

Blended grammar: Kumandene Tariana of northwest Amazonia

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald

Central Queensland University, Cairns, Australia <a.aikhenvald@cqu.edu.au>

Kumandene Tariana, a North Arawak language, spoken by about 40 people in the community of Santa Terezinha on the Iauari river (tributary of the Vaupés River in north-west Amazonia), can be considered a new blended language. The Kumandene Tariana moved to their present location from the middle Vaupés about two generations ago. They now intermarry with the Baniwa Hohôdene, speakers of a closely related language. This agrees with the principle of ‘linguistic exogamy’ common to most indigenous people within the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area. With Baniwa as the majority language, Kumandene Tariana is endangered. The only other extant variety of Tariana is the Wamiarikune Tariana dialect which has undergone strong influence from Tucano, the major language of the region. As a result of their divergent development, Kumandene Tariana and Wamiarikune Tariana are not mutually intelligible.

Over the past fifty years, speakers of Kumandene Tariana have acquired numerous Baniwa-like features in the grammar and lexicon. The extent of Baniwa impact on Kumandene Tariana varies depending on the speaker. Kumandene Tariana shares some similarities with other ‘blended’, or ‘merged’ languages. The influence of Baniwa is particularly instructive in the domain of verbal categories – negation, tense, aspect, and evidentiality.

KEYWORDS: Tariana, Arawak languages, Amazonian languages, blended languages, multilingualism.

1. Colonial expansion and linguistic repertoires in Amazonia

Lowland Amazonia is renowned for its linguistic diversity in terms of number of languages, their genetic affiliation, and their structural patterns. The European Invasion, from the late fifteenth century onwards, produced drastic changes in the linguistic landscape of the region. Genocide, slavery, and introduced diseases have taken their toll. We can estimate that more than two thirds of the original indigenous languages have become extinct since Europeans came along. The linguistic effects of European colonization went beyond mere depletion and loss.

Forced migrations and new contact situations brought about the emergence of new linguistic repertoires. European languages – especially Spanish and Portuguese – were introduced as national languages and languages of interethnic communication. New varieties of these two

– evolved within the South American context – bear the imprint of the original languages, many of them no longer spoken (see Lipski 2010, and a summary in Aikhenvald 2012: 26-32, *forthcoming*).

New realities brought about new languages. In a few instances, decimated tribes came to live together forming new conglomerate groups and creating new identities (see, for instance, Carlin 2011, on the emergence of a new merged group comprised of the Waiwai, Trio, and other North Carib speakers in Suriname). Languages spoken by merged groups with many ancestors are dauntingly complex and distinctly different from their genetic relatives. The known examples include Yucuna, an Arawak language from north-west Amazonia in Colombia, Palikur in the Brazilian state of Amapá and French Guyana, and Kamaiurá, a Tupí-Guaraní language from the Xingu park in Brazil.

New contact varieties emerged – among them Creoles and mission languages spread as *lingua francas*, ostensibly to facilitate interethnic communication. The best documented mission language is known as *Língua Geral Amazônica*, or *Nhêengatú* (literally, ‘good speech’), a regularized and streamlined variety of the now extinct Tupinambá, which was a widely spoken language along the Brazilian coast (as noted by Father Anchieta in 1595). The spread of *Língua Geral Amazônica* across the north-west Amazonia in Brazil started at the end of eighteenth century. *Língua Geral* replaced numerous original languages there (especially in the Upper Rio Negro region), and is still in active use (in 2002 it was accorded the status of an official language of the Federal Territory of the Upper Rio Negro, alongside Baniwa and Tucano). The lexical, and also grammatical, impact of *Língua Geral* is felt in many indigenous languages of the region.

Invaders and missionaries kept advancing into less accessible areas – including the remote regions of the Upper Rio Negro and the Vaupés river basin. The aim of secular invaders – the Portuguese in Brazil and the Spaniards in the adjacent regions of Colombia – was to make Indians work for them, procuring rubber and other jungle produce. The aim of the Catholic religious orders was to convert Indians to Christianity and get them to abandon their traditional ‘heathen’ and ‘devilish’ beliefs and practices, so as to catch as many souls as possible. Numerous groups ended up succumbing to the pressure. One chose to move away, seeking refuge in the remote depths of the jungle. The topic of this paper is a newly emerging language variety spoken by one such group – the Kumandene Tariana (**K-Tariana**, for short).

Currently, K-Tariana is a minority language spoken in one village on the Iauarí river, off the Vaupés. The village is dominated by speakers of Baniwa Hohôdene, a closely related but not mutually intelligible language. Continuous interaction with the dominant Baniwa has turned K-

Tariana into a new blended variety. We find the original Tariana features intertwined with Baniwa forms and meanings. Speakers lose track of the linguistic allegiance of individual forms, creating confusion of identity between them. The extent of Baniwa impact varies, depending on speaker's age, speech genre, and the audience, making it difficult to analyze. The degree of individual variation in K-Tariana is especially high among younger people (in their twenties and early thirties).

The K-Tariana language is endangered. Children and teenagers are no longer able to use it on a day-to-day basis. At the same time, K-Tariana is emblematic for the members of the tribe: it is the badge of their ethnic identity and the core of their marriage practices. K-Tariana is reminiscent of other 'blended', or 'merged' languages spoken in bilingual areas – including Surzhyk (a combination of Russian and Ukrainian), Trasjanka (a mixture of Russian and Belorussian), Portunhol (a merger of Spanish and Portuguese spoken in border areas in South America), Barranquenho (a blend of Spanish and Portuguese spoken in the Portuguese Barrancos on the border between Portugal and Spain), and the extinct Cocoliche (a blend of Italian and Spanish formerly spoken by Italian migrants in Argentina). But just how similar and how different? This is a question we attempt to address at the end of this paper.

In §2, we start with a brief outline of the history and the sociolinguistic situation of the K-Tariana. In §3, we look at K-Tariana within the context of the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area. A few critical phonological features of K-Tariana are addressed in §4. Then, in §5, we turn to the impact of Baniwa in the domain of verbal categories – negation, tense, aspect, evidentiality, and clause-linking. A few examples of the lexical impact of Baniwa on K-Tariana are in §6. The last section contrasts K-Tariana with blended languages documented thus far.

2. The Kumandene Tariana: a break-away group

K-Tariana is one of the two extant dialects of the Tariana language, once a large and powerful group spread all along the Vaupés river banks in Brazil. There are still about 3000 ethnic Tariana – most of whom have lost their language but not their ethnic allegiance. Tariana is the only language from the Arawak family within the multilingual Vaupés Basin Linguistic area. Tariana's closest relative is the Baniwa of Içana-Kurripako dialect continuum. Together with Piapoco and Guarequena, they form the Wapuí subgroup of Arawak languages. K-Tariana is spoken by about forty people in the village of Santa Terezinha on the Iauarí river, an off-shoot of the Vaupés (a tributary of the Rio Negro, which flows into the Amazon).

Less than half of the population of Santa Terezinha are K-Tariana. The majority are the Baniwa Hohôdene, speakers of a closely related, but not mutually intelligible language. The speakers of K-Tariana are multilingual – as is the practice across the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area. The K-Tariana are proficient in Baniwa and the unrelated Tucano; most people have good knowledge of the local Portuguese. K-Tariana is endangered: children no longer acquire it in full form.

The K-Tariana are relatively recent arrivals in their current village. The oldest members of the group (in their sixties) remember that their grandfathers had moved to their present location from their original land near the current mission centre of Iauaretê (mouth of the Papurí River). The move took place via the Aiary River, where the Baniwa Hohôdene language is spoken. This is where, according to the speakers, the K-Tariana started marrying Baniwa women.

The K-Tariana must have moved away from the Iauaretê region early in the twentieth century, as the Salesian missionaries intensified their hold on the area. From what their grandfathers told them, current speakers remember how the missionaries (*payu-nai* in K-Tariana, or *padres*, in Portuguese) told them to throw away all their ritual paraphernalia – and this was the last straw which got them to move on. Many of the Tariana around the Iauaretê area stayed behind; the K-Tariana chose not to.

A word-list collected by Koch-Grünberg (1910: 17, 23-4; 1911) during his stay in Iauaretê from the Kumandene (or ‘Kumatene’) Tariana in 1904 shows that the language was still spoken there then. The presence of the K-Tariana in the Iauaretê area was mentioned by Brüzzi (1961; 1977: 100-2). Nowadays, there are no K-Tariana left in that region. All the Tariana dialects originally spoken around Iauaretê are extinct.

The move of the K-Tariana to Santa Terezinha must have been completed by the early 1950s. This is confirmed by a list of 194 words collected by Father Alcionfilio Brüzzi in 1955, from forty-five year old Fabrícia of Santa Terezinha on the Iauarí River (1961: 34, 146-8) (through a Tucano interpreter). Most of these are identifiable as the same as K-Tariana spoken nowadays by older speakers (Aikhenvald 2014a: 334-5). This list is indicative of phonological changes which must have occurred during the past decades. Diagram 1 summarises the history of the recent migrations of the K-Tariana.

