CLASSIFIERS IN MULTIPLE ENVIRONMENTS: BANIWA OF IÇANA/KURRIPAKO—A NORTH ARAWAK PERSPECTIVE
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Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako, a North Arawak language, has two genders and numerous classifiers employed in various morphosyntactic environments: with numbers, as derivational suffixes on nouns, in possessive constructions, and on adjectives. Some classifiers have the same form in all contexts, while others have different forms. The Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako system is contrasted with the system in Tariana, a closely related North Arawak language which underwent massive restructuring under the influence of the neighboring East Tucanoan languages. Comparison with other Arawak languages of the region provides additional evidence in favor of the system of Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako classifiers being more archaic than that of Tariana.
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1. Background. In the history of Arawak languages,¹ some categories are particularly stable. Their meaning and expression can be reconstructed as far back as Proto-Arawak. A twofold gender distinction is one of these. Other categories are found just in some languages and appear to be prone to diffusion. Classifiers are a case in point. About half the Arawak languages from the area of the Orinoco–Rio Negro basins and the adjacent regions north of the Amazon have numeral classifiers, i.e., classifiers only used in numeral constructions.² Two closely related languages spoken in the Içana–Vaupés basin—the Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako dialect continuum and Tariana—employ large sets of classifiers in a wide variety of morphosyntactic environments including numerals, adjectives, some verbal forms, and possessive constructions. Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako and Tariana share over 80% of their lexicons (Aikhenvald 2001:174) but differ substantially in their grammatical properties—of which classifiers are one.

¹The Arawak language family is the largest in South America, both in terms of its geographic expansion and in terms of number of languages. I avoid using the term Arawakan, employed by some to cover dubious genetic groupings (see Payne 1991). On the history of Arawak languages and the problems of internal classification and reconstruction, see Aikhenvald (1999a; 2001). North Arawak languages (spoken in 11 different locations north of the Amazon: see Aikhenvald 2002:303–11) form a broad genetic branch which divides into a number of low-level subgroups.

²The area is known for a higher concentration of structurally divergent languages than any other Arawak-speaking region. It is sometimes considered a putative homeland of Arawak-speaking peoples: see discussion in Aikhenvald (2002:14).
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First, I investigate the system of genders and classifiers in Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako\(^3\) and then contrast it with the system in Tariana, which underwent massive restructuring under the influence of the neighboring East Tucanoan languages \(^3\). Comparison with other Arawak languages of the region, in \(^4\), provides additional evidence in favor of the system of Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako classifiers being more archaic than that of Tariana.

2. Genders and classifiers in Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako. Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako\(^4\) combines a system of two genders \(^2.1\) with classifiers used in various contexts—see \(^2.2\). Principles of classifier choice and functions of classifiers are discussed in \(^2.3\). The two categories are expressed independently from one another—that is, in different morphosyntactic contexts (see Aikhenvald 2000:67–76, 204–40 for a typological perspective). The two systems interact with each other; first, both reflect categorization of nominals and, second, classifiers for human referents reflect gender-like distinctions.

2.1. The gender system. Baniwa/Kurripako has two genders (feminine and nonfeminine) distinguished in singular demonstratives, personal cross-
referencing prefixes and enclitics, personal pronouns, and as suffixes on nouns, primarily kinship terms.

Cross-referencing prefixes mark: (a) subject of an active intransitive verb \((S_a)\), as in (1); (b) possessor in genitive NPs, as in (2); (c) argument of adpositions, as in (3); and (d) subject of a transitive verb \((A)\), as in (3) and (5). Cross-referencing enclitics mark: (a) subject of a stative intransitive verb \((S_o)\), as in (4); and (b) direct object of a transitive verb \((O)\), as in (5).\(^5\)

Independent pronouns are mainly used to mark topicalized or emphasized constituents in core roles; these and most of the enclitics are derived from cross-referencing prefixes with the demonstrative formative \(-ha\) and subsequent metathesis of the glottal fricative at a morphemic boundary: \(nu\)- (1sg A/S\(_a\))-\(ha\) (DEM) > \(hnua\) ‘I’; \(pi\)- (2sg A/S\(_a\))-\(ha\) (DEM) > \(phia\) ‘you sg’\(^6\). Third-person pronouns can be used in the function of proximate demonstratives and as specifier articles. Cross-referencing prefixes, enclitics, and the corresponding pronouns are given in table 1. The gender-differentiated forms are in boldface. Demonstratives are shown in table 2. Examples are given in (1) and (5).

Feminine forms are used with female referents and nonfeminine forms with the rest.

(1) \(hne\(te\)-pida \ ri\-aku \ h\(rie\) \ is\(fida\)
\then-REP 3sgnf\(S_a\)-speak PROX.DEM.MASC.SG turtle

‘Then this turtle spoke, it is said’.

(2) \(hne\(te\)-pida \ ri\-kantu\-ni
\then-REP 3sgnf-song-POSS

‘Here is his (turtle’s) song, it is said’.

(3) \(na\-de\:-pida \ ri\-fiu \ pana\-phe
3plA-bring-REP 3sgnf-to leaf-CL:LEAF.LIKE

‘They brought leaves for him, it is said’.

\(^5\) See Aikhenvald (1995b) for further details concerning the active–stative person marking in Baniwa/Kurripako and elsewhere in North Arawak.

\(^6\) The metathesis of the glottal fricative accounts for such forms as \(he\(\(a\)\) (underlying form \(ri\)-‘3sg nonfem’ + \(ha\) ‘demonstrative’) ‘he’ and \(f\(ia\)\) (underlying form \(ju\) ‘3sg fem’ + \(ha\) ‘demonstrative’) ‘she’ in table 1, as well as other forms containing a suffix with an initial \(h\), e.g., \(aphe\(\)pa\) (underlying form \(apa\)-‘one’ + \(-hip\)a ‘numeral classifier: humans’ [table 4]), where an additional phonological process of vowel fusion, \(-a\ + \(-i\ > \(-e\), has taken place. All Baniwa/Kurripako and Tariana examples throughout the paper are given in phonological transcription. Examples from Tucano follow the conventions in Ramirez (1997). Examples from all other languages follow the sources. The symbol ’ is used to represent a glottal stop, and ~ stands for nasalization.
(4) **hape-ka-ni**  
be.cold-DECL.-3sgfS₀  
‘He is cold’.

(5) **3u-kapa-ni-pida**  
3sgfA-see-3sgnfO-REP  
**fuatahā**  
**phitfi**  
**3u-kapa-ni-pida**  
3sgfA-see-3sgnfO-REP  
**fuatahā**  
**phitfi**  
‘That female agouti (a small rodent) saw him, it is said’.

