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### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>first person plural exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>first person plural inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>'on', as in x 'acting on' y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMP</td>
<td>accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverbializer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEC</td>
<td>become</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKFTH</td>
<td>back and forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>cause or causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCEN</td>
<td>concentratedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x
CONQ Conchucos Quechua
DEF definitivizer
DESID desiderative
DIR direct (information) or direction
DS different subject
EV evidential
FUT future
GEN genitive
GOAL goal
HABPST habitual past
IMP imperative
IMPFV imperfective
INCEP inceptive
INF infinitive
ITER iterative
LIM limitative
LOC locative
NARR narrative past
NEG negative
NOH nominalizer
PASS passive
PERF perfect
PFV perfective
PL plural
PNCT punctual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUR</td>
<td>purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEST</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECIPE</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECPST</td>
<td>recent past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>reportative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAKE</td>
<td>for the sake of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>similarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>same subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YN?</td>
<td>yes/no question marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The central goal of this thesis is to describe the grammar of clause-combining in Conchucos Quechua, and, in so doing, to show that clause-combining can only be understood in terms of discourse structure. In order to achieve this end, a description of Conchucos Quechua clause types is provided and clause-combining in texts of diverse genres is discussed. Grammar is seen as ultimately motivated by communicative needs in discourse. Texts are seen as networks in which each clause is ultimately interconnected with every other clause through a
hierarchy of interacting relations. The analysis of representative texts in Conchucos Quechua shows that morphosyntactic patterns of clause-combining are fully interpretable only in the light of their discourse contexts.

Particular attention is given in this thesis to the analysis of switch-reference clauses in Conchucos Quechua. These clauses frequently occur linked together in linear series, clause chains. Switch-reference and clause-chaining are strongly influenced by discourse notions of topicality and participant reference. A discourse-directed analysis of these phenomena based on participant reference is shown to be preferable to strictly syntactic accounts based solely on the grammatical notion of subject.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Basic Goals of the Study

The primary aim of this thesis is to show that clause-combining in Conchucos Quechua is not exclusively a morphosyntactic phenomenon, but also a matter of discourse. Since clauses do not combine in isolation from their discourse contexts, their combinations are most fruitfully considered in terms of the textual environment. The thesis is largely descriptive: I outline the clause types and the clause combinations which occur in natural texts in Conchucos Quechua. By appealing to both the immediate and the global contexts of each type of clause combination, I show how discourse function correlates with combinatorial type. In the process, I hope that it will become apparent that discourse considerations are not optional, an 'icing on the cake' added on top of the grammar, but crucial to an understanding of the grammar of clause-combining in Conchucos Quechua.

1.2. The Conchucos Quechua Language and Its Speakers

Quechua is a language family with a number of members, rather than a single language with a number of dialects. There
are approximately eight million speakers of these languages, located geographically from Colombia, in the northern portion of South America, where the Inga Quechua language is spoken, to the province of Santiago del Estero, in Argentina, where a language closely related to Bolivian Quechua is spoken (See Figure 1). At the time of the arrival of the Spanish conquerors in what is now Peru, Quechua speakers populated the coastal areas, but it is now centered almost exclusively along the Andean chain. However, it is also spoken in some adjacent jungle areas, such as the Napo in Ecuador and the Pastaza in Peru. Some linguists claim that Quechua and Aymara are genetically related languages (e.g. Longacre and Orr 1962), but this is controversial.

The Quechua languages have been subclassified by Torero 1964 and Parker 1963 into Quechua I and II and Quechua B and A, respectively. The languages in the I, or B, group differ from the languages in the II, or A, group to roughly the same extent that languages in the Romance family, such as French, Spanish, and Portuguese, differ from one another. Within the respective groups, the I, or B, languages exhibit considerably more heterogeneity and less mutual intelligibility than the more homogeneous II, or A, languages. Interestingly, all of the B languages are located in central Peru, whereas the A languages surround them to the north and south. Thus, another way to appropriately characterize the Quechua language groups is
Figure 1. Quechua-Speaking Areas in South America (Landerman 1978)
Figure 2. The Quechua B Region (Parker 1970)
strictly by geography: The I, or B, languages are those spoken in Central Peru. The southern II, or A, languages are those spoken in Southern Peru, Bolivia, and Argentina, and the northern II, or A, languages are those spoken in Northern Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia. This is the approach taken by Landerman 1978, for example.

Conchucos Quechua, a member of the I, or B, group, is spoken by approximately 150,000 to 200,000 people in the highlands of the Department of Ancash in north central Peru. This is an area encompassed by the provinces of Huari, San Luis and Pomabamba, bounded on the north by the town of Pomabamba, on the south by the town of San Marcos, on the west by the Cordillera Blanca, the 'White Mountain Range,' and on the east by the Marañon River and the Province of Antonio Raimondi (See Figure 2). Conchucos Quechua is only one of several Quechua dialects spoken in Ancash. Various phonological, grammatical and lexical features distinguish it from the Huaraz dialect to the west\(^1\), for example. Among the most apparent distinguishing features of Conchucos Quechua are the prevalence of the suffix -ski for perfective aspect, the absence of monophthongization of vowel diphthongs so evident in Huaraz Quechua, and the presence of a set of lexical items unique in the Quechua languages because they end in the consonant -t, words such as hankat 'completely' and punlakat 'overflowing'. Because others (Cole
1983, for example) have called Huaraz Quechua 'Ancash', I have chosen to avoid confusion by calling the variety which I will be discussing, spoken in Eastern Ancash, 'Conchucos' Quechua.\(^2\) Interestingly, with regard to certain phonological features, both the most conservative of the Quechua languages, that of Sihuas, and the most innovative language, that of Huaraz, are reported to be located in Ancash.\(^3\) Thus, within a small geographical area, considerable linguistic variation exists. Such variation, however, is characteristic of the Central Peruvian area. Within Ancash, the Conchucos dialect is considered to be less innovative than the Huaraz dialect, yet by no means as conservative as the Sihuas dialect.

The Conchucos Quechua data come from my field work in Peru from January, 1980 to June, 1982, and in the summer of 1985. The analysis is based exclusively on texts. These are, primarily, tapes of oral monologues which I have recorded and transcribed, and, secondarily, self-transcribed texts by native Quechua speakers produced in native-authored workshops in which I taught in 1981 and 1982. The texts are of the following genres: narrative, procedural, expository, and motivational. The narratives are both of the folk tale and the personal account varieties. A number of speakers of both sexes are represented, but roughly 25% of the data are from Mariano Jaramillo Paulino, a native of the village of Huanchacamba, an
isolated Quechua community several hours' hike from the town of Pomabamba in northern Conchucos.

A popular notion in Peru has been that all varieties of Quechua are descended from the Cuzco language spoken by the rulers of the Inca Empire at the height of its power. This was generally accepted as fact until the 1960's; but linguists have been realizing, especially since studies of the central dialects have been made available, that the approximately thirty varieties of Quechua most likely could not have evolved in the only five centuries separating the Spanish conquest and the present day. The conclusion is that Quechua was spoken in Peru long before the conquest of the Incas and has continued its evolution to the present.

Quechua is an agglutinating language; words may carry a rather long train of suffixes. For example:

(1) rikaa-yaa-shu-y-niki-kura-ta
    see-PL->2-INF->2-PL-ACC

' those who have seen you (pl)'

A verb with its accompanying affixes may express what, in English, would take an entire sentence:

(2) Ahaa-paa-yaa-ma-sha-tsu
    be:angry-BEN-PL->1-PRT-NEG

'They didn't get mad at me.'
The language is exclusively suffixing. There is no theoretical maximum number of suffixes that a word may carry, but seven seems to be a practical limit.

Quechua has been classified in various sources (Greenberg 1966 and Comrie 1981, for example) as an SOV language with relatively free word order. Typologically, the language does exhibit many of the features of the SOV 'type'. Quechua is SOV-like in that it exhibits such characteristics as exclusive postpositionality, as well as adjective-noun and genitive-noun order within the noun phrase. With regard to statistical frequency of verb-final word order, however, the actual number of verb-final transitive declarative clauses in the Conchucos Quechua data base used for this thesis is only about 25%. The motivating factors behind such a low percentage of verb-final clauses in a purportedly verb-final language are a worthy topic of investigation, but are beyond the scope of this present work.

The language is also characterized by a total regularity of morphological processes, and an absence of articles, relative pronouns and conjunctions (except for occasional Spanish borrowings). A small lexicon is compensated for by the productive use of over seventy-five suffixes. Many lexemes can be assigned to either a substantive or a verb class, although there are a number of 'ambivalents', such as tsaka and tsaka- 'bridge'. A few particles and interjections, such as ama
'prohibitive', aw 'yes', and allaw 'Oh my!' are assigned to neither class.

All native Quechua verb roots and most noun roots end in a vowel. The vast majority are disyllabic, with a canonical structure of (C)V(C)CV(C). Length is phonemic; however, long vowels are not permitted in closed syllables. All non-final verb suffixes end in a vowel. Final suffixes can end in either a vowel or a consonant. Certain suffixes are subject to a phenomenon of vowel modification, termed morphophonemic 'forelowering' by Andean linguists, that is triggered by certain other suffixes which follow. The suffix -yku 'direct', for example, becomes phonetically -yka when followed by -ma: 'first person object':

(3) Qo-yka-ma-y  'Please give it to me!'
give-FCL→↓I-IMP

A typical noun can carry a possessive person-marking suffix immediately after the root, which is, for the first person, indicated by vowel length:

(4) wahi-:  'my house'
house-1

The possessed noun complex may be followed by a pluralizer and/or a case marker:
(5a) wahi-::kuna
    house-1-PL
    ‘our house/my houses’

(5b) wahi-::man
    house-1-GOAL
    ‘to my house’

(5c) wahi-::kuna-man
    house-1-PL-GOAL
    ‘to our house/my houses’

The standard disyllabic verb root may be followed by one or more optional derivational/aspectual suffixes, called ‘pre-transitional’ by Weber 1983a. These are followed by the obligatory inflectional suffixes, called ‘transitions’ by Colonial grammarians,\(^5\) and finally by optional ‘post-transitional’ (Weber 1983a) suffixes. Only clauses with fully finite verbs, those which carry affixes indicating tense, as well as subject and object, are ‘independent’, in the sense that they can stand in isolation. All other clauses are ‘dependent’, in the sense that they rely on the tense, and, sometimes, the person-marking established by their corresponding independent clauses. (6) is an example of a ‘garden variety’ independent Quechua verb with the class labels used by many Andean linguists:

(6) rika
    see
    -TSI
    -CAUS
    -MA-nga
    -nki
    -PAST-2
    -DIR

    ROOT
    (deriv./aspect)
    (optional)

    PRE-TRANSITION
    (tense/person)
    (obligatory)

    TRANSITION

    POST-TRANSITION
    (evid/shading)
    (optional)

    ‘You showed it to me.’
In (6), the pre-transitional causative suffix -tsi is affixed to the disyllabic root ri-ka- ‘see’, and is, in turned, followed by the obligatory verbal transition: the person-marking affix for first person object, -ma, the past tense marker -rqa, and the second person subject marker -nki. This is followed by the evidential marker -m, a word-final apocopated form of -mi ‘direct evidence’.

A verb can be nominalized. Such a verb contains, instead of a verbal tense marker, the appropriate nominalizer: -nqa, for present or past, -na for future, and, occasionally, -sh(q)a, for past. Nominalized clauses are generally not as rich in pre-transitional suffixes as their non-nominalized counterparts. Clauses containing nominalized verbs appear as direct or oblique arguments of non-nominalized clauses, or as adverbial adjuncts. Nominalized clauses can also function as relative clauses modifying noun phrases. The following is an example of a ‘garden variety’ nominalized clause, an object complement:

(7) Punta-ta-qa yarpaa-ri-shun wamra ka-nqa-ntsik-ta.6
     first-ADV-TOP :member-INCSEP-12FUT child be-NOM-12-ACC

‘First, let’s remember when we were children.’ (24.8)

(8) is an example of a nominalized clause used as an adverbial adjunct:
(8) Adverbial Clause:

Tsay-mi kushi-ku-ya-:
that-DIR rejoice-REFL-PL-:

[pay-kuna-pa ayuda-yaa-ma-nqa-n-pita]
3PRO-PL-GEN help-PL->1-NOM-3-ABL

'Thus we rejoice because of their helping us.' (18.15)

Many Conchucos Quechua verbs are marked for switch-reference. That is, same or different subject as the reference clause is indicated by one of two affixes on the verb: -r for Same Subject (SS) or -pti for Different Subject (DS). The switch-reference marker replaces the tense marker in the verbal transition of these verbs. The Same Subject marker is not followed by a subject marker, but, rather, by an optional object marker. The Different Subject marker, -pti, is obligatorily followed by a subject marker. Examples follow:

(9a) [César gringa-ta rika-yku-r-qa] qeshpi-ku-ra-n
     -ACC see-in-SS-TOP escape-REFL-PAST-3

'Upon seeing the gringa, Caesar escaped.'

(9b) [César gringa-ta rika-yku-pti-n-qa] qeshpi-ku-ra-n
     -ACC see -in -DS-3-TOP escape-REFL-PAST-3

'Upon Caesar's seeing the gringa, she escaped.'

Switch-reference clauses are often called 'adverbial clauses' in the literature (cf. Weber 1983a); however, they also have functions which are clearly not adverbial. In addition to
encoding notions such as time, manner, circumstance, reason, and condition, they may also encode sequential events in a narrative. Sometimes, several of them are 'chained' together in an extended utterance such as the following:

(10) Kandaadu-ta chura-ski-r-ni-n
    padlock-ACC put-PFV-SS-Ø-3
     kapcha-ski-r-ni-n-qa
    lock-PFV-SS-Ø-3-TOP
     wahi-ː-ta  llaki-ski-r-ni-n  inariqoq
    house-1-ACC mourn-PFV-SS-Ø-3  quite
     wahi-ː-ta  tunə-pa-ski-r-ni-n
    house-1-ACC circle-BEN-PFV-SS-Ø-3
     kuti-ka-mu-ː
    return-REFL-AFAR-1

'Putting on the padlock, locking it, really mourning for my house, circling around it, I return from there.' (4.3.)

Switch-reference clauses such as those in (10) resemble non-final clauses in 'chaining' languages in New Guinea (Longacre 1972, 1985), and will be discussed in Chapter 7 of this thesis.

1.3. Organization of the Dissertation

The remainder of the thesis consists of seven chapters.

Chapter 2 documents some basic facts about Conchucos Quechua grammar and characterizes Conchucos Quechua clause types.
Chapter 3 provides an explanation of the analytical perspective of the thesis and presents the primary analytical procedure used, Rhetorical Structure Analysis.

Chapter 4 describes the analysis of non-narrative texts, and draws some preliminary conclusions about Quechua clause-combining strategies.

Chapter 5 provides a reference list and typology of rhetorical relations for Conchucos Quechua.

Chapter 6 presents an analysis of the switch-reference system, with particular attention to participant reference in narrative.

Chapter 7 applies a specialized version of Rhetorical Structure Analysis to narrative and reviews the primary functions of clause-chaining constructions.

Finally, Chapter 8 summarizes some of the findings in the previous chapters and suggest some directions for further research.
NOTES to Chapter 1

1 See, for example, Stewart 1984a and 1984b for further elaboration on some of these differences.

The orthography I am using is basically the official Peruvian orthography for Quechua, legalized in 1975. Long vowels are represented as double vowels, /q/ is a back velar fricative.

2 'Conchucos' is the name of the valley where many of the speakers of this language live.

3 Peter Landerman, personal communication.

4 Some more recent analyses, such as Hawkins 1983, abandon the typological significance of verb position. SOV is considered to be a 'limited type indicator'. This is an area ripe for research in the Quechua languages.

5 Peter Landerman, personal communication.

6 All textual examples cited are referenced by text number and page. Texts 13-15 in the data base are included courtesy of Jim and Ellen Wroughton.
2. CLAUSES IN CONCHUCOS QUECHUA

2.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a framework for the rest of the dissertation by outlining some basic facts about Quechua grammar germane to an understanding of clause-combining strategies in discourse. First, I will review some of the relevant literature. Then, I will explain the motivation for considering the clause, rather than the sentence, to be the fundamental unit in clause-combining. Finally, I will characterize the types of clauses which I will consider, explaining the motivations behind the inclusion or exclusion of particular clause types.

2.2. Review of Literature Relevant to Quechua Clause-Combining

Although this present thesis is the only study thus far on clause-combining in any of the Quechua languages, some studies in related dialects of Central touch upon the issue. Three primary sources for information about the Quechua B languages are Adelaar's Tarma Quechua (1977), a reference grammar on a south central dialect; Weber 1983b, a UCLA doctoral dissertation on Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua; and Weber 1983a on relativization
and nominalization in that same dialect. Sources for general information on Ancash Quechua are Parker 1976, Larsen and Levengood 1982, Escribens and Proulx 1970, and Swisshelm 1972. All of these studies accept as a primitive the notion of the sentence, rather than the clause, as the basic syntactic unit, and only Weber's work takes discourse considerations into account. First, I will review the works on Ancash Quechua, then the more substantial reference grammars.

2.2.1. Works on Ancash Quechua

Parker's work is a brief overview of the various Quechua dialects spoken in the Department of Ancash, concentrating primarily on the Huaraz dialect. Parker distinguishes between Basic and Complex Sentences, defining a Basic Sentence as a structure which contains a single verbal root and up to three nominal constituents with functions determined by the verb, as well as an indefinite number of optional nominal constructions. These optional constituents are substantive phrases, true adverbs (a very small class in Quechua), and derived "adverbialized" adjectives.

Parker's 'Basic Sentence' is, in effect, a clause. His definition for Basic Sentence is unsatisfactorily vague, as he does not distinguish the kind of 'verbal root' which is actually employed. Verbal roots in Quechua can be the basis for full-fledged independent verbs, as illustrated
above in (6); or they can be nominalized, as in (7); or marked for switch-reference, as in (8) and (9). From Parker’s examples, it seems that he means a Basic Sentence to include one independent verb only, with no accompanying nominalized or switch-reference verbs. A solitary nominalized or switch-reference clause, then, could not comprise a ‘Basic Sentence’. However, his definition implies otherwise.

According to Parker, two or more Basic Sentences can form a Complex Sentence. There are four kinds of Complex Sentences: Coordinate Sentences, Subordinate Sentences, Embedded Sentences, and Relative Clauses. Coordinate Sentences combine two Basic Sentences; Subordinate Sentences function as modifiers of independent sentences; Embedded Sentences have roles which correspond to nominal functions of the sentence; and Relative Clauses function as modifiers of names or NP’s in the ‘logical structure’. (‘Logical structure’ seems to refer to semantic role structure.)

Here again, terminology is confusing. From the examples for Basic Sentence, the reader is led to assume that a Basic Sentence must contain one and only one independent verb. Yet, here, Parker refers to ‘Subordinate’ and ‘Embedded’ Sentences, neither of which contains an independent verb. Furthermore, he introduces the term ‘Clause’ for Relative Clauses, and it is not at all clear why Relative Clauses are ‘Clauses’, while
everything else is a Sentence. Throughout, the distinction between form and function of particular units is blurred and, at times, quite misleading. For example, although Parker initially defines 'Subordinate' Sentences as modifiers of independent clauses, a functional definition, he later defines that same class as all of those sentences 'subordinated' by the the set of switch-reference suffixes, a form definition. These 'Subordinate' Sentences', he says, are to be distinguished from the nominalized 'Embedded' Sentences with adverbial function, a distinction of form. However, 'Embedded' Sentences are earlier defined as having roles corresponding to nominal elements of the Basic Sentence, a functional definition which in effect excludes many nominalized clauses with adverbial function. Nominalized clauses with adverbial function are *ipso facto* 'caught in the middle' of a form-function equation which does not correspond to linguistic reality. In short, the terminology which Parker uses is confusing and misleading because of an unsatisfactory conflation of form and function and a resulting absence of clear definitions. As a result, we gain little insight into the nature of clausal constructions, the basic 'building blocks' of Quechua discourse.

Larsen and Levengood 1982 is a an overview of Huaylas (essentially, Huaraz) Quechua grammar in which the terms 'independent clause' and 'sentence' seem to be used
interchangeably. They propose seventeen clause types. This seems to be essentially a classification of finite verbs by semantic class. Their discussion of clause-combining is restricted to a section on Complex Sentences, in which they briefly allude to discourse considerations when they mention that certain characteristics of sentence construction depend on text type (p.23). This is followed by an analysis of the 'narrative sentence', an analysis which is pursued in greater detail in another article by Larsen, Larsen 1970. The 'narrative sentence, the basic grammatical unit of the narrative, consists of one or more clauses and a 'sentence marking construction'. (p.421) The 'sentence-marking construction' consists of an initial link or dependent clause marked for switch-reference, an optional sequence connective suffix -na, and an optional evidential suffix. The reasons for designating the sentence as the basic grammatical unit of the narrative, and the 'sentence-marking construction' as an essential constituent thereof, are not given.

Escribens and Proulx 1970 provides a sentence classification similar to Parker's. Here form and function are conflated so that form-based labels are assumed to have exact functional equivalents. Although the sentence is presumed to be the basic grammatical unit, clauses are distinguished as Independent, Dependent, and Embedded. Independent Clauses are those which can function as Major Sentences, which in turn are
defined as predications. Dependent Clauses are those which are marked for switch-reference, and Embedded Clauses are all those which are nominalized. The Dependent and the Embedded classes correspond to Parker's Subordinate and Embedded Sentences, and the classification suffers from the same ambiguities.

Swisshelm 1972, in the introductory portion to his dictionary and text collection, gives a brief grammatical sketch of Huaraz Quechua. He distinguishes independent verbs, which are marked for tense, from dependent verbs, all others. His discussion is concerned exclusively with the morphology of the verb, and does not mention the clause or the sentence.

2.2.2. Reference Grammars

Weber 1983b, a reference grammar for Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua, a language related to Conchucos Quechua, differs fundamentally from the works on Ancash in that its purpose is to provide a thorough description, rather than a brief overview, of one of the Quechua languages. Although the analyses presented in the grammar are thus more detailed and based on a large quantity of natural data, the commitment to the sentence is consistent with the briefer works. Weber defines the sentence compositionally as something which 'must contain a predication' (but may contain other elements). A predication, in turn, 'must contain a predicate' (but may contain other elements). A
predicate consists of a finite verb phrase or a substantive phrase which can be interpreted as the complement of an absent auxiliary verb (p.16). To Weber, the notion of clause does not enter into the definition of sentence. Although he uses the term 'clause' in referring to nominalized 'clauses', adverbial 'clauses', and 'main clauses', this is only in the context of multi-clausal sentences.

Weber does not distinguish Simple (or Basic) from Complex Sentences, as do Parker, Larsen, and Proulx; he thus avoids the needless complication of a longer list of labels devoid of explanation. His approach to Quechua grammar is based on the notion of the sentence as a predication, and a dichotomous division between Main and Subordinate Clause. For Weber, the difference between a main and a subordinate clause is that the main clause is marked for tense, whereas the subordinate clause substitutes a 'substantivizing subordinator', or 'nominalizer', or 'adverbial subordinator' in that same position. Main clauses may be 'conjoined'. This is accomplished primarily by simple juxtaposition. To supplement this, the Spanish coordinating conjunctions y and pero are often borrowed. Subordinate clauses are not 'conjoined' to main clauses; they are 'subordinated'.

Since 'subordinate' includes everything which is not 'main', the 'subordinate clause group includes the following:
Subordinate Substantivized Clauses (nominalized)
Relative Clauses
Participles
Complementation
Adverbial Use of Substantivized Clauses
Adverbial Clauses (marked for switch-reference)

The uses of the adverbial clauses include the marking of temporal relations such as 'while/during', 'immediately thereupon', and 'before', and logical inter-clausal relations, such as reason and concession/adversative (Weber 1983a). The following examples illustrate the distinction that Weber makes:

**MAIN CLAUSE:**

(11) Maqa- ma- ra- n  'He hit me.'
    hit->1-PAST-3

**SUBORDINATE CLAUSES:**

Formed with Adverbial Subordinator (SS Switch-Reference)

(12) [Maqa- ma- r] aywa-ku-ru-n
    hit->1-SS go-REFL-RECPST-1

  'When s/he hit me, she left.'

Formed with Substantivizing Subordinator (NOM-na)

(13) Noqa runa-: [meqa-na-yki-ta]  'I want you to hit him/her.'
    I want-1 hit-NOM-2-ACC

Notice that, in Weber's framework, the subordinate category includes (12), where the switch-reference clause functions as a time adverbial, with (13), where the substantivized clause functions as an object complement.
As mentioned by Haiman and Thompson 1984, many 'traditional' analyses of 'subordination' use the term 'subordinate' to refer to both embedding, where one clause functions as a constituent (a phrase or word) within another clause (a subject or an object, for example); and hypotaxis, where one clause stands in a head-dependent relation with the other, but neither is a part of the other (an adverbial clause, for example) (Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear)). Weber's analysis can be considered 'traditional', in the sense that he does not differentiate embedding from hypotaxis.

The categories main and subordinate are heuristically useful, in that any Quechua clause can be pigeonholed into its 'box'; however, the categorization does not correspond to a natural functional division in discourse. Weber occasionally make reference to 'adverbial' functions of 'adverbial' constructions in the discourse, but he does not consider the possibility that the 'adverbial' constructions may have functions other than adverbial. Instead, he speaks, for example, of switch-reference markers as 'adverbial clause forming subordinators' (1980:48). In other words, one could say that his analysis is from 'bottom to top': he takes form-based categories and adds on some information about their function in the larger context, assuming that the initial form-based definition will 'hold'. Because he has a priori proposed a
bifurcation, he cannot allow the possibility that there may be discourse-motivated functional criteria for proposing more than two main classes of clauses for Quechua. In other words, discourse-motivated functional criteria have not entered into decisions about clause classification.

Adelaar proposes a dichotomy similar to Weber’s. He subclassifies clauses into ‘co-ordinative verbal groups’ and ‘sub-ordinative verbal groups.’

Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear) point out that ‘ideally, a category of a particular type of clause-combining should be recognizable prototypically in both grammatical terms and in semantic/discourse terms’. Since Weber and Adelaar subscribe to the main-subordinate dichotomy, and since ‘subordinate’ function is defined in terms of grammatical class (the presence of a ‘subordinating’ affix on the verb), and not in terms of discourse/semantic function, their analyses, although they follow a long-standing tradition in their interpretation of ‘subordination’, are less than optimal.

2.2.3. Summary

To summarize, previous studies consider Quechua clauses only in the light of predetermined categories. Analyses have been based, first of all, on the presupposition that the basic syntactic unit is the sentence, not the clause. Secondly,
sentences or clauses have been grouped together into classes according to the assumption that grammatical form can be equated with function. Labels are given for categories, but the motivation behind the labeling is often unclear. Thirdly, the notion of discourse function has received negligible attention.

In the next section, I will explain why the clause, rather than the sentence, is the most appropriate grammatical unit for clause-combining in Quechua.
2.3. The Clause as the Basic Clause-Combining Unit

An essential feature which distinguishes the analytical approach in this thesis from previous studies in the Quechua languages is that the clause, defined as a verb and its arguments, is taken to be the fundamental grammatical unit which is manipulable by the clause-combining strategies in the language. The point of view taken is not that one could not in some sense define a sentence in Conchucos Quechua, but, rather, that the notion of grammatical sentence is unnecessary for an understanding of clause-combining in the discourse, and therefore superfluous.

There are several reasons why the notion of grammatical sentence might seem appealing for Quechua. First, certain clauses, those marked for switch-reference, seem to 'depend' on independent clauses, those with full marking of tense and person, for tense and/or person marking. For example, in (14), the first clause 'depends' on the second for its tense marking, and in (15) the first clause 'depends' on the second for both tense and person marking of the subject:


'If you make them cry (your younger siblings), what might people say to us?' (14.5)
(15) Tsay-mi [Huaras-pa aywa-r]  
that-DIR Huaraz-GEN go-SS

tsay-chaw rika-mu-naq pisikultura-ta. (18.14)  
that-LOC see-AFAR-NARR fishfarm-ACC

'Then, when he went to Huaraz, there he saw the fish farm.'

The notion of sentence as an entity of one or more clauses, but containing one and only one independent clause and its accompanying dependent clauses, could be used to label the set of dependency relations exhibited in switch-reference marking as illustrated in (14) and (15). On the other hand, no new insight is gained by using the descriptive label 'sentence'. 'Dependency' has already described the grammatical relation between the clauses.¹

Another reason for appealing to the sentence is that a certain set of suffixes, the evidential-validations -mi 'direct', -shi 'reportative', and -chi 'conjecture' usually occur only once per sentence, where sentence can be defined as one independent clause and its accompanying dependent clauses. Furthermore, the evidential suffix does not occur within a dependent clause, but only on the final verb of that clause:
(16a) [Tsay aswa-ta upya-ski-ya-pti-ː]-mi
that chicha-ACC drink-PFV-DS-1-DIR

puyũ-chaw haqi-yka-n-raq sanku sanku-raq.
container-LOC leave-IMP-PFV-YET mix mix-YET

'After we have drunk that chicha, we leave it in the
container until it is well blended.' (3.1)

(16b) *Tsay aswata-m upyaskiyaptii...
-Dir

However, not every 'sentence' need be marked by an evidential;
and since both the choice of evidential and frequency of
appearance of the evidential are discourse options, where even
the one-per 'sentence' principle is not a categorical rule, it
would seem that the choice and placement of evidential depends
on the nature of assertion in the discourse context, rather than
on a notion of grammatical sentence.

Similarly, the 'topic-marker' -qa, although it may appear
various times in a 'sentence', does not usually appear on
internal constituents of non-independent clauses:

(17) [Tsuku-n-ta tsuku-rka-tsi-r-ni-n]-qa
hat-3-ACC hat-UP-CAUS-SS-3-TOP

apa-ya-raːː witsay-pa.
take-PL-PAST-1 up-GEN

'We put on his hat, and we took him up.' (1.13)

This restriction on -qa could be considered as support for
a sentence level. -Qa could be said to be restricted to
sentence-level constituents, where a non-independent clause is a
sentence-level constituent, along with each of the constituents of
the independent clause which it accompanies. On the other
hand, such a restriction on the occurrence of a suffix is hardly
adequate reason for proposing a level of grammatical sentence,
especially since the restriction is not a categorical rule.
Consider, for example, the following:

\[(18) \text{[\text{Y kondor-qa} \text{ hirka-chaw wañu-pti-n-qa]}}\]
\text{and kondor-TOP hill-LOC die-DS-3-TOP}
\text{ari atoq miku-na-n ka-naq.}
\text{yes fox eat-NOM-3 be-NARR}
\text{And if the condor had died on the hill, he would have been the fox's meal.' (36.2)}

Certain links, typical in narrative discourse, and usually
called 'sentential links' (eg. Larsen and Levengood 1982, Weber
1983b), occur at the beginning of multi-clausal utterances, are
often followed by a pause, and may not be structurally a part of
the clause which follows them. These links may bear the 'topic-
marker' -qa and/or an evidential-validational suffix. (19)
contains such a 'sentential link', Tsayshi, which carries the
reportative evidential marker -shi:

\[(19) \text{[Tsay-shi] kiki-n Inka rika-rtu-uni-n}}\]
\text{that-REP self-3 Inca see-up-DS-3}
\text{warmi rumi-man tikra-ski-naq.}
\text{woman stone-GOAL change-PFV-NARR}
\text{And then when the Inca himself looked at her, the woman turned into stone.' (21.39)}
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However, within the discourse context, these links are more straightforwardly understood as cohesive markers of sequence which guide the narrative forward.

In Conchucos Quechua, the tendency for clausal boundaries to coincide with pauses provides supporting evidence for the clause as the fundamental intonational unit. This situation is reminiscent of that described by Chafe 1984 for English: 'The clause appears to be the prototypical intonation unit type, from which all other types are derived, or are deviations' (1984:36). An intonation unit is 'a sequence of words combined under a single, coherent intonation contour, usually preceded by a pause.' This intonation contour expresses a single 'focus of consciousness.' In other words, Chafe considers the grammatical clause to be a reflection of a basic cognitive unit in discourse. This basic cognitive unit, or 'idea unit' (Chafe 1980), is a reflection of the limited amount of information that can be active in the speaker's (or hearer's) consciousness at any one time (1984:7). Similarly, the clause in Conchucos Quechua can be considered the basic 'packaging' device for that language.²

Conchucos Quechua clauses cluster together into intonational paragraphs. Much as Chafe noted for English, these paragraphs manifest 'the major schematic structure of the story' (1984:58) in narratives. Evidence for these paragraphs in
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Chafe's analysis of English is exclusively pausal, whereas in Quechua, there is also pronounced falling intonation. In Quechua monologic discourse, there are clear breaks between paragraphs, signalled clearly by the intonational patterns of speech, and reflecting major shifts in orientation of the discourse, regardless of genre. The situation is thus similar in this regard to what Chafe reports for English spoken paragraphs, which, he says, 'result from major shifts in a speaker's peripheral consciousness' (1984:48).

However, whereas Chafe found sentences within these English paragraphs to be indicated by falling intonation, such a correlation is not apparent in Conchucos Quechua. Chafe clarifies by suggesting that sentences in spoken English do not seem to have the same cognitive correlates as clauses, extended clauses,\(^3\) or paragraphs, that they 'appear to be determined by a speaker's decisions based on rhetorical effect'. In other words, for Chafe, 'sentence' exists, but as a different kind of intonational entity. In Conchucos Quechua, pauses, or lack of pauses do not support the notion of 'sentence' as an intonational entity of this kind. In instances of parataxis by juxtaposition (see e.g. (34)), two or more clauses are linked together with a conspicuous absence of pause between them. Although they are often followed by a longer pause than one would expect between clauses, this is rarely accompanied by falling intonation.
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In short, the Conchucos data strongly support the notions of 'clause' and 'paragraph', but not 'sentence', as intonational entities with correlates in grammar and discourse. The function of rhetorical structures as organizing devices in discourse will be the focus of attention in the ensuing chapters.

To summarize, certain arguments can be proposed for appealing to the notion of grammatical sentence. However, none of these is in itself crucial to an understanding of the grammar of clause-combining, nor do the reasons together provide necessary and sufficient cause for appealing to the notion of grammatical sentence in the analysis of clause-combining strategies in Conchucos Quechua. The remainder of this chapter will focus on clause types in Conchucos Quechua.
2.4. Clause Types in Conchucos Quechua

2.4.1. Hypotaxis, Parataxis, and Embedding

Because of the plethora of indistinct categories which have often been proposed for Quechua 'sentences', it is important to define from the outset the categories and combinations of clauses which are relevant to this thesis. The clause is defined here in the sense of Chafe 1980a as 'one verb, with whatever accompanying noun phrases are associated with it' (1980a:14). In order to avoid as much terminological confusion as possible, I will use operationally the terms 'independent verb/clause' and 'dependent verb/clause' to distinguish between those clauses which are marked for tense and those which assume the tense interpretation of some other independent clause.

The terms which are crucial for the classification of clause combinations are embedding, hypotaxis and parataxis. In embedding (used here in the sense of Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear)), one clause functions as a noun phrase, as a constituent, within another clause. In hypotaxis (used here in the sense of Halliday and Hasan 1976 and Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear)), one clause functions as a modifier of another clause, but is not a constituent of that clause. Such clauses are often termed 'adverbial' in the literature. In
parataxis, both clauses are on par: neither is a constituent, or a modifier, of the other.

An embedded clause 'forsakes' its clausehood when it assumes this role in a clause combination. Those nominalized clauses which function as subject complements, relative clauses, object complements, complements of an existential verb, or oblique arguments in another clause are examples of embedded constituents. Since their clausehood is structural, but not functional, as they function only as noun phrases which are constituents of other clauses, they are not an object of concern in this thesis. The nominalizing affixes are -nqa, -na, and, occasionally, -shqa. The following are example of embedded clauses:

(20) Object Complement:

Wiya:- [mana alli ka-nqa-yki-ta] (2.1)
hear-I NEG good be-NOM-2-ACC

'I hear that you're not good.'

(21) Complement of BE:

Pero [yarpa-nqa-ntsik-naw] mana ka-ru-n-tsu. (4.1)
but think-NOM-12-SIM NEG be-RECPST-3-NEG

'But it wasn't the way we thought.'

(22) Relative Clause:

Tsay-mi [mana alli rura-q] runa-ta kastiga-ya-q.
that-DIR NEG good do-NOM person-ACC punish-PL-HABPST

'Thus they used to punish the person who did wrong.' (18.8)
(23) Oblique Argument:

Maria Jiray-qa kuti-tsi-naq
Maria Jiray-TOP return-CAUS-NARR

[llapa-n llapa-n-ta Virgen-paq rura-nqa-lla-n-wan.]
all-3 all-3-ACC Virgin-PLR do-NOM-JUST-3-COM

'Maria Jiray sent him back along with everything he had made for the Virgin.' (19.12)

Nominalized clauses which function as arguments of verbs of motion indicating Locational Source or Locational Goal are also classified as embedded:

(24) Locational Source:

[Tsay suta-ra-yka-nqa-n-pita] palla-rku-ya-.;
that pull-STAT-IMPFV-NOM-3-ABL gather-UP-PL-1

'We gather him up from where he is flung out.' (1.12)

(23) Locational Goal:

Tsay-shi runa-qa
that-REP man-TOP

[hina tsakay-chaw-pis aywa-ku-yka-nqa-n-chaw-qa]
like dark-LCC-EVEN go-REFL-IMPFV-NOM-3-LCC-TOP

one person-PL cultivate-REFL-IMPFV-NOM-GOAL arrive-NARR

'Then that man, as he was going along in such darkness, arrived where some people were farming.' (20.8)

At this point, another word of clarification is in order. There is a set of derivational affixes which derive nouns from verbs. These affixes operate purely at the lexical level (much as, for example, the -er suffix in English derives hitter from
hit.) The following are examples are verbs nominalized to
lexical nouns with the nominalizing affixes -na, a deverbative
nominalizer (homophonous to, but distinct from the clausal
nominalizer -na), -y, the infinitive nominalizer, and -q, the
agentive nominalizer:

(26) llapa-n llatsapa-:-ta-wan [llapa-n puñu-na-:-ta-wan]
clothes-1-ACC-COM all-3 sleep-NOM-ACC-COM

llapa-n-ty hipi-na-sh waqta-pa.
all-3-ACC remove->1-PERF away-GEN

' She took me away with all my clothes, with all my
bedclothes, everything.' (1.5)

(27) Y tsay marka-man-na-sh chaa-naq
town-COAL-NOW-REP arrive-NARR

[ñaka-ku-y muchu-y].
suffer-REFL-INF famine-INF

'And suffering and famine arrived at that town.' (21.26)

(28) ñam-ata-n [huk pishta-q] shuyaa-shunki
you-ACC-DiR one kill-NOM wait-3\#2

huk tsaka laadu-n-chaw.
one bridge side-3-LCC

'A killer is waiting for you at the side of a bridge.'
(20.11)

Lest it should appear that all nominalized clauses are
embedded, however, we need to consider those nominalized clauses
which are in a hypotactic relationship with that clause, rather
than embedded in it. In a hypotactic relation, one clause
stands in a head-dependent relation to another, but neither is
part of the other. In other words, although the hypotactic
clause is a modifier of the clause to which it is hypotactically related, it is not a constituent of that clause. In the following examples, the nominalized clauses are hypotactically related to their respective non-nominalized clauses:

(29) Allaw warmi-n-qa mantsa-paku-r
Oh:my woman-3-TOP fear-DIFF-SS
yanasa-n-kuna-man aywa-ku-naq
friend-3-PL-CQAL go-REFLNARR
[Don Panchu Reañu-pa kolora-n usha-ka-nqa-n-yaq].
-GEN anger-3 end-PASS-NOM-3-LIM
'Oh my, his wife, being quite afraid, went to her friends until Don Pancho's anger had abated.' (19.18)

(8) Tsay-mi kushi-ku-ya-:
that-DIR rejoice-REFL-PL-:
[pay-kuna-pa ayuda-yaa-ma-nqa-n-pita].
3PRO-PL-GEN help-PL->1-NOM-3-ABL
'Thus I rejoice because of their helping me.'

(30) Tsay-naw-mi rura-ntsik tanta-ta Todo Santu-paq
that-SIM-DIR do-12 bread-ACC All Saints-PUR
[liapa-n alma-kuna-paq chura-ku-yaa-na-n-paq].
all-3 soul-PL-PUR put-REFL-PL-NOM-3-PUR
'That's the way we make bread for All Saints', in order to put it out for all of the souls.' (3.3)

Notice that the distinction between embedding and hypotaxis cannot be made exclusively on the basis of the structure of the clause in question, but must be made functionally, by its relation to the clause with which it is combining. Examples (23) through (25), and (29), (8) and (30), are all structurally
nominalized clauses with oblique postpositions. However, (23) through (25) are examples of embedded clauses, whereas (29), (8) and (30) are examples of hypotactic clauses. The distinction between form and function is thus crucial for an adequate characterization of clause-combining.

Clauses marked for switch-reference provide straightforward examples of hypotactic clause combinations. In the following, the switch-reference clause is in hypotactic relationship to the non-switch-reference clauses:

(31) Huk warmi-shi allaapa kuya-naq warma-n-ta
one woman-REP alot love-NARR child-3-ACC
[runa-n wanu-ku-shqa ka-pty-n].
man-3 die-REFL-PRT be-DS-3

'A woman really loved her child a lot, since her husband had died.' (21.1)

Lest it appear, however, that all switch-reference clauses are in hypotactic relationship with a corresponding independent clauses, the following example provides evidence to the contrary:

(32) Resa-r qalla-yku-n. 'He begins to pray.' (1.7)
pray begin-in-3

In (32), the switch-reference clause functions as a phasal complement of the independent clause. This switch-reference clause is embedded.
A switch-reference clause may be inserted in another clause without being embedded in that clause. As such, it temporarily 'interrupts' the progress of the first clause, and is structurally in a hypotactic relationship to that clause:

(33) Tsay-shi runa-qa [mantsa-paku-ykaa-lla-r]
that-REP man-TOP fear-DIFF-IMPFV-JUST-SS

wayi-n-kuna waqta-lla-n-chaw punu-ku-yku-naq.
house-3-PL outside-JUST-3-LOC sleep-REFL-IN-NARR

'Then the man, since he was quite afraid, went to sleep outside of the houses.' (20.9)

Two clauses which can be considered to be in paratactic relation are those which can be considered to have equal status (Halliday and Hasan 1976:222). In other words, neither clause either modifies the other in a head-dependent relation, as in hypotaxis, or is a constituent of the other, as in embedding. True parataxis in Quechua is, as mentioned above, accomplished by combining two or more independent clauses without pause, under a single intonation contour. Sometimes, borrowed conjunctions from Spanish are used. Examples of each follow:

(34) Aywa-: Huanchac-pa tardi-yaa-pu-ku-ski-: tsay-pis.
go-1 -GEN spend:night-PL-BEN-REFL that-EVEN

'I go to Huanchac (and) we spend the night there, too.' (4.3)
(35) Tsay-pita-na-mi runtu-sha-yki millwa-ta ayliu-nki
that-ABL-NOW-DIR cut-FRT-2 wool-ACC join-2
y apa-nki taqsha-q mayu-man.
and take-2 wash-q river-GOAL

'Then you gather together the wool you have sheared,
and you take it to wash it in the river.' (21.35)

With parataxis as well as with hypotaxis and embedding, again,
form cannot be assumed always to have a direct correlate in
function; in this case, clauses with 'equal status' formwise do
not necessarily share that equality in discourse function.5

Consider the following:

(36) Waray-kuna-raq-chi ari aywa-shaq Huari-pa musya-pakU-mu-q
tomorrow-PL-yet-CCNJ yes go-FUT -GEN know-DIFF-AFAR-q
kanasta:-maa may-man-shi
basket-1 well where-GOAL-REP
pi-pa maki-n-man-shi shikwa-ru-n.
who-GEN hand-3-GOAL-REP fall-RECPST-3

'One of these days maybe I'll go to Huari to find out
where my basket is, into whose hands it has fallen.' (4.6)

2.4.2. Serial Verbs

Some instances of what might initially appear to be
paratactic relations between two clauses are actually instances
of serial verb constructions within a single clause. Serial
verbs are reported by Foley and Olson 1985 to be common in many
languages, particularly those with clause-chaining, especially
those of West Africa, Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Papua New
Guinea. In their article on clausehood and verb serialization, Foley and Olson address the question of whether serial verb constructions are multi-clausal or monoclusal, and they argue convincingly for the monoclusal interpretation. The members in the serial verb construction follow a same tense-mood constraint, share some common core arguments, and, often, observe a same-subject constraint. Furthermore, the second verb in a serial verb construction is 'always in some sense a further development, result or goal of the first verb in the construction.'

