Language in Society **39**, 617–646.
doi:10.1017/S0047404510000631

Who speaks what to whom? Multilingualism and language choice in Misión La Paz

LYLE CAMPBELL

Dept. of Linguistics
University of Hawaii Manoa
569 Moore Hall
1890 East-West Road
Honolulu, HI 96822
lylecamp@hawaii.edu

VERÓNICA GRONDONA

Eastern Michigan University

ABSTRACT

The multilingualism and patterns of language use in Misión La Paz, Salta Province, Argentina are described and analyzed. Three indigenous languages, Chorote, Nivaclé, and Wichí, are spoken here, but interlocutors in conversations usually do not speak the same language to one another. There is extensive linguistic exogamy, and husbands and wives typically speak different languages to one another. Individuals identify with one language, speak it to all others, and claim only to understand but not to speak the other languages spoken to them. Children in the same family very often identify with and thus speak different languages from one another. This situation is examined and explanations are offered, with comparisons to similar situations elsewhere. The pattern of language choice and multilingual use in this case is arguably unique, with implications for several general claims about language contact and multilingualism.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we describe and analyze the multilingualism and language use in Misión La Paz, Salta Province, Argentina. Three indigenous languages and Spanish are spoken here, but interlocutors in conversations typically do not speak the same language to one another. There is extensive linguistic exogamy, and husbands and wives speak different languages to each another. Our goal in this paper is to describe and explain this situation, with comparisons to similar situations elsewhere. We believe the pattern of language choice and multilingual use in this case is unique.[1]

© Cambridge University Press, 2010 0047-4045/10 $15.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We argue that Misión La Paz (henceforth MLP) is significantly different from situations elsewhere in the world which have partial similarities. We believe that MLP is unique in the combination of dual-lingualism, linguistic exogamy, and lack of language accommodation between husbands and wives that characterizes multilingual language use there.

It is important to document unusual and unique situations of language choice and language use, particularly as we investigate endangered languages. Given the increasing threat from Spanish and population pressures in the region, and from the increasing lack of resources and from the need for alternatives to sustain livelihood, it is possible that the patterns of multilingualism described here will cease to exist in the not distant future, in which case, without documentation, we would have no knowledge of the existence of this probably unique pattern of multilingualism and language choice. This would be an unfortunate loss, for this situation has much to tell us about language contact and multilingualism, with important implications for several general claims about these topics.

2. MISIÓN LA PAZ AND ITS LANGUAGES

Misión La Paz (henceforth MLP) is a community of c.650 people in northern Salta Province, Argentina, on the Pilcomayo River.[2] Three indigenous languages are spoken there: Chorote, Nivaclé, and Wichí. These languages belong to the Mataco-an family.[3] They are not especially closely related, however, with a divergence on the order of Germanic languages. Those who know one of these languages must still learn the others in order to understand them.

Chorote is represented in MLP in three dialects Iyo'wuhwa, Iyojwa'ja (Yohwaha), and Montaraz (Wikinawos, Manjuy). These dialects are reasonably divergent and speakers maintain they have difficulty understanding speakers of the other dialects. Iyo'wujwa has the largest number of speakers in MLP, but there are a good number of Iyojwa'ja speakers also. Montaraz (Manjuy) (the name is not so well established) is represented only by a very few older individuals who have come to MLP from Santa Rosa, Paraguay, the center of this dialect, about 200 kms away. (Children in MLP do not acquire this dialect.) There are c.2,500 speakers of Chorote, most in this region along the Pilcomayo River, with the exception of the Montaraz speakers in Santa Rosa, in some of the Mennonite colonies of central Paraguay, and in a few other scattered locations (c.450 in Paraguay) (*Encuesta Complementaria de Pueblos Indígenas of the Censo Nacional Argentina*, 2004–2005, and *Atlas de las Comunidades Indígenas en el Paraguay*, Dirección General de Estadísticas, Encuestas y Censos, Asunción Paraguay, 2004 [http://www.dgeec.gov.py/].)

Nivaclé is called Chulupí in Argentina (and in older literature sometimes Ashluslay, Ashuslé, Suhin, Chunupí, Churupí, Choropí, and other variant spellings of these names). 'Chulupí' is considered pejorative in Paraguay and the tendency to abandon this name in favor of Nivaclé (from *niwakle* 'person, Nivaclé', also the native name of the language) is beginning to reach Argentina, as well.[4] There

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are several dialects of Nivaclé, two of which are represented in MLP, commonly called locally "Arribeño" [upriver] and "Abajeño" [downriver]. These are not linguistic terms but apply to people who speak various languages along the Pilcomayo River. Most Nivaclé speakers in MLP identify themselves as Arribeños and maintain that the Abajeño dialect, also spoken in MLP by a few persons, is quite different. There are estimated to be 250 to 400 Nivaclé speakers in Argentina (*Encuesta Complementaria de Pueblos Indígenas of the Censo Nacional Argentina*, 2004–2005), and c.8,400 in Paraguay, a total of c.8,800 (*Atlas de las Comunidades Indígenas en el Paraguay*, Dirección General de Estadísticas, Encuestas y Censos, Asunción Paraguay, 2004 [http://www.dgeec.gov.py/]). There were many more Nivaclé speakers in MLP until about 15 years ago, when approximately half of them moved to Tartagal, the largest town in this region of northwest Argentina (c.56,000 inhabitants), some 150 kms from MLP over poor roads.

Wichí was formerly called Mataco, but this is also pejorative and so the name Mataco has been abandoned. Wichí is the largest language of the area, with estimates that range from c.25,000 to c. 34,000 speakers, all in Argentina except the small Noctén group in Bolivia (*Encuesta Complementaria de Pueblos Indígenas of the Censo Nacional Argentina*, 2004–2005). There are a number of reasonably distinct Wichí dialects, though most in MLP speak the Pilcomayo Salteño dialect.[5]

All the younger people and most men in MLP also speak Spanish, though some older women do not, and some older men have only limited knowledge of Spanish. Spanish is not widely used in households.

Misión La Paz (MLP) was founded in 1944 by Anglican missionaries, a mixed community of Chorote and Wichí, to which soon Nivaclé speakers were also brought. It was the last of the missions the Anglicans established in the Chaco region (Gordillo & Leguizamón 2002:86).[6] It is on the Pilcomayo River, which is the boundary between Argentina and Paraguay – Paraguay thus is just across the river from MLP.

3. WHO SPEAKS WHAT TO WHOM IN MLP, AND WHY?

In MLP, surprisingly most interactions are multilingual. That is, each participant in a conversation typically speaks his or her own language, regardless of the language spoken by the person(s) addressed, and in turn the other participants in the conversation each speak their own particular language in return. People communicate regularly with speakers of different languages, but very often not in the same language as the one addressed to them. This sort of communication has been called 'dual-lingualism' or 'passive bilingualism'; it involves non-reciprocal language use where each speaker speaks his or her own language but understands the other's language in return (Lincoln 1979, Sankoff 1968).

In addition to dual-lingualism, linguistic exogamy is also very common in MLP. In general in the linguistically exogamous marriages in MLP, each spouse speaks his/her own language and is addressed in/understands the other spouse's language

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in return – a spouse does not accommodate by speaking the other spouse's language. Each maintains and uses his or her own. Linguistic exogamy appears essentially to be a rule for Chorote and Nivaclé speakers.

3.1. Context of this study and the methods

The results reported here are based on our fieldwork in MLP over the past six years, of approximately six weeks to two months each year. The goals of this fieldwork are language documentation for Chorote, Nivaclé, and Wichí, to produce a grammar (both a practical version for the community and a technical one for scholars) and dictionary of each of the three languages (again in both a practical and a more technical version), with recording (audio and video), analysis, and archiving of many texts of many different genres. We also work with several community-based programs for preparation of educational materials for instruction in the three languages. We have trained several native speakers of each of the three indigenous languages as members of the research team; they have learned to read and write their languages, to use recording equipment and to interview and record other speakers from MLP and nearby areas, and to help with the analysis and the transcription and translation of the texts. They are integral members of the documentation and revitalization project for these languages, and continue their work when we are not in the community. We have worked with and recorded over 80 adults, who have provided oral histories, traditional tales, and other texts. We have had the opportunity to get to know personally most of the adults and a very large number of the children in the community through family connections and participation in various activities there. We have observed (and often recorded) multilingual conversations on nearly a daily basis, in many contexts, in particular among members of the research team and their families, but also in many families in many different work and social settings.

Our methods for addressing language choice and language use here have been straightforward, involving participant observation, and unstructured and structured interviews with numerous community members about language choice and use. Because this specific topic fascinated us and we wanted to understand it as much as possible, we have had many discussions with many community members about it. We also undertook a demographic survey of the community, conducted over two years by Gallardo Alejo (Secretario de MLP and Second Chief, himself Wichí with a Chorote wife and a Nivaclé mother). The demographic survey was straightforward and not difficult to administer – given the small size of the population, everyone knows which language everyone identifies with, which language they speak, and what their family members speak. Gallardo Alejo, as secretario de MLP, was able to write this information from personal knowledge, though he then went from household to household to confirm the information. The reliability of the information is not in doubt, and can be confirmed by asking almost any adult from the community. The questions posed by the survey were quite direct: what

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language/languages is/are spoken by each member of the household? Which language or languages are understood? How does each person identify himself/herself (with which ethnic group/language do they identify themselves)?

In the demographic survey, very few exceptions were found to the linguistic exogamy. There were no cases of Nivaclé married to Nivaclé, only four cases of straight Chorote married with Chorote, and six of Wichí married with Wichí. Wichí do not need to marry non-Wichí speakers, but many of the MLP Wichí are in fact married to speakers of one of the other two languages.[7] Several Wichí families from outside have moved to MLP in recent years, often to escape the flooding each year when the river leaves its banks, a problem for most places in the region except MLP. These cases usually involve Wichí married to Wichí. In addition, 30 persons were identified as having multiple ethnicity (called "cruzado" in local Spanish, where a person's identity was talked about in the surveys in terms of "race" (*raza*) in 2003 but as "ethnicity" (*etnia*) in 2007). Of these, only eleven involve spouses in a marriage speaking the same language (at least sometimes), where seven involved a Chorote-Wichí spouse married to Chorote spouse, three a Chorote-Nivaclé spouse married to a Chorote spouse, with one case of a Chorote-Guaraní spouse married to a Chorote spouse, and no cases of Nivaclé-Wichí spouses married to a Chorote, Nivaclé, or Wichí spouse.

