CHAPTER EIGHT

‘INVISIBLE’ LOANS: HOW TO BORROW A BOUND FORM

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald

If speech communities are in a long-term intensive contact with each other, they come to share grammatical patterns and actual forms. The Vaupés River Basin linguistic area is characterized by a long-term obligatory multilingualism based on language-determined exogamy. There is a strong cultural inhibition against recognizable loan forms, so as to keep distinct languages different. Tariana, the only Arawak language in the area, has hardly any free forms which are borrowed. There is, however, a fair number of hard-to-recognize borrowed bound forms—verb roots, and grammatical enclitics—in addition to numerous patterns and constructions developed under contact influence. This goes against popular belief that free morphemes are easier to borrow than bound ones, reflecting the way in which languages tend to influence each other in every possible sphere in different sociolinguistic situations.

1 Bound Morphology in Language Contact

Long-term intensive contact between speech communities typically results in sharing features and forms. No area of grammar and lexicon appears to be immune to borrowing, copying or calquing. However, the extent of this varies, depending on language attitudes, relationships between languages, and the degree of bi- or multilingualism. The speakers’ language awareness and their efforts to keep their language ‘pure’ of foreign imports is a further important factor.

Some types of lexical meanings can be considered more ‘borrowable’ than others. And it is widely believed that bound morphemes are much less prone to being borrowed from one language to the next than free forms.1 Just like with any putative universal constraint on borrowing or

---

1 See the insightful analysis of principles of borrowing or copying by Johanson (2002). Curnow (2001) offers an overview of borrowed forms and patterns, or categories. Meillet’s
copying in language contact, this is not necessarily the case—given the right social environment.

The outcomes of language contact are often influenced by speakers' endeavours to influence the ways in which their language may change. Foreign imports may be judged unacceptable tokens of despicable language mixing. Speakers of Athabaskan languages traditionally preferred not to accept loanwords from the languages with which they had contact. Instead, they would create names for new objects and ideas from their own lexical and grammatical resources (see the discussion of such 'lexical acculturation' as an alternative to borrowed forms in Brown 1999).

There may be a cultural inhibition against recognizably foreign items. This inhibition, and ensuing linguistic purism, may provide a mechanism for stopping an influx of borrowed words. As pointed out by Herzog (1941: 66), "it is in vocabulary [...] that they [contact-induced changes—A. A.] can be traced most readily, by linguists and speakers alike".

Stable societal multilingualism in both Hopi and Tewa, enhanced by generations of intermarriage, is characterized by intense indirect diffusion—but very little borrowing of actual forms—and shared discourse patterns (Kroskrity 1993, 1998: 32, and also Dozier 1956). In the history of many languages, resistance to loans relates to processes of conscious language planning: as when Kemal Atatürk resolved to rid Turkish of its Arabic loans—some of fair antiquity—replacing them with native coinages (also see Fodor 1984, Tauli 1984, Hint 1996 on the history of various literary languages, and further references in Aikhenvald 2006a).

Resistance against recognizably foreign forms can be part and parcel of the resistance against pressure from a dominant language over a less dominant one, in a situation of a 'displacive' language contact. Likpe, a Kwa language, has few if any loan forms from the dominant Ewe, although there is much structural influence (Ameka 2006).

As Thurston (1987: 93) puts it, "since people generally construe languages as being collections of words, it is primarily by lexical form that linguistic groups identify linguistic contrasts among themselves". It takes a linguist with a penchant for purism to systematically detect and 'purge' unwanted contact-induced structural similarities. According to Mati Hint (1996: 802), himself a linguist and a purist, the major danger for those who wish to keep Estonian 'clean' of Russian influence lies not in the presence

(1948: 87) categorical statement that an inflection can never be borrowed has been proved to be overstated (see Gardani 2008, for a summary).
of occasional loanwords, which can easily be got rid of, and are therefore a minor ‘trouble’. What ‘distorts’ the language is the rapid expansion of grammatical and lexical calques which are pervasive and, as he admits, more difficult to control than foreign forms.

It is not always an easy matter to draw a line between borrowing forms and borrowing patterns. Reanalyzed borrowed forms may occur in borrowed patterns. As we will see in §3 below, if a native form is phonetically similar to a look-alike in a dominant language, it may change its meaning accordingly, and undergo ‘accommodation’. The form in the basic (or target) language remains the same—but it acquires a further meaning.