All of the examples of serial verbs in Conchucos Quechua which I have found involve verbs of motion. The following are examples of serial verb constructions in Conchucos Quechua. Notice that, although both verbs are fully finite, the second is clearly a result of the first:

(37) Tsay-shi hipash-ca runa-n shaa-ri-ku-na-n-paq
that-REP maiden-TOP man-3 rise-INCEP-REFL-NOM-3-PUR

lachapa-n-man aywa-naq tari-naq
clothes-3-GOAL go-NARR find-NARR

nina chipyaq usha-shqa-ta
flare total finish-PRT-ACC

'Then the young woman, so that her man could get up, went to his clothes to find that the fire had completely finished them off.' (20.21)

(38) is a serial sequence of three, with the second and third verbs expressing the goal of the first:
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(38) Shamu-y tushu-shun upu-shun!
come-IMP dance-12FUT drink-12FUT
‘Come dance and drink (with us)!’ (21.14)

The following serial verb constructions are examples of the
purpose-motion construction, which seems to be not only a pan-
Quechua phenomenon, but similar to constructions reported in
other languages, such as Tzotzil (Aissen 1984 ‘motion-cum-
purpose construction’). The non-initial verbs in the purpose-
motion series are not tense-marked or cross-referenced for
person. They share tense and subject with the first verb in the
series and are marked only with the morpheme -q:

(39) Huk hunaq [mitsi-ku-q aywa-naq].
One day  pasture-REFL-PUR go-NARR
‘One day he went pasturing.’ (17.14)

(40) Mana-raq aywe-rnin-qa
NEG-yet go-SS-TOP
alli kaldu-ta upu-ku-rku-r-qa
good broth-ACC drink-REFL-UP-SS-TOP
aswa-ta upu-ku-rku-r-qa
chicha-ACC drink-REFL-UP-SS-TOP
[aywa-kuntsik marka-man misa wiya-q.]
go-REFL-12 town-QUAL mass hear-PUR

‘Before we go, we drink up a good broth, we drink up
chicha (Andean beverage), (and) we go to town to hear
mass.’ (7.1)
The purpose-motion construction can also be found with the verb chura- 'put, place', with a phasal connotation of beginning an activity (as in Spanish ponerse a):

(41) Y Don Panchu-qa tsakay-chaw-na
    and -TOP dark-LOC-NOW
    kusina punku-n-man hama-yku-r
    kitchen door-3-QUAL rest-IN-SS
    [huk mati roqru-ta miku-q chura-kaa-naq.]
    one gourd soup-ACC eat-PUR put-PASS-NARR

'And Don Pancho, as it was now dark, sat down by the kitchen door, and began eating a gourd (bowl) of soup.' (19.15)

In Conchucos Quechua, the second member of the purpose-motion construction is sometimes a Same-Subject switch-reference verb:

(42) Y puma-qa [shamu-naq wiya-rmin].
    and puma-TOP come-NARR hear-SS

'And the puma came to hear.' (18.3)

2.4.3. Other Non-Embedded Clauses in Conchucos Quechua

The clause types which can be found in paratactic or hypotactic relations in texts comprise three major categories: independent clauses with fully finite verbs, dependent clauses marked for Switch-Reference, and those Nominalized clauses which are not embedded.
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Clauses with fully finite verbs include examples such as (34), (35) and (36); Switch-Reference clauses include examples such as (31) and (33); Nominalized clauses used hypotactically include (30), with -pita 'Ablative', (33), with -chaw 'locative', and 'Purpose' Clauses with -na-paq, as in (30).

The following is a list of the nominalized clauses in the data which are used hypotactically:

**Nominalized Clauses:**

- **-chaw 'Locative'**

(33) Tsay-shi runa-qə

that-REFL man-TOP

[quina tsakay-chaw-pis aywa-yka-qna-n-chaw-qə] like dark-LOC-EVEN go-REFL IMPFV-NOM-3-LOC-TOP

huk runa-kuna saachi-ku-yka-qman chaa-naq,

one person-PL cultivate-REFL IMPFV-NOM-CoAL arrive-NARR

'Then that man, as he was going along in such darkness, arrived where some people were faming.' (20.9)

- **-hina 'Like'**

(43) Huk waranqa-naw-mi hina-ylla keeda-ya-shqa

one thousand-SIM-DIR like-ADV stay-PL-PRT

[mana ima-yoq sha-ykaa-ya-qna-n hina]. (24.1)

NEG what-have stand-REFL IMPFV-PL-NOM-3 like

'About a thousand (people) stayed like that (dead), since there wasn’t anything which could serve to detain it (a flood).' (24.1)
-naw ‘Similar’

(44) Yₚ tsuri-n-na-sh qong-o-ri-ku-yku-r ni-naq
and son-3-NOW-REP kneel-INEP-REFL-IN-SS say-NARR

[yacha-ku-shqa-n-naw]:...
know-REFL-NOM-3-SIM

‘And his son, kneeling, said, as he had practiced:...’
(21.30)

-oora ‘Time’

(45) Tsay-shi [karsel-pita yarqu-shqa-n oora] that-REP prison-ABL leave-PRT-3 hour

illapa-ta ranti-naq.
gun-ACC buy-NARR

‘And then, at the time that he left prison, he bought a gun.’ (21.2)

-pita ‘Ablative’

cow-ACC steal-REFL-NOM-3-ABL-REP take-PL-NARR prison-COORD

‘Because he had stolen a cow, they took him to jail.’
(21.2)

-raykur ‘Sake’

(47) Kay ichikilla libritu-ta-n qelqa-ra-mu-
this little book-ACC-DIR write-INEP-AFAR-1

[llapa-lla-yki-ta kushi-rl-tdsi-na-:-raykur]
all-JUST-2-ACC happy-INEP-CAUS-NOM-:-SAKE

‘I write this little book just for the sake of making all of you happy.’ (19.1)
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-yaq 'Limitative'

(48) Tsay-chaw [gellay-ni-n ka-nqa-n-yaq-qa]  
    that-LOC money-3 be-NOM-3-LIM-TOP  
    alli kushi-shqa kawa-rqa-n.  
    good happy-PRT live-PAST-3  
    'There, as long as he had money, he lived quite happily.'  
    (17.10)

Participial Clauses (formed with -shqa 'participle) may also be used hypotactically:

(49) Niykursi aywa-naq wayi-n-pa [iilapa-lla-n qilla-shqa].  
    then go-NARR house-3-GEN rifle-JUST-3 embrace-PRT  
    'Then he went to his house, his rifle embraced.'  
    (21.2)
2.5. Typologies of Clause Linkage and Conchucos Quechua

Various frameworks have been proposed for the classification of interclausal relationships in languages. Among the most recent of these are Longacre 1985, Van Valin 1984, Foley and Van Valin 1984, and Lehmann (to appear). In each case, the general approach is to draw examples from a number of languages, using these to design a cross-linguistic framework for analyzing clause combinations. Since these frameworks have been proposed, one might ask if any or all of them provide an insightful way to look at Conchucos Quechua clause-combining. In this section, I will review each in turn and explain why none of them is adequate for describing the Conchucos Quechua situation.

Lehmann proposes a number of clause-linkage continua according to what he terms 'semantico-syntactic parameters'. He notes that there is a remarkable parallelism of these continua, and that they thus provide a framework for a typology of clause linkage and subordination. A 'subordinate' construction must be 'a constituent of a higher construction.' The sentence is taken to be this basic 'higher construction' in clause-combining. Lehmann's continua all have to do with degree, 'not clear-cut alternatives, but gradual differences.' The parameters are the
following: degree of integration, constituent structure level, desententialization, interlacing, and explicitness of linking. Lehmann further states that 'the cognitive relatedness of the two states of affairs [expressed in the two clauses] is mirrored in the way they are linked in language.'

Lehmann's typology goes a long way towards dissecting the notion of 'subordination', which, as he so aptly notes, 'is applied, in different schools of linguistics, to different kinds of elements.' However, it is not always clear why certain clause types are placed where they are on the various continua. We are neither certain why he has chosen the particular parameters he presents, nor how he judges the degree to which a specific parameter is present in a clause combination in a specific language. In other words, what are the objective criteria involved in the analysis?

An even more basic question regarding this analytical approach has to do with the issue of crosslinguistic typologies in general as related to clause-combining. Can one legitimately compare clause types from different languages on the same continua, formulating thereby a framework for the analysis of clause types in any single language? It seems that the underlying assumption in such an approach is that clause-combining strategies are essentially the same in any language (give or take a combination or two). Yet, just as
morphosyntactic categories of clauses are language-dependent, so, too, we can expect the strategies of combining them to be language-dependent. By virtue of assuming the existence of a typology which is based on a limited amount of data from a few languages, an analysis is ipso facto imposed on any unanalyzed language to which that typology is applied. Thus, any direct application of Lehmann's typology to Conchucos Quechua would, at this point, be premature.

Van Valin 1984 and Foley and Van Valin 1984 propose a 'syntactic bondedness hierarchy' based on a syntactic linkage continuum, and a 'typology of nexus.' Their aim is to provide a typology of all possible clause linkage types, and to claim that 'there is a direct correlation between the semantic relationships holding between two clauses (or subparts thereof) and the syntactic linkage between them, such that the closer the semantic relationship, the tighter the syntactic linkage' (1984:264).

According to Foley & Van Valin's interpretation, clauses have a layered structure of nucleus, core and periphery. The nucleus, or 'head' of the clause, is the innermost layer. It contains the predicates. The core consists of the nucleus and, in addition, one or two arguments of the predicate dependent on its valence. The periphery consists of the core oblique arguments and temporal or locative elements. This layered
The term *Juncture* refers to the joining of a token of any layer of the clause 'to any other token of its same type' (p.188). There are thus three possible types of juncture: Peripheral, Core, and Nuclear. Switch-Reference constructions are given as an example of Peripheral Juncture; and serial verb constructions are given as examples of Core and Nuclear Juncture. The clauses which are joined together are termed *juncts*.

The term *Nexus* refers to 'the nature of the syntactic linkage between two clauses' (p.239). There are three types of Nexus: Coordination, Subordination, and Cosubordination. Foley & Van Valin maintain that 'the essential point with respect to this three-way distinction among nexus types is that dependence is not equivalent to embeddedness' (p.243). *Embedded* is defined as a part-whole relation; *dependence* is defined as a relation in which one clause is dependent upon another for some feature such as tense inflection, but in which the dependent clause is not a part of the other clause. The three nexus types are...
defined according to the two parameters - +/- embedded and +/-
dependent - as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{Coordination} & = & \text{- embedded, - dependent} \\
\text{Subordination} & = & \text{+ embedded, + dependent} \\
\text{Cosubordination} & = & \text{- embedded, + dependent}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 4. Types of Nexus

_Nexus_ and _Level of Juncture_ are two independent parameters
in clause linkage. A given type of _Nexus_ -- coordination,
subordination, cosubordination-- can occur at any level of
_Juncture_ -- nucleus, core or periphery. Likewise, any level of
_Juncture_ may have any kind of _Nexus_. There are thus nine
juncture possibilities.

The _Syntactic Bondedness Hierarchy_ 'captures the relative
strength of the syntactic bond between two juncts in a complex
construction' (p.264). This hierarchy depicts a cline in
strength of syntactic bond for every possible combination of
level of juncture and nexus type. In this hierarchy, Nuclear
Cosubordination reflects the strongest bond and Peripheral
Coordination reflects the weakest bond.

Complementary to the _Syntactic Bondedness Hierarchy_ is the
_Interclausal Semantic Relations Hierarchy_, which depicts a cline
in strength of semantic bond for a variety of semantic
relations, such as causality and conditionality. Taken
together, the two interacting hierarchies form an **Interclausal Relations Hierarchy**. Foley & Van Valin's claim is that this final hierarchy expressed the direct correlation which exists between the tightness of the semantic and syntactic links between clauses. Furthermore:

> given the inventory of syntactic clause-linkage categories in a language, it will always be the case that the strongest semantic relations will be expressed in the most tightly linked syntactic configurations found in the language, the weaker relations in the less tightly linked constructions. (p.271)

Foley & Van Valin are progressive in that they clearly distinguish between embedding and dependence as factors in the nexus category. An 'embedded' clause functions as an argument of another clause, and a 'dependent' clause is one which, although it does not function as an argument of another clause, cannot stand alone. Coordination is nexus between clauses which is [-embedded, -dependent], Subordination is nexus where one clause is [+embedded, +dependent], and Cosubordination is nexus where one of the clauses is [-embedded, +dependent]. Cosubordination, they say, is 'best illustrated by the clause-chaining and switch-reference phenomena widely found in Papuan and American Indian languages (1984:257).

At first glance, Foley and Van Valin's approach is refreshing, as the typology of nexus types provides more categories than traditional bidimensional coordination-
subordination dichotomies. Furthermore, cosubordination might appear to be an ideal category for Conchucos Quechua switch-reference and clause-chaining. However, there are some immediate complications. Clauses with adverbial function in Quechua, for example, are often expressed with switch-reference form. This clashes with Foley and Van Valin’s typology, as adverbial clauses in their framework are instances of subordinate nexus. We can see immediately that their presupposition that form of clause linkage will be a direct reflection of semantic relation of clause linkage is simplistic. In fact, Foley and Van Valin’s classification of adverbial clauses as embedded in the first place is problematic, as these clauses clearly do not function as arguments of the verb in the same way as do the direct arguments. Furthermore, Foley and Van Valin’s typology suffers from the same conceptual difficulty as does Lehmann’s; namely, the idea that a typology conceived from a number of unrelated languages should be adequate for any one language. Specifically, does having a name ‘cosubordination’ tell us anything truly revealing about Conchucos Quechua clause combinations involving switch reference? Decidedly not.

Longacre 1985 is the least rigid of the three typologies. Essentially, his focus is descriptive; however, his work can still be considered to be a typology, as his goal is not only to illustrate the wide variety of ‘sentence-forming devices’ in languages of the world, but also to suggest which devices most
typically encode particular notions. Sentences are 'clusters of clauses'. Although one can take issue with the assumption that clusters of clauses are necessarily sentences, this does not really detract from Longacre's thorough description of clause-combining strategies in a number of languages. His thoroughness is illustrated by the fact that his is the only one of the three typologies described here which includes clauses of reported speech in his classification. He is careful also to distinguish between semantic notions which are encoded in a clause combination and the surface structure, or form, of encoding. He also makes a clear distinction between co-ranking, or coordinative, and chaining structures in languages. The distinctive final clause in chaining structures is likened to an engine which pulls a string of cars, which each non-final clause marked as to whether the following clause has the same or a different subject. He concedes that chaining structures may not necessarily form 'sentences'; they may be so long that they form a unit which is comparable to what he calls a grammatical paragraph.

Longacre is also unique among the three typologies considered here in his attention to discourse considerations. His basic orientation, in fact, is from a discourse perspective, and he makes reference to the discourse context of clause combinations from time to time throughout the article. Another
strong point is the clear separation he makes between 'sentence forming devices' (ie. grammatical forms) and 'the various notions that are expressed through these devices'. His discussion of clause-chaining is particularly insightful. Nevertheless, his approach is still not the most profitable for understanding Conchucos Quechua clause-combining. First, Conchucos Quechua clause-chaining strategies don't conform to his description of what a clause-chaining language should be like (this will be a major focus of discussion in chapter 7). Second, his commitment to the sentence level as an analytical unit would unnecessarily complicate, and possibly obscure, the analysis of Conchucos Quechua clause combinations. Third, although his typology is written from a discourse perspective, his classifications are not truly discourse-motivated. Fourth, because his typology is based on a smattering of cross-linguistic data, its application to Quechua would carry the same danger as the other two typologies: that of fitting the language to the typology rather than the typology to the language.

In summary, of the frameworks which have been proposed in the recent literature, none seems satisfactory for an adequate analysis of clause-combining strategies in Quechua. Although they have utility as heuristic devices, all of such frameworks are, at this point, premature. We have yet to have enough data from comprehensive analyses of clause-combining strategies in
individual languages to provide a reliable language-independent framework. Moreover, none of the proposed typologies is discourse-motivated. Clauses are considered almost exclusively in their local contexts only. As such, the resulting typologies are not explanatory. The classification in Lehmann is basically by form, which leaves us wondering about discourse-semantic correlations. The Foley and Van Valin classification attempts a direct mapping between form and function which proves to be unsatisfactory. The Longacre classification makes only passing reference to discourse. The assumption in all three analyses, then, is that clause-combining can be understood on a local level, that discourse considerations are not crucial.

The analysis which I am proposing for Conchucos Quechua clauses is, in the first place, language-dependent. In order to avoid imposing an unmotivated framework, none of the language-independent typologies is used. Second, the analysis is discourse-motivated. The production of a text is goal-oriented behavior, shaped largely by the speaker's communicative intent. As such, individual clause combinations can only be understood within the larger context of this goal-directed behavior, the text itself.
NOTES to Chapter 2

1 Cumming insightfully comments that 'In another sense, no clause is truly independent; clauses in context rely on the preceding discourse (if any) as well as a host of non-linguistic factors for their correct interpretation.' (1984:369)

2 A word of caution is in order, however. The relation between syntax and intonation is complex, and a thorough study of intonation in Conchucos Quechua needs to be undertaken before anything conclusive can be said in this regard.

3 Chafe’s 'extended clause' includes orienting phrases, repairs, and other non-clausal additions to the basic clause.

4 See Weber 1983a for a thorough description of relativization and nominalization in a related Quechua language.

5 Weber 1983a:93 refers to similar constructions as 'paratactic complements.'

6 Also, there are some clauses in Conchucos formed with the adverbializer -ta, as in:

(i) [Mana muna-yka-q-ta-m] fwersa-ma-rqa-n papaa-ni-:.....
   NEG want-IMPFV-NOM-ACC-DIR force->1-PAST-3 father->-1

   'Although I didn't want to, my father made me...'
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These are, however, statistically quite infrequent, and do not constitute a major class.

My attention was originally drawn to problems with continua by Matthiessen and Thompson (forthcoming).

This is nothing original, as they note. For example, tagmemic theory (e.g. Pike & Pike 1982) has distinguished between nucleus, base and margin for years.
3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.1. Introduction

This chapter consists of two main divisions. The first division reviews various avenues for approaching the study of discourse structure and makes explicit the analytical perspective of this thesis. The second division addresses more specifically the issue of clause-combining. After reviewing several alternative analytical approaches to the study of interpropositional relations (clause-combining), it provides an introduction to the primary analytical technique chosen for non-narrative texts, Rhetorical Structure Analysis. In so doing, it provides the background for the analysis of clause-combining in non-narrative Quechua texts presented in Chapter 4.

3.2. Assumptions about Human Language

How one looks at a particular body of data and what one finds, depends to a large extent, of course, on one's analytical goals. These, in turn, are determined largely by the analyst’s underlying assumptions about human language and what the study of human language involves. Foundational to the research perspective of this thesis is a view of language as a dynamic, communicative system rooted and grounded not only in individual cognitive reality, but in social reality as well. In order to
understand local instances of clause-combining, it is necessary to look both at the textual context in the particular discourses in which instances of clause-combining are found, and the overall communicative context, which is, in turn, interactional and rooted in the socio-cultural context. To isolate the study of language from its communicative context is, ultimately, to come up with an analysis which is artificial, not ‘in touch’ with the reality that language is fundamentally a communicative system.

The discourse perspective taken in this thesis is thus more in harmony ideologically with views of language is expressed in, for example, Hymes’ ethnographic view of communicative events (1962), which views talk as systematically localized within its sociocultural context and searches for the relevant aspects of culture which impinge on the structures and dynamics of speech events in that culture, than the perspective taken in, for example, Sperber and Wilson 1986, where language in general, and the notion of relevance, in particular, is viewed as a primarily cognitive issue. In this respect, this thesis is a step away from what Ochs 1982 has termed the ‘cognitive bias’ in language studies, where language is seen as explainable in terms of the conceptual structures of individual speakers, and a step in the direction of viewing language as a highly complex interpersonal phenomenon.
3.2.1. The Interpretation of Context

The concept of communicative context is ultimately limitless (S. Stewart 1978.) Any given morpheme finds its place in a given clause, in a given text, spoken by a particular person in a particular sociocultural context in which each person has his or her history of 'prior texts' which serve as a grid for the interpretation of any further texts. If we continue this line of reasoning to its logical conclusion, we find that, ultimately, context has no inherent limits, either in time or in space (see also Young, Becker and Pike 1970). All we can attempt to do is limit ourselves honestly and realistically, that is, delimit the context enough to make systematic analysis feasible, yet conceding that whatever we are dealing with is still only a limited picture of communicative reality.

In order to pursue the issue of context productively, an operational definition is necessary. Van Dijk (1986:9) provides a succinct interpretation of context which is a helpful starting point for our purposes here. Van Dijk separates text from context, and, in so doing, provides a useful distinction between the intra-textual and the extra-textual context which I will adapt here. 'The structure of communicative events is an interdependent, multilevel whole, involving both textual and contextual features.' I will not, however, adapt Van Dijk's terminological distinction between 'textual features' and
'contextual features,' but will, instead, speak of two different kinds of context. In this thesis, the terms context, or discourse context refer to the linguistic context of a grammatical structure, that which, for practical purposes, is represented by the printed transcription of Conchucos Quechua. The terms communicative context or communicative situation (or interpersonal context) are used to refer to extra-linguistic context.2

The communicative context is, for the purposes of this thesis, delimited in the sense of S. Stewart 1978, where there is an intersubjective 'agreement regarding the horizon of the situation, an agreement regarding what is relevant or appropriate to the situation in light of this horizon.' (p.9) 'Relevant' context is formed by 'those aspects of intersubjective experience that will figure in forming the horizon of the situation.' (p.85) That is, for example, in a Conchucos Quechua text in which a speaker is addressing his talk to his hearer in order to motivate him to change his or her behavior, the horizon is the tacit agreement between them to limit the relevant context to their lives and relationships within a specific Quechua village in Peru. Thus, the participants in the speech event themselves set the contextual boundaries.
In summary, it is important to stress that, although the division between the linguistic/discourse context and the interpersonal context is, of necessity, somewhat arbitrary, in that language cannot be 'naturally' separated from its communicative context, it serves a very practical purpose: it provides a basis for discussing 'context' for clause-combining strategies in Quechua with a minimum of terminological confusion. In this thesis, although primary attention is given to linguistic context, this linguistic context is seen to have its roots in the interpersonal dimension, the larger communicative context: 'All concrete human events may be seen to be dependent upon their situations. Their meaning will be contextually determined.' (Stewart 1978:9).3

3.2.2. Monologue as Interaction

Of special importance for our purposes here is the view of monologue, especially spoken monologue, as an interactional communicative phenomenon, a special kind of conversation (Schegloff 1982). Printed sheets of transcribed data are only recorded indices of what took place originally as face-to-face interaction within a given cultural setting. Monologues are not spoken or written in a vacuum. When the linguist analyzes monologue text, however, s/he usually lacks the interactive cues—the interlocutor's gestures, facial expressions, for example—to remind him/her of the essential interactive nature
of the text. Because of this, it is often easy to forget the purposeful communicative intent of monologue. Unless someone is talking to him or herself s/he speaks with overt communicative intent, not in the sense of 'speech act', theory (Searle 1969) which is essentially context-independent, but in a contextually rooted interactional sense. The precise nature of this intent will be explored further in 3.7. For the moment, suffice it to say that communication with language is by definition interactional, and, in this respect, monologue is no less interactional than an animated conversation involving twelve people.⁴

3.3. Analytical Perspectives

Four analytical principles in particular have guided this analysis of clause-combining in ConQ. These are not, of course, the only principles which have been followed, and I am in no way implying that they have originated with me. I merely make these four explicit because, while I consider them to be essential in a discourse-based analysis such as this, perhaps not every linguist would.

3.3.1. The Supremacy of the Data

Linguistic analysis should be data-driven. Rather than look for examples of a priori pre-determined categories, the analyst should let the language tell him or her what the
categories are. S/he should beware of the temptation of relabeling an unexplained phenomenon: such relabelings tend to carry with them an aura of insight but are, in essence, devoid of true explanation. (Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear)) So, in this analysis, I have striven to be as concretely descriptive as possible, using operational definitions of presumed categories where necessary, but not decreeing categories which are not functionally validated in the discourse. One cannot necessarily assume that the way one language organizes and prioritizes information will be equivalent in another language (the classic division between ergative and nominative-accusative languages being a case in point). In short, it is essential to avoid linguistic determinism of any ilk. Conversely, however, while one should avoid imposing structure on language when it may not be there, grammatical categories which we do find can tell us something about the way human beings in general structure reality (cf. Bybee 1986).

3.3.2. Discourse Separate from Grammar

Discourse is not a part of grammar in the sense that it is not an 'upper level' of a constituent grammar in the way that, for example, a clause is a 'step up' (Halliday's 'rank') from a verb and its arguments. This view of discourse differs qualitatively from Longacre's 1983 interpretation of grammar as
a four-level hierarchy moving from clause to sentence to paragraph to discourse. Static discourse structures encompass other static grammatical structures. Longacre considers discourse-level phenomena to be like in kind to clause-level phenomena. In other words, grammar encompasses discourse.

In my analysis, I do not consider discourse to be a component of grammar. Dynamic discourse functions are seen to correlate with grammatical structures (Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear)). Grammaticization is viewed in the sense of Du Bois 1985, which studies the competing motivations for grammaticization in discourse, and concludes that "Grammars provide the most economical coding mechanisms... for those speech functions which speakers most often need to perform."

3.3.3. The Process Perspective

Related to the notion of discourse as dynamic is the idea put forth in, for example, Martin 1985), for example, which suggests that process and text (product) are two aspects of human semiosis, and that there is a need for both a product and a process perspective. Similarly, Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983, focusing specifically on comprehension, speak of the on-line assumption of discourse processing: 'Understanding takes place on-line with the processing of input data, gradually, and not
post hoc.' Gumperz (1982:4) speaks of the 'participants' ongoing process of interpretation.

This view of discourse as dynamic process is consonant also with the ethnomethodological approach (cf. Garfinkel.) Viewing discourse not as a process of production and comprehension, but an interpersonal creative accomplishment in which the roles of producer and comprehender are not isolated entities, can provide insights not readily available in many strictly linguistic frames of reference. Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967) sees all practical actions as 'contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life,' (p.11) not as static structures. In fact, the ethnomethodological approach sees all of reality itself as an intersubjective achievement. Language is reality-creating. Through language, participants in an interaction both create and reaffirm a reality which is itself a social consensus. In other words, what is being created through language reflexively points back to a reality which is a common consensus. Even the notion of context is actually an ongoing accomplishment:

Context does not stand guard around the text of the situation, ready to block any leaks in meaning. Rather, it is emergent in the ongoingness of the situation, the "flow" of reality-generating conversation. (Stewart 1978:85)
3.3.4. Avoiding One Comprehensive Methodology

Discourse analysis (or anything else, for that matter) is best accomplished by not trying to do everything at once. In analyses such as those presented by Pike and Pike 1983 and van Dijk and Kintsch 1983, comprehensive charts are laid out to account for various aspects of the structure of the discourse. In this thesis, however, I have not sought to make any single methodology comprehensive. Instead, insofar as practically feasible, I have sought to consider each relevant aspect of text structure independently of the others. That is to say, I have not simultaneously analyzed the rhetorical relations between the clauses in a text along with participant or thematic continuity. Likewise, I have not combined the analysis of thematic continuity with that of, for example, lexical cohesion. Instead, I have viewed these aspects of text structure as different templates, each lending its own contribution to the structural unity of the text. Another way of describing this is by considering these discourse devices to be geometric planes which intersect. Together, they create a unified discourse, even though their functions are not on the same level, or even necessarily parallel.5

Another way of 'healthily' viewing discourse from various perspectives is Pike's Particle, Wave, and Field Perspective. Beekman, Callow and Kopesec 1981, for example, compare this
"threesome" to semantic structure; static constituency is compared to 'particle,' prominence, or focal theme, to the 'wave' and its peaks, and coherence, the idea of a network of interconnecting relations in a text, to 'field.'

3.3.5. The Form-Function Issue

The mapping between form and function is a many-to-many one, rather than an isomorphic one-to-one. Any a priori assumption of a one-to-one ratio between form and function may lead the analyst to conclusions which are fallacious. I mention this only because of the temptation to any analyst to stop and breathe a sigh of relief when s/he has discovered one of the possible functions of a particular grammatical form. The danger is that s/he will heed the temptation to call this the function and fail to search for others. Conversely, the delight of identifying a form which correlates with a particular function can blind the analyst to other forms which fulfill this function. The study of linguistic forms as an end in itself can be enticing, but is not the objective of this thesis. In seeking to unravel the complexities of clause-combining strategies in Quechua, a major research question for this thesis has been: What are the text-organizing principles which are functioning in any particular discourse, and how do choices of particular grammatical forms correlate with these?
3.4. Some Relevant Discourse Notions

An underlying assumption of this thesis is that discourse study is by nature interdisciplinary, because human communication through language provides a virtually limitless domain of study. In the interest of practicality, however, the analyst must limit him/herself to a manageable frame of reference; here, it is linguistics. Within linguistics, in turn, the analyst can make use of a variety of avenues of approach in an effort to reach an understanding of the structure of any given text. These avenues of approach are not necessarily mutually exclusive; ultimately, all of them contribute to the organization of the discourse. I will discuss here only those notions which have a particular bearing on this study.

3.4.1. Coherence and Cohesion

In seeking to uncover the linguistic mechanisms which express the 'texthood', or unity of a particular text, the analyst may appeal to the notions of coherency or cohesion. These two concepts are not always kept distinct when applied to discourse. Crothers 1979, for example, acknowledges that the notion of 'coherence or cohesion' is fundamental to an understanding of text structure. Beekman et al speak of
coherence and 'types of evidence for coherence', essentially, cohesive devices. An insightful way of interpreting the theoretical distinction between the two is given in Thavenius 1983:28:

'Cohesion' is a semantic-syntactic concept manifested by overt grammatical and lexical signals or ties in the text.

'Cohereoce' is a semantic-pragmatic concept, which contributes to the communicative unity of a text. If we experience a text being a complete whole, the text is coherent, with or without textual manifestations.

3.4.2. Cohesion.

Halliday and Hasan 1976, in their definitive work on cohesion in discourse, define this phenomenon as follows: cohesive relations are relations between two or more elements in a text that are independent of the structure. A text is any passage that forms a unified whole, and a tie is a single instance of cohesion within that whole. A text is not a structural unit like a sentence, and cohesion is not a structural relation, but a semantic one which 'refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text' (1976:4). A text for Halliday and Hasan, then, is essentially a semantic, rather than a structural unit. Cohesion is thus a relational, not a structural concept: where the interpretation of any item in the discourse requires making
reference to some other item in the discourse, there is cohesion. Cohesion is 'a necessary though not a sufficient condition for the creation of text'. The cohesive relations, although basically semantic, have grammatical and lexical expressions. Halliday and Hasan include five kinds of cohesive ties in their analysis: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

Grimes 1975 speaks of 'cohesion relationships,' which 'relate what is being said at the moment to what has already been said' (p.113). An important feature of cohesion that he brings out is its essential linear, rather than hierarchical nature; that is, it has to do with the linear tracking of information in time, and not with the organization of the content of a discourse.

Although, in this thesis, attention is given to these connective devices, the primary focus is on the underlying principles of discourse organization reflected in the grammar of clause-combining. The organization of a discourse such that the parts combine to form what is experienced by the participants as a complete whole is more a matter of coherence.

3.4.3. Coherence

A text can be coherent with or without cohesive links. Conversely, a text can be cohesive without being coherent. It
is important, then, to keep separate the notions of coherence and cohesion, as morphosyntactic indicators of cohesion are not a reliable measure of coherence.

Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983 argues that discourse coherence should be accounted for at both the **local** and the **global** level. Local coherence is defined 'in terms of relations between propositions as expressed by subsequent sentences' (p.189). It is 'the establishment of meaningful connections between successive sentences in a discourse' (p.14). Global coherence is considered to be more 'general,' and applies to a whole discourse or to larger fragments of a whole discourse. The representation of this global coherence is provided through the **macrostructure**, an abstract schematic description of the global content of a discourse.

At the local level, van Dijk and Kintsch distinguish between various types of coherence: semantic, syntactic, stylistic and pragmatic; however, they focus their attention on semantic coherence only. They discuss two kinds of semantic coherence: conditional (including temporal) and functional semantic coherence; but they do not claim thereby that other kinds of semantic coherence may not also exist. Conditional local coherence is based on denoted facts: it exists between a sequence of sentences when one fact is a possible, probable or necessary condition for-- or a possible, probable or necessary
consequence of --another fact. Functional local coherence is based on meaning relations: it exists when a sentence is followed by another sentence implying or implied by it.

Local coherence is always relative to the global coherence of the discourse; that is, it is under 'macro-control' of the macrostructure. The macrostructure is 'an abstract semantic description of the global content, and hence of the global coherence of discourse' (p.189). The macrostructure functions as a semantic organizing device in discourse: it is based on relations between macropropositions, which are collections of individual propositions. These individual propositions, however, are not clearly developed at this stage in Van Dijk and Kintsch's work.

According to Mann & Thompson (1986b:57), coherence is related to closure, 'the ability to impose connectivity on disconnected parts of a visual image.' One factor involved in the creating and interpreting of texts as coherent are the perceived organizational relations between parts of a text which they call relational propositions. 'Part of people's creating and interpreting of texts as coherent is the imposition of organizational, or rhetorical, relations between parts of the text.' (Matthiessen and Thompson t.a.:11) Speakers and hearers are not always conscious of these relations between propositions, but they exist as a kind of network which joins
together all the parts of the text. This notion of a network of relations between parts of a text is a crucial one for the analysis of clause-combining in this thesis.

Whereas van Dijk & Kintsch's notion of macrostructure attempts to provide a fully comprehensive account of the semantic structure of discourse, Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson's approach focuses more specifically on the relations between parts of a text. Van Dijk & Kintsch propose to account for a number of discourse processes (interclausal relations, topic, theme, coherence, cohesion, lexical choice, etc.) under the single framework of macrostructure. Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson's approach is thus more in keeping with the analytical perspective taken in this thesis.

3.4.4. 'Theme' and Related Notions

'Theme' has been used to refer to what is known, or familiar, in a given sentence, or to what is most important in a given sentence or discourse, or what is the main subject matter, or topic, of a given discourse. In this section, I will explore some of the ways which this term has been used, prior to defining the way it is put to use in this thesis.

Mathesius 1939, from the perspective of the Neo-Praguean tradition, defines theme as 'that which is known or at least
obvious in the given situation, and from which the speaker proceeds in the discourse' (p.234). Similarly, Firbas (1964:272) notes that 'the theme is constituted by the sentence element (or elements) carrying the lowest degree(s) of communicative dynamism within the sentence.' In other words, from a functional sentence perspective, the information flow is from familiar to unfamiliar, the latter being the more 'dynamic' for communicative purposes. Trávníček (1962:166) moves a step further when he states that theme is 'the sentence element that links up directly with the object of thought, proceeds from it and opens the sentence thereby.' In this formulation, the notion of theme is connected to the discourse/contextual notion of a prevailing 'object of thought' that the speaker 'links up' with. Nevertheless, the Praguian conception of theme is basically as a sentence-level phenomenon. Likewise, Halliday's 1967 classic use of the term 'theme' as 'the point of departure of the clause as a message' is not a discourse-based definition.

Fries 1983, taking the Hallidayan definition as a starting point, studies the text-organizational functions of sentence-initial themes in English. He illustrates how subjects are 'unmarked themes' in English, and thematic tracking is most vivid when sentence-initial themes are 'marked,' that is, non-subjects. Even though Fries is looking at discourse, however, the notion of 'theme' is still presumed to be a sentence-level phenomenon.
'Theme', according to Crothers 1979, is 'the proposition most central to the text's development.'

Nichols 1984 uses 'theme' to refer to the major participant in a story.

Grimes 1975 views 'theme' as one of the 'partitioning principles' of discourse. According to his interpretation, 'discourse itself has to be taken as the ultimate level of organization,' but, within that organization, certain partitioning principles can be identified. These include setting, both temporal and spatial, theme, and participant orientation. 'Theme' is part of what Grimes calls 'staging' relationships, that is, those relationships which indicate the 'speaker's perspective on what is being said' (p.113). The 'theme' is the part of the discourse that the other parts of that stretch of discourse all 'relate to.' The 'theme' is the same as long as the speaker is talking about the same thing. 'Theme' helps to partition a discourse because, when a speaker changes theme, he begins a new section in the organization of a text.6

Van Dijk (1982: 177) speaks of 'thematic unity' as a necessary component of the structure of an episode or a paragraph in discourse, and links this idea with coherence; however, the term 'theme' is not precisely made clear:

Roughly speaking, paragraphs or episodes are
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characterized as coherent sequences of sentences of a discourse, linguistically marked for beginning and/or end, and further defined in terms of some kind of 'thematic unity' -- for instance, in terms of identical participants, time, location or global event or action.

Givón 1983a alludes to the notion of 'thematic paragraph', referring to a cluster of clauses which are all about the same theme, or main idea. Generally accompanying 'thematic continuity' are what Givón calls 'action continuity', a temporal sequentiality or adjacency, and 'topic/participant continuity', sameness of major characters. In this respect, he is quite similar to Grimes. Givón harks back to the three unities in the classical Greek play: Unity of time, unity of place, and unity of action; and he adds to these three a fourth, unity of participants. Thematic continuity is 'the overall matrix for all other continuities in the discourse.' (1983a:8) The thematic paragraph is a chain of equi-topic clause. Within the thematic paragraph, thematic, action, and topic/participants continuity are deeply interconnected. Furthermore, there is an implicational hierarchy such that thematic continuity leads to action continuity, which, in turn, leads to continuity of topics and participants. It is most common for one topic to be the leitmotif of a thematic paragraph.

Givón's definition of theme would appear to be circular, in
that he defines a thematic paragraph on the basis of the notion of topic, yet says that thematic continuity tends to imply continuity of topic. Practically speaking, 'topic continuity' for Givón seems to be essentially 'participant continuity,' and the 'theme' of a discourse is the most continuous participant, the participant mentioned most frequently. On the other hand 'topic' in his definition of the thematic paragraph is essentially the more general notion of 'what is being talked about,' or theme in the Grimesean sense. We are left confused as to the difference between 'theme' and 'topic,' especially in non-narrative genres, where participant continuity and action continuity are not influential factors. We are further confused by Givón's claim that topic continuity gives coherence to a discourse. Is 'continuity' to be equated with 'coherence'? 

Another approach to the notion of 'theme', as related to the comprehension of technical prose, is taken by Kieras 1985. The emphasis here is on processes, or strategies for comprehension. He claims that 'thematic processes are those which identify or derive the important content in a piece of prose, distinguishing it from the details or irrelevancies.' (p.93) The 'important content' is basically that of Van Dijk's (1980) macrostructure, which represents the 'gist' of a passage. Readers 'abstract' the thematic content in terms of Van Dijk's 'macrostructure theory.' 'Theme' for Kieras, then, is whatever
is 'most important.' It is difficult to see how one would operationalize a definition of 'most important' for spoken non-technical data in Quechua. Kieras' approach is perhaps useful for an understanding of comprehension processes in technical prose in English, but it is of little use for our purposes here.

The approach of this thesis is to keep the various strands of linear continuity in a text separate for analytical purposes. Event tracking is to be distinguished from participant tracking. Furthermore, the theme or main subject matter of a text, is to be distinguished from the topic or topical participant of a text. The notions of 'theme' and 'topic' are relevant insofar as they influence speaker choices of specific clause-combining strategies. The terms will be employed as follows:

Theme: The general subject matter, what a text or subtext is 'about.' For example, the theme in a weather report (see 4.5) is the weather; the theme in a narrative about the sorrowful situation of a young woman is that sorrowful situation (see 4.6).

Topic: The specific center of attention, the focal participant in a text or subtext. In narratives, this is the main participant. The topic in the weather report is the particular city about which the weather is being reported; the topic in the narrative about the young woman is the young woman.
3.5. Introduction to Rhetorical Structure Analysis

The primary analytical technique to which I am appealing in this thesis is Rhetorical Structure Analysis, as presented in Mann and Thompson 1984, 1985, and 1986a & b, and Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear). For narratives, I will supplement the Rhetorical Structure Analysis with Longacre’s (1983) plot analysis of monologue discourse. This will be elaborated on in Chapter 7. In choosing to concentrate initially on Rhetorical Structure Analysis, I am not electing to ignore all other approaches to text structure. Rather, I am starting at the most basic level of text organization and bringing in other analytical templates where appropriate.

3.5.1. Background on Relational Propositions

The second chapter of Barbara Fox’s 1984 UCLA dissertation, Discourse Structure and Anaphora in Written and Conversational English, provides an excellent survey of the literature on discourse structure in general and on relational propositions in particular. Mann and Thompson 1985, 1986a&b, and Mann 1984 are the seminal works on clause-combining viewed within the framework of Rhetorical Structure Theory. A further work, Mann and Thompson (to appear), provides a more explicit definitional
foundation for Rhetorical Structure Theory, but was not available at the time this thesis was conceived.

Mann and Thompson 1986a reviews the literature on relational propositions and characterizes them as inherently combinational structures which are essential to textual coherence. Mann 1984 focuses on text organization and the schemas of rhetorical structures as hierarchical. The nucleus-satellite distinction is introduced: 'each region of text has a central nuclear part and a number of satellites related to it'. (1986a:1) Mann and Thompson 1985 summarizes and presents some further refinements to the theory, and Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear) applies Rhetorical Structure Theory to an analysis of 'Subordination' in English and includes a typology of rhetorical relations.

Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson do not claim to be the originators of the idea of relational propositions. Mann and Thompson 1986a, for example, mention Beekman and Callow 1974 and Grimes 1975, among others. Longacre (1976, 1983, 1985) distinguishes between 'notional', or semantic, structure and surface structure, or grammar. He presupposes a sentence level, so the relations he considers are primarily those between clauses within a sentence. Crothers 1979 proposes inferences as being basic to textual coherence. Crothers' inferences seem to be essentially relations between propositions. Crothers does
not explicitly define what he means by 'coherence'; however, he seems to equate this with Halliday and Hasan's notion of cohesion. Meyer 1975, drawing heavily on Grimes, maintains that rhetorical predicates are primarily responsible for giving prose its overall organization (1975:31).

At this point, before elaborating further on Rhetorical Structure Analysis, I will review some of these related approaches to relations between propositions, specifically Crothers 1979, Beekman et al 1981, Longacre (1975, 1983, 1985), Grimes 1975 and Meyer 1975.

3.5.2. Crothers

Crothers 1979 presents a linguistic-logical theory of what he calls 'paragraph and text descriptive representation.' (p.1) The focus of the book is two-pronged: Crothers' intent is to provide both a linguistic theory and a method for pursuing psychological and educational research on reading comprehension and memory in English. Crothers proposes, in particular, a classifications of proposition inferences and another for connective inferences. These classifications are aimed at 'systematizing' the inference-making procedures in reading comprehension. The 'connective inferences' are essentially the same as the relational propositions discussed by Mann and Thompson. As mentioned in 3.4.1, the notion of coherence/cohesion is a crucial one to Crothers. The fact that
he conflates cohesion and coherence is, from the research perspective taken in this present study, a drawback (see 3.4.1.) However, the fact that Crothers' approach is text- rather than sentence- grounded is a very positive aspect of his work.

