THE LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY OF NATIVE SOUTH AMERICA

Greg Urban and Joel Sherzer

Department of Anthropology, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

OVERVIEW

Formerly described as the area of "greatest ignorance concerning the native languages" (135, p. 163), and dubbed "the least known continent," South America has lately been humming and buzzing with linguistic anthropological research. The work has concentrated in three principal areas: discourse, language structure, and multilingualism, with such areas as language acquisition remaining underdeveloped.

Much of the ferment among South Americanists has focused on the discourse-centered approach to culture (192, 194), an emerging synthesis of linguistic and social anthropology. Because of its central tenets—namely, (*a*) that culture is carried in and transmitted by actual instances of language use, and (*b*) that microethnographic studies of the form of language use, as sign vehicle, can be linked to broader problems of social order, as well as to specifically linguistic problems of code structure—there has been a happy marriage between its associated research strategy and the specific characteristics of native South America. The approach requires that discourse be collected in reasonably intact contexts, and that there be a diversity of discourse systems available, of varying degrees of relatedness, on the basis of which comparative investigations can be undertaken. These are conditions that native South America continues to supply.

At the same time, new descriptive studies have appreciably added to our scientific knowledge of the nearly 300 indigenous languages still spoken in South America. This research, much of it conducted by members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL),[1] has supplied a necessary foundation

---

[1] The research of the SIL is rapidly becoming more mainstream. The SIL has a controversial history, mixing linguistics, religion, and politics, and has been much criticized, in particular in Latin America (202).

for comparative generalizations regarding historical-genetic, areal, and typological problems. Progress in these latter areas has been slow but steady.

Finally, there has been a flowering over the past two decades of studies of bilingualism and language contact, many dealing with Quechua and Guaraní and, in lesser measure, with Aymara and with the Mapuche language of Chile and Argentina. Coupled with the work on multilingualism in the Amazon basin and elsewhere, development of this line of investigation may prove helpful in linking together areal-genetic-typological studies, on the one hand, and discourse-centered studies, on the other.

This article is not intended as an evenhanded assessment of developments in each of these major areas. Rather, we propose to take a look at the overall progress of native South American linguistic anthropology specifically from the perspective of the discourse-centered approach. In the recent period, research has been characterized by the relative isolation of two poles: research on (*a*) language as a decontextualized Saussurean distributional structure, and (*b*) discourse as fully situated verbal communication. We explore some of the ways these two poles can be brought into closer proximity.

DISCOURSE RESEARCH

Two conceptions of "discourse" are current in native South American research: (*a*) discourse as *larger-than-sentence level structure,* and (*b*) discourse as *instances and types of language use.* The former is closer to the structural pole and is widespread among SIL researchers (7, 20, 56, 60, 64, 65, 67, 124, 128, 162, 163, 173, 205, 220, 223). In this conception, discourse occupies a position in the linguistic hierarchy alongside phonology, morphology, and syntax. Specifically, whereas syntax accounts for the distributional patterning of continuent units (word classes, phrases, and clauses) up to the sentence level, showing in accord with what rules combinations take place, discourse accounts for how sentences are interrelated (through continuity of topic, organization into paragraphs, or structuring of episodes), showing how the rules of combination at this level form part of grammar and interact with rules of syntax and morphology.

This conception is distinct in important ways from that employed in the discourse-centered approach. First, the discourse-centered approach emphasizes language as used. This means that researchers are interested in types and regularities of usage, but also in actual tape-recorded instances—indeed, the book *Native South American Discourse* comes with a taped set of examples. Simultaneously, researchers are interested in the surrounding extra-linguistic context—physical and social—in which language use occurs. Second, the discourse-centered approach is interested not only in a larger-than-sentence-level phenomena, but also in various microethnographically studiable aspects

of language use, such as voice, pitch, and rhythm, which form part of discourse as a socially communicative sign vehicle. Finally, the discourse-centered approach looks for regularities of other than a purely Saussurean distributional sort—i.e. other than those based upon co-occurrence and complementarity of linguistic forms. In particular, it studies such additional formal devices as line structure, parallelism, and dialogical ordering.

We do not wish to propose that the two notions are incompatible. The structural conception of discourse is merely closer to the pole of language as decontextualized code, the pole that must ultimately be brought into relationship with the context-oriented-usage pole. These distinctions are further clarified in the section below dealing with the structural pole. The present section focuses on some of the main areas of research in the discourse-centered approach.

Style and Genre

A key focus of contextually situated discourse research, which is crucial to the articulation of discourse concerns with problems in social anthropology, is the diversity of speech style. By "speech style" is meant a recognizable type of language use, distinguishable from other types by its formal features (212, p. 312). Native South America has been of particular interest because of the diversity of speech styles that are encountered within relatively small and homogeneous speech communities, and also because of the esthetic fascination of some of the more salient and crystalline speech styles that have been documented in ceremonial contexts. The general question that confronts researchers is: Why does a repertoire of distinctive styles develop in a relatively closed community?

The primary answer given thus far is that stylistic diversity occurs because it is socially communicative. Styles are meaning-bearing sign vehicles, which provide the emblematic template for social order, and which may be utilized by speakers in establishing and transforming social relationships. The work by Graham (87, 88) provides a good example in this regard, showing how three vocal styles (ritual wailing, communal singing, and political oratory) map onto the central Brazilian Shavante nature/culture and social space oppositions. As Urban (212) has argued as well for the southern Brazilian Shokleng, the styles are not merely isolated social diacritics; rather, they can be seen as related to one another in terms of both form and function. The importance of style interrelationships is stressed in other work as well (84, 122, 137, 186, 213, 215).

While we are using "style" here in relation to discourse, the concept is also relevant to illuminating the boundaries between verbal and nonverbal communication, and especially the music-language interrelationship (134, 184–

186, 195). Seeger (184–186), for example, has endeavored in a variety of ways to show how the Suya Indians of the Xingu region blend what may be identified as the "musical" and the "linguistic" in a colorful array of admixtures. The evocative title of one of his papers nicely encapsulates this finding: "Oratory is spoken, myth is told, and song is sung, but they are all music to my ears" (186).

In addition to focusing attention on the intracultural interrelationships between styles, the discourse-centered approach also lends itself to comparative investigation, as in the case of ceremonial dialog (167, 213) and ritual wailing (215). This work links back to earlier observations regarding areal distributions (78, 143). The areal patterns in these styles may reflect intense contacts between different groups and can be seen as related to the areal distribution of more purely code-structural traits. This intersection of areal-diffusional patterning of expressive and performance features of language use with more purely code-structural aspects of language has implications for an interpretation of prehistoric culture contact here as in native North America (see 193). Also intriguing is the relationship between these two types of areal patterning on the one hand and the areal distribution of myths and parts of myths on the other that features so prominently in Lévi-Strauss's *Mythologiques.*

In terms of empirical research, the concept of style merges imperceptibly with that of genre; stylistic research merges with investigations in the ethnography of speaking. In theoretical terms, the genre concept places more emphasis on the meaning or function of the discourse as the basis for differentiating ways of speaking, as in the contrast between myth and folktale or story and song. Genres often have characteristic formal properties, but these are not necessarily definitional in the way that they are for style.

More recently, however, genre has been taken up in the ethnography of speaking (186, 190), where it has come to mean a way of speaking that is *culturally recognized,* usually through a lexical label. In this sense, it encompasses style as part of a cultural account of language use. What is critical is evidence of native awareness of speech diversity through its cultural encoding.

In this context, it should be noted that the first relatively complete overall ethnography of speaking yet attempted focuses on a South American (Panamanian) group—Sherzer's *Kuna Ways of Speaking* (190). For Brazilian Indians in particular, the doctoral research on the Kuikúro of the Xingu by Bruna Franchetto (82), of the National Museum in Rio, must be singled out. Like Sherzer's work, it is an attempt to systematically map the range of speech varieties. Simultaneously, Charles Briggs has initiated intensive research among the Warao of Venezuela. In all of these cases, however, the authors are interested not simply in a cultural account of speaking. They are

also concerned with the formal-functional characterization of the genres or styles.

In the discourse-centered approach, one does not look to culture in order to understand discourse. Rather, one looks to discourse in order to understand how culture is carried and replicated. The discourse itself, as actually occurring sign vehicle, must be studied and described, and it must serve as the basis for generalization and hypothesis. In this sense, the primary emphasis of the discourse-centered approach is a social anthropological one. Researchers are interested in discourse as a sign vehicle functioning in specific contexts. The cultural recognitions of these sign vehicles and their functioning—for example, in lexical encodings—are also themselves sign vehicles. In this case, they function at least in some measure meta-communicatively. But they must not be investigated only as supplying information about the sign vehicles they describe. They are as well part of contextually situated language use.

