Case Marking in Waimiri Atroari: Typical Nominative/Accusative or Nominative with some Inverse/Split -S Features.
(Cariban Language)

Ana Carla Bruno

ABSTRACT

This paper describes and analyzes case marking in Waimiri Atroari. This analysis explores the possibility of whether Waimiri Atroari has the typical inverse split-S system demonstrated by Gildea (1998, 2007) for 19 languages in this linguistic family, or whether Waimiri Atroari presents a typical nominative/accusative system. In addition, it discusses whether in this language the feature of ergativity occurs and, it explores the question whether the valuative and devaluative morphemes are a different kind of case marking.
KEY-WORDS: Waimiri Atroari Language, Case Marking

RESUMO

Este artigo descreve e analisa a marcação de caso em Waimiri Atroari. Esta análise explora a possibilidade desta língua ter o típico sistema inverso cindido demonstratado por Gildea (1998, 2007) para as 19 línguas desta família, ou se apresenta o típico sistema nominativo/acusativo. O artigo também discute se nesta língua o traço de ergatividade ocorre, e verifica também se os morfemas valuativos e devaluativos são um diferente tipo de marcação de caso.
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Língua Waimiri Atroari, Marcação de Caso

1. Introduction

Waimiri Atroari is a language spoken by 1.113 speakers (Waimiri Atroari Program, November, 2005) in seventeen (17) villages in an area in the north of the state of Amazonas and in south of the state of Roraima, Brazil. They are distributed along the Camanaú/Curiaú, Alalaú, Jauperi, and Rio Branquinho Rivers. Waimiri Atroari has a basic AOV word order (Bruno, 2003), but it can have also OAV, SV, and OVA orders as already attested in Hixkaryana, another Cariban language (Derbyshire, 1985). This paper describes and analyzes the case marking system in this language.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 01 gives background on the Waimiri Atroari Language. Section 02 provides a description of the data and a discussion of Gildea's classification (1998) of morphosyntactic properties of the verbal system of a group of languages

in the Cariban family. In section 03, I provide some examples of the ditransitive construction. In section 04, I provide a discussion about the agentivity particle *ia* in order to verify if it can be utilized as an ergative feature. In section 05, I discuss the function of the valuative and devaluative morphemes. Finally, conclusions are developed in section 06.

2. Data Description

Before describing the data, I should clarify that I am using Blake's definition of case (2000:12) in which case in its most central manifestation is a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship that they bear to their head. However, case marking is not the only grammatical mechanism for marking head-modifier relations, since one important type of alternative is the principle of marking the head rather than any dependent. In the present analysis, this is the case of Waimiri Atroari. By this I mean that in this language the nouns do not take any affixes that can be identified as case marking (nominative/accusative or ergative/absolutive).

The structure of the verb in Waimiri Atroari is basically prefix-stem-suffix. It can take a large set of different grammatical markers indicating person, tense aspect-mood, negation, and causativization, as well as a specific derivational suffix used to form nouns -*tipɨ*.

Table 1 - Structure of Waimiri Atroari Verbs

| Case marking | | ROOT | Verbalizer Nominalizer | Causative Negation Imperative Desiderative | TAM | |
Clitic	Prefix				tense aspect-mood suffixes	Interrogative clitic
see	**aa=** 1O	-ini- see		-pɨ -CAU	-pia IMD.PAST	
	h- 1A	-ini- see		-pɨ -CAUS	-pia IMD.PAST	
	m- 2A	-ini- see			-pi IMD.PAST	=e' INT

vomit	**aa=** **1O**		-wen- vomit	-ta VERBL	-pɨ CAUS	-pia IMD.PAST	
	hu- **1A**		-wen- vomit	-ta VERBL	-pɨ CAUS	-pia IMD.PAST	

I also provide both a table with the affixes (personal clitics and prefixes) that mark person in Waimiri Atroari (table 02) and the free pronouns (table 03), as well as further show them in context.

Table 02: Verbal Prefixes (Person Marking)

Intransitive Subjects	**Transitive Subjects**	**Objects**	**Possessive**
1st sing w-/wɨ-/wu-	w-/wɨ-/wu-, h-/hɨ-/hu-	aa=	aa=
2nd sing/pl m-/mɨ-mu-	m-/mɨ-/mu-	a=, k-, kɨ-, ku-	a=
3rd sing/pl n-/nɨ-/nu-	n-/nɨ-/nu-, Ø	Ø	Kɨɨ= / tɨ= (reflexive)
1+2(incl) h-/hɨ-/hu-	h-/hɨ-/hu-	k-/kɨ-	k-/kɨ-
1+3(excl) n-/nɨ-/nu-	n-/nɨ-/nu-, Ø	a'=	a'=

In the table 02 above, I make the distinction between clitics and affixes because the clitics seem to function as arguments while the prefixes do not (See verbal paradigms below). In addition, as we can see in the table 02, the prefixes that mark subjects are very similar to each other, only the set of the first person singular transitive has some prefixes that the first intransitive does not have. In this sense, it is possible to claim that in relation with the prefixes there is not that we can identify as ergativity mark. The prefixes that mark objects are different from the set for intransitive subjects, but very similar to the possessive prefixes. Moreover, according to Gildea (1998), the prefix n- is only found on the Set I (nominative) system.

In relation to the free pronouns (see table 03 below), observe that the free independent pronouns *aa* '1 pro' and *a'a* '1+3 pro' are identical to the person prefixes for possessed nominals. The 1+3 possessive mark loses the vowel after the glottal.

