

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290819236>

Agreement in two Arawak languages: Baure and Kurripako

Chapter · January 2008

DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199238385.003.0016

CITATIONS

10

READS

60

2 authors, including:



Swintha Danielsen

Europa-Universität Flensburg

21 PUBLICATIONS 111 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

16

Agreement in two Arawak languages: Baure and Kurripako

SWINTHA DANIELSEN AND TANIA GRANADILLO

16.1 Introduction

The majority of Arawak languages have been argued to show a semantic alignment (cf. Aikhenvald 1999: 87ff.). Core arguments are cross-referenced on the verb by means of prefixes or suffixes (alternatively, pro- or enclitics). Aikhenvald (1999: 86), describing cross-Arawak patterns, states: ‘Verbs typically divide into three classes: transitive (with two core arguments, A and O), active intransitive (with one core argument, S_a) and stative intransitive (with one core argument, S_o).’ These verb classes differ in their choice of agreement for subject. For transitive and the so-called ‘active’ intransitive verbs the subject, A and S_a , is marked by an agreement prefix. The P of transitive verbs is marked by an agreement suffix.¹ The split in the intransitive verbs is apparent from the fact that the subjects of some verbs, the so-called ‘stative’² intransitive verbs, are marked by a personal suffix identical to that which marks the Ps of transitive verbs (therefore S_p).³

Even closely related languages differ as to which verbs fall in the classes of ‘active’ and ‘stative’ intransitives (Aikhenvald 1999: 86). The choice of the labels ‘active’

Fieldwork on Baure was financed by Radboud University Nijmegen, with technical support and equipment from MPI Nijmegen. Many of the conclusions are owed to comments by Pieter Muysken, Mily Crevels, Hein van der Voort, Katharina Haude, Rik van Gijn, Andrej Malchukov, Katja Hannß, Françoise Rose, and many more. The Baure data have been gathered from the following speakers: Asunta Durán, Dolores Chimanacay, Marcial Chonono, Juana Pinaicobo, Melquiades Durán, Justina Cajareico, Herculía Chipeno, Ignacio Martínez, Lucio Oní, Guillermina Pinaicobo, Rosalía Pinaicobo, Estéban Chipeno, Julian Imanareico, Eustaquia Churipuy, and † Mercedes Peña. Whose cooperation is here acknowledged.

¹ Alternatively these morphemes are analysed as clitics in some Arawak languages, as in the case of Baure in this chapter.

² Different terminology has been suggested instead of ‘active’ vs. ‘stative’. Wise (1986: 571) divides verbs in Arawak languages into ‘active’ and ‘absolute’ verbs. Facundes (2000: 274) treats verbs with S_o marking in Apurinā (North Arawak) only as a subgroup of ‘descriptive’ verbs. Like Merlan (1985: 325), Facundes uses the descriptive labels ‘subjective’ vs. ‘objective’ marking, which are the most neutral.

³ The same personal cross-reference prefixes that mark the subject of transitive and active intransitive verbs (A and S_a) generally also mark the possessor of nouns.

vs. 'stative' relates to the fact that the split generally involves the parameter \pm event (see Table 16.4): stative verbs are non-eventive, such as 'to be cold', while 'active' verbs might include verbs such as 'sleep', 'be lost', or 'sit'. This shows the split in the coding choice for stative intransitive verbs (see also Facundes 2000: 273ff.) and that the split in argument marking is not always semantic, but in some cases has lexicalized into conjugation classes.

Some Arawak languages have a partly fluid semantic alignment system (e.g. Baniwa in Aikhenvald 2001: 175); such a system is characterized by different marking choices for one and the same intransitive verb depending on the semantics of the state of affairs sketched. The split may involve a considerable number or only some of the intransitive verbs. The split systems have only been described in detail for very few individual Arawak languages (mainly for Warekena in Aikhenvald 1998 and Apurinã in Facundes 2000).

In this chapter the agreement systems of two Arawak languages are investigated: Kurripako from the North Arawak group, and Baure from the South Arawak group, chosen for reasons of maximal spread in the family. After having given a general introduction to argument marking systems in Arawak languages, we describe the specific systems of Kurripako (section 16.2) and Baure (section 16.3). Section 16.4 provides additional data on argument marking on predicates derived by attributive and privative prefixes. Section 16.5 presents a comparison of the two languages. In section 16.6 the two languages are discussed from the point of view of semantic alignment. Section 16.7 presents data on fluid semantic alignment in the languages compared. Finally, the results of the comparison are summed up in the conclusion.