Parallelism and Other Devices

The concepts of style and genre focus research on the overall character of the communicative sign vehicle and on its relationship to social and cultural contexts. However, a style is a complex entity, consisting of numerous distinct formal devices, such as ideophones, quotation, and parallelism, as well as intonational contour, voice, and rhythm. Some research has tended to focus on the formal device, asking what functions it fulfills. Other research has tended to focus on the function, asking what devices are used to accomplish it.

Among the various devices, perhaps most significant with respect to the marked or salient styles is parallelism, the use of sign vehicle-internal iconicity, usually based on the "line" as the fundamental unit (189), to form a poetic structure. Parallelism is especially prominent in singing, ritual wailing, and chanting, but also occurs in political oratory (81, 88) as well as in myth-telling of various sorts (188, 190, 214). Its prominence in relatively salient or marked speech styles tends to confirm Jakobson's (115) view of it as an attention-getting device.

Much of the research on parallelism has been influenced by Hymes's (110) and Tedlock's (207) approaches to ethnopoetics. This can be seen, for example, in the way narrative texts are graphically represented (10, 11, 81, 88, 191, 210). The graphic portrayal of this parallelism, following the North American model, is intended as a means of visually capturing the texture and feel of the spoken discourse, giving readers a sense of its poetic structure. Bruce Mannheim (133) shows how an historical Quechua text by Guaman Poma can be retranscribed in light of such sensibilities, and in keeping with the role of parallelism in southern Peruvian verbal art more generally. The influence of Hymes and Tedlock is also evident, for example, in the numerous

texts presented by Basso in her *Musical View of the Universe* (10) and *In Favor of Deceit* (12).

Basso's work, however, simultaneously represents a move toward what we have been calling the discourse-centered approach. She is concerned not only with the structure of the discourse and how to represent it, but as well with what the function of that structure, as formal device, might be. She emphasizes the emotion-bearing character of the formal devices—how mythical discourse plays a role in the cultural transformation of emotion. An orientation to social contextualization and functions of parallelism, as a formal sign vehicle, can also be seen in Urban's (214) work on macro-parallelism in the Shokleng origin myth.

Attention to other devices can be found as well. In Kalapalo, onomatopoetic sounds play a role in actually kindling the emotions produced by a narrative. There is the *tititi* of human footsteps, the *kidik, kidik* of a hammock being untied, the *tik bom* of the hammock collapsing, the *tutik, tutik* of a cricket. Other work has pointed to the role of onomatopoeia and ideophones in Guahibo (224), Mundurukú (50), and Hixkaryana (60). It is unclear to what extent such usages represent an areal or genetic phenomenon (they appear to be particularly pronounced in Carib languages) or are more evenly distributed throughout native South America.

One final major line of investigation has focused on reported, especially quoted, speech (11, 19, 126, 190, 191, 210). This is an especially interesting area because it represents a bridge between the structural and discourse-centered poles. Larson's (126) original effort emphasized this, since she discusses the functions that reported speech performs in Aguaruna with respect to both language structure and discourse. She even shows how the functions may vary across genres. Sherzer (191) has documented as many as five levels of embedding of quotation in Kuna. And Basso (11) shows how Kalapalo quoted speech is typically dialogic, giving the back-channel response as well as the main turn. Much work remains to be done in this area, but it is already apparent that quoted speech may be pivotal to our understanding of the relationship between discourse and language structure.

In addition to empirically investigating the range of formal devices employed in native South American discourse, and charting their distributions, the discourse-centered approach must investigate and clarify the relationship between style (or genre) and device. Devices are constituents of styles. A given intonational contour may be characteristic of ritual wailing in a given culture, and the maximally elaborated use of embedding of quotations may characterize a given style—for example, a sophisticated political form, as in Kuna. However, devices also cut across styles and thus can be seen as a means of linking styles iconically in a complex signal system. Through a careful comparative analysis of how devices crystallize into a style, with

certain social functions, in one culture, only to dissolve and re-emerge in a distinct configuration in another culture, we should be able to glimpse the regularities that underlie the constitution of cultural difference in discourse.

Our discourse approach to the areal distribution of linguistic features in native South America, including both the stylistic features discussed here and the more purely code-structural features discussed below, provides a framework within which to interpret the areal distribution of mythemes, the centerpiece of Lévi-Stauss's *Mythologiques*. Of course, we in some sense turn Lévi-Strauss on his head by explaining, in terms of concrete discourse and performance, data that he looks at in terms of brain structures.

STRUCTURAL RESEARCH

Comparative research at the structural pole has traditionally had three broad goals, which have yet to be properly brought together: (*a*) the attempt to ascertain genetic relationships among and corresponding classifications of languages, most securely through the comparative method; (*b*) the isolation of features showing areal distributions that tend to cut across genetically defined boundaries, and are presumably the result of contact; and (*c*) the demonstration that certain linguistic phenomena are the product of universal constraints. Progress in each of these areas, however, depends critically on the descriptive foundations on which it is built.

Description

At the beginning of the 1970s, Arthur Sorensen (197) lamented the abysmal state of descriptive research on native South American languages. We can report today that enormous progress has been made. Much of this is attributable to missionaries of the Summer of Institute of Linguistics. A good indication of the type of descriptive work SIL has produced is the collection of grammatical sketches in the volume edited by Desmond Derbyshire and Geoffrey Pullum (62), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages,* Vol. 1, which includes works on Apalai, Canela-Krahô, Pirahã, and Urubu-Kaapor. The volume also includes two typological and two comparative studies. However, academic linguists have not been quiescent in the area of structural description either. A major recent summary statement can be found in the volume edited by Harriet Manelis Klein and Louise Stark, *South American Indian Languages: Retrospect and Prospect* (123), which seeks to survey the entire continent.

It is impossible to summarize adequately the full range of descriptive research here.[2] The grammars that have appeared span the continuum from

---

[2]Much material is now available through the Summer Institute of Linguistics. The material is in varying states of readiness and of variable utility.

descriptive to pedagogical. On the descriptive side are works dealing with Kaingáng (225), Mundurukú (49), Asuriní (100), and Bororo (51). These grammars complement such slightly older works as Hoff's (108) classic on *The Carib Language*. On the pedagogical side are grammars of varying degrees of sophistication and utility to researchers, including works on Xavante (140), Nambikwára (125), Cocama (76), Huitoto (146), Tucano (222), and Carapana (144), among others.

The bulk of the technical work, however, has appeared in article form. There are, for example, phonological descriptions of Arekuna (70), Juma (1), Qawasqar (33), Xerente (55), Xavante (139), Southern Nambiquara (165), Kamayurá (176), Kadiwéu (93), and Suriname Arawak (164), as well as further refinements of our understanding of Quechua (25, 221). Above the level of phonology there tend to be fewer general descriptions and more specific ones, in the course of which, however, it is possible to learn a considerable amount about overall morphology and syntax. The articles treat of topics ranging from evidentials in Tuyuca (6) and location and direction in Toba verbal morphology (121) to nominal stem incorporation in Gavião (150), transitivity in Yagua verbs (157), and headless relative clauses in Quechua (36).

By way of general characterization, it may be noted that most of the SIL research has been done within the tagmemic framework developed by Pike. An outstanding example of this is Weisemann's (225) *Die phonologische und grammatische Struktur der Kaingang-Sprache*. However, there has been some influence from transformational generative grammar, as for example in Harrison's (100) work on Asuriní or Fortune's (80) on Karajá. Tagmemic analysis has made virtually no inroads into research by academics other than SIL personnel. But, perhaps surprisingly, transformational generative grammar, too, has made only partial inroads (e.g. 116, 149). Perhaps the most detailed transformational work has been done by Cole and his colleagues on Quechua (e.g. 34–40, 114). While descriptions of South American Indian languages are sometimes taken as data by individuals developing transformational arguments, the bulk of South Americanist work tends to be in a structuralist mode, in this regard much like the North Americanist work published in the *International Journal of American Linguistics*.

Though often difficult to obtain and not yet sufficiently plentiful, texts, vocabularies, and dictionaries are available, primarily through SIL. While South America continues to lag behind North America, and while much remains to be done in the way of basic description, it is critical at this point that stock be taken of the work to date. Fortunately, a project organized by Brent Berlin and Terrence Kaufman, and administered from Berkeley, has been designed to do just this. The *South American Languages Documentation Project* will seek to computerize the available materials, of both a grammatical and lexical nature, to provide a map-generating capability for the study of

distributions, and to organize bibliographic materials. This project is complemented by the *Austin Native South American Language Project*, which we organized and which seeks to map the range and diversity of speech styles in South America, and to archive taped examples as a data bank of stylistic diversity.

Typology, Discourse, and Areal Phenomena

We distinguish here between research that is structurally illuminating with respect to specific languages, whatever the analytical framework employed, and work designed to critically test some theoretical hypothesis about universal grammar and areal distribution. This section deals with the latter.

