

Language contact and pragmatic notions: Tariana in its multilingual context

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald

1. What this paper is about

Languages of different typological profiles are known to employ a wide array of morphosyntactic devices to encode information structure (thus supporting Rizzi 1997, 2002). In languages with flexible, or discourse-dependent, order of clausal constituents, linear position in a sentence or clause often correlates with marking topic or focus (cf. Pereltsvaig 2004). Alternative grammatical means encoding information structure may include particles encoding focus or topic, as in Urarina, an isolate from Peru (Olawsky 2006; also see cross-linguistic discussion in Lambrecht 1994), specialized marking on verbs (e.g. focus systems in Western Austronesian languages: see Dixon and Aikhenvald 1997 for a brief survey), or dedicated person marking such as proximal-obviative in Algonquian languages (e.g., Junker 2004; also see Frascarelli 2000). Valency-changing or valency-manipulating devices — such as applicatives — may have an additional pragmatic function, casting highly topical participants as core arguments (see Mithun 2001, for a general perspective). North Arawak languages of adjacent areas of Brazil, Venezuela and Colombia employ different sets of personal cross-referencing prefixes for grammatical marking of information structure (see Aikhenvald 1995, on Baniwa of Içana, and Bare; Aikhenvald 1998 on Warekena of Xié).

Tariana, a North Arawak language closely related to Baniwa of Içana,¹ is rather unusual for the Arawak family in that it employs cases on noun phrases as a major means for encoding topical and focal constituents. This is in addition to a plethora of other grammatical means including clausal constituent order, an applicative-like verbal derivation and placement of enclitics. In this paper I investigate the grammatical means for encoding pragmatic notions in Tariana, and outline the dynamics of their development in the situation of intensive language contact with genetically unrelated Tucanoan languages, and the increasingly dominant Portuguese, the local *lingua franca*.

Tariana is the only Arawak language spoken in the multilingual area of the Vaupés River Basin. Its position, and the role of contact-induced change in its history, are addressed in §2. I then turn to a brief analysis of grammatical means encoding pragmatic notions in the Traditional Tariana (§3). This is accompanied by a comparison with similar patterns in Tucanoan languages. Intensive diffusion of patterns between Tariana and other languages of the area has brought about a plethora of changes in the ways of information structure is marked in the speech of innovative speakers (§§4-5). The last section (§6) contains a summary.

2. Tariana in its areal context

The Vaupés River 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’. 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. Speakers of East Tucanoan languages (Tucano, Wanano, Desano, and a few others), and of the only Arawak language, Tariana, participate in the exogamous marriage network which ensures obligatory multilingualism (see Aikhenvald 2002, 2006 for further details).

A striking feature of the Vaupés linguistic area is a strong cultural inhibition against language mixing: borrowed forms are condemned as tokens thereof. 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.²

Tariana is an endangered language, currently spoken by about 100 people in two villages along the Vaupés River (the minor dialectal differences are addressed in Aikhenvald 2003; also see Aikhenvald 2006).

At present, Tucano is rapidly gaining ground as the major language of the area, at the expense of other languages in the Brazilian Vaupés (see Aikhenvald 2006, for a summary of historical reasons for this shift). According to traditional patterns of language use, a father would speak his own language to the members of his immediate family; and a mother would teach her children her father's language. These patterns of language use are still being maintained by a few surviving older speakers (60-80 years of age) who use a somewhat archaic variety which we call Traditional Tariana. Younger speakers effectively breach this pattern, by using the dominant Tucano language in their day-to-day life. Consequently, the Innovative Tariana spoken by these people displays more Tucano-like patterns in their language than do traditional speakers. These newly introduced patterns reflect on-going changes produced as the result of gradual and imminent shift to the dominant language. Most speakers of Tariana are also highly proficient in Portuguese, the national language of Brazil, conceptualized as the language of prestige and status in the 'white man'-dominated world (see Aikhenvald 2002: 175-86). The ensuing influence of Portuguese on the indigenous languages — Tariana among them — is reflected in the emergence of new devices for encoding pragmatic notions.

3. Encoding pragmatic notions in Traditional Tariana

A major grammatical device for encoding information structure in Traditional Tariana is case marking for encoding topical, and focussed, constituents (§3.1). Both phrasal and clausal constituent order are used for expressing pragmatic functions of a constituent — but in other ways, displaying different limits on flexibility (§3.2). These patterns partly stem from intensive areal diffusion from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana: in §3.3 we show which ones are fully and which ones are partly shared with East Tucanoan languages of the Vaupés River Basin.

A word on terminology is in order. Following general consensus, topic is understood as what a stretch of text is about (Cruse 2006: 182-3), or, in Pereltsvaig's (2004: 327) words, 'the part of the clause that denotes discourse-accessible information that is the matter of common concern for the speaker and the addressee'. Focus is understood as new, salient, or non-presupposed, part of a clause or a sentence. Contrastive focus implies picking out an element from a set of alternatives, as opposed to other alternatives (also see Zubizarreta 1998).