16.2 Argument marking on Kurripako predicates

Kurripako is a North Arawak language, spoken by around 10,000 people in Northwest Amazonia around the borders of Venezuela, Columbia, and Brazil. The data presented here were collected by Granadillo during short field trips in the 2000 and 2001, and through all of 2004.⁴ The Kurripakos in Venezuela are mostly bilingual, although there are a few monolingual speakers of Kurripako and a few monolingual Spanish speakers. Kurripako is a polysynthetic, head-marking language with predominantly VOS constituent order. The language has a gender and an extensive noun class system and few grammatical cases, dative *-sru*, and various locatives. Subjects and objects are indexed by means of affixes, to be described below.

As already mentioned in the introduction, Split-S systems in argument marking on verbs have been noted for different Arawak languages. Kurripako is a

⁴ Field trips to the Kurripako were partially financed by the Tinker Foundation, University of Arizona Social and Behavioral Sciences Research Institute, University of Arizona Joint Anthropology and Linguistics Research Funds, and National Science Foundation Grant BCS-0318762.

TABLE 16.1. Kurripako agreement affixes

Person	Agent		Patient	
	Sing.	Pl.	Sing.	Pl.
1	<i>nu-</i>	<i>wa-</i>	–	–
2	<i>pi-</i>	<i>i-</i>	–	–
3M	<i>li-</i>	} <i>na-</i>	<i>-na</i>	} <i>-na</i>
3F	<i>ru-</i>		<i>-no</i>	
3FOC	<i>i-</i>		–	
IMPER	<i>pa-</i>		–	

prototypical example of a language with a split in the marking of S (i.e. a semantic alignment) based on eventivity.

16.2.1 Subjective marking (S_a): active verbs in Kurripako

Verbs in Kurripako are either transitive or intransitive; there are additionally a few underived ditransitives and some derived benefactives and causatives. Intransitive verbs are further divided into active and stative subtypes depending on the kind of agreement they take (as described briefly in the introduction).

In Kurripako (K), transitive and active intransitive verbal predicates must carry subject (S_a , A) prefixes (except in negative imperative constructions), which may co-occur with a subject NP. The agreement prefixes mark person, number, and, for 3rd person, gender of the subject. Stative intransitive verbs, in contrast, do not carry personal prefixes, but are instead followed by free pronouns. Example (1) shows a transitive verb, (2) an active intransitive, (3) a stative intransitive, and (4) a possessive NP.

- (1) K *nu-ira-ka patsiaka.*
 1SG-drink-PROG manioc.drink
 ‘I am drinking manioc drink.’
- (2) K *nu-dia-ka-wa panti-liku.*
 1SG-return-PROG-INTR house-LOC
 ‘I am returning into the house.’
- (3) K *haamaa-ka hnua.* (4) K *nu-tsinu-ni*
 be.tired-PROG 1SG 1SG-dog-POSS
 ‘I am tired.’ ‘my dog’

First and 2nd person Ps are not marked on the verb. The independent pronouns, undifferentiated for syntactic function, appear after the verb; it is only their position (after the verb) that signals that they are coding a P. Third person objects (singular feminine, singular non-feminine, and plural) may be expressed by either

suffixes or nouns (or pronouns). These suffixes do not co-occur with either the pronouns or the nouns, as shown in (5–7).

- (5) K *nu-heema kalaka* (6) K *nu-heema srua*
 1SG-barbeque chicken 1SG-barbeque 3SG.F
 ‘I barbecued the chicken (fem.).’ ‘I barbecued it (fem.).’
- (7) K *nu-heema-no*
 1SG-barbeque-3SG.F
 ‘I barbecued it (fem.).’

In Kurripako, a recipient or beneficiary is marked with a dative marker, which appears before the P; it is not grammatical for a P to show agreement on the verb when there is a dative argument in the clause, so it must be expressed with independent pronouns or nominals as shown in (8).

- (8) K *wa-a-pia li-sru peethe*
 1PL-give-PFV 3SG.M -DAT manioc.bread
 ‘We gave him manioc bread.’

The 3rd person focus prefix in Kurripako must be used when there is a fronted 3rd person nominal subject. This is exemplified in (9), in which the subject is focused and can be contrasted with (10), which does not have an emphatic reading.

