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The Vaupés River Basin in northwest Amazonia is a well-established linguistic area. Its major feature is obligatory societal multilingualism which follows the principle of linguistic exogamy: “those who speak the same language as us are our brothers, and we do not marry our sisters.” Speakers of East Tucanoan languages and of one Arawak language, Tariana, participate in the exogamous marriage network and share the obligatory multilingualism.

Long-term interaction between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns and calquing of categories. A typologically unusual system of 11 imperatives in Tariana bears a strong impact from East Tucanoan languages; but to say that imperative meanings were just borrowed or calqued from East Tucanoan languages would be a simplification. The markers come from different non-imperative categories, via distinct mechanisms. I discuss the mechanisms involved in the development of Tariana multiple imperatives and then address the crucial question: Which factors facilitate the diffusion of commands?
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1. What this paper is about. Most languages have a construction used exclusively for directive speech acts (commands, orders, instructions, and so on). Imperative clauses typically differ from their declarative counterparts—sometimes they have fewer grammatical categories, other times more. The statement that imperatives are grammatically impoverished compared to their non-imperative counterparts (advocated by Hamblin 1987 and Schmerling 1982) is not fully accurate. Languages with multiple imperatives have imperative-specific categories—including distance in space (proximal versus distal) or in time (immediate versus delayed) and politeness (abrupt, neutral, polite)—not found in their declarative or interrogative counterparts. Warnings, requests, permissives, and conatives (‘try and do!’) can also be part of the system of imperatives.

Many of these meanings are distinguished in positive imperatives in Tariana, the only North Arawak language spoken in the context of the societal multilingualism in the Vaupés River Basin in northwest Amazonia. Hardly any of these meanings are shared with Tariana’s immediate relatives—North Arawak languages such as Baniwa of Içana and Piapoco spoken just outside the Vaupés linguistic area itself are not involved in the multilingual network.
Imperative meanings are shared with neighbors—East Tucanoan languages unrelated to Tariana but spoken within the same linguistic area.

Tariana imperatives bear a strong impact from East Tucanoan languages; but to say that imperative meanings were just borrowed or calqued from East Tucanoan languages would be a simplification. The markers come from a variety of non-imperative categories, via distinct mechanisms. At the same time, some imperative forms, and meanings, are clearly archaic.

The purpose of this paper is to show how Tariana acquired a typologically unusual system of commands through areal diffusion and through reinterpretation of its own resources. An additional theoretical issue that arises here is the nature and rise of linguistic complexity resulting from language contact.

I start with some background information on the Vaupés River Basin as a linguistic area (2). I then discuss the Tariana imperatives and the mechanisms of contact-induced change involved in their development (3 and 4). And then, in 5, the critical question is addressed: What factors facilitate the diffusion of commands? Section 6 provides a brief summary.

2. The linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin.

2.1. Background information. The Vaupés basin in northwest Amazonia (spanning adjacent areas of Brazil and Colombia) is a well-established linguistic area, characterized by obligatory multilingualism following the principle of linguistic exogamy: “those who speak the same language as 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. Speakers of these languages participate in the exogamous marriage network which ensures obligatory multilingualism.¹

¹ The marriage rules are not completely straightforward: for instance, the Tariana do not marry the Desano, considering them their “younger brothers”; and the Tucano do not marry the Barasano; see further information, discussion, and references in Aikhenvald (2002:22–23). Additional facts and some modern statistics are in Azevedo (2005). Other sources, dealing predominantly with Tucanoan groups, are Christine Hugh-Jones (1979), Stephen Hugh-Jones (1979; 1981), and Jackson (1976; 1983). Sorensen (1967) is a brief account of the Colombian part of the multilingual Vaupés area where only East Tucanoan languages are spoken. Therefore, his work is only marginally relevant here. The Makú languages are also spoken in this area, but their speakers are excluded from the marriage network (see Epps 2005 on the influence of Tucano on Hup, a Makú language; her denomination for the family is “Nadahup”). That the impact of contact-induced change from Tucano on Hup (see Epps 2005; 2007) shows some similarities to that from Tucano on Tariana may be indicative of ancient contacts between the Tariana and the Makú (see Aikhenvald 2007c for further argumentation).
A striking feature of the Vaupés linguistic area is a strong cultural inhibition against language mixing viewed in terms of borrowing forms. Long-term interaction based on institutionalized multilingualism between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns (though not so much of forms) and calquing of categories. As a result, the Vaupés area provides a unique laboratory for investigating how contact-induced changes take place, which categories are more prone to diffusion, and which are likely to remain intact.

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 genetic inheritance and also to “parallelism in drift,” whereby related languages “will pass through the same or strikingly similar phases” (Sapir 1921:171–72). 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 other North Arawak languages, which are closely related to it and spoken outside the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area (defined by obligatory multilingualism), 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. (See figure 1 and appendix 2 in Aikhenvald 2002 for an outline of Proto-Arawak grammar.) Tariana shares about 85–88% lexicon with various dialects of Baniwa; but their morphology and syntax are very different.²

²Tariana, the only representative of the Arawak family within the nuclear Vaupés River Basin linguistic area (whose defining feature is obligatory multilingualism determined by linguistic exogamy; see Aikhenvald 2002; 2007c), used to be a continuum of numerous dialects (one for each of several hierarchically organized clans). The only dialect still actively spoken is that of the Wamia/ikune, traditionally one of the lowest ranking clans (termed Yäine, or Yurupari-tapuya, by Koch-Grünberg 1911). A comparison between various dialects suggests that linguistic diversity within the Tariana continuum was comparable to the differences between various dialects of Portuguese, Spanish, and Galician (see Aikhenvald 2003a:17–18, 620–29). This paper, as all my previous work on this language, is based on information obtained via original fieldwork with speakers of all existing dialects of Tariana (mostly the Wamia/ikune of Santa Rosa and Periquitos, with about 100 speakers in all, and also the dialect of the Kuman-dene subgroups of Tariana, spoken by a couple of dozen adults in the village of Santa Terezinha
Fig. 1.—Map of languages spoken in the Vaupés area and its surrounds.
What do we know about the history of the Tariana? The Tariana appear to be the most recent arrivals in the Vaupés. The exact timing of the Tarianas’ arrival there and the length of contact with Tucanoan speakers are matters of contention (see below and n. 3). Their place of origin, the Wapui Waterfall on the Aiary River (a tributary of the Içana River), is shared with the Baniwa/Kurripako and Piapoco (see Brüzzi 1977, Koch-Grünberg 1911, Nimuendajú 1982, Neves 1998, and Zucchi 2002). We can safely assume that language contact between East Tucanoan languages and Makú predates that between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana. Since some Makú-speaking groups were likely to have been absorbed by the Tariana, the Tariana language could have acquired some features from East Tucanoan languages via a Makú substratum (see Aikhenvald 2007c and Epps 2007).

Numerous high-ranking Tariana groups started shifting to Tucano, whose speakers outnumbered all others, as early as the late nineteenth century (Koch-Grünberg 1911:51). As a result, most Tariana dialects are now gone. The myths and oral histories of different Tariana subgroups indicate that they may have taken different routes, and perhaps assimilated different language groups, before they arrived in the Vaupés basin. And different groups had different histories; thus the Tariana whose dialect still survives today deny any participation in the wars described by Wright (2005) and Biocca (1965). High-ranking Tariana groups may have played a role of “slave-traders” in northwest Amazonia in the eighteenth century (see Carvalho 2005 and also on the Iauari River). The analysis of the existing materials on other dialects is given in the appendix to Aikhenvald (2003a).

