

**Genesis of a category in language contact:
multiple imperatives in the Vaupés linguistic area**

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University

1. Mechanisms of contact-induced language change: general remarks¹

Intensive contact within a linguistic area tends to bring about the gradual convergence of languages whereby the conceptual categories of one language are replicated in another.

Borrowing a conceptual template rather than a morpheme brings about the enrichment of patterns in a target language (see Heine and Kuteva 2001, on the diffusion of conceptual patterns in the formation of reciprocals and comparatives in African languages). Linguistic convergence does not always result in the creation of identical grammars, nor in the straightforward projection of categories in one language into the other. That is, structural and conceptual isomorphism and the creation of almost identical grammatical and semantic structures (illustrated by Friedman 1997, among others) is not a universal outcome of language contact. Languages in contact often maintain their distinct typological profile.

Within a linguistic area, the multilateral diffusion of linguistic features often goes together with creating new types of categories which may lack an exact match in any language within the area. Their contact-induced changes involve a variety of mechanisms including (see Aikhenvald 2003b):

(a) Reanalysis, i.e. a historical process whereby a morphosyntactic device acquires a different structure from the one it had, with little or no change to its surface form or semantics;

- (b) Reinterpretation, or extension, of already existing morphemes and categories, whereby they start being used in a variety of new contexts (see Harris and Campbell 1995: 66-7);
- (c) Grammaticalisation, that is, 'the development from lexical to grammatical forms and from grammatical to even more grammatical forms' (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 2); and
- (d) Grammatical accommodation, defined as morphosyntactic 'deployment of a native morpheme on the model of the syntactic function of a phonetically similar morpheme in the diffusing language' (that is, the language which is the source of diffusion) (Watkins 2001).²

These mechanisms are closely linked. Both reanalysis and grammatical accommodation most often go together with reinterpretation. Whether grammaticalisation and reanalysis are to be considered separate mechanisms remains a matter for debate (see Harris and Campbell 1995: 92, for a summary). While it can be argued that every instance of grammaticalisation involves reanalysis, reanalysis can occur without grammaticalisation. This provides justification for distinguishing these processes.

Linguistic changes vary as to their stability. Completed changes cover those aspects of the grammatical system of a language which do not show any synchronic variation and which go beyond speakers' awareness. On-going or continuous changes are those in progress (Tsitsipis 1998: 34). These two types are important for distinguishing between old and established

¹ Abbreviations used are: DECL - declarative; DETR - detrimental; f - feminine; FUT - future; IMPV - imperative; LIM - limiter; PREC - precative; PRES - present; REC.P - recent past; REP - reported; SEC - secondhand; sg - singular; VIS - visual.

² An example of this process, termed 'shift due to phonetic similarity' by Campbell (1987: 263-4), comes from Pipil, a Uto-Aztecan language: the relational noun *-se:l* 'alone', cf. *nu-se:l* 'I alone, I by myself' has been remodeled after phonetically similar Spanish *sólo* 'alone', and has become an 'adverb'. As a result, it no longer requires possessive prefixes: *se:l* now means 'alone, only'. It has changed more than just form: its meaning has shifted from 'alone' to include the 'only' meaning of Spanish *solo*.

diffusional processes — characterised by completed changes — and new, in-coming, effects of areal diffusion onto the new grammatical structures.³

The evolution of multiple imperatives in Tariana, the only Arawak language in the multilateral linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin dominated by East Tucanoan languages, shows the combined effect of the four mechanisms of contact-induced change. Though each individual term has a structural parallel in another language in the area, the system of Tariana imperatives does not match any of its East Tucanoan neighbours. The emergence of some terms is the result of completed change, while the development of others is still in progress.

2. The linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin: background information

The Vaupés basin in north-west Amazonia (spanning adjacent areas of Brazil and Colombia) is a well-established linguistic area, characterised by obligatory multilingualism following the principle of linguistic exogamy: 'those who speak the same language with us are our brothers, and we do not marry our sisters'. Marrying someone who belongs to the same language group is considered akin to incest and referred to as 'this is what dogs do'. Language affiliation is inherited from one's father, and is a badge of identity for each person. Languages spoken in this area include the East Tucanoan languages Tucano, Wanano, Desano, Tuyuca, Barasano, Piratapuya, Macuna and a few others, and one Arawak language, Tariana.

