

Content Interrogatives in Asheninca Campa (Arawak): Corpus study and Typological Comparison

Michael Cysouw

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig
cysouw@eva.mpg.de

Version of 15 February 2005

comments are appreciated

Abstract

Most languages worldwide distinguish various content interrogatives, like in English *who*, *what*, *where*, *when*, *which*, *how* and *why*. However, Givón (2001) has claimed that in Asheninca Campa there is only one word, *tsica*, that covers all possible interrogative meanings. Based on a corpus of questions extracted from texts, I argue that indeed almost all content questions use the word *tsica*, but the interrogative meaning is further specified by the addition of light verbs. Asheninca roughly distinguishes the same interrogative categories as found in most of the world's languages. Still, the structure of content interrogatives in Asheninca Campa is special from a typological point of view because of four characteristics: there is no distinction between 'who' and 'what'; all content interrogatives are transparently built on the basis of just one root; this basic root has the meaning 'where'; and finally, the derivation is performed by verbs. Based on a worldwide sample of content interrogatives, I argue that these characteristics are rare. However, all these characteristics are relatively widespread in South America, making it less of a surprise that there is a language in this part of the world that accidentally combines all these unusual characteristics.

Keywords

Asheninca Campa, Arawak, Peru, content interrogatives, typology

1. Introduction¹

Givón (2001: 303-304, cf. Diessel 2003: 641) describes a very unusual, but theoretically highly interesting system of interrogatives for the Arawak language Asheninca, spoken in Peru. Givón claims that Asheninca has only a single interrogative, *tsika*, that is used as a question word for all interrogative categories.² The meaning of *tsika* is claimed to be indeterminate, and has to be expressed by different interrogatives when translated into English. Some of Givón's examples are quoted verbatim in (1). In these example, *tsika* has to be translated into English as 'who', 'where', 'how' and 'how much', respectively.

(1) Asheninca (Givón 2001: 304, citing D. Payne, p.c.)

- (a) *tsika i-tim-i-ka iri-ηta*
WH 3M-be-REAL-Q 3M-THERE
'Who is he (that one)?'
- (b) *tsika o-saik-i-ka*
WH 3F-sit-REAL-Q
'Where is she?'
- (c) *tsika i-kaηt-ai-t-i-ro-ka 'choclo'*
WH 3M-say-PASS-&-REAL-3F-Q corn
'How do you say "corn"?''
- (d) *tsika i-kara-t-i-ka iri-ka*
WH 3M-be/PL-&-REAL-Q 3M-HERE
'How much is it?/How many are there?'

¹ I thank the following colleagues for their help in preparing this paper: Katrin Muhme, Beatriz Gualdieri, Carmen Núñez Zorrilla, Sulla Silva Sánchez, Liliana Fernández Fabián, and Pablo Jacinto Santos.

² There are various orthographies of the interrogative *tsika* to be found in the literature. Reed and Payne (1983) write *ϕ^hika*, Reed and Payne (1986) write *t^{sh}ika*, Payne (1989) and Anderson (1985/1986) write *tsika*, and Givón (Givón 2001: 304, citing D. Payne, p.c.) writes *tsika*. I will cite examples in their original orthography, but use the orthography *tsika* in the running text of this article.

Such a system with one ‘cover-all’ interrogative word is highly interesting for a theoretical analysis of the structure of questions. The interrogative *tsica* might be interpreted as showing that there is basically one underlying question quantifier to all interrogatives. This general question quantifier states that there is some information missing in the sentence, which has to be filled in by the interlocutor. The kind of information that is questioned has to be extracted from other clues in the sentence, or from the context. From the description by Givón, the Asheninca interrogative *tsica* appears to be a regular instantiation of such a system with only one questioning element. As far as I know, Asheninca is the only language that has been claimed to have such a solitary indeterminate interrogative word.

Yet, before any further theoretical conclusions are drawn from this one example, it is important to scrutinise the available evidence to obtain a better insight in the function of this interrogative *tsica*. In this article, I will investigate the usage of the interrogative *tsica* in Asheninca by way of a large set of content questions extracted from texts (see Section 3). It turns out that *tsica* is not used in the way as suggested by Givón. More specifically, various auxiliary-like verbs are used in collocation with *tsica* to yield highly specific interrogative meanings. Still, there are various aspects of the interrogatives in Asheninca that are unusual cross-linguistically (see Section 5). By way of a worldwide survey of content interrogatives I will show that the structure of Asheninca question words is somewhat atypical cross-linguistically, but far from as exotic as might be concluded from Givón’s presentation of it.

2. Prior descriptions of Asheninca interrogatives

Besides the short discussion by Givón as cited above, there are a few more brief descriptions of the structure of questions in Asheninca (Reed & Payne 1983: 97-99; 1986: 328-330; Payne 1989: 151-153). Already from these short descriptions, a rather different impression arises of the structure of interrogatives in Asheninca. Especially in Payne (1989: 151-153) there is ample discussion of the use of subsidiary verbs together with *tsica* to establish specific interrogative categories (as will be exemplified extensively below in Section 3.2).

Reed & Payne (1983, 1986) note that there is some indeterminacy of the meaning of *tsica* when used in isolation (i.e. without subsidiary verbs), as exemplified in (2). In these sentences, *tsica* either means ‘who’, ‘what’ or ‘where’. However, even in these cases the meaning of the interrogative can be reconstructed from the structure of the sentence. In (2a), the subject prefix is missing from the predicate (indicated by a zero), the effect being that the interrogative *tsica* is interpreted as a question about this non-marked subject of the predicate, which is here best translated into English as ‘who’. In (2b), the object suffix is missing from the predicate, which changes the sentence into a question about this non-marked object. The interrogative *tsica* is now best translated into English as ‘what’. Finally, in (2c), both subject and object are marked on the predicate, and in this situation the interrogative *tsica* is interpreted as meaning ‘where’.

(2) Asheninca (Reed, 1983 #2591: 98, ex. 15, cf. Reed & Payne 1986: 329, ex. 17)³

- (a) *ç^hika* *ø-aNç-i-ro-ka*
 WH *ø*-do-NONFUT-3F.OBJ-Q
 ‘¿Quién lo hacía?’ (‘Who did it?’)
- (b) *ç^hika* *p-aNç-i-ø-ka*
 WH 2.SUBJ-do-NONFUT-*ø*-Q
 ‘¿Qué hiciste?’ (‘What did you do?’)
- (c) *ç^hika* *p-aNç-i-ro-ka*
 WH 2.SUBJ-do-NONFUT-3F.OBJ-Q
 ‘¿Dónde lo hiciste?’ (‘Where did you do it?’)

Reed & Payne (1986: 329) further note that the meanings ‘what’ and ‘who’ for *tsica* as in (2a) and (2b) are unusual. They argue that these examples are probably the result of a contraction of a more common construction of *tsica* with the verb *-pait-*. Indeed, as will be shown below (especially section 3.2.5), the meaning ‘who’ and

³ The following abbreviations are used in the glossing of the examples: 1 - first person, 2 - second person, 3 - third person, F - feminine, FUT - future, LOC - locative, M - masculine, NONFUT - non future, OBJ - object, POSS - possessive, Q - question particle, REL - relative clause, SUBJ - subject, TAM - unspecified tense/aspect/mood, WH - content interrogative, ? - unidentified morpheme.

‘what’ are not differentiated lexically in Asheninca, but it is highly unusual for them to be expressed by the bare interrogative *tsica* as in (2a) and (2b). Normally they are marked by *tsica* with the verb *-pait-*. Reed & Payne present various interrogative meanings in Asheninca that are derived by combining *tsica* with some other linguistic material, comparable to phrases like *how much* in English. In this sense, Asheninca behaves like other languages. Combinations of an interrogative word with some other linguistic element to express specific interrogative meanings are found in all of the world’s languages.

3. A corpus of Asheninca content interrogatives

To investigate the use of the interrogative *tsica* in Asheninca, I collected all questions from the Asheninca stories as published and translated by Anderson (1985/1986). This resulted in a corpus of 206 content questions (summarised in the appendix), which will be analysed below. In Anderson’s text-collection, all Asheninca texts are translated into regular, easy-going Spanish, which indicates that some freedom was taken in the formulation of the translation. However, in general the Spanish translation appears to be rather close to the Asheninca original. This tendency appears to be even stronger in the translations of direct speech. As far as I am able to judge, the direct speech (including all questions) is in most cases translated very close to the original. When a first version of this paper was finished, I got in contact with three students from Peru (Carmen Núñez Zorrilla, Sulla Silva Sánchez and Liliana Fernández Fabián), who went over the corpus of questions with a native speaker of Asheninca, Pablo Jacinto Santos. He had only very few minor corrections to the questions presented in isolation, confirming the impression that the translations were accurate and close to the original.

Only in eight out of the 206 content questions was a translation either absent or formulated with such freedom that the relation to the original was completely unrecognisable. Five of these sentences were translated for me by Jacinto Santos. The translation of the remaining three questions remained enigmatic and will be disregarded in the analysis. In the glossing of the examples, I have not specified the tense-aspect morphology, as this would only distract from the structure of the interrogatives. I have simply glossed these suffixes as TAM.

3.1. Questions with the bare interrogative *tsica*

Reed & Payne argue that the default meaning of the bare interrogative *tsica* is to ask a question as to the place, i.e. ‘where’ (Reed & Payne 1983: 98; 1986: 329; Payne 1989: 151). My findings support this claim. Investigating those questions in which *tsica* is meaning ‘where’, it turns out that the word *tsica* is used in these questions as a bare interrogative without modification, just like the question words *who*, *where*, *when*, etc. are normally used in English.

When *tsica* is combined solely with a noun phrase (without any verb in the sentence), this results in a meaning ‘where is [NP]?’ , as shown in (3). The interrogative *tsica* can also be combined with a verb, asking for the place where the action of the verb took place, as shown in (4). In the corpus, the most common verbs in such constructions are *-saic-* ‘be at, live’ (4a), *-iyaat-* ‘go’ (4b), *-quen-* ‘go’ (4c), and *-a(g)-* ‘take’ (4d). These verbs are lexically already locative concepts, so the question as to the place appears to be the most obvious question to be asked. However, numerous other verbs, with no locative meaning at all, are also attested with the interrogative *tsica* asking for the place of the action. An example is shown in (4e).

- (3) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-136)

tsica mula-payeeni

WH mule-PL

‘¿Dónde están las mulas?’ (Where are the mules?)

- (4) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-98, III-24, I-148, III-164, I-70)

(a) *tsica i-saiqu-i-ca charine*

WH 3M-be_at-TAM-Q grandmother

‘¿Dónde vive mi abuelo?’ (Where does my grandfather live?)

(b) *tsica p-iyaaat-e-ca, aní*

WH 2-go-TAM-Q lad

‘¿A dónde vas, cuñado?’ (Where are you going, brother-in-law?)

(c) *tsica o-quen-anaque-ca*

WH 3F-go-TAM-Q

‘¿A dónde se fue?’ (Where did she go?)

(d) *tsica p-aaqu-e-ro-ca caniri*

WH 2-take-TAM-3F-Q *yuca*

‘¿De dónde has sacado *yuca*?’ (From where did you get the *yuca*?)

(e) *tsica i-caithov-aque-mi-ca cashecari*

WH 3M-scratch-TAM-2-Q *tiger*

‘¿Dónde te arañó el tigre?’ (Where did the tiger scratch you?)

3.2. Questions with *tsica* and auxiliaries

In the corpus, five auxiliaries (or maybe better ‘light’ verbs) occur combined with *tsica* to obtain specific interrogative meaning: *-quen-*, *-cara-*, *-tzim-*, *-cant-*, and *-pait-*. These auxiliaries take full inflection, although the low variability of the inflectional affixes attested indicates a strong routinization of these auxiliary constructions. Further, the combination *tsica* plus any of the three auxiliaries *-tzim-*, *-cant-*, and *-pait-* can be followed by a relative clause, resulting in yet a different meaning of the question. I will discuss the uses of these five auxiliaries in interrogative constructions in turn.

