A-respond-DIR-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O 3M.S-say-EP-REAL yes PP
no-pok-i
1SG.S-come-REAL
'He responded: "Yes, that I have arrived is the case."

b. Okanta pontsotapaka.
okanta pontso-t-ap-ak-a
3N-M.S.AUX tree.stump-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL
'It has a rounded top (the hill does not have a sharp apex).'

c. Nokanta nantziro ejercicio.
nokanta n-ant-tz-i-ro ejercicio
1SG.S.AUX 1SG.A-make-EP-REAL-3N-M.O exercise
'I kept doing my exercises.'

d. Isaiki itsipataro iina.
i-saik-i i-tsipa-t-a-ro i-ina
3M.S-be.at-REAL 3M.A-join-EP-REAL-3N-M.O 3N-M.POSS-wife
'He lived with his wife.'

4.2. Juxtaposition subordination strategy

This section deals with less subordinate-like, intermediate subordination types. In particular, juxtaposed syndetically and asyndetically linked subordinate clauses are discussed in §4.2.1, whereas the juxtaposition subordination strategy involving combinations of finite structures linked by a bound subordinator (i.e., by an affixed or criticized conjunction) is presented in §4.2.2.

4.2.1. Juxtaposition subordination strategy: asyndetic and syndetic clause linking

Most of Asháninka Perené non-embedded subordinate clauses resemble main clauses since they do not display morphosyntactic signs of dependency which is signaled by special verb forms, not used in independent clauses. Such special verb forms would involve either lack of or reduced verbal categorical distinctions in person or TAM marking, or special marking, not allowed in independent clauses, e.g., nominal or adjectival case or gender agreement marking, special tense, aspect, or mood markers (Cristofaro 2003: 54-55). Nonetheless, the clues that this is clausal subordination usually include the absence of a pause on the clause boundary and articulation of the clauses as one intonational unit (Aikhenvald 2009: 386). Furthermore, this presentation also considers the functional semantic treatment of subordination which focuses on semantic linkages between clauses, in line with Dixon & Aikhenvald (2009) and Cristofaro (2011). The semantically asymmetrical connection of the subordinate clause to the main clause is generally reflected in a situation when "information in a subordinate clause is often placed in the background with respect to the superordinate clause" (Quirk et al. 1985: 919).

The juxtaposition subordination strategy subsumes two subtypes, asyndetic (i.e., the joining together of syntactic units without a free conjunction) and syndetic (i.e., the joining together of syntactic units with a free conjunction) patterns. (In scholarship, the label 'paratactic' is often used in place of 'asyndetic'; both terms are adopted in this presentation.) The paratactic strategy covers a range of complement, relative, and adverbial relations in Asháninka Perené. The paratactic complementation strategy is the device *par excellence* for fulfilling a complement function, known to tendentially encode 'realized' events and states (or facts) (Noonan 2007:117). In Asháninka Perené, this strategy is used with both factual, as seen in (17a), and potential events, as shown in (17b-c). Examples in (17) demonstrate the symmetrical structure of the apposed finite clauses, with no sign

of morphosyntactic dependency marking on the complement clause predicate, each clause being able to stand on its own. Example (17b) illustrate a general pattern of signaling the complement relation on the main clause predicate by the 3 person non-masculine person marker *-ro*.

(17) a. Ikimatziro okaimaki.
i-kim-atz-i-ro [o-kaim-ak-i]
3M.A-hear-PROG-REAL-3N-M.O 3N-M.S-call.out-PFV-REAL
'He heard her call out.'

b. Osheki inevetaro ishimatya tsiteni.
osheki i-neve-t-a-ro [i-shima-t-ia tsiteni]
much 3M.A-like-EP-REAL-3N-M.O 3M.S-fish-EP-IRR night
'He liked a lot to fish at night.'

c. Nonintzi noyotakaimi.
no-nint-tz-i [no-yo-t-ak-a-e-mi]
1SG.S-want-EP-REAL 1SG.A-know-EP-APL.COM-SOC-REGR-IRR-2O
'I want you to learn.'

Complement clauses generally follow the main clause verb, occupying the O argument slot. As far as the subject function is concerned, it is attested with the intransitive polarity verbs *ari*/*aritaki* 'be the case', *kaari* 'be not the case', *aritapaki* 'be enough', and evaluative verbs *kameetsataki* 'be good' and *te onkameetsataki* 'be bad' (see Mihas (2010a: 235-241) for a detailed discussion of these verbs). Only realis (factual) complement clauses, found with verbs of thinking (e.g., *shiyakant* 'imagine', *nyaahant* 'realize', *kinkishiri* 'believe', 'think'), utterance (e.g., *kant* 'say') and emotion (e.g., *tsarov* 'fear'), can be negated. The negative copula verb *kaari* is used to negate non-verbal predicates, as seen in (18a), whereas the negative particle *te* negates verbal predicates, as shown in (18b).

(18) a. Nokinkishiryaka kaari aviroka.
no-kinkishiri-ak-a [kaari aviroka]
1SG.S-think-PFV-REAL NEG.COP you
'I thought it wasn't you.'

b. Nonyaahantzi te pimpoke.
no-nyaahant-tz-i [te pi-N-pok-e]
1SG.S-realize-EP-REAL NEG.REAL 2S-IRR-come-IRR
'I realized you hadn't come.'

Apart from the nominalization strategy (which will be addressed in §4.3), the paratactic strategy is commonly employed to express relativization in Ashéninka Perené. The paratactic relativization strategy, well-attested across languages (Comrie & Kuteva 2005: 212; 2011a: Chapter 122), is utilized in particular formal environments such as *ai*-marked impersonal passive constructions, *te*-negated relative clauses, and *tsika*-initial clauses which relativize locative obliques, as shown in (19a-c), respectively. Example (19c) is an instance of double relativization with two strategies in effect, the paratactic and the nominalizing ones. In particular, the predicate *tsikarika isaiki* 'wherever they were living' refers to the shared locative participant, indexed on the main clause verb by the 3 person masculine suffix *-ri*, whereas the NP head *iyoka* 'these' within the *tsikarika*-marked relative clause is specified by the co-referential *ovantacharika* 'these [folks] who killed [people]'.

