

The grammaticalization of clause types in Ecuadorian Siona

Martine Bruil
Leiden University

Ecuadorian Siona is part of the western branch of the Tukanoan family. This family is known for its complex evidential systems. Ecuadorian Siona differs from most other Tukanoan languages and from what has been attested crosslinguistically with respect to reportative evidentiality. The reportative does not behave as a declarative clause in Ecuadorian Siona. It groups together with interrogative clauses in the language. Reported evidentiality is marked by means of the verbal suffix *-jã* in combination with a specific subject agreement paradigm. This subject agreement paradigm is different from the declarative paradigm. The reportative clauses share the paradigm with interrogative clauses. This is illustrated in example (1):

- (1) a. De'o jãhta-bi. (Declarative)
be.good become.morning-3S.M.PST.ASS
'He woke up well.' (I vouch for it).
- b. De'o jãhta-i? (Interrogative)
be.good become.morning-2/3S.M.PST.N.ASS
'Did you (M)/ he wake up well?' (I am asking).
- c. De'o jãhta-i-jã. (Reportative)
be.good become.morning-2/3S.M.PST.N.ASS-REP
'You (M)/he woke up well.' (Someone told me).

In example (1a), it can be observed that declarative sentences take assertive subject agreement morphology. Interrogative and reportative sentences, on the other hand, take non-assertive morphology. In this paper, I argue that the similarities between interrogative and reportative sentences are due to similar grammaticalization processes. The non-assertive subject agreement morphemes can be reconstructed as nominalizers. The nominalizers were historically used in complementation structures that were applied to form questions and speech reports. Example (2) illustrates the type of complementation structures that were probably used in order to express a question and a report. The 'that' clauses represent the historically nominalized structures:

- (2) a. Is it that someone woke up well?
b. It is said that someone woke up well.

In the case of the interrogative, the main clause disappeared and the subordinated verb obtained a main clause interpretation. Later on, the nominalizers were reinterpreted as main clause subject agreement morphology. A similar process occurred in the case of the reportative. The nominalizers were also used as main clause subject agreement morphology and underwent reanalysis. The only difference is that the main verb was not lost: it is still present in the form of the suffix *-jã*. This suffix has cognates in other Tukanoan languages, such as Barasana (Jones & Jones 1991:28) and Kubeo (Chacón 2009:14), that mean 'to speak' or 'to say.' In both cases, subordinate clause morphology was reanalyzed as main clause morphology and due to this process two new grammaticalized clause types emerged in Ecuadorian Siona: the reportative and the interrogative.

References

- Chacón, T. C. (2009). Lexical and viewpoint aspect in Kubeo. Paper presented at the Conference on Indigenous Languages of Latin America IV, University of Texas.
- Jones, W., & Jones, P. (1991). Barasana Syntax. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.