According to Crothers, 'the treatment of inferences amounts to an extension of the notions of presupposition, premise, and consequence.' (p.2) Unfortunately, he does not define the notion of inference more precisely than this. We assume that he follows something like the dictionary definition:

inference  The act or process of inferring or deriving a conclusion from facts or premises.  (American Heritage)

The 'inferences of connectivity' specify 'unstated' relations between propositions, such as, for example, antecedence and consequence. It is the prevailing concept of coherence, the underlying assumption that a text will 'make sense' as a whole, which dictates the choices of possible inferences between the propositions of the text. The inferences of connectivity exist whether or not any direct coding in the form of a lexical connective appears in the surface appearance of the text.

Crothers produces, by way of illustration, detailed analyses of five typical written English texts of various genres. He claims that, although he has not provided voluminous evidence for the validity of his theory, these analyses, by
virtue of their thoroughness and their basis in a wise sampling of data, provide insights not only into the structure of these isolated examples, but into the structure of the language itself. Crothers rightly contends that the value of a theory of inferences does not rest on the choice of particular inferences in a text as being indisputable, but as being plausible for that text. In other words, the theory does not stand or fall on analysts' agreement on every specific choice of inference, but, rather, on the general principle that there are inferences, and that, even if one or another choice is disputable, the option chosen must be plausible.

Crothers 1979 is indeed a valuable contribution to the study of text organization in English; however, his theory is of limited use for the analysis of clause-combining in Quechua, first, because it takes a 'product' perspective on exclusively written material in English only, and is therefore somewhat rigid, and second, because the classification of combinatory inferences is not comprehensive enough to be of any directly transferrable service. Nevertheless, the basic insight about the crucial value for text structure of the 'combinatorial inferences' is in keeping with the spirit of this present study.
3.5.3. Beekman, Callow & Kopesec

Beekman and Callow 1974 and Beekman et al 1981 are also studies built on written text, in this case, New Testament Greek. Their 'relations between propositions' are part of a comprehensive analysis of what they call the 'semantic structure of written communication.' A proposition is 'the minimal semantic unit consisting of a concept or a combination of concepts which communicates an Event or Relation' (1974:273). All of the specific relations between propositions may be subsumed under two types: Addition, which involves the developing of a semantic unit, and Association, which involves supporting a semantic unit. The former are termed 'Main' or 'Theme' propositions, the latter, 'Support' propositions. Beekman et al brings in some further parameters to categorize and subcategorize relational propositions, such as sequential versus simultaneous, temporal versus logical, causal versus non-causal, and narrative versus non-narrative.

Beekman et al is far more comprehensive than Crothers, but, unfortunately, their interpretation of discourse structure in general, and, as a result, of relational propositions, in particular, is too highly structured. Their interpretation of relational propositions is an outgrowth of a rigid, constituent analysis of text structure in which notions of theme (for them, the 'subject matter' being dealt with) and the analysis of the
propositional structure of individual clauses are inextricably linked with the analysis of relational propositions. Relational propositions do not help to provide text organization, they are a byproduct of thematic organization and secondary in importance to the propositional structure of each individual clause. Beekman et al are not interested in the grammar of clause-combining as much as they are interested in the propositional structure of those clauses that combine. As a result, although their taxonomies and parameters for relational propositions are useful for the study of clause-combining in Quechua, their general static, deterministic view of discourse is not.

Longacre (1976, 1983, 1985) pays primary attention to the grammatical structures which reflect the kinds of relations specified in Beekman and Callow 1974 and Beekman et al 1981. A drawback of Longacre for our purposes is that although, in principle, he emphasizes discourse-determining factors for grammatical structures; with regard to clause-combining, he focuses only on individual instances of clause combinations in their local contexts only, and not on higher-level relations between larger spans of text within which these local combinations are more clearly interpretable. A very positive side of Longacre's work is its crosslinguistic basis, its orientation towards oral, as well as written monologue text, and its emphasis that there is a finite set of possible ways of
combining clauses in any language which it is the linguist’s task to discover.

3.5.4. Grimes

Grimes 1975 defines ‘rhetorical propositions’ as those propositions whose predicates do not involve specifications on roles that must be present in their arguments, that is, propositions whose predicates are a ‘step up’ from sentential predicates which determine the case frames of their arguments. The main function of rhetorical propositions is that of organizing the content of discourse, and they are always present. In Grimes’ framework, there are three classes of rhetorical predicates: paratactic predicates, which dominate all of their arguments in coordinate fashion, hypotactic predicates, which have as one of their arguments the center, a term with respect to which the proposition as a whole is subordinated to some other proposition by being added to it as an ‘extra’ argument, and neutral predicates, which may have both paratactic and hypotactic forms, depending on the discourse context. Grimes also provides a partial typology and some examples of relational propositions, but the study is not a comprehensive one.

Meyer 1975 applies Grimes’ rhetorical relations to research in prose recall in English, to determine what variables can account for differences in recall. Her claim is that structures
'high' in the hierarchy of the structure of the text are better remembered than structures 'low' in the relational hierarchy. Her thesis is that 'rhetorical predicates are primarily responsible for giving prose its overall organization' (p.31)

Grimes and Meyer are successful not only in identifying relational propositions, as did Crothers, Beekman et al, and Longacre, but also in isolating the 'power' of relational propositions to build an organizational network for a text, in other words, to provide coherence.

In summary, Rhetorical Structure Analysis is not unique in its appeal to relations between propositions in discourse. Yet, although others have pursued this notion, Rhetorical Structure Theory is the only account I know of which explicitly views relational propositions "as parts of elements in communicative acts, which function to achieve certain goals on the part of the speaker, rather than as elements of a taxonomy in a 'semantic system'" (1983:20). I will now proceed to a more detailed presentation of Rhetorical Structure Analysis.

3.6. Rhetorical Structure Analysis

The ultimate aim of Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST), as it is being developed by Mann, Mathiessen et al, at the Information Sciences Institute in Marina Del Rey, California, is to provide a discourse foundation for a text generator. It has
been designed for expository, edited written English texts, particularly short texts. Although RST has not been conceived to describe spoken language, I have found that is is a useful analytical tool for the analysis of spoken Quechua, quite independent of its text generation component.

The cognitive basis of Rhetorical Structure Theory is that the text is a means of achieving the speaker or writer's goal by linguistic communication. The assumption is that a speaker or a writer will choose a clause according to the particular relation he or she needs to express at that point in the text.

Descriptively speaking, the study of rhetorical (relational) structures is a way of making explicit the pattern of relations which connects the clauses in a text together to form a coherent whole. These relationships may be signaled, or may occur independently of any particular signals. They 'are not limited to organizational aspects of texts, but are involved deeply in relating subject-matter-specific conceptions to each other.' (Mathiessen and Thompson t.a.:16) In other words, they are involved in all aspects of coherent text production. They are 'relational illocutionary acts' essential to the texthood of a text, and are 'always present in coherent multisentence texts.' (Mathiessen and Thompson t.a.:3)
The rhetorical relations between the component parts of a text are a kind of 'connective tissue' for the text: together they form a network which hierarchically describes the organization of the text in terms of nucleus-satellite relationships at each level. The nuclei form the backbone of the text and reflect the central goals of the speaker/writer. Nuclear text spans are connected to the corresponding span of texts in the network diagram by straight lines. The satellites, in turn, reflect ancillary information which the speaker/writer feels to be necessary for some rhetorical purpose. Satellites are connected to their corresponding nuclei by curved lines. The following example, in English, illustrates the nucleus-satellite distinction:

(50) 1. Even though my back aches,
     2. I mustn't stop writing.

In (50), Clause 1 is in a CONCESSIVE relation to Clause 2; the speaker concedes that the information in Clause 1 could potentially detract from the pursuit of the action of writing; however, in Clause 2, she affirms that the writing must continue. Clause 1 is thus a satellite to the nuclear Clause 2. This can be diagrammed in the following manner:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CONCESSION} \\
1 \rightarrow 2
\end{array}
\]
The following clause combination in Conchucos Quechua illustrates the nucleus-satellite relationship in Quechua:

\text{CLAUSE 1} \quad \text{CLAUSE 2} \\
(51) \quad [\text{Rəqi-tsi-y-ni-ki-kuna-ta runa-rnin}] \quad \text{pusha-ya-ra-q} \\
\text{know-CAUS-INF-Ø-2-PL-ACC} \quad \text{want-SS} \quad \text{guide-PL-PAST->2} \\
\text{'Wanting to familiarize you with it (speaker's home town), I guided you (pl) there.' (4.1)}

In (51), Clause 1, the satellite, is in a REASON relationship to Clause 2, the nucleus. This can be diagrammed as follows:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (1) at (0,0) {1};
\node (2) at (1,0) {2};
\draw (1) -- node[above] {REASON} (2);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

A satellite is only related rhetorically to the rest of the text via its nucleus. Furthermore, the satellite tends to be the marked form: connectives, for example, mark the satellite in a nucleus-satellite combination. According to Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear), 'clause combining in grammar has evolved as a grammaticization of the rhetorical units in text defined by rhetorical relations'. They suggest, for example, that clause-combining of the enhancing hypotactic kind in English is a grammaticization of enhancing rhetorical nucleus-satellite relations. The following example provides further context for (50), illustrating how the satellites are connected to the rest of the network only through their nuclei:
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(52) 1. Even though my back aches, 
2. I mustn't stop writing, 
3. This paper is due tomorrow.

Clause 3 provides the REASON why the action expressed in Clauses 1 and 2 mustn't cease; it is related to the span of text consisting of Clauses 1 and 2. Clause 1 is related to Clause 3 only by virtue of its connection as a satellite to Clause 2.

This can be diagrammed as follows:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
1-3 \\
\text{REASON} \\
1-2 \\
\text{REASON} \\
1 \\
\end{array} \]

Rhetorical relations may also be multi-nuclear. For example, in a CONTRAST relation, both sides of the CONTRAST are on an equal footing. Consider the following excerpt from the December 8, 1986 issue of Time:

1. Reagan's election was a reaction to the micromanagement style of Jimmy Carter, who made it his business to know everything from the fine print in the Pentagon budget to who was playing on the White House tennis court.
2. Reagan, by contrast, has practiced a kind of Zen presidency: the less he worried and prepared, the more popular and effective he would be. (p.34)
In this example, 1, regarding the management style of Jimmy Carter, is in a CONTRAST relation to 2, regarding the management style of Ronald Reagan. This relation can be diagrammatically represented as follows:

```
  1-2
 /    \
\      /
  CONTRAST
 \
  1   2
```

Because rhetorical relations are inherently combinational, they are a particularly suitable framework for a study of clause-combining strategies. An important feature of Rhetorical Structure Analysis is that the same relations which are useful in describing clause-combining at the local level are useful for describing larger spans of text. In other words, local pairs of clause combinations follow the same principles of organization in relation to one another as do larger spans of text, involving the same small number of recurrent relations. So, in a very concrete sense, the grammar of clause-combining can be seen to reflect discourse organization.

Rhetorical Structure analysis provides a descriptive framework which can give us some insights into the hierarchical
structure of a text -- it is not tied strictly to the linear aspects of text development. Furthermore, it is not tied too directly to the grammatical signs in a language: a rhetorical relation exists independently of its signals. Thus it provides, in some measure, a way of separating grammar from discourse so that the analyst can avoid the trap of confusing grammatical form and discourse function, particularly as far as 'subordination' is concerned. (cf. Haiman and Thompson 1984, Thompson (to appear), Matthiessen and Thompson (to appear)). However, the correlation between the relational structure of the text and the grammatical manifestations is such that 'a particular type of clause combination typically codes a particular type of rhetorical organization of discourse.' (Matthiessen and Thompson to appear:8) An operational research question can then be: which rhetorical relations are coded by what kinds of devices?
3.7. Genre

In searching for the organizing principles which underlie any given body of text in the same language, it is important not to make claims about the grammar of the language which are genre-independent. A number of linguists have been careful to heed this admonition. Fox 1984, for example, provides evidence that this is the proper approach for the study of anaphora in English. Hinds (1979:135) is careful to point out that hierarchical organization does exist in discourse types other than narrative, but that the organizing principles are different. Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983) speak of the linguistic and cognitive differences between discourse types, and genre-specific 'schematic strategies.' Longacre 1983) explicitly claims that 'once a discourse type is chosen, many decisions as to structure of very small parts of it are already made'. (p.133)

A major working assumption of this thesis has been that analyses of the Quechua data should be genre-specific because different discourse types may well have different organizing principles. One could even go so far as to say that different discourse types require different theories to lead the linguist to discover the discourse determinants of grammar, as the larger structure so strongly influences the choice of linguistic mechanisms.
Once the decision is made to consider each genre type independently, a second decision must be made regarding how to do so, that is, which criteria should be used to separate texts into diverse genre categories. These decisions are rarely straightforward. Many texts can not be gracefully accommodated into a 'pure' discourse type. It is well known, for example, that narratives may digress into long stretches of background description. Keeping this in mind, it is still possible to classify most discourses according to their predominant pattern, making allowances for those sub-sections which follow the organizing principles of other genres. Some of the differing approaches to typologizing genre in the literature indicate that there is not just one way to do so. By way of clarifying the motivations behind the choices of genre types for the Quechua data, I will review some of the more helpful typologies which have been suggested in the literature.

Beekman et al, focusing primarily on Koiné Greek, distinguish four major types of written discourse, the choice of a particular discourse type in a given instance being closely related to the author's purpose. Two major parameters distinguish these major types: whether or not the presentation is within a chronological framework (Narrative and Procedural; and whether or not the discourse is prescriptive, that is, whether or not some form of command is a prevailing feature
(Procedural and Hortatory). That is, central to the structure of Narrative and Procedural discourse is the notion of 'time-line' or 'event-line.' Expository and Hortatory discourse may display some chronological orientation, but it is not central to the development of the discourse. Similarly, Procedural and Hortatory discourse are both prescriptive, whereas Narrative and Expository discourse are both non-Prescriptive. Again, the claim is not that all commands or suggestions of any kind are absent from Narrative and Expository discourses, but simply that these are not central to the definition of the discourse type. For example, Hortatory discourse is often characterized by extensive Expository portions.

Beekman et al further subdivide Narrative into Narrative Without Plot and Narrative With Plot. The former is simply an account of successive events. A child’s account of 'what I did in school today' is a good example. Narratives With Plot always have some kind of a plot structure involving some kind of build-up to a climax. Two kinds of plot structure can be distinguished, those which involve some struggle or contest, and those which do not. The former are termed 'Problem-Based Narratives' by Beekman et al; the latter, 'Non-Problem-Based Narratives.'

In Problem-Based Narratives, there is always the presence of a conflict, be it physical, psychological, or moral, man
against nature, man against man, or man against society. The conflict provokes actions and interactions which move the plot towards a resolution of the conflict, which often occurs following a peak, or climactic, episode.

Non-Problem-Based Narratives are built around what Beekman et al term Outcome, Remark-Evaluation, and Question-Answer. That is, a 'stimulus' portion in the narrative triggers a 'response' portion; but the driving force of an overriding conflict or problem is not present.

The most valuable feature of Beekman et al's typology for our purposes here is the application of the parameter of Chronological Orientation. The parameter Prescriptive Orientation is less suitable, as Procedural texts in Quechua tend not to be prescriptive, but, rather, descriptive of chronologically accomplished tasks. The sub-divisions of Narrative are useful, although the distinction between Problem-Based and Non-Problem-Based Narrative is not clearly elucidated.

Closely related to Beekman et al's typology, but striving for greater cross-linguistic validity, is Longacre's approach. Longacre 1983 classifies all possible discourses in human language as 'notional' types according to the two basic parameters of Contingent Temporal Succession and Agent Orientation. In Contingent Temporal Succession, events or happenings in a discourse are contingent on previous events or
happenings. Agent Orientation implies at least a partial identity of agentive reference throughout the discourse. The following figure represents Longacre's interpretation of major discourse types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+Ag-Orientation</th>
<th>-Ag-Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARRATIVE</td>
<td>PROCEDURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>How-to-do-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>How-it-was-done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIORAL</td>
<td>EXPOSITORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortatory</td>
<td>Budget Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promissory</td>
<td>Futuristic Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulogy</td>
<td>Scientific Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Longacre's Major Notional Types (1983:5)

Longacre also posits two secondary parameters, Projection and Tension. Projection refers to a situation or action which, although contemplated, anticipated or enjoined, has not actually happened. Tension has to do with the degree of struggle or conflict reflected in the discourse.

A distinct approach to genre classification is taken in Werlich (1976:19-26). Basing the typology on English, Werlich
proposes the following five text types, according to their dominant communicative focus:

1. DESCRIPTIVE
2. NARRATIVE
3. EXPOSITORY
4. ARGUMENTATIVE
5. INSTRUCTIVE

DESCRIPTIVE texts focus on 'factual phenomena' in a 'spatial context.' NARRATIVE texts focus on 'factual and/or conceptual phenomena in the temporal context.' EXPOSITORY texts focus on the 'constituent elements of concepts of phenomena.' ARGUMENTATIVE texts focus on the 'relations between concepts of phenomena that the communicants have,' and INSTRUCTIVE texts focus on the 'composition of observable future behaviour.'

Although, in some respects, Werlich's definitions are vague - for example, what exactly are 'constituent elements of concepts of phenomena?' - he makes a useful distinction between DESCRIPTIVE and EXPOSITORY texts on the basis of whether the focus is factual or conceptual. Neither Beekman et al nor Longacre make explicit this distinction. Another valuable feature of Werlich's typology is his definition of ARGUMENTATIVE texts, because, according to him, a crucial distinguishing feature of this type is that it focuses on relations between concepts. If this is accurate, we would expect the network of rhetorical relations to be particularly crucial in the
organization of this type of discourse. In fact, we might expect rhetorical relations to play a role in defining discourse type. We will direct our attention to this issue in greater detail in the next chapter.

Given that there is no single universally applicable way of typologizing texts into genres, the approach in this thesis has been to design a classification which is most appropriate for the Quechua data base. The criteria for appropriateness are the following: the distinctions should be fine-grained enough to avoid obscuring different strategies of clause-combining in different discourse contexts, yet broad enough to avoid obscuring general principles about the grammar of clause-combining. The classification does not pretend to be comprehensive for all possible texts in Conchucos Quechua, merely adequate for the data base for this thesis.

The first major division of texts is along the parameter of Chronological Orientation, or Temporal Succession, as defined by Beekman, Callow and Kopesc 1981 and Longacre 1983. The analysis of texts which are classified as -Chronological Orientation is presented in Chapter 4. The analysis of texts which are classified as +Chronological Orientation is presented in Chapter 6. The classification is as follows:
3.7.1. Chronological Orientation Categories

EXPOSITORY texts are all texts whose primary goal is the presentation of information in a non-chronological framework. They may be subdivided into DESCRIPTIVE texts, ARGUMENTATIVE texts and REPORTS. DESCRIPTIVE texts present static information, information about the characteristics of animate or inanimate beings. ARGUMENTATIVE texts present information in support of or refuting a particular point of view. REPORTS present information about events in a primarily non-chronological framework, much as a newspaper article reports on an earthquake, for example.

MOTIVATIONAL texts are texts whose primary goal is to evoke a change of attitude or behavior. As a group, they are more subjective than the EXPOSITORY set. They include anything from a gentle giving of advice or effort to assuage to a highly forceful argument.

EXPRESSIONIVE texts are texts whose primary goal is to communicate the subjective opinions or emotions of the speaker. Neither external facts nor the inciting of change is a major
factor. What counts the most is the speaker's inner state. As a group, then, they are the most subjective of the -CO texts. They include, for example, farewell speeches and dedicatory addresses.

These are not, of course, completely clearcut, mutually exclusive categories, but they reflect the dominant speaker goals in constructing the discourse, and are thus adequate for a reasonable analysis of discourse organization for non-chronologically oriented Quechua texts. Essentially, the primary parameter in distinguishing between the three subtypes is that of subjectivity. This can be diagrammatically represented as follows:

```
-Subjective ←----------------------------→ +Subjective
   
EXPOSITORY   MOTIVATIONAL   EXPRESSIVE
```

Figure 6. Subjectivity Continuum for -Chronological Orientation

3.7.2. +Chronological Orientation Categories

The two classes of discourse which are +CO are NARRATIVE and PROCEDURAL. NARRATIVE texts are those whose goal is to give an account of a series of events which take place in a defined time and space frame. They may be subdivided into FOLK NARRATIVES and PERSONAL ACCOUNT NARRATIVES, following Larsen 1977. FOLK NARRATIVES have a plot. PERSONAL ACCOUNT NARRATIVES
have temporal succession, but no plot, in the sense of Beekman et al. 1981.

PROCEDURAL texts tell how something is done, should be done, or habitually used to be done. They may be subdivided into those which are INSTRUCTIVE, in that they are organized as a series of commands (Beekman and Callow's 'prescriptive') and those which merely describe the procedure as 'one does it.'

The complete set of genres for the Conchucos Quechua data is, then, as given in Table X:10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-Chronological Orientation</th>
<th>+Chronological Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Personal Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td>Folk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Instructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Discourse Genres for Conchucos Quechua

3.8. Application of Rhetorical Structure Analysis

The following is a short sub-text illustrating the application of Rhetorical Structure Analysis to Conchucos Quechua. In this text, analyzed in its complete form in Chapter 4, a Quechua godfather (padrino) is giving some strong advice to his wayward godson, who has deserted his wife and children and
is living the life of a philanderer. The speaker is reproaching the prodigal godson, exhorting him to 'grow up' and behave as he feels a family man should. Each clause in the sequence is numbered for clear identification in the diagram.

(53)

1. yapay ka-pti-ki
   again be-DS-2

2. hayta-ra-yka-r-mi
   kick-STAT-IMPFV-SS-DIR

3. noqa kay-pita qarg-o-shayki
   I here-ABL throw:out→2FUT

4. kanan-ta-m apa-q-man carcel-kuna-man
   now-ADV-DIR take→2-COND jail-PL-GOAL

   qayku-tsi-mu-q-ni-ki
   lock:up-CAUS-AFAR-∅→2

5. kay-naw ka-pti-ki
   this-SIM be-DS-2

6. kanan-mi see-qa pamapatsa-q imayka ka-nqa-yki-ta-pis
   today-DIR yes-TOP forgive→2 any be-NOM-2-ACC-TOO

7. peru kanan-pita uray-man runa ka-y-ta yachaku-nki.
   but today-ABL down-GOAL man be-INF-ACC learn→2IMP

English Translation:

1. If you’re like that again,
2. kicking you
3. I’ll throw you out.
4. Right then I could take you to jail to have you locked up,
5. if you’re like this.
6. Right now I forgive you everything that is past,
7. but from now on, learn to be a man.
In this text, clauses 1 through 5 are in a MOTIVATION relationship to clauses 6 and 7; the speaker is trying to get the hearer to change his ways and become a 'man', so he threatens him with strict measures if he doesn't change. Clause 1 provides the CONDITION for clauses 6 and 7: if you're that (bad) way again'. The nuclear 2 and 3 say what will happen if he is that way again. Within this nucleus, clause 2 is in a CIRCUMSTANTIAL relationship to 3, as 2 describes the manner in which the godfather will throw out the godson. Clauses 4 and 5 are in an ELABORATION relationship with 1 through 3: they amplify what the speaker will do to his godson -- he will even go to such lengths as to have him locked up. Notice the symmetry in the relationship of 1 to 2 and 5 to 4, where both satellites are encoded with the DS switch-reference marker -pi.

Figure 7. Rhetorical Structure of Advice Excerpt
will let the godson get away with everything he has done so far, which has certainly not been 'being a man'. Clause 7, the nucleus of this construction, is also the nucleus of the whole text, and expresses the central goal of the text, the godfather's desire that the godson desist from his wayward ways and 'be a man'.

The rhetorical structure clearly shows the hierarchical interdependences in the organization of the text. In the light of this structure, we can investigate the Quechua morphology more closely, to see what kind of correlations are to be found between grammatical constructions and rhetorical relations. For example, there are at least two, and possibly three distinct correlations with rhetorical relations and the choice of switch-reference clauses: CONDITIONAL (pre-'final' verb and post-'final' verb), both DS (1 and 5); and CIRCUMSTANTIAL, SS (1). Clause 2 is clearly more closely tied to Clause 3 than to Clause 1 in the Rhetorical Structure. This is manifested in the grammar by the close cataphoric tie between the SS switch-reference verb in 2 and the independent verb in 3. The Rhetorical Structure shows these two clauses to be functioning as a unit at one level, and clause 1 as clearly not functioning together with this pair at that same level. A glance at the morphology shows this to be reflected in the DS switch-reference marking. So -pti, although its most obvious function is to mark
different subject of the next clause in the grammar, appears in a clause which is in a CONDITIONAL relationship with at least two subsequent clauses. This conditionality is not marked separately in the morphology, but -pti provides a cue to the underlying relationship in the clause combination.

3.9. Final Comments

A limitation of Rhetorical Structure Analysis as far as the Conchucos Quechua data are concerned, is that it is most revealing for texts whose basic organizing principle is logical, not temporal, that is for the -CO texts. Furthermore, since it has been conceived and applied primarily to written English, and is particularly effective in revealing the rhetorical organization of short motivational texts like ads. Moreover, Quechua is a language typologically quite distinct from English. It is important to stress, however, that the basic premises of the Rhetorical Structure approach clearly do hold for Quechua spoken monologue in general. In other words, it is possible to discern a network of relations which bind the clauses of a text together, even though it may not be in English, written, or, necessarily short.

One reason for this is that the data chosen as the corpus for this analysis are, although spontaneous, not fragmented musings on no particular subject, but produced with some degree of planning. Speakers had distinct communicative goals in mind.
from the outset of their monologues; they were not merely engaging in idle, undirected chatter. Although, in some cases, they were developing organizational strategies as they talked, in others, they were following clearly defined strategies dictated, for example, by the plot or the procedure they were describing, or by socio-culturally accepted formulas for argumentation or presentation of information. In the sense of Chafe 1982, their talk tended to be more integrated than fragmented, and, at times, more detached than involved, integration and detachment being qualities more usually evidenced in written language. In the sense of Ochs 1979, their talk is more 'planned' than 'unplanned'. The specific grammatical coding devices are of course, unique to Quechua, but, as we will see in the ensuing chapters, there is a striking congruence with interclausal relations proposed by others for English.
NOTES to Chapter 3

1 See also Hymes 1971, 1972 and 1974.

2 The distinctions I am making are similar to the Hallidayan distinction between 'context' and 'co-text' (see e.g. Halliday 1973). The communicative situation is essentially equivalent to Halliday's 'context of situation'.

3 Furthermore, Stewart goes so far as to say that 'Nonsense becomes that which is irrelevant to context, that to which context is irrelevant' (1978:3).

4 Videotaped data would, perhaps, be somewhat of an improvement over transcribed audio tapes, as more of the communicative interaction would be visible, but we are faced with a further complication. The fact remains that the mere act of analyzing data, while providing a certain analytical objectivity, removes the linguist in time and space from the sociocultural milieu in which the data originated.

5 This is similar to the notion of overlay (cf. Grimes 1973, Longacre and Thompson 1985).

6 'Topic' for Grimes is 'that part of the surface form that represents the speaker's thematic choice' (p.337). This use of topic is non-standard.
This is a good reminder that validity in analysis is not necessarily dependent on quantity of data.

This present work, however, is not the first to make use of Rhetorical Structure Analysis (see e.g. Fox 1984, Noel 1986).

The term 'enhancing hypotaxis' is from Halliday 1985.

This is not to claim, however, that all of these text types are discussed in detail in this thesis.

The alert reader will notice that this diagram varies slightly from the contextualized version in Chapter 4. The subtext is used here 'de-contextualized' purely as an illustration of Rhetorical Structure Analysis.
4. CLAUSE-COMBINING IN NON-NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I illustrate the application of Rhetorical Structure Analysis to Conchucos Quechua texts and show how some of the relationships conveyed by relational propositions are signaled in the grammar. In Chapter 5, I propose a typology of rhetorical relations and show the correlations between types of clause combination and specific rhetorical relations, and suggest some tentative hypotheses about why speakers opt for particular clause combinations in particular discourse contexts. Chapters 4 and 5 actually function in tandem: readers may find it helpful to refer to the relational definitions in the typology section of Chapter 5 from time to time during the reading of the texts analyses in Chapter 4.

Before proceeding further with the analysis, two issues in particular need to be addressed: the issue of objectivity in the analysis and the issue of multiple relations or overlap. I will now briefly discuss each of these in turn.
4.2. Objectivity in the Analysis

Regarding the analyst's objectivity, a question might be posed as to the verifiability of rhetorical relations posited for Quechua, since there is no one-to-one correlation between specific relations and morphosyntactic marking; moreover, it would seem that the analysis is highly dependent on the analyst's interpretation of the structure of the text.

First of all, one theme of this thesis is that one of the features of coherent text is the presence of a network of interclausal relations which bind the text together. It is up to the analyst to discover these relations, not to superimpose a mentalistic structure. Second, a corollary theme of this thesis is that there is a limited number of these interclausal relations in any language, and that they are identifiable through their recurrent patterning. Third, these recurrently patterning relations can--indeed must--be clearly defined. Relations may not be posited ad hoc, but must be justifiable in terms of these definitions. It is this clear definition of each relation as a token of a recurrent type within a network which spans an entire text or, in some cases, sub-text, which safeguards Rhetorical Structure Analysis as it is applied in this thesis from subjectivity.
Fourth, by positing specific, clearly definable relations, I am not thereby claiming that these are the 'ultimate' irrevocable means for interpreting clause-combining in Quechua or other languages. My claim is more modest: that these are plausible means of describing the discourse structure of clause-combining, and names or definitions of specific relations could subsequently be altered without invalidating the basic claim that the recurrent network of relations does exist.

Fifth, only as the discourse unfolds can the analyst 'see' where a particular clause finds its place in the rhetorical structure. In other words, only as the discourse progresses can the analyst determine how the speaker is interpreting past utterances as s/he prepares the way for future utterances, depending on his or her goals and subgoals in constructing the discourse. Often, these goals are not overtly stated by the speaker, but are apparent only from the discernible relations between spans of text. This technique for discovering why a particular clause appears at a particular point in the discourse is a variation of what Bilmes (1985) calls the 'analyst's interpretation' for conversation. Bilmes shows how the purposes of particular utterances in conversation are interpretable only in terms of the contextual environment which is being created. These goals become evident as the conversational talk progresses, but may not be overtly expressed by the speakers.
If we want to determine how a participant came to produce a particular utterance, we have to search out a conversationally grounded analyst's interpretation...to discover how an utterance came to be produced is to find an analyst's interpretation, and this is all very different (at least for the analyst) from discovering what the speaker "meant." The kind of meaning located by an analyst's interpretation is systemic. It arises within the setting and the system and is not the result of imposing outsider categories on events. On the other hand, neither is it to be sought in participants' interpretations. It is an attribute of the system itself. (p.342)

In the analysis of monologue, the 'analyst's interpretation' sees how a speaker is actively interpreting a particular clause within the discourse context of both preceding and following text. This perspective, then, provides a balance to the perspective of Rhetorical Structure Analysis, where the text is viewed more statically, as a hierarchically organized top-down network of interclausal relations.

4.3. Multiple Relations and Overlap

Ford (1987) raises a significant question about the nature of rhetorical relations. Using examples of 'overlap' between relations such as CONTRAST and ANTITHESIS, her analysis shows that the RSA relations are not necessarily mutually exclusive. She concludes that relations can be divided into two sub-types: semantic and pragmatic, and that the pragmatic relations may override the semantic. In the case of CONTRAST and ANTITHESIS,
she gives examples of a 'neutral' semantic CONTRAST used as pragmatic ANTITHESIS.

Mann and Thompson, and Beekman et al 1981 interpret cases of relational propositions which can be interpreted as more than one relation in a slightly different manner. They interpret the combination according to that relation which is the most salient, or dominant, of the set. Thus, their solution to the problem of CONTRAST and ANTITHESIS posited by Ford would be to choose ANTITHESIS, because this is the dominant, or ruling, relation. Kathleen Callow (to appear) takes a similar approach.

The issue of overlapping, or multiple, relations between clauses in a text is by no means a trivial one. The mere fact that there are cases where the analyst is faced with a choice among various relations, while there are other cases where s/he is faced with only one suitable alternative underlines the fact that determining interclausal relations is not a straightforward mechanical procedure. Human language is a very complex phenomenon, and so are relations between spans of text in human language.

For the sake of analytical clarity, the 'plausibility' interpretation chosen by Mann and Thompson is favored over Beekman, Callow and Kopesec's approach. Specifically, in establishing rhetorical relations, it is not the information itself, but how that information is used which is the
determining factor. This, of course, as mentioned above, becomes apparent as the text unfolds. A simple case of ELABORATION, for example, may be used as BACKGROUND for a span of text, information which the speaker or writer feels is necessary for an understanding of that span. The 'overriding' relation, the one that makes the stronger claim about the structure of the text, is BACKGROUND. The choice to include BACKGROUND, and not ELABORATION in the rhetorical structure, however, does not imply that ELABORATION is not present at some level, only that it does not enter into the network of rhetorical relations as conceived here.¹
4.4. Analysis of Representative Texts

In this section, I present analyses of representative texts from each genre type, both to illustrate the application of Rhetorical Structure Analysis to Quechua and to review correlations between specific clause types and specific rhetorical structures. A basic underlying assumption is that it is the place of the clause in the structure, and not just the morphosyntactic structure and local environment of the clause, that define it. The representative texts chosen are the following:

EXPOSITORY

Weather Report (Self-transcribed by speaker)
Ester (Oral)

MOTIVATIONAL

Advice to a Godson (Oral)

EXPRESSIVE

Farewell to Family (Oral)

4.5. Weather Report Text

4.5.1. Presentation of the Text

The following text is a fourteen-clause self-transcribed report by a native Quechua speaker of weather conditions in the
Peruvian Andes during an especially unpleasant rainy season.²

The text is immediately followed by a diagram representing the rhetorical structure analysis.

1. Musya-ri-ya-y!
   know-PNCT-PL-IMP
   Pay heed to this!

2. Cuzco marka-chaw allaapa apaakuy ka-shqa.
   Cuzco town-LOC a:lot flood be-PERF
   In the town of Cuzco there has been a big flood.

3. Kay eneru killa-chaw allaapa tanya-sha
   this January month-LOC a:lot rain-PERF
   This month of January it has rained considerably

4. Mayu-kuna pusiy-shqa
   river-PL overflow-PERF
   Rivers have overflowed,

   field-PL-ACC house-PL-ACC person-PL-ACC take-PERF
   It has taken away fields, houses and people.

6. Uchiza marka-chaw tsay-naw-lla-m tanya-yka-n
   Uchiza town-LOC that-SIM-JUST-DIR rain-IMPFV-3
   In the town of Uchiza it's raining just like that

7. Huk mayu-r-pis allaapa wina-shqa mantsari-ypaq
   one river-3-EVEN a:lot grow-PERF fear-ADV
   Its river, too, has grown a lot, fearfully,

8. Wayi-kuna-ta chakra-kuna-ta apa-r
    house-PL-ACC field-PL-ACC take-SS
    Taking away houses and fields
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9. Runa-kuna-ta-pis wahn-tsi-r
    person-PL-ACC-EVEN die-CAUS-SS

And even killing people.

10. Huk waranqa-naw-mi hinaylla keeda-ya-shqa
    One thousand-SIM-DIR like:that stay-PL-PERF

    About a thousand have remained like that,

    NEG what-with stop-IMPPV-PL-NOM-3 like

    There not being anything which could stop them.

12. Kay Huari marka-ntsik-ta-pis allaapa-m tamya-ya-rn
    this Huari town-12-ACC-EVEN a:lot-DIR rain-IMPPV-3

    It's raining a lot here in Huari, too.

    crop-REFL-NOM-Ø-12-ACC-EVEN yellow-BEC-IMPPV-CAUS-3-NOW-DIR

    It's making our crops yellow (rotten),

    field-12-PL-ACC-EVEN flood-IMPPV-CAUS-3-NOW-DIR

    Our fields, too, it's causing to be flooded.
Figure 8. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of Weather Report

4.5.2. Analysis of the Text

The distinctive feature of a 'report' text such as this is that it is wholeheartedly factual: the speaker/writer has no interest in stimulating any specific response from the listener/reader, in fact, the speaker/writer in this case does not know who all of his readers are and is, thus, quite detached.
from listener-reader response. The primary concern is that of information-giving. Five rhetorical relations are adequate for describing the rhetorical organization of the text: DIRECT, LIST, RESULT, ELABORATION, and CIRCUMSTANCE.

Clause 1 is in a DIRECT relation to the rest of the text (2-14). This satellite draws the attention of the listener to the ensuing discourse, much as 'Hear ye! Hear ye!' does in English. The listener is thus led to expect that significant information is to be provided.

The primary means by which the information is organized is through the LIST relation. Following the title, which serves to direct the attention of the readers to the ensuing body of text, and which is actually a clause in its own right, the author proceeds with a tripartite text in a LIST configuration.

Each of the spans of text in the LIST series shares the feature of being a town in Peru. The division of the text into the three parts is signaled by parallel syntactic constructions: each of the three initial clauses for the respective members of the LIST series, clauses 2, 6, and 12, begins with a noun phrase indicating the location—'in Cuzco,' 'in Uchiza,' 'in Huari,' and in each case the clause type is independent, with the finite verb appearing clause-finally. Notice that there is no single nucleus to the text, only the three-part LIST configuration.
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From a process perspective, we can see how the author establishes a pattern in the first span of the LIST series which he then follows in the production of the subsequent spans in the series. The parallelism in the morphosyntax can be seen, then, as a kind of 'copying' of the initial formula.

All three spans in the LIST series also share parallel RESULT relations at the next lower level in the structure: the nuclei of each of the RESULT satellites states a main weather event which occurred in each of these towns: too much rain, with resultant flooding. As mentioned above, this is encoded in an independent clause, indicating that, in this text, there is a tendency for nuclear portions to be encoded as independent clauses.\textsuperscript{3}

Span 6-11 is the most elaborate of the three spans. The embedded RESULT satellite (8-11) consists, in turn, of two spans which are also in a LIST relation: they describe specific effects of the river's overflowing its banks.\textsuperscript{4} Clauses 10-11 provide ELABORATION of the RESULT that people died, specifying how many there were: Clause 11, in turn, providing the situational CIRCUMSTANCE under which so many people were killed. Clauses 8 and 9 are parallel OV switch-reference clauses; the elaborating Clauses 10-11 are a unit consisting of a nuclear independent clause and a satellite nominalized clause. The effect of this ELABORATION is almost that of a parenthetical
COMMENT. This is accentuated by the use of a separate independent clause to state the number of dead. Notice that, essentially, the 6-11 span is parallel to the other two spans: the additional complexity of structure is all low in the hierarchy, and has to do with the addition of detail embedded in the RESULT satellite.

In contrast, the BACKGROUND relation in the first span of text is located higher in the hierarchy and provides information which the author deems necessary for an adequate understanding of the nuclear statement expressed in 2. We can infer from this that it is the higher level relations, those at the ‘top’ of the diagram, so to speak, that provide the basic scaffolding of interclausal coherence. The lower a relation in the hierarchy, the more it is determined by the relations which stand above it, and the less it affects the organization of the entire text. Another way of explaining this is to consider the degree of ‘dispensability’ of a span of text for the coherence of the text. The lower a span of text in the hierarchy, the more likely it is that it could be eliminated without influencing the comprehensibility of the text as a coherent whole. For example, were the development of the RESULT satellite to 7, Clauses 8-11, to be deleted from the text, the Weather Report would still be fully comprehensible. On the other hand, were the nucleus of the RESULT portion, Clause 7, to be eliminated instead of Clauses 8-11, the text would be rendered less comprehensible:
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rain in and of itself in the Andes does not carry houses, fields, and people away, but the result of that rain, an overflowing river or a landslide.

To conclude this review of rhetorical relations in the Weather Report text, I note that parallel syntactic constructions can also be found in the LIST relation between 13 and 14: both are OV independent clauses whose suffixation is identical and only the specific nouns and verbs are different. The use of the suffix -pis as a cohesive device linking this pair differs from its use in the bipartite LIST relation of 8-9: In 8-9, the use of -pis on the second clause of the pair only conveys the notion of 'also, too' or 'in addition to.' The paired use of -pis in 13-14, on the other hand, conveys the notion of 'both...and' in addition to the simple sense of addition in Clause 9. Note that the -pis in Clause 12 does not indicate a conjunctive relation together with the -pis in Clause 13. Clause 12 is the nucleus of the 13-14 span of text, and this -pis signals a conjunctive relation to the nuclei of the preceding members of the LIST series.

Linearly speaking, this -pis 'hops back' over the intervening text to the last nuclear item in the series, Clause 6. From the viewpoint of the rhetorical structure, however, this -pis simply links two successive nuclei in the framework of the text. The -pis in Clause 7, in contrast, is used, not in
the sense of simple addition, but in the sense of 'even,' stressing the impact of the rain to be such that even the river overflowed. We can see then, how, the use of the same suffix serves differing functions depending on the placing of the relevant clauses in the hierarchical structure of the discourse.

4.5.3. Summary

In summary, we can make several observations about rhetorical relations and Conchucos Quechua clause types in the Weather Repost text. We can see that the rhetorical relations most essential to the coherence of the text are most likely to be found higher in the hierarchy. Furthermore, these highest nuclear portions are the most likely to be encoded by independent clauses. We also see that the unity of the text is reflected in the repeated use of morphosyntactic parallelism for clauses in the LIST relation: in these cases, the subsequent members of the series 'copy' the morphosyntax of the initial clause in the series. Clause types used in the LIST relation are either independent clauses or switch-reference clauses, not nominalized clauses. In other words, a nominalized clause is not an appropriate candidate for the LIST relation. One non-embedded nominalized clause is present in the text: it is the lowest clause in the rhetorical structure hierarchy.
The Weather Report contains two instances of bi-clausal nucleus-satellite pairs: 3-4 (RESULT) and 10-11 (CIRCUMSTANCE). In each case, the nucleus, an Independent Clause, precedes the satellite. Clause 4, the satellite to Clause 3, is another Independent Clause, while Clause 11, the satellite to Clause 10, is an Adverbial Nominalized Clause. In neither case, then, is the satellite of a higher syntactic rank (in the Hallidayan sense) than its nuclear counterpart.

The text exists as a coherent whole without any overt independent conjunctions or links. The suffix -pis operates as a conjunctive link, however, at various levels in the hierarchy; and the precise nature of its function is crucially dependent on its particular place in the structure.
4.6. Esther's Story

4.6.1. Presentation of the Text

Esther's Story is an unedited oral monologue spoken by a young Quechua woman about to leave a small rural Andean town for the big city of Lima. In the text, she provides a personal account of the reasons why she is leaving. The monologue is addressed to a woman friend from that same small town. Although her speech is very emotional, the main goal of the text is neither to express her emotions nor to sway the listener into any change of action or attitude, but, rather, to explain her reasons for being so sad about leaving to a sympathetic listening ear. Even though the provision of factual information is not the only goal of Esther's Story--she is also unburdening her emotions to a friend--the text qualifies as an expository text in that the organization of the text is based on the imparting of information. Naturally, Esther hopes that her friend will affirm and support her in her decision, but the text is not a plea for approval.
Esther's Story

1. Allaapa llaki-sha-m ka-yka-:
   A:lot sad-PRT-DIR be-IMPFV-1
   I am extremely sad

2. Waray aywaku-na-: ka-pti-n
   Morrow leave-NOM-1 be-DS-3
   Because my departure is tomorrow

3. Allaapa kay-chaw sufri-r
   a:lot here-LOC suffer-SS
   (Since) I suffer a lot here,

4. Kay-chaw waqa-rnin
   Here-LOC cry-SS
   I cry here,

5. Ishkay wamra-:-wan waqa-rnin.
   Two child-l-COM cry-SS
   I cry with my two children.

   Morrow-DIR travel-l Peru Andino-COM Lima-GEN
   Tomorrow I travel to Lima with Peru Andino (a bus),

7. Kay-chaw allaapa sufri-rnin
   Here-LOC a:lot suffer-SS
   (Since) I suffer so much here,

8. Waqa-rnin
   cry-SS
   Crying, no mother no child uh...

9. Wamra-: deha-yku-rnin
   child leave-IMPACT-SS
   Leaving my child.
10. Mana-m mama-: ka-n-tsu noqa-pa
NEG-DIR mother-l be-3-NEG I-GEN
I don’t have my mother.