It should be noted that Ramirez (2001) contains numerous errors concerning Tariana and Baniwa of Içana. His claim that Tariana is a dialect of Baniwa is as true as saying that Rumanian is a dialect of Spanish. Note that his Tariana data come from short spans of elicitation with Emílio and Raimundo Brito, whose Tariana bears a strong impact from Baniwa of Içana (see Aikhenvald 2003a:22). Tariana and Baniwa are not mutually intelligible because of major differences in their grammar, and also due to numerous phonological processes in Tariana which obscure the cognacy. This is despite a high number of lexical cognates between the two languages. It is an example of how restricting oneself to just lexical cognates may produce misleading conclusions. The data from Baniwa of Içana come from my own fieldwork; information taken from other sources is acknowledged. When quoting from other sources, I retain the transcriptions of the original sources.

The Vaupés River Basin linguistic area can be considered a subarea within a larger area which encompasses at least the basin of the Içana River (see Aikhenvald 1999; 2001; 2007a; in preparation). A full investigation of diffusional patterns within the larger Vaupés-Içana basin lies outside the scope of this paper, which focuses on Tariana–Tucanoan interactions.

I am grateful to all my teachers of Tariana, the Britos of Santa Rosa and the Muniz of Periquitos, and to Roni Lopez from Santa Terezinha, for teaching me their remarkable language. I am grateful to Alfredo Fontes and the late Tiago Cardoso for teaching me some Tucano. Thanks are equally due to R. M. W. Dixon, Willem F. Adelaar, Janet Barnes, Terry Malone, Kris Stenzel, Clay Strom, Junia Schauer, and José Alvarez for helpful comments and insights. I am also grateful to the IJAL reviewers, the associate editor, and the editor for incisive comments and criticisms.
Hemming 1987:593). But we have no such information concerning the lower-ranking group which still speaks the language—they seem to have safely escaped slavery of any kind.3

2.2. Contact induced change in the Vaupés area. The traditional Vaupés region was a long-standing linguistic area with multilateral diffusion, and with no relationships of dominance between the main players—East Tucanoan and Arawak languages. The language changes which took place during this time (perhaps, over a few hundred years) can be characterized as completed changes. These involved tangible impact of East Tucanoan languages on Tariana, recognizable through comparison between Tariana and closely related Arawak languages spoken outside the area.4

At present, Tucano is rapidly gaining ground as the major language of the area, at the expense of other languages in the Brazilian Vaupés. This is a consequence of the Catholic missionaries’ language and teaching policies, and a number of other, secondary factors. As a result of this encroaching dominance of Tucano, innovative speakers of Tariana display more Tucano-like patterns in their language than do traditional speakers. These newly introduced patterns reflect ongoing changes produced as the result of gradual and imminent shift to the dominant language.

We can distinguish various layers of contact-induced change in Tariana. Completed changes cover those aspects of the grammatical system of the language which show no synchronic variation, are well integrated into the system, and go beyond speakers’ awareness. They are not limited to any one

3 According to Neves (1998), the arrival of the Tariana in the Vaupés area goes back to precontact times (also see Brüzzi 1977 and Nimuendajú 1982). Hypotheses concerning the establishment of the Vaupés area by the end of the eighteenth century (S. Hugh-Jones 1981:42 and Chernela 1993:24) are not corroborated by the facts; see further discussion in Aikhenvald (2002). Natterer’s word list (1831), based on his work with the Tariana of Ipanoré/São Jerônimo, states that the Tariana originate from the Aiary River. Historical and traditional evidence suggests that neither Tucano nor Tariana are the autochthonous population of the Vaupés. That the original inhabitants of the Vaupés area were Makú groups is a statement founded on an assumption—by archaeologists and anthropologists—rather than on tangible facts (see Aikhenvald 2002:19–24).

4 The impact of Tariana on East Tucanoan languages is harder to pinpoint, since there are no East Tucanoan languages spoken outside the Vaupés area, and all known East Tucanoan languages have been affected by a continuous multilingual interaction. To complicate matters, the existing descriptions of East Tucanoan languages do not necessarily reflect the varieties in direct contact with Tariana. The Tariana—as the latest arrivals in the Vaupés area—have always been numerically the minority (see, e.g., Coudreau 1887:161). A few features of East Tucanoan languages which seem to be atypical of Tucanoan as a whole could be attributed to an influence from Arawak languages (see Aikhenvald 2002:61; 2007c and Metzger 1998). Other areas of Tucanoan–Arawak contact are discussed further in Aikhenvald (2002).
of the East Tucanoan languages as a motivating force. Ongoing, or continuous, changes are those in progress (see Tsitsipis 1998:34 for this notion). Such changes reflect the influence of the now-dominant Tucano on Tariana. Speakers are often aware of this influence and often lament it. Imperative categories—as will be seen below—are one of the areas where this influence manifests itself.

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 have been diffused from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana, promoting an impressive structural similarity. I start with an example. 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 learned it from someone else. Other Arawak languages have only one, reported, evidential (also see Aikhenvald 2003b).

Consider the following sentences, from mythological stories. Sentence (1) comes from Tariana and (2) from Tucano. There are no cognate morphemes, and yet the interlinear glosses are almost identical. Sentence (3) comes from Baniwa of Içana, an Arawak language closely related to Tariana but spoken outside the Vaupés area. Most Baniwa forms are cognate to those in Tariana, but the categories and the meanings expressed are very different. Baniwa and Tariana cognates are underlined.5

Tariana

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \ & nese \ pa:ma \ di-na \\
\ & \text{then} \ & \text{one+NUM.CL ANIMATE.FEM} \ & 3\text{sgnf-OBJ} \\
\ & \text{du-yana-sita-pidana} \\
\ & 3\text{sgf-cook-ALREADY-REM.P.REP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘She had reportedly cooked him already’

5 The following abbreviations are used: cl = classifier; con = conative; decl = declarative; emph = emphatic; f, fem = feminine; fut = future; impv = imperative; lim = limiter; malef = malefactive; masc = masculine; neg = negative; nf = nonfeminine; num = numeral; obj = object; pl = plural; pres = present; prox = proximate; rec.p = recent past; rem.p = remote past; rep = reported; sec = secondhand; sg = singular; vis = visual.
Tucano

(2) tiîta ni’kó kîî-re
    then one+NUM.CL.ANIMATE.FEM he-OBJ
do’á-toha-po’
    COOK-ALREADY-REM.PAST.REP.3sgfem

‘She had reportedly cooked him already’

Baniwa

(3) hne-te-pida apa:ma zu-dzana-ni zu-taita
    then-REP one+CL.FEM 3sgnf-cook-3sgnfOBJ 3sgf-finish

‘Then she had reportedly finished cooking him’

Baniwa apa- ‘one’ corresponds to Tariana pa- ‘one’ (both are reflexes of the Proto-Arawak form *ba ‘one’). Tariana yin -yana ‘cook’ corresponds to Baniwa dz, and Tariana d in the third singular feminine prefix du- corresponds to Baniwa ʒ. (Both go back to Proto-Arawak ru/-lu- ‘third-person feminine prefix’; see Aikhenvald 2002, appendix 2.) Tariana s regularly corresponds to Baniwa t. In a diphthong, ai in Baniwa is contracted to i in Tariana. Hence the correspondence of Baniwa -taita ‘finish’ to Tariana -sita ‘perfective marker’, recently grammaticalized from the verb -sita ‘finish’ (its grammaticalization paths are discussed in some detail in Aikhenvald 2000). 6

But the grammatical differences between Tariana and Baniwa are striking. First, unlike Tariana and Tucano, Baniwa has no obligatory tense or evidentiality. An optional reported clitic (with no tense distinction) attaches to the first word in the clause in Baniwa. In both Tariana and Tucano, the marker combining information on tense and evidentiality (in this case, ‘remote past reported’) attaches to the verb.

