NOTES AND DISCUSSION

On South American Indian languages: reply to Aikhenvald

LYLE CAMPBELL

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

1. INTRODUCTION

My aim here is to clarify some misinterpretations in Aikhenvald's (2002) review of my book (Campbell 1997). It is an unusual review, written four years after the book appeared, and not so much a book review as a critique of one chapter, on South American languages; even here it concentrates only on languages of Amazonia.

2. MACROGROUPINGS

Aikhenvald claims I take for granted 'large genetic groupings – Greenbergian fashion' (p. 143) by repeating Kaufman's (1990, 1994) hypothesized larger groupings, inconsistent with my principles for investigating genetic relationships (cf. Campbell 1997: chapters 7 and 8). She apparently missed my warning: 'Most of these [Kaufman's macro]groupings are definitely not to be taken as anything more than hypotheses for further testing' (Campbell 1997: 172). I would have been remiss not to mention them in a survey of classifications of South American languages. Though I chose Kaufman's classification as the most reliable, I did not follow it slavishly; I brought in others' work where differences were relevant.

3. 'LANGUAGE AREAS'

Another criticism is that 'genetic and areal approaches are confused, with no explanation … "Language areas" appear within the description of most families' (p. 143). This is mistaken. Chapter 9, 'Linguistic areas of the Americas', reports the true 'linguistic areas'. Kaufman's 'language area' has nothing to do with these; it is his term for cases where it is difficult to distinguish between distant dialects and closely related languages, where 'there are clear boundaries between … communities … yet there is a high degree of mutual intelligibility' (Kaufman 1990: 69). Thus Kaufman's language areas were appropriately listed with the dialects of the languages in this chapter. The term 'language area' is clear in this context and it should be well-known

141

to South Americanists. Indeed, Kaufman (1990: 69) says emphatically: '"Language area" is not to be confused with "linguistic area" or Sprachbund', as Aikhenvald has done.

4. 'ERRORS' IN LANGUAGE NAMES, LOCATIONS AND GROUPINGS

Many of the sins attributed to me come from the sources available in 1994 when the book was submitted. I mention only representative examples to indicate what is at stake. Space limitations prevent me from addressing others, but few are the errors Aikhenvald alleges them to be.

The first language that Aikhenvald says I 'missed out' is 'Arasa' (Tacanan for her). It was left out to avoid uncertainties. There are three related names – Arasa, Arazaire, Arasairi – assigned unclear classifications in the literature. Nordenskiöld (1905), the sole source on Arasa, said: 'Die Arasa sprechen Tacana mit atsahuacawörtern. Die Atsahuaca sprechen eine Panosprache' [The Arasa speak Tacana with Atsahua words. The Atsahua speak a Panoan language] (Girard 1971: 17). This statement has caused much confusion. Loukotka (1968: 176) says under 'Tacana Stock': 'Arasa – language spoken by the greater part of the Arazaire tribe (of Pano stock) on the Marcopata and Arasa Rivers'. Thus the language is sometimes identified as Tacanan, sometimes Panoan. Under 'Tacana Stock', Loukotka lists ten 'Arasa' words (p. 177) and with his 'Pano Stock' (p. 174), he lists nine words of 'Arazaire', 'language … on the Marcapata River' (p. 173). Loos (1999: 228) also lists 'Arazaire' as Panoan. A comparison of Loutkotka's 'Arasa' and 'Arazaire' reveals they are either the same language or closely related, certainly not of different families:

	ARAZAIRE ('Panoan')	ARASA ('Tacanan')
'sun'	fuári	huári (note *huari* in several Panoan languages)
'one'	nunchina	nonchina
'two'	buta	béta
'head'	mashashue	é-osha
'water'	humapasha	éna (note other Panoan languages with *éna*, *xéne*, etc.)
'house'		so:po (note *shopo*, *shobo* in Panoan languages)

Three of the six words given in both languages match closely ('sun', 'one', 'two'); the other Arasa forms mostly match cognates in Panoan languages. Clearly both the names and the family status of the language(s) are uncertain, and so 'the entire problem of confirmed genetic relationship [of Arasa] must be held in abeyance' (Girard 1971: 17).

Loutkotka's (1968: 177) isolate 'Arasairi' is another name for Toyeri (a.k.a. Huachipaeri), which Kaufman classifies as Harákmbut (see Wise 1999: 311). Accordingly, I listed Arasairi as a dialect of Huachipaeri (Harákmbut)

(Campbell 1997: 177). Kaufman rightly says, 'classifiers have been confused by the names given these languages' (Kaufman 1990: 41).

As seen here, many South American languages have several names applied to them. Thus, I did not miss 'Panará (or Kren-Akakóre)' (p. 144). Rather, Aikhenvald missed it, under the alternative name 'Ipewí (Kren-Akarore, Creen-Acarore)' (Campbell 1997: 196), confirmed in the index. 'Yurutí' is not 'missing' from Tucanoan; 'Yurutí/Juruti' appears among the dialects of Carapano (Campbell 1997: 184). I am criticized for leaving 'Arapaso' and 'Mirití-tapuya' out of Tucanoan, though neither is in Dixon & Aikhenvald (1999). 'Mirití-tapuya' is also not in Loukotka (1968); he says 'Arapaso (Koréa)' is an 'extinct language once spoken on the Yapú River, Amazonas, Brazil. The last survivors now speak only Tucano. [Nothing [is known of this language]]' (p. 185) – there is thus good reason for hesitating with respect to this language.