The linguistic exogamy between Chorote and Nivaclé in MLP is not stated as an explicit rule and it appears not to be recognized consciously. The attitude seems to be that the pattern of linguistically mixed marriages just comes out that way, by chance more than by design, in spite of it being true of the vast majority of the Nivaclé and Chorote cases.

3.2. Language "identity"

In general, people "identify" with a single language and speak it with all others. They claim to understand but not speak one and in many cases both of the other two indigenous languages. This is remarkable, since the other two indigenous languages are spoken around them constantly and they usually have perfect comprehension of these languages which they claim not to speak. Personal identification with a particular language begins in childhood, perhaps around age 6 or so.[8] A child decides to identify with the language of one of the parents, although different children in the same family often choose to identify with a different language from that of some of their siblings, so that typically some siblings speak one of the languages and other siblings speak the other. The choice of language appears not to correlate in any significant fashion with the gender of the child, gender of the parent whose language is chosen, prestige, power, residence, or any of the social variables one might suspect from other situations. The basis for making the choice of which language to identify with is based on personal feelings, aesthetics, and early experiences. In numerous interviews where we have asked on what basis people decided to choose one language over the others to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

identify with, the answers were typically imprecise but along the lines of, "it just felt better," "I liked it more," "it seemed more comfortable," "I thought is was nicer." The result is that most households (typically made up of an extended family of three generations) have multilingual interactions all the time. No one of the languages, however, has greater value or prestige than the others. They are considered absolutely equal and the very question of whether one might be considered more prestigious or powerful or better in some way is so strange to inhabitants of MLP as to be almost impossible for them to comprehend.

For example, in one family, Elitye (grandfather) speaks Chorote but understands Nivaclé and Wichí (and knows Spanish, though not well). His wife Anita (grandmother) speaks Nivaclé and understands Chorote and Wichí (but knows no Spanish). Elitye speaks Chorote to Anita (and to every one else); she speaks Nivaclé to him (and to all others). Franco, their youngest son, living in the same household, speaks Chorote to his wife Valeriana and to others (his Spanish is good). Valeriana speaks Wichí to Franco and to the others (and she also knows Spanish well). (Of eight siblings, two of Franco's brothers identify with Nivacle, the others with Chorote.) Thus, in this household, Elitye speaks Chorote to all, Anita Nivacle to all, Franco Chorote to all, and Valeriana Wichí to all – all day, every day! Franco and Valeriana's children are too young to have made a choice about language yet. This family is by no means unusual. Most households in MLP have constant multilingual interactions involving spouses who speak different languages and family members who identify with different languages.

There are few exceptions to those who speak only one language but understand others. In the 2007 demographic survey (of 107 adults in 34 households), eight people were reported actually to speak (not just understand) more than one of the languages at least to some extent. In all these cases except one, Chorote was one of the languages spoken – in one case the person spoke Nivaclé and Wichí. (In one instance a person spoke both Chorote and Guaraní.) Cecilio, for example, a former lay minister, actually speaks (uses) both Nivaclé and Wichí, and formerly gave sermons in both. Two of his grown children actually speak both Chorote and Nivaclé (but identify with Chorote). These are exceptions, where most others in MLP insist they "speak" only one of the languages but "understand" the others. Other exceptions are instances where some grandchildren have not learned to understand a grandparent's language, forcing the grandparent occasionally to switch to the language of the grandchild in circumstances critical for communicating information. For example, Luis identifies with Nivaclé (his father was Wichí); he speaks Nivaclé with his wife, Ramona, who speaks Chorote to him. Two of his children identify with his language, Nivaclé, while three others identify with Chorote. Nevertheless, his youngest grandchildren (with a Chorote-speaking mother but non-Indian father), living in the same household, identify with Chorote and claim not to understand Nivaclé, forcing Luis actually to address them in Chorote for important communications, a language he claims he does not speak! Some of the children of some former community members who

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

moved to Tartagal know only Spanish and do not speak any of the indigenous languages, though some understand; when they come to visit MLP, instances arise which force some interactions to be in Spanish that otherwise in the household would involve members speaking only the indigenous language with which each identifies personally. Other exceptions happen when people from MLP travel to other areas that are not so multilingual. For example, Franco (Chorote) and Eliseo (Wichí) both actually spoke Nivaclé, a language they claim not to speak, when visiting Nivaclé-speaking areas in Paraguay. (Both Franco's and Eliseo's mothers identify with and speak Nivaclé.) Luis claims not to speak Wichí, his father's language, and when visiting Wichí regions where only Wichí is spoken, Luis is addressed in and understands Wichí but speaks Spanish in return, though Spanish is a language he claims not to know well. Another seeming exception is that several of our consultants can transcribe and translate well recordings in the languages they claim not to speak, and some also will correct a mispronunciation or other mistake one of us makes in one of the languages they claim not to speak.

In general, however, the great majority of persons who have grown up in MLP claim to speak only one of the languages but to understand at least one and often both of the other two languages.

4. HISTORICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONS

Three significant questions come up with regard to the pattern of multilingual use in MLP: (1) how extensive is it in the region? (2) How long has this situation existed? (3) Are the languages converging structurally in this situation? We address each of these in turn.

4.1. Geographical extent

Linguistic exogamy and multilingual conversations are not uncommon in the nearby regions, but they are also not nearly as typical as in MLP. Thus, this pattern of multilingualism is fairly common among the Chorote and Nivaclé in the indigenous sections of Tartagal and in the communities near MLP of La Bolsa and La Estrella, and not so common but still well represented in La Gracia, La Merced, Kilometro 1, and Kilometro 2. Wilbert (1985:3) reported La Merced, La Gracia, La Paz, and La Bolsa as "nowadays partially mixed villages." Siffredi (1973:96) spoke of clan exogamy, reporting the statistically clear tendency in La Merced towards marital interchange between the different ethnic groups, which Braunstein (1983:66) interprets as meaning among the ancient tribes. Bartolomé (1972:430) reported that the Chorotes of Rivadavia Department "live together with Chulupí [Nivaclé], Toba and Mataco [Wichí]" and in San Martín "with Mataco and Chulupí." He reported the "Chulupí" of these two departments as "mixed with Matacos and Chiriguanos." Siffredi (1973:73) observed that "hoy

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

día la convivencia armoniosa de estos dos últimos [Chorote and "Chulupí"] en la localidad de La Bolsa también revela innegables lazos de afinidad" [today the harmonious living together of these last two [Chorote and "Chulupí"] in La Bolsa also reveals undeniable connections of affinity]. Renshaw (2002:58) points out that the Nivaclé in Pedro P. Peña (in Paraguay, about 20 kms. downriver from MLP) are "largely intermarried with the Manjuy and Choroti [Chorote]." Renshaw holds the Manjuy to be a subgroup of the "Choroti" and points out that one of the groups of Manjuy is "largely intermarried with the Nivaclé" (Renshaw 2002:59; see also p. 197). Further afield, Nivaclé in Paraguay marry other Nivaclé speakers (Chase-Sardi 2003); nevertheless, many Chorote there marry Nivaclé speakers. There are also cases in Paraguay of Nivaclé married with Guaraní, Maká, and Toba speakers, and others (Chase-Sardi 2003:306, 358–61, 441, etc.). Both Lafone Quevedo (1915) and Hunt (1915:xxxi), in one of the earliest reports actually to identify the Nivaclé, reported places with extensive "Choroti" [Chorote] and "Suhin" or "Chunupí" [Nivaclé] mixture. We do not know whether they engaged in dual-lingual patterns of interaction.

4.2. Historical antecedents

What is the history of this kind of dual-lingualism and language self-identification in the region? We believe the extent of passive multilingualism (dual-lingualism) and aspects of the choice of the language with which to identify probably are recent, due to the bringing together of speakers of different languages with the founding of MLP in 1944. However, there are also indications that aspects of this pattern of multilingualism were probably around long before that. There are not many historical accounts which mention these languages at all, much less so matters of language choice and multilingualism. Neither Chorote nor Nivaclé are identified clearly in colonial sources, but rather appear to have been considered part of the Mataguayo and Mataco [Wichí] groups (see Kersten 1904). The Chorote were first mentioned by Lozano (1941[1733]:59, 218) as "Choroties"; probably also the group he called "Xolota" (Lozano 1941[1733]:82; cited also in Métraux 1946:235) were Chorote. However, next to nothing was known of either Chorote or Nivaclé until the late 1800s. The "Ashluslay" [Nivaclé] were first mentioned in the report of the Daniel Campos expedition of 1883 (Métraux 1946:236), by Cardús (1886) and by anthropologists who visited them in the early years of 1900 (Rosen 1904; Herrmann 1908; Nordenskiöld 1912). Nevertheless, there are indications in the limited literature that suggest the dual-lingualism is not new among the Chorote and Nivaclé of the Pilcomayo region and did not originate per se in MLP itself. These limited reports appear to reflect a situation much as we have today in MLP where at least some Chorote and Nivaclé both intermarried and used their respective languages in multilingual interactions.

In older reports we find some clear indications; for example, Lafone Quevedo (1895:344, also 1897:53) cites Padre Doroteo Giannecchini as saying:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> From Pikirenda to another 30 (?) leagues more or less, continuing to Paraguay they take the name *Chulupies*: and all the right bank of the Pilcomayo from our Mission of Noctenes [Wichíes of Tartija, Bolivia] to Paraguay it is the same tribe, with words and customs somewhat different; but in substance, it is the same language, and among them they understand one another perfectly **each one speaking his jargon**. (Our emphasis, LC/VG.)[9]

This seems very likely to be reporting the same kind of dual-lingualism that we see in MLP today. Lafone Quevedo cites Giannecchini further as reporting that the "Chorotis" [Chorotes] are a different tribe, but claiming "their language is a true dialect of *Mataco* or *Noctene* (Wichí) and many words are equal to those of the Noctenes [Wichí],"[10] and that "se hallan emparentados y en continua relación con los Noctenes" [they are found related to and in continuous relation with the Noctenes (Wichí)] (Lafone Quevedo 1895:344; also 1897:53).

Nordenskiöld (1912) spent several months in the region on an anthropological expedition (in 1908–1909) at a time when there had still been very little influence from non-Indians in this region. This is one of the earliest anthropological accounts to speak of "Tschoroti" [Chorote] and "Aschluslé" [Nivaclé, from the Chorote name for Nivaclé, /ahluhlay/] (/lh/ = voiceless "l"). Nordenskiöld (1912:23) with a preamble of "since their culture is rather homogeneous, I believe they can be treated together"[11], said:

> We are all brothers, a Chorote Indian once said to me. For the most part the Tschoroti [Chorote] and Aschluslé [Nivaclé] constitute two families. They live in a considerable number of **shared** villages of varying size.[12] (Our translation, our emphasis, LC/VC.)

