

LANGUAGE ISOLATES IN SOUTH AMERICA

Frank Seifart and Harald Hammarström

1 INTRODUCTION

South America is the continent with the highest proportion of language isolates: as much as 60% of the lineages are isolates (no other continent surpasses 50%) and more than 10% of South American languages are isolates (65 out of 574 languages), compared to an average of less than 2.5% on other continents (Table 10.1). But it is not only the number of isolates that is reflective of the genealogical diversity in South America. More generally, this continent exhibits more two-member families, more three-member families, fewer very large families and so on, compared to the other continents. Entropy (as in Table 10.1) is a systematic measure of the diversity of a distribution (here, the division of languages into lineages), and South America shows the highest entropy, which is also reflected in the average of only about 5 languages per lineage, compared to an average of about 25 languages per lineage in other continents.

The fact that the proportion of isolates (and linguistic diversity more generally) is so much greater in South America than on other continents becomes even more intriguing when considering that South America was the continent that was the last to be populated by humans, i.e. languages had less time to diverge there than on other continents. Nichols (1990) pushed the argument that diversity can only be the result of early settlement, implying that the Americas must have been settled several dozen millennia ago, i.e. much earlier than previously assumed. Specifically regarding South America, if one assumes that the Americas were settled first by passing through the Bering Strait and further into South America mainly via the land route whose most narrow stretch is in Panama, then this idea becomes incongruent with the linguistic diversity in South America, which is higher than in North America, yet with a strictly later settlement. Nettle (1999), on the other hand, argues that diversity is the expected result of a relatively recent migration into

TABLE 10.1 NUMBERS ON SOUTH AMERICAN ISOLATES AND LINEAGES COMPARED TO OTHER CONTINENTS

<i>Macro-Area</i>	<i># lgs</i>	<i># isolates</i>	<i># fam</i>	<i>% isolates</i>	<i>Entropy</i>	<i>Avg # lgs/lineage</i>
South America	574	65	44	60%	5.07	5.27
North America	618	31	40	44%	4.29	8.70
Eurasia	1654	12	23	34%	2.83	47.26
Africa	2207	17	33	34%	2.08	44.14
New Guinea Area	2139	55	72	43%	2.88	16.84
Australia	342	9	23	28%	2.21	10.69

Source: Figures taken from Hammarström et al. (2015).

an unoccupied area. In this model, diversity results from initial fissioning in a novel area rich in resources, and lack of diversity arises when there is sufficient time for later expansions to obliterate the diversity from the initial settlement. Blench (2012) is consistent with this scenario, arguing that the most powerful obliterative expansions are the ones linked to agriculture and that these happened relatively late in South America. Nettle's (1999) model is clearly more consistent with the linguistic as well as archaeological data for the Americas. But on a world-level, a simple equation of late settlement with high diversity is difficult to reconcile with the archaeological and linguistic facts of, e.g. the New Guinea area, so probably more parameters than settlement-depth need to be taken into account to explain the emergence of linguistic diversity on a global level.

Specifically regarding South American isolates, Dahl et al. (2011) propose a novel suggestion for their emergence. First, migration routes are calculated using detailed geographical/geomorphological datasets, such that, if entry into South America was in the northwest and the migrating humans were aiming to reach the southern tip, what would be the shortest/least cumbersome way to get there? This procedure yields a route through the Andes to the southern tip with various wrinkles along the way. Dahl et al. (2011) note impressionistically that the geographical distribution of language isolates seems to be concentrated along this route, as if they were 'dropped-off' on migrations along the route. While attractive, the assumption behind obtaining the route in question, namely that the migrations were destined to reach the southern tip, is more convenient than it is realistic. Also, objective measures as to the geographical concentration of isolates are still lacking, as are comparisons to even simpler geologically based co-variation than migration routes, e.g., simply being in a foothills area between the Andes and the rainforest.