Aikhenvald criticizes me (i.e. my sources) for confusing 'names of languages, dialects and rivers' (p. 145); however, it was by river names that groups often came to be identified, cf. the Arasa River for Aikhenvald's 'Arasa' (above) (Loukotka 1968: 176). 'Kurikuriai', from Kaufman, reflects Loukotka's (1968: 192) 'Curicuriaí', identified explicitly with the river: '[Dialect] of the Curicuriaí River' (p. 191), shortened to 'Curicuriaí' or 'Kurikuriai' in the literature (same story for 'Tikié' and 'Papurí'; Loukotka 1968: 191).

Aikhenvald criticizes me for not including 'Sorowahá' in Arauan. The Sorowahá (a.k.a. Zuruahã, Suruwaha) were not contacted by outsiders until 1980, not in sources available in 1994, when I submitted the book. Dixon (1999: 294) mentions preliminary but unpublished missionary work, and even now, apart from the mention in Dixon (1999) and in papers by Everett and Suzuki in Wetzels (1995), nothing is published on this language.

Aikhenvald (p. 144) mentions as an alleged error in genetic groups 'Shebayo, an extinct language whose Arawak-Maipurean affiliation is beyond doubt'. However, I wrote that though there are only a 'scant fifteen words recorded in extinct Shebayo (Shebaye)' – making determination of its subgroup membership difficult – 'evidence had been presented to argue it belongs with the Caribbean subgroup of the family' (Campbell 1997: 179). This leaves little doubt that the 'Shebaya (Shebaye)' on p. 181 was meant to be classified as a Maipurean (Arawakan) language 'too scantily known' to be subgrouped, and not among the 'non-Maipurean Arawakan languages' sometimes listed as Arawakan, also in that list.

5. BRIEF MENTION: OTHER MATTERS

In Aikhenvald's reading, 'the history of South American linguistics is patchy – chapter 2 … accords hardly any consideration to the work of important scholars such as von den Steinen, de Goeje, Tovar & De Tovar, Ibarra

143

Grasso, Nimuendajú, David Payne and Rodrigues' (p. 146). Others may understand this brief section for what it claims to be, 'a brief discussion of the classifications of South American Indian languages as a whole, with particular emphasis on methods' (Campbell 1997: 80). Thus, some works do not appear in this section because they do not deal with the overall classification of South America or they are not methodologically important. However, none of those mentioned is neglected; several figure in the general history of Native American languages, and all figure in treatments of individual aspects of South America (see in Campbell 1997: von den Steinen on pp. 54, 204, 475; de Goeje pp. 22, 204; Tovar & De Tovar pp. 128, 479, cf. also pp. 72, 82, 172, 186; Ibarra Grasso pp. 4, 30, 93, 189, 210, 380; Nimuendajú p. 81; David Payne pp. 13, 178–179, 182, 220–221, 256–257, 350–351; and Rodrigues pp. 13, 23, 170, 182–183, 193, 195, 198–199, 202, 204, 405).

In a review on South America, 'flaws' from a Finno-Ugric paper (Campbell 1990) are irrelevant; nevertheless, some 'flaws' were mere matters of interpretation. I did not miss 'Ingrian' (p. 146); different scholars divide the Finnic dialect continuum differently and many consider 'Ingrian' but a variant of Finnish or Karelian. The omission was not by oversight – former Soviet scholars often list it as a separate language; Finnish scholars rarely do.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Indeed, 'scholars must be warned against uncritical use of Campbell's book' – this holds for all that we read, including Aikhenvald's review. Given the errors, critical readers may suspect that it is rather the review which is 'inadequate and unscholarly' (p. 146).

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2002). Review of Lyle Campbell's *American Indian languages: the historical linguistics of Native America*. *Journal of Linguistics* **38**. 142–147.
Campbell, Lyle (1990). Indo-European and Uralic trees. *Diachronica* **7**. 149–180.
Campbell, Lyle (1997). *American Indian languages: the historical linguistics of Native America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Dixon, R. M. W. (1999). Arawá. In Dixon & Aikhenvald, 293–306.
Dixon, R. M. W. & Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (eds.) (1999). *The Amazonian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Girard, Victor (1971). *Proto-Tacanan phonology* (University of California Publications in Linguistics **70**). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Kaufman, Terrence (1990). Language history in South America: what we know and how to know more. In Payne, Doris (ed.), *Amazonian linguistics: studies in Lowland South American languages*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. 13–67.
Kaufman, Terrence (1994). The native languages of South America. In Moseley, Christopher & Asher, R. E. (eds.), *Atlas of the world's languages*. London: Routledge. 46–76.
Loos, Eugene E. (1999). Pano. In Dixon & Aikhenvald, 227–250.
Loukotka, Čestmír (1968). *Classification of South American Indian languages*. Los Angeles: Latin American Studies Center, UCLA.
Nordenskiöld, Erland (1905). Beiträge zur Kenntnis einiger Indianerstämme des Rio Madre de Dios-gebiete. *Ymer* **25**. 265–312.