East Tucanoan languages are typologically very similar. The 'East Tucanoan type' has developed as a result of the long-term interaction of phenomena of two kinds: genetic affinity and continuous contact. The existing typological similarities can be due to Sapir's 'drift' — whereby

³ 'Discontinuous' change is the third type of change suggested by Tsitsipis, to cover one-off deviations characteristic of individual speakers. In the situation of language attrition these often differentiate fluent speakers from less proficient ones. They lie beyond the scope of this paper.

genetically related languages tend to become similar. But since the East Tucanoan languages are in continuous contact, it is hard — if not impossible — to distinguish similarities due to drift from those due to constant contact and the gradually arising convergence of morphosyntactic structures. East Tucanoan tongues are different enough to be considered separate languages (Barnes 1999). Traditionally, there were no relationships of dominance between language groups. (Nowadays Tucano is gradually becoming the dominant language in the Brazilian Vaupés where Tariana is still spoken.)

A comparison between Tariana and Arawak languages closely related to it and spoken outside the Vaupés area enables us to distinguish between genetically inherited and contact-induced features, as well as independent innovations. Tariana's closest relatives outside the Vaupés are the Baniwa/Kurripako dialect continuum to the north and northeast in Brazil, Colombia and Venezuela, and Piapoco to the northeast, in Colombia. (Also see Appendix 2 in Aikhenvald 2002, for an outline of Proto-Arawak grammar.)

The rampant multilingualism within the Vaupés area goes together with the multilateral diffusion of categories rather than of forms. The reason for this virtual lack of borrowed forms lies in language attitudes prominent throughout the area. 'Language mixing' — traditionally viewed in terms of lexical loans — is condemned as culturally inappropriate, and is tolerated only as a 'linguistic joke' (see Aikhenvald 2002: 189-200). This creates an impediment against any recognizable loan form. In contrast, a wide variety of grammatical structures has been diffused from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana. To name but a few: Tariana and East Tucanoan languages share a system of five evidentials whereby every sentence has to be specified as to whether the speaker saw, heard, inferred, or assumed the information they are reporting, or learnt it from someone else. Other Arawak languages have only one, reported, evidential. Unlike any

other Arawak language in the area and similarly to East Tucanoan languages, Tariana has just one locative case. It also has an array of aspect markers developed out of grammaticalised verbs, another technique found in East Tucanoan but absent from Arawak languages other than Tariana. Each of these, by and large completed, innovations involve different mechanisms of language change. Reanalysis and reinterpretation of existing categories occurred when indirect diffusion involves restructuring a pre-existing category for which there was a slot in the structure — such as case — to match a pan-Tucanoan pattern. A completely new grammatical category with no pre-existing slots evolved via the grammaticalisation of a free morpheme — this is how aspect marking was developed.

Areal diffusion and convergence between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana did not, however, result in creating identical grammars. Similarly to other Arawak languages, Tariana has a few prefixes, in addition to numerous suffixes. East Tucanoan languages are suffixing. And we will see how the unusual imperatives in Tariana are reminiscent of, but not identical with, any of the East Tucanoan systems.

3. Semantics and origin of multiple imperatives in Tariana

Tariana has eleven positive imperatives (see Aikhenvald 2003a: 371-80), unlike any other Arawak language of the area. These imperatives and the mechanisms involved in their development are summarised in Table 1. Only a few of the markers have cognates in Arawak languages.

