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The languages under study

- The Yukuna/Matapi language
  - Arawak
  - 1000 people
  - Lemus Serrano (2016a; 2016b), Robayo (2016)

- The Tanimuka/Retuarã language
  - Tucanoan
  - 500 people
  - Eraso (2015), +20 years of fieldwork
The issue

● Contact between Yukuna (Arawak) and Tanimuka (Tucano) in Colombia

● First study by Aikhenvald (2002)
  ○ One-to-one language contact between Yukuna and Tanimuka/Retuarã
  ○ No dominant language
  ○ “Bidirectional hypothesis”: mutual adjustment
  ○ Very little direct diffusion
  ○ Based on limited data (Schauer and Schauer 1978; Strom 1992)

● A marginal case study used as a contrast with the Tariana (Arawak) case
  ■ Multilateral diffusion in a linguistic area
  ■ Unilateral diffusion from Tucano to Tariana
A new look into this issue

● Our aim

→ Looking at this hypothesis in the light of more recent and thorough descriptions

● Our claims

1- There is also direct diffusion

2- Yukuna is more dominant than Tanimuka

3- There is also some multilateral diffusion
Introduction
Regional context (according to Aikhenvald 2002)

- Vaupés linguistic area (shaded area)
  - Tucano (Tucano, other East Tucanoan languages), Arawak (Tariana), Nadehup (Hup, Yuhup), Kakua-Nukak (Kakua)
  - Institutionalized multilingualism
  - Linguistic exogamy (among Tucano and Arawak groups)
  - Recent dominant status of Tucano

- Tanimuka/Retuarã & Yukuna situation
  - Along the Apaporis and Miriti-Paraná rivers
  - Close contact in the past, little bilingualism at present
  - Existence of linguistic exogamy is problematic
  - No evidence of a dominance relationship

Map 2.1 Arawak and Tucanoan languages in north-west Amazonia, including the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area (with Makú as marginal members)
Map taken from Aikhenvald (2002: 75)
Contact-induced changes (Aikhenvald 2002)

Tucano & Tariana

- Vaupés linguistic area
  - phonological indirect diffusion
  - convergence of morphosyntactic patterns
  - little lexical diffusion

- Tucano influence on Tariana
  - phonological diffusion
  - convergence of morphosyntactic patterns
  - little lexical diffusion

Tanimuka & Yukuna

- Tanimuka/Retuarã & Yukuna
  - mutual adjustment of the phonological systems
  - levelling of morphosyntactic structures
  - changes in grammatical relations and case (in Retuarã only)
  - very little lexical borrowing
Overview

New insights on:

- the socio-historical setting
- contact-induced changes in the lexicon
- contact-induced changes in the morphology

Conclusion
New insights on the socio-historical setting
Ethnogenesis

- Yukuna language
  - spoken by both Yukuna and Matapi
  - Matapi maybe not of Arawak origin, recent ethnogenesis
  - intermarriage between the two groups

- Tanimuka language
  - spoken by both Tanimuka [ũ’pairã] and Letuama [rétuarã]
  - one language with small dialectal differences (Eraso 2015)
  - intermarriage between the two groups
Historical perspective

● Yukuna and Matapis are considered to be the original inhabitants of the Miriti-Parana region (Reichel 1999).

● Rubber exploitation on the Miriti (Hammen 1992:31).
  ○ in the late 19th and early 20th centuries
  ○ Brings people from outside (Miraña, Muinane, Huitoto, Letuama, Tanimuka, Cabiyari, Cubeo, Yauna, Makuna, Barasano)
  ○ Reason for the migration of Tanimuka and Letuama, originally from the river Apaporis (Hildebrand 1975)
  ○ The exogamic system of the Letuama then was applied in that region as well (Eraso 2015)
Present-day sociolinguistic situation

● Close contact
  ○ shared villages
  ○ shared culture (cosmology, mythology, dances, male initiation ritual)
  ○ exchange system (parties, visits, ceremonies, marriage)

● Exogamic system (Schackt 1994)
  ○ Tanimuka, Letuama, Makuna (Tucanoan); Yukuna, Matapi (Arawak); Miraña (Boran).
  ○ Group exogamy rather than linguistic exogamy: Tanimuka & Letuama intermarry, Yukuna and Matapi also

