

CAUSATIVE MARKING IN RESÍGARO (ARAWAKAN):  
A DESCRIPTIVE AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE<sup>1</sup>

Frank Seifart

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

The aim of this paper is twofold: The first and major aim is to contribute to the grammatical description of the underdescribed and severely endangered Arawakan language Resígaro spoken in Colombia and Peru by providing a description of the intricate morphophonology and of the morphosyntactic patterns of causative marking in this language. In doing so, this paper also treats some general grammatical characteristics of the language, such as tone and argument marking. The Resígaro causative marker is used to increase the valency of both intransitive and transitive verbs. The causative objects of causativized verbs are the only syntactically obligatory objects in the language. The second, more minor aim of this paper is a brief comparison of the Resígaro causative marker with cognate forms in the related Arawakan languages Achagua, Piapoco, and Tariana. This reveals

syntactic and semantic parallels that point at a close association of causativization and transitivity in this group of languages. This type of causatives contrasts with so-called sociative causatives of Southern Amazonia.

[KEYWORDS: Resígaro, Arawakan languages, causatives, valency, transitivity]

**1. Introduction.** While most South Arawakan languages have various valency-increasing devices, often including various causative markers (Wise 1990; Aikhenvald 1999; Payne 2002), North Arawakan languages tend to be poorer in this respect. Resígaro has only one morphological valency-increasing device, the verbal derivational causative marker *-(o)ta ~ -(o)tu*, which this paper is about. Like prototypical causatives (Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000: 13), it demotes the subject of the underived verb (*Iláána* ‘boy’ in (1a))<sup>2</sup> to being an object with respect to the derived, causative verb (1b), and introduces a causer (*feédo* ‘grandmother’ in (1b)) as a new participant and subject of the derived causative verb.

(1a) *Ilaána*      *mú*  
boy            sleep  
‘The boy is sleeping’

(1b) *feédo*            *Ilaána*      *mo-tú*  
grandmother    boy            sleep-CAUS  
‘Grandmother makes the boy sleep’

After a brief introduction to the Resígaro people and general characteristics of the language (section 2), this paper first presents a description of the intricate morphophonology of the Resígaro causative marker (section 3). Then a number of morphosyntactic characteristics of causative marking in Resígaro are discussed (section 4), including the expression of objects of causativized verbs, the compatibility of causative marking with different types of verbs, and the fossilization of causative markers on some verbs. Finally (section 5), the Resígaro causative marker is briefly compared to those of cognate forms in the three other Arawakan

languages, Achagua, Piapoco, and Tariana, which are geographically as well as genealogically relatively close to Resígaro.

The only published source on causative marking in Resígaro is Allin (1976), a grammar written in the tagmemic framework. The current paper is based on extensive new Resígaro data from Seifart et al. (eds., 2009)<sup>3</sup>, and it points out where Allin's (1976) analyses are confirmed by this data and where they are not. This description of causativization in Resígaro is used for some comparative analyses in section 5 of this paper, and will hopefully be useful for further typological and comparative analyses.

## **2. The Resígaro people and language.**

**2.1. The Resígaro people.** The traditional territory of the Resígaro was between the Putumayo and Caquetá rivers in Southeastern Colombia, forming part of the multilingual cultural complex known as 'People of the Center', together with the Boras, Muinanes, Ocainas, Nonuyas, Witotos, and Andokes (Whiffen 1915; Echeverri 1997). All of these people were exploited by rubber traders starting in the late 19th century, and many of them were deported to Northeastern Peru in the 1930s. In the course of these events,

traditional social structure increasingly disintegrated, leading to a situation of language endangerment observable today. Resígaro is spoken today by only two fully fluent speakers who live in the Ocaina village of Nueva Esperanza, Ampiyacu river, Loreto, Northeastern Peru, at 3°20'35 South and 71°59'37 West.

**2.2. The Resígaro language.** Resígaro is an Arawakan<sup>4</sup> language with a high percentage of cognate vocabulary shared with Tariana, Baniwa, Yukuna, Achagua, Kabiyaí, and also some other Arawakan languages spoken in roughly the same region (Rivet and Wavrin 1951; Payne 1985; Payne 1991). Many grammatical forms of Resígaro, such as person markers, also have Arawakan etymologies (Payne 1991), placing Resígaro firmly in the Arawakan family. Aikhenvald (1999) groups Resígaro into a ‘Northern Amazonian’ subgroup, but notes that this grouping is based on geographic criteria rather than historical-linguistic evidence.

Typologically, Resígaro is a moderately polysynthetic and mostly suffixing language. It is strictly nominative-accusative and it has a fixed SOV word order (see section 4, below). It has subject cross-referencing prefixes,

which are often fused to the verb stem. Direct object noun phrases are unmarked, which differentiates them from oblique objects, which are case marked.

Figures 1 - 2 show the phonological inventory of Resígaro, mainly to explicate the orthographic conventions (given in angled brackets ⟨ ⟩) used for Resígaro data in this paper. Note the pervasiveness of aspiration and voicing distinctions, e.g. in voiceless nasals, typical for Northern Amazonian Arawakan languages (Aikhenvald 1999: 76-77).

