

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304153998>

# Terena, Chané, Guaná and Kinikinau are one and the same language: Setting the Record Straight on Southern Arawak Linguistic Diversity

Article in *LIAMES Línguas Indígenas Americanas* · March 2016

DOI: 10.20396/liames.v16i1.8646165

CITATIONS

13

READS

288

1 author:



Fernando O. de Carvalho

Museu Nacional - Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (MN/UFRJ)

58 PUBLICATIONS 162 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Historical Linguistics of the Arawak language family [View project](#)



Historical Linguistics of the Tupi-Guarani language family [View project](#)

Fernando O. de Carvalho  
(Museu Nacional/Universidade  
Federal do Rio de Janeiro (MN/UFRJ))

## Terena, Chané, Guaná and Kinikinau are one and the same language: Setting the record straight on southern arawak linguistic diversity<sup>1</sup>

*'(...) las tres tribus de los Guaná, (...) de los Teréno y de los Quiniquináo. Hablan estos tres un mismo idioma, con pequeñas diferencias dialectales'*

Guido Boggiani. 1897. Etnografía del Alto Paraguay

**ABSTRACT:** In this paper I evaluate the available linguistic materials on *Chané*, *Guaná* and *Kinikinau*, often presented in comparative and referential works as distinct Southern Arawak languages. I argue that the existing evidence is not compatible with the recognition of these labels as denoting languages that are distinct from the much better attested and still spoken *Terena* language. Motivated by this conclusion - and by the fact that *Guaná* and *Kinikinau* confusingly refer to languages belonging to groups other than the Arawak family - I propose that the labels *Chané*, *Guaná* and *Kinikinau* should be dropped from linguistic classifications of the Arawak family and from reference works on the Chaco-Pantanal languages, as they misleadingly imply the existence of greater linguistic diversity than is actually the case. This proposal supports some referential classifications that have employed these labels either as alternative names of the language known as *Terena* or, at best, as denoting specific dialectal varieties thereof. Finally, I discuss some open issues regarding the internal diversity within these temporally and geographically separate varieties, including the role of contact with Guaraní and Guaicurúan groups.

**KEYWORDS:** Terena; Guaná; Chané; Arawak; Classification.

**RESUMO:** Este estudo parte da avaliação dos materiais existentes sobre as línguas *Chané*, *Guaná* e *Kinikinau*, usualmente apresentadas, juntamente com o *Terena*, como línguas distintas do ramo meridional da família Arawak, e propõe uma avaliação do grau de distanciamento entre essas variedades. Argumento que a evidência existente - em muitos casos restrita a poucos itens vocabulares - não permite considerar esses rótulos como denotando línguas distintas da língua *Terena*. Motivado por essa conclusão, e pelo fato adicional de que rótulos como *Guaná* e *Kinikinau* são ambíguos, uma vez que se referem também a outras línguas não-Arawak, proponho que os rótulos *Chané*, *Guaná* e *Kinikinau* sejam eliminados de classificações linguísticas da família Arawak e de trabalhos de referência sobre as línguas do Chaco-Pantanal, por sugerirem a existência de maior diversidade linguística regional do que de fato existe. Tal proposta encontra-se de acordo com algumas classificações

---

<sup>1</sup> This work is part of a broader project on the historical linguistics of the Arawak language family funded by a FAPERJ (*Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro*) post-doctoral research grant (E-26/101.323/2014).

referenciais, as quais incluem *Chané*, *Guaná* e *Kinikinau*, seja como denominações alternativas da língua *Terena*, seja como dialetos pouco diferenciados da mesma. Por fim, apresento uma breve discussão de questões ainda pouco exploradas quanto ao processo e os resultados da diferenciação entre essas variedades, como aquela relacionada ao papel que o contato com variedades do Guaraní, com línguas da família Guaicurú e com outras línguas da região do Chaco-Pantanal teve na produção das diferenças atestadas.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Terena; Guaná; Chané; Arawak; Classificação.

## 1. Introduction

The problem of identifying languages in South America is often complicated by the profusion of labels and their different uses. Campbell (2012: 60-61) offers a recent discussion of this problem, noting that there are “instances where a single language has a variety of names and (...) a single name sometimes refers to multiple languages” (pg. 60). One way out of this problem, as Campbell himself suggests, consists in paying special attention to the geographic location of the speakers of the relevant languages and the languages’ family affiliation (Campbell 2012: 62).

Though Campbell (2012) does not include *Chané*, *Guaná* or *Kinikinau* in his list of difficult labels, these should also be counted as problematical, as I argue below. In the present paper I take a detailed look at the linguistic evidence bearing on the reality and usefulness of these labels. I will argue that the labels *Chané*, *Guaná* and *Kinikinau* should be excised from referential classifications of the Arawak family, at least in their frequent use as names of independent languages. I show that language material available under these labels can be profitably seen as samples of a language that is identical to the much better attested, and still spoken, *Terena*, and that keeping these labels as standing for ‘language names’, as is the case in many referential classifications, misleadingly implies greater diversity than actually exists among Southern Arawak languages. Another reason for rejecting these labels is their ambiguous character: *Guaná* and *Kinikinau* also refer to neighboring groups that speak (or spoke) languages belonging to other linguistic families (Mascoy and Guaicurú, respectively). Though the terms *Chané*, *Guaná* and *Kinikinau* (in addition to the related yet less frequently cited *Layaná* and *Echoloadi*) may have significance to broader ethnohistorical investigations, following Campbell (2012: 114-115) these should be included in the vast lists of language labels that “refer to languages known today by other names; probably some have to do with names of towns or clans or subdivisions of groups known by other names”. I will in this way support the classification presented in Campbell (1997; 2012) and Fabre (2005), and implicit in the epigraph by Guido Boggiani that introduces the present paper, according to which *Guaná*, *Chané* and *Kinikinau* stand, at best, for alternative names of one and the same language, one that I opt here to call simply *Terena*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The name *Terena* seems to be analyzable in terms of the root *tere* ‘tail, buttocks’ and the collective or plural marker *-noe*, though this etymology seems to be opaque to modern *Terena* speakers. I am unable at the moment to offer any motivation for the origin of this label, though early observations by Aguirre (1793: 471, 474), where, in addition, a variant *Etelenoe* is reported, seem to agree with this proposal. I ignore here minor variations in transcription such as *Quiniquináu/Quiniquiná/Kinikinau*, *Terena/Tereno*, *Chané/Chaná* or *Guaná/Guanás* unless these prove vital to more substantive linguistic issues. When discussing particular sources I will keep the writing conventions adopted in the original.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the state of terminological confusion in the use of the labels such as *Guaná* and *Chané*, both in the properly linguistic literature and in the tradition of ethnohistorical studies of the Chaco-Pantanal-Paraguay region. As a way to set the context for the discussion, sub-section 2.1 gives a brief review of the known facts about the history of the southern Arawak groups under discussion. Section 3 compares the existing language materials identified under the labels *Guaná*, *Kinikinau* and *Chané* (sub-section 3.1) to the richer material on Terena. I conclude that no sensible differences, apart from those stemming from idiosyncratic transcription practices or poor linguistic analysis, exist that would justify the recognition of distinct languages.