● Pervasive daily bilingualism
Yukuna-Tanimuka family of La Pedrera: Monica Tanimuca (left), Luis Fernando Yucuna (right), and their son. (Photo by Magdalena Lemus Serrano, July 2015)
Tanimuka-Yukuna family of Puerto Lago: Juan Tanimuca (left), his wife Regina Yucuna (middle), their older son Benedicto Tanimuca (right) and their younger son (front). (Photo by Natalia Eraso, 2009)
New insights on contact-induced changes in the lexicon
Lexical borrowings

- list of 366 basic and cultural lexical items (Huber and Reed 1992) in 69 languages of Colombia
- Tanimuka and Yukuna share as many as 35 word forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directionality Pattern</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuk&gt;Tan: Borrowing from Yukuna to Tanimuka</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan&gt;Yuk: Borrowing from Tanimuka to Yukuna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arw&gt;Tan: Borrowing from an Arawakan language, other than Yukuna, to Tanimuka</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuk&gt;Yuk: Borrowing from a Tukanoan language, other than Tanimuka, to Yukuna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan&lt;&lt;Yuk: Unknown directionality, involving Tanimuka and Yukuna only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arw&lt;&lt;Tuk: Multilateral directionality, involving other languages</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality</td>
<td>Yukuna (other Arawakan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUK&gt;TAN</td>
<td><em>isamani</em> (≈ Piapoco <em>samana</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAN&gt;YUK</td>
<td><em>weʔerupa-tʃi wa-iʔirupa-chi</em> 1PL-knee-? (≠ Piapoco <em>ului</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARW&gt;TAN</td>
<td><em>araʔapa</em> (≈ Resigaro <em>aaʔpe</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARW&gt;&lt;TUK (Pan-Arw-Tuk)</td>
<td><em>lena</em> (≈ Piapoco <em>nene</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lexical borrowings

- Some one-to-one contact-influenced borrowings (9 words)
- Most borrowings involve other languages (26 words)
- In cases with clear directionality, Tanimuka is more affected than Yukuna (10 borrowings vs 2)
- The lexicon of Tucanoan languages is more affected than that of Arawak languages
- Preliminary conclusions
  - One-to-one Yukuna-Tanimuka contact is weaker than regional patterns of contact
  - Multilateral borrowings reflect ancient contact between Northern Arawakan and Tukanoan, with the dominance of Arawak languages
Calques

- Borrowing of the pattern, not the matter (Matras & Sakel 2007)
- Calquing is at service of NW Amazon multilingualism (cf. Floyd 2013 about Rio Negro and Vaupes)
- Morphologically complex idioms can be used as evidence for contact, especially when the semantic metaphor is idiomatic (Epps 2013)
## Calques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yukuna (other Arawak)</th>
<th>Tanimuka (other Tucanoan)</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>palá pi-la’a-ká</strong></td>
<td><strong>hiá yi-ré</strong></td>
<td>‘thanks’ (lit. you made me well)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well 2SG-make-TAM.PRS</td>
<td>well 1SG-DEIC1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>2SG-make-N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nuká</strong></td>
<td><strong>mi-bai-ka</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>weji</strong></td>
<td><strong>mã̂̄ška-râ'kâ-o</strong></td>
<td>‘three’ (lit. tripod pot-stand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pot.stand DEM</td>
<td>&lt; <strong>mã̂̄šoka</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Wapishana <em>idikinauda'u</em> maybe from ‘stones under a pot’, Epps and Hansen forthcoming)</td>
<td>three-QNT-CL pot.stand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kele</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(= Secoya toasö, cf. toa sa’a ‘clay pots for fire cooking’; Ecuadorian Siona toasö from toa ‘fire’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pajluwa kuwa’a-ta</strong></td>
<td><strong>írõ-o teña-yu</strong></td>
<td>‘six’ (lit. crossing one) [same construction from 6 to 9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one cross-TRZ.PRS DEM</td>
<td>one-CLS cross-PRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kele</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(= Secoya toasö, cf. toa sa’a ‘clay pots for fire cooking’; Ecuadorian Siona toasö from toa ‘fire’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pajluwa ri-jña’a-ká</strong></td>
<td><strong>írõ-o úpua-rã ē’a-yu</strong></td>
<td>‘eleven’ (lit. taking one towards the foot) [same construction from 11 to 20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one 3SG.NF-take-TAM.PRS</td>
<td>one-CLS foot-ALL take-PRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ri’imá nakojé</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.NF-foot towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calques

