

# Verbs with conservative first person forms in Cariban languages

Florian Matter  
University of Bern

December 2, 2021

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Proto-Cariban verbal person marking and conservative verbs . . . . .	3
1.2	Person marker extensions in intransitive verbs . . . . .	4
1.3	The Cariban split-S system . . . . .	6
1.4	Summary and outlook . . . . .	9
<b>2</b>	<b>Incomplete extensions: the innovative 1S<sub>A</sub> markers</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Proto-Pekodian * <i>k</i> - . . . . .	10
2.2	Proto-Waiwaian * <i>k</i> - . . . . .	14
2.3	Proto-Tiriyóan * <i>t</i> - . . . . .	16
2.4	Akuriyó <i>k</i> - . . . . .	17
2.5	Carijona <i>j</i> - . . . . .	18
2.6	Yukpa <i>j</i> - . . . . .	19
<b>3</b>	<b>Conservative verbs: the usual suspects</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1	* <i>eti</i> and * <i>a[p]</i> ‘to be’ . . . . .	20
3.2	* <i>ka[ti]</i> ‘to say’ . . . . .	21
3.3	* <i>itə[mə]</i> ‘to go’ . . . . .	24
3.4	*( <i>ət</i> -) <i>jəpi</i> ‘to come’ . . . . .	24
3.5	* <i>ipitə</i> ‘to go down’ . . . . .	28
3.6	* <i>e-pi</i> ‘to bathe’ . . . . .	31
<b>4</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	Reasons for conservativeness . . . . .	31
4.2	Conclusion . . . . .	36
<b>A</b>	<b>Predictions for the behavior of individual verbs</b>	<b>41</b>

## List of Figures

1	The Cariban language family . . . . .	2
2	Person marking extensions in Parukotoan, after Gildea (1998: 94) . . . . .	5

## List of Tables

1	Some Hixkaryána verbs . . . . .	1
2	Some Tiriyo verbs . . . . .	2
3	Proto-Cariban Set I (main clause) person markers . . . . .	3
4	Some examples for completed extensions . . . . .	6
5	Participles of S <sub>A</sub> and S <sub>P</sub> verbs . . . . .	6
6	Nominalizations of S <sub>A</sub> and S <sub>P</sub> verbs . . . . .	7
7	Imperatives of S <sub>A</sub> and S <sub>P</sub> verbs . . . . .	7
8	Regular Pekodian S <sub>A</sub> verbs . . . . .	10
9	Verbs preserving 1S <sub>A</sub> *w- in Proto-Pekodian . . . . .	13
10	Loss of *w in Ikpeng . . . . .	13
11	Regular Proto-Waiwaian verbs . . . . .	14
12	Verbs preserving 1S <sub>A</sub> *w- in Proto-Waiwaian . . . . .	15
13	Regular Proto-Tiriyoan S <sub>A</sub> verbs . . . . .	16
14	Verbs preserving 1S <sub>A</sub> *w- in Proto-Tiriyoan . . . . .	16
15	Regular Akuriyó 1S <sub>A</sub> markers . . . . .	18
16	Regular Carijona verbs . . . . .	18
17	Regular Yukpa verbs . . . . .	20
18	Reflexes of *ka[ti] ‘to say’ . . . . .	22
19	Reflexes of *itə[mə] ‘to go’ . . . . .	25
20	Reflexes of *(ət-)jəpi ‘to come’ . . . . .	26
21	Reflexes of *ipitə ‘to go down’ . . . . .	30
22	Frequency counts of S <sub>A</sub> verbs in Apalaí . . . . .	33
23	Predictions for Proto-Tiriyoan . . . . .	34
24	Evaluating predictions for Proto-Tiriyoan . . . . .	34
25	Overview of prediction accuracy . . . . .	35
26	Predictions for Proto-Waiwaian . . . . .	41
27	Evaluating predictions for Proto-Waiwaian . . . . .	42
28	Predictions for Proto-Pekodian . . . . .	42
29	Evaluating predictions for Proto-Pekodian . . . . .	42
30	Predictions for Akuriyó . . . . .	43
31	Evaluating predictions for Akuriyó . . . . .	43
32	Predictions for Carijona . . . . .	43
33	Evaluating predictions for Carijona . . . . .	44
34	Predictions for Yukpa . . . . .	44
35	Evaluating predictions for Yukpa . . . . .	44

## 1 Introduction

The Cariban language family is one of the larger of South America, with between 60'000 and 100'000 speakers unevenly distributed between 22 to 25 extant languages (Gildea 2012: 441). The family is concentrated in Venezuela, the Guianas and Northern Brazil, with a two Western and four Southern outliers. Figure 1 gives an overview of the geographical distribution and genealogical position of the extant Cariban languages. Cariban languages feature relatively rich verbal morphology, both pre- and suffixes, inflecting for person, number, tense, aspect, and evidentiality, combined with a range of valency-modifying affixes. Many also have a split-S system, which can be reconstructed to Proto-Cariban (Section 1.3). For more detailed linguistic overviews of and comparative work on the family, we refer readers to Gildea (1998), Derbyshire (1999), Meira (2002), Meira & Franchetto (2005), Meira (2006a), Gildea & D. Payne (2007), Meira et al. (2010), Gildea et al. (2010), Gildea (2012), Matter (2021), and Gildea & Cáceres (in preparation).

Some languages show a small group of verbs with a divergent first person inflection. This is illustrated for Hixkaryána in Table 1,<sup>1</sup> which shows person paradigms for four verbs, all members of the S<sub>A</sub> inflectional class. In this language, the verb ‘to be’ diverges in its first person marker (*w-*), contrasting with other S<sub>A</sub> verbs like ‘to fall’, which have *k(i)-*. A similar pattern can be found in Tiriyó, where the verb ‘to go’ has a first-person prefix *wi-* while other S<sub>A</sub> verbs have a prefix with phonologically conditioned allomorphs *t-* / *\_ə* and *s-* / *\_e* (Table 2). In both languages, the inflectional patterns of the verbs on the left of the table is representative for the vast majority of S<sub>A</sub> verbs.

In the literature, such divergent verbs have been identified for Hixkaryána (Derbyshire 1985: 188), Waiwai (Gildea 1998: 90), the three Taranoan languages (Meira 1998: 112–115), Bakairi (Meira 2003a), and Arara (Alves 2017: 153). In a language-particular synchronic analysis, these verbs and their first person prefixes may be considered to be IRREGULAR, contrasting with regular prefixes, like Hixkaryána *k(i)-* and Tiriyó *t-/s-*, on regular verbs. However, there is no widely accepted definition of irregularity (Stolz et al. 2012), and many stricter definitions (Haspelmath & Sims 2010: e.g.) require the pattern

<sup>1</sup>The presence of a 1+2 person value implies that of a 1+3 value. This is usually expressed with a free pronoun combined with third person morphology in Cariban languages, so it is not represented as a distinct value in the paradigms we show. In Table 1 other inflectional tables, we omit any TAM suffixes found in the original forms found in the literature, since a) our focus lies on the prefixes and stems, and b) full paradigms containing the same TAM suffix are rarely found. Further, we use standard IPA symbols in our transcription of Cariban languages, with the exception of coronal rhotics, which we simply represent with ⟨r⟩, rather than ⟨ɽ⟩ for Wayana or ⟨ɻ⟩ for Ye'kwana etc. In languages with strong morphophonological processes and/or subphonemic orthography we show the original transcription in an additional surface line when presented in interlinearized examples. We follow Gildea (2018) in using ⟨ə⟩ for the proto-vowel reconstructed by Meira & Franchetto (2005), although it was likely more back (Gildea et al. 2010). Glossing abbreviations:

Table 1: Some Hixkaryána verbs (Howard 2001: 150, 510, 511, 513, 520; Derbyshire 1985: 197, 198)

	‘to fall’	‘to be afraid’	‘to walk’	‘to cut self’	‘to be’
1	<i>k-ehurka-</i>	<i>k-oserʲehi-</i>	<i>k-atarʲeknohi-</i>	<i>k-atama-</i>	<i>w-eʃe-</i>
2	<i>m-ehurka-</i>	<i>m-oserʲehi-</i>	<i>m-atarʲeknohi-</i>	<i>m-atama-</i>	<i>m-eʃe-</i>
1+2	<i>t-ehurka-</i>	<i>t-oserʲehi-</i>	<i>t-atarʲeknohi-</i>	<i>t-atama-</i>	<i>t-eʃe-</i>
3	<i>ɲ-ehurka-</i>	<i>n-oserʲehi-</i>	<i>n-atarʲeknohi-</i>	<i>n-atama-</i>	<i>n-eʃe-</i>




Figure 1: The Cariban language family

Table 2: Some Tiriyo verbs (Meira 1999: 292, 294; Carlin 2004: 274)

	'to sleep'	'to see self'	'to bathe (INTR)'	'to yawn'	'to go'
1	<i>t-ənniki-</i>	<i>t-əene-</i>	<i>s-epi-</i>	<i>s-entapo-</i>	<i>wi-tən-</i>
2	<i>m-ənniki-</i>	<i>m-əene-</i>	<i>m-epi-</i>	<i>m-entapo-</i>	<i>mi-tən-</i>
1+2	<i>kit-ənniki-</i>	<i>k-əene-</i>	<i>ke-epi-</i>	<i>k-entapo-</i>	<i>ki-tən-</i>
3	<i>n-ənniki-</i>	<i>n-əene-</i>	<i>n-epi-</i>	<i>n-entapo-</i>	<i>ni-tən-</i>

Table 3: Proto-Cariban Set I (main clause) person markers (Meira et al. 2010: 495; Gildea &amp; Zúñiga 2016: 497)

(a) Transitive					(b) Intransitive		
A/P	1	2	1+2	3		S <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>P</sub>
1		* <i>k</i> -		* <i>t(i)</i> -	1	* <i>w</i> -	* <i>u(j)</i> -
2	* <i>k</i> -			* <i>m(i)</i> -	2	* <i>m</i> -	* <i>ə(j)</i> -
1+2				* <i>kit(i)</i> -	1+2	* <i>kit</i> -	* <i>k</i> -
3	* <i>u(j)</i> -	* <i>ə(j)</i> -	* <i>k</i> -	* <i>n(i)</i> -	3	* <i>n</i> -	* <i>n(i)</i> -

to occur at a single place in the grammar. For such approaches, these verbs simply belong to a small inflectional (sub-)class, an analysis suggested for the Pekodian languages Bakairi and Arara (Meira 2003a: 4; Alves 2017: 149).

Regardless of the synchronic analysis, the reason for these inflectional patterns can be found in the diachrony of the languages in question. The purpose of this paper is to approach the patterns from a comparative perspective and to provide a unifying diachronic account, for which we first introduce the main clause verbal person marking system of Proto-Cariban, showing that irregular verbs are conservative (Section 1.1). That system was subject to many different kinds of innovations, one of which is responsible for the irregular first person forms (Section 1.2). A particular component of the system, the distinction between S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> verbs, played a major role in the developments under discussion and is the topic of Section 1.3. Section 1.4 summarizes the main points of this section and provides an outlook for the following sections.

### 1.1 Proto-Cariban verbal person marking and conservative verbs

Proto-Cariban is reconstructed by Gildea (1998) as using a person paradigm called Set I in its independent verb forms, shown in Table 3. The choice of person marker in transitive verbs can be characterized as being conditioned by a basic person hierarchy  $1/2 > 3$ . The locuphoric markers had two forms, an A-oriented one for direct (SAP>3) scenarios and a P-oriented one for inverse (3>SAP) scenarios. There was a single aliophoric marker \**n(i)*-, which only surfaced in nonlocal (3>3) scenarios, without morphologically expressed distinctions between different third person referents. Local scenarios were expressed in a non-transparent manner, both using the 1+2 prefix \**k*-.

Formally identical or etymologically related markers occurred in intransitive verbs, which showed a split-S system (Table 3b). That is, S<sub>A</sub> verbs took similar markers as the A-oriented ones in transitive verbs, with the exception of first person (1>3 \**t(i)*- vs 1S<sub>A</sub> \**w*-), as well as the absence of \**i* after all S<sub>A</sub> prefixes. On the other hand, S<sub>P</sub> verbs took markers fully identical to the P-oriented ones. The third person marker in S<sub>P</sub> verbs was identical to the one in 3>3 scenarios (\**n(i)*-).

Equipped with this knowledge about the ancestral system, it becomes clear that the divergent Hixkaryána and Tiriyo forms in Tables 1 and 2 behave irregularly because they preserve the original Proto-Cariban 1S<sub>A</sub> prefix \**w*-; they are therefore CONSERVATIVE. They contrast with regular S<sub>A</sub> verbs, which are innovative in both languages. The reflexes of \**w*- may be considered RELICS, old and restricted to specific lexically conditioned contexts, contrasting with the innovative prefixes found else-

where. These verbs and their prefixes are comparable with the few English nouns like *oks*, which preserve the old plural suffix *-ən*. It, too, was once more widespread, being the normal plural suffix of the weak inflection, compare German *oks-n* ‘ox-en’, *na:mə-n* ‘name-s’, *ha:zə-n* ‘hare-s’, *bɛ:k-ən* ‘bear-s’. Since the irregular Hixkaryána and Tiriyo prefixes are conservative and the regular prefixes are innovative, the next question to be addressed is where these new prefixes came from.

## 1.2 Person marker extensions in intransitive verbs

In his discussion of the Proto-Cariban split-S system and reconstruction of the intransitive person prefixes, Gildea (1998: 88–96) shows that the system has undergone many different modifications in various languages. The main mechanism of change leading to these modifications are **person marker extensions**, i.e. the use of verbal person prefixes being extended to contexts previously occupied by other prefixes. There have been many different person marker extensions in Cariban languages, and some are still ongoing. This is illustrated by Gildea (1998), using the three Parukotoan languages as an example. Apart from segmental changes to individual morphemes, the following innovations happened in the Set I paradigm in Parukotoan:

### 1. Proto-Parukotoan

- (a) 1S<sub>A</sub> \**w-* to 1>3
- (b) 1+2 \**k-* to 1S<sub>P</sub> (completed in Proto-Waiwaian, ongoing in Werikyana)
- (c) 1+2 \**kit-* to 1+2S<sub>P</sub> (completed in Proto-Waiwaian, ongoing in Werikyana)

### 2. Proto-Waiwaian

- (a) 1S<sub>P</sub> \**k-* to 1S<sub>A</sub>
- (b) innovative \**owiroj-* ‘1PRO LK’ for 1P

### 3. Waiwai

- (a) 2S<sub>A</sub> *m-* to 2S<sub>P</sub>

All innovations are person marker extensions except 2b, which combined a pronoun with the linker \**j-*. They are printed in bold in Figure 2, which reproduces Gildea’s (1998) tables as a tree diagram, with adapted transcription and an additional Werikyana 1S<sub>P</sub> marker *∅/j-* (Spike Gildea, p.c.). Hixkaryána has preserved split-S only in the second person prefixes, while Werikyana still shows the variation in the first person and 1+2 prefixes that is reconstructible to Proto-Parukotoan. Waiwai, on the other hand, has lost the system entirely, which notably happened via distinct innovations at three different diachronic stages.

Gildea (1998) discusses person marker extensions in the context of the loss of the split-S system and the accompanying changes to indexing alignment; for our story of conservative verbs we will zoom in on a particular aspect of these extensions. To begin, we argue that they took place via lexical diffusion, characterized as a type of extension by Harris & Campbell (1995: 106–115); this hypothesis is supported by three facts. First, the variation in first person and 1+2 prefixes described above for Werikyana is not completely free. Rather, some verbs only allow for example first person *k-*, but not




Figure 2: Person marking extensions in Parukotoan, after Gildea (1998: 94)

*j*-, while others can occur with both, which is the expected pattern in a lexical diffusion scenario. In addition, this is speaker-dependent (Spike Gildea, p.c.), which is what one would expect from a change in progress. Second, while there is no detailed diachronic scenario for the switch of 1>3 \**t*- and 1S<sub>A</sub> in the Tiriyoan languages (Section 2.3), Meira (1998: 111–112) convincingly argues that it must have happened gradually rather than instantaneously, and entailed both markers spreading at the same time. Whether this gradual switch was along ordered lines or not, lexical diffusion must have played a role.