## 2. A profusion of labels

The label *Guaná* is often presented as the name of a language that is distinct, yet closely related, to Terena (see e.g. Loukotka 1968: 143-144; Payne 1991: 364, after Noble 1965). Payne (1991: 364), in his ground-breaking comparative study of the Arawak languages, lists *Guaná* as the name of a living member of this family spoken in Paraguay. Aikhenvald (1999: 67) has distinct entries for ‘*Guaná/Layana*’,<sup>3</sup> ‘*Terena*’ and ‘*Kinikinau*’ as separate languages of her ‘*South Arawak*’ branch. The use of ‘*Guaná*’ and ‘*Layana*’ as alternative names of the same language suggests a reliance on Loukotka (1968: 143-144), where these are listed along with ‘*Terena*’, ‘*Chané* or *Izoceño*’, ‘*Echoloadi*’ and ‘*Quinquinao*’ as members of the ‘*Chané* group’ of the Arawak language family. Finally, the latest edition of *Ethnologue* also presents a similar classification, with *Terêna* ([ter]) and *Guaná* ([gqn]) given as two separate members of a ‘*Terena*’ group (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2015).

A subtly dissenting classification appears in Campbell (1997: 181) and (2012: 75). Here, a single language called Terena is recognized, though the existence of alternative names for this language is noted (in particular, *Chané*, *Guaná*, *Kinikinao*, *Tereno* and *Etelena*) and a number of dialects are indicated: *Kinikinau*, *Etelena* (*Terena*) and *Guaná*. Danielsen (2011: 517) contains no reference whatsoever to a language called *Guaná*, recognizing a ‘*Terena* subgroup’ containing *Terena* and *Kinikinau* (both spoken in Brazil) and *Chané* (spoken in Argentina and Bolivia). Danielsen (2011) is one of the few modern sources which makes reference to a language called *Chané*, explicitly distinguished from *Terena* (e.g. Danielsen 2014: 198). Two other sources also listing *Chané* as the name of language separate from *Terena/Guaná* are Heckenberger (2011: 60) and Danielsen, Dunn & Muysken (2011: 178).

As briefly discussed in the next section, *Chané*, *Guaná*, *Terena* and *Kinikinau* have an established use in the work of archaeologists, historians and anthropologists, starting with the earliest available sources on the peoples of the region all the way to modern scholarly references (cf. e.g. Aguirre 1793: 471; Brinton 1891: 244; Boggiani 1897: 619; Métraux 1946: 211; Oberg 1948; Santos-Granero 2011; Eriksen 2011: 82-85). This fact, coupled with the terminological inconsistencies noted above, may lead to a compounding of uncertainties in any cross-disciplinary attempt to combine linguistic, ethnohistorical and archaeological evidence for assessing past events (see Eriksen 2011: 63, fn. 79, pg. 71, fn.91). Since our

<sup>3</sup> Aikhenvald (1999) actually writes ‘*Guané*’. I take it to be a typo.

knowledge of the historically attested ethnic and cultural variation in the Pantanal-Chaco-Paraguay region is much more complete than our current understanding of the properly linguistic diversity, it seems that linguists have at time assumed the existence of languages or speech varieties simply by assuming that a separate language should correspond to each of the labels found in the ethnohistorical literature. This silent transposition of ethnic labels to denote linguistic units likely explains, for instance, the continuous reference to a *Chané language* in the linguistic literature. Before proceeding with the consideration of the linguistic evidence on the nature of the relations between these groups, it might be profitable to take a brief look at the ethnic and historical background of the question.

## 2.1. Background knowledge on the Chaco-Pantanal Arawak

Though disagreement remains as to the *Urheimat* of the Arawak peoples (see the collection of papers in Hill & Santos-Granero 2002 and Hornborg & Hill 2011) acceptance of any of the existing proposals implies that speakers of Arawak languages arrived in the Chaco-Pantanal region coming ultimately from the north (see also Métraux 1946: 238; Oberg 1949: 1). In the middle of the XVIII century (around 1767), a people known by the name of Guaná were located along the Paraguay river, in a region that corresponds today to part of the Brazilian-Paraguay border, in a region going approximately from the Paraguayan cities of Bahia Negra in the north to Itapucumí in the south (Aguirre 1793: 471-472; Oberg 1948: 283; 1949: 2).<sup>4</sup> By the end of the XVIII century, however, the Guaná had moved northwards and settled near Corumbá, now in the Brazilian-Bolivian border (Oberg 1949: 3-4).

Plenty of evidence from historical sources attests to the existence, in a region going from the present day Chaco border between southeastern Bolivia and northern Argentina all the way to the Andean *pedemonte*, along the Pilcomayo and Parapetí rivers, of Arawak-speaking groups that recognized themselves by the name of *Chané*, meaning ‘man’ or ‘people’ in their own language (cf. Santos-Granero 2011: 341 and Métraux 1946: 238, where the alternative name *Chaná* is found as well). Another well-known historical fact concerns the eventual assimilation, often by violent means, of this Arawak-speaking population by the Tupí-Guaraní-speaking *Chiriguano* (or *Chiriguana*), who entered the Chacoan territory of southern Bolivia and northern Argentina in the XVI century (see Nordenskiöld 1920: XII-XIII and Santos-Granero 2011: 340-341, the latter noting that this assimilation process lasted for at least three centuries). As it concerns their cultural relations to other Southern Arawak groups in the region, Métraux (1946: 211, 238) notes that, in its historically attested use, the label *Chané* refers simply to the Bolivian and Argentinian representatives of the same people that in Paraguay became known by the name of *Guaná*.

Even if our attention is restricted to the ethnonyms appearing in these early accounts of the regional ethnic landscape, one faces a state of sheer terminological confusion. Thus, *Terena*, *Kinikinau*, *Echoloadi*, *Layaná* and *Niguecactemic* are at times described as ‘subdivisions of the Guaná’ (Aguirre 1793: 474; Métraux 1946: 239; Oberg 1949: 2; Boggiani 1895: 79, though the latter makes no mention of a *Niguecactemic* division). Other sources present *Layaná* as synonym to *Guaná*, and describe the latter as one among many Arawak-speaking groups

<sup>4</sup> I have included these cities, as well as the mention to the borders of modern nation states, as reference points based on the estimated latitudes provided by Oberg (1949).

including the *Tereno* and the *Quiniquináo* (Boggiani 1897: 619), without any implication that the latter two were in some sense ‘sub-divisions’ of the former. Boggiani (1895: 80) claims that *Layanás*, *Chanás* and *Guaná* are ‘the same thing’ (*sono la stessa cosa*), *Layanás* being simply the name given by the Mbayá (Guaicurúan) to the Guanás. In yet another use, Taunay (1868: 111) uses *Chané* as denoting the totality of the Arawak-speaking groups living near Miranda, with *Terena* and *Guaná* standing at an equal level as separate Chané subgroups, at variance thus with Métraux’s (1946: 238-239) observation on the status of *Chané* and *Guaná* as denoting respectively the western and eastern ‘subtribes’ of the same group.

Given this brief and admittedly superficial discussion of the ethnohistorical background of these Southern Arawak peoples, I proceed to the core of the present contribution, to the analysis of the proper linguistic evidence on these groups.

### 3. Guaná, Kinikinau and Chané: The linguistic evidence

This section addresses the existing linguistic evidence on the relation between the languages and speech varieties that have been sampled under the labels *Guaná*, *Kinikinau*, *Chané* and the language of the *Terena*, still spoken by a sizeable population in southern Brazil. I will not comment on the supposed existence of an ‘Echoloadi’ language as nothing exists on this speech variety, a fact recognized even by those who list it as a separate southern Arawak language (see Loukotka 1968: 143).

