

1. Tucanoan

Michael Cysouw, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

1.1 Introduction

The Tucanoan family is a small group of languages in South America, spoken in an area on the border of Colombia and Brasil (the Eastern branch of the family) and in a few smaller areas on the border from Colombia and Ecuador (the Western branch). The Tucanoan languages are all rather similar.

‘Cognate lists show a high degree of correspondences between the Tucanoan languages, and the grammars are also quite similar. Nevertheless, significant differences do exist.’ (Barnes 1994:325)

Aikhenvald (1996) remarks that the diversification between the Eastern Tucanoan languages can be compared to the diversity of the Scandinavian languages. The whole Tucanoan family is probably comparable to the Germanic family as far as internal diversification is concerned.

‘East Tucanoan languages are “a little farther apart” than Romance or Scandinavian languages are from each other and display different degrees of closeness. [...] The majority of the languages are not mutually intelligible; but even if they were, speakers take great care to keep them apart.’ (Aikhenvald 1996:85, quoting Sorensen 1972)

The genetic classification as described in Grimes et al. (1996) of the Tucanoan languages mentioned in this chapter:¹

- Tucanoan:
- Central: **Cubeo**
 - Eastern:
 - Central:
 - Bará: **Barasano, Tuyuca**
 - Desano: **Siriano**
 - Southern: **Macuna, Barasana**
 - Northern: **Tokano, Guanano**
 - Western:
 - Northern:
 - Siona-Secoya: **Siona**
 - Coreguaje: **Koreguaje**
 - Tanimuca: **Retuarã**

¹ In the classification by Ruhlen (1987) Tucanoan is part of ‘Macro-Tucanoan’. One of the languages included in this macro-group is the language Ticuna. From the description in Anderson (1966) it is not obvious that Ticuna is related to the Tucanoan languages as far as the pronominal elements are concerned, although some very general similarities can be distinguished.¹ Ticuna rather resembles Retuarã as far as the pronominal elements are concerned (see section 1.2.2). Roughly stated, Ticuna has pronominal prefixes for subjects and singular-plural distinction with an inclusive-exclusive distinction in the first person plural; all like Retuarã. But the forms of the pronominal elements in Ticuna do not show any resemblance to the Tucanoan languages at all (Anderson 1966). Grimes (1996) lists Ticuna as isolate. I will not further consider Ticuna here.

1.2 Independent pronouns

The independent pronouns of a few of the Tucanoan languages are shown in Table 1. The general structure of the paradigms and the forms show strong correspondences. The most obvious differences are found in the third person forms. These differences will be discussed in section 1.2.4.

	<i>Retuarã</i>		<i>Barasano</i>		<i>Macuna</i>		<i>Tukano</i>		<i>Siona</i>	
	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>1 Excl</i>	yĩʔi	yiha	yũ	yua	ji	gia	jeɕ	ũgsa ²	yĩ	yĩkĩ.
<i>1 Incl</i>		bārã		bādi		bādi		manĩ		
<i>2</i>	bĩʔĩ	bĩʔã	bũ	bua	bĩ	bĩa	mɛɕ	mɛgsa	mwĩ.	mwĩŋsɛɕ
<i>3 Masc</i>	iʔki	iʔrã	ĩ	ĩdã	ĩ	ĩdã	kɛɕ	naa	xãĩ.	xãĩŋwãĩ.
<i>3 Fem</i>	iʔko		so, sō		iso		koo	aha ³	xãõ	xɛkōwãĩ.
<i>3 Neut</i>	iʔka		ti		iti ⁴					

Table 1: Tucanoan independent pronouns⁵

1.2.1 Use of the independent pronouns

In Barasano the pronouns can be used like complete noun phrases, comparable to the European pronouns. The pronouns can also be used though alongside other nominal material. In that case they function like definite markers.

‘A personal pronoun is very often a noun phrase in the subject position and is used in the noun phrase to enhance definiteness.’ (Jones et al. 1991:31)

There are no examples of this ‘pronoun as definite marker’ in the grammar. But there are other examples of double marking of the same argument, either a coreferential full noun and pronoun, or even two coreferential pronouns. In these examples one of the coreferential elements is placed preverbal and the other one postverbal. These examples are analyzed as a ‘topicalised’ preverbal marker and a ‘regular’ postverbal marker, c.f. section 1.2.3 and example (1) and (2) below.

