Nominalisation: subjunction and main predication

Abstract

In Amerindian languages and in many other agglutinative languages subordination is often a matter of nominalisation. In these languages subordinate clauses can be formed by means of nominalised verb forms. In Cholón, a language spoken in North-Peru, this is certainly the case: nominalised forms coincide with subordinate clauses.

In the Cholón language, a nominalised verb form can also coincide with a main predicate. In this paper we study the different subordinate clauses that are formed with nominalisations. We then find out which nominalisations are part of a main predicate, and when this is the case.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to show that in Cholón, an agglutinative North Peruvian SOV language with prefixes and suffixes – nominalised forms, correspond to subordinate clauses, and that a number of them can also correspond main predicates. Traditionally, subordination is considered to be “a construction in which two (or more) clauses are combined with each other in such way that one clause (the subordinate clause) is a constituent of the other (the main clause)” (Van Gijn, Haude & Muysken, 2011: 3). In Cholón, subordination is mainly a

---

1 I would like to thank the editors of this volume for their corrections, remarks and questions, and I thank Willem Adelaar for his most useful comments and observations.

2 Cholón belongs to a small language family, called Cholonan. Hibito is the other member. Both languages are extinct.
matter of nominalisation. The language has only one conjunction, the morpheme -pit, with which clauses can be co-ordinated. Co-ordinator -pit can also be used to express ‘concession’, when suffixed to an imperative or to a nominalised form. In addition to the conjunction -pit, the language has two subordinators at his disposal: the suffixes -eč ‘purposive’ and -hu ‘switch reference’, and one discourse marker: the morpheme -(w)a ‘topic’, to construct a subordinate clause. The subordinator -eč (not to be confounded with the nominaliser -(ε)eč ‘the fact that’) is used to form a purposive or a resultative clause; the morpheme -hu indicates that the subjects of the subordinate and the main clause are not the same person; the topic marker -(w)a can also be attached to nominalised forms and it can be employed to construct a conditional clause. In all other cases, including the cases in which the co-ordinator -pit and the topicaliser -(w)a are suffixed to a nominalised form, subordinate clauses are encoded in nominalised forms.

Nominalisations are verb forms with nominal properties. Like nouns they can be followed by case markers, and they can function as subjects, direct objects, nominal predicates, and modifiers. Nominalisations can be lexical and syntactical. Cholón nominalisations have rather a syntactic than a lexical status. Lexical nominalisations behave like ordinary nouns: they can be pluralised and receive case marking, but they cannot receive subject, object, tense and aspect marking. Cholón nominalised forms, on the other hand, have predominantly verbal properties. They can be marked for subject, object, tense, aspect and negation, but they cannot be pluralised. The only nominal property that they have, showing that the form at issue is a nominalisation after all, is the property of case marking. Syntactic nominalisations are in fact nominalised verb forms which can function as the head (nominalised predicate) of a subordinate clause. Cholón nominalisations can be characterised as ‘clauses in disguise’.
Although Cholón nominalisations cannot be pluralised, a number of them can be noun-like, or, rather, more noun phrase-like, such as the agentive nominalisations a-kole-wuč (1SG.OBJ-love-AG) ‘the one who loves me’ = ‘my lover’ and tsap-uč (3SG.OBJ.catch-AG) ‘the one who catches (fish)’ = ‘the catcher (of fish)’; the modifying nominalisation ki-φ-čikno-ŋo (1PL.A-3SG.OBJ-fear-FUT.NMLS2) ‘that what is having to be feared by us’ = ‘something frightening’ = ‘frightening’; the objective nominalisation φ-tsamo-č (3SG.A-3SG.OBJ.know-FAC) ‘the fact that he is knowing something’ = ‘wisdom’; and the state nominalisations kot-uč (be-AG) ‘the one who is’ = ‘a human being’ and a-kot-lam (1SG.SBJ-be-FUT.NMLS1) ‘my (future) existence’.

The difference between an English lexical nominalisation, such as ‘lover’, derived from the verb ‘love’, and a syntactic, noun phrase-like nominalisation in Cholón can be illustrated when we compare the lexical form mentioned above with syntactical, noun phrase-like Cholón forms. The canonical structure of the lexical construction is as follows: stem-NMLS(-PL)(-GEN). Syntactic, noun phrase-like nominalised forms can have the following structures in Cholón:

- (A-)OBJ-stem-NMLS when the stem is transitive;
- (A-)3SG.OBJ.stem-NMLS when a third person object is indicated by means of an initial stem alternation;
- (SBJ-)stem-NMLS when the stem is intransitive.

Besides being noun phrase-like, Cholón nominalisations can also be clause-like. Clause-like nominalisations can not only be marked for agent/subject and object, like the noun phrase-like ones, they can also be marked for aspect, tense and negation, and they can be followed by case markers. Aspect and tense are only marked when the nominalising element is a demonstrative or the negation -pits-o. A clause-like construction may thus have the following structures:
- A-OBJ-stem-(aspect/ tense)-(NEG)NMLS(-CM) when the stem is transitive;
- A-3SG.OBJ.stem-(aspect/ tense)-(NEG)NMLS(-CM) when a third person object is indicated by means of an initial stem alternation;
- SBJ-stem/3SG.SBJ.stem-(aspect/ tense)-(NEG)NMLS(-CM) when the stem is intransitive.

