

Abstract: Originally published in Spanish in N° 7/8 1988-89 of *Diálogo Andino*, a journal of the Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica Chile, this article reviews some aspects of the Jaqi languages. It demonstrates how morphology, syntax, and linguistic postulates interplay in the structure of a language as that language is used in everyday life.

DATA SOURCE AND GRAMMATICAL PERSON IN THE JAQI LANGUAGES

MJ Hardman

THE JAQI linguistic family is found in the Andes of South America and consists of three modern languages, Jaqaru, Kawki and Aymara.

Jaqaru is spoken by several thousand people in Perú, centered in Tupe in the province of Yauyos, with large concentrations of speakers resident in such cities as Chinchá, Cañete, Huancayo, and Lima. It is a living language in constant use. Tupe itself is bilingual: the children continue to learn both Jaqaru and Spanish. It is said, among other things, that one cannot tell a good joke in Spanish, since that language is lacking in the necessary resources. Those who have gone to live in the cities frequently hold their sessions in Jaqaru. They are also insistent in their desire to have bilingual education with or without governmental support.

Kawki is spoken only by a few people in and around Cachuy also in Yauyos. Kawki is clearly a dying language. Only four people now speak with fluency, with some twenty or so who have some facility, and of these people only one is less than 60 years old. Though many in the community would like to revive the language it is very difficult to do so when there are no children among the living speakers.

Aymara is the native language of a vast expanse of the high flatlands, called the Altiplano, of South America. The current area of Aymara includes Bolivia where it is the native language of a third of the population, southern Perú and northern Chile. In Chile there are some seventy thousand speakers. The Aymara examples in this article are from the Chilean variety of Aymara, unless otherwise specified.¹ The Aymara speakers, in their totality, now number more than three and a half million. The absolute number of speakers is actually increasing, although relative to the population the percentage is decreasing as some young people abandon their native language and/or marry out of the Aymara group.

¹ I wish to thank Prof. Manuel Mamani M., linguist of the Universidad de Tarapacá, native speaker of Aymara, who provided me with the Chilean examples.

Many of the examples are also presented in Jaqaru. The structure described here is common to all of the Jaqi languages and is part of the Jaqi core of linguistic postulates.²

Work previously completed include the basic grammars of Jaqaru (Hardman 1966, 1983) and Aymara (Hardman, Yapita y Vasquez: 1988; Hardman: manuscript), the development of the concept of the linguistic postulate (Hardman 1972, 1978c), and comparative work that has included Kawki (Hardman 1975a, 1975b, 1976/77, 1978a, 1978b). The role of linguistic postulates in syntactic conjugations advances the description of the languages presented in the cited works.

The term *linguistic postulate* refers to a category that is marked in a language at various levels of grammar in such a way that it is difficult to construct a sentence in the language that does not in some way carry the mark of the linguistic postulate (Hardman 1972, 1978c). A linguistic postulate also has realizations within the culture.

For example, in European languages like Spanish and English, number and sex-based gender are linguistic postulates. It is difficult to imagine a sentence in a European language that does not carry any mark of number—that is, without any singular or plural. They exist, but they are not very interesting. At the same time, it is easy to see that these two postulates have a great many realizations within the European cultures. Androcentrism is marked in the grammar and proves very difficult to remove from the culture. Number, singular and plural, forms such an integral part of the conception of the world that it proves difficult for European speakers to imagine a language in which such number marking does not exist. Another reflection is the manner in which we privilege concepts that are “mono—”, like monotheism, together with the heavy intolerance of whatever is not “unitary”.

This essay deals specifically with the interaction of two of the linguistic postulates of the Jaqi languages.³

The first postulate is that of *data source* (Hardman 1986). In the Jaqi languages it is very difficult to construct a sentence that does not in some way carry a mark of *where the information is coming from*. That is, like the number mark in English, in the Jaqi languages it is obligatory to indicate whether what one is saying came from personal experience or through language, or from indirect indications or whether it is outside of personal knowing. The system is a very complex one, based on a few basic categories. The examples below present the five simple categories of Aymara.

- 1) Sariwa. ‘She goes./She went.’ (I saw her go)

² All examples are in the phonemic alphabets of the respective languages.

³ For a more detailed description of these postulates see (Hardman 1972,1978c)

This form is used when the speaker is a personal witness of the event.⁴ If the form is used in other contexts the speaker is judged a liar and as one who shows disrespect towards the listener.

2) Sariw siw. 'She goes, they say. /She went, they say.'