3.1. Case marking

Grammatical relations in Tariana are marked in two ways. A feature Tariana shares with most Arawak languages is marking grammatical relations with personal prefixes, roughly on an active-stative basis (see Dixon 1994). Every verbal root in Tariana is either prefixed or prefixless. Prefixed verbs can be transitive (e.g. *-pitaneta* ‘name someone’), ditransitive (*-bueta* ‘teach’), ambitransitive (type A = S_a, e.g. *-wapa* ‘wait, attend to something’, or type O = S_a, e.g. *-thuka* ‘break’) or active intransitive (S_a, e.g. *-emhani* ‘walk around’).³

Most prefixless verbs are stative intransitive (e.g. *kasitana* ‘be annoyed’). A few are A = S_o ambitransitives (e.g. *nhesiri* ‘enjoy (not food)’ or O = S_o ambitransitives (*hui* ‘enjoy (food); be tasty’) (see Aikhenvald 2003: 235-43 for further examples). There is no object marking on the verb. Both O and S_o acquire zero-realization (whereas in Baniwa of Içana, a closely related language, both are marked with pronominal enclitics).

Grammatical relations are also marked by case enclitics, on a subject/non-subject basis. Case marking of subjects, and of non-subjects — which include direct objects (O), a variety of third (‘extended’) arguments of ditransitive verbs, and numerous obliques, such as recipient, beneficiary, locative, manner, instrument and time — is determined by semantic and pragmatic properties of the constituent, in addition to its grammatical function. The principles of case marking in Tariana are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Grammatical relations and core cases in Tariana

GRAMMATICAL FUNCTION	DISCOURSE STATUS	NOUNS	PRONOUNS
subject (A/S)	non-focussed	subject form (noun-Ø)	Subject form (pronominal prefix + emphatic formative <i>-ha</i>)
	focussed	subject form + clitic <i>-ne/-nhe</i> ⁴	
non-subject (non A/S)	non-topical	subject form (noun-Ø)	pronominal prefix + object suffix <i>-na</i>
	topical	subject form + clitic <i>-naku/-nuku</i> ⁵	

Examples (1)-(2) illustrate a non-focussed subject as opposed to the subject in focus. (1) appears at the beginning of a narrative. The tapir is not contrasted to any other participant (its sentence-initial position correlates with its being the topic of the stretch of discourse).

- (1) *Hema hinipuku di-hña-pidana.*
 tapir garden 3sgnf-eat-REM.P.REP
 ‘A tapir (reportedly) ate (fruits of) a garden.’

In (2), ‘tapir’ — a main protagonist of the story, and the major culprit — is focussed. The subject in (2) has strong contrastive overtones: the tapir — and not a village thief nor an evil spirit — ate the fruits of the garden.

- (2) *Hema-ne hinipuku di-hña-pidana.*
 tapir-FOC.A/S garden 3sgnf-eat-REM.P.REP
 ‘A/the tapir (not anyone else) (reportedly) ate (the fruits of) a garden.’

The tapir here is not a new participant: it is effectively being reintroduced as an important player in the subsequent narrative, and at the same time contrasted to other potential thieves. The clause-initial position of this constituent reflects its topicality, while case marking indicates that it is contrastive.

In (1) and (2), ‘garden’ is not marked as a topic. A topical non-subject is illustrated in (3) — here, the garden is what is being talked about. A topical non-subject may be definite or indefinite. In (3), the subject is accompanied by a demonstrative determiner (the noun phrase is in square brackets):

- (3) *Hema [hĩ hinipu-naku] di-hña-pidana.*
 tapir this garden-TOP.NON.A/S 3sgnf-eat-REM.P.REP
 ‘A tapir (reportedly) ate (fruits of) this garden (we are talking about).’

If the subject is focussed, and the non-subject is topical, a sentence can contain both a marker of focussed subject and of a topical non-subject:

- (4) *hema-ne hĩ hinipu-naku di-hña-pidana.*
 tapir-FOC.A/S this garden-TOP.NON.A/S 3sgnf-eat-REM.P.REP
 ‘A/the tapir (not anyone else) (reportedly) ate (fruits of) this garden (we are talking about).’

Tariana does not have any dedicated marking of definiteness (such as definite articles). Depending on the context, the subject in (1) - (4) can be definite or indefinite (independently of whether it is focused or not).

The pragmatically and semantically determined marking of non-subjects is reminiscent of differential object marking as described by Bossong (1985, 1991) (also see Aissen 2003 and further references there). However, unlike

other instances described there, pragmatically and semantically based marking in Tariana extends beyond direct objects. It also applies to obliques (or adjuncts). The presence of the overt subject marking in Tariana depends on whether or not the subject is focussed. This ‘differential’ subject marking is superficially reminiscent of semantic marking of the subject (A/S) in Australian languages (see Dixon 2002: 132-3) where volition and degree of agency of the subject correlates with the presence of overt marking. In some such languages, case marking is also used for disambiguating who did what to whom, and may thus acquire an additional highlighting discourse function comparable to the focussed subject marker in Tariana (see Dixon 1994: 28-33).