Native South American languages have proven of interest in relation to a number of theoretical hypotheses, notably about (*a*) word order and (*b*) the phonology of nasalization spread. The phenomena of ergativity (23, 101, 148, 160, 161, 211), reduplication (75), and stress (74), have been studied as well, but we do not discuss these here. Word order primarily, and nasalization secondarily, however, are of interest because they suggest ways the linkage between the structural and discourse-centered poles can be empirically explored.

Desmond Derbyshire has been primarily responsible for the interest in word order. In a series of publications (57–61; cf 158) he has argued that Hixkaryana and many other native South American languages as well seem to violate one of the key Greenbergian universals. Greenberg (90) had argued, namely, that the basic order of subject (S), object (O), and verb (V) in languages tended to be of only three types: SOV, SVO, and VSO; the other possibilities, VOS, OSV, and OVS, were rare or nonexistent. Derbyshire proposed, in contrast, that in Hixkaryana and elsewhere in native South America there could be found object first languages, with OVS the basic word order.

Derbyshire (57) framed his initial article in terms of transformational grammar, arguing that basic order was to be understood as the linear constituent order occurring after the application of cyclic rules. The basic order of Hixkaryana was seen as OVS. In a subsequent work, Derbyshire (58) investigated three Carib languages in an effort to understand the diachronic origins of OVS from an earlier SOV word order, perhaps the order of proto-Carib. Interestingly, from a discourse point of view, Derbyshire saw the shift to OVS as possibly the product of a discourse dislocation of the subject in "afterthought" fashion, with the subject later being reincorporated into code-structure ordering.

In the same year, in a renewed effort to refute the hypothesis that OVS order does not occur, Derbyshire & Pullum (61) published a survey of what they regarded as OVS languages. With the exception of one Tupian language (Asurinı́), all of these were Carib, indicating a possible code-structural basis

for the historical evolution of this order, but leaving open as well the possibility of areal diffusion. They also argued, on somewhat less-firm grounds, that OSV ordering could be found (see also 172). Here the examples fully cross-cut language family boundaries, leaving open only areal or independent development explanations.

Without questioning the validity of these studies (cf 27), it is important to observe that native South American research is itself problematic from the point of view of the kinds of data on which structural conclusions, such as these, are based. Much of the research, including Derbyshire's own, is based on studies of narrative texts, usually tape-recorded and transcribed. Such data are distinct from elicitation data, and even further removed from the kinds of intuitionistic data, based on grammaticality judgments, that are employed in most of the transformational literature, and that may be most relevant to formulation of universals of a decontextualized structural sort.

Word order, in particular, may be especially sensitive to these stylistic or genre differences. This is so in considerable measure because, as a meaning-bearing sign vehicle, it encodes not only syntactic relationships, but as well discourse relationships having to do with topic and focus. This leads us to question whether any style or genre can be employed equally in culling structural inferences. And specifically with respect to word order, we wonder whether conclusions derived from studies of narrative genres extend to other genres, such as isolated elicitation and intuitionistic reflection? The role of discourse in relation to word order was actively, albeit inconclusively, discussed at the 1987 *Amazonian Languages Conference* held in Eugene, Oregon.

A distinct problem is posed by the study of nasalization spread (8, 66, 116, 177, 203), which, however, like the problem of OVS word order, may be areally typical of many native South American languages. One would imagine, however, that nasalization spread, unlike OVS order, is insensitive to discourse genre or style. In whatever genre, the same range of nasalization spreading ought to be found, and in this sense it would more certainly be part of language as a decontextualized structure.

The argument in the literature concerns how the spreading or harmony should be analyzed, whether in terms of an analysis in which nasality is carried by segments and "spreads," giving rise to nasalization in adjoining segments of the same syllable and even in strings of contiguous syllables, or whether nasalization should be treated as an autosegment, not localized in a discrete segment. The specific terms of the debate are not of interest to us here. What is of interest is that under each of the various hypotheses native South American languages show a nonsegmental form of nasality. In the one case, the nasality is harmonically conditioned by a true segmental nasality. In the other case, it is autosegmental in nature.

While nasalization spread may not be genre-specific, it may nevertheless be more discourse-like than the truly structural aspects of a language, such as the basic segmental phonology. It is the kind of phenomenon that, like accent, can be imitated and thereby transmitted across language boundaries in situations of multilingualism. It is the kind of phenomenon that may resemble, in however small a measure, a way of talking rather than a code through which reference is achieved.

This suggests that it may be possible to conceptualize the relationship between structure and discourse in terms not so much of an exclusive opposition as of a continuum. Certain phenomena may be more discourse-like than others. The tests of this would be (*a*) detachability from the basic segmental phonology, and hence transmitability across language boundaries, and (*b*) localizability within a given genre or style.

Native South America furnishes especially appropriate conditions for empirically investigating this continuum through comparative analysis. Not only is there structural diversity, as measured by the number of languages and language families, but there are as well communities preserving a wide range of stylistic diversity internally. By seeing which aspects of language tend to be genre-specific and which generalized, and by studying the tendency of different phenomena to areal diffusion, it may prove possible to begin to work out empirically their relatively structural versus discourse characters.

Some interesting work has already been done along these lines. Gudschinsky (96), for example, has shown that two Carib languages, Apalai and Hixkaryana, while exhibiting similarity in phonology and having numerous cognates, nevertheless make use of distinct person-marking systems. The person-marking system is thus here in some measure detachable from the basic segmental phonology. Another interesting case is that of the 17th-century Island-Carib men's language (206), which made use of Karina (Carib) phonology and lexicon, but an Arawakan morphology. Here it is the detachability of an entire morphology that is at issue.

Whatever the specifics of these cases, the South American data do tend to call into question our received notion of language as a system in which "everything hangs together." This notion goes along with a view of genetic reconstruction as synonymous with the study of language and, by extension, culture history. It is entirely possible, and even probable, that the facts of language and culture history entail a more complex process than this monolithic view of language would tend to suggest. In situations of multilingualism and language contact, the differential detachability and transmitability of different aspects of language renders it much less possible to read culture history from genetic reconstruction. However, before the problems of contact can be considered, we must review some of the progress on genetic reconstruction, which has been considerable over the past 20 years.

Genetic Relationships

Because genetic classifications have been taken as evidence of the actual histories of whole languages and cultures, they have often been used by archaeologists, physical anthropologists, social anthropologists, and others as part of their research. It is therefore incumbent upon linguistic anthropologists to take special care in proposing classification schemes. Simultaneously, it is not an exaggeration to say that researchers working on native South American languages have been embarrassed by the dilapidated state of the classification schemes, at the same time as they are chagrined at seeing those schemes taken up uncritically by others.

In fact, there has been considerable progress over the past two decades in unraveling genetic interconnections. The three principal early schemes[3] were those proposed by Loukotka (129) in 1935, by Mason (135) in 1950, and by Greenberg (89, 92) in 1960. None of these is based on genetic reconstruction, as we described it above, each being grounded instead in superficial comparison. Loukotka and Mason were reasonably conservative about seeing connections, Greenberg more bold in allocating all of the known South American Indian languages into three principal and one lesser phyla.

The primary progress has been in the application of the comparative method, with attempts at reconstructions of proto-phonologies and lexicons. It must be recognized that the comparative method is of use mainly in the intermediate cases, where relationship is suspected but remains unproven. When languages are closely related, there has typically been little change in the results brought about by the reconstruction method. Most classifications, for example, have agreed in allocating languages to the core Tupi-Guaraní family or in seeing the Northern Jê languages as kindred. Correspondingly, where far-flung relationships are concerned, the comparative method becomes of limited utility, since it is difficult to assemble sufficiently large cognate sets and the sound correspondences become increasingly complex.

This caveat registered, it may be said that the work to date has already resulted in a significant rearrangement of the pieces of the puzzle. Davis (52) produced one of the first reconstructions for South America. His work on Proto-Jê demonstrated conclusively the suspected genetic relationship between Kaingáng and other members of the family. The reconstruction supplied the basis simultaneously for a reasonably solid determination of Macro-Jê linkages for Karajá and Maxakali, as well as a number of other languages, and it also allowed Boswood (18) to assign Aripaktsa to Jê, based on her research. Even at this early date, however, Davis was able to see a possible

---

[3]Other schemes that have appeared include those by Ibarra Grasso (111), Key (118), McQuown (141), Swadesh (204), Tovar (208), and Voegelins (217).

relationship between Proto-Jê and Proto-Tupi, a relationship also explored by Rodrigues (170). This is of great importance because Greenberg's scheme had assigned Tupi and Jê to distinct phyla.

