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1 Introduction

This paper compares Case and argument structure in languages from three different subgroups of the Tupian family and proposes both a synchronic and a diachronic analysis of the facts presented. Three masters’ theses dedicated to argument structure in Tupian languages – Juruna or Yudjá (Juruna branch), Karitiana (Arikém branch), and Wayoró (Tupari branch) - became available between 2008 and 2011 (Lima 2008, Rocha 2011, and Nogueira 2011, respectively). Based on their findings it is possible to raise new hypotheses about Case and argument structure in the family.

1.1 The Tupian family

The Tupian family of languages is formed by ten branches or subgroups: Arikém, Juruna, Mondé, Mundurukú, Tupari, Ramarama, Purubora, Aweti, Mawé and Tupi-Guarani. It is widely accepted by specialists (Galucio et al. 2015, Meira & Drude 2015) that the latter five are grouped in two genetic units – Ramarama-Purubora and Mawé-Aweti-Tupi Guarani. The Mawé-Aweti-Tupi Guarani unit has migrated out of the Proto-Tupi original homeland in the Western state of Rondônia, Brazil (probably before dividing into three) to the East, as the Juruna and Munduruku have done as well. A genetic division between an Eastern and a Western branch inside the Tupian family has been proposed by Rodrigues (2007) and Rodrigues and Cabral (2012), but Galucio at al. (2015) argue that this division seems to be limited to the plant and animal lexicon (which is more likely to have been borrowed) and is not evidenced by more stable lexical items of the basic vocabulary. For this reason, we choose to take into consideration solely the genetic branching that is uncontroversial at the present state of diachronic studies:
In the next three sections we briefly discuss the argument structure and Case systems of Juruna, Wayoró and Karitiana, respectively, and in section 5 an analysis is presented.

2 Juruna (Yudjá)

According to Lima (2008), Juruna verbs are formed in 5 different ways: (1) from adjectival roots through the addition of the verbalizer {maku} or {-∅} (unaccusatives); (2) from nominal roots through a verbalizer {-∅} or verbalizing tonal changes (unergatives); (3) from a postposition {dju} (transitives); (4) from acategorial roots with verbalizers {-h}, {-k}, {-t}, {-n}, {-∅} (forming all verb types), and {-d} (all except unergatives); (5) from other verbs (transitives). Verbalizing morphology gives evidence for two classes of intransitives (unergatives and
unaccusatives) and one class of transitives in Juruna. The same is true of valence change morphology (\{l-, a-, ma-, ũ\}):

(1) The causativizer \{ma\} is limited to unaccusatives:

\[
\begin{align*}
Ija & \quad i\text{-txia-k-u} & \text{“The water cooled”} \\
\text{water} & \text{3s-cold-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Itxiaka} & \quad i\text{-ma\text{-}txia-k-u} & \text{“The winter made the water cool”} \\
\text{winter} & \text{3s-caus-cold-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

(2) Unergatives are causativized with \{ũ\}, if at all possible:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Una} & \quad ta\text{-}h\text{-}u & \text{“I ran”} \\
1 \text{s} & \text{run-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Una} & \quad a\text{pê} \quad y\text{-}u\text{-}ta\text{-}h\text{-}u & \text{anu “I made the dog run”} \\
1 \text{s} & \text{dog} \quad 3\text{s-caus-run-vblzr-real} \text{is asp}
\end{align*}
\]

(3) Transitive verbs:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Iidja} & \quad e\text{-}huka \quad i\text{-}para\text{-}k\text{-}u & \text{“The woman sewed her dress”} \\
\text{woman} & \text{3s-dress 3s-sew-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Una} & \quad a\text{bê} \quad e\text{-}m\text{-}d\text{-}u & \text{“I listened to music”} \\
1 \text{s} & \text{music listen.to-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