The gender-sensitive suffixes used with kinship terms include: (i) -ri ‘nonfeminine’, -3u ‘feminine’ (on the use of these as parts of noun class markers, see below), e.g., **nu-phe-ri** (1sg-elder.sibling-non.feminine) ‘my elder brother’, **nu-phe-3u** ‘my elder sister’; (ii) -ri ‘nonfeminine’, -du or -dua ‘feminine’, e.g., **nu-dake-3i** ‘my grandson’, **nu-dake-dua** ‘my granddaughter’; and (iii) ∅ ‘nonfeminine’, -dua ‘feminine’, e.g., **nu-kitsini** ‘my male relative’, **nu-kitsini-dua** ‘my female relative’.

To summarize: feminine and nonfeminine genders are consistently distinguished in third-person singular free and bound pronouns, demonstratives, and gender-sensitive derivational markers. This bipartite gender system is a feature of Arawak languages, which goes back to the proto-language. Table 3 summarizes the Proto-Arawak forms (cf. Aikhenvald 1999a:88).
Arawak *ri- is reflected in Baniwa/Kurripako ri-, and Proto-Arawak *ru- in Baniwa/Kurripako ru-., by regular sound correspondences. The reflexes of Proto-Arawak *i- ‘3sg nonfeminine’ and *u- ‘3sg feminine’ are found in Baniwa/Kurripako O/So enclitics -n-i ‘3sg nonfeminine’ and -n-u ‘3sg feminine’. The formative -n- in the third-person marking goes back to the Proto-Arawak marker of O/S_o.7

2.2. Classifiers in multiple environments. Classifiers in Baniwa/Kurripako (in boldface below) occur in various morphosyntactic environments. These can be arranged into three groups, in which different classifier subsets are employed. What unites the three seemingly disparate environments under (I) is that the same forms of classifiers are employed in them.8 Numerous classifier forms are analyzable—as seen below.

(I) As derivational suffixes on nouns, e.g., tfipara-api (metal.object-cl:hollow) ‘pan’; in predicative possessive constructions, as in (6), and with some verbal forms, as in (7):

(6) hrie tfipara-api
    PROX.DEM.NONFEM.SG metal.object-cl:hollow
    nu-daz-api
    1sg-POSS-CL:hollow

‘This pan is mine’.

The third-person singular nonfeminine -ni is a shared retention characteristic of Baniwa/Kurripako, Piapoco, Achagua, and Warekena of Guzman Blanco (whose partial description is in González-Ñáñez 1997). This marker is not related to the possessive -ni (in 2), which goes back to Proto-Arawak possessive *ni.

8 The use of classifiers in possessive constructions, purposive verbal forms, numerals, and adjectives can be described as agreement. Classifiers are always obligatory. Adjectives are a separate word class in most North Arawak languages (in Baniwa/Kurripako and in Tariana they share some properties with nouns, some with verbs, and also have features of their own: Aikhenvald 2004). As shown in tables 4 and 5, numerous classifiers employed with adjectives differ in their form from those employed as (I) derivational markers, in predicative possessive constructions, and with verbs; and (II) with numerals. The existence of different classifiers deriving new nouns (context I) and appearing as agreement markers on adjectives within one NP is one of the morphological criteria which set apart nouns and adjectives.
(7)  
\[ hrie \quad \text{tsipara-api} \]  
\text{PROX.DEM.NONFEM.SG} \quad \text{metal.object-CL:HOLLOW}  
\[ \text{pi-dzana-kašu-api} \]  
\text{2sg-cook-PURP-CL:HOLLOW}  

‘This pan is for you to cook’.

\textit{(II)} With numerals, e.g.,  
\[ \text{apa-api mawipi} \] (one-CL:HOLLOW blow.gun+CL:LONG.THIN) ‘one blowgun’

\textit{(III)} With adjectives, e.g.,  
\[ \text{tsipara-api maka-api} \] (metal.object-CL:HOLLOW big-CL:HOLLOW) ‘big pan’, and on interrogative modifiers, e.g.:

\[ \text{kwama:pi} \] (underlying form: \textit{kwame-api})  
\[ \text{paži-tuki} \]  
\text{which+CL:HOLLOW} \quad \text{dish-DIM}  
\[ \text{pi-pedzu-pha-ri} \]  
\text{2sg-like-INT-REL}  

‘Which little dish is the one you like best?’

Classifiers fall into four groups, according to the forms they distinguish when in environments (\textit{I}), (\textit{II}), and (\textit{III}). In the remainder of this paper, I refer to the four groups of classifiers as sets A, B, C, and D.

**Set A: Classifiers which refer to humans, high animates, and things relating to them (such as body parts).** This group consists of three members, each with a different set of forms in the environments (\textit{I}), (\textit{II}), and (\textit{III}) (except for the feminine animate marker which only distinguishes two forms). The distribution of forms is shown in table 4. Note that these classifiers reflect the differences between feminine animate and nonfeminine, which is reminiscent of gender distinctions discussed in 2.1. An additional distinction of human versus animate is specific just for this group of classifiers. Things relating to nonfeminine animate referents include body parts and newly introduced artifacts which are not classified by their shape or form, such as \textit{tsaia} ‘skirt’ (from Portuguese \textit{saia}) and \textit{kamitsa} ‘shirt’ (from Portuguese \textit{camisa}). The ‘nonfeminine’ category includes male referents as a subset, encompassing other referents which are not human males.

Two distinct nonfeminine forms are used with low numerals (‘one’, ‘two’, ‘three’, and in some dialects also ‘four’).\(^9\) The form \textit{-ita} refers to human males,\(^{10}\) e.g., \textit{apa-ita pedaria} (one-\text{NUM.CL:NONFEM.ANIM} old.man) ‘one old man’; higher animates, e.g., \textit{apa-ita tfinu} (one-\text{NUM.CL:NONFEM.ANIM} dog) ‘one dog’; and body parts, e.g., \textit{apa-ita ri-kapi} (one-\text{NUM.CL:NONFEM.ANIM} 

\(^9\) In most dialects, Portuguese numbers are used for ‘four’ onward.\(^{10}\) The form \textit{-ita} is occasionally used to refer to any human referent, including females.
3sgnf-hand) ‘his one hand’, apa-ita ri-ripi (one-NUM.CL:NONFEM.anim 3sgnf-tail) ‘his one tail’. Following the principle of association by important property (as formulated by Dixon 1972), events and objects associated with humans are also subsumed under the classifier -ita: one hears apa-ita ka-mitsa (one-NUM.CL:NONFEM.anim shirt) ‘one shirt’ and apa-ita mitsa (one-NUM.CL:NONFEM.anim Sunday/mass/week) ‘one Sunday/mass/week’.

The form -hipa refers to human males only; -ita can sometimes be used instead, e.g., apa-ita atfiiri, aphepa atfiiri (one-NUM.CL:NONFEM.anim man) ‘one man’. The form -hipa tends to be used whenever a man is contrasted to a woman. It never refers to any human attribute.

If a noun with a human referent is polysemous, the classifier choice serves to disambiguate the sex reference. Thus, apa-ita nawiki (one-NUM.CL:NONFEM.anim person) means ‘one person’, which could be male or female, while aphepa nawiki (one+NUM.CL:NONFEM.hum person) can only mean ‘one man’. Similarly, apa-ita ienipe (one-NUM.CL:NONFEM.anim child) means ‘one child’—a boy or a girl—while aphepa ienipe (one+NUM.CL:NONFEM.hum child) can only mean ‘one boy’.