Regarding Tupi, a reconstruction is currently available for the Tupi-Guaraní family (127). The principal research, being carried out by Rodrigues (169, 170), has focused on the determination of interconnections with the broader Tupi stock, of which Tupi-Guaraní is only one of perhaps nine families. Rodrigues's work has served to further undermine Greenberg's scheme, and to bring into focus a new configuration for some of the main South American families. While there is still no full-scale reconstruction of Carib (68), Rodrigues (170) has been able to strongly suggest, by means of a careful working out of 121 correspondence sets, that Tupi and Carib are related. It thus appears that Tupi, Carib, and Jê may all be genetically linked, contrary to Greenberg's assertions.

At the same time, Greenberg had included Pano together with Jê and Carib in a single phylum. As Rodrigues (170, p. 397) notes, "no evidence has so far been found of regular phonological correspondences between Pano or Pano-Takána and either Jê or Carib," this despite the availability of two reconstructions for Tacanan (83, 117) and one for Panoan (187). While there is still no reconstruction for Arawak, it is also the case that no solid evidence has been put forth indicating a genetic affiliation with Tupi. Consequently, whereas Greenberg had proposed two phyla, one with Jê-Pano-Carib and the other with Tupi-Arawak, it now appears that the basic nexus is Jê-Tupi-Carib, with Panoan and Arawak having no demonstrated affiliation with these three.[4]

It is impossible here to summarize all aspects of the emerging reconfiguration of genetic relationships in South America, but some of the more interesting developments should be mentioned. More than 20 years ago, evidence (152, 153) was assembled to suggest a relationship between two Bolivian languages, Uru and Chipayan, and the Mayan languages of Central America. Other work (199) suggested a link between the Araucanian or Mapuche languages (of Chile and Argentina) and Mayan. The most sweeping claims have been made more recently by Key (119), who proposes linkages between Uto-Aztecan and a net of South American languages, including Quechua, Aymara, Araucanian, Panoan, and Tacanan. While the evidence for these linkages remains slim and contestable, it is apparent that the past two decades have been a period of ferment in the area of South American genetic classifications.

---

[4]One might also mention, in this context, the evidence put forth by Migliazza (145, p. 29) regarding a possible genetic linkage between Panoan and Yanomama, on the one side, and Yanomama and Chibchan, on the other. We also note the work of Matteson (136) and her associates on reconstruction and the possibility of a Proto-Amerindian.

Regarding Aymara and Quechua, the two most demographically significant languages, there has been progress. Simultaneously, the recent research also raises questions that help us to situate genetic studies with respect to the discourse pole. One issue is that of the genetic linkage between Aymara and Quechua themselves. It had long been suspected that the two were genetically related (89, 92, 119, 155), possibly because they were both associated with complex civilizations and because they were geographically contiguous. But Hardman (98), Proulx (166), and Mannheim (132) have all concluded that the observed resemblances are the result of prolonged contact, rather than common origin, and that there is no solid evidence of genetic affiliation.

We explore the research on language contact in more detail in the next section. In the present context, however, it is worth reiterating that genetic comparison is concerned with the most structural, the least discourse-like, aspects of language: phonology and lexicon. It is therefore less centrally bound up with culture than discourse, which, as in certain situations of multilingualism, may involve more than one linguistic structure. Of course, the comparative method has always prided itself on its ability to differentiate loan words from true cognates—i.e. genetically related words. Yet when genetic studies have been taken up as evidence of history, they have invariably assumed a "one-language-one-culture" hypothesis.

South American research and the discourse-centered approach force us to rethink this hypothesis, which may be more valid for some cases than others. The central Brazilian plateau, for example, and the Jê language family, would seem to be good examples of the one-language-one-culture model, since ethnographic research has not revealed such extensive linguistic exogamy here. However, for the northern and northwestern Amazonian regions, the one-language-one-culture assumption would be wholly unwarranted. Sorensen's (196, 198) path-breaking research, as well as that of others after him (94, 112, 206), has shown a consistent pattern of linguistic exogamy and, therefore, of multilingual discourse systems.

A situation of more than one language per culture has undoubtedly prevailed for centuries as well in the southern Andean region, and, indeed, throughout the Andes (69), where Quechua was a lingua franca. Interestingly, this difference between the northern Amazonian region and highlands, on the one hand, and central Brazil, on the other, complements a conclusion reached by Urban (213, 215) on the basis of a study of speech styles—namely, that the northern Amazon exhibited a tendency to found social order on an "exchange model" and true dialogicality, whereas central Brazil exhibited a tendency toward social order based on a model of sharing and monologicality. In the latter case, structure and discourse are both shared. In the former, structural difference becomes one of a set of differences that allows exchange to take place via discourse. Here discourse becomes the vehicle for a dialogical culture.

When the relationship among structure, discourse, and culture is reconceptualized in this way, it is possible simultaneously to perceive how the evidence from genetic comparisons may be somewhat differently construed. In understanding the history of culture, researchers may want to pay more attention to loan words and contact in light of the more-than-one-language-per-culture hypothesis.

At the same time, we do not wish to sever the connection between structure and discourse. There is a relationship between the two, which should be conceptualized, we have proposed, as poles of a continuum. Shared structure may be one of the bases for shared social order, even when there are differentiated subsystems of discourse. We discuss that possibility in more detail in the next section. Here it may be noted only that this sheds some light on the rather startling results of dialectological studies of Quechua more than two decades ago. Undoubtedly influenced by the one-language-one-culture idea, researchers had assumed Quechua must have spread through the highlands with the Inca conquest. In fact, however, Quechua may have begun its spread much earlier, perhaps around 800 AD, from a locus somewhere in northern Peru (201). From the point of view of the structure-discourse continuum, it is entirely possible that the spread of structure actually paved the way for a monological authoritative discourse system associated with the Inca conquest.

LANGUAGE CONTACT

The past two decades have witnessed an efflorescence of language contact studies. These have been of two principal types: (*a*) research on multilingualism, especially on bilingualism in the Andes and in Paraguay, and (*b*) work on the structural influence of languages on one another, especially of indigenous languages on Spanish and Portuguese and vice versa.

Multilingualism

Studies of multilingualism focuses on speech communities in which more than one language structure is employed in the discourse interactions by means of which the community is fused and its culture transmitted. Most of the studies focus on situations in which bilingualism involves an indigenous language (in the literature, primarily Quechua, Guaraní, Aymara, or Mapuche) and Spanish, and in which there has been historically recent (less than 500 years) contact between the languages. Consequently, it has been possible to view such multilingual situations as unstable and transitory, with movement tending toward the direction of the preferred one-language-one-culture situation. The indigenous multilingualism in northern Amazonia (94, 112, 196, 198, 206), however, forces us to regard the multilingual state as possibly more stable and permanent.

Some of the research has endeavored to ascertain the relationship between the language structures and subgroups in the society—that is, which speakers are monolinguals and which bilinguals—in order to understand how language maps onto social order. Rubin's account (174; see also 44, 45, 54, 168) of Guaraní in Paraguay, for example, demonstrated the remarkable extent of bilingualism in the Paraguayan speech community, but the evidence points simultaneously to the relatively greater association of Guaraní with rural and Spanish with urban. It is also the case that Spanish tends more to be the language of the upper class. But the social class foundations of bilingualism are brought out more dramatically in the Andes in the work on this subject by Albó (2–4, See also 42, 43, 107, 156). The language structures are thus functional within the speech communities as identity markers. As in the Amazonian region, therefore, such cultures portray themselves, by means of the very structures that are employed in discourse, as heterogeneous and pluralistic.

Some of the studies pursue as well the problem of the circumstances under which bilingual speakers use one or the other code. Rubin's (174) work on Guaraní, for example, shows that Guaraní tends to be associated with private/ intimate relations (for example, within the family), while Spanish is associated with public/distant relations. This is confirmed by some of the few microethnographic studies (105, 106), which were done on Mapuche, wherein it is suggested that Mapuche fills affective functions, Spanish practical ones. The different language structures thus become, for bilinguals, signs of different kinds of social relationship.

A discourse-centered approach may allow further elaboration of our understanding of the communicative functions of code choice. In his study of the Amazonian Krenakore, for example, Schwartzman (182) shows how code switching becomes the basic for humor, with puns arising from the differential Portuguese versus Krenakore interpretation of surface forms. Such humor is a part of Krenakore identity maintenance in the face of recent contact. A very different, but equally interesting, phenomenon has been described by Basso (9; cf 41) for the neighboring Kalapalo, where Portuguese relationship terms are used not as a direct result of contact with Brazilian society, but to solve a problem in a multilanguage speech community, in which joint ceremonies are held by monolingual speakers of different languages. Here we begin to glimpse the possible complexities in the relationship between language structures and discourse interactions.