Our third argument in favor of the lexical diffusion scenario brings us back to the conservative Hixkaryána and Tiriyo forms in Tables 1 and 2. In both cases, the innovative 1S<sub>A</sub> prefixes were introduced by a person marker extension spreading via lexical diffusion. We interpret the continued presence of the old 1S<sub>A</sub> prefix in a few verbs as the extension stopping short of these verbs, rather than affecting all targets (S<sub>A</sub> verbs). In our family-wide investigation of person marker extensions, we identified 19 distinct extensions affecting intransitive verbs, and found 6 of them to be incomplete. These incomplete extensions have left between 1 and 7 conservatively inflected verbs in 9 Cariban languages.

Interestingly, all six extensions featured innovative first person markers on S<sub>A</sub> verbs. While extensions occurred with other person values as well, they never affected S<sub>A</sub> verbs, only S<sub>P</sub> ones, and they always affected all potential targets. Illustrative examples for complete extensions are shown in Ta-



Table 4: Some examples for completed extensions (Gildea 1998: 90–92)

(a) Apalaí			(b) Panare			(c) Waimiri-Atroari		
	S <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>P</sub>		S <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>P</sub>		S	
1	<i>i-/∅</i>	<i>i-/j-</i>	1	<i>w(i)-</i>	<i>∅/j-</i>	1	<i>w(i)-/i-</i>	
2	<i>m(i)-</i>	<i>o-</i>	2	<i>m(i)-</i>		2	<i>m(i)-</i>	
1+2	<i>s(i)-</i>		1+2	<i>n(i)-</i>		1+2	<i>h(i)-</i>	
3	<i>n(i)-</i>		3	<i>n(i)-</i>		3	<i>n-/∅</i>	

Table 5: Participles of S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> verbs (Schuring n.d.: 39; Alves 2017: 118, 207; Meira 1999: 333, 334; Tavares 2005: 400; E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 35, 1994: kuruaz-154; Hoff 1968: 430, 433; T. E. Payne & D. L. Payne 2013: 232, 244)

Language	S <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>P</sub>
Werikyana	<i>t-ehurka-fʃe</i> ‘fallen’	<i>ti-jaʔ-so</i> ‘burnt’
Arara	<i>t-o-ep-te</i> ‘come’	<i>t-oregrum-te</i> ‘sad’
Tiriyó	<i>ti-w-ətur-e</i> ‘talked’	<i>t-əpəə-se</i> ‘tired’
Wayana	<i>tə-w-epi-he</i> ‘bathed’	<i>t-onopi-he</i> ‘painted’
Apalaí	<i>t-o-ito-se</i> ‘gone’	<i>t-ihto-se</i> ‘gone down’
Kari’ña	<i>tu-w-oʔka-se</i> ‘come out’	<i>t-okari-se</i> ‘told’
Panare	<i>t-o-tatihpə-se</i> ‘wailed’	<i>ti-sirike-fʃe</i> ‘tired’

ble 4: the extension of  $1+2S_A s(i)-$  ( $< *kit-$ ) to S<sub>P</sub> verbs in Apalaí (Table 4a), of  $2S_A m(i)-$  in to S<sub>P</sub> verbs in Panare (Table 4b),<sup>2</sup> or the extension of the entire S<sub>A</sub> set to S<sub>P</sub> verbs in Waimiri-Atroari (Table 4c). The markedly different behavior of S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> verbs with regards to the extent of extensions affecting them points to the split-S system playing some role, so we will discuss its main properties in Section 1.3. This will also give readers an idea how it is possible for the S<sub>A</sub>/S<sub>P</sub> distinction to be lost only for a single person, or for S<sub>P</sub> verbs to take on S<sub>A</sub> markers with apparent semantic impunity.

### 1.3 The Cariban split-S system

As seen in Section 1.1, the Proto-Cariban distinction between S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> verbs was instantiated by two inflection classes within the Set I person paradigm, but this was not the only inflectional difference: Many languages show an S<sub>A</sub> class marker in deverbalized forms, originating in Proto-Cariban  $*w-$ .<sup>3</sup> With S<sub>A</sub> verbs,  $*w-$  occurred immediately between the possessive prefixes and the verb stem, while S<sub>P</sub> verbs took the bare prefixes. Reflexes of  $*w-$  in languages from different branches are illustrated in Tables 5 and 6 for participles and nominalizations. The distinction between S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> was also borne out in imperatives, where the latter took the P-oriented second person prefix  $*ə(j)-$ , while the former received no prefix (both suffixed with  $*-kə$ ). This is illustrated with reflexes in various modern

<sup>2</sup>The presence of the third person marker *n-* for 1+2 is due to the wholesale loss of that inflectional value.

<sup>3</sup>See Meira (2000: 227), who identifies reflexes of this morpheme as having “no purpose other than being ‘class markers’, without any obvious semantic or functional load”.

Table 6: Nominalizations of S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> verbs (Schuring n.d.: 49, 74; Alves 2017: 97; Meira 1999: 246; Tavares 2005: 130, 409; E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 90, 1994: ner2-003; Hoff 1968: 135, 392; T. E. Payne & D. L. Payne 2013: 390; M.-C. Mattéi-Müller 1994: 23)

Language	S <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>P</sub>
Werikyana	<i>o-w-ehurka-tpiri</i> 'your fall'	<i>o-onenmehi-tpiri</i> 'your waking up'
Arara	<i>w-orik-tubo</i> 'dancing place'	<i>ereymi-tpo</i> 'killing instrument'
Tiriyó	<i>ji-w-aturu-to</i> '(for) my talking'	<i>j-emamina-to</i> '(for) my playing'
Wayana	<i>i-w-aturu-topo</i> 'my story'	<i>j-iniki-topo</i> 'my object for sleeping'
Apalaí	<i>j-epi-topo</i> 'my bathing place'	<i>j-enuru-topō-piri</i> 'the place of my birth'
Kari'ña	<i>a-w-ekupi-ri</i> 'your taking a bath'	<i>aj-ere?na-Ø</i> 'your fainting'
Panare	<i>j-u-ffireema-n</i> 'their eating'	<i>tj-arunkampati-n</i> 'his hair standing on end'

Table 7: Imperatives of S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub> verbs (Derbyshire 1965: 44, 89; Alves 2017: 161; Meira 1999: 323; Tavares 2005: 227; E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 62, 1994: Mopo/20; Hoff 1968: 190; M.-C. Mattéi-Müller 1994: 5, 17)

Language	S <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>P</sub>
Hixkaryána	<i>omoh-ko</i> 'come!'	<i>oj-okajim-ko</i> 'go up!'
Arara	<i>odotpot-ko</i> 'come back!'	<i>o-alum-ko</i> 'jump!'
Tiriyó	<i>epi-kə</i> 'bathe!'	<i>ə-eremina-kə</i> 'sing!'
Wayana	<i>əməm-kə</i> 'enter!'	<i>əw-eremi-kə</i> 'sing!'
Apalaí	<i>otu?-ko</i> 'eat!'	<i>o-ni?-ko</i> 'sleep!'
Kari'ña	<i>o?ma?-ko</i> 'stop!'	<i>aj-awon-ko</i> 'get up!'
Panare	<i>ape-?</i> 'flee!'	<i>ahpən-kə</i> 'jump!'

languages in Table 7. Both the  $S_A$  marker \**w-* and the prefix pattern in imperatives have been lost in some languages, but are reconstructible to Proto-Cariban.

In the modern languages maintaining the split-S system, mismatches between the semantics of verbs and their A- or P-oriented inflectional morphology are common, exemplified with Kari'ña data in (1–2).

(1) Kari'ña

- a. *mi-kupi-ja*  
2>3-bathe-PRS  
'You bathe him/her.' (Hoff 1968: 160)
- b. *a-kupi-ja*  
3>2-bathe-PRS  
'S/he bathes you.' (Yamada 2011: 63)

In (1), the choice between the second person A- and P-oriented markers *mi-* and *a-* depends on the scenario: The transitive verb *kupi* 'to bathe' takes *mi-* in 2>3 scenarios (1a), but *a-* in 3>2 scenarios (1b). The intransitive verbs in (2) show the same person markers, but the choice of marker depends on the verb, rather than semantics.

(2) Kari'ña

- a. *sipi tink-a-ri m-ekema-non hen*  
net pull-NMLZ 2-be.afraid-PRS.UNCERT eh?  
'You're afraid to pull up the net, aren't you?' (Courtz 2008: 253)
- b. *aya:woiya*  
*aj-awomi-ja*  
2-get.up-PRS  
'You are getting up.' (Hoff 1968: 167)

Thus, *ekema* 'to be afraid' takes an A-oriented marker, since it is an  $S_A$  verb (2a), while the  $S_P$  verb *awomi* 'to get up' takes a P-oriented marker (2b). In both cases, the prefix does not appear to contribute to the semantics of the predicate, since there are clear mismatches: 'to be afraid' with an "agentive" marker can hardly be considered a volitional act, while 'to get up' with a "patientive" marker must be considered volitional. Meira (2000) takes a sizable corpus of intransitive verbs from Tiriyo', Kari'ña, Apalaí, and Wayana, and categorizes them by applying different criteria commonly encountered in split-S systems. He shows that neither (non)activities, (non-)agency, (in-)animacy, nor Aktionsart satisfactorily predict the class membership of intransitive verbs in any of the languages.

Rather, the reason for a verb to take A- or P-oriented prefixes is (at least diachronically) a morphological one. Meira (2000: 217–221) demonstrates that those intransitive verbs which (etymologically) have a detransitivizing prefix are treated as  $S_A$  verbs, while essentially all others are  $S_P$  verbs:

Almost all verbs in the  $S_A$  class are detransitivized forms of transitive verbs, either synchronically (with still existing transitive sources) or diachronically (with reconstructible but no longer existing transitive sources) (Meira 2000: 201)

Meira (2000: 221–223) also argues that the detransitivizing prefixes are indeed deriving  $S_A$  verbs, rather than being inflectional in nature: a) there are a few underived  $S_A$  verbs, with no detransitivizing prefix; b)  $S_A$  verbs can develop irregular semantics compared to their transitive counterparts; c) it is unpredictable whether the A or P argument of the underlying transitive verb becomes the S of the derived  $S_A$  verb; d) some originally derived  $S_A$  verbs have lost their transitive counterparts; and e) “basic” concepts are expressed as derivations of more complex concepts, like ‘to dance ( $S_A$ )’ from ‘to dance with (TR)’. He also notes that this leads to an inflectional split not based in meaning, but rather morphology:

Apparently, the morphological behavior of the  $S_A$  verb class is an accidental consequence of the fact that detransitivization, as far back as we can reconstruct, entails all the morphology described [...] as typical of  $S_A$  verbs. The alignment of person-marking prefixes appears not to be driven by any semantic forces in the language; it is as though they were being dragged by the evolution of the reflexive marker. (Meira 2000: 226)

As for the form of this marker, Meira et al. (2010: 505–512) reconstruct two distinct prefixes for Proto-Cariban: reciprocal  $*\partial te-$  and reflexive  $*e-$ , although on verbs their reflexes have been merged in a single morpheme in modern languages. Modern reflexes of  $*\partial te/e-$  show a range of meanings, which can all be characterized as “detransitive”; this range is illustrated with Tiriyo examples in (3).

(3) Tiriyo (Meira 2000: 218–219, 1999: 128, 256)

<i>nonta</i> ‘abandon’	→	<i>e-nonta</i> , <i>\partial i-nonta</i>	‘abandon each other’ (reciprocal)
<i>suka</i> ‘wash’	→	<i>e-suka</i> , <i>\partial i-suka</i>	‘wash self’ (reflexive)
<i>pahka</i> ‘break (TR)’	→	<i>e-pahka</i>	‘break (INTR)’ (anticausative)
<i>puun\partial pi</i> ‘think about’	→	<i>\partial h-puun\partial pi</i> , <i>\partial i-puun\partial pi</i>	‘think, meditate’ (antipassive)

The morphological variation featured in ‘to abandon each other’ and ‘to wash self’ is due to the mentioned collapse between the two Proto-Cariban prefixes: *e-* is a reflex of the reflexive prefix  $*e-$ , while the form *\partial i-* originates in reciprocal  $*\partial te-$ . However, both can occur with either meaning – at least for these two verbs.

#### 1.4 Summary and outlook

We identified  $S_A$  verbs that irregularly inflect for first person in 9 Cariban languages. These irregular forms are actually conservative, belonging to a few verbs unaffected by person marker extensions spread via lexical diffusion. Such conservative forms are only found among the first person forms of

(etymological)  $S_A$  verbs. The goal is to establish what verbs remained unaffected by the individual extensions and to find reasons for their conservativeness, for which we proceed as follows: The topic of Section 2 are the six incomplete innovations, the innovative markers they introduced, and the verbs they left untouched. Since these verbs show considerable etymological overlap between languages, they are reconstructed and discussed in more detail in Section 3. Finally, we search for factors motivating the resistance of these verbs, discuss the findings and put them in a general context of language change and morphology in Section 4.

## 2 Incomplete extensions: the innovative $1S_A$ markers

As stated in Section 1.2, the person marker extensions which did not affect all potential targets all have in common that they feature innovative first person markers on verbs that are (at least historically) members of the  $S_A$  class. Of the six attested incomplete extensions, three can be reconstructed to intermediate proto-languages, while three others happened in pre-modern stages of single languages. The sources of innovative markers vary, but not much: the innovative  $1S_A$  prefix is formally identical to the  $1+2P/S_P$  marker (Proto-Cariban  $*k-$ ) in three cases, to the  $1P/S_P$  marker (Proto-Cariban  $*u(j)-$ ) in two cases, and to the  $1>3$  marker (Proto-Cariban  $*t-$ ) in one case. We discuss each extension separately, contrasting regular (innovative) verbs with irregular (conservative) ones, and reconstructing forms where necessary: Section 2.1 investigates the innovation of  $*k-$  in Proto-Pekodian, reflected in the three daughter languages Arara, Ikpeng, and Bakairi. Section 2.2 takes a closer look at the extension of  $*k-$  in Proto-Waiwaian, which was briefly shown in Section 1.2. Section 2.3 concerns the extension of  $*t-$  in Proto-Tiriyóan, reflected in modern Tiriyó and Akuriyó. Sections 2.4 to 2.6 look at innovative first person markers only attested in single languages:  $k-$  in Akuriyó, and  $j-$  in Carijona and Yukpa.

### 2.1 Proto-Pekodian $*k-$

The Pekodian branch was suggested by Meira & Franchetto (2005), as the result of fieldwork on Bakairi by Meira and the availability of more material on Ikpeng. It consists of closely related Arara and Ikpeng, with Bakairi as a more distant member. Meira & Franchetto (2005) focused on phonological and lexical properties, so no reconstructive work on Proto-Pekodian morphosyntax can be found in the literature. However, all three Pekodian languages have a regular  $1S_A$  marker  $k-$ , as evidenced by the paradigms in Table 8. Thus, it is possible to reconstruct a Proto-Pekodian  $1S_A$  marker  $*k-$ .

In the most detailed description of a Pekodian language, Alves (2017) describes six<sup>4</sup> Arara  $S_A$  verbs

<sup>4</sup>Seven under her analysis, which sees the two meanings of *iffi* ‘to be, to lie down’ as different verbs.

