

Notes on Yurumangüí grammar and lexicon¹

Matthias Urban

DFG-Center for Advanced Studies ‘Words, Bones, Genes, Tools’, University of Tübingen, Germany

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7633-7433>

ABSTRACT: In this article, I offer a contribution to the philological study of premodern materials of languages of South America that have already become extinct. I am concerned with the Yurumangüí language, whose speakers were encountered in the 18th century in the western lowlands of Colombia by a Spanish expedition. This encounter resulted in the production of a short collection of words and phrases by a priest which is analyzed here anew. Problems of inconsistent and likely highly inadequate orthographic representation of the speech of the Yurumangüí informants and other problems, in this case, make it highly difficult to arrive at consistent analyses, as I show throughout my highly tentative discussion of nominal and verbal morphosyntax. I also offer external comparisons for some of the available Yurumangüí lexical material. Far from being able to demonstrate the genetic connections of the language, such comparisons do allow to identify items the Yurumangüí language shared with neighboring languages and hence to situate it within the former linguistic ecology of this part of South America.

KEYWORDS: Yurumangüí; Philology; Premodern sources; Morphosyntax; Loanwords.

RESUMEN: En este artículo ofrezco una contribución al estudio filológico de materiales premodernos de lenguas suramericanas que ya se han extinguido. Me ocupo de la lengua yurumangüí, cuyos hablantes fueron encontrados en el siglo XVIII en las tierras bajas occidentales de Colombia por una expedición española. Este encuentro resultó en la producción de una colección breve de palabras y frases por un clérigo. Esta fuente de datos se analiza de nuevo acá. Cuestiones asociadas con la representación ortográfica inconsistente y probablemente sumamente inadecuada del habla de los consultantes yurumanguies, en este caso, dan lugar a problemas graves en llegar a conclusiones consistentes, como muestro continuamente en mi discusión muy tentativa de la morfotaxis nominal y verbal. Además, ofrezco unas comparaciones externas para una porción del material léxico del yurumangüí. Lejos de ser capaz de demostrar las conexiones genéticas de la lengua, tales comparaciones sí permiten identificar elementos léxicos que la lengua yurumangüí compartió con lenguas vecinas, y por allí situar la lengua dentro de la ecología lingüística original de esta parte de América del Sur.

PALABRAS CLAVES: Yurumangüí; Filología; Fuentes premodernas; Morfosintaxis; Préstamos.

1. Introduction

South America, as is well known, is linguistically extremely diverse, and was still more diverse before the European impact set in motion an unprecedented process of

¹ The first draft of this article was written while the author was supported by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement No. 295918. It was revised while supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project No. UR 310/1-1

language extinction. Many languages must have disappeared without leaving any trace whatsoever, other languages that have vanished we know only by name, and for yet others we have at least premodern sources which are, however, restricted in many ways. In this article, I report on my attempts of analyzing the little extant documentation of the Yurumangú language, which is restricted to a single wordlist. Speakers of this language were encountered in the late 18th century inhabiting the riverine lowlands to the west of the Farallones de Cali mountain chain in Colombia's Valle del Cauca department (cf. Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 60). I will show that in this particular case, unfortunately, very few properties of the languages can be recovered from the extant data with a high degree of certainty. This not only has something to do with the fact that important philological techniques of data analysis, such as comparative reconstitution (Broadbent 1957; Constenla Umaña 2000), which constitute powerful tools of analysis of imperfectly represented and quantitatively limited data, cannot apply to single wordlists. Also, in the Yurumangú case, certain properties of the speech that is recorded seem to bar or at least limit the possibilities of analysis. That said, some limited amount of morphological analysis is possible. Likewise, through the detection of vocabulary items which the Yurumangú languages shared with the neighboring Barbacoan and Chocóan languages as well as the isolate Esmeraldeño, it is possible to situate the language within the prehispanic language ecology of southwestern Colombia.

2. Circumstances of data collection and previous analyses

Yurumangú is an extremely poorly documented language. The only known data, a list of words and phrases, were recorded by the missionary Christoval Romero, who accompanied expeditions by Sebastián Lanchas de Estrada in the 1760s.

In Sebastián Lanchas de Estrada's diary the following passage is interesting (quoted after Rivet 1942: 7). It features frequent zero-anaphora, so referent tracking is not always easy. I therefore add likely referents in square brackets.

Esta Nacion [the Yurumangú] tiene guerra con otra que esta al Sur. De estos [the other nation] hay en la cabezeras de Mycay Rio de este nombre, en el rio de San Juan, y en el de Guajui, hacia Ys-quande. Aqui tienen [the Yurumangú] vna India esclava de aquella Nacion, y dicen [the Yurumangú] hay tres dias de camino. No parlan [the other nation?] vna Lengua, pues son diversas. La dicha Nacion es más pujante, que esta, y dicen [the Yurumangú] que vienen [the other nation] muchos, y se gobiernan (como Nosotros) por días, ellos por soles, y cuentan por los dedos. Y por decir dia dicen [the Yurumangú] *Siconá*, que es el nombre que dan al Sol, y es vn dia...

Of course, the interesting statement for present purposes is that concerning the plurality of the languages of the groups the Yurumangú were at war with. On geographical grounds, the respective languages may have been members of the Barbacoan and/or Chocó families.

The Yurumangú linguistic data were published by Arcila Robledo (1940) and Ortiz (1946) without analysis, and republished by Rivet (1942), accompanied by a transcription into what he (1942: 9) calls "notation phonétique" (which basically consists of a normalization of the Spanish orthography employed by Romero), some grammatical analysis and an attempt to link Yurumangú with the Hokan languages of North America.

Rivet's method to show this connection, which consists of unsystematic comparisons between Yurumangú forms and only selected languages of the many associated with the –still not generally accepted– Hokan family, is, however, not suitable for this task, and hence his evidence must be treated as insufficient. Also, Rivet's grammatical analysis of Yurumangú must be read with caution, because it is frequently based on comparison with languages of suspected Hokan affinity. For instance, he felt entitled to isolate a Yurumangú prefix <d- > only because the middle part of <dijia> 'moon' vaguely resembling "Pomo" (actually a family of Californian languages associated by many with Hokan rather than a single language) *íwe* (there is a suffix <-a> in Yurumangú according to Rivet as well). The Hokan connection was uncritically taken over by Greenberg (1987). A critical evaluation of this connection and the methodological laxness employed by Rivet and Greenberg, particularly regarding morphological segmentation, is in Poser (1992). Swadesh (1963) saw connections with Chamicuro (now recognized as Arawakan) and Ofayé (now believed to be Macro-Gê); on the basis of comparisons with the Chamicuro data in Parker with Orbe Caro & Patow Chota (1987) and the Ofayé forms in de Oliveira (2006), I have not been able to substantiate any particular similarities of these languages with Yurumangú.

Lanchas de Estrada (in Rivet 1942: 8) states that "El Padre [scil. Romero] está más que medianamente introducido en el Ydioma de estos Naturales". However, it is important to bear in mind the circumstances under which the data were assembled. Lanchas de Estrada (in Rivet 1942: 8) relates an episode in which he communicated with a Yurumangú speaker by means of signs, which indicates that at least this individual did not speak Spanish (and this, in fact, would be expected given the isolation of the group). If indeed this was true of the Yurumangú at large, then one needs to look at the data recorded by Romero with different eyes. This is because they could not be the result of elicitation for lack of a common language. Instead, they are rather likely to be a conundrum of names Romero obtained by pointing at things, phrases he overheard in particular situations for which he isolated a meaning they may or may not have had (cf. Quine's 1960 *gavagai*-problem), and phrases with potentially dubious grammaticality he learned to use to obtain a particular outcome (that in turn the Yurumangú may have learned Romero says when he wants something). Furthermore, a number of the forms in the vocabulary give the impression that the Yurumangú to some extent did foreigner talk. An example is <coutana>, which is glossed as 'I'll go to see it' by Romero, but on the basis of comparison with other items in the vocabulary, is analyzable simply as <cou-tana> 'see-go'. In short, at least part of the material may only bear a weak resemblance to actual Yurumangú speech, or at any rate does not reflect grammatical patterns adequately (let alone the language's phonology). Therefore, in this case, I shall make no attempt to reconstruct an approximate pronunciation of the words collected by Romero or to make principled inferences about Yurumangú phonology. The data seem too inconsistently transcribed to arrive at any reasonably safe conclusions in this regard. As an example of the magnitude of the inconsistencies, <queobai> 'man' can be compared with <cueba canana> 'liar' and <quitina> 'woman' with <tintin canana> 'lying woman' (cf. for both <cananocia> 'it is not a lie'). On semantic grounds, we would expect the obviously complex expressions <cueba canana> and <tintin canana> to feature the words for 'man' and 'woman' respectively as their heads. Indeed, that seems to be the case, but the difference in transcription between <queobai> and <cueba> 'man' on the one hand and <quitina> and <tintin> 'woman' on

the other hand show how large the variation in spelling of what must represent the same word can be. Furthermore, as already noted, the technique of phonological reconstitution (Broadbent 1957; Constenla Umaña 2000) does not work with single lists, but crucially requires data from different sources to work – as Constenla Umaña (2000: 176) puts it, one can try to eliminate some variation from data from a single list, but one is unlikely to arrive at any conclusions other than that the data are deficient. Therefore, I restrict myself to some brief notes on regularities in Romero’s transcription in the following paragraph, and will instead later focus on the attempt to identify grammatical elements and patterns that allow to put Yurumanguí better into a comparative perspective. Rivet (1942) appears to have enjoyed access to the original manuscript of the Data. Since I do not, I generally cite all data from the published source that is closest to the original and that hence has philological priority, viz. Ortiz (1946). The only modifications I made is that, unlike Ortiz, I do not capitalize first letters of object-language forms and that I enclose the data in orthographic <chevrons> as a constant reminder that the data are at hand in an orthographic representation that does not reflect the language’s phonetics and phonology except indirectly. I cite the data from Rivet (1942), in his adapted orthography, only when Rivet’s grammatical analyses are being discussed directly. In spite of the fact that Rivet himself was talking about his representation being phonetic, I also enclose data modified by Rivet in orthographic <chevrons>.