EARLY 20TH CENTURY: leaving the Iauaretê area and moving north
LATER: moving via the Aiary River and interacting with the Baniwa there
EARLY 1950S: established in Santa Terezinha on the Iauarí river

Diagram 1. The migrations of the Kumandene Tariana.

How does K-Tariana compare to the other extant dialect of the language, and how does it fit in with the Vaupés language situation and its linguistic practices? We will now consider this question.

3. The Kumandene Tariana in context

The only other extant dialect of Tariana is Wamiarikune Tariana (**W-Tariana**, for short). It is currently spoken on the banks of the Vaupés, in the mission centre Iauaretê and two villages up the river towards the Colombian border (Santa Rosa and Periquitos) (see the map in Aikhenvald 2014a). Just like K-Tariana, W-Tariana is endangered. There are about 70 speakers, and a handful of children who have a speaking knowledge of it. K-Tariana and W-Tariana are not mutually intelligible.¹

The W-Tariana moved to the margins of the Vaupés relatively recently (about 3-4 generations ago), forced by the Salesians to establish their settlements closer to mission centres. They used to live off the Vaupés on the banks of smaller rivulets, in the jungle clearings.

The W-Tariana are proficient in Tucano and a variety of other East-Tucanoan languages (including Wanano, Piratapuya, and Desano), and also local Portuguese. All W-Tariana today use mostly Tucano in their day-to-day lives. In terms of its grammatical structures, the language of the W-Tariana bears a tangible impact of East Tucanoan languages, and especially Tucano (there are numerous examples in Aikhenvald 2002, 2003, and also 2018).

The relationship between the K-Tariana and the W-Tariana is uneasy, to say the least. The K-Tariana are much higher on the Tariana tribal hierarchy than the W-Tariana.

The Tariana used to be divided into a number of hierarchically organised clans. The clans higher up in the hierarchy are said to have emerged first, from a hole in the Wapuí Rapids on the Aiary River. The exact names of clans and their hierarchy varies from one clan to another; most of the groups high on the hierarchy lost their language throughout the twentieth century (see Aikhenvald 2003: 11-24). Each group used to speak their own dialect. Differences between them appear to be comparable to those between Spanish and Portuguese. All the Tariana are classificatory agnatic relatives. Representatives of higher-ranking clans are ‘older siblings’ with respect to lower-ranking ones.

The Kumandene, or Kumada, derive their name from the ‘duck’ (*kumada*), a pet of the Trickster-Creator. They emerged from the smoke of the Creator’s Cigar (as did other higher-ranking tribes). This is in contrast to the W-Tariana who emerged later by floating on the surface of the

Wapuí rapids (hence their name, *Wa-amia-riku-ne* (1PL-float-LOC-PL), literally ‘people of the place where we floated’. The K-Tariana disparagingly refer to the W-Tariana as *iñe* ‘spirit of the jungle; devil’, and refer to their language as *iñe i-aku* (devil INDF-talk) ‘devil’s talk’.

In terms of their traditions, language attitudes, and marriage practices, both the W-Tariana and the K-Tariana are bona fide members of the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area (see Aikhenvald 2002, 2012, 2014a: 325-8, for discussion and further references), along the following lines.

First, the emblematic trait of the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area is its pervasive multilingualism and language-based exogamy. One can only marry someone who belongs to a different language group (see Aikhenvald 2012, *forthcoming*, for an outline of which groups are included in the marriage network). Marrying someone who is a speaker of the same language as oneself is referred to as ‘what dogs do’ by the Tariana and the East-Tucanoan people of the region.

Preferential marriage partners for the W-Tariana are the Wanano and the Piratapuya, and also Tucano. The preferential marriage partners for the K-Tariana are the Baniwa (mostly Hohôdene). All speakers of K-Tariana are proficient in Baniwa, with many being proficient in Tucano (which they need because of their travels to Iauaretê), and some in Portuguese. The village meetings and much of the day-to-day interaction is conducted in Baniwa – the majority language of the village.

Secondly, language and group allegiance is inherited through one’s father. Only someone whose father is Tariana counts as a Tariana. This is true for both dialects.

Thirdly, different languages are kept strictly separate. There have been, traditionally, very few if any loan forms from one’s wife’s language or other languages. This is generally true for the W-Tariana (where there are hardly any loans from East Tucanoan languages), but not for the K-Tariana, as we will see throughout the paper.

The W-Tariana and the K-Tariana are critical of each other. The K-Tariana say that the W-Tariana (the ‘devils’) speak only Tucano. They have a point there: the structural impact of Tucano on the W-Tariana is quite substantial. And the W-Tariana criticise the K-Tariana for ‘speaking Baniwa’ and being Baniwa-like in their customs (e.g. affecting people with poison rather than ‘evil breath’). They have a point there, too – the Baniwa impact on the K-Tariana phonology and grammar is rather striking.

The inherent instability of the Santa Terezinha village contributes to the loss of K-Tariana. The villagers stay together in Santa Terezinha only during approximately half of the year (roughly coinciding with school terms). Between June and August, and then between about October and February, each family moves away to their gardens further up the Iauarí,

into the jungle, to procure garden produce and smoked fish (their main cash crops). The community breaks up; during seasonal movements, Baniwa tends to be the main language within each family. This is in contrast to the practices of the W-Tariana who stay together in their locations. We start with a few observations on the phonology of K-Tariana.

4. *The sounds of Kumandene Tariana*

My first encounter with a speaker of K-Tariana took place in a W-Tariana speaking village Santa Rosa in June 1999. A group of men from Santa Terezinha arrived in the village, with Roni Lopes and his family among them. Roni told me about his hunting experiences. We then spent a couple of days working on the language. Continuous comments from the W-Tariana speaking men helped me take in the differences between the two varieties. The presence of distinctive Baniwa sounds in Roni's Tariana alerted me to a potential contact-induced change. When, in 2012, I went to Santa Terezinha (accompanied by Jovino, my adopted brother and a competent speaker of W-Tariana), the K-Tariana I was exposed to struck me even more as Baniwa-sounding. And indeed, K-Tariana is in the process of acquiring two Baniwa consonants absent from the old K-Tariana (recorded in 1955) and from W-Tariana.

First, Baniwa has a retroflex voiced fricative *ʒ* (correspondent of the flap *r* in W-Tariana and *r* in old K-Tariana, especially before high vowels). Secondly, Baniwa distinguishes between a voiceless alveopalatal affricate *ts* (correspondent of W-Tariana and K-Tariana *ts*) and its voiced counterpart *dz* (correspondent of W-Tariana and K-Tariana *y*). The Baniwa phonemes *ʒ* and *dz* are the ones that are making their way into the new K-Tariana.

The phonological systems of Baniwa, W-Tariana and K-Tariana are similar, but not identical. Phonological systems of W-Tariana, K-Tariana, and Baniwa are in the Appendix. 'New' consonants in K-Tariana are in shaded cells. The emergence of the retroflex voiced fricative in the new K-Tariana is illustrated in (1).

(1) <i>inaru</i>	W-Tariana
<i>inaru</i>	old K-Tariana
<i>inažu</i>	new K-Tariana
<i>inažu</i>	Baniwa Hohôdene
'woman'	

Speakers are aware of these differences. In our work on an ABC in K-Tariana, including *ʒ* in the examples was considered inappropriate – despite the fact that most people were using it.

The voiced fricative is now frequent among speakers of all ages, especially younger ones. Such Baniwa-like pronunciation of K-Tariana *r* before high vowels is a feature of many frequently occurring forms, e.g. the third person feminine prefix *ru-* pronounced as *ʒu-*; the corresponding suffix *-ru* as *-ʒu* and the derivational masculine singular suffix *-ri* as *-ʒi*.

The eighty-year-old Nazarea, herself a Baniwa speaker keen on the maintenance of K-Tariana, volunteered the following set to me:

(2) <i>dza:tte</i>	Baniwa Hohôdene
<i>ya:tse</i>	‘correct’ K-Tariana ²
<i>ya:se</i>	W-Tariana
‘toucan’	

The following day, two almost tame toucan birds in the village were referred to, by 40-50 year olds, as *dza:tse* ‘toucan’. This form was also used by Roni Lopes (who pronounced this same word as *ya:tse* back in 1999). These are just two, most striking examples of K-Tariana sounding Baniwa-like. The incursion of Baniwa phonemes into K-Tariana leads to the confusion of identity between the original K-Tariana and Baniwa forms. We return to this in §6.

5. *The impact of Baniwa on K-Tariana grammar: focus on verbal categories*

The Baniwa-like phonetic make-up of K-Tariana goes hand-in-hand with striking grammatical changes. These span all the areas of the grammar (see Aikhenvald 2014a on demonstratives, cross-referencing and derivational markers, discourse markers, nominal tense, and other categories). My focus here is on verbal categories – the marking of clausal negation (§5.1), the expression of future (§5.2), evidentiality, tense, and aspect (§5.3), and clause-linking markers (§5.4).

