



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Feeling the need: The borrowing of Cariban functional categories into Mawayana (Arawak)

Carlin, E.B.; Aikhenvald A.Y., Dixon R.M.W.

Citation

Carlin, E. B. (2006). Feeling the need: The borrowing of Cariban functional categories into Mawayana (Arawak). In D. R. M. W. Aikhenvald A.Y. (Ed.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 313-332). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14313>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14313>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

13

Feeling the Need

*The Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories into Mawayana (Arawak)*¹

EITHNE B. CARLIN

1 Introduction

This chapter deals with a situation of language contact over a period of some 150 years in the southern Guianas that has resulted *inter alia* in the borrowing, across language families, of a pronoun to express first person plural exclusive, and some functional categories pertaining to nominal past tense marking, affective and frustrative marking, and the marking of a noun to express change of state. All of these borrowed categories into Mawayana are obligatory in the Cariban languages. Lexical borrowing in either direction between Mawayana and the Cariban languages is minimal.

§2 gives an overview of what we know about the Mawayana people and their history of contact up to the present. §3 gives a typological linguistic profile of Mawayana based on data collected in Suriname. §4 shows the instances of contact-induced change in Mawayana, looking at the borrowing of a pronominal form *amna* to express first person plural exclusive (§4.1); nominal past marking (§4.2); the affective marker *_kwe* (§4.3); the use of the frustrative marker *_muku* (§4.4), and the borrowing of the simulative, a category that is essential in the Cariban languages (§4.5).² Conclusions are given in §5.

¹ I would like to thank Maarten Mous and the editors of the volume for their invaluable suggestions and comments on this chapter. All remaining errors are my own.

² In this chapter, enclitics are indicated by a preceding underscore.

2 The Mawayana, past and present

The Mawayana (literally: 'Frog People') are a small Arawak group who live in the southern Guianas, in the frontier corner of Brazil, Guyana, and Suriname, and whose language is closely related to Wapishana. Since the Mawayana are generally subsumed under the term Waiwai it is not known how many ethnic Mawayana there are, except for the community in Suriname where almost 100 people claim Mawayana ethnicity. We know very little of the early history of the Mawayana, their first possible mentioning as Mapoyena being from Fray Francisco de San Marcos in 1725 (see Rivière 1963: 153). Since the first definite reference to the Mawayana in the literature in 1841, however, the history of the Mawayana has been intertwined with and has run parallel to that of consecutively the Taruma group on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the Waiwai groups within which Mawayana is now included. It was the naturalist Robert Schomburgk who reported Mawayana presence in the area to the east of the Parukoto (Cariban) people and not far from the Taruma people (Schomburgk 1841:170). When Schomburgk actually met some Mawayana in 1843, he gave their number as about thirty-nine individuals in one settlement living close to and in constant contact with a group of Taruma who, as requested by the Mawayana, had moved in order to be close to them (Schomburgk 1845: 55). Since the Taruma chief was also acting as chief over the Mawayana we can conclude that relations were indeed friendly and close. Population numbers of most Amerindian groups in the area were declining drastically at Schomburgk's time, mainly due to outbreaks of smallpox and other illnesses, and intermarriage between the smallest groups was prevalent. Thirty years later, in the 1870s, the explorer Barrington Brown mentions meeting up with a group of Mawayana and Taruma together and established that they maintained trading relations with the Wapishana and the Waiwai (Brown 1876: 247–51). Indeed throughout the nineteenth century, the southern Guyana region was a hub of trading activity that spanned most of the Amerindian groups as well as the Maroons on the Surinamese side of the Corentyne River, with the Taruma a major link in all trade relations.³ At that time, and indeed since the migration of the Taruma from the Rio Negro some time after 1732 until the end of the nineteenth century, we find

³ The term Maroons refers to runaway slaves from plantations during the early colonial period in Suriname, who now form distinct ethnic groups in the interior of Suriname, namely the Ndyuka, Saramaccans, Paramaccans, Kwinti, and Matawai. It was predominantly with the Ndyuka that trade relations were upheld with the Amerindian populations.

13. *Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories* 315

several references to the trading acumen of the Taruma who had become quite an influential group before, presumably, disease reduced their numbers dramatically. This influence is also corroborated by the many place names of Taruma origin found in the south of Guyana. From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, the Taruma are hardly mentioned without reference to the Mawayana with whom they had intermarried in spite of a reported aversion to marrying outside their own group (see Schomburgk 1845). In the early twentieth century the numbers of Mawayana had surpassed those of the Taruma: Farabee (1918:172) estimated the number of Mawayana as around 100, and the Taruma as about 50. In the early 1920s, the anthropologist/archaeologist Walter Roth claimed that the Taruma had all but become extinct as a separate group, which is corroborated by the missionary Father Cary-Elwes's statements that in mid-1922 he had advised the Taruma to intermarry with the Waiwai: 'Last time I was here [1919, EBC], I told the Tarumas that they were a sickly lot and clearly dying out, due probably to their in-marriage, and their only chance of survival was for them to take unto themselves Waiwai wives' (Butt, Colson and Morton 1982: 240; see also Rivière 1963: 164). In spite of their incessant precarious situation over the last two centuries, there are still three Taruma speakers in Guyana, living among the Wapishana. The Mawayana in the meantime are mentioned sporadically in the literature, in the Mapuera region which is still the home of a large Waiwai-speaking group today, and by the late 1950s they were already being absorbed by the Waiwai.

