72; Pachêco 2001:

Payne &

D. L. Payne 2013:

89; Cáceres 2011:

122).

There are also potential contact effects:

the southern Pekodian languages Bakairi and Ikpeng (but

not more Northern Arara) share with Upper Xingu Carib the loss of initial \**m* in the same pronoun:

Arara and Ikpeng *mogɨn* and *ugun* ‘dist.anim’ (Alves 2017:

E.

119), Bakairi and Upper

Xingu Carib *akaemo* and *akaɣo* ‘dist.anim.pl’ (Meira 2022;

dos Santos 2007:

55).

Finally,

Arara and

Ikpeng *ug(o)+ro+ŋmo* ‘1+2pl’ (de Souza 1993; Pachêco 2001:

Gildea 2015) is the loss of the initial

some preliminary patterns (Table 3):

second person pronouns are a frequent target, along with medial

animate demonstratives.

A clear shared innovation in the pronominal system is the development of first person \**əwɨ* to \**ju* in

Proto-Panare-Pemongan.

A potential additional criterion for the suggested Venezuelan branch (Gildea

2003;

Mattéi-Müller 2002;

119) etymologically correspond to Upper

syllable of \**məkɨ-rə* ‘med.anim’,

see

Akawaio *kɨrə*,

Panare *kən*,

or the Ye’kwana plural *kanno* (Stegeman & Hunter 2014:

85;

T.

1+2 first and second person,

E.

Payne & D.

L.

Payne (2013),

Stegeman &

Hunter (2014), Alves (2017), Guerrero Beltrán (2019), and Mattéi-Müller & Cáceres Arandia (2019).

2

1 first person,

T.

1+3 first and third person,

2 second person,

3 third person,

anim animate,

dist

distal, emp emphatic, inan inanimate, med medial, pl plural, pRox proximal, sg singular.

1

García Ferrer (2006),

Xingu Carib *kuku+ɣe+ko* (dos Santos 2007:

55), though this may be a coincidence.

1

Pachêco (2001),

Caesar-Fox (2003),

Mattéi-Müller (2003),

Cruz (2005),

While related languages can diverge with respect to the presence (and position) of \**rə*, there are

dos Santos (2007),

Camargo &

Tapinkili (2010),

de Souza (2010),

Swiggers (2010),

Largo (2011),

Cáceres (2011),

The main improve-

Meira (2002) provides a careful comparison of pronominal and deictic forms, and tentatively recon-

structs Proto-Cariban forms.

The cognate sets he identified are used here,

as well as the established

classification of third person forms (Meira 2002:

265–266;

Derbyshire 1999:

54).

will be presented.

2

ment in the present study is careful etymological annotation:

forms like Wayana *əməramkom(o)* ‘2pl’

(Tavares 2005:

180) are segmented into partial cognates (*əmə+r+am+komo*).

Examples for newly iden-

tified cognates are Ikpeng *oren* ‘pRox.anim’ and *wam* ‘pRox.anim.pl’ (Pachêco 2001:

2017) lexical database, to be processed with e.g. lingpy (List et al. 2021).

Since Meira’s (2002) seminal contribution on pronominal and demonstrative forms in Cariban lan-

1

guages, not much comparative work has been done.

New data

and comparative work (Meira & Franchetto

2005; Meira et al. 2010) make another investigation worthwile.

For this study, every pronominal or deic-

tic form in Cariban is being annotated for form, meaning, and (partial) cognacy in a CLDF (Forkel et al.

120) as reflexes of

The goals are to 1) reconstruct

the Proto-Cariban system bottom-up using methods from digital historical linguistics,

2) identify new

genealogical subgroupings or strengthen suggested ones,

3) investigate parallel developments in the

pronominal systems, 4) make the dataset available for further research.

Here, some preliminary results

Interestingly, these two formatives

261),

a formative.

One of these two variants

was likely found in Proto-Cariban,

but their distribution in the family (Fig. 1) makes a reconstruction

impossible.

Closely related languages do not necessarily agree about the etymology of the 1+2 pronoun,

and even dialects (Kari’ña) or sg/pl forms (Ye’kwana) may disagree.

part is a synchronically meaningless base (Meira 2002:

correspond to the second syllables of the first and second pronouns (\**əwɨ* and \**əmə*), respectively.

Another obstacle for reconstruction are widespread reflexes of the emphatic marker \**rə* (Meira 2002:

258).

It has been grammaticalized several times,

in different pronouns,

in almost all branches of the

family.

– are exemplified in Tables 1 and 2.

*mətjə*

*mətjamo*

Proto-Cariban \*

and \*

.

Due to the bottom-up approach, pronominal systems of interme-

diate proto-languages are reconstructed.

Such reconstructions – representing typical Cariban systems

**A second comparison of Cariban pronouns and deictics**

Many of the comparative issues encountered throughout the family

also appear in these tables.

The non-reconstructiblity of Proto-Parukotoan 1+2 forms is due to Proto-Waiwaian having a reflex

of \**kɨ-wɨ*,

but its sister Werikyana a reflex of \**kɨ-mə*.

