

## Overview of the alignment of Arawakan languages\*

Tom DURAND

*INALCO/USPC, SeDyL (UMR 8202)*

**Abstract:** This article compares the alignments of the languages from the Arawakan family, one of the largest linguistic families of South America; in other words, how these languages encode the arguments of intransitive and transitive predicates. It had been shown that most of these languages are characterized by split intransitivity, more precisely by what will be called nominative-absolutive alignment, where an intransitive predicate takes nominative or absolutive agreement according to semantic, pragmatic or morphosyntactic factors. Two major subtypes are observed. In the first, one set of person markers is lexically assigned to a particular intransitive predicate, while in the second, depending on non-lexical factors, a predicate can accept one set or the other. After providing some information on the terminology used, we focus on the different motivations and realizations of this alignment. We also point to other alignments like nominative-accusative or tripartite and the possible diachronic changes who could have led to their presence within the Arawakan family. The study is based on first<sup>1</sup> and second hand data.

**Key-words:** Arawakan languages, alignment, split intransitivity, nominative-absolutive, nominative-accusative, tripartite, argument structure, agreement, diachrony

### 1. Introduction

Arawakan is one of the largest linguistic families of the Americas, with around forty languages still spoken. Their speakers, estimated at 500,000, are located in four countries of Central America – Belize, Honduras,

---

\* I deeply thank Zachary O'Hagan for his corrections and comments.

<sup>1</sup> These data have been collected during my thesis from three field trips in Peru, Colombia, Venezuela and Brazil. The languages studied are Tambo Ashaninka, Perené Ashéninka, Pajonal Ashéninka, Matsigenka, Nomatsigenga, Baniwa of Guainia, Kurripako, Piapoco, Yukuna, Terena, Wauja and Mehinaku.

Guatemala, Nicaragua – and eight countries of South America – Guyana, French Guiana, Suriname, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia and Brazil (Aikhenvald 1999), as shown on this map:



Figure 1: Localization of Arawakan languages

Sociolinguistic features greatly vary from one language to the other. Some count more than 100,000 speakers, like Wayuunaiki and Garifuna, whereas several have less than ten speakers – Añun, Mawayana, Baré, Resigaró, Chamikuro, Iñapari, Baure and Yawalapiti. In addition, there are great differences among Arawakan languages in terms of language contact or the teaching of those languages in schools.

I will follow Aikhenvald's (1999) classification and divide these languages into two main groups, the Northern Arawakan languages and the Southern Arawakan languages.

Concerning the general grammatical features of these languages, they are mostly agglutinating, with a clear tendency for suffixation, and head-marking. All have distinct classes on nouns and verbs, and sometimes on adjectives. In terms of nominal morphology, they have an alienable/inalienable opposition for possession and a rich classifier system (Aikhenvald 1999). Furthermore, despite their diversity, they show clear preponderance of the argument marking on predicates. Personal affixes, and sometimes personal pronouns, are used in the common marking of arguments. Personal prefixes are used to mark a genitival relation on nouns (1), and they are also used to mark the single argument and the agent on active intransitive and transitive verbs, like (2) and (3):

Piapoco:

- (1) *Nu-ti*  
1SG-eye  
'My eye'
- (2) *Nu-tani-ka*  
1SG-talk-REAL  
'I talk'
- (3) *Nu-maida-ni*  
1SG-call-3  
'I called him/her/them' (own field data)<sup>2</sup>

Direct object marking on transitive verbs by personal suffixes is mostly found in the Southern Arawakan branch (example 4). In the Northern branch, personal suffixes and pronouns can be encountered (example 7). The object suffixes may differ from the prefix forms, but it is supposed that they all derive historically from a single source of (bound) pronominal forms.

As mentioned in the introduction, I consider that the alignment designates the distribution of the person markers. To determine the alignment of one language, the argument marking of intransitive and transitive predicates are to be compared. Arawakan languages are generally

---

<sup>2</sup> The examples without references are from my field data.

characterized by split intransitivity. As such, at least two types of argument marking are to be found on intransitive verbs, as in (6) and (9):

Pajonal ashéninka:

- (4) *I-kant-an-a-na* Transitive verb  
 3SG.M-tell-DIR-REAL-1SG  
 ‘He told me’
- (5) *Te i-yoo-tz-i*  
 NEG 3SG.M-know-EP-REAL  
 ‘He does not know’
- (6) *Awawe-t-ak-i-na* Intransitive verb  
 be.swollen-EP-PERF-REAL-1SG  
 ‘I have an inflammation’

Piapoco:

- (7) *I-wawa i-kaka nua* Transitive verb  
 3SG.NOM-want 3SG-see 1SG  
 ‘He wants to see me’
- (8) *I-ya-ka anarima-ba*  
 3SG-live-REAL forest-PERLAT  
 ‘He lived in the forest’
- (9) *Inu-ka nua* Intransitive verb  
 feel.lazy-REAL 1SG  
 ‘I feel lazy’

Concerning non-verbal predicates, it has been shown (Danielsen 2007, Ramirez 1992) that, in general, they take this kind of argument marking to express a state or a characteristic. Then, if a non-verbal predication involves a possessed noun, we may indeed find pronominal marking of two kinds and on two levels: prefixal referring to the possessor, and suffixal referring to the single argument. Here is an illustration with two non-verbal predications:

Bahuana:

- (10) *Waituranawi-na*  
 man-1SG  
 ‘I am a man’ (Ramirez 1992: 31)
- (11) *ϕi-tsinawi-na*  
 2SG-wife-1SG  
 ‘I am your wife’ (Ramirez 1992: 35)

These constructions show the particularities of non-verbal predicates concerning argument marking in comparison to intransitive verbs.

Consequently, it is not sufficient to claim the alignment only by studying the verbal agreement, since the non-verbal agreement may differ. All verbal and non-verbal predications must be considered to identify the distribution of argument markings.

The alignment of Arawakan languages has been discussed in numerous grammars of these languages but quite less in more general studies (Payne 1991, Aikhenvald 1999). Besides, those studies fail to show the diversity of split intransitivity. That is why I propose in this article a new classification of split intransitivity, based on the factors motivating the split(s) and with various subtypes applicable to every language characterized by this phenomenon.

I will now present the theoretical framework for the analysis. I use Merlan's (1985) terminology, considered by Creissels (2008) as the most general and neutral. Indeed, it allows for a precise definition of morphosyntactical behavior without any semantic connotations. Here is Creissels' definition:

*Split intransitivity* is retained here as the most general, neutral and non-committal term transparently referring to situations in which verbs occurring in intransitive constructions divide into two classes characterized by a contrast in the way their single core argument S is aligned with the two core terms of the transitive construction, A and P (Creissels 2008: 142).

An important point is that this phenomenon is not restricted to intransitive verbs but to intransitive predicates.

In the majority<sup>3</sup> of Arawakan languages, split intransitivity does not apply by case marking but by agreement, with prefixes to encode the single argument or the agent, and suffixes or postposed pronouns to encode the single argument or the patient. I will use the terms nominative and absolutive to refer respectively to the encoding of the agent of a transitive verb and to the encoding of the patient of a transitive verb. Merlan and Creissels' terminology – subjective/objective and agentive/patientive – are based too much in syntax and semantics, whereas this agreement belongs to the morphological level. Indeed, it would not be adequate to use the terms subjective/objective since it is not even sure that there are subjects

---

<sup>3</sup> Tariana is a notable exception.

and objects in these languages; or, in other words, if it occurs a hierarchization of the arguments. Concerning the use of the terms agentive and patientive, it would lead to some paradox if the split is motivated by grammatical features. For example, the agent could be encoded by a patientive marker. For these reasons, the terminology I chose seems to be the most adequate and neutral. Furthermore, since person prefixes and proclitics are used as possessives, they will be glossed as genitive to mark the genitival relation between a possessor and a possessee. In regard to annotation conventions, I will put nominative and absolutive glosses between space brackets when using other authors' examples.

