



HAL
open science

Review of Guillaume, Antoine: A Grammar of Cavineña.
Katharina Haude

► **To cite this version:**

Katharina Haude. Review of Guillaume, Antoine: A Grammar of Cavineña.. Studies in Language, 2011, pp.913-921. halshs-00692111

HAL Id: halshs-00692111

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00692111>

Submitted on 27 Apr 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Guillaume, Antoine. 2008. *A Grammar of Cavineña*. Berlin/New York : Mouton de Gruyter [Mouton Grammar Library 44]. xxxiv+900pp. (ISBN 978-3-11-018842-4)

Reviewed by Katharina Haude (SeDyL/CELIA, CNRS)

Cavineña is an endangered language of northern Bolivia with approximately 1,200 speakers. Together with the neighbouring languages Ese-Ejja, Araona, Reyesano, and Tacana, it forms the Tacanan family, which has sometimes been classed with Panoan. Antoine Guillaume (henceforth AG) has carried out research on Cavineña since 1996, and *A Grammar of Cavineña*, a revised version of his 2004 doctoral dissertation, is the first comprehensive description of the language. It is almost exclusively based on natural discourse data collected by the author during a total of about 15 months of fieldwork, complemented with material from the SIL linguists Elizabeth L. Camp and Millicent R. Liccardi, who studied the language from the early 1960s to the mid-1980s. The grammar is written in a functional-typological style.

The volume contains 20 chapters of grammatical description, two glossed texts (ca. 20 pages), a bidirectional Cavineña-English word list (ca. 40 pages), a list of affixes, and a subject index. It is organized according to the syntactic components of the language, zooming in from overviews of larger units to detailed discussions of their segments: a general grammatical overview (Chapter 4) is followed by two large sections on the predicate (Chapters 5-11) and on the noun phrase (Chapters 12-15), each introduced in turn by overview chapters. Additional chapters deal with phonology, postpositions, particles, and subordinate clauses.

Chapter 1 (“The language and its speakers”) provides geographical, sociolinguistic, cultural, and historical background information. The Cavineñas live in small communities along the right bank of the Beni river, between the towns of Reyes in the South and Riberalta in the North, a region that seems to coincide largely with their ancestral settling area. Hardly anything is known about the Cavineñas’ original culture and beliefs. In the late 18th century, they were contacted by Spanish Franciscans, who converted them to Catholicism and stayed until 1941; after this, American Catholics replaced them. In the 1950s, when the SIL started working in the region, part of the population converted to Protestantism. The impact of the rubber boom was relatively limited, with “only” some Cavineña families sold by the priests to a rubber company in 1940.

The chapter gives a nice characterization of the Cavineña sense of humour and their habit of nickname-giving. It also provides information on previous work on the language, fieldwork and data collection, the nature of the data corpus, the writing system, as well as on typological characteristics of Cavineña. It is clear right from the beginning that the grammar is based on very intensive fieldwork during which AG got to know the language and its speakers very well. The way in which sources and contexts of the examples are transparently provided throughout the book, fully confirm this impression.

Chapter 2 (“Phonology”) shows that with its small phoneme inventory (4 vowels, 20 consonants, neither /f/ nor /g/) and a simple syllable structure (no closed native syllables), the phonological properties of Cavineña are typical of the South-West Amazon area. The glottal stop is not a phoneme, but can occur to resolve a hiatus. Pitch accent marks word boundaries.

Chapter 3 lays out the distinction between grammatical and phonological words, based on Dixon & Aikhenvald (2002). A Cavineña phonological word must have more than one syllable. Grammatical words can be either free or cliticized. Clitics or clitic combinations can have their own stress domain and can thereby form phonological words of their own.

Chapter 4 (“Grammatical overview”) provides basic information on the language. Most topics are treated in depth in the subsequent chapters, but some (main-clause structure, coordination) are not, so this is not a chapter to be skipped. Cavineña has free constituent order. Grammatical functions are encoded by case marking, the core cases being ergative (suffix/enclitic *-/=ra*) for A and absolutive (generally unmarked) for S/O. Syntax is nominative-accusative.

Chapters 5 through 11 deal with predicate structure, Chapter 5 providing an overview (partly repeated from Chapter 4). It presents the predicate as consisting of 11 morpheme slots (A-K). Some slots interact with each other, e.g. the first and the last, of which either one or both have to be filled by an inflectional affix. Some can contain more than one morpheme, e.g. the slot that hosts the “Aktionsart” suffixes. A predicate can only be headed by a verb; copula clauses are considered a different clause type, with inflectional morphology carried by a copula verb (*ju-* ‘be’).