In view of the complex history of shuffling and reshuffling identities and ethnicities which was characteristic of the southern Guianas regions, the ethnic term Waiwai is now used to refer to a conglomeration of ethnic groups, namely the Parukoto, Shereo, Tunayana, Katuena, Karafawyana, Mawayana,

TABLE 1. The Waiwai groups

Group	Linguistic affiliation
Parukoto	Cariban
Shereo	Cariban
Tunayana	Cariban
Katuena	Cariban
Karafawyana	Cariban
Mawayana	Arawak
Taruma	Unclassified

and Taruma.⁴ As shown in Table 1, all of these groups are of the Cariban linguistic stock, specifically the Guyana branch of the family, with the exception of the latter two. Mawayana belongs to the Arawak language family and Taruma is an as yet unclassified language. What is known as the Waiwai language is actually a lingua franca which has at least two main dialects, Tunayana, and Karafawyana, the latter of which, according to the Tunayana and Katuena speakers in Suriname, is the 'nicer' and more elaborated dialect. The original language before amalgamation of the groups was apparently Parukoto, also the name of the group who had most input into the formation of the lingua franca. At some time in the early twentieth century the Parukoto ceased calling themselves by that name and were subsumed under the name Waiwai. Thus the remaining language Waiwai is itself a hybrid based on several Cariban dialects that were closely related to Parukoto (see also Hawkins 1998). The input of Mawayana and Taruma to the Waiwai language seems to have been minimal if present at all; rather there are clear indications that the Waiwai lingua franca, and later Trio, likewise a Cariban language, have had quite some impact on the structure of Mawayana.

2.1 *The Mawayana speech community, language attitudes, and patterns of language use*

From the 1950s onwards it looked as though the Mawayana would remain for outsiders an inconspicuous group absorbed by the Waiwai, which is already the case in Brazil and Guyana, where only a few old people still remember some of their former language. However, a strange turn of fate saw the preservation of the language in a Mawayana group in diaspora in the south of Suriname. In the early 1960s, an American missionary who had been active among the Waiwai in Guyana and Brazil set off on an evangelizing mission to the Trio (Cariban), in Suriname, taking with him some 'Waiwai', who were actually ethnic Mawayana, Tunayana, and Katuena. At present these groups reside in the predominantly Trio village Kwamalasamutu, in the Sipaliwini Basin. The originally Waiwai-speaking groups in this village in Suriname together number some 200–300 people who are increasingly becoming monolingual Trio speakers. The ethnic Mawayana community in Kwamalasamutu numbers some 100–50 people, but the number of speakers of Mawayana has

⁴ Both Hawkins (1998) and Howard (2001) who carried out research among the Waiwai in Guyana and Brazil include Sikiiyana (Chikyana) among the Waiwai groups: in general, although the Sikiiyana do speak Waiwai, they are not perceived, either linguistically, or socially, as constituting part of the present-day Waiwai groups. For this reason I have excluded the Sikiiyana here. However, given that they reside in the Surinamese village Kwamalasamutu, where the remaining Mawayana speakers live, they are mentioned below in the description of the social structure of that village.

13. *Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories* 317

declined to the last three of the oldest generation, that is, those first native missionaries. These are the community leader and his wife, and his wife's half-sister. The Kwamalasamutu Mawayana are thus the only Mawayana-speaking community of importance left. The linguistic competences of the ethnic Mawayana in Suriname vary considerably according to generations. In Table 2 I give an overview of the language use patterns that are found among the ethnic Mawayana in Suriname.

As can be seen in Table 2, the older generations of Mawayana are trilingual, younger generations are bilingual, and the youngest generation is monolingual in Trio which is the dominant language of the village. In contrast to the Waiwai groups, the Trio are highly monolingual although some few may have a passive knowledge of Waiwai. As shown above, even the oldest generation of Mawayana speak Trio, and the ethnic Mawayana in Kwamalasamutu now all speak Trio as their only or primary language respectively; however, this is not to say that the older generations who learned Trio as their third or even second language ever learned to master Trio fully or with the competence of a native originally Trio speaker. In fact, many of the more complex grammatical

TABLE 2. Speech patterns of the ethnic Mawayana in Suriname

Generation of ethnic Mawayana	Languages spoken with whom
oldest (+/- 75 years)	Mawayana among each other (3 people); Waiwai with their own children and with other Waiwai groups; Trio with their grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and all other villagers
second generation (+/-60 years)	Waiwai with their parents and their own children, and with other Waiwai groups; Waiwai and increasingly Trio with their grandchildren;
third generation (+/-40 years)	Trio with all other villagers Waiwai with Waiwai speakers of older and peer groups; decreasingly Waiwai and increasingly Trio with their own children; Trio with all other villagers
fourth generation (+/-22 years)	Trio with everyone although they may have a passive knowledge of Waiwai
fifth generation (<20 years)	Trio only

aspects of Trio were never fully mastered by the non-Trio groups. Indeed, the fact that the non-Trio groups were numerically so large in the village of Kwamalasamutu rapidly led to some changes in Trio, namely simplification and sometimes reanalysis (see Carlin 2004: 9–11). The ethnic Mawayana belong to the village elite, and hold high positions in the Western-style polyclinic. Of the other Waiwai-speaking groups, the Tunayana are well represented and dominant in the church elders' council and the Sikiiyana, who are considered to be experts in medicinal plants, run the traditional polyclinic. Thus in all, the Waiwai-speaking group in Kwamalasamutu, taken as a whole, is politically and socially quite dominant. Normally, however, this dominance does not immediately translate into a linguistic dominance: Trio remains the dominant language of the village. There is, however, a good deal of linguistic chauvinism as evidenced by the prevailing language attitude in the village in as far as Waiwai is regarded as being more or less on a par with Trio, but Mawayana, and also Sikiiyana, are regarded as lesser languages, just the old people's jokes. At least that was the general feeling before language documentation of Mawayana started, after which Mawayana became a very real language in the eyes of all the villagers, and in the eyes of the speakers themselves it has become an important and valuable language, one which offers an excuse for their not being able to speak perfect Trio.

