Swintha Danielsen’s book is the first comprehensive descriptive work on Baure, an Arawak language spoken in the Llanos de Moxos region of Bolivian Amazonia. This volume is not only a huge advance in the description of this particular language, it is also a major contribution to Arawak linguistics more generally. Danielsen’s grammar is especially important because Baure is highly endangered: the language presently has fewer than 60 speakers, and most of them are in their seventies or eighties.

The grammar is traditional in its organization, beginning with historical and ethnographic background on the speech community in chapter 1, and then continuing through the “bottom up” sequence of phonology, morphology, the syntax of simple clauses, and multiple clause constructions. The volume finishes with a number of appendixes, including two short texts and a Swadesh list.

Chapter 2 is dedicated to the phonology and morphophonology of the language, which, for the most part, is typical of a southern Arawak language. Most remarkable from a genetic and areal perspective is the abundance of word-final consonants, which result from historical processes of apocope and synchronic processes of metathesis. Also operative are processes of vowel fusion and vowel harmony, which result in highly nontransparent relationships between the surface forms of words and the postulated underlying forms of their constituent morphemes. Because of an early presence of Jesuits in the Llanos de Moxos region, data on Baure is available from the eighteenth century on, which allows Danielsen to trace the historical development of many of these interesting processes.

Chapter 3 orients the reader to the major morphological processes found in the language and to the morphological terminology Danielsen employs. As Baure is a polysynthetic head-marking language, morphology—and especially verbal morphology—is central to the grammar. Danielsen also identifies the word classes of the language in this chapter and provides morphological diagnostics to distinguish them.

Nominal morphology and the noun phrase are described in chapter 4. Baure exhibits a single noun class distinction, between biologically female animates (‘feminine’) and all other nouns (‘masculine’). This distinction surfaces in verbal person marking, possessive markers, and demonstratives. Plural marking on Baure nouns is optional. Nominal possession in Baure follows the typical inalienable/alienable Arawak pattern, in which alienable nouns can be derived from inalienable ones via suffixation, and inalienable nouns take a characteristic possessive suffix, in addition to the possessive prefixes that indicate the person, number, and gender of the possessor. Discussed in detail in this chapter, and sure to interest typologists, is the Baure multiple classifier system. Baure classifiers combine with numerals, certain adjectives, quantifiers, and verbs, as well as forming compounds with nouns. Also covered is a general locative suffix, which is the sole dependent-marking means for licensing non-core arguments in a clause. The chapter closes with a discussion of adjectives, which are included here on the basis of their nominal affinities. Baure exhibits a fairly small “semiclosed” set of morphologically simple adjectives, and two more complex sets. One set consists of quality roots and numerals that obligatorily combine with classifiers, while
the other consists of forms derived from verbs. Like nouns, Baure adjectives may function as arguments and can take nominal morphology, such as number and locative marking. Adjectives also display some verbal properties, however, such as emphatic reduplication.

Chapter 5 is a discussion of the types of predicates found in Baure and the ways in which arguments may be realized. Beginning with verbal predicates, Danielsen observes that subject proclitics constitute the only obligatory form of argument realization in Baure. The objects of transitive verbs may be realized either as person enclitics or as referential NPs. Whenever an argument is realized by a clitic, a coreferential NP may also surface. Unlike many other Arawak languages, Baure verbal person clitics display straightforward nominative–accusative alignment, with a split-S system for certain statives and nominal predicates. Note that Danielsen argues that verbal person markers are best analyzed as clitics, rather than as affixes, as claimed by previous researchers. Also discussed in this chapter is the incorporation of nouns and classifiers into verbs.

Baure also exhibits numerous nonverbal predicates, most of which are based on nouns and adjectives. Arguments of these predicates are generally realized as referential NPs, except when the predicate is a nominalization or when the clause is negated, in which case they are marked with person enclitics. Nominal predicates bear the same aspectual and modal morphology as do verbs.

The extensive verbal morphology of Baure is described in chapter 6. Danielsen abandons the traditional inflectional/derivational distinction as a descriptive framework, since some stereotypically inflectional categories (e.g., aspect) also participate in changes in word class in Baure. This scruple aside, aspect appears to be the sole verbal inflectional category; Baure verbs do not exhibit tense marking. An irrealis suffix is also mentioned, but it is not clear that Baure makes an obligatory realis/irrealis distinction. Danielsen includes reduplication, which is used to mark intensification or iteration of the action expressed by the verb root, in the set of aspectual morphemes.