In each case, the mechanisms involved include (a) adding new forms, (b) losing the forms and the distinctions not found in Baniwa, and (c) enhancement of an already existing form. Interim conclusions are in §5.5.

5.1 *Negation*

The marking of clausal negation is a feature which sets apart the traditional K-Tariana from W-Tariana. In K-Tariana, negation is marked on the verb just with the suffix *-de*. In W-Tariana, negation is marked with the prefix *ma-* and the suffix *-kade* or *-de* (this is an innovation in W-Tariana, absent from other documented varieties of Tariana).³

Guire, a K-Tariana purist, singled out this difference in his explanation of how the W-Tariana ‘do not speak right’, in (3). The negative forms are deitalicised.

(3) K-Tariana: traditional

wha mayakani li-nu-de *wa:*,
we straight 3SG-come-NEG 1PL.say

nha Iwi-taku-peni ma-nu-kade *na:*
they Salt-point-PL.ANIM NEG-come-NEG 3PL.say

‘We say straight: *linude* (‘he is not coming’), they, the Santa Rosa people (lit. people of the Point of salt) say *manukade* (not-come-not, ‘he is not coming’).

Baniwa marks negation differently, using the clause-initial particle *ñame* or *ña*. This negative particle has made its way into K-Tariana. Two patterns emerge. Of seventy negative clauses in the corpus recorded in 2012 (that is, planned and careful discourse), six contain the Baniwa form *ñame*. In three of these, *ñame* is accompanied by the K-Tariana negative form with the suffix *-de*. This is a mixed K-Tariana-Baniwa pattern, exemplified under A. In the other three the Baniwa *ñame* is used with the positive K-Tariana form. This is a replacive pattern, exemplified under B. In each instance, there is no tense marking, as this is obvious from the context (similar to Baniwa).

A. MIXED PATTERN: *ÑAME* VERB-*DE*. An example is at (4), from a story by Laura, in her early fifties.

(4) K-Tariana

ñame *nu-keta-de* *li-ñale-ka*
NEG:BANIWA 1SG-get/encounter-NEG 3SGNF-disappear-SUB
‘I didn’t get (him), as he disappeared’.

Pattern A is frequently used in conversations by speakers in their forties to sixties. In 1999, Roni did not use this. In 2012, he did, in a narrative about his day-to-day life – see (5).

(5) K-Tariana

ñame *hanipa* *na-kawita-de*
NEG:BANIWA much 3PL-pay-NEG
‘They didn’t pay much’.

The negator *ñame* occupies the clause-initial position, just like in Baniwa. Note that tense is marked once per paragraph, and does not have to be expressed on every sentence or clause, similarly to Baniwa (but unlike W-Tariana) (see §5.3).

B. REPLACIVE PATTERN. Using the Baniwa negator *ñame* with a positive verb form is generally a feature of younger people (in their twenties and early thirties), but it is also used by older speakers. In (6), Laura is speaking about herself.

- (6) K-Tariana
ñame nu-anihta ha-ehkwapi
 NEG:BANIWA 1SG-understand DEM-CL:WORLD
 ‘I don’t understand this world’.

In (7), Neusa (in her late twenties) was talking about her bleak future, after her husband’s suicide. The restrictive suffix *-tsa* (see Ramirez 2001) is a Baniwa form.

- (7) K-Tariana
ñame-tsa pa-kapa
 NEG:BANIWA-RESTR:BANIWA IMP-see
 ‘One cannot see (what’s going to happen)’.

Both the mixed pattern and the replacive pattern are rejected by the purists in K-Tariana. However, they are the ones which are used the most, especially so by younger speakers.

In K-Tariana, the form *ñame* is almost uniformly used as a negative reply, ‘no’. W-Tariana uses *hyukade* (lit. *hiku-kade* appear-NEG, ‘not appear’). This same form existed in K-Tariana in 1955 (*uhyakade, ihyakate*: Brüzzi 1961: 146-8), and was used by Roni in 1999. The negative particle must have spread into K-Tariana during the last decade. Table 1 summarises the innovations in negation marking in K-Tariana, and its Baniwa features the language is in the process of acquiring.

CATEGORY	COMMENTS	EXAMPLES	COMMENT
Negative suffix <i>-de</i> on the verb	Considered ‘correct’ K-Tariana by purists; used by older speakers and occasionally younger ones	(3)	Traditional pattern
Marking negation with the Baniwa particle <i>ñame</i> ‘negation’ and the negative suffix <i>de</i> on the verb	Used by all generations of speakers; frowned upon by purists <i>ñame</i> is recognisably Baniwa	(4), (5)	Mixed pattern, Baniwa form used
Marking negation with the Baniwa particle <i>ñame</i> ‘negation’ and the positive form of the verb.	Just occasionally used by older speakers, used by younger speakers; frowned upon by purists since <i>ñame</i> is recognisably Baniwa	(6), (7)	Replacive pattern, Baniwa form used

Table 1. Innovations in K-Tariana negation marking under Baniwa influence.

5.2. Future

The future in both W-Tariana and the traditional K-Tariana has two forms:

- the definite future enclitic =*de* is used only with first person (see Table 2);
- the enclitic =*mhade* marks (a) uncertain future with first person (something I am not sure I will do), and (b) future with other persons.

This system is the result of a calque from Tucano (see Aikhenvald 2002: 126-7). Both clitics can attach to the verb, or to any topical constituent within the clause. Future in Tariana is different from the intentional modality (W-Tariana *-kasu*, traditional K-Tariana *k-atse*: see Aikhenvald 2003; 2014a). There are no evidentiality distinctions in the future.

Baniwa has only one future marker, suffix *-watsa* (Ramirez 2001: 218-20), with the same form for all persons.

Older speakers of K-Tariana use =*de* for the first person definite future in planned narratives. Younger speakers employ just =*mhade* for all persons, adjusting to the Baniwa pattern; so do older speakers in conversations. These change are summarised in Table 2.

MARKING	W-TARIANA	K-TARIANA	BANIWA
= <i>de</i>	definite future (1 st person)	1999, one older speaker: definite future (1 st person in statements, and also 2 nd person in questions) 2012, older speakers: first person in statements	- <i>watsa</i>
= <i>mhade</i>	uncertain future (1 st person); any future (non-1 st person)	1999, older speaker: uncertain future (1 st person); any future (non-1 st person) 2012, all speakers: future with any person	

Table 2. The expression of future in K-Tariana compared with W-Tariana and Baniwa.

An example of the future marker =*mhade* (deitalicised) rather than =*de* with first person is at (8). This is the beginning of a story by Francisco, one of the oldest speakers of the language (told in 2012). For a traditional speaker, =*de* would have been appropriate because he is definitely going to tell me what he knows.

(8) K-Tariana

hī kika hī = mhade nu-kalite nu-keñwa pi-na
 this thus this = FUT 1SG-tell 1SG-start 2SG-OBJ
kwaka, nu-kalite pi-na tuki-ya = mhade nu-kalite nu-yekha-li
 what 1SG-tell 2SG-OBJ little-EMPH = FUT 1SG-tell 1SG-know-NOM.RES
 ‘I will start telling you this, what’s it, I will tell you the little I know’.

In 1999, Roni Lopes used the certain future = *de* ‘future’ with first person speaker, and second person addressee in a question (following what is known as ‘conjunct-disjunct’ pattern), as shown in (9a). Speakers of W-Tariana corrected this = *de* to = *mhade* (in W-Tariana, = *de* can only be used with first person subject) (as shown in (9b)).

(9a) K-Tariana (1999)

<i>Khani</i> = <i>de</i>	<i>pima</i>
where = FUT.CERT	2SG.sleep
‘Where will you sleep?’	

(9b) W-Tariana

<i>Kani</i> = <i>mhade</i>	<i>pima</i>
where = FUT	2SG.sleep
‘Where will you sleep?’	

In 2012, Roni used both = *de* and = *mhade* with first person interchangeably. (10) comes from the beginning of a hunting story. He starts with = *de*, and then corrects himself to = *mhade*, following the pattern prevalent among younger speakers who were standing around us.

(10) K-Tariana (2012)

<i>Hĩ</i> = <i>de</i>		<i>nu-kalite</i>	<i>pi-na</i>	
this = FUT.CERT		1SG-tell	2SG-OBJ	
<i>hlia</i>	<i>kweka</i>	<i>nu-emhani-nipe</i>		
this:BANIWA	how	1SG-walk around-NOM.ACTION		
<i>nhulitu-nipe</i>		<i>nu-emhani</i>		
1SG.fish-NOM.ACTION		1SG-walk around-NOM.ACTION		
<i>Hlia</i> = <i>de</i>	PAUSE	<i>hĩ</i> = <i>mhade</i>	<i>nu-kalite</i>	<i>pi-na</i>
this:BANIWA = FUT.CERT		this = FUT	1SG-tell	2SG-OBJ
‘I will tell you this, this, how I went around, went around fishing. This I will tell you’				

The loss of the first person certain future is not quite complete; but the distinction between two future forms for first person is on its way out, in all likelihood, under pressure from Baniwa. Quite possibly, = *de* is losing ground because of its partial homonymy with the suffixed negator *-de* which is still quite strong (see §5.1).