(19) a. Tzimatsi yamaitakiro ashaninka.
tzimatsi [y-am-ai-t-ak-i-ro ashaninka]
EXIST 3M.A-bring-IMP.P-EP-PRF-REAL-3N-M.O our.fellowman
'There is somebody whom they brought, a woman.'

b. Novaki aparoni, te ishiyari pashinipaye.
n-ov-ak-i aparoni [te i-shiy-a-ri
1SG.S-kill-PRF-REAL one NEG.REAL 3M.A-resemble-REAL-3M.O
pashini-paye
other-PL
'I killed someone who does not resemble others.'

c. Te noyotakotairi tsikarika isaiki iyoka ovantacharika.
te no-yo-t-ako-t-a-e-ri [[tsika=rika
NEG.REAL 1SG.A-know-EP-G.APL-EP-REGR-IRR-3M.O where=COND
i-saik-i iyoka] [ov-ant-acha-ri=ka]]
3M.S-be.at-real DEM kill-APL.INS-STAT.IPFV-REL=DEM
'I don't know where [in which place] lived these [folks] who killed [people].'

The juxtaposition subordination strategy is also used to link adverbial clauses with the means of a free conjunction. Apart from asyndetic (paratactic) adverbial linking, exemplified by (9a), a large inventory of subordinating connectives is utilized to encode adverbial relations of temporal succession, temporal (brief and prolonged) overlap, temporal anteriority, possible and negative possible conditions, and cause and purpose. By definition, adverbial subordinating connectives, which are also termed 'adverbial conjunctions', or 'adverbial

subordinators', mark "some interclausal (or adverbial, circumstantial) relation between the adverbial subordinate clause over which they operate and the main clause they modify" (Kortmann 1998: 457). The presence of an adverbial subordinator does not imply a syntactic dependency relation (Danielsen 2011: 86-87).

In particular, semantic relations of brief temporal overlap are expressed by the adverbial subordinators *aririka*/*arika* 'when' and *airorika* 'when not' (which are possible to be interpreted as conditional 'if' or 'if not', respectively), whereas prolonged temporal overlap is encoded by *ovakera* 'when' and *ikanta*/*okanta* 'in the meantime', 'while'. Temporal anteriority is expressed by *irohatzi* 'until', 'before' and *tekira* 'before' which has a basic meaning of continuative negative 'not yet' in simple clauses.

The subordinating connectives occupy the adverbial clause-initial slot, as shown in (20). Although the connectives require a certain reality status marker in the subordinate verb (*aririka*/*arika* 'when'*, tekira* 'before' require irrealis and *ovakera* and *ikanta* realis), the verbs do not show any signs of reduction of their verbal categorical distinctions. The adverbial subordinators *irohatzi* 'until', 'before' and *airorika* 'when not' occur in both realis and irrealis subordinate clauses depending on the temporal frame of the main verb. The order of clause combinations linked by adverbial connectives is either the same as that of coordinate structures linked with coordinating conjuncts, i.e., A *co-B,* as seen in (20c, f) and (21), or different, i.e. *co-BA*, as shown in (20a-b, d-e)(*A* is the main clause, *B* is subordinate clause, and *co-* stands for the subordinating connective). There is a tendency for the main clause-final position, attested in many languages (Dixon 2009: 39), but irrespective of a clause ordering arrangement, the adverbial subordinator is rigidly clause-initial, occupying a non-flexible position at the margin of the subordinate clause. Adverbial connectives can also occur in simple clauses, referring to the preceding discourse.

(20) a. Aririka antotya, kameetsa ampotsotyaaro.
[aririka a-N-tot-ia] kameetsa a-N-potso-t-ia-ro
when 1PL.S-IRR-cut-IRR be.good 1PL.A-IRR-rub.annatto-EP-IRR-3N-M.O
'When we cut ourselves, it is good to rub annatto [into the wound].'

b. Airorika intzimi, ontzimatye amine.
[airorika i-N-tzim-e] ontzimatye Ø-amin-e
when.not 3M.S-IRR-be-IRR be.necessary 1PL.S-look.for-IRR
'When there is no [money], we have to look [for work].'

c. Ari ikantari nonyaakoventakiri matzi ovakerani nohataki kirinka.
ari i-kant-a-ri no-ni-ako-vent-ak-i-ri
PP 3M.A-happen-REAL-3M.O 1SG.A-see-G.APL-APL.BEN-PFV-REAL-3M.O
matzi [ovakera-ni no-ha-t-ak-i kirinka]
witch when-AUG 1SG.S-go-EP-PFV-REAL downstream
'This is the case that I saw witches when I went [to live] downriver long ago.'

d. Ikanta ikinkishiryaanaka oime, ikantzi: "Nantaitatye henoki."
[ikanta i-kinkishiri-an-ak-a o-ime]
in.the.meantime 3M.S-think-DIR-PFV-REAL 3N-M.POSS-husband
i-kant-tz-i n-antai-t-aty-e henoki
3M.S-say-EP-REAL 1SG.S-go.up.IRR-EP-PROG-IRR hilltop
'While her husband was thinking, he said: "I'll go up the hill."'

e. Tekirata ontzimayetanaketa ovaantsi, pairani osheki manitzi aka.
[tekira=ta o-N-tzim-a-ye-t-an-ak-e=ta ovaantsi]
before=OPT 3N-M.S-IRR-be-EP-DISTR-EP-DIR-PFV-IRR=OPT plot.of.land
pairani osheki manitzi aka
long.ago many tiger here
'Before chacras [individual plots of land] existed, there were a lot of tigers here.'

f. Ari oviratapakari irohatzi ovetsikantanaka irora avotsi.
ari o-vira-t-ap-ak-a-ri [irohatzi
PP 3N-M.A-reach-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL-3M.O before
o-vetsik-ant-an-ak-a irora avotsi]
3N-M.S-construct-APL.INS-DIR-PFV-REAL DEM trail
'So it [the killing] had ended before that highway was built.'

Cause/reason clauses in (21a) are encoded by *tema* (or rarely by *kama*) 'because', 'since', and in (21b) by the temporal connective *ikanta*/*okanta* which may indicate a causal sense. Purpose relations in (21c) are expressed by *onkantya* 'so that'.

(21) a. Te okantero osoronkyaro shina temakya antarotsomonte ovaato.
te o-kant-e-ro o-soronk-ia-ro
NEG.REAL 3N-M.A-can-IRR-3N-M.O 3N-M.A-go.down-IRR-3N-M.O
shina [tema=kya antaro-tsomonte o-vaato]
kapok.tree because=EMPH big-belly 3N-M.POSS-trunk
'She couldn't go down the tree because the trunk was enormously thick.'

b. Apokaki aka ochivaki parenini ikanta nonintzi noyotakaimi.
a-pok-ak-i aka o-cheva-ki parenini
1PL.S-come-PFV-REAL here 3N-M.POSS-branch-LOC river
[ikanta no-nint-tz-i no-yo-t-ak-a-e-mi]
because 1SG.S-want-EP-REAL 1SG.A-teach-EP-APL.COM-SOC-REGR-IRR-2O
'We came here to the river bank because I want to teach you.'

c. Nonkantavaheri onkantya iyoperotanakero.
no-N-kant-av-ah-e-ri [onkantya
1SG.A-IRR-say-DIR-REGR-IRR-3M.O so.that
i-yo-pero-t-an-ak-e-ro]
3M.A-know-AUG-EP-DIR-PFV-IRR-3N-M.O
'I will explain it to them so that they understand it well.'