There has been no borrowing whatsoever from Mawayana into Trio, either grammatically or lexically. Given the sociolinguistic situation sketched above and the negative language attitude towards the minority obsolescent languages, and taking into account the fact that all the groups involved are relatively homogeneous culturally so that the borrowing of new words along with new concepts was not necessary, this is hardly surprising. The question remains, however, as to whether or not Mawayana has had any influence on Waiwai. It would seem not, although more in-depth research on Waiwai may in the future require this statement to be revised somewhat. There has been a negligible number of lexical borrowings, the most notable one being *kamu* 'sun' in Waiwai, which is a loan from an Arawak language, possibly Mawayana. In addition, other lexical cognates in Waiwai, Wapishana, Trio, Mawayana, and Taruma are found in the specific semantic domains of flora and fauna where we find lexical items that are common to the entire larger Guyana area but it is not possible to determine the direction of borrowing.

What is evident, however, is that certain functional and pragmatic pan-Caribbean features have been borrowed into Mawayana, presumably from Waiwai, which were then reinforced under influence from Trio. The features of contact-induced change in Mawayana are dealt with below in §4 after a short linguistic profile of the language.

3 Linguistic profile of Mawayana

At the current stage of research, it would appear that the closest genetic relative of Mawayana is Wapishana. The two languages share a large portion of the basic vocabulary. Both exhibit grammatical patterns that are common to many Arawak languages, for example, the pronominal system, the reflexes of the attributive prefix *ka-*, the negation marker *ma-*, and the like. Mawayana exhibits many Arawak features, that is, it is polysynthetic, has head marking, it is mainly suffixal but also has prefixes for the person markers on the main word classes noun (1), verb, and postposition (2). Mawayana has an attributive (3) and a privative prefix (4). The suffixes are mostly derivational; gender is also marked by means of suffixes but is not productive.

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| (1) | n-kĩnĩ | ‘my spirit song’ |
| (2) | n-siima | ‘with me’ |
| | ĩ-buuka | ‘towards you’ |
| (3) | k-etinu-re-sĩ | jimaada |
| | ATTRIB-kin-POSS-3 | jaguar |
| | Jaguar had family (i.e. he wasn’t alone) | |
| (4) | mĩ-ũsũ | ‘without a wife’ |

Transitive verbs take prefixes to mark the A argument and suffixes to mark the O (5). Intransitive verbs generally, but not always, mark the S by means of a suffix (6). In addition, the S/O markers are cliticized to the verbal negation and conditional markers *ma-* and *a-* respectively (7) and (8).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|--------|------------------|----------|
| (5) | (a) | rĩ-kataba-na | (b) | n-kataba-sĩ | |
| | | 3A-catch.PAST-1O | | 1A-catch.PAST-3O | |
| | | He grabbed me | | I grabbed him | |
| (6) | (b) | tōwā-nā_kwe | (b) | tōwā-sĩ | |
| | | sleep.PAST-1S_AFF | | sleep.PAST-3S | |
| | | Unfortunately | | He fell asleep. | |
| | | I fell asleep | | | |
| (7) | na | kaa-tĩna | ma-sĩ | tōwē_kwe | |
| | DISC | INTER-who | NEG-3S | sleep.PRES^AFF | |
| | Well, who doesn’t sleep then? | | | | |
| (8) | nnu | a-na | maufa | chika-dza | Mawayana |
| | 1PN | when-1S | die | NEG.PART-COMPL | Mawayana |
| | When I die there will be no Mawayana left at all | | | | |

Phonologically Mawayana has a four-way vowel system, as does Wapishana, namely a high front unrounded vowel realized as *i/e*; a high back rounded vowel realized as *o/u*; low (back) *a*; and a high central *ɨ*. The Cariban languages, on the other hand, have six or seven vowels, the vowels of Waiwai being *i*, *e*, *ɨ*, *u*, *o*, *a*. Both Waiwai and Mawayana are lacking the mid-central vowel *ẽ* that Trio has. In addition, Waiwai, Mawayana, Taruma, and Wapishana have nasal vowels and unlike Trio they all have two implosive consonants, *d'* and *ɓ*. Mawayana and Wapishana have a retroflex fricativized rhotic *rʒ* in common that none of the other languages has, which may be indicative of a shared innovation.

4 Contact-induced change in Mawayana

The instances of contact-induced change to the structure of Mawayana that are dealt with in the following sections are: the borrowing of a pronominal form to express person 1+3 'we (exc)'; and the borrowing of functional categories of nominal tense marking, marking of affective, on nouns or verbs, to express the speaker's attitude of 'pity' or 'recognition of unfortunate circumstance'; marking a similitive 'as if' on nominals; and the marking of frustrative on verbs. All of these features, with the exception of affective marking, are obligatory in the Cariban languages.

