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Semantics and Pragmatics of Grammatical Relations in the Vaupés Linguistic Area

ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD

1 Language contact and multilingualism in the linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin

The Vaupés Basin in north-west Amazonia (spanning adjacent areas of Brazil and Colombia) is a well-established linguistic area. Its major feature is an obligatory societal multilingualism which follows the principle of linguistic exogamy: ‘those who speak the same language with us are our brothers, and we do not marry our sisters.’ Marrying someone who belongs to the same language group is considered akin to incest and referred to as ‘this is what dogs do’.1 Language affiliation is inherited from one’s father, and is a badge of identity for each person.

Languages traditionally spoken in the area belong to three unrelated genetic groups: East Tucanoan, Arawak and Makú, or Nadahup (see Epps, Chapter 11).2 Speakers of East Tucanoan languages (Tucano, Wanano, Desano, Tuyuca, Barasano, Piratapuya, Macuna, and a few others), and of an Arawak language, Tariana, participate in the exogamous marriage network which ensures obligatory multilingualism.

A striking feature of the Vaupés linguistic area is a strong cultural inhibition against language mixing viewed in terms of borrowing morphemes.

1 The rules are not completely straightforward: see the discussion in Aikhenvald (2002: 22–3). Sorensen (1967/72) is a brief account of the Colombian part of the multilingual Vaupés area where only East Tucanoan languages are spoken. Therefore, his work is only marginally relevant here.

2 A putative connection between Nadahup (Makú) and Arawak advocated by V. Martins (2004) is based on a misconception, poor data from Arawak languages, and lack of proper application of the comparative method.
Long-term interaction based on institutionalized multilingualism between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns (though not so much of forms) and calquing of categories. As a result, the Vaupés area provides a unique laboratory for investigating how contact-induced changes take place, which categories are more prone to diffusion, and which are likely to remain intact.

The purpose of this chapter is to show how Tariana acquired a typologically unusual system of semantically and pragmatically determined marking of grammatical relations through areal diffusion, and reinterpretation of its own resources. An additional theoretical issue that arises here is the nature and rise of linguistic complexity resulting from language contact.

2 The Vaupés Basin as a linguistic and cultural area

2.1 Languages of the area

East Tucanoan languages are typologically similar; but different enough to be considered distinct languages (Barnes 1999; Aikhenvald 2002). The ‘East Tucanoan type’ has developed as a result of the long-term interaction of phenomena of two kinds: genetic affinity and contact. Similarities between East Tucanoan languages can be due to Sapir’s parellism in drift—whereby genetically related languages tend to develop like structures—and also to the continuous contact between the groups. It is hard, if not impossible, to disentangle the impact of these factors.

West Tucanoan languages which are not in immediate contact with East Tucanoan groups, or with each other, include Koreguaje (Colombia), Siona and Secoya (Ecuador), and Orejon (north-eastern Peru). Data from these are crucial for the understanding of proto-Tucanoan patterns.

Tariana, the only representative of the Arawak family within the Vaupés area, used to be a continuum of numerous dialects (one for each of several hierarchically organized clans). The only dialect still actively spoken is that of the Wamia Qikune, traditionally one of the lowest-ranking clans. A comparison

3 This chapter, like all my previous work, is based upon information obtained via original fieldwork with speakers of all existing dialects of Tariana (mostly the Wamiarikune of Santa Rosa and Periquitos, with about 100 speakers in all). Tariana is highly endangered. I have also worked with the dialect of the Kumandene subgroup of Tariana spoken by a couple of dozen adults in the village of Santa Terezinha on the Iauari River, and analysed all the existing materials on other dialects (see a survey in appendix to Aikhenvald 2003a; and a detailed analysis in Aikhenvald forthcoming). The Kumandene dialect is not mutually intelligible with the Wamiarikune dialect. Speakers communicate with each other in Tucano. An overview of previous work on Tariana is in Aikhenvald (2003a). The recently published monograph Ramirez (2001) contains numerous errors concerning Tariana and most other Arawak languages. His claim that Tariana is a dialect of Baniwa is as true as saying that Romanian is a dialect of Spanish.
between various dialects suggests that the linguistic diversity within the Tariana continuum was comparable to the differences between various dialects of Portuguese, Spanish, and Galician.

A comparison between Tariana and those Arawak languages closely related to it and spoken outside the Vaupés area enables us to distinguish between genetically inherited and contact-induced features, as well as independent innovations. Tariana is part of the ‘Rio Negro’ subgroup within North Arawak, which comprises Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako, Piapoco, Guarequena, Resígaro, Achagua, and Yucuna (see Aikhenvald 2001, 2002). These linguistic affinities are corroborated by shared origin myths—see §2.2 below. Tariana’s closest relative outside the Vaupés is the Baniwa/Kurripako dialect continuum to the north and north-east in Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela, and Piapoco to the north-east, in Colombia. Tariana shares about 85–88 per cent lexicon with Baniwa; but their morphology and syntax are very different (see Map 1).

Speakers of the Makú, or Nadahup, languages in the Vaupés area are outside the marriage network system, and are considered traditional ‘underlings’ (see Epps, Chapter 11). A symbiotic relationship between the Makú and the East Tucanoan group with which it is ‘associated’ ensures cultural and linguistic contact between these. As a result, the Nadahup (Makú) languages in the Vaupés are influenced by East Tucanoan languages. At present, the Tariana do not have any associated ‘Makú’ groups of their own (mythological traditions show that such groups may have existed earlier on).

2.2 What we know about the history of the area

The indigenous people of the Vaupés area—spanning Colombia and Brazil—share numerous cultural and lifestyle patterns. All the groups are divided into subclans hierarchically organized by their ‘seniority’. A member of a junior clan would address a member of a senior clan as an ‘elder sibling’, or ‘elder relative’. Speakers of the same language are considered blood relatives.

The traditional settlement pattern involved multifamily longhouses each including a patrilineage. Speakers of the Arawak and East Tucanoan languages are slash-and-burn agriculturalists, with similar myths and beliefs, as well as weaponry and food-gathering techniques. Both tend to live along large rivers.

I am grateful to all my teachers of Tariana, the Britos of Santa Rosa and the Muniz of Periquitos, and to Roni Lopez from Santa Terezinha, for teaching me their remarkable language. Thanks are equally due to R. M. W. Dixon, Willem F. Adelaar, Janet Barnes, Dominique Buchillet, Pattie Epps, Terry Malone, Kris Stenzel, Clay Strom, Junia Schauer, and José Alvarez, for helpful comments and insights.

