Proposing a New Branch for the Cariban Language Family

Spike GILDEA

University of Oregon

Introduction*

This paper looks at some outstanding problems in the classification of the Cariban language family and proposes a new hypothesis for grouping a number of the languages of eastern Venezuela and the Western Guiana Plateau. The Cariban languages of Venezuela and Guyana, in particular Panare and †Tamanaku, have been treated quite differently in the three most recent classifications, Girard (1971), Durbin (1977), and Kaufman (1994). The lack of agreement amongst Girard, Durbin and Kaufman is not surprising, given the lack of reliable lexical and phonological data for many of the languages in question. Recent work by Mattéi-Muller (1990, 1994) has cast new light on both Panare and †Tamanaku, with an emphasis on lexicon, but also with insightful analyses of phonology. Ongoing work by Meira and Gildea on †Tamanaku grammar and by Fox and Gildea on Akawaio phonology and grammar has

revealed parallels among these languages that were not visible before. Against the backdrop of my (Gildea 1998) reconstruction of Proto-Carib inflectional and derivational morphology, plus some syntactic patterns, many of the grammatical parallels can be seen to be innovations.

These innovative parallels have given rise to two hypotheses: a closer connection between †Tamanaku, Panare and the Pemóng Group (Pemóng, Kapóng and Makushi) and a weaker connection between this core group and Mapoyo, Yabarana, †Chayma, †Cumanagoto, and De'kwana. The evidence for the larger group is tentative, consisting of a single unconditioned phonological split and a single morphological innovation. Evidence for the core group is much stronger, with †Tamanaku, Panare and the Pemóng Group sharing one lexical innovation and four grammatical innovations, and Panare and the Pemóng Group additionally sharing two phonological innovations, one lexical innovation, and three grammatical innovations.

It is important to state clearly that these are only hypotheses; much hard work remains ahead, collecting sufficient (and sufficiently high quality) lexical data to enable the use of the more reliable traditional comparative method to test these hypotheses. In particular, this proposal does not come even close to the standard established in Meira's (2000) classification and reconstruction of the Taranoan Group of the Cariban family. Nonetheless, I put these hypotheses forward because they arise from interesting new data, which need to be in the public domain so that future classifications will also be required to account for them.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 1 reviews the lack of agreement between the existing classifications of the Cariban family, especially with regards to the place of Panare, †Tamanaku and the languages of the Pemóng Group. The next three sections consider the data for each hypothesis mentioned above, beginning with the widest (and weakest) grouping (Section 2), continuing to the more solid grouping of Panare, †Tamanaku and the Pemóng Group (Section 3), then narrowing down to the grouping of Panare with the Pemóng Group (Section 4). The brief conclusion (Section 5) suggests in a bit more detail the next steps that are required to test these comparative hypotheses.

1. Previous classifications of the Cariban family

Early classifications of the Cariban family were made on the basis of very little data, and often included language names for which there were

no data at all (cf. Girard 1971 for a scathing review of every previous classification except for de Goeje 1906/1946, which he merely rakes over the coals). Even the best of the later classifications have faced insurmountable problems with the quality of the data available for most of the languages. There is consensus among modern Cariban scholars that the current classifications are "all flawed, to a greater or lesser degree, by lack of adequate data" (Derbyshire 1999: 25). Girard (1971) remains the only modern family-wide comparative work with published data to support reconstructions and classification. The same weakness that plagued his work remains a problem: "All the early Carib material, regardless of the native language of the researcher, is deficient in approximately the same phonetic areas" (Girard 1971: 45), specifically: (i) an "inability" to distinguish the central vowels [ɨ] and [ə], usually indicating them as e̲, u̲e̲, i̲, and u̲; (ii) failing to transcribe the glottal stop and aspiration in clusters; and (iii) failing to distinguish amongst various fricatives and affricates, partially exacerbated by the fact that the European orthographies relied on by the early works differ so widely in the spelling conventions for particular sounds, particularly [ɨ] and [ʃ]. I add (Gildea 1998a: 10) that most sources have been unable to reliably indicate stress. All of these flaws are found in most wordlists for most Cariban languages, although one can never be sure until a phonetically reliable source is identified to compare with other materials on the same language.

The languages in focus here provide examples of confusion following from poor data: in particular, Akawaio, †Tamanaku and Panare.

Girard (1971) tentatively places 'Akowoyo' with the geographically nearby Carib Group (Kari'na, Carib proper, Galibi); he places †Tamanaku into his Cumaná group, with geographically nearby extinct languages †Chayma and †Cumanagoto; he places Panare into an unclassifiable residue in his Group 15, questioning whether it should even be considered Cariban. Girard is unwilling to seriously consider relationships among his groups, and as such he does not form additional branches between his Groups and Proto-Carib (cf. Figure 1).

Figure 1. Girard's (1971) Classification of the Cariban Family

   1. Cumaná: Chayma, Cumanágoto, †Palenque, †Píritu, †Avaricoto, †Tamanaco?, Mapoyo?

   2. Makiritare: Maionggang, Yekwana/Dekwana, Makiritare, Wayumurá, †Tamanaco?

   3. Pemon: Arekuná, Ingarikó, Kamarakoto, Taulipang, Makuchi, Mapoyo?

   4. Wayana: Wayana, Upurui, Arakwayú, Tiverikoto, Yao

   5. Wayway: Wayway, Hishkaryana, Kachuyana, Parukoto

6. Carib: Carib, Galibi, Kaliña, Akawoyo?
7. Tiriyó: Tiriyó, Kumayena, Pauxi, Pianakoto, Saluma, Tiriometesem,
                 Urukuena, Wama, Carijona, Guake, Hianákoto-Umawa
8. Yawarana: Yawarana, Mapoyo
9. Aparai: Aparai
10. Paushiana: Paushiana, Paravilhana, Sapará
11. Bonari: Bonari, Crishaná, Ipurukoto, Porokoto, Purukoto, Yawaperi
12. Arara: Apiaká, Arara, Parirí, Yarumá
13. Bakairí: Bakairí, Kwikurú, Nahukwa, Yamarikuma
14. Motilon: Motilon, Yukpa, Japreria, etc.
15. Miscellaneous: Opon-Carare, Panare, †Palmella, †Pimenteira

Durbin (1977) places all three in different branches of his Northern-Carib. Akawaio is placed into a tentative subgroup (with Makushi, Pemóng and Purucotó) within his giant (and relatively unsubdivided) East-West-Guiana Carib branch, †Tamanaku into the Venezuela Group of the Coastal Branch, and Panare with Mapoyo and Yabarana in his Western Guiana branch (cf. Figure 2).