In addition to studies mapping the relationship between language structure and social order, considerable work has also been done on questions of how structures are evaluated (48, 54, 77, 168) and of what policies have been adopted relative to them (5, 32, 73, 102, 131). These in turn shade into studies of the relationship of language structures to the educational system (21, 22, 24, 46, 47, 63, 71, 72, 109, 154, 175, 178, 179, 200, 226, 228,

229), which is the primary state-controlled institution of cultural transmission in modern Latin American nations. While we cannot summarize the results of these studies here, it is significant in itself that the studies demonstrate native awareness of the communicative role of language structures within linguistically heterogeneous speech communities.

Structural Influences

There is a tendency in the literature to separate the study of multilingualism, as discussed above, from research on the mutual influences of language structures in the course of contact. The latter has typically been treated in the context of dialectology and structural description. A notable exception in this regard is Albó (4), who shows how the modifications undergone by Quechua and Aymara in the Andes reflect the generally oppressed state of the speakers of those languages. He refers to the process where, for example, Spanish vocabulary displaces native terms, as language "impoverishment," and to the native languages themselves as "oppressed languages." In general, however, the studies do not treat the correlation between structural change and social processes in such a principled way.

We suggested earlier that a phonology and its associated lexicon are closest to the decontextualized structural pole. At the same time, the perhaps most apparent locus of structural influence is in the lexicon, where items from one code may replace, or displace to a secondary function, or form an alternative to items in another code. The two structures presumably come into contact in this way through discourse, though the studies do not tend to focus on this fact.

Interestingly, many of the studies in this area focus on the influence of indigenous languages on Spanish and Portuguese (79, 85, 103, 104, 151, 171, 216). A number of them deal with languages that are now extinct, but that have left a trace in the vocabulary of Spanish or Portuguese—e.g. the 378 Arawak words in Cuban Spanish compiled by Valdés Bernal (216). These lexical influences have contributed to the dialectal diversification of Spanish and to the differentiation between Spain and Latin America (171).

In an intriguing study, Hernandez Aquino (103) has shown that 100 place names in Madrid derive from Amerindian sources, including Quechua, Nahuatl, Chibcha, Mayan, Carib, Tupi-Guaraní, and Arawak, in an apparent reflection of the range of Spain's conquest of the New World. At the same time, Spaniards today have little awareness of the etymology or meaning of the place names. What once may have been symbolically meaningful of language structural heterogeneity within a speech community has today become assimilated into a single code structure.

Some studies deal with the impact of Spanish and Portuguese on indigenous vocabularies (9, 99, 180), but this subject has on the whole not received

systematic treatment, and, as mentioned earlier, Albó's (4) work is among the few to outline a social mechanism for the structural process.

There has also been little work on influences at the level of morphology, grammatical categories, and syntax (53, 99, 209); but some of what has been done is suggestive. In regard to areal considerations, for example, Hardman (99) has argued that the Andean region is unified by the sharing of certain grammatical categories, which transcend language boundaries not only today, but as well in pre-Columbian times. Similarly, Payne (159) shows that types of noun class and noun classification systems cut across genetic linguistic boundaries in the western Amazon. While we would like to understand more fully the discourse foundations of these kinds of cross-linguistic spread, the case serves to again point to the relative detachability of grammatical categories with respect to phonology and lexicon.

Regarding questions of dialect phonetics and phonology, the body of research has been growing. Much of this work has focused specifically on the questions of whether, how, and in what measure indigenous languages have influenced Spanish (28–31, 130, 171). While we cannot review the range of issues dealt with in these studies, we note that we would expect pronunciation and accent, which are part and parcel of discourse, to be the most readily diffusible form of influence from native languages. The phonemic inventory, as opposed to the phonetic realizations, should be most resistant to change through discourse interactions, since it is the least discourse- and most structure-like. Rules of phonological combination should be intermediate, with change occurring first in the borrowed words, which, however, may also themselves be reorganized to conform to phonological rules (26). In any case, a systematic study of this set of issues remains to be done.

CONCLUSION

Fifteen years ago, scholars were more inclined than today to view culture as characterizable in terms of decontextualized structures, and, for this reason, lexical items had a special appeal, pertaining as they do to the structural pole. Linguistic and social anthropology then came into contact, mainly in the area of analyses of kinship terminology as a special portion of the lexicon. Native South America received its share of influence from this line of thought (86, 113, 181, 227), as well as contributing in some measure to the development of lexical semantics in other domains, including color and ethnobiology (16, 17, 97, 218). The conception of culture as decontextualized and structured, of course, extended to areas beyond lexical domains—most notably, to the study of myth, where Lévi-Strauss's classic *Mythologiques* series, which took native South America as its point of departure, played a dominant role.

We suggest in this article that recent research shows a tendency to regard

culture somewhat differently. In the discourse-centered approach, culture is seen as localized primarily in discourse, which is to be understood in terms of both type-level regularities and actual, contextually situated instances of language use. However, we would regard it as to mistake to deny altogether a role for structure, in the classical Saussurean sense. It is for this reason that we have referred rather to the continuum between structure and discourse.

We conclude this article by suggesting, first, that the continuum between structure and discourse is empirically studiable, and, second, that native South America is an ideal laboratory for this kind of research. Such a study, of course, involves large-scale scientific cooperation. It must be founded on careful empirical research on the remaining languages and cultures, research that would range from the fully contextualized account of styles and genres within social processes, to more discourse-internal studies of narratives and other genres, to studies of grammar and the lexicon per se. Such research is already underway. It is beginning to allow us to undertake the kind of comparative work that is essential for testing hypotheses about the continuum, and to envision a possibly new set of theoretical interconnections within the language, culture, and society nexus.

Literature Cited

1. Abrahamson, A., Abrahamson, J. 1984. Os fonêmas da língua Juma. *Série Lingüística* 11:157–74
2. Albó, X. 1970. *Social constraints on Cochabamba Quechua.* PhD thesis. Cornell University
3. Albó, X. 1974. *Los mil rostros del Quechua. Sociolingüística de Cochambamba.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruano. 268 pp.
4. Albó, X. 1977. *El futuro de los idiomas oprimidos en los Andes.* La Paz: Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado
5. Alfaro Lagoria, C., Zegarra Ballón, L. 1976. Peru: institutionalizing Quechua. *Prospects* 6:424–29
6. Barnes, J. 1984. Evidentials in the Tuyuca verb. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 50:255–71
7. Barnes, J., Levinsohn, S. H. 1978. El relato de las conversaciones dentro de la narrativa Tuyuca. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 5:63–72
8. Barratt, L. 1981. Prenasalized stops in Guaraní—where the autosegment fails. *Linguist. Anal.* 7:187–202
9. Basso, E. B. 1973. The use of Portuguese relationship terms in Kalapalo (Xingu Carib) encounters: changes in a central Brazilian communications network. *Lang. Soc.* 2:1–21
10. Basso, E. B. 1985. *A musical view of the universe. Kalalpalo myth and ritual performances.* Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
11. Basso, E. B. 1986. Quoted dialogues in Kalapalo narrative discourse. See Ref. 194, pp. 119–168
12. Basso, E. B. 1987. *In Favor of Deceit: A Study of Tricksters in an Amazonian Society.* Tucson: Univ. Arizona Press
13. Bauman, R. 1978. *Verbal art as performance.* Rowley, Mass: Newberry House
14. Beidelman, T. O. 1971. *The translation of culture.* London: Tavistock Publications
15. Bendor-Samuel, J. T. 1971. *Tupí studies I.* Norman, Oklahoma: Summer Institute of Linguistics
16. Berlin, B., Berlin, E. A. 1975. Aguaruna color categories. *Am. Ethnol.* 2:61–88
17. Bolton, R. 1978. Black, white, and red all over: the riddle of color term salience. *Ethnology* 17:287–311
18. Boswood, J. 1973. Evidências para a inclusão do Aripaktsá no filo Macro-Jê. *Série Lingüística* 1:67–78
19. Boswood, J. 1974. Citações no discurso narrativo da língua Rikbaktsa. *Série Lingüística* 3:99–129
20. Branks, T. H. 1980. La cohesión y pro-

minencia en las narrativas del Guambiano. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 9:1–91

21. Briggs, L. T. 1983. Bilingual education in Bolivia. See Ref. 147, pp. 84–95

22. Burns, D. H. 1984. Quechua/Spanish bilingual education and language policy in Bolivia (1977–1982). *Int. Educ. J.* 1:197–220

23. Camp, E. L. 1985. Split ergativity in Cavineña. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 51:38–58

24. Carpenter, L. K. 1983. Social stratification and implications for bilingual education: an Ecuadorian example. See Ref. 147, pp. 96–106

25. Carranza-Romero, F. 1977. Diptongación y adiptongación en el Kechwa de Ancash-Huaylas. *Lenguaje y Ciencias* 17:96–101