Two classes of verbs can be distinguished: inflecting and non-inflecting. Inflecting verbs are inherently either transitive or intransitive, as is reflected by their morphological and syntactic properties. Four verbs (‘give’, ‘tell’, ‘ask’, ‘take away’) are ditransitive and take two absolutive arguments. Inflecting verbs can be derived from other word classes, but underived inflecting verbs form a closed class.

Non-inflecting verbs require an auxiliary, either *a-* ‘affect’ (transitive) or *ju-* ‘be’ (intransitive, identical with the copula), to carry any inflectional morphology. This class is open and freely incorporates borrowings from Spanish, especially nouns (e.g. *viaje ju-* ‘travel’, from Spanish *viaje* ‘journey’). It also contains denominal verbs derived through conversion, the conversion being obvious from the shift in meaning: for instance, the intransitive verb ‘fish’+ ‘be’ does not mean ‘to be a fish’, but ‘to fish (with an arrow)’, with the agent as the S argument; the transitive verb ‘bait’ + ‘affect’ does not mean ‘to make the bait’ but ‘to put O as bait’. The non-inflecting verb class is extremely interesting and calls for further research from a typological perspective, e.g. in the context of light-verb constructions in languages like English or in comparison to other languages with a closed class of verbs (e.g. Jaminjung; Schultze-Berndt 2000).

Chapter 6 presents the inflectional affixes. They mark tense/aspect/modality and share two affix slots (A and K), in which they are mutually incompatible. In particular contexts (predictability, repetition), often accompanied by marked intonation, inflectional affixes can be absent (but see Chapters 10 and 12, respectively, for the omission of inflectional morphology deriving non-inflecting verbs and nouns).

Chapter 7 describes “Aktionsart suffixes”. The term *Aktionsart*, generally used to refer to the temporal/aspectual properties of a verb, is taken here by its literal meaning ‘kind of action’. The suffixes in this group cover a broad range of meanings, including aspects (completive, incompletive, durative), but also motion (distinguishing between stable and unstable targets), time of day, emotions, or participant number. While assigned to a single morphological slot, two or three Aktionsart suffixes can co-occur.

Chapter 8 deals with valency-changing mechanisms, which are carried out by verbal affixes, root reduplication, and auxiliary change. The valency-reducing mechanisms, which only apply to transitive (and occasionally ditransitive) verbs, are passive, reflexive/reciprocal, and antipassive. The two instances of the passive suffix, *-ta* and *-tana*, are tentatively analysed as free variants of one morpheme (a revised analysis can be found in Guillaume to appear) that marks agentless passives and anticausatives. The passive is convincingly argued to originate from a third-person plural morpheme.

The reflexive/reciprocal, marked by a circumfix, derives intransitive verbs whose single argument represents either agent and patient simultaneously or just the agent, with a focus on the activity itself.

The antipassive is derived from inflecting verbs through reduplication. The derived verb is intransitive verb with only an A argument, the O argument being understood but not

expressed. The verb denotes a “culturally identified activity” (p. 278) like ‘eat (intr.)’, ‘row’ (from ‘stir’), ‘have drinks’. Similar to the reflexive/reciprocal, the focus is on the activity itself.

The antipassive of non-inflecting verbs is formed by “exchanging the transitive auxiliary *a-* ‘affect’ for the intransitive auxiliary *ju* ‘be’” (p. 282f.), illustrated with the verbs ‘say yes to’ > ‘agree’; ‘tell (sth.) to’ > ‘talk (with sb.)’; ‘continue to’ > ‘continue’ (p. 283f.). It is not entirely clear to me why this is called “derivation”, since the substitution of one morpheme for another does not give clues about markedness or directionality, and the examples given do not seem to provide clear evidence of underlying semantic transitivity. An alternative analysis might be that some non-inflecting verbs can occur with either of the two auxiliaries, entailing the corresponding syntactic and semantic effects. Furthermore, this process can also involve non-inflecting verbs derived from inflecting ones through an affix (*-kara* ‘desiderative’), reduplication (which is also an “auxiliary-triggering process”, p. 295 and Chapter 10.6) and incorporation, which raises the question of whether these processes could not be seen as deriving intransitive non-inflecting verbs directly, instead of postulating an intermediate (and apparently sometimes unattested, p. 285) transitive stage.

