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1. Preamble

The difference between language change in “healthy” and in endangered or obsolescent languages very often lies not in the sorts of change, which tend to be the same (Campbell and Muntzel 1989). It tends to lie in the quantity of change and in the speed with which the obsolescent language changes (see Schmidt 1985: 213; Aikhenvald 2002: 243-264). Language displacement frequently results in reduction of paradigms, simplification and loss of the language’s own features, and, ultimately, language shift and loss. As the obsolescent language is “retreating, contracting, as it gradually falls into disuse” (Dixon 1991a: 199), we expect it to be flooded with an influx of patterns and forms from the dominant language.

Contact-induced changes can roughly be divided into three sorts, in terms of their stability. Following Tsitsipis (1998: 34), it appears useful to divide changes into completed, ongoing (or continuous), and discontinuous. Completed changes cover those aspects of the grammatical system of a language which do not show any synchronic variation and which go beyond speakers’ awareness (see the discussion of a Spanish-influenced passive in Purepecha by Chamoreau 2005). Ongoing or continuous changes are those in progress; here the degree of influence of the other language depends on the speaker’s competence and possibly other, sociolinguistic, variables (such as age or degree of participation in community life). Discontinuous changes are one-off deviations characteristic of individual speakers. In the situation of language attrition, these often differentiate fluent speakers from less proficient ones.

This classification of changes is particularly important for distinguishing between old and established diffusional processes – characterized by completed changes – and new, in-coming continuous changes making their way into a speech community. In a situation of language obsolescence, one expects to encounter a multiplicity of sporadic changes which would be considered to be mistakes by fluent speakers (if they existed). Such aberrant individual innovations are tantamount to Tsitsipis’ ad hoc or discontinuous changes. The impact of language shift as seen through discontinuous changes in the context of displacive language contact is the topic of this article.

2. The various facets of language obsolescence

An obsolescent language is no longer actively used or transmitted. We distinguish several kinds of social context in which this occurs.¹

Firstly, an obsolescent language is no longer actively spoken by a community, and is not transmitted to the next generation. Its knowledge is often confined to a handful of last fluent speakers – as is the case for Ingrian Finnish in Estonia (Rionheim 2002), Bare (Aikhenvald 1995), Dyirbal and Yidiny (Dixon 1991a, b), Mawayana (Carlin 2006), and Resigaro (Allin 1975) – or to a handful of not-very-fluent speakers or semi-speakers, or even rememberers –

¹ The examples discussed here reflect what Campbell and Muntzel (1989) call “gradual death” of a language. We do not consider instances of “sudden death” or “radical death” of a language, nor of “bottom-up death.”
as in the case of Nivkh, a Paleo-Siberian isolate (Gruzdeva 2002), or Nyulnyul, an Australian language (McGregor 2002; see Hill and Hill 1986, Hill 1985, for a definition of the terms). We will refer to this as “global” language obsolescence.

Alternatively, language obsolescence can affect individuals or groups of individuals living away from the language community. This is often the case with speakers of immigrant languages, spoken by groups of varied size whose major language is the dominant language of the country. These varieties are sometimes called “heritage” languages. The existing studies include Heritage Russian (Pereltsvaig 2008, and references there; Kagan and Dillon 2001), Heritage Italian, Heritage Norwegian, Heritage Swedish, and Heritage Czech (see Bettoni 1991; Milani 1996; Hjelde 1996; Klintborg 1999; Henzl 1981).

Along similar lines, people who live away from the community where the language is actively spoken also display signs of obsolescence. Obsolescent speakers of many indigenous languages of Papua New Guinea form part of urban communities whose dominant language is overwhelmingly Papua New Guinea English and also Tok Pisin. The domain of their ancestral language is often limited to token symbolic use in speech formulas. And when the speakers attempt to use the language, its make-up is markedly different from the way it is spoken by the speech community in the original area. I have observed this “individual” or “localized” language obsolescence among Manambu speakers – see Section 3.1 (example (1)).

Instances of individual or localized language obsolescence may occur within a broader context of a “global” obsolescence of a language. Pau mari, an Arawá language from Southern Amazonia, is gradually falling out of use, and more rapidly so in the communities on the River Ituxí than on the River Purús. As a result, speakers from the Ituxí communities display more signs of language obsolescence (Aikhenvald 2010; Chapman and Derbyshire 1991).

The interest of individual language obsolescence for a student of language change lies in the possibility of comparing the obsolescent or heritage language with the variety still actively spoken in the “homeland.” In the case of “global” obsolescence, we are sometimes fortunate to have access to a description of a pre-obsol escent variety of a language. For instance, Krejnovich’s work gives us access to Nivkh as it used to be before the language stopped being transmitted to the next generation. Numerous descriptions of Ingrian Finnish allow us to trace the obsolescence of this language as it is currently spoken in Estonia (Riionheimo 2002). The grammar of traditional Pau mari by Chapman and Derbyshire (1991) allows us to trace the nature of obsolescence in the present-day language. The obsolescent Dyirbal (Schmidt 1985; Dixon 1991a) can be contrasted and compared with the language described by Dixon (1972) when it was still fluently spoken. And the Tariana spoken by traditional representatives of the older generation (nowadays in their late eighties) can be contrasted with the speech of younger people who are gradually relinquishing their ancestral language.

A situation of language obsolescence presupposes obsolescent speakers. Their proficiency in the given language may, of course, vary (some may be considered barely “rememberers,” others may conserve a degree of fluency). The difference between obsolescent speakers of obsolescent languages and obsolescent speakers of languages in active use elsewhere may be compared to a well-known difference between societal multilingualism and individual multilingualism. The former is a social phenomenon and is of prime concern to sociolinguists. The latter reflects personal history and is of interest to psychologists more than to sociolinguists. However, we do find that processes of language obsolescence appear to be similar in the context of “global” and of “local” obsolescence (at the level of the individual
This suggests the presence of shared mechanisms which could, and should, be investigated.

A word of caution is in order. Even if we do have access to what can be considered a “pre-obsolescent” variety, we cannot always be sure that this variety did not already bear some signs of decay. When R. M. W. Dixon started his fieldwork on Dyirbal in 1963, the language was actively spoken, in the domestic sphere, by several score people, including children. Over a quarter of a century, Dixon has seen the language decline “from a state in which there was an abundance of speakers … to one in which there is just one good consultant left for each of three dialects, with no one to go to for a second opinion” (Dixon 1991a: 183). But even in the good old days of the early sixties, older speakers would comment on the fact that “words used to be longer” in the language as they can recall it spoken in their childhood by those old people who had passed away. That is, the process of language contraction may have started long before the linguist came to the scene, and this “discourse of nostalgia” (Hill 1998) may reflect speakers’ awareness of this. The few older representatives of the Tariana-speaking community – Cândido Brito and the late Américo and José Manoel Brito – can be viewed as keepers of the traditional language. However, by the time they were born (between 1911 and 1920), Tariana communities were already affected by Brazilian influence, and their traditional lives were under destruction. None of the three elders could remember the full version of traditional rituals and the ritual language. We can safely assume that even their Tariana, fluent as it is compared to that of the younger generation, has already suffered from a certain amount of loss. We can hypothesize that this could have been accompanied by a shift to a dominant language.