(4) Intransitivizing a transitive (or causativized) verb with \{l\}:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{João} & \quad p\text{i\text{-}kah}a \quad a\text{-}pi\text{-}d\text{-}u & \text{“João broke the stool”} \\
\text{stool} & \text{caus-break-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{P\text{i\text{-}kah}a} & \quad l\text{-}a\text{-}pi\text{-}d\text{-}u & \text{“The stool broke”} \\
\text{stool} & \text{intr-caus-break-vblzr-real} \text{is}
\end{align*}
\]

2.1 Ergative Case in Juruna (Yudjá)

Juruna is a nominative-acusative language according to Fargetti (2001) and Lima (2008). We are not convinced of that for two reasons: (1) Agreement with the object occurs in some transitive verbs (as in example (3)) as well as in some unaccusative verbs (as in examples (1) and (2)), suggesting that agreement is indeed absolutive, but with an active-stative system distinguishing between two classes of intransitive verbs; (2) Yudjá has an antipassive (Lima 2008), and this kind of construction seems to be limited to ergative languages cross-linguistically. Antipassives are present in other ergative Tupian languages as well, such as Mekéns (Tupari). Besides, constituent order in Juruna is SOV (OVS is also possible), as in Wayoro, which is ergative and has object pronouns cliticizing to the transitive verb and subject agreement in intransitives, as we will show in section 3. In section 4 we will see that Karitiana is an ergative language with obligatory absolutive agreement (in which object and intransitive subject agreement prefixes to the verb) in all finite clauses.

3 Wayoro
Nogueira (2011) gives the following template for Wayoro verb formation:

\[(5) \text{ ei } + \text{-k} + \text{-a} \quad \text{“To burp”}\]

We choose not to identify verbalizers or theme vowels in the examples below for the sake of simplicity.

Verbalizers in Wayoro are suffixal, as in Juruna - {-k}, {-g}, {-kw}, {-ŋ} and {-Ø} - and in general are not associated with a particular argument structure. Only one verbalizer {-kat} is limited to a single verb class (intransitives). Valence change operations are possible through the use of causativizing and intransitivizing prefixes on the verb. There is no evidence for two classes of intransitives (unergatives and unaccusatives), unlike Juruna:

(6) Intransitive verbs:

(ōn) o-tera-t “I went”
I 1s-go-past

(ndeke) te-ŋōjā-n “He/she sat”
he/she 3-seat-past

(7) All intransitive verbs may be causativized by \{mō-\}:

mbogop te-ikara-t “The child cried”
child 3-cry-past

ārāmērā mbogop mō-ikara-p nā “The woman will make the child cry”
woman child caus-cry-? future

mb-era “I sleep”
1s-sleep

ēn o-mō-ērā-n “You made me sleep”
you 1s-caus-sleep-past

(8) Intransitivization with \{e-\} applies to all transitive verbs (Nogueira 2013), meaning reflexivization (as in “twist”) or anti-causativization (as in “burn”):

ŋgwajk ipokwa ārāmērā “The woman burned the man”
man burn woman

ŋgwajk te-e-pokwa-t “The man burned”
man 3-intr-burn-past

ōn kībī pikarēŋka-t “I twisted the stick”
I stick twist-past
kiβi  te-e-pikarẽŋka-t  “The stick twisted”
stick  3-intr-twist-past

mb-e-pikarẽŋka-t  “I twisted myself”
1s-intr-twist-past

Some intransitive verbs have a vowel e word-initially. Their semantics is that of the middle:

(9) Spontaneous events
    eŋgikwa ‘sweat’

(10) Change of body position events
    embera ‘get.down’, eŋgwetikia ‘get.up’

(11) Natural reciprocal events
    eɲdʒara ‘marry’

(12) Change of location events
    embira ‘fly’, eŋgwaβika ‘run’

3.1 Ergative Case in Wayoro

According to Nogueira (2011) Wayoro is an ergative-absolutive language with obligatory cliticization of the object (absolutive) pronoun to the verb and subject (absolutive) agreement in intransitive verbs. Constituent order is rigidly OV, as in Juruna (SOV or OVS).