Table 03: Free Pronouns in Waimiri Atroari (Bruno, 2003)

1st singular	awɨ, kara~kra, aa
2nd singular/plural	amɨrɨ, amɨ
3rd singular/plural	ka, irɨ, mɨkɨkɨ, mɨkɨka'a, bɨbɨ
1+2 plural inclusive	kɨkɨ
1+3 plural exclusive	a'a

Both A and O marking prefixes occur on Waimiri Atroari transitive verbs, (see table 2, above). Their distribution is conditioned by a person hierarchy that ranks non-third persons (first person '1', second person '2', and first person dual' 1+2') as higher than third persons (speaker/hearer>non-speaker/hearer). Basically, whenever a participant (either A or O) is non-third person, it is marked on the verb with the corresponding A or O prefix. If both participants are third persons, it is possible to get an n- prefix or a zero marker (see discussion below). The higher person in the hierarchy will be marked overtly in the verb (1, 2, 1+2, 1+3>3).

- When first person, second person, and first person plural inclusive act on the third person, the subject prefixes will be chosen, agreeing with the first or second person.

1A3O Aa   ram   ka   **h**-ini-pia.
      1PRO   2PART 3PRO   **1A**-see-IMD.PAST
      'I saw him.'

2A3O Amɨra ram   ka   **m**-ini-pia.
      2PRO   2PART 3PRO   **2A**-see-IMD.PAST

'You saw him'

2A3O Amɨra ram   aa-papa   ia   tɨmere wo **m**-ini-pa.
      2PRO   2PART 1POS-father AGT.PART jaguar kill **2A**-see-REM.PAST
      "You saw my father kill the jaguar.'

- However, when third person acts on first and second person, the object prefixes will still agree with the first and second person.

3A1O Ka   ram   **aa**-ini-pia.
      3PRO   2PART **1O**-see-IMD.PAST
      'He saw me'

3A2O Ka   ram   **a**-ini-pia.
      3PRO   2PART **2O**-see-IMD.PAST
      'He saw you.'

According to Gildea (1998), the Cariban family presents seven different independent clause verbal systems, including Set I (inverse/split –S), Full Set II (ergative), Partial Set II (ergative), Progressive (nominative), De-ergative (nominative), t-V-ce (ergative), and t-V-ce-mi (nominative). He states that "the seven systems are identified by means of six distinct, but interrelated, morphosyntactic properties: forms and patterns of verbal personal prefixes and suffixes, verbal tense-aspect-modality (TAM) suffixes, nominal case-marking patterns, word order restrictions, existence and agreement patterns of auxiliaries, and forms and morphological placement of the collective number markers" (1998:15). Gildea claims that the nominative languages have retained the original system and that ergativity is an innovation, resulting from the reanalysis of old nominalizations as main verbs.

Using Gildea's classification, Waimiri Atroari is classified in the 'Set I System (inverse/split-s)'. According to him this set shares some characteristics, such as personal prefix set and the collective number suffixes; word order is generally nominative, in that the OV unit is clear; there are no auxiliaries and A and O nominals are not case-marked. Gildea (1998:59) states

that in all Set I systems for which we have evidence, the A may occur either preceding or following the OV unit. As with Carib of Surinam (Hoff 1978), in Waimiri Atroari (Bruno 2001, 2003) that more neutral order (in terms of both frequency and markedness) is preverbal: AOV. In this language, a VP can be constituted of a verb alone (1) or a verb preceded by a NP (2). The VP can move to before the subject NP through topicalization and cannot have its components separated, except in the OSV context when the object moves alone to a topic position (4). In Waimiri Atroari there is a second position particle,[1] *ram*, which can be used as a criterion to test the constituency of a given phrase. The particle *ram* can never intervene between two elements of the same phrase (2b). Furthermore, since *ram* is a second position particle, it can be useful in determining which elements in a given sentence were moved, such as in example (2a) below.

(1)   ka-ky!

---

[1] According to the syntactic framework I am adopting here, based on Halpern & Zwicky (1996), the first element is the first immediate constituent of the clause, such as a complement or argument of the verb, an adverbial modifier, or other clausal constituent.

speak-IMPER
'Speak!'

(2)   a. *tahkome*   *i-inɨ-pia*   *ram*   *Irikwa*
        elders   REL-eat-IMD.PAST   2PART Irikwa
    'Irikwa (a mythological entity) ate the elders.'

        b.*[*tahkome*   *ram*   *i-inɨ-pia]*   *Irikwa.*
           elders   2PART REL-eat-IMD.PAST   Irikwa
          "Irikwa (a mythological entity) ate the elders."

    * In Waimiri this sentence is not possible

(3)   *bahinja*   *maia* **kɨnk-E**
        children   knife break-T/ASP
        'The children break the knife.'

(4)   *woky*   *i-ekɨ*   *kra*   **h-ee-ia**
        banana   REL-juice   1PRO   1A-drink-T/ASP
        'I drink the banana juice.'

Gildea (1998:59) explains that personal prefixes in the Set I system identify the subject of an intransitive verb (S) and both the subject (A) and object (O) of a transitive verb. In addition, this set has the inverse prefixes (all those in which 3A acts on SAP-Speech act participants '1', '2', and '1+2' O) that are identical to the subset of the intransitive subject prefixes that he calls So; the direct prefixes (those in which SAP acts on 3O) are most similar to the Sa subset of the intransitive prefixes. In the typology of inverse (Klaiman, 1992), there are four different types of agent-patient (person) pairings observed in transitive clauses: (a) <u>Direct</u> – It describes the situation in which an Speech Act Participant (SAP) acts on third person objects (3O); (b) Inverse – It describes a third person agent (3A) acting on SAP O; (c) Local – When it describes SAP A acting on another SAP O; and finally (d) non local – When 3A acting on 3). According to Gildea (1998:58), in the Cariban languages, direct and local paring share two important proprieties: (1) lack of clear configurational word order and obligatory person-marking prefix. Inverse pairing in

most modern languages pattern with the direct and local, although in some languages some of the inverse prefixes are actually pronominal clitics like the 3A3O.