Figure 2. Durbin's (1977) Classification of the Cariban Family

Northern Cariban

    Coastal
        Venezuelan: †Tamanaco, †Chayma, †Cumanagoto, †Yao
        Perijá: Yukpa, Japrería, †Yuko
        †Opone-Carare

    Western Guiana
        Mapoyo, Yabarana, Panare, †Quaca, †Pareca

    Galibi
        Carib, Cariña

    East-West Guiana
        Wayana-Aparai, †Roucouyene, †Aracaju, Trio-Rangu
        Wama (Akurio), Urukuyana, Trimetesem, Kumayena
        Pianakoto, Saluma, †Pauxi, Cachuena, Chikena, Waiwai
        Paravilhana, Wabui, Sapara, Yauapery, Waimiri, †Crichana, Pauxiana, †Bonari
        Makusi, Purucoto, Pemong (Taulipang), Patamona, Akawaio, †Arinagoto

    Northern Brazilian
        †Palmella, †Pimenteira?
        †Yaruma, Txicão
        †Pariri, †Apiaka, †Arara, †Yuma

Southern Cariban

    Southeastern Colombian
        †Hianacoto-Umawa
        †Guake
        Carijona

    Xingu Basin
        Bakairi
        †Nahukwa

    Southern Guiana
        Ye'kwana, Wayumara-Azumara, Parukoto, Hixkaryana, Warikyana

On the micro-level, Migliazza (1985) collapses some 28 "language" names in the literature into three languages: Pemóng (with dialects Arekuna, Kamarakoto and Taurepang), Kapóng (with dialects Akawaio, Ingarikó, and Patamona – known in Guyana as Patamuna) and Makushi. Kaufman (1994) builds mainly on Migliazza's and Girard's conclusions, combining Kapóng, Pemóng and Makushi into the Pemóng Proper Subgroup of his Pemóng Group, which he tentatively links to the Jawapery and Paravilhana Groups in his North Amazonian Branch. He places †Tamanaku into the Mapoyo-Yabarana Group, and, influenced by Girard, he places Panare into a group of one, isolated at the periphery of the family (cf. Figure 3).

Figure 3. Classification of the Kariban Family (Kaufman 1994)

        A. Opon
        B. Yukpa Group: Yukpa, Japreria, †Koyama
        C. Karib

    Guiana Branch (D-E-F)
        D. Tiriyo Group
           D1. Tiriyo Subgroup: Akuriyo, Tiriyo
           D2. Karihona Subgroup: Hianakoto, Karihona
           D3. Saluma
        E. Kashuyana Group: Kashuyana, Warikyana, Shikuyana
        F. Waiwai Group: Waiwai, Hixkaryana

    North Amazonian Branch (G-H-I)
        G. Jawaperi Group: †Bonari, Jawaperi
        H. Paravilyana Group
           H1. Sapara
           H2. Paravilyana Subgroup: Pawishiana, Paravilyana

I. Pemóng Group
    I1. Pemóng Proper Subgroup: Makushi, Pemóng (Taurepang, Kamarakóto, (J)arekuna), Kapóng (Akawayo, Patamona, Ingarikó).
    I2. Purukotó

Central Branch (J-K-L-M-N-O)
    J. †Kumaná
    K. †Yao Group: †Tiverikoto, †Yao
    L. Wayana Group: Wayana, †Arakuajú
    M. Apalaí
    N. Mapoyo Group: Mapoyo, †Tamanaku, Yavarana
    O. Makiritare

Southern Branch (P-Q)
    P. Bakarí Group: Bakairí, Amonap, Matipú (Kuikúro, Kalapalo)
    Q. Arara Group: Arara-Pirirí, †Apiaká-Apingi, †Juma, †Yarumá, Chikão
    R. †Palmella
    S. †Pimenteira
    T. Panare

If the linguistic relationships proposed in the following sections are eventually sustained, one would like to explain why previous classifiers did not see them. Were the three to show some modicum of agreement on an alternative proposal, my task would be more difficult, but since their results are so different already, any new proposal would perforce differ with at least two of them. The two answers I offer at this point are (i) poor phonological and lexical data, and (ii) the absence of comparative grammatical data. I have discussed elsewhere (Gildea 1998a.: 8-10) the erroneous data that led to Girard's and Kaufman's mistaken isolation of Panare from the mainstream of Cariban. Suffice it to say here that the wealth of new Panare data – phonological, lexical, and grammatical – made available in the 1980s and 1990s force us to consider Panare a more typical member of the family, and to thus seek out the closer affinities it might present with other languages. Work on †Tamanaku by Mattéi-Muller and Henley (1990) and by Meira and Gildea (in progress) has allowed more extensive consideration of Tamanaku phonology and grammar in comparison to the rest of the family. As for Akawaio, in recent intensive collaborative work with native speaker linguist Desrey Fox, I have encountered new and reliable phonological, lexical and grammatical information that was simply not available to even the most recent classifiers. Fox's and my work in progress confirms Migliazza's, Durbin's and Kaufman's decision to put Akawaio (Kapóng) into a group with

Pemóng and Makushi, and provides much of the impetus to seek out the forms compared in the sections below.

2. The Venezuelan Branch

The Venezuelan Branch is composed of the core group, containing †Tamanaku, Panare, and the Pemóng Group, plus a number of outliers: De'kwana, Mapoyo, Yabarana, †Chayma, and †Cumanagota. At this time, I see no basis for making further subgroupings among these outliers, although given relevant data, we might find that some of these languages share also in some of the "core group" innovations described in sections 3 and 4[1]. Membership in the Venezuelan Branch is based on two shared innovations, one in phonology and the other in inflectional morphology.

2.1. Unconditioned split: *o > o, ə

Accepting Girard's (1971.65) arguments that Proto-Carib had no ə, every modern Cariban language that presents one potentially shared in a single innovation, *o > ə. Across the Cariban family, the list of languages that share ə in the vowel inventory is relatively limited: Panare, the Pemóng Group, De'kwana, Mapoyo, Yabarana, Taranoan and Wayana are clear cases. In the cases of †Tamanaku, †Chayma and †Cumanagoto, correspondences of *o ~ e, ue, a, etc. probably represent cases of *o > ə, in which the ə was simply mistranscribed as a front vowel, a low central vowel or a diphthong. Finally, correspondences of *o ~ ɨ in Makushi and Kapóng represent an additional innovation (apparently complete in Makushi, just underway in Akawaio) in which the *o > ə > ɨ.

This innovation is not uncontroversial in that it hypothesizes an unconditioned split within the vowel *o. A counter-hypothesis would be to reconstruct *ə to Proto-Carib and then allow *ə to fall in with *o in an unconditioned merger. This counter-hypothesis would link the rest of the Cariban family together – rather than the group above – in a different shared innovation. Once we have enough reliable lexical information, I expect we will discover enough variation in the lexical distribution of ə to discredit this alternative hypothesis. That is, I expect to see that different

---

[1] In particular, Mattéi-Muller (1999, 2000) argues from lexical data that Mapoyo, Yawarana and newly discovered Pémono are so closely related as to be essentially variants of a single language, which she suggests belongs in a subgroup with †Tamanaku. This suggests that further research is in order on the Mapoyo/Yawarana/Pémono language, specifically searching for each of the comparative features discussed in the subsequent sections in order to test the various hypotheses.

lexical items hosted the shift from *o > ə in different branches of the family, thereby effectively discrediting the counter-hypothesis. In particular, I expect closer analysis of the shift from *o > ə to reveal that the Taranoan Group and Wayana do not share a closer affinity with the Venezuelan Branch, but participated in a separate innovation (or two). I expect to see evidence of independent phonological innovation in part because, as described in the next section, Taranoan and Wayana do not participate in the second innovation that defines the Venezuelan Branch.