Table 8: Regular Pekodian  $S_A$  verbs (Meira 2003a: 4; Alves 2017: 150; Pachêco 2001: 52)

	Bakairi ‘to go up’	Arara ‘to dance’	Ikpeng ‘to run’
1	<i>k-əku-</i>	<i>k-origu-</i>	<i>k-aranme-</i>
2	<i>m-əku-</i>	<i>m-origu-</i>	<i>m-aranme-</i>
1+2	<i>kid-əku-</i>	<i>kud-origu-</i>	<i>kw-aranme-</i>
3	<i>n-əku-</i>	<i>Ø-origu</i>	<i>Ø-aranme-</i>

forming a subclass defined by a first person marker *w(i)-* rather than *k-*, listed in (4). From a comparative perspective, this list is not quite complete, as there is also a reflex of the copula *\*a[p]*, serving syntactically as a postposition introducing adverbial clauses meaning ‘if’ or ‘when’ (Alves 2017: 199–201). However, its inflectional morphology features verbal Set I prefixes, including first person *w-* (5).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(4) Arara (Alves 2017: 153)</p> <p><i>wi-<u>geni</u></i> ‘I said’</p> <p><i>w-i<u>ffini</u></i> ‘I was, lied down’</p> <p><i>w-<u>ebini</u></i> ‘I came’</p> <p><i>w-<u>ibini</u></i> ‘I bathed’</p> <p><i>w-<u>iptoɣri</u></i> ‘I went down’</p> <p><i>w-<u>idoli</u></i> ‘I went’</p> | <p>(5) Arara (Alves 2017: 200)</p> <p>1 <i>w-<u>aptam</u></i> ‘when/if I was’</p> <p>2 <i>m-<u>od-aptam</u></i></p> <p>1+2 <i>kud-<u>aptam</u></i></p> <p>3 <i>Ø-<u>aptam</u></i></p> |
|--|---|

In his brief discussion of Bakairi verbal person marking, Meira (2003a) reports the existence of two subclasses of *S<sub>A</sub>* verbs, one taking first person *w-*, and one *k-*. The verb used to illustrate the first group is *i* ‘to bathe’ (6), contrasting with regular *əku* ‘to go up’ in Table 8 above.

- (6) Bakairi (Meira 2003a: 4)
- w-i-də*
- 1*S<sub>A</sub>*-bathe-IMM
- ‘I bathed’

Since ‘to bathe’ is also found in the *w*-list for Arara, other Bakairi cognates of these verbs are of interest. While Meira (2003a: 4) does list *ge* ‘to say’, *tə* ‘to go’, and *əe(wi)* ‘to come’ as examples of *S<sub>A</sub>* verbs, he does not indicate whether they belong to the class of *S<sub>A</sub>-1* verbs, with first person *k-*, or the *S<sub>A</sub>-2* verbs, with *w-*.<sup>5</sup> Luckily, while von den Steinen (1892) did not accurately record all phonemic distinctions in Bakairi (Meira 2005), he does provide inflected forms of cognates to the Arara verbs in (4). We present them in (7) according to our current understanding of Bakairi phonology and verbal morphology, based on Wheatley (1969), Meira (2003a, 2005), and Franchetto & Meira (2016).

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(7) Bakairi (von den Steinen 1892: 131, 397, 76, 137, 374, 130)</p> <p>a. ⟨u-<u>yépa</u>⟩</p> <p><i>u-<u>ge-pa</u></i></p> <p>1<i>S<sub>A</sub></i>-say-NEG</p> <p>‘I don’t say.’</p> <p>b. ⟨wi-<u>táki</u>⟩ / ⟨wi-<u>tági</u>⟩</p> <p><i>w-i-<u>taki</u></i></p> <p>1<i>S<sub>A</sub></i>-be-INT</p> <p>‘I was.’</p> | <p>c. ⟨k<sup>h</sup>aewí-<u>le</u>⟩</p> <p><i>k-<u>əewi-li</u></i></p> <p>1<i>S<sub>A</sub></i>-come-IMM</p> <p>‘I came.’</p> <p>d. ⟨k<sup>h</sup>-itaké-<u>he</u>⟩</p> <p><i>k-it<u>əgi-se</u></i></p> <p>1<i>S<sub>A</sub></i>-go.down-NPST?</p> <p>‘I go down.’</p> |
|--|--|

<sup>5</sup>It should be noted at this point that Meira (2003a) indicates that the same verbs which take first person *w-* in Bakairi also take a 1+2 marker *k-*. However, this marker is only illustrated for ‘to bathe’, both by Meira (2003a) and von den Steinen (1892). Given the lack of data for other verbs, we will not further discuss this potential additional pattern. If the characterization by Meira is accurate, then verbs with innovative first person prefixes have conservative 1+2 prefixes, and vice versa.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| e.    ⟨úta⟩ / ⟨uúta⟩<br><i>u-tə</i><br>1S <sub>A</sub> -go<br>‘I go.’ | f.    ⟨töre-w-akine⟩<br><i>təɾə w-a-kine</i><br>there 1S <sub>A</sub> -be-PST.CONT<br>‘I was there.’ |
|---|--|

All available descriptions of the third Pekodian language, Ikpeng, list *k-* as the only 1S<sub>A</sub> marker (Pachêco 1997: 55; Campetela 1997: 105; Pachêco 2001: 64; Alves Chagas 2013: 205). However, most Ikpeng cognates of the Arara verbs with 1S<sub>A</sub> *w-* actually do not take *k-*, but rather *i-* or  $\emptyset$ , as shown in (8). The exception is ‘to go’, which has *k-* (9). There is a formally identical Ikpeng cognate of Arara *iptonj* ‘to go down’, but no first person forms are attested (Angela Chagas, p.c.). Further, while reflexes of *\*a[p]* ‘to be’ do exist in Ikpeng, it seems that only reflexes of *\*eti* occur with first person inflectional prefixes (Gildea 2018: 401).

(8) Ikpeng

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| a. <i>i-ge-li</i><br>1-say-REC<br>‘I said.’ (Pachêco 2001: 209)   |  |
| b. $\emptyset$ - <i>effi-li</i><br>1-be-REC<br>‘I was.’ (Pachêco 2001: 139)   |  |
| c. <i>aŋagotpop</i> $\emptyset$ - <i>ip-tfi</i> <i>ik-gwa-ktfi</i><br>always    1-bathe-NPST    river-LOC.aquatic-ALL<br>‘I always bathe in this river.’ (Pachêco 1997: 68) |  |

(9) Ikpeng (Pachêco 2001: 80)

- k-aran-tfi*  
 1-go-NPST  
 ‘I’m going.’

Table 9 gives an overview of the first person forms of the seven verbs under discussion, along with our Proto-Pekodian reconstruction. The presence and distribution of the Ikpeng 1S<sub>A</sub> marker *i-*/ $\emptyset$  suggests that it is cognate with Arara 1S<sub>A</sub> *w(i)-*. Indeed, Proto-Xinguan *\*w* is attested as sometimes being lost in Ikpeng, as evidenced by the correspondences in Table 10. While it is by no means a regular sound change, it allows us to securely connect the two prefixes. Similarly, the supposed change of *\*wi* to Bakairi *u* is found in other correspondences, like *udo* (Meira & Franchetto 2005) from Proto-Cariban *\*witoto* ‘person’ (Gildea & D. Payne 2007: 4). Thus, we reconstruct a 1S<sub>A</sub> prefix *\*w(i)-* to Proto-Pekodian, identical to the Arara one both in form and distribution.

As for the forms of the verb stems, a few comments are necessary: For ‘to be’, Ikpeng *e* is very likely the original vowel, given the Proto-Cariban form *\*eti* (Section 3.1). For ‘to go down’, we reconstruct *\*i* as the initial vowel rather than *\*i* (Section 3.5). Further, the forms are not fully cognate; Meira & Franchetto (2005) make no mention of a regular correspondence between Bakairi *gi* and Ikpeng

Table 9: Verbs preserving 1S<sub>A</sub> \*w- in Proto-Pekodian (Alves 2017: 153, 200; von den Steinen 1892: 76, 130, 131, 374, 397; Pachêco 2001: 42, 80, 139, 209, 1997: 68; Meira 2003a: 4)

	Proto-Pekodian	Arara	Ikpeng	Bakairi
‘be-1’	*w- <i>ap</i> -	w- <i>ap</i> -	–	w- <i>a</i> -
‘be-2’	*w- <i>effi</i> -	w- <i>ifli</i> -	Ø- <i>effi</i> -	w- <i>i</i> -
‘say’	*wi- <i>ge</i> -	wi- <i>ge</i> -	i- <i>ge</i> -	u- <i>ge</i> -
‘go’	*w- <i>itən</i> -	w- <i>ido</i> -	k- <i>aran</i> -	u- <i>tə</i> -
‘come’	*w- <i>epi</i> -	w- <i>ebi</i> -	k- <i>arep</i> -	k- <i>æwi</i> -
‘go down’	*w- <i>iptə</i> -	w- <i>ipton</i> -	?- <i>ipton</i> -	k- <i>itagi</i> -
‘bathe’	*w- <i>ipi</i> -	w- <i>ibi</i> -	Ø- <i>ip</i> -	w- <i>i</i> -

Table 10: Loss of \*w in Ikpeng (de Souza 1993: 44, 70; Alves Chagas 2013: 118; Alves 2017: 143; Pachêco 2001: 21, 164; de Souza 2010: 9; Campetela 1997: 40)

Meaning	Arara	Ikpeng
‘to defecate’	watke	atke
‘DAT’	wina	ina
‘dog’	wokori	akari
‘capuchin monkey’	tawe	tae
‘to sleep’	winki	inki

*ŋ*. However, the addition of a final *ŋ* in Proto-Xinguan is attested elsewhere,<sup>6</sup> and based on the fact Bakairi has generally lost much segmental material, we suggest that both *ŋ* and *gi* are later additions to a root \**iptə*.

The forms for ‘to come’ are not fully cognate, either: Ikpeng and Bakairi both show a reflex of the Proto-Pekodian detransitivizer \**əd*- in combination with a root reconstructible as \**epi*. In contrast, the Arara first person form is directly based on this root \**epi*. However, reflexes of \**əd-epi* can be found elsewhere in the Arara paradigm (10).

- (10) Arara (Alves 2017: 150)  
*m-odebi-ni*  
 2S<sub>A</sub>-come-REC  
 ‘You came.’

On the other hand, both Ikpeng and Bakairi show reflexes of \**əd-ebi* throughout the whole paradigm. Following the line of reasoning used by Meira (1998: 114) (see also Section 2.3) for a similar pattern in the three Taranoan languages, we suggest that the idiosyncratic pattern in Arara is reconstructible to Proto-Pekodian, and that Bakairi and Ikpeng independently regularized the paradigm to only use \**əd-epi*; similar issues are found outside of Pekodian (Section 3.4).

<sup>6</sup>a) Proto-Cariban \**ane* ‘to see’, Arara and Ikpeng *eney*; b) Proto-Cariban \**ata* ‘to hear’, Arara *tay*, Ikpeng *iray*; and c) Proto-Cariban \**ənə* ‘to eat meat’, Arara *oyoy* ‘to bite’ (Gildea & D. Payne 2007: 8; Alves 2017: 56, 144, 57; Pachêco 2001: 25, 270).



Table 11: Regular ‘to fall’ (S<sub>A</sub>) and ‘to sleep’ (S<sub>P</sub>) in Proto-Waiwaian (W. N. Hawkins & R. E. Hawkins 1953: 209, 211; Derbyshire 1985: 189, 190, 196; Howard 2001: 150; R. E. Hawkins 1998: 30)

	Proto-Waiwaian ‘to fall’	‘to sleep’	Hixkaryána ‘to fall’	‘to sleep’	Waiwai ‘to fall’	‘to sleep’
1	* <i>k-epurka-</i>	* <i>ki-winiki-</i>	<i>k-ehurka-</i>	<i>ki-niki-</i>	<i>k-epirka-</i>	<i>ki-winiki-</i>
2	* <i>m-epurka-</i>	* <i>o-winiki-</i>	<i>m-ehurka-</i>	<i>o-wniki-</i>	<i>m-epirka-</i>	<i>mi-winiki-</i>
1+2	* <i>t-epurka-</i>	* <i>tit-winiki-</i>	<i>t-ehurka-</i>	<i>ti-niki-</i>	<i>tj-epirka-</i>	<i>tit-winiki-</i>
3	* <i>n-epurka-</i>	* <i>ni-winiki-</i>	<i>n-ehurka-</i>	<i>ni-niki-</i>	<i>n-epirka-</i>	<i>ni-winiki-</i>

Finally, the V-initial nature of Proto-Pekodian ‘to go’ is evidenced in its Xinguan forms; while the Bakairi change *\*wi* → *u* obscured the morpheme boundary, other forms are V-initial (Section 3.3). The Ikpeng form *aran* is compatible with our reconstruction *\*itən* when considering that Ikpeng *a* is an attested outcome of *\*ə*.<sup>7</sup> This attested change of *\*ə* to *a* need only be preceded by a assimilatory lowering of initial *\*i* to *\*ə*, to yield the form *aran* from *\*itən*. Other Ikpeng reflexes of ‘to go’ offer evidence for the suggested intermediate stage *\*ətən*: *ero-li* ‘s/he went’ (Pachêco 2001: 25).

Summing up, an innovative 1S<sub>A</sub> marker *\*k-* is reconstructible to Proto-Pekodian. Seven verbs can be reconstructed as having resisted this innovation and preserving 1S<sub>A</sub> *\*w(i)-* in Proto-Pekodian. In later, individual developments, Bakairi extended *k-* to ‘to go down’, and Ikpeng to ‘to go’. Further, both languages regularized the paradigm of ‘to come’ to *\*əd-epi*, accompanied by the introduction of first person *k-*.

## 2.2 Proto-Waiwaian *\*k-*

This extension led to the Hixkaryána pattern from Table 1 in Section 1 and was one of the Parukotoan extensions discussed in Section 1.2. In Proto-Waiwaian, the new 1S<sub>P</sub> prefix *\*k-*, already innovated at the Proto-Parukotoan stage, was extended to 1S<sub>A</sub>. For regularly inflected verbs, this created a unified 1S category, reflected in both Hixkaryána and Waiwai (Table 11). Not all S<sub>A</sub> verbs were affected: Waiwai *ka* ‘to say’ does not take *ki-*, but rather conservative *wi-* (11a). Its Hixkaryána counterpart has a prefix *i-* (11b), a potential reflex of 1S<sub>A</sub> *\*w(i)-*. A formally identical prefix occurs in 1>3 scenarios in Hixkaryána (11c), which regularly corresponds to Waiwai *w(i)-* (11d).

- (11) a. Waiwai (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 71)

*wiikekne*  
*wi-ka-jakne*  
 1-say-PST  
 ‘I said.’

- b. Hixkaryána (Derbyshire 1985: 124)

<sup>7</sup>a) *akari* ‘dog’ in Table 10 above; b) *anma* ‘path’ (Pachêco 2001: 24) from Proto-Cariban *\*atema* (Gildea & D. Payne 2007: 12); and c) *jaj* ‘tree’ (Pachêco 2001: 98) from Proto-Cariban *\*jəje*.

Table 12: Verbs preserving 1S<sub>A</sub> \*w- in Proto-Waiwaian (Derbyshire 1985: 70, 197, 198, 1979: 4; R. E. Hawkins 1998: 71, 85; p.c., Spike Gildea)

	Proto-Waiwaian	Hixkaryána	Waiwai
‘be-1’	*w-ah-	w-ah-	w-a-
‘be-2’	*w-efi-	w-efe-	w-eefi-
‘say’	*wi-ka-	i-ka-	wi-ka-
‘go’	*wi-tom-	i-to-	kiw-tom-

*roxehra nay hami Kaywerye ikekoni*

*ro-fe-hira n-a-je hami kajwerie i-ka-jakoni*

1-DES-NEG 3-be-NPST.UNCERT EVID K. 1S<sub>A</sub>-say-REM.CONT

‘I said (to myself), “Kaywerye evidently doesn’t like me”’

- c. Hixkaryána (Derbyshire 1985: 191)

*i-koroka-no*

1>3-wash-IMM

‘I washed him.’