In addition, purpose can be expressed via verbal morphology on either the main clause predicate, as shown in (22), or on the subordinate clause predicate, the latter discussed in §4.2.2. The purposive morpheme *-ashi* 'with the intent' in (22) marks the main clause verb *vetsik* 'make, 'construct' which describes a supporting activity carried out to ensure the realization of the purposeful activity expressed by the subordinate verb *pi* 'convert', 'transform'. Both clauses in (22) are fully finite and are simply juxtaposed.

(22) Ivetsikashitakeri, ikantzi ipyaakeri eentsipaye.
i-vetsik-ashi-t-ak-i-ri i-kant-tz-i
3M.A-make-APL.INT-EP-PFV-REAL-3M.O 3M.S-say-EP-REAL
[i-pi-ak-e-ri eentsi-paye]
3M.A-convert-PFV-IRR-3M.O child-PL
'They made it [the clay] with the intent, they say, to transform it into children.'

4.2.2. Juxtaposition strategy: clause combining with a bound subordinator

In section §4.2.1, asyndetic (paratactic) clause linking and clause combining with a free-standing subordinator was discussed. This section deals with another subtype of the juxtaposition subordination strategy which involves explicit marking of the adverbial relationship of the subordinate clause to the main clause on the subordinate predicate (Danielsen 2011: 88). Ashéninka Perené has a small inventory of verbal morphology expressing particular interclausal relations, namely semantic relations of purpose/result *-ant …-ri* 'on order to', 'that's why', spatial *=ka, =ra, =nta* 'where', temporal *=ra* 'when', and dependent moods inflections *=rika* 'conditional', *=mi* 'counterfactual conditional', and *=kari* 'apprehensive' ('lest').

The purpose and result subordinate relations involve juxtaposition of two finite clauses. The purpose and result relations are expressed by the discontinuous morpheme *-ant …-ri* which consists of the relativizer *-ri* and the instrumental applicative *-ant*. Instrumental applicatives are known to extend their use to other, less common (so-called 'circumstantial') applicative types such as reason, purpose, cause, and motive (Peterson 2007: 207). The morpheme has developed from a combination of *-ant* + *…-ri*, translated as 'the instrument that X', into a nominalized element conveying more abstract senses of purpose and result (see Cysouw (2007: 143) for an analysis of this discontinuous morpheme).

Nominalization is regarded to be a marker of embedded clauses and/or a marker of dependency but the adverbial clauses in (23) neither function as arguments of the main clause nor do they appear to be unable to function as independent clauses. In particular, resultative adverbial clauses are often found in isolation, referring to the previous stretch of discourse. The purpose clause in (23b) is encoded by two types of adverbial subordinators, the optional *onkantya* 'so that', previously cited in (23c), and the bound discontinuous purposive morpheme *-ant…-ri* 'in order to'. The resultative predicate in (23c) occurs in a focused construction introduced by the third person pronoun *irotaki* (N-M)/*iritaki* (M) in the 'contrastive focus' function. Both constructions are frequently found to code the semantic relations of purpose and result, respectively. The purpose relation does not require a fixed clause order, whereas the clause which expresses the resultative relation is generally placed after the main clause, following the iconic CAUSE-EFFECT event pattern.

(23) a. Itzimantakari iyora Naviriri, tzimatsi aparoni ashaninka.
[i-tzim-ant-ak-a-ri iyora Naviriri] tzim-atsi
3M.S-be-APL.REAS-PRF-REAL-REL DEM person's.name be-STAT.IPFV
aparoni ashaninka
one our.fellowman
'In order for Naviriri to be born, there was a fellowman.'

b. Nosaatantavaitzi naari aka, (onkantya) nonkitsatantyaari.
no-saa-t-ant-a-vai-tz-i naari aka [onkantya
1SG.A=bathe-EP-APL.INS-EP-DUR-EP-REAL I.FOC DEM so.that
no-N-kitsa-t-ant-ia-ri]
1SG.S-IRR-dress-EP-APL.REAS-IRR-REL
'I bathe [people] with this [herbs], so that I get dressed [buy clothes].'

c. Machiyenka inatzi, irotaki ishipatonatantari.
Machigenka i-na-tz-i [irotaki
people's.name 3M.S-be-EP-REAL FOC
i-shipatona-t-ant-a-ri]
3M.S-beard-EP-APL.REAS-REAL-REL
'He is Machigenka, that's why [this is the reason] he has whiskers.'

Another variety of the juxtaposition subordination strategy involves combining two finite structures, with one of them marked by a bound subordinator, namely by the spatial *=ka, =ra,* or *=nta* 'where', or by an equally frequent temporal extension of the spatial subordinator *=ra* 'when' (temporal extensions of spatial conjunctions are reported to be well-attested across languages (Cristofaro 2003: 175)).

When attached to the nominal constituents, the locative enclitics *=ka, =ra,* and *=nta* express nominal definiteness combined with the indication of the referent's contiguity to the deictic center (i.e., the speaker). The enclitic *=ka* indicates the referent's close proximity to the speaker, being in the speaker's interactional space, whereas *=ra* signals the absence or non-localization of the referent in the speaker's interactional space. *Ra*-marked nominal referents are inferred to be located farther from the speaker (cf. Enfield 2003: 115). The enclitic *=nta* has a distal value of being far from the speaker.

When marking verbs in subordinate clauses and serial verb constructions, the spatial enclitics typically convey a generic locative sense 'where.' The *ra*-clauses with the temporal sense 'when' cannot occur in isolation, since in simple clauses the enclitic *=ra* is interpreted as having the default spatial sense, exemplifying a rather rare case of morphosyntactic dependency of an adverbial subordinate clause. Examples of clauses marked by bound spatial and temporal subordinators are given in (24).

(24) *Subordinate spatial clauses*
a. Akaha okanta kintsitapakaka Maninkanironi, omaniri atziri.
[aka=ha okanta kintsi-t-ap-ak-a=ka
here=EMPH 3N-M.S.AUX neck-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL=ADV.LOC
Maninkanironi] o-man-i-ri atziri
hill's.name 3N-M.A-hide-REAL-3M.O people
'Here where the bottom of the hill Maninkanironi was located, she hid people.'

b. Aka Manitzipankopaye isaikira manitzi.
aka manitzi-panko-paye [i-saik-i=ra manitzi]
here tiger-house-PL 3M.S-be.at-REAL=ADV.LOC tiger
'Here are the homes of tigers, where tigers live.'

c. Osheki atziri inavita pairani okanta patsatapakanta.
osheki atziri i-na-vi-t-a pairani [okanta
many people 3M.S-be-FRUS-EP-REAL long.ago 3N-M.S.AUX
patsa-t-ap-ak-a=nta]
wound-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL=ADV.LOC
'Where the hill inclines, there were a lot of people long ago.'