Table 1. The origin of multiple imperative system in Tariana

IMPERATIVE CATEGORY	MECHANISM OF DEVELOPMENT	A PROTOTYPE IN EAST TUCANOAN
1. Unmarked simple imperative	Inherited from proto-language	none
2. Secondhand imperative <i>-pida</i> 'do on someone else's order'	Reinterpretation of <i>-pida</i> 'present reported, quotative'	Secondhand imperative in Tucano, Tuyuca, Wanano
3. Proximate imperative <i>-si</i> 4. Distal imperative <i>-kada</i> 5. Delayed imperative <i>-wa</i>	Reinterpretation of future markers <i>-si</i> and <i>-wa</i> ; <i>-kada</i> 'delayed imperative' grammaticalised from the verb <i>-kada</i> 'keep, leave'	No full match: distal imperative in Wanano and Macuna; delayed imperative in Tuyuca; distal and proximate imperative (with different sub-systems for motion and non-motion verbs) and delayed imperative in Barasano
6. Conative <i>-thara</i>	Analogy with Desano; etymology unknown	Conative imperative in Desano
7. Polite <i>-nha</i>	Reinterpretation of an interrogative marker	Polite imperative in Tucano
8. Hortative <i>-ra/da</i>	Borrowed from Tucano or Desano	Same form and same meaning in Tucano, Desano, Macuna
9. Immediate imperative <i>-ya</i>	Reinterpretation of emphatic <i>-ya</i> as a result of grammatical accommodation influenced by the Tucano <i>-ya</i> 'imperative'	Same form and same meaning in Tucano, Tuyuca, Piratapuya
10. Simple imperative <i>-ri</i>	Reinterpretation of nominalisation marker <i>-ri</i> as a result of grammatical accommodation influenced by the Tucano <i>-ri</i> 'imperative'	Same form and same meaning in Tucano and Tuyuca
11. Detrimental imperative <i>-tupe</i>	Grammaticalisation of an extant verbal root <i>*tupa</i> 'break' + <i>-i</i> 'transitiviser' to match a 'detrimental' construction in Tucano	A matching construction in Tucano consisting of a verbal compound VERB-break (transitive) with detrimental meaning and not limited to commands

The simple imperative is formally unmarked. It consists of the second person or first person plural prefix attached to the verbal root, e.g. *pi-ñha* (2sg-eat) 'Eat!' This is the only imperative structure Tariana shares with other Arawak languages, e.g. Baniwa *pi-ihña*, Piapoco *pi-yaa* (2sg-eat) 'eat!' (Klumpp 1990: 63). In East Tucanoan languages, imperatives are always formally marked; simple imperative suffixes include Tucano, Piratapuya, Tuyuca *-ya*, Wanano *-ga*, Desano *-ke* (see F below).

Tariana imperatives form one paradigm. Their markers are mutually exclusive with tense and evidentiality morphemes used in declarative clauses. All imperatives share intonational properties and verb initial constituent order (in contrast to declarative clauses where the order is free with a verb final tendency). All imperatives are negated with the particle *mhãida* 'prohibitive'. In contrast, non-imperative verbs are negated with prefix *ma-* and suffix *-kade*.

The imperative distinctions found in Tariana and shared with at least one East Tucanoan language cover (A) evidentiality; (B) degree of temporal and spatial distance; (C) conative meaning; (D) politeness; and (E) first person or 'hortative'. Two further ways of expressing simple imperative have developed under the influence of Tucano: see (F). The detrimental imperative, seemingly different from the East Tucanoan patterns, is discussed under (G).

(A). EVIDENTIALITY IN IMPERATIVES. The secondhand imperative meaning 'do on someone else's order' is shared between Tariana and numerous East Tucanoan languages, cf. Tariana *pi-ñha-pida* (2sg-eat-SEC.IMPV) and Tucano *ba'â-ato* (eat-SEC.IMPV) 'Eat (on someone else's order)!' The secondhand imperative is also found in Tuyuca (marked with *-aro*: Barnes 1979) and Wanano (*-haro*: Waltz and Waltz 1997: 40).

The secondhand imperative in Tariana and in East Tucanoan languages share a variety of usages, such as the Tariana farewell formula *ma <a-pida* (good-SEC.IMPV) 'good-bye; best wishes' (lit. let it be good on (our) behalf), similar to Tucano *añu-ato* (good-SEC.IMPV), with the same meaning. Other shared contexts are discussed in Aikhenvald (2002: 164-5).

The markers of the secondhand imperative are cognate in East Tucanoan languages which have it. They have no connection with any of the forms in declarative evidentiality-tense paradigms (see Ramirez 1997, Vol. 1:146). In contrast, the secondhand imperative marker *-pida* in Tariana occurs throughout the reported evidentiality paradigm. In declarative clauses, the Tariana reported evidentials are *-pida* 'present reported', *-pida-ka* 'recent past reported' (consisting of *-pida* and the recent past tense marker *-ka*) and *-pida-na* 'remote past reported' (consisting of *-pida* and the remote past marker *-na*). The tense markers *-ka* and *-na* are found throughout the tense-evidentiality system, while present tense is always formally unmarked.

