

**Cliticization and incorporation in Panoan**  
**Adam TALLMAN**  
 (University of Texas at Austin)

In this paper I attempt to tease apart the distinction between cliticization and lexical incorporation in Panoan languages (cf. Woodbury 1996). Verbs in Panoan languages are described as polysynthetic (Fleck 2003: 61; Valenzuela 2003: 80; Ferreira 2005: 48; Zariquiey 2011: 4; Barbosa 2012: 6) capable of encoding a large amount of functional and lexical content primarily through suffixation (Payne 1990: 223; Loos 1999: 234; Fleck 2013: 44). However, in Chácobo the verb complex, which is described as a word unit for other Panoan languages (Zingg 199: 6; Valenzuela 2003: 255; Fleck 2003: 32-451; Zariquiey 2011: 176-210; Ferreira 2008: 71), can be interrupted by a full subject noun phrase. The “inflectional suffixes” of other Panoan languages are detached from the verb stem in (1).

- (1) VERB STEM                      SUBJECT NP                      INFLECTIONAL “SUFFIXES”  
*kā=tikī=yámà*                      *hātírò?ā hónì=bò*                      =*kàn=ní=kí*  
 go=AGAIN=NEG ALL man=PL                      =3PL=REMPAST=PAST  
 ‘All the men didn’t go again a long time ago.’

In this paper, I argue that the verb complex in Chácobo is a phrasal construct composed largely of syntactically placed prosodically dependent clitics (cf. Anderson 2005: Ch. 2; Spencer and Luis 2012). I consider the suffix/enclitic distinction of other Panoan languages in light of this analysis. I argue that the functional morphemes of other Panoan languages are, in most cases, better regarded as incorporated suffixes rather than enclitics (cf. Woodbury 1996). Evidence for this thesis comes from comparison of distributional facts, scopal based ordering of verbal morphemes, and morphophonology between Chácobo and other Panoan languages. This paper thus teases apart the distinction between clitics and clitic variants of suffixes through comparison of genetically related languages.

**References**

Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
 Barbosa, Raphael Augusto Oliveira Barbosa. 2012. Aspectos Tipológicos na formação de palavras em un grupo de línguas da família pano. MA thesis, Campinas.  
 Ferreira, Rogério V. 2008. *A lingua do povo matis: Uma visão gramatical*. Lincom Studies in Native-American Linguistics 60. Munich, Germany: Lincom Europa.  
 Fleck, David. 2003. A grammar of Matses. PhD, Rice University.  
 Fleck, David. 2013. Panoan Languages and Linguistics. *American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers*, Number 99.  
 Loos, Eugene E. 1999. Pano. In *The Amazonian Languages*. Aikhenvald, A. & Dixon, R. M. W. eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
 Payne, Doris, L. 1990. Morphological Characteristics of Lowland South American Languages. *Amazonian Linguistics*, Payne, Doris, L. ed. 213-243.  
 Spencer, Andrew and Ana R. Luís. 2012. The canonical clitic. *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Brown, Dustan, Marina Chumakina and Corbett, Greville G. eds. 124-150. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
 Woodbury, Anthony C. 1996. On restricting the role of morphology in Autolexical Syntax. *Autolexical Theory: Ideas and Methods*. Schiller, Eric, Elisa Steinberg and Barbara Need, eds. 319-363. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
 Valenzuela, Pilar. 2003. Transitivity in Shipibo-Konibo Grammar. PhD, University of Oregon.  
 Zingg, Phillip. 1998. Diccionario Chacobo-Castellano. La Paz: Viceministerio d Educación Inicial, primaria y Secundaria.