- Three constructions restricted to these two languages, idiomatic (except ‘3’ found in other languages): evidence for contact

- Post-columbian constructs, made up in the time of rubber exploitation, according to some Tanimuka speakers

- No hint for directionality
New insights on contact-induced changes in the morphology
Morphological borrowings - the beneficiary

- Very few oblique markers in Tucanoan languages
- Tanimuka beneficiary -ro'si ~ -roo without cognates within Tucanoan
- Cognates in Arawak languages
- Yukuna dative is the best correspondence =jló
- A morphological borrowing from Yukuna into Tanimuka
Morphological borrowings - the beneficiary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yukuna</th>
<th>Tanimuka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=jló</td>
<td>-ro'si ~ -roo  ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-re/-te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*iná a’á na=jló kuliya.*
INDF.PRO give 3PL=DAT caguana
‘One gives caguana to them.’

*i’ká y-e’é.ra’á-ko’ó ~bi-ro’si*
DEM.PROX-N 1S-bring-PAST.REC 2S-BEN
‘I brought this for you.’

**ARAWAK**
- *hlio* (Baniwa)
- *li/-ru* (Achagua)
- *rhu* (Kabiyari)
- *hru* (Kauixana)

**TUCANOAN**
- *re* Tukano
- *de* Kubeo
- *re/-te* Siona
- *re/-te* Maihiki
Morphological borrowings - the causative

- Shared causative construction in Yukuna and Tanimuka
  - same form: *ta*
  - same position: suffix on the verb
  - same syntax: only with intransitive verbs

- Unique within Tucanoan

- Common within Arawak

- A morphological borrowing from Arawak to Tanimuka, but not necessarily from Yukuna specifically
Morphological borrowings - the causative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yukuna</th>
<th>Tanimuka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>unká ri-manúma-lá-cho</em></td>
<td><em>~ϕáú-á-re’ká ki-bá-jú</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG 3SG.NF-shut_up-NEG-PST.RFL</td>
<td>hammock-N-LOC 3M-hang-PRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He didn’t shut up’</td>
<td>‘He is hanging in the hammock.’ (Eraso 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ru-manúma-ta-iya-jló</em></td>
<td><em>ki-ré ~bi-báá-ta-bé</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F-shut_up-CAUS-PST-?</td>
<td>3M-DEIC1 2SG-hang-CAUS-IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘She tried to make him shut up’ (Lemus</td>
<td>‘Hang him!’ (Eraso 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrano field notes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARAWAK** (Aikhenvald 1999: 91)
- *ta* Bare
- *ta* Bahwana
- *ta* Warekena of Xié
- *da* Achagua
- *ida/-da* Piapoco

**TUCANOAN**
- *-o*
- *-wa*
- *-owa*
or periphrasis
Conclusions
New evidence for contact

- Present-day sociolinguistic setting
- Lexical borrowings
- Calques of morphologically complex elements
- Morphological borrowings
- → cases of direct diffusion
Un-balanced contact influence

- Tanimuka has been more affected than Yukuna
  - both in the lexical and morphological changes presented here
  - also when reassessing the changes already presented by Aikhenvald

- This fits with Yukuna being socially dominant nowadays

- Northern Arawakan languages are a more frequent source of lexical borrowings than Tukanoan languages → major cultural role of Arawak people
Not only a one-to-one contact situation

- Within the changes in Tanimuka due to contact
  - some are very likely due to influence from Yukuna
  - others are due to influence from Yukuna or another Arawak language
  - and still others are very likely due to influence from an Arawak language other than Yukuna

- This points to a multilingual situation, in a different sociolinguistic setting in the past
Final conclusion

- The more data, the more complex the picture!
- The contact situation of Yukuna is not as different from the Tariana one as it previously seemed (according to Aikhenvald 2002)
  - two layers of contact: an older multilingual layer; a recent one-to-one contact layer
  - recently becoming unbalanced
- What really differs:
  - degree of change
  - balance in favor of the Arawak language
  - plain group exogamy rather than linguistic exogamy. How does that influence contact-induced linguistic change?
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