This form is used whenever information comes through language, spoken or written. Thus, when one reports on something read in a book, one must so mark it. This mark is not a question of truth or falsity, but rather one of **data source**. To understand the Jaqi system it is important not to confuse data source with the truth/false axis of European languages; the value systems involved are quite different.

3) Saratinwa. 'She had gone.' (but I didn't see her)⁵

This form is used to indicate non-personal knowledge or to indicate surprise. It is the normal form for history when no living person is witness and also for stories, legends, myths.

4) Sarpachawa. 'I'm sure she left./She doubtless left.'
(deduced from secondary evidence)

This form is used when the information is deduced from evidence or implications when personal knowledge or knowledge-through-language is missing.

5) Sarchixalla. 'Of course she left, but I didn't want her to go, it wasn't my fault.'

This form has various functions, but the central focus is that the speaker does not accept any responsibility, whether because of a lack of knowledge or a lack of interest or because the event is unknowable, or because the speaker is simply not responsible.

Below are examples from Jaqaru that correspond to Chilean Aymara, but in Jaqaru the data source category is more complex and does not lend itself so easily to simplification. The three examples given here might not look cognate at first glance, but they are (Hardman 1978b).

Jaqaru: 1) Palwiwa. 'She ate.' (personal knowledge)

Chil. Maq'iwa.

2) Palwimna. 'They say she ate.' (knowledge-through-language)

Chil. Maq'iw siw.

3) Palwata. 'She had eaten.' (non-personal knowledge)⁶

Chil. Maq'atinwa.

In Jaqaru there are no cognates for {-pacha}, or {-chi}; in Jaqaru the Sentence Suffixes are used much more. These suffixes mark all sorts of

⁴ This postulate has also been borrowed into Andean Spanish (Hardman 1982); it is reflected in the use of the preterite for personal knowledge.

⁵ The translation in Andean Spanish would be 'había ido' — the pluperfect is now used for non-personal knowledge. For the non-Andean speaker of Spanish it would be 'fué'.

⁶ The translation reflects Andean Spanish, which would be 'había comido'. For non-Andean speakers it would simply be 'comió' 'she ate'.

shades of data source with great subtlety . Below are two examples that approximately correspond to the Aymara examples.

1) Palwipsa. 'She probably ate.'

Chil. Maq'pachawa.

The translation is the one that will ordinarily be given but it is a poor reflection of the meaning; like Aymara it refers to knowledge from secondary sources, deduced or implied.

2) Palwijilli. 'Well I rather suppose she has eaten.'

Chil. Maq'pachapilla.

This form requires an explanation of the situation, so: "Well, sure she ate but if you tell me she didn't eat, then I will believe you because you know the situation better than I do".

The three basic categories of the Jaqi family are:

1) personal-knowledge (PK)

2) knowledge-through-language (KTL)

3) indirect-knowledge (IK).⁷

These three categories were the three that came to be integrated by borrowing into Quechua and into Andean Spanish (Hardman 1982). Thus, these three categories define a linguistic area.

The second linguistic postulate is that of the *preeminence of the second person*. In the Jaqi languages there are four basic grammatical persons of which the second person has more salience than the rest. The human pronouns of Jaqi⁸ are cognates across all of the languages, and throughout the whole of the grammatical system.

1p nä ~ na ~ naya 'I or we but without you'

2p juma 'you'

3p upa ~ jupa ~ jup"a 'she, he, they' (human)

4p jiwsa ~ jiwasa 'you and I, with or without others'

These four pronouns are indifferent to number, which means that **jiwasa** is not a plural, just as the others are not singulars.⁹

⁷ For details of this system see (Hardman 1972, 1978c). In the Jaqi languages personal knowledge forms are not used for general or received knowledge. On the other hand, it is possible to use personal knowledge for the future; metaphorically, one may look over one's shoulder into a near future (Yapita y Miracle 1981).

⁸ This also has to do with the postulate of human≠non-human, beyond the scope of this article.

⁹ The question of number is important within the study of the postulates. It is human nature to believe one's postulates universal and to try to impose them on anyone one comes into contact with. Number from European languages was no exception: priests, teachers, all the arrivals from European origin have attempted to impose number. The result has been that two suffixes, one from the noun system and one from the verb system, have been selected to act as traditional translators for plurals. These are heard extensively in the advertisements on the radio, for example (Briggs 1981). In recordings made with monolinguals, particularly those who are elderly, these suffixes occur rarely and with other meanings. Nevertheless, sometimes bilinguals try to adapt their Jaqi to Spanish categories, including insisting on matters such as number. On the other hand, teachers in the Andean schools complain constantly that the children seem incapable of learning singular and plural. Furthermore, newspapers regularly publish jokes the point of which is the mountain folks ignorance of singular and plural. As an alien category it can be rather difficult to understand.