Second, the same etymon, Tariana -sita and Baniwa -taita ‘finish’, behaves differently: in Baniwa it is part of a serial verb construction, while in Tariana it is a bound morpheme with an aspectual meaning, ‘already’—just like in Tucano, in (2).

Despite the striking structural similarity, it would be wrong to say that Tariana is simply “reflexified” Tucano. Tucano categories are replicated in Tariana, but a major difference remains. Subject marking in Tucano is achieved

---

6 The relative transparency of morpheme boundaries is due to the predominantly agglutinating profiles of both Tucanoan and North Arawak languages (see Aikhenvald 2002), which have only limited fusion.
through portmanteau suffixes combining information on tense, evidentiality, and person. In contrast, Tariana has subject prefixes inherited from Proto-Arawak, just like its relative, Baniwa. Tariana has preserved its Arawak profile, in addition to the newly acquired East Tucanoan-like features.

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

3. Semantics and origin of multiple imperatives in Tariana. Tariana has 11 positive imperatives (see Aikhenvald 2003a:371–80), unlike any other Arawak language of the area. Three of these reflect changes in progress, resulting from recent formal influence of Tucano, and are treated by traditional speakers as despicable tokens of “language mixing.” The malefactive imperative (discussed in G below) is a tangential member of the imperative paradigm, inasmuch as it behaves somewhat differently from other imperatives and can combine with one of the other imperative markers. These are distinct imperatives, which cannot be reduced to a single imperative construction because of their semantics and partial restrictions on person value.

The imperative forms, and the mechanisms involved in their development, are summarized in table 1. In table 1, East Tucanoan languages with which Tariana is not directly in contact are given in parentheses. Those imperatives which reflect changes in progress are marked with an asterisk. Only a few imperative markers, and even fewer categories, have cognates in Arawak languages (see further examples and discussion in Aikhenvald 2002:303–11).

Tariana imperatives form one paradigm: all their markers (with a partial exception of the malefactive imperative) are mutually exclusive with tense and evidentiality morphemes used in declarative and interrogative clauses, and with each other. The imperatives occur with just four aspect markers, out of 11 found in declarative and interrogative clauses.7 Stative verbs cannot form imperatives, with the exception of one instance of the secondhand

---

7 They can occur with the completed ongoing aspect -daka, noncompleted ongoing proximate -sida/-sula, repetitive ‘once again’ -pita, and completed or complete involvement of S/O -niki but not with anterior, accomplished, not quite completed, short duration, customary, prescribed, or repetitive ‘many times’.

---
imperative. In addition to the paradigm, there is also a ‘malefactive’ imperative which can co-occur with one imperative (secondhand), with stative verbs, and—rarely—with tense–evidentiality markers.

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, except for the malefactive, are negated with the particle mhāida ‘prohibitive’. In contrast, non-imperative verbs and the malefactive are negated with prefix ma- and suffix -kade.

East Tucanoan languages appear to have between eight and eleven imperative forms—that is, about as many as Tariana if we count the three imperatives “in the making.” Imperatives in East Tucanoan languages do not take tense, evidentiality, or person markers used in declarative clauses. They distinguish fewer aspects, and, if they can be negated at all, they are typically negated with a suffix employed in other clause types. Imperative systems in selected East Tucanoan languages are given in Appendix A.8

The formally unmarked simple imperative consists of the second-person or first-person plural prefix attached to the verbal root—see (4a) and (4b):

Tariana

(4a) pi-ñha
   2sg-eat
   ‘Eat!’

(4b) wa-ñha
   1pl-eat
   ‘Let’s eat!’

This imperative is high in frequency and is used for any order, including one to be carried out immediately. This is the only imperative Tariana shares with other North Arawak languages: the cognates of (4a), from Tariana, are (5) from Baniwa and (6) from Piapoco (Klumpp 1990:62).

8 Note that none of the morphemes identified as ‘imperative’ can occur in declarative and interrogative clause types. Whether or not some imperative categories can be reconstructed for Proto-Tucanoan is a topic for a separate investigation. This would first involve an attempt at reconstructing Proto-East-Tucanoan and Proto-West-Tucanoan imperative morphology. Both tasks are difficult to achieve at present, since there are few fully comprehensive reference grammars, and the existing sources often given either incomplete or contradictory information. The focus of this paper is on the history of Tariana positive imperatives and the ways in which imperative meanings diffuse in a linguistic area. Any statement concerning Proto-Tucanoan lies outside my scope.
### TABLE 1
MULTIPLE IMPERATIVES IN TARIANA: MEANINGS, FORMS, MECHANISMS OF DEVELOPMENT, AND PROTOTYPES IN EAST TUCANOAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperative Category</th>
<th>Mechanism of Development</th>
<th>Prototype in East Tucano</th>
<th>Type of Change and Speakers’ Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formally unmarked simple imperative</td>
<td>Inherited from proto-language</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Inherited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secondhand imperative -pida ‘do on someone else’s order’ — see (A) in text</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of the Proto-Tariana-Baniwa -pida ‘present reported, quotative’</td>
<td>Secondhand imperative in Tucano and Wanano (also cf. Tuyuca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximate imperative -si</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of future marker -si</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distal imperative -kada</td>
<td>-kada ‘delayed imperative’, possibly grammaticalized from the verb -kada ‘keep, leave’</td>
<td>No full match: distal imperative in Wanano and Macuna; nonvisual present evidential in Tucano (cf. delayed imperative in Tuyuca; distal and proximate imperative and delayed imperative in Barasano)</td>
<td>Completed change; considered lawful part of the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delayed imperative -wa—see (B)</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of future marker -wa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conative -tha—see (C)</td>
<td>Probably a grammaticalization of a loan root ‘try’ + -da ‘dubitative’</td>
<td>Conative imperative in Desano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polite -nha—see (D)</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of an interrogative marker</td>
<td>Polite imperative in Tucano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hortative -ra/da—see (E)</td>
<td>Borrowed from Tucano or Desano</td>
<td>Same form and same meaning in Tucano, Desano, and Wanana (cf. Macuna)</td>
<td>Recent formal influence from Tucano; traditional speakers treat these forms as unwanted tokens of “language mixing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Immediate imperative -ya—see (F)</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of emphatic -ya as a result of grammatical accommodation influenced by Tucano -ya ‘imperative’</td>
<td>Same form and same meaning in Tucano and Piratapuya (cf. Tuyuca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Simple imperative -ri—see (F)</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of nominalization marker -ri as a result of grammatical accommodation influenced by the Tucano -ri ‘imperative’</td>
<td>Same form and same meaning in Tucano (cf. Tuyuca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Malefactive imperative -tupe—see (G)</td>
<td>Grammaticalization of an extant verbal root *tupa ‘break’ + -i ‘transitivizer’ to match a ‘malefactive’ construction in Tucano</td>
<td>A matching construction in Tucano consisting of a verbal compound VERB-break (transitive) with malefactive meaning and not limited to commands</td>
<td>Completed change; considered lawful part of the language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baniwa

(5) *pi-ihña*

2sg-eat

‘Eat!’

Piapoco

(6) *pi-yáa*

2sg-eat

‘Eat!’

Unlike in Arawak languages, imperatives in East Tucanoan languages are always formally marked; simple imperative suffixes include Tucano, Piratapuya, Tuyuca -ya, Wanano -ga, Desano -ke (see F below).

The imperative distinctions found in Tariana, which are each 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). And (G) features the malefactive imperative, which also has its roots in an East Tucanoan pattern.