- (9) K *atsinali i-ira-ka patsiaka*
 man 3SGFOC-drink-T/A manioc.drink
 ‘The man drinks manioc drink.’
- (10) K *li-ira-ka patsiaka atsinali*
 3SG.M-drink-T/A manioc.drink man
 ‘The man drinks manioc drink.’

16.2.2 S_p marking: stative verbs in Kurripako

S_p marking is marking of the intransitive subject with the affixes otherwise used to show agreement with a P. For Kurripako, this is found with stative intransitive verbs, as shown in (3) above, in contrast to active intransitive verbs, as in (2). The use of the P affixes with these verbs is obligatory; other forms of marking, e.g. an active intransitive verb with an external free pronoun (11), or a stative intransitive verb with a pronominal prefix (12), are ungrammatical.

- (11) K **dia-ka-wa hnua panti-liku.* (12) K **nu-haamaa-ka.*
 return-PROG-INTR 1SG house-LOC 1SG-be.tired-PROG
 ‘I am returning into the house.’ ‘I am tired.’

In terms of agreement patterns, some intransitive subjects pattern with As and some with Ps. The use of the person markers is exactly the same as on transitive verbs, including the bound forms for 3rd person singular objects.

TABLE 16.2. Baure agreement clitics

Person	Nominative		Accusative	
	Sing.	Pl.	Sing.	Pl.
1	<i>ni-</i>	<i>vi-</i>	<i>-ni</i>	<i>-vi</i>
2	<i>pi-</i>	<i>yi-</i>	<i>-pi</i>	<i>-yi</i>
3M	<i>ro-</i>	<i>no-</i>	<i>-ro</i>	} <i>-no</i>
3F	<i>ri-</i>		<i>-ri</i>	
UNSP ^a	<i>e-</i>	–	–	–

^a The unspecified prefix is presumably only used with bound nouns, but not on verbs.

16.3 Baure

The seriously endangered language Baure belongs to the South Arawak branch of the language family, together with the Moxo languages⁵ Trinitario and Ignaciano of Llanos de Moxos in Bolivia. It is spoken in the Bolivian Amazonia⁶ towards the border with Brazil. The data were collected by Danielsen during field trips in 2003 and 2004. Baure is a polysynthetic, head-marking language with VSO order, gender, an extensive noun class system, and no case marking for core arguments. Baure uses agreement clitics on possessed nouns and on different kinds of predicate, as will be described in the following sections.

16.3.1 Nominative subjects: verbal predicates in Baure

Baure shows the same nominative-accusative alignment in its agreement affixes for all verbal predicates, with the subject (S, A) showing agreement by an obligatory proclitic⁷ which may co-occur with a coreferent NP. The full set of agreement clitics is shown in Table 16.2.

Example (13) shows the clitic on a transitive verb, (14) shows two active intransitive verbs with the same agreement clitic, (15) shows two stative intransitive verbs, and (16) shows that the same clitics are also used in possessive NPs.

- (13) B *vi=nik mos*
1PL=eat sweet.corn
 ‘We eat sweet corn.’

⁵ *Moxo* or *Mojo* are alternative ways of spelling the same referent, in English and Spanish. The Moxo languages Trinitario and Ignaciano are very closely related.

⁶ The Llanos de Moxos are part of Bolivian Amazonia.

⁷ In Baure, unlike Kurripako, the agreement markers have been analysed as clitics. This type of clitics has to be considered as on the borderline between affixes and clausal clitics.

- (14) B *vi=šim ač vi=kowyo-po ač vi=imok*
 1PL=arrive and 1PL=bathe-PRFLX and 1PL=sleep
 ‘We arrive, we take a bath (bathe ourselves), and we sleep.’
- (15) B *vi=ha’ino-wo ač vi=imoko-s’-ino-wo*
 1PL=be.tired-COP and 1PL=sleep-APRX-SUBJ-COP
 ‘We are tired and (we are) sleepy.’
- (16) B *vi=tovia*
 1PL=neighbour
 ‘our neighbour’

Transitive verbs show agreement for Ps by means of an enclitic. Unlike the nominative agreement seen in (13–16), accusative markers may not co-occur with an object NP; cf. (17) and (18). Free personal pronouns are used for special emphasis, as in the exceptional preverbal use of *nti* ‘1SG’ coding the subject in (17), and cannot replace agreement on the verb.

- (17) B *nti’ ni=komorik p-a-š simori*
 1SG 1SG-kill one-CLF:animal-one pig
 ‘I killed one pig.’
- (18) B *heni, ver ni=komorikie=ro*
 yes PVF 1SG=kill=3SGM
 ‘Yes, I already killed it.’