The fact that Cholón nominalisations, occurring as the nucleus of subordinates clauses, can be marked for tense, aspect, and person agreement, somewhat goes counter to Cristofaro’s ‘Frequency Hierarchy’ (Cristofaro 2003:289), according to which the lack of TAM distinction and of person agreement are the most frequent parameters for the morphosyntactic coding of subordination.


In this paper we first discuss the different kinds of nominalisations, whether or not followed by case markers, that coincide with a subordinate clause (Section 2). Section 3 focuses on the cases in which a nominalisation functions as the head of a main predicate. Section 4 closes the paper with some concluding remarks.

2. Nominalised subordinate clauses

The Cholón language has different morphemes that can nominalise a verb. All, except for the agentive suffix -(w)uč, can be followed by case markers. The nominalisations and the subordinate clauses formed without case marking are treated in section 2.1, those formed with case markers in section 2.2.
2.1 Nominalised subordinates formed without case markers

Cholón has the following nominalisers: -(e)č ‘factiviser’, -(k)he ‘simultaneity’, -(k)te ‘infinitive’, -lam ‘future nominaliser 1’, -(n)ap ‘sequence’, -(y)o ‘future nominaliser 2’, -(w)uč ‘agentive’, and the negative nominalising suffixes -pakna and -pits-o. They are regularly attached to the verb stem, with the exception of the -pits-o, which is suffixed to a past tense marker. The suffix -pits-o consists of a negator -pits + the future nominaliser -(η)o. (The negative element -pits is likely to be a merger of the derivational suffix -p(e), used to form a negative stem, and the passiviser -its). The nominalisations formed with the factiviser -(e)č and the infinitive marker -(k)te are dealt with in section 2.1.1, those formed by the sequence marker -(k)he and the simultaneity marker -(n)ap are treated in section 2.1.2, and those constructed with the future nominalisers -lam and -(η)o, and the negative nominalisers -pakna and -pits-o are discussed in section 2.1.3. Section 2.1.4 deals with the suffix -(w)uč. A table presenting an overview of the different types of subordinates constructed with the nominalisers -(e)č, -(k)he, -(k)te, -lam, -(n)ap, -(η)o, -pakna, -pits-o, and -wuč can be found in section 2.1.5.

In addition to the nominalising morphemes mentioned, the language uses the deictics ko ‘this (one)’ and iŋko ‘that (one)’ to nominalise finite (fully inflected) forms.³ Finite forms nominalised by -iŋko are never case marked, those by -ko can be followed by the causal case marker -(ʎak-)pat ‘because’ and the ablative case marking combination -man-ap, connoting ‘instead of’, ‘(rather) than’. Nominalised finite forms ending in -ko and -inko, usually function as relative clauses:

\[
\text{a-kt-aŋ-ko} \quad (1\text{SG.SBJ-be-IPFV-DEM}) \quad \text{‘I who am’} \\
\text{a-meno-w-įŋko} \quad (1\text{SG.A-3SG.OBJ.want-PST-DEM}) \quad \text{‘I who loved him’}
\]

³ The phenomenon of a demonstrative functioning as a nominaliser is not an extraordinary feature in Amerindian languages. In Jebero, for instance, the demonstrative asu ‘this (one)’ also has a nominalising function when used as a suffix after verb stems.
In this paper, I do not pay attention to the nominalising demonstratives ko and injo.

2.1.1. Nominalisations formed with -(e)č and -(k)te

Factiviser -(e)č (-eč after a consonant, -č after a vowel) expresses ‘the fact that’. Constructions with -(e)č can function as a subject clause (1), a direct object clause (2), and causal clause (3):

(1)  
\[ \text{a-pšawo-č} \text{ φ-patsa-ŋ} \]  
1SG.SBJ-spin-FAC 3S-take.all.day-IPFV

‘I spend the day spinning’

(lit. ‘The fact that I am spinning takes the whole day’).

(2)  
\[ \text{a-pon-pat i-áa-č a-po-γč-iy} \]  
1S-CLF:group-INS 3PL.SBJ-go-FAC 1SG.A-3PL.OBJ-see-PST

‘I saw them going in a troop’

(3)  
\[ \text{mitah-la-č či-po-šay-č-ŋ} \]  
3SG.OBJ.miss-3PL.A-FAC 3PL.A-3PL.OBJ-whip-IPFV

‘They whip them, because they miss it.’

The nominalising suffix -(k)te ‘infinitive’ (-kte after a vowel and -te after a consonant) is frequently employed as a complementiser:

(4)  
\[ \text{a-áa-kte a-meŋ-ŋ} \]  
1S-go-INF 1SG.A-3SG.OBJ.want-IPFV

‘I want to go.’
2.1.2. Nominalisations formed with -(k)he and -(n)ap

The meanings of the morphemes -(k)he (-he after a consonant and -khe after a vowel) ‘simultaneity’ and -(n)ap (-ap after a consonant and -nap after a vowel) ‘sequencial’ (‘after’) supplement each other: the simultaneity marker -(k)he indicates that the event expressed by the verb takes place simultaneously with the event expressed by another verb (5), whereas the sequence marker -(n)ap indicates that the event takes place before another event (6). The ending -(k)he corresponds to the ending -ing in English, and forms ending in -(k)he are in fact gerunds:

(5) an-tsel Phariseo Jesus mučaŋ i-l-o-w,
    one-CLF:elongated Pharisee Jesus prayer 3SG.A-3SG.OBJ-do-PFV
    a-nek mi-am-o-ki-na ki-khe
    1SG.POS-company 2SG.A-eat-IMP-QUOT say-SIM

‘A Pharisee prayed Jesus, saying: “Eat with me!”’