(A) **Evidentiality in imperatives.** The only evidential meaning widely attested in imperatives across the world is ‘secondhand’ imperative or ‘imperative by proxy’. Such a secondhand imperative meaning ‘do on someone else’s order’ is shared between Tariana and numerous East Tucanoan languages. Semantically identical and structurally similar constructions in Tariana and in Tucano are given in (7) and (8).

Tariana

(7) *pi-ñha-pida*

2sg-eat-SEC.IMPV

‘Eat (on someone else’s order)!’ (that is, eat-you were told to)

Tucano

(8) *ba’á-ato*

eat-SEC.IMPV

‘Eat (on someone else’s order)!’ (that is, eat-you were told to)

The secondhand imperative is also found in Tuyuca (marked with -aro [Barnes 1979]) and Wanano (-haro [Waltz and Waltz 1997:40]).
The secondhand imperatives in Tariana and in East Tucanoan languages share a variety of usages. The Tariana farewell formula matfa-pida (be.good-sec.impv) ‘good-bye; best wishes’ (lit., let it be good on [our] behalf) is similar to Tucano ayu-áto (good-sec.impv), with the same meaning (also see Aikhenvald 2002:164–65). This is the only instance in the language where a secondhand imperative is formed on a stative verb and is highly likely to be a loan translation of a high-frequency farewell formula.

The markers of the secondhand imperative are cognate in those East Tucanoan languages which have it. They have no connection with any of the forms in declarative evidentiality–tense paradigms: compare the reported markers in (2) and in (8) (also see Ramirez 1997:1:146 and Aikhenvald 2003b). 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: see 1 above). 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 (9), another participant, who cannot see the person eating, would immediately repeat this piece of information to a third party, saying (10).

Tariana

(9) di-ñha-ka
3sgnf-eat-rec.p.vis
‘He is eating’ (I have just seen him eat)

(10) 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 place-names, a young speaker would often ask his father about a name he did not know, and then repeat it using the present reported evidential, e.g., 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 -\textit{pida}, which is cognate to Tariana -\textit{pida} (see 3 above). In Baniwa, 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. I hypothesize that the form -\textit{pida}, with no tense reference, was inherited from Proto-Tariana-Baniwa and subsequently reinterpreted as a zero-marked present tense form. Based on its quotative functions, it was extended to cover secondhand, or quoted, commands “by proxy.”

We can recall that imperatives in Tariana are not compatible with any tense markers used in declarative clauses. Using the least formally marked -\textit{pida} as a secondhand imperative is concordant with the general lack of tense markers in Tariana imperatives.

\textbf{(B) Degree of temporal and spatial distance in imperatives.} Imperatives in Tariana distinguish two degrees of spatial distance, and one degree of temporal distance.

Proximate imperative (‘you, do it here’ or ‘you here, do it’) is marked with a suffix -\textit{si}:

Tariana

\begin{equation}
\text{pi-}\text{ñha-}\text{si} \quad 2\text{sg-eat-PROX.IMPV}
\end{equation}

‘Eat here’ (close to the speaker)

Distal imperative (‘you, do it there’ or ‘you there, do it’) is marked with the suffix -\textit{kada}:

Tariana

\begin{equation}
\text{pi-}\text{ñha-}\text{kada} \quad 2\text{sg-eat-DISTAL.IMPV}
\end{equation}

‘Eat over there’ (away from where the speaker is; addressed to people outside the house)

The delayed imperative means ‘do sometime later or further away’ and is marked with the suffix -\textit{wa}:
Tariana

(13) desu kuphe pi-ñha-wa
tomorrow fish 2sg-eat-DELAYED.IMPV

‘Eat the fish tomorrow!’

We can recall that a simple unmarked imperative often refers to an order to do something straight away; however, its exact meaning depends on the context. We shall see, under (E) below, that Tariana is developing another imperative with clear overtones of ‘do it immediately’.

Arawak languages closely related to Tariana do not have special proximal, distal, or delayed imperatives. But a few East Tucanoan languages do. A distal imperative (with no ‘proximal’ counterpart) is attested in Wanano (Waltz 1976:46) (marked with -risa):

Wanano

(14) wahi wajã-risa
fish kill-DISTAL.IMPV

‘Kill the fish’ (at a distance)

Tucano has a future imperative marked with the suffix -apa (West 1980:48, 51), shown in (15a), in opposition to its nonfuture simple imperative counterpart marked with -ya (in 15b):

Tucano

(15a) ba’á-ya
eat-IMPV

‘Eat!’

(15b) ba’á-apa
eat-FUT.IMPV

‘Eat (later)’

9 According to Ramirez (1997:1:145–46), this imperative consists of two morphemes (-a- and -pa-) and marks advice against something adverse; it often has the meaning ‘make sure you do (something) so that something bad does not happen in the future’. It is also said to be used to mark ‘invitation to pay continuous attention’. These meanings are compatible with West’s description and with my own data. Also see Appendix A below.

Brüzzi (1967:200–201) does not mention this form. However, he mentions another imperative form, -nisa ‘extralocal imperative’, whose meaning appears to be similar to Wanano -risa ‘distal imperative’ (see 14), documented by Waltz and Waltz (1997; 2000) and Waltz (1976) but not found in Stenzel (2004). I have never heard this ‘extralocal’ imperative used; neither is it documented in any other sources.
Two further East Tucanoan languages which are not in immediate contact with Tariana have similar categories. Tuyuca (Barnes 1979) has a delayed imperative, marked with the suffix -wa, as in (17):

Tuyuca

(16) basa-wa
    sing-DELAYED.IMPV

   ‘Sing!’ (some other time; later)\(^\text{10}\)

Macuna (Smothermon et al. 1995:62–63) has a distal imperative marked with suffix -iê and a future imperative marked with -ba. But none of these languages has a proximate imperative.

The only East Tucanoan language with a threefold distinction of spatial and temporal distance in imperatives is Barasano (Jones and Jones 1991:76–78). An imperative marked with -ya marks a command to be executed in the presence of the speaker:

Barasano

(17) yh-re goti-ya bû
    1sg-OBJ tell-PRES.IMPV 2sg

   ‘Tell me!’

Distal, or nonproximate, imperative is marked with an additional suffix -a-:

Barasano

(18) i-re goti-a-ya bû
    3masc.sg-OBJ tell-NON.PROX-PRES.IMPV 2sg

   ‘Tell him there!’

A future imperative, marked with -ba (cognate to Macuna -ba and to Tuyuca -wa), indicates a command to be carried out at a considerable distance in space, or later on in time. The systems in Barasano and in Tariana are similar but not identical. The absence of direct contact between Barasano (spoken mostly in Colombia) and Tariana makes it unlikely that one influenced the other. The similarity between the two systems is akin to “parallelism in drift” between languages spoken within one area.

\(^{10}\)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 in Aikhenvald 2002).
Tucano, a major East Tucanoan language with which Tariana is in continuous contact, does not have any special morphological marking for spatial and temporal distance in imperatives. In addition, Ramirez (1997:1:136) reports that a verb accompanied by the “dependent verb” ni’i ‘continue doing something’, and cast in present nonvisual evidentiality, is “much used to ask someone to do something at a distance.” The present nonvisual in Tucano is also used to express future (see Ramirez 1997:1:136, 166–67). The command usage of a nonvisual form can be analyzed as an extension of its future usage, as is frequently the case across the world’s languages. It is, however, interesting that Tucano does have a strategy for expressing distance in imperatives. The Tariana proximate and distal imperatives are consistently translated into Tucano with complex constructions involving ‘come’ and ‘go’. 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.

The marker of proximate imperative -si in Tariana is related to the general future marker -sí in Piapoco (Klumpp 1990:172; Tariana s corresponds to Piapoco s before a front vowel). There is no cognate morpheme in Baniwa.