A strong societal inhibition against recognizable loan forms can indeed produce rather unexpected results: a language with hard-to-recognize borrowed bound forms and hardly any borrowed free forms, in addition to numerous patterns and constructions developed under contact influence. We now turn to these ‘invisible’ loans in Tariana, the only extant Arawak language in the multilingual area of the Vaupés River Basin.2

2 Borrowed Forms in Tariana

2.1 The Context

The Vaupés River Basin in north-west Amazonia (spanning adjacent areas of Brazil and Colombia) is a well-established linguistic area. Its major feature is an obligatory societal multilingualism which follows the principle of linguistic exogamy: ‘those who speak the same language as us are our brothers, and we do not marry our sisters’. Marrying someone who belongs to the same language group is considered akin to incest and referred to as ‘this is what dogs do’.3 Language affiliation is inherited from one’s father, and is a badge of identity for each person.

Languages traditionally spoken in the area belong to three unrelated genetic groups: East Tucanoan, Arawak and Makú (or Nadahup: see Epps 2006, 2008). Speakers of East Tucanoan languages (Tucano, Wanano,

---

2 The genetic unity of the Arawak family has been established since 1783 (see Aikhenvald 2012, for details). The term Arawakan refers to a vague and unsubstantiated grouping (on a par with Nostratic) and ought to be avoided.

3 The rules are not completely straightforward: see the discussion in Aikhenvald (2002a: 22–3). Aikhenvald (2002a, 2006b and 2011) provide an in-depth study of the area, and of the diffusion patterns there. Sorensen (1967) is a brief account of the Colombian part of the multilingual Vaupés area where only East Tucanoan languages are spoken. Therefore, his work is only marginally relevant here.
Desano, Tuyuca, Barasano, Piratapuya, Macuna and a few others), and of an Arawak language, Tariana, participate in the exogamous marriage network which ensures obligatory multilingualism. Hup and Yuhup, the two best-described Makú languages, are outside the marriage network. Due to on-going intensive contact with Tucanoan languages, they also show a considerable number of Tucanoan-influenced structures (Epps 2006, 2008).

A striking feature of the Vaupés linguistic area is a strong cultural inhibition against language mixing viewed in terms of borrowing morphemes. Long-term interaction based on institutionalised multilingualism between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns and calquing of categories. These span almost every area of phonology and grammar, including verb compounding, evidentiality, classifiers, number, manner as a verbal category and many more (see Aikhenvald 2002a, 2006b, and 2011).

In most cases, a comparison between Tariana and Arawak languages closely related to it but spoken outside the Vaupés area helps distinguish between genetically-inherited and contact-induced features. Tariana’s closest relatives outside the Vaupés are the Baniwa/Kurripako dialect continuum to the north and northeast in Brazil, Colombia and Venezuela, and Piapoco to the northeast, in Colombia. Tariana shares about 85–88% lexicon with Baniwa and about 65% with Piapoco. Their morphology, phonology and syntax are very different. One of the reasons lies in the contact-induced structural change. Nowadays, Tucano is gradually becoming the most dominant language in the area. As a consequence, many Tariana speak it on a daily basis. It comes as no surprise that the degree of influence of Tucano is stronger than that from any other East Tucanoan language in the area.

The Vaupés River Basin area provides a unique laboratory for investigating how contact induced changes take place, which categories are more prone to diffusion, and which are likely to remain intact. It also shows how borrowability of forms can be affected by language ideology of the speakers being determined not to allow any unacceptable ‘language mixing’.

Tariana itself is an endangered language, and is rapidly losing ground to Tucano, now a major language, and also to Portuguese. The two extant varieties of Tariana are that of Santa Rosa (whose preferential marriage partners are the Wanano), and that of Periquitos (whose preferential marriage partners are the Piratapuya). The two are as close to each other as American English and British English. We discuss some relevant differ-
ences in §3 below. The Tariana spoken by younger and more innovative speakers displays more structural—and, as we will see in below, formal— influence of the dominant Tucano than the language of the few remaining elders.

2.2 Borrowing the Unborrowable: East Tucanoan Forms in Tariana

The rampant multilingualism within the Vaupés area goes together with diffusion of categories rather than of forms, from East Tucanoan languages (especially the now dominant Tucano) into Tariana, and into Hup. The reason for a virtual lack of borrowed forms lies in the linguistic ideology prominent throughout the area. ‘Language mixing’—traditionally viewed in terms of lexical loans—is condemned as culturally inappropriate, and is tolerated only as a ‘linguistic joke’ (see Aikhenvald 2002a: 189–200). This creates an impediment against loan forms.

Various aspects of language awareness—that is, judgements on what is correct and what is not—among the Tariana are instrumental in monitoring the inhibition against recognizably Tucanoan forms, and unacceptable ‘language mixing’. This is not unexpected for a society where marriage patterns and other aspects of life are regulated by one’s language allegiance. Code-switching is permissible in quotations. Evil spirits and animals speak East Tucanoan languages in stories. Those speakers who code-switch in other circumstances and use Tucano words instead of a Tariana word are mocked as incompetent or senile (see Aikhenvald 2002a: 213, 187–208).