4.1 *The borrowing of a pronominal form*

Originally Mawayana had three exponents of the category of person, 1, 2, and 3. The relevant Cariban languages, Waiwai and Trio, have four exponents of the category of person, that is, 1, 2, 1+2, and 3, with an additional semantic 1+3 person, which is morphologically a combination of first and third person, first for evidential value (on verbs) and third for person agreement (all relevant word classes). In their daily speech, when speaking Waiwai and Trio, the Mawayana are required to use the distinction between first person plural inclusive and exclusive. When speaking Mawayana, a language only spoken in the home, the speakers apparently felt there to be a gap in their pronominal system left by having only one marker (*wa-*) in their own language for the first person plural without an inclusive/exclusive distinction. The Mawayana filled this gap by borrowing the Waiwai pronoun *amna* to express the concept of first person plural exclusive. The Trio counterpart of *amna*, namely *ainja*, exhibits different surface morphosyntactic behaviour from *amna* and although Mawayana uses the pronoun from Waiwai, it oscillates between the behavioural pattern of the Trio and the Waiwai first person exclusive. In both Cariban languages the pronoun is obligatory and as such acts like an

13. *Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories* 321

independent noun. In Trio the pronoun is used in combination with the third person prefix *i-* (Ø before vowels) on a noun in possessive constructions, as shown in (9a), and as an argument on a postposition (9b). In Waiwai, the possessed noun preceded by *amna* has a zero third person prefix before a consonant-initial element and a prefix *ɣ-* before a vowel-initial element as exemplified by the possessed noun in (9c) and by the inflected postposition in (9d). As these examples show, the Waiwai construction is identical to the Trio but the surface allomorphy is reversed, that is, *ɣ-* before vowel-initial nouns or postpositions, and zero before consonant-initial elements⁵.

- (9) (a) *ainja i-pakoro* 'our (exc) house' (Trio)
 (b) *ainja Ø-akërë* 'with us (exc)' (Trio)
 (c) *amna krapa-n⁶* 'our (exc) bow' (Waiwai)
 (d) *amna ɣ-akro* 'with us (exc)' (Waiwai)

In Mawayana, when nominal possessive constructions are formed with *amna*, the third person prefix is never used, rather the noun is left unmarked as shown in (10a). The original Mawayana equivalent is given in (10b). As these examples show, Mawayana now distinguishes between a first person plural inclusive and exclusive by using the original first person plural possessive prefix *wa-* to express inclusivity and the borrowed pronoun *amna* and the possessive construction from Waiwai, which is identical to the Trio construction, to express exclusivity. Mawayana simplifies the form of the possessed noun, leaving it zero marked, which is an option in both Trio (with vowel-initial elements) and Waiwai (with consonant-initial elements), reconciling thus partly with both languages by choosing the simplest form.

- (10) (a) *amna saruuka* (b) *wa-saruuka*
 1+3PN fishtrap 1pl.POSS-fishtrap
 Our (exc) fishtrap. Our (inc) fishtrap.

With verbs in both Waiwai and Trio, person 1+3 is expressed by means of the pronoun (*amna* and *ainja*) in combination with the prefix of the third person marked on the verb: the form of the prefix is *n-* in both languages. In Trio the third person prefix on the verb is always marked but in Waiwai some high-frequency verbs, such as 'say', 'come', and 'go', drop the third person prefix.⁷

⁵ This is actually a simplified version of reality: in Trio a reflex of the relational prefix which is encoded in the glide in Waiwai is found in vowel-initial elements (see Carlin 2004: 74 ff.). However, this does not affect the argumentation presented here.

⁶ The final *-n* in this example is a possessive suffix.

⁷ In Trio the third person personal prefix is only dropped whenever the verb is immediately preceded by an overt lexical object. This is not the case in Waiwai.

Mawayana, on the other hand, when using the pronoun *amna* with the high-frequency verb *me* ‘say’ consistently marks the verb with the third person prefix *rĩ-* thus following the Trio but not the Waiwai pattern, as shown in (11a). Example (11b) shows the original Mawayana first person plural prefix *wa-* in use.

- (11) (a) *amna* *rĩ-me* ALSO: *rĩ-me amna*
 1+3PN 3A-Say.PRES
 We (exc) say
- (b) *wa-me*
 1pl-say.PRES
 We (inc) say

As in Waiwai and Trio, when *amna* is the subject it can occur either before or after the verb in Mawayana; see (11a). However, in most of the occurrences of *amna* as the subject of a verb, with the exception of the verb ‘say’ as stated above, Mawayana does not mark the verb with the third person prefix, leaving the verb unmarked: examples are given in (12a–b).

- (12) (a) *amna* *chake*
 1+3PN go.PRES
 We’re going back
- (b) *atimara* *amna* *karara-de*
 fish sp. 1+3PN catch.with.rod-IT.PRES
 We’re going to catch *anjumara* (Hoplias Aimara) with a rod

Thus Mawayana has in common with Waiwai that it treats a high-frequency verb differently but while Waiwai uses no marking for these verbs, Mawayana does use a third person prefix *rĩ-* for the verb ‘say’ as both Waiwai and Trio do for other verbs for which Mawayana uses no third person marking.