Serial verb construction with spatial ra-marking
g. Nokanta nokinapakira Nihaateni.
nokanta no-kin-ap-ak-i=ra Nihaateni
1SG.S.AUX 1SG.S-walk-DIR-PFV-REAL=ADV.LOC river's.name
'I kept walking along the river [where the river was].'

Temporal subordinate clause
h. Avisakotanahira hatahi.
[Ø-avisako-t-an-ah-i=ra] ha-t-ah-i-Ø
3N-M.S-recover-EP-DIR-REGR-REAL=ADV.T go-EP-REGR-REAL-3N-M.O
'When she recovered, she went away.'

Ambiguity remains regarding the syntactic status of the adverbial clauses which take dependent mood markers=*rika* 'conditional' (also can have a temporal overlap sense), =*mi* 'counterfactual conditional', and =*kari* 'apprehensive' ('lest'). When inflected for one of these moods, the verb forms do not differ structurally from independent ones, but when the mood inflections are found in independent declarative clauses, their predicates exhibit different meanings. According to Cristofaro, verb forms marked by dependent mood markers, should be regarded an instance of dependent verb forms since they cannot be used in independent declarative clauses (2003: 57). In view of this structural criterion, Ashéninka Perené adverbial clauses in (25a, d), marked for the conditional and apprehensive moods, are treated here as morphosyntactically dependent clauses.

However, counterfactual conditional clauses are not regarded morphosyntactically dependent since they are a clear instance of juxtaposition of two structurally equivalent clauses, protasis (unrealized hypothetical condition/cause) and apodosis (unrealized hypothetical result/effect). The formal symmetry is reflected in the juxtaposition of two identically inflected verb forms, both marked by the counterfactual mood marker=*mi* and the irrealis status marker. If a counterfactual clause is negated, then the verb takes the realis marker, as seen in (25b). Each component clause can stand alone, as shown in (25c), although when found in simple declarative clauses, *mi*-marked predicate has a frustrative sense denoting an event that failed or was performed in vain, contrary to speaker's or another participant's

expectations. Structural symmetry of Ashéninka Perené counterfactual conditionals, common cross-linguistically (Haiman & Kuteva 2001: 113), is, however, coupled with the rigid ordering of the clauses, with protasis followed by apodosis, mirroring the CAUSE-EFFECT conceptual asymmetry. In this analysis, the subordinate status of the condition/cause clause is decided on semantic grounds, in line with Blühdorn's view of semantic asymmetry in subordination which is revealed when the clause order is reversed (2008: 70).

(25) *Possible conditional*

a. Ishiyanakirika maniro, arita inkyaapakiri omoronakira.
[i-shiy-an-ak-e=rika maniro] ari=ta
3M.S-escape-DIR-PFV-IRR=COND deer PP=OPT
i-N-ky-ap-ak-e-ri o-moro-naki=ra
3M.A-IRR-enter-DIR-PRF-IRR-3M.O 3N-M.S-hole-CL:round.vacuous=DEM
'If a deer escapes, it will likely to enter it, that cave.'

Counterfactual conditional

b. Eero ipiyatsatami, eero yookaitzirimi.
[eero i-piyatsa-t-a=mi] eero
NEG.IRR 3M.S-disobey-EP-REAL=CNT.F NEG.IRR
y-ook-ai-tz-i-ri=mi
3M.A-leave-IMP.P-EP-REAL-3M.O=CNT.F
'Hadn't he disobeyed, they wouldn't have left him.'

Simple clause counterfactual (counterexpectational)

c. Ari yavisakotahimi.
ari y-avisako-t-ah-e=mi
PP 3M.S-recover-EP-REGR-IRR=CNT.F
'They would have recovered.'

Apprehensive

d. Ontzimatye pintzinae kapichikitaite, pikinkivaritekari shintsipayeni.
ontzimatye pi-N-tzin-a-e kapichikitaite
be.necessary 2S-IRR-rise-REGR-IRR early.morning
[pi-kinkivari-t-e=kari shintsipayeni]
2S-be.old-EP-IRR=APPR quickly
'You have to get up early lest you get old quickly.'

4.3. Nominalization strategy

The use of nominalized verbs is the primary relativization strategy in Ashéninka Perené. The nominalization strategy is also found to form *ri*-marked complement clauses, introduced by the interrogative phrasal forms *tsika ikanta*/*okanta* 'how' and *tsika ikaratzi*/*okaratzi* 'how many/how much', functioning as object complements of a limited

group of utterance and perception verbs. This section covers nominalized relative clauses in §4.3.1, followed by complement clauses in §4.3.2.

4.3.1. Nominalized relative clauses

The most subordinate-like clauses are formed by the nominalizers/relativizers *-ri* or-*ni,* the former being the default relativizer to do with both realis and irrealis events, while the latter being tendentially associated with irrealis events. Relative clauses are postnominal, exhibiting the pattern which is also observed in noun compounding N+N when the head of the nominal compound precedes the modifier, as well as in derived adjectives which follow the head nominal. Other descriptive noun modifiers such as non-derived adjectives, quantifiers, numerals, and demonstratives precede the head. Apparently, the postnominal pattern of relative clause ordering reflects the universal tendency of shifting heavy, long piece of information towards the end of the clause (Hawkins 2004). Examples of headless relative clauses are given in (26). The cited subordinate clauses are placed in square brackets.

(26) *Relativized transitive subject (realis*)
a. Korakitaintsitaima ovakeroriraka.
koraki-t-aintsi=taima [ov-ak-i-ro-ri=ra=kya]
approach-EP-STAT.PFV=DUB kill-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O-REL=DEM=EMPH
'[The one] who must have killed her, approached.'

Relativized intransitive subject (realis)
b. Saikanaki ironyaaka aratsiri.
saik-an-ak-i-Ø ironyaaka [ar-atsi-ri]
be.at-DIR-PFV-REAL-3.O now fly-STAT.IPFV-REL
'[The one] which flies stayed.'