Baure ditransitive verbs (which are mainly derived) allow overt agreement for both objects; the clitic showing agreement with the recipient precedes that of the theme, as demonstrated in (19) and (20).⁸

- (19) B *pi=pa=ni=ro, ni=pa=pi=ro*
 2SG=give=1SG=3SG.M 1SG=give=2SG=3SG.M
 ‘You give it to me, I give it to you.’
- (20) B *ni=wo’ik-ino=pi=ro*
 1SG=butcher-BEN=2SG=3SG.M
 ‘I butcher it for you.’

16.3.2 Accusative subjects: nonverbal predicates in Baure

In Baure, stative nonverbal predicates (not to be confused with stative verbal predicates) take the accusative clitics that are used for object agreement on transitive verbs; cf. (17) and (18). In order to be used as a predicate with agreement, the nominal or adjectival base must be derived with the copular suffix, which

⁸ There are restrictions on the combination of agreement clitics that may appear; generally, two *ro-/ri* 3SG (M/F) clitics are not permitted in series, presumably for phonetic reasons.

functions as a kind of verbalizer. In addition to or instead of the copula, other verbal morphemes may be attached to the base.

- (21) B *monči-wo=ni n=asore-he-wo*
 child-COP=1SG 1SG=be.strong-DISTR-COP
 ‘When I was a child I was very (completely) strong.’

It may be added here that nouns and adjectives can function as predicates without person cross-reference, when the subject is explicit and no aspect or time specification is necessary, being clear from the context. In that case a nominal or adjectival predicate is juxtaposed with the subject nominal, as demonstrated in (22). Example (22) shows the completely unmarked nominal predicate *monči* ‘(be a) child’.

- (22) B ... *koeč te ni=šir monči, ti ni=hin monči napiri*
 because DEM1.M 1SG=SON child DEM1.F 1SG=daughter child also
 ‘...because my son is (still) a child, and my daughter is also (still) a child.’

Adjectival predicates may be treated similarly. Example (23) shows stative predicates based on the adjective *mehewkon* ‘bad’. In both cases the adjectival base functions as predicative and displays the morpheme *-wapa* ‘change of state’ suffixed. The derived verb does not show agreement in the first clause (*mehewkonwapa*) due to the presence of an explicit nominal subject *te pečpi* ‘your roof’. In contrast we find the same predicate in the second clause with agreement (*mehewkonwapero*) and no explicit subject. The accusative clitic *-ro* ‘3SGM’ in *mehewkonwapero* ‘it is bad’ refers to the subject ‘your roof’, which is a non-feminine noun.

- (23) B *mehewkon-wapa te p=ečpi, heni, mehewkon-wape=ro.*
 bad-COS DEM1.M 2SG=roof yes bad-COS=3SG.M
 ‘Your roof is already bad (falling apart), yes it is bad.’

In contrast, all verbs referring to states as well as weather verbs in Baure are marked nominatively, cf. *nasorohew* ‘I was very (completely) strong’ in (21) and in the verbs for ‘to be cold’ in (24) and (25).

- (24) B *ni=mane-wapa.*
 1SG=be.cold-cos
 ‘I am cold/ I got cold.’
- (25) B *nokope’ ro=tokenoko-wo te ahikowon.*
 yesterday 3SG.M=be.cold-COP DEM1.M morning
 ‘Yesterday the morning was cold.’

16.3.3 Accusative subjects in Baure

We have shown that Kurripako shows a split of argument marking on intransitive verbs, just as it has been suggested for Arawak languages in general; cf. section 16.1

above. Baure, on the other hand, distinguishes verbal from nonverbal predicates by different argument marking. There is, however, a small subgroup of frequently used verb-like predicates in Baure with accusative agreement. An exhaustive list of the known members of this class is *kwo-* 'exist, be' (copula predicate), *koehoe-* 'give birth', and *eto-* 'finish'. This kind of accusatively marked predicate can be intransitive, as in (26), but also transitive, as in (27) and (28), and double argument marking on a transitive predicate may occur (29).

Intransitive accusative predicates

- (26) B *kwo=ni ne' pi=weri-ye.*
 exist=1SG here 2SG=house-LOC
 'I am here in your house.'

Even though the following two clauses seem to represent transitive predicates, it is not clear if the NP *pinonev* 'twins' in (27) can really be analysed as a P, because it cannot be replaced by a personal enclitic, a feature of other Ps. The subject NP in (27) on the other hand, can be pronominalized.

