PERSON MARKING AND DISCOURSE IN NORTH ARAWAK LANGUAGES

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald

Abstract. A number of North Arawak languages show a connection between discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents and the way they are cross-referenced on the predicate. Baniwa and Bare have a special cross-referencing prefix used to mark a focussed subject (A/S). In Warekena and Bare cross-referencing prefixes on the verb may be totally suppressed if the subject (A/S) undergoes preverbal fronting as a contrastive focus. This property shows a certain analogy with other languages (e.g., Chamorro), and contributes to an over-all typology of discourse-marking devices in the languages of the world.

1. The aims of this paper

Languages use different strategies for information distribution in sentence and discourse, and correlate discourse-pragmatic and grammatical functions of constituents in different ways. Grammatical means used, among other things, to encode discourse-pragmatic characteristics, include constituent ordering, case-marking, verbal cross-referencing, voice systems and other verbal categories.

The purpose of this paper is to show a connection between discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents and the way they are cross-referenced on the predicate in several previously undescribed North Arawak languages of the Upper Rio Negro: Bare, Warekena and Baniwa of Içana. The strategies used to encode grammatical marking of discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents are:

1 Following Dixon 1994, I distinguish A - the subject of a transitive verb, O - the object of an intransitive verb, S - the subject of an intransitive verb; S_1 - the subject of an active intransitive verb and S_2 - the subject of a stative intransitive verb.

2 Materials on Baniwa of Içana - a North Arawak language spoken in Brazil and Colombia on the Içana river by around 3000 people (some Baniwa dialects are also known as Kurripako) - were collected in 1991 - 1994, during field trips. My materials contain about 350 pp. of narratives (Siuci and Hohóde dialects). In the present paper, I also used three texts published in Taylor 1991, and texts published in Hill 1993 and Wright 1993. Warekena is a North-Arawak language spoken on Xié river in Brazil by a few dozen old people; it is a dialect of Baniwa of Guainia (Venezuela: around 200 speakers). My data (gathered during two fieldtrips, in 1991 and 1994) contain around 150 pp. of texts. Bare is an extinct language, formerly spoken in Venezuela and Brazil, around the Casiquiare channel; my materials come from fieldwork with the last fluent speaker of the language in Brazil in 1991. Tariana is a North Arawak language, spoken by around 100 adults on Uaupés. For Baniwa, there is a short grammar by Taylor 1991. For Tariana, there is a short grammar by Giacone 1963. A dialect of Bare, different from the one I worked with, was described by Sanz 1972. There are a few word-lists on Warekena.

I am grateful to all my teachers of the indigenous languages of the Amazon - Cândido, José, Jovino, Graciliano and Rafael Brito (Tariana), Humberto Baltazar and Pedro Angelo Tomas (Warekena), late Candelário da Silva (Bare), Marcilia, Afonso, Albino and João Fontes, Celestino da Silva and Cecilia and Laureano da Silva (Baniwa), Tiago Cardoso.
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(a) the interrelation of cross-referencing of constituents on the verb, constituent order and the discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents, i.e. the existence of a special set of cross-referencing prefixes used to mark discourse-pragmatic properties of the agentive subject (A/S, according to Dixon 1994);
(b) suppression of cross-referencing of constituents on the verb, as a marking of discourse-pragmatic functions of NPs.

Baniwa of Íçana and Tariana also have topic advancement marked on the verb (see Aikhenvald ms.a). Warekena has oblique advancement and object advancement marked on the verb (see Aikhenvald forthc. b). These categories are somewhat similar to the ‘focus’ in Philippine languages (see Schachter 1976; Payne 1994; Aikhenvald ms.a).

In §2, I shall describe the interrelation of verbal cross-referencing and the pragmatic properties of constituents in Bare. In §3, I shall discuss the suppression of verbal cross-referencing as a means of marking discourse-pragmatic properties in Warekena of Xié. In §4, I shall describe the interrelation of cross-referencing on the verb, constituent order and pragmatic properties of constituents in Baniwa of Íçana. Conclusions and discussion will be presented in §5. Data from several other Arawak languages, belonging to different subgroups of Arawak family (Arawak Lokono, Island Carib, Apurina and Yawalapiti), will be given in Appendix 1 to show that the strategies of encoding discourse-pragmatic characteristics of constituents via a manipulation of verbal cross-referencing affixes are not restricted to North Arawak of the Upper Rio Negro.

2. Person marking and discourse organization in Bare

Here I shall consider the correlation of cross-referencing and discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents in Bare. Bare has two sets of verbal cross-referencing prefixes, the use of which depends on discourse-pragmatic properties of the subject. Cross-referencing prefixes can also be

(Desano, Piratapuya) and Carlito and Marilda Paumari (Paumari). I am very thankful to Bob Dixon, Anya Mostovaya and Tanya Yanko, for useful discussion and help.

Abbreviations used throughout this paper are: ADJ - adjectivizer; AFF - affix; AFFIR - affirmative; AGT - agent; AN - animate; ASSER - assertive; AUG - augmentative; BEN - benefactive; CAUS - causative; CL - classifier; CONT - continuative; DECL - declarative; DEF - definite; DEM - demonstrative; DER - derivational; DIST - distant; EMPH - emphatic; EPEN - epenthetic; EXIST - existential; f. FEM - feminine; FOCUS - focus; FUT - future; GEN - generic; HAB - habitat; IMM - immediate; IMP - impersonal; INAN - inanimate; INCH - inchoative; INDEF - indefinite; INT - interrogative; ITR - intransitive; LOC - locative; NAT - natural phenomena; NEG - negative; nf - non-feminine; NOM - nominalizer; NON POSS, NPOSS - non possessed; OBJ - objective; p - person; PART - particle; PAT - patient; PAUS - pausal; PEJ - pejorative; PERL - permissive; PERF - perfective; PL - plural; POSS - possessive; PR - progressive; PRES - presentive; PROB - probability; Ps - person; PURP - purposive; REC - recipient; REL - relative; REP - repetition; RES - resultative; SEQ - sequential; SG - singular; SIG - significative; ST - stative; SUB - subordinating; TOP ADV - topic advancing; WH - what.
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suppressed under certain conditions. Bare (similarly to Warekena, see §3) has no topic-advancing voice, or passive.

In §2.1. I shall consider cross-referencing markers in Bare. The structure of Bare discourse and the dependency between the pragmatic properties of constituents and verbal cross-referencing will be analyzed in §2.2. Some conclusions will be drawn in §2.3.

2.1. Cross-referencing prefixes in Bare

Bare uses cross-referencing prefixes for A/S, possessor and the arguments of adpositions. No marking is used for O/S.

There are two sets of cross-referencing prefixes. The nominal set is used to mark possessor and argument of adposition, and a verbal set is used to mark A/S. The difference between the two sets lies in the presence of an indefinite person marker a- in the verbal set, and its absence from the nominal set. Cross-referencing prefixes in Bare are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Cross-referencing prefixes in Bare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nu-</td>
<td>wa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>bi-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3nf</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>me-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>me-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(only verbal)

The constituent order in possessive and adpositional constructions is fixed: *possessor-possessed; argument-adposition*.

The constituent order in verb-argument constructions allows considerable variation which depends largely on the organization of discourse (see §2.2).

The following examples illustrate the use of first, second and third person cross-referencing prefixes. (1) and (2) show the use of personal cross-referencing prefixes with a possessed noun with a pronominal possessor, (3) illustrates the use of a personal cross-referencing prefix with an adposition and (4) with a verb.

(1) nu-yaka-å-mi-hi
   1sg-parent-MASC-LATE+MASC
   'my late father'

(2) ehei
   3sgnf+tooth
   'his tooth'

3 There are a number of phonological processes at morpheme boundaries in Bare, Warekena, Baniwa and Tariana which include vowel fusions, e.g., Bare i- + -ahai (3sgnf+tooth) > ehe, Tariana, Baniwa -ni + -ite ('topic advancing' + animate classifier) > -nite.
Person marking and discourse in North Arawak languages

(3) yahañeima revolucion kasa-ka
    at dawn revolution arrive+PERF arrive-DECL
    me-hebite
    3pl-over+LOC
    ‘At the dawn a revolution arrived to them’

(4) me-mada kuhuni me-d’anika-waka ada binehe
    3pl-leave they 3pl-take care-PURP that village
    ‘They (rebels) left them (the villagers) to take care of the village’

In possessive constructions with a non-pronominal possessor, Ø-
person marking is used on the possessed noun. Similarly, Ø-possessive
marker is used on adpositions with a non-pronominal argument, e.g.:

(5) niiwa nu-yuqda nu-yaka-qi bana
    1sg+go 1sg-go around 1sg-parent-MASC house
   ɨnun hemuda i-kaµuka nũ nu-dana habi
dog jump 3sgnf-bite1 lsg-am on
    ‘I went around my father’s house, the dog jumped and bit me on my
    arm’

(6) ɨnun aha
dog tooth
    ‘dog’s tooth’

Bare has traces of morphological ergativity. A/S, are cross-referenced
with prefixes on the verb, and there are no cross-referencing markers for
O/S,. Bare displays two further ergative properties: constituent order and
syntactic pivot. Bare has the constituent orders AVO, S,V and VS,. Thus,
So an O are treated similarly as to the constituent order. Consider the
following examples:

AVO:

(7) idi hwibudi i-gereka-sa-ka kuhũ
    then electric eel 3sgnf-shock-CAUS-DECL he
    ‘Then the electric eel shocked him’

S,V:

(8) kuũd’iyu a-yuhadũ pari habi Yara u-ũana
    lizard INDF-walk wall over Yara 3sgf-stay
    i-d’ukuabi
    3sgnf-under
    ‘A lizard was walking on the wall, Yara was under it’

The majority of Arawak languages display a split-ergative pattern of marking of gram-
matical relations in the verbal cross-referencing. This phenomenon is normally referred to as
‘split-S’, or ‘active-stative’ (see Dixon 1994). The subject of an intransitive active verb (S,) is
cross-referenced with prefixes also used to cross-reference the subject of a transitive verb
(A). The subject of a stative verb (S,) is cross-referenced with suffixes or enclitics also used to
cross-reference the object of a transitive verb (O).
(9) yawi nū bebi 'I am angry with you'
   angry I 2sg+with

S₀V and OV constituent orders are possible when the corresponding constituents are topicalized and undergo left dislocation. The dislocated constituent is then separated by a pause from the rest of a clause, as in (10). This example comes from a story about the speaker’s parents.