As stated in §2, the most commonly attested nominalization type is the *ri*-marked participant nominalization. The nominalizer/relativizer *-ri* relativizes agents, objects, and instruments in subordinate clauses. Examples of relativized subjects are seen in (11a) and (26); relativized objects are illustrated by (11b) and (27a-b). In the subordinate clause in (27c), the relativized instrumental participant functions as the verb argument and occupies the direct object slot, indexed by the relativizer *-ri*. In other words, the relativized instrumental participant *inchapanki* 'pounding stick', whose position is occupied by the relativizer *-ri* on the subordinate clause verb, is promoted via the instrumental applicative *–ant* to object and relativized as a syn-

tactic object, a common strategy across languages which relativize on obliques (Comrie & Kuteva 2011b: Chapter 123).

(27) *Relativized objects (realis)*

a. Kantzimaintacha saikatsi apiteroite nashirote, iminkitakinari nakoki.
kantzimaiNtacha saik-atsi apite-ro-ite n-ashiro-te
nevertheless be.at-STAT two-NMZ-AUG 1SG.POSS-steel-POSS
[i-miNki-t-ak-i-na-ri n-ako-ki]
3M.A-put-PFV-REAL-1SG.O-REL 1SG.POSS-arm-LOC
'However, two steel nails remain, the ones which they inserted in my arm.'

b. Intaryavaitero yasankantavaitero tsikapaita inintakari irirori.
i-N-tari-a-vai-t-e-ro
3M.A-IRR-open.legs-EP-DUR-EP-IRR-3N-M.O
y-asank-ant-a-vai-t-e-ro tsikapaita
3M.A-smell-APL.REAS-EP-DUR-EP-IRR-3N-M.O what
[i-nint-ak-a-ri irirori]
3M.A-want-PFV-REAL-REL he.FOC
'He will open her legs and smell whatever he wanted.'

c. Yaashitaitakiro inchapanki atsinkantarori arroz.
y-a-ashi-t-ai-t-ak-i-ro inchapanki
3M.A-take-APL.INS-EP-IMP.P-EP-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O pounding.stick
[a-tsink-ant-a-ro-ri arroz]
1PL.A-pound-APL.INS-REAL-3N-M.O-REL rice
'They took a pounding stick with which we pound rice.'

The relativizer *-ni* appears with irrealis relative clauses which relativize subjects of intransitive and transitive verbs; the default relativizer *-ri* is used in irrealis relative clauses to relativize objects. Examples in (28) illustrate the *ni*-marked irrealis relative clauses in A and S functions and *ri*-marked irrealis clauses in O function. Relative clauses can be introduced by the indefinite pronominal forms *tsikapaita~paita(rika)* 'what(ever)', as seen in (27b), or *ninkarika* 'whoever', as shown in (28b). The relative clauses are taken in square brackets.

(28) *Relativized transitive subject (irrealis)*

a. Tekatsi aminenani.
tekatsi [amin-e-na-ni]
NEG.EXIST look.for-IRR-1SG.O-REL.IRR
'There is nobody who will take care of me.'

Relativized intransitive subject (irrealis)
b. Arika inkame atziri, ninkarika kamatsini, eentsipatsaini.
arika i-N-kam-e atziri ninkarika
when 3M.S-die-IRR person whoever
[kam-atsi-ni] eentsi-patsaini
die-STAT-REL.IRR child-DIM
'When a person dies, whoever dies, for example, little children.'

Relativized objects (irrealis)
c. Tekatsi nayeri noyari.
tekatsi [n-ay-e-ri n-o-ia-ri]
NEG.EXIST 1SG.A-take.IRR-IRR-REL 1SG.A-eat-IRR-REL
'There is no place from which I will obtain food.'
d. Iroka oshimitaro nontzinantyaarori.
iroka oshimitaro [no-N-tzin-ant-ia-ro-ri]
DEM loom 1SG.A-IRR-lift-APL.INS-IRR-3N-M.O-REL
'This is the loom with which I will lift it [the fabric].'

As examples (27)-(28) demonstrate, Ashéninka Perené relative clauses are gapped, which means that the relativized position is left empty in the surface structure of the subordinate clause (Payne 1997: 330), without being filled by the corresponding person marker in either realis or irrealis relative clauses. When subjects are relativized, the subject prefix on the relative clause verb has zero realization. When objects are relativized, the nominalizers/relativizers *-ri* and *-ni* go into the slot of the pronominal verbal suffix in O function in the transitive relative clause, 'replacing' it. When the relative clause is intransitive, the relative marker *-ri* or *-ni* attaches to the end of the verb. Although the relativized argument is left unexpressed, any other participants are expressed as they normally would in an independent declarative clause.

In contradistinction to nominalized transitive predicates which do not exhibit reduced verbal morphology (except for the gapped relativized cross-indexing person marker), nominalized intransitive verbal predicates (e.g., *saik* 'sit', 'live', *kam* 'die', *pok* 'come', *ha* 'go', *koraki* 'approach', *ar* 'fly', *ant* 'work'), cited in (11a), (27b), (28b),(29a), and non-verbal predicates, formed from nominal roots (e.g., *isha* 'old woman' cf. *ishatatsiri* 'that who is an old woman'; *matzi* 'witch' cf. *matzitatsiri* 'that who is a witch'; *kasanto* 'orchid' cf. *kasantotatsiri* 'that which is an orchid'), when marked by stativity suffixes, *-atsi~-acha* 'imperfective stativity' and *-aintsi* 'perfective stativity', show nearly total […] lack of the categorical distinctions relevant to verbal aspect

and derivational morphology, normally present in simple declarative clauses (Cristofaro 2003: 55). Such reduction of verbal morphology in nominalized intransitive predicates clearly indicates a syntactic dependency relation.

The expression of heads in Ashéninka Perené main clauses ranges from fully expressed NPs to reduced NPs (pronoun, demonstrative, or quantifier) to 'light' heads (bound pronouns) to zero expression (headless) (see Citko (2004: 97-98), Dixon (2010: 337), and Epps (2009) for discussion of 'light' heads in relative clauses). Headless relative clauses are often introduced by the possessive-existential copula verbs *tzimatsi* (positive polarity) and *tekatsi* (negative polarity) which take either a fully expressed NP argument (e.g., *tzimatsi aparoni ashaninka* [EXIST one our.fellowman] 'there was a fellowman') or are followed by a nominalization/headless relative clause (e.g., *tzimatsi hev-a-ri* [EXIST lead-REAL-REL] 'there is/we have one who leads [the community chief]'. The meaning of the existential copula verbs is open to multiple interpretations with regard to the projected identity of their copula complement; the ensuing ambiguity is resolved based on discourse context. For example, *tekatsi* is translated as 'there is nobody' in (28a) and 'there is no place' in (28c).

There is no structural difference between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses. However, the two can be distinguished by the presence or absence of pause phenomena. Restrictive relative clauses and main clause are pronounced as one intonational unit, whereas a non-restrictive clause is separated from the main clause by a pause, which is cross-linguistically a common way of differentiating between the two types of relative clauses (Dixon 2010: 353). In non-restrictive clauses, which uniquely identify their referents, heads are typically expressed by proper names, or by personal or demonstrative pronouns, as seen in (29a-b).

