

PERSON HIERARCHY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS: THE CASE OF AYMARA¹

Elena Filimonova
University of Konstanz, Germany

1. Introduction

Hierarchies play a significant role in the organisation of phonological, grammatical, and lexical structure (to mention a few: Keenan & Comrie's accessibility hierarchy (1977 [1972]), Berlin & Kay's colour term hierarchy (1969), Foley's syntactic bondedness hierarchy (1980), Corbett's hierarchy of semantic agreement targets (1979), animacy hierarchy suggested by different scholars for various linguistics parameters – e.g. Smith-Stark (1974) for number marking, Silverstein (1976), Moravcsik (1978) and others for case marking distribution). In this paper, the person hierarchy will be at issue. Concentrating on Aymara, I will show in what way the ranking of persons can influence morphosyntactic patterns. I hypothesise that person hierarchy is not an "artificial" concept developed by linguists to describe different structural constraints but rather a cognitive parameter inherent to the worldview of the corresponding language society.

According to their involvement in the speech act, one traditionally distinguishes three main characters, or persons: Speaker (S), Addressee (A), and Non-Locutor (or Non-participant of the speech act) (N). Since the time of the first grammars written by ancient Greeks, these persons are usually referred to by numbers, whereby 1st person refers to Speaker, 2nd to Addressee and 3rd to Non-locutor, where the order of enumeration clearly depicts the principle that the Speaker is presupposed to play the prominent role in interpersonal communication. In this paper, however, I will consider cases where the Addressee (the 2nd person) appears to be most salient. Starting with the analysis of morphosyntactic rules, I will argue that grammatical salience of the person spoken to has its functional motivation and is conditioned by the rules of interpersonal communication of the respective culture, which merits a special status not to the Speaker but to the person addressed.

The paper will be structured as follows. In the next section, I will briefly introduce the main features of the person hierarchy. Section 3 will deal with Aymara data demonstrating the ordering of persons. Section 4 will discuss some principles of Aymara culture revealing the underlying conception of Addressee salience. Finally, the major findings of the paper will be summarised.

¹ Acknowledgements: I am indebted to Martha Hardman for answering my numerous questions about Aymara structure and for providing me with additional materials. I am also grateful to Irina Nikolaeva and the editors for useful comments on an earlier version of the paper. Special acknowledgements go to the Spinoza project at Leiden University (Pieter Muysken and his colleagues) who invited me to participate at the Workshop on Bolivian and Rondonian Indigenous Languages. Thanks also to Arista Da Silva and Allison Wetterlin for polishing up my English. All mistakes are my own.

2. *Person hierarchy and its features*

Until recently the hierarchical ordering of persons has not received extensive analysis in linguistic theory. Proceeding from the traditional designation of persons by numbers (and possibly supported by the egocentric nature of the Western worldview), the ordering 1>2>3, in our terms S>A>N, has been considered as the only possible and even axiomatic configuration. However, with the beginning of active studies of the indigenous languages in the last few decades, this stereotype was abandoned. Surveys of person marking morphology in Algonquian languages, which seemed to be clearly motivated by the opposite ranking of speech act participants, i.e. the hierarchy A>S>N, had an overwhelming effect in violating the assumption that the Speaker is universally more highly ranked than the Addressee. The only universal which seems to be absolute across languages is that speech act participants (S and A) always over-rank the Non-locutor(s): {S, A}>N.

The person hierarchy is typically manifested in the polypersonal verb agreement which indicates more than one argument of the verb (e.g. subject and non-subject, subject and direct object, subject, direct and indirect object, etc.). Personal verb inflection in itself is a two-faced phenomenon: On the one hand, agreement is triggered by verbal arguments and in this sense it signals their presence in the syntactic representation of the clause; on the other hand, agreement morphemes encode deictic characteristics of these arguments (e.g., Speaker, Addressee, Non-locutor). These two parameters are logically independent, but we may be able to speak about some prototypical correlation between grammatical relations and the deictic properties they are associated with.