‘When a speaker desires to reinforce or clarify the topic under discussion, the subject or object is fronted to sentence-initial position. [...] In a topicalized construction, it is not infrequent for a pronoun referring to the subject to follow the main verb. Note example (1), where there is a fronted subject noun phrase in a main clause with a pronoun occurring after the verb.’ (Jones et al. 1991:169)

² ‘*mani* se dice cuando la posesion se refiera a todos, *ũgsa* cuando se refiere a algunos tanto.’ (Kok 1922:851)

³ ‘*aha* se dice cuando se habla de personas que no entran en la conversacion pero que estan bajo la vista.’ (Kok 1922:851)

⁴ ‘Los pronombres personales inanimados corresponden a los pronombres demostrativos inanimados medios.’ (Smothermon et al. 1995:35)

⁵ Data from Strom (1992:34) on Retuarã, Jones et al. (1991:31) on Barasano, Smothermon et al. (1995:35) on Macuna, Kok (1922:851, 825) on Tukano and Espinoza Peres (1955:124) on Siona

- (1) *bās-a eha-bā īdā*
people-Pl arrive-3Pl 3PlPron
 People have arrived. (Jones et al. 1991:169)

An example of a fronted pronoun with a regular postverbal coreferential pronoun:

- (2) *yua rīdē bōa-ka-hu yua*
ExclPron only work-FarPast-Other ExclPron
 We were the only ones who worked. (Jones et al. 1991:176)

Ellipsis of arguments occurs regularly in Barasano. Jones et al. (1991) remark that the pronoun does not need to be present because of an obligatorily inflectional suffix on the predicate that refers to the subject.

‘The subject need not be explicit other than to be indicated by the person and number marking on the main verb.’ (Jones et al. 1991:108)

This suffixal inflection does indeed give some information on the subject, but it only distinguishes a few categories, and is therefore not of much use to determine the referent of the subject in most of the possible contexts (see section 1.3.1 for a detailed description of the inflectional categories). One could make a parallel to the verbal inflection (‘agreement’) in English or in Dutch. The categories that are inflectionally marked are completely different in these languages, but the *amount* of oppositions in Dutch, for instance, is comparable to the *amount* of oppositions in the Tucanoan inflection. In the case of English and Dutch though the normal argumentation is that the inflectional marking is not sufficient to (re)construct the referent, and therefore an independent pronoun is obligatorily present in these languages. This is the exact opposite argumentation as found in the Tucanoan languages where an impoverished inflection is already seen as an explanation for the ellipsis of independent marking of the subject.

Ellipsed arguments have to be determined from the context. In most cases there is no problem as the referent of the ellipsed argument is unambiguous:

‘Nominal elements (subject and object) may be absent in a variety of contexts. Subject ellipsis may occur in either main clauses or subordinate clauses. In main clauses, the listener is left to pragmatically determine the referent, which is usually unambiguous because of the context.’ (Jones et al. 1991:165)

‘Object ellipsis is very common. This is especially noticeable in texts regarding procedures for making things. Since the object is the thematic element, the speaker has no need to repeat the object but only to state the actions performed.’ (Jones et al. 1991:167)

The determination of the ellipsed referents is though often not so straightforward. In the next example there are two ellipsed arguments with different referents within one sentence. One needs quite a thorough understanding of the meaning to identify the different referents here:

- (3) *wa eha-boayu-hu bā-yu-hu*
move arrive-Evid-3 NegBe-Evid-3
 Going (he₁) arrived. But (he₂) was not (there). (Jones et al. 1991:167)

‘(3) has two sentences, neither of which has an explicit subject. The subject of the first sentence is understood from the context. The verb of the second sentence is marked with the same inflection as the first sentence but the subject is interpreted to be differ-

ent. The understood subject of the second sentence is the participant whom the understood subject of the first sentence expected to see when he arrived.’ (Jones et al. 1991:167)

The general impression from the other descriptions of Tucanoan languages is that the use of the independent pronouns as described here for Barasano is comparable to the other Tucanoan languages. The only language that shows a rather different systematicity is Retuarã. This language will be discussed in section 1.2.2. In most of the other literature on Tucanoan there is no explicit discussion of the use of the pronouns. Only for Koreguaje there is a short comment on the use of the pronouns: Gralow (1993) notes that the pronouns are not obligatory present. The reason that is presented for the possible ellipsis of arguments is the presence of the suffixal inflection, the same reason as presented for Barasano above. Again it should be noted that the functional load of this inflection to determine the referent is not very strong (see section 1.3.1). To give an impression of the extent of the occurrence of ellipsis Gralow comments that the pronoun in Koreguaje is used more often than in Spanish.