Nouns distinguish two additional cases marking obliques — locative *-se* ‘in, into, from’ and instrumental-comitative *-ne* ‘with, by’. The latter is partially homophonous with the focussed subject marker whose allomorphs are *-ne* and *-nhe* (see (2)). The ‘topical non-subject’ and oblique cases can mark a constituent with the same grammatical function, and can occur together. In (5a), the locational oblique is marked with the locative *-se*:

- (5) a. *Hema hinipuku-se di-eku di-a-pidana.*
 tapir garden-LOC 3sgnf-run 3sgnf-go-REM.P.REP
 ‘A tapir (reportedly) ran into (or in) the garden.’

Using the locative case with nouns which typically refer to location (such as ‘garden’, ‘village’, ‘world’) imparts overtones of definiteness to the noun — this is reflected in the translation of (5a). If the noun is indefinite, the locative case marker is likely to be omitted, as in (5b):

- (5) b. *Hema hinipuku di-eku di-a-pidana.*
 tapir garden 3sgnf-run 3sgnf-go-REM.P.REP
 ‘A tapir (reportedly) ran into (or in) a garden.’

In (5c), the garden is topical — the example comes from a story about a man’s garden that was constantly under attack from various creatures, including village thieves, tapirs and evil spirits. The oblique ‘garden’ is definite and is the topic. It then takes both the locative *-se* and the topical non-subject marker *-naku*:

- (5) c. *Hema hinipuku-se-naku di-eku*
 tapir garden-LOC-TOP.NON.A/S 3sgnf-run

di-a-pidana.

3sgnf-go-REM.P.REP

‘A tapir (reportedly) ran into (or in) the garden (which we are talking about).’

This constitutes a typologically unusual instance of double marking of syntactic function on one noun phrase (or double case: see Aikhenvald 2002).

As can be seen from Table 1, nouns and personal pronouns differ in their principles of case marking. Firstly, nouns in a non-subject function can be unmarked for case (as in 5b), while pronouns are always marked. This is shown in (6):

(6) *Di-ka-pidana* *di-na* *nawiki-nhe.*

3sgnf-see-REM.P.REP 3sgnf-OBJ man-FOC.A/S

‘The man (not anyone else) (reportedly) saw him (the tapir).’

Secondly, the subject form of a pronoun can be analyzed as consisting of a pronominal prefix + a formative *-ha* — *di-ha* (3sgnf-FORMATIVE) ‘he’, *nu-ha* (1sg-FORMATIVE) ‘I’. If a pronoun is marked as a topical non-subject or as a focussed subject, the marking is attached to the subject form, as in (7).

(7) *Di-eku-hu-pidana* *diha-ne.*⁶

3sgnf-run-AWAY-REM.P.REP he-FOC.A/S

‘He (the tapir, not anyone else) (reportedly) ran away.’

If a pronominal non-subject is topical, it can take the non-subject case marker. An example is in (8). Such examples are rare in texts and conversations, and are highly pragmatically marked (Aikhenvald 2003: 147 provides further examples):

(8) *Diha-naku*⁷ *kiaku* *di-kwisa-pidana* *nawiki-nhe.*

he-TOP.NONA/S strongly 3sgnf-scold-REM.P.REP man-FOC.A/S

‘The man (focussed) (reportedly) strongly scolded him (that is, tapir, the one we were talking about).’

The presence of the non-subject marker correlates with the position of its referent on the nominal hierarchy (see Dixon 1994: 85): personal pronouns

have to be case-marked, while other types of noun phrase heads are case-marked depending on their topicality.

In contrast, the marker of focussed subject is used in the same way with any type of noun phrase head. The use of pragmatically-motivated case markers correlates with the linear position of topics and foci within a sentence. This takes us to the next section.

3.2. Constituent order

Traditional Tariana is a language with flexible order of clausal constituents, whose freedom is constrained by discourse-pragmatic functions.⁸ Tariana discourse is elliptical — a feature the language shares with many other highly synthetic languages with pronominal cross-referencing on the verb (cf. Mithun 1987, Hale 1992). As a result, clauses with overtly marked A (transitive subject) and O (transitive object) are not at all frequent. (In fact, such clauses constitute not more than 25% of the corpus).

The order of modifiers within noun phrases operates on a different basis, largely depending on the modifier. Numerals and adjectives precede a noun if its referent is definite and specific; and follow it, if it is not. So, *ñhamepa emi-peni* (two+CL:HUMAN child-PL) means ‘the two children’, and *emi-peni ñhamepa* (child-PL two+CL:HUMAN) means ‘two (indefinite) children’. Such a noun phrase can occur at the beginning of a story, introducing new referents:

- (9) *Emi-peni ñhamepa alia-pidana.*
 child-PL two+CL:HUMAN be-REM.P.REP
 ‘There were two children (reportedly).’

Demonstratives always precede the noun head, as in (4) (see Aikhenvald 2003: 476-8). Unlike other languages, such as Western Romance (see Bernstein 2001), a process of right dislocation does not apply to demonstrative modifiers.