(6) elefante-wa a-tsel meč jnan-te
    elephant-TOP one-CLF:elongated tree face-AD
    pilmoh-no-nap ø-jn-aj
    lean.on-REFL-SEQ 3S-sleep-IPFV

‘The elephant sleeps rested on a tree’

(lit. ‘The elephant sleeps after having leant against a tree’)

(5)

(6)
Forms ending in -(k)he and in -(n)ap have in common that they need not to be marked for person, when the subject of the verb to which they are suffixed is identical (co-referential) to that of the main verb, as in (5) and (6).

Nominalisations constructed with -(k)he may contain a subject clause (7), a direct object clause (8), a nominal predicate clause (9), and they can also have causal meaning (10):

(7)  
\[ \text{me-Át-iy} \quad \text{mi-laš-iy} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{putam} \quad \text{makhay} \]  
2SG.SBJ-weaken-PST 2SG.SBJ-lame-PST high village joy  
\[ \text{kušha-maŋ} \quad \text{mi-esteh-he} \quad \text{ašmaŋ} \quad \text{ø-kot-aŋ} [...] \]  
life-IN 2S-enter-SIM first 3S-be-IPFV  
(It is better for you to enter into paradise weak and lame [...])

(8)  
\[ \text{pašow} \quad \text{me-kt-eč} \quad \text{i-m-pas-aŋ-sim} \]  
good 2S-be-PURP 3SG.A-2SG.OBJ-advise-IPFV-EMP  
\[ \text{mu-lu-poh-he-pits-o} \]  
2SG.SBJ-interior-burn-SIM-NEG-FUT.NMLS2  
(He advises you, so that you will be good, not to abhor you.)

Note that the nominaliser -(k)he can be followed by another nominalising suffix, namely by the negator -pits-o, of which the first element -pits may be a merger of the derivational suffix -p(e), used to form a negative stem, and the passiviser -its.

(9)  
\[ \text{ip-ta-pi} \quad \text{ayča} \quad \text{ʌup-he} \quad \text{i-toŋ} \]  
two-CLF:stony-ALL meat eat-SIM 3PL.SBJ-be.1PFV  
(Both are eating meat.)
(10) \textit{pašow} \textit{kot-he} \textit{tsamoč} \textit{a-kot-t-ay}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
  good & be-SIM & learned & 1S-be-FUT-IPFV \\
\end{tabular}

‘Because I am good, I shall be learned.’

The sequence marker -(\text{n})ap ‘after’ is employed to construct temporal clauses, see (6) above, and causal clauses:

(11) \textit{tsi-tu-p} \textit{η-a-lo-y ø-kot-\text{n}ap} \textit{kama}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
  rain-AD-ABL & 3SG.A-1SG.OBJ-wet-PST & 3S-be-SEQ & illness \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{a-ki-ay}

1S-be-IPFV

‘I am ill, because the rain wet me.’

2.1.3. \textit{Nominalisations formed with -lam, -(\text{η})o, -pakna and -pits-o}

The nominalisers -\textit{lam} ‘future nominalizer 1’ and -(\text{η})o ‘future nominalizer 2’ (-(\text{η})o after a vowel, -\text{o} after a consonant) have the following features in common: (a), both -\textit{lam} and -(\text{η})o refer to a future event and to an obligation or a possibility; (b), forms nominalised by -\textit{lam} and -(\text{η})o are more noun phrase-like than clause-like: they can be used to derive a noun from a verb (see section 1), and, as nouns, they can modify a head noun and function as relative clauses (12a/b), and they can also function as subjects (13a/b), direct objects (14a/b), and nominal predicates (15a/b). This is in line with what Comrie and Thompson (1985: 393) remark about nominalisations: “It is commonplace that a nominalization can occur wherever a noun-phrase is called for. Thus, it is most natural for nominalizations to occur as subjects or objects [...]”.
Examples of a relative clause, a subject, a direct object and a nominal predicate clause coded by -lam and -(ŋ)o are as follows:

relative clause:

(12a) \( ki-tsel-pat \ ku-tup-lam \ pana \)

1PL.POS-foot-INS 1PL.SBJ-walk-FUT.NMLS1 road

‘the road which we have to walk by our feet’ = ‘a footpath’

(12b) \( u-k-ku\haha-weh-o \ tsukiow \)

3SG.A-1PL.OBJ-life-VB-FUT.NMLS2 medicine

‘a medicine which gives us life’ = ‘a vivifying medicine’

subject clause:

(13a) \( poho \ at-mol-e \ iglesia-te \ ki-\hspace{.25em}a-lam \)

morning one-CLF:day-ANT church-AD 1PL.SBJ-go-FUT.NMLS1

\( \phi-pakt-aŋ \)

3S-be-IPFV

‘The day after tomorrow we have to go to church.’

(13b) \( pa\hspace{.25em}ow \ ki-kot-o \ \phi-kot-aŋ \)

good 1PL.SBJ-be-FUT.NMLS2 3S-be-IPFV

‘We have to be good’

direct object clause:

(14a) \( mi-l-o-lam \ ohom-a\hat{a} \ l-o-k \)
2SG.A-3SG.OBJ-do-FUT.NMLS1 quick-ADV 3SG.OBJ-do-IMP

‘Do quickly what you have to do’

(14b) čap.ñoj i-l-o-ŋo φ-tsam-ŋy
pan 3SG.A-3SG.OBJ-do-FUT.NMLS2 3SG.SBJ-3SG.OBJ.know- IPFV

‘He knows [how] to make pans.’

nominal predicate clause:

(15a) ki-ľa-lam ke-kt-ŋy
1PL.SBJ-go-FUT.NMLS1 1PL.SBJ-be-IPFV

‘We can go.’