Sadly, in many cases the obsolescent variety is the only one which is professionally described. Allin (1975) is based on fieldwork with a handful of last speakers of Resígaro, a North Arawak language. Carlin (2006) is based on her fieldwork with two last speakers of Mawayana, also Arawak. The same applies to Nyulnyul (MacGregor 2002), Araki (François 2002), and quite a few other languages from many parts of the world. In none of these cases do we have access to a full “pre-obsolescent” variety. Most likely, we are dealing with “a mere remnant of what the language must have been like when many speakers used it as their only means of communication” (Haas 1941).

Linguistic consequences of language obsolescence – “global,” “individual,” or “localized” – include simplification and reduction of grammar and lexicon. Categories absent from the dominant language are particularly endangered. So the system of numeral classifiers becomes reduced to just a few in Korean as it is spoken by young people in Canberra (Lee 1997) whose major language of communication is English. (This is also known as “negative borrowing.”) The obsolescent language often suffers from stylistic reduction and dialect mixing, and also speakers’ insecurity (see Campbell and Muntzel 1989; Chamoreau 2000; Grenoble and Whaley 1998; Aikhenvald 2002: Chapter 11; Dixon 1991a, b, for Dyirbal and Yidiny; Helimsky 2007: 218, for Selkup).

The impact of the increasingly dominant language on the receding, obsolescent language gradually falling into disuse tends to involve a massive influx of non-native forms. The outcome of this influx may result in unusual phenomena, which may include occasional borrowed bound morpheme and mixed paradigms (Section 3). If speakers tend to avoid imported forms, impending language shift may result in a spread and expansion of look-alikes.
and a massive calquing of structures from the dominant language and accelerated diffusion of patterns (Section 4).2

Speakers of obsolescent languages vary in their proficiency, from fluent language users to semi-speakers with limited competence (Dorian 1973: 417; 1977). In some cases, evaluation may be possible using internal or external clues. But in many cases we have no information about the level of speakers’ knowledge: if a typologically unusual phenomenon is based on such uncertain sources, the validity of the phenomenon is cast in doubt.

3. Non-native forms in language obsolescence

An influx of non-native forms is a typical feature of obsolescent speakers. In Haugen’s (1989: 67) words, “the adoption of English loans” was the “first great step in the direction of English” for immigrant speakers of Norwegian. The adoption of non-native forms often involves lexical items and also grammatical forms. Conjunctions and discourse markers, highly susceptible to borrowing under any circumstances of language contact, are the “usual suspects.”

In Section 3.1, we discuss relevant examples of individual language obsolescence in Manambu, comparing a fluent and an obsolescent speaker. We then turn to the obsolescent Bare, a North Arawak language from Venezuela and Brazil, and compare two sources on the language which display varying degree of obsolescence. In these instances we can argue that language contact in the situation of obsolescence does not produce any remarkable results – the effects are the same as may have occurred in language contact of a non-replacive nature. This is consistent with the idea that an increase in the quantity and the speed of change is the major effect of language obsolescence.3

Language shift in the context of language obsolescence may also result in inclusion of some less likely candidates for borrowing – personal pronouns, both free and bound. In Section 3.2 we look at Mawayana, a North Arawak language with its last two speakers in Suriname in Trio and Waiwai-speaking communities, and then turn to Resígaro, a moribund North Arawak language in northeastern Peru, which has undergone a massive impact of Bora and Witotoan.

Can the influx of non-native forms in language obsolescence obscure its genetic affiliation? This is the topic of Section 3.3.

---

2 Language contact does not explain all the discontinuous changes in language obsolescence. For instance, terminal speakers of Arvanitika Albanian in Greece sporadically lose gender and number agreement; their entire system of tense-aspect-mood categories is disintegrating – imperfective past forms are not used at all, and the marking of grammatical person is “morphologically distorted” (Tsitsitpis 1998: 44-62). This “agrammatism” cannot be explained by “negative borrowing,” that is, loss of categories not present in the dominant language, Greek, since Greek possesses all the categories now lost in the obsolescent Arvanitika (Sasse 1992b: 69-70). Changes in language obsolescence may be motivated by language-internal processes (see, for instance, Dixon 1991b; also Gruzuweva 2002).

3 I have undertaken extensive fieldwork on Manambu (see, for instance, Aikhenvald 2008b), Tariana (see, for instance, Aikhenvald 2002) and also Bare (I worked with the last fluent speaker of the language). For each language, I have recorded a substantial number of texts and natural conversations. ALL the examples in this paper (as in my other work) come from spontaneous discourse. In my fieldwork, I avoid elicitation as being methodologically flawed (see Aikhenvald 2007, Dixon 2007 for further fundamentals of linguistic fieldwork).
3.1 Non-native free forms: following a beaten path

3.1.1 Manambu

Those speakers of Manambu (a Ndu language from the East Sepik area) who live in urban centers and rarely use the language employ numerous non-native forms. An obsolescent speaker who had spent much of his life in an urban town speaking Tok Pisin (the major lingua franca of Papua New Guinea) produced (1). Later on, a fluent speaker volunteered (2), as something she would have said. The Tok Pisin forms are in italics. The form **okey** comes from English. It is also widely used by speakers of Tok Pisin. Non-native forms are in bold.

Obsolescent speaker:

(1) **asa:y kiya-də-k**
father die-3SG.M-COMPL.DS

**aw wuna amay namba tu**
I+LK+F.SG mother number two

**du-ak ra:l okey**
man+dat marry+3f.sg.subj OK

**ata lukautim-də-dəwun**
then look.after-3SG.M.SUBJ-1SG.M.O

**tasol a taim**
but,only that.F.SG time

**sikul-ər yi-dəwun**
school+ALL go-1SG.M.SUBJ

‘After my father died, then my mother married a second man, OK, then he looked after me, only that at that time I went to school.’

Fluent speaker:

(2) **asa:y kiya-də-k**
father die-3SG.M-COMPL.DS

**aw wuna amay**
I+LK+F.SG mother

**nako-də du-ak ra:l ya:kya**
another-SG.M man+DAT marry+3F.SGSUBJ all.right

**ata yakwiya-də-dəwun**
then look.after-3SG.M.SUBJ-1SG.M.O

**aw a səkər**
but,only that.F.SG time

**sikul-ər yi-dəwun**
school+ALL go-1SG.M.SUBJ

‘After my father died, then my mother married a second man, all right, then he looked after me, only that at that time I went to school’

The two versions share one established loan word, **sikul** ‘school.’ Non-native forms are not necessarily restricted to lexical items. Example (1) shows that discourse markers, numerals, and conjunctions are imported from the dominant language. \(^4\) Influx of loan forms is a striking feature of “globally obsolescent” languages. Extensive lexical impact of English has been observed in the speech of the last speakers of Nyulnyul, an Australian language (McGregor 2002: 177). Traditional Gooniyandi and Warrwa did not have coordinating conjunctions: the remaining obsolescent speakers use English forms **nd** (from **and**) and (from **or**). Traditional Nyulnyul did have a conjunction **agal** ‘and’; the two remaining fluent speakers use the English import **nd**.