3.2.1. *-quen-*

Payne (1989: 352) notes that the verb *-quen-* can have two rather different meanings. It can mean either ‘to go, pass by’ or ‘can’. However, looking at the contexts in which it is used, these two meanings are connected by a continuum along the lines of a cross-linguistically common path of grammaticalisation. In its basic meaning *-quen-* is a verb of movement, roughly meaning ‘go’. Together with the interrogative *tsica* this verb can be used to ask ‘go where?’, as, for example is shown in (4c) above. This is just another example of the basic meaning ‘where’ of the bare usage of *tsica*. In the texts, there are four examples of exactly this use, and one example that is translated with ‘be where?’ (5a), which appears to represent a somewhat free translation.

Following a standard path of grammaticalisation, the verb *-quen-* ‘go’ can grammaticalise into an auxiliary marking for future. However, together with the interrogative *tsica*, this future auxiliary does not ask ‘will do it *where?*’ but ‘will do it *how?*’ (5b). There are three examples of this use in the texts. Finally, there are five examples in which the construction *tsica* + *-quen-* is translated as ‘can’, indicating that it is to be interpreted here as a potential instead of a future (5c). The contexts of these cases seem to indicate an aspect of disbelief, resulting in almost rhetorical question ‘how could you do that!’.

(5) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: III-42, I-24, I-128)

(a) *tsica i-quen-aque-ca n-eentsi-te*

WH 3M-go-TAM-Q 1-child-POSS

‘¿Dónde está mi hijo?’ (Where is my son?)

(b) *tsica i-n-quen-e-ca ir-o-yaa-na*

WH 3M-FUT-go-TAM-Q 3M-eat-TAM-1

‘¿Cómo van a comerme?’ (How are they going to eat me?)

(c) *tsica o-n-quen-e pi-niy-acote-ro*

WH 3F-FUT-go-TAM 2-swallow-TAM-3M

‘¿Cómo puedes tragar (un palito de *yuca*)?’

(How could you swallow a stalk of *yuca*?)

3.2.2. *-cara-*

The verb *-cara-* ‘to contain, finish something, be complete’ (Payne 1989: 152, 339) together with the interrogative *tsica* asks for a quantity. This construction is attested three times in the texts. It can both be used as a free interrogative meaning ‘how much/many’ (6a) or adnominally ‘how much/many of X’ (6b). The two adnominal uses as attested in the texts are both asking about a specific point in time. Literally, the questions are ‘how much sun’ (6b) and ‘how many days’, though these are better translated into English as ‘at which hour’ and ‘at which day’, respectively.

(6) Asheninca (Payne 1989: 152; Anderson 1985/1986: III-126)

(a) *tsica o-cara-tsi pi-pi-na-ro*
WH 3F-contain-TAM 2-give-1-3F

‘¿Cuánto me dabas?’ (‘How much did you give me?’)

(b) *tsica i-n-cara-te oorya ir-areet-apaiya*
WH 3M-FUT-contain-TAM sun 3M-arrive-TAM

‘¿A qué hora va a regresar?’ (At which hour will he come back?)

3.2.3. -*tzim*-

The verb *-tzim-* ‘to be, exist, live, be born, have’ (Payne 1989: 358) together with the interrogative *tsica* asks for a person. Without the presence of a lexical verb, but only together with a noun phrase, this combination means ‘be who?’ (7). The combination *tsica* + *-tzim-* can also be used together with a relative clause (marked by a suffix *-ri*) to ask about a human argument of this relative clause. This argument, being unknown to the speaker, is unmarked by cross-referencing affixes on the verb of the relative clause. The missing argument can either be a subject (8a) or an object (8b). In these constructions with a relative clause, the interrogative can either be a free element (8a), or it can be used adnominally with a human noun, meaning ‘which of them’ (8b).

(7) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: III-44)

tsica o-tzim-ajatz-i-ca irona cooya
WH 3F-exist-TAM-Q DEM woman

‘¿Quién será esa mujer?’ (Who might that woman be?)

(8) Asheninca (Payne 1989: 153; Anderson 1985/1986: II-172)

(a) *tsica i-tzim-i-ca poc-atsi-ri*
WH 3M-exist-TAM-Q come-TAM-REL

‘¿Quién viene?’ (Who is coming?)

(b) *tsica o-tzim-i-ca n-eentsi-te pi-nint-aque-ri*
WH 3F-exist-TAM-Q 1-child-POSS 2-want-TAM-REL

‘¿Cuál de mis hijas te gusta?’ (Which of my daughters do you like?)

3.2.4. *-cant-*

The verb *-cant-* ‘to say’ can be used in its literal sense together with the interrogative *tsica* to ask ‘say what?’ (9a). This is attested four times in the texts. In the more abstract meaning of *-cant-* ‘to be, become, follow upon’ (Payne 1989: 339), the combination with the interrogative *tsica* means ‘do what?’ (9b) or ‘what happened?’ (9c). Taken together, these two uses are attested nine times in the texts.

(9) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: III-138, I-16, II-106)

(a) *tsica pi-cant-apaaque-ro-ca pi-niro*

WH 2-say-TAM-3F-Q 2-mother

‘¿Qué le dijiste a tu madre?’ (What did you say to your mother?)

(b) *tsica no-n-cant-yaa-ca iroñaaca*

WH 1-FUT-say-TAM-Q now

‘¿Qué voy a hacer ahora?’ (What am I going to do now?)

(c) *tsica o-cant-aque-mi-ca iroori*

WH 3F-say-TAM-2-Q⁴ 3F.PRON

‘¿Qué pasó con ellas?’ (What happened to them?)

However, the most common occurrence of *-cant-* in questions is in a construction with a following relative clause, marked by a suffix *-ri* on the subordinate verb. This construction is used to ask ‘do what (with the result) that X?’ – better translated as ‘how?’ (10a). This is attested twelve times in the texts. Another possible use of this construction with a following relative clause is to ask ‘what happened (with the result) that X?’ – better translated as ‘why?’ (10b). This is attested five times in the texts.

⁴ I do not understand the presence of the second person object suffix *-mi-* in this sentence, neither from the translation, nor from the context of the story.

(10) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-72, I-32)

(a) *tsica pi-cant-aque-ro-ca p-amentant-aca-ro-ri sheri*
WH 2-say-TAM-3F-Q 2-get_used-TAM-3F-REL tabaco

‘¿Cómo te has acostumbrado al tabaco?’

(How did you get used to tabaco?)

(b) *tsica i-cant-a-ca tsityoqui caari ooc-anta-ri iina*
WH 3M-say-TAM-Q LAZY NEG leave-TAM-REL wife

‘¿Por qué la esposa del (hombre) perico no lo deja?’

(Why does the wife of the lazy husband not leave him?)

3.2.5. *-pait-*

The verb *-pait-* ‘to name, call’ (Payne 1989: 350) together with the interrogative *tsica* asks for a name. This combination is attested eight times in the texts and can best be translated as ‘call how?’ (11).

(11) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-196)

tsica pi-pait-a-ca
WH 2-call-TAM-Q

‘¿Cómo te llamas?’ (How are you called?/What is your name?)

This rather specific meaning forms the basis for an extremely widespread construction consisting of *tsica ipaita(ca)* or *tsica opaita(ca)* with a relative clause, literally meaning something like ‘how is this thing called that X’.⁵ The phrase *tsica ipaita(ca)* or *tsica opaita(ca)* has become a fixed – and rather lengthy – interrogative phrase, with the result that the original interrogative element *tsica* is regularly omitted.

⁵ The prefixes *i-* and *o-* are the third person masculine and feminine prefixes, respectively. I have not found any reason for the choice between these two alternatives. There appears to be a free choice between the use of either prefix. The suffix *-ca* marks questions. It is optionally used in content questions, though it is fairly frequent in the texts.

The interrogative construction *-pait-* with relative clause, but without *tsica*, has become much more frequent than the original structure with *tsica* (in the texts, there are 67 cases without *tsica* versus 32 cases with *tsica*). The interrogative *ipaitica* in isolation has even become the standard phrase meaning ‘what’s up?’ (four occurrences in the texts).

The meaning of this interrogative construction appears, on first notice, to be rather unconstrained. Taking together all the questions from the texts that use the structure *ipaita(ca)/opaita(ca)* plus relative clause (with or without *tsica*), there are 10 examples translated with ‘who?’, 28 asking ‘what?’, 55 asking ‘why?’ and 6 asking ‘how?’. However, on closer inspection, this variety of translations can be reduced to just a few different meanings. The best approach is to consider this interrogative construction as basically asking for an argument of the predicate in the relative clause. However, when there is no contextual uncertainty as to the identification of the arguments, this construction can also be used to ask for a reason of the proposition in the relative clause. All other meanings are idiosyncrasies. These uses are illustrated in turn below.

When the question is asking about the argument of the predicate, this argument can be a human being, and then the best translation is ‘who?’. Typically, the questioned human being is the subject of the verb (12a), but it is also possible that it is an object (12b). The argument can also be non-human, and then the best translation is ‘what?’. In these cases, the questioned thing is typically the object of the verb (13a), but it is also possible that it is the subject (13b). In all these cases, the questioned argument can easily be identified by considering the presence or absence of cross-referencing affixes on the verb in the relative clause. The questioned argument, being yet unknown to the speaker, is never overtly cross-referenced on the verb, in contrast to the known arguments, which are obligatorily cross-referenced (cf. example (2) in Section 2).

(12) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-136, II-128)

(a) *tsica ipaitaca poc-atsi-ri iroñaaca*
 WH come-TAM-REL now

‘¿Quién viene?’ (Who is coming?)

(b) *ipaitaca pi-caim-i-ri incaaran-qui*
 WH 2-call-TAM-REL ?-LOC

‘¿A quién estabas llamando?’ (Whom were you calling?)

(13) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: III-116, III-12)

(a) *paitaca p-amemana-tzi-ri-ca jaca no-yovite-qui*
WH 2-search-TAM-REL-Q here 1-casserole-LOC

‘¿Qué estabas buscando en mi olla de barro?’

(What were you looking for in my casserole?)

(b) *tsica opaitaca ant-aque-mi-ri*

WH do-TAM-1-REL

‘¿Qué te ha pasado?’ (What has happened to you?)

When cross-reference markers indicate all arguments, then the speaker knows all arguments, so the question is not about the identity of any of these arguments. In these cases, the meaning of the question with (*tsica*) *opaitaca/ipaitaca* is most commonly interpreted as asking for a reason of the proposition in the relative clause, translated with ‘why?’ (14a). However, there are a few cases, in which this analysis does not hold. For example in the question in (14b), all arguments are cross referenced on the verb, but this question is not translated as ‘why will a bear take me?’, but as ‘which bear will take me?’ (note the discontinuous alignment of the interrogative *opaitaca* and the noun *maini*). Such examples indicate that, depending on the context, the sentence in (14a) might also be used to express the question ‘which tiger have you brought?’ instead of the actual ‘why have you brought tigers?’

(14) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-136, I-94)

(a) *tsica opaitaca p-am-anta-ri-ri cashecari*
WH 2-bring-TAM-3M-REL tiger

‘¿Por qué has traído tigres?’ (Why have you brought tigers?)

(b) *opaitaca ir-aant-yaa-na-ri maini*

WH 3M-bring-TAM-1-REL bear

‘¿Qué oso va a llevarme?’ (Which bear will take me?)