FIGURE 1

RESÍGARO VOWELS

i/i: ⟨i/ií⟩	u/u: ⟨u/uú⟩
e/e: ⟨e/ee⟩	o/o: ⟨o/oo⟩
a/a: ⟨a/aa⟩	

FIGURE 2

RESÍGARO CONSONANTS

		labial	alveolar	palatal	velar	glottal
stops	vd.	b ⟨b⟩	d ⟨d⟩	dy ⟨dʲ⟩	g ⟨g⟩	
	vl.	p ⟨p⟩	t ⟨t⟩	ty ⟨tʲ⟩	k ⟨k⟩	? ⟨h⟩
	vl. asp.	p <sup>h</sup> ⟨pʰ⟩	t <sup>h</sup> ⟨tʰ⟩		k <sup>h</sup> ⟨kʰ⟩	
affricats	vd.		ɬ ⟨ds⟩	ɕ ⟨ll⟩		
	vl.		ts ⟨ts⟩	tʃ ⟨ch⟩		
	vl. asp.		ts <sup>h</sup> ⟨tsʰ⟩	tʃ <sup>h</sup> ⟨chʰ⟩		
fricatives	vd.	β ⟨v⟩		ʃ ⟨sh⟩		
	vl.	ɸ ⟨f⟩		ʒ/j ⟨y⟩		h ⟨j⟩
nasals	vd.	m ⟨m⟩	n ⟨n⟩	ɲ ⟨ñ⟩		
	vl.	m̥ ⟨m̥⟩	n̥ ⟨n̥⟩	ɲ̥ ⟨ñ̥⟩		

There are two distinctive tones, low (L) and high (H). Roots may bear lexical tone, but the tone patterns of derived and inflected word forms are often affected by grammatical tones or tones associated with affixes or

grammatical contexts. For instance, there is always a high tone on the ultimate syllable of certain phrases, e.g. sentence-finally and in words pronounced in isolation.

### **3. The (morpho)phonology of Resígaro *-(o)ta* ~ *-(o)tu* ‘CAUS’.**

This section gives a brief description of the four main phonological processes associated with causative marking, in order to help the reader understand the paper, and to provide some additional descriptive facts about Resígaro that may be of further interest. First, the causative suffix is subject to a general phonological rule according to which phrase-finally, *a* becomes *u*, as in (2).<sup>5</sup>

- (2a) *gi-jó*                      *dó-ma-tsí*              *tša*  
3.SG.NON\_F-OBL 3.SG.F-say-SUB 3.SG.NON\_F  
*dó-tšo-ta-kaa*  
3.SG.F-sit-CAUS-SUB  
‘Like she had told him, she put him’ [cuentores\_7 22]

- (2b) *tahdáági-ba do-mohtóoko jíípo nó-tso-tú*  
hard-CL:LOG 3.SG.F-guts above 1.SG-sit-CAUS  
'I will put her guts on a hard log' [cuentores\_11 20]

Second, as a morphophonological rule specific to the causative marker, the ultimate vowel of the stem to which *-(o)ta ~ -(o)tu* attaches becomes *o*, irrespective of the quality of that vowel, for instance *no-hmitú* 'I eat' / *no-hmito-tú* 'I make eat'; *ahvéñó* 'burn' / *ahveño-tú* 'make burn'.

Third, the tones of all syllables of the verb stem become low in the causative, e.g. *no-kjú* 'I do' / *no-kjo-tú* 'I make do'; *no-páhtú* 'I see' / *no-pahto-tú* 'I make see'; *ahvéñó* 'burn' / *ahveño-tú* 'make burn'. The causative morpheme itself carries a high tone when it occurs phrase-finally, but may bear a low tone when in a phrase-internal position, as in (2a), above.

Fourth, the position of the glottal stop (/ʔ/ - ⟨h⟩) may change as an effect of causative marking in the following way. If the consonantal onset of the ultimate syllable of the verb stem is preceded by a glottal stop, this glottal stop may move to a position before the consonantal onset of the causative marker, as in *no-péhdó* 'I lick' / *no-pedo<sub>h</sub>-tú* 'I make lick'; *no-jéhkó* 'I

grate’ / *no-jeko<sup>h</sup>-tú* ‘I make grate’; *no-ví<sup>h</sup>dó* ‘I smoke’ / *no-vido<sup>h</sup>-tú* ‘I make smoke’. This is probably a general prosodic rule of the language, although it does not seem to apply to all verbs, see (9*a-b*), for reasons unknown so far.<sup>6</sup>

#### 4. The morphosyntax of causative marking in Resígaro.

**4.1. Argument marking in Resígaro.** This subsection introduces the general rules of argument marking in Resígaro, as necessary background for the discussion of causativization. Subject and direct object noun phrases are unmarked in Resígaro. If both are expressed by independent noun phrases (pronouns or nouns), their grammatical role is identified by a strictly fixed word order, in which the subject must precede the object and both precede the verb (3*a-c*).