NEG-DIR this-LOC who-Ø-a-EVEN be-3-NEG
I don’t have anyone at all here.

12. Kay-chaw qa sufri-rnin-mi
here-LOC-TOP suffer-SS-DIR
(Since) I suffer here,

13. Huklaa marka-pa aywaku-:-man
another town-GEN go:away-1-COND
'I could go to another town'

good-CONJ be-1FUT say-SS
'Perhaps I will be O.K. (there)' saying.

15. Demasiadu kay-chaw qa, allapa sufri-ku-rnin.
too:much here-LOC-TOP a:lot suffer-REFL-SS
(Since) here, too much, too much I suffer.

16. Tsaymí kanan-qa aywaku-:-runa-:-marka-n-pa
thus now-TOP go:away-1 husband-1 town-3-GEN
Thus now I go to my husband’s town

17. Tsay-chaw biida-ta paasa-ku-na-:-paq
that-LOC life-ACC pass-REFL-NOM-1-PUR
So that I can live my life there,

18. Huk-kaq wamra-:-ta deha-yku-r kay Chacas marka-chaw
one-DEF child-1-ACC leave-IMPACT-3 this Chacas town-LOC
Leaving one of my children here in the town of Chacas,

19. Y wamra-:-ta deha-kyu-rnin awila-:-pa ruri-n-chaw.
and child-1-ACC leave-IMPACT-SS grandma-1-GEN in-3-LOC
And leaving my child in my grandmother’s care.
20. Tsay-na-m kanan-qa allaapa ná-pis
   that-NOW-DIR now-TOP a:lot now-EVEN
   suegra-::kuna-pis chiki-yaa-ma-n-mi
   hate-PL->1-3-DIR
   in:law-1-PL-even

So then now, my in-laws hate me a lot

    man-DEF-Ø-1-EVEN cry-CAUS->1-DS-3

And my man’s people make me cry.

22. Tsay llapa-m aywaku-: tundra-pa marka-n-pa.
    that all-DIR go:away-1 husband-GEN town-3-GEN

Precisely because of all that I leave for my husband’s town.

23. Tsay asuntu llapa-m kaychawqa Chacaschawqa
    that matter all-DIR here-LOC-TOP Chacas-LOC-TOP
    muru-ku-sha-pis ima-pis ka-n-tdsu
    plant-REFL-PRT-EVEN what-EVEN be-3-NEG

For that matter, here in Chacas town there isn’t anything of
all that we planted either.

24. Allaapa nesesidaa-chaw
    a:lot need-LOC

(We are in) a lot of need.

25. Kay uslla alla ka-pty-n
    this drought be-DS-3

(Since) there is this drought,

    NEG what-EVEN strong be-3-NEG

There isn’t a thing strong (enough to survive).

27. Tsay-pa llapa-m aywa-ku-: Chacas-pita Lima marka-pa.
    that-GEN all-DIR go:away-1 Chacas-ABL Lima town-GEN

For all of this I’m leaving Chacas for the town of Lima.
Figure 9. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of Esther's Story
4.6.2. Analysis of the Text

Esther's Story consists of twenty-seven clauses, and Clause 1 is the nuclear clause of the text: 'I am extremely sad.' The following eight rhetorical relations form a network which binds the text together: BACKGROUND, SUMMARY, REASON, EVIDENCE, CIRCUMSTANCE, PURPOSE, RESTATEMENT, and MOTIVATION.

The initial division of the text is into two spans: 1-6 plus 9, and 7-27, with 7-27 in a REASON relation to the nuclear 1-5. Notice that there is some internal complexity to 1-5, with Clauses 3-5 providing the REASON for 1-2, with another REASON relation, in turn, of Clause 2 to Clause 1. In effect, Clauses 1-6 constitute the kernel portion of the text: in these clauses, Esther explains that she is sad because she has to leave, which, in turn, is because she suffers so much; then she doubles back to provide the BACKGROUND information which clarifies her statement about imminent departure.\(^5\) Clauses 7-26, then, provide the REASON for the suffering which is occasioning the departure. Thus, in this text, we can say that there is a rhetorical embedding of the REASON relation: Esther is leaving because she is suffering, and she is suffering because of various factors which she makes clear as the text progresses. Because of this layered structure, the REASON relation permeates the entire text.
Clauses 1-5 form a single pause group consisting of an independent clause followed by four Switch-Reference clauses, a clause 'chain'. Since the independent clause is the nucleus in the rhetorical structure, and the Switch-Reference clauses are in a satellite relation to that nucleus, we can see that there is a correlation between syntactic dependency and satellite status in the rhetorical structure.

As in the Weather Report text, LIST is a prominent relation in Esther's Story: Clauses 7-22 and 23-25 are two spans of text in a series in which Esther presents the reasons why she is leaving for Lima. This LIST relation, as in the Weather Report, is high in the text hierarchy and performs a prominent organizational role in the text. The span of text encompassing Clauses 7-22 presents psychological reasons for her imminent departure, while Clauses 23-25 presents physical reasons. The LIST set illustrates how members in the LIST do not necessarily have to be equivalent in length or parallel in structure, as the second member in the series is considerably shorter than the first. The relative length of a span of text, then, is not indicative of the relative placement of that span in the rhetorical structure of the discourse.

The 7-22 text span is also subdivided into a LIST series, with Clause 22 functioning as a SUMMARY to the first portion.
The first span in the series, consisting of Clauses 7-8 and 10-11, is interrupted by a statement of CIRCUMSTANCE which harks back to the BACKGROUND satellite for Clauses 1-2, Clause 6. Clause 9 ‘leaving my child’ is not part of the span of text which offers her suffering as a reason for leaving, but, rather, a delayed addition clarifying a crucial situational CIRCUMSTANCE of her projected trip to Lima.

Clauses 7 and 8 are in a JOINT relation: both clauses together perform the communicative act of declaring the state of affairs for Esther. Clause 8 may appear to be a RESTATEMENT of 7, in which ‘crying’ is substituted as an equivalent for ‘suffering’. Or, technically, the relation could perhaps also be seen as that of a specific satellite to a generic nucleus, so might appear at first glance to be an instance of ELABORATION. In reality, however, Esther inextricably links together crying and suffering (wagarnin and sufrirnin) in her discussion; the two acts are not clearly isolatable, as in a LIST relation, yet one is not considered to be a part or instantiation of the other, as in a part-whole or specific-generic ELABORATION relation. Syntactic parallelism of Same-Subject switch-reference clauses correlates with the JOINT relation. Clause 11 is an amplifying ELABORATION of Clause 10, which conveys the REASON for 7-8.
Clauses 7-9, switch-reference clauses, are the nucleus for 10-11, both independent clauses. This pattern, a span composed of dependent clauses forming the nucleus for a span composed of independent clauses, is extremely rare in Conchucos Quechua. In general, a satellite will not be of higher rank (in the Hallidayan sense) than its nucleus, similar to the situation observed by Matthiessen and Thompson (t.a.) for English, which leads to their claim that enhancing hypotactic clause-combining is a grammaticization of satellite rhetorical relations.

If we bear in mind that a rhetorical structure diagram is, of necessity, constructed from a product perspective, we can reconsider the text from a linear, process perspective. In the process of creating the text, Esther was continuing in 7-9 a syntactic pattern of Same Subject switch-reference clauses established with 3-5. The pattern is broken with the independent clauses in 10-11, which are, by virtue of the change in syntactic structure, set apart from the preceding span. The use of the parallel structure in 10 and 11—both negative declarative statements—further dramatizes this separation from both the preceding and the following text. The -pis in Clause 11, which concludes this entire LIST portion, is not conjunctive, as were the instances in the Weather Report, but a marker of extreme degree: Not only does she not have anyone—she doesn't have anyone at all.
Clause 12 marks the beginning of the second item in the LIST series. The -qa 'topic' on Kaychaw in Clause 12, signaling topic switch, marks this span of text as separate from the preceding span. This use of -qa is similar to two of the usages described by Weber 1983, for Huallaga Quechua. Weber suggests that 'an element is marked with -qa simply because it makes its sentence relevant to the context' (1983:376). Among other usages, -qa may be used to indicate contrast (1983:378), or 'to resume a topic' (1983:385). Weber (p. 378) cites the following example, where 'the speaker contrasts the ultimate outcome for the frog and the condor, to illustrate the contrastive usage:

a. ...allichaw keedaykun saapo.
   in:good he-Remained frog
b. Y kondor-qa perdiykun leetuta.
   and condor-TOP he:lost the:litigation.

a. '...it turned out well for the frog.'
b. 'THE CONDOR (by contrast) lost the litigation.'

The use of -qa in Clause 12 of Esther is similar to the contrastive usage in that one could consider that Esther is contrasting the sorrow of her life 'here' with the potential improvement of her life elsewhere. However, Clause 12 is not in a contrastive relation to Clause 13.

In the other usage, '-qa is used to resume a discourse topic which has been temporarily set aside; -qa occurs on the
NP which refers to that topic after the interruption. Weber cites the following example (p.385):

a. Apaptin kantur aywan kantaparaykar asta when:they:take:it cantor he:goes singing until
   pantiyun rurin kapillaman chayachinanyaq.
   cemetery inside chapel until:they:cause:it:to:arrive
b. Chay kapilla-chaw yapay kantapan may oora.
   that chapel-LOC again he:sings:for:him long time
c. Chaypita apan uchku-man-na pampananpaq.
   then they:take:him hole-GOAL-NOW to:bury
d. Chayman apaptin-pis kantur qa aywan
   to:there as:they:take:him ALSO cantor-TOP he:goes
   kantaraykar
   singing
e. Uchku kantun-man chursykur-pis
   hole side:GOAL when:he:places:him ALSO
   yapay kantapan.
   again he:sings:for:him

a. When they take it (the corpse) the cantor goes singing until they have caused it to arrive inside the cemetery.
b. In that chapel (in the cemetery) again he sings for a long time.
c. Then they take it to the hole (now) to bury it.
d. Also as they take it the cantor goes singing.
e. Also placing it in the hole he again sings.

This usage is similar to that in Clause 12 of Esther’s Story, as, in one sense, KAYCHAWQA in Clause 12 could be considered resumption of KAYCHAW in Clause 7. However, KAYCHAW in Clause 7 is not the topic of that span of text; the topic is Esther, specifically, her state of mind. Furthermore,
Kaychawga in Clause 12 is not the topic of that span of text, either: the main topic is still Esther. The sub-topic, however, is that she might be better off elsewhere, which is a switch from the previous sub-topic, her state of mind. Thus, the function of the -qa on Kaychaw at the beginning of Clause 12 signals a discourse boundary which is reflected in the rhetorical structure of the text. Admittedly, the -qa on Kaychaw indicates that Kaychaw is 'relevant to the context' (there is no way to disprove this claim); however, I have chosen the term 'topic switch' to refer to such uses of -qa in Conchucos Quechua for the following reasons:

1) Kaychaw itself refers to a non-topical referent
2) Kaychaw coincides with a major discourse boundary
3) The span of text which Kaychaw introduces 'switches' to a new sub-topic.  

The nuclear clause of this section is 16, an independent clause. Clauses 12, 14 and 15 are all switch-reference clauses, two in REASON relations, and one in a MOTIVATION relation to Clause 13. The repetition of Kaychaw 'here' and sufrirrin 'suffering' from Clause 7 is a matter of lexical cohesion. Syntactic parallelism between the two clauses also serves a cohesive function.

The use of the conditional, or irrealis, affix in Clause 13 signals the relation of its satellite, 14-15, as one of
MOTIVATION to the nucleus. Esther is expressing an inner conversation she has had with herself: motivation for a potential move to another town is provided by saying/thinking to herself that perhaps she will be better off. It is this sense of 'perhaps', of positive potentiality or favored outcome, which is conveyed by the choice of alli 'good' coupled with the conditional -man. Thus, Esther motivates herself to consider leaving by viewing life elsewhere as more hopeful.

In contrast, Clauses 16-17 express action definitely decided upon and affirmed. The satellite, Clause 17, is in a PURPOSE relation to the nucleus, Clause 16, and is encoded in a -na-paq clause. The link Tsay-mi 'thus' in Clause 16 both forecasts a definitive statement and sets apart 16-17 from 12-15. The former is accomplished by the speaker's choice of the evidential suffix -mi, indicating direct affirmation of the ensuing statement. The latter is accomplished simply by the choice of the overt discourse link Tsay-. The switch-reference clauses in 18-19 encode situational CIRCUMSTANCE. Clause 19 is in an ELABORATION relation to 18: it adds detail to where the child is to be left in addition to just restating 18. Notice that, although the 'coordinate' conjunction y 'and', borrowed from Spanish, introduces the clause, the relation of 19 to 18 is not one of simple addition, or parataxis, as might have been expected. One cannot assume that a 'coordinate' conjunction is
used to coordinate, as the rhetorical structure clearly indicates.

_tsaynam_ 'so now' initiates Clause 20, signaling the third item in the 7-21 LIST series. Clause 21, a switch-reference clause, is in a RESULT relation to the nuclear independent clause 20. Finally, the SUMMARY clause for this series, 22, is encoded by a simple declarative statement introduced by tsay_lla pa m_ 'just for all that'.

Clauses 23-26 form the second member in the higher LIST series, and the theme is the problems of a poor crop--a physical cause, rather than a psychological reason for her departure. Two layers of REASON relation are embedded. The satellite in the 24-25 span, as were the satellites encoded by Clauses 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19, is encoded by a switch-reference clause, Clause 25. This satellite is, in turn, related to a nucleus, Clause 24, which is encoded by an independent clause, a negative statement.

Esther's Story concludes with a clause which summarizes the entire series of reasons for her departure for Lima, again, an independent clause beginning with a definitive tsaypa_lla pa m_ 'for all this.'
4.6.3. Summary

The basic organizational relations for Esther's Story are the REASON and the LIST relations. Those relations which appear only in the upper echelons of the rhetorical structure are BACKGROUND, LIST and SUMMARY. Together with the ubiquitous REASON relation, they provide the basic scaffolding of organizational structure for the text. Relations which appear only low in the hierarchy, besides the REASON relation, are ELABORATION and MOTIVATION.

The rhetorical structure analysis thus reflects the hierarchical nature of the goals of the speaker. Her main goal is to list the reasons for her departure. Elaborating these reasons and revealing her inner psychological motivation for pursuing the course of action she has decided upon are secondary goals. The layering of REASON relations throughout reinforces the centrality of her main goal together with the complexity of the reasons which have fueled her decision to leave for Lima.

Unlike the Weather Report, Esther's Story is replete with overt logical connectives (eg. Tsaymi 'thus,' Tsaynam 'and now') which signal the basic organizational relations of the text. Independent clauses begin each of these major spans of text, and independent clauses are used for summary. Independent clauses are also used to make all negative statements. There is thus a correlation between the choice of overt logical connectives and
Independent clauses thus coincide with major structural boundaries in the text. In contrast, the clauses in the lower positions in the rhetorical structure hierarchy, those which are less essential to the basic organization of the text, are encoded with Switch-Reference clauses, or, in the case of Clause 17, a Nominalized clause.

In most cases, independent clauses form the nuclei of local pairs of clauses in nucleus-satellite relationship. There are nine local pairs in Esther's Story. All of these have post-nuclear satellites, and in no case is the satellite clause of higher rank than the nuclear clause, although, in five of the nine instances, the satellite clause is of the same rank as the nuclear clause (Four Same-Subject Switch-Reference pairs and one Independent Clause pair). The most prevalent Satellite type is the Same-Subject Switch-Reference Clause (7 out of 9), but there is also one nominalized -paq clause in satellite position. We can thus safely say that a morphosyntactic correlate of the nucleus-satellite distinction for local pairs of clauses is the principle that the rank of the satellite will not exceed the rank of the nucleus. We can also say that Switch-Reference Clauses seem to be the most rhetorically flexible clause type, the most readily adaptable to both nucleus and satellite positions. For Independent Clauses, the skewing is in the direction of nuclearity, and, for -na-paq 'purpose' clauses.
(and, perhaps for other non-embedded nominalized clauses), the skewing is in the direction of 'satellitehood'.

One could say that Esther's Story is 'characterized' by the network of embedded REASON relations. These, and the one instance of MOTIVATION, are relations which have to do with the cognitive state of the speaker. They are not present at all in the Weather Report. Esther's story also exhibits a greater number of rhetorical relations than the Weather Report. In other words, the greater the number and degree of embedding of rhetorical relations in a text, the greater the rhetorical complexity of the text. Esther's Story is almost twice as long as the Weather Report, so it is not entirely clear that the increase in rhetorical relations is not effected also by text length. Nevertheless, extent of embedding seems to be indexical of a text's complexity.
4.7. Advice Text

4.7.1. Presentation of the Text

The Advice Text is a 101-clause oral monologue directed by a godfather to his erring godson. The text qualifies as motivational in that the primary goal of the speaker is to exhort the younger man to see the error of his ways and to modify his behavior. He does this, first, by justifying the claim he makes about his godson’s bad behavior and, second, using this as a basis for motivating him to change, and ‘learn to be a man,’ and, finally, giving him directives on how to do so.

The Advice Text is also a Directive text because the speaker strives not only to incite shame in his interlocutor, but to provide him with specific instructions on how to change his ways. As such, it is a quintessential Motivational text, for it strives not only to incite change, but also to present the means for doing so.

Advice Text

1. Pashku, Pashku,

What is it I hear about you?
Hear-1 NEG good be-NOM-2-ACC

I hear that you are not good.

4. Qanyan-pis qanya-ntin-pis
yesterday-EVEN yesterday-WITH-EVEN

chaa-mu-ru-n warmi-ki kay-man
arrive-TR:FRAR-RECPST wife-2 this-GOAL

Yesterday, and the day before yesterday, too, your wife arrived here,

5. Waqa-ra-yka-r
cry-STAT-IMPFV-SS

Crying,

6. Wamra-n-kuna-ta ñikiña-ku-shqa,
child-3-PL-ACC carry:on:hip-REFL-PRT

Her children carried on her hips

one-Ø-3-ACC-TOP hold:hand-REFL-PRT

One held by the hand.

And you-TOP-REP surely be-IMPFV-2 one-DEF house-LOC-NOW

And you are most certainly in another's house.

Perchance this-SIM-PUR-NEG be-PL-PAST-2

Surely it wasn't for this that you were together

10. Huk kasara-ku-r-ni-n-qa-m Iglesia-chaw
One marry-REFL-SS-Ø-3-TOP-DIR Church-LOC

When you got married in the Church.

Holy Mother Church-ABL take-TR:FRAR-PAST-2 wife-2-ACC-TOP

You took your wife from the Holy Mother Church.
12. Hura-rqa-yki altar-chaw
    swear-PAST-2 altar-LOC

    You swore at the altar

13. "Wauu-nqa-: oora-yaq-mi ka-nqa"
    die-NOM-1 hour-LIM-DIR be-3FUT

    (You said) "It will be until the hour that I die"

    be-PL-1FUT live-PL-1FUT

    "We will be together, we will live."

15. "Miku-r
    eat-SS

    "If we eat

16. Mana miku-r-pis
    NEG eat-SS-EVEN

    Or if we don't eat

17. Qeshya-r-pis
    be:sick-SS-EVEN

    Or if we're sick

18. Tari-r
    find-SS

    If we find (things)

19. Mana tari-r-pis
    NEG find-SS-EVEN

    Or if we don't

20. Kawa-yaa-shaq"
    live-PL-1FUT

    We will live (together)"

21. Ni-rnin
    say-SS

    Saying this
take-FR:FAR-PAST-2
You took her out.

now-TOP this-SIM walk-IMPFV-2
And now you walk around like this!

24. Kay-naw ka-r-chi qam-qa,
this-SIM be-SS-CONJ you-TOP
If you're going to be like this

good be-2
You're doing well.

this-SIM-ACC-TOP-DIR Father-12-EVEN be:angry-REFL-3
Our Father gets angry at things like this.

27. Kiki-n Dios Yay-a-ntsik-mi anya-mantsik.
self-3 God Father-12-DIR counsel--->12
Our Father God Himself counsels us.

28. Pay-mi ni-n:
s/he-DIR say-3
He says:

29. Si tsay-naw ka-r-qa-sh
if that-SIM be-SS-TOP-REP
If we are like that

30. Mana noqantsik-qa chaa-shun-atsu Pay-pa muna-nqa-n
Neg we(incl)-TOP arrive-12FUT-NEG s/he-GEN want-NOM-3
Pay-pa gloria-n-man-qa Pay-pa taaku-nqa-n-man-qa
s/he-GEN glory-3-GOAL-TOP s/he-GEN live-NOM-3-GOAL-TOP
We won't arrive to His will, to His glory, to where He lives.
   Not face-3-ACC-EVEN see-1FUT-NEG
   We won't even see His face.

32. Imanir-raq?
   why-QUEST
   Why?

   this-SIM be-PL-DS-2
   Because you are like this.

34. Qam-qa acaasu waata-taqku ka-nki
    you-TOP perchance animal-NEG be-2
    You aren't perchance a wild animal.

35. Qam-qa-m runa ka-nki.
    you-TOP-DIR man be-2
    You are a man.

36. Qam-qa-m yawar-yoq ka-nki.
    you-TOP-DIR blood-having be-2
    You are red-blooded.

37. Qam-qa muna-nki-man-tsuraq qam-wan
    you-TOP want-2-COND-QUEST you-COM
    mamma-ni-ki-wan pani-ki-wan tsay-naw ka-na-n-ta?
    mother-3-2-COM sister-3-COM that-SIM be-NOM-4-ACC
    You wouldn't want it to be like that with your mother
    or your sister?

38. Qam-pa pani-ki
    you-GEN sister-2
    Your own sister

39. Tsay-naw ollgo-n-pita haqi-shqa
    that-SIM husband-3-ABL leave-PRT
    Left by her husband like that

151
40. Wahi-ki-man shamu-n-man	house-2-GOAL come-3-COND

She would come to your house

41. Wamra-lla-n Hikiña-shqa,
child-JUST-3 carry:onto:hip-PRT

Her (one) child just carried on her hip

42. Wamra-lla-n hancha-shqa
child-JUST-3 hold:hand-PRT

Her (other) child held by the hand

43. Waqa-rnin
cry-SS
crying

44. Mana huk kachi-n-paq tari-r
NEG one salt-3-PUR find-SS

Not finding even for a little salt

45. Mana huk awqa-ku-na-n-paq ka-hti-n,
NEG one season-REFL-NOM-3-PUR be-DS-3

There not being enough to season (food)

46. Tsay-naw ka-tsi-yta
that-SIM be-CAUS-ADV

Having it like that

47. 0 qam warmi ka-hti-ki,
Or you woman be-DS-2

Or you, if you were a woman,

that-SIM husband live-CAUS--2-DS--2 you-ACC

Should your husband cause you to live like that.

49. Qam muna-nki-man-tsuraq tsay-naw ka-y-ta
you want-2-COND-QUEST that-SIM be-NOM-ACC

Would you perchance like it to be like that?
50. Imanir-tan tsay-naw ka-nki?
   why-QUEST that-SIM be-2
Why are you like that?

that-SIM be-NOM-2-PUR-CONJ you
You really oughtn’t to be like that.

52. Allapa mama-n-man-pis   taytay-man-pis
   ailot     mother-3-GOAL-EVEN father-GOAL-EVEN
   kuti-ypa  kuti-rnin
     return-ADV return-SS
   So much returning again and again to her mother and
   her father,

53. Maña-ku-r
   plead-REFL-3
   pleading,

54. Puri-rqa-yki
   walk-PAST-2
   You went,

55. Tsoqpa-ku-r-yaq
   implore-REFL-SS-LIM
   Even to the point of imploring them,

56. Hasta waqa-r-yaq,
   until cry-SS-LIM
   Even to the point of crying.

57. Mana-m tsay-naw-tsu runa ka-ntsik.
   NEG-DIR that-SIM-NEG man be-12
   We men are not like that.

58. Runa-qa
   man-TOP
      be-12
   Men...we are.
59. [mana-m kachay birsaku-naw ka-na-paq-tsu]  
   NEG-DIR wild boar-SIM be-NOM-PUR-NEG  
   (We are) not meant to be wild male boars.

60. Rasum-kaq-ta willa-shayki ollqo-mahi-::ta-qa.  
   truth-DEF-ADV tell-1->2FUT man-ACCOMP-1-ACC-TOP  
   I'm telling you in truth, my fellow,

   husband be-NOM-ACC learn-IMP-NOW  
   Learn to be a husband now.

   man be-NOM-ACC learn-IMP-NOW  
   Learn to be a man now.

63. Qam-ta-qa-m yaatsu-q willa-q  
   you-ACC-TOP-DIR advise-1->2 tell-1->2  
   I advise you and tell you,

64. Dios-ni-ntsik-pa Palabra-n-chaw ama tsay-naw ka-rnin-qa.  
   God-Ø-12-GEN Word-3-LOC NEG that-SIM be-ØS  
   In God's Word it says not to be like that.

   I-ACC-TOP not godfather call--1-2-NOW-EVEN-NEG  
   Don't even call me Godfather any more now.

66. Tayta-yki yupay ka-pto-::mi  
   father-2 count be-DS-1-DIR  
   Being a stand-in for your father,

67. noqa qam-ta anya-q willa-q.  
   you-ACC advise-1->2- tell-1->2  
   I advise you and tell you.
68. Ama kanan-pita-qa willa-shaq-tsu. 
   NEG now-ABL-TOP tell-1FUT-NEG 
   (But) from now on I won’t speak any more.

69. Huklaa-chaw huklaa-chaw tsuri-=: yuri-ru-n 
   elsewhere-LOC elsewhere-LOC son-1 come:from-RECPST-3 
   ni-rnin 
   say-SS 
   ‘My son is from someplace else, someplace else,’ saying.

70. Mana-na-si huk-paq aypa ka-yka-rnin 
   NEG-NOW-YET one BEN enough be-IMPFV-SS 
   Since you no longer have enough for (even) one,

71. Mana-na-si huk tsuri-ki-ta shumaq 
   NEG-NOW-YET one son-2-ACC nice 
   escuela-lla-man-pis kacha-rnin 
   school-JUST-GOAL-EVEN send-SS 
   Nor do you even send your son nicely to school anymore.

72. Yachaku-na-n-ta mun-a-rnin 
   learn-NOM-3-ACC want-SS 
   Wanting him to learn,

73. Kiki-ki-pis toqshu ka-nqa-lla-yki-man 
   self-2-EVEN foolish be-NOM-JUST-2-GOAL 
   You yourself are one who would be foolish

74. Toqshu ka-na-n-ta muna-nki. 
   foolish be-NOM-3-ACC want-2 
   (So) you want him to be foolish.

75. Ama tsay-naw-qa ka-nki-tsu. 
   NEG that-SIM-TOP be-2-NEG 
   Don’t be like that!
76. Mana-m tsay-naw-ta-qa wiya-y-ta muna:-tsu. NEG-DIR that-SIM-ACC-TOP hear-NOM-ACC want-1-NEG

I don't want to hear about things like that.

77. Yapay-ku ka-nki?
again-YN? be-2

Are you again going to be the same?

78. Yapay-ku ka-nki?
again-YN? be-2

Are you again going to be the same?

79. Yapay-ku ka-nki?
again-YN? be-2

Are you again going to be the same?

80. Yapay ka-pti-ki
again be-DS-2

If you're like that again,

81. Hayta-ra-yka-r-mi
kick-STAT-IMPFFV-SS-DIR

Kicking you

82. Noqa kay-pita qarqo-shayki.
I these-ABL kick:out-1->2FUT

I'll throw you out.

83. Kanan-ta-m apa-q-man karsel-kuna-man
now-ADV-DIR take-1->2-GOAL jail-PL-GOAL

qayku-td1-mu-q-ni-ki
lock:up-CAUS-FR:FAR-PUR-Ø-2

Right now I could take you to the jailers to have you locked up,

84. Kay-naw ka-pti-ki.
this-SIM be-DS-2

If you're (to be) like this.
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    now-DIR yes-TOP forgive-1→2 any be-NOM-2-ACC-TOP 
    Right now I forgive you everything that is past.

86. Peru kanam-pita utay-ma runa ka-yta yachaku-nki.  
    but now-ABL down-COAL man be-NOM-ACC learn-2IMP 
    But, from now on, learn to be a man.

87. Y kanam-mi siiq-ni:  
    and now-DIR yes-TOP say-1
    And now I tell you indeed:

88. Ama yapay-pita tsay-naw ka-nki-tsu.  
    NEG again-ABL that-SIM be-2-NEG
    Don’t be like that again!

89. Tsay warmi-ta haqi-yku-r  
    that woman-ACC leave-IMPACT-SS
    Leave that (other) woman

90. Tsay kasara-nqa-y(ki)-kaq warmi-ta waata-y.  
    that marry-NOM-2-DEF woman-ACC care:for-IMP
    (And) take care of the woman you married.

    remember-CONE-IMP clothes-3-BEN all-3-BEN you-BEN-EVEN
    Concern yourself for her clothing, for everything, for 
    yourself, too.

92. Imayka-naw aru-hti-ki-qa-n  
    any-SIM work-DS-2-TOP-DIR
    If you work in whatever kind of way

93. Dios Yaya-ntsik bendicion-ni-n mallki-mu-nqa.  
    God Father-12 blessing-Ø-3 impart-FR:FAR-3FUT
    Our Father God will impart His blessing.

94. Si qam-kush mana aru-nki-tsu 
    if you-THOUGH NEG work-2-NEG
    But if you don’t work
95. Qela ka-nki.
    lazy be-2
    You are lazy.

96. Claru, rasun-pa-pis,
    sure truth-GEN-EVEN
    Of course, in truth,
    Kay-naw-pis kachay beraaku-naw puri-ku-r-ni-lla-n-na
    this-SIM-EVEN wild boar-SIM walk-REFL-SS-Ø-JUST-3-NOW
    Now, if you still go around like this, like a wild boar,

97. Mana-m imay-pis runa-ya-nki-tsu.
    NEG-DIR when-EVEN man-BEC-2-NEG
    You won’t ever become a man.

98. Siñoc-qa-m imay-pis wañu-nki-pis
    rather-TOP-DIR when-EVEN die-2-EVEN
    Rather, whenever you die

    not God-GEN face-3-ACC-EVEN see-2-NEG
    You won’t even see God’s face.

100. Ya?
    Well?

101. Kanan-lla-pita-na-ku...
    now-JUST-ABL-NOW-YN?
    And from now on...?

The following is a broad outline of the rhetorical structure of
the text, showing only the high-level relations between text
spans:
Figure 10. Outline of Advice Rhetorical Structure
4.7.2. Analysis of the Text

The relations in the upper level of the rhetorical structure provide the basic organizational scaffolding for the entire text. These eight relations are the following: DIRECT, WARNING, SOLUTION-HOOD, JOINT, BACKGROUND, MOTIVATION, LIST, and RESTATEMENT. DIRECT and WARNING frame the text. The initial vocative, Clause 1, serves to DIRECT the listener's attention to the speaker's entire discourse. The final WARNING, Clauses 100-101, formed with a JOINT relation between two clauses, closes the speech.

The main body of the text, Clauses 2-99, consists of a nucleus and its corresponding satellite: the final, nuclear span, Clauses 87-99, provides the SOLUTION, specific directives for changed behavior, to the problem presented in Clauses 2-86, the abhorrently unacceptable behavior and consequent shame of the Godson.

The major portion of the text is devoted to substantiating this bad behavior and evoking shame in the Godson. Clauses 2-33 provide BACKGROUND which the speaker deems necessary for an appropriate understanding of his claims about shameful behavior, Clauses 34-36, 37-49 and 65-76 list reasons why the Godson should be MOTIVATED to acknowledge and be ashamed of his shoddy behavior, and Clauses 50-64 plus 77-86 reinforce by means of RESTATEMENT the necessity of the boy's learning to 'be a man.'
Clauses 87-99 conclude the main body of the text by providing the SOLUTION to the bad behavior and resulting shame decried in the first portion.

A Question-Answer sequence, Clauses 2-3, opens the 2-86 text span. This correlates with a major structural boundary, the initiation of the SOLUTIONHOOD satellite to the 87-99 span. Clause 2 is a rhetorical question, in that its function is not to elicit information from another speaker, but to communicate the assertion that the godfather has been hearing things about the godson. Clause 2 'opens the way' for the assertion in Clause 3, 'I hear that you are not good'. Question and Answer are formed with independent clauses and, together, they communicate the speaker's opinion about the abject wretchedness of the Godson's behavior. Because the question and answer pair function as a single communicative unit, they are in a JOINT relation in the rhetorical structure.

Within the 2-86 span, similar rhetorical questions mark structural boundaries. A question opens the 34-86 portion, as well as the nuclear span consisting of 50-64 and 77-86. Within the 34-36, 37-49, 65-76 span, Clause 37 is also a rhetorical question (Clause 65 is a simple independent clause). Within the 50-64, 77-86 span, Clause 50 is a rhetorical question, as is Clause 77. Rhetorical questions thus coincide with not only major, but also minor structural boundaries in the text.
The juncture between the satellite span (2-86) and the nuclear span of text, 87-99, is opened by an independent clause. Clause 65 is marked by independent clauses. An independent clause (Clause 86) closes the 2-86 span and another (Clause 87) opens the final, nuclear 87-99 span.

From these data, we can see that only simple independent clauses and rhetorical questions are the syntactic means for defining major structural boundaries in the text. Nowhere is a dependent clause used in this capacity. Furthermore, rhetorical questions are restricted to these boundary points. Rhetorical questions, then, are used exclusively to fulfill a highly specialized upper-level organizational function.

The following are the rhetorical structure diagrams for the entire text:
Figure 11. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of Advice 2-33
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Figure 12. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of Advice
34-49 plus 65-76
Figure 13. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of Advice
50-64 plus 77-86
Figure 14. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of Advice 87-99
Unlike the Weather Report and to a greater extent than Esther's Story, the relations appearing in the higher portion of the rhetorical structure hierarchy are duplicated in various other places lower in the hierarchy (e.g. CONDITION, JUSTIFY, ANTITHESIS, REASON). The lower in the diagram the relation, however, the less major the role it plays in the overall organization of the text.

Only the opening and concluding subsections, 2-33 and 87-99, will be discussed in detail here, although reference will be made to the other portions in Chapter 5.

4.7.3. Clauses 2-33

The basic organizational structure of 2-33 is bipartite: the satellite, 24-33, is in a CONCLUSION relation to the nucleus, 2-23. The rhetorical question, Clause 2, marks the span as a major subdivision of the text; the nucleus of the entire span, Clauses 2-3 as mentioned above, is formed by the Rhetorical Question-Response pair which conveys the speaker's initial claim that he hears bad things about his Godson. Clauses 4-7 provide EVIDENCE for this claim.

Morphosyntactically, the nucleus of the 4-7 span is an independent clause. The satellite (5-7), which is in a
CIRCUMSTANCE relation to the nucleus, is composed of one switch-reference clause and two participial clauses formed with -sha. The switch-reference clause, 5, refers directly to the mother's state, the pair of participial clauses (6-7) to her children. The morphosyntactic relations of clause-combining in the 4-7 span correlate with the nucleus-satellite relations in the rhetorical structure in the following manner: the nuclear clause of the span, Clause 4, is the only independent clause; the clauses which comprise the satellite are all dependent. Within the satellite, Clause 5, the switch-reference clause, and Clauses 6-7, the participial clauses, are in a LIST relation. Clauses 6-7 in turn, are in a LIST relation with one another, one step down in the rhetorical structure. They are also less independent than the switch-reference clauses in the morphosyntactic hierarchy.

Based on these collective data about the wife's situation, the speaker forms a CONCLUSION, which he states in Clause 8, in the form of an independent clause introduced by the borrowed Spanish conjunction y 'and': 'And you are most certainly in another's house.' The conjunction y, together with the topic marker -qa on qarn 'you,' encoding topic switch (as discussed in 4.6.2.), signals this clause as morphosyntactically separate and contrastive rhetorically.
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Clauses 9-23 comprise the speaker’s ASSESSMENT of the Godson’s behavior, based on the claim presented in 2-7. Although he has already communicated a negative appraisal of the situation merely by virtue of the fact that he has embarked on a speech criticizing the Godson, the clauses in this span of text are specifically directed at the task of assessing. This is accomplished by the use of the CONTRAST relation at the highest level: the speaker contrasts the behavior which should have resulted from the promises made in the past with the behavior which actually is occurring. This gross contrast between actual and ideal forms a communicative unit which presents a highly negative ASSESSMENT, encapsulated in the nuclear rhetorical question encompassing Clauses 9-10: ‘Surely it wasn’t for this that you were together when you got married in the Church?’ The speaker uses the most forceful negative construction available in the language, the negative -tagku in a negative statement with question intonation (rhetorical question), thus underscoring the force of the underlying assertion that it was certainly not for this that the Godson was married in the church. A switch-reference clause indicating CIRCUMSTANCE of time, Clause 10, follows as satellite the independent clause, Clause 9. Again, the rhetorical question in 9-10 specifically marks a rhetorical boundary in the text, the boundary between nucleus and satellite in the 2-23 span.
ELABORATION in the form of specific detail provided for the general statement of marriage is the relation of 11-22 to the nuclear 9-10. The nucleus is the statement, in the form of an independent clause, that the marriage took place in a church. Further details as to the specific promises follow. These are presented in the form of direct quotes, in 13-14 and 15-20. 13 and 14 are statements accomplished with independent clauses in a JOINT relation: together they convey the promise of devotion 'till death us do part.'

The span of text comprising 15-20 is a clause chain which concludes with the independent clause in 21 and framed by the quotative nirnin 'saying' in Clause 21. These clauses present a LIST of the CIRCUMSTANCES under which the young man promises to live with his wife—essentially, under any conditions. The LIST is formed symmetrically by coupling two pairs of alternatives, with a third uncoupled alternative in the middle: 15 and 16, and 18 and 19, are in a DISJUNCT 'or' relation, with -pis communicating the notion of 'either.' The relation between 15 and 16 and 18 with 19, although contrastive, is not an instance of CONTRAST, as the speaker's goal at this point in the discourse is not to contrast the two alternatives, but simply to list them as pairs of alternatives. In 17, as there is no partner for qeshyar-, the -pis simply indicates 'and also.' In each case, the clause is a Same Subject Switch-Reference clause.
and the syntactic parallellism is exact. This span of text illustrates the fact that switch-reference clauses may be effectively chained together in Conchocos Quechua, and, more specifically, one function of this chaining is to list a series of alternatives.

The adverb kanan in 23, coupled with the topic marker -qa, again indicating topic switch, introduces the independent clause which concludes both the 9-23 and the entire 2-23 span of text. The contrastive use of this adverb Kanan + -qa in Clause 23 is analogous to the use of the conjunction y + qam + -qa in Clause 8, which concludes the nuclear portion of 2-23: in both cases, this combination of clause-initial elements signals the rhetorical setting-apart of these statements. Notice how the single clause, 23, is, hierarchically speaking, on a 'par' with the entire span 9-22, further support for the claim that length of a span of text is not a determiner of rhetorical import.

The satellite to Clauses 2-23, Clauses 24-33, is a somewhat elaborate structure. Clauses 24-25 make an ironic statement: the speaker says one thing, but means the exact opposite-- alli kanki 'you're doing fine' actually communicates total disgust with the behavior. Clauses 26-33 JUSTIFY this claim that the behavior is abhorrent. Notice that, in 24-33, two CONDITION relations and one REASON relation are present. One might inquire why neither of these relations appears in the 2-23 span:
they have no place in a structure organized as an assessment of facts. In a structure organized under the relations CONCLUSION and JUSTIFY, however, these logical if-then relations are more to be expected. In the first instance of CONDITION, Clause 24, a Same-Subject Switch-Reference clause, provides the CONDITION for the ironic Clause 25. The second instance, Clause 29, is in a CONDITION relation to clauses 30-31.

In the first instance of the CONDITION relation, Clause 24, no specific morphological indicator of condition distinguishes this switch-reference clause in form from any other same-subject switch-reference clause. However, the evidential -χi 'CONJ' on ka-r 'BE-SS' injects an element of hypotheticality into the clause, which, in conjunction with its juxtaposition with Clause 25, conveys the notion of conditionality. We can see from this example that conditionality in Conchucos Quechua interclausal relations is not strictly a matter of formal marking, but a combinatorial phenomenon; the interpretation of Clause 24 as conditional can only be made in relation to Clause 25 and the prevailing context, where this pair of clauses finds its place in a hierarchy dominated by the relation of CONCLUSION, (which, in turn, is conceived only in relation to the upper-level nuclear portion of this sub-text, contained in Clauses 2-23.) By this point in the discourse, the speaker has already established the fact of the Godson's deplorable behavior, and
the foundation has been laid for drawing conclusions about this situation.

The morphosyntax of Clause 24 is worthy of note not only because of the issue of conditionality, but because it also marks the initiation of the entire satellite span 24-33. In Clause 24, the speaker repeats the kaynoo of Clause 23, but this time it is fronted to clause-initial position. Furthermore, the syntax of the clause shifts to an entirely different pattern: whereas Clause 23 is a simple independent clause, Clause 24 is an eccentric switch-reference clause, eccentric not because of the switch-reference marking, but because of the word order. Typically, switch-reference clauses in Conchucos Quechua exhibit verb-final order. Here, the overt pronoun is markedly placed in post-verbal position, and further punctuated with the 'topic marker' -qa, signalling a shift of attention from discussing the Godson's behavior back to addressing the Godson directly.

Kaynoo 'like this' is again repeated at the beginning of Clause 26, the nucleus for 27-31, as well as in Clause 33. Its demonstrative partner 'tsaynoo 'like that' appears in Clause 29. Thus, in the span of text from Clause 23 to Clause 33, the demonstrative is used five times in lexically cohesive functions.
The conditional in Clause 29 has an overt marking of conditionality, the \textit{Si} 'if' borrowed from the Spanish. This time, the evidential marker on the verb is -\textit{sh}, an apocopated form of -\textit{shi} 'reportative,' used here in its validational function indicating some degree of certainty.\textsuperscript{13}

Clauses 29-31 form an indirect quote, which is in a CONTENT relation to Clause 28, 'He (God) says. The indirect status of the quote is clear from the use of the first person plural inclusive in Clauses 30 and 31: 'We won't arrive,' but is forecast by the first person plural inclusive object marker \textit{anyaMANTSIK} in Clause 27. The condition, Clause 29, is related to the pair of Clauses, 30-31, both of which are independent clauses stating the consequences of 'being like that,' with Clause 31 providing concrete instances of the abstraction expressed by Clause 30. The subject of Clause 29 is the first person plural inclusive which has already been introduced in Clause 27 and established as topical by its relation as CONTENT to Clause 28, and, ultimately, Clause 27.