---

\(^4\) In a situation of obsolescent speakers whose usage is unstable, the boundary between loans and code-switches is even harder to draw than in other language-contact situations. This is the reason why I use the term “import” to avoid using either “borrowing” or “code-switch.”
Borrowing conjunctions and discourse markers in itself is not a symptom of impending language death. Hamp (1989) and Johanson (2002) have shown that allowing a certain number of loan forms by no means endangers the language; the opposite can be true. Many fluent speakers of Manambu in the villages use the English discourse marker *okay* and some occasionally slip in the Tok Pisin *tasol* ‘but’ as a replacement for the polysemous *aw* ‘then, but, or’ (see Aikhenvald 2008b, 2009a). This confirms the general assumption that language obsolescence tends to enhance the tendencies present in a “healthy” language.

### 3.1.2 Bare

A comparison between two different stages of language obsolescence of the same language points in a similar direction, that of increased influx of non-native forms. Lopez Sanz’s (1972) brief grammatical description of Bare, a North Arawak language from the Upper Rio Negro area in Venezuela, is based on the analysis of materials (including several texts) collected in the late 1960s from two remaining fluent speakers of the language from Santa Rosa de Amanadona (with a total population of ethnic Bare of 140). There are hardly any loans from Spanish, either lexical or grammatical. Nowadays, people in Venezuela who identify themselves as Bare in Venezuela speak Spanish; the Bare in Brazil speak Portuguese (some also know Nheengatu, or Lingua Geral, a Tupí-Guaraní-based lingua franca of the area).

In 1991, I worked with the late Candelário da Silva (1921-1992), from the Tiburi community, near Cucui, Amazonas, Brazil. Candelário’s family moved in 1912 from Venezuela, fleeing from an uprising. His family maintained links with relatives in Venezuela in the communities of Puerto Ayacucho, San Fernando de Atabapo, and Santa Rosa de Amanadona. According to Candelário, all the remaining speakers of Bare in the above mentioned localities in Venezuela were older than himself. He frequently referred to his elderly aunts in Puerto Ayacucho as authorities to consult with on words in Bare he himself could not remember. Candelário underwent traditional male initiation (his account of it is in Aikhenvald 1995: 52-55), and insisted that he had grown up with Bare as his first language. He was fluent in Bare, his father’s language. His late mother, herself a speaker of Mandawaka (another extinct North Arawak language of the area), had always spoken Bare to him. After her death about 30 years prior to our encounter, he had kept his ancestral language which he used to talk to himself, especially when he used to get drunk (and this, according to Candelário, was not infrequent). Candelário was quadrilingual: his main home language was Nheengatu, and he was equally fluent in Spanish and Portuguese. His children spoke Portuguese and Nheengatu.

The variety of Bare recorded by Lopez Sanz in Santa Rosa de Amanadona has a richer morphology than the language of Candelário. For instance, it has a variety of aspectual and modal markers (e.g. *-phēi* ‘durative’ and *-ya* ‘dubitative’), and a marker of reported speech

---

5 My corpus contains over 150 pages of texts and dialogues, and word-lists. See Aikhenvald (1995) for a grammatical analysis of the material assembled, and a survey of literature on Bare. At the time of my work with Candelário, and writing the grammar, I did not have access to Lopez Sanz (1972). Materials in Lopez Sanz reflect some language attrition. Traditionally, Bare had two major varieties – Arihini (“the ones from here”) and Ihini (“the ones from there”: see Aikhenvald 1995). Newly available materials collected by Johannes Natterer in 1831 demonstrate the existence of lexical differences between the two varieties. In the texts and examples in Lopez Sanz (1972), lexical items from the two varieties appear in free variation. Such dialect mixture, or, in Dixon’s (1991a) words, dialect merging, is typical of language obsolescence. Candelário knew of the two varieties, but could not tell them apart.
-man not attested in the corpus collected from Candelário. Verb forms attested in Lopez Sanz (1972) contain up to five suffixes, whereas Candelário never used more than one suffix on the verb. Another major difference between texts and examples in Lopez Sanz (1972) and the corpus recorded from Candelário is the abundance of Spanish and Portuguese forms, just as would be expected in the case of advanced language obsolescence.

Many of these are not lexical forms. Candelário made an effort to avoid Spanish or Portuguese forms: the few consistent exceptions include playa ‘sand’ (from Spanish playa ‘beach’) instead of either khaadi ‘sand, earth’ (Arihini variety) or kadieho (Ihini variety: Natterer 1831), precisa- ‘need, require’ (from Portuguese precisar ‘need’), and gata- ‘spend, waste’ from Portuguese or Spanish gastar ‘spend’.

Spanish subordinating conjunctions occur where speakers of the more traditional variety recorded by Lopez Sanz (1972) would use a sequencing clitic -ka. This morpheme in Bare, just like in many other Arawak languages of the area, has a variety of meanings: it marks adverbial clauses of most types except purposive, and regularly occurs on conditional, temporal, and complement clauses (see Aikhenvald 2006b for Tariana, and discussion there). An example of -ka, from Lopez Sanz (1972: 80), is in (3) (in boldface); note that in a negative construction -ka attaches to the negation (glosses are supplied by me):

Bare: Santa Rosa de Amanadona

(3)  
hená-ka i-kasa héin i-niká-waka  
NEG-SEQ 3GS-arrive NEG 3SG.M-eat-NEG  
‘If he does not come, he does not eat.’

The polysemous -ka also appears in Candelário’s texts, as shown in the example below from an autobiographical story (also see Aikhenvald 1995: 48-50). Clauses are in brackets, for ease of reference.

Bare: Candelário da Silva

(4)  
[nu-miñaɾi o-maha nikũ] [aɾi bi-paɾata-ni  
1SG-master 3SG.M-say 1SG+for here 2SG-money-POSS  
kumarehe] [bi-katehesa-ka] [beké badahánaka bikũ  
big 2SG-know-SEQ FUT one.day 2SG+for  
ahaw bi-wakhid’a-ka] [hená-ka bi-katehesa]  
with what 2SG-live-SEQ NEG-SEQ 2SG-know  
[phiñukũ bi-paɾata-ni]  
2SG-throw-DECL 2SG-money-POSS  
‘My master said to me: here is your big money, if you know something, one day you will have what to live with, if you do not know, you will throw away your money.’