‘Los accidentes verbales indican también el tiempo y el número y género del sujeto, pero no la persona. Debido a esto, aunque no es necesario repetir el sujeto en cada oración si el oyente ya sabe a quién se refiere, *el pronombre del sujeto se emplea mucho más frecuentemente que en el español.*’ (Gralow 1993:3, italics added MC)

This impression is substantiated by Aikhenvald (1996), commenting about East Tucanoan in general that independent pronouns are not exceptional in discourse.

‘Independent personal pronouns are widely used in discourse. There are many more transitive clauses with two full NP’s than, for instance, in such languages as Bamiwa of Içana or Warekana of Xie [two neighbouring Arawakan languages, MC]. Discourse, however, is highly elliptical, since head nouns are most often omitted, and classifiers on modifiers or possessive markers are used anaphorically.’ (Aikhenvald 1996:87)

In general the frequency of use of the independent pronouns is somewhere between Spanish (only used with strong emphasis) and English (used obligatorily). This shows that even with only a few inflectional categories pronouns do not have to be obligatory, but that there still is a sense in which less inflectional marking correlates with a more extensive use of independent pronouns.

1.2.2 Special case: Retuarã

In Retuarã the situation is rather different from the other Tucanoan languages⁶: The independent pronouns are even less used than in the other Tucanoan languages. Most

⁶ Strom notes: ‘That the language should be changing away from a typical Tucanoan pattern is not surprising since there is substantial influence from a neighbouring Arawakan language’ (Strom 1992:72). Recently he even radicalised his opinion, and now argues that Retuarã is not historically Tucanoan:

‘I now think Retuarã and Tanimuka are mixed languages, not historically Tucanoan. [...] I do not think Retuarã is Eastern Tucanoan. For awhile I accepted a notion of one of my colleagues that we should classify it and another language (Cubeo) as ‘central Tucanoan’ since it did not fit well in either eastern or western. Since then I was asked to help another linguist with a paper she was writing on Yucuna which is a neighboring language, but Arawakan. I was really surprised to see how the subject agreement on the Yucuna verb worked like that in Retuarã. (Prefixing with many of the same strategies as described in the grammar). My tentative hypothesis now is that Retuarã and Tanimuka were once Arawakan but were absorbed into Tucanoan language communities (perhaps this was forced by tribal warfare – some of their history/stories say

occurrences of the pronouns are in special contexts, e.g. in answers to questions or in negated declaratives.

‘Personal pronouns are not frequently used. [...] This free form of the pronoun generally occurs as an abbreviated answer to a question, or when it is the subject of certain types of clauses. In all other uses they occur in a cliticized form, as discussed below. [...] Personal pronouns, however, are frequently used in negated declaratives where often a number/gender suffix is followed by the corresponding personal pronoun.’ (Strom 1992:34)

The major difference between Retuarã and the other Tucanoan languages is the occurrence of a pronominal prefix, presented in Table 2. The occurrence of pronominal prefixes is unusual compared to the person marking system in the other Tucanoan languages; but even more noteworthy is that the Retuarã pronominal prefixes are the only inflectional prefixes in the Tucanoan family. The Tucanoan languages are otherwise completely suffigating (see e.g. on Barasano Jones et al., 1991:5).

The pronominal prefixes of Retuarã strongly resemble the independent pronouns. This could indicate that the prefixes are a result of recent cliticization.

‘The person marker prefixes are the only prefixes of the language. [...] A comparison with the person pronouns strongly suggests that they were once free pronouns that have become clitics.’ (Strom 1992:35)

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>1 Excl</i>	yi-...	yiha-...
<i>1 Incl</i>		bã-...
<i>2</i>	bĩ-...	bĩ?ã-...
<i>3 Masc</i>	ki-...	dã-...
<i>3 Fem</i>	ko-...	
<i>3 Neut</i>	sa-...	

Table 2: Retuarã pronominal prefixes

These prefixes are the normal way by which to mark the subject of a sentence in Retuarã; independent pronouns are normally not used. The use of independent pronouns is thus even stronger marked as it is in the other Tucanoan languages.

‘most commonly the subject of a sentence is expressed as a personal pronoun clitic that is prefixed to the verb.’ (Strom 1992:9)

The independent pronoun can be used to give emphasis to the referent of the subject. Note that in these cases the predicate does not have a personal prefix, as shown in example (4). The pronominal prefix and the pronoun are in complementary distribution.