It is generally assumed that locutors are more active than the Non-locutors, i.e. they are more likely to act and not to be acted upon, and therefore are typically considered to be the best candidates for the subject position. The reverse is true for Non-locutors: They are typically considered to have less control over the situation than any of the speech act participants (SAPs) and in the clause structure are more likely to be expressed as one of the non-subject arguments. Technically this prototypical distribution of participants over grammatical relations is determined by a one-to-one correspondence between higher and lower ranked positions on two hierarchies: the person and relational hierarchies. The person hierarchy, as already mentioned above, generally orders SAPs above Non-locutors (whereby SAPs can in turn be differentiated as higher vs. lower ranked ones) and relational hierarchy ranks subject above other verbal arguments. When, however, the distribution of persons over grammatical relations does not fit the prototypical correlation, i.e. when the higher ranked person corresponds to a lower ranked argument and the lower ranked person occupies the more prominent argument position, a conflict situation arises. Languages which are sensitive to the combinability of deictic and argument statuses signal this conflict morphosyntactically. In such cases, the usual encoding of polypersonal situations does not hold, thus falling outside the frames of the standard morphological paradigm. A close inspection of the persons involved and the analysis of their distribution

over higher vs. lower ranked argument positions enables us to reconstruct their mutual ordering.

The means of expressing the prominent status of a given person may considerably vary from language to language depending on morphologic, syntactic and semantic constraints of the language in question. It would, therefore, be useless to search for a procedure generally applicable to all languages in order to determine the configuration of the person hierarchy (cf. Heath 1998).

It should be noted, however, that cases of unambiguous salience of S or A in the hierarchy of persons occur much more rarely than those where the mutual ranking of SAPs is unclear or opaque. Heath, for example, in discussing the patterning of transitive constructions in Australian and Native American languages, argues that it is extremely difficult to rank one SAP over another: “The $1 \Leftrightarrow 2^2$ combinations are doubly dangerous because they not only contain the most pragmatically sensitive pronominals they also combine them into a syntagmatic structure and thereby necessarily focus attention on the speaker-addressee relationship” (Heath 1991:86). In these situations, “structures that make the most sense cognitively or formally are actually avoided” (Heath 1998:102), instead, opaque and non-transparent structures which mitigate the reference to speech act participants are used. In these cases, the configuration of the person hierarchy may be defined as $\{S \approx A\} > N$, without any preference to anyone of the SAPs.

Among the languages which do signal the higher rank of a given speech act participant, contrary to the expectations that languages with Speaker and Addressee salience are equally distributed, those favouring the Speaker clearly prevail. The cases where the Addressee overrides the Speaker in the person hierarchy are very uncommon and therefore often tend to be ignored in cross-linguistic surveys.

This paper investigates the phenomenon of person hierarchy in Aymara, a Jaqi language spoken by 2,200,000 people in Bolivia, Peru, Chile, and Argentina (data from Ethnologue, 14th edition). The goal of this study is to demonstrate deictic and grammatical salience of the person spoken to in Aymara grammar and to examine extralinguistic features possibly motivating this particular configuration of the person hierarchy ($A > S > N$).

A special status of the Addressee in the Jaqi languages has already been pointed out by Martha Hardman. She considers the salience of the 2nd person (in our terms Addressee) to be one of the tenets, or ‘linguistic postulates’, as she calls them, realised in the language. In Hardman’s terms, linguistic postulates are “those recurrent categorisations in the language which are most directly and most tightly tied to the

² Heath (1991) uses abbreviation ‘ $X \Rightarrow Y$ ’ to refer to the distribution of persons over the main arguments of the transitive verb. An element to the left from the arrow refers to the person occupying the subject position and an element to the right corresponds to direct object. An arrow (\Rightarrow) denotes the transition of the action from one person to another. E.g. $1 \Rightarrow 2$ means that 1st person is a subject and 2nd person a direct object. Further, the bi-directional arrow (\Leftrightarrow) in abbreviations like $1 \Leftrightarrow 2$ denotes the conjunction of person combinations $1 \Rightarrow 2$ and $2 \Rightarrow 1$. In the following discussion I adopt these abbreviations referring to person distribution over subject and non-subject arguments in the verbal inflectional markers.

perceptions of the speakers, those elements which, while language imposed, are so well imposed that speaker considers them just naturally part of the universe ...” (1978a:122-123). In other words, she believes that language specific categories contribute to a worldview in a speaker’s culture. Hardman’s theory of linguistic postulates clearly resembles (and was probably inspired by) the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, according to which language determines, or less resolutely, has a tendency to influence thought and cognition, thus presupposing correlations between different linguistic phenomena and variations in non-linguistic behaviour. I, however, inspired by the ideas presented by Lee 1959 and Plank 1985, suggest that it is not the language that shapes speakers’ worldview but rather the culture that imposes the language and gets manifested in its structure.