Only the form -ita is used in contexts listed under (I). The use of a classifier with the verbal form of topic-advancing voice is illustrated in (9) (this category is functionally similar to a passive: see Aikhenvald 2003:283 on this phenomenon in Tariana).

(9) atfiiri pi-a-nita
    man 2sg-give-TOP.ADV+CL:NONFEM.anim money

‘The man was given money by you’.

Context (III) (with adjectives) allows two synonymous options: one can use either the classifier -ite (derived via the formative -i from the classifier -ita

11 Body parts in Baniwa/Kurripako, as in other Arawak languages, are obligatorily possessed and cannot occur without a possessive prefix (Aikhenvald 1999a).
which is employed in contexts I and II) or the classifier -da-ri (containing the nonfeminine singular marker -ri discussed in 2.1). Constructions maka-ite nawiki and maka-dari nawiki (big-ADJ.CL:NONFEM.ANIM person) both mean ‘a big person’.

The feminine classifier is used to refer to any female (human or nonhuman) and has the form -ma in contexts (I) and (II). These are illustrated in (10):

(10) apa-ma inazu i-mutu-ka-ma
     one-NUM.CL:FEM woman IND-leave-DECL-CL:FEM\[^{12}\]

     ‘one woman who left’

The form of the feminine classifier with adjectives as modifiers is -da-3u (this contains the feminine marker -3u discussed in 2.1 above), e.g., matafa-da-3u inazu (beautiful-CL:ADJ:FEM woman) ‘beautiful woman’. It forms a paradigmatic opposition with the corresponding nonfeminine adjectival agreement classifier -da-ri. (Note that the forms of feminine classifier can be considered an instance of suppletion.)

SET B: CLASSIFIERS WHICH REFER TO SHAPE, CONSISTENCY, QUANTIFICATION, AND SPECIFIC OBJECTS. This group consists of 39 members. The classifiers can refer to animates or to inanimates, depending on their shape and form properties, but hardly ever to humans. They fall into two subgroups:

SUBSET B1. Seventeen classifiers distinguish two forms: one used in contexts (I) and (II), and the other one used in context (III) (with adjectives). These are listed in table 5. Classifiers 1–9 refer to the shape and consistency of an object. Classifiers 10–13 have quantifying semantics, and classifiers 14–17 cover just one noun each (‘canoe’, ‘river’, and ‘excrement’) or a very limited set of nouns (‘skins’). The form of classifiers for ‘excrement’ and ‘skin’ is the same as that of the corresponding nouns.\[^{13}\]

The form -da-ri used on adjectives to refer to round objects is the same as the one used with nonfeminine animates (see table 4). This is an instance of syncretism in classifiers: the semantic distinction between nonfeminine animates and round objects is made in classifier contexts (I) and (II) but not in (III). The classifier -da is also employed as a generic classifier, to refer to

\[^{12}\] Baniwa/Kurripako also has an indefinite prefix i- employed when A/Sa is preposed to the verb, as in (6), and when the possessor or the argument of an adposition appear in front of the possessee and the adposition (see Aikhenvald 1995b). It also occurs on obligatorily possessed nouns, such as body parts, when the possessor is unspecified (as in 13–16). There is no corresponding enclitic or pronoun. Note that the constituent order in Baniwa/Kurripako is determined by discourse. Within an NP, numerals and demonstratives frequently precede the noun, and adjectives can either precede or follow it depending on the topicality of the noun.

\[^{13}\] In some classifiers, a phonological process of monophthongization applies, and -a + -y results in -e.
TABLE 5
SUBSET B1: CLASSIFIERS WHICH DISTINGUISH
TWO FORMS, ONE IN CONTEXTS (I) AND (II) AND ONE IN CONTEXT (III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Contexts (I) and (II)</th>
<th>Context (III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Round objects and natural phenomena and generic classifier; e.g., <em>tifida</em> ‘turtle’, <em>hipada</em> ‘stone’, <em>idza</em> ‘rain’</td>
<td>-da</td>
<td>-da-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nonfeminine flying animate; semioval objects; e.g., <em>piti</em> ‘bat’, <em>kepi</em> ‘bird’, <em>ainidzu</em> ‘mosquito’, <em>parana</em> ‘banana’</td>
<td>-apa</td>
<td>-apa-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feminine flying animate; e.g., <em>karaka</em> ‘hen’</td>
<td>-apa</td>
<td>-apa-3u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flat, round, extended objects; e.g., <em>kanari</em> ‘looking glass’, <em>kaida</em> ‘beach’</td>
<td>-kwa</td>
<td>-kwe &lt; -kwa-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curvilinear objects; e.g., <em>a:pi</em> ‘snake’, <em>hinipu</em> ‘road’</td>
<td>-kha</td>
<td>-khay &lt; -kha-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vertical or upright and standing objects; e.g., <em>haiku</em> ‘tree’, <em>dzawi</em> ‘jaguar’</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-ne, -nay &lt; -na-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hollow smallish objects; e.g., <em>a:ta</em> ‘cup’, <em>kureya</em> ‘spoon’</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-yari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stretchable thin extended objects; e.g., <em>tsaia</em> ‘skirt’, <em>ainidzu-maka</em> ‘mosquito net’</td>
<td>-maka</td>
<td>-make &lt; -maka-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liquids; e.g., <em>u:ni</em> ‘water’, <em>kuti</em> ‘drink of manioc flour’</td>
<td>-ahna</td>
<td>ahne &lt; -anha-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. One side; e.g., <em>apema nu-kapi makemari</em> (one+CL:SIDE 1sg-hand big+ADJ.CL:SIDE) ‘one big side of my hand’</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-ima-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bundle, box, parcel; e.g., <em>apa-pa itsa maka-pari</em> (one-CL:BOX hook big-ADJ.CL:BOX) ‘a big box of fishing hooks’</td>
<td>-pa</td>
<td>-pa-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <em>i:ta</em> ‘canoe’</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-a(-ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <em>u:ni</em> ‘river’</td>
<td>-pawa</td>
<td>-pawa-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. <em>ifa</em> ‘excrement’</td>
<td>-fa</td>
<td>-fa-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Skins; e.g., <em>dzawi</em>ya (jaguar+skin) ‘jaguar skin’</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-ya(-ri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
any object whose shape properties the speaker chooses not to specify (see 2.3 below).

In context (III), classifier 2 has the form -apa-ri, covering inanimate semi-oval objects and animate nonfeminine flying entities, e.g., maka:pa-ri parana (big+CL:SEMI.OVAL-NONFEM banana) ‘large banana’, maka:pa-ri karaka (big+CL:SEMI.OVAL/FLYING-NONFEM hen) ‘big rooster’. The form -apa-3u of classifier 3 covers only animate feminine flying entities, e.g., maka:pa-3u karaka (big+CL:SEMI.OVAL/FLYING-FEM hen) ‘big hen’. This is an instance of gender distinction integrated into the system of classifiers.