(10) nu-yakaŋi, maphau nabi
    1sg-parent-MASC bad 1sg+with
    ‘My father, he was bad with me’

Bare is also syntactically ergative, i.e. it has a strong O/S pivot for coreferential NP deletion in clause linking. This phenomenon can be illustrated with (11) and (12), where the S of the second clause is coreferential with O of the first, and undergoes deletion:

(11) kwati i-kaŋuka fišu i-巴西
    jaguar 3sgnf-bite dog 3sgnf-run
    ‘Jaguar bit the dog and it (the dog) ran’

(12) ite ihiwa-na hiwakhanaind’a maka
    then 3sgnf+go-PERF 3sgnf+work again
    i-ma-khiŋahada tibayuŋe tiniku
    3sgnf-NEG-think mutum bird egg
    i-ma-khiŋahada i-ŋana
    3sgnf-NEG-think 3sgnf-stay
    i-pat’yu’a-ni-uku sei mese
    3sgnf-bag-POSS-LOC six months
    ‘Then he (the man) went away to work, he forgot about the egg of mutum, he forgot it (the egg) stayed in the bag for six months’

In (13), the S of the first clause is coreferential with the O of the second one, and it undergoes deletion:

(13) da kwati i-d’awika mawaya
    DEM jaguar 3sgnf-die snake
    a-kharuka INDF-bite
    ‘The jaguar died, (because) a snake bit (him)’

In a sentence where the S of one clause is coreferential with A of the other, no deletion is possible, and either a full NP or a personal pronoun has to be used. This is illustrated with (4) above and (14) below:

(14) u-temuda kuhu u-bazikuda wihiwa
    3sgf-hear she 3sgf-stand up 3sgf+go
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2.2. Cross-referencing, constituent order and the structure of discourse in Bare

When the A/S constituent is a focus of contrast and undergoes preverbal fronting, cross-referencing prefixes are suppressed, e.g. (3) above and (15). This sentence comes from a story about a dog who bit the narrator when he was eight years old. After that the dog disappeared. The left-dislocated constituent *nu-yaka-xi-minihi* 'my late father' is italicized:

(15) *me-hesa me-wat'u-ka ada finu i-bara-ka*
*3pl-want 3pl-beat-DECL that dog 3sgnf-run-DECL*
*damakarute diiøhu-bu-ka ite i-mahasa-ka*
*junge+DIR road-ALONG there 3sgnf-disappear-DECL*
*wa-kuøaha nu-yaka-ji-minihi madukà kuøu*
*1pl-think 1sg-father-MASC-LATE+MASC kill+PAST he*

'They wanted to beat the dog, (it) ran away to the jungle by the road, there it disappeared. We thought it was my father who killed him'.

The indefinite person marker *a-* in Bare is used when the A/S constituent is in focus, but the contrast is not necessarily as important as in cases such as (15) above. The third person subject immediately precedes the predicate. No other constituent can intervene between the subject and the predicate marked with *a-.* This is illustrated with (16) which is the first sentence from a story about a jaguar and a snake. The A/S constituents, which trigger the indefinite person marker *a-*, are italicized.

(16) *me-bihitè bakunaka kwati a-d'awika-na*
*3pl-encounter+PAST one jaguar INDF-die-PAST*
*me-kuñaha karikite mawaya a-karukà kuøu*
*3pl-think poisonous snake INDF-bite+PAST he*

'They found a jaguar which was dead. They thought it was a poisonous snake who bit him'

The person marker *a-* is also used in cleft constructions as in (17). This comes from the story about how the speaker's parents had to flee from Venezuela, because an uprising took place there. The clefted constituent *ida kñinañu* 'these people' is italicized.

(17) *hmemuduka kuøu bikunama ehentebe*
*3pl+kill he two child+PL*
*ida kñinañu a-ñana ibabi idi*
*this people INDF-stay together there*
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hena hmemuduka-waka
NEG 3pl+kill-NEG
'They (rebels) killed him (the governor), and his two children. These people who were living around, they (rebels) did not kill them'

The person marker a- is also used on the predicate of interrogative sentences when the identity of the A/Sa constituent is being questioned, e.g.:

(18) abadi a-kasa
who INDF-come
'Who is coming?'

It will be shown below (§ 3), that the indefinite person marker a- in Bare shows a number of similarities to the indefinite person marker i- in Baniwa.

2.3. Conclusions

Bare displays two strategies for marking discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents by verbal cross-referencing. An indefinite person marker a- is used to mark a focussed A/S constituent, and it is also used in cleft constructions. Verbal cross-referencing is suppressed when the A/S constituent undergoes preverbal fronting as a constrastive focus.

3. Cross-referencing and discourse structure in Warekena of Xié

In this section, I shall discuss the principles of cross-referencing in Warekena of Xié, with special attention to the suppression of verbal cross-referencing as a means of marking discourse-pragmatic properties. In § 3.1. I shall consider the basic properties of cross-referencing and split ergativity. The dependency between discourse structure and cross-referencing will be considered in § 3.2.

3.1. Principles of cross-referencing

Warekena, like the majority of Arawak languages, including Baniwa of Içana, has a split ergative pattern for the marking of grammatical relations, expressed by means of cross-referencing prefixes and enclitics. The split ergative pattern works in terms of the semantics of the predicate. Warekena uses cross-referencing prefixes for marking A and Sa, and cross-referencing enclitics for marking O and So. Cross-referencing prefixes are also used for marking the pronominal arguments of adpositions and pronominal possessor in possessive constructions. Cross-referencing prefixes and enclitics are given in Table 2.
cross-referencing prefixes and enclitics in Warekena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg prefixes</th>
<th>enclitics</th>
<th>pl prefixes</th>
<th>enclitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nu-</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>wa-</td>
<td>-wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>-pi</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>yu-</td>
<td>-yu</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3nf</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>pa-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-referencing prefixes are obligatory in predicate-argument constructions, and they encode a pronominal argument (A/S), e.g. (19), and mark the agreement with a full NP, e.g. (20).

(19) yu-wiya-mia
    3sgf-die-PAST
    'she died'

(20) yu-wiya-mia nu-jumia wa
    3sgf-die-PAST 1sg-spouse+FEM
    'My wife died'

Unlike Baniwa and Tariana, but similarly to Bare, Warekena has no special possessive marker used in possessive constructions. Nouns with a Ø prefix are used when no possessor is expressed.

(21) Ø-api 'an arm' or 'his arm'
    3sgnf-arm

(22) napi 'my arm'
    underlying form: nu-api
    1sg-arm

Possessive prefixes are obligatory as agreement markers, i.e. a possessed noun agrees with the possessor in gender and number:

(23) yu-fiani-pe neyawa
    3sgf-child-PL woman
    'woman’s children'

Cross-referencing enclitics are used to mark a pronominal constituent in the O/S function.

Verbs of the S_o type in Warekena can denote state, e.g. uqa ‘to be dirty’, anuana ‘to be sick’, jefe ‘to be dry’ or refer to natural phenomena, like ajiwa ‘to dawn; to get up early’, jibuma ‘to grow dark, also: spend the night’. Cross-referencing enclitics are used to mark S_o in (24), O in (25).

(24) ajiwa-wi
    get up early-1pl S_o
    ‘Good morning’ (lit. ‘we got up early’)
(25) yawa-na eni epaŋu-bune kuŋa-na
    fall-1sg O rain it-because wet-1sg So
    ‘Rain fell on me, that is why I am wet’

Cross-referencing enclitics are not used to mark the agreement with O/So constituent expressed by a full NP, e.g. (26) which comes from a story similar to the one about Tom Thumb:

(26) wa fa-wa eda etya wa-bumi
    PRES 3sgnf+go-PR 3sgnf+see old+FEM-PEJ
    ‘Then he (the boy) went and saw an ugly old woman (i.e. a witch)’

There is an exception to this rule. Cross-referencing enclitics can cooccur with a full NP in O/So function, when the latter is antitopicalized (or is in a ‘tail’ function, cf. Dik 1978). The NP undergoes right dislocation. This is illustrated with (27) which comes from a story about two abandoned children (very similar to the story of Tom Thumb). When the children grew old, the brother killed a huge snake, and saved the life of a white man’s daughter. The white man summoned his daughter to ask her who had killed the snake:

(27) wa-ha muta-yu yaqanawi muta-yu
    PRES-PAUS 3sgnf+call-3sgf white man 3sgnf+call-3sgf
ta-ni yata-paŋu-yu
    3sgnf+daughter-POSS yata-paŋu-yu
    ta-ni yata-paŋu-yu
    3sgnf+daughter-POSS 3sgnf+ask-PURP-3sgf
    ‘Then the white man called her, he called her, his daughter, to ask her
    (who had killed the snake)’

The constituent order in Warekena is AVO, VS, S,V, illustrated below.

AVO:
(28) wa-ha wasi weya yufia-ha ema
    PRES-PAUS jaguar 3sgnf+want 3sgnf+kill-PAUS tapir
    ‘Then the jaguar wanted to kill the tapir’

VS,
(29) wa-ha peya etene yue jepe-hê jiani-pe
    PRES-PAUS one old 3sgnf+to many-PAUS child-PL
    ‘There was an old man, he had (lit. to him) many children’

S,V:
(30) peya nu-yaqita wiyua
    1sg-brother 3sgnf+die
    ‘One of my brothers dies’

Warekena has an S/O pivot, or syntactic ergativity (cf. Dixon 1994); on the mixed character of the pivot in Warekena see Aikhenvald forthc. b). The S/O pivot is illustrated by (31) and (32). In (31), the S of the first clause is coreferential with the O of the second one, and so it is omitted
from the second clause. In (32), the O of the first clause is coreferential with the S of the second one, and also is omitted from the second clause.

(31) wa makaque-mia-ha ema wafiw
PRES tired-PERF-PAUS tapir jaguar
muqita-mia-ha
3sgnf+bite-PERF-PAUS
'Then the tapir grew tired, (and) the jaguar bit (him)'

(32) ema pauta-ha kuqimaqiu ijikena-mia-wa
tapir 3sgnf+step-PAUS turtle 3sgnf+bury-PERF-IMPF
'Tapir stepped on the turtle, and it (the turtle) sank (into the mud)'

This phenomenon is shared with Bare (see §2.1).

3.2. Cross-referencing and discourse structure

A constituent which is either topicalized or becomes a new focus of attention undergoes left dislocation. A dislocated constituent is separated from the rest of a clause by a pause, as is enami in (33) below. This example comes from the story about abandoned children. A snake came up to the man, i.e. the abandoned boy who had grown up, but he had a knife to kill it. The constituent eya enami ‘the boy’ undergoes preverbal fronting, since it is a contrastive focus.

(33) eya enami, yue peya matseta
DEM man to one knife
‘The man, he had a knife’

Warekena has a cleft construction used to mark contrastive focus characterized by:

- left dislocation of the subject;
- -ti ‘relative’ marking on the verb;
- suppression of A/S, cross-referencing prefixes on the verb.

No other constituent can be inserted between the subject and the verb in the cleft construction, as shown in (34), where the cross-referencing prefix of 2nd person sg is absent from the verb -tse- ‘to know’, since the subject piya ‘you’ is topicalized and fronted.

(34) yajwa piya-mia-ha tse-ti isqema-ha
now you-PERF-PAUS know-REL what-PAUS
pi-ma-ha nepi wa-jabine
2sg-do-PAUS 3pl+with 1pl-family
‘Now it is you who knows what you will do with the family’

The relative marker -ti is also used in interrogative clauses, e.g. (35) and complement clauses, e.g. (36). In these cases it does not trigger suppression of cross-referencing markers.
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(35) iṭi  pi-yuṭia-ṭi
what 2sg-kill-REL
'What did you kill?'

(36)  neda-ṭi-bena-hā  waṭi  nu-yuṭia-hā
1sg+see-REL-SUB-PAUS jaguar 1sg-kill-PAUS
'When I see a jaguar I kill (him)'

Thus, contrastive focus in Warekena is associated with suppression of cross-referencing prefixes. Cross-referencing affixes cooccur with a full NP to mark an antitopic (or 'tail', in terms of Dik 1978).