2.2. Third person possessive forms, vowel-initial nouns

Across the family, the most common pattern for marking third person nominal possession is to mark the possessed noun with a prefix, **i-** for consonant-initial nouns, **Ø-** for vowel-initial nouns. I have proposed (Gildea 1998: 114-16) the somewhat controversial Proto-Carib reconstruction of *y- for both forms. However, a subset of Cariban languages shows an unexpected allomorph of the third person possessive prefix on vowel-initial nouns, a range of forms which readily reconstructs to *it- (cf. Table 1). Minus the Taranoan Group and Wayana, the group of languages identified in the preceding section is exactly the group identified here.

Makushi	**it-**
Pemóng	**it**
†Tamanaku	**it-**
Kapóng	**it-/dʲ-/dʒ**
Panare	**t(y)-**
Mapoyo	**t-**
Yawarana	**t-**
†Chayma	**tʃ**
†Cumanagoto	**tʃ**
De'kwana	**d-**

Table 1. Unusual allomorphs for third person possessive, vowel-initial nouns

The first innovation would be Proto-Carib *y- > Proto-Venezuelan *it-. The conservative form is retained in Makushi, Pemóng and †Tamanaku, and as one of the variants in Kapóng. The remaining forms represent palatalization and/or voicing of *t, and/or loss of *i. This is best illustrated in synchronic variation in Kapóng, where intervocalic voicing is general, leading to *it- > id-, and palatalization is ubiquitous, generating variant idʲ-. Loss of initial **i** then leaves only **dʲ-**, which is often pronounced **dʒ-**. In previous work, I mistakenly attributed the Panare variant, **t(y)-**, to a collapse with the third person reflexive prefix *t-, which has not been attested in any dialect of modern Panare. The mysterious (although inconsistent)

palatalization of this form would be expected given the source proposed here. It is not surprising that these five languages present the clearest case for *it-, as they are linked by several other innovations (cf. Section 3).

The remaining cases require further research to solidify, but at the least, certain previously mysterious allomorphs of the third person possessive prefix make sense given a proto-form *it-. De'kwana **d-** would be an expected outcome of intervocalic voicing followed by loss of *i and †Chayma and †Cumanagoto tʃ are readily derived from palatalization of *t and loss of *i. Further research is also indicated for Mapoyo and Yabarana, as their inclusion in this table is by inference from certain examples in Mattéi-Muller (1999), and not from any demonstration of phonologically conditioned allomorphy.

3. The †Tamanaku-Panare-Pemóng (TPP) Macro-Group

Five innovations link these five languages, one case of irregular lexical suppletion, four cases of unique grammatical patterns. Each innovation is potentially not limited to these five languages, and given additional descriptive work in the other proposed members of the Venezuelan Branch, I would not be surprised to find other languages participating in these innovations as well. As an additional caveat, I should also add that each of the shared grammatical patterns could conceivably represent conservative patterns that happen to be conserved in only these languages. I will argue against this interpretation in each individual case, but even if the reader is not convinced in one or two cases, I count on the weight of numbers (especially in combination with the cases from section 4) to make the cumulative impression that something here requires explanation.

I begin with the case of lexical suppletion (section 3.1) and then the cases of grammatical innovation (sections 3.2-3.5).

3.1. Suppletion in the paradigm of the verb of speech

While suppletion is common cross-linguistically in verbs of speech, and some Cariban languages present a partial merger in the paradigms of the verb of speech and the copula, the suppletion described here is unique in form, and so far is well-attested only in the TPP Macro-Group.
The Proto-Carib verb of speech is *kaci 'say, make noise (of)' with the final syllable inferred from allomorphy in the imperative across the family. This form descends to Proto-Venezuelan as *ka/kaC. Preceding the verb is the quoted speech, or a word representing the sound produced,

however the quote/sound appears not to be an argument of the verb; the root is syntactically intransitive, with its sole argument (the subject) being the speaker. In TPP, a reflex of *ka/KaC is the root for most Set I inflections, for all imperatives and negative imperatives, and it also appears in some other conjugations in individual languages. The examples for Panare come from Mattéi-Muller (1994: 102, to appear); for †Tamanaku from Gilij (1965, III: 265-273); for Pemóng from Armellada and Olza (1994: 221-225); for Kapóng from Fox (personal communication); and for Makushi from Williams (1932: 90, 265) and Abbott (1991: 29). Table 2 presents a selection of the data illustrating modern reflexes of *ka/kaC[2]:

	Set I	Imperative	Others
Panare		**kah-kə** 'say it'	**ka-'ka** 'don't say it'
			ka-ñe 'sayer'
†Tamanaku	**kwa-cha** 'I say'	**kai'-ke** 'say it!'	
	kwa-i 'I said'	**ka-te-ke** 'you (pl) say it!'	
	m-ga-i 'you said'		
	m-ka-tomne 'you (pl) said'		
	ka-rimya'ne 'he said'		
	m-ka-chi 'you will say'		
	ka-chi 'he will say'		
Pemóng	**kua-i / u-ka-i** 'I say, said'	**ka-ke** 'say it!'	**ane-ka pai** 'want to say it'
	mue-ka-dan? 'have you said?'		**mue-ka-te-i** 'say it (Pl)!'
	tu-ka-i 'saying'		
	ne-ka-tai 'I said'	**ke-ka-i** 'don't say it!'	
Makushi	**ma-ka-i** 'say it!'	**ka-kə** 'say it'	**ka-i** '(in order) to say'
			tɨ-ka-i pra 'not saying'
			an-ka-pai 'want to say'
			ka-i'ma 'saying'
Kapóng	**u-ga-i / gwa-i** 'I said'	**ka'-kə** 'say it'	———
	nɨ-ga-'ang 'he says'		
	gwa-aik 'I say'		
	mɨ-ga-'ang 'are you saying that?'		

Table 2: TPP Reflexes of *ka/kaC 'say'

The shared TPP innovation is the introduction of the root *taro into various portions of the paradigm for 'say', beginning with (and still concentrated on) nonfinite inflections. This root is syntactically transitive, with the speaker

---

[2] Note that the apparent first person infix -w- in Tamanaku, Pemóng, and Kapóng probably represents labialization of the initial velar followed by loss of the Proto-Carib prefix *w- '1Sa' (Gildea 1998: 90).

taking the role of subject or agent phrase, depending on conjugation. The direct object of *taro is usually the utterance itself, although some examples are attested where the interlocutor is the object rather than occurring in a postpositional phrase. The final syllable of *taro is unstable, leading to a frequent allomorph ta (considered by some analysts, e.g. Armellada and Olza 1994, to be the basic form). The examples for Panare come from Mattéi-Muller (1994: 102); for †Tamanaku from Gilij (1965, III: 265-273); for Pemóng from Armellada and Olza (1994: 221-225); for Kapóng from Fox (personal communication); and for Makushi from Williams (1932: 90, 265) and Abbott (1991: 29, 82). Table 3 presents a selection of the data illustrating modern reflexes of *taro.