(15b) mek hayu ki-kol-o ke-kt-ŋy
all men 1PL.SBJ-die-FUT.NMLS2 1PL.SBJ-be-IPFV

‘All men are mortal.’

The negative nominaliser -pakna occurs in nominalisations encoding a subject clause (16), and a nominal predicate clause (17):

(16) into-ŋ ki-l-o-pakna φ-kot-ŋy
which-CMP 1PL.A-3SG.OBJ-do-NEG.NMLS 3S-be-IPFV

‘There is no remedy [for that].’ (= ‘It cannot be done by us’).

(17) a-kot-pakna a-kt-ŋy
1S-be-NEG.NMLS 1S-be-IPFV

‘I cannot be’
The suffix -pits-o has only been found in nominal predicate clauses:

(18)  a-t smo-w-pits-o     a-k t-ayan

1SG.A-3SG.OBJ.KNOW-NEG-FUT.NMLS2 1S-IPFV

‘I did not know it.’

Both negative nominalisers express ‘impossibility’, and both may have been derived from the negative derivational suffix -p(e). The former may be a combination of -p(e), an unidentified element -ak- and a nominalising element -na; the latter may be a combination of -p(e), the derivational suffix -its, indicating a passive voice, and the nominalising morpheme -(ŋ)o. However, notwithstanding these correspondences, -pakna and -pits-o differ in usage: -pakna directly follows the verb stem, and can be used to form a nominalised subject clause as well as a nominalised predicate clause, whereas -pits-o is preceded by a past tense marker, and is only used for the construction of a nominal predicate clause.

2.1.4. Nominalisations formed with -(w)uč

The suffix -(w)uč, -uč after a consonant and -wuč after a vowel, is an agentive marker, and indicates the one who performs the action. Nominalisations ending in -(w)uč differ from the other nominalised forms, in that, that they are never followed by a case marker, and that the subject or the agent of the verb is not marked by a person prefix, but by the ending indicating a third person singular agent or subject. On the other hand, -(w)uč nominalisations can be marked for object.

As said, nominalisations ending in -(w)uč are noun phrase-like, and, as nouns, they could be used to form a subject clause, a nominal predicate, a direct complement, and a
relative clause. In the data, we have only found instances in which a -(w)uč nominalisation is used for the construction of a subject clause (19), and instances showing that the morpheme -(w)uč is used to derive an adjective from a verb (20):

(19)  *pi-man-ap-sim kamatsin ki-o-uč mate-kţ-aŋ*

2S-INES-ABL-EMP order 1pO-do-AG 3sS.come.out-F-IA

*a-putam  i-ŋaső-kte-he*

1sPOS-people Israel 3sA-3sO.reign-INF-BEN

‘From you will come out the ruler who will reign over my people of Israel’.

(20)  *kečwak  ɲole-wuč  tup-uč*

poor 3sO.love-AG walk-AG

‘a charitable person’ = ‘merciful’ ‘fond of travelling’

(lit. ‘the one who loves poor people’)

It is obvious that -(w)uč nominalisations, functioning as an adjective, were used to modify a head noun.

2.1.5. Overview of nominalised subordinates formed without case marking

The different types of subordinates that can be constructed with the nominalising suffixes -(e)č ‘factiviser’, -(k)he ‘simultaneity’, -(k)te ‘infinitive’, -lam ‘future nominaliser1’, -(ŋ)o ‘future nominaliser2’, -pakna ‘negative nominaliser’, -pits-o ‘negation-future nominaliser2’, and -wuč ‘agentive marker’ are shown in the overview in Table 1. The subordinate clauses that assumedly can be formed with the agentive marker -wuč are in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>clause complement</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>clause</th>
<th>clause</th>
<th>clause</th>
<th>clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-(e)č</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘factiviser’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(k)he</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘simultaneity’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(k)te</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘infinitive’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lam</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘future nominaliser1’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(n)ap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘sequential’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(ŋ)o</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘future nominaliser2’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pakna</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘negative nominaliser1’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pits-o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘negation-future nominaliser2’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wuc</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Overview subordinate nominalisations formed without case markers

It thus appears that subject clauses, complement/direct object clauses and nominal predicate clauses can be formed by most of the nominalisers: by five out of eight. Causal clauses can be formed by three nominalisers, and relative and temporal clauses by two out of eight. The most productive nominaliser appears to be the simultaneity marker -(k)he. It can be used to construct five different clauses: subject, direct object, nominal predicate, causal and temporal clauses. The simultaneity marker is followed by the future nominalisers -lam and -(ŋ)o. Both are used to construct four different clauses: subject, direct object, nominal predicate and relative clauses. The factiviser -(e)č occurs in the formation of three types of clauses: in subject, object and causal clauses. The sequential marker -(n)ap and the negative nominaliser -pakna are employed to form two types of clauses: -(n)ap: causal and temporal clauses, -pakna: subject and nominal predicate clauses. The agentive marker -(w)uč is used to construct a subject clause, but it is likely that nominalised forms ending in -(w)uč were also used in nominal predicate clauses, in direct complement clauses, and in relative clauses. The nominalisers -(k)te and -pits-o are the least productive ones. They occur in one kind of clause: the former in complement clauses, the latter in nominal predicate clauses.