26. Carranza-Romero, F. 1980. Cambios fonéticos internos en el Quechua de Ancash. *Leguaje y Ciencias* 20:61–66

27. Carson, N. M. 1981. Macuxi (Caribe) e os universais de Greenberg. *Revista do Centro de Artes e Letras* 3:66–70. Santa Maria, Brazil

28. Cassano, P. 1972. The influence of Guaraní on the phonology of the Spanish of Paraguay. *Stud. Linguist.* 26:106–12

29. Cassano, P. V. 1972. A study of language contact in Chile. *Orbis* 21:167–73

30. Cassano, P. V. 1973. Critique of Bertil Malmberg, "Tradición Hispánica e influencia indígena en la fonética hispanoamericana." *Can. J. Linguist.* 18:31–45

31. Cassano, P. V. 1977. Substratum hypotheses concerning American Spanish. *Word* 28:239–74

32. Chang-Rodriguez, E. 1982. Problems for language planning in Peru. *Word* 33:173–91

33. Clairis, C. 1977. Première approche du Qawasqar: identification et phonologie. *La Linguistique* 13(1–2):145–52

34. Cole, P. 1982. On defining bounding nodes for subjacency. *Linguist. Inq.* 13:139–45

35. Cole, P. Harbert, W., Hermon, G. 1978. Headless relative clauses in Quechua. *Stud. Linguist. Sci.* 8(1):26–41

36. Cole, P., Harbert, W., Hermon, G. 1982. Headless relative clauses in Quechua. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 48:113–24

37. Cole, P., Hermon, G. 1979. Complement structure and islandhood in EST: a crosslinguistic study. *Papers from the Regional Meetings, Chicago Linguistic Society 1979*, 15:60–69

38. Cole, P., Hermon, G. 1979. Subject to Object raising in an EST framework: evidence from Quechua. *Stud. Linguist. Sci.* 9(1):65–89

39. Cole, P., Hermon, G. 1981. Subjecthood and islandhood: evidence from Quechua. *Linguist. Inq.* 12:1–30

40. Cole, P., Jake, J. L. 1978. Accusative subjects in Imbabura Quechua. *Stud. Linguist. Sci.* 8(1):72–96

41. Collins, J. 1983. Translation traditions and the organization of productive activity: the case of Aymara affinal kinship terms. See Ref. 147, pp. 11–21

42. Coombs, D. 1981. "*We're all equal:*" *language, ethnicity, and inequality in a north Peruvian Quechua community.* PhD thesis. Wayne State Univ. 302 pp.

43. Córdova-Guimaray, J. 1981. El bilingüismo en las áreas rurales de Ancash. *Lenguaje y Ciencias* 21:55–62

44. Corvalán, G. 1976. El bilingüismo en el Paraguay: características y evolución. *Revista Paraguaya de Sociología* 13(37):7–35

45. Corvalán, G. 1977. Avances en el estudio del bilingüismo en el Paraguay. *Sociolinguist. Newsl.* 8(2):16–17

46. Corvalán, G. 1983. Las actitudes del maestro y el uso de la primera lengua en la clase. *Sociolinguistics* 14:16–19

47. Corvalán, G. 1984. Education in the mother tongue and educational achievement in Paraguay. *Prospects* 14:95–106

48. Croese, R. A. 1983. Algunos resultados de un trabajo de campo sobre las actitudes de los Mapuches frente a su lengua materna. *RLA, Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 21:23–34

49. Crofts, M. 1973. Gramática Munduruků. *Série Lingüística* 2:3–192

50. Crofts, M. 1984. Ideofonos na narração Munduruků. *Série Lingüística* 11:207–18

51. Crowell, T. H. 1979. *A grammar of Bororo.* PhD thesis. Cornell Univ.

52. Davis, I. 1985. Some Macro-Jê relationships. See Ref. 123, pp. 286–303

53. de Granada, G. 1979. Un caso complejo de interferencia morfológica recíproca en situación de bilingüismo amplio (Español y Guaraní en el Paraguay). *Studii si cercetari lingvistice* 30:379–82

54. de Granada, G. 1981. Actitudes sociolingüísticas en el Paraguay. *Revista Paraguaya de Sociología* 18(51):7–22

55. de Mattos, R. 1973. Fonêmica Xerente. *Série Lingüística* 1:79–100

56. Derbyshire, D. C. 1977. Discourse redundancy in Hixkaryana. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 43:176–88

57. Derbyshire, D. C. 1977. Word order universals and the existence of OVS languages. *Linguist. Inq.* 8:590–99

58. Derbyshire, D. C. 1981. A diachronic

explanation for the origin of OVS in some Carib languages. *J. Linguist.* 17: 209–20

59. Derbyshire, D. C. 1985. *Hixkaryana and linguistic typology.* Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics

60. Derbyshire, D. C. 1986. Topic continuity and OVS order in Hixkaryana. See Ref. 194, pp. 237–306

61. Derbyshire, D. C., Pullum, G. K. 1981. Object-initial languages. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 47:192–214

62. Derbyshire, D. C., Pullum, G. K. 1986. *Handbook of Amazonian Languages,* Vol 1. Berlin: Mounton de Gruyter

63. Dilworth, D. W., Stark, L. 1975. Bilingual education in the highlands of Ecuador. *The Linguistic Reporter* 17(2): 3–5

64. Dobson, R. 1976. Repetição em Kayabí. *Série Lingüística* 5:83–105

65. Dooley, R. A. 1982. Options in the pragmatic structuring of Guaraní sentences. *Language* 58:307–31

66. Dooley, R. A. 1984. Nasalização na língua Guaraní. *Série Lingüística* 11:7–35

67. Dooley, R. A., Green, H. G. 1977. Aspectos Verbais e Categorias Discursivas da Língua Palikur. *Série Lingüística* 7:7–28

68. Durbin, M. 1985. A survey of the Carib language family. See Ref. 123, pp. 325–70

69. Edmonson, B. 1983. The pre- and post-conquest use of Quechua as a lingua franca. *Human Mosaic* 17:88–115

70. Edwards, W. F. 1978. A preliminary sketch of Arekuna (Carib) phonology. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 44:223–27

71. Elizaincin, A. 1981. Sugerencias para los maestros de zonas bilingües. *Lectura y Vida* 2:19–21

72. Engelbrecht, G., Ortiz, L. 1983. Guaraní literacy in Paraguay. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 42:53–67

73. Escobar, A., Mar, J. M., Alberti, G. 1975. Perú: país bilingüe? Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos. 150 pp.

74. Everett, D., Everett, K. 1984. On the relevance of syllable onsets to stress placement. *Linguist. Inq.* 15:705–11

75. Everett, D., Seki, L. 1985. Reduplication and CV skeleta in Kamaiurá. *Linguist. Inq.* 16:326–30

76. Faust, N. W. 1972. *Gramática Cocama: Lecciónes para el aprendizaje del idioma Cocama.* Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 173 pp.

77. Fernandez de la Reguera Aller, I., Hernández Sallés, A. 1984. Estudio exploratorio de actitudes en una situación de bilingüismo. El caso Mapuche. *RLA,*

Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada 22:35–51

78. Fock, N. 1963. *Waiwai: religion and society in an Amazonian tribe.* Ethnographic Series, No. 8. Copenhagen: Danish National Museum

79. Forero, M. J. 1982. Algunos topónimos indígenas de Colombia. *Thesaurus* 37:161–67

80. Fortune, D. L. 1973. Gramática Karajá: um estudo preliminar em forma transformacional. *Série Lingüística* 1:101–61

81. Franchetto, B. 1983. A fala do chefe: generos verbais entre os Kuikuru do Alto Xingu. *Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos* 4:4–72

82. Franchetto, B. 1986. *Falar Kuikúro: estudo etnolingüístico de um Grupo Caribe do Alto Xingu.* PhD thesis. Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro

83. Girard, V. 1971. *Proto-Takanan phonology.* Univ. Calif. Publ. Linguistics, 70. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

84. Gnerre, M. 1986. The decline of dialogue: ceremonial and mythological discourse among the Shuar and Achuar of eastern Ecuador. See Ref. 194, pp. 307–41

85. Goldammer, K. 1984. Aspectos neosemánticos de los indoamericanismos Aruacos en el Español de Cuba. *Islas* 77:23–42

86. Goulet, J.-G. 1981. The Guajiro kinship system: its semantic structure and social significance. *Anthropol. Ling.* 23:298–325

87. Graham, L. 1984. Semanticity and melody: parameters of contrast in Shavante vocal expression. *Lat. Am. Music Rev.* 5:161–85

88. Graham, L. 1986. Three modes of Shavante vocal expression: wailing, collective singing, and political oratory. See Ref. 194, pp. 83–118