5.3. Evidentiality, tense, and aspect

The expression, and the marking, of evidentiality and tense is what sets Baniwa apart from Tariana. We look at the marking of evidentiality in §5.3.1, and then move on to the expression of tense and of aspect in §5.3.2. As mentioned in §5.1, tense is marked once per paragraph, and is

not obligatory in every sentence or clause, similarly to Baniwa (but unlike W-Tariana).

5.3.1. Evidentiality and tense

Grammaticalised expression of information source fused with tense is a salient feature of W-Tariana and all other languages of the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area (see Aikhenvald 2012, *forthcoming*, 2018; Stenzel & Gomez-Imbert 2018). W-Tariana distinguishes five evidentials fused with tense (present, recent past and remote past) in declarative clauses. Every sentence has to be marked for tense and evidentiality, with the clitics listed in Table 3. In contrast, Baniwa has only one, reported evidential, also a clitic, =*pida*. This is used towards the beginning of a sentence, and can attach to a member of any word class. The reported evidential in Baniwa does not have to occur on every sentence, once the information source has been established for the whole paragraph. The reported evidential in Baniwa is cognate to the reported evidentials in W-Tariana, but it does not distinguish tense. Evidentials and tense in W-Tariana, K-Tariana and Baniwa are contrasted in Table 3.

	W-TARIANA			K-TARIANA	BANIWA
EVIDENTIAL VALUE	PRESENT	RECENT PAST	REMOTE PAST	NO TENSE	NO TENSE
VISUAL	= <i>naka</i> , archaic = <i>nuka</i>	= <i>ka</i>	= <i>na</i>	= <i>nuka</i> (optional for most speakers)	—
NONVISUAL	= <i>mha</i>	= <i>mah-ka</i>	= <i>mha-na</i>	= <i>mha</i> (rarely used)	
ASSUMED	—	= <i>si-ka</i>	= <i>si-na</i>	= <i>tsi</i> ‘inferred’ = <i>tsina</i> (restricted to traditional stories only)	
INFERRED BASED ON VISUAL EVIDENCE	—	= <i>nhi-ka</i> (from ANT- REC.P)	= <i>nhi-na</i> (from ANT- REM.P)		
REPORTED	= <i>pida</i>	= <i>pida-ka</i>	= <i>pida-na</i>	= <i>pida</i>	= <i>pida</i>

Table 3. Evidentials in declarative clauses in W-Tariana, Baniwa and K-Tariana.

At present, K-Tariana does not have tense distinctions in evidentials. In the materials recorded in 1999 and 2012, the visual evidential is hardly ever used. There is only one occurrence of the visual evidential = *nuka* in about 100 clauses in the recorded texts where W-Tariana speakers judged it appropriate. Visually acquired information and commonly known facts

where the visual evidential would be appropriate have no evidential marking, as we saw in examples (3)-(7).

The non-visual evidential = *mha* can be used if the speaker cannot see what is being talked about. When asked whether he had any pepper with him, Guire, a traditional speaker and a purist, said (11): he did not have any pepper with him, and couldn't see it but could smell it in the next door cooking house.

- (11) K-Tariana
alia = *mha*
exist = NON.VIS
'It (pepper) is there.' (non-visual evidential: information obtained through smell)

Younger people tend to omit the non-visual evidential in conversations. The inferred evidential (based on visual traces) – a relatively recent development in W-Tariana from a reinterpretation of the sequence of anterior plus tense-marking – is not used in K-Tariana at all. We can hypothesise that it may not have developed there. The evidential = *tsi* is used to cover inference and assumption. The evidential = *pida* is used to mark reported and quoted information.

Evidentials are used as token of narrative genres in Baniwa, Tariana, and all the languages within the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area. All myths and narratives about past times and ancestral travels in Baniwa contain the reported evidential = *pida*. The remote past reported evidential = *pidana* in W-Tariana is an obligatory feature of animal stories, tales, and myths. In these contexts, K-Tariana uses the reported = *pida* (without tense distinctions).

In the past, evidentials in K-Tariana may have distinguished tense. The evidence comes from stories told by older speakers of the language. In W-Tariana, culturally important traditional stories such as origin myths and ancestral travels contain the remote past assumed evidential = *sina* (Aikhenvald 2003: 300). The use of the assumed evidential as a marker of a narrative genre is shared with two East Tucanoan languages of the region, Tukano (Ramirez 1997: 140) and Desano (Miller 1999: 67). A very similar use of a cognate form = *tsina* has been attested in stories about the travels of ancestors of the the K-Tariana. Unlike in W-Tariana, the K-Tariana = *tsina* appears once, at the beginning of a story. This is shown in (12), from a story about the historical origins of the Tariana by Francisco, one of the oldest speakers.

- (12) K-Tariana: traditional
Wha walikatsu hahī nu-kalite nu-keñuwa
we beginningthis.very 1SG-tell 1SG-start

<i>pi-na</i> ,	<i>walikatsu</i>	<i>wa-miña = nhi</i>	<i>wha</i> ,	
2SG-OBJ	beginning	1PL-appear = COMPL	we	
<i>kweka</i>	<i>hĩ</i>	<i>Myaka-pani</i> ,	<i>myaka-pi</i>	<i>walikatsu</i> ,
how	this	Ancestor-rapid	Ancestor-CL:LONG	beginning
<i>kwe = tsina</i>		<i>wa-ni</i>	<i>wa-miña</i>	
how = REM.P.ASSUMED		1PL-do	1PL-appear	

'Our beginning(s), this very one, I am starting to tell you, (in the) beginning we appeared, how at these Ancestor's rapids, Ancestor area (Wapuĩ-Rapids) at the beginning, how we acted to appear'

In W-Tariana, the evidential would have been used on every sentence. The K-Tariana form = *tsina* appeared to be familiar to all the speakers, but no other speakers used it.

The form = *tsina* 'assumed evidential used in stories referring to past times' is cognate to W-Tariana = *sina* 'remote past assumed evidential'. It exists alongside the K-Tariana = *tsi* 'assumed evidential'. The opposition of = *tsi* 'assumed evidential' and = *tsi-na* 'assumed evidential used in stories referring to past times' is suggestive of a former tense-distinction in evidentials in K-Tariana, parallel to those in W-Tariana, with the formative *-na* marking remote past tense. Without this piece of evidence, it would have been impossible to ascertain whether K-Tariana ever had any tense distinctions in evidentials, since older sources on K-Tariana do not contain enough grammatical information.

We can thus conclude that K-Tariana must have lost tense distinctions in evidentials, under pressure from Baniwa. The only evidential which is consistently used is the reported = *pida*, cognate to the Baniwa form. The K-Tariana = *pida* has taken over a number of usages attested in Baniwa (but not in W-Tariana), including quotative in questions (further details are in Aikhenvald 2014a: 350).

5.3.2. Tense and aspect

The loss of tense distinctions in K-Tariana evidentials has left a gap in its grammatical tense marking. This gap has been, or is in the process of being, filled through

- (i) using a Baniwa marker of remote past tense *-pia* (for which no cognates are available in Tariana), and
- (ii) adjusting the Tariana anterior enclitic = *nhi* to the frequently used Baniwa form *-hini*.

Statements in present tense or near future are formally unmarked (as we saw in (6), (7) and the first clause in (12)). Table 4 summarises the marking of tense and aspect in K-Tariana, compared to W-Tariana and Baniwa.

VALUE	W-TARIANA	VALUE	K-TARIANA	BANIWA
ANTERIOR	= <i>nhi</i>	COMPLETIVE, PAST	= <i>nhi</i> , (-) <i>hini</i> , (-) <i>hina</i>	- <i>hini</i>
REMOTE PAST	- <i>na</i> : See Table 3: fused with evidentiality	REMOTE PAST	= <i>pia</i>	- <i>pia</i>

Table 4. Tense and aspect in W-Tariana, Baniwa, and K-Tariana.

The remote past marker *-pia* is used by all generations of K-Tariana speakers (with the exception of the traditional purists who avoid it in careful conversations and stories). Similar to Baniwa, the marker does not have to occur on every sentence within a narrative: once the past tense reference has been established, it does not have to be repeated (Ramirez 2001: 222-4; examples in Cardoso 2012). (13) comes from a story by Roni about what he had been doing the previous months. He pronounced *pia* as an independent word; other speakers treated it as a suffix or an enclitic.