The marker -ri occurs in five other classifiers (10, 11, and 16; in 14 and 17 the classifier form with the marker -ri is in free variation with a form without this marker). The alternative form for classifier 17 in context (III) is the same as in other contexts, while the alternative form for classifier 14 in context (III) is different from contexts (I) and (II) where it is Ø. The marker -ri is presumably cognate with this same marker in classifier 2, but it does not have any specific sex reference. Classifier 15 is unusual in that its form in context (III) contains a marker -ni (possibly cognate with the O/S third-person singular nonfeminine marker -ni in table 1).14

Seven classifiers (4–6, 8, 9, 12, and 13) employ a marker -y to distinguish forms used in contexts (I) and (II) from those in context (III), e.g., (11). The same marker occurs in -ite, the form of the animate classifier employed in context (III) (see table 4).

(11) apa-kha hinipu maka-khay pi-a-ni-kha

‘One big curved road is for you to go’.

SUBSET B2. The remaining 22 classifiers employ one form in all contexts. These are given in table 6. Classifiers 1–12 refer to the form and shape of the referent, classifiers 13–18 are semantically quantifier-like, and 19–22 refer to specific objects or a limited class (‘house’, ‘waterfall’, ‘room’, ‘eggs’, and ‘pits of fruit’).

SET C: Classifiers used only in context (III). Two classifiers are used only with numerals in context (II)—see table 7. Semantically, they are quantifier-like. The classifier -itfia is not analyzable. These classifiers have no special counterpart which can be used in contexts (I) or (III). When nouns subsumed under classifiers in table 7 are used with an adjective, any semantically appropriate classifier from set B is acceptable. The choice depends on the shape of the bundle. The most frequent—and semantically neutral—choice is the generic classifier -da (context I), -dari (context III)—see (12).

14 An alternative whereby -ci, -y, and -ni could be considered adjective markers is not viable because they do not occur with all classifiers, their choice is idiosyncratic, and in two cases (classifiers 14 and 17) they are optional.
### TABLE 6

**SUBSET B2: CLASSIFIERS WHICH EMPLOY ONE FORM IN ALL CONTEXTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Contexts (I), (II), and (III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pointed long objects; e.g., <em>nu-api</em> (1sg-bone) ‘my bone’, <em>phe:ruma</em> ‘flute’, <em>garafa</em> ‘bottle’</td>
<td>-hiku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thin, sharp objects; e.g., <em>tfikure</em> ‘a hair’, <em>nu-kapida</em> ‘my finger’</td>
<td>-hiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Small seedlike objects; e.g., <em>pipefi</em> ‘seed of a palm tree fruit’, <em>a:ji</em> ‘pepper’</td>
<td>-ifi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Folded pieces of cloth; e.g., <em>pieta</em> ‘hammock’, <em>enikarya</em> ‘cobweb’</td>
<td>-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Long, thin objects; e.g., <em>teruripi</em> ‘manioc squeezer’</td>
<td>-pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Small holes; e.g., <em>nu-numa</em> ‘my mouth’, <em>hipadaphi</em> ‘hole in a stone’</td>
<td>-wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Large holes, open spaces; e.g., <em>panthinuma</em> ‘door’, <em>harayawa</em> ‘hole’</td>
<td>-yawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extended, long stretches; e.g., <em>hinipu</em> ‘road’, <em>u:ni</em> ‘river’</td>
<td>-peku, -peki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hollow objects; e.g., <em>ma:wipi</em> ‘blowgun’, <em>tfiparapi</em> ‘pan’</td>
<td>-api</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Limited space; e.g., <em>kiniki</em> ‘garden’, <em>karita</em> ‘lake’</td>
<td>-aphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Long, thin, sticklike object; e.g., <em>haikwapu</em> ‘stick’, <em>dzawithyapu</em> ‘bow’</td>
<td>-apu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thin, flat, foldable objects; e.g., <em>yamakati</em> ‘cloth’, <em>pape5a</em> ‘paper’</td>
<td>-phe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Piece, half; e.g., <em>parahnpada</em> ‘piece of banana’</td>
<td>-hipada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Half; e.g., <em>apa-ida mawizu</em> (one-cl:half pineapple) ‘half a pineapple’</td>
<td>-ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bundle of thin, long objects; e.g., <em>apa-naki lapi</em> (one-cl:thin.bundle pencil) ‘(bundle of ) pencils’</td>
<td>-naku, -naki¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bundle of long objects; e.g., <em>apa-puki parana</em> (one-cl:long.bundle banana) ‘a bundle of bananas’</td>
<td>-puku, -puki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Joint; e.g., <em>apa-tawahre nu-kaphiwida</em> (one-cl:joint 1sg-hand+head) ‘finger joint’</td>
<td>-tawahre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Time cycle; e.g., <em>hamari</em> ‘year’, <em>hekwapi</em> ‘day’</td>
<td>-wari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. <em>panți</em> ‘house’</td>
<td>-dapana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Egg or pit of a fruit; e.g., <em>karakehwe</em> ‘hen’s egg’</td>
<td>-ihwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. <em>hipa</em> ‘waterfall’</td>
<td>-hipani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. <em>tuhwyia</em> ‘room’</td>
<td>-tuhwya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The forms -naku and -naki and -peku and -peki are free variants.
'A big bundle of açai fruit was/is taken by me'.

**Set D: Classifiers used only in context (III)**. Two classifiers occur only with adjectives in context (III)—see table 8. These two classifiers are similar in their semantics: -peni marks plural of animate nouns and their attributes, while -pezi marks collective plural of inanimate referents. If pluralized, any noun with animate referent requires the plural marker -peni on the adjective. Conversely, any noun with inanimate referent can occur with -pezi on the adjective, once it has a collective referent.

To summarize: Baniwa/Kurripako has 46 classifier morphemes. Of these, 41 can be used in context (I). These include two classifiers from set A and 39 from set B. Forty-four can be used in context (II), including three from set A, 39 from set B, and the two of set C. Forty-three occur in context (III), including two from set A, 39 from set B, and the two from set D. This is summarized in table 9.

The largest number of classifiers occur with numerals. One classifier from set A, nonfeminine human -hipa, displays syncretism with the nonfeminine animate classifier -ita in contexts (I) and (II) (table 4). Three classifiers with adjectives are morphologically irregular. Recall that, within set A, the feminine classifier with adjectives is suppletive (-da-3u in context III and -ma in contexts I and II). The nonfeminine animate classifier in context (III)
is either -ite (derived from -ita used in contexts I and II) or -da-ri, the non-feminine equivalent of -da-3u. The same form -dari is used in context (III) for the generic classifier -da ‘round objects’ (table 5). This is another instance of syncretism in classifier paradigms in context (III). Both -da-ri and its feminine equivalent -da-3u contain gender markers (tables 1 and 3). So do gender-differentiated classifiers for flying animates in set B (under 2 and 3 in table 5).

