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A diachronic perspective of verbal personal reference marking in the Quechuan languages

Willem F.H. Adelaar
Leiden University Center for Linguistics

The Quechuan languages (spoken in the Central Andes, mainly Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Argentina) are predominantly suffixing, nominative-accusative in alignment, and lack a clear distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs at the lexical level. Verbal personal reference marking varies across the language family. However, a system of nine pronominal endings can be reconstructed for Proto-Quechua, which has been preserved in its most conservative daughter languages. These nine pronominal endings encode the grammatical person of the subject/actor (‘1’ speaker, ‘2’ addressee, ‘3’ other, and ‘4’ both speaker and addressee), as well as that of a second (non-subject) speech act participant. This second participant may refer to an indirect object, direct object, topic of conversation, etc. Its presence does not necessarily mean that the verb is transitive.

Quechuan pronominal endings may vary according to tense or mood. They can either consist of a single affix or a combination of affixes. Presumably, the single affix endings reflect an earlier system and are older than the affix combinations, which may be due to a modelling effect of the more complex personal reference marking in the neighboring Aymaran languages. At a later stage of development, different types of plural marking linked to personal reference arose independently in branches of the Quechuan family, often generating further complexity and irregularities in the system.

Although the reconstruction of the pronominal endings is relatively straightforward, the reconstruction of the two endings that encode the speaker as a subject ([1 > 3]) and [1 > 2]) has been controversial. Nevertheless, it is possible to reconstruct the Proto-Quechua pronominal endings unequivocally by assuming past phonological changes and substitutions of affixes, which in their turn can be explained by simplification, paradigmatic pressure, and the ambiguity generated by affixes that fulfilled multiple functions. Incidentally, the reconstruction of personal reference marking in Proto-Quechua offers supporting evidence for the primary division of Quechuan in two major branches, which has been questioned in recent literature.
Towards the reconstruction of Proto-Zamucoan nominal suffixation

Pier Marco Bertinetto & Luca Ciucci (Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa)

The Zamucoan family consists of no more than two living languages: Ayoreo (AY) and Chamacoco (CH), spoken in Northern Chaco (between Bolivia and Paraguay) by approximately 4500 and 1600 people, respectively. While the first stable contacts with the Ayoreos began at the end of the Forties, the Chamacocos were already in contact with the Western civilization at the turn of the XIX century, with intense linguistic contact with Spanish and Guarani. The Zamucoan family also includes the now extinct Old Zamuco (OZ), described in the early 18th century by the Jesuit Father Ignace Chomé (1958 [ante 1745]). OZ and AY are very close from the lexical point of view as opposed to CH (Kelm 1964), but all three languages show obvious morphosyntactic correspondences, allowing robust diachronic insights (Ciucci 2013; Ciucci & Bertinetto, to appear).

In terms of typological classification, Zamucoan languages are fusional. Nouns and adjectives share the same suffixation paradigms. The grammatical categories expressed are the following: gender (masculine / feminine), number (singular / plural) and form. By “form” we refer to a peculiar morphological tripartition (base-form vs full-form vs indeterminate-form), which appears to be a unique feature of these languages. The purpose of the talk will be to compare the nominal morphology of the three languages, in order to get an insight into the Proto-Zamucoan nominal inflections, as part of a project aiming at Proto-Zamucoan reconstruction.

The base-form (BF) is characteristically used for nominal predication (a possibly unique typological feature), but its singular is also the starting point of any inflectional and derivational operation, as well as the form adopted by the first member of a compound. The full-form (FF) and the indeterminate-form (IF), by contrast, occur in argumental contexts, and differ among themselves in terms of specificity vs non-specificity of the intended referent. Although these features are to be found in all Zamucoan languages, there are some interesting language-specific differences, as shown below.

The various inflectional allomorphs expressing gender, number and form exhibit remarkable similarities, which allow robust hypotheses on Proto-Zamucoan nominal suffixation and its subsequent evolution. The following table summarizes the main features of BF and FF suffixes (from Ciucci 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OZ</th>
<th>AY</th>
<th>CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculine BF</strong></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-o, -jo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculine FF</strong></td>
<td>-tie</td>
<td>-odoe</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feminine BF</strong></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feminine FF</strong></td>
<td>-tae</td>
<td>-jie</td>
<td>Ø, -e, -a, -ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OZ is the most conservative language. CH, on the contrary, is the most innovative: it has lost the BF/FF contrast in the plural and has developed new allomorphs for the BF singular, due to root reinterpretation. According to recent lexical comparison (Holman et al. 2011; Müller et al. 2013), CH split long ago from OZ and AY, and indeed it only shares 30% of its lexical roots with AY (Bertinetto 2009). However, CH exhibits singular FF allomorphs (masc. -t, -ʨe and fem. -ta, -ʨa)
that closely correspond to their OZ cognates -tie (masc.) and -tae (fem.). This suggests that OZ and CH preserve the original Proto-Zamucoan singular FF allomorphs that went lost in AY. Thus, as also observed in verb morphology (Ciucci & Bertinetto, to appear), some archaic features may be shared by OZ and CH as opposed to AY, despite the striking lexical similarity between OZ and AY.

Finally, we will also point out occasional traces of (remote?) contact with other Chaco languages (Ciucci 2014).
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Reported speech constructions as the grammatical source for divergent tense and aspect systems across the Chapacuran family

Joshua Birchall
Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi

The practice of speech reporting has been described as a discourse strategy across many different languages and language families in lowland South America (Basso, 1986; Michael, 2001; Beier et al., 2002, among others). In the Chapacuran language family, the grammaticalization of the reported speech construction has resulted in different patterns of tense and aspect marking systems in the modern languages.

In the Oro Win language of Brazil, the reported speech construction is still a productive component of the grammar in its original function. In these languages a clause with person marking in the perspective of a reported speaker is treated as a new predicate that is then inflected for person, as shown in (1a), fulfilling a quotative function without a *verbum dicendi*. However, this construction type can also be used when the speaker has not observed such a speech act and is used even when such an act has never occurred. In this case, the ‘reported speech’ is merely reflecting the event perspective of the participant (see Everett (2008) for a similar description of the “intentional state construction” for the related language Wari’). Here, the construction can function to express the imperfective aspect, as shown in (1b).

**Oro Win (personal fieldwork data)**

1. **a.** *maw era n-on*  
   2sg.fut 3sg.nfut-3m  
   ‘He sent him away’ (lit. “You will leave” he (said) to him’)

2. **b.** *pa’ ta ifam na*  
   1sg.fut kill 3.nfut fish
   ‘He went to fish’ (lit. “I will kill fish” he (said)’)

However, in the Moré language spoken in Bolivia, the cognate construction is used to express the future tense, where the first person forms of the original reconstructable proto-Chapacuran future tense paradigm is fused with forms from the non-future paradigm (cf. Angenot de Lima (2002, 349-351)). Interestingly, a similar future construction exists in the nearby language Aikaná (isolate), which van der Voort (2013) posits as having developed from contact with the neighboring Kwaza (isolate) language that has a productive reported speech construction much like Oro Win.

In this paper, I will compare the different uses of the reported speech construction across all the Chapacuran languages for which grammatical information is available, including those with only meager documentation. From there, I will map the different diachronic pathways taken to explain the synchronic distribution of the different functions of this construction in the family. This serves to describe how a regionally common discourse strategy has produced different morphosyntactic outcomes through grammaticalization in this relatively small family.
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The development of portmanteau morphology in Ecuadorian Siona: a story of the formal merger of linguistic categories

Ecuadorian Siona, a Western Tukanoan language spoken in the eastern lowlands of Ecuador, shows complex verb morphology that consists of portmanteau morphemes that express various linguistic categories. This is illustrated in the example below:

(1) a. kaa-hi.
   say-3.M.PRS.ASS
   'He is saying.'

b. kaa-ki?
   say-2/3.M.PRS.N.ASS
   'Are you (S.M) / is he saying?'

The suffix -hi in (1a) marks that the subject falls in the category of third person singular masculine, it marks present tense, and that the clause is an assertive clause. The suffix -ki in (1b) marks a second or third person singular masculine subject, present tense and a non-assertive clause, such as interrogative in this example. Correspondingly, these suffixes encode subject agreement, tense and clause type. The goal of this talk is to tease these linguistic categories apart from a diachronic perspective.

Synchronically, the marking of subject agreement is carried out by distinct suffixes. For instance, the suffix -hi marks a third person singular masculine subject, -ko a third person singular feminine subject, and -ji all other subject in present tense assertive clauses. The use of distinct suffixes seems to be an older phenomenon in Tukanoan languages, because it is found throughout the language family.

Clause types are expressed by the use of separate paradigms of subject agreement morphemes. Both the forms of the suffixes and their categorization change. For instance, the assertive has a third person singular versus a non-third person singular split, while the non-assertive has a second and third person singular versus a non-second or third person singular split. The non-assertive and dependent clause suffixes have cognates that function as nominalizers throughout the Tukanoan family. Therefore, I argue that the non-assertive and dependent verbs have developed from constructions that contained nominalized verbs.