- (3*a*) NP<sub>SUBJ</sub>      NP<sub>OBJ</sub>      V  
*iini*              *onáko*      *ééñú*  
dog              snake      bite  
‘The dog bites the snake’

- (3b) NP<sub>SUBJ</sub>    NP<sub>OBJ</sub>    V  
*onáko*    *iini*    *ééüü*  
snake    dog    bite  
‘The snake bites the dog’

- (3c) NP<sub>SUBJ</sub>    NP<sub>OBJ</sub>    V  
*itsíigí*    *ño*    *píkoh-kaa*    *ihpí*  
fox    1.SG    throw\_away-SUB go  
‘The fox went to throw me away’ [cuentores\_3 21]

Subjects may be cross-referenced by prefixes on the verb. In this case they are usually not additionally realized as independent noun phrases (4). There is no cross-referencing of objects on Resígaro verbs, unlike in other Arawakan languages (see section 5).

- (4) NP<sub>OBJ</sub>      CR<sub>SUBJ</sub>-V  
*tso*            *gi-píkoh-ka*  
3.SG.F        3.SG.NON\_F-throw\_away-SUB  
‘He threw her away’ [cuentores\_4 11]

The expression of the subject is obligatory in Resígaro, either as an independent noun phrase or as a cross-referencing prefix. With non-causativized verbs the expression of objects is always syntactically optional, i.e. it can be left out as in (5a) (see also Allin 1976: 317). However, in the majority of cases in spontaneous speech objects are realized, as in (5b). Because objects are optional, the intransitive-transitive distinction is not clear-cut in Resígaro. Transitive verbs may thus be defined as those that *can* take direct objects, like *píkoh* ‘throw away’ in (5). Aikhenvald (2003) calls similar verbs in the related language Tariana “ambitransitive”, i.e. verbs that can be used either intransitively without an overt object or transitively with an overt object (see section 5).

- (5a) *née-kjó tsa-hpe-í do-píkoh*  
there-ABL QUOT-REM-? 3.SG.F-throw\_away  
'from there, she threw (it/him/her) away' [sachares 56]

- (5b) *oó tsa no-píkoh*  
PERF 3.SG.NON\_F 1.SG-throw\_away  
'I already threw him away' [cuentores\_7 26]

There are a number of (underived) verbs that could be considered as being ditransitive verbs. All of these take one object, expressing a theme argument, that has the same properties as objects of transitive verbs, and another object, a recipient or goal argument, that is case-marked for different oblique cases (6-8). For all of these verbs, any of the two objects is syntactically optional, and their relative order is free.<sup>7</sup>

- (6a) *do-kóvehdemihójí do-ké do-h*  
3SG.F-necklace 3SG.F-DAT 3SG.F-give  
'She gave her necklace to her' [cuentores\_5 077]

(6b) *do-ké do-h*

3SG.F-DAT 3SG.F-give

‘She gave to her’ [cuentores\_5 078]

(7a) *gi-jó do-mú pá-poónu*

3.SG-NON\_F-OBL 3.SG.F-say 2.SG-wake\_up

‘She said to him, “wake up!” [cuentoresbruj 068-069]

(7b) *táhdí tsa-hpe-í gi-mú*

grandfather QUOT-REM-? 3.SG.NON\_F-say

‘“Grandfather,” he said’ [cuentores\_8 80]

(8a) *kapína va-kóo íívi vanohtá*

proper\_name 1.PL-ALL tobacco send

‘Capino send us tobacco’ [pish\_res\_res 002]

- (8b) *no-kóo téhaámí gi-vahnotú*  
1S-ALL letter 3.SG.NON\_F-send  
*chi-póodéji-kjó*  
3.SG.NON\_F-land-ABL  
‘He send me a letter from his land’ [vidaPA 039]

**4.2. Argument frame change and object realization with causativized verbs.** Causative marking applies to both intransitive verbs and transitive verbs in Resígaro (see also Allin 1976: 222, 289-290). Causative marking creates transitive verbs from intransitive verbs, as in (9), see also (1), above. The newly introduced participant is the causer in subject function, and the subject of the underived intransitive verb becomes the causee, the object of the causativized verb.

- (9a) *Ilaána ahiú*  
boy urinate  
‘The boy is urinating’

- (9b) *feédo*                      *llaána*              *ahño-tú*  
grandmother      boy              urinate-CAUS  
‘Grandmother makes the boy urinate’

With transitive verbs, causative marking creates ditransitive verbs, which can take two objects (10), the causee, and the patient, the latter of which corresponds to the underived verb’s object. Both these objects are unmarked, unlike the objects of underived ditransitive verbs.

- (10a) *llaána*              *añóogi*              *jahpú*  
boy              tapir              stab  
‘The boy stabs the tapir’

- (10b) *feédo*                      *llaána*              *añóogi*              *jahpoo-tú*  
grandmother      boy              tapir              stab-CAUS  
‘Grandmother makes the boy stab the tapir’

In causativized verbs, the causee cannot be omitted and must be expressed, unlike the objects of underived ditransitive verbs (see also Allin 1976: 321). This holds for monotransitive causativized verbs (derived from intransitive verbs, see (9)) as well as for ditransitive causativized verbs (derived from monotransitive verbs, see (10)) and has been observed for several hundred tokens of causativized verbs identified in the Resígáro data from Seifart et al. (eds., 2009). Causativized verbs can thus be identified as transitive, for they are verbs that not only *can* take objects (like underived transitive verbs, see section 4.1), but because they are verbs that *must* take objects.