Those agreement markers, nominative and absolutive, are used to name the nominative-absolutive alignment (NOM-ABS), a subtype of split intransitivity where the single argument of a monovalent predicate is encoded by either person marker of a canonical bivalent predicate, that is, nominative or absolutive. This way, we do not include split intransitivity as involving non-canonical arguments like oblique case markers, such as the dative or the locative. Indeed, even strongly NOM-ACC languages as German or Icelandic show some cases of split intransitivity with differential subject marking.

I will now present my own subdivisions of split intransitivity that have a typological aim. I claim that there are two principal types of split intransitivity. First is *lexically determined split intransitivity* (LDSI). It is the most common type in the family and corresponds to a split of intransitive predicates in several lexical classes based on the selected argument. We count three subtypes. In the first one, the split occurs within the intransitive verbs, which is why we call it verbal split. This subtype is quite similar to the split-S phenomenon proposed by Dixon (1979). In the second one, the split is motivated by the distinction between verbal and non-verbal predicates. It will be called transcategorial split. The third one is a combination of the two others. The split occurs between, on the one hand, active intransitive verbs, and on the other hand, stative intransitive verbs and non-verbal predicates. It will be named extended split.

The second principal type of split intransitivity is called *grammatically determined split intransitivity* (GDSI). In this configuration, the split does

not imply the creation of various lexical classes: one intransitive predicate accepts one marking or the other, depending on formal and/or functional motivations. The formal motivations compass tense, aspect and mode morphology or the syntactic position of the predicate. The functional motivations are semantic and pragmatic.<sup>4</sup> We have there the nearest equivalent of the fluid-S languages of Dixon (1979). However, I insist on the fact that these divisions are not a departure from distinctions previously proposed in the literature.

Those two types of split intransitivity are completely compatible. A well-known example aside from Arawakan languages is Guarani, where most of intransitive predicates are characterized by lexically determined split intransitivity and at least twelve predicates characterized by grammatically determined split intransitivity (Ortiz *et al.* 1990: 101).

I will now present in the next two sections the Arawakan languages according the two major types of split, which implies that one language can be cited in both parts. In a third section, I will expose the languages whose alignments differ from NOM-ABS alignment.

## 2. Lexically determined split intransitivity

It is the major split within the family. According to Aikhenvald (1999), it was the dominant split for Proto-Arawak.

As a lexical split, it is necessary to know which lexical factors motivate the split. Mithun (1991) and Primus (1999) showed that LDSI languages select one particular semantic feature, like event, volition or control. I assert that the main feature selected in Arawakan languages is event, a point of view shared by other authors such as Granadillo for Kurripako (Danielsen & Granadillo 2008) or Facundes for Apurinã (Facundes 2000). Indeed, unaccusative verbs – in other words, verbs which denote an event where the referent has no volition or control, like *sneeze* or *fall* – mainly take nominative agreement, since it is an event. Concerning non-eventive verbs, as *be prudent* or *be smart*, the absolutive is applied.

---

<sup>4</sup> I follow here Lazard (1994) for whom semantic and pragmatic motivations have generally the same use.

In fact, the first subtype of LDSI is not present in the family. In all Arawakan languages, the absolutive marking is never restricted to verbs. Aikhenvald (1998: 362) explains, for Baniwa of Guainia,<sup>5</sup> that "almost every noun or pronoun or adjective-like root can be used as an So[unaccusative] type verb". We will illustrate this statement with Apurinã to demonstrate that this split is very common in the Arawakan family. Indeed, we can see that the nominative is attributed to an active verb in (12) and the absolutive – in Apurinã, a suffix – to a stative verb and to a non-verbal predicate in (13) and (14) respectively:

Apurinã:

- (12) *Nu-su-pe-ka-ko* Active verb  
 1SG[NOM]<sup>6</sup>-go-PERF-PRED-FUT  
 'I'll get going.' (Facundes 2000: 122)
- (13) *Hareka-no* Stative verb  
 be.good-1SG.O[ABS]  
 'I am good.' (Facundes 2000: 281)
- (14) *Popũka-ru-ka-ra-no* Non-verbal predicate  
 Apurinã-F-PRED-FOC-1SG.O[ABS]  
 'I (really) am Apurinã.' (Facundes 2000: 398)

In other words, on monovalent predicates, Apurinã is characterized by a split between active verbs from one hand, and stative verbs and non-verbal predicates from the other hand. In my terminology, this type of split is qualified as extended.

Concerning the breadth of the extended split, it is found in Lokono, Bahuana, Mawayana, Yukuna, Piapoco, Tariana, Kurripako, Warekena, Bare, Baniwa of Guainia, Yavitero, Yanesha, Chamikuro, Paresi, Enawene-nawe, Apurinã and Iñapari. I will not detail every one of those languages, since the split is quite similar among them and because it has been presented by other authors. However, the identification of the extended split should be explained for some languages. The particularities of Tariana, Paresi and Enawene-nawe will be treated in Section 4.

Let us start with Piapoco and Bahuana, languages studied respectively by Reinoso (2002) and Ramirez (1992). In both of them, the absolutive

<sup>5</sup> Called Warekena of Xie by the author.

<sup>6</sup> To avoid confusion, my glosses are put in square brackets when situated in other researchers' examples.



marking has been attested within non-verbal predicates. However, I consider that some of the predicates taking absolutive markers are indeed verbs, which leads to an extended split – since the split would occur not only between verbal and non-verbal predicates, but also between active and stative verbs. This conclusion has been attained through first hand data for Piapoco and through comparison with other Arawakan languages.

The controversial point in Piapoco lies in the predicates formed by gender marks, like *waribe-ri* fat-M ‘fat’, as in ‘I am fat’. Those predicates are characterized by some elements of both nominal and verbal morphology, and by the possibility to be used in a predicative or in a modifying position. Reinoso (2002) had classified them as adjectives. However, I argue that they are nominalized verbs. First, except for a few exceptions, what Reinoso call adjectives always show nominalizers, proving that it is not a lexical class. Secondly, when these predicates are employed without nominalizers, they show no nominal morphology. I believe that the loss of finiteness, the acquisition of some nominal morphology and the recurrent use of those derived forms – in comparison to the underived forms – may have led to the classification of those predicates as adjectives. In this case, Piapoco is characterized by an extended split and not by a transcategorial split.

In Bahuana, Ramirez (1992: 33) claims that there is an adjectival class which does not admit personal prefixes or number suffixes and which occurs in a predicative position or as an incorporated NP. However, because these characteristics can be attributed to stative verbs, the existence of a large and open adjectival class seems questionable. Furthermore, the author considers that the predicates formed by the derivational morphemes *ka-* and *ma-*,<sup>7</sup> respectively an attributive and a privative, are adjectives. Nevertheless, those derivational morphemes are known to form verbs in the Arawakan family (Danielsen & Granadillo 2008: 404). All of those elements invite me to consider Ramirez’s adjectives as stative verbs.

---

<sup>7</sup> For further investigations on the privative *ma-*, I suggest the lecture of Michael & Granadillo (eds) (2014).