	Set I	Others
Panare	**ta-e kən** 'he said'	
†Tamanaku	**ta-i** 'he said'	**taro** 'to say'
	ta-tewe 'they said'	**taro pa'** 'saying'
	channe 'he said'	**taro uya** 'I say'
	ta-ine 'he said'	**taro-che** 'in order to say'
	ta-tomne 'he (pl) said'	**taro-chetpe** 'in order to say'
		taro-tepo 'to say'
		taro-nei 'sayer'
		taro-tpe 'that which was said'
Pemóng		**taure-da** 'I say'
		ta-ya (taure-ya) 'he says'
		taure-pue-ya 'he said'
		e ta-u-ya? 'what do you say?'
Makushi		**ta-'pɨ-i-ya** 'he said'
		taa-sa-i'-ya 'he said'
		ta-niŋ 'sayer'
		amula ta-e pu 'you say'
		ə ta-sa nai 'what did he say?'
		ta-u-ya 'I say'
		taa tanne 'while saying'
		taa-won 'what is said'
		taa pɨ' 'saying'
Kapóng		**ta-'pɨ iya** 'he said'
		ta-dok 'something to say'
		se da-bai 'want to say this'
		ta do'-ya 'they say'
		da bək mang 'he is saying it'
		ə'rə da-'pɨ awya 'what did you say?'

Table 3: TPP Reflexes of *taro 'say'

As expected, Pemóng, Kapóng and Makushi pattern virtually identically, with *taro occurring only in etymologically nonfinite inflections. Surprisingly, *taro appears to have advanced farther in

†Tamanaku, appearing in several finite inflections for third person subjects. Panare also shows a reflex of *taro in a finite inflection, but in all the nonfinite forms where we would expect a reflex of **taro**, a third suppletive root, **a'ka(ma)** is found instead (Mattéi-Muller 1994: 102, to appear). This innovation is unique to Panare, but the occurrence of a reflex of *taro in the one inflection is enough to allow speculation that Panare perhaps went through the same change before **a'ka(ma)** moved in.

This hypothesis can be tested by collecting full paradigms for verbs of speech in all the surviving Cariban languages. This would allow us to be much more specific about the precise conjugations where we expect to see suppletion – if the innovation is shared, then the overlap should be significant, and the nonshared suppletion should arguably be considered due to subsequent independent innovation. On the other hand, if this particular suppletion turns out to be widespread in the family, then it would no longer argue for closer relationship between †Tamanaku, Panare and the Pemóng Group. In this latter vein, it is interesting to note that the comparative wordlist in Mattéi-Muller & Henley (1990: 132) lists the forms **tu** for Mapoyo and **yata** for Yabarana, both possible modern reflexes of **taro**, and Meira (pc) reports that he has encountered suppletive forms **tawro** 'saying' and **ta-toko** 'when/while saying' in the paradigm for the Hixkaryana verb of speech.

3.2. The innovative progressive system

As described and argued in some detail in Gildea (1998, Ch. 12), an innovative progressive inflection/construction has arisen in several Cariban languages. The source for the progressive morphology is distinct for transitive and intransitive verbs, giving rise to a suppletive progressive marker: *-**rɨ-poko** 'Action.Nominalizer-on' for transitive verbs and *-**no-poko** 'Infinitive-on' for intransitive verbs. While both the infinitive and the nominalizer derive a nominal from a verb stem, they differ in that the infinitival verb cannot be possessed, whereas the action nominalization is obligatorily possessed by the notional absolutive argument (in this construction, only the transitive O, the accusative). These two different derived nouns are then made objects of the locative postposition ***poko** 'on', which is itself made the complement of a copular clause. The entire source construction is thus parallel to English sentences like "He is on (the)

hunting of deer," and "He is on singing"³. After reanalysis, the nominalizer/infinitive suffix combines with the postposition to create the new progressive inflection; the possessor of the transitive nominalized verb becomes the accusative object; the subject of the copula in both cases becomes the subject of the new progressive clause.

Proto-Carib	***-no poko**	***-rɨ poko**
†Tamanaku	**-ne pake / -pa'**	**-ri pake / -pa'**
Panare	**-nəpə**	**-ŋpə / -mpə'**
Pemóng	**-nəpə' / -ŋpə'**	**-pə'**
Kapóng	**-nəbək / -ŋbək**	**-pək / -bək**
Makushi	**-nɨpɨ' / -ŋpɨ'**	**-pɨ'**

Table 4. The Progressive in the TPP Macro-Group

Phonologically, the progressive suffixes have evolved in each language as follows: in †Tamanaku, the transcription undoubtably is flawed, and we are safe in assuming that the progressive forms are simply the Proto-Carib forms with ***o > ə**, and with the frequent loss of the final vowel of the erstwhile postposition, especially when followed by the first person pronoun. In Panare and the Pemóng Group, the nominalizer ***-rɨ** disappears (as do other word-final and root-final **rɨ** syllables, cf. section 4.4). In the Pemóng Group, the disappearing ***-rɨ** protected the final syllable of the verb stem from reduction (cf. Gildea 1995, 1992, ch. 9), leaving behind a -Ø nominalization; thus, the only marker of the transitive progressive verb is the modern reflex of ***poko** (> Kap/Pem **-pək/-pə'** > Mak **-pɨ'**). In all Cariban languages, ***-rɨ** is the most frequent of some four or five suffixes that mark possessed nouns, the second most common overt marker being ***-nɨ**. In Panare, ***-nɨ > -ŋ** and expanded from its previously limited distribution to mark most possessed nouns and the action nominalization (cf. Wayana for a parallel extension of ***-nɨ** (> **-n**) to mark most possessed nouns following loss of ***-rɨ**). The combination of **-ŋ** + ***poko** (>**pə'**) gives the transitive progressive suffix **-ŋpə' > -mpə'.** For intransitive verbs, the infinitive ***-no > -nə > -ŋ**, with Panare showing only **-nə**, Kapóng/Pemóng showing **-nə** / C+____ and **-ŋ** / V+____, and Makushi showing **-nɨ** / C+____ and **-ŋ** / V+____. These allomorphs combine with the modern reflex of ***poko** in a straightforward way to produce the various allomorphs of the intransitive progressive suffix.

---

³ This is the actual source construction for the modern English progressive. *cf.* Visser 1968, Nagucka 1984).