- d. Waiwai (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 192)

*wíyesí*

*wi-jo-jasi*

1>3-boil-NPST

‘I will boil it.’

This correspondence allows us to establish Hixkaryána *i-* a reflex of \*w(*i*)-, with a similar phonological reduction as in Ikpeng (Section 2.1). Notably, Derbyshire (1985) does not see this *i-* as an irregular 1S<sub>A</sub> prefix, but as the regular 1>3 prefix, because he considers Hixkaryána *ka* ‘to say’ to be transitive (Section 3.2).

There are three more verbs which did not take innovative \*k- in Proto-Waiwaian, shown alongside \*ka ‘to say’ in Table 12. The two roots for ‘to be’ are straightforwardly reconstructible, whereas ‘to go’ is somewhat of a special case. While Hixkaryána has the expected *i-*, Waiwai seems to have combined innovative *k-* with the old \*w-, an etymological analysis also considered by Gildea (1998: 90). Alternatively, this form might have been influenced by deverbalized forms of ‘to go’, where a reflex of the S<sub>A</sub> class marker \*w- has become fossilized (12).

- (12) Waiwai reflexes of the S<sub>A</sub> class marker \*w-

a. *o-wto-topo-nho* ‘my trip’ (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 92)

b. *o-wto-fhe* ‘after I went’ (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 165)

c. *ki-wto-me* ‘for us to go’ (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 204)

In any case, Hixkaryána ‘to go’ was clearly not affected by the extension of \*k-, allowing us to reconstruct a Proto-Waiwaian first person form \*wi-tom-.

Table 13: Regular Proto-Tiriyoan S<sub>A</sub> verbs (Gildea 1994: 87; Meira 1999: 292, 294)

	‘to bathe (INTR)’			‘to sleep’		
	Proto-Tiriyoan	Tiriyó	Akuriyó	Proto-Tiriyoan	Tiriyó	Akuriyó
1	* <i>ʃ-epi-</i>	<i>s-epi-</i>	<i>ʃ-epi-</i>	* <i>t-əəniki-</i>	<i>t-əəniki-</i>	<i>k-əəniki-</i>
2	* <i>m-epi-</i>	<i>m-epi-</i>	<i>m-epi-</i>	* <i>m-əəniki-</i>	<i>m-əəniki-</i>	<i>m-əəniki-</i>
1+2	* <i>ke-epi-</i>	<i>ke-epi-</i>	<i>ke-epi-</i>	* <i>kit-əəniki-</i>	<i>kit-əəniki-</i>	<i>kəʔ-əəniki-</i>
3	* <i>n-epi-</i>	<i>n-epi-</i>	<i>n-epi-</i>	* <i>n-əəniki-</i>	<i>n-əəniki-</i>	<i>n-əəniki-</i>

Table 14: Verbs preserving 1S<sub>A</sub> \**w-* in Proto-Tiriyoan (Meira 1998: 112, 113, 114, 115, 165, 1999: 292, 294, 339)

	Proto-Tiriyoan	Tiriyó	Akuriyó
‘be-1’	* <i>w-a-</i>	<i>w-a-</i>	Ø- <i>a-</i>
‘be-2’	* <i>w-eʔi-</i>	<i>w-ei-</i>	?- <i>eʔi-</i>
‘say’	* <i>wi-ka-</i>	<i>wi-ka-</i>	<i>wi-ka-</i>
‘go’	* <i>wi-təmi-</i>	<i>wi-tən-</i>	ə- <i>təmi-</i>
‘come’	* <i>w-əʔepi-</i>	<i>w-əepi-</i>	Ø- <i>eepe-</i>

Summing up, we reconstruct the four verbs \**eʃi* and \**a[h]* ‘to be’, \**ka[s]* ‘to say’, and \**[i]to[m]* ‘to go’ as preserving the old 1S<sub>A</sub> marker \**w-* in Proto-Waiwaian, while the rest took on innovative \**k-*.

### 2.3 Proto-Tiriyoan \**t-*

The moniker Tiriyoan subsumes Tiriyó and Akuriyó, the more closely related of the three Taranoan languages already identified by Girard (1971), the more distant member being Carijona. Meira (1998) provides an extensive phonological, morphological, and lexical reconstruction of Proto-Taranoan. He faces an interesting puzzle in the Set I paradigms of Tiriyó and Akuriyó: Proto-Cariban 1>3 \**t-* and 1S<sub>A</sub> \**w-* seem to have switched places. This resulted in a regular 1S<sub>A</sub> marker of the form \**ʃ-* / *\_e*, \**t-* / *\_ə* (Table 13).<sup>8</sup> The question of how this switch happened in detail (Meira 1998: 107–112) still has no answer, although it seems necessary to assume a scenario whereby both \**t-* and \**w-* for a time occurred on both transitive and intransitive verbs (Meira 1998: 112).<sup>9</sup> Regarding S<sub>A</sub> verbs unaffected by the spread of \**t-*, Meira (1998) reconstructs the first four items in Table 14 as taking \**w-* in Proto-Taranoan—attentive readers may recognize Tiriyó ‘to go’—for which we provide our reconstructed Proto-Tiriyoan forms. To this list, the other copular root \**eʔi* (Proto-Taranoan \**eʃi* [Meira 1998: 165]) can be added, which has first person *w-*, at least in Tiriyó.

We agree with Meira’s (1998: 113) identification of the idiosyncratic Akuriyó first person prefix ə-

<sup>8</sup>The latter allomorph was subsequently replaced by *k-* in Akuriyó (Section 2.4).

<sup>9</sup>In fact, even the issue of *when* this happened is open. It could have happened at the Proto-Taranoan stage, but the subsequent introduction of *j-* in Carijona (Section 2.5) would have erased any traces of such an innovation. Accordingly, Meira (1998) hesitates to assign this extension to a specific proto-language. We take a conservative stance and reconstruct it to Proto-Tiriyoan only, but acknowledge the possibility of it taking place already in Proto-Taranoan.

on ‘to go’ as a reflex of *\*wi-*. Both components of the irregular change *\*wi-* > *ə-* – loss of *\*w* and lowering of *\*i* to *ə* – are found in other person prefixes (13).

- (13) a. Akuriyó (Gildea 1994: 86)  
           (*w*)*i-toka*  
           1>3-hit  
           ‘I hit him/her.’  
       b. Akuriyó (Meira 1998: 114)  
           *kəʔ-eepi*  
           1+2-come  
           ‘We came.’

For ‘to come’, Meira (1998: 114–115) reconstructs Proto-Taraniyan *\*əepi* for first person, and *\*eepi* for the other person values, based on an idiosyncratic paradigmatic pattern in Tiriyo and the vowel length in Akuriyó. Akuriyó (and Carijona) then levelled this original distribution, similar to what we have suggested for Pekodian (Section 2.1). We agree with this scenario, with the exception that Tiriyo *əepi* looks like a reflex of *\*ət-eepi* (Section 3.4), meaning that the Proto-Tiriyoan form would have been *\*əʔepi*.

In addition, Gildea (1994) recorded four more Akuriyó verbs seemingly not affected by innovative *\*t-* (14a), all *e*-initial movement verbs. We have only found a Tiriyo cognate for *erama* ‘to return’, which behaves like a regular S<sub>A</sub> verb in taking *s-* (14b). Further, these verbs are not mentioned by Meira (1998), who was also working with Gildea’s (1994) data. Given that this data potentially has strong Tiriyo and/or Wayana influence (Gildea 1998: 253) and the lack of support by the available part of Meira’s (1998) data, we cannot reconstruct these verbs as not being affected by the extension of Proto-Tiriyoan *\*t-*.

- (14) a. Akuriyó 1S<sub>A</sub> *\*w-* (Gildea 1994: 84–86)  
           ‘return’   Ø-*erama-*  
           ‘get up’   Ø-*eokahta-*  
           ‘jump’    *w-ejahka-*  
           ‘go out’   *w-ekirika-*  
       b. Tiriyo *s-erama-* (Meira 1999: 301)

## 2.4 Akuriyó *k-*

After the split-up of Proto-Tiriyoan, when *\*t-* had largely replaced *\*w-*, Akuriyó innovated yet another 1S<sub>A</sub> marker: *k-*. It seems to have replaced *\*t-* only in specific environments, with the two markers showing a clear phonologically conditioned distribution in the Akuriyó data available to us (Gildea 1994), with all relevant verbs shown in Table 15. Meira (1998: 107) largely confirms the distribution shown here, but mentions “several cases of first person *t-* in Akuriyó” (on *ə*-initial verbs), albeit without any examples. He also suggests that *k-* might be more recent, with which we agree: since the distribution *\*t-* / *ə* / *\*tʃ-* / *ə* is reconstructible to Proto-Tiriyoan, the most likely scenario is *k-* replacing *\*t-* but not *\*tʃ-*. The few *t-* mentioned by Meira (1998) were then either reintroduced under Tiriyo influence, or

Table 15: Regular Akuriyó 1S<sub>A</sub> markers (Gildea 1994: 77, 79, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87)

first person <i>k</i> -	first person <i>ff</i> -
<i>aempa</i> - ‘to learn’	<i>epi</i> - ‘to bathe (INTR)’
<i>aaffena</i> - ‘to cry’	<i>ekirika</i> - ‘to stay back’
<i>aiwa</i> - ‘to tremble’	<i>entapo</i> - ‘to yawn’
<i>amami</i> - ‘to enter’	<i>etonema</i> - ‘to lie down’
<i>atajiyka</i> - ‘to run’	<i>ewai</i> - ‘to sit down’
<i>aturu</i> - ‘to talk’	<i>ehpa</i> - ‘to bathe (INTR)’
<i>aaniki</i> - ‘to sleep’	

Table 16: Regular Carijona verbs (Robayo Moreno 2000: 173; Meira 1998: 106)

	‘to dance’	‘to arrive’
1	<i>j-eharaga</i> -	<i>ji-tuda</i> -
2	<i>m-eharaga</i> -	<i>mi-tuda</i> -
1+2	<i>kis-eharaga</i> -	<i>kisi-tuda</i> -
3	<i>n-eharaga</i> -	<i>ni-tuda</i> -

are the last remnants of the replacement of *\*t*. Since there are no examples of, or further information about, *a*-initial verbs with *t*-, we cannot discuss these cases.

The verbs listed for Proto-Tiriyoan in Table 14 above did of course also not introduce *k*- in Akuriyó, although we do not know the first-person form of the copular verb *eʔi*. In addition, there is an S<sub>A</sub> verb *i(h)tə* ‘to go down’, which has an irregular first person marker *p*- in Akuriyó, also reconstructible to Proto-Tiriyoan (15). It was not affected by the extension of Akuriyó *k*-, but whether it was an S<sub>A</sub> verb when Proto-Tiriyoan *\*t*- was extended is unclear (see Section 3.5).

(15) First person forms of ‘to go down’

Tiriyo     *p-ihətə*-     (Meira 1999: 294)

Akuriyó   *p-itə*-     (Gildea 1994: 84)

## 2.5 Carijona *j*-

Carijona, the cousin of the Tiriyoan languages, has extended the 1S<sub>P</sub> marker *j(i)*-<sup>10</sup> to S<sub>A</sub> verbs (Meira 1998: 105–107). Combined with the extension of 2S<sub>A</sub> *m*- and 1+2S<sub>A</sub> *kit*-/*kis*- to S<sub>P</sub> verbs, this created a single unified S category for regularly inflected verbs (Table 16). Although the split-S system has been lost entirely, former S<sub>A</sub> verbs can be identified by the presence of a detransitivizer, like *ehinəhi* ‘to fight’, derived from *hinəhi* ‘to kill’ (Robayo Moreno 2000: 179), shown in (16).

<sup>10</sup>Since all affected S<sub>A</sub> verbs are V-initial, only the /\_V allomorph *j*- occurs in that context.

- (16) Carijona (Koch-Grünberg 1908: 79)  
*hɛnɛ(x)tónoko-máɾɛ y-e-hɛnɛ(x)yaj*  
*hinəhtono-ko=marə j-e-hinəhi-jai*  
 enemy-PL=with 1-DETRZ-kill-NPST.CERT  
 ‘I fight with the enemies.’

As noted in Section 2.3, this extension also erased any traces of a potential Proto-Taranoan 1S<sub>A</sub> marker *\*t-*. However, it did not fully eclipse the old 1S<sub>A</sub> marker *\*w-*, which is attested as being preserved in the verbs *tə* ‘to go’ (17a) and *a* ‘to be’ (17b). In addition, the verb *ka* ‘to say’ has a zero-marked first-person form (17c).

- (17) Carijona (Guerrero-Beltrán 2016: 5, 42, personal communication)
- a. *wi-tə-e=rehe*  
 1-go-NPST=FRUST  
 ‘I almost go (but I am not going to go).’
  - b. *əji-marə-ne w-a-e*  
 2-with-PL 1-be-NPST  
 ‘I am with you all.’
  - c. *dēməmara kae əwi iya*  
*n-tə-mə=marə Ø-ka-e əwi i-ja*  
 3-go-PST=DUB 1-say-NPST.CERT 1PRO 3-OBL  
 ‘“Did s/he leave?”, I say to him.’

Based on other C-initial verbs like *tə* ‘to go’ or *tuda* ‘to arrive’, one would either expect conservative *wi-* or innovative *ji-*. We analyse this Ø as a reflex of *\*wi-*, primarily based on the (albeit more regular) loss of *\*w* in Ikpeng and Hixkaryána, and the presumed higher propensity of an irregular marker for idiosyncratic phonological erosion. Further, it is possible that the divergent development of *\*w-* on C-initial *ka* ‘to say’ and *tə* ‘to go’ is a result of the latter’s originally V-initial nature (Section 3.3).

## 2.6 Yukpa*j-*

The divergent nature of the family-internal isolate Yukpa is *inter alia* visible in the loss of many Set I forms and the formation of non-cognate innovative constructions (Meira 2006b). However, it does preserve the Set I prefixes in the immediate past, where a unified intransitive paradigm is found (Table 17). The wholesale loss of 1+2 as an inflectional value was combined with the extension of 2S<sub>A</sub> *m(i)-* to (former) S<sub>P</sub> verbs like *nɪ* ‘to sleep’. These verbs share their first person marker *j(i)-* with former S<sub>A</sub> verbs like *otum* ‘to wash self’, identifiable by their reflex of the detransitivizer *\*əte/e-*. The same prefix occurs in 3>1 scenarios (18a), meaning that *j(i)-* is the reflex of the Proto-Cariban 1S<sub>P</sub> marker *\*u(j)-*.

- (18) Yukpa (Meira 2006b: 139)
- a. *aw j-esare*  
 1PRO 3>1-see  
 ‘S/he saw me.’

Table 17: Regular Yukpa verbs (Meira 2006b: 139; Largo 2011: 72, 76)

	‘to fall’	‘to wash self’	‘to sleep’
1	<i>j-ata-</i>	<i>j-otum-</i>	<i>ji-ni-</i>
2	<i>m-ata-</i>	<i>m-otum-</i>	<i>mi-ni-</i>
3	<i>n-ata-</i>	<i>n-otum-</i>	<i>ni-ni-</i>

- b. *aw*  $\emptyset$ -*esare*  
 1PRO 1>3-see  
 ‘I saw it.’

On the other hand, 1>3 scenarios are zero-marked (18b). Since Proto-Cariban 1S<sub>A</sub> *\*w(i)-* was extended to 1>3 scenarios in most languages (Gildea 1998: 81–82), and since it is prone to phonological erosion elsewhere in the family (see Sections 2.1 and 2.2), we identify the zero marking in 1>3 scenarios as the Yukpa reflex of *\*w-*, contrasting with *j(i)-*, the reflex of *\*u(j)-*.