Interestingly, the ‘ban’ on Tucanoan insertions does not fully extend to code-switches with Portuguese, the national language of Brazil with which most Tariana are familiar (see Aikhenvald 2001, 2003b on the Tariana’s attitudes to the ‘White man’s language’, that is, Portuguese, and to the related Baniwa of Içana). To put it simply: the languages of the Tucanoans, most of whom are traditional marriage partners for the Tariana, are perceived as a more obvious threat to the Tariana language (this is discussed in Aikhenvald 2003b).

Language awareness of Tariana speakers relates to most aspects of the language. The most conspicuous is ‘lexical’ awareness, that is, identifying

---

4 This analysis is based on results from about twenty years of my original work on the language (see Aikhenvald 2002a and 2002a, b). I am grateful to my Tariana family for teaching me their remarkable language, and to R. M. W. Dixon for incisive comments. The Tariana forms are written in a practical orthography in use by the community.
non-native forms. Many speakers can also identify as ‘foreign’ elements which contain sounds atypical of Tariana. These include nasalized \( \ddot{o} \) and \( \ddot{u} \), the high central vowel \( \acute{i} \), and the voiced labial stop \( b \). The phonological awareness (Aikhenvald 2001, 2002a: 213–21) is sometimes accompanied by ‘morphosyntactic awareness’: some speakers can identify loan constructions and instruct others to avoid using them. There is no doubt that speakers are less consciously aware of Tucanoan impact on the Tariana grammar (in agreement with Silverstein 1981) than they would be of its impact on the lexicon. Their ‘morphosyntactic awareness’ extends only to recently introduced grammatical calques, whereby an older, Arawak, pattern still co-exists with another one, calqued from Tucano.

So, would it be correct to assume that Tariana has no morphemes of East Tucanoan origin? The answer is: ‘not quite’. Tariana does have several morphemes of East Tucanoan provenance. None are recognized as borrowings by the native speakers; all are considered ‘proper’ Tariana. These morphemes are phonologically and morphologically integrated. They fall into two categories: verbal roots and grammatical enclitics.

2.2.1 Verbal Roots of Tucanoan Origin in Tariana

It has been generally assumed that verbs will seldom be borrowed or copied (see a survey by Curnow 2001, Moravcsik 1978). Generally speaking, they appear to be much less borrowable than nouns (see Wohlgemuth 2009, for an up-to-date view on borrowed verbs). The fact that East Tucanoan lexical loans in Tariana are exclusively verbs is thus rather remarkable. In §2.4, we discuss a number of nouns shared between Tariana and East Tucanoan languages. For these, we have no evidence for the direction of borrowing.

A word on the structure of the Tariana verbs (see Aikhenvald 2003a: 253–4 on the structure of the verb). Potentially, each verb may have one prefix, up to nine suffixes and up to ten enclitics. Suffixes may include a causative, a reciprocal, a purposive, a classifier, a relativizer, and a benefactive (in addition to a few more). Enclitics cover an array of modalities, imperative mood, tense and evidentiality aspects, switch-reference and manner or type of action.

Verbs also divide into those which take personal cross-referencing prefixes and those which do not. Prefixless verbs typically have stative meanings and tend to be intransitive, while prefixed verbs refer to actions and can be of any transitivity (see Aikhenvald 2003b: 234–44). A verb root will never appear on its own, without a suffix or an enclitic each of which is obligatory for a clause to make sense. That is, a verb will typically never occur as a free form. This is unlike nouns which may, or may not, be marked for case.
Our lexical data base of Tariana contains approximately 3000 roots, 700 of which are verbs (Aikhenvald 2002b, Aikhenvald and the Brito family 2001). Seventeen verbs, discussed below, can be identified as East Tucanoan loans (that is, comprising 2.4% of the verbal lexicon). All but two of the Tariana forms are prefixed verbs. None of these verbs have any cognates in the related Arawak languages. Their meanings are rather specific.