3. Some regularities in and notable features of the transcription

Regarding Yurumanguí pronunciation, one can at least note the absence and rarity of certain symbols. A number of symbols representing consonants in Spanish orthography are absent from the Yurumanguí data or quite rare: <ll> and <x> occur never. Also completely absent from the corpus are the rhotics <r> and <rr> and the laryngeal <h>. There is also only one token of <d>. <j> occurs only four times in the corpus according to my count, and <f> has only one more token than <j>, namely five. I count five tokens of <z>, many of which appear to be variant representations of <s>. <g> is most frequently found intervocally or following <n>; there are only two instances of this letter word-initially, one of which the probably onomatopoeic form <gaga> ‘I am going to defecate’. Usage of <qu> as opposed to <c> follows largely the conventions of Spanish spelling, though there are cases of <c> preceding <i> rather than the expected <qu>. <s> frequently alternates with <c>, as can be seen clearly in the form of the first singular pronoun, <acá> and <asa>, perhaps indicating that there were affricates in Yurumanguí (alternatively, these letters may simply have been difficult to distinguish in the original manuscript).

The forms <baisa> ‘day’ and <maisa> ‘night’ are clearly related to one another; in fact, they may represent different hearings of the same item, under the assumption that the meaning of the item really is ‘day’ as a unit of 24 hours, i.e. the period comprising one day and one night. The variant transcriptions are interesting from a phonological point of view, perhaps indicating a phonological association of some sort between voiced stops and nasals.

All five vowel symbols are common, and they often occur in sequences. Up to five or even six vowel symbols in a row are attested, if initial <y> is interpreted as [i]:

<yaioiabusca> ‘colino de platano’ (which I leave untranslated here and in the following because I am not sure just what entity is designated).

Closed syllables are rare; their presence can only be guessed at from the following forms: <aisteme> ‘I will bring you’, <alustaise> ‘here you have’, <aicán> ‘bird’s wing’, <angaisa> ‘lightning bolt’, <austaque> ‘I have already heard or understood’, <ainpinpia> ‘a small bird’, <baical> ‘machete’, <aisca> ‘hand’, <cuan> ‘dog’, <aslai> ‘I am going to defecate’, <lictina> ‘pot’, <ulsasa> ‘to pull, take something out’, <tinza> ‘fang’, <bisca> ‘to thunder’, <suscuca> ‘to sow’, <casmaisa> ‘to speak between teeth’, <aimasla> ‘to threaten’, <taisquimia> ‘to cuff ears’, <tasca> ‘achira leaf’, <aucasal> ‘to cut that’ (cf. <aucasa> ‘to cut’), <nonsubiá> ‘are we friends?’, <yaioiabusca> ‘colino de platano’, <cocuebiquen> ‘where are you going?’, <taemet> ‘give me or bring me that’, <pun pun lac> ‘I am bathing’, <coco sitalmea> ‘Later I will sell’, <austeica> ‘I take that’, <jamais> ‘to talk’, <biscona> ‘rifle’, <cascati> ‘put it’, and <cayen yepa> ‘great-grandmother’. Depending on interpretation, items like <angua> ‘fire’ and <anga> ‘firewood’, <angaipoa> ‘path’, <angaiaca> ‘burning tobacco’, <cocuebiquen> ‘where are you going?’ may also feature a syllable-final nasal. <s> is particularly frequent in syllable-final position. With the exception of the item <blaisa> ‘to sew’, where two consonant symbols follow each other in the syllable onset, relevant tokens from the above list are also the only instances of sequences of consonant symbols in Romero’s data.

4. Grammar

4.1. General assessment

To anticipate the conclusion of the ensuing discussion, I have not been able to identify a single consistent or even near-consistent grammatical pattern in the data. As discussed in the introduction, this can be attributed either to the rudimentary nature of the transcription, or to the above noted possibility that parts of the recorded forms represent a form of foreigner talk. It is true that the sequence <ca(i)->, for instance, occurs frequently at the beginning of body part and kin terms (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 61), but there is a large number of examples of words belonging to either semantic class where there is no evidence of such a prefix. It is also very tempting to identify an imperative suffix <-é> on the basis of the pairs <chuma> ‘to drink’ – <chumaé> ‘drink!’ (original gloss ‘bebe tu’) and <lamá> ‘to eat’ – <lamaé> ‘Eat!’ (original gloss ‘come tu’), but then there are numerous examples where from the Spanish gloss one would expect the presence of an imperative marker, but <-é> is absent (e.g. <neguay> ‘go away!’, <aumija> ‘sit down!’). And so on. But especially if the quality of the available data is less than optimal, paradigmatic (near-) consistency is important to retain a minimum of faith in the statements that can be made on the structure of the language. Identification of lexical roots is equally problematic. From the aforementioned <lamá> and <lamaé> one’s best guess about the root for ‘to eat’ would be <lama>, but one is lost as soon as one tries to take into account <maypia> ‘you want to eat’ and <noenaji> ‘you don’t eat’.

In the following remarks the goal was to maximize economy, i.e. to identify regularities of Yurumanguí grammar that are able to consistently account for some of the

data, on the understanding that these, with some degree of confidence, genuinely represent something about Yurumangúí grammar that we can know about. I believe that the cases in the data that are not explained by the regularities represent something that we do not, and probably cannot, know. I further believe that it is of vital importance to not only mention explicitly the data the identified regularities are able to explain, but also those they are not able to explain. In this way an independent evaluation of the proposals is possible. Other, perhaps better, interpretations of the data remain possible.

4.2. Nominal morphology and syntax

4.2.1. Possession marking on nouns

A number of Yurumangúí nouns for kinship relations and body-parts, i.e. terms from the semantic domains susceptible of being treated grammatically as inalienably possessed, have a sequence <c(V)-> or <quV-> as the first syllable: <queobai> ‘man’, <quitina> ‘woman’, <caigi> ‘mother’, <caienaié> ~ <caienaye> ‘grandmother’, <cayen yepa> ‘great-grandmother’, <conotea> ‘eyelashes’, <couna> ‘eyes’, <colopeiaisa> ‘heart’, <couna> ‘eyes, pupil of the eye’, <cailusa> ‘hair’, <caumaca> ‘face’, <cuegotea> ‘skin’. However, other nouns in the domains of kinship and body-parts do not have this initial sequence: <maa> ‘father’, <yasa> ‘brothers’, <aisca> ‘hand’, <auciá> ‘ears’, <ataiza> ‘sister’, <tina> ‘teeth’, <laiga> ‘forehead’, <yaisina> ‘vein’, <yaa> ‘blood’, <zoina> ‘saliva’, <bipaspa> ‘heart’, <sipia sinaisa> ‘soul or breath’, <yacuisa> ‘fingernails’. Thus, there are 12 nouns featuring the sequence as opposed to the same number that do not. What is more, the notional nouns <caluma> ‘ripe banana’, <cagua> ‘peach-palm’, <canana> ‘lie’, <cicona> ‘sun’, <cucula> ‘worm or beetle’, <cauba> ‘butterfly’, <quipua> ‘horse fly’, <cogua> ‘guadua’, and <cauisa> ‘palm heart’ also feature the sequence, though they are on semantic grounds unlikely to be possessed, whether alienably or inalienably.

Rivet (1942: 29), as just mentioned, isolates a prefix of the shape <ka-> ~ <ke-> ~ <ki-> ~ <ko-> ~ <ku-> ~ <k->, i.e. <k(V)->, from these. He thinks of this prefix as coding a 1st person possessor, but this is entirely hypothetical and not supported by Romero’s glosses. Furthermore, from the above list it becomes clear that it is a gross overstatement to say that “[l]e plus grand nombre des mots désignant des parties du corps ou des noms de parenté présente le préfixe *ka-, ke-, ki-, ko-, ku-, k-*” (Rivet 1942: 20). However, there is some evidence to support the interpretation as a prefix: <quitina> ‘woman’ can be compared with <tintin canana> ‘lying woman’ (cf. <cananocia> ‘It is not a lie’) and externally with Esmeraldeño <tîn-> ~ <tiôn-> ~ <tiãun> ‘woman’ (Seler 1902: 54).² These comparisons do suggest the presence of additional morphological material in the Yurumangúí form <quitina> ‘woman’ beyond the lexical root. Likewise, <cuegotea> ‘skin’ and <couna> ‘eye’ can be compared with <conotea> ‘eyelid’ (glossed as ‘las pestañas’ by Romero, but as already noted by Rivet 1942: 12, more likely meaning ‘eyelid’). Here, the <cue> sequence of the form for ‘skin’ in isolation is not repeated in

² As for <tintin canana> ‘lying woman’, compare the male form <cueba canana> ‘liar’, in which the initial <eV>-sequence is retained.

the complex form, though neither is the word-internal sequence <go->, so this piece of evidence is not straightforward.