(13) K-Tariana

nu-nu-peta *te* *ā-tse* *nu-yakale-tse-peta*
 1SG-come-again until there-LOC 1SG-village-LOC-again
ā-tse *nu-yakale-tse-peta* *pia*
 there-LOC 1SG-village-LOC-again REM.P
 ‘I came on again, until (I got) there to my village again, there to my village again’.

W-Tariana and K-Tariana share the enclitic = *nhi*. In W-Tariana it has the meaning of anterior, that is an action which started before the time-frame of the narrative or before the moment of speech, and continues to be relevant at the moment of speech (Aikhenvald 2003: 330-7). The same form in K-Tariana is used interchangeably with *hini* and *hina* (both can be phonologically bound or free, depending on the speed of speech), marking any completed action in the recent past (especially that relevant to present). This is a feature of speakers of all generations (including Roni in 1999 and 2012). Both *hini* and *hina* come from Baniwa. Both have been identified as ‘incorrect’ by the linguistically-minded purist Guire. (14) is from a story about Santa Terezinha, by Francisco, one of the oldest speakers.

(14) K-Tariana

Hī *kedali* *wha* *wa* *wa-tawina-hini*
 this/here this.CL:ANIM we 1PL.go 1PL-grow-COMPL
 ‘Here we grew up like this’.

The development of = *nhi* into a completive marker and its interchangeability with the Baniwa form *-hini* ‘completive’ (Ramirez 2001: 232-3, Bezerra 2005: 117, 132) can be interpreted as an instance of gram-

matical accommodation. A K-Tariana morphological marker has adapted its meaning to a segmentally similar (and maybe cognate) form *-hini* in a related language, Baniwa (see Aikhenvald 2006: 24, and references there, on the process of grammatical accommodation). K-Tariana went even further, adopting the Baniwa form *hini* as an alternative to *-nhi*.

The origin of the K-Tariana *hina* appears to be more complex. This form bears segmental similarity to Baniwa *-i:na* ‘recently completed action’ (see the description of its meanings in Ramirez 2001: 225), and could be a blend of *=nhi* and *-i:na*.⁴

In summary, the impact of Baniwa on the expression of evidentiality and tense in K-Tariana has resulted in

- loss of tense distinctions in evidentials (preserved only in formulaic marking of ancestral stories),
- loss of obligatory evidentiality,
- introduction of Baniwa markers of remote past tense and completive aspect, and
- reinterpretation of the erstwhile anterior marker as completive marker and its confusion with the newly introduced Baniwa look-alike (and potential cognate).

5.4. Clause-linking markers

Baniwa and Tariana have few if any clause-linking conjunctions. Linking clauses is achieved through enclitics or suffixes on verbs. The makers employed in K-Tariana bear a distinct imprint of Baniwa.

W-Tariana has ten clause-linking enclitics most of which tend to be switch-reference sensitive (that is, are used depending on whether the subject of the dependent clause is the same of that in the main clause or different from it), in addition to four which are not switch-reference sensitive (Aikhenvald 2003: 516-30). There is also a general subordinating enclitic *=ka*, one of whose functions is that of a complementizer. These are listed in Table 5.

RELATIVE TENSE OF ACTION IN A NON-MAIN CLAUSE	SAME SUBJECT	DIFFERENT SUBJECT
PRIOR TO THAT OF THE MAIN CLAUSE	<i>=hyume/ =yuhme</i> ‘after; because’	<i>=kayami</i> ‘after’
SIMULTANEOUS WITH THAT OF THE MAIN CLAUSE	<i>=nikhe, =kakali</i> ‘during, while’	<i>=nisawa, =kanada, =nipua, =piyana, =ka=liku, =kapua</i> ‘while, during’
NOT SWITCH-REFERENCE SENSITIVE MARKERS	<i>=kaya</i> ‘while’, <i>=khe, =nikhe, =kheya</i> ‘despite’ <i>=ka</i> ‘general subordinator (‘when, if’); complementizer’	

Table 5. Clause-linking enclitics in W-Tariana.

Switch-reference in W-Tariana developed as a result of the impact of East Tucanoan languages. It is not clear whether K-Tariana ever had switch-reference. At present, K-Tariana has just two clause-linking markers. One of them is the general subordinator =*ka* ‘as, if, when; complementizer’ (see (4)). This is shared with W-Tariana and also Baniwa (Ramirez 2001: 241-3; Bezerra 2005: 134-5). The other one is the suffix *-kada* ‘when, if’, from Baniwa *-kada*: ‘when, if’ (Ramirez 2001: 244-6, Bezerra 2005: 125-6). The suffix is used by all generations of speakers (there are no examples of this suffix in the 1999 materials, or any earlier attestations of the language). (15) comes from a story by Francisco (one of the oldest speakers). (16) comes from a story by Neusa, a young speaker.

(15) K-Tariana

<i>hī</i>	<i>kika</i>	<i>nhuani</i>	<i>liwetse</i>	<i>yanape-kada</i>
this	thus	I.COMPL	then	be_child-when
<i>kwamhe</i>		<i>nu-anheta</i>		<i>hekwapi</i>
more_or_less		1SG-remember		day/world

‘This I remembered this way, the world, when I was a child’.

(16) K-Tariana

<i>hī</i>	<i>kaya = mhade</i>	<i>nu-keta</i>	
this	thus = FUT	1SG-meet	
<i>numa-kahwi-kada</i>	<i>nu-na</i>	<i>ha-ehkwapi</i>	
1SG.sleep-wake_up-when	1SG-OBJ	this:INANIMATE-world	

‘I will encounter this when I sleep and wake up for me (in) the world’.

The clause-linking suffix *-kada* has the same segmental form as the classifier *-kada* with the meaning of temporal extent, glossed ‘CLASSIFIER:DAY’, used in both W-Tariana and K-Tariana (which may well be cognate to the Baniwa clause linker *-kada*:). The linker *-kada* in K-Tariana is used much less frequently than =*ka* ‘general subordinator, complementizer’ shared with Baniwa.

The Baniwa clause-linking suffix *-kada:na* ‘while’ is also making its way into K-Tariana. It was used by Neusa in her life story – see (17), where *-kadana* appears accompanied by the emphatic suffix *-itsa* (with which it is fused).

(17) K-Tariana

<i>pa:pi</i>	<i>keži-yali</i>	<i>li-ema-ka</i>	
one.CL:LONG	month/moon-CL:CYCLE	3SGNF-stay-DECL	
<i>tsurara-kali-tse</i>	<i>ke:nipete-kadanitsa</i>	<i>nhua</i>	
soldier-NOMINAL.PAST-LOC	REL.child.CL:ANIM-while.EMPH	I	

‘He stayed (there) as a soldier for a month while I was with child’.

The Baniwa clause-linking suffix is accompanied by the emphatic *-(i)tsa*, also of Baniwa origin.

5.5. An interim conclusion

The impact of Baniwa on the verbal categories in K-Tariana involves
 (a) adding new forms,
 (b) losing the forms and the distinctions not found in Baniwa,
 (c) retention and enhancement of those Tariana forms which have cognate shared forms in Baniwa.

The expression of negation exemplifies (a) and (b). The expression of future is an example of (b). The expression of tense, aspect, and evidentiality shows (a) and (c). The marking of clause-linking involves (a) and (c). A summary of Baniwa impact on the Tariana verbal categories addressed here is in Table 6.

CATEGORY	MECHANISM	K-TARIANA FORMS AND PATTERNS	BANIWA FORMS AND PATTERNS	SEE
NEGATION	(a) adding a new form	negative particle <i>ñame</i>	negative particle <i>ñame</i>	§5.1
	(b) losing a distinction	loss of negative suffix on verb	no negative suffix on verb	
FUTURE	(b) losing a distinction	loss of certain future in first person on verb	no certain future on first person on verb	§5.2
EVIDENTIALITY	(b) losing a distinction	losing tense distinctions on evidentials	no tense distinctions on evidentials	§5.3.1
	(c) enhancing an existing cognate form	maintenance and use of reported evidential = <i>pida</i>	reported evidential = <i>pida</i>	
TENSE-ASPECT	(a) adding a new form	remote past (-) <i>pia</i>	remote past <i>-pia</i>	§5.3.2
	(c) enhancing and reinterpreting an existing form	perfective/completive = <i>nhi</i> , (-) <i>hini</i> , (-) <i>hina</i>	perfective/completive <i>-hini</i> recent completive <i>-hina</i>	
CLAUSE-LINKING	(a) adding a new form	<i>-kada</i> ‘when, if’	<i>-kada</i> : ‘when, if’	§5.4
	(c) enhancing an existing cognate form	= <i>ka</i> ‘general subordinator, complementizer’	<i>-ka</i> ‘general subordinator, complementizer’	

Table 6. Baniwa impact on the K-Tariana verbal categories: mechanisms and outcomes.