(5) Waimiri Atroari direct prefixes

    A   O   V

a. Aa   ram   woki   hi-pi-pia   kanuwa   ta

  1PRO   2PART banana   1A-find-imd.past   canoe   LOC

     "I found banana in the canoe"

    A   O   V

 b. Aa   ram   ka   hu-mi-tah-pi-pia

  1PRO   2PART 3PRO   1A-bleed-VERBL-CAUS-IMD.PAST

    "I made him to bleed"

    A   V   O

c. Awi   hi-kink-E   tiruwa araki

  1PRO   1A-break-T/ASP   pottery now

   "I break the pottery now."

(6) Waimiri Atroari local prefixes

    A   O   V

a. Amira   kara   ki-kitah-pi-pia

    2PRO   1PRO   1A-shout-CAUS-IMD.PAST

    "You made me shout."

    A   V   O

b. Awi   hi-kirki-piani   amiri

  1PRO   1A-burn-REC.PAST   2PRO

   "I burned you."

    A   V   A   o-V

c. Aa   ram   ki-potx-ia   d. amira   aa-kikaka-ki

  1PRO   2PRO   1/2-beat-T/ASP   2PRO   1O-scratch-T/ASP

  "I beat you."   "You scratched me."

    A   O   V

e. amira   kra   ki-ma-pi-pia   sina   kaka

   2PRO   1PRO   1/2-jump-CAUS-IMD.PAST   water LOC

  "You made me jump in the river."

    A   O-V

f. amɨra   aa-k-in-pia
  2PRO   1O-1/2-see-IMD.PAST
  "You saw me."

(7) Waimiri Atroari 3A3O prefix

    A   V   O
a. Renato n-emenikin-pa   xiba   kanuwa   ta
  Renato 3A3O-forget-REM.PAST   fish   canoe   LOC
  "Renato forgot the fish in the canoe."

    A   O   V
b. Ka   ram   ka   Ø-wen-tah-pɨ-pia
  3PRO   2PART 3PRO   throw up-VERBL-CAUS-IMD.PAST
  "He made him throw up."

    A   o-V
c. Irɨ   n-ee-ia
  3PRO   3A3O-drink-T/ASP
  "S/he drinks."

For some 3A3O pairings, Gildea (1998) shows a prefix i- that I called 'Relational Prefix'. He says that when the 3A3O clitic does not occur because of the presence of a preverbal O, a noun referring prefix y- remaining on the verb. (See discussion in section 2.1.1 below)

(8) Waimiri Atroari inverse prefix

    A   o-V
a. Ka   ram   a'-wupotx-ia
  3PRO   2PART 1+3O-beat-T/ASP
  "He beat us."

b. Irɨ   ka   amɨrɨ a-kɨrkɨ-pianɨ
  3PRO   EVID   2PRO   2O-burn-T/ASP
  "They burned you."

Finally, the table 04 illustrates the hierarchy mentioned above and further demonstrates how the case is marked in Waimiri Atroari. It has been observed that some languages mark the

grammatical relation of subject on the verb, but can mark object as well. This happens in Waimiri Atroari when objects are first and second person.

Table 04 Verb See '-ini-'

1A3O	Aa ram ka **h**-ini-pia. 1PRO 2PART 3PRO 1A-see-IMD.PAST 'I saw him.'
2A3O	Amɨra ram ka **m**-ini-pia. 2PRO 2PART 3PRO 2A-see-IMD.PAST 'You saw him.'
3A3O	Mɨkɨka ram ka **Ø**-ini-pia. 3PRO 2PART 3PRO Ø-see-IMD.PAST 'She/he saw him/her'.
1+2A3O	Kɨka ram ka **h**-ini-pia. 1+2PRO 2PART 3PRO 1+2A-see-IMD.PAST 'We saw him.'
3A1O	Ka ram **aa**=ini-pia. 3PRO 2PART 1O-see-IMD.PAST 'She/he saw me.'
3A2O	Ka ram **a**=ini-pia. 3PRO 2PART 2O-see-IMD. PAST 'She/he saw you.'
3A1+3O	Ka ram **a'**=ini-pia. 3PRO 2PART 1+3O-see-IMD.PAST 'She/he saw us.'
3A1+2O	Irɨ **k**-ini-pe-sɨ na. 3PRO 1+2O-see-?-DESID COP 'She/he wants to see us.'
1A2O	Aa ram **k**-ini-pia. 1PRO 2PART 2O-see-IMD.PAST 'I saw you'
2A1O	Amɨra ram **aa=i**ni-pia 2PRO 2PART 1O-see-IMD. PAST or Amɨra **aa**=k-ini-pia 2PRO 1O-2-see-IMD.PAST 'You saw me.'

*Note: Whenever, the interrogative symbol appears this mean that I do not know the meaning.

Moreover, we can observe that the full pronouns of first, second, plural inclusive and exclusive do not occur when they behave as object. Preferentially, the free speaker/hearer pronouns are subjects only. This demonstrates that the first person plural inclusive and exclusive are also above the third person in the hierarchy.