3. Aymara data

In this section, I will mainly concentrate on Aymara data, demonstrating the salience of the person spoken to. This salience can be seen, first and foremost, in the verbal personal inflection. The Aymara verb is characterised by cumulative tense-person morphemes. Usually only two participants of the particular situation receive their reference in the person marker, one of them always being a subject participant and the other one of the non-subject arguments. In Jaqi languages, person-tense suffixes are normally treated as unit morphemes. Person and tense markers have amalgamated to an extent that it is difficult to distinguish (at least synchronically) any constitutive morphemes. Nevertheless, due to the comparative analysis of Jaqi languages and historical reconstruction (Hardman 1978b), some correlations can be stated as “distinctive features” designating the four persons. These person features are not always fixed to a particular argument position and in some cases, the same marker can indicate both subject and non-subject complements, cf. Table 1.

Person	Person distinctive features
Speaker:	<i>-it</i> (as subject and non-subject complement); <i>-ta</i> (as subject)
Addressee:	<i>-ta</i> in the simple tense; <i>-m</i> in the non-realised tenses and some other places, especially as non-subject complement, and long vowel ³ , particularly when joined to one of the other markers;
Non-Locutor:	basically unmarked, either as subject or non-subject complement. <i>-i</i> in the simple tense is easily absorbed and/or omitted; <i>-p</i> or <i>-pa</i> in non-realised tenses;
Inclusive:	an interpolated <i>-s-</i> over the corresponding form for 1st person (as non-subject complement); a nasal (as subject), additionally: <i>-ta</i> for non-future realised tense, <i>-sa</i> for non-realised tenses

Table 1: Person distinctive features in Aymara (adapted from Hardman-de Bautista, Vásquez & Yapita (from here on HVY) 1974:232-233)

³ This long vowel derives from a proto-Jaqi syllable **-ma*, still occurring in some dialects of Aymara and in the other Jaqi languages.

Considering these person features and analysing the tense-person markers of different combinations of persons, we can observe that the distribution of the corresponding person markers is far from uniform. Consider table 2, where simple tense person markers are given:

Person combination	Morphol. marker	Marked person	Marked argument
1=>2	-sma	Addressee marked	non-subj.
2=>1	-ista	Speaker and Addressee marked ⁴	subject & non-subj.
2=>3	-ta	Addressee marked	subject
3=>2	-tam	Addressee marked twice	non-subj.
1=>3	-ta	Speaker marked	subject
3=>1	-itu	Speaker marked	non-subj.
Incl=>3	-tan	Incl marked (Speaker subject marker + nasal)	subject
3=>Incl	-istu	Incl marked (Speaker complement marker + interpolated -s-)	non-subj.

Table 2: Simple tense person markers in Aymara (adapted from HVY 1974:232-233)

In most combinations, only one participant of a given situation appears to be marked. However, it is neither systematically the subject nor the non-subject. The person patterning in Aymara follows the hierarchy: A>S>N., i.e. each person combination is signalled by the participant which occurs higher on the person hierarchy, independently of its syntactic status. However, in the situations where Addressee is involved, the distribution of participants over grammatical relations is also significant. Thus, according to the above-mentioned rule, the combination 3=>2 should be signalled by the Addressee marker, since it is the higher ranked person in this combination. However, in this particular case, due to its non-subject position which is considered to be less prestigious than the subject one, the person spoken to additionally appears to be even doubly marked⁵.

The distribution of person markers in “1↔2” combinations, i.e. where both SAPs are involved, plays an essential role in determining the configuration of the

⁴ With 2nd person as subject, 1st person and Inclusive fall together in form, and Inclusive semantically falls out. However, the old -s- referring to Inclusive, appears intermittently in 2=>1 markers.