All but two ambitransitive verbs contain the suffix -ta ‘verbalizer; causativiser’. These ambitransitive verbs are:

1. Tariana -ba-ta ‘swing’; Tucano bahá ‘swing, rock’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 14);
2. Tariana -besi-ta ‘choose, sort (e.g. grain)’, from Tucano besé ‘choose’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 19), Wanano bese- ‘choose, decide, vote’ (Waltz 2007: 23), Desano beye- ‘choose, elect’ (Alemán et al. 2000: 12);
5. Tariana dole-ta ‘carry on one’s shoulders’, Tucano durê ‘transport, carry’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 51), Wanano dure- (Waltz 2007: 106);
6. Tariana -tôle-ta (variant -tôreta) ‘roll out clay, dough or tobacco’; Tucano tôrê ‘roll (clay or leaves)’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 196), Wanano ture- ‘roll’ (Waltz 2007: 259);
7. Tariana -ya-ta ‘yawn, open one’s mouth’; Tucano -ya’á ‘have one’s mouth open, open one’s mouth’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 231), Wanano yaha- ‘open mouth’ (Waltz 2007: 341).
8. Tariana -yo-ta ‘suspend, swing (e.g. a bag on one’s shoulder)’, Tucano yoô ‘swing, suspend’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 247).

5 Many Tariana also know Wanano, who are the preferential marriage partners of the Periquitos group. No lexical sources on Piratapuya (the preferential marriage partner of the other group) are available. Piratapuya and Wanano are linguistically very close, sharing over 90% lexicon (see Waltz 2002).
The following ambitransitive verb is somewhat problematic because of a
difficult to explain vowel mismatch:


One intransitive verb contains thematic suffix -ka (which often occurs in
native intransitive verbs in Tariana):

11. Tariana -seri-ka ‘spread (oneself)’, Tucano sērî ‘spread (oneself),

Two ambitransitive and two intransitive verbs do not contain any extra
marking in Tariana:

12. Tariana -sînu ‘stretch, pull (a bowstring)’, Tucano sîō ‘give direction to,
extend (something or oneself) in a direction’ (Ramírez 1997, Vol. II: 171),
Wanano sañó ‘stretch’ (Waltz 2007: 226–7),
13. Tariana -wasa ‘catch, drag up (typically a fish from a fish trap)’, Tucano
14. Tariana -wera ‘fall (leaves, hair, some fruit)’, Tucano bîrî ‘fall’ (Ramírez
II: 32), Wanano buru- ‘fall (of leaves)’ (Waltz 2007: 354);
15. Tariana -weta ‘make a trap in hunting (which involves a catch on a
trap being released when the animals falls into the trap) (intransitive),
Tucano wetî ‘free oneself, loosen oneself, escape’ (Ramírez 1997,
Vol. II: 223), Wanano witi- ‘to become disjointed, come loose’ (Waltz
2007: 305).

Two roots were borrowed as prefixless stative verbs:

16. Tariana mŏke) ‘sprain (one’s foot)’, Tucano mo’ké ‘twist, sprain’
(Ramírez 1999, Vol. II: 105), Wanano o moquea- ‘twist’ (Waltz 2007:
176).
17. Tariana aliá ‘be, exist’ (copula verb), Desano ári ‘be, exist’ (copula
verb) (Miller 1999: 68).

This borrowing is remarkable in that it involves developing a new, bor-
rrowed, clause type. Tariana is unique among the Arawak languages of the
Rio Negro subgroup in having an existential copula, which can be negated
like any other verb.
The phonological make-up of items 1–4, 6 and 16 is noteworthy. We can recall, from §2.2.1, that sounds /b/ and /õ/ are tokens of unwanted ‘foreign’ words (also see Aikhenvald 2002a: 214, 218). Items 1–4 contain /b/, and 6 and 16 contain /õ/. Nevertheless, they are used by all generations of speakers, and no-one doubts their legitimacy.

The list of borrowed verbs shows that in all but two instances the Tucano language is the most likely source. This is not surprising, since Tucano is known to every Tariana speaker, and is gradually dominating every sphere of life. Number 5 may have come from Tucano, or Wanano (or its close relative Piratapuya): both Wanano and Piratapuya are preferential marriage partners for the Tariana, so most Tariana are proficient in these languages.

The existing loan from Desano (number 17) may be indicative of intensive contacts in the past. The Tariana treat the Desano differently from all other Tucanoan groups. They are considered ‘younger brothers’ of the Tariana, and the two groups are not allowed to intermarry. Both groups used to live away from the major river (the Vaupés) and only moved to its banks recently. According to reports of some ethnographers, the Desano may have spoken a different language in the past; this language could have been Makú (Koch-Grünberg 1906) or Arawak (Dominique Buchillet, p.c.).

2.2.2  Grammatical Enclitics of Tucanoan Origin in Tariana

Three verbal enclitics of Tucano origin are consistently used by Tariana speakers of all generations: the conditional-potential -bohta (with a pronunciation variant -wuhta), and two manner enclitics =pisi ‘STRETCH’ and =miña ‘LIGHT’.

1. The conditional-potential marker =bohta, =buhta, =wuhta comes from Tucano bound verb bôo pronounced [boho] with a potential and conditional meaning (see Tucano data in Ramirez 1997, Vol. 1: 190–2) plus the Tariana verbalizer -ta.