To sum up, Mawayana has introduced the grammatical marking of a first person exclusive by the obligatory use of a pronoun borrowed from Waiwai, and also by copying the Waiwai pattern of usage. Mawayana also copies the Waiwai pattern in that the high-frequency verb *me* ‘say’ is treated differently from other verbs; namely for this verb it copies the Trio practice of using a prefix, rather than no marker at all. The marker itself, namely *rĩ-*, is the regular third person of Mawayana, and thus not a plural marker, and in this respect Mawayana follows the pattern of both Waiwai and Trio.

4.2 Nominal past

Nominal past marking is widespread and obligatory in the Cariban languages and is used to express former possession, a deceased possessor, a dead entity, or a referent that is useless or no longer usable. There is no doubt that

13. *Borrowing of Caribbean Functional Categories* 323

nominal past as a category in Mawayana has emerged due to contact with the Caribbean languages, in particular Waiwai. Mawayana's closest relative Wapishana does not have nominal past marking. The form of the nominal past marker in Mawayana is *-ba* which is suffixed to a nominal element; when the nominal ends in a vowel, that vowel changes to *e* before past marking. The forms and meanings expressed by the nominal past in Waiwai are given in Table 3. Apart from the two nominal past tense markers *-tho/-thiri* and *-nhiri/-nho*, Waiwai has what Hawkins (1998: 129) calls a modifying particle *pen* that is used to express that the referent which precedes it is 'dead' or 'gone' or in some way deserving of 'pity'. This function of marking a referent as 'past', 'dead', or 'gone' is collapsed in other Caribbean languages (e.g. Trio and Wayana) and is expressed by the suffixal past tense markers. In Mawayana, the functions are also collapsed and marked by the marker *-ba*, but exclude the expression of 'pity', which is present in the semantics of Waiwai *pen*, rather expressing this meaning by means of an affective marker *_kwe* which is dealt with in §4.3 below.

The meanings expressed by the nominal past *-ba* in Mawayana are the following, exemplified in (13a–e):

- former: possessed (13a) and non-possessed (13b) nouns;
- past possession: possessed nouns and nominals (13d–e);
- dead: nouns (13b);
- gone: nouns (13c).

These examples show nominal past marking exactly where it would be required in the Caribbean languages, with the exception of 'dead' in (13b) which is not found in Trio. Similar equivalents exist in Trio for all of these examples in (13). In (14a–b) I give only the Trio equivalents of the nominalized forms in (13d–e) respectively; as can be seen, the forms are structurally identical (notwithstanding some verbal marking required in Trio to mark verb types).

TABLE 3. Forms and meanings expressed by nominal past in Waiwai

Form	Meaning (marked on)
<i>-tho/-thiri</i>	former; past possession (possessed nouns)
<i>-nhiri/-nho</i>	former; past possession (nominalized verbs; non-possessed nouns)
<i>pen</i>	dead, gone, pity

- (13) (a) r-ūsüre-ba_koso chacha
3POSS-wife-PAST^{REP} cry.PAST
His wife cried
- (b) ðu tō maufa_koso jimaade-b a_kwe
ideo.hit. ground ideo.die die.PAST^{REP} jaguar-PAST^{AFF}
Poor jaguar fell down and died
- (c) adze n-mīse-ba rī-ma_ku-sī
where.PAST 1POSS-husband-PAST 3A-say.PAST^{PERSIST-3O}
'Where has my husband got to?' she kept saying
- (d) a'u-riki i-chaka n-chīyā-se-ba-riki
dem.dist-dir 2-go 1POSS-be-NOMZ-PAST-DIR
Go over there to where I was! (to my former place of being)
- (e) ⁿjee katabi-ke-ba jimaada
human.being catch-AG.NOMZ-PAST jaguar
Jaguar used to catch people (jaguar was a catcher of people)
- (14) (a) irē-pona tē-kē ji-w-eh-topo-npē-pona
DEM.INAN.ANA-DIR go-IMP.SG 1POSS-1TR-be-TMP.NOMZ-PAST-DIR
Go over there to where I was!
- (b) wītoto apēi-ne-npē teese kaikui
human.being catch-AG.NOMZ-PAST he.was jaguar
Jaguar used to catch people

The Waiwai element *-pen* differs slightly in meaning from the suffixal past markers since besides the function of marking a human referent as 'past', that is, 'dead', it can also express the notion of 'gone' and 'deserving of pity', as shown in (15a–b) from Hawkins (1998: 129).

- (15) (a) [ahtaŋ na] n-Ø-a-y Raatu pen
wherever 3S-be-SF-UNP Rod gone
Who knows where Rod (a friend) is?
- (b) tuuna ŋ-ekama oy-akno pen
rain 3S-receive.s/thing.undesirable+TP 1POSS-brother pity
My poor brother caught a lot of rain

Thus the scheme for Mawayana relative to Waiwai and Trio as regards nominal past marking with the suffixes and the so-called particle *pen* is given in Table 4.

Thus Mawayana has introduced the category of 'former' marking on nominals which is an obligatorily marked category in Waiwai and Trio. The marker itself, *-ba*, is different from the markers in Waiwai and Trio and its

13. *Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories* 325

TABLE 4. Nominal past marking

Meaning	Mawayana	Waiwai	Trio
former, past possession	-ba	-tho/-thĩrĩ; -nhĩrĩ/-nho	-npě, -hpě
dead	-ba	pen	-npě, -hpě
gone	(-ba) or <i>_kwe</i> (affective enclitic)	pen	—

origin is as yet unknown. The semantic range of the Mawayana past marker shows the Waiwai pattern in that the marker is also used for the meaning ‘dead’. At the same time it also shows Trio influence in that one form is used for all meanings where Waiwai uses two different markers. It also shows Trio influence in its exclusion of the semantic aspect of ‘pity’ for this ‘former’ marker. This latter aspect is expressed in Mawayana by a different marker, namely, by the affective enclitic *_kwe* which is dealt with in the following section.