2.2 Nominalised subordinates formed with case markers

As stated, the nominalisations formed with the suffixes -(e)č ‘factiviser’, -(k)he ‘simultaneity’, -(k)te ‘infinitive’, -lam ‘future nominaliser1’, -(n)ap ‘sequential’, -(ŋ)o ‘future nominaliser2’, -pakna ‘negative nominaliser’, and -pits-o ‘negation-future nominaliser2’ can be case marked. Case markers are used to form adverbial subordinates, see section 2.2.1. A special type of (subordinate) clause is the hypothetical or irrealis clause, expressing a non-realised event, see section 2.2.2.
2.2.1. Nominalised adverbial clauses

Several nominalised adverbial clauses, such as a causal, a comparative, a contrastive, an instrumental, a purposive, a spatial and a temporal clause, can be formed by means of different case markers and case marker combinations. For instance, a causal clause can be constructed with the case marker sequence -tu-p indicating ‘source’. The suffix is a combination of the personnel adessive case marker -tu and the ablative marker -(a)p/nap:

(21) \[ \text{into-}n-a \quad a-m-pako-kt-	extit{aj} \quad a-m-yač-pakna \]

\[ \text{which-CMP-Q} \quad 1SG.A-2SG.OBJ-\text{know-FUT-IPFV} \quad 1SG.A-2SG.OBJ-\text{see-NEG.NMLS} \]

\[ \phi-kot-o-tu-p \]

\[ 3SG.SBJ-\text{be-FUT.NMLS2-AD-ABL} \]

‘How shall I know you, for I cannot see you.’

A comparative clause can be formed by means of the suffix combination -\textit{man-ap}, consisting of the inessive case marker -\textit{man}, followed by the ablative marker -(a)p/nap:

(22) \[ a-n-\textit{utsa} \quad a-l-o-\textit{kte-ma}n-ap, \quad a-kol-o \]

\[ 1SG.POS-RFM-sin \quad 1SG.A-3SG.OBJ-\text{do-INF-IN-ABL} \quad 1S-\text{die-FUT.NMLS1} \]

\[ a-kt-\textit{aj} \]

\[ 1S-\text{be-IPFV} \]

‘I shall die rather than commit a sin’

Cholón uses the suffix -\textit{nake} ‘via’ to construct a contrastive clause:
The instrumental case marker -\textit{pat} can be used to form an instrumental clause:

\begin{align*}
(24) \quad \text{baptismo-}\text{te} & \quad \text{hayu} & \quad \phi-\text{maso-}\text{kiah-}\text{he-}\text{pat} & \quad \text{ki-dios-}\text{a} \\
\text{baptism-AD} & \quad \text{man} & \quad 3\text{S-be.born-IT-SIM-INS} & \quad 1\text{PL.POS-God-TOP} \\
\text{mul-iy-pits-o} & \\
3\text{S-be.satisfied-PFV-NEG-FUT.NMLS2} & \\
\text{‘Our God was not satisfied with [the fact that] man was reborn in baptism.’} & 
\end{align*}

The only example of a spatial clause found in the data is the following subordinate. It is formed by means of the non-personnel adessive case marker -\textit{te}:

\begin{align*}
(25) \quad \text{ki-y-iy-}\phi-\text{te} & \\
1\text{PL.SBJ-sleep-PST-NMLS-AD} & \\
\text{‘where we slept’} & 
\end{align*}

The benefactive case marker -\textit{he} is used to construct a purposive clause:

\begin{align*}
(26) \quad \text{pana-nayme} & \quad \text{Soledad-}\text{te} & \quad \text{ki-ante-kte-}\text{he},
\end{align*}
In order to arrive at Soledad by road, we pass Huaylillas.

A temporal clause can be formed with the ablative marker -(a)p/-nap:

(27)  mi-ša-pe-č-ap ko ašmaŋ mi-l-o-ki
      2S-go-NEG-FAC-ABL this first 2SG.A-3SG.OBJ-do-IMP

‘Before you go, do this first’

Examples (21) through (27) show that the case markers and case marker sequences -tu-p ‘source’, -man-ap ‘ablative’, -nake ‘via’, -he ‘benefactive’, -te ‘adessive’, and -(a)p/-nap ‘ablative’ can be used for the construction of a causal, a comparative, a contrastive, an instrumental, a purposive, a spatial and a temporal clause, respectively.

2.2.2. Hypothetical or irrealis subordinate clauses

Hypothetical or irrealis clauses are formed by attaching the separative case marker -(k)e, functioning as an anteriority or nominal past marker, to the nominalising suffixes -(k)te ‘infinitive’, -(y)o ‘future nominaliser 2’, -pakna ‘negative nominaliser 1’ and -pits-o ‘negation-future nominaliser 2’.

Example (28) below is an instance of a nominalised indirect object clause, constructed with the suffix combination -(k)te-ke (consisting of the infinitive marker -(k)te, followed by the anteriority marker -(k)e), and example (29) that of a nominalised direct object clause,
ending in -pakna-ke (consisting of the negative nominaliser1’ and the anteriority marker -ke).