   We have already seen that this verbalizer is often used in borrowed verbs in Tariana. This marker was most probably borrowed as a dependent verb. The etymologically related morpheme in East Tucanoan languages other than Tucano appears to be a suffix, cf. Desano -bu’bo ‘potential’ (Miller 1999: 81) -bo/-bu, -boo ‘subjunctive’ in Barasano (Jones and Jones 1991: 91), -bo in Macuna (Smothermon, Smothermon and Frank 1995: 64) and in Wanano (Waltz and Waltz 1997: 32; 2007: 450).

   Unlike the potential-conditional forms in East Tucanoan languages, potential-conditional forms marked with =bohta in Tariana do not occur
with evidentials (Aikhenvald 2002a: 142–3; 2003a: 290–3). This morphosyntactic difference between the Tariana potential-conditional morpheme, a borrowing from Tucano, and its prototype in East Tucanoan languages, corroborates the hypothesis that this is a nativized borrowing, with morphosyntactic properties of its own.

This marker is used by speakers of all generations, and it is not recognized as a 'foreign' element. This 'nativization' of the borrowed potential-conditional morpheme goes together with an additional phonological oddity. The form =botha, =buhta has an additional set of variants, with an initial w or v: =wuhta, =wutha, =vuhta, =vutha. This substitution of b with w is an indication of a tendency to make this loan morpheme sound more native—we can recall that b tends to occur just in loan morphemes. During our linguistic discussions of the origin of words containing b, all Tariana speakers agreed that =bohta is an example of a legitimate Tariana morpheme. Some even suggested that the variant -wuhta should be the correct way of pronouncing it. These are the indications of the integration of =bohta into the language.

II. Manner enclitics as a category in Tariana are a result of indirect diffusion, or pattern-copying, from East Tucanoan languages (Aikhenvald 2002a: 136). Most manner enclitics (Aikhenvald 2003b: 342–63) can be traced to grammaticalized bound verbs in Tariana. Just two are borrowed from Tucano. Each of them has a synonym, which is not a loan.

The enclitic =pisi ‘DO.BY.STRETCHING’ is likely to be a loan from Tucano pisì ‘extended, stretched’. This enclitic has a partial synonym, =hisu. For older speakers, =hisu refers to animals and humans stretching their body parts (e.g. nu-kawana-nuku nu-peta=hisu nu-pe=ka (1sg-LEG-TOPICAL.NON.SUBJECT 1sg-extend-CAUSATIVE-DO.BY.STRETCHING 1sg-throw-RECENT.PAST.VISUAL) ’I have stretched my leg’), and =pisi refers to stretching inanimate objects, such as a rope. Young and innovative speakers use =pisi for any type of stretching (and also to describe newly introduced practices, such as ironing clothes).

The enclitics =miña and =phali ‘light’ are synonymous and are used just with the verb ‘see’, as in di-ka=miña (3sgn-see=LIGHT) ‘(close one’s eyes) and see little lights and stars’, and di-ka=phali, with the same meaning. The enclitic =miña is most probably a loan from an East Tucanoan language; cf. Desano numiño ‘little light or stars one sees when one is drunk’ (Dominique Buchillet, p.c).

A few more bound morphemes of East Tucanoan origin are occasionally used by innovative speakers, especially when they are at a loss in
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It is not immediately obvious how to find an exact Tariana equivalent, and the Tucano form is more readily available. The manner enclitic =bulé 'HIT/SPREAD.IN.OPEN SPACE' is an exact copy of Tucano =bure (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 131). The 'proper Tariana' morpheme here was said to be =hala 'HIT/SPREAD.IN.OPEN SPACE' (grammaticalised form of the verb hala 'be open'). Other occasionals include =yaa 'DO.BY.PRESSING', from a Tucano bound verb yāá (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 231) 'press, squeeze', and =thōle 'DO.AGAIN', from Tucano tōhōre) 'do again' (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 195–6). All three were rather consistently used by two innovative speakers, and were considered to be tokens of 'unlawful' language mixing by the rest of the Tariana. The speakers themselves were judged (behind their backs) as sloppy, and not trustworthy in this respect.

Speakers of the Tariana variety of Periquitos make frequent use of the enclitic =ba 'obvious information', a loan from Tucano baa 'obvious information in statements; marker of doubt in questions' (Ramirez 1997, Vol. I; 341–2). This form is condemned as incorrect and a token of a 'mixed' language by the speakers of the Santa Rosa variety (who only occasionally use it and tend to correct themselves if they do). As often happens between close dialects, the Tariana of Santa Rosa consider the Tariana of Periquitos as their rivals, and accuse them of not speaking Tariana properly. Olivia Brito, my major female teacher of the Santa Rosa Tariana, was annoyed at my interest in the Periquitos variety, and snapped at me: 'You want to be like them? Say ba!' (Ba pi-a!).