2.1.1 Relational Prefix

Relational prefix marks contiguity with a preceding possessor and a direct object (nominal argument). Meira et al (2007:19) states that i- relational prefix occurred on vowel initial nouns, postpositions, and verbs preceded by free NPP possessor/objects. (See Waimiri Atroari example below).

(9) sɨna   i-apo'o   tɨɨirɨ i-ɨhia   i-erekɨti-pa xiriminja
  water   REL-inside Tɨɨirɨ REL-hair   REL-cut-REM Xiriminja
  'Inside the river, Xiriminja cut Tyiyry's hair.'

In Waimiri Atroari, a number of vowel-initial noun and verb stems take a 'linking prefix' i- when immediately preceded by their determiners (that is, the possessor, with nouns, and the object, with transitive verbs). Besides its occurrence with transitive verb stems, such as *akɨna* 'to sweep' (10), this prefix occurs generally with obligatorily possessed nouns (body-part and kinship terms, etc.), such as *eba* 'eye' (11):

(10) *bahiɲa n-itxi-pia* *mɨdɨ* *i-akɨna-se*
   child 3-go-IM   house REL-sweep-in.order.to
   'The child went to sweep the house.'

(11) a. *Ewepe* *i-eba*   b. *a=i-eba*
   Ewepe   REL-eye   2=REL-eye
   'Ewepe's eye'   'your eye'

On the other hand, consonant-initial stems, such as *pana* 'ear' and *xikɨ* 'to cut' (12), do not present any linking prefix under these circumstances:

(12) *Kɨnetxiri* *ram* *Irie* *pana* *xikɨ-pia* *maia* *ke*
   Kɨnetxiri   2PART Irie ear cut-IMD.PAST knife INSTR
   'Kɨnetxiri cut Irie's ear with a knife.'

Relational prefixes are very common in languages of the Tupí and Macro-Jê stocks, a fact that has been pointed out as evidence for the genetic relationship between Carib and those two language groupings (Rodrigues 1994)

Besides providing further evidence for the existence of relational prefixes in the Carib family, the consequences of such analysis puzzling the question of how to distinguish pronominal prefixes from clitics in Waimiri Atrori. The hypothesis to be investigated in t is that both noun and verb stems in Waimiri Atroari present only one slot for prefixation. This slot can be occupied either by a personal prefix or by the relational prefix i-. Since personal prefixes and the relational prefix cannot co-occur, the presence or absence of a relational prefix would provide a straightforward criterion to determine whether a given pronominal morpheme preceding a noun or a verb stem is a prefix or a clitic. This distinction would explain the differences in morphological behavior between the 1st person plural inclusive morpheme *k(ɨ)-* (13a, 14a) and the 3rd person morpheme *kɨɨ=* (13b, 14b), for example.

(13)   a.   *k-eba*   b.   *kɨɨ=i-eba*
            1+2-eye   3=REL-eye
            'our eyes'   'his/her eyes'

(14)   a.   *kɨ-pana*   b.   *kɨɨ-pana*
            1+2-ear   3=ear
            'our ears'   'his/her ear'

This analysis is also strongly corroborated by syntactic evidence. Apparently, only the elements here analyzed as clitics seem to have argumental status when attached to a verb, while 'true' prefixes seem to be mere agreement markers.

2.1.2 <u>Inverse/Split -S Features</u>

Van Valin 1990, using the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) framework, proposed a semantic analysis for the intransitive verb classes of Italian and Georgian, according to which 'activity' intransitive verbs belong to Sa category while 'non-activity' ones are in the So category. Meira (2000) explains that in the languages that have the Set I verbal system, intransitive verbs can often be divided prefixes in two subgroups: those that take prefixes similar to the transitive A oriented prefix (Sa) and those that take prefixes identical to the transitive O oriented prefix (So) .

The distinction between verbs denoting activities versus those denoting non-activities does not seem to work for Waimiri Atroari. Many of the examples in the paradigms below take the same prefixes regardless of their semantics. On the other hand, according to Dixon (1979:83), there are languages with split S-marking in which the two intransitive subclasses do not have a clear semantic basis, such as Mandan and Guarani. This could also be the case in Waimiri Atroari. In this language, Tense-Aspect devices do not seem to influence the inverse system in the examples below, as well.

Gildea (2007:34), says that a number of description from the Cariban family have assumed a semantic basis to the two categories, generally in term of agentivity. However, Meira (2000) argues that the majority of the Sa pattern in every modern Cariban languages is derived from a transitive (reflexive/reciprocal/middle) verb and a detransitivizer prefix.

Activities - Sa	Non-activitities - So
Go '-ɨ-'	Bleed[2] '-mɨn-ta'
w-ɨ-sa 'I go'	**wu**-mɨn-ta-pa 'I bled'
m-ɨ-sa 'you go'	**mu**-mɨn-ta-pa 'you bled'
n-ɨ-sa 'she/he goes'	**nu**-mɨn-ta-pa 'she/he bled'
h-ɨ-sa 'we go (1+2)'	**hu**-mɨn-ta-pa 'we bled (1+2)'

---

[2] The word for blood is 'mɨnɨ', in order to get a verb to bleed, we must add the verbalizer '-ta'.

n-ɨ-sa 'we go (1+3)'   **nu**-mɨn-ta-pa 'we bled (1+3)'