In recent work, Epps (in press and personal communication) links South American linguistic diversity, and thus also the high number of isolates, to distinctly South American patterns of social organization. She argues that Amazonian people, and maybe South American people in general (at least prior to the Inca expansion), present particular dynamics of interaction and corresponding linguistic ideologies. Consistent with Eriksen (2011), who uses a Geographic Information System (GIS) to reconstruct ancient ethnogenetic processes from archaeology, linguistics, geography, and ethnohistory, Epps argues that Amazonian societies "developed a set of socio-economic practices in which different groups formed complementary parts of larger systems" rather than being organized in hierarchical, top-down social structures. A prototypical example of such a multiethnic and multilingual system is the Vaupés, which encompasses a couple dozen ethnolinguistic groups. Crucially for linguistic diversity, "differences are viewed as essential to the functioning of the articulated whole" within such systems. This is prototypically exemplified in the institutionalized linguistic exogamy in the Vaupés regional system but is consistent also with remarkably low rates of lexical borrowing across South America (at least Amazonia) (Bower et al. 2011; Bower et al. 2014). This distinctly South American indigenous social structure implies historically relatively little language shift (prior to the arrival of Europeans), which would wipe out linguistic diversity, and it provides a motivation for the maintenance of genealogical distinctions with little subsequent diversification, resulting in the long term in a high number of isolates.

If isolates are the result of purely historical processes of language expansions and language extinction, there is little reason to suspect that language isolates should be structurally different from non-isolates. But the historical processes may be conditioned by factors that leave structural commonalities of isolates as epiphenomena, for example, if isolates were more likely to be spoken by hunter-gatherers or if isolates are remnants of a linguistic area. However, these lines of research have yet to be systematically investigated for the South American continent.

In this chapter, we provide a brief synopsis of language isolates in South America. We define isolates by two criteria as a single language with (1) sufficient attestation, i.e. at least about 50 words of basic vocabulary (otherwise they are considered as “unclassified”), and (2) a language which has not been demonstrated in publication to be related to any other language by the comparative method (Campbell and Poser 2008). It is important that the 50 or so words comprise so-called basic vocabulary which has been found to be relatively resistant to borrowing (Tadmor, Haspelmath and Taylor 2010) and which has better prospects for comparison than, e.g., 50 items of flora-fauna vocabulary or toponyms of uncertain analysis.

For the sake of presentation, isolates are grouped into seven geographic areas, moving roughly from North to South: Orinoco and North (Section 2), Andes (Section 3), Western Amazon (Section 4), Guaporé-Mamoré (Section 5), Central Amazon (Section 6), Eastern Amazon (Section 7), and, finally, Chaco and the Southern Cone (Section 8). Within these sections, we first discuss living language isolates, i.e. with known living speakers, and then extinct language isolates, with no known living speakers. We provide ISO 639–3 codes for living isolates (and for extinct isolates where available), as well as selected references for all isolates. Full lists of bibliographical references can be found in *Glottolog 2.5* (Hammarström et al. 2015), building on the fundamental bibliographical work of Fabre (1998). We use language names as given by Hammarström et al. (2015) and provide only the most common alternative names.

There have been innumerable proposals in the literature to link South American isolates to established language families or to other isolates, which we will not go through in full, but mention a few recent issues in the sections below. Compared to other continents, the level of description of South American languages is relatively good and has considerably increased over the past couple of decades. However, for many isolates of South America, especially the extinct ones, not much more than a wordlist is available, often just enough to identify the language as an isolate according to our criteria. The scarce documentation of so many isolates prompts the question whether we would have found the relative(s) of some of these isolates if only they were better documented than in a short wordlist or two? Surely, more documentation, when used properly, can only increase our knowledge about the historical relationships between languages. But in terms of finding deeper genealogical connections, empirical findings imply that knowing the basic vocabulary is just about as informative as knowing the basic vocabulary and the grammar. Hammarström (2014) shows that, for South America, the classification by Loukotka (1968), which was based solely on basic vocabulary comparison, is almost identical to that of Campbell (2012) who had access to a wealth of documentation of lexicon and grammar that appeared in the meantime. Not only is core vocabulary the basic probative instrument, there are also good prospects for automating the comparison, and still recover a high degree of accuracy (such as the ASJP program, see details in Hammarström 2014). Automated comparison has the advantage of being objective and of double checking that all potential connections are actually explored. Thus, even if we had richer documentation of the extinct isolates listed here as only attested with a wordlist or two, we should not expect a drastic change in the classificatory outcome.