Wetzels, Leo (ed.) (1995). *Estudos Fonológicos de Línguas Indígenas Brasileiras*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
Wise, Mary Ruth (1999). Small language families and isolates in Peru. In Dixon & Aikhenvald, 307–340.

Author's address: Linguistics Department, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
E-mail: l.campbell@ling.canterbury.ac.nz

Response to Campbell

ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD

Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University

(Received 14 October 2002)

It is the mark of a true scholar to recognise when they have strayed beyond their own area of expertise, and to acknowledge errors.

In his reply, Campbell mentions only eight of the fifty errors (and these were only a sample) to which I drew attention in his account of South American languages (Aikhenvald 2002). He states that only a few of the errors I pointed out are such. It is surely incumbent upon Campbell to deal specifically with other 'alleged errors', perhaps by posting refutations on his web-site.

Campbell (2003) again demonstrates partial acquaintanceship with the literature. He excuses his omission of any mention of Sorowahá (a.k.a. Zuruahã, Suruwaha), from the 'Arauan' family, on the grounds that the Sorowahá were 'not in sources available in 1994, when I submitted the book' (p. 143). But a 244-page monograph on this tribe was published in Kroemer (1989), and the language was included in the list of Arawá languages in Buller, Buller & Everett (1993: 80), a paper published in the leading journal in the field. If one writes what purports to be an authoritative survey of a language area, one must make oneself familiar with all the sources on that area.

Campbell appears to pride himself on familiarity with the literature on previous classifications. Loukotka (1968: 191) does mention, for the Makú stock, 'dialect of the Curicuriai River', silently shortened by Campbell (1997: 183) to Kurikuriai. There is further gratuitous abbreviation in Campbell's listing of 'Kuri-Dou' as an extinct language with dialects Kurikuriai and Dou. But Dou is a living language. This is set out clearly in Rodrigues (1986: 92), which was – in 1994 – the most informed and up-to-date listing and classification of Makú languages. (Campbell refers to Rodrigues in other instances, but appears here to pass over this source.)

I pointed out two flaws in Campbell's work on Uralic languages, suggesting that only 'former Soviet scholars' (such as presumably Laanest 1975/1982 and

Viitso 1998: 96) consider Ingrian to be a separate language. This is simply untrue. Ingrian is listed as a distinct language in the fourteenth edition of *Ethnologue* (Grimes 2000: 692), a work certainly not authored by former Soviet linguists, as well as by Harms (1992: 704–705). Interestingly, Ingrian is represented as a distinct language by Campbell himself on 'Figure 6.2, The Uralic family tree', in his recent textbook (Campbell 1998: 169). I also drew attention to Campbell's having omitted mention – from two of his papers – of a whole subgroup of Samoyed languages (Sayan-Samoyedic); to this Campbell offers no reply.

My case rests. Campbell points out (1997: 403) that he is 'reasonably familiar with the relevant research on North American and Mesoamerican languages' and, indeed, this part of his book has been justifiably well-received. But he goes on to say (pp. 403–404) that he has 'no such confidence in South America'. Readers must be warned that the excellence of the first part of the book does not carry over into the section on South America, and this should not be accepted or referred to as a reliable survey.

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2002). Review of L. Campbell's *American Indian languages: the historical linguistics of Native America. Journal of Linguistics* **38**. 142–147.
Buller, B., Buller, E. & Everett, D. L. (1993). Stress placement, syllable structure, and minimality in Banawá. *International Journal of American Linguistics* **59**. 280–293.
Campbell, L. (1997). *American Indian languages: the historical linguistics of Native America.* Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
Campbell, L. (1998). *Historical linguistics: an introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Campbell, L. (2003). On South American Indian Languages: reply to Aikhenvald. *Journal of Linguistics* **39**. 141–145.
Grimes, B. (ed.) (2000). *Ethnologue*, vol. I: *The languages of the world* (14th edn.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
Harms, R. T. (1992). Uralic languages. *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica. Macropaedia* (15th edn.), vol. 22. 701–711.
Kroemer, G. (1989). *A caminho das malocas Zuruahá. Reconhecimento e identificação de um povo indígena desconhecido.* São Paulo: Ed. Loyola.
Laanest, A. (1975). *Sissejuhatus Läänemere-Soome keeltesse.* Tallinn: Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia. (German translation published in 1982 as *Einführung in die ostseefinnische Sprachen.* Hamburg: Buske.)
Loukotka, C. (1968). *Classification of South American Indian languages.* Los Angeles: Latin American Center, University of California.
Rodrigues, A. D. (1986). *Línguas Brasileiras. Para o conhecimento das línguas indígenas.* São Paulo: Ed. Loyola.
Viitso, T.-R. (1998). Fennic. In Abondolo, D. (ed.), *The Uralic languages.* London & New York: Routledge. 96–114.

Author's address: Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Vic. 3086, Australia.
E-mail: a.aikhenvald@latrobe.edu.au