Concerning Chamikuro, its alignment has not been clearly categorized yet. However, the attribution of the absolutive on monovalent predicates indicates the presence of split intransitivity. Indeed, the first person absolutive *-wa* has been annotated with the verbs *pewá-wa* 'I am good' and *plahčomá-wa* 'I am tall' (Parker 2010: 54), just as the noun *meploneya-wa* 'I am a boy' (Parker 1994: 79). Consequently, since we know that the absolutive can be applied to the non-verbal predicates, all depends of the lexical class of *pewá-* and *plahčomá-*. If they are indeed verbs, as stated by Parker (1994), then there would be a split between verbs, implying an extended split. On the contrary, if they are adjectives, then it would be a transcategorial split.

The third subtype of LDSI, where the split occurs between verbal predicates and non-verbal predicates, is present in Mojeño Trinitario (Rose 2011), Baure (Danielsen 2007), Yine (Hanson 2010) and Kawiari (Reinoso 2012).

Mojeño:

- |        |  |                      |
|--------|--|----------------------|
| (15)a. | <i>N=ute-k-po</i><br>1SG[NOM]=come-ACT-PERF<br>'I just came'                       | Active verb          |
| b.     | <i>N=uuna</i><br>1SG[NOM]=be.good<br>'I am good'                                   | Stative verb         |
| c.     | <i>'jiro=nu-po</i><br>man=1SG[ABS]-PERF<br>'I was a man then' (Rose 2011: 472-473) | Non-verbal predicate |

In addition to that split, Mojeño exhibits differential marking on third-person A/S on verbs (Rose 2011). More precisely, when only the subject is a third-person participant, it is marked with the unspecified *ty-*. When both participants are third person, the subject is marked with an index of the *ma-* set, that is to say, the person markers *ma-* 3M (male speaker), *ñi-* 3M (female speaker), *s-* 3F, *ta-* 3NH, *na-* 3, semantically specified in humanness, number, and gender.

Kawiari is treated last because of difficulties in determining its alignment. According to Reinoso (2012: 20), there exist two types of verbs,

active and stative ones. The latter – bearing an absolutive pronoun – are formed by nominal or adjectival roots and the realis suffix *-ka*.

Kawiyari:

- (16) *Miku-ka hnù*  
ill-REAL 1SG[ABS]  
'I am ill'
- (17) *Tioapi-ka hnù*  
sweat-REAL 1SG[ABS]  
'I am sweating'
- (18) *Papuarú-ka hnù*  
other-REAL 1SG[ABS]  
'I am another one (Lit. I am other)' (Reinoso 2012: 20)

The thing is, the suffix *-ka* is not generally recognized as a derivational marker in Arawakan languages. Except in Kurripako where it can serve as nominalizer (Granadillo 2006: 84) or in Apurinã where is used as a verbalizer (Facundes 2000: 58), it is generally considered as an aspectual or modal marker, that is why it is strange to consider the predicates in the three last examples as verbs. If the examples (16) to (18) really have nominal and adjectival roots – and having no first hand data, we will follow Reinoso's categorization –, then Kawiyari show a transcategorial split. However, if those examples are verbs, then we would have an extended split.

We will now talk about Wauja, Mehinaku and Yawalapiti. I will rely on my field data from Wauja and Mehinaku and suppose that Yawalapiti, a very closely-related language, should have the same alignment.<sup>8</sup> Viewing the verb agreement and according to Postigo (2014) and my own data, those languages are NOM-ACC. All verbs take, to mark the single argument, a prefix or a preposed pronoun. However, a significant number of nouns – but not all of them – seem to accept only the absolutive, a postposed pronoun. Here are some examples with equative and locative predication:

Wauja:

- (19) *Yamuku-tai-pei natu-wiu* Equative  
enfant-DIM-IMPF 1SG.ABS-PERF  
'When I was a little child'

<sup>8</sup> This supposition is based in the grammatical similarities with Wauja and Mehinaku, found in Mujica's (1992) work.

- (20)a. *Kapaka putaka-naku-a-wi natu-wiu* Locative  
 yesterday village-LOC-?-PAST 1SG.ABS-PERF  
 ‘I was in the village since yesterday’
- b. \**kapaka natuwuu putakanakuawi*
- c. \**natuwuu kapaka putakanakuawi*

In addition, Wauja and Mehinaku require the absolutive according to derivation. In other words, it is morphosyntactically motivated. As it is, this part will be presented in the next section. However, because the derivational factor refers to lexical classes, which are the basis of the lexical split, I will consider that Wauja and Mehinaku – and probably the Yawalapiti – are characterized by lexical split intransitivity, even if the NOM-ACC alignment is dominant.

### 3. Grammatical split intransitivity

This kind of split intransitivity is illustrated by two branches: the Kampan branch, in Peru, and the Caribbean branch, in the Guyanas and in Central America. Even if they share the same alignment, their differences are a reason to present them separately.

I will start with the Kampan branch, constituted by Tambo-Ene Ashaninka, Ashéninka dialects, Caquinte, Matsigenka, Nomatsigenga and Nanti. I have both first hand and second hand data for all of these languages except for Caquinte and Nanti, for which I rely on Michael (2001, 2008, 2014) and O’Hagan (2015)’s works. The data of Ashéninka I collected from the field belong to Perené Ashéninka and Pajonal Ashéninka.

Let us recall that GDSI consists of the possibility, for the same predicate, to bear the nominative or the absolutive. The use of these personal marks is conditioned by semantico-pragmatic and morphosyntactic factors:

Perené Ashéninka:

- (21) *No-mako-t-ak-i*  
 1SG.NOM-be.tired-EP-PERF-REAL  
 ‘I am tired’
- (22) *Mako-t-ak-i-na*  
 be.tired-EP-PERF-REAL-1SG.ABS  
 ‘I am tired’

There are almost no semantic differences between the two utterances. However, a few predicates like *-shiy* 'run', might show semantic differences according to the use of either person marker. With this predicate, for example, the use of the absolutive may lead to an 'escape' interpretation.

Even though there are no lexical obligations or prohibitions like in LDSI, argument marking is influenced by the semantics of the verb. It appears that stative verbs are more likely to take an absolutive marker – independently from the meaning. This can be shown by my elicitation data: on a translation without a context or with staged communicative events from situations where stative predicates are more likely to be used, like a visit to the doctor where physical or physiological states are enumerated, the occurrences of the absolutive are much higher. Motion verbs too bear more often the absolutive marking, as shown by Heitzman (1991) and T. Payne (1996). Both explain that the absolutive is used to indicate a situational change, be it a spatial or temporal one, as in this example:

Perené Ashéninka:

- (23) *No-ha-t-e*                      *aka*    *no-shitov-an-ak-i*  
 1SG.NOM-go-EP-IRR    here    1SG.NOM-leave-DIR.S-PERF-REAL
- Marankiario-ki*    *aree-t-ak-i-na*                      *Tsirishi-ki*  
 Marankiari.F-LOC    arriver-EP-PERF-REAL-1SG.ABS    LaMerced-LOC  
 'I left Marankiari and I arrived at La Merced'

As we can see, at the first part of the sentence, where the speaker leaves Marankiari, the nominative *no-* is used. When the spatial dimension changes, with the arrival to La Merced, the absolutive *-na* is selected.