⁵ The multiple marking of the Addressee in its subordinate role is not unique for Aymara, it is characteristic of the Jaqi family in general (Hardman 1966, 1978b). Interestingly, a similar pattern of Addressee salience is found in Huallaga Quechua (Weber 1986, 1989). There transitive verbs usually have two slots for both subject and direct object, whereby the person markers precisely refer to the participants involved. However, in 3=>2 and 3=>Incl combinations, the 3rd person subject marker undergoes a kind of shift and appears to be of the same person as the direct object marker. That is to say that, 3=>2 is indicated by morpheme combination 2.Object-2.Subject and 3=>Incl is labelled by Incl.Object-Incl.Subject and not by 2.Object-3.Subject and Incl.Object-3.Subject, respectively. Thus, the 2nd person and inclusive appear to be marked twice, whereas 3rd person receives no encoding at all.

Aside from morphological similarity, however, the tendencies of Addressee salience in Jaqi and Huallaga Quechua seem to be historically independent.

person hierarchy. Here, if the Addressee occurs in a subject position (2=>1), both Speaker and Addressee get encoded in the combination marker. However, if Addressee occurs in a low-ranked non-subject position (1=>2), it is the only person that receives an overt expression. I see this marking strategy as clearly indicating that the person spoken to overranks the Speaker in the person hierarchy.

Another interesting aspect of Addressee salience concerns the rules of person marking when arguments with semantic roles other than patient/theme trigger agreement. In this case, the choice of the complement to be referred to in the person marker is presupposed by a kind of relational hierarchy, according to which a beneficiary/purposive complement (marked by the *-taki-* morpheme) always takes precedence over a directional complement (marked with *-ru-* or *-ta-*). This principle is illustrated in examples (1-3) and (4-6), where the first series shows the prominence of the beneficiary complement over the directional complement ‘to, toward’, and the second series, the beneficiary over the directional complement ‘from, of’:

- (1) *jupa-r ch'uq chura-m*
3-to potato give-IMP.2=>3
‘Give potatoes to her’ (HVY 1974:316)
- (2) *k'iti-taki-s (jupa-r) (ch'uq) chura-rapi:-xa ?*
who-BEN-SENT⁶ 3-to potato give-VBEN-FUT.1=>3-POL
‘On whose behalf shall I give her potatoes?’ (HVY 1974:316)
- (3) *naya-taki-w (jupa-r) (ch'uq) chura-rap-ita:ta*
1-BEN-SENT 3-to potato give-VBEN-IMP.2=>1
‘Give them to her on my behalf’ (HVY 1974:316)
- (4) *jupa-t kis ala-ni:*
3-from cheese buy-Near-FUT.1=>3
‘I’ll buy cheese from him’ (HVY 1974:316)
- (5) *k'iti-taki-s (jupa-t) (kis) ala-rapi:-ta ?*
who-BEN-SENT 3-from cheese buy-VBEN-FUT.2=>3
‘On whose behalf will you buy cheese from him?’ (HVY 1974:317)
- (6) *juma-taki-w (jupa-t) (kis) ala-rapi:-ma*
2-BEN-SENT 3-from cheese buy-VBEN-FUT.1=>2
‘I’ll buy cheese from him on your behalf’ (HVY 1974:316-317)

⁶ Information on SENT: *-wa* marks the sentence as affirmative and/or personal knowledge; *-sa* marks one of the two basic question types of Aymara. It ordinarily occurs with an interrogative, either directly on the interrogative or on a construction containing it.

However, when Addressee occurs in a position of directional complement it can override a beneficiary and gain its expression in the person-tense marker. Thus, in (7a), unlike the examples above, a directional complement is marked.

- (7) a *juma-r jupa-tak ch'uq alja:ma*
 2-to 3-BEN potato sell-FUT.1=>2
 'I will sell you potatoes for (you to deliver/transmit etc.to) him'
 (HVY 1974:317)
- b *juma-r jupa-tak ch'uq alja:*
 2-to 3-BEN potato sell-FUT.1=>3
 'I will sell you potatoes for him' (Hardman, p. c.)

In (7a), the verb person-tense marker *-:ma* signals the Addressee, which is a directional complement, and does not encode the person of a beneficiary-marked constituent. Based on examples (4-6), one would expect here a "1=>3" verbal marker.

According to Hardman (p.c.), any time there is an Addressee, it may take precedence over any other person marking. Thus, the Addressee, be it a beneficiary or directional complement, may, at the discretion of the speaker, be marked in the verb over any other person. Thus, example (7b) is also grammatical, but the preferred variant is probably (7a).