While there have been disagreements about the synchronic status of the syntactic reanalysis in both Panare and the Pemóng Group (cf. Álvarez 1999a[1996] and the response in Gildea 1998:153-60, 208-9, plus Gildea 2000), there is no question that the primary function of the construction in each of these is to indicate the progressive. Further, it is clear that the etymological distributions of the nominalizer and infinitive have changed, being restricted to transitive and intransitive verbs, respectively, in the progressive construction. In other Cariban languages (and as reconstructed to Proto-Carib in Gildea 1998, ch. 7-8), both the nominalizer and the infinitive occur freely on either transitive or intransitive verbs, and both occur freely preceding the locative postposition *poko 'on'. Synchronically, in the Pemóng Group the nominalized intransitive verb can no longer occur at all as the object of the postposition *poko; in Panare, the intransitive nominalization can be an object of *poko, but this PP cannot be a complement of the copula (i.e. can no longer occur in the construction that was the source for the progressive). Similarly, in Panare the transitive infinitive inflection is no longer attested as the complement of *poko; and in †Tamanaku and the Pemóng Group, the infinitive no longer occurs with any transitive verbs.

This combination of restrictions is unusual, and noteworthy precisely because the lost forms/distributions are complementary to the forms that have become the progressive inflection. If one accepts that the transitive nominalization and the intransitive infinitive, *when found together with* *poko *in the source construction*, have been reanalyzed into a single suppletive progressive inflection, then the source construction is left with only intransitive nominalizations and transitive infinitives, an odd combination. The loss of these forms from the source construction then eliminates that odd combination, and in the process eliminates the source construction altogether from the synchronic grammar. Absent the motivation of a reanalyzed progressive, the loss of the "rest" of the source construction is inexplicable and mysterious.

Amongst the five languages in question, Kapóng and Panare show clear evidence for syntactic reanalysis; Pemóng and Makushi show clear semantic evidence for reanalysis; the †Tamanaku data are insufficient to argue convincingly either for a conservative or innovative analysis of the progressive (Gildea 2000 for Akawaio, Gildea 1998, ch. 12 for the others). †Chayma and †Cumanagoto present possible cases of reanalysis, but detailed investigation of the historical materials will be necessary to posit a firm analysis. Parallel innovations are attested in Apalaí and Kaxuyana, but

each is substantially different in other details and they are thus clearly independent innovations.

One problem arises with the claim that the various progressive constructions represent a shared innovation: I have claimed that the nominalizer/infinitive and the postposition fuse into a single suppletive progressive inflection in the modern languages, yet the nominalizer component of the source continued to evolve identically both within and independently of the progressive. Only †Tamanaku retained the original morphological forms, with the Pemóng Group losing the action nominalizer in all contexts (including the innovative progressive construction) and Panare first losing *-rɨ and then extending -ŋ into all contexts where *-rɨ once occurred (including the innovative progressive construction). The fact that these later changes affected all contexts in which *-rɨ once appeared provides convincing evidence that the nominalization/infinitive plus postposition had not, at the time of Proto-TPP, fused into a single morpheme. As shown by Heine (1992, 1993), phonological fusion is not a necessary concomitant of syntactic reanalysis, but merely a common later effect. Thus, although the presence of phonological fusion would have offered reinforcement, the absence of such fusion does not detract from the argument for morphosyntactic reanalysis.

3.3. Finite Relative Clauses

In most of the Cariban family, subordinate clauses are all nominalizations; in particular, the functional load of relative clauses is carried by agent and patient nominalizations. Thus, any form of subordination that utilizes finite inflectional morphology is arguably innovative. In particular, relative clauses based on finite inflected verbs are unattested in any Cariban language outside the TPP Macro-Group, so the occurrence of finite relative clauses across the group should be evidence for shared innovation. Unfortunately, the morphology and syntax of these relative clauses are very poorly understood to date, leaving substantial room for a hypothesis of parallel innovation.

They are attested only in passing for †Tamanaku (Gilij 1965, III: 148, 156) and Kapóng (Fox, pc). Makushi apparently has lost finite relative clauses along with the rest of the etymological finite verbal system (cf. Gildea 1998: 76-78). Finite relative clauses in Pemóng are mentioned in passing in the first dialect of Pemóng (Pemón1), described in Armellada (1943a), Armellada and Olza (1994). For a second dialect of Pemóng (Pemón2), Álvarez (1999a, and especially 1999b) offers substantially more

data, and hence a clearer picture. Only relative clauses in Panare have received any kind of detailed syntactic treatment, and this only in an unpublished Master's thesis (Gildea 1989).

In all four languages, the relativizing morphology comes immediately after the inflected verb, written as postverbal particles in †Tamanaku and as suffixes in the others. The relativizers vary paradigmatically for semantic features of the head noun (NP$_{REL}$), in Panare for animacy, in Kapóng for number, and in Pemóng for both animacy (Pemón2) and number (both Pemón1 and Pemón2). In †Tamanaku, Gilij does not discuss what conditions the alternation between the two forms.

	Sg.Anim	Pl.Anim	Inan (Sg/Pl)
Kapóng:	**-nek**	**nek-nan**	**nek**
Pemón1:	**-nek**	**-nan**	
Pemón2:	**-nɨ'**	**-nan**	**-yi**
Panare:	**-(mə)nəh**		**-(mə)ŋ**
			-sɨn

(Semantic distinction unknown for Tamanaku)

†Tamanaku:	**(ma)nechi**		**(mai)ri**

Table 5. Innovative Relativizers in the TPP Macro-Group

The form of the Singular Animate relativizers are readily relatable (assuming, on phonological grounds only, that †Tamanaku **(ma)nechi** belongs with this group): *(ma)nechi > (ma)nek > (mə)nə' > nɨ'**. The plural form **-nan** is added to the relativizer in Kapóng, and stands alone as the relativizer in the two dialects of Pemóng (specified as plural animate in Pemón2, as merely plural in Pemón1), and one wonders whether it might not turn up in further research in Panare. Suggestive parallels are also seen in the unstable syllable -**ma/mə**, attested in two forms each in Panare and †Tamanaku. An additional connection might exist between †Tam **-ri** and Pan **-ŋ**, both identical (except for the unstable syllable **mai/mə**), to their respective action nominalizers (as discussed in section 3.2). Future descriptions of relative clauses in Pemóng and Kapóng can be expected to offer reliable phonological forms and more complete descriptions of the syntactic patterns of relativization; further research in Panare might uncover a cognate plural form, as well. If such forms do turn up, it may be possible to reconstruct a single shared innovation, with later diversification into semantically more restricted forms.

3.4. Sole reflexes of *-cetɨ 'Nominalizer'

Modern reflexes of **-cetɨ** are attested in only Panare, †Tamanaku and Kapóng. The form is not likely of extremely recent origin, as it is old enough to be a part of innovative inflectional morphology in Panare and Kapóng. The only attestations of a modern reflex of **-cetɨ** as a separate morpheme are found in paradigms in †Tamanaku. The various reflexes attested so far are listed in Table 6.