‘Subject agreement is usually accomplished by means of person marker prefixes, but even in positive clauses, a free pronoun may occur to give emphasis.’ (Strom 1992:35)

they were nearly wiped out). Perhaps they borrowed nearly all the lexical items from Tucanoan, but a few features of Arawakan grammar remained.’ (Strom, p.c. 15 april 1998)

- (4) *yiʔi* *ã-yũ-ka* *bĩ-ĩbã-be*
1SgPron say-Pres-MascSg *2Sg-Be-Imperative*
 I say, “live (with him).” (Strom 1992:35)

It is possible though for both pronoun and pronominal prefix to co-occur, but this is a highly marked construction. There are no examples given in the grammar or in the accompanying texts; but the possibility of double marking is noted by Strom (1992)

‘The basic constituent of an intransitive sentence are an intransitive verb preceded by a free subject or a subject prefix (though not both *except under highly marked conditions*).’ (Strom 1992:112, italics added, MC)

1.2.3 Why prefixation in Retuarã?

The pronominal prefixes in Retuarã are rather unusual for the Tucanoan family. Strom argues that these prefixes could be due to influence from the neighbouring Arawakan language Yucuna (Strom 1992:72). This seems a plausible scenario as areal contact and linguistic diffusion between Tucanoan and Arawakan is more widely attested, e.g. de Vaupas area, where diffusion is attested between East Tucanoan languages and the Arawakan language Tariana (Aikhenvald 1996). Strom even considers the possibility that Retuarã is a relexified Arawakan language (Strom, p.c., see footnote 6), but this seems a rather extreme position, yet to be proven. The most obvious scenario is that the pronouns agglutinated in front of the predicate, because, first, the forms of the pronominal prefixes are clearly Tucanoan and almost identical to the independent pronouns, and because, second, the pronominal prefixes occur in complementary distribution with the independent pronouns.

Prefixation though is non-existent in the Tucanoan languages. Even the placement of the independent pronoun before the verb is already unusual. The grammarians on the various languages all agree that the pronoun can be placed in front when the subject is topicalized. So the preverbal position of the pronoun exists, but is still highly marked. A possible scenario for the prefixation is that this topicalization preverbal construction has become unmarked in Retuarã, and consequently be cliticized. On Barasano Jones et al. (1991) note that fronted pronouns are marked as topic:

‘When a pronoun occurs which refers to the subject, it immediately follows the predicate verb. [...] *When the subject is highlighted, or introduced as a new topic, it is fronted.*’ (Jones et al. 1991:2-3, italics added, MC)

The same marked character of the preverbally placed pronoun is noted for Macuna:

‘Aunque el sujeto se da por lo general al final de la cláusula, se da al principio de la cláusula cuando se enfoca el sujeto o se presenta el participante por primera vez.’ (Smothermon et al. 1995:31)

And also for Koreguaje:

‘Si la oración sencilla del modo indicativo tiene sujeto, generalmente se ubica después del verbo, pero se le puede poner antes para introducirlo por primera vez o para darle más énfasis.’ (Gralow 1993:4)

Because of the highly marked character of the fronted pronouns an exclusively Tucanoan-internal explanation for the prefixation is unlikely. This leaves Arawakan influence as a good explanation for the occurrence of pronominal prefixes in Retuarã.

The Arawakan languages, stated roughly, have pronominal prefixes for subjects and pronominal suffixes for objects.⁷ The prefixal subjects are probably borrowed from Arawakan.

1.2.4 Demonstratives or third persons?

The third person forms show a strong resemblance to the demonstratives in many of the Tucanoan languages. In Macuna and Koreguaje the (anaphoric) third person pronouns simply *are* the demonstratives. On Macuna the grammarians comment:

'Hay distintos pronombres demostrativo dependiendo de la distancia (próximo y distante para los animados; próximo, medio y distante para los inanimados). Los demostrativos medios se usan en expresiones anafóricas.' (Smothermon et al. 1995:35)

Also the animate singular third person pronouns in Macuna are identical to the singular distant demonstratives (Smothermon et al. 1995:36). In Koreguaje the situation is the same:

'El pronombre [only in third person, MC] en el Koreguaje es un demostrativo que reemplaza un nombre o sustantivo.' (Gralow 1993:15)

In Retuarã there are three special demonstratives (Strom 1992:51-52): 'ĩĩ, this one (animate)', 'i?ka, this (neuter)', 'i?sia, that (neuter)'. The forms already strongly resemble the independent pronouns (c.f. Table 1). The link between demonstratives and third person pronouns is even stronger because the (normally anaphoric) independent pronouns can also be used deictically (that is, more demonstrative-like), when they are stressed.