In intransitive verbs, this first-person zero marking is also attested, but only for *to* ‘to go’ (19). That verb contrasts with regular C-initial verbs, which take *ji-*, like ‘to sleep’ in Table 17. In summary, the extension of *j-* in Yukpa only spared *to* ‘to go’, which preserves a phonologically reduced reflex of *\*wi-*.

- (19) Yukpa (Meira 2006b: 139)  
*aw*  $\emptyset$ -*to*  
 1PRO 1S<sub>A</sub>-go  
 ‘I went.’

### 3 Conservative verbs: the usual suspects

In Section 2, we introduced six distinct extensions of personal prefixes into 1S<sub>A</sub> territory, and identified verbs resistant to each innovation. The set of unaffected verbs is rather small in most cases, and (proto-)languages show a considerable degree of overlap in what verbs are unaffected. Therefore, this section presents these verbs from a comparative perspective. Section 3.1 treats both roots of the copula *\*eti/a[p]* ‘to be’, Section 3.2 *\*ka[ti]* ‘to say’, Section 3.3 *\*itə[mə]* ‘to go’, and Section 3.4 *\*(ət)jəpi* ‘to come’. Section 3.5 takes a look at *\*ipitə* ‘to go down’, which is resistant in Proto-Tiriyoan and Proto-Pekodian, and Section 3.6 investigates *\*e-pi* ‘to bathe’, of which the Proto-Pekodian reflex *\*i-pi* resisted the extension of *\*k-*. The *e*-initial verbs not affected by the extension of *k-* in Akuriyó (Section 2.4) will not be discussed here, as they are a large and phonologically coherent group.

#### 3.1 *\*eti* and *\*a[p]* ‘to be’

For a comprehensive comparative overview for these two roots, we refer the reader to Gildea (2018: 375–382). *\*a[p]* is the original copula and can be reconstructed as already having various irregularities in Proto-Cariban. *\*eti*, the other root, is reconstructed by Meira & Gildea (2009) and Gildea (2018)

as originally meaning ‘to dwell, live’, but serving as a copula in Proto-Cariban.<sup>11</sup> Various modern languages use reflexes of these two roots in a suppletive manner, conditioned by person and/or TAM value. Both roots preserved 1S<sub>A</sub> \**w-* in Proto-Pekodian, Proto-Waiwaian, and Proto-Tiriyoan (Sections 2.1 to 2.3). Akuriyó *a* was not affected by the extension of *k-* (Section 2.4), while *e?i* is not attested in a first-person form. Carijona innovated *j-*, but only in the reflex of \**eti* (20); the *a* root preserves *w-* (Section 2.5). Yukpa introduced *j-* to the reflexes of both \**a[p]* and \**eti*, which are preserved as encliticized auxiliaries in certain constructions (21).

- (20) Carijona (Robayo Moreno 1989: 177)  
*iretibə eʃfinəme gəɾə jɛʃʃi*  
*ireti-bə eʃfi-nə=me gəɾə j-eʃfi-i*  
 then-from be-INF=ATTRZ still 1-be-PFV  
 ‘Then I was already grown up.’

- (21) Yukpa (Meira 2006b: 143–144)
- |   | NPST             | PST          |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| 1 | = <i>j-a(-s)</i> | = <i>j-e</i> |
| 2 | = <i>mak(o)</i>  | = <i>m-e</i> |
| 3 | = <i>mak(o)</i>  | = <i>n-e</i> |

### 3.2 \**ka[tɪ]* ‘to say’

Most reflexes of this verb are simply *ka*, but a fleeting syllable \**ti* is reconstructed by Gildea & D. Payne (2007), best visible in the imperative forms of some languages (22).

- (22) Apalaí  
*kafi-ko* ‘say!’  
 (E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 35)

Table 18 shows a comparison of the longest attested forms for each language.<sup>12</sup> This verb was not affected by any of the extensions found in Proto-Pekodian, Proto-Waiwaian, Proto-Tiriyoan, Akuriyó, or Carijona (Sections 2.1 to 2.5). We do not know the first person form of its Yukpa reflex *ka*.

As briefly mentioned in Section 2.2, Derbyshire (1985) analyzes this verb as transitive in Hixkaryána. This analytical choice is not only motivated by the desire to avoid an idiosyncratic intransitive first person prefix *i-* instead of *ki-*. Hixkaryána *ka* also shows the complementary distribution of third person *n-* and preceding objects typical of transitive verbs in Cariban (Gildea 1998: 60–81). Due to its semantics, these objects are either direct speech (23) or ideophones.

<sup>11</sup>Such a stative, locative source is also suggested by the existence of *iffi* ‘to lie down’ in Arara (Alves 2017: 196).

<sup>12</sup>Cognate segments in 18–?? were aligned automatically with LingPy (List et al. 2021), for easier recognition of correspondences.



Table 18: Reflexes of *\*ka[ti]* ‘to say’ (Meira 2003a: 4; Franchetto 2008: 48; Pachêco 2001: 209; Alves 2017: 153; Derbyshire 1985: 182; Meira 1998: 113; E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 107; R. E. Hawkins 1998: 26; Camargo & Tapinkili 2010: 66; Abbott 1991: 59; Swiggers 2010: 123; Courtz 2008: 430; Caesar-Fox 2003: 125; M.-C. Mattéi-Müller 1994: 102; Largo 2011: 63; p.c., Spike Gildea)

Language	Form
Werikyana	<i>ka[s]</i> k a s
Proto-Waiwaian	<i>*ka[s]</i> k a s
Hixkaryána	<i>ka[h]</i> k a h
Waiwai	<i>ka[s]</i> k a s
Proto-Pekodian	<i>*ke</i> k e
Arara	<i>ke</i> k e
Ikpeng	<i>ke</i> k e
Bakairi	<i>ke</i> k e
Proto-Tiriyoan	<i>*ka</i> k a
Tiriyó	<i>ka</i> k a
Akuriyó	<i>ka</i> k a
Carijona	<i>ka</i> k a
Wayana	<i>ka[i]</i> k a i
Apalaí	<i>ka[fi]</i> k a ɟ i
Kari’ña	<i>ka</i> k a
Kapón	<i>ka</i> k a
Pemón	<i>ka</i> k a
Macushi	<i>ka</i> k a
Panare	<i>ka[h]</i> k a h
Upper Xingu Carib	<i>ki</i> k i
Yukpa	<i>ka</i> k a

## (23) Hixkaryána

- a. *oní wyaro nkekoni bíryekomo, tíyoni wya*  
*oní wjaro n-ka-jakoni bíryekomo tí-joni wja*  
 this like 3-say-REM.CONT boy COR-mother OBL  
 ‘This is what the boy said to his mother.’ (Derbyshire 1985: 36)
- b. *moro ha, ketxkoná hatá.*  
*moro ha ka-jafkoni hati*  
 MED.DEM.INAN INTS say-REM.CONT.PL HSY  
 ‘“That one there” they said.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 14)

In (23a), the prefix *n-* occurs because there is no preceding object (‘he said it like this’). In (23b), it does not occur, because ‘they said’ is preceded by direct speech. At least the Tiriyo cognate shows the same pattern, albeit inconsistently so (Carlin 2004: 267).

Derivational suffixes also point to *\*ka[ti]* ‘to say’ being transitive: Tiriyo *ka* is characterized as the only intransitive verb being able to take the causative suffix *-po* and the agentive nominalizer *-ne* (Meira 1999: 263, 169). The exceptionality of *ka* ‘to say’ taking *-po* ‘CAUS.TR’ has also been noted for Kari’ña (Courtz 2008: 82) and Wayana (Tavares 2005: 258). The agent nominalizer *\*-ne* gave rise to the Panare gnomic verbal suffix *-je* on transitive verbs (Gildea 1998: 184–185). The occurrence of *-je* on *ka* likely led T. E. Payne & D. L. Payne (2013: 214) to categorize it as transitive, contrasting with the intransitive analysis by M.-C. Mattéi-Müller (1994: 102). Finally, reflexes of the causativizer *\*-metipo*, usually restricted to transitive verbs (Gildea 2015), are found with *ka* in Apalaí (E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 51) and Waiwai (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 52).

Our categorization of ‘to say’ as an intransitive verb is supported primarily by its person prefixes. Kari’ña offers a minimal pair between transitive *ka* ‘to remove’ and intransitive *ka* ‘to say’, *sikai* ‘I took it away’ vs *wikai* ‘I said’ (Courtz 2008: 288, 45).<sup>13</sup> Similarly, ‘to say’ in Pekodian languages has a reflex of 1S *\*w-* (Section 2.1), and not 1>3 *s-* (Bakairi) or *\*ini-* (Proto-Xinguan). Additionally, languages which differentiate direct prefixes from *S<sub>A</sub>* prefixes by the presence of *i* (Meira et al. 2010: 495) show no *i* for this verb, see (24a) as well as Meira (1999: 294), Tavares (2005: 195), Pachêco (2001: 288), Alves (2017: 150), and Hoff (1968: 168) for the verb’s inflection in individual languages. Finally, the *S<sub>A</sub>* class marker *w-* occurs on nominalizations in Kari’ña (24b), and it is probably reflected as vowel length in the Tiriyo (Meira 1999: 333) and Wayana (Tavares 2005: 196) participles.

- (24) a. Akuriyó (Meira 1998: 113)  
*mi-ka*  
 2-say  
 ‘You said.’
- b. Kari’ña (Courtz 2008: 202)  
*Òmakon ‘wa oti ywykàpo kaiko.*  
*o-ʔma-kon ʔwa oti i-wi-ka-ʔpo kai-ko*  
 2-child-PL OBL greeting 1-S<sub>A</sub>-say-PST.NMLZ say-IMP  
 ‘Pass my greetings to your children.’

<sup>13</sup>Interestingly, the Kari’ña causativized form *kapo* ‘to make say’ does not have the regular 1>3 prefix *s(i)-*, but irregular *w(i)-* (Courtz 2008: 430).

Summing up, this verb could be reconstructed as being intransitive based on its prefixes, but transitive based on some suffixes. Hixkaryána has lost the main intransitive criteria, making its reflex look more like a transitive verb. It is not attested as being affected by any of the person marker extensions in Section 2.

### 3.3 \**itə[mə]* ‘to go’

This verb is reconstructed by Gildea & D. Payne (2007) as \**tə[mə]*, like \**ka[ti]* ‘to say’ with a fleeting second syllable. It is true that many reflexes are clearly *t*-initial, for example Hixkaryána *ntoje* ‘he went’ (Derbyshire 1985: 27), Tiriyo *təkə* ‘go!’ (Meira 1999: 246), or Wayana *kuptəm* ‘we went’ (Tavares 2005: 195). However, once one considers all forms of the various reflexes of this verb (Table 19), an initial vowel \**i* must clearly be reconstructed – in contrast to unambiguously C-initial \**ka[ti]* ‘to say’.<sup>14</sup> This verb was not affected by any of the extensions discussed in Section 2.

### 3.4 \*(*ət*-)*jəpi* ‘to come’

This verb is reconstructed as \**ətepi* by Gildea & D. Payne (2007: 30), but an inspection of all attested reflexes (Table 20) suggests a somewhat more complex story. Crucially, the majority do not reflect the \**ət* part of their reconstruction, and many forms are ostensibly reflexes of \**əpi*, \**jəpi*, or \**jəpi* for the \**əpi* part. We analyze all forms as going back to a Proto-Cariban verb of the form \*(*ət*-)*jəpi*, morphologically segmentable into a detransitivizing prefix and a root \**jəpi*.

Evidence for the originally \**j*-initial nature of the root is found in the Pemongan languages and Werikyana, although the coexistence of *oohi* and *johi* in Werikyana raises the question of whether the *j* in the latter form is actually part of the root. *johi* only occurs with third person in the Progressive (25a), and one might analyze *j*(-) as a reflex of \**i-w-* ‘3-S<sub>A</sub>’, since the S<sub>A</sub> class marker \**w-* is present with other person values (25b). However, while C-initial verbs do show a clear reflex of third person \**i-* (25c), regular V-initial S<sub>A</sub> verbs do not show *j-*, but Ø (25d). Thus, the best explanation for this *j* is that it is indeed part of the root, rather than an outcome of \**i-w-*, which in turn allows us to safely reconstruct \**j* back to Proto-Cariban.

(25) Werikyana Spike Gildea (p.c.)

- a. *johi-ri*  
3.come-PROG  
‘S/he is coming.’
- b. *o-w-oohi-ri*  
2-S<sub>A</sub>-come-PROG  
‘You are coming.’
- c. *i-nki-ri*  
3-sleep-PROG  
‘S/he is sleeping.’

<sup>14</sup>As indicated by the brackets in Table 19, there are many languages where the initial vowel is only present in some forms. Also, the prefix-verb boundary in many inflected forms like e.g. Tiriyo *witənnə* or Arara *widoli* ‘I went’ (Meira 1999: 43; Alves 2017: 153) is ambiguous, since an epenthetic *i* breaks up potential CC clusters. Still, when one considers unambiguous forms, the contrast with \**ka[ti]* becomes very clear.

Table 19: Reflexes of *\*itə[mə]* ‘to go’ (Cruz 2005: 291; Meira 1999: 292; Tavares 2005: 195; Gildea 1994: 87; Alves 2017: 153; Derbyshire 1985: 27, 248; R. E. Hawkins 1998: 45, 62; Pachêco 2001: 54, 80; von den Steinen 1892: 112, 374; Cáceres 2011: 181, 216; Meira 1998: 112; Hoff 1968: 168; Meira 2006b: 139; Cáceres & Gildea 2018: 4; M. C. Mattéi-Müller 1975: 74; M.-C. Mattéi-Müller 1994: 198; Abbott 1991: 48, 50; García Ferrer 2006: 172; Franchetto 2002: 6; Camargo 2002: 99; p.c., Spike Gildea)

Language	Form
Werikyana	<i>to[mə]</i> t   o   m   o
Proto-Waiwaian	<i>*[i]to[m]</i> i   t   o   m
Hixkaryana	<i>[i]to</i> i   t   o
Waiwai	<i>[e]to[m]</i> e   t   o   m
Proto-Pekodian	<i>*itən</i> i   t   ə   n
Arara	<i>ido</i> i   d   o
Ikpeng	<i>aran</i> a   r   a   n
Ikpeng	<i>ero</i> e   r   o
Bakairi	<i>[i]tə</i> i   t   ə
Proto-Tiriyoan	<i>*təmi</i> t   ə   m   i
Tiriyó	<i>tə[n]</i> t   ə   n
Akuriyó	<i>[ə]tə[mi]</i> ə   t   ə   m   i
Carijona	<i>təmə</i> t   ə   m   ə
Wayana	<i>[i]tə[m]</i> i   t   ə   m
Apalaí	<i>ito</i> i   t   o
Kari’ña	<i>to</i> t   o
Kari’ña	<i>[i]ʔ</i> i   ʔ
Ye’kwana	<i>itə[mə]</i> i   t   ə   m   ə
Ingarikó	<i>ətə</i> ə   t   ə
Pemón	<i>[e]tə</i> e   t   ə
Macushi	<i>[a]ti</i> a   t   i
Panare	<i>tə[n]</i> t   ə   n
Yawarana	<i>tə</i> t   ə
Mapoyo	<i>tə</i> t   ə
Upper Xingu Carib	<i>[e]te</i> e   t   e
Yukpa	<i>to</i> t   o

Table 20: Reflexes of *\*(ət-)jəpi* ‘to come’ (Abbott 1991: 32; Álvarez 2000: 102; Caesar-Fox 2003: 125; Cruz 2005: 299, 415; Cáceres 2011: 438; Robayo Moreno 2000: 178; Meira 1998: 168; M. C. Mattéi-Müller 1975: 74; Meira 1999: 294; Alves 2017: 150; E. Koehn & S. Koehn 1986: 37; Pachêco 2001: 265; Stegeman & Hunter 2014: 160; Meira 2003a: 4; T. E. Payne & D. L. Payne 2013: 65; Méndez-Arocha 1959: 68; Courtz 2008: 429; Meira & Franchetto 2005: 182; p.c., Spike Gildea)

Language	Form					
Werikyana	<i>oohi</i>			oo	h	i
Werikyana	<i>johi</i>			j	o	h i
Werikyana	<i>ehi</i>			e	h	i
Proto-Pekodian	<i>*ədepi</i>	ə	d	-	e	p i
Proto-Pekodian	<i>*epi</i>			e	p	i
Arara	<i>ebi</i>			e	b	i
Arara	<i>odebi</i>	o	d	-	e	b i
Ikpeng	<i>arep</i>	a	r	-	e	p
Bakairi	<i>æwi</i>	ə		-	e	w i
Proto-Tiriyóan	<i>*əɽepi</i>	ə	ɽ	-	e	p i
Tiriyó	<i>epi</i>			e	p	i
Tiriyó	<i>æpi</i>	ə		-	e	p i
Akuriyó	<i>eepe</i>			ee	p	i
Carijona	<i>ehi</i>			e	h	i
Apalaí	<i>oepe</i>	o		-	e	p i
Kari’ña	<i>opi</i>			o	p	i
Ye’kwana	<i>ehə</i>			e	h	ə
Akawaio	<i>əsipi</i>	ə	s	-	i	p i
Akawaio	<i>jepi</i>			j	e	p i
Ingarikó	<i>jə</i>			j	ə	
Ingarikó	<i>jepə</i>			j	e	p ə
Patamona	<i>jepi</i>			j	e	p i
Patamona	<i>jəpi</i>			j	ə	p i
Pemón	<i>jepi</i>			j	e	p i
Panare	<i>əpi</i>			ə	p	i
Yawarana	<i>əpi</i>			ə	p	i
Mapoyo	<i>epi</i>			e	p	i
Upper Xingu Carib	<i>ee</i>			ee		

- d. *Ø-osone-ri*  
 3-dream-PROG  
 ‘S/he is dreaming.’