He noted marriages between the Chorote and Nivaclé, and also, less commonly, between Wichí and Chorote as well as betweem Wichí and Nivaclé in the border areas (Nordenskiöld 1912:74). He reported, "the Nivaclé and Chorote tribes are on a par socially, as a Chorote girl can have a love affair with a Nivaclé man and a Nivaclé woman the same with a Chorote man"; this was not possible for either group with Chiriguano (Nordenskiöld 1912:80). He also observed that one Chorote chief was from a Nivaclé family (Nordenskiöld 1912:26; see also Siffredi 1973:73). Wavrin (1926:42) found that "some tribes live on good terms among themselves … Suhin … called Chunapises by the Argentinians [Nivaclés], fuse a little with the Chorotis."[13] Karsten (1932:19) reported "much communication between the two tribes ["Choroti" and "Ashluslay"] and intermarriage is frequent" (see also Karsten 1932:49, 98). Similarly, Susnik (1986–1987:33), from a broader geographical perspective, commented on the "Yofuaha-Chorótis" that the group along the Pilcomayo River maintained "relaciones intertribales 'fraternizantes' con los 'Ashlushlai-Chulupíes' [Nivaclé]" ['fraternizing' intertribal relationships with the Ashlushlai-Chulupíes (Nivaclé)], with exchange of women also with the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Noctenes" [Wichí]. Siffredi (1973:73) pointed out that the Chorote pronoun *sam* 'we' "includes indistinctly the Yojwaha Chorote and some Nivaclé groups]."[14]

We frequently see in these historical and anthropological accounts the interpretation that held that the languages were mutually intelligible or were only dialects of a single language. Thus padre José Cardús (in his 1886 "Las Misiones Franciscanas", cited by Pelleschi 1897:53) named the "Chunupis" (not to be confused with the Vilela, also called sometimes Chunupí) as one of the names by which the "Matacos" [Wichí] were known, and Padre Doroteo Giannecchini cited by Lafone Quevedo (1897:53) named the "Chulupíes" among the Noctenes/Matacos groups: "The Noctenes, the Matacos, the Vejoses, the Guiznaes, the Chulupies (Nivaclés) are a single nation; all speak a single language and all have the same customs."[15] Lehmann-Nitsche (1936:119) cites the common view before his time that Mataco [Wichí] and Chorote were but "codialectos" [co-dialects] as the reason why Chorote was so poorly known, almost unreported at that time.

We believe that observers misunderstood the dual-lingualsim among these groups and took it to mean they were speaking varieties of the same language to one another rather than that they were engaging in bilingual interactions. Some erroneously argue that these are "mixed" languages, based apparently in part on observations of communication among their speakers. For example, Braunstein & Miller (1999:10–11) say:

> there was little cohesion at the level of ethnicity involving the collectivity of tribes (each with its own dialect) speaking a common language. But interactions between bands belonging to different linguistic groups were quite common, and, once stabilized, the interethnic units formed of such alliances were the origin of mixed languages and cultures.

Braunstein has repeatedly advocated language mixture lying behind certain Chaco languages (Braunstein 1993, 1996; Braunstein & Miller 1999; Martín & Braunstein 1990–1991:10), as for example when he said:

> it cannot be dismissed that we should begin to study some Chaco languages as the product of mixture and diffusion more than as the results of the exclusive development by internal tendencies.[16] (Braunstein 1996:28.)

Specifically he believes that there are indicators that the Maká and possibly the "Chulupí [Nivaclé] are groups that originated through the process of ethnic mixture (Braunstein 1996:28). Braunstein (1993:7, 1996:22–3) surveyed others who have held similar views about language mixture (Lafone Quevedo 1896:134, 1915:xiii, Palavecino, Tovar 1981:20, etc.), and others who have favored the idea could be added (e.g. Rossi 2003:126, Susnik 1978:123–4, etc.).[17] Braunstein cites Hunt's (1915:238) statement as early recognition of this and as being very influential:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> they [the Mataco-Mataguyo] were the original occupants of the whole Chaco region, and that the varying dialects have been formed by fugitives from the north and north-west, who by conquest or intermarriage have annexed both country and language.

Braunstein (1993:8, 1996:23) reports that in historical research they had documented "situaciones de convivencia entre parcialidades matacas y chulupíes hacia principios de siglo en la margen izquierda del Bermejo" [situations of Mataco (Wichí) and Chulupí (Nivaclé) groups living together around the beginning of the century on the left bank of the Bermejo River], concluding that this indicated, "sin ninguna duda, algún grado de inteligibilidad" [without doubt, a degree of intelligibility].

We think those who see language mixture have just not understood the patterns of multilingualism in this region. The languages in fact show no evidence of "mixture" (heavy influence of language contact; see below).

In short, Chorote and Nivaclé were seldom referred to in colonial sources and were often thought to be dialects of Wichí ("Mataco"). Sources do, however, indicate that Chorote and Nivaclé lived together, often married one another, and seem to indicate that at least in some instances each spoke his or her own language. We believe these sources reflect a situation similar to that of MLP today where at least some intermarriage took place and where some people engaged in dual-lingualism, though the sources are neither as abundant nor as clear as could be hoped for on this.

4.3. Structural impacts?

It has been observed in other situations of intensive language contact that some languages have undergone structural changes to make them more similar to one another (cf. Aikhenvald 2007a). For example, in cases from India, different languages in contact have changed to become more structurally similar to one another, so that parallel morpheme-by-morpheme translations become possible (see for example Gumperz & Wilson 1971; Nadkharni 1975). This raises the question, do the varieties of the three indigenous languages in MLP show evidence of change towards similar convergence? The answer is "no," although the topic deserves more detailed investigation. First, these languages, as well as several others in the Chaco region, resist lexical borrowings. They have accepted very few loanwords from Spanish or other languages, and instead deploy native linguistic resources to create new words to accommodate concepts acquired through contact (acculturation). For example, 'goat' is not the usual loan from Spanish seen in many other indigenous languages of Latin America, but rather Nivaclé *tašinštax*, 'goat' is derived from *tašinša* 'corzuela (grey brocket deer, *Mazama gouazoubira*)' + *-tax* 'similar to', and Chorote *sonta* < *sona?* 'corzuela' + *-ta* 'similar to' (Campbell and Grondona in press). That is, they acquired the concept, but accommodated the acculturation by using native resources in their languages. Second, contrary to expectations, at least in some regards, these languages, though in constant daily contact, appear to be diverging structurally

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in some traits. We will mention four examples which illustrate this. (The examples given here incidentally show also that though related, these languages are not especially close to one another, as mentioned above.)

For example, all three have /ɬ/, voiceless "l" phonemically, as in Chorote *ɬop*, Nivaclé *ɬup*, and Wichí *ɬup* 'nest', to cite a set of cognate forms. However, younger Iyo'wuhwa Chorote speakers in MLP are now changing this. It is not /ɬ/ for them any more; rather they have essentially changed it to a consonant cluster of /h/ or /x/ + voiced /l/, which alternates with just plain /l/ (with no /h/ or /x/ component) in some contexts, especially word initially and word finally, as in:

xlop / lop 'nest'
xlaʔa / laʔa 'fruit'
xlam / lam 'he'
xloma / loma 'day'
axlu 'iguana'
samehl / samel 'we'
amehl / amel 'you (plural)'

This change is taking place in spite of these Chorote speakers being in constant intensive contact with the other two languages which preserve their unitary voiceless /ɬ/ absolutely. This goes against areal linguistic expectations of languages in this sort of close, intensive contact.

In another example, both Nivaclé and Wichí have and frequently use the contrastive 1st person plural inclusive and exclusive pronominal forms, as seen in the contrasts in Nivaclé between the pairs (1a) and (1b), between (2a) and (2b), and between (3a) and (3b):

(1a) kas-waʔtša [we.INCL-PRONOUN.ROOT] 'we' (all of us)
(1a) yi-waʔtša-ʔeɬ [1st.PERS.EXCL-PRONOUN.ROOT-PL] 'we (but not you)'
(2a) katsi-tata [our.INCL-father] 'our father' (of all of us)
(2b) yi-tata-ʔeɬ [1st.PERS.EXCL-father-PL] 'our father' (but not yours)
(3a) šta-sekkis [we.INCL-scrape] 'we scrape it' (all of us)
(3b) xa-sekkis-eɬ [1st.PERSON.EXCL-scrape-PL] 'we scrape it' (but not you)

The contrast in Wichí is seen in:

(4a) n-ʔameɬ [we.INCL-PRONOUN.ROOT] 'we' (all of us)
(4b) no-ɬameɬ, o-ɬameɬ [we.EXCL-PRONOUN.ROOT] 'we' (but not you)
(5a) ɬa-čoti [our.INCL-grandmother] 'our grandmother' (of us all)
(5b) n-čoti [our.EXCL-grandmother] 'our grandmother' (but not yours)
(6a) yaʔ-lɑn [we.ACTIVE.INCL-kill] 'we kill it' (all of us)
(6b) na-lɑn [we.EXCL-kill] 'we kill it' (but not you)

However, Chorote speakers in MLP have lost this contrast and now have only a single first person plural category:

(7) sam, sameɬ (samel) 'we'
(8a) si-ʔleh 'our language'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(9a) a-lan-a [we-kill-SUF] 'we killed it'

Contrast Chorote (8a) with the Nivaclé equivalents with cognate roots in (8b) and (8c):

(8b) kas-kliʔš 'our language' (INCL)
(8c) xa-kliʔš-eɬ 'our language' (EXCL).

Contrast Chorote (9a) with the Nivaclé cognates in (9a) and (9b):

(9b) šta-klɑn 'we kill it' (INCL)
(9c) xa-klɑn-eɬ 'we kill it' (EXCL).

Thus, Chorote has only 'we' generally, with no implications for either inclusive or exclusive readings. There are, however, frozen forms (no longer understood as different) in the language which reveal that Chorote also had the contrast, as in the case of *sam* and *sameɬ*. Historically *sameɬ* was exclusive, but now both are in use interchangeably, both mean just 'we'. Again, we would not expect one of the languages to lose a morphological contrast so prevalent in the other two languages that speakers of Chorote hear and understand constantly in MLP.