Shout '-kɨta-'   Know '-pɨ-'
aa=kɨta-kɨ   'I shouted'   **hɨ**-pɨ-sa 'I know'
mɨ-kɨta-kɨ 'you shouted'   **mɨ**-pɨ-sa 'you know'
nɨ-kɨta-kɨ 'she/he shouted'   **nɨ**-pɨ-sa 'she/he knows.'
hɨ-kɨta-kɨ 'we shouted' (1+2)   **hɨ**-pɨ-sa 'we know' (1+2)
nɨ-kɨta-kɨ 'we shouted' (1+3)   **nɨ**-pɨ-sa 'we know (1+3)'

Jump '-tahkwa-'   Die '-rɨmɨ-'
wu-tahkwa-kɨ 'I jumped'   **wɨ**-rɨmɨ-tape 'I will die'
mɨ-tahkwa-kɨ 'you jumped.'   **mɨ**-rɨmɨ-tape 'you will die'
nɨ-tahkwa-kɨ 'she/he jumped.'   **nɨ**-rɨmɨ-tape 'she/he will die'
hɨ-tahkwa-kɨ 'we jumped (1+2)'   **hɨ**-rɨmɨ-tape 'we will die' (1+2)
nɨ-tahkwa-kɨ 'we jumped (1+3)   **nɨ**-rɨmɨ-tape 'we will die' (1+3)

Descend '-ootɨ-'   Dream '-inin-'
w-ootɨ-pianɨ 'I descended'   **w**-ininɨ-pa 'I dreamed'
m-ootɨ-pianɨ 'you descended'   **m**-ininɨ-pa 'you dreamed'
n-ootɨ-pianɨ 'she/he descended'   **n**-ininɨ-pa 'she/he dreamed'
h-ootɨ-pianɨ 'we descended'(1+2)   **h**-ininɨ-pa 'we dreamed' (1+2)
n-ootɨ-pianɨ 'we descended'(1+3)   **n**-ininɨ-pa we dreamed' (1+3)

Gildea (1998:91) argues that the main clause system in Waimiri Atroari is the modern reflex of a reconstructible inverse split-s system in Proto-Cariban. The actual Waimiri Atroari system has become more nominative like through the loss of some So forms.

3. **The Ditransitive Construction**

In Waimiri Atroari ditransitive construction, as demonstrated in the table 05 below, I confront a problem: of assuming that the recipient must become the direct object. Observe that when the indirect object is a first, second or first plural exclusive, it is the dative that receives the O prefixes (provided on table 02 above) instead of the verb. In fact, I think that the recipient in

Waimiri is a core argument, but it would be necessary to refine my analysis. According to Gildea (personal communication), we can notice that the recipient is marked by the dative postposition that receives the same Set II prefixes as the postposition or noun across the family. In the Cariban family, the Set II prefixes mark the inverse form of transitive verbs.

Table 05: Verb Give '-rɨ'

1A3O	Aa ram xiba **hɨ**-rɨ-pia ka inaka. 1PRO 2PARt fish 1A-give-IMD.PAST 3PRO DAT 'I gave fish for him/her.'
2A3O	Amɨra ram xiba **mɨ**-rɨ-pia mɨkɨka inaka. 2PRO 2PART fish 2A-give-IMD.PAST 3PRO DAT or Amɨra ram ka inaka xiba **mɨ**-rɨ-pia. 2PRO 2PART 3PRO DAT fish 2S-give-IMD.PAST 'You gave fish to him.' *Observe that the Dative can occur in the end of the sentence, but also in other position in the sentence.
3A3O	Mɨkɨka xiba i-rɨ-pia mɨkɨka inaka. 3PRO fish REL-give-IMD.PAST 3PRO DAT 'She/he gave fish for him'
1+2A3O	Kɨka ram ka inaka xiba **hɨ**-rɨ-pia. 1+2PRO 2PART 3PRO DAT fish 1+2A-give-IMD.PAST or Kɨka xiba **hɨ**-rɨ-pia mɨkɨka inaka. 1+2PRO fish 1+2A-give-IMD.PAST 3PRO DAT 'We gave fish for him.'
3A1O	Bɨba xiba i-rɨ-pia **aa**-inaka. 3PRO fish REL-give-IMD.PAST 1O-DAT or Ka ram **aa**-inaka xiba i-ry-pia. 3pro 2part 1O-Dat fish Rel-give-imd.past 'She/he gave fish to me.'
3A2O	Ka ram **a**-inaka xiba i-rɨ-pia. 3PRO 2PART 2O-DAT fish REL-give-IMD.PAST

1

	or
	Bɨba xiba i-rɨ-pia **a**-inaka. 3PRO fish REL-give-IMD.PAST 2-DAT 'She/he gave fish to you.'
3A1+3O	Ka ram **a'**-inaka xiba i-rɨ-pia. 3PRO 2PART 1+3O-DAT fish REL-give-IMD.PAST 'She/he gave fish for us.'
1A2O	Aa ram xiba **a**-inaka **hɨ**-rɨ-pia. 1PRO 2PART fish 2O-DAT 1A-give-IMD.PAST 'I gave fish for you.'
2A1O	Amɨra ram **aa**-inaka xiba **mɨ**-rɨ-pia. 2PRO 2PART 1-DAT fish 2A-give-IMD.PAST 'You gave fish for me'

Interestingly in table 04, we can note that in the last two examples 1A2O and 2A1O, the dative is marked with the object mark, but the verbs are marked with the subject mark. Moreover, the examples also demonstrate that some nominal expressions, such as *xiba* 'fish' and the person who receives the fish do not need to have a fixed order. The dative, as well, does not have a fixed order, this made me rethink the idea that the dative could be a core argument. In fact, I think that the recipient in Waimiri is not a core argument, but it would be necessary to refine my analysis. Other aspects observed are that Waimiri Atroari requires an external argument acting as subject; we cannot omit any of these subjects given in the examples above.