Most of the longer forms corresponding to Gildea & D. Payne’s (2007) *\*atepi* do not show evidence for the segment *\*j*, but the *i* in the Akawaio form *asipi* is very likely a reflex of the sequence *\*ja*. This analysis is supported by the reflex *ipi* from bare *\*japi* in very closely related Macushi.

Turning to the many forms seemingly reflecting *\*api* and *\*epi* rather than *japi*, we find that both are distributed widely in the family, sometimes even co-occurring in the same language. A unifying account of these forms requires the root *\*japi* to undergo two major sound changes: a) *\*j*-loss; and b) *\*ə*-umlaut after *\*j*. Both phenomena are found in other contexts throughout the family (Meira et al. 2010). However, these sound changes appear to have applied irregularly to this verb, and not always in the same order. For example, the Kari’ña form *opi* can only be explained if *\*j* was lost before the umlaut of *\*ə* to *\*e*, which would have been triggered by *\*j*. On the other hand, forms like Ye’kwana *ehə* must be the result of *\*ə* → *\*e* / *\*j*\_, with subsequent loss of *\*j*. The Akuriyó form *eepi* looks like a reflex thereof as well, but the length is unexpected, and is analyzed by Meira (1998) as reflecting an earlier diphthong *\*ae*.

While a root *\*japi*, the two sound changes, and the optional addition of *\*at*- do account for the majority of the forms in Table 20,<sup>15</sup> the distribution within the family is rather chaotic. In addition to the seemingly unordered distribution of *\*api* and *\*epi*, forms with and without *\*at*- can be found within the same language, usually conditioned by different prefixes. This was briefly discussed in Section 2.1 for Arara (and Proto-Pekodian) and in Section 2.3 for Tiriýó (and Proto-Taranoan). To illustrate, the Tiriýó Set I paradigm shows a reflex of *\*atepi* (< *\*ətjapi*) for first, but of *\*epi* (< *\*japi*) for the other persons (26).<sup>16</sup> It should be noted that forms with and without *\*at*- in different languages are not triggered by the same person values.

- (26) Tiriýó (Meira 1999: 294)
- |     |                |
|-----|----------------|
| 1   | <i>w-əpi</i>   |
| 2   | <i>mən-epi</i> |
| 1+2 | <i>ke-epi</i>  |
| 3   | <i>n-epi</i>   |

Our interpretation of the *\*at* part as a detransitivizer is based on its form and on the paradigmatically conditioned occurrence in some languages. Although the combination of a detransitivizer and an intransitive verb seems semantically illogical, some historical *S<sub>P</sub>* verbs are attested as adding the detransitivizer to become *S<sub>A</sub>* verbs. For example, the Proto-Cariban *S<sub>P</sub>* verb *\*winiki* ‘to sleep’ becomes Tiriýó *ənik* (Meira 1999: 252) and Kari’ña *ənik* (Courtz 2008: 429), both *S<sub>A</sub>*. Also, Waiwai ‘go to sleep’ can be *winik* (R. E. Hawkins 1998: 30) or *et-winik* (W. N. Hawkins & R. E. Hawkins 1953: 204).

<sup>15</sup> Apart from aforementioned Akuriyó *eepi*, another diachronically irregular form is Apalaí *oepe*, where one would expect *\*at-epi* to yield *os-epi* (Meira et al. 2010: 506). Similarly, while *oepe* would be a regular outcome of hypothetical *\*ə-japi*, the / \_C allomorph of the detransitivizer is *e-* in Apalaí. One possibility is that the form is due to borrowing from Tiriýó, which has lost intervocalic *\*t* to create *əpe*. Alternatively, Apalaí *oepe* could be a fossilized loan from Wayana, which has replaced its reflex of *\*ətjapi*, but where intervocalic *\*t* was also regularly lost (Tavares 2005: 63).

<sup>16</sup> While the 1+2 form is a regular outcome of *\*kit-epi*, the second person form is mysterious.

The parallels to ‘to sleep’ end here, since bare *\*jəpi* ‘to come’ apparently already was an S<sub>A</sub> verb, as evidenced by its status in Werikyana, Kari’ña, Arara, Tiriyó, and Panare (27).

- (27) Panare (T. E. Payne & D. L. Payne 2013: 65)

*ju-w-əəpi-n ka=m kano?*  
 3-S<sub>A</sub>-come-NSPEC Q=2.AUX rain  
 ‘Do you think it is gonna rain?’

Summing up, this verb is highly irregular, both from a synchronic and diachronic perspective. The scenario we suggest involves reflexes of the detransitivizer *\*at(e)-* being optionally added to an S<sub>A</sub> verb root *\*jəpi*, which further underwent umlaut and loss of *\*j*, but in no systematic manner, resulting in the chaotic picture in Table 20. As discussed in Section 2.1, innovative *\*k-* was introduced on the Ikpeng and Bakairi reflexes of *\*ətjəpi*, but not on the Arara reflex of *\*jəpi*. Reflexes of *\*ətjəpi* (Tiriyó) and of *\*ətjəpi* and/or *\*jəpi* (Akuriyó) resisted the introduction of Proto-Tiriyóan *\*t-*. Carijona *ehi* shows innovative *j-*, rather than conservative *w-* (28). It is unknown whether there is a Yukpa reflex of this verb, and it was fully replaced in Proto-Waiwaian by *\*omoki* ‘to come’ and was thus not a potential target of innovative *\*k-*.

- (28) Carijona (Guerrero Beltrán 2019: 102)

*əji-wa-e j-eh-i*  
 2-search-SUP 1-come-PFV  
 ‘I came looking for you.’

### 3.5 *\*ipitə* ‘to go down’

Reflexes of this verb were not affected by the extensions of *\*k-* in Proto-Pekodian (Section 2.1) and *k-* in Akuriyó (Section 2.4). The resistance against the former extension was subsequently overcome in Bakairi; its fate in Ikpeng is unknown. When Akuriyó extended *k-*, the verb already had an irregularly inflected first person form with *p-*, inherited from Proto-Tiriyóan. At first sight, it may seem that it also was affected by the two independent extensions of *j-* in Carijona (29a) and Yukpa (29b).

- (29) a. Carijona (David Felipe Guerrero, p.c.)

*irə waffinakano tae j-ehitə-e*  
 INAN.ANA body.of.water along.bounded 1-go.down-NPST  
 ‘...I go down through that guachinacán.’

- b. Yukpa (Meira 2003b)

*aw yéwtu*  
*aw j-ewuhtu*  
 1PRO 1-go.down  
 ‘I went down.’

However, a broader comparative perspective reveals a much more complicated story. Table 21 shows all attested cognates of *\*ipitə*, including verb class membership where applicable; parenthesized forms

indicate uncertainty about cognacy status. It turns out that while a form *\*ipitā* can be reconstructed to Proto-Cariban, different (proto-)languages do not agree about the class of this verb. Its reflexes in languages that preserve the split-S system are distributed fairly evenly between S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>P</sub>.

In one language, Wayana, the verb shows traits of both classes, leading us to consider it a “mixed” verb in our synchronic analysis of Wayana. It takes the first and second person S<sub>P</sub> markers *j-* and *əw-* (Tavares 2005: 200), but the 1+2S<sub>A</sub> marker *kut-* (Tavares 2005: 206). It also shows the S<sub>A</sub> class marker *w-* in nominalizations (30a), but behaves like an S<sub>P</sub> verb in taking a second person prefix in imperatives (30b).

(30) Wayana (Tavares 2005: 200)

- a. *iwiptëë*  
*i-w-iptā-ri*  
 1-S<sub>A</sub>-go.down-NMLZ  
 ‘my going down’
- b. *əw-iptā-k*  
 2-go.down-IMP  
 ‘Go down!’

Its causativized form is *iptā-ka* (Tavares 2005: 255); the restriction of *\*-ka* to S<sub>P</sub> verbs in Proto-Cariban (Gildea & Cáceres in preparation) points to S<sub>P</sub> membership. These patterns lead us to posit the hypothesis that the verb was a regular member of the S<sub>P</sub> class in pre-Wayana, but partially switched to the S<sub>A</sub> class, reflected only in its 1+2 prefix and the S<sub>A</sub> class marker. This in turn implies that reflexes of this verb with S<sub>A</sub> membership in other languages fully switched from S<sub>P</sub> at some point.

Wayana-external comparative evidence supports this hypothesis: The Arara causativized form is *eniptoj* (Alves 2017: 66), and Kari’ña has a cognate form *eni?to* (Courtz 2008: 263); *oni?to* ‘to go down’ in Table 21 is a detransitivized form thereof, lit. ‘to get oneself down’. Both causativized forms contain a reflex of the transitivizer *\*en-*, which was usually found with S<sub>P</sub> verbs (Gildea & Cáceres in preparation). Besides the irregular first person *p-*, Tiriyo *ih̃tā* shows other irregularities, in particular in its causativized forms that also feature a reflex of *\*en-* (Meira 1999: 263). Thus, it seems that this verb was originally S<sub>P</sub>, but then switched its class in four and a half languages of the family, for so far unknown reasons.

These circumstances make it impossible to answer the question of whether ‘to go down’ was affected by the extensions in Proto-Waiwaian, Proto-Tiriyoan, Carijona, and Yukpa. For Proto-Tiriyoan, we cannot establish a relative chronology of the verb class switch, the introduction of the idiosyncratic marker *\*p-*, and the extension of *\*t-*. For Proto-Waiwaian, we lack knowledge not only about the first person form, but even about class membership. Similarly, for Carijona and Yukpa we cannot know whether the verb potentially switched class before the breakdown of the entire split-S system. While there is no language-internal evidence, it is clear that ‘to go down’ does have an inclination to switch classes; in the case of Carijona, that could have already happened at the Proto-Taranoan stage. In all four cases, it is possible that the verb had S<sub>A</sub> status at the time of the extension, resisting it and preserving the old prefix, but it is also possible that it was not even a potential target due to its S<sub>P</sub> status at the time. On the other hand, the class switch happened before the split-up of Tiriyo and Akuriyo, and therefore this verb resisted the extension of Akuriyo *k-* as an S<sub>A</sub> verb. Likewise, it seems very likely that



Table 21: Reflexes of *\*ipitā* ‘to go down’ (Meira 2003b; Derbyshire 1979: 196; R. E. Hawkins 1998: 55; Guerrero Beltrán 2019: 118; Camargo & Tapinkili 2010: 44; Camargo 2002: 99; Courtz 2008: 263; Cáceres 2011: 450; Stegeman & Hunter 2014: 139; Álvarez 2008: 139; Abbott 1991: 34; M.-C. Mattéi-Müller 1994: 88; Méndez-Arocha 1959: 68; Bruno 1996: 58; Gildea 1994: 84; Alves 2017: 153; von den Steinen 1892: 137; Meira 1998: 116; p.c., Angela Fabíola Alves Chagas, Spike Gildea)

Language	Form	Class							
Proto-Parukotoan	<i>*iφito</i>	S <sub>P</sub>		i	φ	i	t	o	
Werikyana	<i>ihito</i>	S <sub>P</sub>		i	h	i	t	o	
Proto-Waiwaian	<i>*hto</i>	?			h		t	o	
Hixkaryána	<i>hto</i>	?			h		t	o	
Waiwai	<i>hto</i>	–			h		t	o	
Proto-Pekodian	<i>*iptā</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i	p		t	ə	
Arara	<i>iptoy</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i	p		t	o	- ŋ
Ikpeng	<i>iptoy</i>	?		i	p		t	o	- ŋ
Bakairi	<i>itagi</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i			t	ə	- g i
Proto-Taranoan	<i>*ipitā</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i	p	i	t	ə	
Proto-Tiriyóan	<i>*ihtā</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i	h		t	ə	
Tiriyó	<i>ihitā</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i	h		t	ə	
Akuriyó	<i>ihitā</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		i	h		t	ə	
Carijona	<i>ehitā</i>	–		e	h	i	t	ə	
Wayana	<i>iptā</i>	S <sub>A</sub> / S <sub>P</sub>		i	p		t	ə	
Apalaí	<i>ihito</i>	S <sub>P</sub>		i	h		t	o	
Kari’ña	<i>oni?to</i>	(S <sub>A</sub> )	o - n -	i	?		t	o	
Ye’kwana	<i>ə?tā</i>	S <sub>P</sub>		ə	?		t	ə	
Kapón	<i>(u?tā)</i>	–							
Pemón	<i>(u?tā)</i>	–							
Macushi	<i>(auti)</i>	–							
Panare	<i>əhtā</i>	S <sub>A</sub>		ə	h		t	ə	
Yawarana	<i>əhtā</i>	–		ə	h		t	ə	
Yukpa	<i>(ewuhtu)</i>	–							
Waimiri-Atroari	<i>ití</i>	–		i			t	i	

the class switch took place before the extension of Proto-Pekodian *\*k-*. Otherwise, the newly-turned-*S<sub>A</sub>* verb would have taken on archaic and lexically heavily restricted *\*w-*, either in Proto-Taranoan, Proto-Xinguan, or Arara.

### 3.6 *\*e-pi* ‘to bathe’

This verb resisted the extensions of Proto-Pekodian *\*k-* (Section 2.1) and, trivially, Akuriyó *k-* (Section 2.4). It took on new *1S<sub>A</sub>* prefixes in Proto-Tiriyoan (Tiriyo *s-epi-*, Akuriyó *fě+pi-* [Meira 1999: 292; Gildea 1994: 87]) and Proto-Waiwaian (Hixkaryána *k-ewehi-*, Waiwai *k-ejefu-* [Derbyshire 1985: 195; R. E. Hawkins 1998: 166]). The first person form of its Carijona reflex *ehi* (Koch-Grünberg 1908: 72) is unknown; we are not aware of a Yukpa cognate.