The following example (11) illustrates how the causee is realized as a non-feminine pronoun in a situation where its expression is not necessary for semantic or pragmatic reasons, namely in a situation where lullabies are explained and where it is entirely irrelevant who is put to sleep. Although this participant plays no role in the discourse, a pronoun in object function is used, apparently for purely syntactic reasons.

- (11) *tša-gí*                      *tša*                      *nó-hyallá*  
3.SG.NON\_F-INST 3.SG.NON\_F      1.SG-son  
*no-mó-taá-ñó*  
1.SG-sleep-CAUS-PURP  
‘With this, my son, I make him/someone sleep’  
[kuwatso\_res\_1 06]

The patient argument of ditransitive causativized verbs is syntactically optional, i.e. it can be realized (see (10-11), above) or it can be omitted (12), like the object of underived transitive verbs, see (5a) in section 4.1. In spontaneous speech, the patient is often omitted, as in (12). Note that *-shu* ‘eat meat’ is a generic verb for eating meaty food that can take nouns denoting types of meat as direct object.

(12) *pjá-htsa-hpe-hoó tsa*

CON-QUOT-REM-PERF 3.SG.NON\_F

*do-sho-tá-ho*

3.SG.F-eat\_meat-CAUS-PERF

‘And then, they say, she already made him eat (meat)’

[cuentores\_4 52]

The two objects of ditransitive causative verbs, causee and patient, are not formally differentiated. Neither is case marked, and their relative order appears to be free, although both must follow the subject noun phrase (if present) and precede the verb. Thus, my main informant alternatively produced both possible relative orders of objects when asked on different occasions to translate an identical sentence into Resígaro, as in (13*a*) and (13*b*). Conversely, when prompted with a Resígaro sentence like that in (14), on different occasions two different translations were given, which differ with respect to the interpretation of the objects.

(13a) *ño iini onáko ehño-tú*  
1.SG dog snake bite-CAUS  
'I make the dog bite the snake'

(13b) *ño onáko iini ehño-tú*  
1.SG snake dog bite-CAUS  
'I make the dog bite the snake'

(14) *tso tsa ño módoñóó-tú*  
3.SG.F 3.SG.NON\_F 1.SG beat-CAUS  
'She makes me beat him / She makes him beat me'

Contrary to what these examples suggest, Allin (1976: 321, 332) states that the causee and patient are differentiated by a fixed order causee-patient. The ambiguity with respect to the two objects just described may thus have to do with Resígaro's advanced stage of language endangerment, in the sense that exaggerated variation is said to be typical of language decay (Dressler 1988: 1553; Campbell and Muntzel 1989: 189). However, a closer look at

examples of ditransitive causative verbs in non-elicited data, i.e. more or less spontaneously produced narrative texts and conversation, reveals that in real speech situations ambiguity hardly ever occurs and this reduces the need for a formal way of distinguishing the two objects of a ditransitive verb. Firstly, as noted above, the patient is often not realized, while the causee is obligatory. Thus, if only one object is realized, as in (15), it must be the causee.

(15) *bóorá*                      *gi-pehdo-tú*

Bora\_people      3.SG.NON\_F-lick-CAUS

‘He made the Boras lick (tobacco)’ (ritually invited them to a festival) [pish\_res\_rec 19]

Secondly, if both objects are realized, the discourse context and probably to a large extent also verb semantics very often disambiguate these constructions, as in (16), where it is clear from the context that it must be a female participant (the main character of the story from which this example is taken) that is being ridiculed.

(16) *tsa*                      *tso*                      *ñe-mohto-tú*  
3.SG.NON\_F              3.SG.F              3.PL-hear-CAUS

‘They made her hear it’ (idiomatic for ‘(ritually) ridiculed her’)

[cuentores\_11 08]

In sum, causativization applies to both intransitive and transitive verbs in Resígaro. The causee must obligatorily be realized, unlike other objects (be it objects of underived transitive verbs or patients of causativized verbs). An interesting side note is that the obligatoriness of argument realization thus remains constant in the derivational process: former subjects remain obligatory and former objects remain optional.

**4.3. Morphological fossilization and other irregularities.** This section discusses two kinds of irregularities that can be observed with some verbs: morphological fossilization and idiosyncratic semantics of the derived verb. A small number of Resígaro verbs include forms that fully conform to the morphophonological characteristics of causative marking (segmental

form, stem vowel change, and tone pattern, see section 2), but that are not segmentable, i.e. these verbs cannot occur without the forms that resemble the causative marker (17-18).

(17a) *tso-nígí*            *tso*            *jetsaiiotú*  
3.SG.F-father      3.SG.F      ask(-CAUS?)  
‘Her father asked her’ [cuentores\_7 25]

(17b) \**jetsaiñó*, \**jetsaiñú*, \**jetsaiñí*, \**jetsaiñé*

Intended meaning: tell (or similar)

(18a) *todokákahdo*    *meégá*            *do-jó*    *ihkotá*  
frog                    woman            3.SG.F-obl arrive(-CAUS?)  
‘The frog woman arrived where she was’ [cuentres\_5 74]

(18b) \**ihkó*, \**ihkú*, \**ihkí*, \**ihké*

Intended meaning: be there (or similar)

These verbs were probably once formed with the causative marker, which has become fossilized on them.<sup>8</sup> Note that *jetsaiñotú* ‘ask’ complies with the rule that the causee must be realized (as confirmed by the several dozen tokens in the Resígaro corpus). The verb *ihkotá* ‘arrive’ (see (18a) and (19), below), however, does not take an argument that resembles a causee, but only an optional goal (or target of motion) argument, marked by the oblique object marker *-jo*. Additional causative marking on this verb stem is possible, as in (19), while such double marking of causatives has not been observed with other causativized verbs in Resígaro. These two characteristics make this verb even more deviant from (other) causative verbs.