2 ISOLATES IN THE ORINOCO AND NORTHERN SOUTH AMERICA

This area spans the basin of the Orinoco River and the Caribbean coast of South America. The main linguistic families of this area are Cariban and Arawakan, which used to occupy

the Caribbean coast and islands, but there are also some Tupian languages, and a number of smaller families. This area hosts 13 isolates, 6 of which are extinct. Many of the isolates of this area were first mentioned, and often documented in more or less a short wordlist, by Theodor Koch-Grünberg, who travelled the area extensively in the early 20th century.

2.1 Arutani [atx]

Located in Southeastern Venezuela and across the border in Brazil, Arutani, also known as Awake, Auake, or Uruak, is a highly endangered (if not extinct) and poorly documented language (short vocabularies and a small amount of analyzed grammar), first mentioned by Koch-Grünberg (1913; 1922; 1928a). Hammarström (2010:181) rejects earlier proposals of a grouping with Sapé (Section 2.2), following the comments by Migliazza (1978; 1985), who collected first hand data on both languages, and thus both Arutani and Sapé are considered isolates here. Arutani appears to be an SOV language (Migliazza 1985:50).

2.2 Sapé [spe]

In the vicinity of Arutani, Sapé has even fewer, if any speakers left. Data from what appear to be the four last speakers (or semi-speakers or rememberers) appeared in Perozo et al. (2008). However, this data is limited to 33 words from one speaker, 11 from another, 6 from two other speakers, and 5 phrases. These phrases lack verbal morphology, so even these are likely not fluent speakers (Raoul Zamponi, personal communication, 2013). Sapé is even more poorly documented than Arutani. Published data is confined to short vocabularies and some phrases (Koch-Grünberg 1928b; de Matallana and de Armellada 1943; Migliazza 1978; Perozo et al. 2008) and a minuscule amount of analyzed grammar (Migliazza 1980; 1983; 1985). As with Arutani, Raoul Zamponi and Chris Rogers have been analyzing Migliazza's data and recordings and everything else on this language, to be published soon.

2.3 Puinave [pui]

Puinave is spoken by a relatively large community on the Colombian side of the Orinoco River. Recent work by Bolaños (2011) re-evaluates earlier claims starting from Rivet and Tastevin (1920) on the relation between Puinave, Kakua-Nukak, and the Nadahup languages. A lot of the earlier parallels need to be discarded with the appearance of high-quality data on all languages involved, and only a minuscule number of parallels remain, including however, pronoun similarities between Puinave and Kakua-Nukak. If they are related at all, the relation must be very distant, because of the near total divergence in basic vocabulary. Thus, to explain their relation in terms of simply deriving from a common ancestor seems to provoke more questions than it answers: if so, why did the two branches essentially only keep pronouns in near-identical forms while replacing the remainder? The structure of Puinave has been thoroughly described by Girón, especially in Girón (2008). Further documentation includes a description of Puinave musical traditions (Girón, Miraval and Miraval 2004). Girón (2008:336–338) describes Puinave as a relatively free constituent order language (agent role signalled by ergative case-marking) where only OSV is ungrammatical in the finite clause.

2.4 Pumé [yae]

Pumé, also called Yaruro or Yuapín, is a relatively vital language spoken in Western Venezuela. Linguistic data has been available since the late 18th century (Hervás y Panduro 1787). A certain amount of grammatical description is available from various sources (Hervás y Panduro 1971 [1799]; Mosonyi 1966; Obregón Muñoz and Pozo 1989; Mosonyi and García 2000), but there is no comprehensive grammar. Yaruro is an SOV language that distinguishes masculine/feminine gender on two levels; there is gender agreement according to the gender of a head noun as well as according to the interlocutor (Mosonyi and García 2000).