Verbs for intransitive ‘to bathe’ are usually typical *S<sub>A</sub>* verbs in Cariban languages, derived with a detransitivizer from a transitive root. These roots are reflexes of *\*pi*, or *\*kupi* in some Venezuelan languages (??). As we have shown in Section 2.1, Proto-Pekodian can be reconstructed as having the pair *\*ipi* (INTR) / *\*ip(i)* (TR). Thus, while Proto-Pekodian ‘to bathe (TR)’ has perfectly regular cognates in other languages of the family, intransitive ‘to bathe’ is divergent in this branch, changing *\*e-* to *\*i-*. This is an irregular development, since reflexes of *\*i-* are not attested as a reflex of the detransitivizer in Pekodian (Meira et al. 2010: 506); its cause is unknown. However, it should be noted that other languages also show unexpected developments in this verb, considering the apparent glide insertion in Waiwaian or the distribution of *\*pi* and *\*kupi* in Venezuelan languages.

## 4 Discussion

In Section 3, we reconstructed the verbs which were untouched by the incomplete person marker extensions discussed in Section 2. ?? gives an overview of what verbs were affected by which extensions, except for *e*-initial Akuriyó verbs unaffected by the extension of *k-*, as they are a large and predictable group. In a few cases we do not know the first person form (?), in others we have reason to believe that the verb does not occur at all or at least not inflected for first person (–), and in the case of ‘to go down’ we often do not know when the switch to *S<sub>A</sub>* happened, if at all (N/A). Every ✓ stands for a verb affected by an extension, while × represents conservatively inflected verbs. This overview makes clear just how pervasive the tendency for these verbs to resist innovative markers is, as they do so in different languages.

It is astonishing that the same 1-7 verbs retain their old first person marker in 6 distinct developments, while a plethora of regular *S<sub>(A)</sub>* verbs take on innovative markers. This suggests that there is some strong motivation for these verbs to not be affected by innovative markers. The question arises what properties unite these verbs and make them so conservative across different Cariban languages. We will discuss possible answers to this question in Section 4.1, using Bybee’s (1985) network model of morphology.

### 4.1 Reasons for conservativeness

Perhaps the most well-known contribution regarding conservativeness, innovativeness, and (ir-)regularity in the lexicon is Bybee (1985) with her network model of morphology, which seems well-suited for the data at hand. It aims “to account for cross-linguistic, diachronic and acquisition patterns in

complex morphological systems” (Bybee 1995: 428). It does so by modeling shared morphological properties such as inflectional patterns as emerging from connections of differing strength between lexemes. A classic example is a network of “strong” English verbs with *strɪŋ–strʌŋ* at the center and pairs like *rɪŋ–rʌŋ*, *spɪn–spʌn*, or *stɪk–stʌk* at its periphery. This network is attracting new verbs in certain dialects, like *snɪk–snʌk* or *brɪŋ–brʌŋ* (Bybee 1985: 129–130). These verbs are recruited based on the lexical connection they form with prototypical members of the group, and accordingly develop irregular or “strong” past tense forms.

As possible bases of these connections between lexemes, Bybee (1985: 118) suggests the criteria of semantic, phonological, and morphological similarity; the English strong verbs are an example for a phonologically motivated network. Another important factor in the model is frequency, since more frequent words have a higher lexical strength (Bybee 1985: 119). This higher lexical strength diminishes the influence from other lexemes, meaning that high-frequency items are more likely to resist innovations. For our diachronic study of Cariban inflectional patterns, the model would predict that a) semantically/phonologically/morphologically similar verbs will be affected by person marker extensions, and b) high-frequency verbs will tend to resist these extensions and thus remain conservative.

When one considers the groups of verbs with innovative first person markers (those not in ??), one can perceive multiple factors potentially serving as the thread connecting a lexical network. Perhaps the most obvious one is that they all have a reflex of the detransitivizer *\*əte/e-*, a hallmark of S<sub>A</sub> verbs (Section 1.3). This also has a phonological consequence: all affected S<sub>A</sub> verbs begin with reflexes of *\*ə* or *\*e*, meaning that networks with a phonological basis are also plausible. A more trivial connection between these other verbs is that they are all S<sub>A</sub> verbs, and thus share inflectional morphological patterns. To make this potential network factor more specific, we will restrict it to the 1S<sub>A</sub> prefix (pre-innovation). These two criteria based on inflectional morphology predict the exact same verbs except in Akuriyó, where there was already innovative 1S<sub>A</sub> morphology, with *k-* and idiosyncratic *p-* on ‘to go down’. There are no semantic patterns that would be obvious, which is not unsurprising given the lack of semantic patterns in the split-S system overall (Section 1.3). For each extension, this leaves us with three hypotheses as to what connected the members of the responsible network: a reflex of DETRZ, their stem-initial phoneme, or a specific 1S<sub>A</sub> prefix.

It is intuitively obvious that many of the conservative verbs in ?? are high-frequency verbs, which would mean high lexical strength and conservativeness according to the network model. A major obstacle to confirming this intuition is the lack of frequency counts for individual lexemes for any Cariban language. We are only aware of Courtz’s (2008: 75) claim of Kari’ña underived S<sub>A</sub> verbs being the most frequent ones: “It is difficult [...] to imagine an intransitive or transitive origin for some of the most frequent middle verbs”. This claim is supported neither by frequency counts nor accompanied by a list of verbs, although it seems likely that these underived S<sub>A</sub> verbs refer to the two roots for ‘to be’, as well as ‘to say’, ‘to go’, and ‘to come’. Given this dearth of data, we conducted a count of S<sub>A</sub> verbs in three glossed texts from E. Koehn & S. Koehn (1994), the results of which are shown in Table 22. The Apalaí data agree with our interpretation of Courtz’s (2008) claim; defining “high frequency” as having an above average count produces the exact same five verbs. While it is not at all certain that this small Apalaí sample is really representative of discourse patterns in the Cariban (proto-)languages under discussion, the absence of alternatives led us to use it as a tool for categorizing verbs as high-frequency.

Thus, in addition to the three hypotheses for possible network factors, each can be combined with

Table 22: Frequency counts of S<sub>A</sub> verbs in three Apalaí texts from E. Koehn & S. Koehn (1994) (163 S<sub>A</sub> verbs, 1070 words)

Verb	Count	% S <sub>A</sub> verb tokens
<i>a</i> 'be-1'	49	30.06%
<i>efi</i> 'be-2'	30	18.40%
<i>ka</i> 'say'	26	15.95%
<i>ito</i> 'go'	23	14.11%
<i>oepe</i> 'come'	13	7.98%
<i>e-pore?ka</i> 'arrive'	3	1.84%
<i>ot-urupo</i> 'ask'	2	1.23%
<i>ot-u?</i> 'eat'	2	1.23%
<i>os-enakũnu?</i> 'choke'	2	1.23%
<i>e-unopi</i> 'laugh'	1	0.61%
<i>at-akĩma</i> 'pack bags'	1	0.61%
<i>at-ankiema</i> 'be happy'	1	0.61%
<i>os-ereh</i> 'be amazed'	1	0.61%
<i>e-metika</i> 'lose loincloth'	1	0.61%
<i>e-tuarima</i> 'suffer'	1	0.61%
<i>e-puka</i> 'fall'	1	0.61%
<i>os-epori</i> 'meet'	1	0.61%
<i>ot-iri?ka</i> 'land'	1	0.61%
<i>ot-i?ka</i> 'finish'	1	0.61%
<i>ot-uru</i> 'talk'	1	0.61%
<i>at-apiaka</i> 'divide up'	1	0.61%
<i>e-siri?ma</i> 'move'	1	0.61%

Table 23: Predictions for Proto-Tiriyoan

	<i>*a</i>	<i>*eʔi</i>	<i>*əʔepi</i>	<i>*təmi</i>	<i>*ka</i>	<i>*epi</i>
	‘be’	‘be’	‘come’	‘go’	‘say’	‘bathe (INTR)’
DETRZ	×	×	✓	×	×	✓
DETRZ+freq	×	×	×	×	×	✓
phono ( / _ *ə, e )	×	✓	✓	×	×	✓
phono+freq	×	×	×	×	×	✓
infl (*w-)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
infl+freq	×	×	×	×	×	✓

Table 24: Evaluating predictions for Proto-Tiriyoan

	<i>*a</i>	<i>*eʔi</i>	<i>*əʔepi</i>	<i>*təmi</i>	<i>*ka</i>	<i>*epi</i>	Score
	‘be’	‘be’	‘come’	‘go’	‘say’	‘bathe (INTR)’	
DETRZ+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
phono+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
infl+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
DETRZ	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	83.3%
phono	✓	×	×	✓	✓	✓	66.7%
infl	×	×	×	×	×	✓	16.7%

frequency; high-frequency verbs are predicted to not undergo innovation, even though the factor under investigation would put them in the same lexical network as regular  $S_A$  verbs. For each extension, this leaves us with six possible explanations for which verbs are affected and which are not. First, we established for each explanation what behavior it would predict for each verb, illustrated in ?? for Proto-Tiriyoan. For example, *\*eʔi* ‘to be’ is expected to participate in innovations spreading in a phonologically defined network, being *\*e*-initial, as well as in an inflectionally defined one, since it shared *\*w-* with other  $S_A$  verbs. However, it would not have belonged to a network defined by the presence of a detransitivizer; if frequency is taken into account, it is expected to remain conservative regardless of the nature of the network. We then checked these predictions against the data in ??, to see how many potentially conservative verb each explanation predicted correctly. This gave us a score of what proportion of potentially conservative verbs had their behavior predicted accurately, illustrated for Proto-Tiriyoan in Table 24 and summed up in Table 25.

It is important to understand that the scores in Table 25 only refer to the group of seven verbs in ??, i.e. those that are attested as resisting at least one extension. For each extension, there were also many run-of-the-mill  $S_A$  verbs, all taking on the new person marker, except for the Akuriyó *e*-initial verbs.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup>While there are a few  $S_A$  verbs not transparently derived from transitive verbs (Meira 1999: 252, 2000: 222; Gildea & D. Payne 2007: 30), which are not featured in ??, these are mostly *\*ə*-initial and were likely productively derived at some point. The verbs to which this does not apply, like Tiriyo *wa* ‘to dance’ (Meira 1999: 252), are all instances of  $S_P$  verbs switching classes. Since none of them is attested as being an  $S_A$  verb at the time of a person marker extension, they are not relevant for our discussion of conservative verbs.

Table 25: Overview of prediction accuracy

	DETRZ	DETRZ+freq	phono	phono+freq	infl	infl+freq
Proto-Waiwaian <i>*k-</i>	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Proto-Pekodian <i>*k-</i>	100.0%	100.0%	71.4%	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%
Proto-Tiriyoan <i>*t-</i>	83.3%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	16.7%	100.0%
Akuriyó <i>k-</i>	83.3%	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Carijona <i>j-</i>	60.0%	60.0%	100.0%	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Yukpa <i>j-</i>	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%

To illustrate, if one adds 1'000 regular  $S_A$  verbs – a conservative estimate based on Courtz's (2008) Kari'ña dictionary – all six explanations consistently predict the behavior of 99.99+% verbs correctly. However, the available data simply does not allow such large-scale tests for Cariban languages, so we restrict our investigation to the edge cases.

The extent of the extensions in both Proto-Waiwaian and Proto-Pekodian is fully predicted by the presence or absence of a detransitivizer. In both cases, only the underived<sup>18</sup>  $S_A$  verbs were not affected, all other  $S_A$  verbs taking *\*k-*. Not shown in ?? are subsequent evolutions in the Pekodian daughter languages, which can largely be argued to also be due to the detransitivizer: First, we argued that both Ikpeng and Bakairi regularized the paradigm to use forms with detransitivizer for first person, which in both languages led to an introduction of *k-*.<sup>19</sup> Second, the subsequent introduction of *k-* to Ikpeng *aran* 'to go' (< *\*itən*) potentially suggests a reanalysis of *ar* as a detransitivizer.

Three extensions are fully predicted by phonological criteria, those in Akuriyó, Carijona, and Yukpa. We have already discussed Akuriyó *k-* (Section 2.4), which only appears on *a*-initial verbs. In Carijona, the extension of *j-* affected *e-* and *a*-initial verbs, including *eh* 'to come' or *effi* 'to be', which do not have a detransitivizing prefix. Only *ka* 'say', *təmə* 'go', and *a* 'be-1' did not take on *j-*. Similarly, the extension of Yukpa *j-* can succinctly be characterized as affecting all vowel-initial verbs; the only verb attested as unaffected is C-initial *to* 'to go'. Inflectional morphology as a network basis only played a potential role in the case of Akuriyó, but it must be noted that we treated the first person markers *t-* and *tʃ-* as distinct, which were of course phonologically conditioned.

When additionally considering putative conservatory frequency effects, prediction accuracy was improved in 8 cases, stagnated in 7 cases, and worsened in 3 cases. The three cases where our rough model of verb frequency arrives at incorrect predictions are found in Carijona and Yukpa, the only languages to feature innovative markers on the reflexes of *\*eti* 'be-2', Yukpa also on *\*a[p]* 'be-1'. Including frequency in the model led to overall improvements, resulting in a 100% prediction accuracy for all three potential factors in Proto-Tiriyoan, as well as for the inflection criterion in Proto-Waiwaian.

Overall, the patterns of most extensions are correctly predicted not by a single explanation, but usually between 3 and 4, except those in Carijona and Yukpa. Here, a lexical network with a phonological basis emerges as an unambiguous winner, while frequency-based explanations fare much worse.

<sup>18</sup>Note that for Proto-Pekodian, we assumed that the idiosyncratic evolution of *\*e-pi* 'to bathe (INTR)' to *\*ipi* made the verb morphologically opaque.

<sup>19</sup>If one instead assumes that first person *\*w-ebi-* and *\*k-ad-ebi-* already co-existed in Proto-Pekodian, the clear correlation between *\*k-* and the detransitivizer remains.

For the other extensions, the network model gives no unambiguous answer to the question of what combination of factors caused the innovative markers to spread the way they did. This in turn is due to the fact that three of the factors we used to account for morphological behavior – detransitivizer, phonology, frequency – largely converge in their predictions: The most frequent verbs are at the same time those without a detransitivizer, and therefore mostly of a different phonological shape than regular  $S_A$  verbs.

#### 4.2 Conclusion

- why are the most irregular verbs all underived  $S_A$  verbs? **something** is there
- ultimately plays into the mystery of how the hell the split-S system actually came into being
- not surprising that more frequent  $S_A$  verbs have no  $*\partial t-$ , but definitely surprising that ‘say’, ‘go’, and ‘be’ are  $S_A$  verbs in the first place!