4.3 *The affective marker _kwe*

Affectivity, that is, the notion that someone is deserving of pity, or is (has been or will be) adversely affected by an action or state, can be expressed by means of an interjection in Mawayana, Waiwai, Wapishana; the forms, which are clearly related, are as follows:

Affective interjections

Mawayana: *okwe*

Wapishana: *kowas*

Waiwai: *okwe*

Trio only knows one interjection, *pě*, to express the general notion of ‘oh dear!’ or ‘how terrible!’ and thus is not further included here. Besides having the interjection *okwe* at its disposal, which is used to modify the entire clause, Mawayana has developed the enclitic *_kwe* to mark the affectedness of the constituents. As such, this clitic’s meaning and the translation of the sentence depend on the constituent to which it is cliticized. The meanings expressed by the affective enclitic in Mawayana include the notions ‘gone’, ‘pity’, ‘embarrassment’, ‘pain’, ‘dismay’, and ‘suspicion’: some examples in Mawayana are given in (16a–c), where the translations are highly context dependent.

- (16) (a) tōwā-sī kofo'kofoṛi_kwe
 sleep.PAST-3S frog.sp_AFF
 Poor frog couldn't help it, he fell asleep
- (b) nko-sī tōwā-nā_kwe rī-ma_koso kofokofoṛi
 3PN-3 sleep.PAST-1S^AFF 3A-say.PAST^REP frog
 'That's it, I fell asleep', frog said, embarrassed
- (c) r-aucha-na_kwe
 3A-bite.PAST-
 1O^AFF
 Ouch, he bit me!

While the affective interjection *okwe* in Waiwai seems to occur either sentence initially or sentence finally, its equivalent in Wapishana, *kowas*, can occur following a particular constituent as shown in examples (17a–c) below. The meaning of *kowas* is given as 'too bad, poor thing, life's like that' (WWA 2000: 53) and as such both in meaning and in position in the clause is more similar to the clitic in Mawayana.

- (17) (a) Taraiporo zuna tuma kowas maonapatan kootaro ati
 prop.name woman COMIT AFF approach.PAST Kutari DIR
 Taraiporo with the lady came closer to the Kutaro creek
 (where something terrible was about to happen to them)
- (b) u-nawuzu dobata naa kowas pa-ba'orantin.
 3POSS-brother pass ASP AFF 3S-be.alone
 Unfortunately his brother passed alone in front
- (c) u-ikodan barara na'akan kibaro, kowas
 3A-find.PAST crab carry frog AFF
 He (the man) found a crab carrying a frog, poor thing.
 (Wapishana Primer n.d.: 29)

Given that the affective-marking elements are similar in form and meaning in all three languages, we can assume that they are related, and considering that the usage of the interjection in Wapishana is more closely aligned with the enclitic in Mawayana than with the more restricted pattern in Waiwai, we may conclude that Waiwai probably borrowed the affective interjection from Mawayana rather than the other way around.

All the meanings expressed by the Mawayana enclitic *_kwe* are expressed in Waiwai by the particle *pen* as shown above, and it is only with the meaning 'dead' that there is some discrepancy since it can only be expressed by the

13. *Borrowing of Caribbean Functional Categories* 327

nominal past marker *-ba* in Mawayana and not by the affective enclitic. Mawayana may have been influenced by Waiwai in that it has developed a clitic in addition to the interjection for the same functions as the Waiwai particle *pen*.

4.4 *The Mawayana frustrative _muku*

Frustrative marking is an obligatory feature of Caribbean languages, the form of which is the clitic *_re(pe)* in both Waiwai and Trio, as well as in many other Caribbean languages. The form of the frustrative enclitic in Mawayana is *_muku*. This enclitic has, for the most part, exactly the same morphosyntactic properties as the Caribbean frustrative, that is, it can be marked on the major word classes, and it carries the same meaning. When marked on nouns it implies that at least one semantic feature of that noun is not fulfilled, see (18a), which is followed by the equivalent in Trio in (18b); on verbs it has the meaning ‘to carry out an action in vain’, that is, the action was unsuccessful, incomplete, or it did not have the required effect, as in (19). On postpositions it has the meaning ‘almost’, as in (19b), cf. also the Trio equivalent in (19c). Identical examples are found in Waiwai.

- (18) (a) *kīwī-dī_koso_muku* *ku-re* (Mawayana)
 head-cover_REP⁺FRUST like-NOMZ
 It was something like a sort of hat (but not quite)
- (b) *kīrīwenpē-re* *apo-n* (Trio)
 hat-FRUST like-NOMZ
 It was something like a sort of hat (but not quite)
- (19) (a) *ī-cha_ku-sī?* *a'u'a* *n-cha_muku_ku-sī* (Mawayana)
 2A-do.PAST⁺PERSIST-3O yes 1A-do.PAST⁺FRUST_PERSIST-3O
 Did you fix it? yes I fixed it (in vain)
- (b) *kīwī-dī-kura_koso_muku* (Mawayana)
 head-cover-like_REP⁺FRUST
 It was almost like a hat (but it wasn't really one)
- (c) *kīrīwenpē* *apo-repe* (Trio)
 hat like-FRUST
 It was almost like a hat (but it wasn't really one)

A few structural instances have been found where the Mawayana usage of the frustrative differs slightly from that in the Caribbean languages in that the frustrative is marked on the first element in the clause, see example (20a),

rather than on the verb as it would be in the Cariban languages, see the Trio equivalent in (20b).