Transitive accusative predicates

- (27) B *koehoe=ri pino-nev.*
 give.birth=3SG.F twin-PL
 'She gave birth to twins.'
- (28) B *ver eto=ni to ni=vesa-č.*
 PFV finish=1SG ART 1SG=read-NOM2
 'I already finished (my) reading.'

Double marking on a transitive accusative predicate(s)

- (29) B *ač ver eto=ro=ni.*
 and PFV finish=3SG.=1SG
 'And I already finished it (the weeding and cleaning of the field).'

In order to decide whether we are dealing with verbs in examples (26–29) it is important to find out more about their origin; thus, in the following we shall tentatively offer some hypotheses in this direction. The copular predicate *kwo-* 'exist, be' is composed of the attributive prefix *kO-* and the copular suffix *-wo* (see example (26)). It patterns like a predicate with a nominal base, in that it appears with the copular suffix, and in that the subject shows accusative agreement.⁹

The predicate *koehoe-* 'give birth' has also been derived by means of the attributive prefix *kO-* and another element, presumably a noun **-ihoe*'. Even though both predicates seem to have evolved from a combination with the attributive

⁹ In Baure there are numerous words whose stems are nothing more than grammatical morphemes in idiosyncratic (lexicalized) combinations.

prefix, *koehoe-* ‘give birth’ can be transitive. Another interesting point is that the attributive generally functions as a verbalizer (as shown in section 16.5 below), and triggers subjective marking, as in (34). Many languages, however, exhibit special verbs or constructions for the predicate ‘give birth’ and for copulas. In addition, the lack of control of the subject in both cases may have led to the accusative construction. It is not clear, however, whether the predicates are best interpreted as exceptional verbs (possibly showing the last relics of the Arawak semantic alignment system), or should be regarded as instances of exceptional non-verbal predicates.

The predicate *eto-* ‘finish’ also functions as an aspectual preverbal particle for terminative, just like the adverb *ver* ‘already, PFV’, which also functions as the preverbal particle for perfective.¹⁰ The predicate base *eto-* may also have been a temporal adverb **eto* with the meaning ‘at the end, over’. The predicate *eto-* ‘finish’ patterns like non-verbal predicates with two exceptions: first, there is no obligatory verbal morpheme before the person enclitic; secondly, the predicate can be transitive and may take two accusative clitics, for both subject and object, where the clitic for the object precedes that of the subject.

The predicate *eto-* ‘finish’ behaves more like a verb than the other accusative predicates. It seems reasonable to assume that it has been grammaticalized from a non-verbal predicate into the present form, which can get double marking of constituents like ditransitive verbs. It cannot be regarded as a typical modern Baure verb, however, because of the accusative marking strategy.

In sum, Baure shows two different kinds of argument marking for semantic subjects, one marking for subjects of verbal predicates and another for subjects of non-verbal predicates.

16.4 Attributive and privative derivations

A common feature of the Arawak languages is the presence of an attributive prefix (*ka-* in Kurripako, *kO-*¹¹ in Baure) and a privative prefix (*ma-* in Kurripako, *mO-* in Baure). In Kurripako, both prefixes may derive stative verbs from nouns and in both cases the derived verb takes *S_p* marking, as shown in (30) and (31).

- | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|-------------------|--------------|------|---|--------------------|--------------|
| (30) | K | <i>ka-ipe-ka</i> | <i>kutsi</i> | (31) | K | <i>ma-ipe-ka</i> | <i>kutsi</i> |
| | | ATTR-meat-T/A pig | | | | PRIV-meat-T/A pig | |
| | | ‘The pig is fat.’ | | | | ‘The pig is thin.’ | |

When a derived verb takes a prefix, person markers cannot appear. We hypothesize that this is because there is only one prefix position in Kurripako verbs. This

¹⁰ When *eto* is used as a preverbal particle for terminative, the verb is not in a subordinate construction; this contrasts to the use of *eto-* as a main predicate in (35), where the second predicate is marked by the action nominalizer, showing that it enters into a subordinate construction.

¹¹ The capital *O* refers to the weakness of this vowel, which may be dropped or may change according to vowel harmony.

hypothesis is further supported by data from the imperatives. Unlike other verbs, imperatives do not have any T/A marking. Positive imperatives carry 2nd person prefix markers, either singular or plural, but this is not true of negative imperatives (prohibitions).