4. Person marking and discourse organization in Baniwa

Baniwa is much more complicated morphologically than Warekena and Bare. This may be partly due to a loss of morphological complexity in the processes of language obsolescence suffered by both Warekena and Bare, see Dorian (1988) on the loss of morphological complexity in a 'language death' situation. Baniwa is the most 'healthy' Arawak language of the Upper Rio Negro region. A number of grammatical properties of Baniwa need to be described here. Agreement types will be viewed in § 4.1. In § 4.2 I shall consider predicate structure. In § 4.3 split ergativity and syntactic pivot in Baniwa will be analyzed. Cross-referencing prefixes and their correlation with discourse-organization will be considered in § 4.4. Cross-referencing enclitics and their role in the marking of discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents will be discussed in § 4.5. Some conclusions will be drawn in § 4.6.

4.1. Agreement types in Baniwa

Baniwa of Íçana has two types of agreement: head-modifier agreement and predicate-argument agreement; see Anderson (1992) on this distinction.

There are two kinds of Head-modifier agreement depending on the type of modifier. The first type involves agreement in numeral and concordial classifiers. Nouns agree with adjectival modifiers in concordial classifier. They agree in numeral classifier with numerals and the expressions of quantity.\(^5\)

Baniwa has a system of 42 numeral classifiers, also used as verb incorporated and genitive classifiers, and 44 concordial classifiers. The two systems partially overlap (see Aikhenvald forthc.). Morphologically, both classifiers and concordial class markers are suffixes. The system of classifiers and noun class markers is a closed one, in the sense that it does

---

\(^5\) Numeral classifiers in Baniwa are also used as verb-incorporated classifiers, if the predicate is in a relative or purposive form, or in the form of topic advancing voice (discussed in Aikhenvald ms.a).
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not permit the introduction of new morphemes, unlike the system of noun classification in Tariana (see Aikhenvald 1994b). The majority of concordial classifiers are derived from the corresponding numeral classifiers with the help of adjectivizing suffixes -y, -ti 'masculine', -tu 'feminine'. The following examples illustrate the head-modifier type of agreement.

Agreement in numeral classifier:

(37) apa-kha a:pi 'one snake'
    one-CL:CURVED snake

Agreement in concordial classifier:

(38) a:pi maka-kha-y
    snake big-CL:CURVED-ADJ
    'a big snake'

The second kind of Head-modifier agreement involves obligatory agreement in gender, with the semantic opposition + feminine animate. This type of agreement is obligatory with demonstrative pronouns as modifiers, e.g.:

(39) hjiehē aṣiṣi 'this man'
    this:MASC man
(40) hjiehē pan-ṭi 'this house'
    this:MASC house-NPOSS
(41) juahā inaṣu 'this woman'
    this:FEM woman

Predicate-argument agreement in person/gender/number is marked by cross-referencing morphemes. This type of agreement appears in the following constructions:

**cross-referencing prefixes**  **cross-referencing enditics**
A/S, of active, i.e. prefixed verbs O/S, of stative, i.e. prefixless verbs
argument of an adposition possessed constituent in possessive
construction

Independent pronouns are mainly used to mark topicalized or emphasized constituents in core roles (see Appendix 2). Third person pronouns can be used in the function of definite articles. Morphologically independent personal pronouns are derived from cross-referencing

---

8 Baniwa is a language of 'split' gender type (in the sense of Aikhenvald 1994b), since gender as agreement category is restricted to predicate-argument agreement and one subtype of head-modifier agreement, and the agreement in classifier is found in other head-modifier constructions.
prefixes with the help of a demonstrative formative -ha, and subsequent metathesis of a glottal fricative on a morphemic boundary, e.g.:

\[ nu- + -ha \rightarrow hnu \]
\[ pi- + -ha \rightarrow phi \]

Cross-referencing prefixes, enclitics and independent personal pronouns are shown in Table 3.

Cross-referencing prefixes, enclitics and independent pronouns display somewhat different systems of person/gender/number oppositions, and also show certain differences in how the agreement works.

Predicate-argument agreement is crucial for our discussion, and it will be considered below, in §4.4 and §4.5.

Table 3. Cross-referencing markers and independent personal pronouns in Baniwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>prefixes</th>
<th>enclitics</th>
<th>independent pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg pl</td>
<td>1 nu- wa- hnu  hwa hnua hwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pi- i- -phi- -hia phi- phia ihia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3nf qi- na- -ni -hna hua hna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f ju- na- -nu -hna fua hna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal pa- pha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite i-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Predicate structure

Baniwa has two types of predicates: simple predicates, expressed with the help of one verb, and complex predicates, i.e. serial verb constructions. Serial verb constructions are easily distinguishable from a sequence of predicates, based on the following criteria (in accordance with Foley & Olson 1985):

(a) the Same Subject Constraint, i.e. the same person/number/gender marking prefixes throughout a serial verb construction;
(b) no other constituent can go between two (or more) verbs which form a single serial verb construction;
(c) a serial verb construction constitutes a single phonological phrase;
(d) a serial verb construction receives a single tense-aspect-mood marking (if any at all), i.e. one component can not be marked for 'future' and the other for 'past';
(e) scope of negation: there is only one negative particle which negates the whole serial construction.
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The Same subject constraint enables us to distinguish between a serial verb construction, as in (42) below (italicized), and a sequence of predicates:

(42) hnete *pi-a phi*ta puwe nu-ihēna-wa
    then 2sg-go 2sg+bring monkey 1sg-eat-PR
    ‘Then bring (lit. go-bring) a monkey for me to eat’ (said a vulture)

The Same Subject Constraint holds in serial verb constructions like the one in (43), where both components of the serial construction acquire the *i-* marker, if required. This example comes from the story about abandoned children.

(43) j¬-nēzi i-a-ka i-peku awakada¬jiku-hna
    3sgnf-father INDF-go-DECL INDF-leave jungle-LOC-3pl
    ‘His father was going to leave them in the jungle’

(44) illustrates the scope of negation:

(44) āna j¬inua-ka j¬i-wini-wa kuphe
    NEG 3sgnf+kill-DECL 3sgnf-hunt-PR fish
    ‘He did not kill any fish’ (lit. not-kill-hunt)

4.3. Split ergativity and syntactic pivot

As was mentioned in § 4.1, Baniwa displays a split-ergative pattern of marking grammatical relations by verbal cross-referencing depending on the semantics of the predicate:

- A=Sn prefixes
- O=So enclitics

This is illustrated by the following examples:

(45) j¬i-kapa-ni
    ‘he sees him’
    3sgnfA/Sn-see-3sgnfO/So

(46) j¬i-emhani
    ‘he walks’
    3sgnfA/Sn-walk

(47) hape-ka-ni
    ‘he/it is cold’
    cold-DECL-3sgnfO/So

This pattern is characteristic of Arawak languages. In Baniwa, split-ergative marking is also linked to the degree of control of the subject over the activity expressed with the help of the verb. Apparently, this works only for a limited number of verbs, as illustrated in the examples below. A/So marking is used when the agent of the action expressed by intransitive verb can be qualified as + control/volition (cf. criteria in Mithun 1991). O=So marking is used when the action is -control/volition. The verb -i@ŋa ‘to spill liquid’ means ‘to weep’, if the subject is encoded as A/So,
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as shown in (48). If the subject is encoded as $O=S_o$, \textit{id\textbar{}a} means 'to rain', as in (49) - apparently a non-controllable activity. The verb -\textit{aku} 'to speak, to make noise' means 'to talk' when used with A/$S_o$ prefixes, as in (50). With $O=S_o$ suffixes it means 'to have the capacity of speaking the language', which is apparently conceived as 'uncontrollable', e.g. (51).

(48) $\textit{id\textbar{}a}$-ka 'he is weeping'
3sgnf+weep-DECL

(49) $\textit{id\textbar{}a}$-ni 'it is raining'
weep-3sgnfS_o

(50) nu-aku-ka pi-nay 'I am talking to you'
1sg-talkDECL 2sg-with

(51) ka\textasciitilde{}ku-hnua Baniwa-i\textbar{}iku
REL+talk-1sgS_o Baniwa-LOC
'I can speak Baniwa'

A/$S_o$ constituents, on the one hand, and O/$S_o$ constituents on the other hand are treated similarly, from the point of view of verbal cross-referencing. Unlike Bare and Warekena (see above), Baniwa does not have any pivot restrictions on the interclausal level. The possibility of deletion of coreferential constituents is governed by their pragmatic status: whether they are a topic or not. I shall exemplify this with (52).

(52) comes from the story about how \textit{pimi} 'a small bird, colibri' and \textit{ma\textbar{}i} 'heron' arranged a competition - who could fly faster. The topic of (52a) is \textit{pimi}, which is subsequently deleted in the function $S_o$ (\textit{khapa} 'tired', \textit{ma\textbar{}i} 'tired, out of breath'), $S_o$ (-\textit{aku} 'talk, say', -\textit{uhwa} 'sit', -\textit{dia} 'return', -\textit{nu} 'come', -\textit{pieta} 'repeat', -\textit{a\textbar{}a} 'fly'); A (-\textit{ahne} 'know, tell') and O (-\textit{uketa} 'run across', -\textit{kapa} 'see'). Another participant, 'heron', is the second topic and is subsequently deleted in (52b).

(52) (a) ma\textasciitilde{}ju\textasciitilde{}me-hnua-pida \textasciitilde{}j-aku \textit{pimi} \textit{qi}-a
die-1sgS_o=O-PART 3sgnf-say colibri 3sgnf-say
khapa-ni-pida \textit{qi}-uhwa ma\textit{ji} \textit{qi}-dia-pida
tired-3sgnfO=S_o 3sgnf-sit heron 3sgnf-return-PART
ka\textit{ju}\textasciitilde{}-kena-pida \textit{qi}-ahne hekwapi
neg-SUB-PART 3sgnf-know day
'I am dying', said the colibri. He grew tired, sat on the heron and went back, he could not tell the day (from the night')

(b) \textit{qi}-dia \textit{qi}-uketa-ni
3sgnf-return 3sgnf-run across-3sgnfO=S_o
\textit{qi}-kapa-pida \textit{qi}-nu-ka \textit{qi}-a
3sgnf-see-PART 3sgnf-come-DECL 3sgnf-go
'He (the heron) came back, saw him (colibri), saw him come'

(c) khapa-ni-pida \textit{qi}-uhwa
tired-3sgnfO=S_o-PART 3sgnf-sit
\textit{qi}-tipi-naku ma\textit{si}a-kena-pida ka\textit{ju}\textasciitilde{}-ketsa
3sgnf-tail-LOC good-SUB-PART NEG-EMPH
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mapi-ni  qi-pieta  qi-a:3a
tired-3sgnfO=S  3sgnf-repeat 3sgnf-fly

'He (colibri) was tired and sat on his (heron's) tail, when he (colibri) became fine, he was not tired, he flew again'

(d)  qi-a-pida-ka  mapi-ni  hjiwa
3sgnf-go-PART-DECL tired-3sgnfO=S0  3sgnfSfall
khapa-ni-pida  uni-ijku
tired-3sgnfO=S0-PART water-LOC

'He (colibri) grew tired again and fell on the water'.