- (20) (a) kusara_muku naaka-na rüichika ma-ĩ yaada (Mawayana)
 deer_FRUST take.PAST-1O fast NEG-2S come.PAST
 The deer took me (would have taken me) if you hadn't come soon
- (20) (b) j-apëi-re wikapau tõe-se-wa-nkëre ëmë
 1O-take.PAST-FRUST deer come-NFIN-NEG_PERSIST 2PN
 ahtao (Trio)
 when
 The deer took me (would have taken me) if you hadn't come soon

Synchronically Wapishana does not seem to have a frustrative marker, nor is it known whether the language ever had a frustrative marker. The etymology of the form of the Mawayana frustrative *_muku* is unknown, since similar forms do not occur in any of the relevant languages; whether or not the source could be Taruma cannot be answered until more data on Taruma are forthcoming. However, we can see from the comparison of structures given above that Mawayana in general follows the Cariban pattern of marking frustrative either on the verb to refer to the action, or on the relevant constituent.

4.5 *The Mawayana similitive-ni*

A further obligatory category in the Cariban languages is the similitive which expresses the notion of 'being for all intents and purposes X but not in essence so' which has the form *-me* (or *-pe*) in all the Cariban languages. For example, the Trio *witoto* 'human being', when marked with the similitive *-me*, *witoto-me* 'a human being' has the meaning 'manifestly but not inherently a human being', as for example when a spirit manifests itself as a human being. In earlier work I have referred to this marker by the gloss *facsimile* (FACS) to indicate that its basic meaning is 'manifestly but not inherently X', see Carlin (2002, 2004). In the Cariban languages the similitive *-me* can be analysed structurally as an adverbial or a depictive, and a marker of secondary predication, and it also has a grammaticalized aspectual meaning. The functional category similitive that has been transferred into Mawayana is found in its basic meaning (21a–b) and as a marker of secondary predication (21c–d), and with grammaticalized aspectual meaning as in (21e). In the first instance, the Mawayana similitive *-ni*, as illustrated by the examples (21a–b), is found mostly, but not only, in the context of physical or spiritual transformations from one state to another which is typically where it is also found in Trio and Waiwai. For purposes of structural comparison, some Trio examples are given in (22a–c), and a Waiwai example in (23).

13. *Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories* 329

- (21) (a) waata-ni r-ayãḏĩyã (Mawayana)
 opossum-SIMIL 3S-transform.PAST
 He changed into an opossum
- (b) na rĩ-kura n-ayãḏĩyã rĩnaru-ni kuirã (Mawayana)
 disc 3PN-like 3pl.s-transform.PAST woman-SIMIL INTERJ
 So like that they transformed into women
- (c) ukufa-sĩ wa-wĩnĩ-ni (Mawayana)
 shoot-3O 1pl.POSS-meat-SIMIL
 Shoot it as our meat!
- (d) uwiya_koso kimĩnĩka rĩnaru kataba a-ĩža-ni (Mawayana)
 anaconda_REP long.ago woman catch.PST 3COREF-pet-SIMIL
 A woman caught an aconda as her pet long ago
- (e) wiyõkãrĩ-ni_koso xahñe⁸ (Mawayana)
 young.man-SIMIL_REP he.was (Waiwai)
 he was a young man
- (22) (a) kaikui-me tẽmetae (Trio)
 jaguar-SIMIL he.transformed
 he transformed into a jaguar
- (b) k-ootĩ-me tiwẽ-kẽ! (Trio)
 1+2POSS-meat-SIMIL shoot-IMP.sg
 shoot it as our meat!
- (c) kĩrimuku-me teese (Trio)
 young.man-SIMIL he.was
 he was a young man

Waiwai: -me

- (23) noro ɲi-ir-a-tkeɲe kayaritomo me
 3PN 3A-make-SF-UP chief ADVZR they made him to be the
 chief

(Hawkins 1998:128)

The source of the similative *-ni* in Mawayana is unknown but it could be related to a morpheme *nii* in Wapishana which is described in the WWA (2000: 172) as expressing a non-current event, as shown in example (24a).⁹

⁸ The verb form *xahñe* 'he was' is an interference from Waiwai. In Mawayana there would not have been a verb form 'to be' here.

⁹ WWA stands for *Wapichan Wadauniinao Ati'o* 'Wapishana for our Descendants', which is the name of a language project initiated by the Wapishana community in Marorona in Guyana.

However, there are occurrences of *nii* as a marker of secondary predication in Wapishana as shown in (24b).

Wapishana: -*ni*

- (24) (a) *n-ikiyan ni pīgar θairdukur kiyan* (non-current event)
 1A-eat *ni* 2PN jaguar say
 I'm going to eat you, the tiger said
- (b) *u-'aipiyan pa-žamatan pa-wanyikini-ni* (similative function?)
 3A-want 3A-grab 3COREF.POSS-food-*ni*
 He wanted to grab him as his meat

These examples show that it is quite possible that secondary predications were marked as such by the morpheme *nii* in Wapishana and thus that this category is native also to Mawayana but that its functions were expanded under influence from Waiwai and Trio where it was used to mark those instances where transformations took place between the spirit world and the human world. Synchronically in Wapishana such transformations are formed by means of a noun plus a verbalizer.