We take up the issue of a more relaxed attitude of the Periquitos people towards Tucano-looking forms in §3.

2.2.3 Free Forms Shared by Tariana and East Tucanoan Languages

A handful of free forms shared by Tariana and East Tucanoan include names for culturally important phenomena. These could be old loans into Tariana (or from Tariana). Tariana kusi|u 'a spirit of the jungle' could be a loan from Tucano kusíru 'a spirit of the jungle' (Ramirez 1997, Vol. II: 89). Tariana paya|u 'manioc beer' could be a loan from an East Tucanoan language other than Tucano, cf. Desano payeru, Piratapuya, Wanana payuru, Tucano peru.

There are also a number of lexical items shared by Tariana, Baniwa and East Tucanoan languages, e.g. Tariana ñumuku, Tucano yumuku, Baniwa (Hohódene dialect) dzumuku 'liquid mash'. The item kahpi 'ritual whisky' is also shared. None of these nouns are identified by speakers as loans. When I pointed out their formal similarity across languages, the Tariana just said: 'They describe the same thing'. The source of diffusion for these
items is not easy to establish. These are considered legitimate words Tariana and Tucano have in common or ‘as equals’ (*pathidapeni*).

The emphatic marker *ne* is shared by Tariana with many East Tucanoan languages (see the discussion in Aikhenvald 2002a: 135). Its origin remains unknown: it is also found in most Arawak languages of the Rio Negro area which have never been in contact with Tucano (Aikhenvald forthcoming). An emphatic negative *ne!* in Hup (Epps 2008: 736–7) is recognized as a Tucano borrowing. This is not the case in Tariana.

The few interjections shared by Tariana, and East Tucanoan languages, and also Baniwa are *ma* ‘let’s go and do something’, *kwe* ‘pleasant surprise’ and *ne* ‘hey! (attention getter)’. Two interjections, *bena* and *be* ‘Wow! My!’ (typically, unpleasant surprise), are used spontaneously (but are considered by most speakers as suspiciously Tucano-like, which is what they are). Sharing interjections (and also ideophones) is a common feature of many linguistic areas (see Emeneau 1980, and also Haig 2001). Shared interjections and attention getters may be due to the fact that languages spoken in a long-standing linguistic area in a situation of societal multilingualism develop shared discourse and communication patterns.

A few loanwords from Língua Geral, a língua franca of Tupí-Guaraní origin widely used in the area in the past, are shared by Tariana and by East Tucanoan languages. They are likely to have been adopted at the end of the nineteenth century. These include six nouns (*yalana* ‘white man’, *yalanata* ‘boss’, *surara* ‘soldier, underling’, *awil-da* ‘needle’, *pisana* ‘cat’, *yapura* ‘butter, cheese’, and *kuyera* ‘spoon’). Two verbs of Língua Geral origin are: *-bue-ta* ‘teach, learn’ and *-ñubue-ta* ‘pray’. All of these are shared with Tucanoan languages, and may have been borrowed separately.

Further bound forms can be identified as Tucano-look-alikes, without being straightforward loans.

3 An Alternative Strategy: Grammatical Accommodation

Grammatical and lexical morphemes may not be borrowed directly, and yet come to share their form and meaning with a morpheme in the contact language. An adjustment of the form and the meaning of a morpheme to make it similar to a look-alike in the contact language is known as ‘accommodation’ (Aikhenvald 2006a), ‘shift due to phonetic similarity’ (Campbell 1987) and ‘homologous loanshift’ (Haugen 1969: 403). The process often affects lexical items. For instance, in the Norwegian spoken in America, *grøn* ‘cereal food’ acquired the meaning of ‘grain’, and *god tid*
‘invisible’ loans: how to borrow a bound form

‘plenty of time’ came to mean ‘good time’, both (under the influence of their English look-alikes).

Grammatical markers—that is, bound morphemes—can change their meanings under the influence of look-alikes in a contact language. Watkins (2001: 58) shows how the influence of the Hittite imperfective marker -ske- on Eastern Ionic Greek resulted in the development of an imperfective meaning by the homophonous Greek morpheme. In Pipil, a Uto-Aztecan language (Campbell 1987: 263–264), a marker of possession -pal was originally a relational noun, as in nu-pal ‘mine’, mu-pal ‘yours’ and so on. On the basis of similarity with Spanish para ‘for, in order to’, this morpheme can now appear without any prefixes and have the meaning of ‘in order to, so that’, being used to introduce a subordinate clause.