The third example involves change in Nivaclé. In both Chorote and central Paraguayan dialects of Nivaclé, active verbs when they appear with the 'prospective' (future intent) clitic, usually translated 'going to', must nevertheless take the pronominal prefixes for inactive/stative verbs, as seen in the contrasts in Chorote between (10a) and (10b) and between (11a) and (11b):

(10a) **a**-ʔwešiy [**1PRES.ACT**-hunt] 'I hunt and gather'
(10b) **si**-ʔwešiy=ayi [**1PERS.INACT**-hunt]=PROSP 'I'm going to hunt and gather'
(11a) **hi**-kapehnan [**2ACT**-cook] 'you cook'
(11b) **in**-kapehnan=ayi [**2INACT**-cook]=[PROSP] 'you are going to cook'

This construction with the inactive/stative prefixes required with the 'prospective' clitic is the original state of affairs for these languages. However, MLP Nivaclé has undergone an innovation. The corresponding construction in Nivaclé here takes not inactive/stative personal pronoun prefixes, but rather only active ones, as in (12a):

(12a) **xa**-mɑʔ**=xayu** [**1PRES.ACT**-sleep=**PROSP**] 'I'm going to sleep'

It is ungrammatical with the inactive/stative subject prefix, as in (12b):

*(12b) **tsi**-mɑʔ**=xayu** [**1STATIVE**-sleep=**PROSP**]

We would expect the presence of this construction in Chorote and other Nivaclé dialects, where its occurrence is reasonably frequent, to have influenced MLP Nivaclé to maintain the construction; however, this is not what happened.

A fourth example involves the contrast between the low unrounded vowels, /a/ (central) and /ɑ/ (back) in the Nivaclé of MLP, as in *yiyaʔ* 'mosquito' and *yiyɑʔ* 'he drinks'. This contrast is now being lost (merged to /a/). Some older speakers still

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

make the contrast consistently; younger speakers, however, do not (mostly have *yiyaʔ* for both 'mosquito' and 'he drinks'), and in some words there is now free variation. They recognize that for some people there are two separate vowels, and sometimes they pronounce the back vowel, but they are unable to tell whether a particular word should have /a/ or /ɑ/, now indistinguishable in their phonemic value for them. Once again, it is unexpected to see such a contrast being lost here, since Wichí also contrasts these same two vowels (although not in all dialects, and hence not by all Wichí speakers in MLP).[18]

In short, while the question of structural convergence is an important one and needs to be studied in greater detail in the MLP languages, it is clear from these examples that pressure towards conformity among the three languages because they are in intensive language contact has not been completely compelling, since they are undergoing some changes which result in greater difference, rather than greater similarity, among the three.[19]

5. BROADER IMPLICATIONS

Is the MLP situation unique? Other cases of dual-lingual interactions are known from around the world; some instances of linguistic exogamy are known from elsewhere; and there are also cases where spouses speak different languages to one another. Nevertheless, we believe the MLP case is fundamentally different from the rest. We take up each of these topics in turn.

5.1. "Dual-lingualism" ("passive multilingualism")

Multilingual interactions involving interlocutors speaking different languages to one another are reasonably common in the world, called 'dual-lingualism' (Lincoln 1979), 'passive bilingualism', and sometimes 'equilingualism', 'non-reciprocal (or asymmetrical) bilingualism', 'pseudo-bilingualism', 'receptive bilingualism', 'restrictive bilingualism', and 'semi-bilingualism' (cf. Hockett 1958:327; Mackey 1988:1487; Sankoff 1968; Warter 2001). Minimally some passive knowledge of the other person's language is required in these situations, though it is possible that one could have stronger knowledge of the other language and still speak only his or her own in such interactions.[20]

Such dual-lingual communication has been observed across generations, for example among some immigrants to the US where parents speak the language of their home country and their children answer them in English (cf. Haugen 1953). Dual-lingual communication is also well-known among Scandinavians involving Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish, where the languages and dialects are not very divergent from one another (cf. Warter 2001) – there dual-lingual usage is not typically between family members or spouses, however. Lincoln (1976, 1979), who coined the term, described dual-lingualism in Bougainville (Papua New Guinea) where Banoni (Austronesian) and Siwai (non-Austronesian) speakers talked with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one another, each in their own language (see below). Hooley (1971) suspects there was passive bilingualism among peoples of the Morobe District, Papua New Guinea, reporting it specifically for Bukaua and Jabem, two closely related languages (sometimes considered dialects of a single language). Situations with dual-lingualism are sometimes said to be common in Melanesia and Aboriginal Australia (e.g. Mühlhäusler et al. 1996:415). Thurston (1987:74) speaks of extensive multilingualism and dual-lingualism in North West New Britain, but with no details given, and Wurm (1996a:737) asserts that in the Philippines "there are very many instances of active or passive, one-way or two-way bilingualism," but again with no details. This notwithstanding, Dutton (1995:220) reports that no case of "dual lingualism" involving Melanesian languages has been adequately described and no additional cases (beyond Lincoln 1979) have been reported.

A number of other cases are cited in the literature, though usually again with little specific information. These include the following: In Siberia, Dolgan and Yakut, "mutually intelligible" Turkic "languages" (Wurm 1996b:976); among the dialects of Altai and "their Turkic-speaking neighbours … Shor, Khakas, Tuva, and Tofa" (Wurm 1996b:975); Nanai and Samagir, Samagair and Ulchi, and Oroch and Udege (Udehe), Tungusic languages; and Chukchi and Koryak (Wurm 1996b:976–7). In northwestern Gansu province in China, Uighur and Kazakh (Turkic languages) (Wurm 1996c:222). In Xinjiang province, six closely related Turkic languages, especially among Uighur, Uzbek, and Tartar, but also prevalent between Uighur and Kazakh, and between Uighur and Kirghiz; also sometimes Tuva and Kazakh (though these two are not so closely related Turkic languages); and Wakhi and Sarikoli (Pamir languages, Iranian branch of Indo-European) (Wurm 1996c:223). Intercommunication among different Chinese dialects (most being Mandarin dialects) in northern China (Wurm 1996:823–4). In Mongolia, Khalkha, Oirat, and Buryat, closely related Mongolian languages (Wurm & Rachewiltz 1996:909). In Krakalpakistan, "among the Turkic-speaking nationalities, whose languages are closely related and mutually intelligible" (Nasyrova 1996:926). In Turkmenistan, Turkmen and the other Turkic languages (Baskakov 1996:931). In the upper Xingu region of Brazil, with extraordinary linguistic diversity, "members of each tribe speak their own language and have a passive knowledge of some of the other languages" (Adelaar 1996:1345; cf. Monod 1970).[21] There appears to be some dual-lingualism in the Vaupés region (see more below), but it is limited and sporadic:

> Conversations in two or more languages indeed occur on occasion, as in visiting, but no one takes special note of it. Each individual initially speaks in his own father-language during such a conversation in order to assert his tribal affiliation and identification, but after a while the junior persons change, without comment, to the longhouse language, to Tukano as the lingua franca, or to another language, whatever one is most convenient for the others. (Sorensen 1967:678.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Most of the cases reported in the literature (but not all) have in common that the people who engage in this kind of dual-lingualism live in small groups, where the population density is low, and in most instances the languages involved are closely related. The smallness of group size and lowness of population density is true of MLP, but the languages involved, though belonging to the same family, are not closely related.[22]

5.2. Dual-lingualism among spouses

The cases reported from elsewhere of spouses speaking different languages to one another seem sporadic and temporary, usually not regulated by formal rules of linguistic exogamy, residency, etc. It had been suggested that such a pattern might exist on Erromango, Vanuatu, but Terry Crowley (personal communication 2004) confirmed that this is by no means a regular pattern there and the only cases are where a husband might speak Erromangan and the wife speaks back to him in Bislama (the English-based creole, lingua franca) while understanding Erromangan. Women often come from elsewhere and speak a different language, but the expectation is that the wife will eventually learn and use the local language in the village. Lincoln (1979:66) reported a case from the Solomon Islands observed by Evelyn Todd of a Savosavo-speaking man and Nggae-speaking wife "conversing dual-lingually." Savosavo is a Papuan language, while Nggae is Austronesian. Lincoln (1976:99) reported a second case, again of only a single dual-lingual marriage, in Bouganville (Papua New Guinea):

> I observed the same kind of interaction [as Todd reported (Lincoln 1979:66)] between a Siwai man and his Banoni wife. He spoke non-Austronesian Siwai and she spoke Banoni [Austronesian]. They could understand each other but neither spoke the other's language. In this village all children learned Banoni. Nearly all the women speak exclusively Banoni. The men usually can speak Banoni, Siwai, and Tok Pisin fluently. Many also know one or more other languages. The point is that the Banoni learn to speak or to understand Siwai to accommodate their relatives or affines who speak Siwai. The Siwai speakers can and do get by without learning to speak Banoni. (See also Lincoln 1979:66.)

It is not clear from this how dual-lingualism may work between spouses there; however it seems clear that it is not nearly so ubiquitous as in MLP nor as institutionalized, and also the two languages here do not seem equally balanced (where Banoni learn and speak Siwai, while Siwai may only learn to understand Banoni). This is different from the situation in MLP.

In short, the cases of dual-lingualism elsewhere appear more sporadic, not as general, long-lasting, and institutionalized as in MLP.

5.3. Linguistic exogamy

While rare, various cases of linguistic exogamy have been reported (see Hill 1978 for a summary). It is reported as probable in Arnhem Land, Australia, present

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

among some groups from the Pacific Northwest Coast and Plateau in North America, for the Upper Xingu region in central Brazil, and most famously in the Vaupés region of the northwest Amazon.

In Northeast Arnhem Land, linguistic exogamy has been reported among the Murngin, where patrilineal, territorially-based, exogamous groups (called *mada*) had a single language, unintelligible with a man's wife's language (from a different *mada*). Children learned first the mother's language, and later shifted to the father's (Berndt 1964:292; Berndt & Berndt 1964:63). Warner (1937) reported that most people spoke three or four languages, and adult men often spoke seven or eight, and that the *mada* and moiety language differences were actually only slight (though Berndt & Berndt 1964 claim they were mutually unintelligible) (see Hill 1978:15).