(19a) *ñä-vá*      *ihkota-á*

3.PL-FUT    arrive(-CAUS?)-SUB

‘They will arrive’ [res\_inf\_2 21]

(19b) *tsa*                      *ne-hkoto-tá-a*

3.SG.NON\_F      3.PL-arrive(-CAUS?)-CAUS-SUB

‘They made it arrive’ [dyushi 110]

Some causativized verbs display idiosyncratic semantic changes from the underived verb to the derived, causativized verb. The verb *-adotá* ‘dance’ (20) is apparently derived from *-adú* ‘fly’ (Allin 1976: 106, not attested in my data), and would thus literally mean (or may have originally meant) ‘make fly’. An additional irregularity is that the derived (or once derived) verb can be used without an overt causee, as in (20).<sup>9</sup>

- (20) *teé-ga*                      *jíí*                      *píí*    ***va-do-tá-a***  
3-CL:PLANK                      above                      TAM    **1.PL-fly-CAUS-SUB**  
*patopjé*    *no-kjú*  
first                      1.SG-do  
‘What we dance on the beam, I will do first’ [lladi\_res 04]

There is also an idiosyncratic shift from ‘obtain, get’ to ‘make someone get married’ (21), the only possible reading of the causativized verb in (22b).

(21a) *kéjééá no-jó kóoné-llá tovah*

who 1.SG-OBL something-DIM get

‘Who will get something for me?’ [res\_inf\_6 148]

(21b) *tso pi-tohvoó-tú*

3SG.F 2.SG-get-CAUS

‘Make her get married!’ [storyalicia 06]

This section discussed two kinds of irregularities associated with causative marking in Resígaro: morphological fossilization and idiosyncratic semantics. These processes indicate that causative marker may become fossilized or lexicalized with some verbs.

## **5. Resígaro causative marking in a comparative perspective.**

### **5.1. Causativization in Northern Amazonian Arawakan languages.**

The following sections offer a brief comparison of Resígaro with the three relatively closely related languages Achagua, Piapoco, and Tariana.<sup>10</sup> This

subsection describes features that these three and Resígaro have in common. Subsection 5.2. deals with some specific features of individual languages that have to do with the relation between causativization and transitivity and that are of particular interest for a comparison with Resígaro.

The forms of the morphological causative marker in these three languages are all similar to the Resígaro marker: *-(i)da* in Achagua (Wilson and Levinsohn 1992: 94; Meléndez L. 1998: 112-113, 126-127), *-ida* in Piapoco (Reinoso Galindo 2002: 253), and *-(i)ta* in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003: 268). All of these forms are reflexes of Proto-Arawakan *\*-ta*, as reconstructed by Payne (1991: 379; see also Wise 1990: 103).

Achagua, Piapoco, and Tariana have split-S systems, i.e. they formally distinguish various kinds of intransitive verbs. The main distinction is between stative intransitives, which do not take cross-referencing prefixes, and active intransitive verbs, which take subject cross-referencing prefixes, like all Resígaro verbs.<sup>11</sup> Causative markers are used on both types of intransitive verbs to form transitive verbs. The following example (22) illustrates the causativization of a stative intransitive verb in Piapoco, and (23) shows that causativization applies in the same way to active intransitive

verbs in Piapoco (Reinoso Galindo 2002: 253-254). Note that Piapoco, like Achagua, has cross-referencing suffixes, which are used for subjects of stative intransitive verbs and objects of transitive verbs.

(22a) *bazabaza-ka-ni*

soft-REAL-3.SG.M

‘it is soft’

(22b) *i-bazabaza-ida-ni*

3.SG.M-soft-CAUS-3.SG.M

‘he softens it’

(23a) *nu-imá*

1.SG-sleep

‘I sleep’

(23b) *nu-imá-ída-ni*

1.SG-sleep-CAUS-3.SG.M

‘I make him sleep’

**5.2. Causativization and transitivity.** There are a number of specific features Resígaro shares with Achagua, Piapoco, and Tariana that point to a close association of the cognate causative marker with transitivity, if transitivity is understood in a broad sense, not only as increasing syntactic valency, but more generally as a differentiation between a maximally affecting Agent and a maximally affected Patient (Hopper and Thompson 1980; see also Kittilä 2009: 82-90). There are both syntactic and semantic features in these Arawakan languages that point to this close association.