These meanings (who/what/which/why) represent the far majority of the uses of (*tsica*) *opaita/ipaita* with a relative clause (93 cases out of a total of 99, which is 94%). The remaining six cases are translated with the interrogative ‘how’. Four of these cases turn out to be exclamations of the type ‘how could you do that?!’ (15a). From the

context, it is clear that these sentences are not intended to be real questions, but expressions of disbelief that the fact observed is really true. Finally, there are also two examples in the texts in which this construction is used to ask for the manner in which a proposition is executed (15b). I cannot decide whether these examples are idiosyncratic uses, or free translations, or whether they represent a further possible use of this construction – though much less common than the other meanings.

(15) Asheninca (Anderson 1985/1986: I-86, II-140)

(a) *opaitaca p-ov-antyyaa-ro-ri pi-sameto*
 WH 2-eat-TAM-3F-REL 2-godchild

‘¿Cómo puedes comer a tu ahijada?’ (How could you eat your godchild?)

(b) *opaitaca pi-yot-antaca-ro-ri pi-soncatzi*
 WH 2-know-TAM-3F-REL 2-antara

‘¿Cómo ha[s] aprendido a tocar la antara?’
 (How did you learn to play the antara?)

3.2.6. Other interrogative constructions

There are a few examples in the texts that do not belong to any of the above categories. First, there are four cases of *tsica* with a following relative clause, but without any intermediate light verb (see the appendix, section A.9). In these examples, *tsica* is translated as meaning either ‘how’ or ‘why’. My suggestion is that these are the result of the omission of the light verb *-pait-*, just like in (2a) and (2b).

Further, there are two examples of content interrogatives without *tsica*. They might be interpreted as showing two different interrogatives, namely *soitaca* (translated as ‘who’) and *iitaca* (translated as ‘why’), both followed by a relative clause (see the appendix, section A.10). However, another interpretation could be that the interrogative *tsica* has been dropped. These examples ask for further investigation.

Finally, there is one construction that is described in the scientific literature on Asheninca (as summarised in Section 2), but that has not appeared in the texts that I have analysed for this paper. There appears to be a special interrogative *tsicapaite*, meaning ‘when’. This interrogative is made from *tsica* with the suffix *-paite*, which is a

suffix indicating ‘at the time of’ or ‘during’ (Payne 1989: 262-264). There does not seem to be a direct relationship between this suffix *-paite* and the light verb *-pait-* as discussed above.

3.3. Summary

The interrogative *tsica* is used to express many different interrogative meanings. However, in the actual usage, the indeterminacy of the meaning of *tsica* is minimised by the use of various light verbs. The various interrogative constructions and their meaning are summarised in Table 1. The important fact to notice is that most interrogative categories as known from European languages are distinguished quite regularly in Asheninca as well. The meaning ‘who’, ‘where’, ‘when’, ‘how’, and ‘how much’ are normally expressed by using different constructions in Asheninca. Only the construction (*tsica*) *-pait-* plus relative clause can be used for a variety of meaning that appear to be rather disparate from a Eurocentric point of view.

Table 1. Summary of interrogative constructions in Asheninca

Construction	Interrogative category
<i>tsica</i>	PLACE: ‘where’
<i>tsica</i> <i>-tzim-</i>	PERSON: ‘who’
(<i>tsica</i>) <i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	VERB ARGUMENT: ‘who/what/which’
	REASON: ‘why’
<i>tsica</i> <i>-quen-</i>	MANNER: ‘how’
<i>tsica</i> <i>-cant-</i> + relative clause	MANNER: ‘how’
<i>tsica</i> <i>-cara-</i>	QUANTITY: ‘how much/many’
<i>tsicapait</i>	TIME: ‘when’

4. Local comparison

The form of interrogative words is highly variable throughout the Arawak languages. They ‘vary even among closely related languages’ (Aikhenvald 1999: 85). Also for the nearest relatives of Asheninca, the Campa subgroup of Arawak, it seems impossible to reconstruct the historical development of the interrogative words (cf. Wise 1986: 573-574). This is an interesting observation in itself, as it is often assumed that interrogative elements are slow-changing elements (cf. Haspelmath 1997: 176). However, because of this variability, it is difficult to reconstruct any aspects of the historical development leading to the content interrogatives in Asheninca. There are various structural parallels between Asheninca and other Arawak languages (see the next section on typology), but there are only faint historical-comparative links elucidating the origin of the peculiar structure of the Asheninca content interrogatives.

A selection of content interrogatives from the Campa languages is presented in Table 2. The first language in this table, Perené, is a dialectal variant of Asheninca. The only substantial difference between Asheninca and this Perené dialect is the occurrence of *ninka* and *paita* in Perené. Reed & Payne (1986: 330) propose that *paita* in Perené has developed as a reduction of the complex phrase *tsica opaitaka* as discussed in Section 3.2.5 above. However, *paita* is also found in Ashaninca (a different language from Asheninca). Also the Nomatsiguenga interrogatives *pairí* and *pairó* might be related to *paita* (the suffixes *-ri* and *-ro* are the third person masculine and feminine suffixes). From these parallels, it seems more plausible to me that the extension of the usage of *tsica* in Asheninca has been the innovation, replacing the older form *paita* as still found in Perené. As for *ninka*, meaning ‘who’ in Perené, Reed & Payne propose that it has been patterned after *paita*. However, the morpheme *-ni-* is widespread in Campa for marking animate, in contrast with *-ti-* for marking inanimate (see, for example, Ashaninca *ja-ni-ca*, Machiguenga *tya-ni*, and Nomatsiguenga *áti-ni*). The word *ninka* seems to be made from this *ni* together with the general interrogative particle *ka*. It is unclear to me how this construction is in any sense related to *paita*. In contrast, it seems very well possible that *ninca* is a reduction of *janica* as found in Ashaninca. Extending this hypothesis, the Ashaninca root *ja-* (used as the basis for ‘who’, ‘where’, and ‘when’), the Machiguenga root *tya-* (used as the basis for ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘how’), and the Nomatsiguenga root *áti-* (used as the basis for ‘where’, ‘when’, ‘how’ and ‘how many’) might be cognate (though there are no obvious sound correspondences relating them to each other, cf. Payne 1991). This hypothesis

implies that the Perené *ninka* > *janica* > *jani* is the older form, which is replaced in Asheninca by a new construction based on the root *tsi-*.

The Asheninca interrogative root *tsi-* might be related to the suffix *-(n)tsi*, which indicates indefinite possessor. This suffix is used with inalienable nouns to indicate that the possessor is not known or not of importance (Payne 1989: 70). Inalienable nouns are obligatorily marked for possessor in the Campa languages, but the suffix *-tsi* is used to counteract this structural obligation. This suffix is also found in closely related languages: in Nomatsiguenga it is *-tsi* (Shaver 1996: 197) and in Amuesha *-Vts* (Duff-Tripp 1997: 31-32) and probably goes back to proto-Arawak **-č̣i* (Payne 1991: 379). Indefinites and interrogatives are often closely related across the world's language, so there might very well be a diachronic relation between these two elements. Cross-linguistically, the most common development is that indefinites are derived from interrogatives (Haspelmath 1997: 176). This direction of change is not possible for Asheninca. The indefinite suffix *-tsi* is found throughout the Campa language, but the interrogative root *tsi-* is only found in Asheninca. This is most probably a local innovation in which an indefinite has turned into an interrogative, using the interrogative suffix *-ca*. This direction of development is unusual cross-linguistically.⁶ However, the interrogatives of Asheninca are such a special case cross-linguistically (see the next section) that also in this aspect they might be an exception to this rule.

Table 2. Selection of content interrogatives in Campa languages*

	Perené	Asheninca	Machiguenga	Nomatsiguenga
'who'	<i>ninka</i>	<i>janica</i>	<i>tyani</i>	<i>paíri</i> (m.), <i>paíró</i> (f.)
'what'	<i>paita</i>	<i>paita</i>	<i>tyati, tata</i>	<i>paíró</i>
'how'	<i>t^{sh}ika</i>	<i>paita, ocanta</i>	<i>tyara</i>	<i>áti</i>
'where'	<i>t^{sh}ika</i>	<i>jaoca</i>	<i>tyara</i>	<i>néga,</i> <i>átini</i> (anim.), <i>átiti</i> (inan.)

⁶ Also note that this hypothesised development from a suffix to an interrogative root would amount to a strong case of degrammaticalisation. Degrammaticalisation is not unattested among the world's languages, though it is a highly unusual development

* The data in this table are given in the orthography of the sources used: Perené (Reed & Payne 1986: 329-330), Asheninca (Kindberg: 53, 190, 218), Nomatsiguenga (Shaver 1996: 37, 40, 62-63, 78-79, 169), Machiguenga (Snell 1998: 34, 71).

Another language that could shed light on the origin of the Asheninca interrogatives is Amuesha. Amuesha is an Arawak language spoken directly neighbouring Asheninca, but classified genealogically just outside the Campa subgroup (Wise 1986: 568).⁷ It has been under strong influence of Quechua, its other neighbour. As a result, a large part of the Arawakan vocabulary in Amuesha has been replaced by Quechua words (Wise 1976). The content interrogatives in Amuesha are either based on a root *es-* (meaning ‘what/which’, and used as basis for ‘who’, ‘when’ and ‘why’, Duff-Tripp 1997: 66) or on a root *err-* (meaning ‘where’ and used as basis for ‘how’, Duff-Tripp 1997: 129), and there is also a suffix *-pa* meaning ‘be where’ (Duff-Tripp 1997: 186).⁸ None of these forms shows any clear cognacy with the Campa or the Quechua languages.

Contact induced change might be the reason for the variable structure of content interrogatives in Asheninca. The two candidates for contact are the Panoan languages to the northeast and the Quechuan languages to the southeast. A selection of Panoan

⁷ Payne & Payne (1991: 489) classify Amuesha as ‘Western Maipuran’, and thus only distantly related to the Campa languages, which are classified as ‘Southern Maipuran’. However, this classification might be wrong in this point because it is based on shared retentions, and Amuesha has lost many reflexes from proto-Arawak because of massive borrowing from Quechua (Wise 1976).

⁸ Amuesha <rr> represents a voiced velar fricative, which is not attested phonemically in any other Arawak language (Aikhenvald 1999: 77). In North Junin Quechua, the Quechua language neighbouring Amuesha, there is a phonemic voiced retroflex fricative/alveolar trill <ř> that is almost exclusively found in Spanish borrowings, representing the Spanish <rr> (Adelaar 1977: 31-37). This phoneme might have been borrowed into Amuesha, either directly from Spanish or through North Junin Quechua. However, the interrogative root *err-* in Amuesha does not appear to be borrowed from either Quechua or Spanish.

interrogatives is present in Table 3. There is a clear root *tsoa* for ‘who’ and a root *jaw-* that is the basis for many other interrogatives. Among these Panoan languages, Shipibo-Konibo has the most regular structure of content interrogatives. The interrogative *jawe* ‘what’ is used as the basis for all other interrogatives, except for *tsoa* ‘who’. The regularity is reminiscent of the conspicuous usage of *tsica* in Asheninca, but this similarity is only typological (cf. Section 5.4). There are too many differences between Shipibo-Konibo and Asheninca to invoke convergence as an explanation. First, the basis of derivation in Shipibo-Konibo is an interrogative meaning ‘what’, not ‘where’. Second, the interrogative ‘who’ in Shipibo-Konibo is not included in the pattern. And, finally, the form *jawe* and *tsica* are clearly not related. If there has been any convergence between these two languages, than it seems most probable that Shipibo-Konibo has borrowed the extreme transparency from Asheninca, not the other way around. Summarising, the form and the structure of the content interrogatives in these Panoan languages does not help to understand the origin of the Asheninca question words.