Clausal constituent order operates on a different principle. The clause-initial and the pre-predicate position of a noun phrase strongly correlates with topicality of a constituent. We saw in examples (3), (4) and (5c) that non-subject constituents marked with *-naku* ‘topical non-subject’ occur in the pre-predicate position. So do the non-focussed subjects, as illustrated in (1), (3) and (8). In each of these cases, the subjects are introduced as future topics of the stretch of discourse. A constituent which is more topical than

the subject tends to occur at the left periphery of the clause, as in (10) ('in her garden'). This is the beginning of the story about a tapir who was stealing fruit from the garden:

- (10) *Payapese-pidana* *uphedo-pidana* [*duha*
 long.time.ago-REM.P.REP widow-REM.P.REP she
hinipuku-se-nuku] *hema di-hña di-ya-nhi.*
 garden-LOC-TOP.NON.A/S tapir 3sgnf-eat 3sgnf-stay-ANT
 'It was (reportedly) a long time ago. There (reportedly) was a widow.
 In her (topical) garden (reportedly) a tapir was eating.'

In contrast, the post-predicate position is usually reserved for a constituent in contrastive focus. Examples (6)-(8) illustrate the focussed subject on the right periphery of a clause. In (11), an object in the post-predicate position is in contrastive focus:

- (11) *Awakada-se dinu* *di-emhani-pidana* *itjiri.*
 jungle-LOC 3sgnf+kill 3sgnf-walk-REM.P.REP game
 'He (reportedly) went around in the jungle hunting game' (not little
 birds).

An oblique in contrastive focus also occupies a post-predicate position on the right periphery:

- (12) *Wyaka di-a* *di-emhani-pidana* [*awakada*
 far 3sgnf-go 3sgnf-walk-REM.P.REP jungle
ieriku-se].
 In.depth.of-LOC
 'He (reportedly) went far deep inside the jungle' (not at the periphery
 of it).

No other constituent can appear in this position.

A topical constituent can also be contrasted to something else. Then, it would occur at the right periphery of the clause:

- (13) *Ha-kada* *dinu* *di-uma-pidana*
 that-CL:DAY 3sgnf+kill 3sgnf-see/try-REM.P.REP
hema-nuku.
 tapir-TOP.NON.A/S

‘That day he (reportedly) tried to kill the tapir’ (the one we are talking about; not any other animal).

In summary, clausal constituent order and differential case marking in Traditional Tariana interact with pragmatic notions of topic and focus. Post-predicate position correlates with contrastive focus (similar to the situation discussed by Xu 2004, for Chinese), while position at the left periphery of a sentence is preferred for topics. This correlation between linear order and the expression of pragmatic notions comes as no surprise — similar correlations have been described for numerous languages (see, for example, Aissen 1992; Pereltsvaig 2004). A focussed subject acquires a special marker, clitic *-ne/nhe*, and a topical non-subject (the category which subsumes core arguments and obliques) is marked with the clitic *-nuku/-naku*.

3.3. Grammatical relations and pragmatic notions in Tariana: an areal perspective

The principles of case marking for topical non-subjects in Tariana have distinct areal roots. The situation with marking the focussed subject, and using constituent order for encoding pragmatic notion is less straightforward.

3.3.1. Case marking for topical non-subjects

The differential non-subject case marking based on semantic and pragmatic properties of the referent is shared by Tariana with its East Tucanoan neighbours. An NP in a non-subject function takes a marker — East Tucanoan *-re* (Barnes 1999: 219-20) and Tariana *-naku/-nuku* — if its referent is topical and has already been introduced into the discourse. The parallelism in structure between the use of cases in Tucano and Tariana is illustrated with the following example which comes from an almost identical story recorded in the two languages. An evil spirit demands that a man should give him his own heart. The man is trying to cheat by offering the spirit the heart of a monkey rather than his own. Both ‘heart’ (the direct object) and ‘evil spirit’ (the beneficiary) are topical, and therefore appear marked with the topical non-subject case (underlined):

Tucano (Ramirez 1997, Vol. III: 193; my own fieldwork)

- (14) a. [*Kĩ̃ yaá ehêri pōra-re*]
 he POSS ‘breath’ CL:LEAF.LIKE-TOP.NON.A/S(=heart)

The patterns of usage of the topical non-subject enclitic *-nuku/-naku* in Tariana displays striking similarity with the pan-Tucanoan *-re*. Both occur on any non-subject constituent which is, or is going to be, the topic of a narrative (Aikhenvald 2003: 145-6). The semantically and pragmatically based marking of non-subjects is a feature spread from Tucanoan into Tariana. As shown in Aikhenvald (2006), the non-subject marker developed from a locative morpheme (following a well-attested grammaticalization path from marking location to marking of topicality: see Radetzky 2002).