Heath (1978, 1981) briefly described cases of extralinguistic marriage between Ritharngu and Ngandi and between Warndarang and Nunggubuyu. Heath (1981:359) surmises for Arnhem Land that there was a high rate of inter-ethnolinguistic group marriages, around 50% for the average EG [ethnolinguistic group] with four clans and 200 persons, hence half the girls born into the EG would be sent at puberty to join husbands in other EG's, and half the wives obtained by men in the EG would be imported from neighbouring EG's. He says:

> If a boy's Mo[ther] was from another EG, bilingualism could begin within the nuclear family itself (one language spoken to Mo[ther], the other to Fa[ther]), though the Mo[ther] probably used both her native language and that of her husband. In any event, a boy would learn some of his Mo[ther]'s language, and would use it off and on throughout his life when dealing with his Mo[ther]'s clanmates. He might well learn one or two other languages because of his relationships to his wife, his Mo[ther's]Mo[ther's]Br[other], and other persons. (Heath 1981:361.)

There is no indication of how widespread passive bilingualism was in these Australian situations; individuals appear to have learned and used other languages as well as their own. Another Australian case, in western Cape York, might be somewhat different, reported by Johnson (1990), though again we have little detail. "Marriage among the Nganhcara is most frequently between speakers of different patrilects" (Johnson 1990:422). The patrilects are very closely related varieties of Nganhcara:

> As children grow up, they first learn their mother's language [patrilect], and then switch to their father's as they become adults. They regard their father's language as their own, but all speakers of Nganhcara are competent in at least two patrilects. Many have also learnt their mother's mother's language, or that of other people who have been present in the local band. (Johnson 1990:422.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"It is also common to hear conversations between people each speaking their own patrilect, but at least passively competent in the other patrilects being spoken" (p. 422). These patrilects, however, are essentially dialects of the same language (or very closely related languages).[23] In such cases a man learned and on appropriate occasions used both his father's and his mother's language.

Tindale (1953:186) held that extra-"tribal" marriages (meaning by his definition also extra-linguistics ones, since for him "tribe" was equivalent to dialect/linguistic group) were common. Nevertheless, he estimates their frequency at only 15%, ranging from 7% to 21% (see Owen 1965:679). This is very different from the situation in MLP where nearly all marriages involving Chorote and Nivaclé are cross-linguistic, as are those involving most Tukanoan groups in the Vaupés region. Heath (1978) describes groups which, whether by choice or not, were forced due to their small sizes to interlinguistic marriages (see also Clendon 2006:47).[24] He reports,

> in some language groups exogamy has become institutionalized. This applies particularly within the Yuulngu family [of languages], where (for example) one large language group, the Dhuwal, consists entirely of clans of the d?u: wa moiety … since intra-moiety marriage was never tolerated, this means that every Dhuwal man had to find a wife from another language group … Other Yuulgnu languages show similar imbalances, though not to this extreme extent [where different clans have highly unbalanced numbers]. (Heath 1978:18.)

Some scholars believe a similar fate fostered the linguistic exogamy in the Vaupés region and among some tribes of the Upper Xingu region of Brazil (see below).

Hill (1978:16) reports that:

> while the Northwest Coast-Plateau peoples did not display a rule of linguistic exogamy which applied to all adults, the preferred marriage pattern for high-status people was everywhere tribal (and hence linguistic) exogamy for all who could afford these desirable marriages. Such marriages reached a frequency of about 40% among the Klallam of the Straits of San Juan de Fuca, for example (Gunter 1927:243). On the Columbia, the preference was for marriage to people in the wealthier down-river groups; on the Pacific coast marriage preferences pointed north, with the ultimate goal a marriage to a wealthy noble of the Nootka or Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island. This marriage pattern resulted in the curious expansion down the Columbia of less prestigious languages at the expense of more prestigious ones (Jacobs 1937, 1954). The pattern of exogamy was accompanied by widespread multilingualism.

This is not the same sort of linguistic exogamy, where failures to conform are considered incest in the Vaupés region (Aikhenvald 2003b:2), or where conformity covers nearly all marriages as in MLP and in the Vaupés, and where status and wealth play no role in MLP.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Owen (1965:678) characterized Baja California patrilocal bands' typical family situation: "with the patrilateral extended family as the principal vehicle of cultural transmission, one of adult males as native speakers of one language, and some portion of the females as native speakers of different languages or at least different dialects." However, unlike in MLP and the Vaupés region, children were enculturated principally in the language of the mother and other females, not in that of the father and other males. Thus Owen (1965:678–9) concluded:

> these patrilocal bands, then, because exogamy forces marriages with members of divergent linguistic and cultural groups, can be further characterized as culturally and linguistically hybrid residence groups, united principally by patrilineal consanguineal ties and to only a lesser degree by ties of either common language or common culture. They are social groups in which at least two languages are commonly employed.

It is believed that, due to their small numbers, the Trumai and others of the Upper Xingu reserve undertook many linguistically exogamous marriages. A child learned at least two languages, his father's and his mother's, though he may learn others, also (Monod 1970).

The Vaupes area of the northwest Amazon region offers the most famous case of linguistic exogamy, obligatory among most of the Tukanoan groups, but also involving a few Arawakan groups there. Residence is patrilocal, traditionally in long houses, where women marrying into the long house spoke different languages so that children grew up with the language of their fathers but also with knowledge of their mother's language and often several others. There was strong interest in learning new languages. (For information on multilingualism and linguistic exogamy in the Vaupés region, see Aikhenvald 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2007a, 2007b; Chernela 1982, 1989, 2001, 2004; Epps 2005, 2007; Goldman 1963; C. Hugh-Jones 1979; S. Hugh-Jones 1993; Jackson 1974, 1976, 1983, 1984, 1988, 1991, 1994; Santos-Granero 2002; Sorensen 1967, 1985; Stenzel 2005.) Aspects of linguistic exogamy and its impact on language choice in the Vaupés relevant to the MLP situation are revealed, at least partially, in the following citations. "In spite of the traditional multilingualism enhanced by language-based exogamy, every Indian identifies with just one language – that of the father" (Aikhenvald 2003b:2). "A woman invariably uses the language of the longhouse – her husband's language – when talking directly with her children." "Children are usually bilingual in both their father's and their mother's languages, but commonly use the former." (Sorensen 1967:677). "All children use the longhouse language (i.e., their father's) to both their father and mother." (Sorensen 1967:678.) In each of these, MLP contrasts with the situation in the Vaupés (see comparisons below).

The age of the linguistic exogamy in the Vaupés region is unknown, though Jackson (1994:387) believes "that Tukanoan linguistic exogamy is an extremely dynamic and relatively recent institution, the result of indirect pressure from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

colonization efforts elsewhere in Colombia, Venezuela, and Brazil." Jackson (1983:21, 100–1) attributes the rise of linguistic exogamy to population loss, small population size, and loss of sibs. For example, the Makuna, who no longer practice it, "recognize the rule of linguistic exogamy as an ideal"; they say that "formerly the different Makuna sibs spoke different languages and that it is only recently that they have adopted a common language" (Århem 1981:114).

While not all cases fit, typically groups practicing linguistic exogamy are small, with band-level social organization and sparse population density, hunters and gatherers or sparsely populated horticulturalists (e.g. in Papua New Guinea and the Vaupés region). The groups in MLP fit this description (or at least did until recently).

5.4. Comparisons

Multilingualism and language use in MLP differ significantly from all the cases mentioned above. We compare and contrast these, with emphasis on the similarities and differences between MLP and the Vaupés region.

The two situations are similar in that spouses marry someone who speaks a different language, and they avoid borrowings from other languages (explicitly mentioned for the Vaupés languages, Sorensen 1967; for MLP, see Campbell & Grondona in press). They involve small populations and low population density (Jackson 1983:17 for the Vaupés area). In both regions the languages are considered of equal status. "Tukanoans in general assume that Vaupés languages are equal to one another" (Jackson 1983:164); "Vaupés languages are in no way ranked … Despite the fact that Tukano is a lingua franca, it is not considered preferable" (Jackson 1983:175). The two situations may differ from most other cases in the world in that the languages involved are not necessarily closely related. Sorensen (1967:674) believed the Tukanoan languages are less closely related to one another than Romance languages are amongst themselves, and a few instanced of non-Tukanoan languages are also involved in the Vaupés area.

However, the situations in the Vaupés region and in MLP differ significantly, in the following ways:

(1) In the Vaupés area, one identifies with and is loyal to the father's language. Wives are expected to learn and use the language of the husband's longhouse, and people there are genuinely happy to learn and speak the languages of other people they come to have conversations with. They learn and use other languages eagerly. In MLP people typically use only their own language, almost never shifting to the language others speak, resulting in multilingual interactions where different languages characterize the conversations. The language a person identifies with can be either the father's or the mother's.

(2) Men exchange women in the Vaupés (Jackson 1983:124–7); for the groups represented in MLP, women initiate matters and select the men they want to marry (cf. Chase-Sardi 2003:562, 580–25; Karsten 1932:53–6; Métraux (1946:325, Rosen 1924:159–60).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(3) Residence is patrilocal in the Vaupés (Sorensen 1967; Jackson 1983). "Residential exogamy, an automatic result of the rules of language group exogamy and patrilocal residence, can claim to be a principle in its own right" (Jackson 1983:135). Vaupés patrilocality with residential exogamy leads somewhat automatically to linguistic exogamy. This is not the case in MLP, where a man often goes to live with the wife's family initially, until after the first child is born, and then frequently the couple go to live with the husband's family, though these patterns are not rigid (cf. Chase-Sardi 2003; Renshaw 2002).

(4) Women are community outsiders in the Vaupés (who come to the longhouse because of patrilocal residence rules), often not the case in MLP. In the Vaupés it is outsider women who are often seen as trouble-makers (Jackson 1983:130, 190; Jackson 1992:13); in MLP it is insider women who are considered the trouble-makers, leading some men to say they prefer women from outside MLP because they make less trouble.

(5) Linguistic exogamy in the Vaupés is a major principle of social organization, residence patterns, kinship, and regional interactions. Among the groups which practice it, failure to conform would be considered incest. The rule is overt, recognized, and formal. In MLP, in contrast, there appears to be nearly complete linguistic exogamy for Chorote and Nivaclé speakers, but the practice is not overtly recognized nor talked about in any consistent way. The Wichí and Nivaclé of other regions do not necessarily practice linguistic exogamy, not all Chorote elsewhere practice it, and only some of the Wichí in MLP have such marriages, and this may make the actual practice in MLP seem less noticeable or less compelling. The Chorote and Nivaclé of MLP practice linguistic exogamy, but it is not as strikingly integrated in their social fabric as in the Vaupés, and seemingly is not overtly recognized as a necessary rule.