Pragmatic factors constitute the core of D. Payne & J. Payne's (2005) article. The authors claim that person marking can be determined by some pragmatic indications like anaphor continuity or word order. They observed a higher proportion (72%) of verbs taking the absolutive where the referent was the subject of the preceding utterance or at the beginning of the utterance (90%). On the contrary, verbs taking the nominative show some subject continuity for only 45% of them and are not at the beginning of an utterance for 72% of them. Topic continuity has been observed too by Mihás (2010) on Perené ashéninka, and even by our informants. Some

of them even said that the verbs with an absolutive marker are generally used as an answer. However, O'Hagan (2015) argues that split intransitivity in Caquinte is better described in terms of temporal features than in terms of pragmatic motivations. In a sense, it follows Heitzmann (1991) and T. Payne's (1996) argumentation where the absolutive marker is used in case of spatio-temporal change. Some further investigations are needed to confirm or disconfirm this hypothesis for other Kampan languages.

There exists a lot of grammatical elements requiring the nominative marker, listed by D. Payne & J. Payne (2005) on Ashéninka. Concerning aspect, the morphemes affected are the progressive *-atzi/-aty*, the imperfective *-ni* for Nomatsigenga. On the contrary, the stative *-atsi/-acha* requires the absolutive. Furthermore, the aspectual opposition punctual/durative plays a significant role in the person markers distribution. Punctual events generally take punctual morphology like the perfective *-ak* and the absolutive whereas durative events may use a nominalized predicate with a personal pronoun or a copula:

Tambo Ashaninka:

- (24) *No-mochira-te kisa-ri / potsi-ta-ri*  
 1SG.GEN-bag-POSS be.dirty-NMZ / be.black-EP-NMZ  
 'My bag is always dirty / has a black color'
- (25) *No-mochira-te kisa-i-t-ak-i, potsi-t-ak-i*  
 1SG.GEN-sac-POSS be.dirty-ANTER-EP-PERF-REAL be.black-EP-PERF-REAL  
 'My bag is black from dirtiness (Lit. My bag is dirty, it is black)'

Nomatsigenga is a notable exception, since my field data show that the punctual events generally take the nominative and the imperfective *-ni*, while the durative events take a nominalized predicate and the absolutive:

Nomatsigenga:

- (26) *No-matsa-t-ë-ni*  
 1SG.NOM-be.weak-EP-REAL-IMPF  
 'I feel weak'
- (27) *Matsa-ri-na*  
 be.weak-NMZ-1SG.ABS  
 'I am weak'

In modal constructions, future, imperative, negative and irrealis constructions in general require the nominative.

I now present the Caribbean languages, starting with Wayuunaiki and Añun. Those languages are in fact characterized by LDSI, differentiating active and stative verbs. However, the differentiation between active and stative verbs is less important than the GDSI phenomenon, that is why they are presented here. Indeed, active verbs differ from stative verbs in main declarative clauses by showing an *a-* prefix, glossed as a zero prefix, or a nominative prefix. The verbal morphology for both active and stative verbs also includes a gender mark agreeing with the single argument. The thing is, the encoding of active verbs depends on syntactic factors, not on lexical ones. If they are in a main clause, they take the absolutive, like the stative verbs. When they are in a subordinate clause, they take the nominative. In other words, the classical Arawakan split, where active verbs take the nominative and the stative verbs the absolutive, only appears within subordinate clauses (Alvarez 2010). In the following examples, whereas the verbs *maka-* ‘stay’ and *kero-* ‘go in’ in (26) and (28) share the absolutive, they show a different agreement in the subordinate clauses in (27) and (29):

Wayuunaiki:

- (28) *Makatüshi taya tepialu'u*  
 maka-tV-shi taya tV=pia-lu'u  
 stay-TH-M 1SG[ABS] 1SG[GEN]=house-LOC  
 'I stayed in my house'
- (29) *Talatashaanashi ma'in taya aka makatüin pia tamaa*  
 tala-tV-shaana-shi ma'in taya aka maka-tV-ni pia tV=maa  
 happy-TH-SUPERL-M very 1SG[ABS] because stay-TH-GER 2SG[ABS] 1SG=COM  
 'I am very happy that you stayed with me' (Alvarez 2010: 5, my translation)
- (30) *Ekerotshi taya tepialu'umüin*  
 V=kero-IV-shi taya tV=pia-lu'u-müni  
 0=go.in-TH-M 1SG[ABS] 1SG[GEN]=house-LOC-to  
 'I went inside my house' (Alvarez 2010: 3, my translation)
- (31) *Jashichisü Aana aka*  
 jashichi-sü Aana aka  
 angry-F Ana because
- tekerolujatiin jüma'anamüin*  
 tV=kero-IV-ni-ja-tü-ni jV=ma'ana-müni  
 1SG[NOM]=go.in-TH-GER-VOL-F-GER 3F[NOM]=domain-to  
 'Ana is angry because I will go inside her house' (Alvarez 2010: 5, my translation)

As we can see, the lexical split can manifest itself only according to grammatical features, which is why I consider that GDSI has priority over LDSI about argument marking in Wayuunaiki and Añun.

Besides, this phenomenon is not restricted to intransitive verbs, so we can say that those languages are characterized on top of that by what I would call split transitivity. Thus, an active transitive verb can choose to encode the agent by the absolutive or the nominative, depending to the pragmatic motivations:

Wayuunaiki:

- (32)a. *A'lakajaainjachi taya tü.*  
 V='laka -jV-V-ni-ja-chi taya tü  
 0=cook-TH-EP-GER-VOL-M 1SG[ABS] DEM.F  
 'I will cook this (Lit. I will be the one who cooks this)'
- b. *Ta'lakajaainjatü tü.*  
 tV='laka -jV-V-ni-ja-tü tü  
 1SG[NOM]=cook-TH-EP-GER-VOL-F DEM.F  
 'I will cook this (Lit. The thing I will cook is this one)' (Alvarez 2010: 12, my translation)

Even if the two last examples are quite similar, there is slight semantic difference. In the example (32a), the use of the absolutive emphasizes the agent whereas, in the example (32b), the nominative emphasizes the patient.

Garifuna is a language whose split is motivated by aspect, more precisely by the opposition accomplished/unaccomplished, according to de Pury (2000).

Accomplished	Indefinite	<i>N-arísida</i> 'I get rich'	
	Imperfective	<i>N-arísidu-ba</i> 'I will get rich'	
	Progressive	<i>N-arísidu-ia</i> 'I am getting rich'	
Unaccomplished	Accomplished	<i>Arísida-ha-di-na</i> 'I got rich'	<i>Rísi-ha-di-na</i> 'I have been rich'
	Continuative	<i>Arísida-gi-na</i> 'I am still getting rich'	<i>Rísi-gi-na</i> 'I am still rich'
	Aorist		<i>Rísi-ti-na</i> 'I am rich'

Table 1: Distribution of person markers according to aspect (de Pury 2000: 57, my translation)



Sheil (2013) insists on the affinity between the nominative and non-finite verbs, verbs present in narrations, future and progressive from one part, and of the absolutive with negation, perfective and non-marked verbs from the other part.