The marker of delayed imperative -wa is cognate with Piapoco general future marker -wa, which can also mark purpose, as in (19):

Piapoco

(19) 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):

Baniwa

(20) zi-uma-ka zi-hña-wa
  3sgnf-seek-DECL  3sgnf-eat-FUT

‘He (the vulture) is looking for (something) to eat’

The distal imperative marker -kada in Tariana could have arisen as a result of the grammaticalization of a verbal root -kada (Tariana), -kadaa (Baniwa) meaning ‘leave (something)’. Cross-linguistically, imperative markers often come from grammaticalized verbs (see some recurrent grammaticalization

---

11 A similar extension, from nonvisual present to future, has occurred in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2002:126–27); however, nonvisual evidentials never appear in commands.
paths in Heine and Kuteva 2002, such as come > hortative, as in German kommen ‘come’ > komm . . . ! (solidarity imperative marker), e.g., Komm, denk darüber nach! (come think about:it after) ‘Come on, think about it!’; cf. English Come on! or come > imperative, as in Nama (Hottentot); or leave > permissive, as in German lassen ‘leave, let’.

(C) CONATIVE IMPERATIVE. The conative imperative in Tariana meaning ‘try and do it’ mirrors the conative imperative meaning ‘try it out’ in Desano (Miller 1999:72–74). This is a distinct imperative form and cannot combine with any other morphemes (including other imperatives). The Desano conative imperative marker consists of the verb -yã ‘see, try out’ followed by the limiter -ta meaning ‘exactly, just’:

Desano

(21) ba-yã-ta
    eat-IMPV.see/try.out-LIM

‘Try and eat please’

The Tariana conative imperative is marked with a suffix -thara, which has no formal similarity to the Desano form:

Tariana

(22) pi-ñha-thara
    2sg-eat-CON.IMPV

‘Try and eat (please); eat it to try it out’

This suffix does not have any cognates in North Arawak languages. However, it is suspiciously similar to a combination of the Tucano bound verb root tíha, tíha ‘try to do, start doing’ (Ramirez 1997:2:189) and the Tariana suffix -da ‘dubitative; politeness marker’ (with a free variant -ca if preceded by a vowel; see Aikhenvald 2003a). Most East Tucanoan languages do not have phonemic aspirated consonants, and Tucano is no exception. However, Tucano does have non-phonemic aspirated stops which appear in normal to rapid speech register when a vowel gets reduced. So, vowel reduction in an unstressed syllable results in the creation of a phonetic sequence stop + h: as a result, one hears the demonstrative tohó ‘that (thing), then’ as tho (Aikhen-

12 The gloss given by Miller (1999:74) is eat-IMPV.prove-LIM, consistent with one of the meanings of the verb -yã.
vald 2002:38). Similarly, -tiha, -tiha is often heard as -tha. This suggests that the origin of the Tariana conative imperative is a bound verb borrowed from Tucano, accompanied by the erstwhile dubitative marker of Tariana origin.

This etymology arguably involves a calque—that is, a form “constructed by taking a word or a phrase in another language as a model and translating it morpheme by morpheme” (Trask 2000:49). Calquing is one of the mechanisms widely used in developing new categories in language contact.

A question arises here. This suggested path of development for the conative imperative involves a loan morpheme. How is this possible in a situation like that in the Vaupés, where borrowings are condemned as tokens of inappropriate language mixing?

As I have shown elsewhere (Aikhenvald 2002:141–42, 224–28), Tariana does have a very limited number of morphemes of East Tucanoan provenance. All these morphemes are bound, fully integrated phonologically, and can be considered “nativized.” They are no longer recognized as loans. That is, their presence does not contradict a cultural inhibition against recognizable “language mixing.” Among such morphemes are a few verbal roots which only occur with prefixes, such as Tariana -ya-ta, Tucano -ya’á ‘yawn, open mouth’, Tariana -wi-ña ‘whistle’, Tucano wií, Tariana -bole-ta ‘de-feather, husk’, Tucano burê. No independent morphemes recognizable as loans, or look-alikes, with Tucano are considered “good language” by the Tariana (see Aikhenvald 2002:215–17 for some examples).

The few “nativized” bound morphemes include the conditional–potential -bohta, which goes back to the Tucano bound verb boo ‘conditional–potential’ (Ramirez 1997:1:191; 2:27), accompanied by the Tariana verbalizer -ta (see Aikhenvald 2002:141–42 for the phonological changes involved). The way conative imperative -thara made its way into Tariana is parallel to the development of the conditional–potential.

Unwanted loans as free forms are easier to detect and to “ban” from the language than are bound forms. This is why the few forms borrowed from Tucano into Tariana are bound (Aikhenvald 2002:224).

An interesting parallel comes from Hup, a Makú language spoken in the Vaupés area, which has undergone a strong areal influence from the same source as Tariana—that is, Tucano. There are very few loan forms from Tucano. And, in Epps’s (2007) words, “the majority of borrowings of Tucanoan origin are verb roots, which may be easier to ‘smuggle’ into the language since—unlike nouns—they are typically embedded in morphologically complex forms.” This goes against the often-repeated assertion that languages borrow free rather than bound morphemes. Yet the sociolinguistic motivation behind this is clear: the driving force is the inhibition against using recognizably “foreign” forms, which is characteristic of the Vaupés area.
(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 of questions; nor can other interrogative markers be used in commands:

Tariana

(23) pi-ni-nha
   2sg-do-POLITE.IMPV

   ‘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 shown in (24) from Tucano (see Ramirez 1997:1:148).

Tucano

(24) weé-kã’a’sã
   do-POLITE.IMPV

   ‘Could you please do (it)?’

Developing an imperative out of an interrogative is typologically not uncommon. Mild commands can be formally cast as questions, 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 and discussion). This development in Tariana is likely to have been prompted by the desire to match the politeness distinctions present in some of the neighboring East Tucanoan languages, using the language’s own resources.

(E) FIRST-PERSON PLURAL IMPERATIVE 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 1997:1:145), as shown in (25) and (26).

Tariana

(25) wa-ïca-da
    1pl-drink-HORTATIVE

Tucano

(26) sì’ri-dã
    drink-HORTATIVE

    ‘Let’s drink!’
This same morpheme occurs in Wanano -hi’da (Stenzel 2004:331), Desano (Miller 1999:72–73), and also in Macuna (Smothermon et al. 1995:62).

The Tariana hortative is likely to be a recent borrowing from Tucano or from Desano 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 treat the hortative as “incorrect” Tariana “mixed” with Tucano. This is typical of Tariana language attitudes: given the general prohibition on mixing languages viewed in terms of lexical loans, the hortative is, not surprisingly, a marginal feature of the language (see Aikhenvald 2002:213–22 on language awareness in the Vaupés area). The hortative can be considered an ongoing 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’, as shown in (27):

Tariana

(27) pi-ñha-ya
2sg-eat-IMPV

‘Eat!’

This imperative marker is strikingly similar to the imperative marker -ya in Tucano, Tuyuca, and Piratapuya and its cognate -ga in Wanano, as illustrated in (28):

Tucano

(28) 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 “proper Tariana.” The morpheme -ya in an imperative construction is condemned as a token of identifiable “language mixing.”