The two classifiers from set D operate on different semantic parameters from the rest of the system: they categorize any noun referent as animate, or inanimate collective. In fact, these plural classifiers can be treated as a separate system of noun categorization which only partly interacts with the rest of the classifiers.

2.3. How to choose and to use a classifier. Classifiers are hardly ever semantically redundant. In most languages with large classifier systems, their choice helps highlight different facets of the meaning of polysemous nouns (as was first described for Burmese by Becker 1975:113; see Aikhenvald 2000:319–20 for a typological overview and Aikhenvald 2003:115 for a similar phenomenon in Tariana). The choice of a classifier in Baniwa/Kurripako also largely depends on what aspect of the referent is highlighted.

A bone, -ñapi, can be viewed as a part of a human body—in which case it requires an animate classifier, (1) from table 4:

(13) apa-ita  
one-CL:NONFEM.ANIM

i-ñapi  
IND-bone

maka-ite  
big-ADJ.CL:NONFEM.ANIM

‘a big bone’ (seen as a part of a human body)

Or it can be considered as a vertical object. Then the classifier for vertical objects (classifier 6 from table 5) is used.
(14) apa-na i-ñapi maka-ne
   one-CL:VERT IND-bone big-ADJ.CL:VERT
   ‘a big bone’ (considered as a long vertical object, i.e., a leg bone)

Or it can be looked at as something long, as in (15) (classifier 5 from table 6). In the context of the story, this property of the bone needs to be stressed because this is what made it suitable to serve as a flute:

(15) apa-pi i-ñapi maka-pi
   one-CL:LONG IND-bone big-CL:LONG
   ‘one long bone’ (e.g., the bone a turtle used to make a flute)

And if a bone is viewed as an object in general, the generic classifier (also used for round things [classifier 1 from table 5]) is employed.

(16) apa-da i-ñapi maka-dari
   one-CL:ROUND/GENERIC IND-bone big-ADJ.CL:ROUND/GENERIC
   ‘a big bone’ (seen as an object)

Along similar lines, if one says hinipu maka-peki (road big-ADJ.CL:EXTENSIVE [classifier 8 from table 6]), one refers to ‘a big and large road’. Saying hinipu maka-khay (road big-ADJ.CL:CURV [classifier 5 from table 5]) ‘a big road (big and twisted)’ implies that the road is big and curved (but not necessarily large). The dimension adjective maka ‘big, large’ occurs with a large array of form and shape classifiers, thus effectively making up for the lack of adjectives such as ‘curved’ or ‘round’ in the language.

Occasionally, a shape classifier can be applied even to a human referent, jokingly stressing their particularly unusual property: saying atsiari maka-ne (man big-CL:VERT) ‘big man’ implies that the man is exceptionally tall and upright, just like a tree.

There is no need for the classifier to appear on the noun itself. But classifiers can occur on nouns with nonhuman referents, to stress a particular property: for instance, tfimu means ‘dog’; to refer to a particularly round and small dog, one can say tfimu-da (dog-CL:ROUND). Classifiers on nouns can make their meanings more specific. For instance, the noun nu-thi (1sg-eye) means ‘my eyes’ (in general). If I want to talk about one of my eyes, I will say nu-thi-da (1sg-eye-CL:ROUND) ‘my (round) eye’. If I talk about an eyelid, I say nu-thi-maka (1sg-eye-CL:STRETCHABLE.THIN). Incidentally, a noun with an inanimate referent can only be pluralized if it contains a classifier, e.g., papeja-phe-pe (paper-CL:LEAF.LIKE-PL) ‘papers, pieces of paper’ but not *papaza-pe. (Nouns with animate referents are pluralized with a suffix -nai.) This function of classifiers is pervasive in the Northwest Amazonia area and has been documented in Bora-Witoto (e.g., Thiesen 1996:105 and
Seifart 2002), Guahibo (e.g., Kerr 1995), East Tucanoan languages (Barnes 1999), and Tariana (Aikhenvald 2000:220–21).

The way native speakers choose classifiers is more like choosing a lexical item than applying a strict grammatical rule of agreement. A story about Hänsel and Gretel was told by two speakers (the late Marcília Rodrigues and her uncle). They used different classifiers to describe the same referent—the big eyelids of a witch. What Marcília referred to as $3u-thi\ maka-ya$ (3sgf-eye $\text{big-ADJ.CL:SKIN}$), João described as $3u-thi-maka maka-phay$ (3sgf-eye-$\text{CL:EXTENDED.CLOTH}$ $\text{big-ADJ.CL:FLAT}$), explaining that the eyelid folds itself around the eye just like a piece of cloth.

In contrast to the comparative freedom in how classifiers are chosen, the two-term gender system (described in 2.1) is rigid. A noun is assigned feminine gender if its referent is an animate female. As a result, only nouns with sex-differentiable referents can be assigned either a feminine or nonfeminine reading: in (5) an agouti (a small rodent) is a mythical woman, and this explains the feminine demonstrative and cross-referencing marker. Had it been a male agouti, the nonfeminine form would have been chosen. No such choice is available for humans—whose gender cannot be changed$^{15}$—or inanimates who always belong to the nonfeminine gender.

Classifiers are obligatory in all morphosyntactic environments (see contexts I, II, III above) except for purposive clauses. There they are used only if the object of the purposive clause is topical. In (17), the bundle of palm leaves is what the story is about; this is signaled by the presence of a classifier.

(17) $wa-tua\ wa-takha\ puapua\ wa-dzekata-ka$ $3u-pa$
1pl+go-FUT 1pl-cut palm.leaf 1pl-make-PURP-CL:BUNDLE
‘We shall go and cut palm leaf to make a bundle (of it)’.

In contrast, there is no classifier in (18): the object of the purposive clause is not part of the topic.$^{16}$

(18) $pe\ z\ i-uhwa\ ri-kapa\ awakada-rikuc\ ri-kapa-ka$ $3u$ $kaka\ i-nu-ri\ i-kahre$
hawk 3sgnf-sit 3sgnf-see bush-LOC 3sgnf-see-PURP
what/who IND-come-REL IND-to
‘The hawk was sitting looking into the bush, in order to see who was coming’.

$^{15}$ Baniwa/Kurripako has hardly any hybrid nouns with human reference (such as ‘grandparent’ or ‘warrior’); these are either gender differentiated or assigned a fixed—feminine or nonfeminine—gender.

$^{16}$ The two examples also differ in their constituent order and the animacy of the participants (these parameters are not relevant for the use of classifiers).
In discourse, classifiers may be used anaphorically, as in:

(19) waʃa wa-dzekata pi-ʃiu tsetu na-dzekata
    let’s 1pl-make 2sg-for basket 3pl-make
    apa-ita  i-dzekata dzama-da
    one-CL:NONFEM.ANIM IND-make two-CL:ROUND/GENERIC

    apa-ita  i-dzekata dzama-da
    one-CL:NONFEM.ANIM IND-make two-CL:ROUND/GENERIC

‘Let’s make baskets for you. They made (baskets): one made two
(baskets) and the other made two (baskets).’