The Question-Response sequence 32-33 concludes the span of text, and is of particular note in two regards. First, the verb \textit{kayaptiki} 'you (pl.) are' indicates a switch from indirect to direct reported speech. (This is apparently what God would say if we were to ask Him why we were prevented from 'making it' to heaven.) Second, Clause 33 is a Different-Subject Switch-
reference clause which is one of the JOINT nuclei of the 32-33 span. Strictly syntactically speaking, it doesn’t reference any overt verb in the text--its subject cannot be said to be ‘different’ from the subject of the verb in Clause 32, as there is no verb as such in Clause 32. Furthermore, the referents of the verb in Clause 33 are the same as the referents of the verb in Clause 31. The issue is referential perspective in the discourse. In Clause 31, the perspective is that of the first person plural inclusive, and God is referred to in the third person. In Clause 33, the perspective switches to God’s point of view. This is accompanied by a switch from indirect to direct speech, which, in turn, warrants the contrastive presence of the different subject marker -pti, even though there is no overt reference clause to which it relates in a strictly syntactic sense.\footnote{}\footnote{\textsuperscript{14}}

4.7.4. Clauses 87-99

The concluding sub-section of the body of the text, clauses 87-99, provides the SOLUTION for all of the preceding problems and complaints presented in the first 86 clauses. The hierarchical structure is less elaborate than that in Clauses 2-33, as most of the relational intricacy is in the satellite portion of the uppermost nucleus-satellite pair.
Clauses 92-99 are in a MOTIVATION relation to the nucleus, Clauses 88-91. Within the nuclear span, Clauses 89-91 provide the SOLUTION for the satellite, Clause 88. Clause 88 is a negative imperative, an independent clause. Clause 90 is a positive imperative for which Clause 89 provides the ENABLEMENT. At first glance, 88 and 89-91 might appear to be in simple CONTRAST. However, understanding the place of this particular sub-text in the overall rhetorical organization of the Advice Text clarifies the issue.

The 87-99 span of text as a whole provides the SOLUTION for the problem of the Godson's dismal behavior. Since 87-99 is the SOLUTION, this dictates that only a change in behavior can be affirmed and encouraged by the Godfather, as he has spent the entire text so far decrying the Godson's present behavior. This affirmed behavior, the nucleus of the ANTITHESIS relation, is, within the larger context, the SOLUTION to the Godson's dilemma.

The action encoded in Clause 89 is an initial step which permits the completion of the action encoded in Clause 90. As such, the relation between the two clauses is not a simple relation of successivity. The action in Clause 90 may take place only by virtue of the action in Clause 89: Clause 89 is in a satellite relationship of ENABLEMENT to Clause 90. The close dependency between the two clauses is reflected in the morphosyntax: Clause 89 is a Same Subject Switch-Reference
clause, which, as a dependent clause, cannot stand alone as a separate utterance, but 'points ahead' to the following clause, and Clause 90 is an independent clause. Clause 91 then completes the span of text by providing added detail (ELABORATION) for Clause 90.

The span encompassing Clauses 92-99, which provides MOTIVATION for the SOLUTION proposed in 88-91, itself consists of two spans of text in CONTRAST: 92-93 and 94-99. In this instance of CONTRAST, the speaker juxtaposes the consequences of working and of not working, respectively. Within each of these two spans are satellite clauses in CONDITION relation to their respective nuclei. These paired conditionals are analogous to the pairs discussed in Part I (Clauses 24-25 and 29-31) in the following manner. In each case, the first of the pair consists of a satellite CONDITION encoded by a switch-reference clause but no overt marking of conditionality, whereas the second consists of a satellite CONDITION formed with the borrowed Spanish Si 'if.' In this case, the suffix -kush 'though' is paired with Si, indicating an alternative which is in contrast to the one just presented.

The second of this pair of contrasted conditionals has a much more highly developed nucleus than the first: we can infer from this that perhaps the speaker considers negative threats and the inciting of fear to be more effective means of
changing the Godson’s behavior than promising the blessings of God, so he brings his point home by describing the inevitable RESULT of lazy behavior.

A further CONDITION relation is embedded in this span of text: Clause 96, a Same Subject Switch-Reference clause, is in a CONDITION relation to Clause 97. Again, this conditional, like Clause 92, is understandable as such from the overall hierarchical context, not from any specific morphosyntactic marking of conditionality. This pair of clauses, in turn, is in an ANTITHESIS relation to Clauses 98-99. In this relation, not only are the two spans of text contrasted to one another, but the speaker expresses her or his commitment to one of the contrasted spans, in this case, the latter span. The clause-initial contrastive link in Clause 98, Sinoqua, from Spanish sino, indicates this contrastive juxtaposition. Sinoqua indicates that the upcoming clause will be affirmed as truth, rather than the previous clause. Implied in Clause 97 is the assumption that, if one truly becomes a man, he will see the face of God (win God’s approval and be ‘saved’). So the speaker is telling his Godson in no uncertain terms that, rather than becoming a man and being ‘safe’ before God, he will be in grave danger, if he continues his present course of action. Not only will he not receive God’s blessing; he won’t even get to see the face of God.
4.7.5. **SUMMARY**

The Advice Text displays a large variety of relations. If we consider the number and degree of embedding of rhetorical relations in a text to be an indicator of rhetorical complexity, this text is not only the longest, but by far the most complex of the texts analyzed thus far in this chapter.

The relative priorities of the goals of the text are reflected in the hierarchical organization of the rhetorical structure. The highest order organization of the text as a whole is defined by a nucleus-satellite pair in a SOLUTIONHOOD relation, with the nucleus providing the SOLUTION--an alternative form of behavior--for the PROBLEM--behavior is unconscionable--developed in the satellite. Other top-level organizational relations are JOINT, BACKGROUND, MOTIVATION, LIST, and RESTATEMENT. DIRECT and COMMENT relations frame the text.

In the 2-33 span, CONCLUSION defines the top-level division, with ASSESSMENT and JUSTIFY at the next level. In the 87-99 span, MOTIVATION defines the top level (which is, in turn, framed with a DIRECT relation), and CONTRAST and SOLUTIONHOOD are at the next level. Relations appearing only lower in the hierarchies, and, therefore, reflecting less central goals of the speaker, are ELABORATION, CONDITION, CIRCUMSTANCE, ANTIITHESIS, and CONTENT.
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For adjacent pairs of clauses in nucleus-satellite relation in the 2-33 and 87-99 spans, nowhere is a satellite of higher rank than its nucleus. In fact, all of the nuclei are independent clauses. Satellites are either independent or switch-reference clauses, and they may either precede or follow the nucleus. Of these pairs--a total of seven--three of the satellites follow the nucleus and four precede. Three of the satellites are in CONDITION relation; both of these are switch-reference clauses which precede the nucleus (Clauses 24, 92 and 96). On the other hand, two of the satellites are in ELABORATION relation; both of these are independent clauses which follow the nucleus (Clauses 31 and 91). The other two satellites are in CIRCUMSTANCE relation; one of these is independent, and one, switch-reference. Clause 10, the switch-reference clause, follow Clause 9, whereas Clause 98, the independent clause, precedes Clause 99.

Of the multi-nuclear pairs of clauses in the 2-33 and 87-99, there are three pairs of local JOINT relations in the 2-33 span: 2-3, 6-7, and 13-14. Either exact syntactic parallelism or complementarity is exhibited in each case. Span 2-3 is a complementary Question-Answer pair. Span 6-7, a pair of syntactically parallel descriptive clauses formed with adjectival participles, is rhetorically embedded in another JOINT relation which, in turn, forms a CIRCUMSTANCE satellite
for Clause 4. Span 13-14 is formed with a pair of independent clauses in future tense. We can see, then, that hierarchical parity is reflected in syntactic parallelism.

Overt conjunctive links are notably absent in the Advice Text: in 101 clauses, we find four overt conjunctions. These are the following: γ 'and', borrowed from the Spanish, in Clause 8, peru 'but', also borrowed from the Spanish, in Clause 86, another γ in Clause 87, and, finally, sinoogam 'rather', also borrowed from the Spanish. The γ in Clause 8, together with the -qa on qam, indicating topic switch, signals the contrastive CONCLUSION relation which is quite high in the 2-33 span's hierarchy. However, this is a 'dead-end' relation, not crucial to the further organizational breakdown of the text. Peru, in Clause 86, signals the nucleus of the CONCESSION relation comprising Clauses 85-86. This relation is also high in the hierarchical structure, but similarly, terminal to any further organizational development. The γ in Clause 87, on the other hand, coincides with a major textual boundary: it initiates the entire, crucial 97-99 span. Finally, sinooga in Clause 98 signals the nucleus of the ANTITHESIS relation comprising Clauses 96-99, at the bottom of the rhetorical structure hierarchy.
We can conclude that overt conjunctions do not play a significant organizational role in the Advice Text. Although the rhetorical structure is elaborate, only in one case does an overt link coincide with a major textual boundary. In short, we can safely say that the rhetorical relations between clauses and concomitant clausal morphology are tight enough to bind the text together without the overt 'glue' of conjunctive links.
4.8. Farewell Text

4.8.1. Presentation of the Text

The Farewell Text is an example of a text which is highly emotive and whose loose structure takes the application of Rhetorical Structure Analysis to its practical limits. The text is diffusely constructed from the viewpoint of rhetorical relations, but the relations are there. This text provides an excellent example of a text where a common subject matter and a plethora of cohesive devices provide most of the glue which binds the text together as a coherent whole. Through the use of cohesive devices and a unity of subject matter, the text is perceived as a coherent whole, with regard to specific topic within the given theme, the text is rather fragmented.

The speaker’s primary goal in the text is, in leaving his home village for a distant town, to elaborately bid farewell to his mother. He also includes a statement to his brother. His sub-purposes are to assuage his mother’s sorrow and concern at his leaving, and to make sure his property is taken care of while he is absent. He does this by justifying his departure, reassuring his mother of his love and concern, promising to keep in touch, and leaving certain instructions for his brother. The larger text, which consists of 65 clauses, is, in effect, a series of briefer
texts, united by unity of subject matter, but not by hierarchical structure. Because of this unity of subject matter, coupled with a range of (lexical) cohesive devices, an illusion of coherence is created, a 'pseudo-coherence.'

The body of the text is reproduced here in its entirety, and the rhetorical structure diagrams are followed, as in the previous sections, by the analysis.

**Farewell Text**

1. Mamay,  
Mother,

2. Kay-naw-paq-chari noqa-ta kay mundo-man mira-ma-ra-yki  
this-SIM-PUR-INDDEED I-ACC this world-GOAL add-1-PAST-2

Kay patsa-man yuri-ra-:  
this earth-GOAL be:born-PAST-1

It was for things just like this that you brought me into the world, that I was born to this earth.

3. Tayta-ntsik noqa-man-pis bendicion-ta mallki-yka-mu-tsun  
Lord-12 me- GOAL-EVEN blessing-ACC impart-POL-FR:FAR-3IMP

qam-ta-pis kay mundu-man mira-ma-q-ni-::ta  
you-ACC-EVEN this world-GOAL add-1-NOM-Ø-1-ACC

May Our Lord impart His blessing on both me and you, the one who brought me into this world.

4. Kanan-mi karu marka-:pa aywa-ku-:  
now-DIR far town-GEN go-KEFL-1

Now I am going to a far-away town.

5. Peru mana-m qonqa-shayki-tsu  
but NEG-DIR forget-1->2PUT-NEG

But I won't forget you.
6. Tayts-antsik-man-chi18 siempre maña-ku-ykaa-shaq  
   Lord-12-GOAL-CONJ always plead-REFL-IMPFV-1FUT

   I will always pray to Our Lord

7. Qam-paq-pis kawa-na-yki-paq  
you-BEN-EVEN live-NOM-2-PUR

   For you too so that you might live,

good be-IMPFV-NOM be-REFL-NOM-2-PUR

   (That you) be well, so that you live well.

   I-BEN that-SIM plead-REFL-POL-2

   Similarly, please pray like that for me.

10. Llaki-na-nqa-yki oora  
    be:sad-DESID-NOM-2 hour

    This is the time that you want to be sad

11. Peru mana-m noqa-qa qonqa-shayki-tsu  
    But NEG-DIR I-TOP forget-1->2FUT-NEG

    But I won’t forget you

12. Wañu-nqa-: oora-yaq-qa  
    die-NOM-1 hour-LIM-TOP

    Until the hour that I die.

13. Kay-naw-paq-chari Dios Yaya-ntsik noqa-ta-pis  
    this-SIM-PUK-indeed God Father-12 I-ACC-EVEN

    kama-tsi-man  
    create-CAUS-GOAL

    For such things as this God orders me

14. Qaya-ma-n  
call-1->3

    He calls me
15. Maytsay-man-pis chura-ma-n
wherever-GOAL-EVEN put->1-3

He puts me any place (wherever).

16. Pay ni-nqa-n-ta-chi noqa rura-shaq
he say-NOM-3-ACC-CONJ I do-1FUT

I will do just what He says.

17. Pay-raykur-mi aywa-ku-=-pis
he-sake-DIR go-REFL-1-EVEN

It is for His sake, moreover, that I am going,

18. Mana-m kiki-: muna-y-pita-tsu.
NEG-DIR self-1 want-NOM-ABL-NEG

(It is) not because of my own desire.

19. Ama [llaki-r] llaki-ma-nki-tsu allaapa qa
NEG be:sad=SS be:sad->1-2-NEG a:lot-TOP

Don`t [(by) being sad] mourn for me a lot.

20. [Llaki-r]
be:sad-SS

[(by) being sad]

21. Llaki-ma-r-ni-=-pis
be:sad->1-SS-Ø->1-EVEN19

Should you still be sad for me,

22. Reza-ku-nki Dios-ni-ntsisk-man
pray-REFL-2 God-Ø-12-GOAL

Pray to Our God.

23. Ama waqa-nki-tsu
NEG cry-2-NEG

Don`t cry.

24. Waqa-yka-nqa-yki-ta-qa
cry-IMPFV-NOM-2-ACC-TOP

If you are crying,
   console-PASS-2

   Be consoled.

26. Waqa-ptic-i-lla-qam
    cry-DS-2-JUST-TOP-DIR

   Just by your crying,

27. Maldiciona-yka-mak-nq-man-pis
    curse-IMPACT->1-2-COND-EVEN

   You might even place a curse on me.

28. Tsay-kuna llapa-n-ta ma-la-q
    that-PL all-3-ACC ask-1->2

   All of these things I ask you,

29. Qam kuya-q shonqo ka-ptic-ki
    you love-REFL-NOM heart be-DS-2

   You, you being the heart who loves

30. Llaki-qi mamas-ni-: ka-ptic-ki
    be:sad-REFL-NOM mother-Ø1 be-DS-2

   You being my mother who grieves

31. Kay mundu-chaw qeshpi-tsi-ma-shqa ka-ptic-ki
    this world-LOC escape-CAUS->1-PRT be-DS-2

   You being the one who raised me in this world.

32. Tsaymi kanan-q aara-pa aywa-ri-pis
    thus now-TOP far-GEN go-SS-EVEN

   So/Thus now, even though I go far away,

33. May-pa aywa-ri-pis
    where-GEN go-SS-EVEN

   And wherever I should go,

34. Shonqo:-chaw-qa apa-ykaa-shayki.
    heart-1-LOC-TOP take-IMPFV-1->2FUT

   I will be taking you in my heart.
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35. Dios-ni-ntsik-pa Hawpa-n-man cha-ykaa-tsi-shayki
   God-Ø12-GEN front-3-GOAL arrive-IMPFV-CAUS-l->2FUT

   I will be presenting you before Our God.

36. Qam-pis ama gongqa-skI-ma-nki-tsu
   you-EVEN NEG forget-PPF->l-2-NEG

   Don't you forget me, either.

37. KartakU-ykU-ma-nki
   letter:write-FOL->l-2

   Please write to me.

38. Noqa-pis-mi kartakU-mu-shayki
   i-EVEN-DIR letter:write-FRAR-l->2FUT

   I, too, will write to you.

39. Karta-ta chaksi-nqa-:
   letter-ACC receive-NOM-1

   Upon receiving your letter,

40. Hina-lla-ta-m noqa-pis kuti-ksi-mu-shaq karta-yki-ta
    like-JUST-ADV-DIR i-EVEN return-CAUS-FRAR letter-2-ACC

   I will likewise answer it immediately,

41. Karta-ta musya-na-yki-paq noqa-paq qam-pita-pis
    letter-ACC know-NOM-2-PUR i-BEN you-ABL-EVEN

   A letter to let you know ... for me from you, too.

42. Wawqe-:,
    brother-1

    My brother,

43. Aywa-lla-- ni-ku-- mi
    go-JUST-1 say-REFL-1-DIR

    I tell you farewell.

44. Aywa-lla-- ni-ku-- mi kay wahi-ta.
    go-JUST-1 say-REFL-1-DIR this house-ACC

    Farewell I say to this house.
45. Noqa miku-r  
   I eat-SS  
   When I was eating  

46. Mana miku-r  
   NEG eat-SS  
   (Or) I was not eating  

47. Yarpa-chaku-rnin  
   think-CONCEN-SS  
   Deliberating  

48. Ka-pti-n  
   be-DS-3  
   Having (lit. If there was)  

49. Mana ka-pti-n  
   Neg be-DS-3  
   Not having  

   I-TOP escape-CAUS-PAST-1 this house-ACC  
   I myself constructed this house.  

51. Kanan haqi-ski-r aywa-na-:-paq.  
   now leave-PFV-SS go-NOM-l-PUR  
   Now abandoning it so I can go.  

52. Pero naqa-na awkis-ya-ski-r-ni-n-chi  
   but well-NOW old-BEC-PFV-SS-Ø-3-CONJ  
   kuti-kU-mu-na-:-paq  
   return-REFL-FR:FAR-NOM-1  
   But, now, so that I can return perhaps when  
   I have become old,  

   cave-Øl-ACC leave-IMPACT-1FUT  
   I will abandon my shelter/abode.
54. Qam-ta-pis, Taytay, awkin-ya-r-ni-ki
you-ACC-EVEN, Sir, old-BEC-SS-Ø-2

And you, too, Sir, when you get old

55. Patsa-chaw haqi-shayki.
earth-LOC leave-1→2FUT

I will leave you in the ground.

56. Nawpa-ta-qa-m imayka-naw pis yanapa-r-ni-ki-kuma ka-ra-:
past-ADV-TOP-DIR any-SIM-EVEN help-SS-Ø2-PL be-PAST-1

In the past, I used to help you in all kinds of things,

57. Peru kanan-qa-m aywa-ku-r-pis
but now-TOP-DIR go-REPL-SS-EVEN

But now, even though I have to go,

58. Yanapa-yaa-shayki-lla-m
help-PL-1→2FUT-JUST-DIR

I will of course (still) help all of you.

59. Mana-m allaapa qonqa-ski-yaa-mu-shayki-tsu.
NEG-DIR ailot forget-PFV-PL-FR:Far-l→2FUT-NEG

I won’t forget you by a long shot.

60. Wahi-:ta rika-ya-nki
house-l-ACC see-POL-PL-2

Please look after my house,

61. Kiki-:ta rikaa-ma-q yupay-lla.
selv-1-ACC see→l-NOM count-JUST

Just as if you were looking after me.

62. Chakra-:kuna-ta rika-yku-nki
field-l-PL-ACC see-POL-2

Please look after my fields

63. Kiki-:ta rikaa-ma-q yupay-lla
self-1-ACC see→l-NOM count-JUST

Just as if you were looking after me.
64. Ichik ichik werta-kuna-ta
   little little garden-PL-ACC

   Llapa-n-ta parqo-paku-rnin muru-paku-rnin ka-yka-nki
   all-3-ACC irrigate-ITER-SS plant-ITER-SS be-IMPFV-2

   My little gardens, be irrigating and planting all of them.

65. Imanataq!
   Take care!
4.8.2. Analysis of the Text

The speaker's central goal in the Farewell Text is to console his mother by adequately bidding her farewell. However, neither does he state this goal outright, nor is its expression traceable to one single, nuclear clause, as was possible with Ester's Story and the Advice Text. The topmost level of organization of the text is a LIST of three spans of text, held together by virtue of the unity of subject matter. This can be represented diagrammatically as follows:

```
  LIST
  /  \
1-41  42-65
   /  \
  LIST
 /  \
2-31  32-41
```

Figure 15. Rhetorical Organization of Farewell Text

The rhetorical structure diagrams for the analysis of the text are the following:
Figure 17. Rhetorical Structure Diagram for Farewell 32-41
Figure 18. Rhetorical Structure Diagram for Farewell 42-65
The first span of text, addressed to the mother, consists of 1-41, and is introduced by the vocative Mamay 'my mother,' which functions in a DIRECT relation to the span. This, in turn, consists of a bipartite list, consisting of 2-31 and 32-41. The present discussion of the text will be limited to this portion addressed to the mother. The first in the LIST spans, 2-31, is introduced by a clause (Clause 2) which appears, at first glance, to be, not one, but two independent clauses. Actually, however, 2b, kay patsaman yurira 'I was born to this earth' forms a single clause with 2a, noqata kay mundoman miramarayki 'you brought me into this world': both together are under the scope of the postpositional phrase kaynawpaqchari 'For things just like this'. Clause 3 is in a COMMENT relation to Clause 2: it is an invocation which, pragmatically speaking, reaches outside of the text proper, addressing, in a kind of aside, a third person, God, who is not the primary interlocutor to whom the body of the speech is addressed.

4.8.3. Clauses 2-31

Clauses 4-9 begin the next subset in the first LIST series. Clause 4 is in a CONCESSION relation to Clauses 4-9, with Clauses 6-8 providing ELABORATION on the nucleus, Clause 5. The nucleus of the CONCESSION relation is signaled by the overt conjunction, borrowed from Spanish, P eru, 'But.' Clauses 7-8, in a PURPOSE relation to Clause 6, are encoded by -na-paq clauses. Clause 8,
although it might appear to be a RESTATEMENT of 7, qualifies as ELABORATION (Amplification) on Clause 7, in that it adds specific information to the more general 7, rather than simply restating that clause in the same or in abbreviated form. Clause 9 is a reciprocal request encoded by an independent clause, in the form of a polite command addressed by the speaker to the mother. This request, which functions in a COMMENT relation, is made on the basis of the promise stated in Clause 6, that he will always pray for her; thus, Clause 6 is nuclear in that relation.

Clauses 10-12 form the third subset in the first LIST series. Similar to the previous subset, the first clause in this span, Clause 10, is in a CONCESSION relation to the rest of the span, Clauses 11-12, with Clause 12, an adverbial nominalized clause, providing a CIRCUMSTANCE of time for Clause 11, and the nucleus of the CONCESSION satellite again signalled by peru. Notice how the rhetorical parallelism between 4-8 and 10-12 correlates with parallelism in the morphosyntax, a coincidence of cohesion and coherence.

Clauses 13-18 form the fourth subset in the series. They are organized on the basis of the JUSTIFY relation, with Clauses 13-15 providing the justification for clauses 16-18. In this way, the speaker conveys the idea that he is only responding to God's commands. In a narrower sense, this JUSTIFY relation can be seen as an instance of causation, with the speaker interpreting God's
command as the CAUSE of his action. But, from the viewpoint of the speaker's main goal here, his intent is not to discourse on the nature of divine will as the instigator of human activity. Instead, his purpose is to soothe his mother by justifying his right to embark on a certain course of action. The authority of God is called in as the reason for his activities only in order to establish the appropriateness of his action in his mother's eyes. If she can accept his departure as ordained by God, he won't have much explaining left to do!

Clauses 14-15 provide ELABORATION for Clause 13. These two clauses are, in turn, in a JOINT relation: they coordinate together to perform the communicative act of ELABORATION. This pairing is signalled in the morphosyntax by the use of the conjunctive -pis on the first constituent of Clause 15. Together, the pair provide specific instantiation of the abstraction of being 'called' of God.

Clause 16 provides the nucleus for the JUSTIFY satellite composed of 17-18, as well as the nucleus for the JUSTIFY relation discussed above. Clause 16 is an OSV independent clause in future tense. OSV clauses, although quite permissible in Conchucos Quechua, are rare enough to be more salient than their SOV counterparts: this noticeable fronting of the object, 'just what God has said' underscores the emphasis on God as the one responsible for the speaker's actions. At this point, the speaker
is justifying his actions by explaining that he is under the orders of a higher power and, thus, should not be blamed or even questioned for taking the course of action to which he has committed himself.

Within the JUSTIFY satellite, Clause 18, an independent clause with an elided GO verb (aywa-) is in an ANTITHESIS relation to Clause 17, an independent clause with an overt GO verb. The -pis at the end of Clause 17 conveys the paratactic conjunctive notion of 'furthermore.' Clause 18, the satellite of the ANTITHESIS relation, negates a state of affairs--it is not because of 'my own will'--and Clause 17, the nucleus, affirms an opposing state of affairs--it's for His sake. Syntactically, the two clauses are on par in the sense that both are independent; however, the satellite, Clause 18, 'relies' on the nuclear Clause 17 for the interpretation of the elided verb GO, so, in this sense, can be considered not only rhetorically dependent, but also grammatically dependent on its immediate predecessor.

Clauses 19 through 31 comprise the final span in the initial LIST series. This span, in turn, is composed of two members in a LIST relation with a satellite SUMMARY consisting of Clauses 28-31. In the first span, 19-22, Clauses 19-21 are in an ANTITHESIS relation to Clauses 21-22. In this span, the mother is instructed not to cry (the satellite ANTITHESIS). Rather, when she is sad and wants to cry, she is to pray (the nuclear THESIS).
The nuclear clauses within both nucleus and satellite portions of the span comprising (19-22), Clauses 19 and 22, are independent clauses. Their respective satellites, Clauses 20 and 21, are switch-reference clauses. Clause 20, a same-subject switch-reference clause which interrupts Clause 19, provides temporal CIRCUMSTANCE. Clause 21 is a same-subject switch-reference clause in a CONDITION relation to Clause 22. As has been observed in several other instances of conditionals discussed thus far in the chapter, there is no overt indicator of conditionality in Clause 21. (The -pis suffix conveys the notion of 'still' or 'anyway,' and is a cohesive device linking the nuclear clause pair (21-22) to the satellite clause pair (19-20) in the ANTITHESIS relation). By comparing these two examples of switch-reference clauses, we can see that Conchucos Quechua does not morphosynthetically distinguish between temporality (as in Clause 20) and conditionality (as in Clause 21). Furthermore, we can observe that it is the satellite clauses which are the dependent clauses, whereas their nuclei are independent.

In the second span, Clauses 23-27, the speaker instructs his mother not to cry. The syntactic structure is, to a remarkable extent, parallel to that in 19-22. The MOTIVATION relation between the satellite 26-27 and the nucleus 23-25, however, is new. Clauses 26-27 provide negative motivation in the form of a veiled threat: the intent is to motivate the mother to comply with the
son's instructions not to cry in order not to place a curse on him. Both nucleus and satellite of the ANTITHESIS relation are formed with independent clauses. The temporal CIRCUMSTANCE satellite to Clause 25, Clause 24, is formed with the adverbializer -ta, a rare suffix which may be unique to Conchucos Quechua. Both this clause and Clause 26, the conditional, are set off contrastively from their respective nuclei with the 'topic marker' -qa. The 26-27 span is distinct from the previous conditional pair (21-22) in that the latter is a hypothetical conditional, whereas the former takes the form of a command.

Clauses 28-31 summarize the section, with 29-31 forming a DIRECT satellite for the SUMMARY, Clause 28, and 30 and 31 RESTATEMENTS of 29. Clauses 29-31 are all switch-reference clauses; only the nuclear 28 is an independent clause.

4.8.4. Clauses 32-41

Clause 32 marks the beginning of the second major section of the Farewell Text, Clauses 32-41. This major division is signalled by the clause-initial link Tsaymi 'thus,' which also is the boundary marker indicating the beginning of the first in a two-part LIST series comprising Clauses 32-35. Clauses 32 and 33 form a pair of CONDITIONALS (concessive) in relation to the nuclear span comprising 34-35, and are themselves in JOINT relation. The concessive element in the conditional relation is expressed in the morphology with the use of the suffix -pis on the verbs both in 32
and 33, the conditionality itself, however, being understood from
the context. The nuclear pair, 34-35 are both independent clauses.
32 and 33 form a pair syntactically in terms of parallel
construction, as well as rhetorically. In like manner, so do 34
and 35.

Clauses 36-37 comprise the second part of the LIST series.
Clause 36 is in an ANTITHESIS relation to Clause 37. The satellite
and nucleus are independent clauses—commands—one negative and
the other positive. The -pis on Qam ‘you’ at the beginning of
Clause 36 is a cohesive device which refers back to Clauses 34 and
35, conveying the sense of ‘either.’ The -pis on Noqa ‘I’ at the
beginning of Clause 38, however, refers back to Clauses 36 and 37,
conveying the notion of ‘too’ or ‘also.’

Clauses 38-41 form the third part of the LIST. As with 37,
the nucleus of 36-37, 38, the nucleus of 38-41, has one satellite,
an ELABORATION which specifies a typical instance of the general
action of letter-writing. Clause 39, which indicates the temporal
CIRCUMSTANCE of 40-41, is a rare instance of a relative clause used
in an adverbial function, lit. ‘the letter that I receive.’ Clause
41, the PURPOSE satellite of Clause 41, is a -na-paq clause with
some additional fragments (noqapaq qampitapis ‘for me from you,
too’).21
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4.8.5. SUMMARY

The Farewell Text is clearly the most loosely organized of the representative texts analyzed in this chapter. It is not concerned with conveying factual information or changing the listener's behavior, but only with swaying emotions. The fundamental organizing relation is the LIST, and, in this sense, the organization resembles that of the Weather Report. In this case, however, the LIST series is less tightly bound together: there is greater variation in subject matter, length, and parallelism in the rhetorical structure.

Cohesive devices, in particular, parallelism in the syntax, play a prominent role in creating an apparent coherence. In fact, however, the coherence of the text is provided almost exclusively by the continuity of basic subject matter: beyond this the structure is quite diffuse, as evidenced in the rhetorical structure diagram.

Relations occurring high in the rhetorical structure, that is, immediately under the LIST, are CONCESSION, ELABORATION, CONDITION, JUSTIFY, SUMMARY, and ANTITHESIS. (COMMENT has an 'extra-structural' function to be discussed in Chapter 5) Mid-level relations are ANTITHESIS, CONDITION, COMMENT, ELABORATION, FRUSTRATED INTENT, RESTATEMENT, JOINT, PURPOSE, and CIRCUMSTANCE. Relations occurring only at the bottom of the hierarchy are JOINT, ELABORATION, CIRCUMSTANCE, COMPARISON, ANTITHESIS, REASON and
PURPOSE. Notice how, in this text, ELABORATION appears at all levels of the hierarchy, whereas, in the Advice Text, it was restricted to the lower portions.

In the entire text, there are fourteen adjacent clause pairs in nucleus-satellite or multi-nuclear relations. All of the nuclei excepting one, Clause 7, are Independent clauses (Clause 7 is a 'Purpose' clause). Of the satellites, 6 are Independent clauses, two are Switch-Reference clauses, 2 are 'Purpose' clauses, and 1 is a nominalized clause used adverbially. In other words, of the eleven nucleus-satellite pairs, in no case is a satellite of higher syntactic rank than its corresponding nucleus.

Regarding nucleus-satellite order, four of the eleven satellites precede their nuclei and seven follow. REASON (Clause 52) and CONDITION (Clause 26) precede the nucleus. ELABORATION (Clause 8), PURPOSE (Clause 41), COMMENT (Clause 3), and COMPARISON (Clauses 61 and 63), follow the nucleus. Only two of the satellites, ANTITHESIS (Clauses 18 and 36) and CIRCUMSTANCE (Clauses 12 and 24), are found both preceding and following their corresponding nuclei. Thus, it appears that the relation of a satellite to its nucleus and its placement with regard to that nucleus are not coincidental.
Of the bi-nuclear relations, Clauses 32-33 and 34-35 are pairs of syntactically parallel Switch-Reference clauses and Clauses 43-44 are a pair of almost identical Independent clauses. The LIST series comprising Clauses 45-49 also follows the same syntactic parallelism, with Switch-Reference clauses. The Farewell Text thus exhibits the same trend towards syntactic parallelism in multi-nuclear relations as the other texts.

The Farewell Text contains five instances of overt conjunctive links: four instances of peru 'but' and one instance of Tsaymi 'thus'. Only the Tsaymi (Clause 32) bears a text-organizational function: it initiates the second major division of the text. Other than that, the peru's function on a purely local level: they all initiate the nuclear portions of CONCESSION relations. Thus, we can see that the presence of peru correlates with a specific rhetorical relation, however, it does not bear a significant text-organizing function. Links in the Farewell Text, therefore, are similar in their functioning to links in the Advice Text: the 'texthood' of the text is not dependent upon them as a unifying force.
4.9. Final Summary of All Texts

In this chapter we have seen the effectiveness of Rhetorical Structure Analysis through its application to the analysis of clause-combining in texts of diverse genres. A small set of relations has been shown to be effective in describing text organization, and the same relations apply at any level of the rhetorical structure hierarchy (As Mann and Thompson (to appear) have shown with Antithesis for English). Hierarchical organization reflects the relative priorities of the speaker/writer, and the relations found in the upper tiers of the hierarchy are the most crucial in creating textual coherence. In the texts studied, these are LIST, SOLUTIONHOOD, and REASON.

The number and kind of relations which occur in a text have been shown to be useful in distinguishing between text types. Depth of embedding in the rhetorical structure has been seen as an indicator of rhetorical complexity. On the other hand, quantity of clauses in a span of text is not a reliable index of rhetorical salience.

The determination of a rhetorical structure for a particular text is only an outline which elucidates some of the complexities of the relations between spans of text. It does not pretend to comprehensively define all aspects of text structure. Nevertheless, these rhetorical relations do bind a text together.
In general, they are not dependent on overt links or morphosyntactic signals for their presence, although these may appear with high frequency in certain cases (eg. peru with the nucleus of CONCESSION). Furthermore, the interpretation of certain morphosyntactic signals, such as the suffixes -pis 'even, also' and -qa 'same topic marker or topic switch marker', has been seen to depend on context within the rhetorical structure.²²

With very few exceptions, in adjacent pairs of clauses in nucleus-satellite relationship, a basic principle holds: no satellite may be of higher rank than its nucleus. Furthermore, for the body of texts as a whole, and for all of the individual texts except for the Advice Text, there is a statistical tendency for the clausal satellite to follow its nucleus, as displayed in Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satellites</th>
<th>Pre-Nuc.</th>
<th>Post-Nuc.</th>
<th>Percent Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEATHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTHER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVICE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAREWELL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Nucleus-Satellite Order for Adjacent Clause Pairs
For satellites of any size span, the correlation between satellitehood and post-nuclearity is even more consistent. Table 4 displays the relevant figures for all of the nucleus-satellite pairs in the four texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Nuc.</th>
<th>Post-Nuc.</th>
<th>Percent Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEATHER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTHER</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVICE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAREWELL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Nucleus-Satellite Order for All Levels

The Rhetorical Structure Analysis of Motivational texts such as the Advice Text is the most intricate, as there are many layers of embedded relations. With linearly oriented texts such as the Farewell Address, the rhetorical network is flatter, less elaborate. In each case, however, the approach is effective in elucidating the clause-combining strategies in texts of various lengths, both with regard to highlighting the diverse functions a single morphosyntactic clause type—such as the switch-reference clauses—may exhibit, and to showing the correlation between satellitehood and relative syntactic rank as compared to the nucleus.
The analysis of the texts in this chapter also illustrates that oral unedited texts in Conchucos Quechua may be non-fragmented, planned, and goal-oriented; as all but the Weather Report were unpremeditated oral texts.
Notes to Chapter 4

1 One of the claims made in chapter 5 is that rhetorical relations may be grouped into sets according to certain definable parameters. Overlap, or multiplicity, of relations will tend to occur within these sets, not across sets.

2 The Weather Report is one of a group of texts included in a newspaper composed by Conchucos Quechua speakers learning how to write for the first time. Capitalization and punctuation are as in the original. As Spanish is the only written medium with which Quechua speakers are familiar, it is reasonable to assume that the organization of the text is somewhat influenced by Spanish structure. This does not invalidate, however, the use of this structure for Quechua.

3 Interestingly, the satellites of all three spans (in the case of 8-11, the nucleus within that satellite) are independent clauses. 8-11 is actually a RESULT relation embedded rhetorically in the 7-11 RESULT relation, and 7, the nucleus to which 8-11 are satellites, is an independent clause. Worth noting also is the embedded RESULT relation of Clause 4 to Clause 3 in the first span of the LIST series, as Clause 4, too, is independent. Thus, the encoding of nuclear portions as independent clauses does not preclude similar encoding of satellite portions.
This relation is not JOINT because the elements are in a series, and do not qualify as a single communicative act (see 5.2.17).

This satellite could perhaps be considered as ELABORATION, however BACKGROUND is the predominant relation. The speaker is providing information she feels necessary for her speaker to understand that she is taking a significant journey, not just a jaunt to a neighboring village (see also 5.2.3.)

See Chapters 6 and 7 for further discussion of Switch-Reference and clause-chaining.

Ester is, in effect, the topical participant, and thus 'qualifies' for the attenuated Same-Subject Switch-Reference marking (see 6.6.)

The function of -ga here is quite like the function of -ri in Southern Peruvian and Bolivian Quechua.

A 'local' pair is a sequence of two clauses in nucleus-satellite relation.

The case of 7-9 is not a local pair of clauses, but it is still explainable, as mentioned above, when we understand the process perspective and the effect of Esther's topicity.
11 The Godson was philandering and behaving irresponsibly in general. In this text, the speaker is reconstructing the actual situation: the godson is not actually present.

12 An example of a non-directive motivational text is a monologue in which the speaker, a young Quechua woman, is scolding a young girl, exhorting her to change her ways and be good, but not directing her as to the specific solution to her problems.

13 Notice that Clause 32 also is a rhetorical question 32-33 marks end of span. Nowhere else except in the final WARNING is a rhetorical question to be found. This is also a boundary: the end of the text.

14 The 'topic marker' -qa also appears on the verb. Cole 1983 remarks that this is a marker of conditionality for Huaraz Quechua. In view of the many functions of -qa and the many instances of conditionals without -qa, however, this would appear to be an oversimplification.

15 Examples such as this illustrate the fact that switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua is not just a matter of grammar. See Chapter 6 for a more in-depth discussion of this issue.

16 Actually, the chains of switch-reference are not linearly determined (see Chapter 6).
17 As with the Advice Text, this is his recollection—his mother is not actually present.

18 The use of the conjectural evidential -chi at this point is enigmatic.

19 To my knowledge, such instances of double object marking are unique to Conchucos.

20 2b could be considered in apposition to 2a in the sense that both are in the same syntactic relation to Kaynawpaqchari 'For things just like this'. It is not a RESTATEMENT of 2a because Kaynawpaqchari (or the equivalent) is not restated.

21 This is to be expected, of course, in unedited natural text.

22 The function of -qa seems to be quite similar to that of Japanese -wa in various respects (see, e.g. Downing 1987).
5. RHETORICAL RELATIONS FOR CONCHUCOS QUECHUA

5.1. Introduction

The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide a reference list of rhetorical relations based on the analysis of non-chronologically oriented texts, as exemplified in Chapter 4. These definitions have as their starting point the work of Thompson, Mann, Matthiessen, Fox, and their colleagues at the Information Sciences Institute, and are influenced also by Grimes 1975, Longacre 1976, 1983, 1985, and Beekman et al 1981.

A secondary purpose of this chapter is to suggest that rhetorical relations may be grouped into sets according to certain definable parameters. The possibility of analyzing the relation between two spans of text in more than one way will arise only when one or more parameters are shared. The grouping of relations according to some of these parameters which I propose is only one of several possible approaches to the issue.

5.2. List of Rhetorical Relations

The determination of a rhetorical structure for a particular text is, as stressed in the previous two chapters, only an outline which elucidates some of the complexities of the relations between
spans of text. It does not pretend to be comprehensive. The following twenty-six rhetorical relations, listed in alphabetical order, have been found useful for describing clause-combining strategies in Conchucos Quechua. Definitions, relevant examples, and comments follow.

ANTITHESIS
ASSESSMENT
BACKGROUND
CIRCUMSTANCE
COMMENT
COMPARISON
CONCESSION
CONCLUSION
CONDITION
CONTENT
CONTRAST
DIRECT
DISJUNCT
ELABORATION
ENABLEMENT
EVIDENCE
JOINT
JUSTIFY
LIST
MOTIVATION
PURPOSE
REASON
RESTATEMENT
RESULT
SOLUTIONHOOD
SUMMARY
5.2.1. **ANTITHESIS**

An ANTITHESIS relation occurs when the speaker contrasts two opposing points of view or courses of action, committing her or himself to only one of these alternatives, the nucleus. In Conchucos Quechua, if only a two-clause span is involved, both nucleus and satellite are generally encoded as independent clauses. Either nucleus or satellite may appear first. If the satellite precedes the nucleus, the conjunctions *peru* `but’ or *sinoo* `rather’, borrowed from Spanish, may be used as overt signals of the nuclear portion. ANTITHESIS relations are most often found in motivational texts, although they are not limited to these genre (Consider, for example, Clauses 17-18 and 19-22 of the Farewell text) Farewell text). They tend to occur in the middle or upper portions of the rhetorical structure hierarchy and are not found at the lowermost level. They are absent from strictly information-giving texts such as the Weather Report.

The following excerpts illustrate the ANTITHESIS relation:

\[
\begin{align*}
(54) & \\
\text{ANTITHESIS} & \\
1-2 & \\
\end{align*}
\]
1. Llapan-ntsik-mi aywa-na-ntsik.
   all-12-DIR go-DESID-12
   "All of us should go."

2. Mana-m pi-si keeda-na-n-tsu kay-chaw-qa.
   NEG-DIR who-YET stay-DESID-3-NEG this-LOC-TOP
   "Not a single one of us should stay here." (15.2)

(55)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ANTITHESIS} \\
1 \quad 2
\end{array}
\]

   but think-NOM-12-SIM NEG be-RECPST-3-NEG
   "But it wasn't as we had thought (it would be)."

   Instead-TOP other-GOAL-BEN be-RECPST-3
   "Instead, it was destined to be something else." (4.1)

Examples of nucleus-satellite spans related by ANTITHESIS in the
texts discussed in Chapter 4 are:

   Advice Text: 34-36, 58-59, 77-86, 96-99
   Farewell Text: 17-18, 19-22, 23-25, 36-37
5.2.2. ASSESSMENT

in an ASSESSMENT relation,⁴ the satellite portion provides the speaker’s evaluative opinion on the nuclear portion. The evaluation may be either positive or negative. All of the ASSESSMENT relations in the Chapter 4 texts are found in the Advice text, appear in the upper portions of the rhetorical structure, and are multicausal in scope. The following, reproduced from Chapter 4, is an example:

(56)

71. Mana-na-si huk tsuri-ki-ta shumaq
    NEG-NOW-YET one son-2-ACC nice
    escuela-1la-man-pis kacha-rnin
    school-JUST-GOAL-EVEN send-SS
    "Nor do you even send your son nicely to school anymore."

72. Yachaku-na-n-ta muna-rnin
    learn-NOM-3-ACC want-SS
    "Wanting him to learn."

73. Kiki-ki-pis toqshu ka-nqa-1la-yki-man
    self-2-EVEN foolish be-NOM-JUST-2-GOAL
    "You yourself are one who would be foolish"

74. Toqshu ka-na-n-ta muna-nki.
    foolish be-NOM-3-ACC want-2
    "(So) you want him to be foolish."
Other examples of ASSESSMENT in the texts of Chapter 4 are Advice 2-23 and 65-76.

5.2.3. BACKGROUND

In a BACKGROUND relation, the speaker provides material in the satellite which she or he feels it is necessary to make explicit in order for the hearer to adequately comprehend the nuclear text span. BACKGROUND relations tend to appear in the upper portions of the rhetorical structure. The nuclear portions of the BACKGROUND satellites at all levels in my data base are encoded by independent clauses. A BACKGROUND satellite may precede or follow its nucleus.