The present tense reported *-pida* is used to transmit information acquired almost simultaneously with the moment of speech. If someone says *di-ñha-ka* (3sgnf-eat-REC.P.VIS) 'he is eating' (I have just seen him eat), another participant, who cannot see the person eating, would immediately repeat this piece of information to a third party saying *di-ñha-pida* (3sgnf-eat-PRES.REP) 'he is eating I am told'. The present reported is used almost like a quotative evidential. During my work on Tariana placenames, a young speaker would often ask his father about a name he did not know, and then repeat it, using the present reported evidential: *Kerekere-pani-pida* (sparrow-rapids-PRES.REP) '(the name is) "rapids of a sparrow", he has just said'. The meaning of 'secondhand' imperative is also essentially quotative: one quotes a command by someone else, transmitting someone else's order.

Unlike Tucanoan languages and Tariana, most Arawak languages have only one, reported, evidential, typically used in traditional tales and also in quotations. In Baniwa, the form of this reported evidential is *-pida*, which is a clear cognate to Tariana *-pida*. This evidential does not occur in commands.

Tariana developed a secondhand imperative marker out of its 'own' resources, via the reinterpretation of a reported evidential morpheme to match a conceptual category found in East Tucanoan languages. The East Tucanoan languages have no present tense form for the reported evidential; neither is there any quotative marker. We hypothesise that the form *-pida*, with no tense reference, inherited from the Proto-Tariana-Baniwa, was reinterpreted as a zero-marked present tense form. Due to its quotative functions, it was extended to cover secondhand, or quoted, commands.

(B) DEGREE OF TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL DISTANCE IN IMPERATIVES. Imperatives in Tariana distinguish three degrees of distance. Proximate imperative ('you, do it here' or 'you here, do it') is marked with a suffix *-si*, e.g. *pi-ñha-si* (2sg-eat-PROXIMATE.IMPV) 'Eat here'. Distal imperative ('you, do it there', or 'you there, do it') is marked with the suffix *-kada*, e.g. *pi-ñha-kada* (2pl+listen-DISTAL.IMPERATIVE) 'Eat over there' (addressed to people outside the house). The delayed imperative means 'do some time later or further away', and is marked with the suffix *-wa*, e.g. *desu pi-ñha-wa* (2sg-go-DELAYED.IMPV) 'Eat tomorrow'.

A few East Tucanoan languages have a special distal imperative. In Wanano (Waltz 1976: 46) it is marked with *-risa*, as in *wahi wajã-risa* (fish kill-DISTAL.IMPV) 'kill the fish' (at a distance).⁴ Tuyuca (Barnes 1979) has a delayed imperative, marked with the suffix *-wa*, as in

⁴ A 'distance' marker appears in the so called 'courtesy' imperative in Desano (Miller 1999: 72-3) as in *guʔa-dĩ-sa* (bathe-for.now-DISTANCE) 'go ahead and bathe for now (we can talk later)'.

basa-wa (sing-DELAYED.IMPERATIVE) 'Sing!' (some other time; later).⁵ Macuna (Smothermon et al. 1995: 62-3) has a distal imperative marked with suffix *-tẽ*, and a future imperative marked with *-ba*. But none of these languages have a proximate imperative. Tucano, a major East Tucanoan language with which Tariana is in continuous contact, does not have any morphological marking of spatial and temporal distance in imperatives. (The Tariana proximate and distal imperatives are translated into Tucano with complex constructions involving 'come' and 'go'. The idea of 'delayed' imperative is translated with lexemes such as 'later'.)

The only East Tucanoan language with a three-fold distinction in spatial and temporal distance in imperatives is Barasano (Jones and Jones 1991: 76-8). Unlike Tariana, Barasano distinguishes motion and non-motion verbs for proximate and distal imperatives. This is summarised in Table 2 below, using the example of the verb *ãbi* which means 'pick up' when used as a non-motion verb, and 'bring/carry' when it implies motion.

Table 2. Spatial distance in imperatives in Barasano

Proximate imperative		Non-proximate (distal) imperative	
Motion verbs	Non-motion verbs	Motion verbs	Non-motion verbs
Marker <i>a-yá: ãbi-a-yá</i> 'bring it here!'	<i>-ya: ãbi-ya</i> 'pick it up!'	<i>-a-sa: ãbi-a-sa</i> 'take it away'	<i>-a-ya: ãbi-a-ya</i> 'pick it up there!'