The sequencing marker is not used to introduce speech reports: as shown in (4), speech reports are juxtaposed to the verb of speech.

Besides the sequencing -ka, Bare had an adverbial form aheuku ‘when, as soon as; then’ used both by the two speakers in Santa Rosa de Amandona and by Candelário. If
accompanied by the sequencing -ka on the verb, *abeuku* is a temporal linker ‘when.’ Example (5) comes from a mythical text recorded by Lopez Sanz (1972: 83):

Bare: Santa Rosa de Amanadona

(5) *isíinka abéuku ihiwa-ka Puluna-minali…*

3SG.M+like when 3SG.M+go ?-master…

‘It was when Pulunaminali (the master of all animals) went (round)…’

In (6), from an autobiographical story by Candelário, *abeuku* is also accompanied by -ka on the verb (in the last clause).

Bare: Candelário da Silva

(6) *da-yaɾaki nu-maha i-ku me-maha ni-ku*

DEM-whisky 1SG-say 3SG.M-for 3PL-say 1SG-for

*ke nihiwã abeuku i-mákhi-ka sa yaɾaki*

that 1SG+go when 3SG.M-finish-SEQ DEM whisky

‘Then we drank, we managed to drink all the whisky, I said to him, they said to me that I shall go when the whisky finishes.’

In the few examples of *abeuku* without an accompanying sequencing -ka in the variety of Santa Rosa de Amanadona, the form means ‘then’ (Lopez Sanz 1972: 84):

Bare: Santa Rosa de Amanadona

(7) *abéuku humadan*

then 3F.SG+leave

‘Then she lets (him) go.’

Unlike the two speakers from Santa Rosa de Amanadona, Candélario used *abeuku* as a temporal linker without the accompanying -ka on the verb. In (8), -ka appears in the preceding clause, so its absence in the third clause (introduced with abeuku) could be explained as an instance of ellipsis:

Bare: Candelário da Silva

(8) *[me-nika kubati] abeuku idi-ka*

3PL-eat fish when then/there-SEQ

*abeuku bed’a-waka me-nika matsuka*

when nothing 3PL-eat manioc.flour

‘They (dogs) eat fish, when/if it is there, when (there is) nothing, they eat manioc flour.’

However, in other examples like the one in (9) -ka is simply not used, and *abeuku* is the only linker:

(9) *bihiwã awehéntei abeuku i-makhi*

2SG+go here+ELATIVE when 3SG.M-finish

‘You will go away when it (the drink) finishes.’

Candelário insisted on translating *abeuku* as ‘when’ (Portuguese *quando*). The conjunction occupies the same clause-initial position as *quando* in Portuguese (or *cuándo* in Spanish). The
apparent obsolescence of the sequencing -\textit{ka} in the presence of \textit{abeuku} may indicate that Candelário was adopting a Spanish-Portuguese strategy for temporal linking. He never used this Spanish-Portuguese form himself. He freely used other Spanish or Spanish-Portuguese conjunctions. Just occasionally, the verb in a subordinate clause introduced by a conjunction would be accompanied by -\textit{ka}. The temporal \textit{mientras ke} (from Spanish \textit{mientras que}) ‘while, whereas’ is accompanied by -\textit{ka} in (10):

(10) \textit{mientras-ke} \textit{nu-nakúda-ka} \textit{i-maře-d’a} \textit{kubati} \\
while-that 1SG-go-SEQ 3SG.M-steal-\textsc{inchn} fish \\
‘While I was gone, he (the dog) started stealing the fish.’

The causal \textit{purke} ‘because’ (from Spanish \textit{porque}) is used on its own in the penultimate clause of (11). It is accompanied by -\textit{ka} in the second clause of (12):

(11) \textit{idi} \textit{me-máha-ka} [\textit{ke} \textit{hena} \textit{me-yehé-waka} \\
then 3PL-say-\textsc{decl} that NEG 3PL-can-\textsc{neg} \\
\textit{me-dia-sa-ka} \textit{nū} [\textit{purke} \textit{hena} \textit{hnwiña-waka} \\
3PL-drink-caus-\textsc{seq} i because NEG 1SG+fall-\textsc{neg} \\
\textit{yařakī} \textit{áhaw} [\textit{hena} \textit{hnwiña-waka}] \\
whisky from NEG 1SG+fall-\textsc{neg} \\
‘Then they said to me that they could not make me drunk, because I do not fall down from whisky, I do not fall down.’

(12) [\textit{damakaru-kua} \textit{nu-řehedi}] [\textit{purke} \textit{nu-řehedi} \textit{nu-yuvahada-ka}] \\
jungle-\textsc{loc+long} 1SG-like because 1SG-like 1SG-walk-\textsc{seq} \\
[\textit{pero} \textit{nu-witi} \textit{hena-hana} \textit{yada-ka-nā}] \\
but 1SG-eye NEG-more 3SG.M+see-\textsc{decl-perf} \\
‘I enjoy the jungle, because I like to walk, but my eyes do not see any more.’

The linker \textit{ke} (from Spanish, Portuguese \textit{que}) is used to introduce speech reports, as in (11) and (6). About 60 percent of speech reports in the corpus contain \textit{ke}. This same form occurs in the meaning of ‘so that,’ as in (13).

(13) [\textit{bihīwa} \textit{behéwa}] [\textit{kuhū} \textit{ke} \textit{id’úarī} \textit{beke} \textit{bī}] \\
2SG+take 2SG+from he that well FUT you \\
‘Take it (poisoned pillow) from you, so that you will be well.’

Candelário used other Spanish conjunctions, for instance, the coordinator \textit{pero} ‘but’ (from Spanish \textit{pero} ‘but’) shown in (12). None of the Spanish-Portuguese conjunctions appear in the Santa Rosa de Amanadona variety. Note that conjunctions occupy the same place as in Spanish. In contrast to the other documented variety of Bare, and to most other Arawak languages, Bare spoken by Candelário is losing the sequencing enclitic -\textit{ka}, a marker which has no equivalent in either Spanish or Portuguese. This is an instance of “negative borrowing.” We can thus conclude that the influx of non-native forms into the speech of the last fluent speaker of Bare is accompanied by leveling of structures. The obsolescent Bare imports Spanish and Portuguese forms, and also becomes more similar to the dominant Spanish and Portuguese in terms of its grammatical structure.

Conjunctions – especially free forms – are among the most borrowable elements of the language (the interested reader is advise to consult Stolz and Stolz 1996 with special focus on
American Indian languages; Matras 1998, and Aikhenvald 2006a). As stated at the end of §3.1.1, the fact that Spanish and Portuguese conjunctions have been borrowed into Bare should not be considered as a special phenomenon in language obsolescence. What is indicative of Bare as an obsolescent language is the high number of loans from the dominant languages. That is, this contact-induced change in language obsolescence appears to follow a beaten path, albeit at an increased rate. we can recall, from §1 of this paper, that the difference between language change in vital, and in obsolescent language, may lie in the 'quantity of change'. It is indeed the case here.