#### 3.1. Guaná/Guanás

The goal of this section is to show that all the existing language samples that present (a) an Arawak language (b) whose name is given as *Guaná*/*Guanás* constitute early documents of a language that is virtually identical to modern Terena. The qualification in (a) is important and deserves some comment: the label *Guaná* also denotes an ethnic group of the Paraguayan Chaco, as well as its language, which belongs to the Mascoy (Enlhet-Enenlhet) language family. This confusion in the use of the same label to denote two geographically close yet utterly distinct languages has been noted for a long time (cf. e.g. Boggiani 1895: 78; Métraux 1946: 226; Fabre 2005: 516, fn.22).

Of the early sources that document an Arawak language under the name *Guaná*/*Guanás*, the following have been analyzed here: Aguirre (1793), the Guaná vocabulary gathered by Castelnau (1851) and published in Martius (1867), and the richer materials of Taunay (1868, 1875). Starting with lexical data, the extant vocabularies of the Guaná language have clear and close parallels to modern Terena:<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> In the presentation of Terena data here I have kept the diacritics used by Ekdahl & Butler (1979) as an indication of differing prosodic phenomena - vowel lengthening, consonant lengthening, intensity peaks and pitch curves - that seem to be related to stress placement, but whose independence with respect to the distribution of accentual marks is still an open issue. Similar diacritics are employed by Bendor-Samuel (1961) and Eastlack (1968). A circumflex ‘^’ indicates a lengthened vowel and descending pitch, while an acute mark ‘´’ indicates that the syllable in question is relatively more prominent, though lengthening occurs in the following segment (usually a consonant) instead. There are minimal contrasts such as *íti* [‘itti] ‘blood’ versus *íiti* [‘iiti] ‘you’, where doubling in phonetic transcription indicates lengthening.

**Table 1.** Guaná vocabulary items compared to modern Terena

	Guaná - Taunay (1868, 1875)	Guaná - Castelnau (1851)	Guaná - Aguirre (1793)	Modern Terena
‘arm’	< Daké >	< dahaki >	-	<i>táki</i>
‘mouth’	< Bahó >	< baaho > ‘labium’	-	<i>páho</i>
‘head’	< Duuti >	<dooti> ‘capilli’	-	<i>túti</i>
‘wife’	< Iêno >	-	-	<i>jêno</i>
‘woman’	<Senó>	<zeeno>	<Saéna>	<i>séno</i>
‘girl’	-	-	<Aronoe>	<i>árunoe</i>
‘man’	< Oiêno >	-	< Hayyena >	<i>hójeno</i>
‘husband’	< Immá >	-	< Ymá >	<i>íma</i>
‘father’	<Tatá>	-	<Haá>	<i>há?a</i>
‘child’	<Calliuônó>	-	-	<i>kaliwôno</i>
‘boat, canoe’	-	<wataiki>	-	<i>wateke</i>
‘house’	<Pêti>	-	<Peti>	<i>pêti, pêno</i>
‘good, beautiful’	< Unati >	< ounati >, < honnati >	-	<i>únati</i>
‘hot’	<Cótoti>	<kotouti>	-	<i>kótuti</i>
‘cold’	< Câssati >	-	-	<i>kásati</i>
‘you (sg.)’	< Ití >	-	< Yti >	<i>íti</i>
‘you (pl.)’	-	-	<Ytinoe>	<i>itínoe</i>
‘that’	-	-	<Raa>	<i>ra</i>
‘to eat’	<Ningá>	<nigoati>	<Nicati>	<i>nikóti</i>
‘field’	< Mehúm >	<maihiho>	-	<i>mêum</i>
‘tree’	-	< ticoti >	-	<i>tikóti</i>
‘earth, floor’	< Poké >	-	< Paquee >	<i>poké?e</i>
‘water’	< Unné >	< houna >	< Onne >	<i>úne</i>
‘fire’	< Iucú >	-	< Yocó >	<i>juku</i>
‘sky’	<Uanukê>	<wanokey>	<Vanoquée>	<i>wanúke</i>
‘day’	<Cátche>	<katchai>	-	<i>káfe</i>

Some of the correspondences, not necessarily identities, in the data above can be understood as predictable differences in independently produced phonetic transcriptions (e.g. *ai* corresponding to *e*) or to stem from conventional regularities in the scripts employed (e.g. Castelnau’s <ou> matching <u> or *u* elsewhere, in agreement with French spelling conventions). Still other mismatches can be assigned to detectable shortcomings in the phonetic transcriptions. Thus, the form for ‘man’ in the Taunay data lacks a word-initial

glottal aspirate when compared with the Terena form. Additional Guaná data shows that although word-medial glottal aspirates were indicated in Taunay's transcription (cf. 'mouth'), he seems to have systematically missed the presence of word-initial aspirates. Compare: Guaná <Annáiti> 'big' (Taunay 1875: 150), Terena: *hánaiti* (Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 153); Guaná <Andiá> 'watermelon' (Taunay 1875: 152), Terena: *handea* (Silva 2013: 157, ultimately from Spanish *sandía*).

In addition to the forms for 'house' noted in Table 1 above, which match Terena *péti* and *péno*, both Guaná and Terena agree in showing another form, derived from the verb *owo* 'to live, dwell' (see Aikhenvald 1999: 81, fn. 9 on the general nature of this phenomenon within Arawak). The word <Vuóvogú> 'our house' is given in Taunay (1875: 159) and is easily analyzable into the 1pl possessive prefix *w-* (discussed below) and the noun *-owoku* (see Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 71 for the Terena form).

In the entry for 'father', the Guaná form in Aguirre (1793) is a close match to the root *há?a* 'father' attested in modern Terena (cf. Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 26). The form presented by Taunay, <Tatá>, is probably a vocative, matching *tâta* /*tatá?a* attested in Terena (Ekdahl & Butler 1969).

Since there is independent evidence that the difference between voiceless and voiced obstruents (the latter appearing only in surface, phonetic forms in Terena) were distinguished in Taunay's transcription (more on this below), the correspondences where a voiced stop in Guaná is matched by a voiceless stop in Terena are specially interesting. In the inalienable nouns for 'head', 'arm' and 'mouth', as well as in the verb 'to eat', the presence of voiced stops in Guaná can be likely explained by assuming that these represent 1sg possessive forms (or 1sg subject, in the case of 'to eat'). I will come back to this issue below when discussing the grammatical similarities between Guaná and Terena.

What is perhaps the greatest interest in the Aguirre (1793) data on Guaná is that it seems to show an earlier stratum of Terena, before the application of a sound change, of still unclear conditioning, that changed *some* instances of \**a* to *o* (see Payne 1991: 472-476 for discussion and data). Comparanda such as <Saéna> : *séno* 'woman'; <Hayyena> : *hójeno* 'man' and <Paquee> : *poké?e* 'earth', suggest that the earliest data on Guaná were recorded before the operation of this shift.