A future imperative, marked with *-ba* (cognate to Macuna *-ba* and to Tuyuca *-wa*), refers to a command to be carried out later. The systems in Barasano and in Tariana are similar, but not identical.

As said above, none of the North Arawak languages in the area have any spatial or temporal distinctions in imperatives. They do have cognates for the Tariana imperative markers.

⁵ Speakers of Tariana do not appear to be aware of the similarity between Tuyuca and Tariana delayed imperative *-wa* because their knowledge of Tuyuca is limited. This is in contrast to Tucano, Wanano, Piratapuya and Desano in which most Tariana are highly proficient (see Appendix 4 to Aikhenvald 2002).

The marker of proximate imperative *-si* in Tariana is related to the affirmative future marker *-si* in Piapoco (Klumpp 1990: 172; Tariana *s* corresponds to Piapoco *s* before a front vowel). The marker of delayed imperative *-wa* is cognate with Piapoco general future marker *-wa*, which can also mark purpose, as in *na-à na-wénda-wa amàca* (3pl-go 3pl-sell-FUT hammock) 'they will go to sell hammocks'. The same morpheme has a future and a purposive meaning in Baniwa (Hohôdene dialect), e.g. *ʒi-uma-ka ʒi-hña-wa* (3sgnf-see-DECL 3sgnf-eat-FUT) 'He is looking for (something) to eat'. The distal imperative marker *-kada* in Tariana could have arisen as a result of the grammaticalisation of a verbal root *-kada* (Tariana), *-kadaa* (Baniwa) meaning 'leave, keep'.

(C) CONATIVE IMPERATIVE. The conative imperative in Tariana meaning 'try and do it' mirrors the conative imperative meaning 'try it out' in Desano (Miller 1999: 72-4), e.g. Desano *ba-yã-ta* (eat-PREC-LIM); Tariana *pi-nha-thara* (2sg-eat-PREC) 'Try and eat (please); eat it to try it out'. Its etymology in Tariana is unknown.

(D) POLITENESS. Polite commands and suggestions in Tariana are marked with the clitic *-nha* homophonous with *-nha* 'present visual interrogative'. Polite imperatives do not have a rising intonation typical for questions; nor can other interrogative markers be used in commands, e.g. *pi-ni-nha* (2sg-do-POLITE.IMPERATIVE) 'Would you like to do (it), could you please do (it)?'

A number of East Tucanoan languages have special marking for a polite imperative, as in Tucano *weé-kã'a'sã* (do-POLITE.IMPERATIVE) 'Could you please do (it)?' (Ramirez 1997, 1:149).

Developing an imperative out of an interrogative is typologically not uncommon.

Questions occur frequently as mild commands, as in English (e.g. *could you close the window?*),

Mongolian, and Chukotka-Kamchatkan languages. Tatar and Uzbek use future with a question particle for polite invitations. In Kannada, yes-no questions are used as polite commands (see Aikhenvald forthcoming, for further details). This development in Tariana is likely to have been prompted by the desire to match the politeness distinctions present in some of the neighbouring East Tucanoan languages, using the language's own resources.

(E) FIRST PERSON, OR 'HORTATIVE'. Tariana has a special first person plural imperative (or hortative) marked with *-da/-ra*. Functionally and formally this morpheme is reminiscent of the Tucano hortative *-rã/-dã* (Ramirez 1997, Vol. I: 145), e.g. Tariana *wa-ira-da* (1pl-drink-HORTATIVE), Tucano *sĩri-dã* (drink-HORTATIVE) 'Let's drink!' This same morpheme occurs in Desano (Miller 1999: 72-3); and in Macuna (Smothermon et al. 1995: 62).

The Tariana hortative is likely to be a recent borrowing from Tucano, and is a feature of young people's language. Traditional speakers of Tariana are aware of the similarity between the Tariana and the Tucano morphemes, and consider it 'incorrect' Tariana. This is typical of Tariana language attitudes: Tucano look-alikes and potential loans are considered 'bad language' (see Aikhenvald 2002: 213-22 on language awareness in the Vaupés area). The hortative is thus a marginal feature of the language. It can be considered an on-going innovation rather than a completed change, in contrast to the imperatives in A-D above which are used by all speakers.