3.2 Influx of non-native free forms: unusual patterns

We now turn to some rather unusual borrowing patterns in obsolescent languages. In a number of instances, obsolescent languages borrow personal pronouns from the dominant language. In the examples available, pronominal forms which express categories attested in the dominant language but absent from the obsolescent one may get borrowed.

3.2.1 Mawayana

Mawayana (Carlin 2006) is a highly endangered North Arawak language spoken by just two elderly people in a village where Trio and Waiwai, from the Carib family, are the dominant languages. The two remaining speakers of Mawayana have little opportunity of using the language, and are aware that when they go, so will Mawayana.

Just like most other Arawak languages, Mawayana originally had first, second, and third person, without distinguishing between first person plural inclusive (I and you) and exclusive (I and a third person, excluding you). In contrast, Waiwai and Trio have different forms for first person inclusive and for first person exclusive. As a result of influence from Waiwai and Trio as dominant languages with an obligatory distinction between inclusive and exclusive, the two remaining speakers of Mawayana consistently use the Waiwai pronoun amna to express the concept of first person plural exclusive (e.g. Waiwai amna krapan ‘our (excl) bow’). The original first person plural prefix wa- in Mawayana has been reinterpreted as inclusive.

\[(14a)\quad \text{amna} \quad \text{saruuka} \quad (14b) \quad \text{wa-saruuka} \]

\[1+3 \text{PN} \quad \text{fishtrap} \quad 1\text{PL.POSS-fishtrap} \]

\[\text{‘Our (excl) fishtrap.’} \quad \text{‘Our (incl) fishtrap.’} \]

The borrowed form comes from Waiwai. However, the behavior of the verb bears an impact from Trio: in Trio the first person exclusive pronoun requires a third person prefix on the verb, while in Waiwai the third person singular prefix is often dropped. Example (15) shows that Mawayana follows the Trio pattern of person marking:

\[(15)\quad \text{amna} \quad \text{rï-me} \]

\[1+3 \text{PN} \quad 3\text{A-say.PRES} \]

\[\text{‘We (excl) say.’} \]

The first person inclusive is marked with the Mawayana prefix wa- (originally first person plural):
Carlin (2006) is the first summary of the grammatical features of the language in the light of language contact (and a full grammar is in progress). The borrowed form amna does not occur in the previous records of the language, which include longish lists of words and phrases in Howard (1986), and materials in Farabee (1918: 283-286) and Schomburgk (1848), all collected when the language was more actively spoken than it is at present. This suggests that borrowing a pronoun – something not unheard of, but rather unusual – could be the result of excessive influx of non-native forms characteristic of Mawayana as an obsolescent language.

3.2.2 Resígaro

The genetic affiliation of Resígaro – a small language spoken in northeastern Peru surrounded by speakers of Bora and Witotoan groups – with the Arawak family was established by Igualada (1940) and Igualada and Castellví (1940); also see Loutkotka (1968: 136). The first extensive materials on the language published by Rivet and de Wavrin (1951), and based on the data collected by de Wavrin in the early 1930s, provided ample evidence in the same direction (see Payne 1985 for a summary). The group itself comprised not more than a thousand people at the time of Whiffen’s (1915) travels in the area. The first mention of Resígaro (Recígaro), by Hardenburg (1910), places it among other Witotoan groups. Tessmann (1930: 583) does not provide linguistic affiliation, but states that culturally they are close to the Bora-Witoto, and linguistically are “perhaps close to Bora.” At that time, the language was still actively spoken. Note that there is no evidence of any genetic relationship between Bora-Witotoan and Arawak languages (see Loukotka 1968; Aschmann 1993).

In his pioneering salvage grammar of Resígaro, based on fieldwork with ten remaining speakers whose major language was Bora, Trevor Allin (1975) came to a different conclusion. The sheer number of Bora, and also Witotoan, forms in Resígaro indicated to him that the languages were genetically related. He did not deny that Resígaro belongs to the Arawak family, but suggested that, given the high percentage of shared forms between Bora, Witotoan languages, and Resígaro, the limits of Arawak should be expanded, and Bora and Witotoan be included.

There is, however, no doubt that the impressive number of Bora and Witotoan forms in Resígaro are due to borrowing (see Payne 1985, and detailed discussion in Aikhenvald 2001). These lexical loans constitute about 24 percent of the vocabulary, and include just a few verbs and numerous nouns, covering body parts plus a few other items such as ‘fish’ and ‘hill.’ The most striking is the fact that “core” lexical items, such as terms for body parts, are shared with Bora or with Witotoan languages. However, the lexical data published by Rivet and de Wavrin (limited as they are) often do not register a loan.

A prime example is the word for ‘tooth,’ Resígaro -e/hepè ‘teeth,’ which is similar to Muinane Witoto iípe, proto-Witoto *pe (Aschmann 1993). The reflex of the Proto-Arawak form *nene (Aikhenvald 2001) survives in Resígaro -onènè ‘front teeth’ (Allin 1975). Rivet

7 "Über die Resígaro ist nichts Näheres bekannt. Sie gehören kulturell sicher zu der Uitoto-Boragruppe und sprachlich vielleicht in die Nähe der Bora."
and de Wavrin (1951: 213) give the form wó-ne (1pl-tooth) ‘tooth,’ and no form similar to Bora or to Witotoan.

The Resígaro described by Allin uses borrowed numbers ‘one’ and ‘two’ (see Table 1). This is quite remarkable for an Arawak language, since lower numbers (if they exist at all) generally appear to be rather resistant to borrowing. And the overwhelming majority of Arawak languages preserve the reflexes of Proto-Arawak forms (fourth column in Table 1). Once again, Rivet and de Wavrin (1951) register different forms, which are clearly Arawak in origin. The form for ‘two’ shows the effects of the phonological process \(^*y > t\) found in other cognates with Proto-Arawak.

Does this imply that pre-obsolescent Resígaro was more Arawak-like in its lexicon and grammar? In all likelihood, yes.

Table 1. Numbers ‘one’ and ‘two’ in Resígaro, Bora and Arawak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Resígaro (Allin 1975)</th>
<th>Bora</th>
<th>Resígaro (Rivet and de Wavrin 1951)</th>
<th>Proto-Arawak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>sa-CL</td>
<td>tsa-CL</td>
<td>‘apā(ha)pène</td>
<td>*pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>migaa-</td>
<td>mifiēé/mihaa-CL</td>
<td>‘e(i)tzāmə</td>
<td>*yama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bora influence on Resígaro grammar goes further than free forms (see Aikhenvald 2001 for a detailed discussion of structural influence of Bora on Resígaro, and also the discussion of borrowed classifiers). Borrowed bound morphemes include one pronoun, number markers, oblique case markers, and also classifiers. The independent pronouns and cross-referencing prefixes in Resígaro (where they are mostly used to mark A/Sa and as possessors of inalienably possessed nouns) are compared to Bora in Table 2 (Allin 1975: 116-117; Thiesen 1996: 33). Borrowed morphemes are in boldface.