'Stress can also indicate deixis on personal pronouns (in third person). Stress occurs on the first syllable of the pronoun when the referent is relatively far away from the speaker; when the referent is close, the stress occurs on the final syllable.' (Strom 1992:13)

The distinction between pronouns and demonstratives is rather superimposed on the structure of Retuarã, which does not really distinguish formally between the two concepts. For some other Tucanoan languages the resemblance between the third person pronouns and demonstratives did also not go unnoticed:

'In Siona, demonstratives serve as personal pronouns, and in the languages Siriano and Barasana, third-person personal pronouns show a clear relationship to demonstrative pronouns.' (Malone 1988:126)

For Barasano pronouns and demonstratives are mixed or combined in different ways depending on the referent:

'Animate demonstrative pronouns are formed by adding the personal pronoun to inanimate demonstrative pronouns.' (Jones et al. 1991:32)

The general mix of function of (anaphoric) pronouns and (deictic) demonstratives shows that this distinction is rather artificial one for the formal structure of the Tucanoan languages. The wish to distinguish neat third person pronouns from demonstratives, like in our well-known European languages, in spite of the problems to disentangle them formally probably accounts for the differences in the description of the third person pronouns as noted at the start of section 1.2.

⁷ c.f. Matteson (1965:94, 106), Wise (1971:67), Payne (1981:14, 33-35), Reed et al. (1986).

1.2.5 Pronominal case marking

There is no real case marking for subject, object or the like in Tucanoan; only in Retuarã some faint traces can be found. In Retuarã, transitive sentences with pronominal arguments use the pronominal prefixes with the ‘case’-marker *-re* for object-marking. The full pronoun with the suffix *-re* can be used to indicate proximity (Strom 1992:14).⁸

- (5) ko-re ki-ĩã-koʔo
 FemSg-Case *MascSg-see-Past*
 He saw her. (Strom 1992:114)

The third person *sa-* prefix in Retuarã has some special uses. It is often used impersonally, as in (6), but this prefix is also the only prefix that can co-occur with another pronominal prefix on the same verb stem, as exemplified in (7); *sa-* here marks a third person object. This structure of Retuarã is not found in any of the other Tucanoan languages.

‘The pronoun clitic *sa-* (third person neuter) may be used to fill a subject slot when no particular subject is intended. Similar to the English ‘it’ in ‘it is cold’. [...] The pronoun *sa-* also serves as an object marker.’ (Strom 1992:36)

- (6) hihia sa-baa-yu
 cold *3Neut-make-Pres*
 It is cold. (Strom 1992:36)
- (7) sa-bã-ko-riẽrã
 3Neut-Incl-try-Evid
 Let’s try it. (Strom 1992:36)

1.3 Pronominal inflection

There are verbal suffixes in all Tucanoan languages that ‘agree’ in a certain sense with the subject. There is a slight, but important difference between the Eastern and the Western Tucanoan languages. The Eastern Tucanoan languages have two functionally different type of agreement-like suffixal paradigms, which are related though in their form. The difference between the sets can be identified in constructions with first or second person subjects. The Western Tucanoan languages only have one of these two suffixal paradigms. This paradigm does not agree in person, only in gender and number with the subject. The two systems will be described in turn.

1.3.1 Eastern Tucanoan

The suffixal agreement systems in the Eastern Tucanoan (Barasano, Tuyuca, Macuna) languages are all different in detail, but they share the general feature of distinguishing two different sets of suffixes. The categories in the two paradigms are only slightly different, but differ crucially enough to be separated.

⁸ The suffix *-re* is found in all Tucanoan languages, although the precise function varies:

‘The suffix *-re* marks subjects or objects which are human or referred to by a proper name. [...] In other Tucanoan languages the same form, *-re*, often marks objects or focus. It is never used, however, on a subject as it is in Retuarã. Apparently language change has brought about a re-definition of the term case marker in Retuarã.’ (Strom 1992:59, fn. 29)

Barasano has an agreement set with the typical Eastern Tucanoan ‘other’ category. This category is used to mark the unusual combination of third person inanimate subjects and first and second person subjects. There are separate forms for third person animate. The forms of the agreement set are shown in Table 3; a few examples of the use of the ‘other’ category are given in (8) and (9):

‘Agreement of person, number, gender, and animacy between subject and verb is required, and is shown by subject agreement markers which occur in final position in the phrase. [...] *-ha* is used for all inanimates, and for speech-act participants, i.e. first or second person, singular or plural.’ (Jones et al. 1991:73-74)

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>3 Masc</i>	...-bī	...-bā
<i>3 Fem</i>	...-bō	
<i>Other</i>	...-ha/bu/hu/hu ⁹	

Table 3: Barasano ‘agreement’ suffixes

- (8) bua-re ĩago bahi-**bu** yu
2SgPl-Obj *see* *Be-Other* *1SgPron*
 I was (arrived) in order to see you (pl). (Jones et al. 1991:86)
- (9) asi-a-**ha**
hot-Pres-Other
 It is hot. (Jones et al. 1991:23)

With some of the Barasano ‘tenses’ the agreement set is not used with first and second person.¹⁰ With Realis-Present-Proximate (Jones et al. 1991:83) and with Irrealis-Avoidance (Jones et al. 1991:88) the first and second person are zero-marked. In these cases the ‘other’ category only marks inanimate third person, reducing the person-gender-number agreement to only gender-number agreement.