With respect to syntax, first note that Aikhenvald (2003: 67) analyzes Tariana as having ‘ambitransitive’ verbs, besides various kinds of intransitive verbs (which take no direct objects, see section 5.1) and that with ambitransitive verbs “the object NP can always be optionally omitted”. In contrast, the objects of causative verbs are obligatory in Tariana to the effect that “the only strictly transitive verbs in this language are the ones which

contain the transitivizer *-i(ta)*” (Aikhenvald 2003: 236) (the “transitivizer” *-i(ta)* is identical to the causative suffix). This is a clear parallel to Resígaro (see section 4.2).<sup>12</sup>

With respect to semantics, in both Tariana and Piapoco the use of the causative marker on transitive verbs can have the effect of adding a meaning component of repeated or intensive action, in which case it does not affect the valency of the verb. In Piapoco (24-25), causative markers used on transitive verbs seem to always add a meaning component of intensive or repeated action, and to not change the valency (Reinoso Galindo personal communication 2010).

(24a) *no-mani-ni*

1.SG-do-3.SG.M

‘I do it’

(24b) *nu-mani-ida-ka-ni*

1.SG-do-CAUS-REAL-3.SG.M

‘I do it repeatedly’

(25a) *nu-ika-ka-ni*

1.SG-look-REAL-3.SG.M

‘I am looking at it’

(25b) *nu-ika-ida-ni*

1.SG-look-CAUS-3.SG.M

‘I am searching for it’

A similar semantic effect has been reported for Tariana, where the complete causative marker *-ita* (rather than just *-i*) can be used to mean affectedness, intensive action, or definiteness of a topical object noun phrase with many verbs (Aikhenvald 2003: 272-273). All these meanings are related to transitivity in the above-mentioned sense. This has not been observed for Resígaro, where the causative marker always increases the valency and never adds these kinds of semantic components.

A final comparative observation is that in Tariana only a relatively small subset of transitive verbs increase their valency when they combine

with the causative marker.<sup>13</sup> Interestingly, almost all of these refer to traditional actions performed during rituals (Aikhenvald 2003: 270-271), for instance *-eme* ‘sniff snuff’/*-emeta* ‘make sniff snuff’; *-ñapa* ‘bless’/*-ñapeta* ‘get someone to bless someone’, *-sita* ‘smoke’/*-siteta* ‘make/let smoke’ (26), and *ira* ‘drink’ / *irata* ‘make drink’ (27).<sup>14</sup>

(26a) *yema*      *di-sita-naka*  
tobacco      3.SG.NON\_F-smoke-PRES.VIS  
‘He is smoking tobacco’

(26b) *nuri*      *nhuas*      *yema*      *nu-de-ka*  
1.SG+son    1.SG      tobacco    1.SG-have-SUB  
*nhua*      *pi-na*      *yema*      *nu-siteta-de*  
1.SG      2.SG-OBJ    tobacco    1SG-smoke+CAUS-FUT.CERT  
‘My son, when I have tobacco, I will get you to smoke (this)  
tobacco’

(27a) *na-ira-karu*                      *kahpi*  
3.PL-drink-PURP.VIS    ritual\_whiskey  
‘They drink ritual whiskey’

(27b) *ne-pidana*              *di-na*                      *ira-kasi*  
then-REM.REP    3S.NON\_F-OBJ    drink-NOM  
*direta-daka*  
3S.NON\_F+drink+CAUS-YET  
‘And yet he gave him a drink’

In Resígaro causative marking on transitive verbs is not restricted to verbs from the ritual domain in the same way as in Tariana, but a high proportion of transitive verbs with causative markers found in the corpus are from this domain, such as ‘ritually making hear (i.e. ridiculing)’ (16) and ‘ritually making lick (i.e. inviting)’ (20). These instances seem to involve partial re-analyses of causative marking with a different meaning, and may thus indicate that causatives are archaic in this subgroup of Arawakan, as Aikhenvald (2003: 272) argues for Tariana.

In sum, two particular characteristics found in Resígaro and some of its closely related languages indicate a close association of the cognate causative marker and transitivity: first, the syntactic obligatoriness of objects with causativized verbs, and second, the semantic effects of causative marking in some of the languages.

**6. Conclusion.** Based on a description of Resígaro causative marking and some comparative evidence this paper discussed the association between causative marking and transitivity, in the sense of a maximal differentiation between an affecting Agent and an affected Patient, in a group of Northern Amazonian Arawakan languages. This association is in accordance with non-prototypical (i.e. non-valency increasing) uses of causative markers in a number of other languages (Kittilä 2009). This type of causative contrasts with another type of causatives found in South America (mainly in Southern Amazonia), namely that of sociative causatives (Guillaume and Rose 2010). Sociative causatives express ‘making someone do something by doing it with him’, i.e. causation with the active involvement of the causer. These semantics involve an attenuation of the active role of the Agent and the

affected role of the Patient. As such, sociative causatives contrast with the maximal differentiation between a causer as an affecting Agent and a causee as an affected Patient observed in the languages considered here.

## REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 1999. The Arawak language family. In *The Amazonian languages*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 65-106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2001. Areal Diffusion, Genetic Inheritance, and Problems of Subgrouping: A North Arawak Case Study. In *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance. Problems in Comparative Linguistics*, ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon, 167-194. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2003. *A Grammar of Tariana, from Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2007. Reciprocal and Sociative in Tariana: their Genetic and Areal

Properties. In *Typology of Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir Nedjalkov (with the assistance of Emma Š. Geniušienė and Zlatka Guentchéva), 1351-1366. *Typological studies in language* 71. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

ALLIN, TREVOR R. 1976. *A Grammar of Resígaro*. Horseleys Green: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

[http://www.sil.org/americas/peru/show\\_work.asp?id=15285](http://www.sil.org/americas/peru/show_work.asp?id=15285).