## References

- Abbott, Miriam (1991). "Macushi". In: *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). Vol. 3. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 23–160.
- Álvarez, José (2000). "Construcciones progresivas en pemón y otras lenguas caribes". In: *Opción* 32: 96–130.
- (2008). "Cláusulas relativas, nominalización y constituyentes en pemón (Caribe)". In: *Opción* 24.57: 114–143.
- Alves, Ana Carolina Ferreira (2017). "Morfofonologia, morfossintaxe e o sistema de tempo, aspecto e modo em Arara (Karib)". Ph.D. dissertation. Universidade de São Paulo.
- Alves Chagas, Angela Fabíola (2013). "O Verbo Ikpeng: estudo morfossintático e semântico-lexical". Ph.D. dissertation. Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- Bruno, Ana Carla dos Santos (1996). *Dicionário Waimiri-Atroari-Português*. Manaus: Programa Waimirí-Atroari / Conevênio FUNAI-Eletronorte.
- Bybee, Joan (1985). *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- (1995). "Regular morphology and the lexicon". In: *Language and cognitive processes* 10.5: 425–455. DOI: 10.1080/01690969508407111.
- Cáceres, Natalia (2011). "Grammaire fonctionnelle-typologique du ye'kwana, langue caribe du Venezuela". Ph.D. dissertation. Université Lumière Lyon 2.
- Cáceres, Natalia & Spike Gildea (2018). "A first analysis of Tense-Aspect constructions in Yawarana (Cariban)". Paper presented at Amazónicas VI. Baños, Colombia.
- Caesar-Fox, Desrey Clementine (2003). "Zauro'nödok Agawayo Yau: Variants of Akawaio spoken at Waramadong". Ph.D. dissertation. Rice University.
- Camargo, Eliane (2002). *Léxico bilingüe: aparai-português / português-aparai*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Camargo, Eliane & Anaiman Tapinkili (2010). *Hakëne omijau eitop Wajana-Palasisi / Dictionnaire bilingue Wayana-Français*. Paris: CELIA/DRAC-Guyane, TEKUREMAI.
- Campetela, Cilene (1997). "Análise do sistema de marcação de caso nas orações independentes da língua Ikpeng". MA thesis. Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- Carlin, Eithne B. (2004). *A Grammar of Trio: A Cariban Language of Suriname*. Vol. 55. Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Courtz, Henk (2008). *A Carib grammar and dictionary*. Toronto: Magoria Books.
- Cruz, Maria Odileiz Sousa (2005). "Fonologia e gramática Ingarikó: Ka?pon-Brasil". Ph.D. dissertation. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Derbyshire, Desmond C. (1965). *Textos Hixkaryana*. Vol. 3. Publicações Avulsas. Belém: MPEG.
- (1979). *Hixkaryana*. Vol. 1. Lingua Descriptive Studies. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- (1985). *Hixkaryana and Linguistic Typology*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- (1999). "Carib". In: *The Amazonian Languages*. R.M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 23–64.
- de Souza, Shirley Dias Cardoso (1993). "Alguns aspectos morfológicos da língua Arara (Karib)". MA thesis. Universidade de Brasília.



- de Souza, Shirley Dias Cardoso (2010). "The morphology of nouns in the Ugoronjmo language (Arara of Pará)". MA thesis. University of North Dakota.
- Franchetto, Bruna (2002). "Kuikuro: uma língua ergativa no ramo meridional da família Karib (Alto Xingu)". In: *Ergatividade na Amazônia*. Vol. 1. Francesc Queixalós (ed.). Brasília, Paris: Laboratório de Línguas Indígenas, Centre d'études des langues indigènes d'Amérique.
- (2008). "Absolutivo e ergativo pensados a partir do Kuikuro". In: *Amerindia* 32: 37–56.
- Franchetto, Bruna & Sérgio Meira (2016). "A phonological hypothesis on the historical origin of Kuikuro and Bakairi verb classes". Talk held at Amazónicas VI. Universidad Nacional de Colombia en Amazonia, Leticia.
- García Ferrer, Donaldo José (2006). "Diccionario piloto pemón-español". BA thesis. Universidad del Zulia.
- Gildea, Spike (1994). "Akuriyó field notes".
- (1998). *On reconstructing grammar: Comparative Cariban morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2012). "Linguistic studies in the Cariban family". In: *The Indigenous Languages of South America: A Comprehensive Guide*. Lyle Campbell & Verónica Grondona (eds.). Vol. 2. The World of Linguistics. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 441–494.
- (2015). "The evolution of valence categories in the Cariban family". Paper presented at the Venezuelan Cariban Conference. Lyon. URL: [https://www.academia.edu/30561539/The\\_evolution\\_of\\_valence\\_categories\\_in\\_the\\_Cariban\\_family](https://www.academia.edu/30561539/The_evolution_of_valence_categories_in_the_Cariban_family) (visited on 10/02/2020).
- (2018). "Reconstructing the copula and nonverbal predicate constructions in Cariban". In: *Non-verbal predication in Amazonian languages*. Simon E. Overall, Rosa Vallejos & Spike Gildea (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 365–402.
- Gildea, Spike & Natalia Cáceres (in preparation). "The Cariban Language Family". In: *Amazonian Languages: An International Handbook*. Patience Epps & Lev Michael (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gildea, Spike, Berend J. Hoff & Sérgio Meira (2010). "The story of \*ô in the Cariban Family". In: *Fieldwork and linguistic analysis in Indigenous languages of the Americas*. Andrea L. Berez, Jean Mulder & Daisy Rosenblum (eds.). University of Hawai'i Press: 91–123.
- Gildea, Spike & Doris Payne (2007). "Is Greenberg's "Macro-Carib" viable?" In: *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Ciências Humanas* 2.2: 19–72.
- Gildea, Spike & Fernando Zúñiga (2016). "Referential hierarchies: A new look at some historical and typological patterns". In: *Linguistics* 54.3: 483–529.
- Girard, Victor James (1971). "Proto-Carib phonology". Ph.D. dissertation. University of California.
- Guerrero Beltrán, David Felipe (2019). "The Grammar of Space in Karijona, a Cariban language from Northwest Amazonia". MA thesis. Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Guerrero-Beltrán, David Felipe (2016). "The alignment and person-marking system in Karijona (Cariban, Northwest Amazonia)". Paper presented at the Language and Culture Research Centre, James Cook University.
- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell (1995). *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Andrea Sims (2010). *Understanding morphology*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder Education.

- Hawkins, Robert E. (1998). “Wai Wai”. In: *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). Vol. 4. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 25–224.
- Hawkins, W. Neill & Robert E. Hawkins (1953). “Verb inflection in Waiwai (Carib)”. In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 19.3: 201–211.
- Hoff, Berend J. (1968). *The Carib Language: Phonology, Morphophonology, Morphology, Texts and Word Index*. Vol. 55. Verhandeligen van het Koninklijk instituut voor taal-, land- en volkenkunde. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Howard, Catherine V. (2001). “Wrought Identities: The Waiwai expeditions in search of the “unseen tribes” of Northern Amazonia”. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor (1908). “Die Hianákoto-Umáua”. In: *Anthropos* 3: 83–124, 297–335, 952–982.
- Koehn, Edward & Sally Koehn (1986). “Apalai”. In: *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*. Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). Vol. 1. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 33–127.
- (1994). *14 textos Apalai*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Largo, Wilson S. (2011). “Una gramática Yukpa”. ms. Bogotá: Fundación para el Desarrollo de Pueblos Marginados.
- List, Johann-Mattis et al. (2021). *LingPy: A Python library for quantitative tasks in historical linguistics*. Version v2.6.8. Leipzig. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5144474. URL: <https://lingpy.org>.
- Mattéi-Müller, Marie Claude (1975). “Vocabulario básico de la lengua mapoya”. In: *Antropológica* 42: 57–78.
- Mattéi-Müller, Marie-Claude (1994). *Diccionario ilustrado Panare-Español, Índice Español-Panare: Un aporte al estudio de los Panares-Eñepa*. Caracas: Graficas Armitano.
- Matter, Florian (2021). “Diachronic and typological aspects of Cariban verbal argument marking”. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Bern.
- Meira, Sérgio (1998). “A reconstruction of Proto-Taranoan: Phonology and Inflectional Morphology”. MA thesis. Rice University.
- (1999). “A Grammar of Tiriyo”. Ph.D. dissertation. Rice University.
- (2000). “The accidental intransitive split in the Cariban family”. In: *Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization*. Spike Gildea (ed.). Vol. 43. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 201–230.
- (2002). “A first comparison of pronominal and demonstrative systems in the Cariban language family”. In: *Current Studies on South American Languages: Selected papers from the 50th International Congress of Americanists in Warsaw and the Spinoza Workshop on Amerindian Languages in Leiden*. Mily Crevels et al. (eds.). Leiden: Research institution of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies (CNWS): 255–275.
- (2003a). “A marcação de pessoa nos verbos em Bakairi (Karib)”. In: *Ergatividade na Amazônia*. Vol. 2. Francesc Queixalós (ed.). Brasília, Paris: Laboratório de Línguas Indígenas, Centre d’études des langues indigènes d’Amérique: 155–163.
- (2003b). “Primeras observaciones sobre la lengua yukpa”. In: *Lingua Americana* 7.12.
- (2005). “Reconstructing Pre-Bakairi Segmental Phonology”. In: *Anthropological Linguistics* 47.3: 261–291.
- (2006a). “Cariban Languages”. In: *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Keith Brown (ed.). Oxford: Elsevier: 199–203.

- Meira, Sérgio (2006b). "Syntactic reanalysis in Yukpa (Cariban)". In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 72.1: 135–150.
- Meira, Sérgio & Bruna Franchetto (2005). "The Southern Cariban languages and the Cariban family". In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 71.2: 127–192.
- Meira, Sérgio & Spike Gildea (2009). "Property concepts in the Cariban family: adjectives, adverbs, and/or nouns". In: *The linguistics of endangered languages: Contributions to morphology and morphosyntax*. W. Leo Wetzels (ed.). Utrecht: LOT: 95–133.
- Meira, Sérgio, Spike Gildea & Berend J. Hoff (2010). "On the Origin of Ablaut in the Cariban Family". In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 76.4: 477–515.
- Méndez-Arocha, Alberto (1959). "Un vocabulario Yabarana con Apuntes Fonéticos". In: *Antropológica* 7: 65–84.
- Pachêco, Frantomé B. (1997). "Aspectos da gramática Ikpeng (Karíb)". MA thesis. Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- (2001). "Morfossintaxe do verbo Ikpeng (Karíb)". Ph.D. dissertation. Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- Payne, Thomas E. & Doris L. Payne (2013). *A Typological Grammar of Panare: A Cariban Language of Venezuela*. Brill's Studies in the Indigenous Languages of the Americas. Leiden: Brill.
- Robayo Moreno, Camilo Alberto (1989). "'En faisant une rame": texte carijona". In: *Amerindia* 14: 189–199.
- (2000). "Avance sobre morfología carijona". In: *Lenguas indígenas de Colombia: una visión descriptiva*. María Stella González de Pérez & María Luisa Rodríguez de Montes (eds.). Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo: 171–180.
- Schuring, Phillip Arthur (n.d.). "Uma gramática morfossintática básica da língua Katxuyana". MS.
- Stegeman, Ray & Rita Hunter (2014). *Akawaio-English Dictionary*. SIL International. URL: <https://akawaio.webonary.org/>.
- Stolz, Thomas, Aina Urdze & Johan van der Auwera (2012). "Introduction: Irregularity – glimpses of a ubiquitous phenomenon". In: *Irregularity in Morphology (and beyond)*. Thomas Stolz et al. (eds.). Berlin: Akademie Verlag: 7–38. DOI: 10.1524/9783050059587.
- Swiggers, Gisela (2010). "Gramática de Referencia del Pemón". Ph.D. dissertation. Universidad del Zulia.
- Tavares, Petronila da Silva (2005). "A grammar of Wayana". Ph.D. dissertation. University of Houston.
- von den Steinen, Karl (1892). *Die Bakairi-Sprache: Wörterverzeichnis, Sätze, Sagen, Grammatik; mit Beiträgen zu einer Lautlehre der karaibischen Grundsprache*. Leipzig: Koehler.
- Wheatley, James (1969). "Bakairi verb structure". In: *Linguistics* 47.47: 80–100.
- Yamada, Racquel-María (2011). "A New Approach to *ky-* and *-ng* in Kari'nja: Evidentiality or Something Else?" In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77.1: 59–89.

## A Predictions for the behavior of individual verbs

Table 26: Predictions for Proto-Waiwaian

	<i>*ka[s]</i> 'say'	<i>*eʃi</i> 'be'	<i>*ah</i> 'be'	<i>*[t]to[m]</i> 'go'	<i>*eeʃi</i> 'bathe (INTR)'
DETRZ	×	×	×	×	✓
DETRZ+freq	×	×	×	×	✓
phono ( / _ *o, e, a )	×	✓	✓	×	✓
phono+freq	×	×	×	×	✓
infl (*w-)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
infl+freq	×	×	×	×	✓

Table 27: Evaluating predictions for Proto-Waiwaian

	<i>*ka[s]</i> 'say'	<i>*eʃi</i> 'be'	<i>*ah</i> 'be'	<i>*[i]to[m]</i> 'go'	<i>*eeʃi</i> 'bathe (INTR)'	Score
DETRZ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
DETRZ+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
phono+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
infl+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
phono	✓	×	×	✓	✓	60.0%
infl	×	×	×	×	✓	20.0%

Table 28: Predictions for Proto-Pekodian

	<i>*ap</i> 'be'	<i>*eʃi</i> 'be'	<i>*epi</i> 'come'	<i>*itan</i> 'go'	<i>*ipta</i> 'go down'	<i>*ke</i> 'say'	<i>*ipi</i> 'bathe (INTR)'
DETRZ	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
DETRZ+freq	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
phono ( / _ *ə, e )	×	✓	✓	×	×	×	×
phono+freq	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
infl (*w-)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
infl+freq	×	×	×	×	✓	×	✓

Table 29: Evaluating predictions for Proto-Pekodian

	<i>*ap</i> 'be'	<i>*eʃi</i> 'be'	<i>*epi</i> 'come'	<i>*itan</i> 'go'	<i>*ipta</i> 'go down'	<i>*ke</i> 'say'	<i>*ipi</i> 'bathe (INTR)'	Score
DETRZ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
DETRZ+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
phono+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
phono	✓	×	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	71.4%
infl+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	×	71.4%
infl	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	0.0%

Table 30: Predictions for Akuriyó

	<i>ih̥tə</i> 'go down'	<i>epi</i> 'bathe (INTR)'	[ə]tə[mi] 'go'	<i>ka</i> 'say'	<i>ee̯pi</i> 'come'	<i>a</i> 'be'
DETRZ	×	✓	×	×	×	×
DETRZ+freq	×	✓	×	×	×	×
phono ( / _ə )	×	×	×	×	×	×
phono+freq	×	×	×	×	×	×
infl ( <i>k</i> -)	×	×	×	×	×	×
infl+freq	×	×	×	×	×	×

Table 31: Evaluating predictions for Akuriyó

	<i>ih̥tə</i> 'go down'	<i>epi</i> 'bathe (INTR)'	[ə]tə[mi] 'go'	<i>ka</i> 'say'	<i>ee̯pi</i> 'come'	<i>a</i> 'be'	Score
phono	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
phono+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
infl	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
infl+freq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
DETRZ	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	83.3%
DETRZ+freq	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	83.3%

Table 32: Predictions for Carijona

	<i>ehi</i> 'come'	<i>ka</i> 'say'	<i>ef̥i</i> 'be'	<i>təmə</i> 'go'	<i>a</i> 'be'
DETRZ	×	×	×	×	×
DETRZ+freq	×	×	×	×	×
phono ( / _ə, e )	✓	×	✓	×	×
phono+freq	×	×	×	×	×
infl ( <i>*w</i> -)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
infl+freq	×	×	×	×	×

Table 33: Evaluating predictions for Carijona

	<i>ehi</i> 'come'	<i>ka</i> 'say'	<i>effi</i> 'be'	<i>təmə</i> 'go'	<i>a</i> 'be'	Score
phono	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
DETRZ	×	✓	×	✓	✓	60.0%
DETRZ+freq	×	✓	×	✓	✓	60.0%
phono+freq	×	✓	×	✓	✓	60.0%
infl+freq	×	✓	×	✓	✓	60.0%
infl	✓	×	✓	×	×	40.0%

Table 34: Predictions for Yukpa

	<i>to</i> 'go'	<i>a</i> 'be'	<i>e</i> 'be'
DETRZ	×	×	×
DETRZ+freq	×	×	×
phono (/ _V)	×	✓	✓
phono+freq	×	×	×
infl (*w-)	✓	✓	✓
infl+freq	×	×	×

Table 35: Evaluating predictions for Yukpa

	<i>to</i> 'go'	<i>a</i> 'be'	<i>e</i> 'be'	Score
phono	✓	✓	✓	100.0%
infl	×	✓	✓	66.7%
DETRZ	✓	×	×	33.3%
DETRZ+freq	✓	×	×	33.3%
phono+freq	✓	×	×	33.3%
infl+freq	✓	×	×	33.3%