Similar phenomena are found in nominal morphology. The Baniwa ablative suffix *-(h)itte* ‘from’ was used on the K-Tariana noun phrase *ñapu yepu-* (river down) ‘downriver’, as *ñapu yepu-ite* ‘from downriver’ (instead of the Tariana form *-tse* ‘locative’, that is, *ñapu yepu-se*) (examples of insertions of Baniwa demonstratives are in (10); further examples are in

Aikhenvald 2104a). The net result is a truly hybrid, or blended grammar – a Tariana dialect with an overlay of Baniwa.

6. Further impact of Baniwa on Kumandene Tariana

Baniwa is the main language used by the Santa Terezinha villagers at all times. We have seen that the main outcomes of Baniwa influence on K-Tariana involve obsolescence of forms and structures which are not shared with Baniwa and the enhancement of those which are. The consonants of K-Tariana bear a distinctive ‘Baniwa-accent’ (which we discussed in §4). Cognate forms between K-Tariana and Baniwa tend to be adjusted to Baniwa. This phenomenon is known as phonological loanshift (see, e.g., Haugen 1969, Aikhenvald 2006). For instance, the K-Tariana form *-inu* ‘kill, hunt’ (Brüzzi 1961: 146-8) corresponds to Baniwa *-inua* ‘kill, hunt’. In 1999, Roni used the form *-inu*. In 2012, everyone in the village was using *-inua* as a bona fide Tariana form. The Baniwa form *-keñua* ‘begin’ has impacted the K-Tariana *keña*: the form *-keñwa* is now the predominant one (see (8)). The K-Tariana time word *heku* ‘yesterday’ was used by Roni and his family in 1999, and in 2012 (see this form in Koch-Grünberg 1911: 285). Most villagers – including Roni when he is among them – pronounce it as *wheku*, under the influence of Baniwa *wheekodza* ‘yesterday’.

An example of semantic loanshift are the words for ‘sun’ and ‘moon’. Similarly to W-Tariana, K-Tariana originally used one term for both (under the influence of East Tucanoan languages). Older speakers (including Francisco, Roni, and also Laura) still tend to. But most people use the cognate of Baniwa word meaning ‘sun’ for ‘sun’, and the former term meaning ‘sun, moon’ for ‘moon’ (incidentally, returning to its original meaning in the proto-language). Table 7 summarises this. The form *kamuy* in the meaning of ‘summer heat, year cycle’ is in use in W-Tariana and older varieties of K-Tariana.

PROTO-ARAWAK	BANIWA	K-TARIANA (2012, MOST SPEAKERS)	K-TARIANA (2012, OLD SPEAKERS)	K-TARIANA (1999, OLDER SOURCES)	W-TARIANA	CF. UNRELATED TUCANO
* <i>ketsi</i> ‘moon’	<i>ke:ži</i> ‘moon’	<i>ke:ži</i> ‘moon’	<i>ke:ri, ke:ži</i> ‘moon, sun’	<i>ke:ri</i>	<i>ke:ri</i>	<i>muhîpũ</i>
* <i>kamuy</i> ‘sun’	<i>kamui</i> ‘sun’	<i>kamui</i> ‘sun’				

Table 7. ‘Sun’ and ‘moon’ in K-Tariana, related languages, and Tucano.

Baniwa forms are used as if they were bona fide Tariana ones. Neusa referred to herself as *maduidzami* ‘widow’, a Baniwa word (which contains the Baniwa consonant *dz*: see (2)). An older speaker corrected this to the original K-Tariana *uphevini* ‘widow’; but used *maduidzami* when talking about herself. The term for a typical foodstuff of the region, manioc flour mixed with water, is *matsuka*, used in Baniwa (originally a loan from *Língua Geral Amazônica*). Older speakers also use another term, *kalibe* (a loan from *Língua Geral caribé*: Stradelli 1929: 403);⁵ the original term *kawhi* (Koch-Grünberg 1911: 229) is no longer remembered. And there are many more examples along these lines.

Speakers of W-Tariana are critical of what they consider an excessive mixture with Baniwa by the K-Tariana, and mock them behind their backs. The ‘shibboleth’ markers of Baniwa in Tariana are two forms. One is the discourse marker *ne:ni* ‘then, so’ corresponding to the ‘proper’ W-Tariana *nese* and K-Tariana *netse*. The other is the verb *-kite* ‘talk, speak’, rather than W-Tariana and K-Tariana *-kalite*. The form *ne:ni*, from Baniwa *ne:ni*, is used by most K-Tariana instead of *netse*.

The growing impact of Baniwa onto K-Tariana is exacerbated by the rampant inter-speaker and intra-speaker variation within the small community of Santa Terezinha. Depending on the speaker and on the audience, the number and the frequency of Baniwa forms can increase and decrease. This is especially so for younger people who are mostly exposed to Baniwa and are insecure in their K-Tariana. This high degree of variation makes documenting K-Tariana problematic: with the language in flux, this would entail documenting the voice of an individual (in the sense of Johnstone 2000). Even the question of a language community for the K-Tariana of Santa Terezinha is problematic: we can recall, from §2, that the Tariana speech community is in flux due to seasonal movements. Yet the K-Tariana identify as speakers of the Tariana language – their mark of identity which determines the marriage practices and status in the region.

The situation among the K-Tariana can hardly be considered an instance of code-switching with Baniwa: the Baniwa forms are integrated into the Tariana and blended together. How does K-Tariana fit in with what we know of other blended languages?

7. Kumandene Tariana: a blended language?

In contrast to mixed languages, K-Tariana did not develop for in-group communication; nor is it a conscious creation of a special in-group variety (in contrast to Michif and others: see Bakker 2017: 244-5). K-Tariana is reminiscent of so-called blended languages in bilingual communi-

ties. It is different from ‘fudged’ dialects or ‘mixed dialects’, since Tariana and Baniwa cannot be considered dialects of one language. These ‘hybrid’ combinations employ forms and meanings from both languages (in all the instances described, closely related). Many of them do not have a high status, and hardly any have a written norm.

Blended languages emerge in two types of situations: (a) languages spoken in border areas, and (b) immigrant minority languages. All the documented instances of ‘blends’ involve interleaving of closely related languages. None of them can be considered creoles nor creolised varieties. All blended languages documented so far involved closely related languages, with a high number of cognates – which facilitate the confusion of identity between them.

A prime example of blended language in the border area comes from Spanish-Portuguese border varieties in South American countries (also known as *Portunhol*). The mixture of Spanish and Portuguese elements appears to be random and subject to individual variation. (18a) is an example of a Bolivian adjusting their Spanish to Portuguese. (18b) is an attempt by a Brazilian to adjust their Portuguese to Spanish (Lipski 2010: 570-1; 2006). Forms identical in Spanish and Portuguese are deitalicised, Spanish forms are underlined, and the rest of the forms (in italics) are Portuguese.

(18) a. ‘Portuguesified’ Spanish
você não ta entendendu lo que quiere decir
‘you don’t understand what that means’.

(18) b. ‘Hispanified’ Portuguese
tamben tive una relación con Paraguay
‘I also had a relationship with Paraguay’.

The *Fronterizo* language spoken on the border between Brazil and Uruguay (Lipski 2010: 569-72) is an example of a fairly consistent bilingual blend of Spanish and Portuguese (a full grammar of it is still outstanding). An example is in (19).

(19) *Fronterizo*
Y se dificulta mais aprender o español ou o português
‘and it is harder to learn Spanish or Portuguese’.

Fronterizo is the first language for a number of people in the area. The language has a folk literature and musical production, and may gradually become a symbol of an emergent ethnic identity. However, it does produce ‘highly ambivalent feelings among speakers and observers alike’

(Lipski 2010: 573), because of its non-literary and marginal status. It is in some ways similar to Barranquenho, a relatively stable blend of Extremeno Spanish and Alentejo Portuguese between Estremadura and Andaluzia on the border of Spain with Portugal. Barranquenho must have emerged around the beginning of the 18th century (Clements, Amaral & Luís 2008: 15). The language has predominantly Portuguese lexicon alongside various Spanish features in its morphology, phonology, and verbal semantics (Clements, Amaral & Luís 2011; see also Auer 1999: 326-8). The language is now conventionalised, and has become an emblem of identity, distinct from both Spanish and Portuguese.

Further examples of documented blends spoken in border areas includes combinations of closely related East Slavic languages – Surzhyk, a mixture of Ukrainian and Russian, and Trasjanka, a mixture of Belorussian and Russian. Neither is endangered; both have traditionally low status. Surzhyk is currently emerging as a marker of linguistic identity in the predominantly Ukrainian-speaking regions in the Ukraine (see Bernsand 2001, Kent 2012, Bilaniuk 2004; Hentschel & Zaprudski 2008, and Zeller 2013: 267-8).

A blend of Ojibwa and Cree, two closely related Algonquian languages, has been documented for a number of isolated groups in northeastern Manitoba (Canada), under the name of Ojicree. One such variety is that of Island Lake. In terms of its lexicon, this variety is predominantly Ojibwa with an admixture of Cree (Wolfart 1973). The amount of Cree in Inland Lake can apparently be manipulated depending on the situation: ‘at least among the older generation, a more Cree-oriented speech form is favored for public speeches and in religious contexts’ (Wolfart 1973: 1317, based on E. Sawatzky, personal communication). This is similar to the ways in which the K-Tariana can make their speech more or less Baniwa-like depending on the audience, and speech genre: a story about one’s ancestors will contain fewer Baniwa elements than a casual conversation with one’s peers or children.