Table 3. Selection of content interrogatives in Panoan languages*

	Amahuaca	Yaminahua	Cashinahua	Shipibo-Konibo
‘who’	<i>tzóva</i>	<i>tsoa</i>	<i>tsua</i>	<i>tsoa</i>
‘what’	<i>jáú</i>	<i>afe</i>	<i>java</i>	<i>jawe</i>
‘how’	<i>jáú, cuzá</i>	<i>afe</i>	<i>jaska</i>	<i>jawe keská</i>
‘where’	<i>ráni, ráqui</i>	<i>faki, raki</i>	<i>jani</i>	<i>jawe-rano</i>
‘when’	<i>cuzântínyan</i>	<i>afetiã</i>	<i>jatian</i>	<i>jawe-tian</i>

* The data in this table are given in the orthography of the sources used: Amahuaca (Hyde 1980), Yaminahua (Eakin 1991), Cashinahua (Montag 1981: 602-607), Shipibo-Konibo (Valenzuela 2003: 378-381).

Also the Quechua interrogatives do not elucidate the peculiar structure of content interrogatives in Asheninca. The structure of question words in the Quechua languages seems to be rather stable, pace some small phonological changes, but there is no parallel

to the Asheninca structure. I will discuss here the interrogatives from North Junin Quechua (Adelaar 1977: 179, 253-254), the most directly adjacent Quechua language to Asheninca. However, the data from Huallaga Quechua (Weber 1989: 327-329) and Ayacucho Quechua (Soto Ruiz 1976: 68, 175) are basically identical. There are two roots that do not allow for any further analysis in Quechua: *pi* ‘who’ and *ayka* ‘how much/many’.⁹ The other interrogatives might be historically related to each other, though synchronically they are distinct in all Quechua languages: *ima* ‘what’, *may* ‘where’, *mayxa* ‘which’ and *imay* ‘when’. Other interrogatives are derived from *ima*. This system is neither structurally nor lexically alike to the Asheninca content interrogatives.

Summarising, the content interrogatives in Asheninca are an idiosyncrasy within its linguistic surrounding. Even the closest relatives show a rather different structure. Asheninca appears to have had a separate development, innovating a new interrogative root *tsica* and extending the usage of this root to rebuild all other interrogatives, leading to the highly regular structure of the interrogative system. This development is not paralleled by other, genealogically unrelated, languages in its direct neighbourhood, so this development in Asheninca cannot be explained by contact induced change.

5. Typological comparison

To assess whether or not the structure of content interrogative in Asheninca deserves a special status among the world’s languages, I have been searching for parallels in this respect between Asheninca and other languages.¹⁰ There are four characteristics of the content questions that make Asheninca a noteworthy case cross-linguistically. These will be discussed in turn. First, the indeterminacy between ‘who’ and ‘what’; second,

⁹ The interrogative *ayka* in Quechua might be a loan from Jaqaru (Hardman 2000: 32-34).

¹⁰ The comparative evidence that I present in this section is based on a large-scale typological investigation into the structure of content interrogatives. Some preliminary results of this investigation can be found in a handout of a presentation in 2004, available at <<http://www.eva.mpg.de/~cysouw/pdf/cysouwQUESTION.pdf>>.

the complete transparency of all question words; third, the usage of the meaning ‘where’ as the basis for further specification, and, finally, the usage of light verbs for specification. All these characteristics are relatively unusual among the world’s languages, though none of them is unparalleled elsewhere.

5.1. No differentiation between ‘who’ and ‘what’

In his classic paper on the typology of interrogation, Ultan (1978: 229) claims that it is nearly universal for languages to have a distinction between ‘who’ and ‘what’ (see also Lindström 1995). As exceptions to this universal, Ultan presents Khasi (an Austroasiatic language from India, Rabel 1961: 68-69) and Lithuanian (a Baltic language, Ambrazas 1997: 198-199; the same homonymy is also found in its close relative Latvian, Nau 1998; Nau 1999).¹¹ Asheninca is also a counterexample to this allegedly near universal (cf. Section 3.2.5), which thus deserves explicit mentioning.

However, besides Asheninca, there are various Arawak languages that do not (obligatory) differentiate between ‘who’ and ‘what’. The interrogative *tána* in Achagua (Wilson 1992: 26, 125-7) and *cuti* in Terêna (Eastlack 1968: 7-8; Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 190-4) are described as not differentiating between ‘who’ and ‘what’. In Bare, the interrogative *ne* is likewise noted to be used for both ‘who’ and ‘what’, though the word *abadi* more specifically can be used to mean ‘who’ (Aikhenvald 1995: 25). The same situation is described for Warekena, where the interrogative *ifi* is translated both with ‘who’ and ‘what’, though *damaIi* and *datfibuJe* are given as interrogatives that more specifically mean ‘who’ (Aikhenvald 1998: 261, 325-326). In Apurinã (Facundes 2000: 365) the interrogative *kepa/kipa* can be used to ask for both ‘who’ or ‘what’. However, disambiguation can be achieved with the insertion of the masculine or feminine affix to form *kerupa* (masc.) or *keropa* (fem.). Finally, the interrogatives *pairí* and *pairó* in

¹¹ Ultan (1978: 229) also present Sango as an exception, noting that the interrogative *yẽ* ‘what’ can also be used in the meaning ‘who’ alongside the interrogative *zo wa*, which would be the regular way to say ‘who’. However, I have not been able to find examples of the usage of *yẽ* for ‘who’ in the available descriptions of Sango (Samarin 1967: 74-5, 217; Thornell 1997: 76)

Nomatsiguenga are the masculine and feminine form of ‘who’. The feminine form also appears to be used for the meaning ‘what’ (Shaver 1996: 37, 40, 169).

More general, the absence of an opposition between ‘who’ and ‘what’ is relatively widespread among the languages of South America. For example, it is found in the Sakirabiat dialect of Mekens (a Tupi language from Brazil, Galucio 2001: 166-168), in Paumari (an Arawa language from Brazil, Chapman 1986; Chapman & Derbyshire 1990: 203-216), and in Ika (a Chibchan language from Colombia, Frank 1990: 82-86). Further, it is found in many languages of the Mataco-Guaicuruan family in Paraguay and Argentina: Maká (Gerzenstein 1994: 178), Mataco (Viñas Urquiza 1974: 106-107), Mocoví (Grondona 1998: 162), and Toba (Klein 2001: 23). So, from a worldwide perspective, the conflation of ‘who’ and ‘what’ in Asheninca deserves special attention, though on a more local level this homonymy is apparently not as uncommon as often assumed.

5.2. Pure transparency

Transparent interrogatives are interrogatives that are synchronically derived from other interrogatives in the languages. For example, the English *how much* is transparently derived from the interrogative *how*, which is also an interrogative on its own. Almost all the world’s language have at least a few of such transparent interrogatives. However, it is rather unusual to have a completely transparent system of interrogatives, as in Asheninca. Transparent interrogatives have to be distinguished from pervasive interrogatives signals, like the English *wh-*. Having such a regular interrogative signal is not unusual across the world’s languages.¹² Yet, there is an important differences between transparent interrogatives and interrogative signals. Interrogative signals, like *wh-*, cannot stand on their own, nor do they have a separable meaning.¹³ In contrast, the

¹² However, it is unusual that this element is used throughout all content interrogatives. In most language with a recurrent interrogative signal there are a few question words that do not conform to this general pattern, like *how* in English.

¹³ It might be argued that *wh-* has an abstract interrogative meaning in complementary distribution with *th-*, which has an abstract deictic meaning (cf. Diessel 2003). The parts

basis of transparent interrogatives, like *tsica* or *how*, can occur alone and have a meaning when used in isolation. Asheninca has a completely transparent system of interrogatives in which all interrogative are derived from one and the same basis. Such systems have been called ‘pure transparent’ by Muysken & Smith (1990: 887). There are some more cases like this among the world’s languages, though it is extremely rare. Such a system has, for example, been claimed to exist in Indo-Pakistani Sign Language (Zeshan 2000: 155-157; 2004: 23), 18th Century Sranan (Muysken & Smith 1990; Bruyn 1993) and Kenya Swahili Pidgin (Heine *et al.* 1991: 57).

Pure transparent systems are extremely rare worldwide. However, if we allow for just a bit of leeway, there are some more cases to be observed, though still only a few. In contemporary Fongbe, a Kwa language from Benin, almost all interrogatives are based on *tɛ* ‘which’, except for *nàbí* ‘how much/many’. There are two more, apparently frozen, lexemes *àní* ‘what’ and *négbòn* ‘how’ (Lefebvre & Brousseau 2002: 72-73). In its close relative Ewe, spoken in Ghana, almost all interrogatives are based on the suffix *-ka* ‘which’, except for *néniè* ‘how much/many’ (Pasch 1995: 79-80, R.-J. Anyanwu, p.c.). Some more cases are found on and around New Guinea. In Abun, a West Papuan language from Irian Jaya, the word *u* ‘which’ is used as basis for almost all interrogatives, except for *suma* ‘what’ and *ot* ‘how much’ (Berry & Berry 1999: 106-114). Eipo, a Trans-New-Guinea language from Irian Jaya, uses *yate* ‘what, which, what kind’ as basis for almost all interrogatives, except for *dan-* ‘where’ and *wirib-* ‘how’ (Heeschen 1998: 153-156). In Kilivila, a Papuan Tip (Austronesian) language from Papua New Guinea, the prefix *a-* can be used with nouns to express ‘which’. All

to be combined with these abstract roots would then also be in need of a meaning (e.g. *-ere* marking ‘PLACE’, *-at* marking ‘THING’, *-en* marking ‘TIME’). However, such an analysis is an extremely local generalisation, as all these hypothesised morphemes only occur in the limited domain of interrogative and demonstrative pro-forms. Further, the counterparts of *who* (**tho*), *which* (**thich*), *this* (**whis*) and *these* (**whese*) do not exist, and the interrogative counterpart of *thus* is *how* (and not **whus*). So, even within the domain of interrogatives and demonstratives this generalisation only has a very limited applicability. Although there are undoubtedly many striking parallels between interrogatives and demonstratives cross-linguistically, a morphological analysis does not appear to be the most promising approach.

interrogatives have this prefix *a-*, though not all roots that take *a-* are nouns in the synchronic structure of the language (Senft 1986: 59-63). Turning to South America, in Nambikuara, an unclassified language from Brazil, almost all interrogatives are based on the prefix $\tilde{l}h^l$ - followed by nominalizers, classifiers or full nouns. The only exception is usage of the prefix $y\tilde{a}^l$ - for ‘what’ (Kroeker 2001: 26-30). As discussed above, Shipibo-Konibo (see also section 4), a Panoan language from Peru, uses *jawe* ‘what, which’ as basis for almost all interrogatives, except for *tsoa* ‘who’ (Valenzuela 2003: 378-381). Likewise, Pirahã uses *gó* ‘what, which’ as basis for almost all interrogatives, except for *kaoí* ‘who’ (Everett 1986: 239-245).

Summarising, the Asheninca content interrogatives are indeed special because they are pure transparent. There are a few languages in the world that have such completely transparent systems of content interrogatives, but those systems are all based on the interrogative ‘what/which’ and are specified by nouns to delimit the class of items that is interrogated. In contrast, the Asheninca system is based on the interrogative ‘where’, and the various interrogative classes are specified by auxiliary-like verbs. Parallels in other languages to these two characteristics of Asheninca will be investigated in the next two sections.

5.3. ‘Where’ as interrogative base

The Asheninca interrogatives are all based on *tsica*, which means ‘where’ when used without modification. The use of ‘where’ as a basis to derive other interrogative meanings is relatively rare cross-linguistically. This claim might sound odd, as interrogatives based on ‘where’ are well known from the Germanic languages. However, from my typological survey this also appears to be an exceptional case.