It is exactly this kind of functional marking (only gender-number, and no person) that is found in the other verbal suffix paradigm. The origin of these markers is nominal, not verbal. In Barasano there are gender-number suffixes for nouns, sometimes also used to make nouns form verbs (Table 4). More common though is to use a nominalizing suffix to make deverbal nouns (Table 5). These two sets are clearly linked in form, possibly the nominalizing paradigm is a set of gender markers fused with a time/space marker. The main difference between the nominal gender suffix and the nominalizing paradigm is that an ‘inanimate’ category is added in the nominalizer paradigm (Jones et al. 1991:41-42).

⁹ ‘-bu’ is used in past (Jones et al. 1991:85), ‘-hu’ in the far past (Jones et al. 1991:86), ‘-hu’ in the inferred (Jones et al. 1991:87).

¹⁰ In the descriptions of most Tucanoan languages the word ‘tense’ is used rather broadly for all kind of verbal categories that are normally called either tense, aspect, mood or evidentiality. I just follow the broad use of the word ‘tense’ in my recapitulation here.

but there are three linguistic elements that refer in different ways to the same argument, combining their forces to help the hearer of this sentence with the identification of the referent.

In Barasano the nominalizing paradigm does not occur alone; it is always accompanied by a form of the agreement paradigm (see Table 6). This is not the case in Tuyuca, and probably neither in Macuna, two other Eastern Tucanoan languages. In Tuyuca all the ‘tense’ suffixes are fused with the agreement-sets into so called ‘evidential’ suffixes.

‘The independent verb in Tuyuca is minimally composed of a verb root and an evidential. [...] The evidential indicates how and when the speaker obtained the information about the state or event he is describing, as well as ‘third person vs. other’ distinctions.’ (Barnes 1984:256)

The two different agreement-sets, as described above for Barasano, are still recoverable from internal and comparative reconstruction in Tuyuca as described in Malone (1988). Originally, the extensive system of evidentials originated from independent evidentials combined with one of two different ‘agreement’ systems (Malone 1988:125).

‘The complex Tuyuca evidential system developed from a simple system by means of extensive morpheme fusion, reanalysis and semantic drift.’ (Malone 1988:120)

Both nominalizer and agreement sets can be distinguished, but they have not been used in combination to form the evidential suffixes: either a gender-number (‘nominalizing’) suffix or a person-gender-number (‘agreement’) suffix has been used; but never both as in Barasano. These two systems are formally related, but functionally they are rather different. The first system (shown in Table 7) is a form of gender-number agreement:

‘Number/gender markers for gerunds and nominalized verbs, [...they] also occur with demonstratives, number, and adjectives in Tuyuca and other Tucanoan languages.’ (Malone 1988:125-126)

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>Masc</i>	...-(g)i	...-ra
<i>Fem</i>	...-(g)o	
<i>Neut</i>	...-ro	

Table 7: Tuyuca gender-number paradigm

The second paradigm (shown in Table 8) is a combined person-gender-number set with the typical Eastern Tucanoan ‘other’ category:

‘In the evidentials third-person plural subject is signalled by *a*, third-person feminine singular by *o*, and third-person masculine singular usually by *i*. The remaining category, referred to as ‘other’, is signaled in a variety of ways and encompasses the singular and plural of first and second person as well as inanimate, so that, for example, ‘I played’, ‘we played’, ‘you (sg.) played’, ‘you (pl.) played’ and ‘it played’ are all represented (using the visual evidential) by *apé-wi*.’ (Barnes 1984:258)

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>3 Masc</i>	...-i	...-a
<i>3 Fem</i>	...-o	
<i>Other</i>	...-i, ∅	

Table 8: Tuyuca person-gender-number paradigm

Also for Macuna there are two different paradigm distinguished by Smothermon et al. (1995:46-47). They are almost completely identical to the Barasano suffixes. The two paradigms are shown in Table 9 and Table 10.