In summary: a combination of semantic properties — definiteness, specificity and animacy — determines case marking of non-subject core constituents across the Vaupés area. In some languages topicality is an additional factor. But since topics tend to be definite in Tariana this may be a corollary of the definiteness requirement. Overt non-subject case marking of locative and temporal constituents is based entirely on their pragmatic functions — topicality and focality.⁹

3.3.2. *Case marking for focussed subjects*

No other Arawak language — except Tariana — has any pragmatically based subject marking. 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. Desano (Miller 1999: 161-2) employs the contrastive suffix *-p̂*, which ‘most frequently occurs with the subject’ but ‘can be attached to any noun phrase in the sentence’. The suffix *-se'e* in Wanano (Stenzel 2004: 175-6; Waltz and Waltz 1997: 45) tends to mark focussed subject. Tucano *-a, p̂* and *pe'e* (Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 231-2; 218-19) mark contrastive focus, with a tendency to occur on subjects.¹⁰

In all likelihood the Tariana pattern of focussed subject marking is a Tucanoan-based innovation. However, unlike the topical non-subject marker, the Tariana focussed subject clitic *-ne/-nhe* lacks a one-to-one correspondent morpheme in Tucano, the major contact language. We will see, in §4, how this impacts the reinterpretation of the focussed subject marker in Innovative Tariana, and results in the reduction of its use.

3.3.3. *Constituent order*

East Tucanoan languages are predominantly verb-final, with a tendency towards an AOV and SV order (see Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 367-72 on

Tucano, Miller 1999: 2 on Desano; Morse and Maxwell 1999: 141-2 on Cubeo). Topical constituents tend to occur at the left periphery of the sentence, while constituents in contrastive focus occur sentence-finally. In Tucano, sentence-final constituents on the right periphery are separated by a short pause, and are used for disambiguation and clarification (Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 372). That is, unlike Traditional Tariana, Tucanoan languages have a fixed clausal constituent order which partly correlates with grammatical function of the core arguments. Tucanoan languages do not employ phrasal constituent order as a means of marking topicality or focality of arguments.

Sentence-final tendency for linear position of constituents in contrastive focus is attested in other East Tucanoan languages, e.g. Barasano (Jones and Jones 1991: 169), and Wanano (examples in Stenzel 2004: 175).

We now turn to the ways in which patterns of encoding pragmatic notions in Innovative Tariana mirror those found in Tucanoan languages.

4. Encoding pragmatic notions in Innovative Tariana

Innovative Tariana maintains the basic patterns of differential case marking of non-subjects, and of subjects, as described for the traditional language. However, it comes closer to the patterns found in East Tucanoan languages, in particular, Tucano, in the following aspects.

Firstly, Innovative Tariana has a fixed verb-final constituent order with a strong verb-final tendency. Just as in the traditional language, sentence-initial position is strongly associated with topical material. The sentence-initial topicalization is frequently associated with left-dislocation: the left-most constituent is separated from the rest of the sentence with a pause. Example (15) is a variant of (5b) produced by an innovative speaker:

- (15) *Hema [PAUSE] hinipuku di-eku di-a-pidana.*
tapir garden 3sgnf-run 3sgnf-go-REM.P.REP
'A tapir (reportedly) ran into (or in) a garden.'

Along similar lines, a pause accompanies left-dislocation in Tucano (Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 367). A similar phenomenon was described for Portuguese in Callou et al. (1993).

Secondly, the post-verbal position is restricted to disambiguation, clarification and afterthought. The post-verbal subject is always preceded by a pause (cf. Donati and Nespor 2003 on the association between focus and

pause). The use of the focussed subject marker *-ne/-nhe* is most frequently restricted to disambiguating who did what. An example is at (16). We can recall, that in (2), from Traditional Tariana, the focussed subject is not separated with a pause.

- (16) *Di-eku di-a-pidana [PAUSE] hema-ne*
 3sgnf-run 3sgnf-go-REM.P.REP tapir-FOC.A/S
di-eku di-pinita-pidana [PAUSE] nawiki-ne.
 3sgnf-run 3sgnf-follow-REM.P.REP man-FOC.A/S
 ‘The tapir (reportedly) ran, the man (reportedly) followed.’ (lit. He ran, the tapir, he followed, the man)

Innovative speakers hardly ever employ subjects marked for contrastive focus in positions other than post-predicate one. This agrees with the Tucano pattern whereby focus tends to be in the position of the right periphery. Younger speakers tend to use the focussed subject marker less frequently than do traditional ones. Some younger speakers freely omit the focussed subject marker in examples like (16).

The tendency to establish a one-to-one correspondence between sentence-final position and right-dislocation, with an accompanying pause, is paralleled by the process of right-dislocation as a means of marking an anti-topic and afterthought in Portuguese (see Koch et al. 1996, and Tarallo and Kato 1996: 327).

The loss of frequency in the usage of the focussed subject marker *-ne/-nhe* is partly due to the more prominent role of constituent order for encoding pragmatic notions in Innovative Tariana than in the traditional language. That the focussed subject marker does not have an exact parallel in the dominant Tucano is also a contributing factor. An additional circumstance contributing to the loss of the focussed subject marker is partial phonological obsolescence in Innovative Tariana.

Due to the linguistic pressure from Tucano, innovative speakers lose the distinction between aspirated and non-aspirated nasals. 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 — for many innovative speakers *-ne/-nhe* is almost always pronounced as *-ne*.