The following is an example of BACKGROUND:

(57)

\text{Advice}\newline 38-40
\text{BACKGROUND}\newline 38,40 39

38. Qam-pa pani-ki\newline you-GEN sister-2\newline
"Your own sister"

39. Tsay-naw ollqo-n-pita haqi-shqa\newline that-SIM husband-3-ABL leave-PRT\newline
"Left by her husband like that"

40. Wahi-ki-man shamu-n-man\newline house-2-GOAL come-3-COND\newline
"She would come to your house."
Other BACKGROUND relations in Chapter 4 are found in the following spans of text: Weather Report 2-4, Ester's Story 1-2 and 6, and Advice 2-86, 38-39, 44-45.

5.2.4. CIRCUMSTANCE

A CIRCUMSTANCE satellite sets a spatial, temporal, or situational framework for the nucleus. CIRCUMSTANCE relations tend to occur at the bottom of a rhetorical structure, but may also appear higher in the hierarchy. At the upper levels, CIRCUMSTANCE relations never provide for the basic organizational structure of a text, but do serve an orienting function. In this role, they precede the nucleus. At the local level, CIRCUMSTANCE satellites are must often encoded by switch-reference clauses, but may also be encoded by an adverbial nominalized clause or, occasionally, for situational circumstance only, by an independent clause. The clause encoding CIRCUMSTANCE is likely to contain a time or location word such as imay 'when' or may 'where'. An example of this is the 10-11 sequence of the Weather Report, where the independent clause, 11, the satellite, provides the situational framework for 10, the nucleus, a nominalized clause.

The following is an example of a CIRCUMSTANCE relation which sets the spatial framework of the nucleus. The locational Maypa introduces the CIRCUMSTANCE satellite, and is, indeed, a
grammatical marker of locational CIRCUMSTANCE. The affix -si 'yet', at the end of the clause, adds the sense of 'wherever'.

(58)

\[ \text{CIRCUMSTANCE} \]

1. May-pa aywa-r-si
   Where-GEN go-SS-YET
   'Wherever you go,'

2. Ima-ta-si ayuda-paku-sku-nki
   what-ACC-YET help-DIFF-PFV-2
   'Be of some kind of help to others.' (14.1)

CIRCUMSTANCE relations in Chapter 4 are: Weather Report 10-11, Advice 12-22, 81-82, Farewell 11-12, 24-23, and 39-41.

5.2.5. COMMENT

In a COMMENT relation, a parenthetical segment of text is appended to the main rhetorical framework. This is the only relation which can be considered extra-hierarchical: the satellite may scope a clause or span anywhere in the hierarchy and might have nothing to do with the overall rhetorical organization of the text. A COMMENT may appear in the form of an aside or a sudden temporary switch in perspective. Often, the COMMENT satellite reaches outside of the discourse world into the 'real' world, as in the Invocation (Cl.3) of the Farewell text. A COMMENT satellite may be
in the form of a request, as in Cl. 9 of the Farewell Text. It can also be a warning, as in Clause 63 of the Farewell Text, which frames the close of the text much as the DIRECT relation frames the onset of a text or text span. Any kind of clause or clause fragment may function in a COMMENT relation.  

The following excerpt, from a motivational text exhorting the local village population to go after some cow thieves, is an example of the COMMENT relation:

(59)

1. Qati-shun chase-12PUT
   'Let's chase them!'

2. Tsay-pa-sh apa-ykaa-ya-ru-n. that-GEN-REP take-IMPFV-PI-RECPST-3
   'Maybe they have been taking them over there (gestures)!'  

3. Kinray-pa-sh may-pa-chari across-GEN-REP where-GEN-INDIE
   witsay-pa qaqa-pa witsa-ykaa-tsyai-yen. up-GEN boulder-GEN climb-IMPFV-CAUS
   'Maybe they made them climb off to the side, or yonder, up to the boulders (gestures)!' (15.1)

A COMMENT satellite may also be in the form of a request, as Clause 9 of the Farewell Text illustrates. Other COMMENT relations in the
Chapter 4 texts are found in the following spans of text: Ester's Story 1-2, with 9, and Farewell Text 60-65.

5.2.6. COMPARISON

In a COMPARISON relation, the satellite portion is affirmed to be similar in some respect to the nuclear portion. In my database, the nuclei are consistently independent clauses and the satellites, nominalized clauses. The postposition yupay is an overt grammatical marker of the COMPARISON relation.

The 60-61 and 62-63 spans in the Farewell Text are examples of COMPARISON:

60. Wahi::ta rika-kyu-ya-nki
    house-1-ACC see-POL-PL-2

    'Please look after my house,'

61. Kiki:::ta rika-a-ma-q yupay-lla.
    self-1-ACC see->1-NOM count-JUST

    'Just as if you were looking after me.'

62. Chakra::kuna-ta rika-kyu-nki
    field-1-PL-ACC see-POL-2

    'Please look after my fields'

63. Kiki:::ta rika-a-ma-q yupay-lla
    self-1-ACC see->1-NOM count-JUST

    'Just as if you were looking after me.'
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5.2.7. CONCESSION

In a CONCESSION relation, the speaker admits to the truth or possibility of the truth of material contained in the satellite text span which is potentially damaging to the acceptance of the material presented in the nuclear span. However, she or he affirms the truth or acceptability of the material contained in the nucleus. Usually, a switch-reference clause encodes the satellite portion, which precedes the nucleus, encoded by an independent clause. The nucleus may be introduced by the link Itsan ‘yet’, but this is not obligatory.

An example of CONCESSION is the following:

(61)

```
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CONCESSION} \\
1-2 \\
1 \\
1-3 \\
3 \\
\end{array}
```

1. Rason-mi parla-y-ta qa noqa-ntsik allapa yacha-ntsik true-DIR speak-NOM-ACC-TOP 1PRO-12 a:lot know-12

‘It is true that we really know how to speak Quechua well.’

2. Musya-ntsik pay-kuna-pita-pis mas know-12 3PRO-PL-ABL-EVEN more

‘We know even more than they do.’


hard study-PL-PERF

‘On the other hand, they have extensively studied its grammar.’

(28.3)
Another kind of CONCESSION is when frustrated intent (see also Longacre 1983) is expressed: the speaker concedes that, although an intended purpose or goal is pursued, it is being thwarted (with resulting dissatisfaction on the part of the speaker). An example of this relation is found in the 45-53 span of the Farewell Text:

(62)

45. Noqa miku-r  
I eat-SS  
´When I was eating´

46. Mana miku-r  
NEG eat-SS  
´(Or) I was not eating´

47. Yarpa-chaku-rnin  
think-CONCEN-SS  
´Deliberating´

48. Ka-pty-n  
be-DS-3  
´Having (lit. If there was)´

49. Mana ka-pty-n  
Neg be-DS-3  
´Not having´

I-TOP escape-CAUS-PAST-1 this house-ACC  
´I myself constructed this house.´
     now leave-PPV-SS go-NOM-1-PUR
     'Now abandoning it so I can go.'

52. Pero naqa-na awkis-ya-ski-r ni-n-chi
     but well-NOW old-REC-PFV-SS-O-3-CONJ
     kuti-ka-mu-na-paq
     return-REFL-FR:FAR-NOM-1
     'But, now, so that I can return perhaps when I have
     become old,'

     cave-ACC leave-IMPACT-1FUT
     'I will abandon my shelter/ abode.'

The following spans are examples of CONCESSION in Chapter 4:
Advice Text 66-74 and 85-85, Farewell Text 4-9 and 10-12.

5.2.8. CONCLUSION

In a CONCLUSION relation, the satellite text span provides information which the speaker infers from facts already presented in the nuclear span. As distinguished from the ASSESSMENT relation, in which the satellite portion provides the speaker’s evaluative opinion (positive or negative) on the nuclear portion, the CONCLUSION relation supplies information of a factual nature. Usually, the CONCLUSION satellite in Conchucos Quechua consists of a single independent clause which follows the nucleus.

The CONCLUSION relation is exemplified in Clauses 2-33 of the Advice Text, as described in Chapter 4.
5.2.9. CONDITION

In a CONDITION relation, the realization of the nuclear portion depends upon the realization of the satellite portion, although both of these may be hypothetical. CONDITION relations tend to appear in the middle of a rhetorical structure: neither on top, as a major text-organizing relation, nor on the bottom, as clearly non-essential to the basic organization of the discourse. Usually, in a two-clause pair, the CONDITION satellite precedes the nucleus. CONDITION tends to be a highly local relation. In the text studied, the maximum combined size of nucleus and satellite spans is four clauses. The satellite is a single-clause unit which usually takes the form of a switch-reference clause frequently marked with the 'topic marker' -qa; and the nucleus, an 'independent clause. There is, however, no 'conditional morphology' as such in Conchucos Quechua. The following excerpt illustrates the CONDITION relation:

\[(63)\]

1. [Gusta-yaa-shu-pty-ki-q\(\text{a}\)]
   please-PL-3->2-DS-2-TOP

2. Qellqa-yaa-mu-shaq-mi mas-ta.
   write-PL-TO:HERE-1PUT-DIR more-ACC

"If it pleases you (pl.), we will write you more." (24.7)
The following example illustrates the possibility of a post-nuclear CONDITION satellite:

(64)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1-2 \\
1 \leq \text{CONDITION} \\
1 - 2
\end{array}
\]

1. Yapay kay-chaw-na-m qellqa-mu-shaq waki-n-ta,
again this-LOC-Now-DIR write-TO:Here-1Put other-3-ACC

'\text{I will likewise write others here}.'

2Pro-PL-Gen this-DEF-PL good-SIM be-DS-3-Top

'\text{If these seem good to you.}' (19.2)

Conditionals may also be concessive, as the following excerpt from the Farewell text illustrates:
32. Tsaymi kanan-qa kaaru-pa aywa-r-pis
   thus now-TOP far-GEN go-SS-EVEN

   'So/Thus now, even though I go far away,'

33. May-pa aywa-r-pis
    where-GEN go-SS-EVEN

   'And should I go anyplace,'

34. Shonqo-:-chaw-qa apa-ykaa-shayki.
    heart-1-LOC-TOP take-IMPFV-1->2FUT

   'I will be taking you in my heart.'

35. Dios-ni-ntsik-pa Haawpa-n-man cha-ykaa-tsi-shayki
    God-12-GEN front-3 GOAL arrive-IMPFV-CAUS-1->2FUT

   'I will be presenting you before Our God.'

A final example of CONDITION illustrates how a na-paq 'purpose'
clause, rather than an independent clause, may encode the nuclear
portion of the pair:
(66)

1. Keche-cha-w liyi-y-ta yacha-ri-ya-pte-ki-qa
   Quechua-LOC read-NOM-ACC know-INCEP-PL-DS-2-TOP

   "If you first are able to read in Quechua"

2. Kastellanu-cha-w qa liyi-y-ta mas ratulla
   Spanish-LOC-TOP read-NOM-ACC more fast
   yachaku-na-yki-paq.6
   earn-NOM-2-PUR

   "You will learn how to read faster in Spanish." (28.2)

The following spans of text exemplify CONDITION relations in
Chapter 4:

Advice Text: 24-25, 29-31, 80-82, 92-93, 94-99, 96-97, and
98-99.

Farewell Text: 21-22.

5.2.10. CONTENT

In a CONTENT relation, the satellite portion 'fills in'
information which the speaker deems necessary for a complete
rendering of the statement in the nuclear text span. It is
distinguished from the BACKGROUND relation-- in which the speaker
provides material which she or he feels it is necessary to provide
in order for the hearer to adequately comprehend the nuclear text span—in that it completes the nuclear span rather than rendering it comprehensible within the larger text. Thus, whereas the more highly text-organizational BACKGROUND relations tend to appear in the upper portions of the rhetorical structure, CONTENT relations are more likely to appear in the lower portions. CONTENT satellites consist most frequently of one or more independent clauses which may consist entirely of reported speech; their corresponding nuclei are independent clauses with 'say' verbs. The following excerpt from the Advice Text is an example of CONTENT:

(67)

63. Qam-ta-qa-m yaatsi-q willa-q
you-ACC-TOP-DIR advise-1->2 tell-1->2
'I advise you and tell you'

64. Dios-ni-ntsik-pa Palabra-n-chaw ama tsay-naw ka-rnin-qa.
God-0-12-GEN Word-3-LOC NEG that-SIM be-SS
'In God's Word it says not to be like that.'

231
Other examples of CONTENT from the texts in Chapter 4 are all found in the Advice Text: 12-14, 15-21, 27-33, and 28-31.

5.2.11. CONTRAST

The CONTRAST relation is a relation between two nuclear spans of text. The situations in the two nuclei, although comparable in some respects, differ on at least one pivotal point, the point which is compared contrastively. CONTRAST relations tend to appear high in the rhetorical structure hierarchy, indicating that they have a relatively significant degree of influence on the rhetorical organization of the text. There are no examples in the data of a non-independent clause encoding either one of the two sides of a CONTRAST.

The following is an example of a CONTRAST relation between two independent clauses:

(68)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{1-2} \\
\text{CONTRAST} \\
1 \\
2 \end{array} \]

1. Kanan-yaq ka-n kastellanu-lla-chaw imayka-pis qellqa-shqa. now-LIM be-3 Spanish-JUST-LOC all:kind-EVEN write-PRT

"Until now there are all kinds of things written only in Spanish."

2. Kechwa-chaw qa kasi ka-n-tsu ni ima-pis. Quechua-LOC-TOP almost be-3-NEG not that-EVEN

In Quechua, on the other hand, there is almost nothing. (28.1)
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Other examples of CONTRAST, in Chapter 4, are: Advice Text 9-23 and 92-99.

5.2.12. DIRECT

A DIRECT satellite is a single-clause span which draws the attention of the listener to the nuclear span of text which it scopes. As such, the DIRECT satellite always precedes its nucleus, which is often the entire ensuing text. Often, the DIRECT satellite is a vocative. It may, however, be an attention-drawing command with the essential rhetorical force of 'Hear ye, Hear ye!', as in the following example, reproduced from the Weather Report text discussed in Chapter 4:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DIRECT} & \quad 1-14 \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad 2-14 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Musya-ri-ya-y!
Know-INCERP-PL-IMP

Know this!

Other examples of DIRECT contained in the Chapter 4 texts are:

Advice Text: 1 for 2-101, 60 for 61-64, 87 for 88-99

Farewell Text: 1 for 2-41, 42 for 43-65
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5.2.13 DISJUNCT

DISJUNCT is a bi-nuclear 'or' relation between two alternatives. It differs from CONTRAST in that the two members are not being compared at a crucial point of difference. The relation may be signalled by the conjunction o 'or', borrowed from Spanish. An example is the following:

(70)

1. Sia-kush qela ka-nki
   if-ALT lazy be-2
   If you are lazy

2. o mana-kush ima-ta-si rura-nki
   or nothing-ALT what-ACC-YET do-2
   Or if you don't do anything

   then not what-ACC-YET give-PL-3->2-NEG
   Then they won't give you anything at all. (13.2)

Examples of DISJUNCT from the Chapter 4 texts are found in the following spans: Advice Text 15-16, 18-19, and 37-48.
5.2.14. ELABORATION

An ELABORATION relation is one in which the satellite provides added detail about the nucleus. Nowhere in the data does ELABORATION appear at the highest level of text organization. It can appear anywhere else in the rhetorical structure, however. Frequently, it shows up in the lowest echelons. In all of the instances studied, it follows the nucleus.

ELABORATION relations can be subclassified into subtypes, with the possibility of rhetorical embedding of the different types. The subtypes are listed here, with the nuclear portion indicated first. Examples from the Chapter 4 texts are included:

1. Abstraction: Instance (Advice 12-21, 26-33, 37-46, 68-74))
2. Whole: Part (Advice 9-22)
3. Process: Step(s) (Advice 11-22, Farewell 38-41)
5. Generalization: Amplification (Advice 30-31, 80-84, Farewell 58-59)

The following example, reproduced here from the Advice Text, illustrates the Generalization-Specific ELABORATION relation:
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90. Tsay kasara-nqa-y(ki)-kaq warmi-ta waata-y.
    that marry-NOM-2-DEF woman-ACC care:for-IMP
    
    '(And) take care of the woman you married.'

91. Varpa-ochuk-γ llatapa-n paq llapa-n-qaq qam-paq-pis.
    remember-CONCEN-IMP clothes-3-BEN all-3-BEN you-BEN-EVEN
    
    'Concern yourself for her clothing, for everything,
    for yourself, too.'

5.2.15. ENABLEMENT

In an ENABLEMENT relation, the material presented in the
satellite portion makes possible the completion of the action
proposed in the nuclear portion. ENABLEMENT relations are most
often found in directive texts. Clause 89 of the Advice Text is in
a relation of ENABLEMENT with 90-91, cited above:
89. Tsay warmi-ta haqi-yku-r
that woman-ACC leave-IMPACT-SS

"Leave that (other) woman"

90. Tsay kasara-nqa-y(ki)-kaq warmi-ta waata-y.
that marry-NOM-2-DEF woman-ACC care:for-IMP

"(And) take care of the woman you married."

remember-CONCEN-IMP clothes-3-BEN all-3-BEN you-BEN-EVEN

"Concern yourself for her clothing, for everything,
for yourself, too."

5.2.16. EVIDENCE

In an EVIDENCE relation, the satellite text span provides
evidence, usually in the form of factual data, for the claim put
forth in the nucleus. On the local level, the EVIDENCE satellite
may be filled by either an independent clause or a switch-reference
clause. On a global level, the EVIDENCE relation may be the
highest organizer of the text, or it may interact with the rest of
the text on a more local basis, as in the following example:
1. Kay willa-yka-nqa:-naw mana-m upa-lluta-lla-tsu
   this tell-IMPFV-NOM-1-SIM NEG-DIR dumb-CCPL-JUST-NEG

   As I have been telling you, they are not completely stupid

   where-CCAL-EVEN go-PL-3

   They even go all over the place. (28.5)

Other examples of EVIDENCE from Chapter 4 are found in the
following spans: Advice 2-7, and 69-74.
5.2.17. JOINT

The JOINT relation, as does the CONTRAST relation, consists of two nuclei and no satellites. JOINT is a 'tighter' relation than LIST: both nuclei are equally necessary, whereas a member of a series could be omitted without obliterating the LIST relation. For example, the Rhetorical Question-Answer pair, as in 2-3 of the Advice Text, qualifies as a JOINT. JOINT is not to be confused with DISJUNCT, where the members are presented as a pair of alternatives. JOINT relations may occur at any level of the rhetorical structure hierarchy, but are most frequent as lower-level pairs of clauses.

The following example, from a text which explains why people speak, but don't write Quechua, illustrates the JOINT relation:

(74)

\[ \text{JOINT} \]

1. Llapa-ntsik qalla-rqa-ntsik parla-y-ta kechwa-chaw-mi.
   all-12 begin-PAST-12 talk-NOM-ACC Quechua-LOC-DIR
   
   "All of us began to speak in Quechua."

2. Awilu-ntsik-kuna, mama-ntsik-kuna ashma-ma-rqa-ntsik
   grandparent-12-PL parent-12-PL raise->1-PAST-12
   kay parla-n-wan.
   this talk-3-COM
   
   "Our grandparents, our parents raised us with this their talk."
(24.8)
The relationship between Clauses 2 and 3 can be likened to that between two sides of a coin: Clause 2 is produced from the perspective of the Quechua speaker; Clause 3, from the perspective of those who reared him or her to speak that language. Clauses 2 and 3 function together to describe the language-learning situation for native Quechua speakers.

JOINT relations are found in the following spans in the texts presented in Chapter 4:

Ester's Story: 7-8
Advice Text: 2-3, 13-14, 32-33, 50-51
Farewell Text: 14-15, 30-31, 32-33, 34-35, and 43-44.

5.2.18. JUSTIFY

In a JUSTIFY\textsuperscript{9} relation, the satellite text span attempts to establish the appropriateness or right of the speaker to put forth the claims made or action taken in the other part, such that the acceptance of the JUSTIFY satellite by the listener increases her or his acceptance of the nucleus. As might be expected, JUSTIFY is found in motivational, rather than purely reportative or expressive texts. JUSTIFY is a significant text-organizational relation; as such, it tends not to occur at the lowest level of a rhetorical structure. As a corollary, it occurs only with spans of text greater than the minimal two-clause set in the data. In most cases, it follows the nucleus. The initial clause in the JUSTIFY
satellite is frequently marked with the affix -pis 'even, moreover', as the following example from the Farewell Text illustrates:

(75)

16. Pay ni-nqa-n-ta-chi noqa rura-shaq
   he say-NOM-3-ACC-CONJ I do-1FUT
   'I will do just what He says.'

17. Pay-raykur-mi aywa-ku-:-pis
   he-SAKE-DIR go-REFL-1-EVEN
   'It is for His sake, moreover, that I am going,'

18. Mana-m kiki-: muna-y-pita-tsu.
    NEG-DIR self-1 want-NEG-ABL-NEG
    '(It is) not because of my own desire.'

Notice how in (75), the use of negation in Clause 18, and the ANTITHESIS relation of this clause to 17, lay the foundation of the JUSTIFY relation of that span to Clause 16.

The following are examples of JUSTIFY in the Chapter 4 texts:

Advice Text: 24-33, 50-59, 57-59, 61-64
Farewell Text: 13-18, 16-18
5.2.19. LIST

A LIST relation consists of two or more nuclei, but no satellites. A LIST is an addition relation which is non-sequential in nature, but there must be a common 'thread' of subject matter between the elements of the LIST. For instance, in the Weather Report text, each of the members in the upper-level LIST series shares the feature of being a town in Peru with unfavorable weather conditions. LIST differs from JOINT in two respects: First, JOINT is exclusively binuclear; LIST usually consists of at least three nuclei. Second, the two nuclei in JOINT are more tightly bound together: one cannot be eliminated without rendering the span of text rhetorically incomplete. Third, parallel syntactic constructions correlate with LIST, but rarely with JOINT, relations.

To illustrate this, compare, for example, a LIST in the Weather Report (Clauses 13-14) with a JOINT in the Advice Text (Clauses 13-14):
12. Kay Huari marka-ntsik-ta-pis allaapa-m tamya-yka-n
   this Huari town-12-ACC-EVEN a:lot-DIR rain-IMPFV-3
   "It's raining a lot here in Huari, too."

    crop-REFL-NOM-Ø-12-ACC-EVEN yellow-BEC-IMPFV-CAUS-3-NOW-DIR
    "It's making our crops yellow (rotten)."

    field-12-PL-ACC-EVEN flood-IMPFV-CAUS-3-NOW-DIR
    "Our fields, too, it's causing to be flooded."

12. Hura-rqa-yki altar-chaw
    swear-PAST-2 altar-LOC
    "You swore at the altar"

    die-NOM-1 hour-LIM-DIR be-3FUT
    "(You said) "It will be until the hour that I die.""

    be-PL-1FUT live-PL-1FUT
    ""We will be together, we will live.""
In (76), either Clause 13 or Clause 14, in parallel syntactic construction, could be eliminated without any loss of understanding of the text. In (77), neither Clause 13 nor Clause 14 could be eliminated without deleting an essential portion of the marriage vow.

LIST is a versatile relation: it may occur in any kind of text and at any level of the rhetorical structure, and can do anything from providing the essential framework of rhetorical organization at the topmost level to listing the details in an ELABORATION relation at the bottommost level of a text. On the local level, any kind of clause can participate in a LIST.

The following clause spans in the texts in Chapter 4 are arranged in LIST relation:

- Weather Report: 8-11, 13-14
- Ester’s Story: 7-26, 7-21
- Advice Text: 5-7, 15-19, 34-36 with 37-49 and 65-76
- Farewell Text: The first two levels of the Rhetorical Structure.

5.2.23. MOTIVATION

In a MOTIVATION relation, the action expressed in the nucleus is not yet performed. The satellite serves to increase the hearer’s desire to perform that action. Understandably, then, MOTIVATION relations play a significant role in directive texts.
MOTIVATION relations tend to be high-level text organizers, and are found rarely on the lowest levels of the rhetorical hierarchy. The clauses in MOTIVATION satellites are most frequently of the -na-paq 'purpose' type.

The following excerpt from a short text giving advice to pregnant women illustrates a lower-level MOTIVATION relation:

(78)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1-2 \\
\hline
1 \\
\hline
2 \\
\end{array}
\]

1. Aywa-y Hospital-man o Centro de Salud-man kada killa go-IMP hospital-GOAL or Center of Health-GOAL each month

rika-tsi-ku-q see-CAUS-REFL-PUR

"Go to the Hospital or Health Center to have yourself looked at each month."

2. Llullu-yki shumaq yuri-na-n-paq baby-2 nice appear-NOM-3-PUR

"So that your baby will come out well." (28.10)

Instances of MOTIVATION in Chapter 4 are: Advice Text 88-99 and Farewell Text 23-27.

5.2.21. PURPOSE

In a PURPOSE relation, the satellite text span names the purpose for which the action named in the nuclear text span is
initiated. The action expressed in the nuclear text span has not yet taken place. In Conchucos Quechua, PURPOSE relations tend to be very local--between pairs of clauses, and thus, low in a rhetorical structure hierarchy. Most frequently, but no means always, the PURPOSE satellite is formed with a -\textit{na-paq} 'purpose' clause scoping a nucleus which is formed with an independent clause.

In the following, from a text directed by an older woman to a younger woman, instructing her not to steal food, either for herself or for others, is an example of the PURPOSE relation:

(79)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node [text width=1cm] (n1) {1};
\node [text width=2cm, above of=n1] (n2) {\textit{PURPOSE}};
\node [text width=2cm, above of=n2] (n3) {2};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

   NEG other-BEN-COM-TOP do-2-COND-NEG take-2-COND-NEG
   'You oughtn't to be doing it, taking it also for others'

   person-PL-ACC give-NOM-2-PUR-COM-TOP
   'To give it away to other people, too.' (13.1)

The following is an example of a PURPOSE relation formed with the postposition -\textit{raykur} 'sake', rather than with the -\textit{na-paq} 'purpose' complex:
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1. Kay ichiklla libritu-ta-m qellqa-ra-mu:  
   this little booklet-ACC-DIR write-INCEP-TO:HERE-:  
   'I write this little booklet'

2. Llapa-lla-yki-ta kushi-ra-tsi-na:-raykur,  
   All-JUST-2-ACC happy-INCEP-CAUS-NOM-1-SAKE  
   'Because of my wanting to make all of you happy'  
   kay Huari kwentu-kuna-wan.  
   this Huari story-PL-COM  
   'with these Huari stories.' (19.1)

Other examples of PURPOSE in Chapter 4 are: Advice 71-72, Farewell 6-8 and 40-41.

5.2.22. REASON

REASON relations are of two kinds, both of which are based on the notion of causation. In the psychological REASON, the satellite provides a rationale for believing what is presented in the nucleus, or an explanation which renders the action expressed in the nucleus more reasonable or sensible. An example of psychological REASON are the first two clauses of Ester's Story:
(81)

1. Allapa ilaki-sha-m ka-yka-:
anlot sad-PRT-DIR be-IMPFV-1

'I am extremely sad'

2. Waray aywaku-na-: ka-hti-n
morrow go-NOM-1 be-DS-3

'Because my departure is tomorrow.'

Frequently, the satellite portion of lower level REASON relations (between local pairs of clauses) is formed with a switch-reference clause which, in turn, spans a nucleus formed with an independent clause. However, cases of REASON satellites formed with independent clauses related to nuclei formed with switch-reference clauses are to be found (e.g. Ester 7-11), as are cases where both nucleus and satellite are formed with switch-reference clauses.

The other kind of REASON relation is the physical cause type. Here, the satellite portion presents a cause for a condition or state conveyed by the nuclear portion. This relation has nothing to do with internal psychological state, belief or volitionality. An example of this kind of REASON is the following excerpts from Ester's Story, reproduced here for convenience:
24. Allaapa nesesidaa-chaw
   a:lot  need-LOC
   "(We are in) a lot of need,"

25. Kay usllalla ka-p'ti-n
   this drought be-DS-3
   "(Since) there is this drought."

REASON may be the highest relation in a text (e.g., Esther's Story),
one of the lowest, or anywhere in between. Other examples of text
spans with REASON satellites from the text in Chapter 4 are:
   Esther's Story: 1-27 (exc. Cl.8), 1-5, 1-2, 7-11, 23-26, 24-26,
   Advice Text: 30-33, 65-74, 70-74.

5.2.23. RESTATEMENT

   A RESTATEMENT relation is one of sameness, where, essentially,
the satellite portion repeats the material presented in the
nucleus. By definition, then, the RESTATEMENT satellite invariably
follows its nucleus. RESTATEMENT may be a major text-
organizational device; for example Clauses 77-86 are in RESTATEMENT relation to Clauses 50-64 of the Advice Text. Clauses 77-86 also illustrate how the RESTATEMENT relation serves a function of reinforcement: this span of text underlines the importance of the action proposed in the nucleus. RESTATEMENT satellites tend to copy the syntactic form of their nuclei. Consider, for example, the following excerpt from Ester's Story, where 10, the nucleus, and 11, the satellite, are both independent clauses in parallel syntactic construction.

(83)

10. Mana-m mama:- ka-n-atsu noqa-pa
   NEG-DIR mother-1 be-3-NEG I-GEN
   'I don't have my mother.'

11. Mana-m kay-chaw pi-ni:-pis ka-n-atsu.
    NEG-DIR this-LOC who-Ø-a-EVEN be-3-NEG
    'I don't have anyone at all here.'

Verbatim repetition qualifies as RESTATEMENT. For example, 77-79 of the Advice Text is a span consisting of what might be termed layered 'reinforcing repetition':
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77. Yapay-ku ka-nki?
    again-YN? be-2

    'Are you again going to be the same?'

78. Yapay-ku ka-nki?
    again-YN? be-2

    'Are you again going to be the same?'

79. Yapay-ku ka-nki?
    again-YN? be-2

    'Are you again going to be the same?'

On the other hand, rather than providing simple reinforcement, a
RESTATEMENT satellite may give a different 'slant' than the
nucleus, by restating the material presented in the nuclear portion
by paraphrase. The following is an excerpt from the Farewell Text:
30. Llaki-ku-q mamaa-ni-: ka-pty-ki
    be:sad-REFL-NOM mother-0-1 be-DS-2

    'You being my mother who grieves,'

31. Kay mundu-chaw qeshpi-hts-ama-shqa ka-pty-ki
    this world-LOC escape-CAUS--->1-PRT be-DS-2

    'You being the one who raised me in this world.'

Other examples of RESTATEMENT from the texts in Chapter 4 are:

5.2.24. RESULT

A RESULT relation is a temporally sequenced relation of
causality, with the satellite text span expressing a state of
affairs which is caused by the nuclear portion. Because causality
is involved, RESULT is not a relation of simple successivity.\textsuperscript{10}
Unlike REASON and PURPOSE, which have the potential of
volitionality, RESULT is a non-volitional relation. In a sense, the
RESULT relation is the mirror image of the REASON relation:
the two differ only in which portion is considered to be central,
or, nuclear. In the REASON relation, the nuclear portion is the
result of the satellite REASON (CAUSE); in the RESULT relation,
the nuclear portion is the REASON (CAUSE) for the satellite portion.

The following excerpt provides an example of RESULT:

(86)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{RESULT} \\
\hline
1 \\
2
\end{array}
\]

1. Wishqa qeshya rura-ka-n ichishaq kuru-kuna-pita-m.  
   flu sick do-PASS-3 tiny worm-PL-ABL-DIR
   
   'The flu is caused by tiny worms.'

2. Tsaymi kwerpu-ntsik mana pwedi-u-tsu washaa-ku-y-ta.  
   thus body-12 NEG be:able-3-NEG defend-REFL-NOM-ACC
   
   'Thus our body isn't able to defend itself.' (28.5)

Other examples of RESULT in Chapter 4 are: Weather Report 5 with 2, Esther's Story 21 with 20, and Advice Text 96-99 with 95.

5.2.25. SOLUTIONHOOD

In a SOLUTIONHOOD relation, the nuclear text span is presented as the solution to the problem posed in the satellite text span. SOLUTIONHOOD in the Conchucos Quechua data is a strictly upper-level text organizational relation. Consider the following excerpt from the text contrasting the use of Quechua with the use of Spanish, portions of which have already been cited in 5.2.9 and 5.2.11:
   now-LIM be-3 Spanish-JUST-LOC all:kind-EVEN write-PRT
   'Until now there are all kinds of things written only
   in Spanish.'

   Quechua-LOC-TOP almost be-3-NEG not that-EVEN
   'In Quechua, on the other hand, there almost isn’t anything.'

3. Tsaymi kanan-pita bana-man-qa noqa-kuna yarpa-yu-:  
   thus now-ABL up-Goal-TOP lpro-PL think-PL1
   'So, from now on, we intend'
   kechwa-chaw-pis qellqa-mu-y-ta.  
   Quechua-LOC-TOO write-TO:HERE-NOM-ACC
   'to write in Quechua, too,'

4. Imayka noticiakunatapis kastellano mana yachaqkuna  
   all:kind news-PL-ACC-TOO Spanish NEG know-NOM-PL
   'So that those who don’t know Spanish'
   entiendi-yaa-na-n-paq.  
   understand-PL-NOM-3-PUR
   'may understand all kinds of news items, too.' (28.1)

Examples of SOLUTIONHOOD from the texts in Chapter 4 are: Advice  
Text 2-99 and 88-91.
SUMMARY is similar to RESTATEMENT, except that the satellite, rather than essentially repeating the nuclear span, makes an even more abbreviated statement. The nuclear span is noticeably longer than the satellite span. Furthermore, SUMMARY spans a larger body of text. SUMMARY is also similar to CONCLUSION, but the two differ in that CONCLUSION is an inferring relation, whereas SUMMARY abbreviates what has already been explicitly stated. Clause 46 in the Advice Text, for example, is in a SUMMARY relation to Clauses 41-45:

41. Wamra-l·la-n ḫikiña-shqa,
    child-JUST-3 carry:on:hip-PRT
    "Her (one) child just carried on her hip"

42. Wamra-l·la-n hancha-shqa
    child-JUST-3 hold:hand-PRT
    "Her (other) child held by the hand"

43. Waqa-rnin
    cry-SS
    "Crying"

44. Mana huk kachi-n-paq tari-r
    NEG one salt-3-PUR find-SS
    "Not finding even for a little salt"
45. Mana huk awqa-ku-na-n-paq ka-pty-n, nég one season-REFL-NOM-3-PUR be-DS-3

"There not being enough to season (food)"

46. Tsey-naw ka-tsi-yta
that-SIM be-CAUS-ADV

"Having it like that."

Other examples of SUMMARY in the Chapter 4 texts are:

Ester's Story: 22 to 7-21, 27 to 7-26
Advice Text: 46 to 41-45, 49 to 37-48
Farewell Text: 28-31 to 19-27
5.3. RELATIONAL AFFINITIES AND A RELATIONAL TYPOLOGY

5.3.1. Introduction

Whereas section 2 of this chapter provides a straightforward alphabetical list of rhetorical relations for Conchucos Quechua, in this section, I propose various criteria for grouping these relations into sets. Specifically, from time to time the analyst is confronted with a situation where more than one rhetorical relation may seem suitable in relating two spans of text. In cases such as this, what are the criteria for choosing between alternative analyses?

Ford 1987 suggests that there is a need to distinguish between relations which are semantic and those which are pragmatic. Semantic relations are defined as those which structure information, without 'reference to text goals and intended effects on readers,' whereas pragmatic relations are those which 'are best defined with reference to text goals and intended effects on readers' (p.14). According to Ford, the semantic relations are more basic in that they 'tend to be presentational formats through which the relations that are serving to support text goals, pragmatic relations, may be achieved' (p.15).
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Matthiessen & Thompson (t.a.), on the other hand, propose a typology of rhetorical relations in which they distinguish between i) relations having to do with the success or felicity of a rhetorical act such as requesting, ii) relations pertaining to the subject matter of the text, and, iii) residue (p.22.) They note, however, that it is possible to identify cross-classifications in their taxonomy.

The typology proposed here differs in several regards from both Ford's and Matthiessen & Thompson's classifications. First, the typology is based on oral Quechua monologue, as opposed to written English texts. Second, unlike Ford, I make no attempt to identify any set of relations as somehow more 'basic'. Nor, in contrast to Matthiessen & Thompson, do I make any attempt to classify the relations into mutually exclusive sets. The discussion here is restricted to the notion of cross-cutting parameters by which certain 'family resemblances' between rhetorical relations can be pinpointed. The claim is that overlap between relations will tend to occur at just those points where one or more parameters between the conflicting relations is shared. The list of parameters which are identified here is open-ended; that is, it is to be expected that further investigation will reveal further shared features among groups of relations.
The proposal I am making is the following. These parameters have been conceived as a supplement to other approaches: specifically, in this analysis, they have been shown to be the most effective means of isolating shared features among rhetorical relations in the analysis of Conchucos Quechua.

5.3.2. Parameters for Rhetorical Overlap

The following parameters have been found useful for Conchucos Quechua:

Parameter 1: Multi-Nuclear vs. Nucleus-Satellite
Parameter 2: Oppositional vs. Non-Oppositional
Parameter 3: Elaborating vs. Non-Elaborating
Parameter 4: Contingent vs. Non-Contingent
Parameter 5: Closure vs. Non-Closure
Parameter 6: Causal vs. Non-Causal
Parameter 7: Evaluative vs. Non-Evaluative
Parameter 8: Change-Provoking vs. Non-Change-Provoking
Parameter 9: Extra-Hierarchical vs. Hierarchical

5.3.3. Parameter 1: Multi-Nuclear vs. Nucleus-Satellite

This parameter isolates the four multi-nuclear relations:

CONTRAST
DISJUNCT
JOINT
LIST

Multi-nuclear relations are relations where all of the members are on par, with none more central than any of the others. CONTRAST and JOINT are bi-nuclear by definition. Bi-nuclearity
with DISJUNCT or LIST is optional in that, theoretically speaking, there is no limit to the number of members in the relation. Furthermore, regarding tightness of binding between the members, as long as DISJUNCT or LIST have the minimum of two members, one or more of the members could be eliminated without rendering the text incomprehensible. For example, the Weather Report text would still be coherent if the discussion of any one of the three towns were eliminated, whereas the elimination of one side of a CONTRAST nullifies the CONTRAST relation.

5.3.4. Parameter 2: Oppositional vs. Non-Oppositional

This parameter isolates those relations which share the element of opposition: they compare or contrast two elements. These relations are the following:

ANTITHESIS
COMPARISON
CONCESSION
CONTRAST

Antithesis opposes two elements, but affirms one of these in the contrast. COMPARISON reinforces the material in the nucleus by comparing something else to it. CONCESSION also opposes two elements, but it concedes some ground in the satellite portion, while still affirming the nuclear portion. CONTRAST opposes two elements on a par, neither affirming or reinforcing either one.
5.3.5. Parameter 3: Elaborating vs. Non-Elaborating

This parameter isolates all those nucleus-satellite relations which provide added detail to the nuclear portion. The following relations are included:

\texttt{BACKGROUND}
\texttt{ELABORATION}
\texttt{RESTATEMENT}

ELABORATION is the most general of the three. BACKGROUND is the pragmatic use (in the sense of Ford 1987) of ELABORATION to render the nucleus more comprehensible. RESTATEMENT may exhibit this parameter in that it may involve repetition with a slight variation in detail, which, in effect, is added detail.

5.3.6. Parameter 4: Contingent vs. Non-Contingent

This parameter isolates the CONDITION and temporal CIRCUMSTANCE relations from all the others. CONDITION and temporal CIRCUMSTANCE relations share the feature of contingency. For CONDITION, it is usually a logical contingency, but this frequently overlaps with the notion of temporal contingency (Conchucos Quechua does not distinguish between \texttt{if} and \texttt{when} in the morphology). For example, depending on context, \texttt{Shamuptenca} can mean either 'If s/he comes' or 'When s/he comes'.
5.3.7. Parameter 5: Closure vs. Non-Closure

Parameter 5 isolates those satellite relations which bring closure to the nuclear span of text. In all of these cases, the satellite portion follows the nuclear portion. These relations are:

CONCLUSION
RESULT
SUMMARY

SUMMARY provides closure by reviewing essential material provided in the nuclear portion. CONCLUSION provides closure through logical inference based on the nuclear portion. RESULT provides closure by stating the effects of nuclear-based causation.

5.3.8. Parameter 6: Causal vs. Non-Causal

The relations which share Parameter 6 all share the element of causality. These relations are:

PURPOSE
REASON
RESULT

PURPOSE provides potential cause for a proposed event or decision. REASON provides the instigating cause for a completed action or decision. RESULT provides the outcome of a causal event or decision.
5.3.9. Parameter 7: Evaluative vs. Non-Evaluative

Parameter 7 isolates the feature of argumentation in relation to a nuclear point. The argumentation is evaluative in nature. The relevant relations are:

ASSESSMENT
CONCLUSION
EVIDENCE
JUSTIFICATION
REASON

ASSESSMENT states an opinion scoping the nuclear portion. CONCLUSION provides evaluative closure to the nucleus. EVIDENCE provides information to affirm the truth of the nucleus. JUSTIFICATION provides information to affirm the appropriateness of the nuclear claim. REASON provides cause for believing the claim put forth in the nucleus.

5.3.10. Parameter 8: Change-Provoking vs. Non-Change-Provoking

In the relations which share this parameter, the element of facilitating projected change is in focus. This parameter has to do with ensuring 'the success or felicity of a rhetorical act' (Matthiessen & Thompson t.a.:22) The relations which share this parameter are ENABLEMENT, MOTIVATION, PURPOSE and SOLUTIONHOOD. ENABLEMENT provides the means for the change proposed in the nucleus, MOTIVATION instigates the change, PURPOSE provides reasons for the change which is about to be
pursued, and SOLUTIONHOOD presents a problem which the material presented in the nuclear portion can resolve. In a sense, ENABLEMENT and SOLUTIONHOOD satellites are mirror images of one another: the former provides the solution to the problem, whereas the latter provides the problem to the solution.

5.3.11. Parameter 9: Extra-Hierarchical vs. Hierarchical

This parameter isolates the two relations which do not play a role in the hierarchical structure of the rhetorical analysis. These are: COMMENT and CONTENT.

5.4. Summary

This chapter has defined, described and illustrated the twenty-seven rhetorical relations which have been found adequate for the analysis of clause combining in Conchucos Quechua texts. Furthermore, the relations have been grouped according to some of their shared parameters. The reasoning behind this parametric grouping is that overlap of relations will occur only when one or more parameters are shared.
NOTES to Chapter 5

1 The relational definitions given in Mann and Thompson (to appear), however, were not available at the time this thesis was conceived.

2 For example, Mann and Thompson (to appear) find the distinction between 'subject matter' and 'presentational' relations useful.

3 The speaker need not hold this nuclear portion in 'positive regard'. My analysis differs from Thompson and Mann's 1987 analysis of Antithesis in this regard. For example, in (35), within the textual context, the material presented in Clause 2 is in negative regard: in this text, an account of an excursion, the speaker explains what a miserable time he had as opposed to what he had eagerly anticipated.

4 This relation corresponds to Mann & Thompson's (to appear) two relations: INTERPRETATION and EVALUATION.

5 Obviously, a variety of things are subsumed under the name COMMENT. Future research may call for more subtle divisions.

6 This example also illustrates the fact that it is possible to have an independent statement in Quechua without a finite (independent) verb.
This can be seen, for example, in the 11-22 span of the Advice Text.

I found no examples in my data of Set: Member and Object:Attribute, two of the subtypes proposed by Mann and Thompson. This is not to claim that this relation does not exist in Conchucos Quechua, only to state that they were not present in the particular data base for this thesis.

Note that this use of JUSTIFY differs from the relation defined by Mann and Thompson for written English. Their JUSTIFY focuses more on the reader's attitude towards the nuclear span; that is, his or her willingness to accede to the writer's right to present the nuclear material. This use of JUSTIFY focuses more on the listener's attitude towards the nuclear material itself.

In Chapter 7, the SEQUENCE relation will be introduced for simple successivity.