Morphological factors are not the only ones affecting the person encoding. Syntactically, the absolutive marker is required in subordinate clauses, built with a relative pronoun and the extractor *-ba*:

Garifuna:

- (33) *Onli le eibagua-ba-i*  
 dog REL.SG.M run-EXT-3SG.M[ABS]  
 ‘The dog that runs’ (Stark 2013: 13, from Cathcart, fieldnotes, 2011)

In transitive constructions, a split occurs too. In fact, both the nominative and the absolutive can be used to encode the agent. Stark (2013) and Sheil (2013) claim that this marking is conditioned by the definiteness of the patient. If the latter is definite, the agent would be expressed by the nominative (34a); on the contrary, it is expressed by the absolutive (34b):

- (34)a. *Hou nu-mu-tu keiki*  
 eat 1SG[NOM]-AUX-3SG.F[ABS] cake  
 ‘I ate the cake’
- b. *Hou-ti-na keike*  
 eat-LNK-1SG[ABS] cake  
 ‘I ate cake’ (Stark 2013: 6)

Thus, the particularity of Garifuna with regard to its alignment(s) is to present both split intransitivity and split transitivity, like Wayuunaiki and Añun.

To end our description of GDSI, I will mention that this phenomenon can be found – in small amounts – in languages with LDSI. In Kurripako and Apurinã, for example, some predicates can take nominative or absolutive, changing the meaning, as shown by the comparison between (35) and (37), with the nominative, and (36) and (38), with the absolutive:

Kurripako:

- (35) *Li-idza-ka*  
 3SG.M[NOM]-cry-PROG  
 ‘He is crying’

- (36) *Idza-ka-ni*  
rain-PROG-3SG[ABS]  
'It is raining' (Danielsen & Granadillo 2008: 410)

Apurinã:

- (37) *Ny-hereka*  
1SG[NOM]-be.good  
'I am good (cured)'
- (38) *Hereka-nu*  
être.bon-1SG[ABS]  
'I am a good person' (Chagas 2012: 107)<sup>9</sup>

Besides, the attributive *ka-* and the privative *ma-*, both derivational morphemes, require the absolutive in numerous languages, even if the derived verb is an active verb that canonically takes the nominative. In a way, it has to be expected, since the derived predicate formed involves a less agentive entity:

Kurripako:

- (39) *Ka-ñeti-ka*            *hnua*            Stative verb derived from an active verb  
ATTR-steal-REAL    1SG.ABS  
'I like to steal / I am a thief'

Piapoco:

- (40) *Ka-kape-ka*            *nua*            Stative verb derived from a noun  
ATTR-house-REAL    1SG.ABS  
'I own a house'

In other languages, as in Lokono, these derivative markers combine with stative roots and nouns, classes that take canonically the absolutive (Patte 2014).

The derivational constructions also involve the split found in Wauja and Mehinaku. In those languages, the absolutive is required for nominalized verbs. In the next examples, we can see that the use of the nominalizers *-ya*, *-itsi* and *-la* leads to the use of an absolutive in (41a), (42a) and (43a). The impossibility to prepose the pronoun before the predicate, as in (41b), (42b) and (43b), confirm that we have a bound pronoun.

---

<sup>9</sup> The author calls them "descriptive ambivalent verbs".

Wauja:

- (41)a. *Ma-tulu-naku-ya natu*  
 PRIV-ear-LOC-NMZ 1SG.ABS  
 ‘I do not hear anything / I am deaf/an idiot (Lit. I am the one without ears)’  
 b. \**Natu matulunakuya*
- (42)a. *Ahumaitsa-itsi natu*  
 run-NMZ 1SG.ABS  
 ‘I am a runner / I run all the time’  
 b. \**Natu ahumaitsaitsi*

Mehinaku:

- (43)a. *M-awayulukumâ-la-wa natu-hã*  
 PRIV-dog-NMZ-PAST 1SG.ABS-PAUS  
 ‘I have never had a dog’  
 b. \**Natu mawayulukumãlawawa*

I note that the predicates formed bear both nominal and verbal morphology, and have some properties of the adjective class identified by Postigo (2014: 28). Moreover, it is intriguing that the absolutive marking has been preserved for those predicates, since various Arawakan languages such as Kurripako, Piapoco and Yukuna do not allow the absolutive with nominalized verbs.

To sum up, languages characterized by GDSI as a major split often show a large range of motivations conditioning the split. Caribbean languages also exhibit a split between transitive verbs.

## 4. Uncommon alignments

We can observe two major alignments apart of the NOM-ABS alignment, that is, tripartite alignment and nominative-accusative alignment.

### 4.1. Tripartite alignment

The Arawakan languages that show tripartite alignment are Paresi and Tariana. However, the use of the same terminology should not obscure the morphological differences between the two.

Paresi is a language with a unique case of split intransitivity in the Arawakan family. Indeed, the split does not occur by the encoding of

prefixes on the one hand and suffixes or postposed pronouns on the other hand, but only by the encoding of proclitics. According to Romling (2013) and Brandão (2014), there are three sets of proclitics. The first set, glossed nominative, is attributed to the single argument of active intransitive verbs, and to the agent of transitive verbs. The second set, which I gloss arbitrarily K to avoid confusion with other glosses, is employed for the single argument of stative and patientive intransitive verbs,<sup>10</sup> motion intransitive verbs, and for a few transitive verbs. The third set is used with verbal roots with an initial vowel.<sup>11</sup> The opposition between the three sets only disappears for the third person, when zero marking is used. In parallel, the patient of a transitive verb is encoded by a postposed pronoun – the unique encoding of this argument explains the gloss accusative:

Paresi :

- (44)a. *Ø-moko-tya-h-ita-ha natyo* Transitive verb  
 3-hit-TH-PL-PROG-PL 1SG[ACC]  
 ‘They are hitting me’ (Brandão 2010: 24)
- b. *Na-tona kahare* Active intransitive verb  
 1SG[NOM]-walk INTENS  
 ‘I walked a lot’ (Brandão 2010: 22)
- c. *No-nidyi heta* Stative intransitive verb  
 1SG[K]-be.thin COMPL<sup>12</sup>  
 ‘I will be thin’ (Brandão 2010: 23)

To summarize, Paresi has both a NOM-ABS alignment and a tripartite alignment, because intransitive predicates show a split between their person markers, and because there are three different encoding for the single argument of intransitive verbs and the arguments of transitive verbs.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Concerning eight intransitive predicate taking the K set, Brandão (2014) considers they are adjectives whereas Romling (2013) classifies them as verbs.

<sup>11</sup> Since the third set is motivated by phonological factors only, they do not affect the split.

<sup>12</sup> The completive marker implies here an emphasis on the endpoint of the situation.

<sup>13</sup> I insist on the fact that what I call tripartite alignment slightly differs from what is called tripartite alignment in the literature. In both cases, there is a three ways system to code the arguments of intransitive and transitive verbs. However, the distribution of the person markers is quite different. In the literature, the three encodings are attributed to the single argument, the agent of a transitive verb and the patient of a transitive verb. In the languages I described in this article, the three encodings apply to 1) the single argument of an unergative verb and the agent of a transitive verb, 2) the single argument of an unaccusative verb and of a non-verbal predicate, and 3) the patient of a transitive verb.