Tense distinctions can generally be identified as a change in the consonant of the portmanteau suffix. For instance, the present and past tense suffixes for the assertive paradigms are: -hi / -bi for third person singular masculine, -ko / -o for third person singular feminine, and -ji / -wi for non-third person singular. After taking into account various sound changes that have taken place in Ecuadorian Siona, one can reconstruct morphophonemic marking that encoded tense at some stage. Some paradigms start historically with a fortis consonant (*p, *t, *k) and others with a lenis consonant (*b, *d, *g). This fortis - lenis distinction is found throughout the Tukanoan family and this distinction is due to a preceding tense suffix in various Eastern Tukanoan languages. In those languages, some tense suffixes trigger a fortis consonant and others do not (Gomez-Imbert, 2004). Tense marking in proto-Ecuadorian Siona probably underwent the following changes: first tense was expressed by means of a tense suffix that triggered the consonant to be fortis, in a second stage the tense suffix was dropped and the morphophonemic effect was the main encoding of tense and in a final stage the morphophonemic effect became opaque due to some sound changes and the expression of tense became part of the function of the portmanteau morpheme. In conclusion, the linguistic categories of subject agreement, tense and clause type were historically encoded by separate morphemes. Due to sound changes and the

---

1 2 = second person; 3 = third person; ASS = assertive; M = masculine; N.ASS = non-assertive; PRS = present; S = singular.
2 The lenition and the blocking of lenition was already observed by Idiatov & Van der Auwera (2004; 2008) for the velar consonants in the closely related Western Tukanoan language Sekoya.
omission of additional morphology such as the tense suffix, all these categories were fused in one suffix.
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The Ye’kwana ergative imperfective: a case of reanalysis

Natalia Cáceres Arandia
Laboratoire DDL

In this paper I present a case of syntactic reanalysis in the Cariban language Ye’kwana, spoken in Southern Venezuela and Northern Brazil (approx. total pop. 8,576).

An imperfective construction (ex. 1) cognate to a nominal construction (ex. 2) has introduced an ergative alignment in main clauses where all the other inflections, including past-perfectives, are non-ergative.

```
(1) simada ejudu tüdüdü mödö üuwö,
simada oju-dü t-üdü-dü mödö ü-uvwö
arrow handle-PSSD 3O-make-PRG DEM2in 1SG-DAT
'I'm making the bow'.

(2) weichojo ekammajötüdü mödö
w-ei-tojo Ø-ekamma-jötü-dü mödö
INTR-COP-INSTR 3O-tell-plurac-NZR DEM2in
'That is the way to tell (lit. the telling of) how we live'.
```

This innovative inflection presents the same argument structure as the nominalization: the absolutive (S/P) is unmarked for case, and must immediately precede the verb; when there is no absolutive NP, the absolutive must be marked as a verbal person proclitic; reference to the ergative (A) is not obligatory, but if an A (pro)noun occurs, it must bear the DATIVE postposition.

The source construction for the progressive is identical to the one laid out in Gildea (1998, ch 9) for the Full Set II construction: the nominalized clause is the predicate noun of a predicate nominal clause, with the demonstrative pronoun mödö as its subject: ‘that is my singing / that is the destruction of the city by the enemy’ > ‘I am singing / the enemy is destroying the city’. As the main clause construction has evolved, the pronoun mödö no longer occurs in all examples.
A gramática das construções auxiliares do Canela: descrição e história
Flávia de Castro Alves (Universidade de Brasília)

Castro Alves (2004, 2010) identifica negação e quatro elementos modificadores de predicados, os 'modos de avaliação': 'ser.pouco', 'ser.muito', 'ser.bom' e 'ser.ruim'. Estes operadores avaliativos compartilham com a negação uma cisão de tempo no alinhamento, de tal forma que no passado A leva um marcador de caso ergativo, enquanto que no não-passado A é expresso por meio de um nominal não-marcado ou de um pronome nominativo.

Pesquisas posteriores revelaram outros auxiliares que condicionam o alinhamento nominativo-absolutivo de maneira consistente, em que o A será marcado como ergativo apenas devido à déixis temporal. Estes auxiliares, juntamente com os modos de avaliação e a polaridade negativa, estão listados na Tabela 1.

Várias dessas formas estão ilustradas nos exemplos (1-2), mas a ilustração completa de todas as formas está além do escopo desta apresentação.

O objetivo geral deste trabalho é portanto apresentar duas propriedades confusas dos auxiliares: (1) alguns auxiliares flexionam-se como verbos, mas a maioria não; e (2) a ocorrência do preverbo tober é opcional com o aspecto iterativo e terminativo; obrigatório com o aspecto progressivo e continuativo; e ausente com a negação e a modalidade avaliativa (ver Tabela 2).

O objetivo principal, no entanto, é apresentar a gramática das construções auxiliares do Canela como uma coleção de construções distintas costuradas (ou seja, como uma colcha de retalhos, metafóricamente falando). Estas construções entram de forma independente nas orações principais, em diferentes momentos da história. À medida que os novos retalhos (as camadas de construções inovadoras) multiplicam e/ou expandem seus domínios funcionais, o tecido da gramática das orações principais anterior vai sendo coberto.

Esta é uma área de investigação em curso na gramática de Canela. Pesquisas futuras irão expandir nossa compreensão da distinção entre auxiliares versus verbos que tomam orações como complemento. No entanto, não vemos nenhuma probabilidade de que as análises futuras questionem a existência de pelo menos duas categorias de auxiliares que a condicionam o alinhamento nominativo-absolutivo no não-passado: a polaridade negativa e os modos avaliativos, e os aspectuais conclusivo (3b) e ingressivo (3a), semanticamente inderiváveis.
'Eles vão dormir pouco'  

'o pé de cajú está secando'  

'você começou a fazer (algo)'  

'o cachorro não vai comer tudo (o arroz caído no chão)'  

'você começou a fazer isso'  

'nossas esposas acabaram de moquear (os animais caçados)'

S [s-V]sv Aux  
(1) a. ke ha mẽ h-ɔt krirene  
3 IRR PL 3-dormir.NF AVAL

b. aʔkrɔt=pɜr iʔ-ŋkɔtɔ=mõ  
cajú=pé 3-secar PV=ir

A [o-V]sv [ Aux ]
(2) a. pe ka iʔ-tɔn kʰãm=tɔ=tẽ  
PD 2 3-fazer.NF LOC=PV=ir

'bocê começou a fazer (algo)'  

A [o-V]sv Aux Aux  
(3) a. aʔtɛ iʔ-tɔn kʰãm=tɔ=a-tej  
2-ERG 3-fazer LOC=PV=2-ir

'bocê começou a fazer isso'

A o-V [ Aux ]Conclusivo  
(3) b. paʔ-prõ te h-ɔmĩr tɔ=iʔ-kʰrã=kurɔn  
1Incl-esposa ERG 3-moquear PV=3-cabeça=matar

'nossas esposas acabaram de moquear (os animais caçados)'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modalidade</th>
<th>Aspecto Imperfectivo</th>
<th>Aspecto Perfectivo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avaliativa</td>
<td>Iterativo</td>
<td>Terminativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pej</em> ‘bom’</td>
<td><em>(to)</em>=pijef ‘uma.vez’</td>
<td><em>(to)</em>=h--j--ipej ‘acabar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>k’et</em> ‘mau’</td>
<td><em>(to)=af--jpa--k’rut</em> ‘duas.vezes’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--amre ‘acabar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tɔʔhi</em> ‘muito’</td>
<td>*(to)=ŋkren ‘três.vezes’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--iku ‘parar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>krirɛ</em> ‘pouco’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--3ʔto ‘muitas.vezes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitiva/Epistêmica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Progressivo</th>
<th>Completivo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tej</em> ‘poder, dever’</td>
<td><em>(apu)</em> ‘estar.em.pé’</td>
<td><em>(par)(m)</em> ‘completamente’, ‘tudo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(to)=mʲ ‘PV=ir’</td>
<td>*(to)=tfj ‘PV=estar.em.pé’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(to)=tɛ ‘PV=ir’</td>
<td>*(to)=iʔkrâ ‘matar cabeça (dele)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irrealis