4.2.2. Diminution and Augmentation

Rivet's (1942: 24) evidence for the diminutive and augmentative morphemes <-si-> and <-kal>, which he furthermore postulates, comes from two pairs of words in Romero's data: <initina> 'mate' – <initisina> 'small mate' and <baisina> 'knife, razor' – <baical> 'machete'. The first pair is actually rather convincing, and suggests either a stem <initina> and an infix inserted before the final syllable or a stem <initi>, followed by a suffix <-si> and another suffix <-na> (Rivet's terminological choices are inconsistent since he opts for the latter analysis, which means that the supposed diminutive morpheme is not actually an infix but a suffix). While <baical> 'machete' as the augmentative of <baisina> 'knife' is unconvincing, there are some interesting other alternations involving <ɫ> that are worth mentioning briefly, although no clear morphological mechanism can be identified. For one, <aimasla> 'to threaten' seems related to <aimasa> 'to kill' and, also in the verbal domain, the forms <aucasa> 'to cut' and <aucasal> 'to cut that' betray some sort of morphological connection as well. Alternations involving <ɫ> also occur in the nominal domain, compare <caluma> 'ripe banana' with <cu> 'banana'. Whatever the function and nature of <ɫ> in these pairs, <baical> 'knife' and <baisina> 'knife' may pertain to the same pattern.

Rivet's (1942: 25) identification of <-za> as an augmentative, finally, is not sufficiently supported by the data, the relevant comparison being only <tina> 'teeth' vs. <tinza> 'canine tooth'. Clearly, these forms are morphologically related, but just in what way cannot be stated with any certainty; perhaps they are mere variants of the very same word.

4.2.3. A nominal suffix <-a> or <-Ca>?

Quite many nouns (or to be more precise, forms appearing in Romero's data that on the basis of the semantics of their translation are *assumed* to be nouns) end in a sequence <-Ca>. This is in fact so common that it is easier to list those nouns which do not: <queobai> 'man', <caigi> 'mother', <minni> 'earth', <ayo> 'river' (cf. <aia> 'water'), <aufuí> 'any kind of wood', <cuan> 'dog', <caienaié> ~ <caienaye> 'grandmother', <aguabai layaco> 'jaguar', <taucano> 'parrot', <aicán> 'bird's wings', <baical> 'machete', <totoque> 'axe', <nasotasi> 'manioc', <pipie> 'fan', and <bai> 'door'. If on the basis of comparison of <queobai> 'man' and <cueba canana> 'liar' (cf. <canana> 'lie') one treats <ai> as a variant spelling of <a>,³ treats <taucano> and <nasotasi> as possible loans (cf. section 6), and <totoque> and <pipie> as possible loans (cf. section 6) and/or onomatopoeic and therefore not subject to the structural peculiarities of the Yurumanguí lexicogrammatic system in the same way as non-onomatopoeic vocabulary, the number of items that do not adhere to the canonical structure becomes even smaller.

³ On the basis of <queobai> 'man' and <caigi> 'mother', Rivet (1942: 30) wishes to isolate a kinship term-suffix <-i>. To these comparisons, he also adds <aguabai layaco> 'jaguar'.

There are some interesting skewings as to the frequency of consonants in final <-Ca>-sequences: by far the most frequent are symbols for a –presumably– alveolar sound, in particular <s> and <n>. However, the frequency of occurrence of these letters is not unique to that position, but pertains to the entire corpus. Nevertheless, there are some interesting semantic correlates with the nature of the consonant preceding the final <a> which may suggest that one is dealing not with a suffix <-a>, but rather with several different suffixes of the shape <-Ca>:

<-na>, for one, is particularly frequent in nouns denoting tools: <baisina> ‘knife, razor’, <sipana> ‘hat’, <lictina> ‘pot’, <initina> ‘mate’, <initisina> ‘small mate’, <pitina> ‘basket’, <paina> ‘spear’, <biscona> ‘rifle’, <naupana> ‘support pad’, and <yepena> ‘needle’. Other nouns with <-na> as the final syllable are: <quitina> ‘woman’, <cicona> ‘sun’, <caicona> ‘head’, <canana> ‘lie’, <aocona> ‘maize’, <aucana> ‘corn cob, husk’ (these two may actually be variant spellings of the same word), <tina> ‘tooth/teeth’, <couna> ‘eyes’, <nana> ‘conga ant’, and <yaisina> ‘vein’. Alongside the abovementioned pair <initina> ‘mate’ – <initisina> ‘small mate’, one item in particular, <biscona> ‘rifle’, makes it tempting to identify <-na> as a derivational suffix for instrument and/or agent nouns: as Rivet (1942: 23) noted, this item may be derived from <bisca> ‘thunder’. For <couna> ‘eye’, one can then propose the analysis <cou-na> ‘see-agent/instrument (cf. <coutana> ‘I go to see it’, which is, as already mentioned, presumably analyzable simply as <cou-tana> ‘see-go’). Words for ‘eye’ derived from ‘to see’ occasionally appear also in other languages of the world. As for the rest of the Yurumanguí words containing the putative <-na> morpheme, a plausible derivation base is unattested.

A final syllable <-ca> is frequently, but far from exclusively, found in terms for natural kinds: <aisca> ‘hand’, <aimaca> ‘beans’, <naupica> ‘coney’, <naubaca> ‘wild pig’, <yuoica> ‘sparrowhawk’, <angaiaca> ‘burning tobacco’, <auccuca> ‘damajagua’, <caumaca> ‘face’, <aisca> ‘hand’, <boca> ‘squash’, <ilica> ‘k.o. bird’, <tasca> ‘achira leaf’, <nou saca> ‘bamboo board’, <yaioibusca> ‘colino de plátano’.

Several nouns also have a final <-sa>, though here even less semantic consistency can be noted. On the other hand, the similarity between <colopia> ‘You owe me’ and <colopeiaisa> ‘heart’ can hardly be accidental. One could think of ‘to want, to desire’ as a semantic link between verb and putatively derived noun (in Khoekhoe, a Khoisan language of southern Africa, for instance, †*gao-b* ~ †*gao-s* ‘heart’ is related to †*gao* ‘to want, have desire’, Haacke & Eiseb 2002).

Generally, as the frequent counterexamples indicate, the correlation between the final consonant of the word and that word’s semantics is a statistical regularity only, and in no way approaches the consistency one would expect from a grammatical pattern. Indeed, apart from the regularity of a final <-Ca>-sequence, there is little evidence in the behavior of forms in the data that would allow one to identify <-a> as a suffix rather than part of the root. It may simply be a paragogic vowel which appears to satisfy a hypothetical Yurumanguí constraint on (surface) syllable structure.⁴ This latter is also supported by the fact that a final <-a> is very frequent in verbal forms as well.

⁴ Compare e.g. the “echo vowels” in Jê languages and Ofayé (Ribeiro & van der Voort 2010: 554).

Possibly the behavior of nouns when entering into constructions can shed light on the issue. From what little data we have, it seems that the final <-a> remains when the noun enters into a syntactic construction as undergoer.

- | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|---|------------------|------------------------|
| (1) <angua> | ‘fire’ | – | <angua taiuiuma> | ‘Bring me fire!’ |
| <cuu> | ‘banana’ | – | <cuatuame> | ‘Bring me banana!’ |
| <cagua> | ‘peach-palm’ | – | <cagua taume> | ‘Bring me peach-palm!’ |

This could mean that <-a> simply belongs to the noun root. With complex lexemes, interpreting the evidence is difficult. <Yaisina> ‘vein’, as already noted, is likely a complex form containing <yaa> ‘blood’. Since this can be interpreted phonetically as either [ja:] or [jaʔa] with [-ʔa] as the putative suffix, and since we do not know the shape of the sequence <-isina> in isolation (nor its meaning), this case can be both interpreted as <yaa> having lost the suffix in this construction (otherwise the expected form for ‘vein’ would be *<yaisina>), or as having retained its final vowel. Equally equivocal is the case of <couna> ‘eye’ compared with <conotea> ‘eyelash’. Here we lack a form of the root <-tea> without preceding material, and hence the evidence for the assignment of the word-internal vowel <o> to a root. But it is plausible considering this <o> as identical to the <a> of <couna>, which assimilated to the preceding <o> in non-final position. In sum, we are left with the strong statistical regularity that Yurumanguí nouns tend to end in <-a>, with the possibility that one is dealing with a separate morpheme, but also with several facts which rather suggest prosodic reasons for the regularity. Moreover, a mere strong preference for vowel-final roots is possible.