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>3 Masc</i>	...-(b)ĩ	...-(b)ã
<i>3 Fem</i>	...-(b)õ	
<i>Other</i>	...-(b)ĩ	

Table 9: Macuna person-gender-number paradigm

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>Masc</i>	...-gĩ	...-rã
<i>Fem</i>	...-go	
<i>Inan</i>	...-ro	

Table 10: Macuna gender-number paradigm

The Eastern Tucanoan languages all have two different ‘agreement’ sets, one with only gender-number categories and one with person-gender-number categories. The person marking has rather unusual categories though, distinguishing between third animate and other, combining third inanimate with speech-act participants. The gender-number paradigm is probably originally a nominalizing paradigm, but the origin of the person-gender-number paradigm is unclear.

There are differences between the Eastern Tucanoan languages as to when which of the two sets is used. In Barasano a gender-number marker only occurs besides a person-gender-number marker; in Tuyuca there was (in a historical reconstruction) more independence: either a gender-number marker or a person-gender-number marker is used. If different sets co-occur, possible together with independent pronouns or other independent arguments, there is hardly ever any redundancy, or double-marking, present because of the functional differences between the categories in the paradigms. So, strictly speaking, there is no linguistic agreement.

1.3.2 Western Tucanoan

In the Western Tucanoan languages (Retuarã, Koreguaje, Siona, Tokano) there is just one of the two verbal ‘agreement’ paradigms from Eastern Tucanoan. There is only a gender-number set in these languages, no person-gender-number set, and also no ‘other’ category. In Retuarã there is a gender-number suffix (shown in Table 11) that is used rather sparingly. Strom (1992:35) calls this ‘agreement’:

‘Subject agreement is marked on the verb by a number/gender suffix only when there is no expressed subject. or when there is a bare subject noun phrase or pronoun (i.e. not marked by *-re-*).’ (Strom 1992:71)

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>Masc</i>	...-ka/ki	...-rã
<i>Fem</i>	...-ko	
<i>Inan</i>	...-(k)a	

Table 11: Retuarã gender-number paradigm

This suffix is also used with forms that we would translate as verbal, although one could analyze them as nominal. The two translations of sentence (11) illustrate these two possible analyses. The gender-number suffix indicates the gender of a speech-act subject, just like in the example (10) from Barasano above:

- (11) *bãē* *ko-yiʔ-yu* *ō-rĩ-be-yu-ko* *yiʔi*
now *3FemSg-answer-Pres* *know-Evid-Neg-Pres-FemSg* *1SgPron*
 Now she answers: ‘I don’t know’ (I’m a not-knower). (Strom 1992:71)

Also in Koreguaje there is only one set of suffixes, marking gender-number (Table 12, Gralow 1993:7). There is homophony between masculine singular and inanimate, but this is probably a merger. This suffix agrees with the gender of the subject, irrespective of the person, as can be seen in example (12).

	<i>Sing</i>	<i>Plur</i>
<i>Masc</i>	...-mɯ	...-me
<i>Fem</i>	...-mo	
<i>Inan</i>	...-mɯ	

Table 12: Koreguaje gender-number marking

- (12) *sai-mɯ* *chɯ’ɯ*
go-Masc *1SgPron*
 Yo (masculine) voy. (Gralow 1993:4)

The same situation is found in Siona. Espinoza Peres (1955:124, 134-135) notes different pronouns for reference to males or females, and gendermarking on verbs. Tokano also follows the Western Tucanoan system, with only gender and no person marking (shown in Table 13), but it is not completely clear from the (rather limited) description what happens with first and second person subjects.

‘primera persona del singular, segunda persona del singular, primera persona del plural, segunda persona del plural: preponiendo el pronombre personal respetivo al verbo, que no tiene desinencias especiales. Tercera persona: preponiende el pronombre respetivo al verbo que tiene desinencias especiales para cada forma.’ (Kok 1922:854)

3 <i>Masc</i>	...-mi
3 <i>Fem</i>	...-ma
3 <i>Plural, Neutral</i>	...-mo

Table 13: Tokano verbal gender-number markers

The Western Tucanoan suffixal ‘agreement’ is even more impoverished as in the Eastern Tucanoan languages. There is no marking of person on the verb, only of gender and number. Still this does not cause any obligatory use of independent pronouns. Interestingly, the gender marking occurs also with speech-act participants, leading to different forms of ‘I’ depending on whether a male or a female is speaking. There are no traces of person marking to be found in the Western Tucanoan inflections. This indicates that the person-gender-number paradigm is an innovation of Eastern Tucanoan.¹¹

1.4 Switch-Reference

Some of the suffixal inflections that were described in section 1.3 are in some grammars analyzed as marking a switch-reference system. Under the auspices of Ron Langacker, different Tucanoan languages are described showing a switch reference system, for which some of the suffixal markers are used.¹² This analysis is followed by Jones et al. (1991:138-142) for the description of Barasano, but not by Strom (1992) for Retuarã. Nor is it found in the description of Macuna (Smothermon et al. 1995). In Barasano it is the animate nominalizer that functions as overt switch-reference marker. This is only used in adverbial clauses, otherwise switch-reference is to be determined pragmatically.