4 The Baniwa-Kurripako form a dialect continuum; the individual dialects differ as to the degree of mutual intelligibility (see Aikhenvald 2001, 2002; and also Taylor 1991: 7–8). The materials on the Hohodene and Siuci dialects of Baniwa come mainly from my own work (Aikhenvald MS), and also Taylor (1991). Major sources on other languages are listed in the References.
Map 1 Languages spoken in the Vaupes area and its surrounds.
A strong inhibition against the influx of borrowings—viewed in terms of lexical items and easily detectable loan morphemes—is a general feature characteristic of every group. The Nadahup (or Makú), in contrast, lack most of these features. They are traditionally nomadic hunters and gatherers; they live mostly in the jungle, near small streams, and do not practise strictly linguistic exogamy. The Arawak and East Tucanoan peoples consider them inferior—this attitude is reflected even in early documents mentioning the ‘Makú’ (see Sampaio 1825: 81–2; Koch-Grünberg 1906a: 179–80, 1906b: 878; Stradelli 1890).5

A major problem in the ethnohistory of the peoples of the area—especially with respect to the Arawak-speaking groups—is language loss and absorption of one group by another. According to oral tradition of the Desano, Tuyuca, Cubeo, Tariana, and Baniwa peoples, a few ‘Makú’ groups actually lost their own languages and started using the languages of their ‘conquerors’. These ‘former Makú’ usually have a lower status in the internal hierarchy of their tribes (see Koch-Grünberg 1906b: 878; Janet Barnes, p.c.).

The Tariana themselves often accuse rival clans of being ‘ex-Makú’ who had lost their language (see text 1 in Aikhenvald 1999a). We have no way of proving or disproving such statements. Their potential importance lies in a possible Nadahup, or Makú, substratum for the languages of the Vaupés, including Tariana.

The Tariana appear to be the most recent arrivals in the Vaupés. Their place of origin, the Wapui Cachoeira on the Aiary River (a tributary of the Içana River), is shared with the Baniwa/Kurripako and the Piapoco (see Bruzzi 1977; Koch-Grünberg 1911; Nimuendajú 1982; Neves 1998; Zucchi 2002). We can safely assume that language contact between the East Tucanoan languages and the Nadahup pre-dates that between the East Tucanoan languages and Tariana. Since some ‘Makú’-speaking groups were likely to have been absorbed by the Tariana, the Tariana language could have acquired some features from East Tucanoan languages via a Nadahup (‘Makú’) substratum.

The myths and oral histories of different Tariana subgroups indicate that they may have taken different routes, and perhaps assimilated different language groups, before they arrived in the Vaupés Basin.6 Numerous

---

5 As shown in Martins and Martins (1999: fr. 3), the term ‘Makú’ is used in a number of meanings, only one of which is coextensive with ‘Nadahup’ as presented in Chapter 11 of the present volume. Whether the Makú mentioned by Sampaio (1825) are the same as the current members of the Nadahup family remains an open question.

6 According to Neves (1998), the arrival of the Tariana in the Vaupés area goes back to pre-contact times (also see Bruzzi 1977, and Nimuendajú 1982). Hypotheses concerning the establishment of the Vaupés area
high-ranking Tariana groups started shifting to Tucano, whose speakers outnumbered all others, as early as the late nineteenth century (Koch-Grünberg 1911: 51). As a result, most Tariana dialects are now gone.

2.3 Language contact and language change in the Vaupés area

The traditional Vaupés region was a long-standing linguistic area with multilateral diffusion, and with no relationships of dominance between the main players—East Tucanoans and Arawak. The language changes which took place during this time (perhaps, a few hundred years) can be characterized as completed changes. These involved tangible impact of East Tucanoan languages on Tariana, recognizable through comparison between Tariana and closely related Arawak languages spoken outside the area.

The impact of Tariana on East Tucanoan languages is harder to pinpoint, for the following reasons.

I. There are no East Tucanoan languages spoken outside the Vaupés area. All known East Tucanoan languages have been affected by a continuous multilingual interaction.

II. The Tariana—as the latest arrivals in the Vaupés area—have always been numerically the minority (see, for instance, Coudreau 1887: 161).

III. The existing descriptions of the East Tucanoan languages do not necessarily reflect the varieties in direct contact with Tariana.

Just a few features of East Tucanoan languages which seem to be atypical of Tucano as a whole could be attributed to an influence from Arawak languages. The development of aspirated stops in Wanano, and of pronominal proclitics in Wanano and in Desano could be due to Tariana influence (Stenzel 2004: 194–5; Waltz and Waltz 1997: 37; Miller 1999: ex. 662 on p. 162; cf. Aikhenvald 2002: 61 for further details). In the Wanano of Carurú (geographically close to Periquitos: Stenzel 2004: 261, 267–76) stative verbs are less morphologically complex than active verbs, and less likely to occur in verbal compounds (or single word serial verbs) (p. 269). These properties are reminiscent of Tariana, and other Arawak languages of the Rio Negro area. We should, however, keep in mind that an ‘Arawak-looking’ feature in any
East Tucanoan language may well have come from a now extinct Arawak language, or an extinct Tariana dialect. At present, Tucano is rapidly gaining ground as the major language of the area, at the expense of other languages in the Brazilian Vaupés. This is a consequence of the Catholic missionaries’ language and teaching policy, and a number of other, secondary factors (such as men spending more and more time away from their families working on cash crops: see Aikhenvald 2002).

As a result of this encroaching dominance of Tucano, innovative speakers of Tariana display more Tucano-like patterns in their language than do traditional speakers. These newly introduced patterns reflect ongoing changes produced as the result of gradual and imminent shift to the dominant language (see Aikhenvald 2002: 175–86, on the influence of Portuguese).

Figure 1 summarizes the types of language change and diffusion within the Vaupés area, with a focus on Tariana.

---

**Figure 1** The impact of language contact on Tariana
3 Tucanoan and Arawak: a typological comparison

All East Tucanoan languages are dependent marking, with some head marking. They are almost exclusively suffixing and mildly synthetic. East Tucanoan languages are of a nominative-accusative profile, with a typologically uncommon system of semantically and pragmatically determined non-subject case marking. That is, the overt case marking of a non-subject constituent (be it a direct object, a recipient, a locative, or a temporal constituent) depends on its definiteness, specificity, and individuation. Some languages have developed pragmatically determined subject marking: contrastive subjects (A and S) acquire special marking which other subjects lack.