The next aspect of Aymara grammar which is also most probably motivated by Addressee salience concerns the use of independent personal pronouns. Typically, free pronouns in Aymara are omitted but may occur for redundancy or explicitness, in direct reflection of the verb person (HVY 1974:209). One would suppose that free pronouns of all four persons are used equally. However, as McKay (1985) showed with his statistical calculations of the frequency of free personal pronouns in Aymara texts, this assumption is far from true, cf. Table 3.

As we can see, the pronoun referring to the Addressee clearly appears to be the most frequently used (in 3/4 of cases where 2nd person has been involved), whereas 1st person and inclusive free pronominal forms are only used in half of the cases (each 50%). Moreover, diachronically the 2nd person pronoun also appears to be the most stable. Thus, in comparison to the 1st person pronoun, which shows much variation between Jaqi languages in general and Aymara dialects in particular, the 2nd person pronoun seems to be resistant to all kinds of morphophonemic changes. This diachronic stability of pronominal forms referring to the Addressee may also be attributed to the salient status of the person spoken to (Hardman 1978b:435).

Person	Pronominal forms	%
Speaker	nä, na, naya	50
Addressee	juma	75
Non-Locutor	upa, jupa, jup''a	10
Inclusive	jiwsa, jiwasa	50

Table 3: The frequency of free pronoun use in Aymara (in %)
(McKay 1985, adapted from Hardman 1988/1989:127)

Finally, one should mention in particular the inclusive/exclusive dichotomy in the Aymara pronominal system which, as I have shown in Filimonova (1999), seems to correlate with the grammatical salience of the person spoken to⁷. Traditionally, the inclusive/exclusive opposition is regarded as a subdistinction within the 1st person category. Its meaning is usually interpreted as denoting the inclusion vs. exclusion of the Addressee into the referential group of the Speaker, whereby the Speaker — aside from the presence of the other participants (A(s) or N(s)) which actually appear to be involved in the action to no lesser extent than the Speaker — is considered to be the main person in the corresponding set. In languages characterised for an Addressee salience, however, the semantic focus of the inclusive form shifts towards the Addressee, thus emphasising his/her involvement in the corresponding group.

Thus, structurally the Aymara inclusive has nothing to do with the 1st person and would be better recognised as a separate fourth person. The exclusive, however, is distinguished as a 1st person form. This can be clearly seen from (8) where the four basic pronominal forms and the corresponding referential sets are presented. The forms are unspecified for number but can optionally take a plural marker *-naka*, thus yielding in: *naya-naka*, *jiwsa-naka*, *juma-naka*, and *jupa-naka*.

- (8)
- | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------|
| naya / na | {S}, {S+N+...+N} |
| jiwsa | {S+A+...+A}, {S+A+...+N...} |
| juma | {A}, {A+A+...+A}, {A+N+...+N} |
| jupa | {N}, {N+N+...+N} |

Interestingly, the status of an inclusive as a separate person seems to be not only a structural but also a psychological reality, being perceived by the speakers as an “integral part of Aymara thought and culture” (Hymes 1972:106 referring to Cole 1969⁸). I believe that the distinct status of inclusive in Aymara is stipulated by the presence of the person spoken to in its referential set. This person, as I will show in the next section, forms a kind of a pivot in the interpersonal communication of Aymaras.

⁷ The reverse is, however, not true. Languages possessing inclusive /exclusive opposition do not necessarily imply grammatical salience of the 2nd person.

⁸ His thesis remained unavailable for me.

In sum, all these features (Addressee salience in the person markers, the use of independent person pronouns and their historical development, the presence of inclusive/exclusive opposition and the structure of inclusive) clearly indicate the influence of the person hierarchy, particularly of the A>S>N kind, in patterning the morpho-syntactic structure of Aymara.

4. Aymara world view and tenets of interpersonal communication

In the previous section I summarised the features that characterise the grammatical salience of the person spoken to. However, the special status of Addressee in Aymara is not limited to the language only. In this section, I will investigate the hypothesis that the morpho-syntactic salience of the person spoken to is initiated and determined by a certain conception of self in the Aymara culture. Following Shweder and Bourne (1984), I will call this sociocentric as opposed to egocentric.