89. Greenberg, J. H. 1960. The general classification of Central and South American languages. See Ref. 219, pp. 791–94

90. Greenberg, J. H. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. See Ref. 91, pp. 73–113

91. Greenberg, J. H. 1966. *Universals of Language.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press

92. Greenberg, J. H. 1987. *Language in the Americas.* Stanford, Calif: Stanford Univ. Press

93. Griffiths, G., Griffiths, C. 1976. Relatório fonêmico do Kadiwéu. *Série Lingüística* 6:130–56

94. Grimes, B. F. 1985. Language attitudes: identity, distinctiveness, survival in the

Vaupes. *J. Multilingual Multicult. Dev.* 6:389–401

95. Gross, D. R. 1973. *Peoples and cultures of native South America.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday

96. Gudschinsky, S. C. 1973. Sistemas contrastivos de marcadores de pessoa em duas línguas carib: Apalaí e Hixkaryána. *Série Lingüística* 1:57–62

97. Hardman, M. J. 1981. Jaqaru color terms. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 47:66–68

98. Hardman, M. J. 1985. Aymara and Quechua: languages in contact. See Ref. 123, pp. 617–43

99. Hardman-de-Bautista, M. J. 1982. The mutual influence of Spanish and the Andean languages. *Word* 33:143–57

100. Harrison, C. H. 1975. Gramática Asuriní. *Série Lingüística* 4:1–175

101. Harrison, C. H. 1986. Verb prominence, verb initialness, ergativity and typological disharmony in Guajajara. See Ref. 62, pp. 407–440

102. Hernán Ramírez, L. 1980. Los estudios Peruanos de lingüística Andina. *Studii si Cercetari Lingvistice* 31:311–19

103. Hernandez Aquino, L. 1975. Indoamericanismos en la Toponimia de Madrid. *Yelmo* 26:37–38

104. Hernandez Aquino, L. 1977–78. Las primeras palabras indígenas. *Yelmo* 34–35:36–37

105. Hernández Sallés, A., Ramos Pizarro, N. 1980. Proyecto de investigación: el Español hablado por los Mapuches o Araucanos del centro-sur de Chile. Estudio de un grupo familiar. *RLA, Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 18:59–64

106. Hernández Sallés, A., Ramos Pizarro, N. 1983. Situación sociolingüística de una familia Mapuche. Proyecciones para abordar el problema de la eseñanza del Castellano. *RLA, Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 21:35–44

107. Hochmann, K. 1978. El bilingüismo en Sucre (Bolivia). *Lenguaje y Ciencias* 18:77–80

108. Hoff, B. J. 1968. *The Carib language: phonology, morphonology, morphology, texts and word index.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff

109. Hornberger, N. H. 1985. *Bilingual education and Quechua language maintenance in highland Puno, Peru.* PhD thesis. Univ. Wis., Madison

110. Hymes, D. 1981. *"In vain I tried to tell you": essays in Native American ethnopoetics.* Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

111. Ibarra Grasso, D. E. 1958. *Lenguas indígenas Americanas.* Buenos Aires.

112. Jackson, J. 1974. Language identity of the Colombian Vaupés Indians. In *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking,* ed. R. Bauman, J. Sherzer, pp. 50–64. New York: Cambridge University Press

113. Jackson, J. E. 1977. Bará zero generation terminology and marriage. *Ethnology* 16:83–104

114. Jake, J. L. 1979. Some remarks on relativization in Imbabura Quechua. *Stud. Linguist. Sc.* 9(2):109–29

115. Jakobson, R. 1960. Concluding statement: linguistics and poetics. See Ref. 183, pp. 350–77

116. Kaye, J. 1971. Nasal harmony in Desano. *Linguist. Inq.* 2:37–56

117. Key, M. R. 1968. *Comparative Tacanan phonology: with Cavineña phonology and notes on Pano-Tacanan relationship.* The Hague: Mouton

118. Key, M. R. 1979. *The grouping of South American Indian languages.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr

119. Key, M. R. 1981. North and South American linguistic connections. *La Linguistique* 17(1):3–18

120. Key, M. R. 1987. *Comparative linguistics of South American Indian languages. Lang. Sci.* 9

121, Klein, H. E. M. 1981. Location and direction in Toba: verbal morphology. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 47:227–35

122. Klein, H. E. M. 1986. Styles of Toba discourse. See Ref. 194, pp. 213–35

123. Klein, H. E. M., Stark, L. 1985. *South American Indian languages: retrospect and prospect.* Austin, Texas: Univ. Texas Press

124. Klumpp, J., de Klumpp, D., Levinsohn, S. 1983. Continuidad en la situación y anti-tópico en la narrativa Piapoca. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 12:3–32

125. Kroeker, B. 1980. *Aspectos da língua Nambikuára.* Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 112 pp.

126. Larson, M. L. 1978. *The Functions of Reported Speech in Discourse.* Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 421 pp.

127. Lemle, M. 1971. Internal classification of the Tupi-Guaraní linguistic family. See Ref. 15, 107–29

128. Longacre, R. E. 1977. *Discourse grammar: studies in indigenous languages of Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador.* 3 volumes. Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics

129. Loukotka, C. 1968. *Classification of South American Indian languages.* Los Angeles: Latin American Center, University of California

130. Malmberg, B. 1964. Tradición Hispánica e influencia indígena en la fonética

Hispanoamericana. *Presente y Futuro de la Lengua Española* 2:227–43
131. Mannheim, B. 1984. Una nación acorralada: Southern Peruvian Quechua language planning and politics in historical perspective. *Lang. Soc.* 13:291–309
132. Mannheim, B. 1985. Contact and Quechua-external genetic relationships. See Ref. 123, pp. 644–88
133. Mannheim, B. 1986. Poetic form in Guaman Poma's *Wariqsa Arawi. Amerindia* 11:41–67
134. Mannheim, B. 1987. Couplets and oblique contexts: the social organization of a folksong. *Text* 7:265–88
135. Mason, J. A. 1950. The languages of South American Indians. *Handbook of South American Indians* 6:157–317
136. Matteson, E., Wheeler, A., Jackson, F. L., Waltz, N. E., Christian, D. R. 1972. *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages*. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 127. The Hague: Mouton
137. McDowell, J. H. 1983. The semiotic constitution of Kamsá ritual language. *Lang. Soc.* 12:23–46
138. McLeod, N., Herndon, M. 1980. *The ethnography of musical performance*. Norwood, Pennsylvania: Norwood
139. McLeod, R. 1974. Fonemas Xavante. *Série Lingüística* 3:131–52
140. McLeod, R., Mitchell, V. 1977. *Aspectos da língua Xavante*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 228 pp.
141. McQuown, N. A. 1955. The indigenous languages of Latin America. *Am. Anthropol.* 57:501–70
142. Mertz, E., Parmentier, R. J. 1985. *Semiotic mediation*. New York: Academic
143. Métraux, A. 1947. Mourning rites and burial forms of the South American Indians. *América Indígena* 7:7–44
144. Metzger, R. C. 1981. *Una gramática popular del Carapana*. Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 240 pp.
145. Migliazza, E. C. 1985. Languages of the Orinoco-Amazon region: current status. See Ref. 123, 17–139
146. Minor, E., Minor, D. 1983. *Gramática pedagógica del Huitoto*. Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 285 pp.
147. Miracle, A. W. Jr. 1983. *Bilingualism: social issues and policy implications*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press. 188 pp.
148. Monod-Becquelin, A. 1976. Classes verbales et construction ergative en Trumai. *Amérindia* 1:117–44
149. Moore, D. 1984. *Syntax of the language of the Gavião Indians of Rondônia, Brazil*. PhD thesis. City University of New York