Mann & Thompson (to appear) define these relations as part of a 'cause cluster', with distinctions between volitionality and non-volitionality.
6. THE SWITCH-REFERENCE SYSTEM

6.1. Introduction

Since colonial times, linguists have reported that the Quechua languages contain certain inflectional morphemes indicating switch-reference. Among the most recent analyses are Weber 1980 and 1983, for Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua, and Cole 1983 for Ancash (Huaraz) Quechua. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua, and to show that it exhibits a grammatical system strongly subject to the influence of discourse notions of topicality and participant reference. The analysis is based primarily on narrative texts.

First, I describe the switch-reference system in the Quechua of Conchucos. Second, I propose certain revisions to previous analyses based on the need to fully account for the data in this particular language. Specifically, I show that the analysis of switch-reference needs to be broadened in two ways: (a) although clauses marked for switch-reference have been defined as 'adverbial', this nomenclature is not representative in that it refers to only one of their functions; and (b) the analysis can be simplified and certain discrepancies can be explained if the system is understood in terms of discourse structure.
This chapter thus constitutes a temporary departure from Rhetorical Structure Analysis. Chapter 7 will concentrate on the analysis of narrative and on clause chaining, and will integrate the findings on clause combining presented in this chapter with the findings presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

6.2. The Nature of Switch-Reference Systems

According to Haiman and Munro (1983:ix), 'Canonical switch-reference is an inflectional category of the verb, which indicates whether or not its subject is identical with the subject of some other verb... Functionally, switch-reference is a device for referential tracking.' (1983:ix)

Generally speaking, Conchucos Quechua could be said to exhibit canonical switch-reference. That is, same or different subject as the reference clause is indicated by one of two affixes on the verb: -r, or its variant -rín for Same Subject (SS)\(^1\) and -pti for Different Subject (DS). The switch-reference marker replaces the tense marker in the verbal transition of these verbs. The Same Subject marker is followed by an optional object marker. The Different Subject marker, -pti, is obligatorily followed by a subject marker. Examples follow:

(89a) [Gringa-ta rika-yku-r-qa] qeshpi-ku-ra-n
-ACC see-IN-SS-TOP escape-REFL-PAST-3

'Upon seeing the gringa, he escaped.'
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(89b) [Gringa-ta rika-yku-pty-n-qa] qeshpi-ku-ra-n
         -AQC see-IN-DS-3-TOP escape-REFL-PAST-3

  'When he saw the gringa, she escaped.'

Weber (1980, 1983) state, that, for the Quechua languages in general, precise identity of subject is necessary for Same Subject switch-reference marking to be warranted. This is not quite true for Conchucos. The following example illustrates that mere inclusion of participants in an event encoded by the verb is enough to merit SS marking in Conchucos:

(90) [Yayku-ri-pty-n-na-m]
     enter-INCEP-DS-1-NOW-DIR

     [shumaq wayi-n-man yayka-ra-qty-ma-r]
     pretty house-3-CAUS enter-INCEP-CAUS--1-SS

     shumaq parla-ku-ya-rqa-t
     nice talk-REFL-PL-PAST-1

  'When I entered, they ushered me into their pretty house, and we talked nicely with one another.' (21.20)

In (90), the second clause is marked as having the same subject as the final clause. However, the subject of the final clause, the first person plural is not the subject of the second clause. On the other hand, the participants in the two clauses are identical: 'they' plus 'me' in clause 2 = 'we' in the final clause. (See Gordon 1983 for the description of a similar situation in Maricopa.)
6.3. Functions of Switch-Reference Clauses.

I have mentioned that switch-reference clauses are often called 'adverbial clauses' in the literature (cf. Weber 1983). Nevertheless, they also have functions which are clearly not adverbial. In addition to encoding notions such as time, manner, circumstance, reason, and condition, rhetorical relations, as discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, they may encode sequential events in narrative. They may also function as complements of other clauses. Setting aside for the moment a more thorough analysis of the grammatical system, we will now review some of these functions of switch-reference clauses in Conchucos Quechua.

6.3.1. Adverbial Functions.

Cross-linguistically, adverbial clauses may be used to mark such things as temporal relations, logical inter-clausal relations, reason, conditional, and concessive/adversative relations. In this section, we will review some of the adverbial functions of switch-reference clauses in Conchucos Quechua.

Switch-reference clauses may indicate the time of an event expressed by the reference clause:

(91) [Yayku-yka-pto-n-na-qa] waska-qa rachi-ski-n enter-UP -DS-3-NOW-TOP rope-TOP tear-PFV-3

When she climbs up, the rope breaks.
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(92) [Niptin] [watiqa-rpu-pto-n-qa]  
    link    gaze-down-D$5\rightarrow$-TOP
    achikay-pa wawa-n-ta tanqa-ri-ynk-naa yaku-maa
    witch-GEN child-3-ACC push-PUNCT-W1:FORCE-NARR water-GOAL

    'Then, as she (the witchs child) was looking down,
    she (the other child) pushed her into the water.' (22.12)

An extension of this time function in narrative or procedural texts
is the use of switch-reference clauses to recapitulate just-
completed activity, as the immediately subsequent activity is
initiated (Longacre & Thompson 1985). Thus, in (93), an excerpt
from a procedural text explaining how to prepare boiled wheat, the
switch-reference clause 'sums up' the just-completed activity of
sifting the ashes, and so provides a transition to the next
activity in the procedure, which happens to be adding ashes to
boiling water.

(93) Uchpa-ta sirni-ntsik. [Uchpa-ta sirni-ski-rnin-mi]...
    ash-ACC sift-12    ash-ACC sift-PPV-SS-DFR

    We sift the ashes. Having sifted the ashes...' (10.1)

A switch-reference clause may also indicate the manner in
which an event proceeds:

(94) [Tsayqa qapchacha-y-ya qapchacha-ya] paki-ra-n
    thus    crackle-NOM-GEN crackle-SS break-PAST-3

    'Thus crackling crackling it broke.' (1.20)
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Switch-reference clauses may be used to indicate reason: (95) provides an example of a switch-reference clause which gives the reason justifying the claim made in the reference clause, while (96) provides an example of a switch-reference clause which gives the speaker’s reason for pursuing an activity:

(95) [Dios-ntsik-chaw tari-ka-rnin-qa]
    God-12-LOC find-PASS-SS TOP
    mana-na-pis saqma-yaa-shunki-na-tsu
    NEG-NOW too stone-PL-32-NOW-NEG
    'Since he is now found to be with our God, he won’t stone you any more.' (1.17)

(96) [Reqi-tni-yi-ki-kuna-ta muna-rnin] pusha-ya-ra-q
    'Wanting to familiarize you with it (speaker’s home town),
    I guided you (pl) there.' (4.1)

A switch-reference clause may also indicate the circumstances under which the activity in the reference clause is pursued:

(97) Tsaymi noqa punu-ykaa-naq-na ka-:
    thus I sleep-IMPFV-NARR-NOW be-1
    [alsu-man laata-rku-r]
    upstairs-GOAL climb-UP-SS
    'Now I had been sleeping, having climbed upstairs.' (1.5)

(98) and (99) provide examples of switch-reference clauses used as conditionals:
(98) \[\text{Cem-ta mana wanu-}t\text{-si-r-ni-ki-}qa\text{-m} \]
\[\text{you-ACC NEG die-CAUS-SS-∅->2-TOP-DIR} \]
\[\text{wanu-}t\text{-si-shaq abogaada-yki-ta} \]
\[\text{die-CAUS IPUT lawyer-2-ACC} \]

'If I don’t kill you, I will kill your lawyer.' (1.2)

(99) \[\text{Yarpa-chaku-r-}l\text{-la-}qa\text{-chari} \]
\[\text{utì-pis ka-nki-ma} \]
\[\text{think-DELIB-SS-JUST-TOP-INDEED crazy-EVEN be-2PUT-COND} \]

'Indeed, if you preoccupy yourself so, you could even go crazy.' (9.1)

6.3.2. Non-Adverbial Functions.

Switch-reference clauses in Conchucos can be used to encode sequential events in a narrative. As such, they resemble non-final clauses in chaining languages in New Guinea (Longacre 1972). (100) is an example of a clause chain containing five switch-reference clauses:

(100) \[\text{Kandaadu-}ta\text{ chura-}ski\text{-r}n\text{in} \]
\[\text{padlock-ACC place-PPV-SS} \]
\[\text{kapcha-}ski\text{-r}n\text{in}-qa \]
\[\text{lock-PPV-SS-TOP} \]
\[\text{wahi-}i\text{-}ta\text{ llaki-}ski\text{-r}n\text{in} \]
\[\text{house-1-ACC mourn-PPV-SS} \]
\[\text{imariqo wahi-}i\text{-}ta\text{ tunu-}pa\text{-ski-}r\text{nin} \]
\[\text{ailot house-1-ACC go:around-BEN-PPV-SS} \]
\[\text{kuti-ka-mo-:} \]
\[\text{return-REFL-TO:HERE-1} \]

'Putting the padlock in place, locking it up, mourning (for) my house, circling around it a lot, I return.' (4.3)
A switch-reference clause may also encode the main predication in a two-clause sequence such as the following:

\[(101) \text{Saanu-m ka-rqa-: Kasaku-rqa-: warmi-:wan-pis well-DIR be-PAST-1 marry-PAST-1 wife-1-COM-EVEN}\\]
\[\text{[saanu ka-yka-r-\text{mi}] well be-IMPFV-SS-DIR}\\]

'I was well. Even when I got married to my wife, I was well.' (21.5)

In (101), the independent clause which begins the second sentence actually functions in an adverbial relation to the switch-reference clause.

At the other end of the spectrum, switch-reference clauses may function as less than 'true' clauses, embedded as complements of other clauses. For example, the second member of the purpose-motion construction, the complement to the verb of motion (see also Aissen 1984), is sometimes a SS switch-reference verb:

\[(102) \text{Y puma-qa shamu-naq wiya-rnin and puma-TCP come-NARR hear-SS}\\]

'And the puma came to hear.'

Similarly, a phasal complement in Conchucos is formed with a switch-reference verb:

\[(103) \text{Resa-r qalla-yku-n. pray - begin-IN-3}\\]

'He begins to pray.' (1.7)
A switch-reference clause may even function as a subject complement:

(104) Loqloq-ya-rnin-qa paara-n-lla.
    bubble-BEC-SS-TOP stop-3-JUST

'The bubbling stops.' (102)

Matthiessen & Thompson (to appear) point out that 'ideally, a category of a particular type of clause combining should be recognizable prototypically in both grammatical terms and in semantic/discourse terms'. In previous analyses of switch-reference, it seems, the notion of discourse function has not been taken as crucial. As a result, analyses are based on only part of the picture, and, at times, simply not explanatory. At this point, after a closer investigation of the weaknesses of some analyses not centered on discourse, we will proceed to the specifics of a discourse-directed analysis.
6.4. Other Analyses of Switch-Reference

6.4.1. Foley & Van Valin

Foley & Van Valin (1984:339) observe that switch-reference mechanisms are always associated with verb-final languages. Although Conchucos Quechua can be typologically analyzed as verb-final, constituent order is quite free, and a switch-reference marked clause need not precede the independent clause. In (105), the switch-reference clause follows the independent clause, in (106), switch-reference clause both precede and follow the independent clause, and in (107), an entire chain follows the independent clause:

(105) Kanaqqa paasa-tsoi-ma-nki itsoq ka-q maki-kimi-wan
now-TOP guide-CAUS->1-2 left be-NOM hand-2-COM
   [tukru-yki-ta awi-ra-yka-r-mi]
cane-2-ACC wave-STAT-IMPF-PSS-DIR
   'Now you get me across, waving your cane.' (20.12)

(106) [Tsay llapa-n-ta wanu-ska-tsoi-r]
that all3-ACC die-PFV-CAUS-PSS

 llapa-n-kuna aywa-ku-yaa-naq
all3-PL go-REFL-PL-NARR
   [shumaq punku-n-ta wicha-rku-r]
nice door-3-ACC close-UP-PSS

   'When they had killed them all, they all left, nicely closing
the door.' (28.13)
(107) Autoridaa-ni-ntsik-kuna marka-mayi-ntsik-kuna-m
authority-Ø-12-PL town-fellow-12-PL-DIR

Electro Peru-pa ofisina-kuna-ta wichqa-pu-ya-rqa-n
Electro Peru-GEN office-PL-ACC close-BEN-PL-PAST-3

chunka huk humaq kay killa-chaw
ten one day this month-LOC

marka-ntsik-pa wayi-n-chaw llapan qorika-rku-r
town-12-GEN house-3-LOC all gather-UP-SS

willa-naku-ri-r
tell-RECIP-INCEP-SS

mana alli aktsi-ntsik ka-ptyi-n
not good light-12 be-DS-3

kay ofisina-chaw aro-q-kuna mana alli aru-ya-ptyi-n.
this office-LOC work-NOM-PL NEG good work-PL-DS-3

"The authorities, our fellow townspeople, closed the offices
of Electro Peru eleven days this month, gathering in our town
hall, discussing with one another, since our light wasn’t
good, as the workers in this office don’t work well." (24.2)

Foley & Van Valin further mention that the switch-reference
morphemes "anticipate an NP in the next junct." That is, the
interpretation of switch-reference which they advocate is strictly
linear, with each switch-reference clause referring only to the
next clause. However, this interpretation is problematic for the
following reasons: (a) It is not workable for cases where the
switch-reference clause(s) follow the independent verb. In (107),
for example, the fifth clause cannot be interpreted as referring
ahead to the sixth clause, because their subjects are different.
Each successive clause in this example could, however, be
interpreted as referring linearly back to the immediately preceding
clause. (b) Even when they don’t follow the independent verb,
Conchucos Quechua switch-reference clauses do not always refer to the immediately following clause. Consider the following, an excerpt from a narrative about a man who accidentally ate a lizard in his soup. Here, no kind of linear interpretation is possible:

(108) 1. [Tsayta-naw arash-ta rika-yyu-r-qa]
      that-SIM lizard-ACC see-UP-SS-TOP

2. [mayu yaku-man aywa-yyu-r]
   river water-COAL go-UP-SS

3. [pasaypa shonqu-n tikra-pty-n]
   greatly heart-3 turn-DS-3

4. usha-paku-naq-tsu shini-n-ta moqtsi-ku-y-ta
   end-DIFF-NARR-NEG mouth-3-ACC rinse-REFL-INF-ACC

"Seeing the lizard like that, going up to the river, his heart being quite shocked, he didn't stop rinsing out his mouth."

(19.17)

The subject of the first two switch-reference clauses in (108), the man who ate the lizard, is the same as the subject of the final independent clause. The third switch-reference clause is marked with the DS -pti, indicating that 'his heart' is considered to be a different referent than the man for the purposes of switch-reference assignment. For a strictly linear assignment of switch-reference to be valid, the second clause would have to also be marked with the DS -pti, because of the lack of identity in reference between clauses 2 and 3. We thus see that, on two counts, verb finality and strictly linear reference, Foley & Van Valin's analysis fails for Conchucos Quechua.
(108) is still explainable in strictly syntactic terms if we consider each of the switch-reference clause as subordinate clauses referring only to the independent verb for their marking. However, we cannot say that switch-reference clauses in general refer only to the independent verb, because of examples such as the following, where the first clause cannot possibly be referring to the final independent verb:

(109) [Punta placu-ta usha-ri-pti-n]  
first plate-ACC finish-INCEP-DS-3

again give-INCEP-DS-3 again finish-INCEP-NARR

"He (her lover) finished the first plate, she gave him some more, he finished it likewise." (26.1)

In (109), an excerpt from a story about a woman and her lover, the first clause is marked with -pti even though it is coreferential to the independent clause. In this case, the first clause cannot be marked with reference to the final independent clause, because that would have required SS marking. On the other hand, a linear interpretation proves satisfactory, just the opposite of the case illustrated by (108). The woman’s lover is the referent for the subject in the first clause, the woman herself the referent for the subject in the second clause, and the lover again the referent for the subject in the final clause. The first two clauses are accordingly marked with -pti. At this point, we must conclude that neither a strictly linear interpretation nor an interpretation in
which each switch-reference clause refers only to the independent verb is adequate for Conchucos Quechua.

6.4.2. Weber

Weber (1980, 1983) equates switch reference with subordination. According to this interpretation, problems such as those presented in (108) and (109) can be resolved simply by positing the appropriate layers of subordination, where some switch-reference clauses can be interpreted as subordinate to others. In (108), for example, the first clause can be considered subordinate to the second clause, the second subordinate to the third, and the third subordinate to the final clause. Alternatively, each of the first three clauses can be considered to be directly subordinate to the final clause. These two alternative patterns of syntactic subordination can be represented as follows:

![Figure 19. Hypothetical structures for (108)](image)

(106) can be similarly explained by proposing the following layers of subordination:
Figure 20: Hypothetical structure for (109)

There are two problems with Weber's interpretation. First, in cases such as (108), it is not possible to syntactically determine which is the correct interpretation of the layers of subordination. With reference to the 'subordination' relation between the 'adverbial' and the 'superordinate' clause, Weber himself (1983:279) remarks:

It is not always obvious what is subordinate to what. In fact, it can sometimes be quite subtle. Although there are some formal constraints on what can be subordinate to what, it is probably not possible to give a formal procedure for determining the subordination relations. Extra-syntactic considerations certainly enter into determining the chains of subordination.

Second, it is difficult to discern any independent motivation for the system, other than making switch-reference "work." That is, for cases such as (109), where all three clauses express sequential events and a non-hierarchical linear interpretation is eminently satisfactory, the clauses must be layered in hierarchical syntactic relations in order for Weber's system to be consistent.
In brief, there is a circularity to Weber's analysis. By positing syntactic subordination we can explain puzzling cases of switch-reference, so when we have switch-reference, we must, in turn, have syntactic subordination. Besides switch-reference marking, what justification do we have for layered syntactic subordination? And is syntactic subordination a suitable explanation for switch-reference marking?

Weber's interpretation does resolve many of the switch-reference puzzles, by providing a unitary account for disparate cases such as (108) and (109). Nevertheless, besides the problem of determining the 'correct' chains of subordination, there are significant counterexamples which, in his framework, defy explanation, and can only be explained by taking discourse structure into account. We will now examine some of these crucial examples.

6.5. The Failure of Strictly Syntactic Explanations.

Consider the following excerpt from the procedural text on wheat preparation cited earlier:

(110) [Tsari-rukia] mana maki-ki-chaw shupra-ka-n-atsu.
    grab-UP-SS  NEG hand-2-LOC  peel-PASS-3-NEG

'Upon grabbing it/ When you grab it, it (the wheat) can't be peeled in your hand.' (10.3)
In (110), the subject of the switch-reference clause, the impersonal 'you', is marked as coreferential to the subject of the final independent clause, the wheat, a clear violation of local principles of switch-reference marking. (111), an excerpt from the Farewell Text, is an example of a switch-reference clause marked DS, when SS is to be expected:

(111) [Waqa-ṗti-ki-lla-qa-m] maldiciona-yka-ma-nki-man-pis.  
cry-DS-2-JUST-TOP-DIR curse-UP-->1-2-COND-EVEN

'Just by crying, you might even place a curse on me.'

Although the subjects in the two clauses of (111) are coreferential, -pti marks the first clause, another clear violation of syntactic principles of switch-reference marking. Given that native speakers, even when questioned repeatedly, will uphold such patterns as perfectly correct, we must assume that another principle is somehow overriding the syntactic system.

6.6. The Discourse Basis of Switch-Reference.

The claim made in this thesis is that switch-reference in Quechua is, as are all other clause combining strategies in the language, ultimately motivated by discourse-semantic considerations. The key determinant for switch-reference marking is not verbal cross-referencing in the syntax, but participant reference in the discourse, specifically, reference to the central participant in a span of text.
Consider again (110), the excerpt from the procedural wheat preparation text. The clause which receives the SS marking is that clause which encodes the actions of the agent in the wheat preparation, the primary, in fact, only active participant in the text. In this text, which contains a total of 66 clauses, 31, or almost half, are marked for switch-reference. Of those switch-reference clauses, only 7 are marked for DS; none of these 7 refers to the wheat preparer, only to the current state of the ingredients in the preparation. The SS marking in (110) references the central participant in the discourse.

Consider now (111), from the 63-clause Farewell Text analyzed in Chapter 4, the central participant is the speaker himself, who is expressing his own attitudes about going, and making certain requests of those he is leaving behind. Not a single of the 6 DS clauses he uses refers to himself. In (111), the DS marking indicates that the participant being referred to at this point, the speaker’s mother, is distinct from the central participant in the discourse, the speaker himself. In this pair of clauses, reference to the central participant is actually with the object of the reference clause:

(111) [Waqa-pit-ki-lla-qa-m] maldiciona-yka-ma-nki-man-pis.  
cry-DS-2-JUST-TOP-DIR curse-DIRECT--I-2-COND-EVEN

'Just by crying, you might even place a curse on me.'
Examples such as these provide support for viewing switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua as responsive to global, discourse factors. If individual instances of switch-reference are considered in their discourse context, instances which 'break' syntactic rules, however they are defined, are seen to be consistent at the discourse level, if, that is, the notion of central, or focal participant is taken into account. Violations of local syntactic patterns can be seen as cases in which the discourse notion of central, or focal participant has 'overridden' the syntactic pattern. These violations are not random aberrations, but obey a 'higher' rule, that of discourse organization.
6.7. Switch-Reference and Central Participants.

In order to more fully illustrate the behavior of switch-reference with regard to central participants, it is appropriate at this point to discuss several notions germane to the idea of central participant in the discourse. Among these are topicality, in the sense of Givón, 1983, topicworthiness (T. Payne 1985), and information management (Du Bois 1986, Chafe 1986).

The Givonian notion of topicality is essentially a 'distance' view which is quantitatively measured: the indicator of topicality is the number or density of mentions of a participant. Briefly, the more often or more recently a participant is mentioned in a narrative, the more likely this participant is to continue as topic.

Payne, citing Reinhart 1982, defines participant topicworthiness as 'the relative likelihood of a participant to be talked about' (p.53). Payne notes that certain entities are inherently more topicworthy than others, and that other entities are endowed with topicworthiness 'because of the semantics or pragmatics of the particular speech context,' that is, they possess 'context-imparted topicworthiness.' (p.54) For example, the speech act participants themselves always rate high in topicworthiness, and are thus universally referred to with reduced morphosyntactic
coding devices, such as pronouns, regardless of how many times they have been mentioned in the preceding textual context. Entities can be brought on to the 'discourse stage' both by linguistic means, such as presentative constructions (Hetzron 1971), and non-linguistic means, such as body language or shared presuppositions of the interlocutors. Central characters in a narrative are more likely topics than non-central characters, even if there are at times rather large distances between mentions. In other words, according to T. Payne 1985:87, number of mentions and distance between mentions are not the only criteria for topic persistence, as topicality is hierarchical:

The central characters are topical throughout the discourse, and therefore are highly topicworthy at any given point in the discourse. Major characters are highly topicworthy throughout particular sections of the discourse. Minor characters, on the other hand, come and go and are, in general, unlikely topics at any point.

According to DuBois 1986, 'there appear to exist consistent and well defined patterns for the introduction of new information and the management of old information throughout a discourse.' Thus, languages will tend to exhibit grammatical patterns specific to the introduction of new participants. These are distinct from the patterns which track already familiar participants in a discourse. For example, a participant may be first mentioned with an explicit coding device such as a full NP in an oblique role, but then immediately 'promoted' to a more central role such as A, O or
S (A, S and O are used in the sense of Dixon 1979.) The participant is then tracked with a more attenuated form in the discourse. Similarly, Hetzron 1971 speaks of 'presentative' constructions, constructions in which an entity is clearly 'set up' for further reference. Jaggar 1983 shows how, in Hausa, participants that are going to 'matter' are introduced in a way distinct from those which are not.

Chafe (to appear) approaches the issue from a cognitive perspective, stressing the limitations of short-term memory. Accordingly, only a very small amount of information may be focused on, or 'active' at any one time. At any one time, a particular concept may be in one of three states of activation: 'active,' 'semi-active,' or 'inactive.'

An active concept is one that is currently lit up, a concept in a person's focus of consciousness. A semi-active concept is one that is in a person's peripheral consciousness, a concept of which a person has a background awareness, but which is not being directly focused on. An inactive concept is one that is currently in a person's long-term memory, neither locally nor peripherally active.

A concept can change status from active to semi-active, to inactive, or from inactive to semi-active or active. In order to be spoken of in an attenuated form, a concept must be active
("Given Information") for the speaker, and judged by that speaker to be active for the hearer as well. In other words, it must not only have been introduced, but be currently 'lit up' in the focus of consciousness of both speaker and hearer. A concept cannot remain in the active state for long unless the activation is 'refreshed.' If not, it becomes semi-active.

According to Chafe, concepts can become semi-active in one of two ways: either an active concept is not refreshed or inactive concepts become accessible because they are 'concepts which belong to the set of expectations associated with a schema' (in the sense of Bartlett 1932, Mandler & Johnson 1977, Schank & Abelson 1977, Tannen 1979, etc.), 'a cluster of interrelated expectations' which can be partially characterized as a list of the included participants and events (p.16-17).

An inactive concept may become active only at considerable cognitive cost. Normally, then, a single intonation unit can express no more than one new concept. Chafe calls this the "one new concept at a time constraint."

The claim made here for Conchucos Quechua is that Same-Subject switch-reference in narrative, the most attenuated means of coding a referent in the discourse, is reserved for central participants. These are the participants which are inherently high in topicworthiness in that, for example, they are animate. They are
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not only introduced, or, in Chafe's terminology, retrieved from semi-active or inactive states, but clearly 'set up' as having active status in the discourse (i.e. topicworthiness). Furthermore, unless these participants are clearly presented as centrally topicworthy, they do not qualify for Same Subject switch-reference coding.³

By way of illustration, consider the following excerpt from a folk tale which is the Quechua equivalent of the traditional European Hansel and Gretel tale.

(112)

1. Achikay ima-pa-chari kwentu.
   Witch what-GEN-INDEED story

   The (Old) Witch, (this is) what the story is.

2. Huk-shi señor ka-naq.
   one-REP man be-NARR

   There was a man.

3. Waktsa-chari ka-ra-n.
   poor-INDEED be-PAST-3

   He was very poor.

4. Mama-n papaa-ni-n ishkay wamra-yoq.
   mother-3 father-Ø-3 two child-HAVING

   (There was) their mother, their father, with two children.

   so-TOP well go-PL-NARR beg-DIFF-NOM house-PL-GOAL

   So then, they went to houses to beg.
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corn-ACC-INDIEDE little give-PL-3

Corn, indeed, they gave them a little.

7. Triiguu-ta qara-ya-n.  
wheat-ACC give-PL-3

Wheat they gave them.

8. Tsayqa tardiin-n chaski-r-qa  
Then evening-Ø-3 arrive-SS-TOP

Then, arriving in the evening

9. Wamra-kuna punu-yka-q-ta tari-ski-r-qa:  
child-PL sleep-IMPFV-NOM-ACC find-PFV-SS-TOP

Finding the children sleeping

let's:see cook-REFL-INCVP-12FUT yes

Let's see, let's cook, yes.

child-PL-TOO sleep-IMPFV-3-SURE

The children are surely still sleeping.

12. Anka-ku-ri-shun-raq  
toast-REFL-INCVP-12FUT-YET

Let's toast it (corn) yet

13. Ni-pty-n,  
say-DS-3

When he said that,

14. May-chaw-raq itsa-qa kanalla-qa?  
where-LOC-YET perhaps-TOP pan-TOP

Now where perchance is the pan?

15. Ni-pty-n  
say-DS-3

When she said that,
16. Uraa kuchu-lla-chaw-mi,
   under corner-JUST-LOC-DIR

   Underneath, just there in the corner,

17. Uraa kuchu-lla-chaw
   under corner-JUST-LOC

   Underneath in the corner

18. Ni-n wamra-n.
   say-3 child-3

   Says their child.

19. Ni-pto-n
   say-DS-3

   When s/he says that

    child-TOP wake:up-IMPFV-STAT-3-SURE

   The child has surely awakened.

21. Aw, kanan witsa-nqa ni-r4
    yes now go:up-3FUT say-SS

   Yes, now they’ll climb up, saying

22. Shikra-man wiña-rku-r-qa
    basket-GOAL add-UP-SS-TOP

   Putting them into a basket

    parent-3-PL throw:out-PFV-PL-NARR rock-ACC

   Their parents then threw them out on a rock.

Although the speaker initiates the narrative by telling her
hearers that this is the Achikay story, she does not yet introduce
the Witch. The actual telling begins with Clause 2, where the
first main character, a man, is introduced as the subject of the existential verb. This participant, inherently topicworthy by virtue of his humanness, is established as main participant at this point in the story in three ways.

First, the grammatical construction chosen for his introduction is a presentational construction: the man is given indefinite subject status and the verb chosen is the existential verb in the narrative past. Second, crucial background information about him is provided in the immediately ensuing clauses. Clause 3 gives some facts about him—his poverty—necessary background for comprehending his later actions. Clause 4, although lacking an overt verb, provides us with the composition of his family. Third, he is subsequently referred to only with verbal cross-referencing.

From the plural verb form in Clause 5, it is understood that both the man and his wife go begging, even though she has not been formally introduced. In other words, the speaker assumes that the hearer understands that the wife 'goes along with' the husband, has been vicariously introduced through his presentation. At this point in the story, then, there are two main participants. The children, who are introduced only as adjuncts to the NP in Clause 4, are understood as not included in the expedition. In this situational-cultural context, the wife is considered to be 'part' of her husband in a sense in which the children are not. From the
context, and the established topicality of the husband and wife, we also understand that Clauses 6 and 7 have the impersonal ‘they’ as subject, and the husband and wife, although not overtly mentioned, are the understood recipients of the corn and wheat.

Up to this point, all of the clauses are independent. (This includes the NP’s with implicit existential verbs in Clauses 1 and 4.) Clause 8 and 9 are the first instances of dependent clauses, Same-Subject switch-reference clauses. There is no question as to the identity of the subject referent in either case: it is the man. Clauses 1-7 have established two options: the man alone or the man together with his wife. By the absence of the plural affix on the verbs in 7 and 8, the first option is indicated.

Notice that if we were to try to explain these clauses using a strictly syntactic approach based on subordination, we would be in a difficult position: we would not be able to find a matrix verb for these clauses to reference. Apart from reported speech, there is no independent verb until Clause 18, and this is a say verb. In Clauses 10-12, the man speaks to his wife. Clause 13, ‘When he said that,’ with the Different-Subject switch-reference affix -pti, marks topic-switch: by choosing -pti, the speaker signals that the next speaker or actor will be a different referent than the man. However, the next speaker is not identified; only her speech is reported. Again, we understand, from the context and concurrent hierarchical ordering of available participants, that the speaker
is the man's wife. Clause 15 similarly signals upcoming topic switch. However, in this case, we are told who the speaker is, their child. (Had the speaker not been identified here, we would have, of course, assumed it to be the man.)

The identity of the speaker(s) in the Same Subject Switch-Reference Clauses 20-21, following the switch in 19, is again, by default, a parent. He or she then proceeds to stuff the children in a basket, after which the parents together throw them out.\textsuperscript{8} In Clause 24, the thus-far established central characters, the parents, are referred to with a possessed NP: \textit{mamankuna 'their parents,'} while reference to the children, still peripheral characters, is with zero anaphora, verbal cross-referencing only.

Structurally, this is a significant point in the story. With these choices of referential strategies, the children are being established as the main characters and the parents are being ushered from the stage. The presence of the Full NP is not for the purpose of identifying the parents as the subject of that clause and the previous two Same-Subject Switch-Reference clauses. As mentioned above, their identity is not only known, but central, active in status (\textit{Chafe (to appear)}). The use of the Full NP, the first overt reference to the parents (besides verbal cross-referencing) since the introduction of the father in Clause 2, demotes them from their central participant status. Simultaneously, the children, who have been presented in Clause 9
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as the syntactic objects of the verb *tari* ‘find’, are established as the central participants for the next episode. This is clear from the use of the attenuated form of reference in Clause 23—zero marking on the verb for third person object verbal cross-referencing. Furthermore, the parents are never ‘heard from’ again.

In summary, the referential strategies used in this excerpt from the *Achikay* story are as DuBois 1986 and Givon 1983 predict. As DuBois predicts, new mentions of referents are in the S and O, but not the A roles (A, S, and O used as in Dixon 1979). As maintained in Givon 1983, established topics are coded with forms less explicit than Full NP’s. The most attenuated form of reference for A’s in Conchucos Quechua is Same-Subject switch-reference. This is reserved for the established central participants, in Givonian terms, the ‘topical’ participants.

Thus, the switch-reference system is grounded in discourse. The referent to a Same-Subject switch-reference clause is inferrable from the established discourse context, because that referent has been previously introduced with the use of a Full NP in the S or O role. In other words, Same-Subject switch-reference traces central participants through a text.
6.8. Switch-Reference as Continuity-Discontinuity Marking

If Same-Subject switch-reference marking is reserved for central participants, then what about the Different-Subject marker -\textit{pti}? Is it reserved for non-central participants? In this section, we will see how not just Same-Subject -\textit{r}, but -\textit{pti} as well, is used for specific extra-syntactic purposes in the discourse. When we consider that most texts focus on one central participant or topic at a time and that the SS marker is the 'default' case for that central participant or topic, we can then observe that the DS marker is an attention-drawing device signaling non-focal participants, actions, or states of affairs which are peripheral to the main event line or topic strand of the discourse.

Different-Subject -\textit{pti} is relegated to the following environments: structural boundaries in the discourse where there are topic shifts to new central participants, and hypotactic clauses which perform adverbial kinds of non-event functions, clauses whose subjects are frequently inanimate or non-referential. Same-Subject -\textit{r} is thus a \textit{continuity} marker; Different-Subject -\textit{pti} is a \textit{discontinuity} marker.\textsuperscript{9}

Support for the continuity-discontinuity distinction can be found in statistical frequency data. The Conchucos switch-reference system, although a binary one, is certainly not
statistically symmetrical. That is, as far as frequency, the Same-Subject -r is statistically far more frequent than the DS -pti. In the wheat preparation text discussed in 6.5, for example, out of 31 switch-reference clauses, the majority, or 24, or 77 percent, are SS. Of the 7, or 23 percent, which are DS, none of these encode action engaged in by the active participant in the text, the preparer of the wheat. In the Farewell Text analyzed in Chapter 4, similarly, 14 out of 20, or 70 percent, of switch-reference clauses are SS, and only 6, or 30 percent, are DS. In a narrative about a burro's adventures, composed of 32 clauses, there are eighteen SS switch-reference clauses and no DS switch-reference clauses.

Returning to (108), reproduced here for convenience, we see that the referent to the third clause in (108), 'his heart', is not the central participant (a body part is not considered to be the same referent as its inalienable possessor). Accordingly, the clause is marked with -pti and functions adverbially. The -r marking found in the first two clauses is, as usual, reserved for the actions of Don Panchu, the central participant. The switch-reference marking is thus straightforwardly explained in terms of discourse organization:
(108) 1. [Tsayta-naw arash-\
ta rika-yku-r-qa]  
that-SIM lizard-ACC see-UP-SS-TOP

2. [mayu yaku-man aywa-yku-r]  
river water-GOAL go-UP-SS

3. [pasaypa shonqu-n tikra-pti-n]  
greatly heart-3 turn-DS-3

4. usha-paku-naq-tsu shimi-n-ta moqtsi-ku-y-ta  
end-DIFF-NARR-NEG mouth-3-ACC rinse-REFL-INF-ACC (19.17)

"Seeing the lizard like that, going up to the river, his heart  
being quite shocked, he didn't stop rinsing out his mouth."

In (109), also reproduced here, we notice that, although SS  
marking is the default case, reserved for main participants, we  
find two initial -pti clauses in a row, both of which encode events  
which advance the story line. Again, considering the discourse  
structure, we find an explanation. This set of clauses appears  
quite early in the story (Clauses 4 and 5), when the two  
participants have just been introduced. Neither has been  
established as the primary participant, and thus neither qualifies  
as central. As a result, neither is an appropriate candidate for  
SS marking and, to avoid ambiguity of reference, -pti is used.10

(109) [Punta platu-\nta usha-ri-\npti-n]  
first plate-ACC finish-INCEP-DS-3

[yapay qara-ri-\npti-n] yapay usha-ri-q.  
again give-INCEP-DS-3 again finish-INCEP-NARR

"He (her lover) finished the first plate, she gave him some  
more, he finished it likewise."
However, once the central participant, the young woman in the story, is established, -pti is supplanted by -r Same-Subject to refer continuously to that participant.

A discourse interpretation in terms of participant reference, then, provides a unitary explanation for examples such as (108) and (109), whereas a strictly syntactic account, although it can be made to 'work' (as explained in 6.4.2.), is devoid of explanatory value.

The chain in (113) provides a clear example of -pti clauses being used to refer to adverbial notions, with -r clauses referring to the actions of the central participant, a young man who is recounting his experiences on his way to the town of Huari from his home town of Llamelín:

(113)

1. Rupay ka-yka-pti-n
   sun be-IMPFV-DS-3

2. Maletin-ni-ː-ːta hancha-rku-r
   suitcase-Ø-1-ACC grab:by:hand-UP-SS

3. Pasaypa tamya-yka-pti-n
   a:lot rain-IMPFV-DS-3

4. Shamu-yka-r
   come-IMPFV-SS

5. Shamu-yka-r
   come-IMPFV-SS

   river-GOAL arrive-1

'When it is day, I grab my suitcase, since it is raining a lot, I come and come, (and) I arrive at the river.'
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Clauses 1 and 3 in (113), marked with -pti, are adverbial clauses. Clauses 2, 4 and 5, marked with -r, are event clauses whose subject is the central participant, here expressed overtly only with first person marking on the final verb. Event clusters such as this will be a primary focus of discussion in Chapter 7.

In summary, the -pti Different-Subject marker is reserved for clauses which refer to discontinuous or not-yet-continuous participants and events; the more attenuated -r is the 'business-as-usual' continuity device. In view of -pti's greater iconic noticeability and greater likelihood than -r to appear on clauses with adverbial function, it is not surprising that switch-reference clauses in the Quechua languages are typically referred to by many (cf. Adelaar 1978, Weber 1983, Cole 1983) as 'adverbial' clauses.

6.9. Concluding Remarks on Discourse and Grammar

To what extent, then, is the marking of switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua grammaticized? That is, to what extent are speakers following some kind of syntactic rule in the assigning of same or different subject marking? At the two-clause level, with one independent clause and one switch-reference clause, the switch-reference clause apparently refers to the verb in the independent clause. However, we have seen some glaring exceptions to this, such as the examples discussed in 6.5. These instances show that a strictly syntactic account will not suffice. For such exceptions,
only a discourse explanation is adequate: global discourse considerations override local syntactic patterns.

Above the two-clause level, we find that examples are virtually always explainable in a strictly syntactic sense. This explanation however, is uninsightful and mechanical. The analyst (e.g. Weber 1983) must posit frequently elaborate hierarchies of subordination, with 'subordination' motivated only by the need to make the chains of switch-reference 'work' syntactically. Such instances are more transparently elucidated according to discourse principles of participant reference, where Same-Subject switch-reference marking is reserved for established central participants and Different-Subject switch-reference marking is reserved for less central, adverbial kinds of reference ('background' in the sense of Hopper 1979). The statistical asymmetry between -r and -pti also is indicative of a discourse-driven system: -r is the marker for the 'expected,' -pti for the 'unexpected.'

The two-clause pairs show us that, at this level, switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua is essentially grammaticized, but still sensitive to the discourse factors of participant tracking which provided the original motivation for the system. The larger sequences, particularly the clause chains, and the cases of switch-reference lacking a 'reference' verb, show us the extent to which, above the two-clause level, switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua is still directly sensitive to participant tracking factors in the
discourse, and, to that same extent, not fully grammaticized. The motivation behind the assignment of syntactic hierarchies in these cases can only be to make a syntactic system such as that proposed by Weber (1978 and 1980), discussed in 6.4.2., 'work.' The motivations for considering -r to be a continuity marker and -pni to be a discontinuity marker, on the other hand, are their evident semantic/pragmatic roles in the discourse.

If switch-reference is equated with subordination, as in Weber's approach, not only do we gain no explanatory value, we obscure the source for the explanation, which is, in turn, found only by looking at participant reference in the discourse. These clauses may function in ways more typically 'main' than 'subordinate': to call them all 'subordinate' is to obscure, even to misrepresent these discourse functions. In clause chains involving event clusters, such as (109) or (113), it is simply inappropriate to speak of subordination.

This chapter has shown not only the choice of a particular kind of clause combination (independent, switch-reference, or nominalized) to be discourse-based, but that, even within a particular class of clauses, in this case, the switch-reference clauses, the choice between morphosyntactic forms (-r or -pni) is discourse-based. A discourse-directed analysis of switch-reference based on participant reference is thus to be favored over the imposition of non-explanatory syntactic hierarchies.
NOTES to Chapter 6

1 There are also some rare occurrences of the -shpa suffix, found in other Quechua dialects, for Same Subject with verbs of saying.

2 For further information on a similar phenomenon in Yuman, see Langdon & Munro 1979.

3 Exceptions to this are rare, but do occur in the following environment: when cursory attention is focused on a peripheral participant, Same-Subject reference may be used for that participant, but only if that clause is in a hypotactic relation (in rhetorical terms, a satellite) to a corresponding Different-Subject switch-reference clause (in rhetorical terms, the nucleus to that satellite). For an example of this, see 7.3.

4 The final ‘say’ verb in this clause is part of a quotation formula pattern often used to close quotes in Quechua. Since its function is to mark the end of a quote rather than to perform as a separate clause, it is not given clause status in this analysis.

5 This clause is clearly separated by pauses in the speech as a separate utterance.
6 Tsayqa is a discourse link which marks a major structural boundary between initial presentational material and the beginning of the action in the narrative.

7 Not all speakers of the Quechua languages are as precise about plural markers as are Conchucos speakers; the presence or absence of the plural marker is a more useful diagnostic device than in some other dialects. However, in this case the wife is given secondary status as 'going along' with her husband, anyway, so the two of them together are sometimes referred to in the singular.

8 As mentioned in 6.4.2., SS Switch-Reference may be used for inclusion of participants. The precise identity of the actor is not relevant in this context, as the ultimately responsible instigating agent is the father, and the wife 'goes along' with him, as explained in the discussion of Clause 4.

9 This is not unrelated to what Scancarelli 1985 found for Pima and Papago.

10 Notice how a strictly syntactic account in the style of Weber would mechanically suffice for this example. However, it would not be explanatorily motivated.
7. **CLAUSE COMBINING IN NARRATIVE**

7.1. **Introduction**

In this chapter, I return to Rhetorical Structure Analysis, illustrating its application to narrative texts. I include a sample analysis of a short narrative and, based on the analysis of narrative, I incorporate some modifications to the list of Rhetorical Relations presented in Chapter 5. I also address in greater detail the issue of genre-specificity and its effects on the grammar of clause-combining, specifically with regard to the switch-reference clause chains introduced in Chapter 6. In Chapter 8, I summarize some of the conclusions reached in this thesis and propose some directions for further research.

7.2. **Narrative Analysis**

7.2.1. **Review of Various Approaches.**

Several relatively current studies in the literature on English deal with the existence of identifiable organizational structure in narrative discourse. Among these are Labov & Waletzky 1967, Meyer 1975, Grimes 1975, Rumelhart 1975, Kintsch & van Dijk 1975, Mandler & Johnson 1977, and Thorndyke 1977. These scholars maintain that narratives have their own internal, or underlying,
structure, and that this structure can be explicitly identified. Although all of them are concerned with the interrelationship between discourse structure and comprehension and recall, Meyer, Rumelhart, Mandler & Johnson, and Thorndyke, in particular, approach narrative from the standpoint of cognitive psychology: at issue is the relation between narrative structure and memory. The latter two articles, which most explicitly discuss simple, prototypical narrative structure, will be discussed here.