An additional factor in the emergence of the ‘Ojicree’ of Island Lake could have been what Wolfart (1973: 1317) refers to as ‘modern conditions’ – the use of Cree in schools, hospitals, or the ‘Cree bias of preachers’. Once again, this resonates with the emergence of the K-Tariana-Baniwa blend as a result of the European colonial expansion – from which the K-Tariana fled only to be overwhelmed by the Baniwa, their marriage partners and neighbours.

Blending of forms and constructions in related languages may have been a factor in the creation of koines (Hock 1991: 485-6), and in the processes of decreolisation of Creoles in contact with the lexifier language. A prime example is the processes of change in the contemporary Tok Pisin, the English-based Creole lingua franca of Papua New Guinea: in the ur-

ban areas, the language gradually blends into Papua New Guinea English, gradually losing its status as a Creole and forming a new emergent variety of English (see, for instance, Turégano Mansilla 2002).

A number of immigrant minority languages can be considered ‘blends’ – Norwegian and Swedish intertwined with English in the USA (Haugen 1969, Klintborg 1999), and possibly also Spanglish, a blend of Spanish and English in the USA (Rothman & Rell 2005; Lipski 2008). The extinct Cocoliche, spoken by Italian immigrants in Argentina across the period between the second half of the nineteenth and the first two decades of the twentieth centuries, was a blend of Italian dialects (spoken by the immigrants) and Argentinian Spanish (see Whinnom 1971: 97-8).⁶ Most of these immigrant varieties are endangered to varying extents; most undergo attrition and gradually die out, as did Cocoliche.

K-Tariana is an immigrant language. The speakers moved to their current location only a few decades ago, and are aware of their origins outside their current location. It stands apart from immigrant languages in one respect. Speakers of Norwegian and Swedish in the USA have the option of visiting their homeland and refreshing their knowledge of the ‘original’ language as it is spoken there. This option is no longer there for the K-Tariana: the original variety formerly spoken in the Iauaretê area is now completely gone. The K-Tariana are antagonistic towards using materials in W-Tariana, the only other extant Tariana dialect, since it is spoken by those lower than themselves in the tribal hierarchy.

A common feature of all blended languages, and especially immigrant ones, is a high degree of individual variation. As Whinnom put it in his discussion of Cocoliche,

Cocoliche was completely ‘unstable’ in given individuals [...] the acquisition of lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic material must with each individual speaker have been subject to chance, so that the speech of no two individual *cocoliche*-speakers was ever quite identical. (Whinnom 1971: 98)

Lack of stability and high degree of variation within each speaker is prominent in K-Tariana, a blend of the original Tariana language with the closely related (and dominant) Baniwa, making its full documentation a difficult enterprise. Depending on the audience and speech genre, each of the forty extant speakers may use more or fewer Baniwa forms; younger speakers’ language sounds more and more Baniwa-like. A high degree of variation is exacerbated by obsolescence of the knowledge of traditional lore, and of the language itself. This is reminiscent of the ephemeral nature of language change in endangered immigrant minority languages

– as captured by the very title of Klintborg’s (1999) monograph, *The transience of American Swedish*.

Attitudes toward blended immigrant languages vary. In just a few cases, blended varieties are gradually becoming symbolic for the group identity of the minorities which speak them – this has been documented for Spanglish and American Norwegian. And this is where the strength of Tariana lies. The language continues to be the badge of identity for those who have Tariana fathers. It will perhaps survive for a few generations – albeit in a heavily modified form, blending in with the dominant Baniwa language on a larger and larger scale.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person; ANT = anterior; CL = classifier; CL:ANIM = classifier for animates; COMPL = completive; DECL = declarative; DEM = demonstrative; EMPH = emphatic; FUT = future; FUT.CERT = certain future; IMP = impersonal; INDF = indefinite person; LOC = locative; NEG = negative; NOM.ACTION = action nominalization; NOM.RES = result nominalization; NON.VIS = nonvisual evidential; OBJ = object; PL = plural; PL.ANIM = animate plural; REC.P = recent past; REL = relative; REM.P = remote past; REM.P.ASSUMED = remote past assumed; RESTR = restrictive; SG = singular; SGNF = singular non-feminine; SUB = subordinator.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to speakers of all the varieties of Tariana who taught me their remarkable language. Special thanks go to Peter Bakker, Zenilson Bezerra, Péter Maitz, and all the participants of the special workshop of the Language and Culture Research Centre and the University of Augsburg ‘Language contact and the emergence of hybrid grammars’ (11-12 July 2018, Cairns), within the framework of the Project ‘Language emergence in multilingual contexts’ (DAAD/Universities Australia). Special thanks go to R. M. W. Dixon for his extensive comments on an earlier draft of this chapter. I am grateful to Brigitta Flick for carefully checking this text.

Appendix

Phonological systems of W-Tariana, K-Tariana, and Baniwa Hohôdene.

Consonants in brackets are limited to personal names of Portuguese origin.

(A) W-Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003: 26, 32)

	BILABIAL	APICO-DENTAL	APICO-ALVEO-PALATAL	LAMINO-PALATAL	DORSO-VELAR	GLOTTAL
voiceless stop	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>			<i>k</i>	
aspirated voiceless stop	<i>ph</i>	<i>th</i>			<i>kh</i>	
voiced stop	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>			(<i>g</i>)	
aspirated voiced stop		<i>dh</i>				
voiceless fricative			<i>s</i>			<i>h</i>
voiceless affricate				<i>ts</i>		
nasal	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>		<i>ɲ</i>		
aspirated nasal	<i>mh</i>	<i>nh</i>		<i>ɲh</i>		
flap			<i>r</i>			
lateral			<i>l</i>			
semi-vowel	<i>w</i>			<i>y</i>		
aspirated semi-vowel	<i>wh</i>					

Table I. Consonants of W-Tariana.

	FRONT			CENTRAL		BACK		
	SHORT	NASALISED	LONG	SHORT	NASALISED	SHORT	NASALISED	LONG
close-high	<i>i</i>	<i>ĩ</i>	<i>i:</i>	<i>ɨ</i>		<i>u</i>	<i>ũ</i>	<i>u:</i>
mid-close	<i>e</i>	<i>ẽ</i>	<i>e:</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>õ</i>			
low-open						<i>a</i>	<i>ã</i>	<i>a:</i>

Table II. Vowels of W-Tariana.

(B) K-Tariana (based on the analysis based of Brüzzi 1961: 146-8 and recordings; fieldwork in 1991 and 2012)

	BILABIAL	APICO-DENTAL	APICO-ALVEO-PALATAL	LAMINO-PALATAL	DORSO-VELAR	GLOTTAL
voiceless stop	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>			<i>k</i>	
aspirated voiceless stop	<i>ph</i>	<i>th</i>			<i>kh</i>	
voiced stop	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>			(<i>g</i>)	
aspirated voiced stop						
voiceless fricative						<i>h</i>
retroflex voiced fricative				<i>ʒ</i>		
voiceless affricate			<i>ts</i>			
voiced affricate			<i>dz</i>			
nasal	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>		<i>ɲ</i>		
aspirated nasal	<i>hm</i>	<i>nh</i>		<i>ɲh</i>		
flap			<i>r</i>			
lateral			<i>l</i>			
aspirated lateral/flap			<i>rh</i>			
semi-vowel	<i>w</i>			<i>y</i>		
aspirated semi-vowel	<i>wh</i>					

Table III. Consonants of K-Tariana (the phonemes found in the innovative blended variety due to Baniwa influence are shaded).

	FRONT			CENTRAL		BACK		
	SHORT	NASALISED	LONG	SHORT	NASALISED	SHORT	NASALISED	LONG
close-high	<i>i</i>	<i>ĩ</i>	<i>i:</i>			<i>u</i>		<i>u:</i>
mid-close	<i>e</i>	<i>ẽ</i>	<i>e:</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>õ</i>			
low-open						<i>a</i>	<i>ã</i>	<i>a:</i>

Table IV. Vowels of K-Tariana.