(F) ALTERNATIVES TO THE SIMPLE IMPERATIVE. An additional second person imperative marked with *-ya* in Tariana has overtones of 'do it immediately', e.g. *pi-ñha-ya* (2sg-eat-IMPERATIVE) 'Eat!' This imperative marker is strikingly similar to the imperative marker *-ya* in Tucano, Tuyuca and Piratapuya, cf. Tucano *apê-ya* (play-IMPV) 'play!' (in Barasano, this morpheme marks present

imperative: Jones and Jones 1991: 76). The *-ya* imperative in Tariana is frequently used by younger speakers, and hardly ever by traditional speakers. All speakers concur that this is not 'good Tariana'.

This is reminiscent of the hortative discussed in (D). However, the Tariana *-ya* may not be a loan from an East Tucanoan language. Tariana has a clitic *-ya* 'emphatic' whose cognates are found in other Arawak languages, e.g. Baniwa *-tsa*, an emphatic clitic occurring in imperatives and prohibitives. The extension of Tariana *-ya* to mark imperatives is an example of grammatical accommodation. The emphatic marker *-ya* is likely to be acquiring a new function as an imperative, to match the function of its East Tucanoan look-alike.

Nominalisations marked with *-ri* in Tariana occasionally appear in commands, as an alternative to simple imperatives, e.g. *piñha-ri!* (2sg-eat-NOMINALISATION) 'eat!' This usage — restricted to casual speech by younger people — could be influenced by the *-ri* marked imperative in Tucano, as another instance of 'grammatical accommodation'. Just like the *-ya* imperative, this instance of on-going change is frowned upon by Tariana language purists.

(G) DETRIMENTAL IMPERATIVE. The detrimental imperative in Tariana marked with the enclitic *-tupe* means 'let something happen to the person's detriment', e.g. *pi-a-tupe* (2sg-go-DETR.IMPV) 'may you go (there) to your detriment'. This imperative is somewhat different from other imperatives. Firstly, it is negated like a declarative verb, with a combination of a prefix *ma-* and a suffix *-kade*, e.g. *ma:-kade-tupe diha* (NEG+go-NEG-DETR.IMPV he) 'may he not go to his own detriment' (note that person-number distinctions on the verb are then neutralised). Secondly, it can occasionally combine with evidentials used in declarative clauses, as in (1). This example comes from a story about a woman who had been nasty to the narrator. On hearing the news that

a pattern of grammaticalisation of the verb 'break' into a detrimental marker attested in Tucano as source language was replicated in Tariana as a target language. Numerous aspect markers in Tariana developed in a similar way, by calquing the Tucano structures morpheme by morpheme; examples are Tariana *-ñha-sita*, Tucano *ba'â-toha* (eat-finish) 'eat up, eat completely'; Tariana *-ñha-yena*, Tucano *ba'â-tiha* (eat-do little by little) 'eat little by little, start eating'. In these cases, the grammaticalised verb is still used as an independent lexical item in Tariana. In contrast, the verb **-tupa* was lost. In addition, the detrimental construction has become limited mostly to the context of command (a process opposite to the 'extension' of a category from one context to many). This is an example of a native deployment of what is an essentially a borrowed structure.

4. The etymologically heterogenous imperative system in Tariana: a summary

The system of imperatives in Tariana is etymologically heterogenous and multi-sourced. The markers come from different non-imperative categories, via distinct mechanisms. So do the semantic distinctions.

The Tariana multiple imperative system is only superficially reminiscent of East Tucanoan languages. There is no single East Tucanoan system which could have served as a prototype for calquing into Tariana. While some distinctions calqued into Tariana are pervasive in East Tucanoan — as, for instance, the secondhand imperative — others are not. The three-fold distinction between proximate, distal and delayed imperative is unique to Tariana. Each of these distinctions may be expressed in individual East Tucanoan languages, but Tariana is the only language in the area to have all three in paradigmatic opposition to each other. The highest number of semantic analogies to the Tariana imperative distinctions are found in Tucano, Tuyuca and Barasano, the three East Tucanoan languages with the most complex imperative systems.

A few imperative categories found in East Tucanoan did not diffuse into Tariana. Among these are the impolite or familiar imperative (found in Tucano and Tuyuca), attention getting imperative (in Tucano and in Wanano), and special imperative forms for motion verbs (in Macuna and in Barasano).