Negative imperatives appear with a privative marker *ma-* and a restrictive suffix *-tsa*. When these affixes are added, the normal agreement suffixes are not found and the subject can only be expressed by means of an independent pronoun, just like Ps.

- (32) K *ma-pita-tsa!*
 PRIV-bathe-RES
 'Don't bathe!'

This can be considered evidence for the presence of only one prefix slot and the necessary S_p marking of some of the stative verbs. When one of these verbs has a second argument, this second argument is assigned an oblique case, such as locative as seen in example (33).

- (33) K *ka-ako-ka hnua kuripako-liku*
 ATTR-word-T/A 1SG Kurripako-LOC
 'I speak Kurripako.'

In Baure the privative prefix *mO-* 'without' derives negative opposites mainly of attributive nominals (very often in the function of modifiers) which otherwise are marked by the attributive prefix *kO-* 'with'.¹² In contrast to Kurripako, attributive predicates are marked nominatively, as in (34); like Kurripako, the derived privative counterparts are marked differently, with the accusative clitics. Example (35) shows that privative predicates in Baure behave like nonverbal predicates. It can be argued that the attributive functions as a verbalizer, while the privative derives nouns (or adjectives).

- (34) B *ver ri= k-avinon* (35) B *m-avinon-e=ri?*
 PFV 3SG.F=ATTR-husband PRIV-husband-LK=3SG.F
 'She is already married.' 'Is she unmarried?'

One difference with respect to other nonverbal predicates is that privative predicates do not need the copula morpheme before the person enclitic, but instead the linker *-a*¹³ (which in 35 has undergone a morphophonological change *-a > -e*). Example (35) can be compared to (21) above, in which the base of the nonverbal predicate was a noun. The predicate in (21) can only get the person clitic attached when it is preceded by a verbal morpheme, such as the copula suffix *-wo*. Example

¹² Modifiers or adjectives in Baure all show nominal properties. They can, however, be distinguished from nouns morphologically and syntactically.

¹³ The linker *-a* has a very wide range of functions, among others connecting stative bases (verbal or nonverbal) with non-stative suffixes; it always follows incorporated nouns or classifiers and may occur in noun compounds.

(23) also exhibits an example of a nonverbal predicate based on an adjective, showing the same characteristics.

Note the derivational differences between Kurripako and Baure in the use of these prefixes. Whereas in Kurripako the attributive or privative prefixes derive stative verbs with objective marking, in Baure the privative prefix derives nonverbal predicates taking objective marking and the attributive prefix derives verbal predicates taking subjective marking.

16.5 Comparison

As seen earlier in Tables 16.1 and 16.2, both Kurripako and Baure show verbal agreement for core arguments but differ with respect to details of the inventory.

Note the paucity of object suffixes in Kurripako compared to Baure (Aikhenvald 1999 lists four Arawak languages that have completely lost their agreement suffixes). In Kurripako, agreement suffixes are used only for P and S_p. When there is both a recipient and a patient, the recipient is indicated by a dative marker and the patient follows the recipient. This is the only order allowed; it is the same as the order of the enclitics in Baure (cf. examples (19) and (20) for Baure and (8) for Kurripako).

There are significant differences in the agreement patterns of intransitive sentences, however. Kurripako separates active subjects from stative subjects by marking the first group similarly to an A and the second group similarly to P. Baure, in contrast, marks the subjects of all verbal clauses identically, using nominative agreement, regardless of whether they are S or A. It is only subjects of nonverbal predicates that have argument markings like P. The split in this case is between verbal and nonverbal subjects and not between different kinds of intransitive verbs. The question then becomes whether these two different cases can both be considered semantic alignment.

16.6 Semantic alignment?

Mithun (1991) explores the semantic bases of the phenomenon of split alignment systems, and presents three prototypical cases that have different semantic features triggering the different agreement markers used with different types of intransitive verbs. Table 16.3 summarizes the features, provides examples of typical verbal meanings, and shows the distribution of agreement that differentiates each of the three language types. Stative-active languages are those that follow the first pattern, exemplified here by Guaraní. Guaraní differentiates intransitive verbs for lexical aspect, specifically for eventhood (Mithun 1991: 523) by marking two different cases. Intransitive event verbs are marked by agreement pattern 'I for active or grammatical agent' while all 'event' verbs are marked by agreement pattern 'II for stative or grammatical patient'. Examples (36)–(40) parallel A–F

TABLE 16.3. Summary of agreement marking (Mithun 1991: 524)