4 Karitiana

There is no evidence for unergatives and unaccusatives as separate verb classes in Karitiana (Rocha 2011). Valence change morphology - causative and passive - is prefixal, as in all Tupian languages. As in Wayoro, causativization morphology in Karitiana occurs with any intransitive verb and intransitivizing morphology (in this case, a passive {a-}) occurs with any transitive verb:

(13) All intransitive verbs may be causativized by {m-}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-assert-dance-stem.formative-nfut</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The man danced”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s-assert-caus-dance-stem.formative-nfut</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The man made me dance”

*ø-pyr-a-terekterek-na-n taso
taso 3-assert-passive-dance- stem.formative-nfut man

ø-pyr-otam-yn John VS
3-assert-arrive-nfut John
“John arrived”

ø-pyry-mb-otam-yn Ivan John VSO
3-assert-caus-arrive-nfut Ivan John
“John made Ivan arrive”

(14) All transitive verbs may be passivized by {a-}:

ø-pyr-’y-dn taso ti’y VSO
3-assert-eat-nfut man food
“The man ate the food”

ø-pyr-a-y-dn ti’y VS
3-assert-passive-eat-nfut food
“The food was eaten”

*ø-pyry-m-’y-dn (ti’y) taso
3-assert-caus-eat (food) man

(15) The complement clause of a copula verb must be headed by an intransitive verb:

John ø-na-aka-t i-otam-ø SVO
John 3-decl-copula-nfut nomlzr-arrive-copula.agr.
“John arrived”

*John ø-na-aka-t i-oky-t
John 3-decl-copula-nfut nomlzr-kill-copula.agr.

John ø-na-aka-t i-a-oky-t SVO
John 3-decl-copula-nfut nmlzr-passive-kill-cop.agr.
“John was killed”

4.1 Ergative Case in Karitiana

Karitiana is an ergative-absolutive language (Landin 1984) with absolutive agreement (Storto 1999). Word order is SVO and VS in declarative clauses and VSO and VS in assertatives (Storto 1999, 2014). Non-finite clauses are verb-final and there is an obligatory fronting of the verb in finite clauses (Storto 1999).
5 Analysis and Discussion

Lima (2014) gives a dyadic structure (Hale & Keyser 2002) for Juruna unaccusatives in which the root of the verb (R) - an adjective in (16) - is the complement of a light verb V2 that has a subject in the specifier position of the light verb. This subject may become the internal argument of a higher verb V1, which in her analysis is the causativizer {ma-}. Conflation is the operation that Hale & Keyser (2002) propose to explain how the phonological material of the root ends up inside the verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Subj} & \quad \text{made} & \quad \text{woman} & \quad \text{become} & \quad \text{thin} \\
\text{Subj} & \quad \{\text{ma-}\} (v1) & \quad \text{iidja} & \quad \emptyset (V2) & \quad \text{lāmi} (R)
\end{align*}
\]

Post-conflation representation for unaccusatives:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V1} \\
\text{malāmi} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{V2} \\
\text{iidja} \\
\text{V2} \\
\text{R}
\end{array}
\]

Lima (2014) analyzes unergatives and transitives with a monadic structure (Hale & Keyser 2002). Unergatives differ from transitives in a single way. Whereas in the latter the complement is a noun phrase, in the former it is a root (a noun in (17) that forms a unit with a light verb V1):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{make/do} & \quad \text{jump} & \quad \text{(or V OBJECT for transitives)} \\
\emptyset (V1) & \quad \text{pīrīk} (R)
\end{align*}
\]

Pre- and post-conflation representation of unergative verbs:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V1} \\
\text{R} \\
\text{pīrīk-} \\
\text{V1} \\
\text{R} \\
\text{pīrīk-}
\end{array}
\]