†Tamanaku:	**-cheti**	'Frequentative Nzr'	< *-cetɨ
	-cheti-pe	'Purposive'	< *-cetɨ pe
	-ceti-pa-no	'Purposive-Nominalized'	< *cetɨ pe-no
Panare:	**-sehpe**	'Purposive, same subject'	< *-cetɨpe
	-sehpa	'Future'	< *cetɨ pe-no
	-se'ñape	'Purposive, different subject'	< *cetɨ-na pe
Kapóng:	**-se'ñape**	'Purpose of motion, same subject'	< *cetɨ-na pe

Table 6. Reflexes of *-cetɨ in the TPP Macro-Group

The nominal status of the verb plus **-cetɨ** (at least etymologically) is clear in that it is followed by the attributivizing postposition **pe** in all three languages. An additional form is created by nominalizing the postposition with the suffix **-no**, which has the effect (family-wide) of changing a preceding **e** to **a**. This vowel ablaut is the only remaining evidence of the nominalization in Panare, captured in the modern alternation between **-sehpe** and **-sehpa** (cf. Mattéi-Muller to appear for this and several other examples in Panare). The source of the **ña** syllable in the two purposive suffixes remains mysterious.

Various different nominalizations have evolved into inflected main clause verb forms in both Panare and Kapóng; the other nominalizations **cum** main clause inflections all reconstruct to Proto-Carib as nominalizers (cf. Gildea 1998, ch. 7). By analogy, one might expect a comparable antiquity for *-cetɨ. However, I am aware of no firm cognates (or even likely candidates) in any other branch of the family, a finding which suggests a more recent origin. If it is attested in other branches of the family, then the hypothesis of shared innovation will fall and this will no longer be a criterion that argues for closer relationship between †Tamanaku, Panare and the Pemóng Group.

3.5. The innovation of *a-* as an impersonal prefix and *an-* as '3O.Negative'

The final innovation to be considered in this section is quite poorly documented; I include it here mostly in the hopes of stimulating further

descriptive work on this affix, in the hopes of identifying its source and evolution. Across the family, the third person object prefix of a negative verb contains the expected **i-** '3' plus an alveolar nasal: **in-** '3O.Neg'. Uniquely in this proposed branch, the form is **an-**. Additionally, in a number of non-agreeing verb forms (i.e. forms that usually take either no personal prefix or an invariant form **i-** or **ɨ-**), these languages take a surprising invariant prefix **a-**.

	Vintr imperative	negative	desiderative	Vtrans negative	imperative
Panare	**a-**	**a-**		**an-**	
Kapóng			**a-**		**an-**
Tamanaku					**an-**

Table 7. The Surprising **a-** element in prefixes in the TPP Macro-Group

This series of personal prefixes with an **a-** element may be unrelated (most appear in different columns on the chart!), but as they are found in no other languages in the family, their origin might be found at the level of Proto-TPP. Certainly I will examine future grammatical descriptions for further evidence of an **a-** creeping into the domain previously occupied by **i-/ɨ-**.

This concludes the presentation of innovations that link †Tamanaku, Panare and the Pemóng Group. In the next section I list those that exclude †Tamanaku, indicating a more recent connection between Panare and the Pemóng Group.

4. The Panare-Pemóng Macro-Group

The five additional properties that connect Panare and the Pemóng Group include two phonological (section 4.1) and three grammatical innovations (sections 4.2-4.4).

4.1. Phonological Innovations: Syllable Reduction.

Across the Cariban family, the final syllable of verb stems reduces when followed by a suffix that begins with a simple CV (Gildea 1995). The innovation in Panare and the Pemóng Group is to extend that syllable reduction to the final syllable of unpossessed nouns and possessed nouns that have no explicit suffix indicating their syntactic status (in Meira's 1999 terms, 'zero-grade' possessed nouns) and at least one postposition. The shared syllable reduction involves two distinct phonological innovations, loss of a word-final high vowel (with a couple of exceptional

mid vowels lost) and then subsequent debuccalization of the now word-final consonant. Obstruents drop back in the oral tract, first to the velum and then to the glottis; all become stops as well, although at the glottal point of articulation, a fricative allophone has also been observed in at least Panare and Makushi. Nasals drop back to the velar point of articulation.

gloss	'on'	'hair'	'house'	'yam'	'name'	'mountain'	'feces'	'louse'	'flesh'	'blood'
P-C	*poko	*cipotɨ	*ewotɨ	*——	*ecetɨ	*wɨpɨ	*wetɨ	*yamɨ	*punu	*munu
Tam	pake	cipoti	yeutit	icaku	eceti	tipue	weti	cike	punu	micuku
Pem	pək	cipok	——	cak	esek	wɨk	——	ayaŋ	puŋ	mɨŋ
Kap	pək	cipok	ewɨk	sak	ezek	wɨk	wek	ayaŋ	buŋ	mɨŋ
Mak	pɨ'	cibo'	yewɨ'	——	ese'	wɨ'	we'	azaŋ	puŋ	mɨŋ
Pan	pə'	ipo'	yiwɨ'	co'	yice'	i'	we'	sɨhpəŋ	puŋ	mechu'

Table 8. Cognate Sets Illustrating Syllable Reduction in the Panare-Pemóng Macro-Group

As can be seen, †Tamanaku does not share in either of the phonological innovations. Panare and the Pemóng Group share in the loss of the final vowel in all these examples. If we consider debuccalization to be a progressive process, then it would be *C > k > '. In this case, we could reconstruct both loss of the final vowel and the first stage of debuccalization, *C > *k, to the PP Macro-Group. Then the subsequent change from *k > ' would be independently observed in Makushi and Panare, with allophony already seen in Kapóng and Pemóng as well. In Kapóng, allophony has extended all the way to gemination of a following word-initial obstruent, or even deletion (leaving the following obstruent voiceless in intervocalic position, where voicing would otherwise be expected). For all four languages, a word-final nasal (*m / *n) > ŋ.

It is worth observing at this point that parallel loss of a word final vowel has been observed in other Cariban languages, although not so widespread nor so specifically targeting the category of nouns. In particular, further examination of the historical materials on †Chayma and †Cumanagoto may reveal a pattern in final vowel loss there, as well. Also, as noted by Meira (2000) for the Taranoan Group, syllable reduction appears to be diffusing through the lexicon in waves, leading to numerous cognates in which some members of the group show reduction and others do not, preventing reduction from being reconstructed to Proto-Taranoan for those roots. When you add in the possible confounding variable of the extensive contact enjoyed by the Cariban languages of Venezuela and the Guiana Plateau, more data will certainly lead to a more complicated picture for this particular innovation.

4.2. Loss of 1+2 prefix, gain of 1+2 suffix (source unknown)

In Proto-Carib, four persons were morphologically distinguished in personal prefixes: first, second, third, and first person dual inclusive (1+2). The Proto-Carib 1+2 verbal prefixes, *-kɨc- '1+2A' and *k(ɨ)- '1+2O', and the possessive/object of postposition prefix *k(ɨ)- '1+2', are lost in Panare and the Pemóng Group. An innovative suffix *-nə (Mak. -nɨ) '1+2S' occurs between the derivational suffixes and the inflectional suffixes in Panare and two of the three Pemóng Group languages, Makushi and Kapóng. In Kapóng, the same suffix can occur as '1+2O', and it can occur in a wider range of verbal systems.