Among the four persons, the second person is primary, both in use in discourse and within the morphology.

Use: The verbs in Jaqi carry personal suffixes that include both subject and object; the pronouns are optional. The pronouns are only used if one has a good reason to do so. One student did a count of the frequency of the various pronouns in free texts (McKay 1985). If one considers all of the possible occurrences of the optional pronouns, we find that **jup**"a occurs once in ten times, **naya** and **jiwasa** occur about half the time, but **juma** occurs in three out of every four opportunities whether as object or as subject. When we look at optional specification with possessives we find the same pattern.

Within Andean Spanish, in the rules of courtesy, we find again reflections of this importance of the second person and of the respect inherent in this concept. We often find the use of the Spanish respect pronoun **usted** even with speakers who are unfamiliar with the verb forms, which gives rise to such forms as usted vas, usted eres, forms with a respect pronoun but a familiar verb, even between family members.

Bilinguals speaking Jaqi, especially in the case of Aymara, have incorporated to a certain extent the "plural" concept from Spanish. They use it selectively, using the marking of plural to place greater emphasis on matters related to the linguistic postulates. For example, plural is used almost exclusively when referring to humans, and, within the human, it is used preferentially with the pronoun **juma**.¹⁰

Briggs (1981) did a study of courtesy where she noted the constant necessity of inclusion of the second person in whatever was being said or done. Sometimes this type of inclusion may look to an outsider like it were including the first person, but that is not what is going on. The inclusion together of the speaker and the hearer is seen as a courtesy to the second person. Thus it is discourteous to say 'give me water' or even 'I want water'. The courteous thing to say is 'let us drink water' **um umt'asiñani**,¹¹ although normally it is unnecessary to ask; the Jaqi people are customarily attentive and frequently anticipate the needs of the second person.¹²

Morphology: In the morphology the second person is marked much more than the other persons. It is so much so, for example, that in the grammatical person 3>2 the second person is marked to the total exclusion of the third. These marks are not suffixes, but rather phonemic elements that characteristically occur with a given set of forms. For example, *wh* is this

¹⁰ The suffixes labeled "plural" are not cognate across the languages; in addition they have a number of other functions.

¹¹ In addition there are the forms **umam wajt'ita**; **um umt'asirijtwa**, etc. Today in Chile the form given in the text is found more frequently in ceremonies or in formal situations

¹² There is a code of courtesy that includes, among other elements, a prohibition on the use of the imperative between comadres and compadres. If one wishes to give such a command one must use circumlocutions. There is also a code for requesting help between persons who share a ritual kinship, all of which are based on the preeminence of the second person. (Hardman et al 1988, Hardman manuscript b, Briggs 1981).

type of mark for information questions in English. For example, we consider the verbal suffixes:

Jaqaru: -matama 'third person to second person future'

Aymara: -¹³ta m 'third person to second person future'

Chilean Aymara: -itanta 'third person to second person future'

The three forms consist of three marks that are "distinctive features" of the morphology system (Hardman 1966, 1983):

Jaqaru: -ma ta ma

Aymara: -¹³ ta m

Chilean Aymara: -n ta m
2p 2p 2p

J: yakmatma 'she will give to you'

A: churätam 'she will give to you'

AC: churantam 'she will give to you'

The morphological distinctive feature of the third person is **pa**; it does not occur even once in these forms. The distinctive features of the second person are **ma**¹³ and **ta**; these indeed are found, three times. These distinctive features are not separate morphemes—they are the characteristic features that occur in morphemes referring to these persons.

The theme of this article is the interaction between the two linguistic postulates of *data source* and *preeminence of the second person*.

From a purely logical point of view, it is impossible to have personal knowledge of the internal state (pain, hunger, thirst) of another person. One can see secondary evidences, but no direct knowledge. This logic is grammatically marked in the Jaqi languages. Sentence suffixes are obligatory in the Jaqi languages; without them one does not have a sentence. For this reason, for the interrelationship of these postulates, it is difficult to obtain a complete conjugation paradigm of the kind used in language textbooks using European criteria.