4.4. Cross-referencing prefixes as agreement markers

Here I shall consider how cross-referencing prefixes are used in Baniwa to mark predicate-argument agreement, and how the use of different prefixes correlates with discourse-pragmatic properties of the A/S constituent cross-referenced on the predicate. In §4.4.1. I shall describe the general principles of cross-referencing the A/S constituent on the predicate. In §4.4.2. I shall consider person marking in possessive and adpositional constructions. In §4.4.3. I shall describe the subject-predicate agreement with the help of personal cross-referencing prefixes, i.e. prefixes other than indefinite person marker i-. In §4.4.4. I shall describe the usage of indefinite person marker i- for A/S constituent cross-referencing on the predicate. Cross-referencing enclitics will be considered in §4.5. A cognate of the indefinite person marking prefix i-, found in Tariana, will be considered in §4.7. Some conclusions as to the system of cross-referencing markers in Baniwa will be drawn in §4.6.

4.4.1. General principles. Cross-referencing prefixes have an opposition of three persons in the singular, the gender opposition being obligatory in third person singular; fourth person, or impersonal marker pa-; and 'indefinite' person marker i-.

Fourth person, or 'impersonal' is generally used when referring to a generalized, unspecified person, e.g.:

(53) phewida < pa-hwida 'someone's head'
imp-head

A corresponding independent pronoun pha means 'someone'. The use of impersonal is illustrated by (54) from the story about the abandoned children.

(54) pa-da  hekwapi  qi-a3uku-pida  qi-kha:3e
one-CL day  3sgnf-appear-PART 3sgnf-to
pa-ita  pedru  pa:hne  qi-pitana
one-CL:AN Pedro 4p+know 3sgnf-name

'One day someone called Pedro came up to him (to the boy who was working for a witch), his (Pedro's) name is known'

© The Editorial Board of Studia Linguistica 1995.
The impersonal form is also used in counting with body parts (hand, foot) in complex cardinal numbers (bigger than four):

(55) đamema pa-kapi šinu
two+CL:SIDE IMP-hand dog
‘ten dogs’ (lit. two hands of dogs)

The first, second and third person prefixes are used under the following conditions:

(i) when the constituent which triggers the person/gender/number agreement follows the agreeing constituent, i.e. either when A or S follow the verb, e.g.:

(56) ği-aku aŋɑŋi
3sgnf-say man
‘the man says’

or when the possessor follows the possessed noun or the argument of the adposition follows the adposition, e.g.:

(57) ği-šinu-ni Joã̂o
3sgnf-dog-POSS John
‘John’s dog’

(58) ği-ʃiʃu  Joã̂o
3sgnf-for John
‘for John’

(ii) the constituent that triggers the agreement is omitted from the surface structure or pronominalized, e.g.:

(59) ği-aku pi-aku
3sgnf-say 2sg-say
‘he says’ ‘you say’

(60) ği-ʃinu-ni nu-ʃinu-ni
3sgnf-dog-POSS 1sg-dog-POSS
‘his dog’ ‘my dog’

(61) ği-ʃiʃu nu-ʃiʃu
3sgnf-for 1sg-for
‘for him’ ‘for me’

If the subject (A/S constituent), the possessor or the argument of an adposition is expressed by the pronominal constituent, the independent personal pronouns are almost never used. The cases when they are used will be discussed in Appendix 2.

If the above conditions do not apply, the indefinite person marker i- is used. Consequently, gender, number and person agreement is neutralized, e.g.:
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(62)  aṭjāṭi i-aku
      man  INDF-say
     ‘the man says’
(63)  João i-ṣinu-ni
     John INDF-dog-POSS
    ‘John’s dog’
(64)  João i-ši
     John INDF-for
    ‘for John’

The prefix $i$ is also used to mark a non-possessed form of inalienably (i.e. obligatorily) possessed nouns. The nouns then also have the suffix -ti, which mark a non-possessed form of an obligatorily possessed noun, e.g.:

(65)  i-hwida-ṭi
      INDF-head-NPOSS
     ‘a head’
i-enipe-ṭi
      INDF-child-NPOSS
     ‘a child’

The use of a non-possessed form of an inalienably possessed noun ŋapi ‘bone’ (italicized) in a narrative is illustrated by (66).

(66)  hnete na-waketa i-ŋapi apa:pi
     then 3pl-join+CAUS INDF-bone one+CL:PLATE
     pažatu-šiku 3u-enipe i-ši
     plate-LOC 3sgf-child INDF-for
    ‘Then they (the devil and his wife) joined the bones into a plate for her children’

The superficial link between constituent order and person marking in Baniwa is evident. To understand the semantics and function of person marking and constituent order, we must have a closer look at how it is used in the language.

4.4.2. Person marking in possessive and adpositional constructions. The unmarked constituent order in possessive and adpositional constructions is Possessor-Possessed and Argument-Adposition. The possessed constituent and the adposition are then marked with $i$- indefinite possessive prefix, as illustrated in (63) and (64) above. The use of a possessive construction with unmarked constituent order is illustrated in (67), which comes from the story of abandoned children. The children are trying to deceive the witch who is feeding them to make them fat enough to be eaten, by showing a rat’s tail to her instead of their fingers:

(67)  na-hnāta-pida hiṣi i-ṭipi
     3pl-show-PART rat INDF-tail
    ‘They (the children) showed the rat’s tail (to the witch)’
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If the constituent order is Possessed-Possessor or Adposition - Argument, the possessed constituent and the adposition receive third person cross-referencing markers, and they show gender and number agreement, as illustrated in (57) and (58) above. This order is used to antitopicalize the possessor constituent, or the argument of an adposition. There must be a pause between the two constituents of a possessive or an adpositional construction, to indicate the antitopicalization. This is illustrated with (68), (69) and (70). (68) comes from a story about a snake. The possessor constituent of the possessive construction *qi-wawa*-iku *hja ita* ‘into the inside of the canoe’ is anti-topicalized for clarification; a more appropriate translation is ‘into its inside, i.e. the canoe’s’. In (69), the argument of the adposition *fiu* ‘for’, *iffida* ‘turtle’ is anti-topicalized. (70) illustrates the agreement in gender between the possessed noun *3u-pana* ‘her house’ and its antitopicalized possessor, *phi* ‘agouti’.

(68) *ti-peku pe:the i-dupe*
3sgnf-throw manioc bread INDF-remain
*qi-wawa*-iku, hja ita
3sgnf-inside-LOC he canoe
‘He (the fisherman) threw crumbs of a manioc bread inside of it, the canoe’

(69) *ma$pa hnuma *qi-fiu, iffida*
bad REL 1sg-hear 3sgnf-for turtle
‘It is bad that I should listen to him, this turtle’ (said the jaguar)

(70) *Jua newiki 3u-dia 3u-taita gu-dia*
she person 3sgf-return 3sgf-finish 3sgf-return
*3u-pana*-iku, Jua phi@
3sgf-house-LOC she agouti
‘The woman, she came back from her (agouti’s) house, of that agouti’

4.4.3. *Personal cross-referencing prefixes and discourse structure.* Here I shall present a brief analysis of the organization of Baniwa discourse, which will enable us to elaborate the principles which underlie the person marking of the predicate and constituent ordering.

Baniwa discourse is highly elliptical. Transitive clauses with two full NPs are extremely rare, and that is why it is difficult to determine what constituent order is the ‘unmarked’ one – AVO or OVA. Usually a new participant is introduced in the beginning of the text, and then referred to with the help of cross-referencing affixes throughout the text. The new participants are usually introduced in the beginning of discourse/narrative in post-predicate position in S function, e.g. (71) and (72).

7 I have several hundred elicited sentences in my corpus, in which the order AVO is the most frequent. However, I can not exclude that the speakers were influenced by the constituent order in Portuguese sentences they were asked to translate, and that is why I avoid using this material here.
Person marking and discourse in North Arawak languages

(71) ne:ni-pia-pida apa-ita ne:ni nawiki
EXIST-PAST-PART one-CL:AN EXIST person
‘There was one (animate), there was a man’

(72) apa-waj-pia-mi-pida apa-ma madui:ami
one-CL:CYCLE-PAST-AFF-PART one-CL:FEM widow
‘Once there was a widow’

A new participant introduced in S function in post-predicate position can be repeated in a following sentence, for clarification, in ‘tail function’ (cf. Dik 1978), or as an ‘afterthought’, as illustrated by (73), from the story of a vulture.

(73) u:pi qi:dayakata-ka pedji
long ago 3sgnf-do-DECL vulture
hnete kwaka qi:h1a-qi hjeho pedji
then what 3sgnf-eat-REL this:MASC vulture
kai ka qi:flu mawitakai hjeho pedji
when 3sgnf-to hunger this:MASC vulture
‘Long ago the vulture did (it this way). Then this is what the vulture ate, when he was hungry, the vulture’

A participant introduced in the beginning of a story is usually referred to with the help of cross-referencing prefixes. A full noun phrase reappears when the referent is difficult to identify; for example, if there are two participants introduced at different stages in the text and referred to with the help of the same set of affixes. For a topically established participant, the full noun phrase in A/S, function always occupies the post-predicate position, and personal cross-referencing prefixes are used. I shall illustrate this with the following examples.

‘Man’ as the main participant of the story about a man and a turtle is introduced in the beginning in (71) above. He is referred to with the help of cross-referencing affixes in four next sentences. In the fifth sentence, the turtle a3a is introduced:

(74) qi:nu-ka a3a qi:nu-pida qi:tsueta-pida
3sgnf-come-DECL turtle 3sgnf-come-PART 3sgnf-push-PART
da:pi
glass
‘A turtle came (and) pushed the vine’

To identify the participants, nawiki ‘man’ has to be repeated in the following sentence:

(75) qi:dawa-ka-pida haiku i-dana-mi nawiki
3sgnf-hide-DECL-PART tree INDF-back-PEJ man
‘The man hid behind a fallen tree’
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Thus, the participant which had already been introduced at the beginning of a story, has to be 'reintroduced' in a story where a long stretch of text has passed since the referent was last mentioned, as if it were a new participant. This 'reintroducing' of a participant is used as a kind of disambiguating device.

A constituent which is a contrastive focus of the discourse undergoes preverbal fronting, or left dislocation. There is a pause after the fronted constituent, and the predicate retains the personal cross-referencing markers. This is illustrated by (76). This example comes from the story about a snake. The man was told by the fish to bring to the rivershore the daughter of his which he would see first when he came home, and (76) tells which daughter it was. Semantically, this procedure is close to cleft constructions in English. The left-dislocated constituent is italicized:

(76) ʼi:tu piketemida3u, 3u-kapa-ni
3sgnf+daughter last-CL:AN FEM 3sgf-see-3sgnfO
3u-eku 3i-khuete
3sgf-run 3sgnf-towards
'(It was) his youngest daughter, (who) saw him and ran towards him'

4.4.4. Indefinite person prefix ʼi-. The indefinite person prefix ʼi- is used in:
- independent sentences (§4.4.4.1);
- interrogative and cleft sentences (§4.4.4.2);
- complement clauses (§4.4.4.3)

Syntactically, all these constructions share the following features:
• the A/Sa constituent precedes the verb;
• the verb receives the ʼi- prefix, and there is no agreement with the A/Sa constituent in person/gender/number;
• no other constituent can be inserted between the A/Sa constituent and the predicate.