4.2.4. Root combination

Several examples illustrate that lexical roots of Yurumanguí can be combined to form the names for body parts and natural kinds. None of the examples taken by itself is unproblematic, but together, the evidence is quite strong: <conotea>, glossed in Romero’s vocabulary as ‘eyelash’, when compared with <couna> ‘eyes’ and <cuegotea> ‘skin’ turns out to be a complex form literally translatable as ‘eye-skin’, in which case the gloss ‘eyelash’ is a mistake for ‘eyelid’ (cf. Rivet 1942: 12). The root <tea> is present also in the word for ‘sole of shoe’, <nautea>. The problem in both cases is that an explanation for <cuego> in the word for ‘skin’ is lacking. Further, as already mentioned in 4.2.3, <yaisina> ‘vein’ must contain <yaa> ‘blood’ (the meaning of <-sina> is not known), and <augafa> ‘ashes’ must contain <anga> ‘firewood’ (again, the meaning of <-fa> is not known). One can note that there is a consistent dependent-head order in these combinations (cf. also Constenla Umaña 1991: 53). Strictly speaking we do not know whether the mechanism by which these forms are created is a morphological or syntactic one, i.e. whether one is dealing with compounds or conventionalized phrases (hence the neutral title “root combination” for this section).

However, the abovementioned forms can be contrasted with <tintin canana> ‘lying woman’ where, as we have already seen in 4.2.1., <tintin> can be identified as ‘woman’ on the basis of comparison with <quitina> ‘woman’ and <canana> as having to do with lying on the basis of comparison with <cananocia> ‘It is not a lie’. Here, the head precedes

the dependent, suggesting a different kind of construction. Constenla Umaña (1991: 53) thinks of <tintin canana> as a substantive followed by an adjective.

4.3. Verb morphology and syntax

4.3.1. Negation

A sequence recurring in some negated sentences is <-ci> (cf. Constenla Umaña 1991: 53). The forms in (2) appear to be instances of the presence of this suffix:

- | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------|
| (2) <causacié> | ‘Don’t cry!’ | (cf. <causá> | ‘cry’) |
| <suipacia> | ‘No, see you later’ | | |
| <cumaipacia> | ‘I don’t return anymore’ | | |
| <cananocia> | ‘It is not a lie’ | | |

Rivet (1942: 36) and Constenla Umaña (1991: 53) further offer as evidence the pair in (3), which appears to match perfectly (cf. also Rivet 1942: 36):

- | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| (3) <cunacia> | ‘Yes, I have seen him’ |
| <cunacicia> | ‘I have not seemed him’. |

Two notes are in order: first, Ortiz (1946) has <cinacia> ‘Yes, I have seen him’, but nothing resembling <cunacicia>. Second, Rivet’s (1942: 36) glosses are not those actually found in Romero’s vocabulary (i.e. the version which Rivet has seen), which has <cunacia> ‘I have not seen him’ and <cunacicia> ‘Yes, I have seen him’. Rivet (1942: 19fn1) assumed that this is an erroneous inversion, which in fact seems reasonable in the light of the pattern emerging from the data above (I cannot form an opinion of my own because Ortiz 1946 does not have these data and I do not have access to the original manuscript).

To these, Rivet (1942: 36) further adds (i) <nonsubsiá> ‘Are we friends?’, on the basis of his reinterpretation of this phrase as actually meaning ‘Are you not angry?’, (ii) <bileasia> ‘disgust’, on the interpretation that the literal meaning is ‘not eat’ (‘ne pas manger’; this in turn rests on an ad-hoc comparison of the sequence <bile> with Pomoan data), and (iii) <maititasia> ‘resungar’, which he assumes to be literally ‘to not say’, on the basis of comparison with <austaimeti> ‘I have understood what you tell me’, and the interpretation that these forms contain a common root ‘to speak’.

Even if the last three examples adduced by Rivet are removed from the list on grounds of their speculative nature, the evidence for a negative suffix <-ci> is rather strong. However, we must also bear in mind what this interpretation does *not* explain, namely the list of expressions in (4), which on the basis of the gloss should feature <-ci>, but do not. Of those, the first four are particularly problematic, while the glosses for the last four suggest that the actual meaning may be such that the morpheme really does not occur.

(4) <noenaji>	‘You don’t eat’
<aupita>	‘I don’t hear’
<sinatina>	‘I don’t have’
<copia>	‘I have not seen that’
<baipia>	‘Is not here, has not come here’
<suina>	‘Went or is not here’
<naipasila>	‘Don’t be careful that nothing will happen to you’ ⁵
<cuaia>	‘expression used by the Yurumanguí when Romero did not understand them’

Rivet (1942: 36-37) handles the problematic remaining data by assuming a total of four further Yurumanguí negative affixes, all of which are just attested two or three times and vary in their shape. Rather unconvincingly, he posits a further negative suffix <-ta> on the basis of <aupita> ‘I don’t hear’, <pinita> ‘empty house’, and the abovementioned <nonsubsiá> ‘Are we friends?’, which he reinterprets as ‘Are you not angry?’. Further affixes Rivet assumes are <su-> (extracted from <suina> ‘Went or is not here’, <suipacia> ‘No, see you later’, and with doubts on his behalf <sinatina> ‘I don’t have’), <k-> ~ <ka-> (extracted from <copia> ‘I have not seen that’ and <casmalisa> ‘to mumble’), and finally <na-> ~ <no-> (extracted from <naipasila>, ‘Don’t be careful that nothing will happen to you’, glossed by him as ‘Don’t be afraid’, and <noenaji> ‘You don’t eat’). Of these, the most plausible one is actually <su->; from the translation ‘No, see you later’ for <suipacia> one might guess that this is not a verbal affix but rather an independent negative particle.

4.3.2. Verbal person marking

The analysis of <-ci> as a negative suffix is interesting because it leads to an interpretation in another area of grammar, namely that of cross-referencing affixes on verbs. One can note that the form implying the addressee, <causacié> ‘Don’t cry!’, has a final <-é>, whereas the other forms have <a>. Indeed, Rivet (1942: 33) posits an imperative suffix <-e> ~ <-i> ~ <-y>. However, when one looks at further examples implying a 2nd person but no imperative mood (judging from glosses), one also encounters <-e(-)> in a number of further cases which leads to a possibility interpreting of <-e(-)> as a 2nd person personal reference marker. Thus, the form <causacié> ‘Don’t cry’ and <cucae> ~ <cucae> ‘Where are you?’ may be analyzed as in (5), on the assumption that the imperative reading in the former is pragmatic and does not have a morphological exponent:

(5) <causa-ci-é>	<cu-ca-é>
cry-NEG-2	where-be-2
‘Don’t cry!’	‘Where are you?’

This analysis also allows for a differing analysis of the <-é> in the already mentioned forms which Rivet treats as an allomorph of his <-e> ~ <-i> ~ <-y> imperative suffix:

⁵ Original: ‘no tengas cuidado que nada te sucederá’.

- (6) <lama-é> <chuma-é>
 eat-2 drink-2
 ‘Eat!’ (‘come tu’) ‘Drink!’ (‘bebe tu’)

Again, we need to posit the imperative reading as pragmatic only (but note the original Spanish glosses in which the imperative is also expressed with an additional redundant pronoun: ‘come tu’, not ‘¡come!’, ‘bebe tu’, not ‘¡bebe!’).

We have no way of telling the degree of morphological boundness. The fact that the final <-e> frequently bears a diacritic may suggest that one is dealing with a separate pronoun forming a phonological word of itself. At any rate, personal reference by suffixing rather than prefixing would be typologically natural if the final elements <aga>, <cay> in the phrases in (7) with 1st person reference are interpreted as variants of the 1st singular pronoun, which is spelled <acá> and <asa> in isolation by Romero. This would imply VS order in intransitive clauses, at least with pronominal agents (there is no data in the manuscript for lexical NPs in agent role).

- (7) <taita aga> ‘I go already’
 <tana cay> ‘I go or come with me’

Further examples for which Romero’s glosses suggest the presence of a 2nd person marker are in (8), though they have some unaccounted parts:

- (8) <cocue-biqu-e-n > (cf. <cocobica> ‘Where do you come from?’)
 q-go-2-?? (cf. section 4.2.3. for the interpretation of <cocue->)
 ‘Where do you go?’
 Problem: final <n>

- <cucu-ian-e-a>
 q-do-2-?? (cf. section 4.2.3. on the interpretation of <cucu->)
 ‘What are you doing?’
 Problems: final <a>; root <ian> not attested otherwise

The data in (9) show <e> preceded by <m>, in turn preceded by a lexical root. One can therefore speculate that this <m> is a separate morpheme indicating an unknown verbal category. I shall gloss it as ‘v.MORPH’ in the following, though this of course is only a fig leaf to conceal my ignorance about its function.

- (9) <cua-tua-m-e> (cf. <cua> ‘banana’, <taemet> ‘give me, or bring me this or that!’)
 banana-bring-v.MORPH-2
 ‘Bring me banana(s)!’

- <cagua tau-m-e> (cf. <cagua> ‘peach-palm’, <taemet> ‘give me, or bring me this or that!’)