The only valency-increasing mechanism is the causative, which adds a causer in A function. There are three different causative suffixes. One applies to intransitive verbs only, where it can indicate both direct and indirect causation. Another suffix applies to transitive verbs. Here, direct and indirect causation are distinguished by the marking of the two non-A arguments: in direct causation, both are unmarked (i.e. absolutive), and in indirect causation, the causee is marked as oblique. A third causative affix applies to both transitive and intransitive verbs and marks “sociative causative”, a common phenomenon in languages of South America (cf. Guillaume & Rose to appear). The absence of an applicative derivation, in contrast, is unusual for the area (T. Payne, p.c.).

Chapter 9 describes the seven postural (‘sit’, ‘stand’, ‘lie’, ‘hang’) and directional (‘up’, ‘down’, ‘away’) suffixes. Postural suffixes characterize the posture of the S/A participant; directionals characterize the direction of the S/O participant. The postural suffixes are typically attached to the intransitive auxiliary, while the directionals are attached to independent posture verbs like ‘sit’ or ‘stand’, indicating the direction in which the posture is taken (e.g. ‘stand up’, ‘sit down’).

Chapter 10 describes “auxiliary-triggering processes”, i.e. processes that derive non-inflecting verbs: any further affix must be attached to an auxiliary, i.e. either *ju-* ‘be’ or *a-* ‘affect’. These processes can apply to inflecting and non-inflecting verbs, and they can apply

more than once. They mostly consist in the addition of an affix or preposition to the verb, often with a modal or aspectual meaning, or in reduplication. As with all non-inflecting verbs, the auxiliary only occurs when further affixes are required. There is also a “zero-marked auxiliary-triggering process” (p. 342ff.), where inflectional affixes are not attached to the verb, but to an auxiliary, without any overt marking on the verb. This “process” often cooccurs with the incorporation of an element into the predicate phrase. When a transitive verb incorporates its object, it automatically takes the intransitive auxiliary *ju-*, in line with the well-known effect that incorporation leads to a valency-decrease (cf. Mithun 1984). The gloss of the auxiliary as ‘be(ANTIPASS)’ in these constructions is confusing (see also the discussion of Chapter 8): an antipassive verb incorporating the demoted patient argument, or an incorporating verb additionally marked as antipassive, seems like an unnecessarily complicated analysis. As AG himself points out, this matter requires further research.

Chapter 11 offers a detailed analysis of predicative adjectives. These can only occur as copula complements, i.e., they cannot be the heads of predicates or noun phrases and, unlike attributive adjectives, cannot directly modify nominals. There are two classes of predicative adjectives: a closed class of adjectives that require a suffix (by default the dummy *-da*) or reduplication, and an open class of adjectives that can occur without morphological augmentation.

Chapter 12 provides an overview of noun-phrase structure and describes the lexical category of nouns. Nouns fall into three subclasses: an open class of independent nouns that can occur without possessor or additional affixation; a small closed class of kinship terms, obligatorily marked as possessed, and a closed class of so-called *e*-nouns (characteristic of Tacanan languages, p. 409), which mostly denote parts of wholes and take a semantically empty prefix *e-* when occurring independently. The class of independent nouns accepts loans and derivations from other word classes, and it also contains some part-of-whole and some kinship terms. Nouns can be derived from verbs by several affixes that create agentive, locational, or instrumental nouns. A limited number of verbs can be used as nouns when stripped of their inflectional morphology or (in the case of non-inflecting verbs) the auxiliary (p. 441), the result normally being an action/state noun: ‘hunt’ > ‘(the) hunting’, ‘fight’ > ‘(the) fight’.

Chapter 13 focuses on noun modification. Nouns can be modified through noun juxtaposition, attributive adjectives, genitive modifiers, number-marking clitics, quantifiers, and relative clauses. Noun juxtaposition involves phonologically independent words and is therefore not considered compounding. The attributive adjectives form a small, closed class

that includes words like ‘young’, ‘old’, ‘big’ etc. The number markers include dual and plural markers. The genitive modifier is a genitive-marked pronoun or noun phrase that encodes a possessor. Quantifiers include terms like ‘all’, ‘few’ etc., but also numerals, which, from ‘three’ upwards, are loans from Aymara. Relative clauses are finite clauses overtly marked by an enclitic attached to the last phrase.