The splitting of the universe into two parts — society and self — is a phenomenon, which most likely occurs in every individual. However, the identification of these two parts, the definition of their boundaries and their interrelation can be completely different. In the egocentric world (where undoubtedly the Western culture is classified), “society is imagined to have been created to serve the interests of idealised ... autonomous”, while in the sociocentric world, “individual interests” are subordinated “to the good of collectivity” (Shweder and Bourne 1984:190). In the sociocentric world, the value of a person depends on the position he/she occupies in the system of interperson or intergroup relationship and not on his/her personal achievements and success in any given sphere of life. Thus open competition and forceful self-expression are missing in Aymara culture (Saavedra 1981:27). In such cultures, “... self-expression and self-fulfilment can find their fullest scope within the cooperative situation, in terms of helpfulness, of sharing, of respect for inviolability of the rights of the others” (Lee 1959:52). Saavedra observes that “Given the chance, the Aymara will generally judge a person, regardless of background, according to the individual qualities. This process is quite different from criteria of wealth, social class, education, and cultural background that the Hispanic [and other peoples of the Western culture – E.F.] use” (1981:25-26)⁹. Within this framework that Aymara culture offers to its members, there seems to be no boundary between an individual and community, no clear-cut opposition between the individuals in the interpersonal communication. Hence in speech acts, the Speaker does not behave as a dominant person; rather s/he is always considerate of those in his/her presence, showing them respect and deference.

Culturally the Aymara are very aware of who they are speaking to, always acknowledging the presence of another. Aymara people make tentative requests and avoid command situations, i.e. situations where the Speaker is supposed to have control over the actions of the other person. Lee (1959) calls this characteristic “the prin-

⁹ It should be mentioned that this observation is made by a Hispanic who grew up with a Hispanic attitude toward the Aymara and later studied Aymara people and language.

principle of the inviolate integrity of the individual”, mentioning “that no personal orders can be given or taken without a violation of personal autonomy” as a corollary of this principle (1959:8). Possibly because of this tenet, all imperatives in Aymara are usually softened by special ‘polite’ suffixes and particles.

Aymara has a much more elaborated system of politeness than most European languages. Beside polite and courteous welcomings and farewells (address forms (lexical items and honorific forms)) and lexical politeness markers such as ‘please’, Aymara has an abundant system of derivational and inflectional suffixes and sentence markers that convey the presence or absence of politeness and courtesy. Therefore, unlike European languages, where politeness is of lexical and pragmatic nature, politeness in Aymara seems to be ‘primarily morphological’ (Briggs and England 1981:291). I will now give a few examples of Aymara polite morphology, a more detailed analysis, however, can be found in Briggs (1981).

In general, Aymara roots are not in themselves polite or impolite but acquire overtones of politeness and impoliteness through the presence or absence of suffixes (Briggs 1981:90). For example, a verbal derivational suffix *-t’a-*, which usually has the semantics of a ‘momentaneous action’ also signals the courtesy of the corresponding verb. Thus, the verb *jisk’iña* ‘to ask’ seems to have a corresponding polite form *jisk’it’aña* which is then better translated as ‘to ask a specific action’. “Without *-t’a-* the verb has the meaning ‘to ask aimlessly, purposelessly, like a drunk’ and “would typically produce a negative reaction in the person addressed” (Briggs 1981:92).

The most obvious label of politeness in Aymara is a sentence marker *-ya-*, which can be attached to nouns or verbs. Its semantic colouring ranges from “mere courtesy to urging to emphasis” and frequently occurs with imperatives, where it is used as a softener or attenuator. Here are some examples demonstrating the usage of the *-ya-* suffix with imperatives:

Mother addressing an adult son:

- (9) *t’aqtara-pi-k-ita-ya*
 look-be.sure.to-just-IMP.2=>1-POL
 ‘Please just look for it for me’ (concerning the hoe she had previously given to him but needs back) (Briggs 1981:102)
- (10) *juma-ki-y amuy-t’a-m*
 2-just-POL look.after-POL-IMP.2=>3
 ‘You look after it’ (HVY 1974:417)

An adult or older sibling urging a child to do something:

- (11) *iraqqasi-ma-y*
take-IMP.2=>3-POL
'Take it!' (Briggs 1981:104)
- (12) *jala-ma-y, jala-ma-y*
run-IMP.2=>3¹⁰-POL run-IMP.2=>3-POL
'Run, run' (Briggs 1981:104)
- (13) *anaki-ma-y*
herd-IMP.2=>3-POL
'You go on and herd' (Briggs 1981:104)