Unlike most other Arawak languages but similarly to the Bora-Witotoan group, Resígaro has inclusive versus exclusive opposition in first person non-singular, and also a dual number. The first person plural exclusive pronoun muu-à was borrowed from Bora, similarly to the way the last speakers of Mawayana introduced a Waiwai form to cover the same meaning. In Resígaro, it was subsequently reanalyzed as consisting of a prefix muu- and a particle -/à, following the analogy of other non-singular pronouns in the language itself, such as na-/à ‘third person plural’ and fa-/à ‘first person plural inclusive.’ This shows the linguistic creativity of the last speakers, captured by Sasse’s (2001) colorful metaphor, the “Phoenix from the ashes” (in the spirit of Dorian 1999, and Dal Negro 2004).

The Resígaro dual markers feminine -mupi, masculine -musi (also from Bora: see Table 2) combine with muu- reanalyzed as a bound form. Unlike other pronouns, the first person plural exclusive has no corresponding prefix used with nouns and with verbs, which may point towards its later origin. The Bora forms in Resígaro are in bold in Table 2.
In their comparatively detailed discussion of personal pronouns, free and bound, in Resígaro, Rivet and de Wavrin (1951: 204-206) do not mention the first person plural exclusive form (the analysis of pronominal markers occupies about a half of their short grammatical summary: 204-209). They do not mention the number markers on nouns at all. We can hypothesize that the introduction of non-native free and bound pronominal forms by the last speakers of the language is likely to be a result of contact-induced change in the situation of extreme linguistic stress.

This is not to say that the Resígaro described by Rivet and de Wavrin (1951) had no loans from Bora or Witotoan; to the contrary. One example is Resígaro teé́ (Allin 1975), Tehe(y)hi (Rivet and de Wavrin 1951) ‘river,’ Bora theé́, proto-Bora-Muinane *teé́. The proto-Arawak form is *huni ‘water, river.’ A reflex of this form is attested in Resígaro’s closest genetic relatives Tariana, Baniwa, and Piapoco as uni ‘water, river.’

Further bound morphemes borrowed from Bora into Resígaro include markers of masculine and feminine dual, oblique cases, and numerous classifiers (see Aikhenvald 2001; Allin 1975; Thiesen 1996). None of these are mentioned by Rivet and de Wavrin (1951): we may hypothesize that the influx of borrowed morphemes into the obsolescent language is a recent phenomenon, but we have no means of definitely proving this.

Borrowing a pronoun, free or bound, is not unheard of, but is quite unusual (Gardani 2005). Third person plural pronouns they, their, them in English are considered to be borrowings from a Scandinavian source (Campbell 1997; Baugh 1957: 120). Miskito, a vibrant Misumalpan language, is said to have borrowed first and second person singular pronouns from Northern Sumu (Campbell 1997, based on Ken Hale, p.c.), also Misumalpan. Further examples of borrowing individual free pronominal forms come from Matisoff (1990: 113) and Newman (1977, 1979a, b). Campbell (1994) reports that Alsea, an isolate from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resígaro</th>
<th>Bora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronouns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prefixes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>nó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>phú, pha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG M</td>
<td>tsú, tsá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG F</td>
<td>Tsó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL du M</td>
<td>fa-musi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL du F</td>
<td>fa-mupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL du M</td>
<td>muu-musi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL du F</td>
<td>muu-mupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2du M</td>
<td>ha-musi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2du F</td>
<td>ha-mupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3du M</td>
<td>na-musi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3du F</td>
<td>na-mupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL INCL</td>
<td>fa-á, fi, fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL EXCL</td>
<td>muu-á, muu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>ha-á, hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>na-á, hná</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon, borrowed a whole set of Salishan pronominal suffixes. However, the instances such as Mawayana and Resígaro should be treated with caution as bona fide examples of borrowing pronouns. The fact that these borrowings were documented at a stage when both Mawayana and Resígaro are used by just a handful of speakers whose major language is different alerts us to a potential effect of a massive influx of non-native forms characteristic of the last stages of a language’s life. Can a massive influx of borrowed forms obscure a language’s affiliation? This takes us to our next section.

3.3 Language obsolescence and language affiliation

It is well known that teasing apart similarities due to genetic inheritance from those due to borrowing of varied kinds is one of the hardest problems in comparative linguistics (cf. the classic controversy between Boas and Sapir: see Swadesh 1951). Ideally, if two languages descend from the same ancestor, the forms and their meanings must be easily relatable, via the application of established rules for phonological change and semantic change. In reality, the distinction between inherited and diffused similarities may be difficult to draw, especially in a situation of prolonged and uninterrupted diffusion of cultural and linguistic traits across an area; see, for instance, Dixon (1997; 2002), Dench (2001), and Heath (1978), for the Australian area, and further examples in Aikhenvald (2006a). Similarities between languages can be suggestive of a genetic relationship, but not sufficient to postulate it with full assurance. Murrinh-patha and Ngan.gitjemarri, two languages spoken in the Daly River region of Northern Australia, share just cognate paradigms for portmanteau forms of inflective simple verbs, but scarcely anything else in grammar and almost no lexicon (Dixon 2002: 675). The paradigm of free pronouns is the only fully “Chadic” feature of the Tangale group (Jungraithmayr 1995). Such examples are bound to remain “fringe” puzzles to comparative linguists.

The case of Resígaro is rather instructive in this respect. The influx of Bora and Witotoan forms into this language led Trevor Allin to believe that the language was related to Bora and to Witotoan (Allin 1975). Payne (1985) undertook a careful reconstruction and comparison with the previous stage of the language captured by Rivet and de Wavrin (1951), to prove that the language is not Bora-Witotoan. But what if all we have is a highly obsolescent stage? An almost extreme example of influx of non-native forms into a pronominal paradigm and its restructuring comes from Marrku, the traditional language of Croker Island (Australian area) (Evans et al. 2006; Evans 2007). Like many Australian languages, Marrku has been on the decline for many decades. It was reported that by 1939 there were only five speakers left (Evans et al 2006: 2); by 1991 there were only two semi-speakers who were then highly proficient in other indigenous languages of the area (especially Iwaidja). The verb paradigms accessible to Evans (2007) show a curious picture: while there is strong evidence from body-part prefixes (Evans 2000) in favor of an erstwhile genetic relationship between Marrku and other Iwaidjan languages, verbal paradigms in Marrku – collected from obsolescent speakers – contain massive borrowings from Iwaidja and its relative Ilgar. This massive

---

8 Another frequently given example of a putative borrowing of part of the pronominal paradigm comes from Kambot (or Botin), from the Grass family in New Guinea (Foley 1986: 210-211). A closer look at the paradigm of Kambot pronouns in the original sources (Laycock and Z’graggen 1975; Pryor 1990) shows that this hypothesis is based on misinterpretation of the data (see Aikhenvald 2009b, for a full analysis).
influx, without any previous stage of the language to be compared with, makes exact genetic classification of Marrku an almost impossible task (Evans 2007).