These constructions (henceforth I shall call them ʼi-constructions) have a considerably low frequency in texts. My corpus, of over 350 pp. of texts, has only 62 occurrences of these constructions. There are no restrictions on the transitivity of the predicate. In all, 30 were with intransitive verbs (Sa), and 32 with transitive verbs (A).

The role of ʼi-construction in participants tracking in discourse will be considered in §4.4.4.4.

Conclusions concerning the semantic and pragmatic constraints common to all these constructions will be considered in §4.4.4.5.

4.4.4.1. ʼi-constructions in independent sentences. An ʼi-construction can never begin a discourse (with one exception, explicated below). Their comparative rarity may be explained by the fact that they are pragmatic-
ally marked. *I*-constructions in independent sentences are used to code thematic information expressed by help of A/S, preposed to the predicate. They are only possible if the A/S constituent is already known to the speaker.

The referent can either have been introduced already, as illustrated by (77), (78), or it may belong to 'background' information, e.g. (79), (80), (81). The referent of the A/S constituent is 'extracted' out of the clause, and the whole *i*-construction can be seen as providing a characteristic which can be assigned to a set of referents, or one extracted referent. The referent is in focus, and its appearance is important for the backgrounding of future discourse, though it may not appear again.

(77) and (78) come from the text about a snake. After the 'mandi' fish entered the fisherman's canoe, it managed to persuade the fisherman not to kill it, and says that if he sends his daughter to the shore, a lot of fish will come to his net (77). In (78) (which is seven clauses further in the text) the promise was fulfilled. The important thing is the fisherman's success. The fish is never mentioned again in the story.

(77) ne̥ni-watsa pinua manupe kuphe i̥-aku j̥-j̥u
EXIST-FUT 2sg+kill mary fish 3sgnf-say 3sgnf-for
'Here, you will kill much fish, he (the fish) said'

(78) ne̥ni hu̥̥e kuphe hie-wa-ka j̥-j̥u
then much fish INDF+enter-PR-DECL 3sgnf-for
ke̥̥apuku̥̥i pac̥u
'Then much fish entered to him, pac̥u (a valuable kind of fish)'

Similar examples can be observed in conversations. One speaker, Cecilia, brought a turtle to show us. The turtle was the centre of everybody's attention. (79) was said by Cecilia to explain what was going on:

(79) i̥̥ida i̥̥-uma i̥̥-mutu-wa
turtle INDF-want INDF-go away-PR
'The turtle wants to go away'

An A/S participant need not be overtly stated in the narrative. It can belong to 'background' information. After having told a couple of stories about Napi̥iki̥ku̥i 'the son of the bone; the God', the speaker (João) began a story about a vulture with the following sentence, apparently assuming that Napi̥iki̥ku̥i 'the God' is already known to his audience.

---

8 One of the reasons why I have not applied any statistical procedures of the kind suggested in Givón (1983) for calculating topic continuity and topic persistence is the frequency of topically backgrounded constituents in Baniwa which apparently have never been mentioned before in this particular narrative, but either have been mentioned in some previous discourse the speaker still has in mind or belong to a kind of 'background', or 'encyclopedic' information everyone is assumed to know. It is evident that the limits of a text are virtually undefinable, then.
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I shall tell an old story about how things were in the old days, lit. how the son of the bone started (things) long ago

(81) kwame maţia-ka wahni-ka depi ʤawi
INT good-DECL 1pHwalk-DECL night jaguar
i-ma-kadana INDF-sleep-SUB
‘How good it is for us to walk in the night when the jaguar is asleep’
(from a song)

Jaguar, however, is understood as a quite tangible referent, cf. the following line of the song:

(82) ʤawi ʤawi kwaka pi-dehne-3i
jaguar jaguar what 2sg-do-REL
‘Jaguar, jaguar, what are you doing?’

(83) hjehe hékwapi-3iku-ʧi Jesus ʧaʤa katsa
this day-LOC-REL:MASC Jesus now so
ʧaʤa-ni yaqanawi-nai i-ahne-3i
now-3sgnfO=S0 white man-PL INDF-know-REL
‘This creator, now white people know him as Jesus’

An A/S, participant in an i-construction may not be previously introduced in the narrative. There are then the following possibilities:

(i) The event or a state of affairs is characteristic of the new A/S, referent. This is illustrated by (84) and (85) below.

(84) comes from a story about a man who encountered a group of wild pigs and went away with them. When he decided to come home, his wife did not recognize him, because he had become physically similar to a wild pig himself. (84) describes what happened then, and it is the last sentence of the story. Majieʧi ‘shaman’ has not been introduced before. On the other hand, the existence of a shaman in every settlement is presupposed, and blessing is a typical activity of a shaman. Thus, the A/S constituent in an i-construction to a certain extent belongs to background information. The i-construction is used to describe a typical activity of a referent.
(84) $q\-uka$  $q\-pana-\=iku$  $ma\=ji\={\=ti}$
3sgnf-arrive 3sgnf-house-LOC shaman

$i\-\text{putsua-}\=ni$  $pida$  $q\-\=\acute{a}\=se-\=ka$
INDF-bless-3sgnfO=S\_o  PART 3sgnf-feel-DECL

$maj\=\={\=ni}$
good-3sgnfO=S\_o

‘He (the man) arrived to his house, a shaman blessed him, and he became fine’

(85) is the final paragraph of the story about a man and a magic turtle. The man was captured by the turtle and, though he tried to flee, was bitten by a snake and died. The $i\-$ construction is used for ‘the snake bit him’. The snake is not mentioned anywhere else in the text. It belongs to a kind of background information (one would imagine that since the man was in the jungle there would be snakes there), and ‘biting’ is the snake’s typical activity.

(85)  $q\-\text{mutu-}\=\text{pida}$  $q\-\text{daka}$
3sgnf-go out-PART 3sgnf-urinate

$i\-\text{kaite-ka-tsa-}\=\text{pida}$  $q\-\text{taita}$
3sgnf-speak-DECL-EMPH-PART 3sgnf-finish

$kama\=\text{ena-}\=\text{pida}$  $api$  $i\-\text{hua-ka}$
then-PART snake INDF-bite-DECL

$kama\=\text{etsa-ka}$  $pida-ka$  $ma\=\=jume-ka-\=ni$
then-DECL PART-DECL die-DECL-3sgnfO=S\_o

‘He went out to urinate, finished speaking. Then the snake bit him, and he died’

(ii) A referent has not been mentioned before, but he belongs to the same domain as an already mentioned participant, clarifying its semantics. This is illustrated by (86) and (87).

(86) comes from the story about a snake. The fisherman’s children went to the port to see what was happening, i.e. whom their sister who had been ‘sacrificed’ to the mandi-fish was going to bring home. Two sentences earlier their younger sister asked their father to prepare a room for her new husband. (86) clarifies who this husband actually was: he was a snake.

(86)  $maka\=\text{ka-}\=\text{y}$  $umawa\=\=ji$  $i\=\text{\_hua}$  $\text{neni}$
big-CL:CURVED-ADJ rattle snake INDF-lie EXIST

‘There was a big rattle snake lying there’

(87) comes from the story about the abandoned children. A sister wanted to marry a magic man who was hiding in one of the rooms; when her brother came home, he saw that it actually was a snake.

(87)  $h\=\=ji$  $\=\=ji$  $\=\=ji$  $kapa$
3sgnf+turn 3sgnf+see 3sgnf+down-PERL
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umawaqi i-nu 3sgf-qi-khaqe
snake INDF-come 3sgf-towards
‘He (the brother) turned to look under him: a big snake was coming
towards him’

The few transitive sentences with two full NPs in Baniwa are found only
in i-constructions. This is illustrated with the example (88) from the story
about a widow who married an evil spirit. Her own children were trying to
flee from her after having killed the evil spirit and transformed his child
into a deer. The mother was trying to stop them. In (88), she discovered
that her daughter was digging the ground with her fingernails to make a
hole and flee. 3u-kapi ‘her hand’ is a topic. Fuddua ‘her mother’ is in focus;
the overt subject NP Fuddua ‘her mother’ is also necessary to distinguish
between the two participants - the daughter and the mother.

(88) hnete Fuddua hipa 3sgf-i-kapa 3u-kapi
then 3sgf+mother INDF+take INDF-see 3sgf-hand
3u-tsuta-iiku-pida nenipida hipay
3sgf-fingernail-LOC-PART EXIST-PART soil
‘Then her mother took her (daughter’s) hand. On her fingernail,
there was soil’

4.4.4.2. Indefinite person marker i- in interrogative and cleft construc-
tions. In interrogative sentences and indirect questions in Baniwa the
interrogative word is moved to the clause initial position. If it is an A/Sa
constituent, an i-construction is used, as illustrated by (89).

(89) qi-kapa kwaka hipa-3i 3sgf-qi-flu
3sgf-see who INDF+take-REL 3sgf-for
‘He (the man) was looking at what was happening, i.e. who was taking
him (the turtle)’

(90) is an example of the i-marker used in a cleft construction (from a
story about the magic turtle).

(90) nu-kapa-pia apa-ita 3a3a i-sweta
1sg-see-PAST one-CLAN turtle INDF-stay+CAUS
dapi, hipia-pia i-de-i-i-hhua
vine he-PAST INDF-take-REL-Isg
‘I saw a turtle (who was) pushing a vine, it was he who took me’

I-constructions are used in cleft sentences, especially if the subject is a
personal pronoun. Then independent pronouns are used to mark the
subject. This is illustrated by (91), from the story about abandoned
children (see Appendix 2, on the use of independent personal pronouns in
Baniwa).

(91) kwa-wada pi-flu tidye 3a3a i-sweta
INT-PURP 2sg-for firewood NEG she
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i-na-ji-hnu
INDF-want-REL-1sgO=S
‘What do you have the firewood for? (the wondrous man called Pedro asked the boy). No, it is she (i.e. the witch) who wants me to (make fire)’ (answered the boy)

Similarities between emphatic constructions and questions have been already noted by linguists; many languages mark them similarly (e.g., French; Berber). Among others, Schachter (1973) provides a logical explanation for their formal similarity (cf. also Cooreman 1987).

4.4.4.3. I-constructions in complement clauses. I-constructions can be used to mark the predicate of a complement clause, if

(a) the A/S, constituent of a complement clause is shared by the predicate of a main and a complement clause and
(b) it immediately precedes the predicate of the complement clause;
(c) it belongs to thematic information, or is focussed.

In the examples which follow the core constituents of a transitive complement clause are coded by full NPs.