- peach-palm bring-v.MORPH-2
 ‘Bring me peach-palm!’

These phrases, along with <baitiza> ‘close the door!’ or ‘closes the door’ (<bai> ‘door’), suggest OV order in transitive clauses (Constenla Umaña 1991: 53). This would parallel dependent-head order in the possessive constructions mentioned above.

A less optimistic interpretation of the sequence <-me> would be to assume identity of the entire sequence <-me> in <cuatume> ‘Bring me banana(s)’ and <cagua taume> ‘Bring me peach-palm!’ with the Spanish pronoun *me*. This would be in contradiction with <aisteime> ‘I’ll bring you’, however, where the Spanish oblique *me* would be unexpected, judging from the translation.

There is another example containing the sequence <me>, tentatively analyzed in (10). Its translation ‘I have already understood what you tell me’ is consistent with the interpretation of <-e(-)> as a 2nd person marker, potentially preceded by a separate morpheme <m>:

- (10) <aus-tai-m-e-ti> (cf. <austaque> ~ <aupeitaia> ‘I have already heard or understood’, <aupita> ‘I don’t hear’)
 hear-??-V.MORPH-2-??
 ‘I have already understood what you tell me.’

<-tai-> is probably a separate root that occurs elsewhere in the data, compare again <aisteime> ‘I’ll bring you’ as well as <alustaise> ‘Here you have’. Since it seems impossible to assign a specific semantics to it, I leave it unglossed. The interesting fact about (10), however, is the final <-ti>. It occurs in another example involving an inanimate 3rd person undergoer, namely <cascati> ‘put it!’. While this example adds some plausibility to the idea of <-ti> as a 3rd person marker, it is problematic for the absence of the expected <-e-> as the 2nd person marker. But there is yet further support for <-ti> as a 3rd person marker, possibly restricted to undergoer role, at least if one is willing to allow for the final vowel to be dropped. It comes from the form <taemet> ‘give me, or bring me this or that!’, which we already have encountered. It might be analyzable as in (11):

- (11) <tae-m-e-t>
 give-V.MORPH-2-3
 ‘Give me, or bring me this or that!’

Final <-ti> ~ <-t> would be identified by Rivet as an alternant of his (1942: 22) demonstrative “infix” <-ita-> ~ <-uta-> ~ <-tai-> ~ <-ti-> ~ <-tei-> ~ <-ta-> ~ <-t->. In his analysis, the <-tai-> sequence in <aisteime> ‘I’ll bring you’ and <alustaise> ‘here you have’ is also identified with this postulated demonstrative (Rivet 1942: 22). I find the range of alternants way too large to be convincing, even if one has to allow for some variation due to the nature of the data.

However, both the alternative conjectural identification of <-e> as a 2nd person marker and that of <-t> ~ <-ti> as a 3rd person marker suggested above is very shaky as well, because of other data which are inconsistent with it. Consider, for one, the frequent examples in Romero’s vocabulary where the gloss implies reference to a 2nd person, but no <e> is present, which include, imperatives aside, those in (12):

- (12) <guijifi> ‘What’s your name?’
 <canaca> ‘What do you offer, what do you want?’
 <aipiaya> ‘You go’
 <tana cay> ‘I go, or come with me’
 <cocobica> ‘Where do you come from?’
 <naipasila> ‘Don’t be careful that nothing will happen to you’
 <maypia> ‘You want to eat’
 <aupisia> ‘You want to drink’

Further, it is indeed the case that many of the examples in which <-e> figures are in imperative mood. Hence, Rivet’s (1927: 33) postulation of an imperative suffix <-e> ~ <-i> ~ <-y> has some plausibility. Rivet quotes the examples in (5) and both in (6), along with those in (13) as examples:

- (13) <tana cay> ‘I go, or come with me’
 <neguay> ‘Go away!’
 <ubai> ‘Drink!’

Hence, while for <tana cay> an alternative analysis involving the 1st person pronoun is available (cf. (7)), the imperative interpretation has some explanatory potential. Further, examples (9) and (11) may be added to Rivet’s list, strengthening the case. However, both under Rivet’s imperative interpretation as well as that elaborated above, inconsistent data remain, so that a clear preference does not emerge.

Rivet (1942: 33) also offers an alternative interpretation of final <-me>. Together with an assumed variant <-ma>, he considers it to express either the imperative mood or future tense. The evidence he quotes is in (14):

- (14) <taemet > ‘Give me, or bring me this or that’⁶
 <angua taiuiuma> ‘Bring me fire’
 <aisteime> ‘I’ll bring you’
 <coco sitalmea> ‘Later I will sell’
 <cocotanamea> ‘to return’

As with other of Rivet’s postulated morphemes, the graphemic and semantic range is quite large, though not exuberantly so in this case.

Further, Rivet (1942: 22) posits a second person suffix <-ka> ~ <-ken>, which according to him only occurs in interrogative contexts. He considers the data in (15) as evidence:

- (15) <canaca> ‘What do you offer, or what do you want?’
 <cucae> ‘Where are you?’
 <cocuebiquen> ‘Where are you going?’
 <cocobica> ‘Where do you come from?’

⁶ Rivet transcribes this item as <ta-u-me>.

Several of these examples have problems: For one, if <-ca> in <canaca> ‘What do you offer, or what do you want?’ is indeed a 2nd person suffix, and, if <cana> is ‘what?’ (cf. 4.3.3. below), there is no verb root in this phrase. Rivet’s assumption that <-ken> is in fact a variant of <-ka> in <cocuebiquen> ‘Where are you going?’ and <cocobica> ‘Where do you come from?’ makes them, apart from the difference in the second vowel, notational variants of the same thing, hence covering the difference in the meaning given for them by Romero. On a more general level, by distributing the striking association of <e> in phrases with an implied 2nd person over two different morphemes (<-me> ~ <-ma> ‘imperative/future’ and <-ka> ~ <-ken> ‘2nd person singular in interrogative phrases’), he fails to capture a more general regularity in the data.

Another question is that of the presence of a 1st person verbal reference marker. Like nouns, Yurumangú verbs frequently end in <-a>. It is possible to speculate that this final vowel is in fact such a marker. Concurrently, one could analyze <cananocia> as in (16), at the same time suggesting that the proper translation is not ‘it is not a lie’ but ‘I don’t lie’:

- (16) <canano-ci-a> (cf. <canana> ‘lie’)
 lie-NEG-1
 ‘I don’t lie’

Yet another interpretation would be one which assumes <-a> to be another 3rd person suffix, then retaining the original translation ‘It is not a lie’. This analysis would imply that, if <canana> is indeed a nominal root, verbal morphology can be added to nouns as well. All of this is, however, not sufficiently supported by facts and does not lead to consistent patterns. It is important to note here that, as seen in 4.2.3., <-a> is also the ending of most Yurumangú forms translated by Romero as Spanish nouns. A more parsimonious explanation of the frequency of the final vowel would therefore be to assume that it is a phonetic phenomenon conditioned by requirements of Yurumangú phonology. One also must not forget examples such as (17), already alluded to in section 2, for which a maximally simple morphological analysis as concatenated verb roots without any grammatical morphology is sufficient and indeed preferable:

- (17) <cou-tana> (cf. <tana tana> ‘walk’, <tana cay> ‘I go, or come with me’,
 <cou-na> ‘eye’)
 see-go
 ‘I go to see it’

4.3.3. Copular constructions

On the basis of the data in (18), Rivet (1942: 23) identifies a demonstrative of the shape <-na> ~ <-ina>:

- (18) <ai-na> ‘Here it is’ (cf. section 6.6. on Spanish influence)
 <cu-na> ‘Where is 3SG?’ (cf. section 4.3.4. on the segmentation of <cu->)
 <sui-na> ‘Went or is not here’ (cf. section 4.3.1. on <sui->)
 <ca-na> ‘What?’ (cf. section 4.3.4. on the segmentation of <ca->)

I would interpret <na> here as a kind of copula (recall, incidentally, the possible homographic nominal ending <-na> in section 4.2.3.). <alaicana> ‘How is this called?’ rather straightforwardly contains this element as well, or is even headed by <cana> ‘what’.

With the exception of <cananocia> ‘it is not a lie’ which I would give a different interpretation (see (16)), the interpretation of <na> as a copula in the data in (18) together with <nonsubsiá> ‘Are we friends?’, the associated response <naibita> ‘Yes, we are friends’, and <cucae> ‘Where are you?’, almost exhaustively accounts for the data in which a copula figures in translations (though note <aiaba> ‘It is far’ and <baipia> ‘Is not here, or has not come here’). This interpretation has the additional advantage of also being able to account for <taina> ~ <tainaila> (at least its first variant), and allows to isolate a morph <tai-> for ‘brave’.

4.3.4. Content questions

Rivet (1942: 34) identifies an interrogative prefix oscillating between <ka-> ~ <k-> ~ <ku-> ~ <ko-> ~ <gu->. That such an element existed is quite likely from an examination of the available data. All of the ‘where’-questions, as seen in (19), indeed feature an element <cV_{back}-> in initial position.

- | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|
| (19) <cuna> | ‘Where is 3SG?’ |
| <cucae> | ‘Where are you?’ |
| <cocuebiquen> | ‘Where are you going?’ |
| <cocobica> | ‘Where do you come from?’ |

Apparently, this element at times occurs reduplicated, as can be seen from the final two examples. Note that there is a semantic correlate for reduplication: where <cV_{back}-> occurs non-reduplicated, what is being asked for is the place of something, whereas when it occurs reduplicated, a direction is in question.

<cV_{back}->, however, also occurs in ‘what’-questions, as seen in (20):

- | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| (20) <cucuianea> | ‘What are you doing?’ |
| <guijifi> | ‘What’s your name?’ |

To the examples in (20), <cuaia> ‘expression used by the Yurumanguí when Romero did not understand them’ might be added. On the basis of the data in (20), one could refine the hypothesis as to the semantic correlate of reduplication in terms of aktionsart: the reduplicated form might be used when an event is questioned, the simple form when a state is questioned. Needless to say, chance is an equally possible source for the alternations between simple and reduplicated forms of the prefix. A sequence <coco> that might instantiate the same interrogative prefix also occurs in <coco sitalmea> ‘Later I will sell’ and <cocotanamea> ‘to return’, where it is highly unexpected (perhaps <cuicuiapia> ‘I want to see or look’ should be added here as well). These forms either indicate that the function of the (reduplicated) <cV_{back}->-prefix is inadequately captured by calling it an interrogative prefix, or that they alternatively may showcase another morph with unknown semantics which happens to be similar in form.

However this may be, the examples in (20) further indicate that one cannot consistently distinguish between a ‘where’-interrogative prefix and one for ‘what’. There are two instances of <ca-> occurring in ‘what’-questions, though in reality both probably are tokens of the same basic form <cV_{back}->. These are seen in (21):

- (21) <ca-na> ‘What?’
 <canaca> ‘What do you offer, or what do you want?’

A further token of <cana> ‘what?’, as already mentioned in section 4.3.4., is likely found in <alaicana> ‘How is this called?’. The interpretation of yet another phrase translated by Romero as a question, <nonsubsiá> ‘are we friends?’, remains unclear.

4.3.5. Further grammatical morphemes postulated by Rivet

Rivet (1942) identified a sizable number of further grammatical morphemes. For some of these, he does not or cannot actually identify a meaning, for which reason alone I consider the segmentation problematic. For others, he actually provides a meaning, but there is just a single example of the hypothesized morpheme in the corpus. These segmentations I therefore also regard as problematic. Such is the case, for instance, for the postulated 1st and 2nd person plural prefixes <na-> and <non-> ~ <nom->, the demonstratives <-ba> and <-iko>, the present tense suffix <-se>, and the passive “infix” <-iba->. Other morphemes postulated are problematic not because their token frequency is too low, but because they are inconsistent in their position. For instance, his postulated demonstrative <-l> ~ <-lu-> ~ <al-> ~ <ala-> occurs either to the left, to the right, or even interspersed between other material.

Rivet (1942: 34) also identifies an element <-pia> indicating “volition” on the basis of the data in (22) (the last example he considers unsure).

- (23) <maypia> ‘You want to eat’
 <cuicuiapia> ‘I want to see or look’
 <colopia> ‘You owe me’
 <aupisia> ‘You want to drink’

The first two examples indeed suggest the presence of an element indicating volition, though it is unclear whether this is really a grammatical affix or rather simply a verb meaning ‘to want’. The identification of this element in <colopia> and <aupisia> is conjectural, although the assumption of a morph meaning ‘to want’ is at the very least consistent with the probable presence of a form related to <colopia> in the word for ‘heart’ (cf. section 4.2.3.).

5. Summary of grammatical characteristics

Summarizing what little one can say in a more or less definite manner, we have a profile in which there is dependent-head order in what Constenla Umaña (1991:

53) conceives of as genitive-substantive combinations as well as in transitive clauses. Putative adjectives in an NP, on contrast, follow the head of the phrase, which may be paralleled by VS order in intransitive clauses. Hence, Yurumanguí morphosyntax appears inconsistent with regard to the ordering of head and dependents. While my attempt to identify patterns of verb morphology, particularly verbal person reference markers, cannot be called successful, Yurumanguí, apart from a prefixal interrogative marker, still gives the impression of a language with a tendency towards suffixing verbal morphology (recall the relatively secured existence of the negative suffix <-ci>).⁷ Potentially there was quite large number of suffix slots most of which cannot be precisely reconstructed on the basis of Romero's data.

6. Lexical comparisons

6.1. Esmeraldeño

Some lexical similarities with Esmeraldeño (data from Seler 1902), a coastal language of Ecuador, can be noted. Most of those mentioned here have already been noted by Rivet (1942: 55); I do not list all of his comparisons because some seem quite far-fetched or depend on his grammatical analysis which should not be accepted uncritically. Those that seem plausible include Yurumanguí <yasa> ‘brothers’ – Esmeraldeño <yar-sá> ‘my brother’ (compare also Emberá *ja'ba*, Emberá data cited in this article from Pardo Rojas 2015 unless otherwise indicated), Yurumanguí <cuan> – Esmeraldeño <quine> ‘dog, predatory animal’, Yurumanguí <quitina> – Esmeraldeño <tín-> ~ <tiôn-> ~ <tiãun> ‘woman’ (cf. Yurumanguí <tintin canana> ‘lying woman’ for <qui-> as a prefix). Further, Yurumanguí <pipie> and Esmeraldeño <péple> ‘fan’ resemble one another; again, the comparison may also be made with Emberá *pe'pena* ‘fan’ and Epena *p^he'p^hema* ‘fan used to fan cooking fires’ (Epena data cited in this article from Quiro Dura & Harms 2015) and further with Tsafiqui (Barbacoan) *pe'pé* (Moore 1966). The similarities in this one item should, however, not be overinterpreted – words for ‘fan’, or in some cases rather the verb for ‘to blow’ from which they are derived, are frequently onomatopoeic, cf. also assorted data in Liedtke (1996: 102).

Another similarity not mentioned by Rivet is that between Yurumanguí <bicaisa> ‘fever or strong heat’ and Esmeraldeño <viacúle> ‘fever’ and <viáccotile> ‘heat’ (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 158 suggests *vi-/bi-...-le* as a canonical frame for a group of Esmeraldeño adjectives; this points to an Esmeraldeño-internal etymology). Under the assumption of consonant metathesis at some point, Proto-Chocó ***ku'wa* ~ *kuwamia* ‘fever’ (Proto-Chocó and Proto-Emberá forms cited in this article from Constenla Umaña & Margery Pena 1991), might also be comparable.

⁷ The initial position of the question marker is not a strong counterexample to the assumption of a suffixing dominance for Yurumanguí, as interrogative phrases have a tendency to occur in initial position. This is particularly common in South America (Dryer 2011).

6.2. Chocó

Rivet (1942: 55) makes further comparisons with Chocó languages specifically; I replace the forms cited by him by equivalent forms from modern sources or reconstructed forms which represent a common Chocoan word shape where possible.

He compares Yurumanguí <cana> ‘what’ with forms descending from Proto-Choco **kāre* ‘what’, <pitina> ‘basket’ with a Chocó form <peta-čagé> the provenience and accuracy of which I have not been able to verify, and <gaga> ‘defecate’ (glossed by Romero as ‘voy a purgar el vientre’) with Emberá *ã’ga-* ‘to defecate’ (cf. Proto-Emberá **ã* ‘excrement’). These forms are, of course, suspect of onomatopoeia, cf. Constenla Umaña’s (1981: 380) Proto-Chibchan form **gǎ* ‘excrement’ and the well-known forms in European languages such as Spanish *cagar*. The similarity between Yurumanguí <sibesa> ‘sand’ and Emberá *ĩ’bi* and Epena Pedee *’ipu*, which Rivet finally recognizes, is noteworthy, but not necessarily meaningful.