(6) Dual-lingualism, while sometimes practiced in the Vaupés region, is more sporadic and short-term, not general nor characteristic of most people, as it is in MLP (see above, Sorensen 1967:678). In MLP, dual-lingualism is the predominant kind of verbal interaction.

(7) Language identity is with the father's language in the Vaupés; language identity in MLP is a personal choice, and depends on an individual's feelings about the language selected.

(8) In most cases of dual-lingualism (but not all), the languages (and dialects) are quite closely related. This is not the case in MLP. It is possibly also not the case in the Vaupés, although we believe the Eastern Tukanoan languages that participate there to be more closely related to one another than the Matacoan languages of MLP are to one another. (Naturally, this does not hold for the cases of intermarriage in the Vaupés between speakers of Arawakan languages and Eastern Tukanoan languages. These non-Tukanoan language participants are much fewer in number, but nevertheless they do practice absolute linguistic exogamy as a group.)

6. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

From the comparison above, we conclude that MLP is significantly different from the Vaupés area and from other situations in the world which have partial

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

similarities. We presented arguments to support our conclusion that MLP is unique in its combination of dual-lingualism, linguistic exogamy, and lack of language accommodation between husbands and wives that characterizes the Chorote and Nivaclé speakers, as well as many of the Wichí speakers, there. As mentioned at the outset, it is important to document unusual and unique situations of language choice and patterns of language use, such as this one, as we investigate endangered languages. Given the increasing threat from Spanish and population pressures in the region, it is possible that the pattern of multilingualism described here will be lost in the not so distant future. If that were to happen without documentation, we would have no knowledge of the existence of this arguably unique pattern of multilingualism and language choice. This would be an unfortunate loss, for this situation has much to tell us with respect to various claims in the literature concerning language contact and multilingualism.

For example, it has been claimed that languages in such close contact will tend to converge structurally and avoid changes towards divergence. For example, Aikhenvald (2007a:45) asserts that "languages in contact – where a significant proportion of the speakers of one also have some competence in the other – gradually become more like each other … This is known as convergence. Languages become structurally isomorphic …" However, the three indigenous languages in MLP, as seen in the examples presented above, have undergone some specific changes which result in greater divergence. This suggests the issue of convergence versus divergence in cases of close language contact needs careful scrutiny in future investigations.

In another area, it is quite common in the literature on human genetics to take as the null hypothesis that language and genes should correlate in a one-to-one manner (e.g. Cavalli-Sforza 1997; Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1988; Hunley & Long 2005; cf. Bolnick et al. 2004). Situations of linguistic exogamy, as described here, graphically reveal the problem of assuming such a correlation of language and genes (Campbell in press).

NOTES

[1]We would like to thank Jane H. Hill and Suzanne Romaine for very helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper (absolving them of any responsibility for any infelicities this paper may have). We gratefully acknowledge that the research upon which this paper is based was supported by the Hans Rausing Endangered Language Program ELDP grant, "Description of Chorote, Nivaclé and Kadiwéu: three of least known and most endangered languages of the Chaco" (MDP 0048) and the NEH grant (DEL NEH/NSF), "Wichí: Documentation, Description and Training" (NEH/NSF 0553890).

[2]Gerzenstein (1978:20) reported that the population of MLP in 1970 as 383 persons, 194 males and 189 women, with about 150 of them being Chorote. She reported "Mataco" [Wichí] and Chorote living together, with fewer "Axluxlaj" [Nivaclé]. If these figures are correct, they reveal considerable change and growth in the MLP population since then.

[3]Called the Mataco-Mataguayo family in Spanish. The family has four languages, these three and Maká, spoken in the outskirts of Asunción, Paraguay.

[4]*Chulupí* means 'cockroach' in the Spanish of Bolivia and parts of Paraguay.

[5]Wichí dialectology is not well understood; speakers report numerous dialects, some they find difficult to understand, and varieties of Wichí are sometimes considered separate languages, with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

names such as Güisnay, Noctén, Vejoz, Wichí Oriental (Abajeño, Arribeño), and Wichí Salteño (cf. *Ethnologue.com*). Sources differ greatly. Some claim only two dialects, "Upriver" and "Downriver" (Gerzenstein 1992; Golluscio 1993); however, these are terms used by all the communities to refer to their neighbors up or down stream, regardless of which dialects or languages they may speak. Tovar (1981) also distinguished two principal dialects, (1) Northeastern or Güisnay and Pilcomayo (which includes MLP), and (2) Southwestern or Vejoz. Golluscio & Tomé (1993) also have two, but theirs are (1) the zone from Embarcación to the Pilcomayo, and (2) the zone from Morillo (Salta) to Pozo del Tigre (Formosa). Others cite three dialects (Susnik 1961; Tovar 1958, 1981): (1) Vejoz, Western, (2) Noctén, Northern, and (3) Güisnay, the rest of the Wichí linguistic area. Others follow Najlis' (1968) three divisions: (1) Pilcomayo dialect, (2) Bermejo dialect, and (3) Vejoz. Still others claim five dialects (Najlis 1968, 1971, 1984) or more: – twenty two Wichí "tribes" have been identified (Fabre 2005). Braunstein (1991–2, 1992–3, 1993) recognizes 11 distinct Wichí groups: (1) Noctén or Oktenay [Northeast, Bolivia], (2) Pilcomayo Salteño [including Misión La Paz], (3) Vejoz (Wehwós) [including Tonono, Tartagal, Embarcación and the Bermejo River], (4) Wichí Montaraz [Alto de la Sierra, west central Rivadavia department to the border of Formosa], (5) Pilcomayo Formoseño [riverine communities] or Güisnay, (6) Wichí Montaraz of Formosa and Salta [North Bermejo groups], (7) Southwest Wichí [between Rivadavia on the Bermejo and bordering Jujuy], (8) The Bermejo and Bermejito groups [Cunatas], (9) Bermejo groups in Chaco province [Eastern sub-Bermejo groups], (10) Bazanero [Ukutas], and (11) Gomeléy "Downriver"). These "ethnolinguistic" groups are equated vaguely with such dialect names as Pilcomayo, Montaraz; Montaraz; Bermejo Medio, Pilcomayo-Carmen, Wejwus (Vejoz), Pilcomayo Salteño [where Misión La Paz is located], Western Mataco-Bermejo; etc. (Fabre 2005). Unfortunately, the linguistic traits that might define Wichí dialects are not presented in these works.

[6]The Gran Chaco is the extensive dry lowland plain of central South America, stretching some 647,500 sq km across northern Argentina, Paraguay, southeastern Bolivia, and southern Brazil. It is bordered on the west by the foothills of the Andés, on the east by the Paraná and Paraguay rivers, on the north by the Mato Grosso plateau, and in the south by the Río Salado (Braunstein 1996:19; Brauenstein & Miller 1999:1; Métraux 1946:197).

[7]Gerzenstein's (1978:20–2) Chorote informants from MLP also for the most part had parents who spoke different languages from one another and these informants were married to spouses who spoke a different language; for one, however, reportedly her parents were both Chorote speaking and for another both his parents and his wife were reportedly Chorote speakers. It is not easy to know how common this may have been in the 1970s, though she may well have been seeking precisely such persons, since she notes that (p21) an informant form La Gracia deserved more confidence, given his Chorote descent and given that he had lived long with groups where the language was spoken (not MLP, where perhaps she saw the other languages spoken there as potentially distracting from getting information on Chorote not influenced by other languages). Some of the Chorote informants for the Chorote texts in Wilbert & Simoneau (1985:5) from other locations also had mixed parentage, in addition to those from MLP.

[8]We do not yet have as much information on how children are socialized linguistically and how they make the choice of the language with which they identify as we hope to obtain. This remains for future investigation.

[9]De Pikirenda hasta otras (?) leguas más o menos, por adelante hasta el Paraguay toman el nombre *Chulupies*: y toda la ribera derecha del Pilcomayo desde nuestra 1a Misión de Noctenes hasta el Paraguay, es la misma tribu, con palabras, y costumbres algo diferentes; pero en la sustancia, es la misma lengua, y entre sí se entienden perfectamente hablando cada uno su jerigonza.

[10]Su idioma es un verdadero dialecto del *Mataco* ó *Noctene* y muchas palabras son iguales á las de los Noctenes.

[11]Da ihre Kultur ziemlich gleichartig ist, glaube ich, sie zusammen behandlen zu können.

[12]Wir sind alle Brüder, sagte einmal ein Tchoroti-Indianer zu mir. Im grossen gesehen bilden auch die Tschoroti und Aschluslé zwei Familien. Sie wohnen in einer bedeutenden Anzahl Dörfer von wechselnder Grösse verteilt.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[13]Quelques tribus vivent en bons termes entre elles … Suhin [Nivaclé] … désignés par les Argentins sous le nom de Chunapises, fusionnent un peu avec les Choroti.

[14]Comprende indistintamente a los Yojwaha y a alguna parcialidad chulupí.

[15]Los Noctenes, los Matacos, los Vejoses, los Guiznaes, los Chulupies, son una sola nacion, que hablan todos una sola lengua y todos tienen las mismas costumbres.

[16]No es descartable que debamos empezar a estudiar algunas de las lenguas chaqueñas como producto de la mezcla y la difusión más que resultantes del exclusivo desarrollo de tendencias internas.

[17]Of course not everyone favored the notion of language mixture; Brinton (1898:182) argued against it and rejected it explicitly.

[18]Perhaps this is not as strong an example of change towards divergence where convergence might be expected as the other three examples are, since it could be argued that the absence of the contrast in Chorote and in some Wichí dialects could contribute to the on-going merger in MLP Nivaclé.

[19]A reviewer of this paper asked a relevant question about attrition or possible convergence with Spanish. It is true that in all four of these examples, the changes result in loss of contrasts, in attrition. These could be the result of normal language change, but the point is that, if structural convergence is expected in such a situation, then it would be expected that the changes resulting in these structure differences (loss of contrasts the other languages have) would have been inhibited. That did not happen; rather, the changes resulted in greater structural divergence among the languages. Influence from Spanish is extremely unlikely as an explanation in this case. Spanish has had very little impact on these languages in general (see Campbell & Grondona in press). Spanish was not widely known until very recently. Most older women do not know Spanish and older men often do not know it well. Spanish is not the dominant language of any of the indigenous people in MLP. While indigenous languages are losing ground to Spanish in communities closer to urban centers and some children there no longer speak or understand the indigenous languages, this is definitely not the case in MLP. Spanish continues to have a minor role in most communications in the village.