In contrast, Arawak languages are predominantly head marking, polysynthetic to varying extents, and mostly suffixing with only a few prefixes. The forms of prefixes are rather uniform across the family, while suffixes vary. Pronominal prefixes cross-reference the core participants—the subject of a transitive verb (A) and of an intransitive active verb (S_a). The subject of an intransitive stative verb (S_o) and the direct object (O) are either marked with suffixes, as in Baniwa and many other Arawak languages (e.g. closely related Guarequena), or not marked at all, as in Tariana and a few more languages (e.g. Resigaro, or Bare).

That is, Arawak languages display a split-S (active-stative) profile: the subject of a transitive verb and the subject of an active intransitive verb are marked in one way, and the subject of an intransitive stative verb and the direct object of a transitive verb in another (see Aikhenvald 1999b). Since the active-stative marking is obvious only for pronominal constituents, and not so much for nouns, the expression of grammatical relations can be considered asymmetrical.

The typological differences between Tucanoan and Arawak patterns are summarized in Table 1.

The Nadahup (Makú) languages spoken in the Vaupés area appear to conform to the Tucanoan mould: they are predominantly suffixing, with dependent marking, core cases, and no traces of ergativity. There are remnants of unproductive derivational prefixes in Dâw (Martins and Martins 1999); and the only prefix in Yuhup (Ospina 2002: 90) is also derivational in nature. (Cacua (Cathcart 1972: 16) has pronominal prefixes on the verb.) This is in stark contrast with Nadèb, spoken in the area of the Middle Rio Negro, which is prefixing and suffixing, exclusively head marking (with no core cases), and ergative.

Tariana combines features shared with genetically related Arawak languages and patterns acquired via areal diffusion from genetically unrelated East
Tucanoan languages, in addition to independent innovations. The semantically and pragmatically based marking of non-subjects in Tariana, and in the Nadahup languages of the Vaupe’s (§4.8 of Chapter 11) is strongly reminiscent of the East Tucanoan pattern.

4 The East Tucanoan impact on Tariana: an illustration

Prolonged and balanced intensive language contact brings about gradual convergence resulting in structural isomorphism (see Chapter 1). A wide variety of phonological, morphological, and syntactic structures has been diffused from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana, promoting an impressive structural similarity (see further details in Aikhenvald 2002).

Consider the following examples, from a myth. (1) is from Tariana, and (2) is from Tucano. There are hardly any cognate morphemes, and yet the interlinear glosses are almost identical. Example (3) comes from Baniwa of Içana, an Arawak language closely related to Tariana, but spoken outside the Vaupés area. The Baniwa forms are cognate to those in Tariana, but the categories and the meanings expressed are very different. Baniwa and Tariana cognates are underlined.

Tariana

(1) nese pa:ma di-na
du-yana-sita-pidana
then one+num.cl.animate.fem 3sgnf-obj
3sgf-cook-already-rem.past.rep
She had reportedly cooked him already

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Proto-Tucanoan</th>
<th>Proto-Arawak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefixing/suffixing</td>
<td>suffixing</td>
<td>some prefixes and many suffixes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prefixes: A=Sₐ= possessor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relative ka-, negative ma-;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suffixes: other categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent or head marking</td>
<td>dependent; some head marking</td>
<td>head marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core cases</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative/ergative</td>
<td>nominative/accusative</td>
<td>active/stative: A=Sₐ; O=Sₒ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then one+ num.cl.animate.fem he-obj
doi’á-toha-po
cook-already-rem.past.rep.3sg.fem
She had reportedly cooked him already

Then she had reportedly finished cooking him

Baniwa
apa- ‘one’ corresponds to Tariana pa- ‘one’ (both are reflexes of Proto-Arawak form *ba ‘one’). Tariana y in -yana ‘cook’ corresponds to Baniwa dz, and Tariana d- in the 3sgfem prefix du- corresponds to Baniwa 3u-. (Both go back to Proto-Arawak ru-/lu- ‘third person feminine prefix’; see Aikhenvald 2002: appendix 2). Tariana s regularly corresponds to Baniwa t. In a diphthong, ai in Baniwa is contracted to i in Tariana. Hence the correspondence of Baniwa -aita ‘finish’ to Tariana -sita ‘perfective marker’, recently grammaticalized from the verb -sita ‘finish’ (Aikhenvald 2000).

But the grammatical differences between Tariana and Baniwa are striking. First, unlike Tariana and Tucano, Baniwa has no obligatory tense and evidentiality. An optional reported clitic (with no tense distinction) attaches to the first verb in the clause in Baniwa. In both Tariana and Tucano the marker combining information on tense and evidentiality (in this case, ‘remote past reported’) attaches to the verb.

Secondly, the same etymon, Tariana -sita and Baniwa -taita ‘finish’, behaves differently: in Baniwa it is a part of serial verb construction, while in Tariana it is a bound morpheme with an aspectual meaning, ‘already’—just like in Tucano, in (2).

And thirdly, Baniwa uses a bound pronoun to mark a pronominal object ‘him’, while Tariana employs what looks like a case form of a pronoun, ‘translatable’ morpheme-per-morpheme into Tucano.

Yet, despite the amazing structural similarity, it would be wrong to say that Tariana is simply ‘relexified’ Tucano. Most Tucano categories are replicated in Tariana, with one major difference. Subject marking in Tucano is achieved through portmanteau morphemes combining information on tense, evidentiality, and person. Tariana has subject prefixes inherited from Proto-Arawak, just like its relative Baniwa. Tariana has preserved its Arawak profile, in addition to the newly acquired East Tucanoan-like features. This brings us to the next section.
5 Grammatical relations in Tariana, in the light of the Vaupés languages

We start with a general outline of grammatical relations in Tariana (§5.1), and then discuss the semantic and pragmatic basis for the marking of non-subjects (§5.2). Oblique cases, and their development and correlation with the pragmatic marking of non-subjects, are discussed in §5.3. Pragmatically based marking of subjects is the topic of §5.4.