13 As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, an alternative analysis may involve an instance of “grammatical accommodation” motivated by the similarity between the Tucanoan forms and a putative homophonous Tariana dubitative/politeness marker -da/-ra which occurs in the conative form -thara. The only argument against this analysis is the native speakers’ rejection of the Tariana hortative as a token of language mixing with Tucano.
This is reminiscent of the hortative discussed in (E). However, the Tariana -ya may not be an actual loan from an East Tucanoan language. Tariana has a clitic -ya ‘emphatic’ whose cognates are found in other Arawak languages. One example is Baniwa -dza, an emphatic clitic used in imperatives and prohibitives. In Tariana, -ya regularly occurs in one inherently prohibitive expression, a defective verb used as a short command:

Tariana

(29) ma:ku-ya phia
    NEG+talk-EMPH you

‘Shut up!’

Ma:kuya is etymologically cognate to Baniwa prohibitive ma:ku-dza (NEG+Speak-IMPV) ‘do not talk’ (note that dz in some Baniwa dialects, such as Hohôdene, regularly corresponds to Tariana y, e.g., Baniwa dzawi, Tariana yawi ‘jaguar’). The combination of a prefix ma- and a suffix -dza is a normal way of forming prohibitives in Baniwa; ma:kuya in Tariana could be either a loan from a dialect of Baniwa in which Tariana y corresponds to y (for instance, Kumandene Kurripako) or an archaic expression.

The deployment of Tariana -ya as an imperative marker is an example of a semantic extension of a native morpheme under the influence of a look-alike in a contact language (this is known as grammatical accommodation; see Aikhenvald 2002; 2003b and 4 below). The emphatic marker -ya is likely to be acquiring a new meaning as an imperative, to match the function of its East Tucanoan look-alike. And this extension could be seen as an activation, or enhancement, of a tendency to use the emphatic -ya in commands, shared by Baniwa of Içana and Tariana. The process of activation is well attested in contact-induced change (see Clark 1994:118 on how Outlier Polynesian languages in contact with non-Polynesian languages use possessive suffixes much more often than their Polynesian relatives). The development of command functions for the emphatic -ya in Tariana is an example of multiple motivation in language change.14

Nominalizations marked with -ri in Tariana occasionally appear in commands, as an alternative to simple imperatives but with a somewhat different meaning: ‘make sure you do’.

14 Another option, suggested by an anonymous reviewer, is that the emphatic -ya was used just with imperatives in Proto-Tariana-Baniwa, then was marginalized in Tariana due to its resemblance to Tucanoan forms, and then reappeared in young people’s speech due to language shift toward Tucano. However, the emphatic -ya is highly frequent in Tariana in non-imperative contexts (see Aikhenvald 2003a:367–70). This is an argument against such an alternative interpretation.
Tariana

(30) *pi-*ňha-*ri!*

2sg-eat-NOMINALIZATION

‘Eat!’ (make sure you eat, lest you go hungry)

This usage is restricted to casual speech by younger people for whom Tucano is the main language of day-to-day communication. Tucano, just like most other East Tucanoan languages, has a suffix *-ri* used in commands with an overtone of warning, with the meaning ‘or else’ (see Ramirez 1997:1:146–47; cf. Stenzel 2004:390 and Barnes 1979). The usage of nominalizations as commands in Tariana has in all likelihood been influenced by the *-ri* marked imperative in Tucano. That the form in (30) is a nominalization is corroborated by the translations given by traditional speakers of Tariana.

This is another instance of ongoing “grammatical accommodation” which has not yet become part of the accepted grammar. Just like the *-ya* imperative, this instance of ongoing change is frowned upon by Tariana language purists, and those who are identified as users of forms like (30) are accused of being incompetent speakers who “mix languages.”

(G) **MALEFACTIVE IMPERATIVE.** The malefactive imperative in Tariana marked with the enclitic *-tupe* means ‘let something happen to the subject’s detriment’.

Tariana

(31) *pi-a-tupe*

2sg-go-MALEF.IMPV

‘May you go (there) to your detriment’ (I told you not to, but you didn’t give a damn)

(32) *ahi* di-swa-*tupe*

here 3sgnf-lie-MALEF.IMPV

‘Let him (tapir) lie here’ (to his own detriment, because he is going to be eaten)

This imperative stands apart from other imperatives in the language in a number of properties.

First, 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-MALEF.IMPV he) ‘may he not go to his own detriment’ (note that person–number distinctions on the verb are then neutralized).
Second, it can occur together with the reported imperative. In (33), the speaker expresses her annoyance with those who were going to spread nasty gossip about her family because a certain anthropologist “told them to”:

Tariana

(33) na-sape-tupe-pida
3pl-talk-MALEF.IMPV-SEC.IMPV

‘Let them talk (to their detriment, since this will be in vain) following her (verbal) order’

Third, it can occasionally combine with evidentials used in declarative clauses, as in (34). This example comes from a story about a woman who had been nasty to the narrator. On hearing the news that she had been devoured by a snake, the narrator exclaims (34); he assumes that she is bound to be in a bad way, to her own detriment:

Tariana

(34) ma:t fi duhmeta-sika-tupe duha-yāna
bad 3sgf+feel-REC.P.ASSUMED-MALEF.IMPV she-PEJORATIVE

‘May she be in a bad way to her own detriment (assumingly), she the nasty one’

This clause is unusual for a command in that an overt subject (a pronoun) is included. Examples like (34), however rare, show that -tupe constructions in Tariana are not restricted to commands and were in all probability originally used in declarative clauses and later on extended to commands. And, in addition, the malefactive imperative is the only imperative in the language which can be formed on stative verbs, such as ‘be alive’ as in (35) and ‘be good’ in (36):

Tariana

(35) tarada-tupe
be.alive-MALEF.IMPV

‘Let (you or him/her) be alive’ (to your, her, or his detriment, since their mother is dead)

(36) matfa-tupe di-na
be.good-MALEF.IMPV 3sgnf-OBJ

‘May it serve him right’

No East Tucanoan language has a malefactive imperative. However, Tucano does have a structurally and semantically similar construction not restricted
to commands. The verb *bata*(*a*) ‘break (transitive)’ as a second component in compounds has a malefactive meaning ‘do something to the subject’s detriment’ (see Ramirez 1997:2:17), as shown in (37) and (38):

**Tucano**

(37) *wa’è-bataa’ya*

  go-break=MALEF+IMPV

  ‘Go to your detriment’

(38) *we-rî-bataa’mi*

  die-break=MALEF+REC.P. VIS

  ‘He has died to his own detriment’

Comparison with the closely related Piapoco shows that the Tariana malefactive -*tupe* comes from a verb ‘break’, *-*tupa plus the transitivizer -i (-tupa + i resulted in -tupe; see Aikhenvald 2003a:48 on the phonological process of vowel contraction a + i → e in Tariana). This root survives in Piapoco as -*supa* ‘break (intransitive)’ (Klumpp 1995:80; Piapoco s is a regular correspondent of Tariana t and a reflex of Proto-Arawak *t*). The transitivizing morpheme -i is productive in modern Tariana and in many other Arawak languages (Aikhenvald 2002:306).

The malefactive construction in Tariana has arisen as a result of a loan translation of a Tucano verbal compound. This is another example of areally induced grammaticalization, whereby the development of the verb ‘break’ into a malefactive 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. A similar example is Tariana -*yana-sita*, Tucano *do’á-toha* (cook-finish) ‘to cook completely; to complete cooking’, shown in (1) and (2) above. But here the grammaticalized verb is still used as an independent lexical item in Tariana: -sita ‘finish; manage’ (Aikhenvald 2000).

In contrast, the verb *-*tupa is no longer used in Tariana. In addition, the malefactive 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 essentially a borrowed structure. The mechanism is similar to that illustrated for the conative imperative -*thara* in Tariana.

I now turn to a discussion of mechanisms of contact-induced change deployed in the evolution of the Tariana imperative system and to an evaluation of the outcomes of these changes.
4. The etymologically heterogeneous imperatives in Tariana. 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 from 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) are not universal outcomes of language contact. Languages in contact often maintain their distinct typological profiles.