Going beyond vocabulary data, a scrutiny of grammatical patterns attested in Taunay (1868, 1875) further illustrates the striking similarities between Guaná and Terena. In order to express natural gender (1a), Terena speakers employ the nouns *séno* 'woman' and *hójeno* 'man' as modifiers (cf. e.g. Rosa 2010: 81). The same pattern is attested in Guaná (1b):

(1) *Expression of natural gender in Guaná and Terena:*

(a) < Camú >		'horse'	(Taunay 1875: 146, 148)
< Senó-camú >		'mare'	
(b) <i>séno</i>	<i>kaliwôno</i>	'girl'	
woman	child		
<i>hójeno</i>	<i>sîni</i>	'male jaguar'	
man	jaguar		



In both Terena (e.g. Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 46-47, 74-75) and Guaná (Taunay 1875: 161), a negative particle - *ako* in the former, <acó> in the latter - precedes the main verb in the formation of negative sentences:

(2) *Negative particles in Guaná and Terena:*

< Acó indja >	‘I don’t know anything’	
<i>ako piha</i>	‘He/She didn’t go’	(Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 75)
<i>ako okójuho</i>	‘He/She didn’t speak’	(Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 46)

Another negative marker described for Terena, *awo* (Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 75) is attested as well in Guaná, as in <Auó ningá> ‘I never ate’ (Taunay 1875: 162).

In nominal phrases modifiers precede heads, again with identical morphemes involved:

(3) *Modifiers preceding head nouns in Guaná and Terena:*

< Poinu cáche >	‘another day’	(Taunay 1875: 162)
<i>poʔi káfe</i>	‘another day’	(Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 16)

Some of the most interesting grammatical patterns recorded by Taunay concern the expression of person-number (possession) in Guaná nouns. In the partial nominal paradigms presented by Taunay (cf. e.g. 1875: 159) consonantal and vocalic alternations are apparent once 1 and 2 person singular forms are compared:

(4) *Realization of 1sg and 2sg possessors in Guaná*

- |                |           |            |                   |
|----------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|
| (a) <Ungê>     | ‘my eyes’ | < Iuukê >  | ‘your (sg.) eyes’ |
| (b) < Daké >   | ‘my arm’  | < Tiakí >  | ‘your (sg.) arm’  |
| (c) < Guiirí > | ‘my nose’ | < Quiirí > | ‘your nose’       |

Of crucial relevance here are the alternations between <ng> ~ <k> (a), <D> ~ <T> (b) and <G> ~ <K> (c).<sup>6</sup> The pattern in question is identical to the one attested in Terena. Bendor-Samuel (1961a: 58-62; see also Eastlack 1968: 3-4) describes the exponence of 1 person as the realization of a ‘nasal prosody’ (*n-prosody*), while 2 person nouns and verbs show a ‘palatal prosody’ (*y-prosody*). Nominal forms readily comparable to the Guaná data are given below (data from Bendor-Samuel 1961a: 60; Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 21, 25-26):

<sup>6</sup> Aguirre (1793: 501) had noticed that ‘La lengua Guana carece de los pronombres *meus, tuus*; lo suple con elegancia y bella asonancia, con solo mudar letras iniciales y algunas de las vocales’.

(5) *Realization of 1sg and 2sg possessors in Terena*

- (a) *jêno* 'his wife'  
*jêñô* 'my wife'  
*jino* 'your wife'
- (b) *ówoku* 'his/her house'  
*ôwôŋgu* 'my house'  
*jówoku* 'your house'
- (c) *tâki* 'his/her arm'  
*ndâki* 'my arm'  
*têaki* 'your arm'

Broadly speaking, and applying terms not necessarily compatible or derived from Bendor-Samuel's somewhat Firthian analysis, the expression of 1sg possession involves the 'anchoring' of a [nasal] feature at the left edge of a root, with progressive spreading of this feature (see 5a), a process which is eventually blocked if the root in question has an obstruent consonant (as in 5b; if this consonant is word-initial, no spreading occurs, as in 5c). In these contexts, however, an obstruent consonant is spontaneously voiced due to the docking of the [nasal] feature (which also induces the appearance of a surface, pre-nasalized phase), hence leading to phonetic alternations such as those in (5b, c), exactly parallel to those reported for Guaná by Taunay. As for 2sg possession, it is marked by the prefix *j-* in roots whose first segment is a vowel other than *i* (5b), or by fronting or raising the first eligible vowel starting at the left edge of the root (Bendor-Samuel's *y-prosody*). The *j-* allomorph is attested for Guaná in the form for 'your eye', <Iukê>, while the form for 'arm', <Tiakí>, shows the formation of a diphthong. Ekdahl & Butler (1979: 21) note that the Terena root for 'arm' is exceptional in this regard, as it shows diphthong formation rather than a simply fronting of the base vowel *a*. The exceptional or aberrant status of this root in the realization of a 2sg possessor constitutes a striking agreement between Guaná and Terena.

Finally, the Guaná Possessive pronouns given in Taunay (1875: 158) are also clearly matched by forms in modern Terena (see Eastlack 1968: 4; Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 64-65, 67):

Table 2. Guaná and Terena possessive pronouns

	Guaná		Terena	
	Possessive	Personal	Possessive	Personal
1sg Poss	< Induguê >	< Ondí >	<i>induke</i>	<i>úndi</i>
2sg Poss	< Itiguê >	< Ití >	<i>ítike</i>	<i>íti</i>
3sg Poss	< Iuti >	< Nôê >	<i>ituke</i>	<i>Ø</i>
1pl Poss	< Utiguê >	< Utí >	<i>wituke</i>	<i>úti</i>

Taunay's <Nôê> is actually the plural suffix *-noe*, used optionally in the case of 3 person plural possessors or arguments (3 person singular is 'Ø'; Eastlack 1968: 3). The 3sg possessive form <Iuti> is hard to interpret. It could be instead a 3sg personal pronoun produced analogically on the basis of a model such as <Ití> : <Itiguê>, though (unattested) \*<Itu> would be expected in this case. On the basis of such scant evidence it is impossible to evaluate such a claim or to distinguish it adequately from the effects of an incorrect analysis by Taunay.

In spite of these few shortcomings the similarity or near-identity in the data is striking. Note in particular that the derivation of the possessive pronouns with *-ke* in both Terena and Guaná speaks in a favor of a rather close relation between the two speech varieties, as they differ in this respect from other closely related languages. Baure possessive pronouns are derived by the suffixation of the formative *-r(o)* to personal pronouns (Danielsen 2011: 503), while in Mojeño (Moxeño) person-number prefixes are attached to a base *-jeɽe* to form possessive pronouns (see Ott & Ott 1983: 28 for the Ignaciano variety).

Overall then, the analysis presented in this section supports the claim that there is little linguistic evidence to assume that Guaná and Terena are in any interesting sense different languages. Coupled with the documented use of the label *Guaná* to denote a non-Arawak language of the Mascoy family, these observations suggest that eschewing the use of this label may be the most sensible option for future work on the Arawak languages of the Bolivia-Paraná subgroup.

### 3.2. Kinikinau

As was the case with *Guaná*, the label *Kinikinau* (also *Quiniquináu*, *Quiniquinao*) is ambiguous, though matters are in this case much simpler, since the confusion has its origins in a single early source, Fonseca (1880), which presents a vocabulary for an already extinct northern Guaicuruan language called *Quiniquinau* (see Viegas Barros 2013: 15 and Boggiani (1897: 619-620) on some of the problems created by this ambiguity, for instance, for Brinton (1891: 244)).