(1)   Panare

   a. **w-tə-n̲ə̲-sa'**   b. **w-tə-n̲ə̲-sehpa**
      SA-go-1+2-PERFECT   SA-go-1+2-FUTURE
      'We (Incl) have gone / our (Incl) having gone.' 'We (Incl) will go.'

   c. **w-tə-n̲ə̲-hpə**   d. **w-tə-n̲ə̲-htépe**
      SA-go-1+2-PERFECT.INFERENTIAL   SA-go-1+2-DESIDERATIVE
      'We (Incl) have gone / our (Incl) having gone.' 'We (Incl) want to go.'

(2)   Kapóng

   a. **(u-)go'man -n̲ə̲-tai**   b. **Ø-embaga-n̲n̲ə̲-tai**
      (1-) remain-1+2-PAST2   3A1O-awaken-1+2O-PAST2
      'We (Incl) lived/remained'   'He woke us (Incl) up.'

   c. **(u-)go'man-n̲ə̲-'aik**   d. **kɨrə ya Ø-wə-n̲ə̲-sa   kong mang**
      (1-) remain-1+2-IMPERFECTIVE.CERTAIN   3Sg ERG 1O-hit-1+2O-PERF COLL 3.COP
      'We (Incl) live/remain (are living/remaining).' 'He has hit us.'

(4)   Makushi (Abbott 1991.50, 103)

   a. **es-erinka-n̲ sɨrɨrɨ**   b. **erepan-n̲ɨ**
      DETR-sing-1:INCL Speaker.Involvement   eat.1:INCL
      'We all will sing.'   'We arrive.'

   c. **entamo'ka-n̲**   d. **epɨrema-n̲-pai-'nɨkon**
      eat-1:INCL   pray-1:INCL-HORT-COLL
      'We eat.'   'Let's all pray.'

Given that two of three Pemóng Group languages share the same innovation as Panare, it is safe to reconstruct the innovative 1+2 suffix to Proto-Panare-Pemóng and assume that Pemóng has subsequently lost it. Perhaps in future research, some dialects of Pemóng will be found that still utilize **-nə** '1+2'.

4.3. The use of *-*sapo* 'Abs.Nzr' with personal prefixes (and in main clauses)

Clear reflexes of this Proto-Carib nominalizing suffix are relatively rare. On the one hand, they are found in †Chayma, Kapóng, Makushi, Pemóng and Panare; on the other, in the somewhat distant Parukotoan Group, in languages Hixkaryana and Waiwai[4]. In the Parukotoan languages, a verb bearing *-**sapo** cannot be possessed, nor can it bear personal prefixes. Also, the form is rarely used. In the PP Macro-Group languages, the verb bearing ***-sapo** is obligatorily possessed by its notional absolutive (either a free noun or prefix); further, this suffix is now used as a perfect/passive inflection in all four languages, suggesting that the reanalysis might have been a shared innovation inherited by all four.

(5) Panare

    a. **wɨtəsa'**

      Ø-wɨ-tə-sa'

      1S-Sa-go-PERF

      'I have gone'

    b. **pétyumasa'**

      Ø-pétyuma-sa'

      1O-beat-PERF/PASS

      'I have been beaten' or 's/he/it has beaten me'

    c. **y-ɨkɨtɨ-sa' mən manko Toman uya**

      3-cut-PERF is.INAN mango Thomas AGT

      'The mango has been cut by Thomas / Thomas has cut the mango.'

(6) Pemóng

    a. **pemon ye'sa' man**

      pemon yepɨ-sa' man

      person arrive-PERF 3.be

      'The man arrived.'

    b. **pemon enna'posa'**

      pemon enna'po-sa'

      person return-PERF

      'the person returned.'

(7) Kapóng

    a. **Karoik ya tɨiwɨk agu'nəzak a'kraimudung be**

      Karoik ya tɨ-iwɨk agu'nə-sak a'kraymudung be

      Karoik ERG 3REFL-house paint-PERF green   ATTR

      'Karoik painted his house green.'

    b. **ə'r ə gang aye'sak**?

      ə'r ə gang a-yepɨ-sak?

      what for   2-come-PERF

      'What have you come for?'

---

[4] Derbyshire (1999) asserts that Carib **-xpo** is also a reflex of *-**sapo** rather than *-**tɨpu**, as I propose in Gildea 1992/1998. Until now, I have seen no compelling evidence to favor one position over the other, but if it is really a reflex of *-**sapo** then my claim about the unique innovation of person-marking on the *-**sapo** verb in the PP Macro-Group will fall, as the **-xpo** verb in Carib takes person-marking.

c. **king ya   yenno'sak   mang**
   king ya   y-ennogɨ-sak mang
   king ERG 1-send-PERF 3.COP
   'The King has sent me.'

(8)   Makushi (Abbott 1991.115, 118)
   a. **a-ko'man-pɨ'-sa'**   b. **i-nɨmɨ-sa-i'-ya**   **wanɨ-pɨ'**
      3-remain-ITERATIVE-COMPLETIVE   3-leave-COMPLETIVE-3-ERG be-PAST
      'He has remained (repeatedly).'   'He had left it.'

4.4. Loss of the Proto-Carib possession / Action Nominalization suffix *-rɨ*

This innovation has been discussed already in section 3.2, so I will simply summarize here: Proto-Carib *-rɨ* > †Tamanaku **-ri** (probably [-rɨ] > Panare, Pemóng, Kapóng, Makushi **-Ø**; in a separate development, possessed nominal suffix Proto-Carib *nɨ > Panare **-ŋ** and extends to most possessed nouns, then to replace *-rɨ* as the action nominalizer.

Parallel loss of *-rɨ* is seen in other Cariban languages, including Wayana and Tiriyó, and what looks like an intermediary stage of loss is seen in the frequent elision of the vowel (*-rɨ* > **-r**) in the Parukotoan Group (Hixkaryana, Waiwai, Kaxuyana), Chayma and Cumanagota. The Tiriyó loss is certainly a separate innovation, as Meira (2000: 69-70) reconstructs *-rɨ* to Proto-Taranoan, with the loss in Tiriyó being very recent (actually within the last century).

Conclusion

This paper has pointed out a number of possible shared innovations that link a number of geographically contiguous Cariban languages into a branch, which I propose to call the Venezuelan Branch. Most of these proposed innovations are in the area of morphosyntax, and nearly all are somewhat tentative due to the absence of rich grammatical descriptions for most of the languages in question. Further questions might arise about whether these innovations are in fact limited to the proposed groupings. For instance, some of the innovations proposed for the restricted Macro-Groups (both TPP and PP) might in fact be found in other languages in the Venezuelan Branch; others might be found in languages that I do not propose to belong in the Venezuelan Branch (for instance, the names Wayana and Tiriyó come up several times as "parallel innovators"). Even the proposed shared innovations in phonology come primarily from phonological analyses of the individual languages, and not from extensive cognate sets. And finally, I cannot ignore the possibility that the TPP

Macro-Group looks more similar to me than it might to other researchers simply because I have the personal experience of working closely with Panare, Akawaio and †Tamanaku, while I have no such personal experience with the other languages in the putative Venezuelan Branch[5].