This makes the focussed subject look the same as the instrumental *-ne*. In (17a), a traditional speaker said *waru-nhe* (parrot-FOC.A/S), and one innovative speaker repeated this on several occasions as *waru-ne*, as in (17b). He then translated the sentence into Portuguese as ‘He died, with the

parrot’, confirming that for him, *-ne* covers both contrastive subject and comitative.

- (17) a. *Di-yami-pidana hĩ waru-nhe.*
 3sgnf-die-REM.P.REP this parrot-FOC.A/S
 ‘The parrot (not anyone else) (reportedly) died.’
 b. *Di-yami-pidana [PAUSE] hĩ waru-ne.*
 3sgnf-die-REM.P.REP this parrot-FOC.A/S
 ‘He (reportedly) died, the parrot’, translated as ‘He (reportedly) died, with parrot.’

Examples like (17b) do not make sense to many speakers of Innovative Tariana. As a result, they avoid using *-ne* with subjects altogether. That is, linguistic pressure from Tucano results in the obsolescence of the unusual differential subject marker in Tariana.

5. Further means of encoding pragmatic notions in Traditional and in Innovative Tariana

Traditional Tariana has a number of additional means employed for encoding topical core arguments and obliques. Two of these illustrate rather striking differences between the traditional, and the innovative, language.

When the causative-applicative derivation *-i* is added to a transitive verb in Traditional Tariana, it serves to foreground a topical oblique constituent. In (18), the verb *-wapa* ‘wait, attend’ appears as a simple transitive verb:

- (18) *Nu-na di-wapa-pidana.*
 1sg-OBJ 3sgnf-wait-REM.P.REP
 ‘He was (reportedly) waiting for me.’

In (19), the verb takes the causative-applicative suffix *-i*; its effect consists in foregrounding the oblique which traditionally accompanies ‘waiting’ — such as ritual offering. The ritual offering is the topic of the stretch of discourse:

- (19) *Di-walita-nipe-ne-pidana nu-na di-wapa-i.¹¹*
 3sgnf-offer-NOM-INS-REM.P.REP 1sg-OBJ 3sgnf-wait-APPL
 ‘He was (reportedly) waiting for me with the ritual offering (topic).’

The applicative derivation is not fully productive. The type of oblique depends on the semantics of the verb. Each verb has a preferential oblique which can be cast as topic through using the causative-applicative derivation. In many cases, the knowledge of which oblique to choose depends on the cultural context — for instance, for the verb ‘bless’ the expected foregrounded oblique involves the instrument of blessing, and for the verb ‘call’ it involves the purpose of calling. As a result of the encroaching obsolescence of Tariana, many younger and innovative speakers do not have enough cultural or linguistic knowledge to confidently use the causative-applicative derivation as a topicalizing device. The device itself becomes obsolescent in the young speakers’ language.

Tense, aspect and evidentiality in Traditional Tariana are expressed with floating clitics, whose position depends on the information structure. If the sentence contains no established topic, they occur on the verb, as in (1)-(4) — which is their functionally unmarked position. If there is a new topic, clitics attach to it, as in (19).

Tucanoan languages express the same categories of tense, aspect and evidentiality with suffixes attached to the verb. The positioning of affixes is never used to encode topics. Innovative speakers of Tariana, who speak mostly Tucano in their day-to-day lives, follow the Tucano mould: they put the clitics exclusively on the verb, and do not employ them as an additional topicalizing device.

So far, one may have the impression that Innovative Tariana is impoverished as compared to the traditional language. But this is not exactly so.

Innovative Tariana is developing an incipient cleft-like construction, under Portuguese influence. A young speaker spontaneously produced (20a) — which is a loan translation from a cleft construction in the local Portuguese reproduced in (20b):

- (20) a. *Maria-naka kwaka wa-na du-ni du-waketa.*
 Maria-PRES.VIS what 1pl-OBJ 3sgf-do 3sgf-join
 ‘Maria is the one who helps us (we see it).’
 b. *Maria é que nós ajuda.*
 Maria is what us helps
 ‘Maria is the one who helps us.’

Such cleft constructions are used more and more often, as more and more younger speakers of Tariana acquire proficiency in Portuguese — which is the symbol of status in indigenous communities, and especially mission

centres where many of the Tariana reside. They are rarer than constructions with left dislocation marked by a pause (also a phenomenon widespread in colloquial Portuguese, including Amazonian Portuguese). Such cleft constructions have not been so far documented for Tucanoan languages.

6. To conclude

Both Traditional and Innovative Tariana constitute prime examples of languages which combines portmanteau mechanisms for marking grammatical relations and information structure. Both employ special marking for topical non-subjects —a feature resulting from intensive areal diffusion from Tucanoan languages. Traditional Tariana has a number of other ways of encoding topics: these include variable position for tense, aspect and evidentiality clitics, and an applicative verbal derivation with a foregrounding effect. In Traditional Tariana, the clitic *-ne/-nhe* consistently marks a focussed subject.

Just like its relatives from the Arawak family, Traditional Tariana has discourse-dependent clausal constituent order which does not correlate with grammatical function. That is, grammatical relations do not correlate with the syntactic position of a constituent within a clause or a sentence. Alternative orders of clausal constituents bear different pragmatic overtones, with left periphery associated with topicality and right periphery with focus.