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 several 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 neighbors. The emergence of some terms is the result of completed change, while the development of others is still in progress.

The system of imperatives in Tariana is etymologically heterogeneous and multisourced. 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 which made their way into Tariana are pervasive in East Tucanoan—as, for instance, the secondhand imperative—others are not. The threefold 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 unlike most other languages in the area in that it has all three in a paradigmatic opposition. The highest number of semantic analogies to the Tariana imperative distinctions is found in Tucano, Tuyuca, and Barasano, the three East Tucanoan languages with the most complex imperative systems. (See Appendix A for the meanings and the forms of imperatives in a selection of East Tucanoan languages.)

The mechanisms involved in the evolution of the multisourced and heterogeneous imperatives in Tariana include:

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

(ii) **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). This is the case for the imperatives marked with -ya and -ri (F).

The outcomes of the process of grammatical accommodation are marginal in the language, given the negative attitude to any recognizably foreign forms. They represent instances of ongoing rather than completed change. And they are considered “bad” language by traditional language authorities on Tariana.

(iii) **Borrowing**: Despite an inhibition against borrowed forms, the hortative (E) marker in Tariana is likely to have been borrowed from Tucano. This recognizably foreign form is considered a token of inappropriate language mixing.

(iv) **Areally induced grammaticalization and loan translation**: The conative imperative (C) and the malefactive imperative (G) have developed via grammaticalization of independent verbs, to match semantically similar structures in East Tucanoan languages. These processes show striking similarities to other instances of contact grammaticalization, such as the development of proximative aspect using the verb ‘become’ in Nandi, a Nilotic language, under the influence of the Bantu language Gusii (Kuteva 2000). Further examples are in Heine and Kuteva (2005).

To say that imperative meanings are just borrowed or calqued from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana would be a simplification. A number of mechanisms—including areally induced grammaticalization—are instrumental in their development. A similar point has already been illustrated, using materials on the development of evidential markers and case morphemes in Tariana, in Aikhenvald (2003b). 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

---

15 An example of this process, termed “shift due to phonetic similarity” by Campbell (1987:263–64), comes from Pipil, an 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.
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.

5. Why imperatives? And now to the crucial question: why imperatives? What is it that makes the meanings associated with commands so immensely diffusible?

A major factor behind the diffusion of patterns in a situation of obligatory multilingualism is the desire to be able to say what one’s neighbor can say—making “the categories existing in the languages that are in contact mutually compatible and more readily intertranslatable” (Heine and Kuteva 2003:561). For the coexisting systems to converge, both (a) functional and semantic and (b) formal matching is desirable.

Several linguistic factors facilitate diffusion of forms and of patterns. Some of those mentioned here have been overtly identified by Heath (1978), and a few others correlate with tendencies in grammatical borrowing (e.g., Moravcsik 1978, Matras 1998; 2002, and Dalton-Puffer 1996:222–25).

Frequency is a major facilitating factor in linguistic diffusion: the more frequent the category in one language, the likelier it is to diffuse into another. This is reminiscent of Du Bois’s (1985:363) statement that “grammars code best what speakers do most.” Frequency played a role in the integration of borrowed French derivational morphology into Middle English (Dalton-Puffer 1996:224–25) and of Italian derivations into Maltese (Tosco 1996). And see Trudgill (2004:159) on the role of frequency in the spread of phonetic patterns in the formation of dialects of English. Commands are among the highest frequency forms in Tariana conversations and narratives, as well as in Tucano (based on personal observations; I have no data for other East Tucanoan languages).

Another facilitating factor is the impact a category has on cultural norms and behavioral requirements. An obligatory category in a language which correlates with behavioral requirements is more susceptible to diffusion than one which does not. Such a category is also salient in terms of its frequency in texts of varied genres. The existence of obligatory evidentials presupposes a requirement for an explicit statement about how one knows things. Those who are not explicit run the danger of being treated as liars, or as incompetent. This cultural requirement may explain why evidentiality spreads so easily into contact languages, including some varieties of American Indian English (Bunte and Kendall 1981), Latin American Spanish (Laprade 1981), and Amazonian Portuguese (Aikhenvald 2002), and diffuses across linguistic areas (see Aikhenvald 2004:chap. 9). Evidentiality made its way from Carib languages into Mawayana (Carlin 2007) and from Tucanoan independently into Hup and Tariana (Epps 2005 and Aikhenvald...
The importance of evidentiality for successful communication within the Vaupés area was undoubtedly a factor in the development of evidentiality in every clause type in Tariana—including commands.

Sharing pragmatic patterns and types of context and subsequent diffusion of organizing discourse structures results in common genres, idiomatic expressions, and further ways of saying things in languages in contact. Examples of borrowed interjections and speech formulas abound in the literature (see Aikhenvald 2007b, Matras 1998, and Brody 1995). Commands are highly prominent in greetings and speech formulas throughout the Vaupés area. We can recall the identical structures in Tariana *matʃa-pida* (be.good-sec.impv) ‘good-bye; best wishes’ (lit., let it be good on [our] behalf) and Tucano *āyu-āto* (good-sec.impv), with the same meaning, mentioned in 3 above. The appearance of a reported evidential in farewell formulas is not unusual—a formula similar to that in Tucano and Tariana was documented by Fortescue (2003:296) for West Greenlandic: *inuullua-ri-lin-nguuq* (live.well-non.immediate-3pl+optative-rep) ‘give my greetings to them’. The farewell formula was calqued from Tucano into Tariana, creating an anomalous structure: secondhand or any other imperative (except for malefactive) cannot be formed on stative verbs except in this case.

In a situation of intensive language contact, similar situations are conceptualized in similar ways and warrant similar verbal description. If one language uses serial verbs for describing a complex of subevents as one event, another language is likely to evolve a verb-sequencing construction to match this, as did Tariana (Aikhenvald 2000) and Hup, to match the Tucano “prototype” (Epps 2007). Semantically similar verbs are likely to follow similar grammaticalization paths in languages in contact, as shown by Enfield (2001), among others, in his discussion of shared grammaticalization patterns of the verb ‘acquire’ throughout mainland South East Asia.

This brings us to a tendency to achieve word-for-word and morpheme-for-morpheme intertranslatability, exacerbated by the existence of a perceivable “gap” which facilitates diffusion. For instance, Australian languages had no “conventionalized counting systems,” that is, no numbers used for counting (Hale 1975:295–96). As Aborigines came into contact with European invaders and their counting practices, this gap was filled either through borrowed forms or by exploiting native resources. Borrowing of the exclusive 1+3 pronoun *amna* into Mawayana (Arawak) from Waiwai fills an existing “gap” in the pronominal system (see Carlin 2007).

It is likely to have been for the same reason—to express the same obligatory categories present in East Tucanoan languages—that Tariana developed a wide variety of imperative meanings which it originally lacked. Morpheme-per-morpheme loan translations from East Tucanoan languages helped maintain the iconic correspondences between Tariana and its neighbors, promoting
mutual understanding and successful communication. Along similar lines, younger speakers of Yimas in New Guinea use an analytic prohibitive construction—possibly under the influence of Tok Pisin, the local lingua franca (Foley 1991).