Ultimately, a reliable classification of the entire family will only come into being as a result of solid descriptive work coupled with careful comparison and reconstruction at the group-level. In the Cariban family, the only example of such work to date is Meira's 2000 reconstruction of Proto-Taranoan, which reconstructs phonology, lexicon, and both inflectional and derivational morphology. Particularly noteworthy is how Meira collected extensive personal field notes on two of the three Taranoan languages, and how he compiled and evaluated all previous sources of information on all three of the individual languages in the group. Future comparative work in the Cariban family can now take the Taranoan Group, and its reconstructed forms, as the comparator, and thus arrive at a more accurate overall picture. This is the model I hope to work towards, one group at a time, until the comparative picture of the overall family becomes clearer.

But despite the preliminary and tentative nature of the conclusions that can be drawn from the data presented here, it is necessary to move forward with new classificatory hypotheses to test. We cannot continue indefinitely to cite and recite classifications that we know are deeply flawed, simply because we cannot yet do the job the way it ultimately must be done. Perhaps in the long term, we will disconfirm all of the classificatory hypotheses that arise from the facts as they appear at this point in time. Even in that case, I would hope that this paper is still seen as making a contribution by presenting a series of facts that require further investigation, and by encouraging and providing direction to additional descriptive work so that in the future, better facts can eventually point to a better conclusion.

---

[5] Of course, I do have personal experience with a reasonable number of Cariban languages in Brazil, Surinam and French Guiana, including Akuriyó, Apalaí, Carib, Hixkaryana, Ikpéng, Kaxuyana, Tiriyó, Waiwai and Wayana. I have not been biased by that experience to propose any of these languages for membership in the Venezuelan Branch, nor would I propose a special branch to encompass all of them. My caveat is more intended as an acknowledgement that additional knowledge of Panare, Akawaio and †Tamanaku has given me the opportunity to observe parallels more readily, an opportunity that will not be forthcoming for other languages of the proposed Venezuelan Branch until clear, reliable descriptive work is done for those languages that are still spoken, and solid archival work on the extensive 16th century materials for †Chayma and †Cumanagota.

References

ABBOTT, Miriam
    1991 Macushi. *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, vol. 3, Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds), 23-160. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

ÁLVAREZ, José
    1998 Split ergativity and complementary distribution of NPs and pronominal affixes in Pemóng (Cariban). *Opción* 25: 69-94. Maracaibo, Venezuela: Universidad de Zúlia.
    1999a. *Construcciones progresivas en pemón e otras lenguas caribes.* 30 pp. ms. Revised version of 1996 presentation: Construcciones progresivas en pemón e panare: ¿Nominalización o reanalisis? Presented at IX Jornadas de Lingüística ALFAL-AsoVAC, Barquisimetro, November 17-23.
    1999b. Estrategias de relativización en pemón (Caribe). 21 pp. ms.

ARMELLADA, Cesário de
    1943a. *Grammatica de la Lengua Pemón*, vol. I. Caracas: Artes Gráficas.

ARMELLADA, Cesário de & Jesús OLZA
    1994 *Gramática de la Lengua Pemón (Morfosintaxis)*. San Cristóbal, Venezuela: Universidad Católica del Táchira.

DERBYSHIRE, Desmond C.
    1999 Carib. *The Amazonian Languages.* R.M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 23-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DURBIN, Marshall
    1977 *A survey of the Carib language family. Carib Speaking Indians, Culture, and Society,* Ellen Basso (ed.), 23-38. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

FOX, Desrey
    2000 Grammatical and lexical variation within the Akawaio (Cariban) language in the village of Waramadong. *Workshop in American Indian Languages*, U.C. Santa Barbara.

GILDEA, Spike
    1989 *Simple and Relative Clauses in Panare.* M.A. Thesis, Department
         of Linguistics, University of Oregon.
    1995 A comparative description of syllable reduction in the Cariban
         language family. *International Journal of American Linguistics*
         61: 62-102.
    1998 *On Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative Cariban Morphosyntax.*
         Oxford: Oxford University Press.
    2000 The Innovative Progressive in Akawaio (Cariban). *Workshop on*
         Amerindian Languages, University of California, Santa Barbara.

GILIJ, Filippo Salvatore
    1780-1784 *Saggio di Storia Americana.* Vol. 1-3. Rome.
    1965 (1780-84*) Ensayo de Historia Americana* (Translation of Gilij
         1780-1784, by Antonio Tovar), Vol. 1-3. Caracas: Italgráfica.

GIRARD, Victor
    1971 Proto Carib Phonology. University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.
         dissertation.

GOEJE, Claudius H. de
    1909 *Etudes Linguistiques Caraïbes.* Amsterdam: Verhandelingen van
         de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, afdeeling
         letterkunde, n.r. 10 (3).
    1946 *Etudes Linguistiques Caraïbes.* Amsterdam: Verhandelingen van
         de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, afdeeling
         letterkunde, n.r. 49 (2).

HEINE, Bernd
    1993 *Auxiliaries: Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization.* New
         York: Oxford University Press.
    1994 *Grammaticalization as an explanatory parameter. Perspectives*
         on Grammaticalization, William Pagliuca (ed.), 255-287.
         Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

KAUFMAN, Terrence K.
    1994 The native languages of South America. *Atlas of the World's*
         Languages. Christopher Mosely & R. E. Asher (eds), 46-76.
         New York: Routledge.

MATTEI-MULLER, Marie-Claude
  1994 *Diccionario Ilustrado Panare-Español, indice Español-Panare.*
       Caracas: Comisión Quinto-Centenário.
  1999 Mapoyo, Yawarana, two variants of a same Carib language: New
       outlook on ergativity and classification of Carib Languages. 21pp. ms.
  2003 Pémono: lost link between the Mapoyo and the Yawarana, ergative
       languages of the northwest Guyana of Venezuela. *Amerindia* 28
       [dans ce volume]
  to appear. Voir et Savoir en Panaré. *L'énonciation médiatisée* II, Zlatka
       Guentcheva & Jon Landaburu (eds.), Bibliothèque de
       l'Information Grammaticale, Louvain-Paris: Peeters.

MATTEI-MULLER, Marie-Claude & Paul HENLEY
  1990 *Los Tamanaku: su lengua, su vida.* San Cristobal: Universidad
       Católica del Táchira.

MEIRA, Sérgio
  1999 A Grammar of Tiriyó. Ph.D. Dissertation, Rice University.
  2000 *A Reconstruction of Proto-Taranoan: Phonology and Morphology.*
       Lincom Studies in Native American Linguistics 30. Munich: Lincom
       Europa.

MIGLIAZZA, Ernest C.
  1985 Languages of the Orinoco-Amazon Region: current status. *South
       American Indian Languages: Retrospect and Prospect*, Harriet E.
       Manelis Klein & Louisa R. Stark (eds), 286-303. Austin:
       University of Texas Press.

WILLIAMS, James
  1932 *Grammar notes and vocabulary of the language of the Makuchi
       Indians of Guiana.* St. Gabriel-Mëdling near Vienna, Austria:
       Verlag der Internationalen Zeitschrift Anthropos.