Mandler & Johnson 1977, in their landmark article on story structure and recall, claim that there is 'an idealized internal representation of the parts of a typical story' (1977:112), and refer to this structure as the 'story schema.' They suggest that this idea is at least as old as Bartlett's 1932 pioneering study of memory, which introduces the notion of story schemata. Mandler & Johnson's 'story schema' is used 'to refer to a set of expectations about the internal structure of stories which serves to facilitate both encoding and retrieval.' (1977:112). Their analyses are based on Rumelhart's 1975 characterization of story structure. They propose a story 'grammar' for episodes with a single protagonist. The story grammar is composed of a series of potentially recursive rewrite rules which provide a representation of the story as a tree structure composed of such constituents as STATE, EVENT, REACTION, and OUTCOME.

Thorndyke 1977 also proposes a set of grammar rules for simple
stories. He shows that comprehensibility and recall of narrative are a function of the amount of inherent plot structure of the story. Higher-level organizational parts of a story are more likely to be recalled than lower-level details. Thorndyke's claim is that speakers use a general, previously learned organizational framework in composing and interpreting stories. When a particular story is encoded, a frame is created for that specific story which is a modification of the prototypical 'story' frame. Stories have four components at the top level of structure: Setting, Theme, Plot and Resolution.

Both Mandler & Johnson's and Thorndyke's approaches to story structure are inadequate for the Conchucos Quechua data for two reasons in particular. First, they are too restrictive, as they are designed only for a particular kind of story--one with a single protagonist in each episode. Second, the prescribed structures are highly formulaic in a way which Quechua narratives---even oft-repeated legends and folk-tales---are not; story grammar is simply too rigid a model for the data.

7.2.2. Longacre's Approach

More suitable to the analysis of the data at hand is Longacre's approach to monologue discourse. Although I do not agree with Longacre that discourse has 'grammatical structure' (1979:115), I do, to some extent, concur with the statement that
Once a discourse type is chosen, many decisions as to the structure of very small parts of it are already made. (1983:133) Analysis should be genre-specific because different discourse types may well have different organizing principles. For the analysis of narrative discourse, then, an analytical approach which is designed for plot-oriented text proves to be the most fruitful. For oral, unedited monologue narrative, the model should not be so tight and static as to be formulaic.

Pike & Pike 1983 presents a comprehensive approach to narrative analysis which is not formulaic; however, it is so detailed that basic organizational structure is not highlighted. Longacre's 1983 approach, on the other hand, is both elastic and straightforward. He views plot as the notional, or semantic, structure of narrative discourse in general, even those narratives of episodic nature 'where the plot is in low relief due to absence of any perceptible climax' (1983:20). He reminds the reader that the antecedent tradition goes back to classical times, and then provides a skeleton outline of plot structure, what he calls 'the rhetorician's scheme':

1. Exposition 'Lay it out'
2. Inciting Moment 'Get something going'
3. Developing Conflict 'Keep the heat on'
4. Climax 'Knot it all up proper'
5. Denouement 'Loosen it'
6. Final Suspense 'Keep untangling'
7. Conclusion 'Wrap it up'
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Longacre is not saying that every narrative has to 'fit in' to this structure, but that this structure describes the way narratives in many languages are organized. It has proven to be useful for understanding the way Quechua narratives are organized.

7.3. Application to Conchucos Quechua Narrative

In this section, I present the analysis of a Conchucos folk-tale about a thoroughly despicable man who reaps his reward when he, through his own stupidity, eats a pregnant lizard that has accidentally fallen into the soup which his long-suffering wife has prepared for him. The tale is representative of Quechua stories in that it is centered around the theme of revenge for the innocent oppressed (in this case, the wife) over the cruel powers which control their lives (in this case, the man).

Chapter 4 was devoted largely to the comprehensive explication of Rhetorical Structure Analysis of individual texts. The discussion in this section is restricted to those characteristics of narrative structure, as illustrated in the LIZARD SOUP story, which prove to be distinct from what we have found in non-narrative. Rhetorical Structure Analysis is thus shown to be a useful tool for distinguishing between genres.

For the analysis of narrative texts such as LIZARD SOUP, it is necessary to add two new rhetorical relations to the inventory presented in Chapter 5, SEQUENCE and JOINT SEQUENCE. On the other
hand, some relations essential for non-narrative directive texts, such as MOTIVATION and ANTITHESIS, were not needed.

The SEQUENCE relation, as illustrated in the upcoming diagrams for the LIZARD SOUP story, is similar to the LIST relation in that it is a multi-nuclear series. It differs from the LIST relation only in the feature of TEMPORAL SUCCESSION. However, because temporal succession is a crucial distinguishing feature of narrative, the introduction of a distinct relation is, I believe, justified. One very obvious indicator of SEQUENCE is the distinctive use of conjunctive links in narrative.

7.4. Text and Analysis

The subdivisions delineated by Longacre 1983 provide a framework for analyzing the narrative in sub-sections according to rhetorical structure. The plot structure of the narrative, using the schema provided by Longacre 1983, is the following:

1. Title and Exposition     Clauses 1-8
2. Inciting Moment          Clauses 9-16
3. Developing Conflict     Clauses 17-35
4. Climax                  Clauses 36-40
5. Denouement              Clauses 41-44
6. Final Suspense          Clauses 45-47
7. Conclusion              Clauses 48-50
The outline of the Rhetorical Structure is as follows:

Figure 21. Rhetorical Structure Outline of Lizard Soup Story
The story is presented here with its plot structure and section-by-section rhetorical analysis:

**LIZARD SOUP**

01. Huari hawa-n-chaw mayu kuchu-lha-n-chaw
    Huari below-3-LOC river edge-JUST-3-LOC

    INKA RAQA ni-ya-shqa-n-chaw-mi
    Inca Ravine say-PL-NOM-3-LOC-DIR

    don Panchu Reañu warmi-n-wan ishka-lha-n tayaa-naq,
    wife-3-COM two-JUST-3-live-NARR

    Below Huari, just at the edge of the river, at the ravine they call 'Inca', don Pancho Reañu and his wife, just the two of them lived.

02. Mana-sh tsuri-n-kuna ka-naq-tsu.
    NEG-REP child-3-PL be-NARR-NEG

    They didn't have children.

03. Don Panchu Reañu-qa ka-naq huk tsatsa
    -TOP be-NARR one old

    hatunkaray runa, pullan pacha-n-yaq shapra-shqa,
    enormous man half stomach-3-LIM beard-PRT

    sellama ollqa-tuku-q.
    extremely be:angry-MAKE-NOM

    Don Pancho Reañu was an old, enormous man, bearded to the middle of his stomach, extremely angry.

04. Kada macha-rku-r
    Each be:drunk-UP-SS

    Each time he got drunk

05. Warmi-n-ta-qa tsuktsuk-ya-tsi-ku-q,
    Wife-3-ACC-TOP tremble-BEC-CAUS-REFL-HABPST

    He used to make his wife tremble
06. Raku, raku-ta-raq qayarapa-r. thick thick-ADV-YET insult-SS

Heavily, so heavily insulting her.

7a. Allaw warmi-qa, Alas wife-TOP

Alas the wife

08. Llampu shonqu ka-y-ni-n-wan Soft heart be-NOM-Ø-3-COM

Being soft-hearted

7b. Imayka-ta awanta-ku-q. All: class-ACC endure-REFL-NARR

Used to put up with all kinds of things.

09. Huk hunaq don Panchu Reañu aywa-naq chakra aru-tsi-ku-q, One day go-NARR field work-CAUS-REFL-NOM

One day don Pancho Reañu went to the field to direct the work.

10. Qoyati peyon-kuna-wan huntu aru-rku-rnin, All: day worker-PL-COM together work-UP-SS

Working all day, together with the laborers


Sweating like a fat horse from the heat

12. Ichik machata-shqa, ampi ampi-na wayi-n-man chaari-naq, Little be-drunken-PRT dark dark-NOW house-3-GOAL arrive-NARR

A little drunk, when it was quite dark, he arrived at his home

13. Warmi-n-ta miku-y-ta watuka-r, Wife-3-ACC eat-NOM-ACC demand-SS

Demanded food from his wife


Being extremely angry
15. Chakra aru-q ka-y-ni-u-ta qala-tuku-r. 
Field work-NOM be-NOM-3-ACC nude-MAKE-SS

Changing from his work things.

16. Imanir-mi miku-y-ta kama-shqa-lia-ta-na
Why-QUEST eat-NOM-ACC prepare-PRT-JUST-ACC-NOW

shuya-tsi-ma-nki-tsu karaho ni-r.
wait-CAUS-->1-2-NEG dammit say-SS

Why haven’t you kept the prepared food waiting for me, 
dammit, saying.

17a. Allaw warmi-n-qa
Alas wife-3-TOP

Alas his wife

18. Mantsa-paku-y-pita-pis tsuktsuk-ya-r-raq
Fear-DIFF-NOM-ABL-EVEN tremble-BEC-SS-YET

Even trembling yet from her anxious fear

17b. Ras ras papa roqru-ta qara-ri-naq
Quickly quickly potato soup-ACC give-PNCT-NARR

Quickly quickly gave him potato soup.

19. Y don Panchu-qa tsakay-chaw-na
And don Pancho-TOP dark-LOC-NOW

kusina punku-u-man hama-yku-r 
kitchen door-3-Goal sit-IN-SS

And don Pancho, in the dark now sitting down 
by the kitchen door

One gourd soup-ACC eat-NOM put-NARR

Began to eat a gourd of soup.

21. Pullan mati-ta-na miku-shqa ka-yka-r
Half gourd-ACC-NOW eat-PRT be-IMPFV-SS

Now, when he had eaten half a gourd
Rocoto pepper-ACC-SIM gourd-3-LOC perceive-INCEP-NARR
He felt something like a rocoto pepper in the gourd.

23. Tsayqa shonqu-n ruri-lla-n-chaw, ni-naq:
Then heart-3 inside-JUST-3-LOC say-NARR
So he said to himself:

24. Karaho...Kay-chaw roqotu ka-yka-pty-n, noqa-qa
Damn This-LOC rocoto be-IMPVF-DS-3 I-TOP
upa-kuna-naw mana-na llapi-r, miku-ku-yka:- mirninqa,
dumb-PL-SIM NEG-NOW squash-SS eat-REFL-IMPVF-1 say-SS-TOP
Damn... Here’s this rocoto in here, and I am eating it
like dumb ones who can’t squash it, saying,

25. alli kiriri-ku-yku-r
good chomp-REFL-IMPACT-SS
Chomping good

26. llapi-r usha-naq.
squash-SS finish-NARR
He finished squashing.

27. Niykur-qa cunka kuchara-ta-naw yawa-ri-naq
Then-TOP ten spoon-ACC-SIM taste-INCEP-NARR
After that, he tasted about ten spoonfuls

28. Y mana aya-pty-n-qa,
And NEG bite-DS-3-TOP
And since it didn’t bite (the pepper)

29. Wirpa-n-ta-pis chachak kani-ruk-r,
Lip-3-ACC-EVEN hard bite-UP-SS
Fiercely biting even his lip

30. Yapay yapay llapi-r usha-naq.
Again again squash-SS finish-NARR
Again again he finished squashing it.
Nor that-SIM-EVEN NEG bite-NARR-NEG rocoto-SIM-TOP

But even like that it didn't bite like a rocoto (pepper) ought to.

32. Tsaynash llullu roqutu-char ni-r-qa, 
Then tender rocoto-INDEED say-SS-TOP

Then, surely it's an unripe rocoto saying,

33. Shimi-n-man apa-youtu-nin 
Mouth-3-GOAL take-IN-SS

Taking it up into his mouth

34. Rogutu-ta-naw kapturi-naq. 
Rocoto-ACC-SIM nibble-NARR

He nibbled at it like a rocoto.

Nor that-SIM-EVEN bite-NOM-ACC-TOP perceive-NARR-NEG

Not even like that could he perceive its bite.

36. Tsay-pita-qa don Panchu Reaña-qa puspuru-ta shikra-skí-r 
That-ABL-TOP -TOP match-ACC strike-PFV-SS

After that don Pancho Reañó struck a match

37. Rika-yuku-na-n-paq-qa, 
See-IN-NOM-3-PUR-TOP

So that he could see in

38a. Huk yana chichu arash-lía-ta 
One black pregnant lizard-JUST-ACC

A little black pregnant lizard,

39. Roqutu-m ni-r 
Rocoto-DIR say-SS

Calling it a rocoto,

40. Pacha-n-sí pashta-qpaq 
stomach-3-T00 burst-ABOUT:TO

Even until his stomach was to the point of bursting,
38b. Llapui-kunaq.
   Squash-REFL-NARR

   He had squashed.

41. Tasay-ta-naw arash-ta rika-yku-r-qa,
    That-ACC-SIM lizard-ACC see-IN-SS-TOP

    Seeing the lizard like that

42. Mayu yaku-man aywa-yku-r
    River water-GOAL go-IN-SS

    He went to the river water

43. Pasa-ypa shonqu-n tikra-pty-n,
    Extreme-ADV heart-3 turn-DS-3

    His heart really turned over

44. Ushapaku-naq-tsu shimi-n-ta moktsi-kuy-ta.
    Finish-DIFF-NARR-NEG mouth-3-ACC wash-REFL-NOM-ACC

    He didn’t cease rinsing out his mouth.

45a. Allaw warmi-n-qa
    Alas wife-3-TOP

    Alas his wife

46. Mantsapaku-r
    Fear-DIFF-SS

    Anxiously fearing

45b. Yanasa-n-kuna-man aywa-kunaq,
    Friend-3-PL-GOAL go-REFL-NARR

    Went to her friends

47. Don Panchu Reañu-pa kolera-n usha-ka-nqa-n-yaq.
    -GEN anger-3 end-PASS-NOM-3-LIM

    Until don Pancho Reañó’s anger had abated.

48a. Arash-qa
    Lizard-TOP

    The lizard
49. Kusina-ku-nqa-n oora
   cook-REFL-NOM-3 time

   At the time she was cooking

48b. Miku-ya ruri-n-man shushu-ski-naq.
   Eat-NOM inside-3-COAL fall-PFV-NARR

   Fell into the food.

    Wife-TOP NEG that-ACC see-NARR-NEG nor realize-NARR-NEG

    The wife didn’t see it or realize it.

The Rhetorical Structure Analyses for the individual sections are
the following:
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Figure 22. Exposition of Lizard Soup
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INCITING MOMENT

Figure 23. Inciting Moment of Lizard Soup

DEVELOPING CONFLICT

Figure 24. Developing Conflict of Lizard Soup
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Figure 25. Climax of Lizard Soup
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Figure 26. Denouement of Lizard Soup
FINAL SUSPENSE

Figure 27. Final Suspense of Lizard Soup
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Figure 28. Conclusion of Lizard Soup
7.5. Discussion

Clauses 1-8 are non-narrative, non-chronologically oriented. They set the stage for the action in the story by introducing the two main characters in the story, Don Panchu and his wife, and establishing Don Panchu as the Central Participant. The action begins with Clause 9, when Don Panchu goes off to work in the fields, returning home exhausted and demanding food from his wife. The conflict develops in the span of text comprising Clauses 17-35, when the wife serves her husband some soup. He tries tenaciously to lick his bowl clean, but he can't seem to be able to chew up a 'rocoto' pepper which doesn't seem to be very hot, anyway. The harder he tries to finish off his meal, the more frustrated he becomes.

The story climaxes with Clauses 36-44, when Don Panchu strikes a match in order to see into his bowl (there isn't much light in Quechua homes after dark) and, to his utter dismay, finds a little black pregnant lizard at the bottom. The story rushes towards its conclusion as he frantically runs to the river and tries to wash his mouth out. A brief Final Suspense is expressed in Clauses 45-47, when the wife, overwhelmed with fright at her husband's antics, runs off to her friends until his anger subsides. Clauses 48-50 conclude the story by explaining that the poor woman had had no idea that a lizard had fallen into the soup while she was preparing it. She was completely innocent of this perfect revenge plot.
The LIZARD SOUP story is rendered coherent not by superficial cohesive coding devices, but by the overall narrative framework and by the clause combining choices which, in turn, evoke the network of rhetorical relations expressed in the above diagrams. LIZARD SOUP contains (only) 5 overt links: Y ‘and’, the ‘coordinating’ conjunction borrowed from Spanish, initiating Clause 19, Tsayqa ‘so’, initiating Clause 23, Niyurqa, literally ‘upon saying that’, but often used in time-oriented texts to indicate temporal sequence, initiating Clause 27, Tsaynash ‘and then’, initiating Clause 32, and Tsaypitaqa ‘after that’, initiating Clause 36.

The conjunctive links do, however, coincide with structural boundaries: Clause 19’s Y introduces the second member of a JOINT SEQUENCE (see below), a minor structural break. The link in Clause 23 introduces the first member of a similar JOINT SEQUENCE. The link in 27 initiates the 27-31 span in the Developing Conflict, 32’s link initiates the final span in the Developing Conflict section, and the link in Clause 36 initiates the Climax section. All of these links, which, except for Y and Tsayqa, are limited to environments involving chronological sequence, appear in the build-up portion of the narrative, that is, the portion of the story with the most significant action. Furthermore, they all initiate nuclear portions of text.
The JOINT SEQUENCE relation is a highly specialized form of the JOINT relation discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. In a JOINT SEQUENCE, the two members of the JOINT are intimately associated as two parts/ steps of what is essentially a single act (e.g., Cl.19-20) or as two activities which are so intimately interconnected as to be almost a single act (e.g., wife gives bowl, he takes it). Thus, as with the non-sequential JOINT, the two members of the pair essentially perform a single communicative act. The most consistent morphosyntactic correlate of the first kind of JOINT SEQUENCE, which involves a single participant, is one or more Same-Subject Switch-Reference clauses coupled with a single independent clause, as in Clauses 28-30.

The most consistent morphosyntactic correlate of the second kind of JOINT SEQUENCE, which involves two participants, is exemplified in the span comprising Clauses 17-20, where spans of text with nuclear portions encoded as independent clauses are linked by the conjunction y 'and'.

The assignment of the SEQUENCE and the JOINT SEQUENCE relations to the relevant spans of text in the LIZARD SOUP narrative reveals an interesting fact about Switch-Reference clauses which was alluded to in Chapter 6: they can encode sequential events in a narrative. However, this encoding of sequential events is restricted: the event or series of events encoded by a Switch-Reference clause or clauses must be the
nucleus of one of the members of a JOINT SEQUENCE relation, and the other member of the JOINT SEQUENCE must have as its nucleus an independent clause with the same actor/agent.

Switch-Reference clauses in JOINT SEQUENCE relation with a corresponding independent clause are members of a tightly-knit event cluster; they encode non-independent chronological events. In this sense, they do not qualify as 'true' nuclei in the same sense as independent clauses, which can appear as individual nuclei of the larger SEQUENCE relation.

Of the 24 Switch-Reference clauses found in the LIZARD SOUP text, 21 are of the Same-Subject variety. Of these 21, 4, or 19%, are in JOINT SEQUENCE relations. Another four of the 21 form non-relational quote frames. The others are in the following satellite relations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUMSTANCE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELABORATION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two Different-Subject Switch-Reference clauses in the text are predictably fewer in number (cf. Chapter 6.7). These are both in satellite relations (Clause 28- REASON, Clause 43- CIRCUMSTANCE.) They do not appear as members of a JOINT SEQUENCE.

LIZARD SOUP also contains 5 non-embedded nominalized clauses: Clauses 8, 37, 40, 47, and 49. These function exclusively in satellite relations:
7.6. Summary

In summary, the LIZARD SOUP text shows that, while there is a degree of overlap in the relations which particular clause types can assume, there are definite limits to the degree of sharing. A rhetorical combinatorial hierarchy is reflected in the morphosyntax of clause combining. Independent clauses appear exclusively as nuclei to any kind of clause and as satellites only to other independent clauses. Same-Subject Switch-Reference clauses also appear as nuclei, but only in a clearly definable restricted environment, that of JOINT SEQUENCE. They may appear also as nuclei to other switch-reference clauses, or to nominalized clauses, but they may not appear as the nucleus of a satellite independent clause. Different-Subject Switch-Reference clauses appear only as satellites, as do nominalized clauses.
7.7. Clause Chains and Genre Specificity.

In Chapter 6, clause chains were introduced and briefly discussed with regard to 'final verb' placement. In this section, I discuss some of the functions of clause chains in Conchucos Quechua discourse, showing how these functions are highly genre-dependent. First, I define more precisely what a clause chain is in Conchucos Quechua.

Longacre 1985 makes the only reference I know of to clause 'chains' in Quechua. He mentions that chaining structures are most 'remorselessly developed' in New Guinea and some of the surrounding islands. However, chaining structures also occur in South America, specifically in Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. According to Longacre, they are also reported to occur in Northern Pomo (data from J. Ravenhill) and Crow (data from R. Gordon) in North America (p.264). As for clause chaining in South America, it 'characterizes Quechua, as well as Aguaruna and Cashinahua in Peru' (p.277). According to Longacre, clause chaining in South America is similar to clause chaining in New Guinea in that 'there is a verb of distinctive structure that occurs but once in the entire sentence.' Clause chaining in South America differs from New Guinea clause chaining, however, in that 'nothing quite as characteristic as a medial verb occurs.'
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The distinctive features of clause chaining, according to Longacre 1972 and 1985, are the following:

1) There is a clause, characteristically final in the chain, which occurs but once in the chain, and which has a distinctive structure from all of the other clauses. This final clause is 'like an engine that pulls a string of cars.'

2) Each of the non-final clause bears marking to indicate whether the immediately subsequent clause has a subject which is the same or different from itself. In South American languages, reference may be in relation to the final verb only.

3) Temporal relations such as chronological overlap or chronological succession are highly significant in chaining constructions.

Longacre also makes a point of stressing that, in many cases, it is highly unfruitful to consider a chain a sentence. The most extreme example of the futility of such an equation is chaining in the Aguaruna language of Peru (Larson 1978), where a lengthy text may consist of a single chain.

Chains in Conchucos Quechua are aptly described by characteristics 1) and 3); however, as we have seen in Chapter 6, they do not conform to characteristic 2) in either respect. That is, neither is a strict linear interpretation nor an interpretation relating each clause only to the independent verb adequate to
explain the range of cases which occur. For further elucidation of this point, consider the chain in (114):

(114)

1. Huk runa-sh montaanã marka-pa aywaku-naq
   One man-REP mountain town-GEN go-NARR

2. Hapa-lla-n-nà ka-ski-r
   alone-JUST-3-NOW be-PPV-SS

3. wayi-n-chaw mana pi-pis ka-pti-n
   house-3-LOC NEG who-EVEN be-DS

4a. llapa-n kasta-n-kuna-pis
    all-3 family-3-PL-EVEN

5. wanu-ku-r
   die-REFL-SS

4b. usha-kaaku-shqa ka-ya-pti-n.
    end-COMPL-PRT be-PL-DS-3

   'A man (once) went to a mountain town, seen he had now become completely alone, since there was no one at all in his house, since each/all of his family members, having died, were completely finished off.' (20.7)

This five-clause chain initiates a travelogue narrative about a man's adventures with a ghost. The story, a transcribed oral narrative titled 'The Man Who Went to the Mountain with the Spirit'. From the title, we already know who the central participant of the text will be, the man. Clause 1 in the chain, an independent clause, presents him. The verb is given full marking for tense and person: the Narrative Past tense is, by definition, only for third person. Clause 2 refers to the man only with Same-Subject marking on the verb, the suffix -r. Tense
marking and person marking are absent. Clearly, Clause 2 does not refer ahead to Clause 3, as Longacre would predict for a New Guinea-style chain, as the subject of Clause 3 is *mana pipis* 'no one at all'. This clause could, however, be interpreted as referring back to the 'final' verb (obviously this is a misnomer for Quechua!), Longacre's option for South American languages. Clause 3 is marked with the Different-Subject affix -pti, followed by third-person marking. Clause 3 can also be understood as referring back to the independent verb in Clause 1. Clause 4 presents a problem for either interpretation. Marked with the Same-Subject affix -r, it obviously does not refer to the man, as he isn't the one who has died. It can be interpreted as referring ahead to Clause 5, Longacre's option for New Guinea languages.

We see, then, that chains in Conchucos Quechua do not precisely conform with either of Longacre's options. Cases such as these are explainable in terms of rhetorical dependence: Clause 4 is rhetorically dependent on Clause 5, and is related to the rest of the chain only through Clause 5. Thus, the chains of Switch-Reference are hierarchically constructed. Furthermore, as explained in 6.6, this situation is explained by the discourse organization of participant reference. In this instance, attention is temporarily shifted from the Central Participant, the man, to his family. At this precise moment in the discourse, they are the focus of attention. Notice, however, that this -r Same-Subject
(Continuity) marker is rhetorically embedded in the different-subject (discontinuity) construction, and that the clauses referring to the man, Clauses 1 and 2, are above them in the rhetorical hierarchy:

Figure 29. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of (114)

Because of the possibilities for nesting of switch-reference clauses (within other switch-reference clauses), the Conchucos Quechua chaining strategy is more elaborate than either of Longacre’s options. However, since it is hierarchically rather than linearly based, it is closer to what he presents as the South American standard.

For our purposes here, in order to qualify as a chain, a series of clauses must contain one independent clause and a minimum of two accompanying dependent switch-reference clauses. The presence of one or more nominalized clauses is optional. In
theory, clause chains in Conchucos Quechua may consist of any number of switch-reference clauses with their accompanying main clause, but, in practice, it is unusual to find a chain of more than four or five clauses. Chains are demarcated form the preceding and the following streams of speech by a lengthier pause than that between clause-size 'intonation units' (Chafe 1980). The final portion of a chain is most generally also accompanied by falling intonation.

7.7.1. Clause Chains in Narrative

The prototypical function of the clause chain in narrative is to encode an EVENT CLUSTER (cf. previous section) consisting of a series of closely interrelated events. The actor engaged in these events is the central participant at that point in the text. In these chains, an initial orienting clause, frequently a Different-Subject switch-reference clause, introduces the event cluster, encoded by a series of Same-Subject Switch-Reference clauses followed by a single independent clause. An example is the following account of the stealing from a church of a coveted Andean statue/image of a saint:
1. Mīsā-ta rura-ka-ski-pṭi-n-qa kuura-qa
   Mass-ACC do-REFL-PFV-DS-3-TOP curate-TOP
   "When the priest had finished saying mass,"

2. Llushti-ku-r
   undress-REFL-SS
   "Undressing him (the image),"

3. Apa-ykacha-nqa-n-yaq tsay roopa-n-kuna-ta llatsapa-n-kuna-ta
   take-BCKFTH-NOM-3-LIM that clothes-3-PL-ACC clothes-3-PL-ACC
   ornamentu-n-kuna-ta hipi-rka-nqa-n-yaq-qa4
   ornament-3-PL-ACC remove-rka-NOM-3-LIM-TOP
   andas-pita paska-ski-r-ni-n-qa
   carrier-ABL release-PFV-SS-∅-3-TOP
   "To take him, having taken off all of those clothes, those clothes
   and ornaments to take him, loosening (the image) from the carrier,"

4. Lapi tsukutsuku-rka-tsi-r
   press hat-UP-CAUS-SS
   "Pressing a hat on him,"

5. Huk ratash llanqi-ta llanqi-rka-ṭsi-r4
   one ragged sandal-ACC sandal-UP-CAUS-SS
   "Putting a pair of ragged sandals on him,"

6. Alli ponchu-n-kuna-wan pitu-ru-r-qa
   well poncho-3-PL-COM wrap-UP-SS-TOP
   "Wrapping him up well with their ponchos,"

7. Uma-n-ta wata-rpu-r-qa
   h-ad-3-ACC tie-IN-SS-TOP
   "Tying up his head,"

8. Apa-ri-ruku-r
   take-INCEP-UP-SS
   "Taking him up,"
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9. Hipl-yaa-mu-n iglesia ruri-n-pita.
   remove-PL-FR:FAR-3 church inside-3-ABL

   "They removed him from the inside of the church." (6.5)

   The Rhetorical Structure for (115) can be diagrammatically
   represented as follows:

   ![Diagram of Rhetorical Structure](image)

   Figure 30. Rhetorical Structure of (115)

   Notice how, in instances of longer chains such as these, the
   switch-reference clauses as a set share one of the JOINT SEQUENCE
   nuclei. The concluding finite verb serves as a kind of anchor, a
   brief resting point in the discourse. The event-encoding Switch-
   Reference clauses are dependent on the upcoming finite verb, since
   the temporal sequence of events cannot reach closure without the
   final punctuating statement of that verb. On the other hand, as
shown in Chapter 6, the Same-Subject Switch-Reference clauses in a narrative such as this are not dependent on the ensuing independent verb for subject identification, as these clauses are employed when that entity is already clearly presented. In other words, the dependence is primarily rhetorical, not grammatical.

Event clusters such as (112) are restricted to the action portions of narrative. As a further example, consider also Clauses 41-44 of LIZARD SOUP, encoding immediate post-climax action. Clause chains in narrative may also contain non-independent clauses functioning in adverbial senses. (110) in Chapter 6 provides an example of such a chain.

7.7.2. Clause Chains in Non-Narrative

Clause chains are less common in non-narrative contexts. The prototypical function of the clause chain in non-narrative texts or text portions is to list a conjoined series (LIST) of situations or a series of alternatives (DISJUNCT). The following excerpt from a text by a Quechua catechist on the Sacraments in the Catholic Church provides an example of a CONJOINED SERIES:
1. Y tsay-naw communion-chaw alma-ntsik-ta miku-tsi-r-qa
   And that-SIM communion-LOC soul-12-ACC eat-CAUS-SS-TOP

   And when we feed our souls like that at communion

2. Kawa-na-ntsik Dios muna-nqa-n-naw-mi
   live-DESID-12 God want-NOM-3-SIM-DIR

   We want to live according to God's will

3. Runa-mahi-ntsik-kuna-wan mana chiki-naku-r
   man-fellow-12-PL-GOAL NEG hate-RECIP-SS

   Not hating our fellow man

4. Mana wasa-n-ta rima-r
   NEG bad-3-ACC speak-SS

   Not speaking badly (of anyone)

5. Mana llula-ku-r
   NEG lie-REPL-SS

   Not lying

6. Tsay-naw mana ima-si alli-ta rura-r.
   That-SIM NEG what-TOO good-ACC do-SS

   Like that not doing anything bad at all. (17.17)

---

Figure 31. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of (116)
The following example illustrates the encoding of a series of ALTERNATIVES. (117) is an excerpt from a text listing some of the ways one a child can contract diarrhea (Qecha Qeshya) in the Andes. The initial question (independent clause) to which the chain of Different-Subject Switch-Reference clauses (Cl.2-5) provide the answer, is included for clarity.

(117)

1. Ima-naw-pita-mi yuri-n kay qeshya? What-SIM-ABL-QUEST arise-3 this sickness
   How does this sickness arise?

2. Infeksyon rinri-chaw ka-pty-n
   Infection ear-LOC be-DS-3
   If there is an infection in the ear

3. Allpa-ta wamra-kuna mikuy-ya-pty-n
   dirt-ACC child-PL eat-PL-DS-3
   If the children have eaten dirt

4. Rakcha yaku-ta upu-ya-pty-n
   Foul water-ACC drink-PL-DS-3
   If they have drunk foul water

5. Infeksyon aqish-ni-n-chaw ka-pty-n.
   Infection intestines-Ø-3-LOC be-DS-3
   If there is an infection in their intestines.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{LIST} \\
\text{2} & \text{3} & \text{4} & \text{5} \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 32. Rhetorical Structure Diagram of (117)
Notice how Clauses 2-5 in (117) are a chain of Different-Subject Switch-Reference clauses which cannot be interpreted in a linear sense. Specifically, the referents to the subjects of Clauses 3 and 4, wamrakuna 'the children' (expressed only by the verbal cross-referencing in Clause 4) are identical. Yet both clauses receive Different-Subject -pti affixation. Each of these clauses expresses a distinct way of contracting diarrhea. (Diarrhea, not the alternatives, is the topic of the text.) Thus, the contrastive -pti marking for such non-topical alternatives (rather than the topical -r) is the expected form for all alternatives, regardless of whether two or more of them have identical subject referents.

Furthermore, in strictly syntactic terms, the 2-5 chain of alternatives stands 'on its own' without an independent clause within the chain. (117), then, provides two pieces of evidence supporting the interpretation of switch-reference in Conchucos Quechua as a discourse phenomenon.5

7.8. Summary

In this chapter, we have seen that Rhetorical Structure Analysis, coupled with Longacre's Plot Analysis, is a useful tool for investigating clause combining strategies in Conchucos Quechua. Two new sub-types of rhetorical relations have been introduced in order to appropriately accommodate the list of rhetorical relations in Chapter 5 to narrative analysis: SEQUENCE and JOINT SEQUENCE.
We have also seen that clause chains in Conchucos Quechua perform radically different functions, depending on the discourse context. Clause chains in narrative text portions are used primarily to encode event clusters. Clause chains in non-narrative text portions are used primarily to encode a conjoined series (LIST) or a series of alternatives (DISJUNCT).
NOTES to Chapter 7

1 The -pti in Cl. 24 is not included in this count because it is embedded within a COMMENT.

2 Weber 1983:293-4 speaks only of 'megasentences' at peak points in a narrative.

3 This is contrary to what Weber predicts for 'megasentences', which he says are restricted to climactic portions of narrative.

4 This -rka suffix is apparently distinct from those -rka suffixes which are the result of morphophonemic forelowering (see SECTION NUMBER), in that there is no trigger suffix present.

5 Clauses 45-50 in the FAREWELL TEXT of Chapter 4 also constitute a series of chained alternatives.
3. SOME CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER DIRECTIONS

8.1. Introduction

The primary goal of this thesis has been to show that clause-combining in Conchucos Quechua can only be understood in terms of discourse structure. In order to achieve this goal, clause-combining in a range of texts has been discussed. The purpose of this final chapter is twofold: first, to review the major claims and discoveries presented in this thesis and, second, to propose some directions for further research in Quechua studies and in the study of human language in general.

8.2. Conclusions

8.2.1. Conclusions Regarding Quechua

This thesis has provided a description of Conchucos Quechua clause types. As such, it has documented a previously unanalyzed Quechua dialect. I have sought to show that the grammar of clause-combining has discourse-semantic correlates. Thus, individual clause combinations must be considered in the light of their discourse contexts in order for their morphosyntactic patterns to be understood.
Rhetorical Structure Analysis has proven to be an effective tool for describing clause-combining strategies in Conchucos Quechua. Texts have been seen as networks in which each clause is ultimately interconnected with every other clause through a hierarchy of interacting rhetorical relations. Certain clauses have been seen as structurally 'more important' by virtue of their relative placement in the relational hierarchy. Certain morphosyntactic signals have been shown to correlate with major structural boundaries. Furthermore, the interpretation of monosyllabic affixes such as -pis 'even, also' is seen as highly dependent on the contextual environment. Even the seemingly most minute details are interrelated with the whole; thus, they can only be understood in the light of the whole.

To balance the inevitably static hierarchical view provided by Rhetorical Structure Analysis, a concerted effort has been made to interpret texts from a process, not just a product perspective. This view was most explicitly implemented in Chapter 6, where the grammar of Switch-Reference was seen as essentially a discourse phenomenon motivated by factors of continuity and discontinuity in participant reference. Grammar has been seen as motivated by communicative needs in discourse. This is exemplified by the use of Same-Subject Switch-Reference clauses to trace Central Participants in chronologically oriented narrative and procedural texts.

343
Although care has been taken to make precise genre distinctions for analytical purposes (cf. Fox 1984), Rhetorical Structure Analysis has been shown to be effective not only for non-narrative genres, but for narratives, as well. In fact, the catalogue of Relational Propositions and their hierarchical ordering in a text provide an effective means for distinguishing among the various genres. Rhetorical Structure Analysis is thus a very effective tool for defining prototypical genres. The analysis of Quechua texts actually shows that genre is an abstract notion which has little to do with clause combining as such. Choice of genre, does, however, set the stage for the preference certain rhetorical relations and particular hierarchical orderings of these relations. It is these choices, rather than the choice of an abstract genre, that influence the choices of particular clause combinations. For example, the chronological event structure of a narrative sets the stage for the choice of the JOINT SEQUENCE relation and, thus, for the speaker's option to create a clause-chaining structure.

8.2.2. Conclusions about Human Language

Although a foundational assumption of this thesis has been that clause-combining is a highly language-specific phenomenon, the fact that an analytical approach which was devised primarily for English (Mann & Thompson) and for Koiné Greek (Beekman, Callow &
Kopesec) can prove so efficient in revealing the clause-combining strategies of a language as distinct from the Indoeuropean family as Quechua, tells us that the application of Rhetorical Structure Analysis must be mirroring something about human cognition in general. Speakers and hearers actively search for coherence and closure in discourse: this is part of our humanness. The research presented in this thesis supports the view that Rhetorical Structure Analysis has considerable cross-linguistic validity: it should prove to be an effective analytical tool for studying clause-combining strategies in other languages as well. As it has for Conchucos Quechua, I would expect that its application to other languages will also be a means of distinguishing between genres.

This thesis has also shown that the choice of analytical perspective in linguistic analysis is crucial. The kinds of answers one finds in anything, of course, depend upon the kind of questions one is asking. If the linguist assumes that the interesting questions are limited to sentence-level phenomena, she will come up with answers that are, at best, incomplete, and, at worst, incorrect. The clearest instance in this thesis of different answers based on the two different approaches is the discussion of switch-reference: if it is assumed to be a local phenomenon, most cases can be mechanically explained according to syntactic dependency patterns. Certain instances, however, still defy explanation. A discourse-level analysis explanatorily
incorporates both the mechanically explainable instances and the apparent exceptions into a single unitary account.

This thesis has provided another piece of evidence in support of the claim put forth by Pike, Longacre, Mann and Thompson, Fox and others that one of the basic organizational principles in discourse is hierarchical, that 'hierarchical structuring is a universal of language.' The stance taken here, however, is not that the whole determines its parts (Longacre 1972), but that the parts interact with the whole. The question to ask is 'How does this text mean what it does?' (Fries 1985), incorporating both local and global perspectives.

Finally, although the thesis has concentrated on the hierarchical structure of texts, it has also drawn attention to notions of topicality and participant reference. For instance, morphemes such as -ga 'topic' are seen to have specific discourse-organizational roles. Moreover, the Switch-Reference system is rooted in the discourse need for efficient participant reference.

8.3. Further Directions

8.3.1. Quechua Studies

The most immediate research question which comes to mind is: How transferable are these findings for Conchucos Quechua to other members of the Quechua language family? On some issues (for example, the discourse explanation for switch-reference) I expect
the findings reported here to be highly applicable. That the clause-combining strategies are essentially the same across the spectrum of Quechua languages, however, I strongly doubt. There should be fairly high transferability within the Quechua B group, but the inventory of clause types in the Quechua A group is probably too distinct for the exact findings reported here to be highly applicable. The pan-Quechua applicability of this approach to the study of clause-combining, however, I do not doubt.

For Conchucos Quechua, many other questions regarding clause-combining remain to be answered. For example, whereas we have seen that switch-reference clauses share functions of independent clauses not shared by nominalized clauses, it is not yet clear in all cases what might motivate a speaker to choose between a switch-reference clause performing an adverbial function and a non-embedded nominalized clause performing that same function. We know, for example, that switch-reference clauses, but not adverbial nominalized clauses, perform recapitulative functions in narrative. The precise options for other environments remain to be explored.

Regarding the inventory of Rhetorical Relations proposed for Conchucos Quechua, I do not claim to have presented a complete, unalterable list. The aim has been to present a catalogue of relations which have been shown to 'work' for the analysis of natural texts. It is to be hoped that this inventory can be continually refined.
Another broad area for future research in Quechua is the discourse-pragmatic motivation behind clause ordering and 'final' verb placement in clause chains. Why, in a presumably verb-final language, do so many chains have their independent clauses initially or medially? It seems that a good proportion of information which the speaker assumes to be totally unfamiliar to the hearer is reserved for independent clauses. Chafe’s 1984 study on adverbial clauses in English raises some similar questions, and concludes that 'a comprehensive understanding of information flow is what is needed for an understanding of these phenomena.' (Chafe 1984:pp) If this is so, then what is the preferred information structure for Conchucos Quechua?

Chafe distinguishes four kinds of adverbial clauses for written English: preposed and bound (Type A), postposed and bound (Type B), preposed and free (Type C), and postposed and free (Type D). He explains these distributions in terms of the dynamics of information flow, suggesting that Type C represents the 'prototypical use of an adverbial clause', in that it presents 'guidepost information for a following main clause'. (1984:448) Matthiessen & Thompson (to appear) claim that the sequence in which nucleus and satellite occur in rhetorical structure is highly discourse-determined, that order may have an effect on the interpretation of relational propositions. For instance, a
relation preceding the nucleus may be used to signal a new structural portion of the text.

Instances of this in Conchucos Quechua are the initial recapitulative switch-reference clauses used in Quechua narrative and procedural discourse. These never appear after the independent verb. (118), an excerpt from a narrative, provides an example of an initial recapitualitive switch-reference clause which summarizes a previous event before the event sequence continues:

(118) ...aywa-naq demanda-q-ni-n. [Demanda-ski-pty-n]...
go-NAR demand-PUR-0-3 demand-PFV-DS-3

'...he went demanding. When he had finished demanding...'

On the other hand, switch-reference clauses may provide background information to a just-completed action. In my pilot study on adverbials (Stewart 1984a) I found that, in a folk tale about a Condemned Soul, 12, or 11% of switch-reference clauses occurred following the finite verb. Of these, eight, or 66.5%, encoded background information, adding explanatory or elaborating comments. Three of the twelve examples, or 25%, framed quotations, as in (119), an example of a closing quote formula:

(119) ...ni-r-ni-n ni-naq
      say-SS-Ø-3 say-NARR

'...saying, s/he said'
One of the twelve examples was a switch-reference clause embedded in a nominalized clause, and so would not enter into consideration for the purposes of this dissertation. In short, the data indicate that pre-independent-verb switch-reference clauses and post-independent-verb switch-reference clauses serve distinct discourse functions. Conchucos Quechua seems to have a 'preferred' clause-combining structure for switch-reference clauses with respect to the independent verb. I suggest that this structure is highly predictable and represents the communicative goals of the speaker and the practical limits of information processing capabilities of the hearer.

Also worthy of further attention is the set of na-paq 'purpose' clauses in Conchucos Quechua. What kind of correlations can be made between their placement in the clause combination (before or after the independent verb) and their function in the discourse? My hypothesis is that clause-combining order, as with the clause combining order of switch-reference and independent verbs, will reflect discourse function to a significant degree.
3.2. Further Directions for the Study of Language

An initial research area concerns the cross-linguistic applicability of the List of Rhetorical Relations and the Typology of Rhetorical Relations presented in Chapter 5. According to Longacre 1985:264, with reference to clause-combining within sentences, in spite of the ‘striking differences’ between languages, the same relations are usually marked. I would presume that the same would be true for Rhetorical Relations, but this remains to be seen.

Assuming that at least a significant subset of determinable Rhetorical Relations is universally applicable across human languages, a caveat is in order: we have every reason to suspect that the use of these relations and the correlations with clause types will vary dramatically from language to language. It is important not to assume that, just because a certain set of Rhetorical Relations may be cross-linguistically valid, that all languages are somehow ‘the same’ at some underlying semantic level. Languages organize their grammars in ways often bizarre for the Western-trained analyst. Let this analyst not assume that the rhetorical organization is necessarily uniform for all languages.

I would be seriously remiss if I were to neglect mentioning a further significant area for future research on clause-combining, namely conversational analysis. As human language is essentially
interactional, the only way to ultimately gain a firm grasp of clause-combining strategies is to study clause combinations in conversational contexts.

These chapters have investigated only one area in the vast richness of what we call human language. Much remains yet to be explored. This thesis has proposed to present some steps in the right direction.
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