For example, it is possible that a form such as ***Yamktamwa** 'you are hungry' could occur in Jaqaru; it is intelligible, but it is not said because it encloses a contradiction. That is, {-wa} indicates personal knowledge, and I am speaking of you, affirming personal knowledge of your hunger—obviously impossible; I cannot feel your hunger. Therefore, sentence suffixes are going to vary according to the grammatical person.

Below is an abbreviated paradigm of Aymara where one can note the following:

for the first person the norm is personal knowledge;

for the second person the norm is interrogative;

for the third person the form must be at least knowledge-through-language or some point further along the data source scale. For

¹³ Long vowel is a regular reflex of **ma** (Hardman 1975b).

healthy adults the normal form is knowledge-through-language (if one doesn't know, one can ask); for babies before language acquisition¹⁴ the norm is the inferential, which can also be used of sick or drunk adults. The forms, such as non-personal-knowledge, occur with frequency.

Maq'a.t.(w)¹⁵ awtj.itu. 'I'm hungry.'
 food of PK hunger 3>1p

Maq'a.t.t awtj.tam. 'Are you hungry?'
 food of ¿? hunger 3>2p

Maq'a.t.(w) awtj.it siw. 'They say she's hungry.'
 food of PK hunger 3>1p say

Maq'a.t awtj.pacha. 'She is probably hungry' food of
 hunger 3>3p INF

The parallel forms in Jaqaru, with the corresponding form in Chilean Aymara, are:

Na.j yamk.utu.wa. 'I hungry.'
 1p to hunger 3>1p PK
Chil. Maq'at awtjituw.

Jum.q yamk.tam.txi. 'Are you hungry?'
 2p ato hunger 3>2p ¿?
Chil. Maq'at awtjtamti.

Up." yamk.i.mna. 'They say she's hungry.'
 3p to hunger 3>3p KTL
Chil. Jup"ä maq'at awtjituw siw.

Jiws.j yamk.ushtu.wa ja.txi. 'We're hungry, right?'
 4p to hunger 3>4p PK ¿?
Chil. Maq'at awtjistuw janicha.

In Jaqaru, as in Aymara, personal-knowledge (PK) is normal for the first person. For the second person one uses the suffix {-txi} which is the yes/no interrogative. For the third person one uses knowledge-through-language (KTL). For the fourth person, one uses personal knowledge, immediately

¹⁴ It is important to note that the autonomy of personal perception is respected even in the case of the newborn. In Andean Spanish this is reflected by the use of such terms as *seguro*, *de repente*, *a lo mejor*, which are obligatory within the discourse and put the phrase outside of personal-knowledge. For example, recently, a bilingual Aymara-speaking student tried to say a sentence in Spanish without data source referring to a baby; he couldn't. With each effort one of the earlier mentioned phrases would slip out.

¹⁵ In this environment the allomorph of {-wa} is zero (Hardman, et al 1988, Hardman manuscript b); I have added the suffix in parenthesis in facilitate recognition of its presence.

followed by an interrogative of reconfirmation, where once again the second person comes into focus.

Another example from Jaqaru:

Uma.w chakk.utu. 'I'm thirsty.'

Uma.tx chakk.tma. 'Are you thirsty?'

Uma.mn chakk.i. 'They say she's thirsty.'¹⁶

For this paradigm the fourth person is difficult. The closest possible form, and not from a free text, would be a future anticipation of thirst, for example, before a trip up the mountain, but it would be more common to comment on the need to carry water.

Umaps chakshtuni. 'We will probably get thirsty.'

Umatxash chakshtuni. 'We will probably get thirsty.'

Another example from Jaqaru:

Iki.w wayrk.utu. 'I'm sleepy.'

sleep PK carry 3>1p

Chil. Iki.w purj.itu.

Iki.tx wayrk.tma. 'Are you sleepy?'

sleep ¿? carry 3>2p

Chil. Iki.t purj.tama.

Iki.mn wayrk.i. 'They say she's sleepy.'

sleep KTL carry 3>3p

Chil. Iki.w purj.itux siw.

No form is available for the fourth person.

Namp'a.nh.w usk.i. 'My head aches.'

head 1p PK hurt 3>3p

Chil. P'iqi.w usj.itux.

Namp'a.m.tx usk.i. 'Does your head ache?'

head 2p ¿? hurt 3>3p

Chil. P'iqi.t usj.tama.

Namp'.p".mna usk.i. 'They say her head hurts.'

head 3p KTL hurt 3>3p

Chil. P'iqi.w usj.itux siw.