5.1 Case marking in Tariana

Just as in most Arawak languages, grammatical relations in Tariana are marked with personal prefixes, roughly on an active-stative basis. Every verbal root in Tariana is either prefixed or prefixless. Prefixved verbs can be transitive (e.g. -wapeta ‘wait for something’), ditransitive (-bueta ‘teach’), ambitransitive (type A = Sa, e.g. -hima ‘hear, see, think, understand’), or type O = Sa, e.g. -thuka ‘break’), or active intransitive (Sa, e.g. -emhani ‘walk around’). Most prefixless verbs are stative intransitive (e.g. kasitana ‘be annoyed’); some are A = So ambitransitives (e.g. nhesiri ‘enjoy (not food)’) or O = So ambitransitives (hui ‘enjoy (food); be tasty’). The verb ‘cook’ in (1) illustrates a transitive verb, with the subject (A) prefix (du- ‘third person feminine singular’).

There is no object marking on the verb. Both O and So acquire zero realization (whereas in Baniwa of Icàna both are marked with pronominal suffixes).7 A stative intransitive ‘prefixless’ verb is shown in (4).

(4) harame-pu-mahka nhua
be.scared(So)-AUG-REC.PAST.NONVIS I
I am/have been very scared—STATIVE INTRANSITIVE

Grammatical relations are also marked by cases, on a subject/non-subject basis. The marking of non-subjects and of subjects is determined by different semantic and pragmatic properties of the constituent, as well as its grammatical function (cf. Bossong 1985, 1991).

Table 2 summarizes the semantically and pragmatically determined marking of subjects and non-subjects on NPs in Tariana.

The non-subject case -naku/-nuku is used for a variety of topical constituents, including object, recipient, beneficiary, locative, manner,

---

7 The oldest word list of Tariana, collected by Johann Natterer in 1831 at Ipanoré, contains what appears to be a bound object pronoun nua (reminiscent of Baniwa of Icàna -hnua (1sgS,0)) attached to the verb: t sino li maa nua (dog 3sngf bite? I) ‘dog bit me’.
Nouns distinguish two additional cases—locative and instrumental-comitative—while personal pronouns do not normally have a locative case (rare examples, all with inanimate referent, are discussed in Aikhenvald 2003a: 140, 150).

The 'topical non-subject' and oblique cases can mark the constituent with the same grammatical function, and can occur together.

Nouns and pronouns differ in their principles of case marking.

I. Nouns in a non-subject function can be unmarked for case (as in (5b)), while pronouns are always marked.

II. The subject form of a noun is ø-marked, as in (1). The subject form of a pronoun consists of a pronominal prefix + formative -ha: di-ha (3sgnf-emph) 'he', nu-ha (1sg-emph) 'I'.

Table 2. Grammatical relations and core cases in Tariana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Discourse status</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject (A/S)</td>
<td>non-focused</td>
<td>subject form (noun-Ø)</td>
<td>subject form (pronominal prefix + emphatic formative -ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>subject form + clitic -ne/-nhe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-subject (Non A/S)</td>
<td>non-topical</td>
<td>subject form (noun-Ø)</td>
<td>pronominal prefix + suffix -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>topical</td>
<td>subject form + clitic -naku/-nuku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Oblique cases in Tariana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locational</td>
<td>subject form + -se</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental-comitative</td>
<td>subject form + -ne</td>
<td>pronominal prefix + -ine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a noun is marked as a topical non-subject or as a focused subject, the marker is attached to the ø-marked citation form, e.g. pa-ñha-nipe-nuku (impers-eat-nomz-def.non.a/s) ‘the food (object)’ in (6b). If a pronoun is marked as a topical non-subject or as a focused subject, the marking is attached to the subject form, as in (7). If a pronoun in a non-subject function is not topical, it takes the case marker -na which attaches to a pronominal prefix, e.g. di-na ‘him’ in (1).

III. Both locative and instrumental-comitative case attach to a ø-marked form of a noun, e.g. nawiki-ne (person-inst/comit) ‘with the man, with the help of man’, awakada-se (jungle-loc) ‘in/to/from the jungle’. Pronouns hardly ever take the locative case. An instrumental-comitative form of a pronoun involves a pronominal prefix + -ine, e.g. nu-ine ‘with me; by me’.

This is reminiscent of the two underived postpositions, the comitative -api ‘together with’ and the beneficiary -siu ‘for the benefit of, instead’, e.g. nu-api ‘together with me’, nu-siu ‘for me’. But unlike case markers, if -api or -siu have a noun as their argument, they take a dummy prefix i-, e.g. tsiari i-api (man indef-with) ‘with a man’. That is, the case marker -ine ‘instrumental-comitative’ (and also -na ‘pronominal non-subject’) behaves similarly to a postposition. This fully agrees with its origins: see §5.3. As expected, pronouns are more archaic than nouns.

5.2 Semantic and pragmatic basis for marking non-subjects

5.2.1 General principles Tariana and East Tucanoan languages share semantic and pragmatic motivation for marking non-subjects. An NP in a non-subject function takes the marker—East Tucanoan -re (Barnes 1999: 219–20) and Tariana -naku/-nuku—if its referent is definite. In (5), ‘food’ is indefinite and consequently takes no case marker. In the adjacent sentence in text, (6), ‘food’ is definite because it has already been introduced (Stenzel 2004: 143).

Wanano
(5) (a) hi-phiti-ro chua ~da-ta’a
cop-coll-part food bring/take-come

Tariana
(b) thuya pa-ñha-nipe nheta na-nu-na
all impers-eat-nomz 3pl+bring/take 3pl-come-rem.past.vis
Everybody brings (a lot of) food
Wanano

(6) (a) ti-~da  
\text{ANAPHORIC-PL}  
~da-sa'a  
\text{chua-re}  
\text{bring/take-MOVEMENT.inside}  
\text{food-DEF.NON.AS}  
chua  
\text{yoa-ra}  
\text{eat}  
\text{do/make-VIS.IMPERFECTIVE.NON.1}

Tariana

(b) naha  
\text{they}  
nhe-ta  
\text{na-nu-na}  
\text{pa-nha-nipe-nuku}  
\text{IMPERS-eat-NOMZ-DEF.NON.AS}  
na-nha-hyu-pena  
\text{3pl-eat-PURPOSIVE.NVIS-FUT}  
They take the food inside to eat

The presence of the marker correlates with the position of its referent on the nominal hierarchy (modified from Dixon 1994: 85), and the degree of its individuation—see Figure 2. A pronominal argument or a proper name is always case marked. A noun with an uncountable inanimate referent is less likely to be case marked than a noun with an animate or with a human referent (see Stenzel 2004: 219–25, and references there; Ramirez 1997: 224).