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ha</em> ‘estar.em.pé’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polaridade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ingressivo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>na(re)</em> ‘Negativo’</td>
<td>*(to)=hîr ‘PV=estar.sentado’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(k’hâm (to)=tɛ ‘Loc=(PV=)ir’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ausência</th>
<th>Opcionalidade</th>
<th>Obrigatoriedade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>na(re)</em> ‘Negativo’</td>
<td>*(to)=pijef ‘uma.vez’</td>
<td>*(to)=m-toast ‘PV=ir’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>par(m)</em> ‘tudo, completamente’</td>
<td>*(to)=aj--jpa--k’hur ‘duas.vezes’</td>
<td>*(to)=tɛ ‘PV=ir’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pej</em> ‘bom’</td>
<td>*(to)=ŋkren ‘três.vezes’</td>
<td>*(to)=tfj ‘PV=estar.em.pé’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>k’et</em> ‘mau’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--eʔto ‘muitas.vezes’</td>
<td>*(to)=hîr ‘PV=estar.sentado’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tɔʔhi</em> ‘muito’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--ipej ‘acabar’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--iku ‘parar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>krirɛ</em> ‘pouco’</td>
<td>*(to)=h--j--amre ‘acabar’</td>
<td>*(to)=iʔkrâ kura ‘matar cabeça (dele)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(k’hâm (to)=tɛ ‘Loc=(PV=)ir’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabela 1: Polaridade, aspecto e modalidade expressos por meio de auxiliares em Canela

Tabela 2: Ocorrência do preverbo *(to)* cliticizado aos auxiliares do Canela
The evolution of subject-verb indexing strategies in the Tukanoan family

Thiago Costa Chacon
University of Brasilia

Lev Michael
University of California, Santa Barbara

This paper explores the evolution of verbal subject-indexing morphology in declarative clauses with the unmarked (i.e. firsthand/witnessed) evidential in Tukanoan languages. It is based on the analysis of approximately 35 verb paradigms in 15 Tukanoan languages from the Western Tukanoan (WT) (Koreguahe, Maibíki, Siona and Sekoya) and Eastern Tukanoan (ET) (Brasano, Desano, Makuna, Karapana, Kubéo, Kotiria, Pira-Tapuyo, Tatuyo, Tukano, Tuyuka and Yuruti) branches of the family.

The analysis proceeded in three steps: (1) reconstruction of Proto-Tukanoan verbal subject-indexing categories; (2) tracing the changes in these categories for intermediate proto-languages and modern Tukanoan languages; and (3) reconstruction of proto-forms and etymologies of existing verbal subject-indexing morphemes.

The results of this analysis indicate that the Proto-Tukanoan subject-indexing paradigm contrasted 3rd PERSON SINGULAR with the other, unmarked, person-number categories. The evolution of this system was initially driven by the independent development of morphological and semantic complexity in each of the major branches of the family, due to the inclusion of categorial distinctions in the verbal system that are typical of Tukanoan nominal classification systems, such as ANIMATE VS. INANIMATE, MASCULINE VS. FEMININE, SINGULAR VS. PLURAL.

Careful analysis of the evolution of subject-indexing categories and forms amounts to a body of evidence in favor of the following conclusion:

- Verb inflection offers conclusive evidence for a classification of Tukanoan languages in two branches, ET and WT;
- Verb inflection derives historically, in several important cases, from erstwhile nominal affix and categories;
The extension of certain forms and categories from the nominal to verbal domain occurred independently in different branches of the family in a very likely case of parallel drift (Sapir 2004 [1921]).

The evolution of verbal subject-indexing forms has been accompanied by a trend of all Tukanoan becoming more agglutinating than Proto-Tukanoan.

There are remaining questions regarding the exact diachronic processes that have lead to the development of specific morphemes, such as: 1) the verbal or nominal origin of some forms; 2) the nature of morphophonological processes affecting portmanteau suffixes, in which subject-indexing forms are fused with tense and aspect; and 3) and the issue of the role of language contact in the evolution of verbal subject indices.

This paper reports on ongoing research, and thus assessment of the above questions, and further analyses of the data, remain to be carried out. We envision doing so in collaboration with a group of Tukanoan language specialists that have recently started collaborating on a classification of the Tukanoan family based on cognate innovations, and using computational phylogenetic methods. In addition, we also highlight a growing body of historical and comparative work of the Tukanoan family, such as recent reconstruction of Tukanoan phonology, morphology and cognate sets (Malone 1988, Chacon 2013, Chacon 2014, Chacon to appear, Skilton 2013), internal reconstruction of Siona verbal morphology (Bruil 2013) and functional-typological analysis of subject-verb indexing categories in the family (Chacon to appear).

References cited


Continuity and grammatical change in Tupi-Guarani negation marking

Wolf Dietrich (Universität Münster)

In Tupi-Guarani languages the negative predicative morphology of declarative sentences is different from that of imperative (prohibitive) sentences. Some languages of the family show a specific negative morpheme in non-predicative topicalized clauses. Word formation morphology functions in negative nominal lexical units, where negation is expressed by specific negative suffixes. All four kinds of negation show morphologic variation. With regard to a first cross-linguistic analysis of negation in some Tupi-Guarani languages (Dietrich 2005), we now have much more data of more Tupi-Guarani languages. Some of them exhibit detailed linguistic descriptions in recent years (Araweté, Asurini do Xingu, Avá-Canoeiro, for example, but also genetically problematic languages such as Kokama and Aché). Nevertheless, sufficient data are lacking still for a number of the languages of the family.

The detailed description of all four kinds of negation, including variation in several languages, shows cognates in most of the existing members of the linguistic family. Some languages, especially languages of group II and I, evidence change in the morphology of negation in declarative sentences. Chaco Guarani (Chiriguano, group I) and Yuki (group II) seem to have abandoned the traditional discontinuous morpheme *n- ...i introducing a new negative clause meaning ‘does not exist’, which is mbáeti in Chaco Guarani, biti in Yuki. These clauses are also used as negative morphemes (prepositions) in declarative sentences. Other languages have negative particles (imame and natyvi in Asurini do Xingu, ina in Araweté, tima and ina in Kokama) whose origin is still unclear. Imame, (t)ima, and ina/ina may be reflexes of *-eme, partially reanalyzed in other syntactic contexts. Looking for cognates in a wider Mawetí-Guarani language family, we can see that both Awetí and Mawé show discontinuous morphemes in declarative sentences, but no clear cognates. Therefore this paper will be limited to Tupi-Guarani proper.

Chaco Guarani, Aché (group I), Siriono (group II) and some more languages (Araweté e.g.) show further change by introducing the ancient lexical negative morpheme -’e’yım as a negative suffix -dä, -jä, -llä in declarative sentences. It will be shown that this suffix is a cognate of ancient *-e’yım. Consequently, as a substitute of ancient *e’yım a new negative nominal lexical suffix is formed by the use of the root mba’e ‘thing’ in negative contexts.

With regard to prohibitive sentences, there seems to be a split morphology in the evolution of Tupi-Guarani languages: Those languages that did not preserve the probably older *-eme suffix introduced the a- morpheme (Guarani ani, Kagwahib ahan, Araweté -hana).
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The locative origins of core constituent marking in the Barbacoan languages
Simeon FLOYD & Elisabeth NORCLIFFE (Max-Planck Institute, Nijmegen)

Like most languages in the northern Andean region, the five present-day Barbacoan languages can all be characterized as having nominative-accusative alignment, with the accusative case morphologically marked, and the nominative unmarked. While the systems show strong constructional similarities, such as a tendency not to mark inanimate objects, their formal elements present a puzzle: none of the Barbacoan languages’ accusative markers are cognate with each other. We can compare this to the neighboring Quechuan family’s accusative –ta, which exists in all current varieties and can be traced back to proto-Quechua (Adelaar and Muysken 2004:213). Barbacoan accusative markers appear to be more recent, and this paper investigates how they developed, as a case study of how locative marking may have played a part in re-structuring the basic transitive construction across a small language family.

In the two relatively closely related languages Tsafiki and Cha’palaa, the accusative markers are non-cognate forms -ka and -nu, respectively. What these morphemes have in common is that they are also used as locatives: both languages independently selected one of a variety of locative markers and extended its functions to mark accusative case. Other locatives have been recruited to mark dative and genitive case relations as well. Looking at the locative markers across the different languages reveals several cognates; for example, Cha’palaa has a locative -ka that is cognate with Tsafiki’s accusative/locative. In Awa Pit, the accusative -ta is also formally identical to a locative, suggesting that similar processes have occurred there as well. The Guambiano accusative –wan is more difficult to connect directly with the locative system, but the instrumental case appears to be cognate with Tsafiki’s locative ka, suggesting that all the languages have followed similar but distinct paths towards acquiring core and/or oblique case markers from locative morphology.

Based on data from primary field research (Cha’palaa, Guambiano) and published sources (e.g. Curnow 1997 on Awa Pit, Dickinson 2002 on Tsafiki), this study will trace the parallel development of accusative case marking from locatives in the Barbacoan languages, and ask what this implies about the history of nominative-accusative alignment in the family and the reconstruction of the Proto-Barbacoan case system.