2.5 Taruma

The Taruma people lived near the mouth of the Rio Negro River in Brazil in the late 17th century (Rivière 1966) but subsequently moved to the Southern Guianas where the tribe diminished and ceased to exist as a separate ethnolinguistic group sometime around the 1920s. Without a separate ethnolinguistic identity, the language was presumed extinct until three surviving speakers were found living among the Wapishana (Carlin and Mans 2014:82–85). Only one speaker remains today who is no longer completely fluent (Sérgio Meira, personal communication, 2015). Eithne Carlin and Sérgio Meira have worked with the last (semi-)speakers and some unpublished textual data collected in the 1920s has survived, which promises that at least some of the grammatical characteristics of Taruma will be known. Until now, the only published data consists of wordlists (Loukotka 1949). An ISO 639–3 code for this language has recently been requested.

2.6 Warao [wba]

Warao is one of the largest languages of Venezuela with about 28,000 speakers along the Caribbean coast. Various grammatical descriptions are available (Vaquero 1965; Romero-Figeroa 1997; Granados 1998). These document that Warao has the exceedingly rare OSV word order in pragmatically neutral sentences (except for stative sentences) (Romero-Figeroa 1985; 1997:5–12), as in example (1). Note that we present language data throughout as given in the original sources, i.e. orthographically in most cases. This includes the use of apostrophe to represent glottal stops, as in example (7).

- (1) Warao (Romero-Figeroa 1997:5)
erike huba abu-a-e
 Enrique snake bite-PUNCTUAL-PAST
 ‘A snake bit Enrique.’

Warao has been hypothesized to belong to some constellation of macro-Chibchan (see Kaufman 1990:35, 50, 54 and references therein). Some versions of this hypothesis involve the extinct language Timucua in Florida, North America (Granberry 1993:15–16). Later evaluations of such proposals have dismissed the alleged similarities as chance resemblances (e.g., Sturtevant 2005:14, Arinterol 2000:118).

2.7 Yuwana [yau]

Yuwana is more commonly known as Hodi (Jotí, Hoti), sometimes also as Waruwaru, or Chikano (Chicano). Its several hundred speakers are monolingual hunter-gatherers

in an inaccessible region in central Venezuela, contacted first only in the 1970s. There are descriptions of a number of Yuwana grammatical features (Vilera Díaz 1985; 1987; Quatra 2008a), and there is a dictionary (Quatra 2008b). Yuwana has a system of nominal classification reminiscent of the Sáliban languages, and once the Yuwana system has been sufficiently described, a systematic comparison can be undertaken. Jolkesky (2009) is an initial comparison involving lexical and some grammatical morphemes of Yuwana, Sáliban, Andoque (Section 4.1), and Tikuna.

2.8 Extinct isolates of the Orinoco and Northern South America

Six extinct isolates of this area have sufficient documentation (i.e. at least wordlist of about 50 words) to identify them as such according to our criteria. The **Betoi-Jirara** dialect cluster was once spoken in what is now the border between Colombia and Peru. Based on older materials, Zamponi (2002; 2003) produced a basic grammatical description. Betoi is an SOV language (Zamponi 2002:218–219). The extinct language **Guamo** was spoken near the Caribbean coast and is only known from a wordlist from the 18th century (Anónimo 1928a). **Jirajaran** was spoken by a number of groups (possibly speaking a different dialect, or closely related languages), **Jirajara** proper, **Ayomán**, and **Gayón**. They presented violent resistance against the first conquistadors of South America, and finally became extinct in the 20th century. Wordlists and very limited grammatical information is available (Oramas 1916; Jahn 1927; Querales 2008). In the vicinity of Jirajaran, **Otomaco** was spoken, it is essentially known only from one wordlist (de Luzena no date), which was sufficient for Rosenblat (1936) to draw up a phonemic inventory. Slightly more information, including some morphosyntactic facts, are known about the extinct isolate **Timote-Cuica** cluster, from the same region (Arrieta E. 1993; 1998), allowing a phonological analysis and discerning some grammatical characteristics such as SVO word order (Arrieta E. 1993:101–102).