I will now propose an explanation to the existence of this unusual alignment. With regard to the NOM-ABS alignment of Proto-Arawak (Aikhenvald 1999), I claim that Paresi acquired this split after a NOM-ACC stage because of three reasons. First, considering that the three series have a common origin,<sup>14</sup> a split within proclitics implies that all intransitive verbs used to bear nominative. Second, Paresi does not use a suffix or a postposed pronoun for non-verbal predicates, a usual feature for an Arawakan language with NOM-ABS alignment. Its absence nowadays suggests that split intransitivity was lost some time before the appearance of those three sets. Finally, the semantic motivations of Paresi, with both an active/stative and an agentive/patientive opposition, are larger than for other Arawakan languages with NOM-ABS alignment, with only an active stative opposition. This non-selection of a specific semantic opposition can be interpreted as a recent installation of this alignment.<sup>15</sup>

Tariana is a language with a lexical split, even if it is mainly nominative-accusative (Aikhenvald 2001). Unergative verbs take the nominative (45) whereas unaccusative verbs take the absolutive (46):

- (45) *Nu-a nu-pita-de*  
 1SG[NOM]-go 1SG[NOM]-wash-FUT.CERT  
 ‘I will go and wash myself’
- (46) *Harame-pu-mahka nuha*  
 be.scared-AUGM-REC.P.NONVIS 1SG[ABS]  
 ‘I got very scared’ (Aikhenvald 2004: 98)

Besides, due to language contact with healthy Tukano, Tariana became the only Arawakan language which marks their arguments with case marking (Aikhenvald 1999, 2001, 2004). More precisely, this language exhibits various case marks distributed according to an accusative system. More precisely, Aikhenvald (2004) distinguishes the cases affixed to the subject – S and A argument – and the ones affixed to a non-subject element, such as a P or an indirect object:

<sup>14</sup> We suppose that the modification of an already existing element is far more conceivable than the creation of a new element.

<sup>15</sup> The extension of the semantic motivations could be another interpretation. However, it is an improbable scenario, since no other Arawakan language did it.

Grammatical function	Discourse status	Nouns	Pronouns
Subject (A/S)	Non-focused	-Ø	
	Focused	-ne/-nhe	
Non-subject (Non A/S)	Non-topical	-Ø	-na <sup>16</sup>
	Topical	-nuku	

Table 2: Grammatical relations and core cases in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2004: 101)

This nominative-accusative case marking is illustrated in the next examples where *-ne* AGT is attributed to the agent of a transitive verb in (47), *-na* OBJ is employed for the patient and the goal of a bitransitive verb in (48) and *-nuku* TOP.NON.A/S to the patient of a transitive verb in (49):

Tariana:

- (47) *Duhua-ne heku-kena du-thuka*  
**she-AGT** tree-branch 3SG.F[NOM]-break(A)  
*duka du-pe-pidana*  
 3SG.F[NOM]+arrive(Sa) 3SG.F[NOM]-leave(A)-REM.P.REP  
 ‘She managed to break the branch (and) left (it)’ (Lit. ‘She arrived at breaking the branch.’) (Aikhenvald 2001a: 183)
- (48) Nuha **pi-na di-na** nu-a-mhade  
 PRO1SG **2SG-OBJ 3SG.NF-OBJ** 1SG[NOM]-give-FUT  
 ‘I will give you to him.’ or ‘I will give him to you.’ (e.g. talking to, or about, a baby) (Aikhenvald 2001a: 179)
- (49) Kawhi-**nuku** ni-ira-de nuha  
 manioc.flour-**TOP.NON.A/S** 1SG[NOM]-drink-FUT.CERT PRO1SG  
 ‘I will drink the manioc flour (we were talking about)’ (Aikhenvald 2004: 99)

To conclude, Tariana has both a NOM-ABS alignment and a tripartite alignment like Paresi, with the [Ua, A][Up][P]. Nevertheless the great difference is that the innovation of Tariana about argument encoding lies in the coding of the patient.

#### 4.2. Nominative-accusative alignment

According to Merlan (1985), a language with split intransitivity does not show perfect symmetry in the encoding of the single argument. In other words, a quantitative balance between the two classes of intransitive predicates is not to be expected, there is always a larger and a smaller one.

<sup>16</sup> This is the canonical grammatical relations encountered in the language. In another work, Aikhenvald (2001) shows in which situations the *-na* case can be used on the S argument.

In Arawakan languages, the majority of intransitive verbs tend towards NOM-ACC alignment. Some have achieved their conversion and have lost all or almost all of their occurrences of split intransitivity. Thus, the P encoding is not used for other arguments and can be qualified as accusative. Those NOM-ACC languages are Palikur, Wapishana, Resigaro, Achagua, Terena, Kinikinau<sup>17</sup> and Nanti. We will now present every one of those languages in that arbitrary order, tempting to explain this alignment change.

Paresi has been described by Launey (2001a, b) as a NOM-ACC language with a few traces of split intransitivity. Identifying those traces is problematic because of its low degree of bound verbal morphology:

Palikur:

- (50) *Ig wewpa*  
 PRO3M hunt  
 'He hunts'
- (51) *Ig mekseh*  
 PRO3M doctor  
 'He is a doctor' (Launey 2001a: 22)
- (52) *Neg awayg barewye*  
 DEM.M man handsome.M/N  
 'This man is handsome' (Launey 2001a: 39)
- (53) *Ig amnih-un*  
 PRO3M save-O1[ACC]  
 'He saves me' (Launey 2001a: 32)

The prefixes no longer mark the nominative and have been relegated to their genitive use:

Palikur:

- (54) *N-ig-uh*  
 1SG.POSS[GEN]-father-POSS  
 'My father' (Launey 2001: 22)

A trace of split intransitivity was found by Aikhenvald and Green (1998). The authors claim that the suffixes are used to encode the S argument when interrogative pronouns have a predicative position:

---

<sup>17</sup> Terena and Kinikinau are very proximate languages, which is why what will be said here about Terena should prevail for Kinikinau.

Palikur:

- (56) *Pariye-ki-ap*  
 who/what-EMPH-2SG.S=O[ABS]  
 ‘Just who are you?’ (Aikhenvald & Green 1998: 469)

It is important to know that Palikur has an open and large lexical class of adjectives similar to Indo-European languages – with three subclasses (Launey 2001a). Taking into account the lexical classes of the majority of other Arawakan languages, where there are few to no adjectives, it seems that this is an innovation made from stative verbs. We hypothesize that those stative verbs lost their verbal morphological features, changing into adjectives. At the same time, the word order argument-predicate establishes itself, preventing the postposition of an argument to the verb, that is to say, the absolutive marking. Thus, this scheme is extended to active verbs, erasing gradually the active-stative distinction, since the morphosyntactic differences between active and stative verbs gradually disappeared.

Regarding Wapishana, Santos (2006) argues that there are no more traces of split intransitivity. Active verbs take the personal prefixes whereas, for stative predicates, the examples presented show a significant number of predicates formed on the adjectival marker *-ʔu*:

Wapishana :

- (56) *Amazaɖa tɪbaʔi-ʔu*  
 world big-ADJ  
 ‘The world is big’ (Santos 2006: 152)

The author claims that Wapishana too has an open class of adjectives leading to the use of personal pronouns preposed to the predicate. However, it is still unclear why this mark is as much present in Wapishana. It was probably a nominalizer affixed to stative verbs used gradually to the finite stative verbs. In this way, the latter would have lost some verbal features such as agreement, leading to the loss of split intransitivity.

Unlike the languages to which it is most closely related, Baure and Mojeño, Terena seems to have lost its split intransitivity, a fact confirmed by Butler (1977, 1978), Rosa (2010), Neubaner (2012), Silva (2013) and by my own data. The loss of split intransitivity is surprising for a language that attaches importance to the active-stative distinction. This feature was



already pointed out by Butler (1977) with the different motivations including special active or stative morphemes – example (55) – and by the use of a lot of copulas and auxiliaries – as in (56) and (57):

Terena:

- (57)a. *Ngasaxo-ti*  
1SG.NOM.be.cold-IMPF  
'I am cold'
- b. *Ngasaxo-k-ena-ti*  
1SG.NOM.be.cold-EP-STAT-IMPF  
'I am sensitive to the cold'
- (58) *Mahopi ngoye*  
be.naked 1SG.NOM.AUX  
'I am naked'
- (59) *Yomomo-pi ngoe*  
mud-be.covered.with 1SG.NOM.AUX  
'I am covered with mud'

Besides, I suggest that the imperfective *-ti* was originally a possession marker that acquired properties of nominalization. In this way, the nominalized predicates would have used, as the single argument, a pronoun, like in Achagua or Piapoco. Thus, the absolutive marking would have been less and less frequent because of the use of free pronouns with the nominalized predicates.