Rocha (2011) identifies a single class of intransitive verbs in Karitiana and thus represents all intransitives with a dyadic structure; to him, transitive verbs are the only ones that have a monadic structure in Karitiana. Nogueira (2011) gives the same analysis for Wayoro.
Comparing the three languages analyzed, it is clear that it is not a coincidence that the same morpheme that is used to causativize all intransitives in Karitiana and Wayoró is a cognate with the causative that is limited to unaccusatives in Juruna. This item reconstructs as a causativizer of intransitives in Proto-Tupi (Rodrigues 2007, Rodrigues & Cabral 2012), suggesting that Proto-Tupi was like Karitiana and Wayoró, in that it had a single class of intransitives. Juruna is different from the two other languages analyzed in that it is a language in which the active-stative (unergative-unaccusative) distinction plays a role. We hypothesize that Proto-Tupi had an ergative-absolutive Case system and a single class of intransitives, in which all intransitive subjects used to be arguments in a dyadic structure. Juruna must have diverged from that original pattern expanding the transitive monadic structure to a subclass of intransitives with agent arguments, what made the Case system eventually change to include the active-stative distinction.

Case and argument structure go together in this respect inside the Tupian family: languages that have a single class of intransitives (Karitiana and Wayoró, shown here, but also Karo representing three subfamilies inside Rondônia) are ergative-absolutive and do not distinguish between unaccusatives and unergatives whereas the ones that has two well defined classes of intransitives (Juruna, Munduruku, Mawé, Aweti and Tupi-Guarani) have incorporated this distinction in their Case system. We know that Juruna is an innovative language in the Tupian family because it patterns with other languages that left Rondônia, the homeland of Proto-Tupi, to the East: Tupi-Guarani, Mawé and Aweti, all of which have an active-stative system (Meira & Drude 2015), which is absent in the Tupian languages that remain in Rondônia. The other Tupian subfamily that is outside of Rondônia today, Munduruku, has a mixed system: ergative-absolutive, as Rondônia languages, and active-stative as the languages outside of Rondônia (Gomes 2014). Lima points out, in an unpublished paper, that Juruna may be described as an ergative-absolutive language based on examples such as (1) and (3), although previous descriptions (Fargetti 2001, Lima 2008) have claimed the language to be nominative-accusative.

Valence demoting morphology in Wayoró {e-} is a cognate with the Karitiana passive morpheme {a-}. In fact, in all Tupari languages besides Wayoró {e-} is a cognate with the passive {a-} in Karitiana. In Tupari languages it is never a passive, but an anticausative, middle and a reflexive, and in Karitiana it is only an impersonal passive. The intransitivizer {l-} in Yudjá is used as a reflexive and a passive. Lima (2014) mentions that {l-} has two allomorphs [e-] and [l-], what suggests that they are cognates with Karitiana {a-} and Tupari {e-}. Also, Rodrigues and Cabral (2012) as well as Nogueira (2013) point out that Sateré-Mawé (Mawé subgroup) and Mundurukú (Mundurukú subgroup), representing two other branches inside Tupian, have a cognate middle/reflexive prefix {we-}.

Proto-Tupi had a prefix {we-} (‘reflexive’ according to Rodrigues & Cabral 2012) that is present today in two languages as an impersonal passive (Karitiana and Karo and perhaps in Juruna) and in many others as a reflexive or middle voice (Wayoró, Munduruku, and Mawé). Gabas Júnior (1999) describes an impersonal passive in Karo whose allomorphs are [be-], [we-], and [pe-]. Given this distribution, wider as a reflexive/middle and rarer as a passive, it is reasonable to say that this morpheme was probably a marker of middle voice in Proto-Tupi and became a passive in Karitiana, Karo and Juruna. In the latter, the original reflexive use is still available according to Lima (2014). This suggests that Juruna has expanded the use of the reflexive to include the passive. This must have happened (either influenced by language contact or by genetic proximity) before Juruna or its mother-language migrated out of Rondônia, because
only Rondônia languages (Karitiana and Karo) have been reported to have a passive inside the Tupian family.
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