150. Moore, D. 1985. Nominal stem and adjective stem incorporation in Gavião. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 51:513–15
151. Muysken, P. 1986. Quechua. *Studium Linguistik* 19:61–75
152. Olson, R. 1964. Mayan affinities with Chipaya of Bolivia I: correspondences. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 30:313–24
153. Olson, R. 1965. Mayan affinities with Chipaya of Bolivia II: cognates. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 31:29–38
154. Oñativia, O. V., Reyes Donoso, M. A. 1977. Basic issues in establishing a bilingual method. *Reading Teach.* 30:727–34
155. Orr, C., Longacre, R. E. 1968. Proto-Quechumaran. *Language* 44:528–55
156. Painter, M. 1983. Aymara and Spanish in southern Peru: the relationship of language to economic class and social identity. See Ref. 147, pp. 22–37
157. Payne, D. L. 1985. Degrees of inherent transitivity in Yagua verbs. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 51:19–37
158. Payne, D. L. 1986. Basic constituent order in Yagua clauses: implications for word order universals. See Ref. 62, pp. 440–65
159. Payne, D. L. 1987. Noun classification in the western Amazon. See Ref. 120, pp. 21–44
160. Payne, T. E. 1983. Yagua object clitics: syntactic and phonological misalignment and another possible source of ergativity. *Papers from the Parasessions, Chicago Linguistic Society 1983*, pp. 173–84
161. Payne, T. E. 1984. Split S-marking and fluid S-marking revisited. In *Papers from the Parasessions, Chicago Linguistic Society 1984*, pp. 222–32
162. Payne, T. E. 1985. *Participant coding in Yagua discourse*. PhD thesis. UCLA
163. Peirson, E. J. 1980. Formas de destacar informacion en las narrativas del Puinave. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 10:87–103
164. Pet, W. J. A. 1979. Another look at Suriname Arawak phonology. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 5:323–31
165. Price, P. D. 1976. Southern Nambiquara phonology. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 42:338–48
166. Proulx, P. 1987. Quechua and Aymara. See Ref. 120, pp. 91–102
167. Rivière, P. 1971. The political structure of the Trio Indians as manifested in a system of ceremonial dialogue. See Ref. 14, pp. 293–311
168. Rhodes, N. C. 1980. Attitudes toward Guaraní and Spanish: a survey. *The Linguistic Reporter* 22:4–5
169. Rodrigues, A. D. 1964. A classificação

do tronco lingüístico Tupi. *Revista de Antropologia* 12:99–104

170. Rodrigues, A. D. 1985. Evidence for Tupi-Carib relationships. See Ref. 123, pp. 371–404

171. Rohwedder, E. 1975. Zur Lautung, Grammatik und Lexikologie des Lateinamerikanischen Spanisch. *Fremdsprachen* 19:119–23

172. Romero-Figueroa, A. 1985. OSV as the basic order in Warao. *Linguistics* 275:105–21

173. Rowan, O. 1977. Estrutura discursiva Parecis. *Série Lingüística* 7:101–09

174. Rubin, J. 1968. *National bilingualism in Paraguay.* Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 60. The Hague: Mouton

175. Rubin, J. 1978. Toward bilingual education for Paraguay. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978,* pp. 189–201

176. Saelzer, M. 1976. Fonologia provisória da língua Kamayurá. *Série Lingüística* 5:131–70

177. Safir, K. 1982. Nasal spreading in Capanahua. *Linguist. Inq.* 13:689–94

178. Salas, A. 1983. Alfabetizar y enseñar en Mapudungu? Alfabetizar y enseñar en Castellano? Alternativas para la escuela rural en la Araucania Chilena. *RLA, Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 21:59–64

179. Sandvig, R. T. 1983. La importancia de la literatura nativa para la alfabetización en una lengua vernacular. *RLA, Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 21:45–50

180. Santander, R. L. 1978. Préstamos del Quechua y Castellano a la lengua Kunza. *RLA, Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 16:135–40

181. Scheffler, H., Lounsbury, F. 1971. *A study in structural semantics: the Siriono kinship system.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

182. Schwartzman, S. 1984. Linguistic humor and the maintenance of Krenakore identity under contact. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 50:232–37

183. Sebeok, T. A. 1960. *Style in language.* Cambridge: MIT Press

184. Seeger, A. 1979. What can we learn when they sing? Vocal genres of the Suyá Indians of Brazil. *Ethnomusicology* 23:373–94

185. Seeger, A. 1980. Sing for your sister: the structure and performance of Suyá akia. See Ref. 138, pp. 7–43

186. Seeger, A. 1986. Oratory is spoken, myth is told, and song is sung, but they are all music to my ears. See Ref. 194, pp. 59–82

187. Shell, O. 1965. *Pano reconstruction.*

PhD thesis. University of Pennsylvania

188. Sherzer, J. 1977. Cuna Ikala: literature in San Blas. See Ref. 13, pp. 133–50

189. Sherzer, J. 1982. Poetic structuring of Kuna discourse: the line. *Lang. Soc.* 11:371–90

190. Sherzer, J. 1983. *Kuna ways of speaking: an ethnographic perspective.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press

191. Sherzer, J. 1986. The report of a Kuna curing specialist: the poetics and rhetoric of an oral performance. See Ref. 194, pp. 169–212

192. Sherzer, J. 1987. A discourse-centered approach to language and culture. *Am. Anthropol.* 89:295–309

193. Sherzer, J., Bauman, R. 1972. Areal studies and culture history: language as a key to the historical study of culture contact. *Southwest. J. Anthropol.* 28:131–52

194. Sherzer, J., Urban, G. 1986. *Native South American Discourse.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

195. Sherzer, J., Wicks, S. A. 1982. The intersection of music and language in Kuna discourse. *Lat. Am. Music Rev.* 3:147–64

196. Sorensen, A. P. 1967. Multilingualism in the northwest Amazon. *Am. Anthropol.* 69:670–84

197. Sorensen, A. P. 1973. South American Indian linguistics at the turn of the seventies. See Ref. 95, pp. 312–41

198. Sorensen, A. P. 1985. An emerging Tukanoan linguistic regionality: policy pressures. See Ref. 123, pp. 140–56

199. Stark, L. 1970. Mayan affinities with Araucanian. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 6:57–69

200. Stark, L. 1983. Alphabets and national policy: the case of Guaraní. See Ref. 147, pp. 70–83

201. Stark, L. 1985. Ecuadorian highland Quechua: history and current status. See Ref. 123, pp. 443–78

202. Stoll, D. 1982. *Fishers of men or founders of empire? The Wycliffe Bible translators in Latin America. A U.S. evangelical mission in the Third World.* London: Zed Press

203. Stolte, J. A. 1980. La nasalización en las lenguas Tucanas Orientales. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 7:1–27

204. Swadesh, M. 1963. On aboriginal languages of Latin America. *Curr. Anthropol.* 4:317–18

205. Swain, C. L. 1978. Climax in Shirishana narrative. *Linguistics* 203:29–50

206. Taylor, D. R., Hoff, B. J. 1980. The linguistic repertory of the Island-Carib in the seventeenth century: the men's lan-

guage—a Carib pidgin? *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 46:301–12

207. Tedlock, D. 1983. *The spoken word and the work of interpretation.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

208. Tovar, A. 1961. *Catálogo de las lenguas de América del Sur.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana

209. Tumler, T. 1976. Die Satzkomplexität im Spanischen der Andenländer: Vorbericht zu einer soziolinguistischen Untersuchung. *Linguistische Berichte* 43: 55–68

210. Urban, G. 1984. Speech about speech in speech about action. *J. Am. Folklore* 97:310–28

211. Urban, G. 1985. Ergativity and accusativity in Shokleng (Gê). *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 51:164–87

212. Urban, G. 1985. The semiotics of two speech styles in Shokleng. See Ref. 142, pp. 311–29

213. Urban, G. 1986. Ceremonial dialogues in South America. *Am. Anthropol.* 88: 371–86

214. Urban, G. 1986. Semiotic functions of macro-parallelism in the Shokleng origin myth. See Ref. 194, pp. 15–57

215. Urban, G. 1988. Ritual wailing in Amerindian Brazil. *Am. Anthropol.* 90(2):In press

216. Valdés Bernal, S. 1984. En torno a los remanentes del Aruaco insular en el Español de Cuba. *Islas* 77:5–22

217. Voegelin, C. F., Voeglin, F. M. 1977. *Classification and Index of the World's Languages.* New York: Elsevier

218. Wagner, C. 1982. A propos de l'analyse semique. *Cah. Lex.* 40(1):11–26

219. Wallace, A. F. C. 1960. *Men and cultures: selected papers of the fifth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania

220. Waller, H. E. 1976. A conjunção nhũm na narrativa Apinajé. *Série Lingüística* 5:7–29

221. Weber, D. J., Landerman, P. N. 1985. On the interpretation of long vowels in Quechua. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 51:94-108

222. West, B. 1980. *Una gramática popular del Tucano.* Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 240 pp.

223. West, B. 1985. La partícula adversativa en el discurso Tucano. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 13:83–111

224. Weidman de Kondo, R. 1976. Onomatopeya en guahibo. *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines* 2:21–32

225. Wiesemann, U. 1972. *Die phonologische und grammatische Struktur der Kaingang-Sprache.* Janua Linguarum Series Practica 90. The Hague: Mouton

226. Wise, M. R., Riggle, E. 1979. Terminología matemática y la enseñanza de conocimientos básicos entre los grupos étnicos de la Amazonia Peruana. *Lenguaje y Ciencias* 19:85–103

227. Wordick, F. J. F. 1975. Siriono kinship terminology. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 41:242–85

228. Yabar, P., Zierer, E. 1975. Modelo para la formación de profesores de Quechua (Ancashino) como segunda lengua. *Lenguaje y Ciencias* 15:168–88

229. Zierer, E. 1975. Second-language teaching and learning in (present day) Peru. *Lenguaje y Ciencias* 15:97–123