A diachronic incursion into verb argument marking, morphosyntactic alignment and other treasures of the Tupari languages (Tupian family)

The Tupi linguistic family has been traditionally classified into ten branches (Rodrigues 1984/1985) that comprise about 40-45 languages (Moore et al. 2008): Arikém, Mondé, Puruborá, Ramarama, Tupari, Mundurukú, Jurúna, Awetí, Mawé, and Tupí-Guaraní. Three of these ten branches (Mondé, Tupari e Tupí-Guarani) are considered more important for comparative studies and linguistic reconstruction, and from these three, the Tupari branch, which is the second largest branch of the family, could be considered the most strategic due to its estimated time depth and to the number of current languages (five): Akuntsú, Wayoro, Makurap, Mekens e Tupari. Comparative studies of this branch (Galucio and Nogueira 2012; Nogueira and Galucio, to appear) have been published based on the growing number of descriptive works on the Tupari languages that have become available in recent years (Alves 2004; Aragon and Carvalho 2007; Aragon 2008; Braga 2005, 2007; Galucio 2001, 2011, 2014; Seki 2002; Nogueira 2011, 2013. The first results of the morphosyntactic comparative analysis show that the derivational morphemes are very stable throughout the historical development from Proto-Tupari to the daughter languages. Valence change morphemes such as the causative, a general transitivizer, and a nominalizer have been already reconstructed for Proto-Tupari. For this presentation we will focus on the patterns of verb argument marking and morphosyntactic alignment in the Tupari family. All five Tupari languages show a similar morphosyntactic alignment pattern that can be characterized as ergative-absolutive alignment. There is a complementary distribution of the personal pronouns and prefixes, in which free pronouns mark the ergative argument (A), and (bound) prefixes mark the absolutive argument (S and O). This pattern is shown in examples (1) and (2), from Galucio & Nogueira (2012:20-21), for three Tupari languages (Makurap, Mekens and Tupari). The occurrence of this system in all five daughter languages, with cognate forms and similar morphosyntactic properties allowed the reconstruction of the nominative-absolutive pattern of morphosyntactic alignment for Proto-Tupari.

S-Argument

(1) a. o+apitet-a (on) 1S+think-TH.V I ‘I think.’

b. o-er-a-t (ot) 1S-sleep-TH.V-PST I ‘I slept.’

c. o-kar-a on 1S-fall-TH.V I ‘I fell down.’

A and O-Arguments

(2) a. tʃeke o+peat-a he 1S+look.for-TH.V ‘He looks for me.’
b. o-so-a-t ět  
1S-see-TH.V-PST you  
‘You saw me.’

(Mekens)

c. o-to-a en  
1S-see-TH.V

‘You saw me.’

(Tupari)

In this paper, we will further investigate the morphosyntactic alignment system in simple sentences, and extend the analysis to subordinate sentences in the Tupari family, especially in object relative clauses, object wh-questions and cleft sentences with object focus. These constructions are distinct from simple sentences both in the form of the verb (non-finite) and in the pattern of verb argument marking. They show the ergative argument (A), not the absolutive (O) marked as a prefix on the verb. These constructions are illustrated in examples (3) and (4) for two languages of the family, Mekens and Wayoro.

(3) a. kiypit ko pa őt o-i-at  
fish ingest fut I 1s-nmlz-catch  
‘I will eat the fish that I caught’

(Mekens)

b. arob= ēp te e-i-mi  
What=really foc 2s-nmlz–kill.by.shooting  
‘What did you kill/shoot?’

(Mekens)

(4) a. djar-i-mõ-e-ngonĩ-rom ipyä yäy mbiro (Wayoro)  
2p-?-caus-intr-fish-neg piranha.fish tooth have  
‘You didn’t caught fish that has teeth, piranha fish’

b. y-i-mâyā-m ēroa tika  
3-?-tell-nmlz that want-to-know  
‘that which he wanted to know’

(Wayoro)

These constructions have been analyzed as predicative nominal constructions in Mekens, showing a process of argument grammatical nominalization, marked with an object nominalization morpheme i- that is homophonous to the third person object prefix i- (Galucio 2011), and as inverse voice constructions in Wayoro (Nogueira 2011). For this presentation, we will compare verb argument marking and other morphosyntactic properties of subordinate sentences in the Tupari family, especially in the object focus constructions (relative clauses, wh-questions and cleft sentences), explaining the synchronic correspondences and discrepancies of these constructions in the five languages of the family, and proposing an account of the changes in the development of these constructions that can explain the current patterns in the different languages. The grammatical reconstruction of these constructions for the Tupari family will be an important step for understanding their path of development in other Tupian branches that show similar morphosyntactic constructions.
DOUBBLE NEGATION, NEGATIVE CONCORD AND EVIDENCE FOR JESPERSEN CYCLES IN TUPÍ-GUARANÍ LANGUAGES

Dmitry V. GERASIMOV (Institute for Linguistic Studies, St Petersburg, Russia)

Tupí-Guaraní (TG) languages are characterized by circumfixal patterns of standard clausal negation, where negation is expressed twice, preverbally and postverbally:

(1) Emerillon
d-o-kusug-i
NEG-3A-rain-NEG
‘It is not raining.’ (Rose 2003: 66)

It has been proposed in (Zeijlstra 2004: 146-147) that negative concord (strict or non-strict) is a necessary prerequisite for preverbal expression of negation, while (de Swart 2010: 184) suggests that strict negative concord is a crucial condition for development of double negation. Both claims are refuted by (Van Alsenoy & van der Auwera 2014), who show, based on a survey of 103 languages from Asia, Africa and the Americas, that double negation is in fact a much more widespread phenomenon than negative concord.

Strict negative concord is well-attested in Paraguayan Guaraní:

(2) Paraguayan Guaraní
O-japo-værä peteĩ purahei
3A-make-DEB one song
ha nd-o-u-i-et-e-voi iŋ-akā-me mba'eye i-porã-mí-va
and NEG-3A-come-NEG-SUP-EMPH 3-head-LOC nothing 3-good-DM-REL
‘He had to compose a song, but nothing good occurred to him.’ (Ferrer 2009: 9)

(Gerasimov 2011) puts forward a hypothesis, based on internal evidence, that this should be a relatively recent development. If this is true and Guaraní has shifted to negative concord after the double negation pattern had emerged, it would constitute another piece of evidence against interrelatedness of the two phenomena. In the present study, we turn to other TG languages as well as to closely-related Awetí and Sateré-Mawé for comparative evidence, relying mostly on published sources.

Clausal negation by means of discontinuous marker n(d)a-...-i is found in all documented TG languages, except Urubú-Kaapor, Kokama, the Siriono-Yuki cluster and some modern Bolivian Chaco Guaraní dialects, though in the latter is has been replaced by other strategies within the historic period (Dietrich 2007: 14). The split affix *n-...-i is reconstructed for Proto-TG by (Jensen 1998: 545).

The picture with negative concord (or lack thereof) is far less clear, mostly due to lack of data. Whether a language employs NPIs or inherently negative indefinites under clausal negation is notoriously hard to deduce from textual examples (Haskelmath 1997: Ch. 8), and the fact that not only descriptive grammars but also dedicated works on negation, such as (Jensen 1994) or (Carneiro 2012), are often completely silent about the issue doesn’t help things much either. It is clear, however, that indefinite pronouns used in negative contexts have developed independently in different branches and subbranches of TG and that there are both languages that display negative concord and those that do not within the family. For instance, while Paraguayan Guaraní and Mbya are both negative control languages, the closely-related Tapieté is not:
(3) Tapieté

\[
\text{mba’e a-yapo-ü pò ä-i sh-anté’i-inte ä-ï}
\]

thing 1A-болеть-NEG because 1A-be 1-lazyness-SUP 1A-be

‘I will do nothing because I am lazy.’ (González 2005: 291)

(4) Tapieté

\[
\text{mba’etí ko-pe}
\]

thing DEM-LOC

‘Nobody is there.’ (González 2005: 337)

Therefore, while double negation is a Proto-TG phenomenon, negative concord is a more recent development that evolved independently in individual TG languages. TG thus provides additional argument against the claim that emergence of double negation is dependent on negative concord.

The next question is whether we can reliably attribute the development of double negation in Proto-TG to the Jespersen cycle. It appears very likely that the first part of negative circumfix represents the original negator, while the second part derives from a minimizer and is cognate to the diminutive suffix *-’i (Jensen 1998: 509), but given the scarcity of phonological material, here we thread on a rather shaky ground.

We conclude with brief discussion of further developments indicative of Jespersen cycle in Bolivian Chaco Guaraní, Kamaiura, Awetí and Sateré-Mawé. The distribution of negative patterns in TG, currently somewhat understudied, is of great interest to the history of the family, the typology of diachronic changes and the general theory of negation.