A good example of the inclination of Terena towards an accusative system is the possibility of substituting the personal prefixes by pronouns. Nevertheless, as Neubaner (2012) pointed out, they cannot co-occur.

Achagua had conserved a split intransitivity phenomenon at least until the 18th century, a fact confirmed by Neira & Rivero (1762)'s data. However, the works of Meléndez (1989; 1994 and 1998) and Wilson (1992) show no single example of split intransitivity.

The principal hypothesis concerning the loss of this phenomenon is the competition between finite forms and non-finite forms. The data of Meléndez and Wilson show that a lot of examples include nominalized verbs. This kind of predicates is used as a modifier of an NP, whether it is a personal pronoun or a noun.

Finally, Resigaró is a language that has lost its split intransitivity during the 20th century, according to Seifart (2011). The author advances the

hypothesis that this change resulted from language contact with Bora, from the Witoto family. To exemplify it, he compares a variety spoken in the 1920s and 1930s with the contemporary variety, and showed that the absolutive marker that could have been in some intransitive predicates has been replaced by a preposed pronoun or a prefix:

Resigaro from the 20s-30s		Current Resigaro	
<i>Tsa-mi</i>	<i>kamā-gi</i>	<i>Tsa-mí</i>	<i>kamú</i>
PRO3SG.NF-RECPST	drunk-3SG.NF[ABS]	PRO3SG.NF-RECPST	drink
‘He was drunk’		‘He was drunk’	
		<i>Gi-kamú</i>	
		3SG.NF[NOM]-drink	
		‘he was drunk’	

Table 3: Argument differences between Resigaro from the 20s-30s and current Resigaro

Nevertheless, Seifart does not give details of the non-verbal predications that could bear the absolutive agreement. On the contrary, Allin's work (1976) shows various examples of stative predicates with postposed pronouns:

Resigaro:

- (60) *Nii maaʔtsa no*  
 not tired I  
 ‘I am not tired’ (Allin 1976: 239)
- (61) *Do-náadó-neé tsó*  
 her-sister-with she  
 ‘She is with her sister’ (Allin 1976: 257)

Those examples demonstrate that further investigations are needed to verify if those pronouns have a fixed syntactic position characteristic of an absolutive agreement. Anyway, it surely must not be an extended phenomenon, which is why we must consider that Resigaro is mainly NOM-ACC, maybe completely.

Finally, Nanti has been considered by Michael (2008) to be NOM-ACC language, with merely some traces of split intransitivity as marginal instances. It is true that Matsigenka, its closest related language in the Kampan branch, does not show such prolific split intransitivity as in Ashaninka, Ashéninka or even Nomatsigenga. Nanti speakers are more isolated than the other Kampan speakers, so the loss of split intransitivity cannot be explained by language contact with Spanish. It can be said then that this loss is due to an internal evolution, maybe an influence of a NOM-ACC syntax on the NOM-ABS morphology. The same evolution is

occurring in Matsigenka at a later stage, given that this language still bears split intransitivity.

## 5. Conclusion

This overview has shown the great diversity of Arawakan languages regarding alignment in general and split intransitivity in particular. The two principal types of split intransitivity can be encountered – the lexical extended split is the most prevalent –, with numerous lexical and grammatical motivations, mostly coexisting. Some splits even occur with transitive verbs, as in the Caribbean branch. Besides, the appearance of the NOM-ACC and the tripartite alignments inside the Arawakan family provides us more information about the diachronic evolution of alignment, in particular concerning the disappearance of some morphological features. Furthermore, this evolution is highly related to language contact, since morphosyntactic features directly related to alignment can be borrowed from neighboring languages, as in Tariana.

The results obtained are resumed in the next table. The languages are annotated with !, symbolizing a highly threatened language, and †, an extinct language. Where a NOM-ABS alignment is present, the type of split is specified. I am aware that the alignments of some languages – Kawiyari, Yawalapiti, Enawene-nawe – have not been properly confirmed yet. However, there is no actual study on these nearly undocumented and highly endangered languages, which is why the lack of data will remain. Consequently, it appears preferable to presume their alignment for the moment. Further work is needed to confirm or disconfirm them.

Languages	Alignment	
Septentrional Arawak	Palikur	NOM-ACC
	Garifuna	Grammatical split
	Lokono	Extended split
	Wayuu	Grammatical split
	!Añun	
	Wapishana	NOM-ACC
	†Bahuna	Extended split
	!Resigaro	NOM-ACC with some possible remains of extended split
	Yukuna	Extended split
	Achagua	NOM-ACC
	Piapoco	Extended split
	!Tariana	Extended split and tripartite
	!Kawiyari	Transcategorical split
	Kurripako	Extended split
	Warekena	
	!Bare	
	Baniwa from Guainia	
	†Yavitero	
	†Maipure	Transcategorical split
Meridional Arawak	Yanesha	Extended split
	!Chamikuro	
	Wauja	Lexical split
	Mehinaku	
	!Yawalapiti	
	Paresi	Extended split and tripartite
	Enawene-nawe	
	Terena	NOM-ACC
	!Kinikinau	
	!Baure	
	Mojeño trinitario	Transcategorical split
	Yine	
	Apurinã	
	!Iñapari	Extended split
	Ashaninka Tambo-Ene	
	Asheninka Perene	
	!Caquinte	
	Matsigenka	
	Nomatsigenga	
	!Nanti	NOM-ACC

**Abbreviations**

ABS	absolute	LOC	locative
ACC	accusative	M	masculine
ACT	active	N	neuter
ADJ	adjective	NF	non-feminine
ATTR	attributive	NOM	nominative
AUGM	augmentative	O	object
AUX	auxiliary	PERF	perfective
COMPL	completive	PL	plural
DEM	demonstrative	POSS	possessive
DIM	diminutive	PRED	predicate marking
DIR.S	directional.source	PRIV	privative
EP	epenthetical	PRO	pronoun
F	feminine	PROG	progressive
FUT	future	REAL	realis
FUT.CERT	certain future	RECPST	recent past
GEN	genitive	SG	singular
GER	gerund	STAT	stative
IMPF	imperfective	SUPERL	superlative
IRR	irrealis	TH	thematical
LNK	linker	VOL	volitional