Once we focus on the 'Kinikinau language' that is undoubtedly Arawak, it seems that much of its distinctiveness *vis-à-vis* Terena is either an artifact of incorrect linguistic analyses, or can be characterized as overstatements.<sup>7</sup> In the first category one has the data in the comparative study of Matteson (1972), where, for instance, an opposition between voiced and voiceless stops is reconstructed for 'Proto-Shani', the common ancestor of Baure, Terena and Kinikinau (the label 'Bolivia-Paraná' is in vogue nowadays for the subgroup including Terena and the Bolivian Arawak languages).

---

<sup>7</sup> Danielsen, Dunn & Muysken (2011) consider Kinikinau as a language closely related to Terena. Whether these are really separate languages or co-dialects has no bearing on the interpretation of their results, as dialects or closely-related languages appear tightly clustered anyway as a result of producing network-based representations on distance data. Still, access to the data base employed by the authors would make it possible to evaluate whether any spurious estimate of distance between these two speech varieties, of the kind seen in the Matteson (1972) data, has leaked into their analysis. As Kinikinau is one of the languages for which their (secondary) data is only 'tentatively reliable', according to their own judgment (Danielsen, Dunn & Muysken 2011: 183), this is a possibility that cannot be ignored. The data on which their analysis is based is not presented, however, either in the published article itself or elsewhere in electronic form.

The basis for Matteson's (1972) reconstruction of a set of voiced stops *\*b*, *\*d*, *\*g* lies in correspondence sets in which Kinikinau has a voiced stop matching voiceless stops in Terena, and this correspondence set is in apparent contrast with a series in which both varieties agree in showing voiceless stops only (Matteson 1972: 186). This implies, in turn, that Kinikinau is, in this respect, more conservative than Terena and differs from the latter in that it preserves an important phonemic contrast. However, the correspondence showing voiced stop reflexes in Kinikinau is spurious, as the forms compared are not entirely cognate and hence not really comparable. Typical examples of such correspondences are the following (I omit the Baure data as it is irrelevant to the discussion):

(6) *Example of Kinikinau-Terena Correspondences in Matteson (1972).*

Kinikinau	<i>bahó</i>	:	Terena	<i>páho</i>	'mouth'
	<i>bóju</i>	:		<i>púju</i>	'knee'
	<i>giri</i>	:		<i>kíri</i>	'nose'
	<i>máɫdoke</i>	:		<i>mótoki</i>	'skin'
	<i>mongo-ti</i>	:		<i>imóko</i>	'sleep'

All the Kinikinau forms above can be interpreted as showing the effects of spontaneous voicing induced by the [nasal] expressing 1sg, as discussed in section 3.1.<sup>8</sup> With the exception of the form for 'sleep', *all* forms in Matteson (1972) where a Kinikinau voiced stop matches a voiceless stop in Terena are body-part terms, whose 'natural' elicitation form contains a possessive marker (in the case of Terena the forms are 3sg possessive, which has zero exponence in the language). Note as well that in the case of word-medial voiced stops in 'skin' and 'sleep' the conditions for nasalization to spread from the left edge of the word to medial position are there: since no obstruent occurs to the left of the voiced segment, these medial consonants are exactly where one would expect the nasal feature to 'dock' and stop spreading. The correspondence implying the reconstruction of voiced stops - and suggesting that Kinikinau and Terena differ in one important phonemic aspect - is not an actual cognate set, as 1sg forms in one language are being compared to 3sg forms in another. The contextual voicing effect triggered by nasalization associated with the 1sg prefix was also wrongly reconstructed for the proto-language in the case of the 1sg independent prefix, Kinikinau *ũndi* : Terena *ũndi*.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The same applies to the forms for 'eye' in the data given in Loukotka (1968: 144).

<sup>9</sup> This would not be implausible as a reconstruction of an allophonic process. Since Matteson (1972: 186) refers to proto-phonemes and phoneme reflexes, I take it that the voiced stop in this form is presumed to represent a phoneme. Besides, if reconstruction were in this case based on Kinikinau data transcribed at the systematic phonetic level it would, once more, imply greater difference than actually exists, as phonetic voicing of obstruents in nasal contexts is also widespread in Terena.

In recent years, Ilda de Souza has produced some welcome studies on the language of an ethnic group that nowadays lives among the Kadiwéu (Guaicuru) and who identify themselves as Kinikinau, not as Terena (Souza 2007, 2008). Setting aside the issue of their ethnic identity, examination of the linguistic material provided by Souza reveals a language that could be easily analyzed as a co-variety, with Terena, of the same language. Some of the stated differences are innocuous, as they stem from alternative phonological analyses, such as that of ‘reducing’ the surface variation [w] ~ [v], observed both in Terena and Kinikinau, to either an underlying approximant or to a fricative. The lexical differences originate in the different histories of contact and cultural diffusion with other groups (as recognized by Souza 2007: 126; see in particular items for ‘metal’ or ‘iron’; this issue will be discussed in section 4) or from the replacement of patrimonial lexical items by periphrastic expressions in Kinikinau, probably as a result of its obsolescent status. Thus, Souza’s comparison of Kinikinau *kali poinu* and Terena *âti* ‘younger brother’ as exemplifying a lexical difference, shows only that her Kinikinau informants produced an analytic expression, a phrase built with the adjective *kali* ‘small’ and the noun *poinu* (or *po?inu*) ‘brother’, arguably related to *po?i* ‘other’, all forms attested in Terena as well (Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 114 on *po?inu*). The Terena form, in turn, is a probable cognate of roots such as Lokono *-ait?i* ‘son/brother’s son’ (Pet 2011: 195) and is therefore part of the Arawak patrimonial lexicon.

Finally, Souza (2008: 112) claims that in Terena one finds two suffixes marking Plural, *-noe* and *-hiko*, as described, for instance, in Ekdahl & Butler (1979: 35), but only *-hiko* seems to be used in Kinikinau. Again, this is well within the range of variation attested for Terena varieties spoken in different villages, as discussed in Rosa (2010: 82-83).

Thus, there is no evidence that could suggest that Kinikinau and Terena should be counted as two separate southern Arawak languages. As discussed in this section, it is often the case that data employed as examples of the differences between the speech varieties of the Terena and the Kinikinau (defined as such on the basis of the ethnic identity of the speakers) turns out to be not so compelling upon further scrutiny.

### 3.3. What about Chané?

On the language of the Chané groups, virtually nothing is known. Danielsen (2013), for instance, a study of the available sources on a number of extinct Arawak language formerly spoken in Bolivia, such as Apolista and Saraveka, mentions the existence of a Chané language, though she notes that not enough data exists to make it possible to include the language in her study. Schmidt (1917: 20) claims that during Erland Nordenskiöld’s stay among the Chané, some speakers retained knowledge of the Chané language, though it had at the time the status of secret language (*Geheimsprache*), something that made it impossible to obtain extensive data on their original Arawak language.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> In the original: ‘Zur Zeit, als Erland Nordenskiöld diesen Stamm besuchte, waren es nur einige Leute, die der ursprünglichen Arawak-Sprache mächtig waren, und auch aus diesen ließen sich schwer bestimmte Angaben herausholen, da diese Sprache gewissermaßen den Charakter einer Geheimsprache erhalten hatte’ (Schmidt 1917: 20).