The origin of this phenomenon in Germanic is local specification. In many Germanic languages, the interrogative ‘where’ can be combined with prepositions to specify the place that is asked for. For example, in German, combinations like *worauf* (‘on top of what’, lit. ‘where-up’), *worunter* (‘below what’. lit. ‘where-under’),

wohinter ('behind what', lit. 'where-behind) are based on the interrogative *wo*.¹⁴ This is a very common phenomenon worldwide. However, in the Germanic languages some combinations of 'where' with a preposition do not have a local meaning. In English, various such non-local interrogatives based on 'where' once did exist, though they are all obsolete in modern usage. Interrogatives like *wherefore* (meaning 'for what reason') and *wherewith* (meaning 'with what') are nowadays only found in archaically styled texts. In contrast, in German and Dutch non-local meanings of combinations of 'where' with prepositions are still in regular use. Various Dutch interrogatives, like *waarom* 'why', *waarmee* 'with what', *waarvan* 'of/from what' and *waarvoor* 'for what reason' are transparently derived from *waar* 'where'. Likewise in German, where the interrogative *wo* 'where' is the basis for such examples like *wofür* 'for what reason', *wozu* 'with which goal', *wovon* 'of what' and *womit* 'with what'. The most astonishing non-local derivations are attested in Danish. Like in the other Germanic cases discussed, *hvorfor* 'why' is derived from *hvor-for* 'where-for'. However, Danish also has the interrogatives *hvornår* 'when' and *hvordan* 'how', both based on the root *hvor* 'where'.

Except for the Germanic cases, I know of only a few examples of this phenomenon outside America. In Persian, the interrogative *æz koja*, literally 'from where' is actually used with the meaning 'how' (D. Stilo, p.c.). Two other examples come from non-Pama-Nyungan languages of Australia. In Bunuba, the interrogative *ngaanhini* 'how much/many' is composed of the parts *ngaa-nhini* 'where-ABLATIVE' (Rumsey 2000: 74) and in Kugu Nganhcara, the interrogative *wantanda* 'how' appears to be derived from *wantu* 'where', though there is no indication of any productive morpheme *-anda* (Smith & Johnson 2000: 404). Of course, the above list is far from exhaustive. However, it turns out to be rather difficult to find examples outside America. In contrast, in America – with special emphasis on South America – there are various examples of interrogatives that are transparently derived from the interrogative 'where'. In none of these languages, as presented below, the whole paradigm of content interrogatives is derived from 'where', as is the case in Asheninca; only individual

¹⁴ The /r/ in *worauf* and *worunter* is probably left over from the Middle German **wor*, which became *wo* in Modern German. It is only found when the adposition following *wo* starts with a vowel. In this sense, it the /r/ seems to function synchronically as an epenthetic consonant.

words show such a regular derivation. However, already the existence of such individual examples is special from a worldwide perspective.

In the Americas, the following examples of interrogatives derived from ‘where’ were found in a typological survey. In Slave, an Athabascan language from Canada, the interrogative *juden̄i* ‘which’ is composed of the parts *jude-ni* ‘where-COMPLEMENTIZER’ (Rice 1989: 1146). In Urubu-Kaapor, a Tupí-Guaraní language from Brazil, the interrogative *myja* ‘which, how, how much/many’ is composed of the parts *my-(h)a* ‘where-NOMINALIZER’ (Kakumasu 1986: 354, 376).¹⁵ In Paumari, an Arawa language from Brazil, the interrogative *hanahini* ‘which’ is composed of the parts *hana-hi-ni* ‘where-BE-AGREEMENT’ (Chapman 1986: 218-219). In Apurinã, an Arawak language from Brazil, the interrogative *nhapakunupa* ‘how much/many’ is composed of the parts *nha-pakunu-pa* ‘where-plus-INTERROGATIVE’ (Facundes 2000: 366). In Huallaga Quechua, a Quechua language from Peru, the interrogative *mayqan* ‘which’ is composed of the parts *may-qa-n* ‘where-TOPIC-AGREEMENT’ (WEBER 1986: 341-342; 1989: 327-329). In Matses, a Panoan language from Peru, the interrogative *midacquid* ‘which’ is composed of the parts *mida-ic-quid* ‘where-BE-NOMINALIZER’ (Fleck 2003: 254-258, 566-568, 980-983). Further, in Pech, a Chibchan language from Honduras, the interrogatives *pis* ‘how much/many’ and *piyã?* ‘which’ appear to be based on *pi* ‘where’, but there is no explanation in the description of this language whether these are transparent morphological modifications (Holt 1999: 75-76). The same holds for Barasano, a Tucanoan language from Colombia. In this language, the interrogative *dōkōro* ‘how much/many’ appears to be based on the interrogative *dō* ‘where’, though there is no mention of a regular morpheme *-kōro* (or the like) in the grammar (Jones & Jones 1991: 31).

Summarising, content interrogatives derived from a root ‘where’ are relatively rare from a worldwide perspective. However, in the Americas, and especially in South

¹⁵ This analyses is not explicitly given in the description of Urubu-Kaapor by Kakumasu. However, there are two phonological processes described that make it plausible that this is the origin of *myja*. First, ‘the segments /t/, /h/, and /n/ are slightly palatalized when preceded by /i/’, and, second ‘a transitional sound approximating the semivowel /y/ occurs between a high front or central vowel and a low central vowel’ (Kakumasu 1986: 400).

America, various cases of such derivations are attested. The most common derivative meanings are ‘which’ and ‘how much/many’, and cases of derivations meaning ‘how’, ‘why’, and ‘when’ are also attested, though rare. I have not encountered an example of the derivation of ‘who’ and ‘what’ from a root meaning ‘where’, except for Asheninca.

5.4. Verbs used for modification

The final exceptional characteristic of Asheninca is the way in which interrogatives are derived from the basis *tsica*. There is a small set of auxiliary-like light verbs that, when used together with *tsica*, result in highly specific interrogative meanings. This is unusual cross-linguistically. The most common methods among the world’s languages to transparently derive interrogatives from other interrogatives are the usage of specifying nouns, nominalization/classifiers, person/number/gender inflections or case affixes (examples of all these approaches are included in the examples discussed in the previous sections). The usage of specifying verbs is only rarely attested.¹⁶

Just as in the previously discussed aspects of Asheninca interrogatives, this special characteristic of Asheninca is not unparalleled elsewhere in the world’s linguistic diversity. However, it is a rare phenomenon, and it is never used as consistently as in Asheninca. Below I will list some parallels as found in a typological survey. As far as this small set of cases is representative of the worldwide distribution, there is again a preference for this phenomenon to occur in America. In Gwari, a

¹⁶ In contrast, i interrogatives of actions the usage of auxiliaries is commonly found, like in English *to be who*, *to do what*, *to say what*, *to go where*. Yet, even in these questions the usage of auxiliaries is not universal. There are various languages in which action interrogatives are not related to the non-action interrogatives. For example, in Jamul Tiipay, a Yuman language from Mexico/USA, the interrogative *maayiiich* ‘what’ is not related synchronically to the action interrogatives *ch*i* ‘say what’ and *ma’wi* ‘do what’ (Miller 2001: 174-179). However, the majority of the world’s languages appear to be more alike to English in that they use auxiliaries to derive action interrogatives. The special aspect of Asheninca is that non-action interrogatives, like ‘who’ or ‘how many’ are derived by the usage of an auxiliary.

Nupoid (Niger-Congo) language from Nigeria, the interrogative *ná* ‘how much/many’ can be combined with the verb *wú* ‘to appear’ to ask the question ‘what colour’ (Hyman & Magaji 1970: 115). In Southern Paiute, a Uto-Aztecan language from the USA, the interrogative *’aǵáni* ‘how’ is composed of *’aǵá* ‘what’ and the verb *ni* ‘to do’ (Sapir 1930: 209-210; Givón 1984: 230). In Desano, a Tucanoan language from Brazil, the interrogative *doʔpii* ‘why’ consists of the basis *doʔpa* ‘how’, modified by the auxiliary *ii* ‘to do’ (Miller 1999: 32).

The usage of auxiliary-like verbs is found in various Arawak languages, although it is not always described very succinctly. An exception to this is a detailed description of the interrogatives in Terêna (Ek Dahl & Butler 1979: 190-194). In this description, many combinations of *cuti* ‘who/what’ or *na* ‘where’ with various auxiliaries are described to yield other interrogatives. These constructions are in spirit very close to the system of Asheninca as described in this paper. Another case is described for Apurinã, where the interrogative *kenerepa* ‘why’ is composed of *ke-...-pa* ‘who/what’ and the verb *-nere-* ‘will’ (Facundes 2000: 365). Genealogically closer to Asheninca, in Machiguenga, the interrogative *tyara* ‘where’ can be combined with the verb *-kant-* ‘to say’ to yield meaning ‘how’ or ‘why’ (Snell 1998: 259). Also in Machiguenga, the demonstrative *aka* ‘here’ (possible a loan from Spanish) can be used with the verb *-kara-* ‘to cut’ to mean ‘when’, with the verb *-kant-* ‘to say’ to mean ‘how much/many’ or with the verb *-na-* ‘to be’ to mean ‘where’ (Snell 1998: 74). The usage of the verbs *-kara-* and *-kant-* is completely parallel with their usage in Asheninca, though the interrogative basis is completely different (*tsica* vs. *aka*).

6. Conclusion

The interrogative *tsica* in Asheninca does not have a ‘cover-all’ usage as implied in the description of Givón (2001: 303-304). This interrogative indeed occurs in almost all content questions in Asheninca, but it has a clear basic meaning ‘where’. Other interrogative meanings are derived by highly specific collocations with auxiliary-like light verbs. This principle is more widespread in the Arawakan language, but no other language appears to apply it as strictly as Asheninca does. Even its closest relatives (and

also the neighbouring non-Arawak languages) have more than one basic interrogative root.

There remain four characteristics of the Asheninca content interrogatives that are especially noteworthy from a worldwide perspective. First, there is no lexical differentiation between ‘who’ and ‘what’. Second, the interrogatives are pure transparent, meaning that all interrogatives are transparently derived from one basic interrogative (viz. *tsica*). Third, the basis of the pure transparent system is an interrogative meaning ‘where’, in contrast to the few other pure transparent systems among the world’s languages, which are based on meaning ‘what/which’. And finally, the derivation from this basis is performed by auxiliary-like verbs. All these aspects have parallels in other languages around the world, but the combination of these four features is only found in Asheninca. However, all these four special characteristics seem to have a higher density of occurrence in South America, so this one case might be interpreted as the coincidental, but expected, conflation of various areally common features.