In section 4.2.3., the possibility of an analysis of <couna> ‘eye’ as <cou-na> ‘see-agent/instrument’ was suggested. Rivet (1942), however, has already noted similarities between this form, which he prefers to analyze as <co-una>, with the Chocó root of the verb ‘to see’: Waunana has *oon* (Mejía Fonnegra 2000), Emberá *u’nu-*, and Epena *unu-*. But there are still wider similarities: Proto-Cariban ‘eye’ is reconstructed as **ōnu-ru* (Gildea & Payne 2007); in Cariban, like apparently in Yurumanguí, this is derivationally related to a verb meaning ‘to see’, reconstructable as **ōne* (Gildea & Payne 2007). Notable is also Cayuvava *ruune ~ un- ~ uun-* ‘to see’ (Key 2015a) as well as Cuiba *tane* (Mosonyi et. al 2000) and its Guahibo etymon **tá-Ne|nai|ne-kota* (Christian & Matteson 1972). Obviously, both theories cannot be right, but because at present we cannot reliably decide whether any of the two suggestions is accurate, both are worth mentioning without making a commitment as to which, if any, is accurate

Yet there are some more similarities with Chocó forms which Rivet did not detect. The most spectacular Yurumanguí items which almost certainly have a Chocó, more precisely Emberá origin, are <caienaié> ‘grandmother’ and <cayen yepa> ‘great-grandmother’. The Emberá (Chamí variety) forms for ‘grandmother’ and ‘great-grandmother’ are *táta* and *tata-pã* respectively (Aguirre Licht 1999: 76). These bear no similarity to the Yurumanguí forms. The source terms, instead, are those for ‘grandfather’ and ‘great-grandfather’, which are *cajúre* and *cajúre-pã* (Aguirre Licht 1999: 76). Note that Emberá /t/ is realized as [n] in accented syllables when occurring in nasal contexts (Aguirre Licht 1999: 21). *-pã* is a separate morpheme in Emberá which Aguirre Licht (1999: 76) describes as expressing “superiority”. Its semantics seems to be akin to an augmentative (cf. *dáma* ‘snake’ vs. *dama-pã* ‘boa’, Aguirre Licht 1999: 76), though there is a separate suffix *-curuma* expressing augmentation according to Aguirre Licht (1999: 85). Moreover, Yurumanguí <cicona> ‘sun’ appears to be related to <couna> ‘eye’; the same association occurs in Emberá (which has *u’mã-dau* for ‘sun’, *dau* is ‘eye’). The forms are not directly comparable, though the association between ‘sun’ and ‘eye’ itself may have spread by calquing. A further item not mentioned by Rivet but perhaps worth pointing out is Yurumanguí <yaa> ‘blood’ and Emberá *oa*, Epena *’waa*, Proto-Emberá **u’a* with the same meaning. With regard to all of these forms, though particularly with regard to the very good match between the Yurumanguí forms for ‘grandmother’ and ‘great-grandmother’ with the Emberá words

for ‘grandfather’ and ‘great-grandfather’, one must bear in mind the possibility that they actually do not represent borrowings into Yurumangúí, but that Romero may have elicited them from Emberá speakers living among the Yurumangúí. As stated in the introduction, Lanchas de Estrada noted in his diary that there was a captive woman among them who spoke another language, possibly an Emberá variety. Finally, Yurumangúí <queobai> ~ <cueba> ‘man’ (which latter extracted from <cueba canana> ‘liar’) bears a striking similarity to Cueva <cabra> ‘cacique’s deputy’ (Constenla Umaña 1991: 47). Cueva is an extremely poorly documented language of putative Chocó affiliation that was once spoken in Panama. A possible Waunana cognate for Cueva <cabra> is Waunana *kapera* ‘friend’ (Constenla Umaña 1991: 47).

There are also some similarities between grammatical morphemes in Emberá and potential ones in Yurumangúí. For instance, Emberá features a particularizing prefix *ci-* (Aguirre Licht 1999: 81), which can be compared with the putative noun prefix <c(V)-> in Yurumangúí discussed in section 3.2.2. Further, Emberá has a suffix *-a* indicating declarative mood as well as a homophonous verbalizing suffix *-a* (Aguirre Licht 1999: 41); both are very frequent in Aguirre Licht’s (1999) Emberá data. These suffixes are worth mentioning because of the extremely frequent final <-a> in Yurumangúí forms, though this is also the case of forms which are, judging from their Spanish translations, nominal in nature. Another point of comparison is that, as in the Emberá varieties (Aguirre Licht 1999: 38), Yurumangúí to some extent seems to have featured roots which are taken by themselves neutral with respect to word class, as evidenced by the already frequently cited <couna> ‘eye’ and <coutana> ‘I’ll go to see it’ as well as <auciá> ‘ear’ and <aupita> ‘I don’t hear’, i.e. roots which occur both in the verb of perception as well as in the associated organ. Finally, Adelaar with Muysken (2004: 61) points out that the constituent order regularities noted by Constenla Umaña (1991: 53) are shared between Yurumangúí and Chocó languages. While this may be an indication of grammatical convergence, it is equally conceivable that the similarities are due to chance.

6.3. Possible Tupí-Guaraní loans

There are two items for which a Tupí etymology can be proposed. One is <taucano> ‘parrot’, for which Proto-Tupí has ***tukan* ‘toucan’ (Rodrigues & Cabral 2012: 503). The match is segmentally quite good, and the semantic development (or misinterpretation on behalf of Romero) from ‘toucan’ to ‘parrot’ seems acceptable. The development of a paragogic final vowel is a characteristic feature of Old Tupí/Tupinambá and the lingua franca Nheengatú that developed out of them (Da Cruz 2011) as well as Kokáma and Omágua, languages with a complicated history, but without doubt a strong portion of lexical items originating from Tupinambá (see Cabral 2011 for more details). Alternatively, the term may have been borrowed into Yurumangúí from another Tupí language, with the final vowel being a Yurumangúí-internal development due to phonotactic restrictions. That the term was borrowed from yet another intermediate, possibly even European, language rather than directly from Tupí is also possible.

The other item is <aguabai layaco> ‘jaguar’. Proto-Tupí has ***ameko* (Rodrigues & Cabral 2012: 503), but most Tupí-Guaraní languages have reflexes of **yaʔwár* (Schleicher

1998: 351). In a number of languages, the reflex means ‘dog’, the feline meaning expressed being by a complex form (marking reversal), or it is polysemous, meaning both ‘dog’ and ‘jaguar’. Kokáma indeed has *yahuara* ‘dog, jaguar’ (Faust 1978). Because of the left-headedness of Yurumangúí NPs, <layaco> can be interpreted as an adjectival modifier with unknown meaning. Problematic is the suffix (?) <-bai> in the Yurumangúí form which lacks a good explanation (but cf. <queobai> ‘man’ and other forms in Romero’s data).

6.4. Possible Western Tucanoan loans

<Nasotasi> ‘manioc’ might be comparable with the Western Tucanoan language Siona, which has the name *hãʔso* (Key 2015b), and Koreguaje, which has *ãʔso* ‘sweet manioc’ (Cook & Gralow 2001), for the same root crop. These terms do not reflect Proto-Western-Tucanoan *kii (Wheeler 1992: 48). The root may have a wider distribution, cf. Yanomami *naši koko* (Lizot 2015) and Chacobo (Panoan) *nasisi* ‘manioc variety’ (Boom 1996: 24). The sequence <-tasi> in the attested Yurumangúí form may be an adjectival modifier with unknown meaning, which is expected to follow the head, as in <tintin canana> ‘lying woman’. However, not least because of the lack of an explanation of <-tasi>, the case is weak. The Yurumangúí word for ‘cotton’, <ubaisa>, might be compared with Proto-Tucanoan *buʔsa (Waltz & Wheeler 1972: 140), though this is hampered by the facts that <-sa> is likely a Yurumangúí suffix, that Western Tucanoan languages do not reflect this etymon (Siona *yii*, Koreguaje *chui*, Key 2015b, Cook & Gralow 2001), and that contact with Eastern Tucanoan is less likely on geographical grounds.

6.5. Shared items with languages to the south

Ortiz (1946: 25) suggests that <chuma> ‘to drink’ may be a loan from Yurumangúí to local Spanish to denote ‘drunkenness’, but Adelaar with Muysken (2004: 61) draw attention to the fact that this word has a wider distribution in Ecuador and Peru, suggesting Mochica *cyuma-* ‘(get) drunk’ as the source and hence Mochica > Spanish > Yurumangúí as the most likely direction of borrowing. Noteworthy are also Colán <cũm> and Culli <cumù> ‘to drink’ (Martínez Compañón [1782-1790]1985), and similar forms in further Peruvian languages. There are more Yurumangúí words vaguely resembling Culli ones, including Yurumangúí <causá> – Culli <ačasù> ‘to cry’ and Yurumangúí <angua> – Culli <guanararac> ‘fire’. Another item suggesting possible relations to languages spoken to the south of the Yurumangúí’s location at the time of contact is <totoque> ‘axe’, which may be shared with Mapuche *toki* ‘stone axe’ (Adelaar with Muysken 2004: 41).

6.6. Spanish influence

The case of the history of <chuma> discussed above suggests to Adelaar with Muysken (2004: 41) that “notwithstanding their apparent isolation, the Yurumangúí were not entirely free of contact with neighbouring speakers of Spanish”. Further noteworthy items in this context are <vecatuta> ‘cheese’, the first element of which may be Spanish

vaca ‘cow’, as well as <aina> ‘here 3SG is’, in which <ai> may represent either Spanish *ahí* ‘there’ or *hay* ‘there is’.

6.7. Discussion

Unfortunately, from the lexical similarities I have been able to find, no general picture as to the more remote linguistic prehistory of Yurumangú emerges. The strongest evidence of lexical and possibly grammatical influence comes from comparisons with Chocó, more precisely Emberá, that is, a language probably spoken in the vicinity of the location of the Yurumangú at the point of contact. Certain grammatical patterns which can be extracted from the Yurumangú data also suggest, but do not prove, the possibility of some degree of grammatical convergence between Yurumangú and Emberá. Also, clear connections in the lexical domain are found with the Esmeraldeño language of coastal Ecuador. The semantic domains in which loanwords are found are not restricted to trade items such as artifacts. Particularly notable is the fact that between these three languages, a number of kinship terms, extending also to the word for ‘woman’ in the case of Esmeraldeño and Yurumangú, are shared. Since kinship is intimately tied with culture, this suggests a closer relation between the peoples than one of occasional trading, involving also at least some similarities in cultural behavior. In this context, the fact that such a short vocabulary as Romero’s contains the Yurumangú word for the peach-palm strongly suggests that this is an item of some degree of cultural significance. Constenla Umaña & Margery Peña (1991: 176), in their reconstruction of Chocó phonology, explicitly note the importance of this palm for the indigenous groups of the region.