(29) a. Aviroka antatsini ovaantsi.
aviroka [ant-atsi-ni ovaantsi]
you work-STAT-REL.IRR plot.of.land
'You are the ones who will be working on the land.'

b. Ari ipokakiri yora, hevatakantzirori iglecia.
ari i-pok-ak-i-ri yora
PP 3M.A-come-PRF-REAL-3M.O DEM.M
[heva-t-ak-ant-tz-i-ro-ri iglecia]
lead-EP-APL.COM-SOC-APL.REAS-EP-REAL-3M.O-REL church
'That [one] who was leading the church came here.'

The negative copula of existence *kaari*, used to negate nominal and adjectival predicates (e.g., *iriroríte kaari ashaninka* 'they are not our fellowmen'), is found to negate relative clauses in the subject function, as seen in (30).

(30) a. Tzimatsi evankaripaye kaari kimisantahirori.
tzimatsi evankari-paye [kaari
EXIST young.men-PL NEG.COP
kimisant-ah-i-ro-ri]
pay.attention.to-REGR- REAL-3N-M.O-REL
'There are young men who don't pay attention to traditional advice.'

b. Tzimatsi pashinipaye kaari tsonkironi.
tzimatsi pashini-paye [kaari tsonk-e-ro-ni]
EXIST other-PL NEG.COP finish-IRR-3N-M.O-REL.IRR
'There are others who will not finish it (the assignment).'

4.3.2. Nominalized complement clauses

The *ri*-nominalization strategy is utilized within a tiny group of complement clause constructions by verbs of utterance or perception. These verbs take nominalized complements introduced by the interrogative quantifier *tsika okaratzi*/*ikaratzi* 'how much/many', as shown in (31a), or the interrogative manner form *tsika okanta*/*ikanta* 'how', which always occurs with the instrument/reason applicative marker *-ant*, as seen in (31b). The phrasal interrogative elements consist of the content interrogative *tsika* with the basic locative meaning 'where' and an inflected 'light' verb, either *kara* 'copula of capacity' or *kant* 'be'. The nominalized *tsika*-complement clauses cannot stand alone. In order to be integrated into discourse as questions about quantity or manner, they would have to take the interrogative mood marker =*ka*.

(31) a. Nosampitemi tsika okaratzi pikovakotenari.
no-saNpi-t-e-mi [tsika okaratzi pi-kov-ako-t-e-na-ri]
1SG.A-ask-EP-IRR-2.O WH COP 2A-want-G.APL-EP-IRR-1SG.O-REL
'I will ask you [about] how much you will charge me.'

b. Ishiyahetanaka yaminakotahetena tsika ikanta noshitovantari.
i-shiy-a-he-t-an-ak-a y-amin-ako-t-a-he-t-e-na
3M.S-run-EP-PL-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL 3M.A-watch-G.APL-EP-REP-PL-EP-IRR-1SG.O
[tsika okanta no-shitov-ant-a-ri]
WH 3N-M.AUX 1SG.S-escape-APL.INS-REAL-REL
'They all ran to watch me escape.'

5. Conclusions

Aimed at providing a descriptive account of subordination in Ashéninka Perené within a functional-typological framework, this paper argued that subordination in Ashéninka Perené (Arawak) is a gradient, continuum-like phenomenon accounted for by a variety of subordinate clause types. In view of an overriding majority of Ashéninka Perené subordinate clauses being finite, distinctions between the subordinate clause types were captured largely on the basis of presence or absence of explicit predicate marking by an affixed or cliticized conjunction and functional analysis of semantic clause linkages. The formal criteria of morphosyntactic dependency of the clause and its syntactic embeddedness proved to be of limited utility. In sum, typology of subordination in Ashéninka Perené includes the following types of subordinate clauses.

(i) Finite adverbial clauses linked either asyndetically or by the free-standing adverbial subordinators *aririka* 'when/if', *airorika* 'if not', 'when not', *ovakera* 'when', *okanta*/*ikanta* in the meantime', 'because', *tekira* 'before', *irohatzi* 'until', 'before', *tema*/*kama* 'because', *onkantya* 'so that', and apposed finite and relative clauses. This group exhibits the loosest form of subordination and occupies the closest place to coordinate structures on the subordination continuum.

(ii) Clauses with a bound dependency marker (i.e., an affixed or cliticizing conjunction) which does not alter the structure of the subordinate predicate. This type includes intermediate subordinate clauses, such as finite adverbial clauses whose semantic relation to the main clause is expressed by the bound conjunction of purpose/result *-ant…-ri*; location markers *=ka, =ra, =nta* 'where'; and the counterfactual condition marker *=mi*. The adverbial clauses are neither embedded nor morphosyntactically dependent.

(iii) Clauses which bear special verb marking on the morphosyntactically dependent verb. This type subsumes the embedded, morphosyntactically dependent nominalized relative and complement clauses, marked by the nominalizers/relativizers *-ri* or *-ni,* and non-embedded, morphosyntactically dependent adverbial temporal *ra*-clauses, possible conditional *rika*-clauses, and conditional undesirable consequence *kari*-clauses.

Another goal of the paper was to examine Ashéninka Perené subordination strategies in the context of cross-linguistic studies of subordination in other native South American languages which claim that (i) grammatically integrated predicative elements such as serial verb constructions and verbal compounds, (ii) combinations of finite structures, […] with a (bound) dependency marker, and (iii) nominalization are the most dominant subordination patterns (van Gijn et al. 2011: 10). It was shown that Ashéninka Perené subordination strategies essentially mirror those attested across native South American languages.

Firstly, verb serialization is argued here to be a prominent subordination strategy in Ashéninka Perené, known to be an Arawak and Kampan feature (Aikhenvald 1999: 98). Both verb serialization and paratactic subordination strategies, which involve two grammatically integrated predicative units, fall into the category of the 'integrating strategy', well-attested across native South American languages (van Gijn et al. 2011: 10). In Ashéninka Perené, the integrating serialization strategy in §4.1, found with phasal, comparison, and motion verbs, encodes complement and purposive complement relations. Although serial verb constructions resemble apposed finite structures, they can be differentiated from coordinated clauses on the basis of their semantics, by virtue of their conceptualization as a single event. The integrating paratactic strategy, discussed in §4.2.1, is used to express complement, relative, and adverbial relations of temporal sequence, cause, and condition.