Loukotka (1968: 144; also cited in Danielsen 2013) gives three lexical items as representative of the Chané language: <úne> ‘water’, <yúku> ‘fire’ and <sopóro> ‘maize’. Inspection of the data presented in Nordenskiöld (1912: 157-158), Loukotka’s source on Chané, reveals some additional items, mostly culture items of wide diffusion in the region, such as <tamúco> for ‘dog’ (cf. Terena *tamuku*), perhaps ultimately from Chiquitano *tamokoş* (Ciucci 2014: 32). Though the side-by-side presentation of the Chané, Guaná, Terena and Kinikinau (Quiniquinao) data in Loukotka (1968: 144) is enough to show their virtual identity, I repeat here the comparisons made by Loukotka, with comments that show that the ‘languages’ in question are even more similar than suspected from the mere inspection of this vocabulary list:

**Table 3.** Loukotka’s (1968) sample vocabulary for his ‘Chané group’

	Chané	Guaná	Terena	Quiniquinao
Head	-	<i>do-otí</i>	<i>do-otí</i>	<i>do-otí</i>
Eye	-	<i>u-ké</i>	<i>u-né</i>	<i>u-nhé</i>
Hand	-	<i>u-ouú</i>	<i>u-ouú</i>	<i>w-ouú</i>
Water	<i>úne</i>	<i>une</i>	<i>une</i>	<i>uné</i>
Fire	<i>yuku</i>	<i>yukú</i>	<i>yuku</i>	<i>yukú</i>
Sun	-	<i>kaché</i>	<i>kaché</i>	<i>kadzyé</i>
House	-	<i>petí</i>	<i>ovongu</i>	<i>péti</i>
Tapir	-	<i>kamo</i>	<i>gamó</i>	-
Maize	<i>sopóro</i>	<i>tsoporo</i>	<i>soporó</i>	<i>osopóro</i>
One	-	<i>posha</i>	<i>paisuan</i>	<i>poikuá</i>
Two	-	<i>piá</i>	<i>piá</i>	<i>piá</i>
Three	-	<i>mopoa</i>	<i>mopuá</i>	<i>mopuá</i>

No doubt much of the formal mismatches in the Loukotka data in Table 3 can be accounted for simply as a function of the use of distinct and less than systematic transcription systems.<sup>11</sup> Of linguistic significance, the different forms for ‘one’ above evidence the use of different suffixes attached to the root *poe-* or *poeha-*, cf. Terena *póehaaşo* ‘one’, *póehaiko* ‘only one’ (Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 38-39), a property found throughout the Arawak family (cf. e.g. Payne 1991: 382-383, 414; Aikhenvald & Green 1998). On the apparent mismatch in the forms for ‘house’ above, see the comments on the data in table 1.

The meager existing evidence on the language of the Chané provides no compelling evidence in support of the contention that they spoke a language sensibly different from that of the Guaná, Terena and Kinikinau. It is entirely consistent, however, with Métraux’s (1946: 238) claim that the Chané and the Guaná were one and the same people, simply having different fates in that the former were eventually absorbed as part of the ‘Chiriguano cluster’ of southern Bolivia and northern Argentina.

<sup>11</sup> No explanation is offered to the introduction of hyphens in the forms for ‘hand’, ‘head’ and ‘eye’. Note, however, that Loukotka was a student of Paul Rivet and the latter was known for introducing (supposedly) morphemic boundaries by means of hyphens without any linguistic justification to do so (see Campbell 2012: 66).

Thus, rather than being a separate Arawak language of ‘difficult classification’ in the family (see Danielsen, Dunn & Muysken 2011: 190), the scant evidence existing on Chané points to a language that is indistinguishable from modern Terena. As is well known, the name *Chané*, or a variant thereof, is nothing but the general term for ‘person; man’ among the southern Arawak peoples of the Bolivia-Paraná region: Mojeño Ignaciano *afane*, Ott & Ott (1983: 569); Old Mojeño <*achane*>, Marbán (1701: 2); Terena *fâne*, Ekdahl & Butler (1969); perhaps also Baure *fŋonoe*- ‘fellow countryman’, reported in Payne (1991: 411) and Saraveka <*ečeeena*>, Créqui-Montfort & Rivet (1913: 509). Given the universal tendency to derive glossonyms from ethnonyms, it is hardly surprising that this would happen as well in the case of the *Chané*. Indeed, interesting evidence is once again found in Taunay (1868: 129): there, the author reports that a Kinikinau man referred to his language as ‘*Chané language*’,<sup>12</sup> and the term is given in Taunay (1875) as a synonym of ‘*Guaná*’. Note, finally that the label *Chané*, finds a clearer match in the consonant-initial cognate attested in Terena, *fâne*, contrasting with the vowel-initial forms <*achane*> and *afane* attested for the Mojeño varieties. Within the domain of more ‘cultural’ vocabulary but still significant, one has <*sopóro*> for ‘maize’ in the Nordenskiöld *Chané* wordlist, a form identical to those attested in Terena/Guaná and in contrast to Mojeño Ignaciano *sipani* (Ott & Ott 1983: 584) and Mojeño Trinitario *sponi* (MENT 1993: 25).

I conclude that, as with *Guaná* and *Kinikinau*, there are no good reasons to retain the use of the label *Chané* as implying the existence of a language separate from modern Terena. These similarities suggest that the place of the *Chané* speech variety within the southern Arawak (or, less inclusively, the Bolivia-Paraná branch) lies closer to modern Terena than to the languages of the Mojeño cluster.

#### 4. Synthesis - a modest proposal - conclusions and open issues

Given the examination of the existing linguistic evidence in the preceding sections, I submit that keeping the labels *Chané*, *Guaná*, *Terena*, *Kinikinau*, *Echoloadi* and *Layaná* as labels for distinct Southern Arawak languages is not only confusing but also potentially harmful. It is confusing for it conflates two different kinds of labels: those that have a proven and useful existence in ethnohistorical studies and those that denote recognizably distinct languages. In the case of *Guaná*, specifically, there is even more room for confusion, as it also refers to a geographically close yet utterly distinct language of the Mascocoy (Enlhet-Enenlhet) family.<sup>13</sup> Keeping these labels may be potentially harmful as well, as it conveys a false impression of relatively great linguistic diversity where there is much less so. Given that measures of regional language diversity are often employed as part of larger arguments and reasoning chains aiming at uncovering past events, such as

<sup>12</sup> In the original: ‘(...) Nas minhas notas encontro ainda uma confirmação de que a denominação de chané, é valiosíssima. Disse-me um Quinquiná: *Humndí quechatí cequexivó nhumzó chané?* O senhor quer aprender a minha língua chané? e acrescentou: *Encre nhumzó acó ochori iaquexovói chané* Pois minha língua não custa aprender o chané (literalmente).’ Taunay (1868: 129, fn.1).

<sup>13</sup> There is mention in the literature of additional confusion: the term *Guaná* was apparently applied to denote a Guaicurú people as well (cf. Perea y Alonso 1942: XXXIV). As a reviewer of this paper notes, *Chaná*, a variant spelling of *Chané*, is also the name of an extinct language of the Charrúa language family (see Viegas Barros 2009).

population movements, their trajectories and points of origin, the existence of assessments of linguistic diversity decoupled from a careful analysis of the existing data may constitute a serious drawback.