The former expresses a frustrated event, the latter a non-realised event:

(28) a-n-uts   a-tsap-te-ke   m-a-luwe-y
1SG.POS-RF-enemy  1SG.A-3SG.OBJ.catch-INF-ANT  2SG.A-1SG.OBJ-prevent-PST

‘You prevented me from catching my enemy.’

(29) mi-ha-wa   mi-l-o-ha-pakna-ke   ok-nake
2-PL-TOP  2A-3SG.OBJ-do-PL-NEG.NMLS-ANT  1SG-PER

a-l-o-aj
1SG.A-3SG.OBJ-do-IPFV

‘I do what you (pl) have not been able to do.’

The sequences -(ŋ)o-ke ‘future nominaliser1-anteriority marker’ (30), and -pits-o-ke ‘negation-future nominaliser2-anteriority marker’ (31), occur in conditional clauses formed by means of the topicaliser -(w)a:

(30) paːxow mi-kot-o-ke-wa   a-m-peɲo-kte-ke
good  2S-be-FUT.NMLS2-ANT-TOP  1SG.A-2SG.OBJ-want-INF-ANT

‘If you had been good, I would have wanted you.’

(31) alkalde   a-kt-i\-pits-o-ke-wa
mayor  1S-be-PST-NEG-FUT.NMLS2-ANT-TOP

mi-ёнtsap-la-pakna-ke
2SG.OBJ-help-3PL.A-NEG.NMLS-ANT
‘If I had not been mayor, they would not have helped you.’

3. Nominalised main predicates

We may distinguish three groups of nominalised main predicates: nominalisations formed by the future nominalisers -lam and -(ŋ)o, nominalisations containing the negative nominalisers -pakna and -pits-o, and a group constructed with the irrealis markers -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, and -pakna-ke. They are treated in section 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, respectively.

3.1. Main predicates formed by -lam and -(ŋ)o

As noted in section 2.1.3, nominalisations constructed with the morphemes -lam ‘future nominaliser 1’ and -(ŋ)o ‘future nominaliser 2’ have in common that they refer to a future event and to an obligation or a possibility, that they can be used to derive a noun from a verb, and that they can modify a head noun and function as relative clauses (12a/b), as subject clauses (13a/b), as direct object clauses (14a/b), and as nominal predicate clauses (15a/b). In the cases in which the nominalised form functions as a subject or as a nominal predicate clause, the main verb is a copulative verb, see the examples (13a/b) and (15a/b), respectively. However, in (13a/b) the subject of the copula is an impersonal third person singular, whereas in (15a/b) the subject of the copula is co-referential with that of the subordinate verb. It appears that, when the copulative verb is omitted, forms ending in -lam and in -(ŋ)o may correspond to main predicates.

In (32) below, for instance, the main verb, the finite copula form ø-kot-ay ‘he/ it is’ (< kot ‘be’), is omitted after the nominalisations mits-pale-kiah-lam and u-ku-peño-lam. By the
omission of ø-kot-aŋ ‘he/it is’, the nominalisations ending in -lam take over its function and meaning, so that they resemble main predicates.\(^4\)

\begin{align*}
\text{(32)} \quad & \text{kapak mi-kot-nake} \quad \text{kas} \quad \text{male-pale-kia-ŋ} \\
& \text{power} \quad 2\text{SG.}\text{POS-being-\textsc{per}} \quad \text{wind} \quad 3\text{S.}\text{pass.by-pass.}\text{by-\textsc{refl-}\textsc{ipfv}} \\
& \text{tsi} \quad \text{mits-pale-kiah-lam} \quad \text{et-pit} \\
& \text{rain} \quad 3\text{S.}\text{come-pass.}\text{by-\textsc{refl-}\textsc{fut}\textsc{.nmls1}} \quad \text{fire-\textsc{cor}} \\
& \text{u-ku-peño-lam} \\
& \text{3SG.A-1PL.OBJ-warm-\textsc{fut}\textsc{.nmls1}} \\
& \text{‘By your power, the wind blows from all parts, the rain falls down from all parts, and the fire warms us from all parts.’}
\end{align*}

The same counts for the following example. In (33), the copula a-kt-aŋ ‘I am’ is omitted after a-meño-ŋo.\(^5\)

\begin{align*}
\text{(33)} \quad & \text{a-pa} \quad \text{ŋol-iy} \quad \phi\text{-kot-aŋ-ko-man-ap-a} \\
& \text{1SG.}\text{POS-father} \quad 3\text{S.}\text{die-PST} \quad 3\text{S.}\text{\textsc{be-}\textsc{ipfv-\textsc{dem-in-}\textsc{abl-top}}} \\
& \text{ok-e} \quad \text{a-kl-iy} \quad \text{a-kot-te-he} \\
& \text{1SG-\textsc{ant}} \quad 1\text{S.}\text{die-PST} \quad 1\text{S.}\text{\textsc{be-}\textsc{inf-ben}} \\
& \text{a-meño-ŋo} \\
& \text{1SG.A-3SG.OBJ.want-\textsc{fut}\textsc{.nmls2}} \\
& \text{‘I would have preferred to have died myself than that my father had died!’}
\end{align*}

\(^4\) Without the copula ø-kot-aŋ ‘he is’, the forms mits-pale-kiah-lam and u-ku-peño-lam literally mean ‘his falling down from all parts’ and ‘his warming us from all parts’, respectively; the forms mits-pale-kiah-lam ø-kot-aŋ and u-ku-peño-lam ø-kot-aŋ, with the copula, are translated as ‘he is falling down from all parts’ and ‘he is warming us from all parts’, respectively.