Gradual language obsolescence and intensified spread of contact-induced patterns from the dominant Tucano conspire to make Innovative Tariana appear more Tucano-like in the ways it encodes pragmatic concepts.

As a consequence of the influence of the dominant Tucano, with its predominantly verb-final clausal constituent order, Innovative Tariana is becoming predominantly verb-final. Under the influence of the dominant Tucano, the order of clausal constituent order is acquiring a strong verb-final tendency. The position of left-periphery is now strongly associated with topicality and left dislocation of a constituent (marked with an audible pause). The position of right periphery is associated with disambiguation and anti-topics. These patterns are also shared with Portuguese, another dominant language of the area. In addition, Innovative Tariana is developing an incipient cleft construction under Portuguese influence. The focussed subject marker is becoming obsolescent which is partly due to its coalescence with the comitative-instrumental marker as a result of the loss of the phonological contrast between simple *n* and aspirated *nh*.

We conclude that in Innovative Tariana linear position in a sentence or clause is acquiring new functions to do with marking information structure, partially replicating the Tucanoan pattern, and partially aligning with the patterns in Portuguese. Information structure remains encoded in the syntax and morphology of the innovative language — but the means of encoding are simpler in some ways, and more complex in others.

These results corroborate the diffusability of (a) clausal constituent order and (b) encoding pragmatic concepts, in a situation of intensive language contact with a pervasive societal multilingualism.

Notes

1. I am grateful to all my teachers of Tariana, the Britos of Santa Rosa and the Muniz of Periquitos, for teaching me their remarkable language. The data on Tariana and Tucano come from original fieldwork. Thanks are equally due to R. M. W. Dixon for incisive comments and insights.
2. Comparison between Tariana and closely related Arawak languages, such as Baniwa of Içana, helps distinguish between archaic inherited features on the one hand, and innovative and diffused traits on the other. This lies beyond the scope of this paper.
3. Abbreviations: 1, 2, 3 - first, second, third person; A - transitive subject; ANT - anterior; APPL - applicative; CL - classifier; EMPH - emphatic; FOC.A/S - focussed subject; INS - instrumental; LOC - locative; NOM - nominalizer; O - object of transitive verb; OBJ - object marker; PL - plural; PRES.VIS - present visual; REM.P.REP - remote past reported; S - subject of intransitive verb; S_a - subject of intransitive active verb; S_o - subject of intransitive stative verb; sgf - singular feminine; sgnf - singular nonfeminine; TOP.NON.A/S - topical non-subject.
4. The allomorph *-nhe* is used if the noun does not contain an aspirated consonant, e.g. *nawiki-nhe* (person-FOC.A/S). Otherwise, the allomorph *-ne* is selected, e.g. *hema-ne* (tapir-FOC.A/S), *ñhamepa-ne* (two+CL:HUMAN-FOC.A/S) ‘they two’.
5. A more archaic allomorph *-naku* used by the representatives of the older generation. The variant *-nuku* is used by younger people: in Innovative Tariana, enclitics tend to undergo assimilation between the two final vowels.
6. Here are throughout this paper, the formative *-ha* is not provided with a gloss, since forms like *diha* ‘he’, *nuha* ‘I’ etc can be considered fossilized.
7. Despite a formal similarity between *-na* ‘object marker on pronouns’ and *-naku* ‘topical non-subject’, there is no evidence for any historical link between these (see Aikhenvald 2006).

8. Alternatively, Tariana can be considered 'discourse-configurational' (cf. Kiss 1995). Note that I refrain from using the term 'word order' since it does not allow us to distinguish between order of individual words within a phrase (or phrasal constituent order) and order of clausal constituents.
9. Case marking in East Tucanoan languages and in Tariana also 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 being interpretable as instances of noun incorporation: see Barnes 1999: 220; Morse and Maxwell 1999: 70-1.) Exact correlations between constituent order and information structure in East Tucanoan languages require further investigation.
10. The lack of a common morpheme for focussed or contrastive subject among the East Tucanoan languages may suggest that this is a recent innovation. However, West Tucanoan languages Koreguaje and Siona spoken outside the Vaupés area have a marker marking subject (Aikhenvald 2006; Cook and Levinsohn 1985: 92-100; Wheeler 1967: 61-3; Wheeler 1987: 124-6), suggesting older origins of this pattern.
11. For ease of reference, the form is given in its archaic shape; the contemporary Traditional Tariana shape is *di-wape*.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.
1995 Person-marking and discourse in North-Arawak languages. *Studia Linguistica* 49: 152-95.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.
1998 Warekena. In *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, Desmond C. Derbyshire and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), vol. 4, 215-439. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.
2002 *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.
2003 *A Grammar of Tariana, from North-west Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.
2006 Semantics and pragmatics of grammatical relations in the Vaupés linguistic area. In *Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic typology*, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), 237-66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Aissen, Judith L.
1992 Topic and Focus in Mayan. *Language* 68: 43-80.
- Aissen, Judith L.
2003 Differential object marking: Iconicity vs economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 435-83
- Barnes, Janet.
1999 Tucano. In *The Amazonian languages*, R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), 207-26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, Judy B.
2001 Focusing the "right" way in Romance determiner phrases. *Probus* 13: 1-29.
- Bossong, Georg
1985 *Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Bossong, Georg
1991 Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In *New analyses in Romance linguistics*. Dieter Wanner and Douglas A. Kibbee (eds.), 143-70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Callou, Dinah, João Moraes, Yonne Leite, Mary A. Kato, Célia T. de Oliveira, Elenice Costa, Mônica Orsini, Violeta Rodrigues
1993 Topicalização e deslocamento à esquerda: sintaxe e prosódia. In *Gramática do Português Falado*, Vol. III. *As abordagens*, Ataliba Teixeira de Castilho (ed.), 315-60. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp/FAPEESP.
- Cook, Dorothy M. and Stephen Levinsohn
1985 Coreguaje: Domains of Focus Markers. In *From phonology to discourse: studies in six Colombian languages*, Ruth M. Brend (ed.), 91-116. Dallas: SIL.
- Cruse, Alan
2006 *A glossary of semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W.
1994 *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W.
2002 *Australian languages: their nature and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald
1997 A typology of argument-determined constructions. In *Essays on Language Function and Language Type*, Joan Bybee, John