As can be seen from the examples presented, within the grammatical system of the Jaqi languages one cannot have personal-knowledge of the internal states of another person, not even in the case of infants or the sick;

¹⁶ In Chilean Aymara the structure is different; there is a verbalization of a nominalization. The three correlative forms are: **Uma.t jiwa.ta.** ".t.wa.; **Uma.t jiwa.ta.jta.ti.**; **Uma.t jiwa.ta.** ".t.w siwa.. In each case death from (lack of) water is the literal translation.

this class of information is only available through knowledge-through-language or sources even less direct.

The concepts and uses might be more clearly seen if we look at some special uses. The first example is with the verb **illa** 'to see.' from Jaqaru.

- Illk.t".wa. 'I see.'\ 'I'm taking care of (a baby).'
 \ 'I'm awake.'
Illk.ta.txi. 'Are you seeing?.'\ 'Are you taking care
 of (a baby)?.'\ 'Are you awake?.'
Illk.ta.wa. 'You are taking care of (a baby)..'
 \ 'You know (place)'¹⁷

Semantically, for the first person and the second person one has the same range of meaning, providing the sentence form is personal-knowledge for the first person and interrogative for the second-person. Personal-knowledge for the second person drastically shifts the possibilities, again reflecting what is possible to experience personally.

The second example is with the verb **ishapa** 'to hear/listen' from Jaqaru:

- Ishapk.t".wa. 'I hear.'\ 'I understand.' *Chil.* Istijtwa.
Ishapk.ta.txi. 'Do you understand?' *Chil.* Ist'jtati.
Ishapk.i.mna. 'They say she understands.' *Chil.* Ist'jtwasiw.
Ishapk.i.wa. 'She understands (a language). *Chil.* Ist'jiwa.
Ishapk.i.qa. 'She's listening (to a radio).' *Chil.* Ist'jtati.¹⁸

In this example, as in the previous case, for the first person there is ambiguity. With the second person only the interrogative form is permitted and there is no ambiguity.¹⁹ The contrast is even clearer if we look at the first two forms of the third person. Both forms refer to language ability, and in the second case, for example, the speaker has conversed with the person referred to and has personal-knowledge of her abilities. In both cases the caution is given to a second person, that they take care with their language, just in case.

Returning to the form for the second person, we can see that there would be no motive to speak to a second person of their polyglot abilities. If I am speaking directly to you, there is also no motive for distinguishing between 'to hear/listen.' and 'to understand.'; you are always the center of the focus, so the form is always interrogative and with only one semantic interpretation.

¹⁷ In Chilean Aymara there is a distinction between 'to see' **uñjaña**, and 'to be awake' **uñjattata**, that is, 'person who has just begun to see', a nominalized verb. For the forms correlative to Jaqaru, it is necessary to reverbilize them. The Chilean forms with the meaning of 'to see' are: Uñjtwa.; Uñjtawa. The forms with the meaning of 'awake' are: Uñjattatästäwa.; Uñjattatästäti.

¹⁸ Except for the last form, where the interrogative is still required, Chilean Aymara has parallel structures, and the verb **istjaña** is also 'understand/hear/listen'.]

¹⁹ The negative form for the first person is also not ambiguous in normal situations: it is what is said when one does not understand. If it is to indicate a physical defect, then a gesture toward the ear is required.]

For the third person it is different; if you observe a person in an attitude of listening and wish to speak of it, then you can use the sentence suffix {-qa}, which is attenuation of personal-knowledge, but not so far off as knowledge-through-language; it falls somewhere in the inferential range.

To close this sketch of the interrelationship of the two linguistic postulates of data source and preeminence of the second person, I will cite some examples of cultural correlates.

First, and most importantly, is the code of courtesy already mentioned, which carries indications for daily conduct in all circumstances. Combining the preeminence of the second person with data source results in great respect for the autonomy of each person and a certain deference towards others, which is expressed in courtesy and in the recognition of human status, of **jaqi** status, of all persons who conduct themselves as human beings.

Equally, there is respect for the motivations and privacy of others, and conversations are not peppered with questions digging into the motives of others. The ordinary question is 'What did she say?', not the questions we would ask 'What does she think?' or 'What does she believe?'.

There is an acceptance of personality as given, without efforts to "reform". This does not mean that there is not criticism. There is indeed a great deal of criticism, including mutual criticism; there is after all, one verb tense devoted to criticism, but this all refers to deeds, not to thoughts. There is in Jaqaru a saying very close to the Spanish saying of "genio y figura hasta la sepultura" temperament and face to the grave.' which is:

Uk'am yurkiriqua uk'machaw jiwki.
'As one is born thus also does one die.'