\(^5\) a-meño-ŋo, without the finite form a-kt-aŋ ‘I am’, literally means ‘my wanting it’; a-meño-ŋo a-kt-aŋ with the finite copula form, means ‘I am wanting it’, ‘I want it’. The form a-kot-te-he ‘my being’ preceding the nominalised form a-meño-ŋo is a complement of a-meño-ŋo (a-kt-aŋ) ‘I want it’, where ‘it’ refers to a-kot-te-he.
Nominalised main predicates ending in -(ŋ)o often occur in exclamations (see also (33) above):

(34)  a  Dios,  into-ŋ-am  a-m-pako-ŋo

INTJ  God  which-CMP  1SG.A-2SG.OBJ-know-FUT.NMLS2

a-kot-o    a-m-yač-pakna    a-kot-o-tu-p

1S-be-FUT.NMLS2  1SG.A-2SG.OBJ-see-NEG.NMLS  1S-be-FUT.NMLS2-AD-ABL

‘O God, how shall I be able to know you, for I cannot see you!’

3.2. Main predicates formed by -pakna and -pits-o

Nominalisations ending in -pakna occur as subject clauses, see (16), and as nominal predicates (17), and the ones ending in -pits-o as nominal predicates (18). In all these cases the main verb is a copula. When the copula is missing, the subject and nominal predicate clauses formed with -pakna and the nominal predicate ones constructed with -pits-o appear to take the place of the copula and resemble main predicates, like those ending in -lam and -(ŋ)o do when the copulative verb is absent, see section 3.1 above,

(35)  into-ŋko  hayu-pit  misa  i-sinah-pakna-le

which-DEM  man-INDF  Mass  3SG.A-3SG.OBJ.hear-NEG.NMLS-Q

‘Is there anyone not attending Mass?’

(36)  a-sinah-pits-o

1SG.A-3SG.OBJ.hear-NEG-FUT.NMLS2
‘I did not hear it’

3.3. Main predicates formed by -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, -pakna-ke

In section 2.2.2 we have seen that the nominalisations ending in -(k)te-ke ‘INF-ANT’, -(ŋ)o-ke ‘FUT.NMLS2-ANT’, and -pakna-ke ‘NEG.NMLS-ANT’ are used to form a subordinate clause. However, like those constructed with -lam, -(ŋ)o, -pakna and -pits-o, they can also be used for the construction of a main predicate. The nominalised forms ending -lam, -(ŋ)o, -pakna and -pits-o look like a main predicate when a copulative verb is omitted. I therefore assume that, analogically, the forms constructed with -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, -pakna-ke also resemble main predicates when a copulative verb is absented. In section 2.2.2 we have also seen that nominalised forms ending in -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, and -pakna-ke express a non-realised or a hypothetical event. The latter is also the case when the -(k)te-ke and -(ŋ)o-ke nominalisations are similar to main predicates. The fact is, both -(k)te-ke and -(ŋ)o-ke consist of an element indicating ‘future’: -(k)te ‘to do something’ and -(ŋ)o ‘future nominaliser 2’, respectively, and, at the same time, of a morpheme indicating ‘past’: the anteriority marker -ke. Both -(k)te-ke and -(ŋ)o-ke thus express ‘future in the past’ and indicate an event that could or would take/ have taken place, hence their occurrence in main clauses expressing a wish:

(37)  inaham    Dios    a-ŋole-kte-ke
       wishfully  God      1SG.A-3S.OBJ.love-INF-ANT

‘I wished I had loved God.’

(38)  inaham,    paŋow     a-kot-o-ke

6 a-sinah-pits-o literally means ‘my not having to hear it’. The non-nominalised counterpart of a-sinah-pits-o ‘I did not hear it’ would be a-sinah-pe-y ‘1sA-3sO.hear-NEG-PST’.
wishfully good 1S-be-FUT.NMLS2-ANT

‘I wished I had been good.’

The use of nominalisations formed by -pakna-ke partly differs from those formed with -(k)te-ke and -(ŋ)o-ke. The -pakna-ke nominalisations are negative by nature and indicate an event that could not happen. Therefore, they are not suitable to express a wishful thinking. On the other hand, nominalised forms constructed with -pakna-ke do occur in main clauses following a conditional ‘if’ clause (40), as do the nominalisations constructed with -(k)te-ke (39):

(39)  Juan paśow ø-kot-o-ke-wa    mul-pit
      Juan good 3S-be-FUT.NMLS2-ANT-TOP 3SG.POSS.SON-COR
      paśow ø-kot-te-ke
      good 3S-be-INF-ANT

‘If Juan had been good, his son would also have been good.’

(40)  yel ø-kot-iy-pits-o-ke-wa    ayča
      salt 3S-be-PST-NEG-FUT.NMLS2-ANT-TOP meat
      ki-mtiḥ-pakna-ke
      1PL.A-3SG.OBJ.salt-NEG.NMLS-ANT

‘If there had not been salt, we could not salt the meat.’

Examples (39) and (40) resemble each other. Both instances are complex sentences consisting of a conditional clause: *Juan paśow ø-kot-o-ke-wa ‘if Juan had been good’* and *yel ø-kot-iy-pits-o-ke-wa ‘if there had not been salt’, respectively, followed by a main clause expressing
the implication of the condition. Note also that in Cholón the clause in which the condition is stipulated regularly precedes the main clause, describing the fulfilment of the condition, and that both the subordinated ‘if-clause’ and the main clause are nominalised forms.