In (92), the A/S, constituent of the complement clause is coreferential with O of the main clause. This comes from the story about a man and a magic turtle. The man is explaining to other people what happened to him. a3a ‘turtle’ is the topic of the main clause, and it is focussed in the complement clause (in square brackets):

(92) nu-kapa-pia [apa-ita a3a i-sweta da:pi]
1sg-see-PAST one-CL:AN turtle INDF-stay+CAUS vine
‘I saw [a turtle pushing a vine]’

(93) hnete ji-aku ji-taita kadtu-mi-tsa-pida
then 3sgnF-speak 3sgnF-finish so-AFF-EMPH-PART
ji-flu Pedru ji-flu [gíaqi-da i-duitu]
3sgnF-for Pedro 3sgnF-for man-CL:ROUND INDF-push
ju-wa-wa jua peda:ja
3sgf-fall-PR she old
‘Then he (Pedro) explained (lit. speak-finish) [how he (the boy) should act (lit. how is up to him), (so that) the boy should push] the old woman so that she falls’

4.4.4.4. The i-construction and referent tracking in discourse. The opposition between full person/gender/number agreement with the A/S,
constituent with the help of cross-referencing affixes, and *i*-person marking is very useful in distinguishing participants in otherwise elliptical discourse.

Examples below illustrate how the different person marking is used to referent tracking in discourse, i.e. helps to identify who is doing what to whom.

In the following example from a text about a colibri bird and a heron, 3sgnf A/S, person marker on the verb -*dia* 'return' indicates that *maqî* 'heron' can not be its subject.

(94) *qi-a* khapa-ni-pida *qi*-uhwa maqî
    3sgnf-go tired-3sgnfO=Sî 3sgnf-sit heron
*qi-dia-pida*
    3sgnf-return-PAR

'He (colibri) grew tired, sat on the heron and *came back*'

If *maqî* 'heron' were the subject of the verb -*dia* 'to return', the sentence would be (95):

(95) *qi-a* khapa-ni-pida *qi*-uhwa maqî
    3sgnf-go tired-3sgnfO=Sî 3sgnf-sit heron
*i-dia-pida*
    INDF-return-PAR

'He (colibri) grew tired, sat down (on the heron?) (and) the heron returned'

The operation of the Same Subject Constraint (see §4.2) also helps to distinguish a serial verb construction from predicate coordination. (96) comes from the story about a snake. The mandi fish is explaining to the fisherman what he should do. The serial verb construction which has the same subject marking (*i*-, since the A/S, constituent expressed by a personal pronoun is focalized), is italicized.

(96) hnete thewena pi-nu-kada-naku pi-de-watsa jua
    then tomorrow 2sg-come-SUB-LOC 2sg-bring-FUT she
apa-da pi-enipe kwame suma-watsa jua
    one-CL:ROUND 2sg-child how 3sgf+want-FUT she
i-uka-ji i-kapa-phia 3u-keñweta *qi-aku
    INDF-come-REL INDF-see-2sgO 3sgf-start+CAUS 3sgnf-say
*i-fiu*
    3sgnf-for

'Then tomorrow, when you come, bring one of your daughters, the way she will want it, the one who will come to see you, she will be the first, he (the fish) said to him (the man)'

The distinction between gender/person/number markers and the indefinite person marker have a similar effect to a switch-reference mark-
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ing device. (97) and (98) show how different person markers help to disambiguate otherwise ambiguous constructions:

(97) hía pan-tí na-dehne-ni-dapana-tsa
    he house-NPOSS 3pl-make-TOP ADV-CL:HOUSE-EMPH
    nu-kešíni iaka i-ema
    1sg-friend far 3sgnf-stay
    ‘The house that was built by my friend(s), it is far away’

(98) hía pan-tí na-dehne-ni-dapana-tsa
    he house-NPOSS 3pl-make-TOP ADV-CL:HOUSE-EMPH
    nu-kešíni i-a-ka i-ema
    1sg-friend INDF-go-DECL INDF-stand
    ‘The house was built by my friend(s) (and) he went away’

4.4.4.5. Conclusions. The common semantic features of all the uses of i-construction are:

- extracting a previously introduced or otherwise backgrounded Agent (A/S, constituent) out of the clause, by left-dislocation or preverbal fronting;
- focussing the Agent (A/S, constituent);
- describing the event/state of affairs which can count as characteristic of the focussed Agent.

4.5. Cross-referencing enclitics

Cross-referencing enclitics distinguish four persons and two numbers. The distinction between two genders – feminine animate and non-feminine – is maintained in third person singular. As can be seen in Table 3, the cross-referencing enclitics coincide with the independent pronouns, with the exception of 3rd person singular enclitics. They are enclitics, because they occupy the last position in a morphological word, following affixes and other clitics, e.g. (99) where a cross-referencing enclitic goes on the final constituent of a VP:

(99) pišyume-ka-ni
    clear-DECL-3sgnfSₜ=O
    ‘The day is clearing’

The basic difference between cross-referencing enclitics and prefixes is that the former have no counterpart for i-marking and for impersonal pa-. Enclitics also function differently with respect to agreement.

The cross-referencing enclitics mark Sₜ and O when the verb has a pronominal argument, e.g. Sₜ in (100) and O in (101).

* A/Sₜ is obligatorily cross-referenced on the verb in the form of topic-advancing voice (see Aikhenvald ms.a).
(100) kenipe i-jiu-nu
    REL+INDF+child 3sgnf-to-3sgfSo
    'She had children with him'

(101) pādga nu-inua-ka-ni
    now 1sg-kill-DECL-3sgnfO
    'Now I am going to kill him' (the jaguar said of the turtle)

An O/S₀ constituent is never cross-referenced on the verb if expressed by a full NP which is either a new topic, or an established topic, or a reintroduced participant.

A subject of an So verb and an O of a transitive verb can be postposed to the predicate when used to introduce a new participant at the beginning of discourse (see examples above, in § 4.4), or when they belong to an established topic.

An O/S₀ constituent can undergo left-dislocation, if it is a contrastive focus. The O/S₀ constituent is then not cross-referenced on the verb, and there is a pause which separates the topicalized constituent from the rest of the clause.

Preverbal fronting of the O constituent is illustrated by (102) from the story about a jaguar and a turtle.

(102) pi-маnё-ta-kawa pi-awada pa hnuipa-ka-3a
    2sg-deceive-REFL 2sg-think REL 1sg+foot-DECL-AFF
    phipa-ţi haiku i-păq-3a
    2sg+grab-REL tree  INDF-root-AFF
    'You are deceiving yourself, you think it is my foot you took, (but) it is the root of a tree' (said the turtle to the jaguar)

There seems to be a complementary distribution between full NP and verbal cross-referencing with enclitics—similar to Modern Irish, Breton (see Hale & McCloskey 1984, Anderson 1982) or Gaviao (Moore 1984). There is, however, an important difference between the use of enclitics vs full NPs in Baniwa and pronominal cross-referencing on verbs vs full NPs in Celtic languages and Gaviao.

The O/S₀ constituent is cross-referenced by personal enclitics, if it is the antitopic ('tail'), and is postposed to the predicate. There must be a pause, between the predicate and the postposed constituent. (103) illustrates such a use of -ni '3sgnf O=S₀' to mark S₀ as an antitopic.

(103) upi-pia maju-me-ni
    long ago-PAST die-3sgnfS₀
    pi-a-ni-ta mi i-ju rağıta
    2sg-give-TOP ADV+CLAN-PAST INDF-for money
    'The one to whom you gave the money died long ago'

Cf. an example with an established topic in S₀ function and where no enclitic occurs:
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(104) kame-tsa maqiume iñemi
    then-EMPH die devil

'And then the evil spirit died'

Another example of how the O=Sₐ cross-referencing enclitic is used to mark an antiopic is (105), which comes from a story about the evil spirit (Curupira) and his wife. The story begins with a description of how people killed the evil spirit’s child. This part is summarized with (105). The direct object constituent, awakajuna i-enipe ‘child of the evil spirit’ is antitopicalized for clarification.

(105) hnete na-inua-ni awakajuna i-enipe
    then 3pl-kill-3sgnO=Sₐ wild one INDF-child

'So they killed him, the child of the evil spirit'

4.6. Conclusions

Here I shall summarize the functions of person-marking devices, their correlations with constituent order in Baniwa, and how both are used to encode discourse-pragmatic properties of core constituents.

A. Cross-referencing morphemes are obligatory for pronominal referents in all types of constructions.

B. Constituent order VA/Sₐ is used to introduce a new participant and reintroduce an already known referent, for identification of discourse participants. A full person/gender-number agreement with A/Sₐ is used on the verb. Constituent order VO/Sₐ is used to introduce a new participant. No agreement markers are used on the verb.

C. Constituent order A/SₐV is used when an already known, or backgrounded Agent (A/Sₐ constituent) is focussed. Then, A/Sₐ is cross-referenced on the predicate with the indefinite person marker i-. The person/gender-number agreement of verb with its subject is neutralized. These constructions, called here ‘i-constructions’, are pragmatically marked.

D. Left dislocation is used for topicalizing arguments of a predicate, both A/Sₐ and O/Sₐ. If a constituent A/Sₐ is topicalized, a full person/gender-number agreement with A/Sₐ is used on the verb.

E. Right dislocation is also used for A/Sₐ and O/Sₐ constituents, the possessor constituent in possessive constructions and adpositions for antitopicalization. The antitopicalized O/Sₐ constituent is obligatorily cross-referenced on the verb, by personal enclitics.

F. The unmarked order in possessive and adpositional constructions is Possessor-Possessed and Argument-Adposition. Indefinite person prefix
i- is then used on the possessed constituent or the adposition, to mark the possessive relationship.

G. Syntactically, Baniwa has three classes of arguments: A/S₁; O/S₀, and Possessor and Argument of an adposition. The latter show the same person-marking prefixes as A/S₁, and similar right dislocation procedures as O/S₀. It is known (cf. Dixon 1994:219ff.) that split ergative languages treat Possessors in different ways – some treat them similarly to A/S₁, as Arawak languages do, and some similarly to O/S₀, as Tupi-Guarani languages do. Baniwa uses the same morphological marking for A/S₁ and Possessors. They show a certain similarity to the O/S₀ argument in their syntactic behaviour.

H. The important property of Baniwa is the existence of an i-construction. There is an important analogy between the use of i- person marker in Baniwa and a- person marker in Bare (see §2). Parallels with some other languages of the world, with particular reference to Philippine languages will be drawn in §5. A related construction in a genetically close language, Tariana, will be considered in §4.7.

4.7. A construction related to the i-construction in a genetically close language: Tariana

The only North Arawak language to have preserved the i-person marker is Tariana. Tariana is very close to Baniwa. It also displays a number of significant differences from Baniwa in grammatical structure, which are partly due to the fact that Tariana belongs to a different linguistic area and shares a number of grammatical characteristics with East Tucanoan languages.

Tariana has a system of cross-referencing prefixes similar to Baniwa (see Table 4).

Table 4. Cross-referencing prefixes in Tariana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>m1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3nf</td>
<td>di-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>du-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imp</td>
<td>pa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between verbal and nominal prefixes is that only the latter have the indefinite person prefix i-, cognate with Baniwa i-. The constituent order in Tariana is free. Unlike Baniwa, the i- prefix in Tariana is never used on verbs or deverbal nouns. The i-prefix in Tariana is used on obligatory possessed nouns if the possessor is not known, e.g.,
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(106) i-thaku-yawa
    INDF-snout-CL:HOLE
    'nostril'

Nouns with the indefinite person prefix i- are used in counting (where Baniwa would use impersonal pa-), e.g.:

(107) ūama i-sawi  'two horns'
    two  INDF-horn

It is also used as a possessive marker in possessive constructions with a non-pronominal possessor on possessed nouns, e.g. (108), and on adpositions which can take a pronominal prefix, if they have a non-pronominal argument e.g. (109).