CAMPBELL, LYLE, AND MARTHA C. MUNTZEL. 1989. The structural consequences of language death. In *Investigating obsolescence. Studies in language contraction and death*, ed. Nancy C. Dorian, 181-196. *Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language* 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DANIELSEN, SWINTHA. 2007. *Baure: an Arawak language of Bolivia*. *Indigenous Language of Latin America* 6. Leiden: CNWS Publications.

DIXON, R. M. W., AND ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD. 2000. Introduction. In *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, ed. R. M.W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 1-29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- DRESSLER, WOLFGANG U. 1988. Spracherhaltung - Sprachverfall - Sprachtod. In Sociolinguistics. Soziolinguistik. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft, ed. Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, and Klaus J. Mattheier, 1551-1563. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 3.2. Berlin, Band 2.
- ECHEVERRI, JUAN A. 1997. The people of the center of the world. A study in culture, history and orality in the Colombian Amazon. Ph.D. dissertation, New York: New School for Social Research, Faculty of Political and Social Science.
- GUILLAUME, ANTOINE, AND FRANÇOISE ROSE. 2010. Sociative causative markers in South-American languages: a possible areal feature. In *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale. Mélanges offerts à Denis Creissels*, ed. Franck Floricic, 383-402. Lyon: ENS Éditions.
- HOPPER, PAUL J., AND SANDRA A. THOMPSON. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56, no. 2: 251-99.
- KITTILÄ, SEPPO. 2009. Causative morphemes as non-valency increasing

devices. *Folia Linguistica* 43, no. 1 (5): 67-94.

MELÉNDEZ L., MIGUEL ANGEL. 1998. La lengua achagua. Estudio gramatical.

Lenguas aborígenes de Colombia. Descripciones 11.

PAYNE, DAVID. 1985. The genetic classification of Resígaro. *International*

*Journal of American Linguistics* 51, no. 2: 222-231.

———. 1991. A Classification of Maipuran (Arawakan) Languages Based  
on Shared Lexical Retention. In *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*.

Vol. 3, ed. Desmond C. Derbyshire and Geoffrey K. Pullum, 355-499.

Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

———. 2002. Causatives in Asheninka: The case for a sociative source. In  
*The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, ed.

Masayoshi Shibatani, 485–505. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

REINOSO GALINDO, ANDRÉS EDUARDO. 2002. Elementos para una gramática  
de la lengua piapoco. Bogotá: Ministerio de Cultura.

RIVET, PAUL, AND ROBERT DE WAVRIN. 1951. Un nouveau dialecte arawak:

Le Resígaro. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 40: 203-40.

ROSE, FRANÇOISE. 2010. Irrealis and negation in Mojeño Trinitario, a South  
Arawak language. Paper presented at the SSILA Winter Meeting,

Baltimore, 8 January 2010.

SEIFART, FRANK. 2010. The Principle of Morphosyntactic Subsystem

Integrity in language contact: a case study on morphological borrowing  
in Resígaro (Arawakan). Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary  
Anthropology, Leipzig. Manuscript.

SEIFART, FRANK, DORIS FAGUA, JÜRIG GASCHÉ, AND JUAN ALVARO

ECHEVERRI, eds. 2009. A multimedia documentation of the languages  
of the People of the Center. Online publication of transcribed and  
translated Bora, Ocaina, Nonuya, Resígaro, and Witoto audio and video  
recordings with linguistic and ethnographic annotations and  
descriptions. Nijmegen: DOBES-MPI.

<http://corpus1.mpi.nl/qfs1/media->

[archive/dobes\\_data/Center/Info/WelcomeToCenterPeople.html](http://corpus1.mpi.nl/qfs1/media-archive/dobes_data/Center/Info/WelcomeToCenterPeople.html).

WHIFFEN, THOMAS. 1915. The North-West Amazons: notes of some months  
spent among cannibal tribes. London: Constable.

WILSON, PETER J., AND STEPHEN H. LEVINSOHN. 1992. Una descripción  
preliminar de la gramática del achagua (Arawak). Bogotá: Instituto  
Lingüístico de Verano.

WISE, MARY RUTH. 1990. Valence-Changing Affixes in Maipuran Arawakan Languages. In *Amazonian Linguistics. Studies in Lowland South American Languages*, ed. Doris L. Payne, 89-116. Austin: University of Texas Press.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on a presentation given at the symposium “Lenguas arawak: estrategias de aumento de valencia” at the “Coloquio Internacional Amazónicas III: Fonología y sintaxis”, held at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, April 19 - 24, 2010. Financial support from the DobeS program of the Volkswagen Foundation for Resígaro data collection and processing is gratefully acknowledged. Many thanks to the Andrade family of Nueva Esperanza, Peru, for their hospitality and patience, and to Andrés Reinoso for generously providing additional Piapoco data. I am grateful for comments from Iren Hartmann on earlier versions of this paper, as well as for detailed comments from IJAL reviewers Françoise Rose and Swintha Danielsen, and for additional comments from IJAL editor Keren Rice, all of which substantially improved this paper.