I propose, therefore, that a single Southern Arawak language should be recognized for the Chaco-Pantanal region, a language that was, in a historical period starting at the late XVIII century spoken in the Chaco, to the west of the Paraguay river, but which, due to a number of migratory movements of its speakers, came to be spoken exclusively to the east of the same river, in what corresponds nowadays to Brazilian territory (Oberg 1949: 1-5). I support, therefore, the classification of Southern Arawak languages as it appears in reference works such as Campbell (2012) and Fabre (2005), calling the single Arawak language of the Chaco-Pantanal region *Terena*. For a variety of reasons this language appears, in its oldest attestations, referred by alternative names - *Guaná*, *Chané*, *Kinikinau* - yet there is little if any linguistic significance to this multiplicity of names. Based on the classification suggested by Danielsen (2011: 517), the following structure for the internal relations of the southern Arawak languages can be approximated at the moment:

(7) *Southern Arawak Languages (or Bolivia-Paraná Arawak):*

**Baure branch**

**Baure**

**Carmelito**

**Joaquiniano**

**Pauna branch**

**Paunaka**

**Paikoneka**

**Mojo (Moxo) branch**

**Ignaciano**

**Trinitario**

**Terena Language (Terena, Chané, Guaná, Kinikinau)**

The classification above is extremely conservative in that it assumes only the ‘obvious’ clusters of speech varieties, no higher-level structure being proposed.<sup>14</sup> Though an investigation of linguistic distances within this southern Arawak subgroup based on a prior, consistent application of the Comparative Method is still lacking (see Danielsen, Dunn & Muysken 2011 for a different approach), my overall impression is that the diversity within each of the branches (Pauna, Mojo and Baure) is slightly greater than that within the Terena language (i.e. the variation between the language samples discussed here). This would justify the tentative presentation of these as ‘branches’, as opposed to Terena, which figures as a single language with diverse co-dialects, some of which have been extinct.

<sup>14</sup> I deviate from Danielsen (2011: 517) in that I do not add the subgroup formed by the Xingu Arawak languages (Yawalapiti, Waurá, Mehinaku and Kustenaú), plus the ‘Paresi branch’ (Paresi, Saraveka and Enawenê-Nawê) to the classification. I have restricted the notion of ‘Southern Arawak’ here to what is known elsewhere as ‘Bolivia-Paraná’ branch. The separation between Paresi-Xingu on the one hand, and Bolivia-Paraná on the other seems to me to represent a much older split. Matters here are far from clear though, as is the case more generally with the internal classification of the Arawak language family.



The plausible suggestion that much of the linguistic, especially lexical, differences between the diverse Terena-speaking groups stem from different histories of contact with speakers of non-Arawak languages opens a virtually unexplored route for investigation into the history of the Terena language and its speakers. Though a copious literature exists, for instance, on the particular ‘economic symbiosis’ relating Arawak and Guaicurú groups in the Chaco - the earliest mention of local Arawak groups makes reference to the ‘*Chanás subditos de los Mbayá*’ (Boggiani 1879: 620) - the linguistic consequences of this relation have not deserved careful attention on the part of linguists.

Taunay (1875) noted a huge influx of Guaicurú items denoting elements of the fauna, especially names for fish species, in his Guaná data. Later, Taunay (1868: 130) reports the existence of small, mostly lexical differences between the language spoken by the Kinikinau, the Terena and the Layaná and some of these lexical differences are explicitly commented upon in his vocabulary. Thus, Taunay found among the Terena a term for ‘God’ that is clearly of Guaraní origin, <*Nhandé-Iára*>, while other groups would use an Arawak expression <*Echái Uanuké*> (Taunay 1868: 118). Likewise, the use of the Guaraní word for ‘tapir’, <*moreví*>, is described as typical of the Layaná, while other groups would use the patrimonial Arawak item <*camú*> (Taunay 1868: 131). Some obvious Tupí-Guaraní loanwords are found in the Terena cultural and fauna vocabulary: *juki* ‘salt’ (PTG \**jukir*, Mello 2000: 168), *ka?i* ‘monkey’ (PTG \**ka?i*, Mello 2000: 172), *marakaja* ‘cat’ (PTG \**marakaja*, Mello 2000: 177). Further investigation of these loanwords may ground more precise historical inferences. Thus, the form <*moreví*> ‘tapir’, treated as a ‘Guaraní loanword’ by Taunay, is attested only in Paraguayan Guaraní, Chiriguano and Old Guaraní (Mello 2000: 196), as opposed to the more widespread forms related to *tapir*. Other forms have a much less clear origin, though point to wider and far-reaching connections. A form *firipa* occurs in Terena as the name of a “clothing of the ancestors” (Silva 2013: 261-262). Oberg (1948: 283) is more precise, describing the *Chiripá* as a loincloth wore by the chiefs of the moieties in terms of which Terena groups used to be organized. A form such as *Chiripá* is well-known as the self-designation of some Guaraní-speaking groups in southern Brazil and in Paraguay, and the origin of the term in a characteristic dress is also accepted (Mello 2007). The term has no obvious Arawak etymology, but is also attested in other southern Arawak languages, such as Paresi, though with the meaning ‘skirt’ (Brandão 2014: 174).<sup>15</sup> Investigations of these matters will no doubt gain much from an evaluation of early, historical data on the diverse varieties of the Terena language, as I hope to have exemplified in the present paper.

<sup>15</sup> As noted by a reviewer of this paper, the Terena form *firipa* likely comes from Spanish and ultimately from Quechua, were the item can be transparently analyzed as *chiri* ‘cold’ and *-paq* ‘Benefactive suffix’.

## References

- Aguirre, Juan Francisco (1793 [1898]). Etnografía del Chaco. *Boletín del Instituto Geográfico Argentino* XIX: 464-510.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (1999). The arawak language family. In R. M. W. Dixon; Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *The Amazonian Languages*, pp. 65-106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y; Diana Green (1998). Palikur and the typology of classifiers. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40 (3): 429-480.
- Bendor-Samuel, John (1961a). *An outline of the grammatical and phonological structure of Terêna*. Part 1. Arquivo Linguístico 090. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL).
- Bendor-Samuel, John (1961b). *An outline of the grammatical and phonological structure of Terêna*. Part 2. Arquivo Linguístico 091. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL).
- Boggiani, Guido (1895). Vocabolario dell'idioma Guaná. *Memorie de la Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 3: 57-80.
- Boggiani, Guido (1897). Etnografía del Alto Paraguay. *Boletín del Instituto Geográfico Argentino* 18 (10-12).
- Brandão, Ana Paula (2014). A reference grammar of Paresi-Haliti (Arawak). Texas: University of Texas at Austin. (Doctoral Dissertation.)
- Brinton, Daniel (1891). *The American race*. Philadelphia: David McKay.
- Campbell, Lyle (1997). *American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of Native America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, Lyle (2012). Classification of the indigenous languages of South America. In Lyle Campbell and Verónica Grondona (eds.). *The indigenous of South America: A comprehensive guide*, pp. 59-166. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Castelneau, Francis de (1851). *Expédition dans le Parties Centrales de l'Amérique du Sud*. Paris: P. Bertrand.
- Ciucci, Luca (2014). Tracce di contatto tra la famiglia Zamuco (Ayoreo, Chamacoco) e altre lingue del Chaco: Prime Prospezioni. *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica* 13: 1-52.
- Créqui-Montfort, G de; Rivet, P. (1913). Linguistique Bolivienne: La langue Saraveka. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 10 (2): 497-540.
- Danielsen, Swintha (2011). The personal paradigms in Baure and other Southern Arawakan languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77 (4): 495-520.
- Danielsen, Swintha (2013). Evaluating historical data (Wordlists) in the case of Bolivian extinct languages. *Language Typology and Universals* 66 (3): 272-298.
- Danielsen, Swintha (2014). Los verbos genéricos o pro-verbos en la lengua baure. In Marisa Malvesttiti; Patricia Dreidemie (eds.) *III Encuentro de Lenguas Indígenas Americanas (ELIA), Libro de Actas*, pp. 197-209. San Carlos de Bariloche: Universidad Nacional de Río Negro.
- Danielsen, Swintha; Dunn, Michael; Muysken, Pieter (2011). The spread of the Arawakan languages: A view from structural phylogenetics. In Alf Hornborg; Jonathan Hill (eds.). *Ethnicity in ancient Amazonia: Reconstructing past identities from archaeology, linguistics and ethnohistory*, pp. 173-195. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.