Example (2) above, which is from a traditional story, introduced the first
song sung by a turtle to tease a nasty jaguar. (20), which is from the same
story, introduces his other song:

(20) hneTe-pida apa-da
    here-REP one-CL:ROUND/GENERIC

‘Here is one (other) (song), it is said’.

A referent may not even get a mention by a noun, if the context is explicit
enough. A classifier is sufficient to know what is implied, as in (21), from a
conversation:

(21) ȵame ri-uma ri-dana-ka nu-hriu-ni-tsa
    no 3sgnf-want 3sgnf-write-DECL 1sg-to-3sgnfO/S6-EMPH
    aphewi (underlying form: apa-hiwi)
    one+CL:POINTED

‘It is not going to write, I have another (pen).’

These general characteristics of the use of classifiers in Baniwa/Kurripako
are echoed by similar structures in its close relative Tariana, and also in lan-
guages from East Tucanoan and Bora-Witoto families (and are reminiscent
of the Yagua classifier system: see Payne [this volume]). What is highly un-
usual about the Baniwa/Kurripako system is the existence of the different
sets of classifiers grouped under sets A–D above. In the next section, I show
the ways in which the system of classifiers in Tariana became different from
that in Baniwa/Kurripako, under the impact of East Tucanoan languages.

3. The East Tucanoan impact on classifiers in Tariana. Tariana is a
close relative of Baniwa/Kurripako and the only Arawak language spoken in
the multilingual area of the Vaupés river basin (see Aikhenvald 2002 for an
exhaustive discussion). The ways in which its classifier system has been par-
ially restructured to fit in with the East Tucanoan patterns are particularly instructive for our understanding of classifier constructions in northwest Amazonia and within the North Arawak subgroup of Arawak.

Tariana—which used to be a dialect continuum, with individual dialects as different as Spanish and Portuguese (see Aikhenvald 2002; 2003:620)—is in constant contact with East Tucanoan languages. The Vaupés area is known for its rampant multilingualism due to exogamy and the ensuing one-way diffusion of structural patterns from East Tucanoan into other languages (Tariana and Makú—see details in Aikhenvald 1996; 1999b; 2002 and Epps 2005). Multilingualism in the Vaupés area is accompanied by a strong inhibition against language mixing in terms of lexical loans. As a result, in spite of the striking structural similarity between Tariana and genetically unrelated East Tucanoan languages, there are almost no lexical loans between them.

Tariana preserves a number of common Arawak grammatical features, including the two genders in third-person singular cross-referencing prefixes (nonfeminine di-, feminine du-\(^{17}\)), independent third-person pronouns (diha ‘he’ and duha ‘she’), and derivational suffixes (compare with table 3 above; see Aikhenvald 2003:196–200 for an extensive discussion).

Tariana has over 60 established classifiers. Unlike Baniwa/Kurripako, in Tariana most derivational suffixes can be used as classifiers, and this explains their large number (also see Aikhenvald 2002:92–95 for how classifiers interrelate with the lexicon, under Tucanoan influence). Classifiers are used in similar, but not quite identical, contexts as in Baniwa/Kurripako. The existing differences in classifier use are due to influence from East Tucanoan languages (predominantly from Tucano).

Areally diffused patterns involve just about every aspect of phonology, morphology, syntax, and discourse organization. With respect to nominal classification, areal influence of East Tucanoan languages on Tariana affects: (i) the context of classifier use; (ii) the existence of different forms of classifiers in different contexts; and (iii) the semantic organization of the system.

Table 10 summarizes the interaction of areally diffused and genetically inherited patterns in classifier systems in Tariana. In this table, Tariana is compared to Baniwa/Kurripako and to the East Tucanoan languages. The patterns of classifier use in Tariana which developed as a result of language contact are in boldface. In what follows, I discuss these issues in some detail.

(i) With respect to the differences in the contexts of classifier use, we have seen that Baniwa/Kurripako uses gender distinctions in demonstratives (see 1 and 5 above, and 22 below).

\(^{17}\) In Tariana, d- in morpheme-initial position corresponds to Baniwa/Kurripako r-.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Baniwa/Kurripako</th>
<th>Tariana</th>
<th>East Tucanoan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Context of classifier use</td>
<td>Numerals, adjectives, relative</td>
<td>Numerals, adjectives, relative</td>
<td>Numerals, adjectives, relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>predicate, purposive predicate,</td>
<td>predicate, purposive predicate,</td>
<td>predicate, purposive predicate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>topic-advancing voice,</td>
<td>topic-advancing voice,</td>
<td>topic-advancing voice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>predicative possessive constructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>predicative possessive constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstratives, all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>possessive constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Different forms in different</td>
<td>Separate form for the ‘human’</td>
<td>Separate form for the ‘human’</td>
<td>Same form for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contexts</td>
<td>numeral classifier</td>
<td>numeral classifiers (falling into disuse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A number of classifiers have a somewhat different</td>
<td>Only animate nonfeminine classifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>form used with adjectives</td>
<td>has a somewhat different form used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with adjectives (falling into disuse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Semantic organization</td>
<td>Nouns with any referent classified by shape</td>
<td>Only nouns with inanimate referents</td>
<td>Only nouns with inanimate referents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classified by shape</td>
<td>classified by shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this same context, Tariana (23) and East Tucanoan languages (e.g., Tucano in 24) use classifiers. The same classifier set is used in all other contexts.

(23) ha-ma

DEM: GENERIC-CL:FEM  woman

‘this woman’

(24) a’ti-go

DEM: GENERIC-CL:FEM  woman

‘this woman’

Along similar lines, classifiers in Tariana are used in possessive constructions of all types, just like in Tucano. In contrast, as we saw in (6) above, classifiers in Baniwa/Kurripako are restricted to just predicative possession. The structural parallelism between a Tariana and an East Tucanoan structure is shown in (25) and (26).

(25) pi-ya-ku

2sg-POSS-CL:EXTENDED  hammock-CL:EXTENDED

‘your hammock’

(26) mi’i ya-gí

2sg  POSS-CL:LARGE  hammock-CL:LARGE

‘your hammock’

In Baniwa, classifiers occur in predicative possessive constructions: pi-pieta-ni (2sg-hammock-poss) is the only way of saying ‘your hammock’. A construction structurally similar to Tariana (25), pi-dza-ku (2sg-poss.cl:ext), means ‘(this hammock) is yours’ (the possessive -dza is cognate to Tariana ya).