In agreement with this hierarchy, an animate object is likelier to acquire case marking than an inanimate object. In ditransitive constructions, the recipient or the benefactive is typically animate. Consequently, there is a strong tendency throughout the East Tucanoan family to case-mark second objects of ditransitive verbs (e.g. Tucano examples in Ramirez 1997: 226). If an inanimate ‘gift’ is definite, and the recipient is indefinite, the ‘gift’ is case marked. That is, definiteness ‘overrides’ animacy and individuation in choosing a case marker.

The overt case marking also correlates with the pragmatic properties of a constituent. For instance, in Desano the non-subject case -re appears on nouns referring to ‘specific individuals already on stage in the discourse’ (Miller 1999: 58–60). The case marker does not occur on nouns that have ‘just been introduced to the discourse’ (also see Morse and Maxwell 1999: 111).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st and 2nd p</th>
<th>Demonstratives</th>
<th>Proper nouns</th>
<th>Common nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>3rd p pronouns</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inanimate</td>
<td>countable sg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

more likely to be case marked

Figure 2 Nominal hierarchy and non-subject case marking in the Vaupés area
on Cubeo, and Kinch 1977 on Yurutí). In Tariana, the marker -nuku/-naku occurs on any constituent which is, or is going to be, the topic of a narrative (Aikhenvald 2003a: 145–6).8

When used on locatives and time words, the marker indicates that the constituent ‘will have further significance in the discourse’ (Barnes 1999: 220; also see Stenzel 2004: 177–8, 241–2). Along similar lines, the use of -re with locative and temporal constituents in Tucano correlates with their topicality, rather than their definiteness or specificity.

In summary: a combination of semantic properties—definiteness, specificity, and animacy—determines case marking of non-subject core constituents across the Vaupe’s area. In some languages topicality is an additional factor. But since topics tend to be definite this may be a corollary of the definiteness requirement. Overt non-subject case marking of locative and temporal constituents is based entirely on their pragmatics.

While the semantic and pragmatic motivation for non-subject case marking in the Nadahup languages of the area requires further investigation, the general tendency in the marking of non-subject core arguments appears to follow the ‘Standard Average Vaupe’s pattern’. The choice of the object marker -an in Hupda (see §4.8 of Chapter 11) correlates with definiteness and animacy of a non-subject participant. The suffix -dê in Cacua (Cathcart 1972) occurs on pronominal and definite non-subjects (direct objects and recipients), as well as on proper names (also see Ospina 2002: 140–8, on Yuhup; and Martins 1994: 133–5; 2004: 157, 351, 667, on Dâw).

West Tucanoan languages operate on similar semantic and pragmatic principles. In Koreguaje, -re (Cook and Levinsohn 1985: 104–8) is used to mark a specific object, especially if it is human and individuated. An item just mentioned by the speaker takes the -re suffix if the speaker wishes to ‘talk further about that item in particular’ (p. 105). When used with inanimate and locative referents, -re marks them as ‘being of further significance to the story’ (108). Similar principles apply in Siona (Wheeler 1987: 127, 1967), Secoya (Barnes 1999), and Orejon (Gable 1975: 27; Velie and Ochoa 1977).

The semantically and pragmatically based marking of non-subjects is a feature spread from Tucanoan into all other languages of the area. Tariana adds one further complexity described in the next section.

---

8 Case marking in East Tucanoan languages and in Tariana correlates with the position of the object argument: an unmarked argument with a generic referent is likely to occur in the preverbal position. (This may result in OV constructions interpretable as instances of noun incorporation: see Barnes 1999: 220; Morse and Maxwell 1999: 70–1.) Since the correlations between constituent order and information structure in East Tucanoan languages remain largely unexplored, we leave this question open.
5.2.2 How Tariana differs from the ‘Standard Average Vaupés’ pattern

Tariana differs from the Vaupés pattern of non-subject case choice in one important way. In East Tucanoan and in West Tucanoan languages pronominal arguments are always case marked, in the same ways as nouns. This is understandable—pronouns are high on the hierarchy in Figure 2, and inherently definite. The available data from the Nadahup languages point in a similar direction (e.g. Hup discussed in Chapter 11, and also Cacua, in Cathcart 1972: 16).

In Tariana, too, every pronominal non-subject has to be case marked, but the case marker is not the same as the one on nouns—see (1). And an additional option is available: unlike in any other Vaupés language, if the pronoun is highly topical, it can also take the non-subject case marker, as in (7). Such examples are pragmatically marked (see Aikhenvald 2003a: 147).

Tariana

(7) nuha-naku ma:-kade-na
1sg.SU-DEF.NON.A/S NEG+give-NEG-REM.PAST.VIS
To me (that the story is about) he did not give (what he promised)

Speakers who use predominantly Tucano in their homes produce forms like diha-nuku (he-DEF.NON.A/S) as equivalents to the Tucano kti- re, in (2), and to the traditional Tariana di-na (1). Such usage is corrected by the few traditional speakers. The emergence of forms like diha-nuku is an instance of ongoing change. This indicates the loss of a difference between topical and non-topical pronominal non-subjects, as a result of ‘displacive’ effect of Tucano.

In summary: the pragmatically and semantically motivated non-subject case marking is a strong feature of the Vaupés area, well represented in East Tucanoan and also found in Nadahup. Its source is Tucanoan. Tariana has absorbed this feature, at the same time retaining the principle of marking pronominal and non-pronominal constituents in different ways—a feature reminiscent of a common Arawak pattern. At the same time, traditional Tariana evolved an additional formal distinction between topical and non-topical pronominal non-subjects. This distinction is on its way out in the innovative language, under pressure from the dominant Tucano.

5.3 Oblique constituents

In §5.3.1–2, we discuss the marking of locatives, instruments, comitatives, and benefactives in Tariana and how these have been restructured to fit in with the pan-East Tucanoan patterns. The same syntactic function can be marked twice within one NP—see §5.3.3.
5.3.1 Locatives  Most Arawak languages of the Upper Rio Negro area have a fair number of locative markers. In contrast, East Tucanoan languages typically have just one locative case (Tucano, Wanano, Piratapuya -pi; Barasano -hi, Desano -ge). This case covers location ‘at’, direction ‘to’ and ‘from’, and also occurs on temporal constituents.