Список условных обозначений
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Reconstructing Historical Change in Person-Marking: The Nominative/Accusative/Absolutive/Ergative Prefixes in Cariban

Spike Gildea
University of Oregon & Collegium de Lyon

In the Cariban family, there is a series of personal prefixes/pronominal clitics that appears in various functions in different languages: marking the possessors of nouns, objects of postpositions, and a range of syntactic functions on verbs (absolutive, accusative, ergative, and, marginally, nominative) and auxiliaries (absolutive and nominative). It is fortunate that no single synchronic language presents all of these possibilities, but two in particular, Akawaio and Panare, have most of them. In this paper, I first present synchronic evidence that the same set of forms does, in fact, index persons in all of these distinct roles. I then offer an independent reconstruction of the pathways by which a single set of reconstructible prefixes becomes specialized for indexing so many different grammatical roles. Finally, I suggest that this reconstruction provides independent evidence for the importance of individual constructions in the interpretation of polysemous morphemes: essentially, the role indexed by the prefix not an inherent part of the meaning of the prefix, but rather is determined by the construction in which the prefix occurs.

In brief, the original prefix set reconstructs to the function of possessor when it occurs on a noun and to object of a postposition when it occurs on that postposition. The different verbal roles then reconstruct to different source constructions.

- Action nominalizations of verbs are inalienably possessed by their notional absolutive argument and their notional A is either a NP marked by the dative postposition or a prefix on that postposition. When these nominalizations become reanalyzed as main clause verbs, the possessive prefixes become verbal prefixes that index the ABSOLUTIVE argument of the clause and the prefix on the dative postposition becomes an index of the ERGATIVE A (and in at least three languages, this combination then goes on to become an ergative suffix on the verb).
- The accusative verbal prefix is found only in the progressive construction, in which a transitive action nominalization merges with an intransitive infinitive form, which cannot be marked for person. After reanalysis, the possessor of the transitive nominalization becomes a verbal prefix that indexes the accusative, while the intransitive infinitive becomes a main verb that bears no personal prefix.
- The nominative verbal prefix is found only in the subject focus construction in Panare and the interactive moods in Kuikuro, both derived from an object nominalization that is inalienably possessed by the notional A. After reanalysis, the possessive prefix becomes a verbal prefix that indexes the A of a transitive verb — in Kuikuro, this combined with intransitive action nominalizations (which index S) to yield a nominative prefix in interactive moods, whereas in Panare, the object nominalization extends to intransitive verbs to yield a nominative prefix via a different route.

The reanalyzed absolutive verbal prefix also occurs on the copula, which then can function as an auxiliary for some of these innovative constructions: the person prefix on the auxiliary for the progressive construction indexes the nominative argument of the clause, whereas the prefix on the auxiliary for the past-perfect construction indexes the absolutive argument of the clause.

We now can explain the formal unity of these prefixes alongside the wide range of grammatical roles that they index: the formal unity reflects the fact that they had a unified origin, but when individual subordinate clauses containing these prefixes were reanalyzed as innovative main clauses, each new construction brought the same historical prefixes into a different main clause grammatical role.
Reconstructing the morphology of the pronominal systems of Takanan languages (Amazonian Bolivia and Peru)

Antoine Guillaume (Laboratoire DDL, CNRS & Univ. Lyon 2)

This paper deals with the reconstruction of core argument pronouns in the small Takanan family of the Amazonian lowlands of Northern Bolivia and South-Eastern Peru. This family of languages consists of the following 5 languages: Araona (ARA), Cavineña (CAV), Ese Ejja (ESE), Reyesano (REY) and Tacana (TAC). According to Girard’s (1971) phonological and lexical reconstruction, they are classified within three sub-branches, all placed at the same level within the family tree: Kavinik (CAV), Chamik (ESE), and Takanik (ARA, REY, TAC). The study is based on the following descriptions of the languages: Guillaume (2008) for Cavineña, Vuillermet (2012) for Ese Ejja, Pitman (1980) and Emkow (2006) for Araona, Guillaume (2009) for Reyesano, and my own fieldnotes (2009-2013) for Tacana.

The paper reconstructs two series of core argument pronouns to Proto-Takanik and Proto-Takanan: a set of first-position independent pronouns (P1) used to express contrast and a set of second-position weak or enclitic pronouns (P2) used to express accessible referents. In the reconstructed P1 set, there are both ergative and absolutive forms of the pronouns. In the modern languages, the ergative pronouns are only found in four of them (ARA, CAV, ESE, TAC). In one of these, TAC, they are only attested in the singular. As for the fifth language, REY, it lacks ergative pronouns altogether.

The P2 weak or enclitic pronoun sets of the modern languages are historically derived from P1 independent pronouns, showing phonological and morphological reductions which result in loss of case distinctions found in the P1 forms. In a secondary development, P2 forms have become (hierarchical) verbal prefixes in one language (REY). The fact that all five languages have P2 forms, and that these forms are not all transparently related to the synchronic independent P1 pronouns in each individual language, suggests that, at the time of Proto-Takanan, second position clitics had already differentiated from the P1 pronouns.
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The antipassive/causative syncretism and its origin in Mocovi (Guaycuruan)

Cristian Juárez & Albert Alvarez
Universidad de Sonora (México)

In terms of valency changing operations, antipassive and causative constructions are considered as opposite operations since the antipassivization process corresponds to a valency decrease whereas the causativization process implies a valency increase (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000, Givón 2001, among many others). Therefore, a same marker is not expected to be used synchronically in both valency changing processes.

Although the antipassive/causative syncretism seems to be, as far as we know, unattested cross-linguistically, a formal similarity between both antipassive and causative markers has been documented in some languages, as in West Mande languages where a common source (*tin ‘do’) has been proposed for the antipassive and causative suffixes (Creissels 2012).

This presentation will show that this uncommon antipassive/causative syncretism is present via the use of the verbal marker -**(a)**ɑɑn in Mocovi, a Guaycuruan language spoken between Chaco and Santa Fe provinces in Argentina. Firstly, we will describe how this suffix is used to encode antipassive and causative clauses in Mocovi. Secondly, we will explain the syncretism, looking for the possible functional similarities between both types of construction. Lastly, we will adopt a diachronic perspective in order to determine the source of this verbal marker and to describe the grammaticalization pathway that has led to the currently observed syncretism. It will be thus shown that this Mocovi voice marker -**(a)**ɑɑn is formed historically out of a double derivation, which resembles the recently proposed origin for voice markers in Japhug Rgyalrong (Sino-Tibetan, Jacques 2014), namely NOMINALIZATION + DENOMINAL DERIVATION → VOICE DERIVATION.

**References**


In many languages of the Cariban family, tense-aspect-mood (TAM) suffixes form a rather elaborate system, with many important distinctions, including various past tenses (recent vs. distant, perfective vs. imperfective), future, present (gnomic vs. progressive), counterfactual/hypothetic, and others. To this, one often also has to add number and evidentiality (certainty) markers, further increasing the size of verb words. (cf. examples in Gildea 2014, Gildea & Meira 2014).

In the Parukotoan branch, this complexity reaches its maximum; in this branch, however, there is some evidence suggesting that this complexity is relatively recent, having resulted from the incorporation of erstwhile independent particles and clitics into the verb word. In this presentation, some preliminary results are discussed which support this idea, further leading to the hypothesis that the original TAM system of Proto-Cariban was much simpler than what is found in most present-day languages, and that the family, and especially the Parukotoan branch, has significantly increased the complexity of its TAM morphology."
Proto-Arawak *ma-: From privative derivation to standard negation

Lev Michael, University of California, Berkeley

This paper reconstructs the morphosyntactic function of Proto-Arawak morpheme *ma-, arguing that it was a derivational morpheme that derived privative stative verb stems from inalienable nouns. I further argue that the negation function of privative extended in many branches of the family from this strictly nominal environment to a number of quasi-nominal environments along the nominal-verbal cline (Hopper and Thompson 1984), and in a subset of these languages, to increasingly verbal, and even fully verbal, environments. I also argue that in a small number of languages the use of the privative extended from the nominal domain to that of subordinate verbs, that, by virtue of restrictions on the inflectional morphology they may take (i.e. by virtue of 'deranking' (Cristofaro 2005)), can also be considered quasi-nominal environments. This process of parallel drift (Sapir 1921) across the family has resulted in a rich quilt of functions among the modern-day reflexes of the Proto-Arawak privative.

The idea that the ubiquitous Arawak negation marker m(a)- reconstructs to Proto-Arawak as a privative has a long history (Matteson 1972, Payne 1991). As detailed descriptions of Arawak languages became more numerous, however, instances of non-privative functions of reflexes of *ma- began to accumulate, leading authors such as Aikhenvald (2002: 290-291) to de-emphasize its privative function, and characterize it as a 'general negation' marker. The language specific studies of Arawak negation in Michael and Granadillo (2014), reveal, however, that reflexes of *ma- rarely function as standard negation elements (in fact, is only clearly the case for two languages: Tariana and Garìfuna), and that there is a strong tendency for its reflexes to only negate stative or subordinate verbs, or to function synchronically as a privative derivational suffix. On this basis, Michael (2014) suggests that the traditional hypothesis regarding the function of Proto-Arawak *ma- is correct, and that the multifarious functions exhibited by its reflexes are due to varied processes of grammaticalization that have affected the reflexes of this morpheme. The purpose of this paper is to substantiate in detail this traditional hypothesis, which is stated but not defended in the original works cited above, and only sketchily defended by Michael (2014).