(108) pa-ita kuphe i-pitana-ka kayu
    one-CL:GEN AN fish  INDF-name-DECL like
    kepitana-ka
    REL+name-DECL
    'The name of one fish is like the name of the other'

(109) sinku anu i-pumi diha di-mia
    five year INDF-after he 3sgnf-drown
    di-uka lape-se
    3sgnf-arrive mud-LOC
    'After five years (when) he (the turtle) managed to drown in the mud'

Thus, the i-prefix in Tariana is restricted to the function of a possessive marker in possessive and adpositional constructions, and to that of an 'indefinite' possessor. In colloquial speech, there is a tendency to use personal pronominal markers instead of i- even in possessive constructions, as illustrated in (110).

(110) pa-piu-naki di-kawa
    IMP-sweep-CL:BROOM 3sgnf-leg
    'the handle of a broom'

In one idiomatic expression the person-marking prefix i- is in free variation with a personal cross-referencing prefix. In this expression, shown below in (111), the constituent order is AV, and it is fixed.

(111) phiṣi i-hyā-ka
    agouti INDF-eat-SEQ/DECL
    or
    phiṣi d-hyā-ka
    agouti 3sgnf-eat-SEQ/DECL
    'Agouti eating (the moon): i.e. 'waning moon'.
The use of the *i*-construction in Tariana shows some similarities with its use in Baniwa. The basic difference between the two languages is, however, that Tariana uses *i*- only as a marker of possessive relationship. Even in this function, this prefix has a tendency to be ousted by personal cross-referencing prefixes. There are, however, definite traces of the *i*-prefix being used with verbs. This enables us to affirm that (a) *i*- is an archaic feature of Tariana; (b) Tariana is restricting the use of *i-*, which could be partly due to areal influence of neighbouring East Tucanoan languages.

5. Conclusions

North Arawak languages of the Upper Rio Negro show two strategies for grammatical marking of discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents in verbal cross-referencing.

(i) A special cross-referencing prefix is used to mark a focussed A/S constituent (=Agent) in Baniwa and Bare. The person-gender-number distinctions are neutralized. I show in Appendix 2 that at least two more North Arawak languages – Achagua and Yucuna – have special cross-referencing devices for a focussed subject. The link between verbal cross-referencing and discourse-pragmatic characteristics of core constituents may be a common North Arawak feature.

(ii) Cross-referencing prefixes on the verb may be totally suppressed, if the A/S constituent undergoes left dislocation as the result of topicalization. This strategy is used in Warekena and Bare. I show in Appendix 2 that cross-referencing prefixes can be suppressed if the subject undergoes topicalization in some other Arawak languages (Lokono, Island Carib (North Arawak), Apurina (Pre-Andine Arawak) and Yawalapiti (Xinguan Arawak)).

Both strategies are in complete agreement with the predominantly head-marking characteristics of North Arawak languages.

Strategy (i) shows a certain similarity to focus-marking in Philippine languages. According to Schachter and Otanes (1972:69), 'focus is the feature of a verbal predicate that determines the semantic relationship between a predicate verb and its topic'. Note also Topping (1973:243), on Chamorro: '... the Chamorro speaker must indicate through the syntactic structure of his utterance which of the substantive elements is the 'theme'...'
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of the utterance, or what, in his own conceptual framework, is at the heart of the utterance.'

The correlations between discourse-pragmatic functions of constituents, marking of NPs and predicate marking do not necessarily affect the transitivity of the verb, and hence can not be considered as 'candidates' for voices. A clear example of such a case is the focus-marking in Chamorro, via the ergative infix -um- (see Cooreman 1987, 1983) which is used under the following circumstances (Cooreman 1987:43 ff.):

(i) in focus constructions in which Agent/subject is focussed;
(ii) in WH-questions in which the identity of the Agent/subject is questioned;
(ii) some manipulative and modality verbs require that the complement verb be infixed with -um-;
(iv) in relative clauses in which the head of the relative clauses functions as agentive subject;
(v) agentive subjects modified by a number of quantifiers trigger the appearance of -um-.

Chamorro uses both verbal cross-referencing and case marking for encoding grammatical relations. Case-marking is restricted to definite NPs. Verbal cross-referencing operates basically on an ergative basis. The infix -um- replaces ergative verbal-cross-referencing agreement markers. The A constituent is necessarily placed before a verb marked with -um. Thus, the focus-marking by -um involves cross-referencing and constituent ordering.

As was shown in Cooreman (1983:478 ff.), the -um- construction is used to mark pragmatically salient agents and affected participants which have roughly the same degree of topicality. Semantic categorization of -um- constructions involves two properties, as stated in Cooreman (1987:174): (i) 'it is used to code Agents [. . .] which are extracted out of the clause'; i.e. to provide a characteristic which can be assigned to a certain set of elements or referents, thus specifying the set of referents to which this characteristic can be applied; (ii) it is used to describe 'an event or a state of affairs which counts as a characteristic of the extracted Agent referent'.

Similarly to the 'indefinite person prefix' in Baniwa and Bare, -um- 'replaces' personal cross-referencing prefixes. In principle, Baniwa i-, Bare a- and Chamorro -um- may each be considered as portmanteau morphemes which encode both the person/number agreement marking and the discourse-pragmatic characteristics of constituents: A in Chamorro, and A/S, in Baniwa and Bare. This correlates with predominantly ergative morphosyntax of Chamorro (as it is outlined by Cooreman (1983, 1987), and active/stative morphosyntax of Bare and Baniwa.
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The second strategy of grammatical marking of discourse-pragmatic properties of core constituents has numerous analogies in the languages of the world. Some examples for such a correlation were considered in Anderson (1982, 1992) under the notion of 'disagreement', or lack of agreement between a verb and its subject. A correlation between left dislocation, or preverbal fronting of a contrastive focus and the suppression of the agreement on the verb is found in other languages as well (e.g., Mzab, a Berber language, see Aikhenvald 1984).

The two strategies of grammatical marking of discourse-pragmatic properties of constituents in Arawak languages are apparently independent of voice distinctions, and should be considered as grammatical categories in their own right.

An over-all functional typology of discourse-marking devices in the languages of the world must necessarily take into consideration these, as well as many more other verbal categories which combine the marking of grammatical relations with discourse-pragmatic factors.

11 The following examples considered in Anderson (1974), from Abkhaz and Abaza, are relevant for our discussion. The suppression of agreement prefixes in Abkhaz (see Hewitt 1979:268) and Abaza (Allen 1956) depends on the constituent ordering. In both languages, the 3rd person S=O prefix yə - is deleted, if the noun phrase immediately precedes it.

12 Languages use different strategies for information distribution in sentence and discourse, and correlate discourse-pragmatic and grammatical functions of constituents in different ways. One of the most widespread strategies of marking discourse-pragmatic functions is constituent ordering. Most languages place thematic information first, and non-thematic second; some use the opposite strategy, e.g., Ojibwa (see discussion in Tomlin & Rhodes 1992). Inversion is widely used for marking pragmatic status of constituent (e.g., Birner 1994, for a discussion of inversion in English). Pragmatic order rules govern the constituent ordering in so called languages with a so-called free-word order (e.g., Payne 1994). A great many languages of the world employ left dislocation for contrastive focus as so called 'topicalization' procedure (cf. Andrews 1985, Chafe 1976). Right dislocation is typical for 'anti-topicalization', or the marking of 'afterthoughts', or 'tails' (cf. Chafe 1976, also Aikhenvald 1984, 1990 on Kabyle and other Berber languages). Another strategy is to employ some surface grammatical marking of discourse-pragmatic functions of sentence constituents. Languages can encode the discourse-pragmatic functions by a special grammatical marking on the NPs (as in Tariana, Arawak, and East Tucanoan; see Aikhenvald 1994a; also see Kirchuk 1993 for Hebrew, Plungian 1993 for Dogon, Nilsson 1985 for Turkish, Mithun 1994 for Kapampangan; also see Mallinson and Blake 1981:62) or on the verb. The dependency between tense-aspect marking and the distribution of new and old information, mainly encoded through subject, was analyzed by Hopper (1979). Pragmatics of voice distinctions (see a lengthy discussion in Givón 1994, Gildes 1994, Payne 1994) implies a correlation between the marking of grammatical relations of constituents, their overt expression in the surface structure and the existence of a special morphological marker on the verb.

Some languages use different types of verbal cross-referencing which correlate with different case-marking systems to encode different discourse-pragmatic functions. For instance, in Paumari (Arawá), ergative cross-referencing on the predicate and ergative case-marking are used to encode topically continuous A or O. Accusative cross-referencing and accusative cross-marking are used to encode O in the function of new topic. Both cross-referencing and case-marking systems also correlate with restrictions on constituent ordering (see Chapman & Derbyshire 1991).
Appendix 1

Verbal cross-referencing and discourse-pragmatic characteristics: evidence from other Arawak languages

Here I shall analyze data from several other Arawak languages, to illustrate the two strategies of encoding discourse-pragmatic characteristics of constituents:

(i) suppression of cross-referencing prefixes.
(ii) manipulation of cross-referencing affixes.

In § 1 I shall consider the evidence for suppression of cross-referencing prefixes, and in § 2 I shall look at the possibilities of manipulation of cross-referencing affixes, for various discourse-pragmatic effects.

1. Suppression of cross-referencing prefixes

I found evidence in favour of a dependency between suppression of verbal cross-referencing prefixes, constituent order and discourse-pragmatic properties from the following Arawak languages: Arawak Lokono, Island Carib (both Ta-Arawak subgroup of North Arawak), Apurina (Piro-Apurina subgroup of Pre-andine Arawak) and Yawalapiti (Xinguan Arawak).

1.1. Arawak Lokono and Island Carib

Both Arawak Lokono and Island Carib have a split ergative marking of the type $A=S_a/O=S_o$ in verbal cross-referencing. Pronominal prefixes are used for cross-referencing $A=S_a$, the arguments of postpositions and possessor in possessive constructions; suffixes are used to $O=S_o$. The data on Lokono come mainly from Pet (1987).

The correlation between constituent order, discourse structure and person cross-referencing are not mentioned in Pet (1987). This correlation is, however, easily retrievable from the examples given in Pet (1987) and especially from the texts in the Appendix. $A/S_a$ cross-referencing is obligatory if the verb has a pronominal argument, as in (1):

\(\text{(1) } \text{kia bena, thy-sika ama l-ansi-sia} \)

\(\text{that after, 3sgf-give what 3sgnf-want-WH=OBJ} \)

\(\text{ly-myn} \)

\(\text{3sgnf-to} \)

\(\text{‘After that she gave him what he wanted’ (143).} \)

It is also obligatory with an argument postposed to the verb. My analysis of the texts in Pet (1987) shows that the $A/S_a$ constituent postposed to the verb is used to introduce a new participant, as in (2), or to restate already
introduced participants which had not been expressed with the help of a full NP for a long stretch of a text, as in (3).