7. References

- Adelaar, Willem F. H. (1977). *Tarma Quechua: grammar, texts, dictionary*. Lisse: De Ridder.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra A. Y. (1995). *Bare*. (Languages of the World/Materials; 100). Munich: Lincom.
- (1998). Warekena. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Vol. 4, pp. 225-440. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (1999). The Arawak language family. In: R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) *The Amazonian Languages*, pp. 65-106. (Cambridge Language Surveys). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ambrazas, Vyautas (1997). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Baltos Lankos.
- Anderson, Ronald Jaime (1985/1986). *Cuentos Folklóricos de los Asheninca*. (Comunidades y Culturas Peruanas; 18-20). Pucallpa: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Berry, Keith & Christine Berry (1999). *A Description of Abun: A West Papuan Language of Irian Jaya*. (Pacific Linguistics; B 115). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Bruyn, Adrienne (1993). Question words in 18th-century and 20th-century Sranan. In: Jaap van Marle (ed.) *Historical Linguistics 1991*, pp. 31-47. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory; 107). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chapman, Shirley (1986). Paumarí interrogatives. In: Joseph E. Grimes (ed.) *Sentence Initial Devices*, pp. 215-33. (Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics; 75). Arlington, Tx.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Chapman, Shirley & Desmond C. Derbyshire (1990). Paumari. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Vol. 3, pp. 161-354. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Duff-Tripp, Martha (1997). *Gramática del Idioma Yanasha' (Amuesha)*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana; 43). Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Eakin, Lucille (1991). *Lecciones para el aprendizaje del Idioma Yaminahua*. (Documento de Trabajo; 22). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

- Eastlack, Charles L. (1968). Terena (Arawakan) Pronouns. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 34 (1): 1-8.
- Ekdahl, Elizabeth Muriel & Nancy Evelyn Butler (1979). *Aprenda Terêna*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Everett, Daniel L. (1986). Pirahã. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Vol. 1, pp. 200-325. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Facundes, Sidney (2000). *The language of the Apurinã people of Brazil (Maipure/Arawak)*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of New York at Buffalo.
- Fleck, David William (2003). *A Grammar of Matses*. Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University.
- Frank, Paul S. (1990). *Ika Syntax*. (Studies in the languages of Colombia; 1). Arlington, Tx.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Galucio, Ana Vilacy (2001). *The morphosyntax of Mekens (Tupi)*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Gerzenstein, Ana (1994). *Lengua Maká: Estudio descriptivo*. (Archivo de Lenguas Indoamericanas). Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Givón, T. (1984). Ute. In: William S. Chisholm, Jr. (ed.) *Interrogativity: A Colloquium on the Grammar, Typology and Pragmatics of Questions in Seven Diverse Languages*, pp. 215-43. (Typological Studies in Language; 4). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (2001). *Syntax: An Introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Grondona, Verónica Maria (1998). *A grammar of Mocoví*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Hardman, M. J. (2000). *Jaqaru*. (Languages of the World/Materials; 183). Munich: Lincom.
- Haspelmath, Martin (1997). *Indefinite Pronouns*. (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Clarendon.
- Heeschen, Volker (1998). *An Ethnographic Grammar of the Eipo Language Spoken in the Central Mountains of Irian Jaya (West New Guinea), Indonesia*. (Mensch, Kultur und Umwelt im Zentralen Bergland von West-Neuguinea; 23). Berlin: Reimer.

- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi & Friederike Hünemeyer (1991). *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holt, Dennis (1999). *Pech (Paya)*. (Languages of the World/Materials; 366). Munich: Lincom.
- Hyde, Sylvia (1980). *Diccionario Amahuaca*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana; 7). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Daniel J. Magaji (1970). *Essentials of Gwari Grammar*. (Occasional Publication; 27). Ibadan: Institute of African Studies.
- Jones, Wendell & Paula Jones (1991). *Barasano Syntax*. (Studies in the Languages of Colombia; 2). Arlington, Tx.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Kakumasu, James (1986). Urubu-Kaapor. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Vol. 1, pp. 326-406. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kindberg, Lee (1980). *Diccionario Ashaninca*. (Documento de Trabajo; 19). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Klein, Harriet (2001). *Toba*. (Languages of the World/Materials; 179). Munich: Lincom.
- Kroeker, Menno (2001). A Descriptive Grammar of Nambikuara. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 67 (1): 1-87.
- Lefebvre, Claire & Anne-Marie Brousseau (2002). *A Grammar of Fongbe*. (Mouton Grammar Library; 25). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lindström, Eva (1995). Animacy in interrogative pronouns. In: Inger Moen, Hanne Gram Simonsen & Helge Lødrup (eds.) *Papers from the 15th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, pp. 307-15. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Miller, Amy (2001). *A Grammar of Jamul Tiipay*. (Mouton Grammar Library; 23). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miller, Marion (1999). *Desano Grammar: Studies in the Languages of Colombia* 6. (Publications in Linguistics; 132). Arlington, Tx.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Montag, Susan (1981). *Diccionario Cashinahua*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana; 9). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Muysken, Pieter & Norval Smith (1990). Question words in Pidgin and Creole languages. *Linguistics* 28: 889-903.

- Nau, Nicole (1998). *Latvian*. (Languages of the World/Materials; 217). Munich: Lincom.
- (1999). Was schlägt der Kasus. Zu Paradigmen und Formengebrauch von Interrogativpronomina. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 52: 130-50.
- Pasch, Helma (1995). *Kurzgrammatik des Ewe*. (Grammatische Analysen Afrikanischer Sprachen; 5). Köln: Köppe.
- Payne, David L. (1991). A classification of Maipuran (Arawakan) languages based on shared lexical retentions. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Vol. 3, pp. 355-500. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Payne, Judith (1989). *Lecciones para el Aprendizaje del Idioma Asheninca*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana; 28). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Rabel, Lili (1961). *Khasi, a Language of Assam*. (Humanities Series; 10). Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Reed, Judy & David L. Payne (1983). Los pronominales en el Asheninca. In: David L. Payne & Marlene Ballena Dávila (eds.) *Estudios Lingüísticos de Textos Asheninca (Campa-Arawak Preandino)*, pp. 91-100. (Serie Lingüística Peruana; 21). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- (1986). Asheninca (Campa) pronominals. In: Ursula Wiesemann (ed.) *Pronominal Systems*, pp. 323-31. (Continuum; 5). Tübingen: Narr.
- Rice, Keren (1989). *A Grammar of Slave*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rumsey, Alan (2000). Bunuba. In: R. M. W. Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.) *Handbook of Australian Languages*. Vol. 5: Grammatical Sketches of Bunuba, Ndjébbana and Kugu Nganhcara, pp. 34-152. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Samarin, William J. (1967). *A Grammar of Sango*. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica; 38). The Hague: Mouton.
- Sapir, Edward (1930). Southern Paiute, A Shoshonean Language. In: William Bright (ed.) *Southern Paiute and Ute Linguistics and Ethnography*. (Collected works of Edward Sapir; 10). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (collection published in 1992).
- Senft, Gunter (1986). *Kilivila: The language of the Trobriand Islanders*. (Mouton Grammar Library; 3). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Shaver, Harold (1996). *Diccionario Nomatsiguenga-Castellano, Castellano-Nomatsiguenga*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana; 41). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Smith, Ian & Steve Johnson (2000). Kugu Nganhcara. In: R. M. W. Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.) *Handbook of Australian Languages*. Vol. 5: Grammatical Sketches of Bunuba, Ndjébbana and Kugu Nganhcara, pp. 357-507. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snell, Betty A. (1998). *Pequeño Diccionario Machiguenga-Castellano*. (Documento de Trabajo; 32). Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Soto Ruiz, Clodoaldo (1976). *Gramática Quechua: Ayacucho-Chanca*. Lima: Ministerio de Educación.
- Thornell, Christina (1997). *The Sango Language and its Lexicon*. (Travaux de l'Institut de Linguistique de Lund; 32). Lund: Lund University Press.
- Ultan, Russell (1978). Some general characteristics of interrogative systems. In: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of Human Language*. Vol. 4: Syntax, pp. 211-48. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Valenzuela, Pilar M. (2003). *Transitivity in Shipibo-Konibo Grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Viñas Urquiza, Maria Teresa (1974). *Lengua Mataca*. (Archivo de Lenguas Precolombinas; 2). Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Weber, David John (1986). Huallaga Quechua pronouns. In: Ursula Wiesemann (ed.) *Pronominal Systems*, pp. 333-50. (Continuum; 5). Tübingen: Narr.
- (1989). *A Grammar of Huallaga (Huánunco) Quechua*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics; 112). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wilson, Peter J. (1992). *Una Descripción Preliminar de la Gramática del Achagua (Arawak)*. Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Wise, Mary Ruth (1976). Apuntes sobre la influencia Inca entre los Amuesha; factor que oscurece la clasificación de su idioma. *Revista del Museo Nacional* 42: 355-66.
- (1986). Grammatical characteristics of PreAndine Arawakan languages of Peru. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Vol. 1, pp. 567-642. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Zeshan, Ulrike (2000). *Gebärdensprachen des indischen Subkontinents*. (Linguistic Research Forum; 4). Munich: Lincom.
- (2004). Interrogative constructions in signed languages: crosslinguistic perspectives. *Language* 80 (1): 7-39.

Appendix A: Asheninca

In this appendix, all 206 Asheninca content questions are summarised that are attested in the three-volume text collection by Anderson (1985/1986). They are grouped together in sections according to their formal structure, and within this grouping they are further ordered into subsections according to their meaning. Every Asheninca question is quoted verbatim, with an indication of the volume in which it is found (in roman numerals) and the page number within this volume (in arabic numerals). The Spanish translation as given by Anderson accompanies these questions.

The translations of these Asheninca stories are written in such a way as to be normally readable as a Spanish text, which means that Anderson had to take some freedom in formulating his translations. However, the translation of the direct speech – which includes all content questions presented here – appears to be rather close to the Asheninca original. In some cases, I have included round brackets in either the Asheninca original or in the Spanish translation, namely when the bracketed words did not have a direct equivalent in the other language.

When this paper was almost finished, I got in contact with three students from Peru (Carmen Núñez Zorrilla, Sulla Silva Sánchez and Liliana Fernández Fabián), who went over the corpus of questions with a native speaker of Asheninca, Pablo Jacinto Santos. He had only very few minor corrections to make. He corrected some of the spelling, which I did not correct in this paper as I decided to keep on to the spelling of Anderson (1985/1986). Jacinto Santos also commented that a few sentences, when presented in isolation, should have a singular subject instead of the plural as given in the translations. However, the context of these sentences might make the meaning plural (plurality is not consistently marked in Asheninca). Finally, he made a few additions to the translations, which I have added in straight brackets below.

For eight out of the 206 questions have I been unable to find a direct translation in the Spanish translation of what appears to be an Asheninca content question. Five of these eight sentences were translated for me by Pablo Jacinto Santos. His translations can be identified by the straight brackets around the whole translation. The three remaining questions have been left unanalysed.

Section	Structure	Meaning	Cases
A.1.1	<i>tsica</i> + NP	be where	9
A.1.2	<i>tsica</i> + V	where	4
A.1.3	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-saic-</i>	live where	5
A.1.4	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-iyaat-</i>	go where	7
A.1.5	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-a(g)-</i>	take from where	8
A.2.1	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-quen-</i>	go where	6
A.2.2	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-quen-</i>	will do how	3
A.2.3	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-quen-</i>	can do how	5
A.3	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-cara-</i>	how much/many	3
A.4.1	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-tzim-</i> + NP	be who	2
A.4.2	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-tzim-</i> + relative clause	which of them	2
A.5.1	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-cant-</i>	say what	4
A.5.2	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-cant-</i>	do what/what happened	9
A.5.3	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-cant-</i> + relative clause	how	12
A.5.4	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-cant-</i> + relative clause	why	5
A.6.1	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-pait-</i>	call how	9
A.6.2	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	who	4
A.6.3	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	what/which	12
A.6.4	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	why	15
A.6.5	<i>tsica</i> + <i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	how	1
A.7.1	<i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	who	6
A.7.2	<i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	what	16
A.7.3	<i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	why	40
A.7.4	<i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	how	1
A.7.5	<i>-pait-</i> + relative clause	how could (exclamation)	4
A.8	<i>ipaitaca</i>	how are you/what's up	4
A.9	<i>tsica</i> + relative clause	(various meanings)	5
A.10	Other interrogatives		2
A.11	No translation		3
Total			206

A.1.1. *tsica* + NP ('be where')

- (I-100) *tsica piri*
'¿Dónde está tu papá?'
- (I-136) *tsica mulapayeeni*
'¿Dónde están las mulas?'
- (II-106) *tsica jetari*
'¿Dónde están las carachamas?'
- (III-60) *tsica niyompare*
'¿Dónde está nuestro amigo?'
- (III-120) *tsica pitomi*
'¿Dónde está tu hijo?'
- (III-126) *tsica piime*
'¿Dónde está tu esposo?'
- (III-162) *tsica pirentzi*
'¿Dónde está tu hermano?'
- (III-188) *tsica iroñaaca pitomi*
'¿Dónde está [ahora] tu hijo?'
- (III-190) *tsica iroñaaca pitomi*
'¿Dónde está [ahora] tu hijo?'