4. Concluding remarks

In section 1 we have seen that Cholón nominalisations are more noun phrase-like or more clause-like, and that they can be considered as ‘clauses in disguise.’ Besides a nominalising suffix, attached to the verb stem, a nominalisation may contain morphemes referring to a subject, if the stem is intransitive, or to an agent and an object, when the stem is transitive. The nominalised form can furthermore contain a negation, and only a past marker, if the negator is -pits-o.

Cholón has only four subordinating affixes to form a subordinate clause, to wit: the purposive marker -(e)č, the switch reference marker -hu, the coordinator -pit, and the topic marker -(w)a. The vast majority of the subordinate clauses are formed by nominalised forms, constructed with the following morphemes: the factiviser -(e)č, the simultaneity marker -(k)he, the infinitive marker -(k)te, the future nominaliser -lam, the sequence marker -(n)ap, the future marker -(ŋ)o, and the negative nominalisers -pakna and -pits-o. They are suffixed to a verb stem and they are used to form the following subordinates: subject, direct complement, nominal predicate, relative, causal and temporal clauses. See the overview of nominalisers and the different subordinate clauses formed by them in Table 1, section 2.1.5.

The nominalised forms mentioned above can be followed by case markers, which underlines the nominal status of these forms, since only nominal stems can be case marked. Examples of case marking suffixes encountered with nominalised forms are -(a)p /-nap ‘ablative’, -he ‘benefactive’, -man-ap ‘ablative’, -nake ‘perlative’, -pat ‘indtrumental’, -te
‘non-personnel adessive’, -tu-p ‘source’. They are used to form the following adverbial subordinate clauses: causal, comparative, contrastive, instrumental, purpositive, spatial and temporal clauses, respectively.

A special type of nominalised subordinates is the irrealis or hypothetical clause. Irrealis clauses are constructed with the nominalisations ending in -(k)te, -(ŋ)o, -pakna, -pits-o, followed by the nominal past marker -(k)e, see section 2.2.2.

In Amerindian languages, it is not uncommon for a nominalised form to function as the head of a subordinate clause. In Cholón, interestingly, the nominalisations ending in -lam, -(ŋ)o, -pakna, -pits-o, and in the irrealis endings -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, -pakna-ke, and -pits-o-ke, are used to form as the head of both a subordinate clause and a main clause. They normally function as a subordinate clause, but become a main predicate when, functioning as a subject clause or as a nominal predicate clause, the verb they are related to by subordination is a copulative verb that is omitted. In these cases the nominalised form can substitute the copula and take its place.

Nominalised forms constructed with -(ŋ)o ‘future nominaliser2’ often occur as main predicates in exclamations, see (33) and (34), those with -(k)te-ke ‘INF-ANT’ and -(ŋ)o-ke ‘FUT.NMLS2-ANT’ in wishes (37) and (38), and the ones with -(k)te-ke ‘INF-ANT’ and -pakna-ke ‘NEG.NMLS-ANT’ in sentences in which a condition is made, see (39) and (40). In such ‘if ... then’ sentences, the conditional ‘if’-clause contains a nominalisation formed by -(ŋ)o-ke ‘FUT.NMLS2-ANT’ and -pits-o-ke ‘NEG.FUT.NMLS2-ANT’, and the corresponding main clause a nominalisation formed by -(k)te-ke ‘INF-ANT’ and -pakna-ke ‘NEG.NMLS-ANT’, respectively. It is never the other way round. Nominalised conditional clauses ending in -(k)te-ke ‘INF-ANT’ or -pakna-ke ‘NEG.NMLS-ANT’, followed by main predicates ending in -(ŋ)o-ke ‘FUT.NMLS2-ANT’ and -pits-o-ke ‘NEG.FUT.NMLS2-ANT’ have not been found in the data. The canonical order in
‘if ... then’ sentences seems to be: -(ŋ)o-ke ‘FUT.NMLS2-ANT’ ... -(k)te-ke ‘INF-ANT’, and -pits-o-ke ‘NEG-FUT.NMLS2-ANT’... -pakna-ke ‘NEG.NMLS-ANT’.

So, as regards nominalisations resembling main clauses, in conclusion we can say that only the nominalisations formed by means of the morphemes -lam, -(ŋ)o, -pakna, -pits-o, -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, -pakna-ke, and -pits-o-ke can look like main predicates, when: (a), they originally functioned as a subject or as a nominal predicate clause; (b), the main verb they were subordinated to is a copulative verb; (c), the copulative verb is suppressed. Nominalisations constructed with -lam, -(ŋ)o, -pakna, -pits-o, -(k)te-ke, -(ŋ)o-ke, -pakna-ke, and -pits-o-ke thus function as the head of a main predicate, provided that a copula is understood.

Abbreviations and symbols

<p>| A   | agent       |
| ABL | ablative    |
| AD  | adessive    |
| ADV | adverbial marker |
| AG  | agentive    |
| ALL | allative    |
| ANT | anteriority |
| BEN | benefactive |
| CLF | classifier  |
| CM  | case marker |
| CMP | comparative |
| COR | co-ordinator |
| DEM | demonstrative |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>factiviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT.NMLS1</td>
<td>future nominaliser expressing obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT.NMLS2</td>
<td>future nominaliser expressing obligation/ possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INES</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>indirect speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>iterative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negator, negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>nominalised form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLS</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>perlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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