The mechanisms involved in the evolution of the multi-sourced and heterogenous imperatives in Tariana include:

(a) REINTERPRETATION of existing morphemes by their extension to new contexts analogous with those found in Tucanoan languages. This is the case for secondhand imperative, proximate, distal and delayed imperatives and the polite imperative.

(b) GRAMMATICAL ACCOMMODATION AND BORROWING. This is the case for the hortative and for the imperatives in *-ya* and in *-ri*. The outcomes of these processes are marginal in the language. Firstly, they represent instances of on-going rather than completed change. Secondly, they are considered 'bad' language by traditional authorities on Tariana.

(b) AREALLY INDUCED GRAMMATICALISATION. An example is the development of a detrimental form in Tariana by grammaticalising a transitive verb 'break' (which is no longer used in the language) to match a semantically similar structure in Tucano. This is similar to other instances of contact grammaticalisation, such as the development of proximate aspect using the verb 'become' in Nandi, a Nilotic language, under the influence of the Bantu language Gusii (Kuteva 2000).

To say that imperative meanings were just borrowed or calqued from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana would be a simplification. A number of mechanisms — including areally induced grammaticalisation, a concept we owe to Bernd Heine's work — are instrumental in its development. To lump them under an umbrella label of 'borrowing' or 'calquing' is an

oversimplification which obscures the possible historical scenarios for each case. This is ultimately an argument against considering borrowing (calquing, or copying) of grammar in language contact as a unitary mechanism of language change. The structural complexity of a language within a multilateral linguistic area is due to a combination of genetically inherited material with the results of the varied mechanisms of areal diffusion and independent innovations.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2002. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: OUP.
- Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2003a. *A grammar of Tariana, from northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2003b. 'Mechanisms of change in areal diffusion: new morphology and language contact.' *Journal of Linguistics* 39: 1-29
- Aikhenvald, A. Y. forthcoming. 'Imperatives and other commands'.
- Aikhenvald, A. Y. and R.M.W. Dixon. 2001. (eds). *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnes, J. 1979. 'Los imperativos en tuyuca.' *Artículos en lingüística y campos afines* 6: 87-94.
- Barnes, J. 1999. 'Tucano', pp. 207-26 of *The Amazonian languages*, edited by R.M.W. Dixon and A.Y. Aikhenvald. Cambridge: CUP.
- Campbell, L. 1987. 'Syntactic change in Pipil.' *IJAL* 53: 253-80.
- Friedman, V. A. 1997. 'One grammar, three lexicons: ideological overtones and underpinnings in the Balkan *Sprachbund*.' *CLS* 33: 23-44.
- Harris, Alice and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. 2001. 'Convergence and divergence in the development of African languages', pp. 393-411 of Aikhenvald and Dixon eds.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, W. and P. Jones. 1991. *Barasano Syntax*. (Studies in the languages of Colombia 2.) Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Klumpp, D. 1990. *Piapoco grammar*. Colombia: SIL.
- Klumpp, D. 1995. *Vocabulario Piapoco-Español*. Santafé de Bogotá: Asociación Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Kuteva, T. 2001. 'Areal grammaticalisation: the case of the Bantu-Nilotic borderland.' *Folia Linguistica* XXXIV: 267-83.
- Miller, M. 1999. *Desano grammar*. (Studies in the Languages of Colombia 6.) Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Ramirez, H. 1997. *A fala Tukano dos Yepa-Masa*. Tomo I. *Gramática*. Tomo II. *Dicionário*. Manaus: Inspeoria Salesiana.
- Smothermon, J. R., J. H. Smothermon and P. S. Frank. 1995. *Bosquejo del Macuna: Aspectos de la cultura material de los macunas; Fonología; Gramática*. Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Tsitsipis, L. D. 1998. *A linguistic anthropology of praxis and language shift. Arvanítika (Albanian) and Greek in Contact*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Waltz, Nathan. 1976. *Hablemos el guanano. Una gramamta pedagogica del guanano*. Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico del Verano.

Waltz, Nathan and Carolyn Waltz. 1997. *El Agua, La Roca y El Humo. Estudios sobre la cultura wanana del Vaupés*. Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico del Verano.

Watkins, C. 2001. 'An Indo-European linguistic area and its characteristics: ancient Anatolia. Areal diffusion as a challenge to the comparative method?' pp. 44-63 of Aikhenvald and Dixon, eds.