Different polite suffixes in Aymara are easily combined with each other, expressing various shades of courtesy. Consider the following examples, 14a and b, where more than one polite suffix are used:

- (14) a *al- t'a- s- ita- y, kasiru*
buy-POL-REFL-IMP.2=>1-POL sir.POL
'Please buy from me' (because it's the end of the day and there is still a lot to sell) (Briggs 1981:92)
- b *al-t'a-si-way-ita-y, kasiru*
buy-POL-REFL-POL-IMP.2=>1-POL sir.POL
'Please, buy from me, sir' (Briggs 1981:92)

An extensive usage of polite suffixes in Aymara also seems to penetrate into the speech of the native Spanish speakers in La Paz. Laprade (1981) mentions a great frequency of the particles *pues*, *nomás*, *siempre*, and *pero* in La Paz Spanish. Unlike standard Spanish, these particles often have the function of softener or attenuator for the preceding phrase.

Interestingly, the morphological markedness of politeness in Aymara is usually accompanied by corresponding intonational contours. "In Aymara a subdued, almost whining intonation connotes courtesy in persuasion or in requesting a favour" (Saavedra 1981:27). These contours seem to be an integral part of expressing courtesy in Aymara and serves to avoid brusqueness.

The Aymara specialists perpetually emphasise the necessity to consider correct address forms, politeness suffixes and intonational contours when teaching Aymara to Hispanics. Not to be addressed in polite forms is interpreted by Aymara as a negation of the presence of the human being, since only animals can be addressed without

¹⁰ According to the Aymara linguistic tradition, all verbs in Aymara are considered to be transitive and 'intransitive verbs' (in an Indo-European sense) imply a zero 3rd person complement (HVY 1974:210). Therefore in (12) and (13), where 'intransitive' verbs are used, *-ma-* is glossed as a morpheme denoting personal interaction.

the polite forms (Saavedra 1981:26). Otherwise the Aymara feel insulted, something the Hispanics seldom realise. Instead they misinterpret the sullen reaction of the Aymara as unfriendliness or unwillingness to communicate.

In sum, the worldview of the Aymara is characterised by a special concept of ego, according to which and an individual, contrary to the Western conception, is de-emphasised and not contrasted to the other selves. Hence the centre of awareness is shifted from an individual to those in his/her presence. For interpersonal communication this means that the role of Speaker becomes less authorised, relinquishing the foreground to the other SAP, i.e. person spoken to. This perception of world structure is presumably reflected in the language, which evolves particular grammatical constraints in response to the specific demands of the society in which it is used.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I first argued that irregularities of person marking in Aymara are influenced by a special configuration of the person hierarchy, according to which the person spoken to overranks the Speaker: A>S>N. Secondly, I suggested that this layout of the person hierarchy is determined by a special conception of ego in the Aymara culture which, unlike Western perception, does not consider an individual to be the centre of the universe and hence shifts the emphasis from the speaker to those in his/her presence.

Support for this hypothesis comes from other language families, which also demonstrate grammatical salience of the person spoken to (e.g. Algonquian, Sioux). As I have shown elsewhere (Filimonova 2000), anthropological data (descriptions of philosophy of life and everyday communication) which characterise these language societies also confirm the suggestion that the underlying conception of ego may influence the language and shape its person marking. In addition, these tentative results clearly reveal the hidden potential of cooperative work between language specialists and anthropologists. Linguists can learn much in trying to describe the grammars of non-native languages within the framework of the corresponding logic rather than imposing their own, as if it were universal.

Finally, independent of whether the link between the development of morphosyntax and the culture is to be considered as casual or spurious, an important typological implication of the findings discussed in this paper is the fact that one-to-one correspondence between the referents (i.e. S, A, and N) and their morphosyntactic labels (i.e. 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons) is not universal. In languages in which the morphosyntactic structure provides examples of the salience of the 2nd person forms, this person actually appears to be the 1st person. Using the terms of the referential categories (the Addressee is more highly ranked than the Speaker, or the Speaker is set lower than the Addressee) allows this disambiguity to be avoided.

References

Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay

1969 *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Briggs, Lucy

1981 'Politeness in Aymara language and culture', in: M. J. Hardman (ed.), pp. 90-113.