(C) Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako (Taylor 1990; Bezerra 2005, 2012, Ramirez 2001)

	BILABIAL	DENTAL	ALVEOLAR	ALVEO-PALATAL	PALATAL	VELAR	GLOTTAL
unaspirated voiceless stop	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t̥</i>			<i>k</i>	
aspirated voiceless stop	<i>ph</i>	<i>th</i>				<i>kh</i>	
voiced stop	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>				<i>(g)</i>	
voiced fricative	<i>(v)</i>						
voiceless fricative							<i>h</i>
retroflex voiced fricative				<i>ʒ</i>			
voiceless affricate				<i>ts</i>			
voiced affricate				<i>dz</i>			
unaspirated nasal	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>			<i>ɲ</i>		
aspirated nasal	<i>hm</i>	<i>hn</i>			<i>hɲ</i>		
flap			<i>r</i>				
aspirated flap			<i>hr</i>				
glide	<i>w</i>				<i>y</i>		
aspirated glide	<i>hw</i>						

Table V. Consonants of Baniwa of Içana (Hohôdene).

	front		central		back	
	short	long	short	long	short	long
high	<i>i</i>	<i>i:</i>			<i>u</i>	<i>u:</i>
low	<i>e</i>	<i>e:</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a:</i>		

Table VI. Vowels of Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako.

Notes

¹ This paper is based on original fieldwork with speakers of Kumandene Tariana in 1999 and 2012 (five hours recordings of different genres); materials on the Wamiarikune Tariana collected between 1991 and the present include over 30 hours recordings of different genres (see, e.g., Aikhenvald 2002, 2003). Baniwa Hohôdene (Baniwa, for short) shares ca. 75% lexicon with traditional Tariana varieties. A general outline of K-Tariana, and a brief discussion of the Baniwa-Kurripako dialect continuum are in Aikhenvald (2014a).

² The form *yase* 'toucan' was documented in Koch-Grünberg (1911: 137) for the ancestor dialect of K-Tariana.

³ Aikhenvald (2014b) provides an overview of negation marking in W-Tariana and other North Arawak languages; a discussion of negation in Baniwa is in Ramirez (2001b: 424-8); see also examples in Taylor (1990); Bezerra (2005, 2012) offers a comparison between Baniwa and Kurripako varieties in terms of their negation marking.

⁴ Peter Bakker (personal communication) suggests that alternatively it could be the result of a fusion of *hini* with the remote past marker =*na*. We cannot exclude this option; however, this is unlikely because this would involve a haplology of two non-identical syllables, not attested elsewhere in the language.

⁵ The Língua Geral form *caribé* (and its variants *carimé*, *carimbé*) refers to a mixture of cold water with addition of fruit or turtle eggs with manioc flour (Stradelli 1929: 127, 402). The form *kalibe* in K-Tariana refers to a mixture of manioc and water. The introduction of the form *kalibe* into K-Tariana may have been facilitated by phonological proximity with the name of *Kali*, the mythical creator of manioc, and the term for manioc (*kaliri*).

⁶ Ennis (2015) offers a discussion of some linguistic features and the history of Cocoliche and other blended contact languages in Argentina. An in-depth analysis of the status and grammatical features of Cocoliche is in Aimasso (2015-2016); Schmid (2005: 128-31) offers a brief outline of Cocoliche in the context of emigrant varieties of Italian.

Bibliographical References

- 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. Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic perspective. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.), *Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-66.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. *Languages of the Amazon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2014a. Language contact, and language blend: Kumandene Tariana of north-west Amazonia. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 80. 323-370.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2014b. Negation in Tariana. In Michael, Lev & Granadillo, Tania (eds.), *Negation in Arawak languages*. Leiden: Brill. 86-120.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018. 'Me', 'us' and 'others': Expressing the self in

- Arawak languages of South America. In Huang, Minyao & Jaszczolt, Kasia (eds.), *Expressing the Self: Cultural Diversity and Cognitive Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 13-39.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. *forthcoming*. The Amazon. In Mufwene, Salikoko S. & Escobar, Anna María (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aimasso, Andrea 2015-2016. *Cocoliche. Necesidad, esfuerzo, identidad y, quizá, un idioma*. Tesi di Laurea. Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia.
- Anchieta, José de 1595. *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais vsada na costa do Brasil*. Coimbra: Antonio de Mariz.
- Auer, Peter 1999. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3. 309-332.
- Bakker, Peter 2017. Typology of mixed languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 217-253.
- Bernsand, Niklas 2001. *Surzhyk and national identity in Ukrainian Nationalist Language ideology*. Forum Berlin Osteuropa Info. <www.oei.fu-berlin.de>.
- Bezerra, Zenilson A. 2005. *Gramática Kuripako*. Mimeographed. Missão Novas Tribos do Brasil.
- Bezerra, Zenilson A. 2012. *Dicionário Kuripako/Português*. Mimeographed. Missão Novas Tribos do Brasil.
- Bilaniuk, Laada 2004. A typology of *surzhyk*: mixed Ukrainian-Russian language. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 8. 409-25.
- Brüzzi, Alcionílio Alves da Silva 1961. *Discoteca Etno-lingüístico-musical das tribos dos rios Uaupés, Içana e Cauaburi*. São Paulo: Centro de Pesquisas de Iauareté da Missão Salesiana do Rio Negro.
- Brüzzi, Alcionílio Alves da Silva 1977. *A civilização indígena do Vaupés*. Roma: Las.
- Cardoso da Silva, Ilda 2012. *Historias Baniwa*. São Gabriel da Cachoeira: Escola Municipal Indígena Herieni / Cairns, LCRC.
- Carlin, Eithne B. 2011. Nested identities in the Southern Guyana-Suriname corner. In Hornborg, Alf & Hill, Jonathan D. (eds.), *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia*. Denver: University Press of Colorado. 225-236.
- Clements, J. Clancy; Amaral, Patrícia & Luís, Ana 2008. Cultural identity and the structure of a mixed language: The case of Barranquenho. *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 34: 13-22.
- Clements, J. Clancy; Amaral, Patrícia & Luís, Ana 2011. Spanish in contact with Portuguese: the case of Barraquenho. In Díaz-Campos, Manuel (ed.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*. London: Blackwell. 395-417.
- Ennis, Juan Antonio 2015. Italian-Spanish Contact in Early 20th Century Argentina. *Journal of Language contact* 8. 112-45.
- Haugen, Einar 1969. *The Norwegian language in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hentschel, Gerd & Zaprudski, Siarhiej (eds.) 2008. *Belarusian Trasjanka and Ukrainian Suržyk. Structural and social aspects of their description and categorization*. *Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia* 17. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.
- Hock, Hans Henrich 1991. *Historical linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Johnstone, Barbara 2000. The individual voice in language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29. 405-24.
- Kent, Kataryna 2012. *Morphosyntactic analysis of Surzhyk, a Russian-Ukrainian mixed lect*. PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Klintborg, Steffan 1999. *The transience of American Swedish*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor 1910. *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern. Reisen in Brasilien 1903/1905*. Volume 2. Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth A.-G.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor 1911. Aruak-Sprachen Nordwestbrasilien und der angrenzenden Gebiete. *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft*, Wien, Vol. 41. 33-153, 203-82.
- Lipski, John M. 2006. Too close for comfort? The genesis of “Portuñol/Portunhol”. In Face, Timothy L. & Klee, Carol A. (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 8th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 1-22.
- Lipski, John M. 2008. *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lipski, John M. 2010. Spanish and Portuguese in contact. In Hickey, Raymond (ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact*. London: Routledge. 550-580.
- Miller, Marion 1999. *Desano grammar*. Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Ramirez, Henri 1997. *A fala Tukano dos Yepê-masa. Tomo 1. Gramática*. Manaus: Inspetoria Salesiana Misionária da Amazônia, CEDEM.
- Ramirez, Henri 2001. *Uma gramática do Baniwa do Içana*. Manaus: Editora da Universidade do Amazonas.
- Rothman, Jason & Rell, Amy Beth 2005. A linguistic analysis of Spanglish: relating language to identity. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences* 1,3. 515-36.
- Schmid, Stephan 2005. Code-switching and Italian abroad. Reflections on language contact and bilingual mixture. *Rivista di Linguistica* 17. 113-65.
- Stenzel, Kristine & Gomez-Imbert, Elsa 2018. Evidentiality in Tukanoan languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 357-387.
- Stradelli, Ermanno 1929. *Vocabulários da Língua Geral Portuguez-Nheêngatú e Nheêngatú-Portuguez*. Rio de Janeiro: Revista do Instituto Historico-Geográfico.
- Taylor, Gerald 1990. *Introdução à língua baniwa do Içana*. Campinas: Editora Unicamp.
- Turégano Mansilla, María del Pilar 2002. *Language and society in Papua New Guinea: pidginization, creolization, and decreolization in Tok Pisin*. PhD dissertation, Universitat de Valencia.
- Whinnom, Keith 1971. Linguistic hybridization and the ‘special case’ of pidgins and creoles. In Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 91-115.
- Wolfart, H. Christoph 1973. Bounrady maintenance in Algonquian: A linguistic study of Island Lake, Manitoba. *American Anthropologist* 75. 1305-1323.
- Zeller, Jan Patrick 2013. Variation of sibilants in Belarusian-Russian mixed speech. In Auer, Peter; Caro Reina, Javier & Kaufmann, Göz (eds.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives IV: Selected papers from the Sixth International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVe 6), Freiburg, June 2011*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 267-280.