The oblique case system in Tariana follows the East Tucanoan model. Tariana has one locative case marker, -se, which covers all of ‘to, towards, onto, out of, in/on’. In both Tariana and East Tucanoan languages, a locative constituent can be unmarked for case if the locative meaning is recoverable from the context, the referent is backgrounded (Aikhenvald 2003a: 155; Miller 1999: 59–60). In others Arawak languages, locative markers are obligatory.

Functional similarity between the only locative case in Tariana and in East Tucanoan (using Desano as an example language: Miller 1999: 59–60) is shown in Table 4. The last column illustrates Baniwa of Íçana.

The reflexes of the Baniwa case markers in Tariana and their cognates elsewhere in the Rio Negro subgroup of the Arawak languages are shown in Table 5 (see Aikhenvald 2003c, for sound correspondences). Importantly, the ‘surface locative’ -naku in Baniwa corresponds to the non-subject case -naku/-nuku ‘topical non-subject’ in Tariana.

The etymology of the pronominal non-subject marker -na is not included in Table 5. That the pronominal -na is an established feature of Tariana is corroborated by its occurrence in the Tariana sentences collected by Koch-Grünberg (1911). This marker is most likely cognate with the locative formative -na- attested in Piapoco in combinations with other locational morphemes, e.g. i-ricu-ná (3sg-in-LOC) ‘during’, compare i-ricu (3sg-in) ‘inside’, i-ricu-ise (3sg-in-FROM) ‘from inside (something)’, i-wall-ise

| Table 4. Marking location: functional parallelism of Tariana and East Tucanoan |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Desano (East Tucanoan) | Tariana (North Arawak) | Baniwa |
| *yuki-ge* (tree-LOC) | *haiku-se* (tree-LOC) | *haiku-naku* on surface of a tree |
| | | *haiku-ʒiku* inside/towards (inside of) a tree |
| | | *haiku-hre* towards a tree |
| | | *haiku-ʒikhiʃte* (underlying form: from inside a tree *haiku-ʒiku-hiʃte*) |

5.3.2 Marking instruments, accompaniment, and benefactives As shown in Table 6, the morpheme -ne/-ine in Tariana marks instrument and accompaniment, matching the East Tucanoan instrumental-comitative postposition (Tucano me'ra: Ramirez 1997: 249–50; Desano bērā: Miller 1999: 62; Wanano --be're: Stenzel 2004: 172). The cognates in Baniwa and Resigaro just have a comitative meaning. The instrumental-only marker (the forms shown in Table 6) has been lost in Tariana.

In agreement with its Arawak profile, Tariana marks pronominal and nominal NPs in the instrumental-comitative function in different ways.

Two underived postpositions in Tariana, -api ‘with (a secondary participant)’, and -siu ‘for’, have no functional equivalent in East Tucanoan languages. The comitative postposition, -api ‘together with (a secondary participant); about’, in Tariana is cognate to Piapoco -api-cha and Baniwa -api-dza, api-ya ‘together with, in the company of (implying equal participants)’. Note the semantic difference: Tariana -ne/-ine implies equal participation of the players, while Baniwa -inai does not. The Tariana benefactive postposition -siu ‘for’ has a cognate in Baniwa -hriu (other cognates are in Table 6). In languages other than Tariana this form marks all addressees and recipients (no matter whether core or oblique). Not so in Tariana: the non-subject case marks core argument addressees and recipients, and the postposition -siu marks a beneficiary which is an optional oblique. Its additional meaning is ‘instead of, in someone’s stead; on behalf of someone’. So, pi:mi i-siu (colibri indef-for) in Tariana means ‘for the benefit of/instead of/on behalf of colibri’. In Baniwa, pi:mi i-hriu (colibri indef-for) means ‘(give/say) to colibri, for colibri, etc.’

The postposition -siu in Tariana has shifted its meaning to mark a non-core constituent. And, in one additional instance, a core relation expressed by the benefactive in Baniwa is marked by the Tariana non-subject case.

A small subclass of stative verbs referring to physical states such as ‘be hungry’, ‘be thirsty’ mark their only argument with the non-subject case (8). Their only argument has some subject properties. For instance, it obeys the same-subject requirement in serial verbs, but does not trigger same-subject switch-reference markers. There is no agreement on the verb.

Tariana

(8) mhàisiki kai-pidana di-na  
be.hungry ache-REM.PAST.REP 3sgnf-OBJ  
He was reportedly hungry (lit. hungry ache him)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Baniwa</th>
<th>Tariana</th>
<th>Tucano</th>
<th>Cognates of Baniwa markers in Tariana</th>
<th>Cognate markers elsewhere in North Arawak languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locative and directional 'to'</td>
<td>-ʒiku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-rifu 'derivational suffix; the inside of', and a sequencing enclitic -ka-rifu-se 'while'</td>
<td>Piapoco -rifu 'inside', Achagua -zhiku 'inside, in full contact with', Cabiyari riku, Resigaro -giko 'in'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative and directional 'on or to the surface of'</td>
<td>-naku</td>
<td>-se</td>
<td>-pi</td>
<td>-naku, -nuku 'topical non-subject'</td>
<td>Achagua -naku, Cabiyari -naku 'on the surface'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional allative 'towards'</td>
<td>-he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-se 'locative'</td>
<td>Piapoco -re/le 'toward'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative 'from'</td>
<td>-(hi)je</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none (the Baniwa form occurs only in conjunction with another locative)</td>
<td>Piapoco -ise 'from'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Instrumental, comitative, and benefactive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Baniwa</th>
<th>Tariana</th>
<th>Tucano</th>
<th>Cognates of Baniwa markers in Tariana</th>
<th>Cognate markers elsewhere in North Arawak languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comitative (secondary)</td>
<td>-inai</td>
<td>-api</td>
<td>me’ra</td>
<td>Baniwa -inai cognate of Tariana -ne/ine</td>
<td>Resigaro -néé ‘comitative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative (equal)</td>
<td>-api-dza</td>
<td>-ne/-ine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baniwa -api-dza cognate to T -api</td>
<td>Piapoco api-cha ‘comitative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>-iyu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No cognates in Tariana</td>
<td>Piapoco, Cabiyari, Achagua, Guarequena (iy)u, Yucuna d’u ‘instrumental’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td>-hriu</td>
<td>-siu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-siu ‘for, instead’ cognate to Baniwa -hriu ‘for (second argument)’</td>
<td>Piapoco -li, Achagua žu ‘dative: to, for’, Yucuna hlo ‘indirect object’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Tariana construction is similar to Baniwa of Içana:

**Baniwa**

(9) kaywi-pida hrisiu maitakay
    ache-rep 3sgnf+ben be.hungry

He was reportedly hungry (lit. hungry ache for/to him)

This structure is not found in East Tucanoan languages: verbs referring to physical states mark their subjects in the same way as all other subjects:

**Tucano**

(10) yi’i ihá me’ra nii-sa’

I  hunger with  be-rec.past.nvis. nonthird.person

I am hungry (lit. I am with hunger)

Having non-canonically marked subjects for verbs of physical states is a feature of numerous Arawak languages of the area (for instance, Warekena and Bare). The non-subject case in Tariana has expanded at the expense of the benefactive postposition—which no longer marks core arguments. The Arawak non-canonical argument pattern has been preserved, but with restructuring.

5.3.3 *Marking the same grammatical function twice*  An additional contact-induced change in Tariana is the development of a system whereby the same grammatical function may be marked twice in a grammatical word. Both Tucano yuki-pi-re and Tariana haiku-se-naku (tree-loc-def.non.a/s) translate as ‘in the (topical) tree’. The locative case marker (Tucano -pi, Tariana -se) provides locational meaning. The Tucano -re and the Tariana -naku/-nuku indicate generic ‘non-subjecthood’ and the topicality of the noun phrase.

Most Arawak languages combine two locative case markers to express complex locative meanings. Examples include Baniwa haiku-naku-h/e (tree-on.surface-towards) ‘towards the surface of a tree’, Piapoco capii i-ricu-ise (house-3sg-inside-from) ‘up to inside the house’ (Klumpp 1990: 164), and Achagua cri-tui ri-ku-la (sun-cl:round loc-inessive-towards) ‘towards the inside of the sun’ (Meléndez 1998: 97)

Every morpheme in a Baniwa form haiku-naku-hre (tree-on.surface-towards) ‘towards the surface of a tree’ is cognate with every morpheme in Tariana haiku-se-naku ‘on this very (topical) tree’. The differences between Baniwa and Tariana are:

(a) the meaning of the combination. In Baniwa the locative markers specify each other. In Tariana one marker is locative par excellence, and
the other conveys pragmatic information together with the information on the non-subject status of the constituent.

(b) definiteness and topicality of noun referent is marked in Tariana, and not in Baniwa.

(c) morpheme order. In Baniwa, the order of morphemes is iconic, while in Tariana it is not.

Once again, the Tariana form matches East Tucanoan structures while keeping the actual Arawak morpheme shapes.

5.4 Pragmatic basis for subject marking

Subjects (A/S_A/S_o) in Tariana are marked by the clitic, -ne/-nhe, if contrastive, or if they introduce a new important participant in the discourse. The distribution of the allomorphs in traditional Tariana is purely phonological: the allomorph -ne appears if a noun or a pronoun contains an aspirated consonant or a glottal fricative; in all other cases -nhe is used, e.g. nuha-ne (1-FOC.A/S) ‘I (contrastive subject)’, nawiki-nhe (person-FOC.A/S) ‘person (contrastive subject)’. The origins of this form are not known. The subject of (11) is not focused, and remains unmarked. The subject of (12) is contrastive, and is marked.

Tariana

(11) [paita tS̃a Q̃i]A di-kapi-pidanaO di-pisa
    one+CL:anim man 3sgnf-hand-REM.PAST.REP 3sgnf-cut
    One man cut his hand (beginning of a story)

(12) diha niyami-ka di-ka diha waru-nhe
    he 3sgnf+die-SUBORD 3sgnf-see he parrot-FOC.A/S
    The parrot (not anyone else) saw that he (evil spirit) had died

The -ne/-nhe marker helps tracking referents, and disambiguating third person participants. No other Arawak language has any pragmatically based subject marking of the sort. In contrast, some East Tucanoan languages do. But, unlike the non-subject marker -re which is uniform throughout the family, markers of contrastive subjects vary. They include Wanano -sēe (Stenzel 2004: 175–6; Waltz and Waltz 1997: 45), and Tucano -'a (Ramirez 1997: 231–2). Desano (Miller 1999: 161–2) employs the contrastive suffix -pi, which ‘most frequently occurs with the subject’ but ‘can be attached to any noun phrase in the sentence’.

The lack of a common morpheme for focused or contrastive subject among the East Tucanoan languages may suggest that this is a recent innovation. However, a very similar pattern is found in West Tucanoan languages, that is,

In all likelihood the Tariana pattern of focused subject marking is a Tucanoan-based innovation. As a result of linguistic pressure from Tucano, innovative speakers lose the distinction between aspirated and non-aspirated nasals; so for many people -ne/-nhe is almost always -ne. This makes the focused subject look the same as the instrumental -ne. In (12), a traditional speaker said waru-nhe (parrot-foc.a/s), and an innovative speaker repeated this as waru-ne. He then translated the sentence into Portuguese as ‘The evil spirit died, he saw with parrot’ (Morreu curupira, ele viu com papagaio), confirming that for him, -ne covers both contrastive subject and comitative.

This encroaching link between the ‘focused’ subject and the instrumental (see further examples in Aikhenvald 2003a: 143) partly results from language obsolescence in the situation of ‘displacive’ language contact with Tucano. The phonemes not found in any East Tucanoan language, such as aspirated nasals, tend to be lost; therefore, the form -ne becomes a general one for both contrastive subject and the instrumental-comitative. Another factor is the typological naturalness of a polysemy between the instrumental-comitative and the subject focus. This polysemy is widely attested cross-linguistically, and, as we have just seen, is also found within the Tucanoan speaking domain. That is, a new pattern of case syncretism is on its way in innovative Tariana.

6 Theoretical implications of the Vaupés language situation—what can we conclude?

The typologically unusual and synchronically complex system of marking grammatical relations in Tariana is the result of an intricate network of genetically inherited and contact-induced features, accompanied by independent innovations. Table 7 summarizes the features in the marking of grammatical relations which Tariana shares with its Arawak relatives, and those diffused from its Tucanoan neighbours. Tariana innovations which look neither really Arawak nor really Tucano are in bold and are introduced with ‘but’.