Chapter 14 is dedicated to postpositions. Postpositions are analysed as roots that are encliticized to nouns and mark the noun’s relation to the predicate. They thus function like case markers (as is also reflected by their labels: ergative, dative, genitive, locative, comitative/instrumental), and most are identical to the case markers that occur on pronouns (Chapter 15, see below). Some mark multiple semantic roles, like the “dative” marker =*ja*, which encodes the possessor in *mihi-est* type copula clauses, benefactive, experiencer, and (in restricted contexts) agent; this element, furthermore, functions as genitive marker, which AG analyses as a (synchronically) different morpheme, occurring in a different environment and marking attributive possession. Apart from these “major” postpositions that mark grammatical relations, there are some “minor” postpositions that occur less frequently and have more idiosyncratic meanings. Furthermore, there are postpositions which do not obligatorily require an argument; these encode mainly spatial relations.

Chapter 15 discusses pronouns and demonstratives, defined as words referring to entities and words referring to places, respectively. They are marked for case by morphemes identical to the postpositional enclitics (p. 573), but show a larger degree of fusion with the stem, which is why AG has chosen to keep them separate from the postpositions and to treat the pronouns as monomorphemic elements with different case forms.

While pronouns had already been the subject of a study by Camp and Liccardi (1977), it was AG’s finding that Cavineña pronouns can be divided into two classes: independent and bound. The two types of pronouns can cooccur. Independent pronouns usually come first in the clause. Bound pronouns are restricted to certain types of main clauses, where their position is fixed after the first main-clause constituent; they undergo intricate morphological processes, like the dropping of the ergative or absolutive marker from a pronoun that is last in a clitic sequence, but not last in the sentence. Several bound pronouns can cooccur, and their linear order is determined by the person they encode: third person precedes second person, which in turn precedes first person. Since at least one of the pronouns in a clitic string is case-marked, there are no ambiguities as to their semantic roles. However, there are some co-occurrence restrictions between ergative and absolutive pronouns, which depend on number and person.

Beyond the description of pronouns and demonstratives, this chapter (section 15.3) also describes the expression of arguments as NPs, independent pronouns or bound pronouns, and the possibilities of omission and cooccurrence, in connection to the encoding of grammatical functions.

Chapters 16 and 17 focus on particles. Particles cover a large variety of functions, from sentence linkers (e.g. ‘then’) to the specification of times of day (e.g. ‘early morning’, ‘at night’). Particles can either be independent or restricted to first or second position of certain clause types. Some (e.g. the ‘frustrative’) can belong to more than one of these categories. Second-position particles are cliticized to the last phonological word of the first constituent of the clause and, in case of co-occurrence with bound pronouns, precede these. When two or more second-position particles cooccur, they follow a strict linear order. Phrasal particles, the topic of Chapter 17, are encliticized to the last phonological word of a phrase and have scope over the phrase only. They mark categories like negation, focus, or intensification.

Chapters 18–20 deal with adverbial and relative clauses. Nonfinite adverbial clauses (Chapter 18) form clausal constituents; they are strictly verb-final, and instead of verbal inflection, the verb carries a dependency marker which distinguishes between same-subject temporal, same-subject purposive, and purpose-of-motion clauses (in the latter, A arguments are marked by the genitive/dative case, hinting at a possible nominalizing origin of the dependency marker). Arguments are only expressed when not co-referential with the superordinate clausal argument. Finite adverbial clauses (Chapter 19) are headed by a predicate with an inflected verb and overtly marked for the clause type, which includes different-subject temporal, conditional, and concessive clauses. Relative clauses (Chapter 20) are similar to finite adverbial clauses in that they contain an inflected verb and are overtly marked for dependency by a clause-final enclitic. This marker is omitted, however, when the shared argument of main and relative clause is marked by a postposition in the same slot. There are no grammatical restrictions on relativizability, but the tendency is for non-A arguments to be relativized.

In sum, with its highly detailed description of a previously poorly documented language, this book is a substantial contribution especially to the field of Amazonian linguistics and to linguistic typology. It is clearly written, with thorough discussion of the analyses offered, and accessible to linguists from all backgrounds. The terminology is consistent, and linguistic levels are carefully separated.

I particularly admire the way the examples are presented, which makes alive the situations they describe and the speakers who provided them. The practice of attributing grammaticality judgments to individual speakers might serve as a recommendation for any language description. The examples are presented with lots of context, which not only facilitates understanding but also allows the reader to find answers to potential additional questions, e.g., on information structure, supported by the texts and the word list at the back of the volume. All analyses are based on thorough evidence; even examples that belong to earlier sections are referred to, also in the schematic overviews, so that each phenomenon is extensively illustrated and the examples can be put to maximal use. Alternative analyses are proposed and discussed, and the conclusions drawn are generally convincing. With its treatment of the data and the care with which the analyses are presented, including hypotheses on possible etymologies of morphemes, the book will be a valuable and long-lasting reference work on a language from a linguistically highly diverse and interesting region.