Jelinek (1984), in her article 'Empty categories, case, and configurationality', explains that there is a distinction between pronominal clitics and nominal expressions where independent pronouns are included. According to her, nominal expressions can be considered adjuncts with non-argumental function, in this sense nominal expressions, as adjuncts do not need to have fixed order. I wonder whether this is true for Waimiri Atroari inasmuch as we can note in the examples that the subject has a fixed order and an argumental function. This aspect will be considered as a remaining issue.

4. The Agentivity Particle

Interestingly, Waimiri Atroari has a particle *ia* that tells what argument is the participant that performs the action in the sentence. In the examples below, we can observe that this particle occurs in different kind of sentences and it is not necessarily related to causative construction. It can appear when it is necessary to identify the CAUSEE as the agent of the structure (see example 18), but it is not obligatory. As we can observe also it appears after nouns or pronouns.

(15) Ipaikɨpa naminja   *ia*   t-iika-hkɨpa   wɨkɨr-eme   nɨ-tam-pia.
    After   dog   AGT.PART REFL-bite-after man-DEV   3S-cry-IMD.PAST
        "After the dog bit the man, he cried.'

(16) naminja *ia*   aa=ika-hkɨpa kara   wɨ-tam-pia.
    dog   AGT.PART   1O-bite-after 1PRO   1S-cry-IMD.PAST
        "When the dog bit me, I cried."

(17) naminja *ia*   a=ika-hkɨpa   mɨ-tam-pia.
    dog   AGT.PART   2O-bite-after 2S-cry-IMD.PAST
        "When the dog bit you, you cried."

(18) aa   *ia*   a=ika-hkɨpa   ka   mɨ-tam-pia.
    1PRO   AGT.PART   1O-bite-after   EVID   2S-cry-IMD.PAST
        "When I bit you, you cried."

(19) k-eme   *ia*   aa=ika-hkɨpa ka   k-eme   nɨ-tam-pia.
    3PRO-DEV   AGT.PART   1O-bite-after EVID 3PRO-DEV 3S-cry-IMD.PAST
        "He cried when he bit me."

(20) aa   ram   Kaina *ia*   kɨrɨwu   h-ini-pɨ-pia.
    1PRO   2PART   Kaina AGT.PART   snake   1S-see-CAUS-IMD.PAST
        " I made Kaina see the snake."

(21) ka ram aa-mama   *ia*   sanja   iahkwa   ini-pianɨ.
  3PRO 2PART 1POS-mother AGT.PART   manioc flour make   see-REC.PAST
        "He saw my mother make manioc flour."

(22) aa ram   witɨ   pɨs-anɨ   itxi   ta   kɨrɨwu huwa **ia**   aa=iika-paikɨ.
1PRO2PART meat   look for-T/ASP jungle LOC   snake   ?   AGT.PART   1O-bite-after
      I was hunting when the snake bit me."

According to Gildea (1998) and Meira (1999), there is in the Carib family a postposition

ya (in the Proto-Carib wɨya) that marks different kinds of participants: directionals, datives,

causees, ergative and agent markers. Meira (1999:512) explains that the various kinds of

participants that *ya* marks do seems to show some 'commom semantic threads'- they are all

human or sentient. In Tiriyó, language described by Meira, we can observe in examples (23, 24,

and 25) below that the distinction is not always clear.

(23) pahko   **ya**   wit-te-e.
  1:father   Dir   1Sa-go:prs.Ipf-Cty
  "I am going to my father's (house,village)."

(24) maja   wi-ri-po   ii-**ya**.
  knife   1A-make-Caus:Prs.Prf   3-Causee
    "I had him make a knife."

(25) pireu   w-ekarama-po   Asehpe**ya**   Simetu   **ya**.
  arrow   1A-give-Caus:Prs.Prf   Asehpe Causee/Dat? Simetu Causee/Dat?
  "I made Asehpe give the arrow to Simetu"~ "I made Simetu give the arrow to Asehpe."

Gildea (1998:121) claims that "the Cariban system of nominalization is ergatively

organized, with the sole genitive relationship to the nominalized verb being claimed by the verb's

notional absolutive argument (S and O), and the notional ergative argument (A) being therefore

forced into oblique status". According to him, in the northern Full Set II dominant languages,

such as Makuxi and Kapón, the goal/dative function of this morpheme has been lost, leaving only

the ergative agent-marking function. (Look at examples 26 and 27).

Makuxi-(26) [t-ekkari   aretɨ'ka-sa'-tɨu-**ya**]   yai   aw-enna'po-'pɨ.
    3.Refl-food   finish-Nomlzr-3Refl-ERG   at   3-return-TAM
    "When he finished his food, he returned."or

(lit. 'at the finishing of his food by himself he returned').

Kapon-(27) [makonaiama   y-akwar-ri   ota-∅]   eyne-pu   ∅-**ya**
            god   Rel-spirit-Psn descend-Nmlzr   see-TAM   3-ERG
            "He saw the spirit of God descending."

As we can observe in the Waimiri Atroari examples (15-22) above, the morpheme *ia* does not mark datives and directionals. It clearly marks agents and causees. In two clauses with two different actor *ia* appears after the actor who denotes more agentivity.

Another interesting aspect of the particle *ia* that can be a topic for further research is related to the notion of agency. According to Mithun (1991:516), the prototypical agent is considered the 'participant which performs, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate'. In this sense, this assumption seems to demonstrate that agentiveness as performance/instigation, and control/volitionality is not perfectly adequate for Waimiri Atroari.