	Guaraní	Lakhota	Central Pomo
A. +event 'jump', 'go', 'run' +P/E/I ^a +control	I	I	I
B. +event 'hiccough', 'sneeze', 'vomit' +P/E/I -control	I	I	II
C. +event 'fall', 'die', 'slip' -P/E/I -control	I	II	II
D. -event 'reside', 'be prudent', 'be patient' +P/E/I +control	II	I	I
E. -event 'be tall', 'be strong', 'be right-handed' -P/E/I -control -affect	II	II	I
F. -event 'be sick', 'be tired', 'be cold' -P/E/I -control +affect	II	II	II

^a 'P/E/I stands for performed/effected/instigated. The symbols I and II identify the case used with such verbs in each language—I for active or grammatical agent, II for stative or grammatical patient' (Mithun 1992: 523).

in the table (with D missing), supporting the claim that the Kurripako semantic alignment is based on eventhood.

- (36) K *nu-ito kenke-riku.* (cf. A in Table 16.3)
1SG-go field-LOC
'I go to the field.'
- (37) K *hlia hmapeni i-katha leche.* (cf. B in Table 16.3)
3SG.M child 3SGFOC-vomit milk
'The child vomits the milk.'
- (38) K *heri i-hiwa hiipai-naku.* (cf. C in Table 16.3)
horsefly 3SGFOC-fall dirt-LOC
'The horsefly falls on the dirt.'
- (39) K *halipa hlia-hi juan.* (cf. E in Table 16.3)
be.tall 3SG.M-DEM Juan
'Juan is tall.'

- (40) K *hnete haamaa kepinaa hlia.* (cf. F in Table 16.3)
 DM be.tired be.full 3SG.M
 ‘Then he was tired and full.’

Examples of verbs of type D are not included because they are absent from the Kurripako database. There is the verb ‘to live’, but it is not clear that this is the same as ‘to reside’. The main difficulty in trying to find other examples that could be substituted for ‘to be prudent’ and ‘to be patient’ is that the assignment of the semantic feature of control (which is the critical feature in this case) is one that is very much tied to cultural values and very difficult to discern if the right question has not been asked or the critical contrast is not present in the data. That said, it is still possible to fit Kurripako into one of the three types without this set of data because of the distribution of the argument marking. Examples for sets A, B, and C all pattern together having prefixes, whereas examples for sets E and F pattern together having suffixal patient type marking. So this means that it can only fit into the first distribution within this typology, and we would expect to find that verbs of type D also have their semantic subject marked like transitive objects.

In Baure an intransitive S argument shows the same nominative agreement that characterizes the A of a transitive verb. It is, however, possible to have accusative marking for predicates of type D–F on the base of adjectives or nouns. This is exemplified in the following alternative examples:

- (41) B *ač teč šije’ pikor, pikoro-wo=ro* (cf. D in Table 16.3)
 and DEM2.M fox rascal rascal-COP=3SG.M
 ‘And that fox is rascally, he is a rascal.’
- (42) B *to eton č-išie’, č-išie-wo=ri* (cf. E in Table 16.3)
 ART woman big-size big-size-COP=3SG.F
 ‘The woman is tall, she is tall.’
- (43) B *ač mavi-wape=ro* (cf. F in Table 16.3)
 and sick-COS=3SG.M
 ‘And he is (seriously) ill.’

All the predicates in (41)–(43) are constructed on the basis of adjectives, and nonverbal predicates take accusative marking in Baure. The results of comparison are summarized again in Table 16.4. As is common among Arawak languages, Kurripako follows the pattern of an active-stative alignment system based on eventhood, whereas Baure in the main shows a nominative-accusative system in its verbal clauses.

Given the data presented above, we argue that Kurripako has a semantic alignment system in which eventhood is the relevant semantic feature that gives rise to a different marking system for stative intransitive subjects vs. agents and active intransitive subjects. The split in Baure is between verbal and nonverbal predicates. Eventhood is still a semantic feature that groups the nonverbal predicates

TABLE 16.4. Summary of agreement strategies in Kurripako and Baure (cf. Table 16.3 and Mithun 1991: 524)

	Kurripako	Baure
A. +event 'jump', 'go', 'run' +P/E/I +control	I ^a	I
B. +event 'hiccough', 'sneeze', 'vomit' +P/E/I -control	I	I
C. +event 'fall', 'die', 'slip' -P/E/I -control	I	I
D. -event 'reside', 'be prudent', 'be patient' +P/E/I +control	II	I/(II)
E. -event 'be tall', 'be strong', 'be right-handed' -P/E/I -control -affect	II	I/(II)
F. -event 'be sick', 'be tired', 'be cold' -P/E/I -control +affect	II	I/(II)