[20]The term 'passive bilingualism' has sometimes been used in a different sense to refer to cases of incomplete or atrophied knowledge of a second language, where someone has limited or passive knowledge of another language but does not actively use it with frequency. Sankoff's (1968) use of 'passive bilingualism' referred to the ability of someone to receive information from another dialect or language which he or she is not able to speak – allowing for but not requiring asymmetrical use of two languages in conversations. Both these uses may be related but are not exactly the same as the notion of asymmetrical or non-reciprocal use where each interlocutor uses his or her own language in bilingual interactions. Often, though, 'passive bilingualism' has been used to refer to these kinds of cases, the same as 'dual-lingualism', and we use the term here in that sense also.

Ultimately "dual-lingualism" is probably an inadequate term. Trilingual conversations in MLP are frequent, where interactions are not just in two languages, but where Chorote, Nivaclé, and Wichí are all present in a single conversation, with different participants each speaking his or her own language. Salisbury (1962:2) also reported a case of trilingual conversations in the New Guinea Highlands (see Lincoln 1979:70).

[21]Sporadic cases of passive bilingualism between Shoshone and Northern Paiute (reasonably closely related Uto-Aztecan languages of the Numic branch) have also been reported in certain areas (Bakker & Grant 1996:1126), though Miller (1978) records only population "mixing" and some bilingual individuals but no instances of dual-lingualism in his thorough study of Shoshone dialects with attention to bilingualism.

[22]Glottochronological dates (generally rejected by most linguists) for Matacoan languages range wildly, from 17 centuries (Swadesh 1959) to from 4250 to 6500 years ago (http://www.safarmer.com/Indo-Eurasian/AMERINDclassAng2.pdf), but they do reflect that these are not especially closely related languages. Tovar (1964), perhaps the most cited, gave percentages but did not calculate the dates; he found "Mataco" [Wichí] and Chorote share 61 of 100 words of Swadesh list, Mataco and "Chunupí" [Nivaclé] 38 of 100, Chorote and Chunupí 44 of 100, "Enimaga" [Maká] and Chunupí 44

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of 100, and Chorote and "Enimaga" 33 of 100 (Tovar 1964:371). These figures reflect languages that are not at all closely related.

[23]Johnson (1990:423) also reports that "speakers of Nganhcara sometimes marry outside of their own immediate culture and are often multilingual in Wik-Mungkan, Thayorre, Ngathanh, or other languages of the region". There is no information, however, about whether there is any dual-bilingual interaction involving these different languages.

[24]As Clendon (2006:47) says, "speech communities are not themselves exogamous, despite the claim of linguistic exogamy … social ideals that require (extended and classificatory) kin-group exogamy obviously increase the likelihood that marriages will be contracted across language boundaries."

REFERENCES

Adelaar, Willem F. H. (1996). Areas of multilingualism in northern South America. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler, & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 1345–6. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (1999). Areal diffusion and language contact in the Içana-Vaupés basin, north-west Amazonia. In Alexandra Aikhenvald, & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *The Amazonian Languages*, 385–412. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— (2000). *Classifiers: A typology of noun categorization devices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——— (2001). Areal Diffusion, genetic inheritance, and problems of subgrouping: a North Arawak case study. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance*, 167–194. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——— (2002). *Language Contact in Amazonia*. New York: Oxford University Press.

——— (2003a). Mechanisms of change in areal diffusion: new morphology and language contact. *Journal of Linguistics* 39:1–29.

——— (2003b). Multilingualism and ethnic stereotypes: the Tariana of northwest Amazonia. *Language in Society* 32:1–21.

——— (2007a). Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic typology*, 1–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——— (2007b). Semantics and pragmatics of grammatical relations in the Vaupés linguistic areas. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic typology*, 237–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Århem, Kaj (1981). *Makuna social organization: a study in descent, alliance and the formation of corporate groups in the North-Western Amazon*. (Uppsala Studies in Cultural Anthropology, 4.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Bakker, Peter, & Grant, Anthony P. (1996). Interethnic communication in Canada, Alaska and adjacent areas. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon, *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 1107–69. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bartolomé, Miguel Alberto (1972). Indian groups in Argentine: the Chaco area and Misiones. In W. Dostal (ed.), *The Situation of the Indian in South America*, 430–2. Geneva: World Council of Churches.

Baskakov, Aleksandr N. (1996). Language situation in western central Asia. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 929–31. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Berndt, Ronald (1964). Comment on Naroll. *Current Anthropology* 5:292.

———, & Berndt, Catherine (1964). *World of the First Australians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bolnick, Deborah A. (Weiss), Shook, Beth A. (Schultz), Campbell, Lyle, & Ives Goddard. 2004. Problematic use of Greenberg's linguistic classification of the Americas in studies of Native American genetic variation. *American Journal of Human Genetics* 75:519–23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Braunstein, José (1983). *Algunos rasgos de la organización social de los indígenas del Gran Chaco*. (Instituto de Ciencias Antropológicas, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Serie Trabajos de Etnología, 2.) Buenos Aires.

——— (1991–2). Presentación: esquema provisorio de las tribus chaqueñas. *Hacia una Nueva Carta Étnica del Gran Chaco* 4:1–8. Las Lomitas, Formosa: Centro del Hombre Antiguo Chaqueño.

——— (1992–3). Presentación. *Hacia una Nueva Carta Étnica del Gran Chaco* 5:1–3. Las Lomitas, Formosa: Centro del Hombre Antiguo Chaqueño.

——— (1993). Territorio e historia de los narradores matacos. *Hacia una nueva carta étnica del Gran Chaco* 5:4–74. Las Lomitas, Formosa: Centro del Hombre Antiguo Chaqueño.

——— (1996). Clasificación de las lenguas y pueblos del Gran Chaco. In Eusebia H. Martín & Andrés Pérez Diez (eds.), *Lenguas indígenas de Argentina 1492–1992*, 19–32. (Instituto de Investigaciones Lingüísticas y Filológicas "Manuel Alvar".) San Juan: Editorial Fundación Universidad Nacional de San Juan.

——— & Miller, Elmer S. (1999). Ethnohistorical introduction. In Elmer S. Miller (ed.), *Peoples of the Gran Chaco*, 1–22. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

Brinton, Daniel G. (1898). The linguistic cartography of the Chaco region. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 37:178–204.

Campbell, Lyle (In press). Languages and Genes in Collaboration: some Practical Matters. In Bernard Comrie & Carol Genetti (eds.), *Language and genes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———, & Grondona, Verónica (In press). Linguistic acculturation in Chulupí and Chorote. *International Journal of American Linguistics*.

Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi Luca (1997). Genes, peoples, and languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 94:7719–24.

———, Piazza, Alberto, Menozzi, Paolo, & Mountain, Joanna (1988). Reconstruction of human evolution: bringing together genetic, archaeological and linguistics data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 85:6002–6.

Chase-Sardi, Miguel (2003). *¡Palavai nuu! Etnografía Nivaclé*. Asunción: Centro de Estudios antropológicos.

Chernela, Janet M. (1982). Estrutura social do Uaupés brasileiro. *Anuário Antropológico* 81:59–69. Rio de Janeiro.

——— (1989). Marriage, language, and history among the Eastern Tukanoan speaking peoples of the Northwest Amazon. *Latin American Anthropology Review* 1:36–42.

——— (2001). Piercing distinctions: making and remaking the social contract in the North-West Amazon. In Laura Rival & Neil Whitehead (eds.), *Beyond the visible and the material: the americanindianization of society in the work of Peter Rivière*, 177–95. New York: Oxford University Press.

——— (2004). The Politics of Language Acquisition: language learning as social modelling in the northwest Amazon. *Women and Language* 27:13–21.

Clendon, Mark (2006). Reassessing Australia's Linguistic Prehistory. *Current Anthropology* 47:39–61.

Dutton, Tom (1995). Language contact and change in Melanesia. In Peter Bellwood, James J. Fox & Darrell Tryon (eds.), *The Austronesians: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, 192–213. Canberra: ANE E Press.

Epps, Patience (2005). Areal diffusion and the development of evidentiality: Evidence from Hup. *Studies in language* 29:617–50.

——— (2007). The Vaupés melting pot: Tukanoan influence on Hup. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact*, 267–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fabre, Alain (2005). Los pueblos del Gran Chaco y sus lenguas, segunda parte: los mataguayo. Ms. submitted to *Suplemento Antropológico*, Asunción Paraguay. ([www.tut.fi/fabre/BookInternetVersio/Dic=Mataguayo.pdf.)

Gerzenstein, Ana (1978). *Lengua chorote* (tomo 1). (Archivo de Lenguas Precolombinas, 3.) Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Lingüística.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (1992). Una variedad oriental del mataco: Algunos datos fonológicos y fonológicos. *Hacia una Nueva Carta Étnica del Gran Chaco* 4:67–79. Las Lomitas, Formosa: Centro del Hombre Antiguo Chaqueño.

Goldman, Irving (1963). The Cubeo: Indians of the Northwest Amazon. (Illinois Studies in Anthropology, 2.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press. (2nd edition, 1979.)

Golluscio, Lucia (1993). La posesión en wichí. *Signo & Seña* 3:219–40. Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires.

———, & Tomé, Marta (1993). Lingüística y pedagogía, sistemas fonológicos, sistemas de escritura y sistema ortográficos: el caso de los Wichí del Teuco (Provincia del Chaco). *Actas de las Primeras Jornadas de Lingüística Aborigen* 1:123–37. Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Gordillo, Gastón, & Martín Leguizamón, Juan (2002). *El río y la frontera: movilizaciones aborígenes, obras públicas y Mercosur en el Pilcomayo*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.

Gumperz, John J., & Wilson, Robert (1971). Convergence and creolization: a case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian Border in India. In Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 151–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunter, Erna (1927). *Klallam ethnography*. (University of Washington Publications in Antrhopology, 1.5:171–314.) Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Haugen, Einar (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: a study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Heath, Jeffrey (1978). *Linguistic diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aborignal Studies.

——— (1981). A case of intensive lexical diffusion: Arnhem Land Australia. 57:335–67.

Herrmann, Wilhem. (1908). Die ethnographischen Ergebnisse der Deutschen Pilcomayo-Expedition. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 40:120–37.

Hill, Jane H. (1978). Language contact systems and human adaptations. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 34:1–26.

Hockett, Charles F. (1958). *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

Hooley, Bruce A. (1971). Austronesian languages of the Morobe district, Papua New Guinea. *Oceanic Linguistics* 10:79–151.