The notion of semantic agency is a complex on, as explored in Foley &Van Valin 1984. DeLancey 1985, and among many others. Foley &Van Valin (1984:29) characterize their general category 'actor' as 'the participant which performs, effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate', features shared by prototypical agents. They characterize their general category 'undergoer' as 'the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation but rather is affected by it some way', features shared by prototypical patients.

In Waimiri Atroari, as demonstrated in examples (18) and (19) above, there are a participant that instigate and control the action and another that perform the action. The participant that perform or do the action will be followed by the *ia* particle. Interestingly, the participants who will perform the action not necessarily have volition or control the situation. Agentivity is the primary semantic factor that distinguishes A from O, the semantic features from it seems to play no role in the selection of case marker in Waimiri Atroari.

5. The Valuative and Devaluative Morphemes

In Waimiri Atroari nouns (animate or inanimate), pronouns, and adjectives can take two kinds of morphemes that indicate whether a thing is good to be used and is new, or a person is alive- taking the Valuative –*e'me*; or the thing is old, used or is dead- taking the Devaluative-*eme*.

These morphemes can occur with subjects of intransitive and transitive verbs, examples (29) and (30), and objects of transitive verbs. I haven't seen a situation in which both of them occur in the same sentence. Maybe because only one is necessary inasmuch as they are not necessary to disambiguate the sentence. Moreover,-e'me and –eme are not obligatory, and the Valuative occurs less than the devaluative morpheme.

(28) aa   ram naminja ia   k-**eme** iika h-ini-pia.
 1PRO   2PARt dog   AGT.PART 3PRO-DEV bite 1S-see-IMD.PAST
   "I saw the dog bite him."

(29) wɨkɨr-**eme**   wu-pianɨ ram tɨmere.
 man-DEV   kill-REC.PAST 2PART jaguar
   "The jaguar killed the man."

(30) wɨkɨr-**eme**   nɨ-damem-pa.
 man-DEV   3S-die-REM.PAST
   "The man died."

(31) Pana Mateus   imeses-**eme** wu-pianɨ wiwe   ke.
 yesterday Mateus   bat-DEV kill-REC.PAST wood   INSTR
   "Yesterday Mateus killed the bat with the wood."

(32) aa wo'nj-**e'me** h-aminjakɨ-pianɨ   a=wenpa-tɨpa tre'me tɨruwa kaprɨ pɨkɨ.[3]
 1PRO clay-VAL 1S-permit/let-REC.PAST 2O-learn-? PART pan make how
   "I permitted you to tamper in the clay to learn how to make a ceramic pan."

(33) aa-pap-**e'me**   sehe.
 1POS-father-VAL tall
   "My father is tall." (He is alive)

---

[3] In this sentence, the valuative morpheme is marked in the word clay, to indicate that this is a good clay to make ceramic pan.

Behaving in this way, I wonder whether I can use these morphemes as semantic cases marking that appears in nouns. Particularly, I believe that I cannot use them as case-marking for two reasons: The first reason is related to the Gildea's explanation that A and O nominals are not case marked in the Set I system. The second reason is speculative, but I suppose that if these two morphemes could be used as case marking, the valuative -*e'me* would appear more that the devaluative –*eme*, inasmuch as the valuative would mark the ergative A. However, although both of them are not obligatory, the devaluative occurs more in the sentences. Moreover, as can be observed, both S/A can take these morphemes, is not just S/O or just A; therefore, I think I cannot use them as indication of ergativity, as well.

6.Conclusion

Ergativity is a system or pattern of casemarking which casemarks A as ERG and S/O as ABS (Blake 2001). According to Gildea (1998:18-19), the primary identifying characteristics of the ergative verbal system (set II) in some Cariban languages are an absolutive personal prefixes, ergative personal suffixes, ergative case marking on the A nominal, and ergative organized word. Waimii Atroari does not show any feature of the Set II system It does not treat the S and the O in the same manner and it does not receive any mark on the A nominal.

Waimiri Atroari follows the Inverse Split system-S observed by Gildea (1998). However, as he claims the actual system has become more nominative-accusative like due the loss of the So

forms. It is observed that the inverse prefixes are in transition. The selection of the prefixes in intransitive verbs is not conditioned by tense or aspect where the ergative is always found in either past tense or perfect tense (Dixon 1979:95).

In Waimiri Atroari language, first, second, and first plural inclusive and exclusive person are ranked higher than third person. However, when second person acts on first or first acts on second, it was observed that in some cases we have subject agreement, while others show object agreement. Therefore, subject and object marking must follow this hierarchy: 1=2,1+2/1+3>3. Although we have observed that full internal pronouns as object were not obligatory; this is not true for the external arguments. A remaining issue that needs to be observed with more details is the behavior of the ditransitive verbs in order to understand better the role of the indirect object. Clearly, the dative does not function as a core argument. As pointed out by Gildea (personal communication) nobody has done yet a comparative treatment of the ditransitive construction.

Abbreviation

AGT.PART	Agentivity particle
CAUS	Causative
DAT	Dative
DEV	Devaluative
DIR	Directional
EVID	Evidential
INSTR	Instrumental
2PART	Second position particle
IMD.PAST	Immediate past
NOMLZ	Nominalizer
REC.PAST	Recent past
REFL	Reflexive
REM.PAST	Remot past
PFR	Perfective
PRO	Pronoun

Prs	Present
S	Subject
SAP	Speech Act Participants
Object	Object
TAM	Tense/aspect/mood
T/asp	Tense/aspect
Val	Valuative
Verbl	Verbalizer
1	First person singular
2	Second person singular or plural
3	Third person singular or plural
1+2	First person dual inclusive
1+3	First person plural exclusive

References

Blake, Barry. 2001. *Case.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruno, Ana Carla. 2003. *Waimiri Atroari Grammar: Some Phonological, Morphological, and Syntatic Aspects*. PhD Dissertation. Tucson: University of Arizona.