Briggs, Lucy and Nora C. England

1981 'Linguistics and Foreign Aid', in: M. J. Hardman (ed.), pp. 282-294.

Cole, John Tafel

1969 *The Human Soul in the Aymara Culture of Pumasara: An Ethnographic Study in the Light of George Herbert Mead and Martin Buber*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Corbett, Greville G.

1979 'The agreement hierarchy', *Journal of Linguistics* 15:203-224.

Filimonova, Elena

1999 *Universal'nye anomalii licnyx mestoimenij [Universal Anomalies of Personal Pronouns]*. Doctoral dissertation, Moscow State University.

2000 'Nature, Culture, and Compromise: Person Hierarchy as a Cognitive Parameter', Paper held at the International Conference on Cognitive Typology, Antwerpen, April 12-14.

Foley, William A.

1980 'Toward a universal typology of the noun phrase', *Studies in Language* 4:169-199.

Hardman, Martha J.

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

1978a 'Linguistic postulates and applied anthropological linguistics', in: V. Honsa & M. J. Hardman-de-Bautista (eds.), *Papers on Linguistics and Child Language, Ruth Hirsch Weir Memorial Volume*, The Hague: Mouton, pp.117-136.

1978b 'Proto-Jaqi: Reconstrucción del sistema de personas gramaticales', *Revista del Museo Nacional [Lima] de la cultura Peruana* 41:433-456.

1982 'The Mutual Influence of Spanish and the Andean Languages', *Word* 33:143-157.

1988/89 'Fuente de datos y persona gramatical en las lenguas Jaqi', *Dialogo Andino* 7/8:123-133.

Hardman-de-Bautista, Martha, Juana Vásquez, and Juan de Dios Yapita Moya

1974 *Outline of Aymara Phonological and Grammatical Structure*, Gainesville, Fla.: Aymara Language Materials Project, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida.

- Hardman, Martha J. (ed.)
 1981 *The Aymara Language in Its Social and Cultural Context*, Gainesville: University Presses of Florida.
- Heath, Jeffrey
 1991 'Pragmatic Disguise in Pronominal-Affix Paradigms', in: Frans Plank (ed.) *Paradigms: The Economy of Inflection*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 76-89.
 1998 'Pragmatic Skewing in 1↔2 Pronominal Combinations in Native American Languages', *IJAL* 64:83-104.
- Hymes, Dell
 1972 'On personal pronouns: 'Fourth' person and phonesthematic aspects', in: M. Estellie Smith (ed.), *Studies in Linguistics in Honor of George L. Trager*, The Hague: Mouton, pp.100-121.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie
 1977 [1972] 'Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar' [Paper read at LSA Annual Meeting, Atlanta], *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Laprade, Richard A.
 1981 'Some Cases of Aymara Influence on La Paz Spanish', in: M. J. Hardman (ed.), pp. 18-29.
- Lee, Dorothy
 1959 *Freedom and Culture*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Moravcsik, Edith A.
 1978 'On the distribution of ergative and accusative patterns', *Lingua* 45:233-279.
- 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.
- Plank, Frans
 1985 'Die Ordnung der Personen', *Folia Linguistica* 19:111-176.
- Saavedra, Carlos
 1981 'Social and Cultural Context of the Aymara in Bolivia Today', in: M. J. Hardman (ed.), pp. 207-227.
- Silverstein, Michael
 1976 'Hierarchy of features and ergativity', in: R. M. W. Dixon (ed.) *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, pp. 112-171.
- Smith-Stark, T. Cedric
 1974 'The plurality split', *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10:657-671.
- Shweder, Richard A. and Edmund J. Bourne
 1984 'Does the Concept of the Person Vary Cross-Culturally?', in: R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 158-199.

Weber, David J.

1986 'Huallaga Quechua Pronouns', in: U. Wieseemann (ed.), *Pronominal Systems*, Tübingen: Narr, pp. 333-349.

1989 *A Grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Abbreviations

BEN	Benefactive
FUT	Future
HON	Honorific
IMP	Imperative
INCL	Inclusive
NEAR	Nearative
POL	Polite
REFL	Reflexive
SENT	Sentential marker
SG	Singular
VBEN	Verbal Benefactive
1	1st person
2	2nd person
3	3rd person