References:

- Aikhenvald, A. A. (1996) ‘Areal diffusion in Northwest Amazonia: the case of Tariana’ *Anthropological Linguistics* 38(1): 73-116.
- Anderson, L. (1966) ‘The structure and distribution of Ticuna independent clauses’ *Linguistics* 20: 5-30.
- Barnes, J. (1984) ‘Evidentials in the Tuyuca Verb’ *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50(3): 255-271.
- Barnes, J. (1994) ‘Tuyuca’ in: P. Kahrel and R. v. d. Berg (Eds.) *Typological Studies in Negation*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 325-342.
- Espinoza Peres, L. (1955) *Contribuciones Lingüísticas y Etnográficas sobre algunos pueblos indígenas del Amazonas Peruano*. Madrid, consejo superior de investigaciones científicas.

¹¹ The innovation of suffixal person marking in Eastern Tucanoan could be another influence from neighbouring Arawakan languages. As the Eastern Tucanoan languages are in nearer contact with Arawakan as the Western Tucanoan languages this could also account for the difference between the two Tucanoan branches. Arawakan languages have suffixal person marking, although marking roughly ‘object’ (see references in footnote 7).

¹² cf. Salser et al. (1979), West (1979:348), Waltz (1976:27), Langacre (1983).

- Gralow, F. L. (1993) *Un Bosquejo del Idioma Koreguaje*. Santafé de Bogotá, Instituto lingüístico de Verano.
- Grimes, B. F. (Ed.) (1996) *Ethnologue*. Dallas, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Grimes, J. E. and B. F. Grimes (1996) *Ethnologue Language Family Index*. Dallas, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Jones, W. and P. Jones (1991) *Barasano Syntax*. Arlington, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Kok, P. P. (1922) 'Ensayo de gramática Dagseje o Tokano' *Anthropos* 17: 838-865.
- Langacre, R. E. (1983) 'Switch-Reference systems in two distinct linguistic areas: Wajokeso (Papua New Guinea) and Guanano (Northern South America)' in: J. Haiman and P. Munro (Eds.) *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 185-208.
- Malone, T. (1988) 'The Origin and Development of Tuyuca Evidentials' *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54(2): 119-140.
- Matteson, E. (1965) *The Piro (Arawakan) Language*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Payne, D. L. (1981) *The Phonology and Morphology of Axininca Campa*. Arlington, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Reed, J. and D. L. Payne (1986) 'Asheninca (Campa) Pronominals' in: U. Wiesemann (Ed.) *Pronominal Systems*. Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag: 323-331.
- Ruhlen, M. (1987) *A Guide to the World's Languages*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Salser, J. K. and N. Salser (1979) 'Some features of Cubeo Discourse and Sentence Structure' in: R. E. Longacre and F. Woods (Eds.) *Discourse Grammar: studies in indigenous languages of Columbia, Panama and Ecuador*. Arlington, Summer Institute of Linguistics. 2: 253-272.
- Smothermon, J. R., J. H. Smothermon and P. S. Frank (1995) *Bosquejo del Macuna*. Santafé de Bogotá, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Strom, C. (1992) *Retuarã Syntax*. Arlington, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Waltz, N. E. (1976) 'Discourse Functions of Guanano Sentence' in: R. E. Longacre and F. Woods (Eds.) *Discourse Grammar: studies in indigenous languages of Columbia, Panama and Ecuador*. Arlington, Summer Institute of Linguistics. 1: 21-146.
- West, B. (1979) 'Results of a Tucanoan Syntax Questionnaire Pilot Study' in: R. E. Longacre and F. Woods (Eds.) *Discourse Grammar: studies in indigenous languages of Columbia, Panama and Ecuador*. Arlington, Summer Institute of Linguistics. 3: 339-375.
- Wise, M. R. (1971) *Identification of Participants in Discourse*. Norman, Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Other Sources:

- 'Desano Verb' by Jonathan Kaye (1971)
- 'Grammar of Siona' by Alva Wheeler (1971)
- 'Morphology of Tucano' by Arthur Sorenson (1970)
- Different works on Secoya by Orville Johnson
- 'Estudios Tucanos' in Leiden