^a Here I stands for S_a marking, and II stands for S_p marking.

together, but it is secondary to the word class assignment, since non-eventive verbal predicates show nominative agreement. We conclude that Baure cannot be considered an example of semantic alignment, since the differential marking of subjects of intransitives has no semantic basis, but is determined by the syntactic category of parts of speech. Yet the system may have evolved from one of semantic alignment. Possibly stative intransitive verbs and nonverbal predicates were earlier marked in the same way. Such a system could easily change into the current one if all intransitive verbal predicates became regularized. The lack of historical and comparative data, however, makes this hypothesis impossible to test at present.

16.7 Fluid-S marking on verbs

In Kurripako, there is one pair of verbs that can be described in terms of fluid semantic alignment. The same verb base may take either S_a and S_p marking with different meanings, as seen in (44) and (45).

- | | | | |
|------|--|------|---|
| | - <i>idza</i> - 'cry' → S _a agreement | | <i>idza</i> - 'rain' → S _p agreement |
| (44) | K <i>li-idza-ka</i> | (45) | K <i>idza-ka-ni</i> |
| | 3SG.M=CRY-PROG | | rain-PROG-3SG.M |
| | 'He is crying' | | 'It is raining' |

In Baure there are also some traces of a fluid system in argument marking. There is at least one example of a verb base that can have both nominative and accusative marking with slightly different interpretations. This is the verbal base *-moro'in(o)*- 'be sick of/be thirsty', which can either take regular nominative marking (46), in which case it means 'be sick of', or accusative marking (47), in which case it is found to mean 'to be thirsty'.¹⁴

- moro'in*- 'be sick of' → subjective
- (46) B *ver kač=hi ri=nik, ri=nik, ri=nik,*
 PFV GO=QUOT 3SG.F=eat 3SG.F=eat 3SG.F=eat
nka kač=hi ri=moro'ine=ro=hi.
 NEG GO=QUOT 3SG.F=be.sick.of=3SG.M=QUOT
 'She started to eat and eat and she didn't get sick of it.'
- moro'in*- 'be thirsty' → objective
- (47) B *ikarek moro'ino-wape=ri=hi*
 thus be.thirsty-COS=3SG.F=QUOT
ač ri=kač-po-w wapoeri-ye=hi.
 and 3SG.F=GO-PRFLX-COP river-LOC=QUOT
 'Thus she got thirsty and went to the river.'

These examples, even if they are few, provide some evidence of an earlier system of at least partial fluid semantic alignment. It is possible that there were more verbs behaving in this way, but there are no historical data to ascertain this. The presence of the phenomenon in two geographically separate and genetically distant languages suggests that fluid marking was a characteristic of proto-Arawak.

16.8 Conclusions

Kurripako and Baure differ in their predicate argument marking. Kurripako follows the prototypical active-stative split as described for Arawak languages in general, whereas Baure predicates can be divided into verbal and nonverbal syntactic classes. The accusative marking in Baure was presumably originally a feature of stative predicates, but nowadays it is only nonverbal predicates which exhibit this agreement pattern. Some traces of Fluid-S making, combined with minor patterns in the dataset, hint at a formerly richer class of accusative predicates, possibly

¹⁴ It is possible that the base of the accusative-marking predicate is in fact the adjective **moro'in* 'thirsty'—adjectives are treated like other nonverbal base, showing accusative marking. The final syllable *-n(o)* may also be reanalysed as the nominalizer *-no* 'NOM1'.

including verbs, and suggest that a system of semantic alignment similar to that of Kurripako might be reconstructed for Baure. Most contemporary Baure verbs are not marked accusatively, however. Kurripako also presents traces of fluid semantic alignment, suggesting that this was a feature of proto-Arawak (*contra* Aikhenvald 1999).

It is our hope that the data provided here from two distantly related and geographically disparate Arawak languages will further our understanding of this language family in particular and of argument marking systems in general. Given the relatively shallow time depth of the Arawakan family, which is supposed to have broken up around 3,000 years ago (Zucchi 2002), our study suggests that the active/stative distinction may be typologically unstable (see Mithun, this volume, for a similar observation with respect to semantic alignment in North America).