This paper is based on an database of reflexes of Proto-Arawak *ma- in 27 Arawak languages (corresponding to all Arawak languages for which sufficiently detailed descriptions of negation exist), which records: 1) the main clause and subordinate clause functions of reflexes of the privative (including restrictions to any subclasses of verbs); 2) its derivational functions; and 3) if the language has no productive reflex of the morpheme, whether it is found frozen in any roots.

These data indicate that there are two sets of implicational relationship between the functions of the privative, given in (1) and (2), where use of reflexes of *ma- at one point in the implication hierarchy entail their use to the right of that point:

(1)

standard negation (all verb classes) >> standard negation (stative verbs) >> privative derivation.

(2)

subordinate clause negation >> privative derivation

These implicational facts are most easily explained, I argue, by assuming a process by which the
distribution of reflexes of *ma- extended from the original privative derivational function to functions further to left on the hierarchies, including, for a small subset of languages, all the way to the standard negation function. Some languages, such as Lokono, appear to extended the functions of ma- along both trajectories represented in (1) and (2).

Apart from arguing for reconstructing a privative derivational function for Proto-Arawak *ma-, I will sketch out how the function of reflexes of this morpheme have extended in different branches of the family, producing the attested diversity of their functions across the family.
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Abstract: Ideophones and related phenomena in Tupian languages
Sabine Reiter, Universität zu Kiel

Departing from a detailed analysis of ideophones and synchronic evidence for their possible development towards a specific type of verb root in Aweti, this paper explores the possibility of similar developmental processes in a variety of related languages. In Aweti, the grammaticalization process by which a light verb ‘e (‘say’), used with ideophones to form complex predicates, is assumed to have turned into a verb class marker is accompanied by a decrease in iconicity or expressiveness of the “ideophonic” element when uttered in discourse. The whole process can be subsumed under Güldemann’s (2008) mimetic approach to the development of complex verb constructions, which he describes for African languages.

Aweti ideophones in current language use may display great differences with regard to their morphological and syntactic behaviour. Some are phonologically and syntactically marked as independent units, others are syntactically independent but semantically linked to the predicate of the preceding or following clause. Some ideophones constitute the predicate of a clause in their invariant form. Others occur as the uninflecting part of a complex predicate formed by a light verb. Finally, ideophones may be formally identical with verb roots.

In absence of a historical dimension this synchronic variation in Aweti is regarded here as an indicator of change, and cross-linguistically, too, in various related Tupian languages certain construction types and usages seem to indicate similar processes. In addition, the research results regarding ideophones and complex verb constructions in other languages of the world (e.g. McGregor 2002, Güldemann 2008) make some diachronic pathways of change more likely than others.

The study is based on annotated corpus data (audio and video) from the Aweti language which was contrasted with similar constructions in eleven Tupian languages for which grammars and other linguistic studies and/or video data were available.
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This paper will deal with two constructions involving a prefix ta- in Tupi-Guarani languages, a subgroup of Tupi languages from the Amazonian basin. These constructions are outstanding in that they are both unexpected in the general typology of these languages. The paper is based on a comparative database of Tupi-Guarani morphosyntax, comprising data from thirty languages, and from additional literature on Tupi languages.

The first construction, found in the great majority of Tupi-Guarani languages (see for example Barbosa 1956, Guasch 1996, Villafañe 2004 on Tupinambá, Paraguayan Guarani and Yuki respectively), is made of a prefix ta- attached to the main verb before the person prefix/enclitic. The resulting meaning of the construction is hortative/polite imperative/jussive. This construction stands out from common Tupi-Guarani main clause syntax (Jensen 1998), because TAM are usually encoded either by suffixes on the predicates or by discourse particles. Moreover, ta- is one of the two prefixes (with the negation marker) that can stand before the person markers.

The second construction, found in only some Tupi-Guarani languages (see for example Grenand 1980, Magalhães 2007, Rose 2011 on Wayampi, Guajá and Emérillon, respectively), is also made of a prefix ta- attached to the verb before its person prefix/enclitic, but it attaches to a dependent finite verb following the main clause and the resulting meaning of the construction is purposive. This purpose construction stands out from common Tupi-Guarani dependent clause syntax (Jensen 1990), because all other dependent markers are clause-final, and all but one type of the other dependent clauses are non-finite.

Neither of these ta- clauses has been reconstructed for Proto-Tupi-Guarani (Schleicher 1998, Jensen 1999) though they are mentioned as a single phenomenon in a Tupi-Guarani comparative study (Dietrich 1990). There are not found in other Tupi languages. The synchronic co-existence of these two outstanding main and dependent clause constructions could be explained in a variety of ways: one construction deriving from the other (in the two possible directions), the latter itself derived from a source construction; both deriving from the same source construction; and each one deriving from a different source construction. Up to now, the functional link of these two constructions has regularly been underlined, either considering them as one phenomenon (Seki 2000), or suggesting that the use of the ta- clause as a dependent clause could be derived from its use as main clause (see for example Rose 2011). This hypothesis is consolidated by suppletive forms found in the same context in both types of ta-clauses.

Though a functional motivation is plausible enough to explain how one is derived from the other, this paper shows that data from a non-Tupi-Guarani Tupi language, Xipaya (Rodrigues 2007b), points to two possible source constructions involving a ta auxiliary, itself derived from a Proto-Tupi verb **co ‘to go’ (Rodrigues 2007a). The paper hypothesizes two different processes of reanalysis from these two source constructions resulting in the two constructions under study. This paper shows that although a functional explanation for the close resemblance of two synchronic constructions is attractive, diachronic syntax can reveal that this resemblance is actually due to the common origin of the two different constructions at the source of the constructions under study.
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Piaroa [ISO 693-3: pid] is spoken on both sides of the Colombian-Venezuelan border by approximately 15,000 people (INE, 2013). The language is a member of the Sáliban family and is most closely related to Mako [wpc]; the third member of the family is Sálaba [slc] (see Author, accepted). Based on primary data for Mako and Piaroa from the author’s own fieldwork, this talk explores the origins of the highly complex Piaroa subject marking system described in the published sources on the language.

In the present and past tense, the subject of a verb is marked via a suffix (1): -sã for first person, -hã for second person and -∅ for third person. In addition to this marking, feminine forms are marked with the feminine classifier -ahu. In future tense, however, subjects are doubly marked. In addition to the suffixes in the forms in (1), each form has an additional prefix (2) or suffix (3) depending on the verb; these two other sets of subject affixes vary for both person and number. Notice that the additional suffix occupies a position immediately after the verbal root while the first set of suffixes comes after the inflected form.

Such a complex system raises multiple questions regarding its origin and development. Firstly, why are subjects marked twice in the future? Secondly, what motivates the split observed in the marking with additional prefixes and suffixes in the future? And lastly, which of the two systems is the oldest and which one is innovative? Comparative data from Sálaba and Mako provide the answers to these questions.

In both Sálaba and Mako, all subjects are marked with either a set of prefixes that immediately precede the verb root (4-5) or a set of suffixes that immediately follow the verb root (6-7). This system of two sets of subject affixes is reconstructable for Proto-Sáliban (Author, accepted) and must therefore have been inherited from the common ancestor of these three languages. Mako data (8-9) suggests that it is the verb’s phonology that accounts for the split: verb roots that end in a consonant take a prefix; those that end in a vowel take a suffix. So, if the subject prefixes/inner suffixes were inherited from Proto-Sáliban, what is the source of the Piaroa subject markers that come at the end of all verbs (i.e., -sã for first person, -hã for second person and -∅ for third person)?

I argue here, based on Mako data, that these markers are in fact old copular suffixes that were extended to verbal predicates in habitual aspect and once they entered the verbal predicate domain they were further extended to all tense/aspect combinations.

Identity constructions in Mako involve a nominalized (by means of a classifier) verb form and a copular suffix, which varies for person: -tsa for first person (10), -ha for second person, and -∅ for third person (11). The Mako copular construction is also used in verbal predicates with habitual aspect: In (12), the verb ‘stay’ takes a prefix for 3sg.masc and a tense suffix; in (13), person is marked with a -∅ and gender with the masculine classifier and there is no tense morphology. The semantic basis for this extension seems clear: someone who is a worker is someone who works all the time/habitually.

Notice that the Mako copular suffixes are cognate with the Piaroa subject suffixes in (1) and that feminine forms are also cognate (cf. -ahu (1) and -ahu (10)). This evidence suggests that the new paradigm of subject affixes in Piaroa has as its origin a set of three copular suffixes and that sentences in habitual aspect must have been the context into which the copular suffixes entered the verbal predicate domain; their use in other tense/aspect combinations being a further extension of the construction.