AG frequently points out the need for further research on particular aspects of the grammar, and of course, the first full grammatical description of a language can hardly be expected to be complete. More implicitly, however, and perhaps beyond the aims of a descriptive grammar, the book invites further discussion of some phenomena, some of which I would like to point out here.

It is quite obvious that the traditional distinction between affixes and clitics is challenged by a language like Cavineña. AG does not offer a definition or discussion of what he analyzes as a clitic, but this category is extremely important in this language, since many morphemes cannot be adequately described as either affixes or words; as is common practice (cf. e.g. Gerlach and Grijzenhout 2000: 8; Nevis 2000: 388), AG analyses as clitics all morphemes that have a fixed position in a clause and/or that are phonologically dependent on an adjacent word, i.e. that have an intermediate position between independent words and affixes; he marks them consistently with the cliticization symbol = (an additional space precedes second-position clitics to indicate their syntactic nature). A disadvantage of the categorical separation between affixes and clitics is that it hides the fact that in Cavineña, many morphemes can occur both as enclitics and as suffixes. So for example, the postpositions that mark grammatical relations are described in Chapter 14, while the case suffixes on pronouns are described in Chapter 15, almost suggesting that their identity in form is accidental. Also, enclitics are listed in the index of full words, while affixes are provided in a separate index; to find out where e.g. the ergative marker (=ra/-ra) is discussed, one has to look it up in both lists and is referred to different chapters. It might have rendered

the description more elegant if these markers had been introduced together in a chapter on grammatical relations, representing them as (phrasal) affixes everywhere (cf. Anderson 1992), alongside with an account of their differing properties in the different environments and perhaps a discussion of a possible grammaticalization path.

A related issue is the frequently-mentioned “homophony” of other morphemes that show striking formal and semantic similarities. Perhaps the most noteworthy case is the element *ju* ‘be’, which is found as a copula, as an independent verb root, and as an intransitive auxiliary; the same form, furthermore, occurs as locative marker (=/*ju*). While the differences in distribution and function of the “homophonous” verb roots are extensively argued for (5.4 “Analytical issues”), the similarity is not discussed, although the phonological identity of elements with these meanings is probably significant (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002). The glossing shows that AG is aware of this issue, but, as in the case of the suffixes/clitics, it would have been nice if he had pointed it out explicitly.

However, these matters can be dealt with in future studies, for which this grammar lays a solid basis. The wealth of fascinating data it provides will advance the study of typologically highly interesting phenomena.

References

- Anderson, Stephen A. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Camp, Elizabeth L. & Millicent R. Liccardi. 1977. “Cavineña pronouns in relation to theme and topic.” In *Work papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics*, Ursula Wiesemann (ed.), 21-51. Riberalta: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Dixon, R.M.W. & Alexandra A. Aikhenvald. 2002. “Word: a typological framework.” In *Word: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, R.M.W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), 1-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerlach, Birgit & Janet Grijzenhout. 2000. “Clitics from different perspectives.” In *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*, Birgit Gerlach and Janet Grijzenhout (eds.), 1-29. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Guillaume, Antoine. To appear. “The passives in Cavineña.” In *Ergativity and voice*, Gilles Authier and Katharina Haude (eds.). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Guillaume, Antoine and Françoise Rose. To appear. "Sociative causative markers in South-American languages: a possible areal feature." In *Mélanges de Linguistique Générale et de Typologie Linguistique*, Florian Floricic (ed.). Lyon: Presses de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. "The evolution of noun incorporation." *Language* 60 (4): 847-894.
- Nevis, Joel A. 2000. "Clitics." In *Morphologie / Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung / An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation. 1. Halbband / Volume 1* [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationsforschung/HSK 17.1]. Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan (eds.), 388-404. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva. 2000. *Simple and Complex Verbs in Jaminjung. A study of Event Categorisation in an Australian Language*. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute Series in Psycholinguistics, Vol. 14.

Reviewer's address:

Katharina Haude
CNRS
SeDyL/CELIA
8 rue Guy Môquet
94801 Villejuif CEDEX
FRANCE