Cross-linguistically speaking, imperative categories are highly diffusible in language contact. Yucuna, a North Arawak language, underwent considerable restructuring under the influence of Retuarã, a Tucanoan language. Yucuna has a distal imperative (Schauer and Schauer 2000; 2005:314–15), just like in Retuarã (Strom 1992:135–37). The forms are different, but the meanings are similar. The Tariana dialect of Periquitos differs from that spoken in Santa Rosa in the number of “lexical accommodations,” whereby Tariana words sound more similar to their counterparts in an East Tucanoan language than they are expected to. Since the preferential marriage partners of the Periquitos Tariana are the Wanano, the source of lexical accommodation is mostly Wanano. One of the most salient instances is a command—the Periquitos correspondent of Santa Rosa wasã ‘let’s go!’ is wahsã ‘come on, let’s go’, influenced by Wanano bahsã ‘let’s go!’ (Marino and Domingo Muniz, personal communication, and Aikhenvald 2002:216).

Uninflected one-word imperatives are easily borrowed in many language contact situations; examples include hai ‘come on’ in Rumanian, borrowed from Turkish, and Modern Hebrew yala ‘let’s go’, of Arabic origin. A hybrid formation, yàlabái ‘bye bye’ in Modern Hebrew, is a combination of two loans—the Arabic yalla and the English bye. Irregular imperatives of ‘come’ are an areal feature in Ethiopia (Tosco 2000:349–51). Along similar lines, the imperative form banaga-Ø ‘return!’ in Jirrbal and Girramay dialects of Dyirbal is highly likely to be borrowed from Warrgamay bana-ga (return-IMPV) ‘return!’ (the form found in Ngajan and Mamu dialects of Dyirbal is ñuñba-Ø ‘return!’, zero-marked for imperative) (R. M. W. Dixon, personal communication).

The data of Tariana confirm an additional point: archaic forms and structures tend to survive in imperatives (in agreement with Kuryłowicz 1964:137; also see Dixon 1994:189 on how imperative constructions also frequently preserve archaic patterns of marking grammatical relations). Despite the massive areal diffusion of imperative meanings and even forms from East Tucanoan languages, Tariana retained the archaic simple unmarked imperative, shared with its close relatives.

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 possibly in Wanano), and special imperative forms for motion verbs (in Macuna and in Barasano). The question of why these did not diffuse is open for now.
6. Conclusion. We can now conclude that, on the whole, the Tariana system is different and in certain ways tending to become somewhat more complex than that in any neighboring language. That is, within this linguistic area, the multilateral diffusion of linguistic features goes together with creating new types of categories which may lack an exact match in any other language within the area.

An intricate interaction of areal diffusion, genetic inheritance, and independent innovation—whose net result goes beyond mere intertranslatability—accounts for the complex and etymologically heterogeneous system of Tariana imperatives. Intensive and prolonged language contact has promoted linguistic complexity.

The mechanisms involved in the creation of new categories are:

(i) **REINTERPRETATION** of existing morphemes by their extension to new contexts analogous with those found in Tucanoan languages

(ii) **GRAMMATICAL ACCOMMODATION**

(iii) **BORROWING OF MORPHEMES AND THEIR MEANINGS**

(iv) **AREALLY INDUCED GRAMMATICALIZATION AND LOAN TRANSLATION**

In addition to this, the archaic zero-marked imperative also survives. Its survival may well be corroborated by a typological naturalness of having the least-marked verbal form used as a second-person command—after all, more than half of the world’s languages work this way (Aikhenvald [forthcoming]).

The major motivations behind a striking spread of the imperatives within a linguistic area lie in (a) their frequency and (b) their correlations with cultural conventions and language practices which have to be shared in such an area with obligatory multilingualism as is the Vaupés.

**APPENDIX A**

**IMPERATIVE MEANINGS AND MARKERS**

**IN A SELECTION OF EAST TUCANOAN LANGUAGES**

TUYUCA (Barnes 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>general imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-goa (feminine)</td>
<td>impolite, familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gua (masculine)</td>
<td>delayed imperative: refers to a future action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wa</td>
<td>confirmational imperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Appendix A does not include the information on imperatives in Cubeo (Morse and Maxwell 1999:24–26) and Retuarã (Strom 1992:135–39) because the classification of these languages as East Tucanoan is controversial (Barnes 1999:209 and Aikhenvald 2002:286).
-ri imperative of warning
-aro third-person secondhand imperative
-co ‘invitation’, with 1pl only
-ma permissive

**Tucano** (Ramirez 1997, West 1980, Welch and West 2000, and Brüzzi 1967)\(^{18}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>general imperative (Ramirez 1997, West 1980, Brüzzi 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-râ/dâ</td>
<td>first-person plural hortative (Ramirez 1997, West 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a-pâ</td>
<td>future imperative (West 1980); advice against something adverse (Ramirez 1997; see n. 9 in text); ‘familiar imperative’ (Welch and West 2000)(^{19})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{-rê-gi} \) (masculine sg)\)
\( \text{-rê-go} \) (feminine sg)\)
\( \text{-rê-râ} \) (plural)\)
\(-ri\) imperative of warning (Ramirez 1997, West 1980)\)
\(-ato\) third-person secondhand imperative (Ramirez 1997, West 1980, Brüzzi 1967)\)

\( \text{-a’sâ} \) impolite imperative (Ramirez 1997)\)
\( \text{-kâ’â’sâ} \) polite imperative (Ramirez 1997)\)

\( \text{-gi-sa’â} \) (masculine sg)\)
\( \text{-go-sa’â} \) (feminine sg)\)
\( \text{-râ-sa’â} \) (plural)\)
\(-ma\) permissive (Ramirez 1997, West 1980)\)
\(-nîsa\) extralocal imperative (Brüzzi 1967)\)

**Wanano** (Waltz and Waltz 1997; 2000, Waltz 1976, and Stenzel 2004)\(^{20}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ga/-a</td>
<td>general imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hi’da</td>
<td>first-person plural hortative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{-ri} \) apprehensive, ‘lest’; ‘admonitive’ \)
\( \text{-risa} \) distal; polite \)
\( \text{-haro} \) third-person imperative ‘by proxy’ (\(?\) \)
\( \text{-dô/bi} \) emphatic \)

\( \text{SOURCE} \)
Stenzel (2004), Waltz
and Waltz (1997; 2000),
Waltz (1976)
Waltz and Waltz (1997; 2000), Waltz (1976)
Waltz and Waltz (1997; 2000)

\(^{18}\) Note the discrepancies in the number of imperatives in the sources. If a form is found in all three sources, I retain the transcription from Ramirez (1997) as the most recent source.

\(^{19}\) Welch and West (2000:425) distinguish between ‘familiar imperative’ -â-pa and ‘familiar warning’ consisting of -a-gender-number-pa. It is possible that Ramirez (1997) has failed to distinguish two markers -a- and pa.

\(^{20}\) Note the discrepancies in the number, and the forms, of imperatives in the sources, even by the same author(s). If a form is found in all four sources, I retain the transcription in Stenzel (2004).
### Desano (Miller 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ju-</td>
<td>demonstrative imperative with verb ‘look’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ke</td>
<td>general imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dīša/-rīša</td>
<td>polite imperative (contains distance marker -sa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bi-ta (masculine sg)</td>
<td>scolding imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bi-rā-ta (plural)</td>
<td>permissive with first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-si</td>
<td>first plural imperative or hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rā</td>
<td>conative ‘try . . . it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yā-ta</td>
<td>imperative of warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>third-person imperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Macuna (Smothermon, Smothermon, and Frank 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-je</td>
<td>general imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sa</td>
<td>imperative of movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tē</td>
<td>distal imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>future imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ha-ro</td>
<td>third-person imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-be</td>
<td>warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ro-ki-ha (masculine sg)</td>
<td>first-person singular nonfuture imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ro-ko-ha (feminine sg)</td>
<td>first-person singular future imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki-ha (masculine sg)</td>
<td>first-person plural nonfuture imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ko-ha (feminine sg)</td>
<td>first-person plural future imperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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