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations are used in this paper: 1 - first person; 2 - second person; 3 - third person; ABL - ablative; ALL - allative; asp. - aspirated; CAUS - causative; CERT - certain; CL - classifier; CON - conjunction; CR - cross reference; DAT - dative; DIM - diminutive; F - feminine; FUT - future; INST -

instrument; M - masculine; MID - middle voice; NOM - nominalizing; NON\_F - non-feminine; NP - noun phrase; OBJ - object; OBJ - oblique; PERF - perfective; PL - plural; PRES - present; PURP - purposive; QUOT - quotative; REAL - realis; REFL - reflexive; REM - remote past; REP - reported; SG - singular; SUB - subordination; SUBJ - subject; TAM - (unidentified) tense- aspect- mood; V - verb; VIS - visual; vd - voiced; vl - voiceless.

<sup>3</sup> Square brackets after Resígaro examples indicate the session name and annotation number from this collection. These data can be accessed online, although access to part of the data requires registration. Examples without mention of session names were elicited by the author without recording.

<sup>4</sup> The Arawakan language family has been firmly established by Payne (1991). Some authors (e.g. Aikhenvald 1999; Danielsen 2007; Rose 2010) use the term “Arawak” instead of “Arawakan” to refer to this family. I use the latter term here, following Payne (1991).

<sup>5</sup> Allin (1976:94-95) states that “a word-final /u/ [i.e. /w/ ⟨u⟩, FS] always becomes /a/ before another word in the same utterance [...] but final

/u/ does not usually change before a suffix”. The latter is clearly not confirmed by my data, as can be observed in (3b).

<sup>6</sup> Allin (1976:106) also states that in some verbs, the vowel preceding the causative marker is lengthened (see (10)), and that in others unaspirated stem consonants may become aspirated, as in *apí* ‘to be awake’ - *apjo-tú* ‘to awaken’ (examples from Allin 1976:106). Both processes seem to be restricted to a few verbs only.

<sup>7</sup> Allin (1976:331) considers that ‘give’ is the only ditransitive verb in Resígaro, but syntactically it seems to behave exactly like ‘say’ or ‘send’ (7-8). He remarks about Resígaro ‘give’ that the “dative object occurs either immediately before or immediately after the Object, generally in the latter position” and that the (direct) object has not “been observed to be omitted [and] is therefore regarded as obligatory” (Allin 1976:331). The latter cannot be confirmed for direct objects by my data (see (6b)), although it seems to apply to dative objects in my data. The very frequent, if not obligatory use of the dative object may be motivated by the extreme phonological reduction of the verb root to just a glottal stop due to phonological fusion with the subject pronoun. Dative case marking is almost exclusively used with ‘give’ (and

sometimes with ‘send’) and thus a clear indication of a verb of transaction even in the almost complete absence of phonological realization of such a verb. Note also that the forms *vanohtá* ~ *vahnotú* ‘send’ may contain a fossilized causative marker (see section 4.3).

<sup>8</sup> Resígaro *ihkotá* ‘arrive’ is probably a cognate of Tariana *-uká-*, and both would be reflexes of Proto Arawakan *\*kau* (Payne 1991:394). This would further suggest that *ihkotá* was once formed with a causative marker. I found no cognates of Resígaro *jetsaiñotú* ‘ask’ in related Arawakan languages.

<sup>9</sup> Note that *teé-ga* (3-CL:PLANK) ‘this beam’ is not a direct object, but an oblique locative object, marked by the locative postposition *jií* ‘above’.

<sup>10</sup> These languages were chosen for comparison with Resígaro because they are the geographically closest Arawakan languages, and probably also genealogically close within Arawakan (Payne 1991:438; Aikhenvald 1999:70). They were also chosen because good descriptions are available for them. Cognate forms of the Resígaro causative marker are also attested in a number of other Arawakan languages (see Wise 1990:102-103; Aikhenvald 1999:90-91).

<sup>11</sup> For instance, the prefixless stative intransitive verbs of Tariana *lama* ‘burn’ and *hama* ‘be tired’ (Aikhenvald 2003:239) are probably cognate with Resígaro *-ahmú* (e.g. *na-hmú* ‘they burn’) and *-imú* (e.g. *gi-mú* ‘he sleeps’).

<sup>12</sup> The close parallel between Tariana and Resígaro with respect to this specific syntactic characteristic is noteworthy also because other aspects of Resígaro grammar, especially those pertaining to nouns, pro-forms, and noun phrases, are quite different to those of its close relatives due to drastic restructuring of Resígaro under Bora influence (Payne 1985; Aikhenvald 2001; Seifart 2010). The descriptions of Achagua and Piapoco do not discuss the obligatoriness of objects.

<sup>13</sup> Note that these are necessarily ambitransitive verbs, that can also be used intransitively, since the only truly transitive verbs are those formed with a causative.

<sup>14</sup> Note that another reason for the special behaviour of some of these verbs may be that they are verbs of drinking and eating (Aikhenvald 2007:1361).