In conclusion, there are a few things I would like to mention with a hope of further studies; these observations are the fruit of some thirty years of work among the Jaqi, in anecdotal form. The strong sense of personal responsibility together with the impossibility of knowing the internal states of another appears to leave little room for popular interest in the psychological sciences. Also, there is relatively little interest in obtaining an exact balance between evil deeds and punishments, in contrast with our calvinistic notions. One important concept is a strong work ethic with great value placed on work and production, also a great value placed on education and on writing, to preserve the word. Land-holding, always individual²⁰ within certain community controls and communal uses of the land, is related to these basic concepts of the Jaqi culture.

The detailed study of grammar is a valuable way to discover and comprehend the basic concepts of a culture, but this study cannot take place

²⁰ That is, women and men have their own land, and, although they work the land together after marriage, ownership does not change except by sale (not desirable) or by inheritance as the lands are passed onto daughters or sons. That is, the land never becomes common property.

in a vacuum; to discover grammatical categories it is essential to observe usage from within a culture in daily life.²¹

Adapted from an article originally published in Spanish in N° 7/8 1988-89 of *Diálogo Andino* journal of the Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica Chile.

Bibliography

Briggs, Lucy T.

1981 "Politeness in Aymara Language and Culture". In *The Aymara Language in Its Social and Cultural Context*. M. J. Hardman, ed. University Presses of Florida, Social Science Monograph Series, 67. University of Florida, Gainesville.

1981 "Missionary, Patrón, and Radio Aymara". In *The Aymara Language in Its Social and Cultural Context*. M.J. Hardman, ed. University Presses of Florida, Social Science Monograph Series, 67. University of Florida, Gainesville.

Hardman, M. J.

1966 *Jaqaru: Outline of Phonological and Morphological Structure*. Mouton, The Hague.

1972 "Postulados Lingüísticos del Idioma Aymara". In *Reto del Multilinguismo en el Perú*. Alberto Escobar, ed. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

1975a "El Jaqaru, El Kawki, Y El Aymara". In *Actas, El Simposio del Montevideo (1969), Primer Congreso Interamericano de Lingüística*. Mexico City, Mexico.

1975b "Reconstrucción del Sistema Personal Verbal de Proto-jaqi". *Revista de Museo Nacional*, tomo xli: 433-456. Lima, Perú.

1976/77 "La Familia Lingüística Jaqi". *Revista Yauyos* 4: 15-16/17.

1978a "Jaqi: The Linguistic Family". *IJAL* vol. 42:2

1978b "La Familia Lingüística Andina Jaqi: Jaqaru, Kawki, Aymara." In *Vicus Cuadernos, Linguistica II*:5-28. Amsterdam: John V. Benjamin Publishers.

1978c "Linguistic Postulates and Applied Anthropological Linguistics". In *Papers on Linguistics and Child Language, Ruth Hirsch Weir Memorial Volume*. M.J. Hardman and Vladimir Honsa, eds. Mouton, The Hague.

1982 "Mutual Influences of Andean Languages and Spanish". *Word* 33:1-2.

1983 *Jaqaru: Compendio de la Estructura Morfológica y Fonológica*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos

1986 "Data Source Marking in the Jaqi Languages". In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols, eds. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.

manuscript

Aymara Grammar. Revised and augmented edition.

Hardman, M. J., Juan de Dios Yapita, and Juana Vasquez, with
Laura Martin, Lucy T. Briggs, Nora England.

²¹ I wish to thank Prof. Manuel Mamani M., Julia Córdova, and Dr. Dimas Bautista Iturizaga for reading Spanish versions of this article and offering me their advice and corrections, to Prof. Manuel Mamani M. for the examples in Chilean Aymara and to Dr. Dimas Bautista Iturizaga for the examples in Jaqaru.

1988 Compendio de la Estructura Gramatical del Idioma Aymara. [Aymar Ar Yatikañataki. Vol. III, 1975] (Lucy Briggs, ed.; Translated by Edgard A.Chavez Cuentas). La Paz: Instituto de Lengua y Cultura Aymara.

McKay, James Tuell

1985 "Language, Structure, Worldview and Culture Contact: Understanding Aymara Culture and History in a Bolivian Context." M.A.thesis. University of Florida, Gainesville.

Yapita, Juan and Andrew Miracle

1981 "Time and Space in Aymara". *In* The Aymara Language in Its Social and Cultural Context. M. J. Hardman, ed. University Presses of Florida, Social Science Monograph Series, 67. University of Florida, Gainesville.