The relational noun -sel ‘alone’ in Pipil traditionally required possessive prefixes, e.g. nu-sel ‘I alone, I by myself’. It has also been remodelled after phonetically similar Spanish sólo ‘alone,’ and has become an ‘adverb’—no longer requiring a prefix. The form has also shifted its meaning from ‘alone’ to ‘only,’ to match the ‘only’ meaning of Spanish solo (Campbell 1987: 263–4). Along similar lines, Likpe developed a present progressive construction under the influence of surface similarity with a progressive in Ewe (Ameka 2006).

Five bound morphemes in Tariana have undergone grammatical accommodation under the influence of Tucano. Three of these are markers of commands. Tucano and most other East Tucanoan languages use the suffix -ya as a marker of imperative. Tariana has a phonologically similar morpheme -ya ‘emphatic’ which may occur on imperative verbs, with the meaning of urgent command (Aikhenvald 2008). This usage is restricted to innovative speakers and frowned upon by the elders.

The deployment of Tariana -ya as an imperative marker is a prime example of a semantic extension of a native morpheme under the influence of a look-alike in a contact language. Tariana and Baniwa share an emphatic marker -ya which is used in some commands in Baniwa and is now acquiring a new meaning as an imperative in Tariana, to match the function of its East Tucanoan look-alike. This extension could be seen as an activation, or enhancement, of a tendency to use the emphatic -ya in commands, shared by Baniwa of Içana and Tariana. The process of activation is well-attested in contact-induced change (see Clark 1994: 118, on how Outlier Polynesian languages in contact with non-Polynesian languages use possessive suffixes much more often than their Polynesian relatives).

Tucano has the marker -ri used for commands with a tinge of a ‘warning’ (e.g. make sure you don’t fall). Tariana has a relativizer -|i used in a
wide-variety of functions (this morpheme goes back to Proto-Arawak) which is also used in commands. No such usage is attested in any other Arawak language of the area. Elders do not consider this ‘correct’ Tariana.


The Tariana hortative is likely to be a recent borrowing from Tucano or from Desano, and is a feature of young people’s language. Traditional speakers of Tariana are aware of the similarity between the Tariana and the Tucano morphemes, and treat the hortative as ‘incorrect’ Tariana ‘mixed’ with Tucano.

Another example of grammatical accommodation is the enclitic -ta whose original meaning is ‘really; just’. An emphatic marker of the same form occurs in Piapoco (Klumpp 1990: 173) and in Baniwa (own data). In the Tariana spoken by younger people -ta is acquiring another meaning, that of ‘repetitive’, under the influence of its partial homophone in Tucano taba ‘again’ (Ramirez 1997, Vol. 1: 185).6

A five-term evidentiality system in Tariana has been developed following the Tucano mould. The terms for visual, non-visual, reported and the assumed evidentials have been developed out of the language’s own resources. The ‘inferred’, or ‘visual traces’ evidential refers to knowledge inferred based on visual traces, e.g. inferring that it has been raining judging by the puddles on the ground. Its development is likely to have involved a formal influence from a marker of the same category in Tucano. The evidential markers in Tariana are -nhi-ka ‘recent past inferred’ and -nhi-na ‘remote past inferred’. The marker -nhi- has developed out of the Tariana anterior aspect marker -nhi. This combines with the recent past marker -ka and remote past -na (both markers express visual evidentials if used on their own). The evidential construction with an identical meaning in Tucano involves a nominalization (often marked with ø or a suprasegmental) and the auxiliary niî ‘do, be’ which takes the appropriate tense marker and the visual evidential specification (see Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 140–141, 291–292).

6 The repetitive enclitic system in traditional Tariana is -pita (its cognate in Baniwa is -peta). The morpheme -ta ‘emphatic’ is used by all generations, but most people consider it ‘bad’ Tariana, most probably because it is homophonous with Wanano -ta ‘exactly’ (Waltz and Waltz 1997: 45–6) and Desano -ta ‘exactly, just’ (Miller 1999: 164).
In Tariana, just like in closely related Baniwa of Içana, *n* and *nh* are different phonemes. Not so in Tucano (where the status of nasals as phonemes is problematic, since one can argue that nasality is a prosodic feature). Younger speakers (fifties to thirties) confuse *nh* and *n*, and use *n* where *nh* is expected and used by the older generation. This enhances the formal similarity between the Tucano *niĩ* and the Tariana -*ni*.

The Tariana morpheme -*nih* in Tariana -*nihka* 'recent past inferred' and -*niña* 'remote past inferred' has developed functional similarity with Tucano *niĩ* due to their phonetic similarity. A complex predicate containing the copula *niĩ* in Tucano is thus 'calqued' into Tariana as one grammatical word.