**References**

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 1998. Warekena. *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, D. Derbyshire & G. Pullum (eds), 4: 225-439. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 1999. The Arawak language family. *The Amazonian Languages*, R.M.W Dixon & A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 65-105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2001. Non-canonically marked arguments in North Arawak languages of South America. *Noncanonically marked subjects and objects*, A.Y. Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon & M. Onishi (eds), 177-199. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. The adjective class in Tariana. *Adjectives: a crosslinguistic typology*, R.M.W. Dixon & A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 97-124. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra & Green, Diana. 1998. Palikur and the typology of classifiers. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40(3): 429-80.
- Allin, Trevor R. 1976. A Grammar of Resigaró. PhD dissertation, University of St. Andrews.
- Alvarez, José. 2010. Definitud y foco en las conjugaciones subjetiva y objetiva del guajiro. Bogotá: Portal de lenguas de Colombia: diversidad y contacto.
- Brandão, Ana Paula Barros. 2010. Verb morphology in Paresi-Hality. Master dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Brandão, Ana Paula Barros. 2014. A reference grammar of paresi-haliti (arawak). PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Butler, Nancy. 1977. Derivação verbal em Terena. *SIL-Série Lingüística* 7: 73-100.
- Butler, Nancy. 1978. *Modo, extensão temporal, tempo verbal e relevância contrastiva na língua terena*. Brasília: SILEL.
- Chagas, Angela Fabiola Alves. 2012. Estrutura argumental dos verbos descritivos Apurinã. *Liames* 12: 103-122.
- Creissels, Denis. 2008. Remarks on split intransitivity and fluid intransitivity. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 7, Bonami, O. & P. Cabredo Hofherr (eds), 139-168. Paris.  
<<http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss7/creissels-eiss7.pdf>>
- Danielsen, Swintha. 2007. *Baure. An Arawak language of Bolivia*. Indigenous Languages of Latin America 6. Leiden: CNWS.
- Danielsen, Swintha & Granadillo, Tania. 2008. Agreement in two Arawak languages: Baure and Kurripako. *The typology of semantic alignment*, S. Wichmann & M. Donohue (eds), 396-411. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55(1): 59-138.
- Facundes, Sidney da Silva. 2000. The language of the Apurinã people of Brasil (Maipure/Arawak). PhD dissertation, University of New York, Buffalo.
- Granadillo, Tania 2006. An ethnographic account of language

- documentation among the Kurripako of Venezuela. PhD dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Hanson, Rebecca. 2010. A Grammar of Yine (Piro). PhD dissertation, La Trobe University, Melbourne.
- Heitzman, Allene. 1991. Tiempo y lugar en la narrativa del ashéninka pajonalino. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Etnolingüísticos* 6: 113-32.
- Launey, Michel. 2001a. A propos de l'opposition verbo-nominale en Palikur. *Amerindia* 26-27: 17-50.
- Launey, Michel. 2001b. *Eléments de grammaire Palikur*. Cayenne: Ibis Rouge éditions.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1994. *L'actance*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Meléndez Lozano, Miguel Angel. 1989. El nominal en achagua. *Lenguas Aborígenes de Colombia*, Serie Descripciones 4: 3-66.
- Meléndez Lozano, Miguel Angel. 1994. Esquemas sintácticos de la predicación e interpretación semántica de la lengua achagua. *Bulletin de l'IFEA* 23(3): 465-79.
- Meléndez Lozano, Miguel Angel. 1998. *La lengua achagua, estudio gramatical*. CCELA, UNIANDES. Vol. 11. Lenguas Aborígenes de Colombia, Descripciones. Bogotá: Colciencias/Universidad de los Andes.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1985. Split-intransitivity: Functional oppositions in intransitive inflection. *Grammar inside and outside the clause*, J. Nichols & A. Woodbury (eds), 324-62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Michael, Lev D. 2001. Reported speech, experience, and knowledge in an Amazonian society: the Nanti of Southeastern Peru. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 44(2): 363-72.
- Michael, Lev D. 2008. Nanti evidential practice: Language, knowledge, and social action in an Amazonian society. PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Michael, Lev D. 2014. The Nanti reality status system: Implications for the typological validity of the realis/irrealis contrast. *Linguistic Typology* 18(2): 251-88.

- Michael, Lev & Granadillo, Tania (eds). 2014. *Negation in Arawak Languages*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/Agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67(3): 119-36.
- Mujica, Mitzila Isabel Ortega. 1992. Aspectos fonológicos e gramaticais da língua Yawalapití (Aruak). Master dissertation, Campinas University.
- Neira, Alonso & Juan Rivero. 1762. *Arte y Vocabulario de la Lengua Achagua. Doctrina Christiana de uno y otro sexo é instrucción de Cathecumenos*. San Juan Franco.
- Neubaner, Gardenia Barbosa Nascimento. 2012. Aspectos gramaticais da língua Terena. Master dissertation, Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso, Belo Horizonte.
- O'hagan, Zachary. 2015. «La intransitividad escindida en caquinte». Conference on Indigenous Languages of Latin America VII, October 29, Austin.
- Ortiz, Diego, Domingo Aguilera & Elda Marecos. 1990. *Hablemos el guarani: curso completo en cuatro niveles para extranjeros*, vol. 1. Asuncion: CEPAG.
- Parker, Stephen. 1994. *Datos adicionales del idioma chamicuro*. Yarinacocha: ILV.
- Parker, Stephen. 2010. *Chamicuro data: morphophonemic paradigms. Datos del chamicuro: paradigmas morfofonémicos*. Dallas: SIL.
- Patte, Marie France. 2014. Negation in Guianese Lokono/Arawak. *Negation in Arawak languages*, L. Michael & T. Granadillo (eds), 54-73. Leiden/ Boston: Brill.
- Payne, David. 1991. A classification of Maipuran (Arawakan) languages based on shared lexical retentions. *Handbook of Amazonian languages*, D. Derbyshire & G. Pullum (eds), 3: 355-499. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Payne, David. & Payne, Judith. 2005. The pragmatics of split intransitivity in asheninka. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Ethnolingüísticos* 10: 37-56.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1996. Estatividad y movimiento. *Serie Lingüística Peruana* 37: 221-68.



- Postigo, Adriana Viana. 2014. *Língua wauja (arawak): uma descrição fonológica e morfossintática*. PhD dissertation, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho, São Paulo.
- Primus, Beatrice. 1999. *Cases and Thematic Roles. Ergative, Accusative and Active*. Tübingen: De Gruyter.
- Pury, Sybille de. 2000. Les verbes empruntés au français par le garifuna: des verbes d'état ? *Amerindia* 25: 49-64.
- Ramirez, Henri. 1992. Le Bahuana, une nouvelle langue de la famille Arawak. *Chantiers Amerindia* 17-1.
- Reinoso, Andrés Galindo. 2002. *Elementos para una gramática de la lengua piapoco*. Bogotá: Ministerio de cultura.
- Romling, Glauber da Silva. 2013. *Morfossintaxe da língua paresi-haliti (arawak)*. PhD dissertation, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.
- Rosa, Andréa Marques. 2010. *Aspectos morfológicos do Terena (Aruák)*. Master dissertation, Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso do Sul, Três Lagoas.
- Rose, Françoise. 2011. Who is the third person ? Fluid transitivity in mojeño trinitario. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77 (4): 469-94.
- Santos, Manoel Gomes dos. 2006. *Uma gramática do Wapixana (Aruak): aspectos da fonologia, da morfologia e da sintaxe*. PhD dissertation, UNICAMP, Campinas, SP.
- Seifart, Frank. 2011. Bora loans in Resígaro: Massive morphological and little lexical borrowing in a moribund Arawakan language. *Cadernos de Etnolingüística, Série Monografias* 2.
- Sheil, Christine. 2013. *The Status of Person Markers in Garifuna*. ms.
- Silva, Denise. 2013. *Estudo lexicográfico da língua terena: proposta de um dicionário bilíngüe terena-português*. PhD dissertation, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho, São Paulo.
- Stark, Tammy. 2013. *An analysis of Garifuna person markers as pronominal affixes and the implications for lexical arguments and DP structure*. ms.
- Wilson, Peter J. 1992. *Una descripción preliminar de la gramática de la lengua achagua (Arawak)*. Bogotá: ILV.