Secondly, juxtaposition of finite clauses linked by a (bound) subordinator, discussed in §4.2, is another principal subordination strategy in Ashéninka Perené, the characteristic shared with other Arawak languages (Aikhenvald 1999: 99; Danielsen 2007: 381-383, 2011: 85-89; Michael 2008: 414-438). This subordination strategy subsumes a wide range of semantic clause linkages such as adverbial relations of temporal succession, temporal (brief and prolonged) overlap, temporal anteriority, possible and negative possible conditions, cause and purpose, result, locality, counterfactual condition, and undesirable possible consequence.

Furthermore, nominalization of verb predicates to form relative and some types of complement clauses was shown to be a common subordination strategy in Ashéninka Perené, found to be productive in other Arawak, Amazonian, and Andean languages (Adelaar 2011: 272; Aikenvald 1999: 100; Danielsen 2011: 89-98). Participant nominalization (of agent, object, instrument, or place) is by far the means *par excellence* to form relative clauses, often headless, which occur in A, S, and O functions. As shown in §4.3.1, participant nominalization

distinguishes between realis and irrealis events, using *-ri* to code A, S, O participants in realis events, along with O participants in irrealis events, and *-ni* to express A and S participants in irrealis events. It was seen in §4.3.1 that nominalization of transitive predicates allows for the retention of their verbal morphology, whereas intransitive predicates, marked by the stativity markers *-atsi~-acha* 'imprefective stativity' and *-aintsi* 'perfective stativity', exhibit significantly reduced verbal marking, signaling a relation of morphosyntactic dependency with the main clause.

Finally, it was observed that the nominalization strategy can be used in conjunction with affixing, or the affixing strategy can be utilized alone. It was demonstrated in §4.3.2 that the former is used to form complement clauses in O function. In particular, the instrument/reason suffix *-ant* was found to encode nominalized complements, taken by utterance and perception verbs and introduced by the interrogative manner form *tsika okanta / ikanta* 'how'. Affixing can be utilized singularly as a subordination strategy, as shown in (22), where the suffix of intent *-ashi* marks the main clause predicate.

Address of the Author

The Cairns Institute, James Cook University, PO Box 6811, Cairns, QLD 4870 Australia
<elena.mihas@jcu.edu.au>

Notes

[1] Many thanks are due to the Ashéninka Perené community for their participation in this research. In particular, I would like to thank Gregorio Santos Pérez, Raul Martin Bernata, and Delia Rosas Rodríguez for their insights into Ashéninka Perené subordination. I am most grateful to the granting agencies, the National Science Foundation (DDIG #0901196) and Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (SG 0002) for their support of this research. I also thank two anonymous reviewers and Edith Moravcsik for the extensive feedback on the paper.

[2] The graphemes used in the cited examples stand for the following phonemes: [i] /i/, ii /i:/, e /e/, ee /e:/, a a/a/, aa /a:/, o/o/, oo /o:/, p/p/, k /k/, t/t/, ty/tʲ/, ts /tsʰ/, tz /ts/, ch /ʧ/, s/s/, sh/ʃ/, h/h/, r /ɾ/, m/m/, n/n/, ny/ɲ/, v /w/, y/j/, N [n, m, ŋ].

[3] I follow Dixon 1994 terminology to distinguish between A-subject of transitive verbs, O-object of transitive verb, and S-subject of an intransitive verb.

[4] Split intransitivity is defined here as an inflectional pattern in which intransitive verbs, in order to index their subjects, inflect by using the marker of a transitive subject (see Van Valin (1990); Mithun (1991); Næss (2007:38); Payne & Payne (2005) for a detailed discussion of factors accounting for split intransitivity).

[5] The notion of dependency concerns the verb's non-finiteness (signaled by absent or reduced participant and/or tense, aspect, mood marking) and the inability of the clause to be integrated into discourse on its own (Payne 1997: 306). However, the present work is essentially dealing with finite subordinate structures which express a variety of semantic relations and which are formally similar to main clauses. Verb forms occurring in Asháninka Perené independent declarative clauses typically display the same range of inflectional distinctions found in subordinate clauses. This situation renders the dependency/finiteness criterion to be of limited utility for the analysis of Asháninka Perené subordination.

[6] While dealing with the subordination phenomenon in less known languages like Asháninka Perené, one looks for "an adequate set of accepted labels" to be used in the analysis (Dixon 2003: 64). The labels 'marked' and 'unmarked', when applied to subordination, may confuse the reader due to the interference of the well-known notion of typological markedness, taken to denote "asymmetrical or unequal grammatical properties of otherwise equal linguistic elements: inflections, words in word classes and even paradigms of syntactic constructions" (Croft 2003: 87). Following Haspelmath's proposal with regard to terminological choices – "an important general principle of good terminological usage is that old, well-established terms should not be used in a completely novel sense…"(1996: 46) – the term 'paratactic', rather than 'unmarked' is considered to be more appropriate in this account of Asháninka Perené subordination.

[7] A broad variety of Asháninka Perené subordination strategies, from asyndetic juxtaposition to cliticizing subordinators, serves as evidence to support the claim that syntactic complexity may not be a result of native speakers' exposure to a 'colonizer' language with a long-standing written tradition (Sakel, Mithun & Bertinetto 2012: 1). In a situation when native speakers have a short history of literacy (see Mihas 2010b) and fiercely resist lexical and grammatical borrowing from Spanish, Asháninka Perené syntactically complex grammar structures have remained fairly uncompromised. Recent focused studies of subordination in indigenous languages of the Americas have demonstrated that language contact does not have to be a precondition for the development of syntactic complexity in languages of oral societies (see Faarlund 2012 and Mithun 2012, respectively, on subordination strategies in Zoque Chiapas from Southern Mexico and Central Alaskan Yup'ik spoken in southwestern Alaska).

Abbreviations

A	subject of transitive clause	IDEO	ideophone
ADJ	adjectivizer	IMP.P	impersonal passive
ADV	adverbial	INS	instrumental
APL	applicative	INT	intent
APPR	apprehensive	IPFV	imperfective
AUG	augmentative	IRR	irrealis
AUX	auxiliary	LOC	locative
BEN	benefactive	M	masculine
CL	classifier	NEG	negation
CNT.F	counterfactual	N-M	non-masculine
COM	comitative	NMZ	nominalizer
COND	conditional	O	object

CONT	continuous
COP	copula
DEM	demonstrative
DIM	diminutive
DIR	directional
DISTR	distributive
DUB	dubitative
DUR	durative
EMPH	emphasis
EP	epenthetic
EVD	evidential
EXH	exhaustive listing
EXIST	existential
FOC	focus
FRUS	frustrative
HAB	habitual
ICPL	incompletive
OPT	optative
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PP	positive polarity
PFV	perfective
PROG	progressive
PST	past
Q	question marker
REAL	realis
REAS	reason
REGR	regressive
REL	relative
S	intransitive subject
SG	singular
SOC	sociative
STAT	stative
T	temporal
TOP	topic

Bibliographical References

Adelaar Willem F.H. 2011. Participial clauses in Tarma Quechua. In van Gijn Rik, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken (eds.). *Subordination in native South American languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 267-280.

Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. 2009. Semantics and grammar in clause linking. In Dixon Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *The semantics of clause linking: A cross-linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 380-402.

Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. & Robert M.W. Dixon (eds.). *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-68.

Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. 1999. The Arawak language family. In Dixon Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *The Amazonian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 65-106.

Blühdorn Hardarik 2008. Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse. Evidence from the study of connectives. In Fabricius-Hansen Cathrine & Wiebke Ram (eds.). *'Subordination versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 59-85.

Citko Barbara 2004. On headed, headless and light-headed relatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22. 95-196.

Comrie Bernard & Tania Kuteva 2011a. Relativization on subjects. In Dryer Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online.* Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 122. Available online at http://wals.info/chapter122. Accessed on 2012-09-20.

Comrie Bernard & Tania Kuteva 2011b. Relativization on obliques. In Dryer Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 123. Available online at http://wals.info/chapter123. Accessed on 2011-11-09.

Comrie Bernard & Tania Kuteva 2005. The typology of relative clause formation in African languages. In Voeltz Erhard F. K. (ed.). *Studies in African linguistic typology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 209-225.

Creissels Denis 1999. Setswana ideophones as uninflected predicative lexemes. In Voeltz Erhard F.K. & Christa Kilian-Hatz (eds.). *Ideophones*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 75-85.

Cristofaro Sonia 2011. Purpose clauses. In Dryer Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 126. Available online at http://wals.info/chapter126. Accessed on 2011-11-09.

Cristofaro Sonia 2008. Asymmetric events, subordination, and grammatical categories. In Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk Barbara (ed.). *Asymmetric events*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 151-172.

Cristofaro Sonia 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Croft William 2003. *Typology and Universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cysouw Michael 2007. Content interrogatives in Pichis Asheninca: Corpus study and typological comparison. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 73(2). 133-163.

Danielsen Swintha 2011. Clause embedding strategies in Baure (Arawak). In van Gijn Rik, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken (eds.). *Subordination in native South American languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 79-107.

Danielsen Swintha 2007. *Baure: An Arawak language of Bolivia.* Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ILLA) 6. Leiden: CNWS Publications.

Dixon R.M.W. 2010. *Basic linguistic theory. Grammatical topics*. Vol 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon R.M.W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in typological perspective. In dixon Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *The semantics of clause linking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-55.

Dixon R.M.W. 2006. Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective. In Dixon Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *Complementation: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.1-48.

Dixon R.M.W. 2003. Demonstratives: A cross-linguistic typology. *Studies in Language* 27(1). 61-112.

Dixon R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon R.M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) 2009. *The semantics of clause linking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enfield Nicholas 2003. Demonstratives in space and interaction: Data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79(1). 82-117.

Epps Patience 2009. Between headed and headless relative clauses: evidence from Hup. Paper presented at the Eighth Biannual Conference of the Association for Linguistic Typology, Berkeley, July 23-26 2009.

FAARLUND Jan Terje 2012. Degrees of clause cohesion: Complementation and subordination in Chiapas Zoque. *Linguistic Discovery* 10.1. 62-74.

HAIMAN John & Tania KUTEVA 2001. The symmetry of counterfactuals. In BYBEE Joan & Michael NOONAN (eds.). *Complex sentences in grammar and discourse*. *Essays in honor of Sandra A. Thompson*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.101-124.

HASPELMATH Martin 2007. Coordination. In SHOPEN Timothy (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description.* Vol 2. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-51.

HASPELMATH Martin 2004. Coordinating constructions: An overview. In HASPELMATH Martin (ed*.). Coordinating constructions*. Typological studies in language, 58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 3-39.

HASPELMATH Martin 1996. Word-class-changing inflection and morphological theory. In BOOIJ Geert & Jaap VAN MARLE (eds.). *Yearbook of Morphology* 1995. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 43-66.

HAWKING John A. 2004. *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KORTMANN Bernd 1998. Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe. In VAN DER AUWERA Johan with Dónall P.Ó BAOILL (eds.). *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 457-561.

LEHMANN Cristian 2004. *Nexion-Complex sentences. Course materials*. Erfurt: Universtität Erfurt.

MATTHIESSEN Christian & Sandra A. THOMPSON 1988. The structure of discourse and 'subordination'. In HAIMAN John & Sandra A. THOMPSON (eds.). *Clause combining in grammar and discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 275-329.

MICHAEL Lev 2008. *Nanti evidential practice: Language, knowledge and social action in an Amazonian society.* Austin: University of Texas. PhD dissertation.

MIHAS Elena 2010a. *Essentials of Ashéninka Perené (Arawak) grammar*. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin. PhD dissertation.

MIHAS Elena 2010b. Orthography development in Ashéninka Perené (Arawak): a case study. *Cadernos de Etnolingüística* 2 (2). Available online at http:// www.etnolinguistica.org/issue:vol2n2. Accessed on 3/12/2012.

MITHUN Marianne 2012. Exuberant complexity: The interplay of morphology, syntax and prosody in Central Alaskan Yup'ik. *Linguistic Discovery* 10.1. 5-26.

MITHUN Marianne 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivation. *Language* 67. 510-546.

NÆSS Åshild 2007. *Prototyptical transitivity.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

NOONAN Michael 2007. Complementation. In SHOPEN Timothy (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description.* Vol 2. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 52-150.

PAYNE David & Judith PAYNE. 2005. The pragmatics of split intransitivity in Asheninka. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estidios Ethnolingüísticos* 10. 37-56.

PAYNE Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax. A guide for field linguists.* Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

PETERSON David 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
SAKEL Jeanette, Marianne MITHUN, & Pier Marco BERTINETTO 2012. Variation in clause combining: Views from the New World. Introduction. *Linguistic Discovery* 10.1. 1-4.
QUIRK Randolph, Sidney GREENBAUM, Geoffrey LEECH, & Jan SVARTNIK 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
THOMPSON Sandra A., Robert E. LONGACRE & Shin Ja J. HWANG 2007. Adverbial clauses. In SHOPEN Timothy (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description.* Vol 2. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 237-300.
VAN GIJN Rik, Katharina HAUDE & Pieter MUYSKEN 2011. Subordination in South America: An overview. In VAN GIJN Rik, Katharina HAUDE & Pieter MUYSKEN (eds.). *Subordination in native South American languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-23.
VAN VALIN Robert D. & Randy J. LAPOLLA 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
VAN VALIN Robert D. 1990. Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66. 221-260.