The Tucano structure involves a complex predicate containing the copula *niũ* marked with visual evidentials and a nominalization. The Tariana structure does not contain a nominalization—it consists of a verb accompanied by reanalyzed anterior marker -*nh* and past visual evidentials as tense markers. A connection between anterior and past is clear and well-attested cross-linguistically.

This is a rather complex instance of a grammatical accommodation. Interestingly, it is mirrored by the development of an additional inferred evidential marked with -*ni*- in Hup and Yuhup, two Makú languages from the same area which have undergone influence from Tucano. Epps (2008: 661–2) provides strong evidence in favour of diffusional origin of this form and construction in Hup, based on the Tucano model.

We can recall, from §2.2.2, that speakers of the Tariana variety of Periquitos are somewhat more open to Tucanoan forms than those of Santa Rosa. Since the preferential marriage partners of the Periquitos Tariana are the Wanano, the source of lexical accommodation is mostly Wanano. One of the most salient instances is a command—the Periquitos correspondent of Santa Rosa *wasã* 'let's go!' is *wahsã* 'come on, let's go', influenced by Wanano *bahsã* 'let's go!' (Marino and Domingo Muniz, p.c.; Aikhenvald 2002a: 216). The Santa Rosa form is cognate to Baniwa *ahSa*) 'let's go!'.

What are the consequences of this more relaxed attitude to loan forms for language maintenance? The Tariana language is endangered, especially in Santa Rosa (the youngest full speaker was born in 1975). The language is better maintained in Periquitos: it is still spoken by children and even toddlers. This degree of language maintenance may go together with a slightly higher degree of influence from the dominant languages. One can hypothesize that if a minority language does survive next to a larger dominant language, it has to allow for a certain amount of borrowing of
morphemes, or direct diffusion. As Hamp (1989: 203) put it, ‘acculturation represents adaptation for survival’.

4 CONCLUSIONS: ON SURREPTITIOUS LOANS

Borrowed forms are easier to detect than borrowed patterns. A strong inhibition against borrowing forms may result in a language which on the surface looks to have hardly any foreign ‘imports’. However, we have seen that borrowed forms do ‘sneak in’. Such loan forms are surreptitious and not easy to detect. In the case of Tariana, the only Arawak language spoken in the linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin renowned for its societal multilingualism, they include seventeen verbs, and three enclitics. Most of these verb roots are hidden behind Tariana prefixes and suffixes. All these verbs occur accompanied with further suffixes or enclitics, and hardly ever on their own, in natural discourse. There are also a few look-alike morphemes which now show Tucanoan influence in their meanings. That is, diffusion of patterns within the Vaupés contact situation does involve a certain amount of formal influence, sneaking in through the ‘back door’ of bound morphology. This makes them ‘invisible’ to the native purists. Unlike free forms, they are difficult to detect and are there to stay.

An interesting analogy is found in Hup, a Makú language from the same area. Hup has undergone significant diffusional impact from Tucano. However, in keeping with the practices and language ideology of the Vaupés River Basin, Hup speakers make a conscious effort to keep their language distinct from Tucano (Epps 2006). There are rather few actual forms borrowed from Tucano (albeit more than there are in Tariana: Tucano borrowings in Hup include a few nouns, including terms for ‘spade fish’, ‘rat’, ‘a type of spirit’, pineapple’ (Epps 2008: 78–81), and several terms for plants (Epps 2005).

Epps (2006: 285–6) notes that “the majority of borrowings of Tukanoan origin are verb roots, which may be easier to ‘smuggle’ into the language since—unlike nouns—they are typically embedded in morphologically complex forms (as is the case in Tariana: see Aikhenvald 2002a: 224)”. These include the inherently negative verb múy ‘not get any, fail’ borrowed from Tucano muí ‘fail something, be unlucky in hunting’ (Ramírez 1997, Vol. II: 108; Epps 2008: 746). And, similarly to Tariana, a bound morpheme has been borrowed. The verbal suffix -kodé ‘do VERB a little bit’
was borrowed from the Tucano bound verb *kure* 'do something a little bit' (Ramírez 1997, Vol. II: 87; Epps 2008: 583).

To conclude: a situation of intensive language contact and long-standing multilingualism will promote structural similarity between languages. And even under the strict requirement to keep away from any recognizable borrowed forms, some foreign intruders will sneak in. They may be hidden within morphologically complex forms—just like borrowed verbs and grammatical enclitics in Tariana. A seemingly unusual situation—whereby bound morphemes are borrowed where free ones are not—reflects a general way in which languages tend to influence each other in every possible sphere.
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