5 Conclusions

It has been shown in this chapter that Mawayana has undergone grammatical expansion in that it has borrowed those categories that are obligatory in the Cariban languages. Some agreement categories that do not exist in the Cariban languages, such as gender marking, or a classifier system which possibly existed in Mawayana, became irrelevant and were lost, in contrast to Wapishana which retained gender. Some, if not all, obligatory categories in the Cariban languages, which do not express agreement but which nevertheless are obligatorily expressed, were transferred first and foremost from Waiwai and were then reinforced and modified by subsequent Trio influence.

Mawayana shows clear resistance to the transfer of actual morphological forms but not to the transfer of structural categories, that is, the actual grammatical material used for these structural innovations is not taken over with the category marker with the exception of the free-standing forms. In the lexicon there is only a negligible number of borrowings. In fact, as shown here there are only two markers that in form Mawayana has in common with its closest relative Wapishana, namely *-ni* with a different meaning synchronically, and *_kwe* which is clearly related in form to the Wapishana *kowas* and

13. *Borrowing of Cariban Functional Categories* 331

Waiwai *okwe*.¹⁰ The actual direction of transfer of the latter category cannot be determined. However, while *kowas* in Wapishana and *okwe* in Waiwai are free forms, Mawayana has developed it into a grammatical form, namely the enclitic *_kwe*. Thus, once transferred, these markers are restructured according to Cariban patterns, whereby the affective enclitic *_kwe* clearly patterns along with the Waiwai particle *pen*.

The sources of the other new categories that have been introduced, namely the nominal past *-ba* and the frustrative *_muku*, cannot be traced, leading us to the conclusion that language-internal sources were pressed into service for the purposes required by the Cariban categories. Alternatively, given the history of the Mawayana and their intermingling with the Taruma, the Taruma language may ultimately be shown to be this unknown source. It is clear, however, that Mawayana has fully incorporated the past marking as shown also with the *-ba* on the nominalized forms which are identical to the Cariban structures; the examples given above look like calqued forms. Thus, in this situation of language shift that is leading to language death, the structural properties of obligatory inherent inflection are taken over from the dominant second language Waiwai and are transferred into the maintained first language Mawayana.

In spite of the fact that Mawayana is a moribund language, and has been for the better part of 150 years, the language did not lose any major categories; on the contrary, it has actually gained from the contact situation: the features given above are additions or at least expansions on functions that were already present. Thus there has been no grammatical breakdown of Mawayana as one might expect in such a language death situation. The fact that the southern Guianas can be seen as a cultural area only worked in favour of this acceptance of the new or expanded forms and functions. I think it has been the case that Mawayana chose to overlay the functions on its existing resources. In fact, this expansion by means of new functions is quite spectacular in a situation of language shift followed by language death, where the usual pattern of influence of language A (original language) on language B (target language being shifted to) is reversed. We can deduce from the resultant structural changes in Mawayana that although the Mawayana speakers were not originally bilinguals, their dominant language had become Waiwai and that it was for

¹⁰ We cannot of course rule out the possibility that Wapishana did have a marker *-ni* with similitive meaning comparable to the Cariban *-me*. The Wapishana were Christianized much earlier than the Mawayana and Waiwai and it is quite possible that if this marker belonged to the realm of the spirit world and transformations, it may have been thrown out with the spirits required for its use. If this is

reasons of 'feeling the need' to express the same obligatory categories that they transferred these into their original language.

References

- Brown, C. B. 1876. *Canoe and camp life in British Guiana*. London: Edward Stanford.
- Butt-Colson, A. and Morton, J. 1982. 'Early missionary work among the Taruma and Waiwai of Southern Guiana: the visits of Fr. Cuthbert Cary-Elwes, S.J. in 1919, 1922, and 1923', *Folk* 24: 203–61.
- Carlin, E.B. 2002. 'Patterns of language, patterns of thought: the Cariban languages', pp. 47–81 of Carlin and Arends 2002.
- 2004. *A grammar of Trio, a Cariban language of Suriname*. Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaften 55. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- and Arends, J. (eds.), 2002. *Atlas of the languages of Suriname*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Derbyshire, D. C. and Pullum, G. K. (eds.). 1998. *Handbook of Amazonian languages*, Vol. 4. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Farabee, W. C. 1918. *The central Arawaks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hawkins, R. E. 1998. 'Wai Wai', pp. 25–224 of Derbyshire and Pullum 1998.
- Howard, C. V. 2001. *Wrought identities: the Waiwai expeditions in search of 'unseen tribes' of Northern Amazonia*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago.
- Rivière, P. G. 1963. *An ethnographic survey of the Indians on the divide of the Guianese and Amazonian river systems*. B.Litt. thesis, Oxford University.
- Schomburgk, R. H. 1841. 'Report of the third expedition into the interior of Guayana, comprising the journey to the sources of the Essequibo, to the Carumá Mountains, and to Fort San Joaquim, on the Rio Branco, in 1837–8', *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* 10: 159–90.
- 1845. 'Journal of an expedition from Pirara to the Upper Corentyne, and from thence to Demerara', *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* 15: 1–104.
- WWA. 2000. *Scholar's dictionary and grammar of the Wapishana language*. Lethem: Wapishana Language Project.