4. Further outcomes of language contact in language obsolescence

An influx of foreign forms is not a universal outcome of language obsolescence. We saw above that an obsolescent language may tend to rapidly become structurally similar to the dominant one. Almost all the categories present in Bora are expressed in Resígaro; Mawayana replicates the Trio and Waiwai patterns (without necessarily borrowing the forms). Nivkh, a Paleo-Siberian isolate on the path towards extinction, has undergone massive restructuring of imperative paradigms under the influence of Russian (see Gruzdeva 2002). Similar examples abound.

Intensive language contact in the situation of language obsolescence goes together with enhancement of already existing similarities. Forms in the obsolescent language which are similar to those in the dominant one tend to become more frequent, and to assume the meanings influenced by the dominant language.

Ingrian Finnish spoken by a handful of Finns scattered around Estonia is a case in point. Most speakers are undergoing a rapid shift to Estonian. The two languages are closely related and structurally similar; as a result, it is not always possible to distinguish Estonian and Finnish forms. The most striking foreign form recorded in the language of the few remaining speakers is the past tense marker -si- employed instead of the Ingrian Finnish -i- (Riionheimo 2002: 201-202). This past tense marker is highly productive in Estonian; its appearance in Ingrian Finnish can thus be explained by the influence of the dominant language. But there is also a language-internal explanation: there is a subclass of verbs in Ingrian Finnish which requires -si- past rather than -i- past. Similarity in form of the Ingrian Finnish and the Estonian past marker is a strong contributing factor to its increased frequency in the moribund Ingrian Finnish. Other than that, speakers tend to avoid using Estonian forms.

In a situation of traditional inhibition against borrowed forms, growing language obsolescence may go hand in hand with expansion of those morphemes that have the same form in the obsolescent and in the dominant language. Tariana is the only Arawak language spoken in the Vaupés basin in northwest Amazonia (spanning adjacent areas of Brazil and Colombia). This used to be a well-established linguistic area, characterized by obligatory multilingualism based on the principle of linguistic exogamy: “those who speak the same language as us are our brothers, and we do not marry our sisters” (see Aikhenvald 2002 and references there). Languages spoken in this area traditionally included the East Tucanoan languages Tucano, Wanano, Desano, Piratapuya, Tuyuca (and a few others), and the Arawak language Tariana (now spoken by over 100 speakers in two villages). Speakers of these participate in the exogamous marriage network which ensures obligatory multilingualism. Nowadays, Tariana is no longer spoken by children, and fewer and fewer people use the language even in domestic settings. The growing obsolescence of Tariana and its rapid

---

9 Last speakers often avoid consciously using loan forms, even if they were used in the language. R. M. W. Dixon reports that Dick Moses, one of the very last fluent speakers of Yidiny, made sure his language was free of English intrusions. As Dixon (1977: 29) reported, “Moses has eliminated what were certainly established English loan words”; “in place of mudaga ‘motor car’ and biligan ‘billy can,’ he uses dundalay and gunbu:l which he said were originally the avoidance style forms for these items.” Similar examples of purism have been documented for Arizona Tewa (Kroskrity 1993).
replacement by now dominant Tucano is accompanied by a rapidly increasing number of calqued forms and constructions from Tucano.

The long-term interaction based on institutionalized societal multilingualism between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns (though not so much of forms) and calquing of categories. Comparison of Tariana with closely related Arawak languages (such as Baniwa/Kurripako and Piapoco) helps identify the diffused and the inherited features in Tariana. A striking feature of the Vaupés linguistic area is a strong cultural inhibition against language mixing, viewed in terms of borrowing forms, or inserting bits of other languages, in one’s Tariana. This inhibition operates predominantly in terms of recognizable loan forms. Speakers who use non-native forms are subject to ridicule which may affect their status in the community. What often happens in the language of obsolescent speakers is reinterpreting Tariana morphemes in accordance with the meaning their look-alikes may have in Tucano.

Consider the Tariana clitic -ya ‘emphatic.’ This clitic is now increasingly used by obsolescent insecure speakers as a marker of immediate command (17), mirroring the Tucano imperative -ya (18):

(17) Tariana

\[
\text{pi-ñha-ya} \\
\text{2SG-eat-IMPV} \\
\text{‘Eat!’}
\]

(18) Tucano

\[
\text{ba'â-ya} \\
\text{play-IMPV} \\
\text{‘Play!’}
\]

The -ya imperative in Tariana is frequently used by younger speakers, and hardly ever by the few traditional older speakers, who concur that this is not “proper Tariana.” The morpheme -ya in an imperative construction is condemned as a token of identifiable language-mixing (see Aikhenvald 2008a, for cognates of the emphatic -ya in other Arawak languages, and the imperative marker -ya in Tucanoan languages).

Another similar example comes from the increased use of nominalizations marked with -ɾi in Tariana commands. This is an alternative to simple imperatives, but with a somewhat different meaning, ‘make sure you do.’

(19) Tariana

\[
\text{pi-ñha-ɾi!} \\
\text{2SG-eat-NOMINALIZATION} \\
\text{‘Eat!’ (make sure you eat, lest you go hungry)}
\]

This usage is restricted to casual speech by younger people for whom Tucano is the main language of day-to-day communication. Tucano, just like most other East Tucanoan languages, has a suffix -ɾi used in commands with an overtone of warning, with the meaning of ‘or else’ (see Ramirez 1997, Vol. 1: 146-147). The usage of nominalizations as commands in Tariana has in all likelihood been influenced by the -ɾi marked imperative in Tucano. That the form in (19) is a nominalization is corroborated by the translations given by traditional speakers of Tariana, who themselves avoid using commands like (19), using an apprehensive construction instead.
Traditional Tariana did not use to have any special morpheme for first person plural imperative (or hortative). Nowadays, obsolescent speakers employ a hortative -da/-ɾa. Compare Traditional Tariana, in (20a), with (20b), recorded from an obsolescent speaker:

(20a) Traditional Tariana

\[ wa-iɾa \]
1PL-drink

(20b) Obsolescent Tariana

\[ wa-iɾa-da \]
1PL-drink-HORTATIVE

‘Let’s drink!’

Functionally and formally this morpheme is reminiscent of the Tucano hortative -rã/-dã (Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 145) which is shared with other Tucanoan languages:

(21) Tucano

\[ sìɭri-dã! \]
drink-HORTATIVE
‘Let’s drink!’