A.1.2. *tsica* + V ('where')

- (I-70) *tsica icaithovaquemica cashecari*
'¿Dónde te arañó el tigre?'
- (II-150) *tsica jaca jatsicaquemica*
'¿Dónde te mordió?'
- (III-48) *tsica janta opeyaca pichecopite*
'¿Dónde perdiste tu flecha?'
- (III-210) *tsica poviroca iroñaaca iroca quithaarentsi*
'¿Dónde la tienes ahora [esta ropa]?'

A.1.3. *tsica* + *-saic-* ('live where')

- (I-98) *tsica isaiquica charine*
'¿Dónde vive (mi) abuelo?'

- (I-110) *tsica osaiquica ijananeryaate Pava*
‘¿(Por) dónde está el agua de[l] Dios [del monte]?’
- (II-100) *eejatzi tsica osaiquica pyaarentsi ishinquitaiyarini*
‘¿ [y] Dónde está el masato que tomaron?’
- (III-50) *tsica isaiquica manincariite*
‘¿Dónde viven?’
- (III-86) *tsica osaiquica iroñaaca pinampi*
[¿Dónde está ahora tu comunidad?]

A.1.4. *tsica* + *-iyaat-* (‘go where’)

- (I-66) *tsica jiyaatzica ashitarori ipanco*
‘¿Dónde está el dueño de la casa?’
- (I-134) *tsica piyaateca*
‘¿A dónde van?’
- (III-24) *tsica piyaateca, aní*
‘¿A dónde vas, cuñado?’
- (III-82) *tsica piyaateca*
‘¿A dónde te diriges?’
- (III-90) *tsica piyaateca*
‘¿A dónde vas?’
- (III-178) *tsica piyaatzica*
‘¿A dónde fuiste?’
- (III-188) *tsica piyaateca*
‘¿A dónde vas?’

A.1.5. *tsica* + *-a(g)-* (‘take from where’)

- (I-148) *tsica paaqueroca caniri*
‘¿De dónde has sacado yuca?’
- (I-150) *tsica paaqueroca caniri*
‘¿De dónde consigues la yuca?’
- (I-150) *tsica aaqueroca, tema tecaatsi onquenapaaque ovaritentsi*
‘¿De dónde está sacando estos alimentos cuando no hay nada?’
- (I-152) *tsica paaqueroca caniri*
‘¿De dónde sacas la yuca?’

- (II-36) *tsica nayeca iroñaaca nontsipatyaari nonquinqithavaitacairi*
‘¿Dónde conseguiré una compañera con quien conversar?’
- (II-158) *tsica paataiqueroca iroca ivenquipayeeni*
‘¿Dónde has conseguido estas clases diferentes de ivenqui?’
- (III-162) *tsica paaqueroca*
‘¿Dónde la has encontrado?’
- (III-178) *tsica paaqueroca iroñaaca iroca quithaarentsi irooperori*
‘¿Dónde conseguiste la ropa de mejor calidad?’

A.2.1. *tsica* + *-quen-* (‘go where’)

- (I-122) *tsica onquene onchequeri tema antaripayeeni cashecari icaratzi 5*
[¿Por dónde vas a ir a contarle si los tigres son grandes?]
- (I-190) *tsica nonquenaajateca inquene nonquemero noshintsinca*
‘¿Dónde puedo ir para probar mi fuerza?’
- (II-46) *tsica iquenanaqueca ishitovantaari iroñaaca*
‘¿Por dónde salió [ahora]?’
- (III-86) *tsica iquenapaaqueca iroñaaca irica atziri*
‘¿De dónde habrá venido est hombre?’
- (III-42) *tsica iquenaqueca neentsite*
‘¿Dónde está mi hijo?’
- (III-164) *tsica oquenanaqueca*
‘¿A dónde se fue?’

A.2.2. *tsica* + *-quen-* (‘will do how’)

- (I-24) *tsica inqueneca iroyaana (iyequiite)*
‘¿Cómo van a comerme?’
- (I-76) *tsica pinqueneca pishintsite*
‘¿Cómo es que tienes fuerza?’
- (II-130) *tsica inqueneca noyaaro samacaa*
‘¿Cómo voy a comer este palo podrido?’

A.2.3. *tsica* + *-quen-* (‘can do how’)

- (I-128) *tsica onquene piniyacotero* (occurs two more times on this page)
‘¿Cómo puedes tragar (un palito de yuca)?’

(I-152) *tsica inqueneca impemiro tsitsiri caniri*

‘¿Cómo puede darte yuca?’

(II-88) *tsica inqueneca atonqueri*

‘¿Cómo podemos matarlas si son personas?’

A.3. *tsica* + *-cara-* (‘how much/many’)

(I-108) *tsica ocaratzica osamanitavai osaiqui ijananeryaate Pava*

‘¿Cuánto se demora para llegar al agua de[I] Dios [del monte]?’

(III-126) *tsica incarate oorya irareetapaiya*

‘¿A qué hora va a regresar?’

(III-160) *tsica oncarate quitatieri pimpiyantaiyaari*

‘¿Qué día estarán de regreso por aquí?’

A.4.1. *tsica* + *-tzim-* + NP (‘be who’)

(I-152) *tsica intzimeca tsitsiri pemirone*

‘¿Quién es ese grillo?’

(III-44) *tsica otzimaajatzica irona cooya*

‘¿Quién será esa mujer?’

A.4.2. *tsica* + *-tzim-* + relative clause (‘which of whom’)

(II-172) *tsica otzimica neentsite pinintaqueri*

‘¿Cuál de mis hijas te gusta?’

(III-166) *pamenero eeroca tsica otzimi pinintziri*

‘¿Cuál de ellas te interesa más?’

A.5.1. *tsica* + *-cant-* (‘say what’)

(II-138) *tsica icantzica nosari* (occurs two more times on this page)

‘¿Qué está diciendo mi nieto?’

(III-138) *tsica picantapaaqueroca piniro*

‘¿Qué le dijiste a tu madre?’

A.5.2. *tsica* + *-cant-* (‘do what/what happened’)

(I-16) *tsica noncantyaaca iroñaaca*

‘¿Qué voy a hacer ahora?’

- (I-70) *tsica picantaquerica*
‘¿Por qué?’
- (I-86) *tsica pincanteroca*
‘¿Qué haces (con tu ahijada)?’
- (I-134) *tsica ancantérica maini*
‘¿Qué podemos hacer con el oso?’
- (I-186) *tsica picantacaya*
[¿Cómo estás hoy?]
- (II-78) *tsica noncantaiyaaca navisacotantaiyaari*
‘¿Qué puedo hacer para salvar mi vida?’
- (II-106) *tsica ocantaquemica iroori*
‘¿Qué pasó con ellas?’
- (III-154) *tsica noncantyaaca niyaatantaiyaari nonampiqui*
‘¿Qué haré ahora para llegar a mi casa [pueblo]?’
- (III-202) *tsica ocantanaquemica nopini amanatavacaantanacari iroñaaca*
‘¿Qué efecto hizo mi pinitisi para hacerte jugar conmigo?’

A.5.3. *tsica* + *-cant-* + relative clause (‘how’)

- (I-32) *tsica ancantaqueroca*
‘¿Cómo (se utiliza)?’
- (I-38) *oncantajaantyama potzireeri cashecari*
‘¿Cómo hiciste caer al tigre?’
- (I-72) *tsica picantaqueroca pamentantacarori sheri*
‘¿Cómo te has acostumbrado al tabaco?’
- (I-78) *tsica noncantyaaca niyaatantaqyaari isaiquirra*
‘¿Cómo puedo llegar (a la luna)?’
- (I-98) *tsica picantaqueroca pipocantacari jaca*
‘¿Cómo llegaste aquí?’
- (II-24) *tsica icanta jiñaantapiintariri ani irirori maniro*
‘¿Cómo es que mi cuñado siempre los encuentra?’
- (II-48) *tsica picantaquerica paantacari oshequi*
‘¿Cómo has conseguido tanto pescado?’
- (II-142) *tsica ocanta piyotantacari ari asaiqui jaca camincari pipocantacari*

- ‘¿Cómo sabes que hay un muerto en algún sitio?’
 (III-82) *tsica picantziroca eeroa pamasheetzi*
 ‘¿Cómo bailan ustedes?’
 (III-102) *tsicatya picantaca eeroa piyotantarori piquiricavaitzi*
 ‘¿Cómo has aprendido a hilar?’
 (III-128) *tsica noncantairoca naantaiyaarori*
 ‘¿Cómo podré recuperarla?’
 (III-208) *tsica ocantaca piñaantariri eeroa poshinirintsipayeeni*
 ‘¿Cómo consigues animales?’

A.5.4. *tsica* + *-cant-* + relative clause (‘why’)

- (I-28) *tsica picantaquerica oshequi pithaavacaataicari*
 ‘¿Por qué tienen miedo?’
 (I-32) *tsica icantaca tsityoqui caari oocantari iina*
 ‘¿Por qué la esposa del (hombre) perico no lo deja?’
 (I-76) *tsica picantatyaaca*
 ‘¿Por qué (te burlas)?’
 (II-104) *tsica icanta icamantajaantari irirori jetari*
 ‘¿Por qué mueren las carachamas con el barbasco?’
 (III-180) *tsica picantzirica eeroa pitomi piquitamarotacaantariri*
 ‘¿Por qué es blanco tu hijo?’

A.6.1. *tsica* + *-pait-* (‘call how’)

- (I-32) *tsica opaitajaantaca*
 ‘¿Cómo se llama?’
 (I-32) *tsica opaitaca pinitsitatsine*
 ‘¿Qué es el pinitsi?’
 (I-32) *tsica opaitaca pipini*
 ‘¿Qué nombre es ese?’
 (I-48) *tsica ipaitaca irinta*
 ‘¿Cómo se llaman esos?’
 (I-48) *tsica ipaitaca ataitatsiri*
 ‘¿Cómo se llama este que sube (al árbol)?’
 (I-56) *tsicama ipaitaca irica*

‘¿Cómo vamos a llamar a esos (hombres)?’

(I-90) *tsica ipaitaca*

‘¿Qué clase (de carne) es?’

(I-196) *tsica pipaitaca*

‘¿Cómo te llamas?’

(III-86) *tsica opaitaca noñaakeri*

[¿Cómo se llama lo que vi?]

A.6.2. *tsica* + *-pait-* + relative clause (‘who’)

(I-50) *tsica ipaita quiyataamatsitaquerori omoro*

‘¿Quién hizo el hueco?’

(I-136) *tsica ipaitaca pocatsiri iroñaaca*

‘¿Quién viene?’

(III-16) *tsica ipaitaca ayitapiintairiri atyaapate*

‘¿Quién roba nuestras gallinas?’

(III-162) *tsica opaitaca iroca cooya añaakeri*

‘¿Quiénes serán esas mujeres que hemos encontrado?’

A.6.3. *tsica* + *-pait-* + relative clause (‘what/which/’)

(I-96) *tsica opaitaca poimpatsiri*

‘¿Qué cosa sonó?’

(I-174) *tsica ipaitaca oshincotachari jaca*

‘¿Qué has asado?’

(I-192) *tsica opaitaca pinintacotanari*

‘¿Qué deseas de mí?’

(II-38) *tsica opaitaca nontziyerori iroca peentsite*

‘¿Qué le puede dar de comer a tu hija?’

(II-46) *tsica ipaitaca pantapairi jaca ...*

‘¿Qué haces aquí?’

(II-154) *tsica opaitaca povashitaantari piquentantariri irica thamiri*

‘¿Cerca de qué tipo de fruto silvestre pusiste tu maspute para cazar el paujil?’

(II-72) *tsica opaitaca antaqueriri*

‘¿Qué le pasó (a este niño)?’