(2) is the first sentence of the Metamorphosis story (pp. 265 ff.)

(2) alika th-a-n pero besonaa-n
    how 3sgnf-dummy verb-SUB dog change-SUB
    kakythi-bia wadili myn
    person-INCH man BEN
    'How a dog changed into a person for a man'

(3) comes later on in the same story:

(3) Jon khi-da, thy-simaka-ka to pero
    there thusly-EPEN 3sgf-cry out-PERF the dog
    'When this happened, the dog cried out'.

The A/S constituent is preposed to the verb if the constituent is topicalized. The cross-referencing prefixes are then omitted, e.g., (4).

(4) ken l-eitha kho kia ly-pero-n
    and 3sgnf-know not that=one 3sgnf-dog-POSS
    nisa-n lon-da no
    prepare-SUB him=BEN-EPEN it
    'And he (the man) did not know it was his dog who prepared it (the food) for him'

The A/S fronting and subsequent omission of cross-referencing prefixes is also used in interrogative sentences, e.g.:

(5) ama-ron nisa-n lon-da ba no
    what-non male prepare-SUB to him-EPEN again it
    'Who is preparing it for him?' (i.e. the food for the man)

According to Pet (1987:110ff.), the first position in the clause is reserved for representing 'highlighted new information', and it corresponds to communicative focus. As indicated in Pet (1987:115), 'focus' (labeled by him as COMP position) is distinct from topicalization, since topicalization involves an intonation break.

The correlation between constituent order and cross-referencing on the verb in Island Carib was pointed out by Douglas Taylor (1952:230):

... if a nominal subject precedes the finite verb, the latter does not take the person-marker prefix in cross-reference to it; so lūbuṯa adarāsarābdina its material hindering-will-be-me and ladarāsarubādina lūbuṯa it-hindering-will-be-me its material both may be translated by the material for it will hinder/delay me.

Considering the close relationship between Island Carib and Lokono, we hypothesize that there must be similar conditioning for the suppression of cross-referencing prefixes in Lokono and Island Carib; however, much
more work needs to be done on both languages in order to obtain more definite results.

Neither Lokono nor Island Carib appear to have any traces of a passive, or topic advancement marked on the verb.

1.2. Apurina

A correlation between the position of a constituent as to the predicate and its cross-referencing on the verb in Apurina was pointed out in Facundes (ms.), cf. also Pickering (1974). Postverbal NPs are cross-referenced on the verb, as illustrated in (6), (8), and preverbal nominals are not, as shown in (7).

(6) a-mapuruka-ri iwa ata
    1pl-root up-3sgMasc it:Masc we
    'We rooted it up'

(7) iwa mapuruka-ru uwa
    he root up-3sgFEM:OBJ it-FEM
    'He rooted it up'

(8) iwa u-mapuruka uwa
    it:Masc 3sgFem-root up she
    'She rooted it up'

According to Pickering (1974), constituent fronting in Apurina reflects a kind of topicalization of this constituent, though a lot more data are needed to confirm this.

1.3. Yawalapiti

In Yawalapiti (Xinguan Arawak), verbs cross-reference only A/Sₐ (see Mujica 1992). The most frequent constituent order in AVO. The A/Sₐ constituent is sometimes not cross-referenced on the verb. We hypothesize that the omission of cross-referencing may be linked with preverbal fronting of A/Sₐ as a contrastive focus. Consider the following examples:

(9) i'ī i-ša-a-pa juta'ka
    he 3sgnf-eat-CONT-ST salt
    'He is eating salt' (ex. (380))

(10) kutipiqa kuka aša kupati
    hawk PAST eat fish
    'The hawk ate fish'

The data of Yawlapiti are too scarce, and the existing description too preliminary to make any definite conclusions. We can, however, hypothesize that there is some kind of correspondence between constituent cross-referencing on the predicate and its pragmatic characteristics.
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2. Manipulation of cross-referencing affixes and discourse

A peculiar interrelation between verbal cross-referencing prefixes and suffixes, depending on discourse-pragmatic parameters is found in two related North-Arawak languages of Colombia – Achagua and Yucuna.

Achagua (Wilson 1992) has three person-marking devices: cross-referencing prefixes and cross-referencing suffixes which jointly mark A/S, and affixless forms. Cross-referencing prefixes distinguish three persons and two numbers, and a gender opposition in 3rd person. Cross-referencing prefixes and suffixes distinguish singular and plural, with a ±feminine opposition in singular.

According to Wilson (1992), prefixes and suffixes appear to be in a complementary distribution in accordance with the pragmatic functions of the constituents. There is also a suffix (or clitic?) \(-ni\) used to mark pronominal 3rd person O (cf. \(-ni\) ‘third person singular non-feminine cross-referencing clitic’ in Baniwa).

Cross-referencing prefixes are used to cross-reference a pronominal A/S and possessor in possessive constructions:

\[(11) \quad \text{nu}-\text{caba-ni} \\
\quad \text{1sg-see-3p} \\
\quad \text{‘I see him/her/them’ (Wilson 1992: ex. (45))}
\]

\[(12) \quad \text{ruwaida} \quad \text{baaji} \quad \text{pelora} \text{shiatai} \\
\quad \text{3sgf-sit-CAUS one-CL:REC jug water} \\
\quad \text{‘She put a jug of water’ (172)}
\]

\[(13) \quad \text{nu}-\text{eenibi} \\
\quad \text{1sg-child} \\
\quad \text{‘my children’ (169)}
\]

They are also used in serial verb constructions (e.g., (18)).

Affixless forms are used to mark possessor in a possessive construction:

\[(14) \quad \text{eema} \quad \text{junicai} \\
\quad \text{horse companion} \\
\quad \text{‘horse’s companion’ (170)}
\]

They are also used in to mark A/S constructions, if the conditions necessary for the employment of cross-referencing suffixes are not fulfilled, e.g. (16). They are used in cleft and interrogative sentences, e.g.:

\[(15) \quad \text{tana meda jini} \\
\quad \text{tana meda hi-ni} \\
\quad \text{who do \ ASSER-3with} \\
\quad \text{‘Who did it?’ (48)}
\]

\[(16) \quad \text{Juani wowai eema} \\
\quad \text{John want horse} \\
\quad \text{‘John wants a horse’ (54)}
\]
Cross-referencing suffixes are used to appear on the verb, to signal a new topic which is relevant for the future narrative, e.g.:

(17) nuya yerri Umaapu licu
    nuya ya-e3i umaapu 3iku
    1sg be-Amasc sg Humapo LOC

‘As for me, I am in Humapo’ (281)

The employment of cross-referencing suffixes sometimes has an emphatic sense, as in (18):

(18) bainacu quini’ee eewerri
    bainaku kini-ee eewa-e3i
    long ago nobody-FOC can-Asg
    lijinanico bacai
    li-hina-ni-ka-u aaba-ka-i
    3sgn-f-walk-REP-AFFIR-PS one-AFFIR-SIG

‘Long ago nobody dared walk alone’ (282)

Yucuna (Schauer & Schauer 1978) has a similar situation, though the available data are far more scarce than those for Achagua. Yucuna has two person-marking devices in Argument-Predicate constructions.

A/S, is marked by cross-referencing prefixes if it is expressed by a pronominal argument, e.g.:

(19) R-ero’o jimichi
    3sgn-pull grass
    ‘He is pulling the grass’

(20) jimichi r-ero’o-ca
    grass 3sgn-pull-DEF
    ‘He is pulling the grass’ (p. 41)

If there is an overtly marked non-pronominal A/S, constituent which precedes the predicate, person-marking suffixes are used to mark the agreement with O, as in (21) and (22).

(21) Juan j-ero’o-ri jimichi
    John INDF-pull-MASC grass
    ‘John is pulling the grass’ (p. 42)

Constituent order AVO is apparently used as a left-dislocation marking device, possibly for topicalization, e.g. (p. 16):

(22) Caja r-e’ehué quejüi’icha-ri rica
    already 3sgn-brother follow-3sgnO he
    ri-nocaloje r-ajñacaloje penaje
    3sgn-kill 3sgn-eat in order to
    ‘His brother followed him in order to kill him and to eat him’
The constituent order Possessor – Possessed and Argument – Post-position is the unmarked one in corresponding possessive and adpositional constructions; j-person marking is then used, e.g.:

(23) cahuacajo j-uni
down-place INDF-water
‘the spring of water’ (p. 33)

Thus, both Achagua and, possibly, Yucuna use subject fronting and a subsequent substitution of cross-referencing verbal prefixes by suffixes as a topicalization, or focus marking device. Neither Achagua nor Yucuna have any traces of a passive, or topic advancement marked on the verb.

Appendix 2
The use of independent personal pronouns in Baniwa

Independent personal pronouns in Baniwa are used either to emphasize a pronominalized participant, especially in topicalization, or as copula complements in existential and locative sentences. The independent personal pronoun is used emphatically in (1) and (2). Both come from the story about the agouti. The ghost of a woman’s dead husband asks agouti whether she had seen his wife. The agouti answers him that she has no idea about it. Interestingly, the narrator of the story, Marcilia, insisted on translating this sentence as something like ‘she is not with us’. Then the agouti asks the spirit if he knows the whereabouts of his wife (2).

(1) kwa pi-kapa jua nu-inu
 INT 2sg-see she 1sg-woman
 ſame-tsa hnuai ni i-ahne-zi idehe-nu
 no-EMPH I-3sgnfO INDF-know-REL where-3sgfS
 ‘Did you see my wife (the dead man asked). No, ‘she is not with me’ (lit.
 I don’t know where she is (answered agouti))

(2) phia-pha i-kapa-nu
 you-INT INDF-see-3sgfO
 ‘And you, did you see her?’ (agouti asked)

Topicalization of an independent pronoun can occur together with the i-construction. This is illustrated in (4) and (3). These examples come from the story about Spider’s children. The boy and the girl encountered an old witch in the jungle, and they argue about who will be the first to go and see her. The boy insists that it should be him who would go again and get the food from the witch (3). The first person independent pronoun is topicalized. The girl says: ‘no, I shall go’ (4). The i-construction is used. In the following sentence (5), the boy answers her, insisting that she will not go; the second person independent pronoun is topicalized, and the
personal prefix occurs, not \(i\)-. The next sentence of the story says that it was the girl who finally went (and the consequences were disastrous).

(3) \(hnua\)-pha-tua hnuta pida \(qi\)-aku
\(I\)-EMPH-FUT 1sg-get PART 3sgf-say
'It is me who will get (the witch), he (the boy) said'

(4) \(fiame\) hnua-watsa i-a-wa \(jua\) inaru
no \(I\)-FUT INDF-go-PR she woman
'No, I shall go, said the girl'

(5) \(fiame\) phia pi-taita-ka
no you 2sg-do-DECL
'You, you will not do it'

A topicalized independent personal pronoun can be repeated twice for the sake of emphasis. (6) comes from the story about the Spider’s children. When the witch realized that the children were fat enough to be eaten, she said to the boy:

(6) \(pi&ja\)-watsa phia-watsa phia phia-wa pi-takha ti3e
now-FUT you-FUT you 2sg+go-PR 2sg-cut wood
'Now as for you, it is you (and not herself) who will go and cut fire-wood'
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