The Tariana hortative is likely to be a recent borrowing from Tucano. Or it could be the result of a reinterpretation of already existing Tariana morpheme -da/-ɾa ‘dubitative’ which is sometimes used to express politeness. Traditional speakers of Tariana are aware of the similarity between the Tariana and the Tucano morphemes, and treat the hortative (as in (20b)) as “incorrect” Tariana “mixed” with Tucano. This is typical of Tariana language attitudes: given the general prohibition on mixing languages viewed in terms of lexical loans, the hortative is, not surprisingly, a marginal feature of the language (see Aikhenvald 2002: 213-222 on language awareness in the Vaupés area).

Or a look-alike can oust another, non-shared morpheme. Tariana has numerous verbal markers to do with extent and type of action, among them the enclitic -piʔa ‘repetitive action: do again.’ This enclitic is being replaced by the form -ta ‘repetitive’, shared with related languages, but infrequent in the traditional language. The form -ta is similar to Tucano taha, often reduced to -ta (Ramirez 1997: 343-4).

These instances of a semantic extension of a native morpheme under the influence of a look-alike in a contact language (known as grammatical accommodation: see Aikhenvald 2006a) are symptomatic of language shift in language obsolescence. This is an alternative to influx of non-native forms.

Obsolescent Tariana offers curious examples of drastic restructuring. Tucanoan languages and Tariana are genetically unrelated, and typologically different. Like many Arawak languages, Tariana employs prefixes for subject cross-referencing, while Tucanoan languages are predominantly suffixing. As a result of long-term contact, Tariana has developed numerous un-Arawak features, including cases for core arguments and a complex system of evidentials. (These are instances of completed changes.) Obsolescent Tariana is developing a system of cross-referencing enclitics, as exemplified by (22b), mirroring the Tucanoan pattern.

The following example is a typical beginning of a story. It was recorded from a fluent middle-aged speaker who always tried to speak the traditional language. The structural
parallelism with Tucano is striking, but not complete. The major difference lies in the person that is marked: Tariana employs a prefix (just like any Arawak language would), while Tucano employs a suffix (portmanteau with a tense-evidential marker). The relevant forms are in bold.

(22a) Traditional Tariana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tariana</th>
<th>Tucano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payape-se-nuku</td>
<td>Diporó-pi-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paita</td>
<td>ni'ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nawiki</td>
<td>masi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long.ago-LOC-TOP.NON.A/S</td>
<td>one+CL:HUMAN person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tariana

dy-uka-na
3SGNF-arrive-REM.P.Vis

aĩ-nuku
here-TOP.NON.A/S

Tucano

etâ-wĩ
arrive-3SGNF.REM.P.Vis

a'to-ré
here-TOP.NON.A/S

‘A long time ago a man arrived here.’

A similar story told by an obsolescent speaker (now in his early thirties) started in a subtly different way:

(22b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tariana</th>
<th>Tucano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payape-se-nuku</td>
<td>Diporó-pi-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paita</td>
<td>ni'ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nawiki</td>
<td>masi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long.ago-LOC-TOP.NON.A/S</td>
<td>one+CL:HUMAN person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tariana

dy-uka-na=diha
3SGNF-arrive-REM.P.Vis=he

aĩ-nuku
here-TOP.NON.A/S

Tucano

etâ-wĩ
arrive-3SGNF.REM.P.Vis

a'to-ré
here-TOP.NON.A/S

‘A long time ago a man arrived here.’

The Tariana in (22b) is structurally closer to Tucano since the speaker employs an encliticized personal pronoun following the evidential. When (22b) was uttered, no one commented on the language difference. Speakers are more aware of non-native forms than they are of non-native patterns. Nevertheless, when I played (22b) back to a traditional elder, he commented that =diha should not have been there.

Instances like (22b) demonstrate that Tariana is becoming almost like relexified Tucano. But since language change in language obsolescence is unstable and discontinuous, chances are that this relexified variety will not live beyond the life-span of the last speakers.

4. What can we conclude?

A study of contact-induced change in the situation of language obsolescence poses specific problems. Basically, the same or similar issues arise when we investigate the speech behavior of obsolescent speakers of otherwise well-spoken languages, and processes of change in those languages which are on their way out.

Independently of whether we are dealing with obsolescent languages or just with obsolescent speakers, the influx of non-native forms tends to be pervasive. This is
understandable: language obsolescence is typically associated with word-retrieval problems, and it is easier to just use an item from the dominant language.

In other instances of language obsolescence, we encounter instances of influx of non-native forms beyond lexicon. Mawayana and Resigaro have borrowed pronouns, while Resigaro has also restructured its cross-referencing system, effectively incorporating a non-native bound form of a pronoun. This is in addition to borrowing numbers ‘one’ and ‘two,’ and numerous further bound morphemes. These instances of borrowing members of closed classes and even bound forms are typologically unexpected and unusual. However, a question arises: are these really borrowings, or are they just instances of nonce forms? That the last speakers’ usage is unstable and ephemeral is a well-known fact. Typologists and historical linguists need to be wary of that when they encounter unusual patterns of borrowed forms in obsolescent languages.

A further, commonly attested, effect of language contact in obsolescence is the enhancement of forms already shared with the dominant language. This often concerns frequently used forms and constructions, such as the expression of commands. In addition, enhanced structural diffusion may result in one language becoming like a reflection of the other: the obsolescent Tariana may sound like relexified Tucano. This is an extreme – but again, often ephemeral – outcome of language shift.

In Johanson’s (2002) words, “languages do not die of ‘structuritis’” – that is, contact-induced change does not result in language extinction. But the processes of language obsolescence may promote structural changes amazing in their extent. Before passing into extinction, an obsolescent language may become a “carbon copy” of the dominant idiom. This excessive copying is hardly surprising. The dominant language is the one used on a day-to-day basis by speakers of an obsolescent language, and so the structures from the dominant language get calqued and transferred into the language falling into disuse. (More discussion and examples can be found in Aikhenvald 2002, Grenoble 2000, and classic work by Hill and Hill 1986, Tsitsipis 1998 and Campbell and Muntzel 1989).

Contact-induced changes in the situation of language obsolescence are inherently unstable (as was pointed out by Tsitsipis 1998). Ephemeral as they are, their outcomes may go against generalizations obtained in “healthy” language situations.

Acknowledgments
I am deeply grateful to the late Candelário da Silva, the last speaker of Bare, to the members of the Brito family who taught me their native Tariana, and my adopted family at Avatip who taught me their native Manambu. Special thanks go to R. M. W. Dixon, who provided invaluable comments on this article. I am also grateful to Claudine Chamoreau for her careful editing.

Abbreviations

A   Transitive subject
ALL  Allative
CAUS Causative
CL   Classifier
COMPL.DS Completed different subject
CONN Connective
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