Baure exhibits eight valence-altering affixes, including a causative prefix, and benefactive and applicative suffixes, which, given the paucity of adpositions in the language, serve as important means for adding arguments to clauses. Valency-decreasing morphology includes a passive and a reciprocal, both of which are suffixes.

Chapter 7 is devoted to a set of 11 verbal particles, which Danielsen suggests have grammaticalized from verbs in serial verb constructions (see below). These particles express temporal, aspectual, and modal meanings, and are somewhat unexpected for a southern Arawak language. Five of these verbal particles overlap in meaning with verbal suffixes, with which they tend to be in complementary distribution, and Danielsen suggests that Baure may have been in the process of shifting from suffixal marking of TMA categories to marking them analytically.

Chapter 8 focuses on closed word classes, including adverbs, articles and demonstratives, person clitics and pronouns, and discourse particles. Temporal adverbs are numerous and important in Baure, as the language does not mark tense, and they form the focus of Danielsen’s discussion of adverbs. Both person clitics and free pronouns exhibit complete paradigms of singular and plural forms for all persons, although the feminine/masculine distinction present in third-person singular forms is lost in the plural. As is typical of Arawak languages, free pronominal forms are derived from the bound forms by the addition of a suffix.
Chapter 9 is devoted to the syntax of simple sentences in declarative, imperative, and interrogative moods, and to negation. Baure presents a number of constructions used for directives and requests, including a morphological imperative, formed with a suffix homophonous with one of the language’s nominalizers, a directive construction formed by the omission of all TAM morphology, another that employs the irrealis suffix, and an analytic construction that makes use of special imperative forms meaning ‘go’ and ‘come’.

Polar interrogatives are distinguished by intonation, while content interrogative clauses are characterized by the use of the nominalized form of the verb. Interrogative particles, when employed, as they are for reason and who/what interrogatives, appear at the left margin of the clause. Most interrogative constructions, however, are based on verb roots and derived verb stems that serve to express content interrogative meanings.

Negation is generally marked by one of three preverbal particles, although a restricted set of verbs may be negated morphologically by means of a prefix *ma- that presumably reconstructs to the Proto-Arawak negative marker *ma.

Multi-clause constructions are described in chapter 10, the final chapter. Baure clause-linking constructions consist principally of clauses that are formally indistinguishable from independent ones, and which are linked by free syntactic elements. These constructions include clausal negative and positive polarity conjunctions and disjunctions, and adversative, reason, purpose, conditional, and temporal clause-linking constructions. Baure also presents a small number of clause-linking constructions in which verbal morphology marks interclausal relations, as in the case of locative clauses, which exhibit on the verb the same locative suffix found on nouns.

Relative clauses are formed either with deverbal nominalizations, where no relative pronouns are employed, or by simple apposition, where coreference between the NPs in the two clauses yields clausal modification of the relevant NP.

Finally, Baure exhibits a number of predicate- and clause-chaining constructions. Of greatest typological interest, perhaps, are the serial verb constructions, which are characterized by verbs with coreferential subject proclitics and, in many cases, by the absence of TAM morphology on one of the verbs.

As in any work of this scope, not all topics are covered in equal detail. Topics that merit greater attention in future work include the stress system, which is discussed only briefly, and information structure, which would probably provide greater insight into variations in constituent order and choices in the way arguments are realized. The one criticism I have of the volume—and the responsibility for this lies as much with the editors as with the author—is that the work is poorly proofread. Typographical errors and awkward prose abound in the work, which is an unfortunate distraction.

Though Danielsen is modest on the topic, it is clear that fieldwork in the social context responsible for the progressive loss of Baure was challenging, and she is to be commended for her achievement. Danielsen’s grammar of Baure is a major contribution to Amazonian linguistics, and I recommend it without reservation to Arawakanists, areal specialists, and interested typological linguists. I think I can speak for all Arawakanists and Amazonian specialists when I say that I look forward to her future publications.
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