_____. 1995. *Person Subject and Object Marking in Waimiri Atroari*. Paper Presented at the Linguistic Institute, July, Albuquerque New Mexico.

_____. 1996/1998. Fieldwork notes. Waimiri Atroari Reservation.

DeLancey, Scott. 1985. On Active Typology and Nature of Agentivity. *Relational Typology*, ed. by Frans Plank, 47-60. Berlin:Mouton.

Derbyshire, Desmond C. 1985. *Hixkaryana and Linguistic Typology*. Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1979. Ergativity. In *Language* 55.59-138.

Falk, Yehuda. 1997. Case Typology and Case Theory. Ms. downloadable from: myfalk@ mscc.huji.ac.il

Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gildea, Spike. 2007. Linguistic studies in the Cariban family. Handbook of South America, ed. by Lyle Campbell and Verónica Grondona. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____. 1998. *On Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative Cariban Morphosyntax*. Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 18, Oxford: Oxford Press.

Halpern, Aaron and Zwicky, Arnold. 1996. *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Hoff, Berend J. 1978. The Relative Order of the Carib Finite Verb and Its Nominal De-pedents. *Studies on Fronting*. Ed. Frank Jansen, pp 11-27. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty Categories, Case, and Non-configurationality. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2:39-76.

Klaiman, Mimi. 1992.Inverse Languages. In *Lingua* 88. 227-61

Meira, Sérgio, Spike Gildea, and Berend Hoff. 2007. On the Origin of Ablaut in the Cariban family. ms.

_____. 2000. The accidental intransitive split in the Cariban family. *Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization Theory. Typological Studies in Language,* v. 43., ed. by Spike Gildea, pp. 201-230.Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

_____. 1999. *A Grammar of Tiriyó*. PHd Thesis: Rice University.

Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. In *Language* 67: 510-546.

Rodrigues, Aryon. 1994. Grammatical affinities among Tupi, Carib, and Macro-je. Un-published manuscript, Universidade de Brasilia.

Wunderlich, Dieter and Lakamper, Renate. 2001. On the Interaction of Structural and Semantic Case. In *Lingua*,V.111:277-418.

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1990. Semantic Parameters of Split Intransitivity. In *Language* 66, 221-260.

APPENDIX

Table 05: Verb Threw up '-wenta-'

1A3O	Aa ram ka hu-wentah-pɨ-pia.
	1PRO 2PART 3PRO 1A-threw up-CAUS-IMD.PAST
	' I made him throw up.'
2A3O	Amɨra ram ka mu-wentah-pɨ-pia.
	2PRO 2PART 3PRO 2A-threw up-CAUS-IMD.PAST
	' You made him throw up.'
3A3O	Ka ram ka Ø -wentah-pɨ-pia.
	3PRO 2PART 3PRO Ø-threw up-CAUS-IMD.PAST
	'She/he made him throw up.'
1+2A3O	Kɨka ram ka hu-wentah-pɨ-pia.
	1+2PRO 2PART 3PRO 1+2A-threw up-CAUS-IMD.PAST

	‘We made him throw up.’
3A2O	Ka ram a-wentah-pɨ-pia. 3PRO 2PART 2O-threw up-CAUS-IMD.PAST ‘ She/he made you throw up.’
1A2O	Aa ram ku-wentah-pɨ-pia. 1PRO 2PART 2O-threw up-CAUS-IMD.PAST ‘ I made you throw up.’

Table 06: Verb rest ‘-irima-’

1A3O	Aa ram ka h-irima-pɨ-pianɨ. 1PRO 2PART 3PRO 1A-rest-CAUS-REC.PAST ‘I made him/her rest.’
2A3O	Amɨra ram ka m-irima-pɨ-pianɨ. 2PRO 2PART 3PRO 2A-rest-CAUS-REC.PAST ‘You made him/her rest.’
3A3O	Ka ram ka Ø-irima-pɨ-pianɨ. 3PRO 2PART 3PRO Ø-rest-CAUS-REC.PAST ‘She/he made him rest.’
3A2O	Ka ram a-irima-pɨ-pianɨ. 3PRO 2PART 2O-rest-CAUS-REC.PAST ‘She/he made you rest.’
1A2O	Aa ram k-irima-pɨ-pianɨ.’ 1PRO 2PART 2O-rest-CAUS-REC.PAST ‘I made you rest.

Table 07: Verb –wenta- ‘throw up’

1sg	Aa wen-ta-pa 1PRO vomit-VERBL-REM.PAST ‘I threw up.’
2sg	amɨrɨ mu-wen-ta-pa 2PRO 2S-vomit-VERBL-REM.PAST ‘you threw up.’
3sg/pl	mɨkɨkɨ nu-wen-ta-pa 3PRO 3S-vomit-VERBL-REM.PAST ‘he/she/they threw up’
1+2 incl	kɨkɨ hu-wen-ta 1+2PRO 1+2S-vomit-VERBL-REM.PAST ‘we threw up.’

1+3 excl	a'a nu-wen-ta-pa. 1+3PRO 1+3S-vomit-VERBL-REM.PAST 'we threw up.'