- (II-132) *tsica opaitaca amiretyaari iroñaaca*
‘¿Qué agua podemos beber?’
- (II-156) *tsica ipaitaca povacaapiintarori piina tera pinquentavaite*
‘¿Qué comen tú y tu esposa?’
- (III-12) *tsica opaitaca antaquemiri*
‘¿Qué te ha pasado?’
- (III-52) *tsica ipaitaca tsimeritatsiri irica pocaintsiri*
‘¿Qué pájaro es este que está volando?’
- (III-82) *tsica opaitaca iroñaaca potziritacari*
‘¿Qué es eso que te has echado?’
- A.6.4. *tsica* + *-pait-* + relative clause (‘why’)**
- (I-136) *tsica opaitaca pamantariri cashecari*
‘¿Por qué has traído tigres?’
- (I-144) *tsica opaita ooncantacari*
‘¿Por qué tenemos esta inundación?’
- (I-176) *tsica opaitaca jantaminhatantamiri icovi irovacaiyaamiro ivatha*
‘¿Por qué quiere Taavantzi fastidiarte haciéndote comer su carne?’
- (I-182) *tsica opaitaca paantyaariri novaamparite*
‘¿Por qué quieres quitarnos nuestro fuego?’
- (II-42) *tsica ipaitaca itstinampaantanari ipairyaavaitana*
‘¿Por qué se burla de mí repitiendo (mi nombre)?’
- (II-104) *tsica opaitaca picoviri eeroa pishirontaminthatantanari*
‘¿Por qué me fastidian?’
- (II-106) *tsica opaitaca pishiyapithatantaarori eentyo*
‘¿Por qué has dejado a mis hermanas solas?’
- (II-112) *tsica opaitaca napaatantacarori opoqui apaniroini*
‘¿Por qué he perdido la oportunidad (con esta mujer) que vino sola?’
- (II-118) *tsica opaitaca pipocashitaamatsiziri eeroa*
‘¿Por qué han venido ustedes a pelear?’
- (II-130) *tsica opaita pipocantacari iroñaaca jaca*
‘¿Por qué has venido a este lugar?’
- (II-150) *tsica ipaitaca nompemiri iroñaaca nothoncataqueri novacari*

- ‘¿Por qué me pides cuando ya la terminé?’
 (II-174) *tsica opaitaca noñaantacariri chapinqui irica camaari*
 ‘¿Por qué me encontré con el diablo’
 (III-22) *tsica opaitaca irovantyaanari ovayiri*
 ‘¿Por qué me va a matar un enemigo?’
 (III-24) *tsica opaitaca picaimacaantariri*
 ‘¿Por qué lo llamas?’
 (III-146) *tsica opaitaca caari povantari iroñaaca irica ovayiri*
 ‘¿Por qué no matas a este guerrero?’

A.6.5. *tsica* + *-pait-* + relative clause (‘how’)

- (II-160) *tsica opaitaca picominthatantaari*
 ‘¿Cómo te has vuelto buen cazador?’

A.7.1. *-pait-* + relative clause (‘who’)

- (I-186) *ipaitaca picaimiøri incaaranqui*
 ‘¿A quien estás llamando?’
 (II-92) *ipaitaca checavaitatsiri*
 ‘¿Quién está cortando ese árbol?’
 (II-98) *ipaitaca ashitarori itzivine*
 ‘¿De quién es la sal?’
 (II-128) *ipaitaca picaimiri incaaranqui*
 ‘¿A quién estabas llamando?’
 (III-26) *paitaca nintamatsiterineri irirori* (occurs one more time on this page)
 ‘¿Quién lo va a querer?’

A.7.2. *-pait-* + relative clause (‘what’)

- (I-88) *ipaitaca antaqueriri shametzi*
 ‘¿Qué le pasó a mi ahijado?’
 (I-94) *opaitaca iraantyaanari maini*
 ‘¿Qué oso va a llevarme?’
 (I-106) *opaitaca pisaicaventziri incaarequi*
 ‘¿Qué hacen en el lago?’
 (I-116) *opaitaca pantzirica*

- ‘¿Qué haces?’
- (I-128) *ipaitaca jovintziri compaatziri otyocoretantari*
‘¿Qué clase de yuca ha sembrado mi compradre?’
- (I-130) *opaitaca antaquemiri*
‘¿Qué te pasa?’
- (I-182) *ipaitaca paantariri novaamparite*
‘¿Qué hacen con mi fuego?’
- (II-42) *ipaitaca pantzirica*
‘¿Qué haces?’
- (II-54) *ipaitaca nompeyaari iroñaaca*
‘¿En qué me convertiré?’
- (II-110) *paitaca pantzirica*
‘¿Qué estás haciendo?’
- (II-134) *paitaca pameniri*
‘¿Qué estás buscando?’
- (II-162) *paitaca antaquemiri*
‘¿Qué te ha pasado?’
- (III-82) *paitaca pantzirica eeroca*
‘¿Qué hacen ustedes aquí?’
- (III-116) *paitaca pamemenatzirica jaca noyovitequi*
‘¿Qué estabas buscando en mi olla de barro?’
- (III-156) *paitaca antaquemiri*
‘¿Qué te sucedió?’
- (III-174) *paita picocovatziri*
‘¿Qué buscas?’

A.7.3. **-pait-** + **relative clause** (‘why’)

- (I-84) *ipaitaca antaquerori pitsiro ocamantacari*
‘¿Por qué murió tu hermana?’
- (I-88) *ipaitaca piraacotari*
‘¿Por qué están llorando?’
- (I-98) *opaitaca apocantacari incaaranqui*
‘¿Por qué hemos venido?’

- (I-114) *opaitaca nonthañaantyaarori*
‘¿Por qué lo voy a mezquinar?’
- (I-122) *ipaitaca icaimantari atomi*
‘¿Por qué está gritando nuestro hijo?’
- (I-138) *ipaitaca poocacotantarori novarite*
‘¿Por qué has botado mi comida?’
- (I-150) *opaitaca posampisampitantanari*
‘¿Por qué me preguntas?’
- (I-178) *opaitaca payitantariri novaamparite*
‘¿Por qué has traído mi candela?’
- (I-190) *ipaitaca picaimantanari*
‘¿Por qué me llamas?’
- (II-28) *opaitaca itotantarori ivatha*
‘¿Por qué está cortando su carne?’
- (II-28) *ipaitaca pototantoarori pivatha*
‘¿Por qué cortas tu carne?’
- (II-30) *ipaitaca ishiyantacari quemishi*
‘¿Por qué se ha escapado el gusano?’
- (II-42) *opaitaca pitsinampaavaitantanari pishovirivaitzi novairoqui*
‘¿Por qué tocas la quena con mi nombre?’
- (II-42) *opaitaca povantyaanari*
‘¿Por qué vas a comerme?’
- (II-42) *opaitaca pipairyaantanari novairoqui*
‘¿Por qué repites mi nombre?’
- (II-52) *ipaitaca icantantanari ...*
‘¿Por qué me dice eso?’
- (II-54) *ipaitaca pintsitocantyaanari, aní*
‘¿Por qué quieres matarme, cuñado?’
- (II-56) *paitaca pithatantari otavantoqui pancotsi*
‘¿Por qué estás colgado como un murciélago?’
- (II-62) *opaitaca piquisantapaanari iroñaaca*
‘¿Por qué te enojas?’
- (II-66) *paitaca sitaitantarori sovane*

- ‘¿Por qué has quemado mi chacra?’
 (II-76) *paitaca pomantsiyaavaitantariri asheninca*
 ‘¿Por qué has hecho daño a nuestros paisanos?’
- (II-88) *ipaitaca picaimentari*
 ‘¿Por qué estás llamando(me)?’
- (II-102) *opaitaca nomaimotantacariri camincari*
 ‘¿Por qué dormí en la casa de un muerto?’
- (II-108) *opaitaca piraantari ...*
 ‘¿Por qué estás llorando?’
- (II-108) *opaitaca icamantari*
 ‘¿Por qué ha muerto?’
- (II-112) *paitaca poiricantyaanari*
 ‘¿Por qué quieres agarrarme?’
- (II-120) *ipaitaca piraraatantari*
 ‘¿Por qué lloras?’
- (II-120) *ipaita potoncantyaaneri*
 ‘¿Por qué van a matarme?’
- (II-126) *paitaca pairicantanari*
 ‘¿Por qué me agarran?’
- (II-128) *opaitaca picaicaimatashitziri “oovivivi”*
 ‘¿Por qué estas gritando “ovivivi”?’
- (II-134) *paitaca pithaatantacarori noñaate*
 ‘¿Por qué has tomado mi agua?’
- (II-134) *paitaca pipocantari*
 ‘¿Por qué has venido?’
- (II-142) *opaitaca pamatavitantanari*
 ‘¿Por qué me has engañado?’
- (II-154) *ipaitica pipocantari, aní*
 ‘¿Por qué has venido, cuñado?’
- (III-44) *paitaca pishirontaminthatantanari noñaapiintzimima*
 ‘¿Por qué te estás riendo?’
- (III-44) *paitaca pinquentatantayaanari*
 ‘¿Por qué quieres picarme?’

- (III-44) *paitaca povashirevaitantarica*
‘¿Por qué estás triste?’
- (III-62) *paitaca oshitovantari iriraane shima*
‘¿Por qué está sangrando el pescado?’
- (III-106) *paitaca ipirantantari maranque*
‘¿Por qué has puesto tan cerca a esa culebra?’
- (III-170) *paitaca piraantari*
‘¿Por qué lloras?’

A.7.4. -pait- + relative clause (‘how’)

- (II-140) *opaitaca piyotantacarori pisoncatzi*
‘¿Cómo ha[s] aprendido a tocar la antara?’

A.7.5. -pait- + relative clause (‘how could’ - exclamation)

- (I-86) *opaitaca povantyaarori pisameto*
‘¿Cómo puedes comer a tu ahijada?’
- (I-90) *ipaitaca povacaantyaanariri*
‘¿Cómo puedes darmela para comer?’
- (1-90) *ipaitaca avantyaariri*
‘¿Cómo puedes comerlo?’
- (I-174) *ipaitaca novantyaarori ivatha atziri*
‘¿Cómo puedo comer carne humana?’

A.8. ipaitaca (‘how are you/what’s up’)

- (I-86) *ipaitaca*
‘¿Qué pasa?’
- (I-88) *ipaitaca*
‘¿Qué pasa?’
- (I-88) *ipaitaca*
‘¿Cómo pasó eso?’
- (I-130) *ipaitaca*
‘¿Qué pasa?’

A.9. *tsica* + relative clause (various meanings)

(I-68) *tsica piñaantacariri eeroa ...*

‘¿Cómo sabes lo que ... ?’

(I-88) *tsica icamantacari atomi*

‘¿Por qué murió nuestro hijo?’

(II-26) *tsicama ipaitatyaarica*

‘¿Por qué (no traes otra clase de carne)?’

(II-106) *tsica ovamaantariri irirori jetari isaicavetatya*

[¿Cómo lo mató a él la carachama cuando vivía?]

(III-20) *tsica piyotziroca eeroa ...*

‘¿Cómo sabes tú que ... ?’

A.10. Other interrogatives

(II-62) *soitaca cantzimiri iroñaaca sintoveri soirine*

‘¿Quién te dijo que tumaras mi pijuayo?’

(II-136) *iitaca pipocashitziri nosaro “tsii”*

‘¿Por qué has venido a este lugar?’

A.11. No (literal) translation

(II-92) *tsica opaitaca jasariimatantairi irovai*

(III-62) *tsica opaitaca paamaventantanacari tema te nompoque naaca iroñaaca
novayiritemi*

(III-126) *tsica ocantaca iroñaaca onintantamiri piina povacaashitaro piiri*