- Haiman and Sandra Thompson (eds.), 71-113. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Donati, Caterina and Marina Nespore
2003 From focus to syntax. *Lingua* 113. 1119-1142.
- Frascarelli, Mara
2000 *The syntax-phonology interface in focus and topic Construction in Italian*. Amsterdam: Kluwer.
- Hale, Kenneth L.
1992 Basic word order in two "free word order" languages. Reprinted in *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*, Doris L. Payne (ed.), 63-82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Junker, Marie-Odile
2004 Focus, obviation, and word order in East Cree. *Lingua* 114: 345-365.
- Kinch, R. A.
1977 El enfoque temático vs el enfoque no temático en yuriti. *Estudios Tucanos II*: 129-75. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano: Lomalinda, Meta.
- Kiss, Katalin É.
1995 Introduction. In *Discourse configurational languages*, Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), 3-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koch, Ingedore G. Villaça, Clélia Cândida A. Spinardi Jubran, Hudinilson Urbano, Leonor L. Fávero, Luiz Antonio Marcuschi, Maria do Carmo O. T. Santos, Mercedes Sanfelice Risso
1996 Aspectos do processamento do fluxo de informação no discurso oral dialogado. In *Gramática do Português Falado*, Vol. 1. *A Ordem*, Ataliba Teixeira de Castilho (ed.), 143-84. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp/FAPESP.
- Lambrecht, Knud
1994 Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representation of discourse referents. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, Marion
1999 *Desano grammar*. Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Morse, Nancy L. and Maxwell, Michael B.
1999 *Gramática del Cubeo*. Santa Fé de Bogotá: Editorial Alberto Lleras Camargo.
- Mithun, Marianne
1987 Is basic word order universal?. In *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, Russell S. Tomlin (ed.), 281-328. Amsterdam: John

- Benjamins. (Reprinted in *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*, Doris L. Payne (ed.), 15-61, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.)
- Mithun, Marianne
2001 Understanding and explaining applicatives. *Proceedings from the Parasessions of the Thirty-seventh Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 37-1: 73-97.
- Olawsky, Knut
2006 *A grammar of Urarina*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya
2004 Topic and focus as linear notions: Evidence from Italian and Russian. *Lingua* 114: 325-344.
- Radetzky, Paula K.
2002 The functions and evolution of topic and focus markers. PhD Dissertation, University of California Berkeley.
- Ramirez, Henri
1997 *A fala Tukano dos Yepâ-masa. Tomo I. Gramática. Tomo III. Método de aprendizagem*. Manaus: Inspeção Salesiana Misionária da Amazônia.
- Rizzi, Luigi
1997 The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.). *Elements of grammar. Handbook in generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 281-337.
- Rizzi, Luigi
2002 Locality and left periphery. In A Belletti (ed). *Structures and beyond. The cartography of syntactic structures. Volume 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stenzel, Kristine S.
2004 *A reference grammar of Wanano*. PhD Dissertation. University of Colorado.
- Tarallo, Fernando and Mary Kato
1996 Preenchimento em fronteiras de constituintes. In *Gramática do Português Falado*, Vol. II. *Níveis de Análise Lingüística*, Rodolfo Ilari (ed.), 315-353 Campinas: Editora da Unicamp FAPESP.
- Waltz, Nathan and Caroline Waltz
1997 *El Agua, La Roca y El Humo. Estudios sobre la cultura wanana del Vaupés*. Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico del Verano.
- Wheeler, Alva
1967 Grammatical structures in Siona discourse. *Lingua* 19: 60-77.
- Wheeler, Alva

- 1987 *Gantëya Bain. El Pueblo Siona del río Putumayo, Colombia. Tomo 1: Etnología, Gramática, Textos.* Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano:
- Xu, Liejiong
2004 Manifestation of informational focus. *Lingua* 114: 277-299.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa
1998 *Prosody, focus, and word order.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.