(ii) With respect to the classifier form in different contexts, we have seen that a number of classifiers in Baniwa/Kurripako have a distinct form when used with an adjective. In (11), the form -kha-y (ADJ.CL:CURV) is used with an adjective, and the form -kha (CL:CURV) occurs on the numeral ‘one’ and on the verb. (Also see n. 14: the marker -y cannot be considered an “adjectivizer.”) In Tariana, one form is used in all contexts, as shown in (27), where the classifier is -kha.
(27) \textit{pa-kha} \hspace{1em} \textit{hinirusi} \hspace{1em} \textit{hanu-kha} \\
\text{one-CL:CURV} \hspace{1em} \text{rope} \hspace{1em} \text{big-CL:CURV} \\
\textit{pi-a-ni-kha-naka} \hspace{1em} \text{Tariana} \\
\text{2sg-give-TOP.ADV-CL:CURV-PRESENT.VISUAL} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{‘One big rope is given by you (to someone; I saw this)’}.

The only exception in Tariana is the classifier for nonfeminine animates and animate human attributes, which has the form -ite with adjectives and -ita in all other classifier contexts—see (28). Some innovative speakers tend to use just one form, -ita, in all the contexts. Other speakers generalize the form -ite and use it in lieu of -ita. A special form of numeral classifier is employed for human referents, also -hipa (like in Baniwa/Kurripako: see table 4). This form is also falling into disuse, thus making the innovative Tariana even more similar to Tucano.

(iii) I now turn to the restructuring of the semantic organization of the system as it relates to the classification of animate referents. While in all Baniwa/Kurripako varieties animate beings may be classified by their shape, in Tariana and Tucano a special animate classifier is employed. We saw in table 5 that a snake in Baniwa/Kurripako may take a classifier for ‘curved’ objects -kha. In Tariana, the equivalent is (28), with the classifier used for animates (note the difference in gloss between Baniwa and Tariana: in Tariana, the classifier -ita/ite can be used with female referents, while in Baniwa this is not the case). The classifier -kha in Tariana is used only for inanimate objects of curved forms; *\textit{pa-kha} api is not acceptable.

(28) \textit{pa-ita} \hspace{1em} \text{api} \hspace{1em} \textit{hanu-ite} \hspace{1em} \text{Tariana} \\
\text{one-CL:ANIM} \hspace{1em} \text{snake} \hspace{1em} \text{big-ADJ.CL:ANIM} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{‘a big snake’}

This is structurally similar to Tucano, where ‘one snake’ is \textit{ni’kí pîrô} (one+NUM.CL:ANIM snake) (Ramirez 1997). A shape classifier would not be used with an animate referent in any Tucanoan language, except in certain constructions in the East Tucanoan language Cubeo. Cubeo has been influenced by Baniwa/Kurripako and is thus another instance of Tucanoan–Arawak contact (outside the Vaupés linguistic area proper). In Cubeo, animals came to be classified by their shape, rather than just as animates (see Gomez-Imbert 1996). This is a different direction of generalization from that in Tariana, under the Tucano influence.

Just as in Baniwa/Kurripako (2.3), classifier choice in Tariana depends on which aspect of the referent is highlighted. If one says \textit{hinipu hanu-kha} (road big-CL:CURV) ‘big road’, one implies that the road is long and curved, and \textit{hinipu hanu-pek} (road big-CL:ROAD.STRETCH) refers to a ‘big stretch of road’. This is also similar to Tucano. Unlike Baniwa/Kurripako—but like Tucano—
such reclassification is impossible for animates in Tariana (as mentioned above). Similarly to Baniwa/Kurripako, and to Tucano, classifiers are used anaphorically and as a referent-tracking device (Aikhenvald 2003:115–17).

This agrees with a general principle: features of Tariana which are shared with Baniwa/Kurripako tend to be lost, unless they are also a feature of the East Tucanoan languages (see Aikhenvald 2002:264–74).

4. Classifiers in Baniwa/Kurripako in a North Arawak perspective. I now look at the classifier system in Baniwa/Kurripako in the light of other languages from the same subgroup of the Arawak family.

The system of noun categorization devices in Baniwa/Kurripako is typologically interesting in the ways in which genders are distinct from classifiers. Two genders (inherited from Proto-Arawak) are present in cross-referencing prefixes and enclitics, and in demonstratives. In addition, somewhat different classifier forms are employed in different morphosyntactic contexts (see Aikhenvald 2000:230–40 for further typological parallels). Of the 46 classifier morphemes, 44 occur with numerals, 43 with adjectives, and 41 in other contexts (see table 9). Of the classifier morphemes in Baniwa/Kurripako, 31 have cognates in Tariana: three in set A, 25 in set B, one in set C, and the two in set D (see Aikhenvald 2001).

A noteworthy and unusual feature of the Baniwa/Kurripako classifier system is the existence of special forms employed on adjectives. Some of these consist of the classifier employed elsewhere and followed by the suffix -y.

If the classifier can be applied to gender-differentiated animates, the classifier forms on adjectives combine with the gender-sensitive suffixes: the ubiquitous nonfeminine -\(i\) and feminine -\(ju\). In Tariana, different forms for adjectival agreement and for other classifier contexts are attested only for the nonfeminine animate classifier (1 in table 4; see 3). No other Arawak language is known to have anything of the sort.

That the Baniwa/Kurripako classifier system is closer to the Proto-Baniwa/Kurripako-Tariana system than the one in Tariana is corroborated by the ways in which Tariana has lost—or is in the process of losing—the features shared with Baniwa/Kurripako and absent from East Tucanoan languages. There is no evidence that the Baniwa/Kurripako dialects discussed here have been influenced by any Tucanoan source.\(^{18}\) Neither is there any evidence indicating that special forms of classifiers in adjectives ever existed in Tariana. It is in principle possible that such forms are a Baniwa/Kurripako innovation, given that they are not found in other Arawak languages. However, since other Tariana features demonstrably developed under Tucanoan influence, I assume that this is also true for the special forms on adjectives.

\(^{18}\) Note that in the instances of Baniwa–Cubeo contact, Cubeo was affected by Baniwa, and numerous Cubeo clans abandoned their language in favor of Baniwa (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1986 and Morse and Maxwell 1999).
At present, only one dialect of Tariana, that of the Wamiarikune group of Santa Rosa and Periquitos, is still spoken. The analysis of existing materials on extinct Tariana dialects (such as the dialect of Ipanore, first documented by Johannes Natterer in 1831, and then by Koch-Grünberg 1911; see Aikhenvald 2003:620) shows that the more archaic ones\(^{19}\) are closer to Baniwa/Kurripako than to the present-day Tariana.

Eight of 15 Arawak languages spoken in the Orinoco–Rio Negro area and the two closely related languages further away, Resígaro and Yucuna, have classifiers. (For further comparisons demonstrating close relationships between these languages in terms of lexicon, and of grammatical morphemes, see Aikhenvald 2001 and appendix 3 in Aikhenvald 2002.) Besides Baniwa/Kurripako and Tariana, classifiers in multiple functions are found only in Resígaro (Allin 1975). The system of Resígaro classifiers is structurally very similar to Bora (Bora-Witoto family) with which Resígaro is reported to be in constant contact (also see Tessmann 1930:583 on the cultural affinity between the Resígaro and the Bora-Witoto). Classifiers are employed with numerals, adjectives demonstratives, and on verbs in relative clauses. Of 56 classifiers, nine are of Arawak origin and the remainder were borrowed from Bora (see Aikhenvald 2001:186–88). This is another instance of diffusion of classifier contexts into an Arawak language. But, unlike Tariana, Resígaro also borrowed classifier forms.