This research constitutes an important contribution to the description of Piaroa and to our understanding of complex systems of verbal person marking and their possible sources.

REFERENCES:
(1)  | Person | masculine       | feminine      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>ādīt-sē</td>
<td>‘I (male) work’</td>
<td>ādīt-æhu-sē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ādīt-hē</td>
<td>‘you (male) [SG] work’</td>
<td>ādīt-æhu-hē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>ādīt</td>
<td>‘he works’</td>
<td>adit-æhu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mosonyi, 2000:662)

(2)  | Person |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG.MASC</td>
<td>ğ-ādīt-æ’k”ā-sē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.MASC</td>
<td>k”-ādīt-æ’k”ā-hē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.MASC</td>
<td>ādīt-æ’k”ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mosonyi, 2000:662-663)

(3)  | Person |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG.MASC</td>
<td>pæ-d-æ’k”ā-sē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.MASC</td>
<td>pæ-k”-æ’k”ā-hē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.MASC</td>
<td>pæ-ʔ-æk”ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mosonyi, 2000:663)

(4) Sáliba  (5) Mako  (6) Sáliba  (7) Mako

c-om-a | ğ-otid-a | gu-d-a | wahi-t-a |
|1SG-come-REAL | 1SG-work-REAL | walk-1SG-REAL | not.know-1SG-REAL |
| I come’ | ‘I work’ | ‘I walk’, ‘I go’ | ‘I don’t know’ |

(Estrada Ramírez, 2000:695)

(8)  | PREFIX-TAKING VERBS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bamat-</td>
<td>‘to stop’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deh-</td>
<td>‘to light’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9)  | SUBJECT-TAKING VERBS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me-</td>
<td>‘to fall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-</td>
<td>‘to scrape’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) ik”i | otid-ahu-ḥa |
|2SG.PRO | work?-CL.FEM-COP.2 |
| ‘You (female) are a worker’ |

(11) ite | otid-ḥ-∅ |
|3SG.PRO.MASC | work?-CL.MASC-COP.3 |
| ‘He is a worker’ |

(12) mariu-ma / tebo-ni | ḍ-h obe-ma |
| tapir-TOP? | woods-OBJ | 3SG.MASC-stay-TAM-TOP? |
| ‘the tapir, he lives in the woods’ (lit. ‘the tapir always stays in the woods’) |

(13) hōba-ma | tebo-ni | ḍe |
| that.one-TOP? | woods-OBJ | stay-CL.MASC |
| ‘he lives in the woods’ (lit. ‘he always stays in the woods’) |
AN INNOVATIVE IMPERFECTIVE KARI’NJA (CARIBAN, SURINAME)
Racquel-María Sapién
University of Oklahoma
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ABSTRACT
This paper presents an analysis of an innovative imperfective construction in Kari’nja (Cariban, Suriname). Although mentioned briefly by Hoff (1968), there has to date been no principled description of the construction. Nevertheless, it appears frequently in texts. The typical Kari’nja finite main clause, termed a “Set I” system by Gildea (1992, 1998), has the following characteristics: an absence of case marking, a set of verbal personal prefixes that codes A, O, and S arguments, very few constituent order restrictions, a single collective verbal suffix that may index any argument, and conditioned syllable reduction in verb roots that reduce.

(1) [ A ] [ O ] [ V ]
 [ awu ] mo:ko wodi s- ene -ja
 1 that woman 1A3O- see -PRS.TNS
‘I see that woman.’

By contrast with the more typical Set I system, the innovative Kari’nja construction is characterized by the following: a non-bound ergative case marker affixed for person and collective, separate sets of personal prefixes indexing O and S versus A, strong constituent order restrictions, a unique collective suffix for O and S versus A, and no syllable reduction.

(2) [ o- V ] [ a- Erg]
 [ Itjotopyry ] i’ja.
 [ i- kota -po(ty) -ry ] i- ’ja
 [ 3- cut -ITER -IMPF ] 3- ERG
‘She’s chopping it up.’ (CF MaCh 0011)

This paper describes formal and functional properties of the synchronic construction, examines potential source constructions, and describes the mechanism by which it entered main clauses, thereby situating the construction among cognate constructions in other languages in the family. The construction is unique in Kari’nja in that it exhibits ergative patterns of morphosyntax. The construction’s imperfective aspectual value validates a claim of a counter-universal, tense/aspect-based ergative split in Kari’nja.

REFERENCES
Cyclic grammaticalization in the person marking systems of the Caribbean Northern Arawak languages

This paper investigates the history of suffixal person markers in the four Caribbean Northern Arawak (CNA) languages Garifuna, Wayúu, Añun, and Lokono. At first blush, Wayúu, Añun, and Lokono appear to have dramatically reduced suffixal person marking systems on comparison with Garifuna; it could thus follow that (i) the Garifuna suffixal person marking system is a retention that was once widespread across these languages, (ii) is cognate to the suffixal person markers in the other Northern Arawak languages, and (iii) this system underwent extreme reduction in Wayúu, Añun, and Lokono, providing evidence that these languages form a subgroup to the exclusion of Garifuna. In contrast to this idea, I present evidence that this reduced suffixal person marking system is retained in grammatical pockets in Garifuna. This suggests that this reduced pronominal system reconstructs to proto-CNA, and that the more elaborate suffixal person markers found in Garifuna are, in fact, innovative, having regrammaticalized from the pronominal system in the language. I argue that insubordination of complement clauses led to the suffixal person marking we find in Garifuna to the exclusion of the other languages.

In unmarked clauses, A and Sa arguments are marked prefixally in every CNA language, and free pronouns cannot co-occur with these prefixal person markers. Suffixal agreement of and A or Sa argument occurs in Añun and Wayúu when an overt pronominal subject argument is present. In this case, the verbal suffixal agreement marker carries number and gender (but not person) agreement for the overt pronoun, as seen in (1) & (2).

(1) Aashahaashi taya. Wayúu aashahaash speak-i -SG.M 1.SG

‘I speak.’

(Uriana and Ipuana (2000), p.367)

(2) Akichi te iyi Añun a- ka -ich -i te iyi at.1- comer -asp.2 -SG.M 1SG fish

‘I ate fish.’

(Patte (1989), p.80)

For Garifuna, suffixal agreement of an Sa argument only occurs under particular discourse conditions, but when these conditions are met, the suffixal person markers cannot co-occur with a full pronoun, as seen in (3), which contrasts with the Wayúu and Añun examples we saw in (1) & (2). Like in all CNA languages, a full pronoun cannot co-occur with a prefixal person marker, as we see in (4). This example also shows that suffixal person marking is usually co-referential with an O argument.

(3) Eremuhatina (*nuguya). Garifuna

Eremu -ha -tina nuguya sing -PERF -1SG 1SG

‘I sang.’

(Kaufman (2010), p. 7)

(4) Lalwahayon (*lìgiya) hiyaru. Garifuna

l- alwaha -ya -un lìgiya hiyaru. 3.SG.M- look.for -IMPF 3.SG.M girl

‘Pablo is looking for the girl.’

(fieldnotes 2, p.22)

A possible analysis for the data so far is that Garifuna retains pronominal enclitics that are reconstructable to proto-CNA and these enclitics have grammaticalized into agreement affixes in the other CNA languages. An alternate analysis, which I propose and defend in this paper, is that proto-CNA exhibited reduced suffixal person marking and Garifuna innovated a new set of pronominal clitics.

Garifuna exhibits reduced suffixal agreement marking in extraction clauses, which occur in focus constructions, wh-questions, and relative clauses. These constructions all involve movement of a core argument to the left edge of the clause, and the post-verbal marker ba hosts agreement markers that co-index the extracted argument, as we see in (5) & (6). The suffixal person markers in (5) & (6) are phonologically reduced on comparison with the suffixal person markers in (3) & (4). Unlike the other Garifuna examples we saw, they can co-occur with full pronouns, bringing them in line with the other CNA languages.
Table 1 summarizes the phonological shape of the CNA suffixal person markers. We see that Garifuna main clause person suffixes do not appear to be cognate with the suffixal person markers of the other CNA languages, but the suffixal person markers exhibited in the extraction system do appear to be cognate with the other CNA agreement suffixes, in addition to their functional similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Garifuna</th>
<th>Garifuna</th>
<th>Lokono</th>
<th>Añun</th>
<th>Wayúu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-tiña</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-tibu</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>-tiwa</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>-tiña</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-tiña</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A possible diachronic source for the Garifuna pronominal enclitics is insubordination. Strong evidence for the fact that insubordination in the language has occurred is found in the main clause negator ma-, which functions as a privative marker in the other Arawak languages, and has a diachronic source as a subordinate clause negator in Garifuna. A construction in which a complementizer inflected for a verbal argument could be reanalyzed as a pronominal suffix is found in (7).