The major theoretical implications of the analysis of the Vaupés linguistic area are listed below. Our particular focus is on an Arawak language, Tariana, where the area impact of Tucanoan languages is easily discernible from patterns shared with related languages.

I. Diffusion of patterns rather than of forms. The rampant multilingualism within the Vaupés area goes together with the multilateral diffusion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Arawak</th>
<th>Tariana</th>
<th>Tucanoan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Asymmetrical marking for nouns and for pronouns</td>
<td>yes, but: cross-referencing</td>
<td>cases and cross-referencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grammatical relations on active-stative basis</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oblique subjects</td>
<td>yes, but: marked with benefactive adposition</td>
<td>marked with non-subject case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 One locative case</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 One marker for comitative and instrumental</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Two comitatives</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Stacking of locative cases</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Benefactive marker</td>
<td>yes, but: used for core and oblique arguments</td>
<td>used for oblique arguments only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Semantically and pragmatically marked non-subjects</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Locative case and non-subject marking on same NP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Focused subject</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of categories rather than of forms. The reason for this virtual lack of borrowed forms lies in language attitudes prominent throughout the area. ‘Language mixing’—traditionally viewed in terms of lexical loans—is condemned as culturally inappropriate, and is tolerated only as a ‘linguistic joke’ (see Aikhenvald 2002: 189–200). This creates an impediment against any recognizable loan form, and allows us to fully concentrate on the issue of borrowability of patterns and constructions.

II. Borrowability of patterns operates in terms of the following preferences (see §4.1 of Chapter 1):

(a) The more pragmatically motivated, the more diffusible. We have seen that semantically and pragmatically motivated marking of non-subjects is a strong feature throughout the Vaupés area, originating in Tucanoan, and permeating both Tariana and Nadahup languages. The diffusion involved matching pragmatic motivation (topicality, definiteness, and specificity, of a non-subject argument), semantic motivation (marking non-subjects in agreement with the Nominal Hierarchy in Figure 2), and also grammatical function (whereby non-subjects include recipients, and obliques). In addition, the non-subject marking in Tariana is determined by the noun’s topicality, to a larger extent, than in the Tucanoan languages.

Pragmatically determined marking of contrastive subjects, recently developed by some Tucanoan languages, readily infiltrated Tariana.

(b) Tendency to achieve morpheme-for-morpheme and word-for-word intertranslatability. This explains the matches of instrumental-comitative and of catch-all locative in Tariana and in Tucanoan (§5.3.2).

(c) The existence of prosodically salient markers especially if fused with the root creates an impediment to the diffusion of the whole category. This explains:

- Tendency to retain genetically inherited patterns expressed through prefixes marking A/S in Tariana. In all likelihood, stability of prefixes in the language is due to the fact that (a) they are often stressed; and (b) they are often fused with the root (which does not exist without them). That cross-linguistically prefixes are more resistant to diffusion than suffixes is untrue: see examples of the diffusion of both in Kruspe (2004), and Heath (1978). And a few Tucanoan languages appear to have developed bound pronominal prefixes or proclitics out of full pronouns, under the influence from Arawak (see Aikhenvald 2003b about the development of prefixes in Retuarà (Tucanoan), under the
influence of Yucuna, Arawak; also see §2.3 above). The consequences of this tendency are:

- Retaining prefixes involves maintaining the grammatical difference between prefixed and non-prefixed verbs, and keeping alive the subtle differentiation between verbs of state with ‘oblique subjects’ and simple stative verbs.
- Retaining prefixes involves maintaining the difference in marking grammatical relations for nouns and for personal pronouns, that is, a typically Arawak ‘case asymmetry’.

III. MECHANISMS EMPLOYED IN DEVELOPING MATCHING STRUCTURES IN CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGE. Diffusion of structural patterns—in the almost complete absence of loan forms—implies that formal marking for the new grammatical categories is developed from the language’s own resources. Thus:

- Reanalysis, reinterpretation, and extension of existing categories occurred when indirect diffusion involved restructuring a pre-existing category for which there was a slot in the structure to match a pan-Tucanoan pattern—compare the reinterpretation and extension of the Proto-Baniwa-Tariana allative ‘towards’ as a catch-all locative matching the Tucanoan pattern; and the reinterpretation of the Proto Rio-Negro Arawak ‘surface’ locative case as topical non-subject marker in Tariana, mirroring the Tucanoan -re.
- Grammaticalization of a free morpheme, to create a completely new grammatical category with no pre-existing slots evolved via the grammaticalization of a free morpheme—compare grammaticalization of a perfective aspect in Tariana, to match a Tucanoan prototype (examples 1–2).

IV. EFFECTS OF DISPLACIVE VERSUS BALANCED LANGUAGE CONTACT. The impact of intensive multilingualism and of language contact depends on the relationships between languages. As shown in §4.2.3 of Chapter 1, ‘balanced’ language contact takes place in a situation of a long-standing linguistic area and stable multilingualism without any dominance relationships. A prime example of balanced contact was the traditional Vaupés area. Balanced language contact promotes typological diversity and results in increased structural complexity. The effects of balanced contact on Tariana can be seen in Table 7—the resulting structures are more complex than ‘pure’ Arawak or ‘pure’ Tucanoan. The effects of balanced contact are completed changes in Tariana.

‘Displacive’ language contact produces the opposite: the dominant language imposes its patterns. Its ultimate result is loss of typological diversity
accompanied by language loss. The displacive effect of Tucano onto Tariana produces ongoing changes resulting in some simplification. The gradual obsolescence of asymmetrical case marking for nouns and pronouns, by replacing the pronominal non-subject case with subject pronouns marked with the nominal -nuku, is a prime example.

However, even in a situation of ‘displacive’ effect of one language onto another, we do not have to assume that the system will have to become simpler. The loss of distinction between focused subject and instrument/comitative marking in modern-day Tariana is due to pressure from Tucano. As a result, one case is distinguished, instead of two. But the semantics of this case has become more complex.

A complex interaction of areal diffusion, genetic inheritance, and independent innovation—whose net result goes beyond mere intertranslatability—accounts for the complex system of pragmatically and semantically motivated marking of grammatical relations in Tariana.
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