Some linguistic contact, whether direct or indirect with Tupí-Guaraní languages of Western Amazonia, and at least loose contact with the South as evidenced by the presence of the wanderwort <chuma> ‘to drink’ may have existed. The evidence for both, however, is weak because the case rests essentially on the comparison of one key form, albeit with a good semantic and phonetic match in both cases. Adelaar with Muysken (2004: 61) emphasize that although the territory of the Yurumangú was close to the coast, they were an inland tribe, and go on to suggest that they may be “survivors of one of the groups of the Cali region who may have fled exploitation by the cruel Belalcázar and his men”. The shared items with Esmeraldeño and Chocó are quite numerous and hence a problem if one wishes to posit a presence of the Yurumangú at their location at contact with Lanchas de Estrada’s expedition of at best 200 years. Rather, Yurumangú appears to have been well-embedded into the local linguistic ecology.

References

- Adelaar, Willem F.H., with the collaboration of Pieter C. Muysken (2004). *The languages of the Andes* (Cambridge Language Surveys). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486852>
- Aguirre Licht, Daniel (1999). *Embera* (Languages of the World/Materials, 208). Munich/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

- Arcila Robledo, Gregorio (1940). Vocabulario de los indios yurumanguies. *Voz Franciscana* 16(179): 341-343.
- Boom, Brian Morey (1996). *Ethnobotany of the Chácobo Indians, Beni, Bolivia*. New York: New York Botanical Garden, Scientific Publications Department.
- Broadbent, Sylvia M. (1957). Rumsen I: methods of reconstitution. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 23(4): 275-280. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/464419>
- Cabral, Ana Suelly Arruda Câmara (2011). Different histories, different results: the origin and development of two Amazonian languages. *PAPIA* 21(1): 9-22.
- Christian, Diana R.; Matteson, Esther (1972). Proto Guahiban. In *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages* (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, 127), pp. 150-159. The Hague: Mouton.
- Constenla Umaña, Adolfo (1981). *Comparative Chibchan phonology* (Doctoral Dissertation in Linguistics). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Constenla Umaña, Adolfo (1991). *Las lenguas del área intermedia: introducción a su estudio areal*. San José: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.
- Constenla Umaña, Adolfo (2000). La restitución: un método lingüístico reconstructivo sincrónico. *Filología y Lingüística* 17(2): 161-180. doi: [10.15517/rfl.v26i2.4525](https://doi.org/10.15517/rfl.v26i2.4525)
- Constenla Umaña, Adolfo; Margery Peña, Enrique. (1991). Elementos de fonología comparada Chocó. *Filología y Lingüística* 17(1/2): 137-191. doi: [10.15517/rfl.v17i1-2.20972](https://doi.org/10.15517/rfl.v17i1-2.20972)
- Cook, Dorothy M.; Gralow, Frances L. (2001). *Diccionario bilingüe koreguaje-español, español-koreguaje*. Santafé de Bogotá: Editorial Buena Semilla.
- Da Cruz, Aline. (2011). *Fonología e gramática do nheengatú: a língua geral falada pelos povos Baré, Warekena e Baniwa*. Utrecht: LOT.
- De Oliveira, Maria das Dores (2006). *Ofayé, a língua do povo do mel: fonologia e gramática*. (Doctoral Dissertation in Linguistics). Maceió: Universidade Federal de Alagoas.
- Dryer, Matthew S. (2011). Position of interrogative phrases in content questions. In Matthew S. Dryer; Haspelmath, Martin (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. Retrieved from <http://wals.info/chapter/93> (Accessed 22/07/2019).
- Faust, Norma W. (2008). *Gramática cocama: lecciones para el aprendizaje del idioma cocama* (Serie Lingüística Peruana, 6). Spanish version by Ezequiel Romero, revised by Walter del Aguila and Irma Inugay. Third edition. Lima: Ministerio de Educación/Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Fonnegra, Gustavo Mejía (2000). *Presentación y descripción fonológica y morfosintáctica de las lenguas indígenas de Colombia: una visión descriptiva*, pp. 85-96. Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Gildea, Spike; Payne, Doris (2007). Is Greenberg's "Macro-Carib" viable? *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Ciências Humanas* 2(2): 19-72. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1981-81222007000200003>
- Greenberg, Joseph H. (1987). *Language in the Americas*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

URBAN – NOTES ON YURUMANGUÍ GRAMMAR AND LEXICON

Haacke, Wilfried H.G.; Eiseb, Eliphaz (2002). *A Khoekhoegowab dictionary with an English-Khoekhoegowab Index*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan.

Key, Mary Ritchie (2015a). Cayuvava dictionary. In Mary Ritchie Key; Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The Intercontinental Dictionary Series*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from <http://ids.clld.org/contributions/283> (Accessed 22/07/2019.)

Key, Mary Ritchie (2015b). Siona dictionary. In Mary Ritchie Key; Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The Intercontinental Dictionary Series*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from <http://ids.clld.org/contributions/256> (Accessed 22/07/2019.)

Liedtke, Stefan (1996). *The languages of the 'First Nations': comparison of Native American languages from an ethnolinguistic perspective* (Lincom Handbooks in Linguistics, 1). Munich/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Lizot, Jacques (2015). Yanomámi. In Mary Ritchie Key; Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The Intercontinental Dictionary Series*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from <http://ids.clld.org/contributions/253> (Accessed 22/07/2019.)

Martínez, Compañón, Baltasar Jaime ([1782-1790] 1985). *Trujillo del Perú en el siglo XVIII*, vol. 2. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica.

Moore, Bruce R. (1966). *Diccionario castellano-colorado, colorado-castellano*. Quito: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Mosonyi, Esteban Emilio; Mosonyi, Jorge Carlos; Machal, Marcelo (2000). Cuiba (Jiwi). In Esteban Emilio Mosonyi; Jorge Carlos Mosonyi (eds.). *Manual de lenguas indígenas de Venezuela*, vol. 1: 224-263. Caracas: Fundación Bigott.

Ortiz, Sergio Elías (1946). Los indios yurumanguies. *Acta Americana* 4: 10-25.

Pardo Rojas, Mauricio (2015). Embera dictionary. In Mary Ritchie Key; Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The Intercontinental Dictionary Series*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from <http://ids.clld.org/contributions/247> (Accessed 22/07/2019.)

Parker, Stephen, with Orbe Caro, Gregorio; Patow Chota, Alfonso (2008). *Kana acha'taka ijnachale = kana chamekolo: vocabulario y textos chamicuro* (Comunidades y Culturas Peruanas, 21). Second edition. Lima: Ministerio de educación/Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Poser, William J. (1992). The Salinan and Yurumanguí data in *Language in the Americas*. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 58(2): 202-229. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/ijal.58.2.3519756>

Quine, Willard van Orman (1960). *Word and object*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Quiro Dura, Eladio; Harms, Philip Lee (2015). Epena dictionary. In Mary Ritchie Key; Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The Intercontinental Dictionary Series*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from <http://ids.clld.org/contributions/248> (Accessed 22/07/2019.)

Ribeiro, Eduardo Rivail; van der Voort, Hein (2010). Nimuendajú was right: the inclusion of the Jabutí language family in the Macro-Jê stock. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 76(4): 517-570. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/658056>

- Rivet, Paul (1942). Un dialecte hoka colombien: le Yurumangí. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 34: 1-59. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3406/jsa.1942.2334>
- Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna; Cabral, Ana Suely Arruda Câmara (2012). Tupían. In Lyle Campbell; Veronica Grondona (eds.). *The Indigenous languages of South America: a comprehensive guide*, pp. 495-574. (The World of Linguistics, 2). Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schleicher, Charles Owen (1998). *Comparative and internal reconstruction of the Tupi-Guarani language family* (Dissertation in Linguistics). Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Seler, Eduard (1902). Die Sprache der Indianer von Esmeraldas. In *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Amerikanischen Sprach- und Alterthumskunde. Vol. 1: Sprachliches. Bilderschriften. Kalender- und Hieroglyphenzifferung*, pp. 49-64. Berlin: A. Asher & Co.
- Swadesh, Morris (1963). On aboriginal languages of Latin America. *Current Anthropology* 4(3): 317-318. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/200380>
- Waltz, Nathan E.; Wheeler, Alva (1972). In *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages* (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, 127), pp. 119-149. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wheeler, Alva (1992). Comparaciones lingüísticas en el grupo tucano occidental. In Stephen H. Levinsohn (ed.). *Estudios Comparativos: Proto tucano*, pp. 17-53. Santafé de Bogotá: Editorial Alberto Lleras Camargo.

Recebido: 23/7/2019

Revisto: 22/9/2019

Aceito: 23/9/2019