(7) **Busietina lun madiaha na.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Garifuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>busie</td>
<td>Garifuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td>-tina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>lun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>adiahna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG-</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SG</td>
<td>dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SG</td>
<td>COMP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I sang.’
(fieldnotes)

The work contributes to diachronic studies of Arawak morphosyntax more broadly because the Arawak person marking system is a feature of the language family that scholars often take into consideration in diagnosing genetic relatedness. A less thorough examination of the person marking systems of these languages might erroneously exclude Garifuna from CNA.
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From noise-making to non-visual evidence: Genesis of an evidential category
Kristine Stenzel, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

This paper discusses the origin of the category of NON-VISUAL sensory evidence in Kotiria (Wanano), an Eastern Tukanoan (ET) language spoken in the Vaupés basin, a border region between Brazil and Colombia in northwestern Amazonia. The evidential systems of ET languages are well known both for their complexity and their obligatory nature. In Kotiria and other ET languages, evidential coding occurs on all finite verbs in realis statements, and also occurs, though with fewer distinctions, in interrogative constructions. Studies of ET languages (Barnes 1984; Malone 1988; Ramirez 1997; Gomez-Imbert 2007, 2011; grammatical sketches in González de Pérez & Rodríguez de Montes 2000, among others) show that ET evidential systems are generally composed of four basic categories:

VISUAL, the most frequently occurring category, which indicates direct sensory evidence and whose markers additionally code distinctions of person and tense or aspect;
INFERENCE (alternately labeled ‘APPARENT’ or ‘DEDUCED’), used to express conclusions based on directly observed, but after-the-fact, evidence;
ASSUMED (alternately referred to as ‘ASSERTION’), a somewhat ‘catch-all’ category used to express generally known and shared information; and
HEARSAY, a less-commonly used category that may have more than one form indicating temporal/aspectual distinctions.

A few languages have an additional NON-VISUAL category, used in situations involving other-than-visual sensory evidence and those in which no directly observable evidence is possible, e.g. to refer to the physical sensations of the speaker.

Kotiria is one of the ET languages in which a five-way evidential system that includes a category indicating direct sensory, but specifically non-visual, evidence has developed (Stenzel 2008, 2013; Waltz 1997 offers an alternate analysis of the system as composed of four categories). Table 1 shows the five categories and the semantic features by which they can be identified. It indicates that the NON-VISUAL category occupies a specific semantic niche within the territorial boundaries of ‘firsthand, external’ evidence, contrasting with the equally ‘direct’ VISUAL category as well as the ‘indirect’ category of INFERENCE.

### Table 1. Kotiria evidentials (Stenzel 2013:272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>FORMS</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nonfirsthand</td>
<td>quotative</td>
<td>-yu’ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diffuse</td>
<td>-yu’ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firsthand</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td>visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st perf.</td>
<td>-ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>-ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non1st perf.</td>
<td>-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nonvisual</td>
<td>koo-ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ri hi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>-ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st = first person subject; imperf. = imperfective; non1st = second or third person subject; perf. = perfective.

Table 1 also presents the rather eclectic means by which the five evidential categories are morphologically encoded in Kotiria.Suffixes are used for three of the categories (HEARSAY, VISUAL, and ASSERTION), INFERENCE is coded by an analytic construction involving the copula hi and a verbal complement nominalized by -ri, and NON-VISUAL evidence is indicated by a more complex and ‘lexical-like’ construction
that likewise involves a nominalized verbal complement. Use of analytic constructions rather than suffixes for certain evidential categories, primarily INFERENCE, is found in a few other ET languages, but no other ET language has a non-visual construction that is quite comparable to that of Kotiria.

Examples of the NON-VISUAL construction are seen in (1) and (2), which also show that while use of the NON-VISUAL typically indicates auditory information, it may include other types of non-visual sensory perception as well, a semantic extension often found in systems with a specific NON-VISUAL category.

(1) numia ńa’a’ina taa nia koatara
~dubí-a ~ya’á~ida tá-a ~dí-a koá-ta-ra
woman-PL catch-NOM.PL come-(3)PL be.PROG-(3)PL NONVIS-come-VIS.IMPERF.2/3
‘Women-kidnappers are coming.’ (the speaker hears them)

(2) borasũka’a wa’aro koataa
borá~su-ka’a wa’á-ro koá-ta-a
fall-arrive-do.moving go-(3)SG NONVIS-come-ASSERT.PERF
‘(The curupira) fell right down.’ (the speaker hears and additionally feels the vibration from the great creature’s fall)

The paper begins by discussing the NON-VISUAL category as a contrasting member of the Kotiria evidential system, presents further discussion of its semantic and structural properties, and offers additional examples of its use in naturally occurring language. It argues that the Kotiria NON-VISUAL has likely developed both recently—being that there is no similar NON-VISUAL construction even in its mostly closely-related sister language, Wa’íkhaná (Piratapuyo)—and independently, based on contrasts both in form and in use from the NON-VISUAL markers that occur in other ET languages. It proposes that the Kotiria NON-VISUAL has grammaticalized from a serial verb construction composed of the lexical roots koa, historically (though no longer synchronically) meaning something akin to ‘make noise’ and the verb of cislocative movement ta ‘come’. Evidence for this origin comes from older lexical forms such as placenames like koama phoaye ‘noisy stream rapids’, in which the ‘make noise’ meaning of koa is still evident.

It is typologically more common for NON-VISUAL evidential markers to develop from sensory verbs such as ‘hear’ than from verbal roots of the ‘make noise’ type (Anderson 1986, Aikhenvald 2004). However, this latter path of grammaticalization is also attested, and seems to find parallels in other languages of the Vaupés of different genetic origins, and may represent a shared areal trait (Epps 2008; Ospina Bozzi 2002). This analysis of the genesis and development of the Kotiria NON-VISUAL expands, and to a certain degree reformulates, the initial analysis of the construction (Stenzel 2008). It provides additional details related to its component elements, integrating comparative data from Wa’íkhaná as well as further examples and insights arising from data collected during a three-year documentation project on the Kotiria language and aspects of Kotiria culture.
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The development of switch reference suffixes in Panoan languages

Daniel VALLE, University of Texas, Austin

One of the most salient features of Panoan languages, spoken in the Amazon regions of Bolivia, Brazil and Peru, is their complex systems of switch reference (Valenzuela 2003, Loos 1999, Fleck 2013). Switch reference (SR) markers in Panoan languages are final verbal suffixes that attach to subordinate verbs instead of TAM / person inflection. Panoan SR suffixes usually encode three types of information: (i) temporal relation of the subordinate clause with regard to the main clause, (ii) coreferentiality or not of core arguments in the main and subordinate clause and (iii) grammatical function in the main clause of the coreferential argument. The number of SR suffixes and the functions they serve vary from one Panoan language to the other (e.g. Kakataibo shows 21 SR suffixes, Zariquiey 2011). While some of these suffixes seem to be cognates across some Panoan languages, other SR suffixes are not.

This paper explores one of the mechanisms by which SR suffixes may have arisen in Panoan languages. While some SR markers such as -kin ‘simultaneous event, A/S>A’ and -xun ‘previous event, A/S>A’ seem to have developed out of the stacking of locative/directional markers and participant agreement markers (Valenzuela 2003:ch 20), this paper focuses on a different set of SR suffixes, which may or may not be cognates across the surveyed languages, as those in the sample table below, but share the same grammaticalization mechanism. I will argue here that these SR suffixes grammaticalized out of (clausal) nominalization suffixes plus (non-)core case markers. Panoan languages make extensive use of nominalizations and typically have different nominalizers that also encode tense/aspect. In addition, clausal nominalizations have the ability to receive number and case. The use of case-marked clausal nominalization in adverbial function can have provided the context for them to be re-analyzed as SR morphemes, which is evidenced by the ambiguous readings this construction can receive, as seen in original data collected in Kakataibo. This analysis has the advantage of predicting some of the semantic features of the SR markers, such as their temporal orientation (e.g. previous event).

By sketching a possible grammaticalization path for some of the SR suffixes found in Panoan languages, it will be shown that most of these morphemes are independent innovations in the different languages but the grammaticalization mechanism by which they emerged is the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominalizer suffix</th>
<th>Case marker</th>
<th>Switch reference suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kakataibo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>({=wëtan}) ‘COM.A’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shipibo-Konibo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Valenzuela 2013)</td>
<td>(-ai) ‘INCOMPL NMLZ’</td>
<td>({=n}) ‘ERG’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>({=titan}) ‘temporal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yaminahua</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faust and Loos 2002)</td>
<td>(-a) ‘PROG NMLZ’</td>
<td>({=na}) ‘LOC’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-a) ‘COMPL NMLZ’</td>
<td>({=na}) ‘LOC’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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