The first part is a 1+2 prefix,

while the second

Peru





















Bolivia

Brazil

2

Geographical and genealogical distribution of 1+2 cognates

Figure 1:











Colombia



2

\**mokɨ*

dist

\**kɨ+*?*+jamo(+ro)*

\**kɨ+*?*(+ro)*

1+2

\**moro*

\**mok+jamo(+ro)*

\**moko+ro*

med

\**om+jamo(+ro)*

\**omo+ro*

\**mok+jamo*

\**soro/onɨ*

*ʃamo(+ro)*

\**moʔ+t͡*

\**moso(+ro)*

pRox

\**owɨ(+ro)*

1

inan.sg

\*uku

\*kɨ-mə



anim.pl

\**iro*

3inan

\**in+amo+ro*

\**noro*

3anim

\**amna*

1+3

\**monɨ*

med

\**əmə+rə+jamo*

\**əmə+rə*

2

\**(t͡ʃ)erə/(t͡ʃ)en*

\**mət+jamo*

\**məte(+rə)*

pRox

\**u+rə*

1

\**mərə*

inan.sg

anim.pl

anim.sg

pl

sg

(b) Deictics

(a) Pronouns

Proto-Pekodian

anim.sg

pl

sg

(b) Deictics

(a) Pronouns

Proto-Parukotoan

Table 2:



*ʃi+mna*

\**t͡*

1+3

\**mən*

\**mək+jamo*

\**məkɨ*

dist

\**uku+rə*

1+2







Suriname

Guiana

French



Guyana

\*epɨnə



\*kɨ, \*kɨ-mə

\*ju-PL

Venezuela



\*kɨ-wɨ

Table 1:



dis-

“Alguns aspectos morfológicos da língua Arara (Karib)”.

MA

thesis. Universidade de Brasília.

— (2010). “The morphology of nouns in the Ugoroŋmo language (Arara of Pará)”. MA thesis. University

of North Dakota.

dos Santos,

Gélsama Mara Ferreira (2007).

“Morfologia Kuikuro: Gerando nomes e verbos”.

Ph.D.

Shirley Dias Cardoso (1993).

sertation. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

*CLDF 1.0*

Forkel, Robert et al. (2017).

. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1117644. uRl: https://doi.org/10.

5281/zenodo.1117644.

García Ferrer, Donaldo José (2006). “Diccionario piloto pemón-español”. BA thesis. Universidad del Zulia.

Gildea, Spike (2003). “Proposing a new branch for the Cariban language family”. In: *Amerindia* 28: 7–32.

— (2015). “15 years later: Current Perspectives on the Venezuelan Branch Hypothesis”. Paper presented

Derbyshire,

Camargo, Eliane & Anaiman Tapinkili (2010). *Hakëne omijau eitop Wajana-Palasisi / Dictionnaire bilingue*

*Wayana-Français*. Paris: CELIA/DRAC-Guyane, TEKUREMAI.

Cruz,

Maria Odileiz Sousa (2005).

“Fonologia e gramática Ingarikó: Kaʔpon-Brasil”.

Ph.D.

dissertation.

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

at the Working Conference on Venezuelan Cariban Languages.

Desmond C.

(1999).

“Carib”.

In: *The Amazonian Languages*.

R.M.W.

Dixon & Alexandra Y.

Aikhenvald (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 23–64.

de Souza,

*gramática e história*.

(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 (2002).

“En busca de criterios clasificatorios para la Familia Caribe”.

In:

*Línguas indígenas Brasileiras:*

*fonologia,*

Johann-Mattis et al.

Ana Suelly Arruda Câmara Cabral &

Aryon D.

Rodrigues (eds.).

2 vols.

Atas do I Encontro Internacional

do Grupo de Trabalho sobre

Línguas Indígenas da ANPOLL. Belém: EDUFPA: 37–53.

3

Northwest Amazonia”. MA thesis. Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

uRl:

https : / / www. academia .

edu/30561529/15\_years\_later\_Current\_Perspectives\_on\_the\_Venezuelan\_Branch\_

Hypothesis (visited on 10/15/2018).

Guerrero Beltrán,

David Felipe (2019).

“The Grammar of Space in Karijona,

a Cariban language from

Waramadong”. Ph.D. dissertation. Rice University.

Largo,

Wilson S.

(2011).

“Una gramática Yukpa”.

ms.

Bogotá: Fundación para el Desarrollo de Pueblos

Marginados.

List,

med.anim.pl

79.17%

1+2pl

11

16

68.75%

3.anim.pl

8

12

66.67%

24

8

14

57.14%

1+2

9

20

45.00%

1

20

Distribution of grammaticalized emphatic markers

Pronoun

With emp

Total

Ratio

2

11

24

83.33%

med.anim

14

17

82.35%

2pl

19

morfossintaxe e o sistema de tempo,

med.inan

1

22

4.55%
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