Other Arawak languages of the area have just numeral classifiers.\(^{20}\) That the largest number of classifier morphemes in Baniwa/Kurripako are used as

\(^{19}\) The dialects documented by Koch-Grünberg and Natterer are archaic in their lexicon as well as their grammar: for instance, there are traces of bound pronouns.

\(^{20}\) The number of cognates in classifiers in North Arawak languages and the number of classifiers in each are shown below (Aikhenvald 2002:307). The etymology of Tariana classifiers not attested in Baniwa/Kurripako is unknown.

### Number of Cognates in Classifiers in North Arawak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Classifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tariana (over 60 classifiers)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniwa/Kurripako</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resígaro</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucuna</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achagua</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniwa of Guainia/Warekena</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahwana</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maipure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Maipure is in brackets, due to the scarcity of the data [summarized in Zamponi 2003.]). Languages without classifiers are: Piapoco (Klumpp 1990; 1995), Guarequena (Gonzalez-Náñez 1970; 1997), †Bare (Aikhenvald 1995a); †Yavitero (Mosonyi 1987), †Manao (Goeje 1948), and †?Kaishana (Hanke 1960). No information on classifiers is available for the majority of extinct languages once spoken in the area such as Mandawaka, Yabaana, Yumana, Passe, Amarizana, and Guinau (most probably, a dialect of Bare), or for Kabiyari.
numeral classifiers is consonant with the fact that this is the most archaic classifier context for Arawak languages north of the Amazon.

All the Arawak languages of the area distinguish two genders in demonstratives and cross-referencing (except for Bahwana, where genders survive just in derivational suffixes: Ramirez 1992:47), with reflexes of the Proto-Arawak gender markers (table 3).

A pervasive feature of most North Arawak classifier systems is integrating the old Arawak gender marking into the system of classifiers. Two genders are distinguished in numeral classifiers with human and animate referents in Achagua (Wilson 1992:62–63), e.g., bá-keeži (one-cl:human. masc) ‘one (man)’ versus bá-keetoo (one-cl:human.fem) ‘one (woman)’ and bá-na-i (one-cl:mammal-masc) ‘one (male animal, e.g., dog)’ versus ba-na-u (one-cl:mammal-fem) ‘one (female animal, e.g., bitch)’ (also see Meléndez 1998:83–90). In each case, the masculine gender markers -ži and -u and feminine -žu and -u are direct reflexes of Proto-Arawak forms in table 3. Two of the numeral classifiers in Yucuna also reflect a gender distinction: -ha refers to human males and -ha-ru refers to human females (Schauer and Schauer 2000:51). Here, -ru is a reflex of the Proto-Arawak feminine marker in table 3.

Along similar lines, in Bahwana (Ramirez 1992:47, 55) two numeral classifiers mirror the gender distinctions: -tura for male animates and -ruwa for female animates. While the etymology of -tura is obscure, -ruwa most probably contains the feminine marker -ru (also found in some derivational morphemes), of Proto-Arawak origin. Of 56 classifiers in Resígaro (Allin 1975:154–66, 365), one, -gí ‘human male and all nonhuman animates’, is a reflex of the Proto-Arawak nonfeminine marker (in the available data, the suffix -dó ‘female’, a reflex of the Proto-Arawak feminine suffix in table 3, occurs only as a derivational suffix in one kinship term, náadó ‘sister of sister’).

To summarize: the most archaic classifier context for Arawak languages north of the Amazon is that of numeral classifiers. The emergence of multiple classifier contexts is a shared innovation reconstructible for Proto-Baniwa/Kurripako-Tariana.

Exactly what triggered this innovation is food for further thought. Two Arawak languages which share a high percentage of lexicon and grammatical morphemes (60–70%) with Baniwa/Kurripako and with Tariana are Piapoco (Klumpp 1990; 1995) and Warekena (González-Ñáñez 1997). One difference is striking—neither Piapoco nor Warekena have classifiers of any sort. Both are spoken outside the adjoining Vaupés–Içana basins.

This, and the existence of structural similarities shared by Tariana, East Tucanoan languages, and Baniwa/Kurripako—but notably absent from other North Arawak languages (Aikhenvald 1999b)—suggest that multiple classifiers as a Proto-Baniwa/Kurripako-Tariana innovation could be indicative
of old contact-induced changes in an area which goes beyond the Vaupés into the basin of the Íçana and its tributaries.

APPENDIX A

ON DIALECTAL VARIATION IN BANIWA/KURRIPAKO CLASSIFIERS

Dialects of Baniwa/Kurripako differ from each other in the sets of classifiers they use and in their number. For instance, Hill (1988) lists 19 classifiers for Curricarro, while Gonzalez-Ñáñez (1985) gives 25 for éje-Kurripako. (Gonzalez-Ñáñez does not distinguish between different classifier forms in different contexts; Hill mentions their existence but does not further discuss classifiers used in contexts other than with numerals.) Valadares (1994) lists 30 classifier morphemes for Kumandene and Ayanene. The basic principles of classifier choice and the grammatical contexts appear to be the same.

Some of these have cognates in related languages. Thus, éje-Kurripako has a classifier -athi (or Vthi) ‘concave objects’ which could be related to the Tariana classifier -thiwa ‘concave hole, ravine’. The éje-Kurripako classifier -ake (Vke) ‘tree branch’, as in apâke jâiku íkè (one+CL:TREE.BRANCH tree IND:branch) ‘one branch of a tree’ is cognate with the first part of the complex classifier in Tariana -ke-na ‘branch of a tree’; its second syllable could be cognate with the classifier -na ‘vertical’, found in both Tariana and Baniwa. The classifier -hwya ‘concave objects’ in Kumandene and Ayanene (Valadares 1994:130) is cognate with Tariana -hwya ‘classifier for canoes’, and the classifier -ki for ‘thin small objects’ is cognate with the Tariana classifier -ki, -khi with the same semantics. The Kumandene-Ayanene and Kurri classifier -i for humans could be cognate with Achagua nonfeminine gender marker -i (Wilson 1992:63). No cognates have been established for other classifiers, such as Curricarro -weni ‘man-made fire’.

The semantic range of classifiers varies from one dialect to another. For instance, in éje-Kurripako, the classifier -heko is used for sticks and trees, while in Hohôdene it covers long thin objects like sticks, but not trees. In Kumandene and Ayanene—and also in Hohôdene and Siuci—the vertical classifier -na is used to refer to four-legged animals, e.g., apa-na dzawi (one-CL:VERT jaguar) ‘one jaguar’. In éje-Kurripako, the classifier -heko is used for these referents, e.g., apheko dzavi (one+CL:STICK.LIKE jaguar) ‘one jaguar’.
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