- Eastlack, Charles (1968). Terena (Arawakan) pronouns. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 34 (1): 1-8.
- Ekdahl, Muriel; Butler, Nancy (1969). *Terêna dictionary*. Arquivo Linguístico 069. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL).
- Ekdahl, Muriel; Butler, Nancy. 1979. *Aprenda Terêna*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL).
- Eriksen, Love (2011). *Nature and culture in prehistoric Amazonia: Using GIS to reconstruct ancient ethnogenetic processes from archaeology, linguistics, geography and ethnohistory*. Sweden: Lund University.
- Fabre, Alain (2005). Los pueblos del Gran Chaco y sus lenguas, Primera parte: Los Enlhet-Enenlhet del Chaco Paraguayo. *Suplemento Antropológico* 40 (1): 503-569.
- Fonseca, João Severiano de (1880). *Viagem ao redor do Brasil, 1875-1878*. Volume I. Rio de Janeiro: Typographia de Pinheiro & Co.
- Heckenberger, Michael (2011). Deep history, cultural identities and ethnogenesis in the Southern Amazon. In Alf Hornborg; Jonathan Hill (eds.). *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia: Reconstructing past identities from archaeology, linguistics and ethnohistory*, pp. 57-74. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.
- Hill, Jonathan; Santos-Granero, Fernando (2002). *Comparative arawakan histories: Rethinking language family and culture area in Amazonia*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hornborg, Alf; Hill, Jonathan (2011). *Ethnicity in ancient Amazonia: Reconstructing past identities from archaeology, linguistics and ethnohistory*. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.
- Lewis, M. Paul; Simmons, Gary F.; Fennig, Charles D. (eds.) (2016). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 19th Edition. Dallas, Tx.: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL).
- Loukotka, Čestmír (1968). *Classification of South American Indian languages*. Reference Series 7. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Marbán, Pedro (1701). *Arte de la lengua moxa, con su vocabulario, y cathecismo*. Lima: Imprenta Real de Joseph de Contreras.
- Martius, Karl Friedrich von (1867). *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas zumal Brasiliens*, II. Glossaria Linguarum Brasiliensium. Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer.
- Matteson, Esther (1972). Proto-Arawakan. In Esther Matteson (ed.). *Comparative studies in amerindian Languages*, pp. 160-242. The Hague: Mouton.
- Mello, Antônio Augusto (2000). *Estudo histórico da família lingüística Tupi-Guarani*. Florianópolis: UFSC. (Doctoral Dissertation).
- Mello, Flávia Cristina de (2007). Mbyá e Chiripá: Identidades étnicas, etnônimos e denominações entre os Guarani do sul do Brasil. *Tellus* 7(12): 49-65.
- MENT (1993). *Diccionario trinitario-castellano, castellano-trinitario*. Misión Evangélica Nuevas Tribus. ms.
- Métraux, Alfred (1946). Ethnography of the Gran Chaco. In Julian Steward (ed.). *Handbook of South American Indians. Vol. 1 The marginal tribes*, pp. 197-370. Washington: US Government Printing Office.
- Noble, G. Kingsley (1965). *Proto-Arawakan and its descendants*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nordenskiöld, Erland (1912). *Indienerleben. El Gran Chaco (Südamerika)*. Leipzig: Albert Bonnier.

- Nordenskiöld, Erland (1920). *The changes in the material culture of two Indian tribes under the influence of new surroundings*. Comparative Ethnographical Studies 2. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.
- Oberg, Kalervo (1948). Terena social organization and law. *American Anthropologist* 50(2): 283-291.
- Oberg, Kalervo (1949). *The Terena and the Caduveo of Southern Mato Grosso, Brazil*. Smithsonian Institution. Institute of Social Anthropology Publication nr. 9. Washington: US Government Printing Office.
- Ott, Willis; Ott, Rebecca Burke de (1983). *Diccionario ignaciano-castellano con apuntes gramaticales*. Cochabamba: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano (ILV).
- Payne, David L. 1991. A classification of maipuran (Arawakan) languages based on shared lexical retentions. In Desmond Derbyshire; Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). *Handbook of amazonian languages*, vol. III, pp. 355-499. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Perea y Alonso, Sixto (1942). *Filología comparada de las lenguas y dialectos arawak*. Instituto de Estudios Superiores de Montevideo. Montevideo: A. Monteverde y Cia.
- Pet, Willem (2011). *A grammar sketch and lexicon of Arawak (Lokono Dian)*. SIL E-Books 30. Summer Institute of Linguistics [Publication of 1987 Doctoral Dissertation].
- Rosa, Andréa M. (2010). *Aspectos morfológicos do Terena (Aruák)*. Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais: UFMG. (MA Thesis).
- Santos-Granero, Fernando (2011). Captive identities, or the genesis of subordinate quasi-ethnic collectivities in the American tropics. In Alf Hornborg; Jonathan D. Hill (eds.). *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia*, pp. 335-347. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.
- Schmidt, Max (1917). *Die Aruaken: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Kulturverbreitung*. Leipzig: Verlag Veit & Comp.
- Silva, Denise (2013). *Estudo lexicográfico da língua Terena*. Araraquara: UNESP. (Doctoral Dissertation).
- Souza, Ilda de (2007). Índios Kinikinau: Aspectos etnolinguísticos. *Tellus* 13: 103-133.
- Souza, Ilda de (2008). *Koenukuno 'e Emo'u: A língua dos índios Kinikinau*. Campinas: IEL UNICAMP. (Doctoral Dissertation).
- Taunay, Alfredo (1868). *Scenas de viagem: Exploração entre os rios Taquary e Aquidauana no distrito de Miranda*. Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Americana.
- Taunay, Alfredo (1875). Vocabulário da língua Guanã ou Chané (Provincia de Matto Grosso). *Revista Trimestral do Instituto Historico Geographico e Ethnographico do Brasil*, XXXVIII: 143-162.
- Viegas Barros, J. Pedro (2009). *Misia Jаланá: Una frase charrúa a la luz de los nuevos datos de la lengua Chaná*. *Cadernos de Etnolingüística, Série Notas*, 1.
- Viegas Barros, J. Pedro (2013). *Proto-Guaicurú: Una reconstrucción fonológica, léxica y morfológica*. Muenchen: LINCOM Europa.

Recebido: 4/1//2016

Versão revista e corrigida: 7/3/2016

Aceito: 10/3/2016.

LIAMES 16(1): 39-57 - Campinas, Jan./Jun. - 2016

57