Hugh-Jones, Christine (1979). *From the Milk River: spatial and temporal processes in Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hugh-Jones, Stephen (1993). Clear descent or ambiguous houses? A re-examination of Tukanoan social organization. *L'Homme* 126–28:95–120.

Hunley, Keith, & Long, Jeffrey C. (2005). Gene flow across linguistic boundaries in Native North American populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 102:1312–17.

Hunt, Richard J. (1915). *El Choroti o Yófuaha*. Liverpool: H. Young.

Jackson, Jean E. (1974). Language identity of the Columbian Vaupés Indians. In Richard Bauman & Joel Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, 50–64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— (1976). Vaupés marriage: a network system in the Northwest Amazon. In C. A. Smith (ed.), *Regional analysis, vol. 2: Social systems*, 65–93. New York: Academic Press.

——— (1983). *The Fish People: linguistic exogamy and Tukanoan identity in Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— (1984). Vaupés marriage practices. In Kenneth M. Kensinger (ed.), *Marriage practices in Lowland South America*, 156–79. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

——— (1988). Gender relations in the central Northwest Amazon. *Antropológica* 70:17–68. Caracas.

——— (1991). Being and becoming an Indian in the Vaupés. In Greg Urban & Joel Sherzer (eds.), *Nation-States and Indians in Latin-America*, 131–55. Austin: University of Texas Press.

——— (1992). The Meaning and Message of Symbolic Sexual Violence in Tukanoan Ritual. *Anthropological Quarterly* 65:1–18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (1994). Becoming Indians: the politics of Tukanoan ethnicity. Anna Roosevelt (ed.), *Amazonian Indians from prehistory to the present: anthropological perspectives*, 383–406. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Jacobs, Melville (1937). Historic perspectives in Indian languages of Oregon and Washington. *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 28:55–74.

——— (1954). The areal spread of sound features in the languages north of California. (Papers from the Symposium on American Indian linguistics held at Berkeley, July 7, 1951.) *University of California Publications in Linguistics* 10:46–56.

Johnson, Steve (1990). Social parameters of linguistic change in an unstratified Aboriginal society. In Philip Baldi (ed.), *Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology*, 419–33. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Karsten, Rafael (1932). *Indian tribes of the Argentine and Bolivian chaco: ethnological studies*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Kersten, Ludwig (1904). *Die Indianerstämme des Gran Chaco bis zum Ausgange des 18. Jahrhunderts: ein Beitrag zur historischen Ethnographie Südamerikas*. Leiden: Brill.

Lafone Quevedo, Samuel A. (1895). Introducción preliminar. Lenguas argentinas: Grupo Mataco-Mataguayo del Chaco, Dialecto Noctén, "Pater Noster" y apuntes, by Inocencio Massei, 343–50. *Boletín del Instituto Geográfico Argentino* 16.9–12:343–76.

——— (1896). Introducción. Lenguas Argentinas: grupo mataco-mataguayo del chaco: dialecto Vejoz, vocabulario y apuntes, by M. S. D'Obrigny, 121–35. *Boletín del Instituto Geográfico Argentino* 17.4–6:121–73.

——— (1897). Introducción preliminar. Los Indios Matacos y su lengua, by Juan Pelleschi, 3–66. *Boletín del Instituto Geográfico Argentino* 17.10–12, 18.4–6:4–248.

——— (1915). Introducción. El Choroti o Yófuaha, by Richard J. Hunt, v–xxv. Liverpool: H. Young.

Lehmann-Nitsche, Robert (1936). Die Sprachliche Stellung der Choropí (Gran Chaco). *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 69:118–24.

Lincoln, Peter C. (1976). Banoni, Piva and Papuanization. *Pacific Linguistics*, Series A, 45:77–105. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.

——— (1979). Dual-lingualism: passive bilingualism in action. *Te Reo* 22:65–72.

Lozano, Pedro (1941[1733]). *Descripción chorographica del Gran Chaco Gualamba*. (Re-edition and prologue by Radames A. Altieri.) Tucumán: Instituto de Antropología.

Mackey, William F. (1988). Bilingualism and multilingualism. In Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier & Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 2:1483–95. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Martín, Herminia, & Braunstein, José A. (1990–1). Nuevos rumbos de la etnolingüiística chaqueña: geografía, historia y difusión. *Hacia una Nueva Carta Étnica del Gran Chaco* 2.3–12. Las Lomitas, Formosa: Centro del Hombre Antiguo Chaqueño.

Métraux, Alfred (1946). Ethnography of the Chaco. In Julian H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*, 1:197–370. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Miller, Wick R. (1978). Multilingualism in its social context in Native North America. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4:610–16.

Monod(-Bécquelin), Aurore (1970). Multilinguisme des Indiens Trumai du Haut Xingu (Brasil central). *Langages* 5.18:78–94.

Mühlhäusler, Peter, Dutton, Tom, Hovdhaugen, Even, Williams, Jeff, & Wurm, Stephen A. (1996). Precolonial patterns of intercultural communication in the Pacific Islands. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 401–37. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nadkarni, Mangesh V. (1975). Bilingualism and syntactic change in Konkani. *Language* 51:672–83.

Najlis, Elena (1968). Dialectos del mataco. *Anales de la Universidad del Salvador* 4:232–41. Buenos Aires.

——— (1971). Premataco Phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 37:128–30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (1984). *Fonología de la protolengua mataguaya*. (Cuadernos de lingüística.) Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Nasyrova, Ol'ga Dosžanovna (1996). Languages of interethnic contacts in Karakalpakistan, the former Karakalpak Autonomous ASSR. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 925–32. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nordenskiöld, Erland (1912). *Indianerleben: El Gran Chaco (Südamerika)*. Leipzig: Albert Bonnier.

Pelleschi, Juan (1897). Los indios matacos y su lengua, con una introducción por S.A. Lafone Quevedo y dos mapas. *Boletin del Instituto Geográfico* tomo xvii, cuadernos 10–12, tomo xviii, cuadernos 4–6. Buenos Aires: "La Buenos Aires".

Owen, Roger C. (1965). The patrilocal band: a linguistically and culturally hybrid social unit. *American Anthropologist* 67:675–90.

Palavecino, Enrique (1928). Las tribus aborígenes del Chaco Occidental. *Anales de la Sociedad Argentina de Estudios Geográficos* 3:186–209. Buenos Aires.

Renshaw, John (2002). *The Indians of the Paraguayan Chaco: identity and Economy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Rosen, Eric von (1904). The Chorotes, Indians of the Bolivian Chaco. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Americanists* 14:649–58. Stuttgart.

——— (1924). *Ethnographical research work during the Swedish Chaco-Cordillera expedition*. Stockholm: C.E. Fritze.

Rossi, Juan José (2003). *Los wichí ("mataco")*. Buenos Aires: Galerna.

Salisbury, Richard F. (1962). Notes on bilingualism and linguistic change in New Guinea. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4.7:1–13.

Sankoff, Gillian (1968). *Social aspects of multilingualism in New Guinea*. Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, Montreal.

Santos-Granero, Fernando (2002). The Arawakan Matrix: Ethos, Language and History in Native South America. In Fernando Santos-Granero & Jonathan D. Hill (eds.), *Comparative Arawakan Histories*, 25–50. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Siffredi, Alejandra (1973). La autoconciencia de las relaciones sociales entre los Yojwaja-chorote. *Scripta Ethnologica* 1:71–103. Buenos Aires.

Sorensen, Arthur Peter, Jr. (1967). Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon. *American Anthropologist* 69:670–84.

——— (1985). An emerging Tukanoan linguistic regionality: policy pressures. In Harriet E. Manelis Klein & Louisa R. Stark (eds.), *South American Indian languages: retrospect and prospect*, 140–56. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Stenzel, Kristine (2005). Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon, Revisited. [www.ailla.utexas.org/site/cilla2/Stenzel_CILLA2_vaupes.pdf.]

Susnik, Branislava (1961). *Apuntes de etnografía paraguaya I*. Asunción: Museo Etnográfico "Andrés Barbero".

——— (1978). *Los aborígenes del Paraguay I: Etnología del Chaco Boreal y su periferia (siglos XVI y XVII)*. Asunción: Museo Etnográfico "Andrés Barbero".

——— (1986–7). Lenguas chaqueñas. *Los aborígenes del Paraguay* 7:1–131. Asunción: Mueso Andrés Barbero.

Swadesh, Mauricio (1959). *Mapas de clasificación lingüística de México y las Américas*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Thurston, William R. (1987). Processes of change in the languages of northwestern New Britain. *Pacific Linguistics* B99:1–163.

Tindale, Norman B. (1953). Tribal and intertribal marriage among the Australian Aborigines. *Human Biology* 25:169–90.

Tovar, Antonio (1958). Notas de campo sobre el idioma mataco. *Revista del Instituto de Antropología* 9:7–18. Tucumán: Instituto de Etnología. Universidad Nacional de Tucumán.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (1964). Relación entre las lenguas del grupo mataco. *Homenaje a Fernando Márquez Miranda*, 370–7. Madrid/Seville: Seminario de Estudios Americanistas y de Antropología de las Universidades de Madrid y Sevilla.

——— (1981). *Relatos y diálogos de los matacos seguidos de una gramática de su lengua*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica. Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana.

Warner, William Lloyd (1937). *A Black Civilization*. New York: Harper & Row.

Warter, Per (2001). Lexical identification and decoding strategies in interscandinavian communication. (Sonderforschungsbereich, 538.) *Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit/Working Papers in Multilingualism* 21. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.

Wavrin, Marquis de (1926). *Les derniers Indiens primitifs du Bassin du Paraguay*. Paris: Libraire Larose.

Wilbert, Johannes (1985). Introduction. *Folk literature of the Chorote Indians*, ed. by Johannes Wilbert & Karin Simoneau, 1–14. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

——— & Simoneau, Karin (eds.) *Folk literature of the Chorote Indians*. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

Wurm, Stephen A. (1996a). Major languages of wider communication and trade languages of the Philippines. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 735–6. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——— (1996b). Indigenous lingue franche and bilingualism in Siberia (beginning of the 20th century). In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 975–8. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——— (1996c). North China: intercultural communication involving indigenous languages other than Chinese. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon, (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 815–26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——— with Igor de Rachewiltz (1996). Contact languages and language influences in Mongolia. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, 909–12. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

(Received 5 June 2009; revision received 30 November 2009;
accepted 9 December 2009; final revision received 6 April 2010)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000631 Published online by Cambridge University Press