The recently extinct isolate **Máku** in Southern Venezuela, whose last speaker remained in Brazil until about 2002, is not to be confused with the former name of the Nadahup linguistic family or the Maco language, or other Amazonian languages with similar names (Hammarström 2011). Vocabulary and basic grammatical description is available (Migliazza 1965; 1966; Maciel 1991). Raoul Zamponi is preparing a more extensive grammatical description based on all earlier materials (Raoul Zamponi, personal communication, 2014). Máku was an SOV language (Migliazza 2008).

3 ISOLATES OF THE ANDES

There are 12 known language isolates in the Andean region of South America, the majority of which (8) are extinct, reflecting the early penetration of the Andes by Europeans, which, on the one hand, left some early documentation but, on the other hand, lead to massive language loss (adding to a possible earlier wave of language loss due to the Inca expansion). Moving from North to South, the major language families (once) spoken this area are Chibchan and Quechuan (with Barbacoan nested between them), while the Southern Andes are dominated by Aymara and Mapudungun (see also Section 8).

3.1 Páez [pbb]

In the Northern Andes in Colombia, what Adelaar (2004) calls the “Chibchan sphere,” Páez is the second largest language in numbers of speakers in Colombia (40,000 according

to Crevels 2007) and may be the largest isolate in South America in terms of numbers of speakers. A number of good grammatical descriptions are available on this language (Slocum 1986, Jung 1989, Rojas Curieux 1998). Páez grammar is noteworthy, among other things, for its complex phoneme inventory, with various series of consonants (involving aspiration, prenasalization, and palatalization) and various series of vowels (involving length, glottalization, and aspiration).

3.2 Tinigua [tit]

Tinigua is a moribund (if not extinct) and understudied language in the Andean foothills, reaching into the Western Amazon. Very little is known about this language and its sister dialect/language Pamigua (Castellví 1940; Tobar Ortiz 2000), and it tends to be neglected either in surveys of their original habitat or their final location. The Tinigua suffered persecution throughout the last century. Tobar Ortiz (2000), who was able to work with the last two speakers, is the only significant source for grammatical data. Tinigua is described as an SVO language (Tobar Ortiz 2000).

3.3 Camsá [kbh]

In Southern Colombia, Camsá is an isolate that belongs to the “Quechuan sphere.” There are a few descriptive studies on Camsá (Howard 1967; 1977), including studies authored by members of the speech community (Juajibioy Chindoy 1962; Jamioy Muchavisoy 1989, 1992, 1999). Camsá grammar is unlike those of surrounding language in that it has a number of prefixes, and it has an extraordinarily complex morphology.

3.4 Leco [lec]

A number of language isolates are or were spoken in the vicinity of Lake Titicaca, on the border between Peru and Bolivia. Leco is the only one of these with remaining (semi-) speakers, albeit very few. Van der Kerke (2000; 2002; 2006; 2009) provides descriptions of various aspects of its grammar.

3.5 Extinct isolates of the Andes

In a once large territory, encompassing lake Titicaca, **Puquina [puq]** was recognized as a ‘general language’ (along with Quechua), i.e. the lingua franca, also used by the Spanish administration, in the early colonial period, which implies a considerable number of speakers. However, it rapidly became extinct soon after (Adelaar 2004:350). Its earlier status left a multilingual religious text, *Rituale seu Manuale Peruanum* (de Oré 1607), as a principal source for the language, which was first analyzed by de la Grasserie (1894). A considerable amount of information on this language is available from this document, and from a limited number of other older sources (Adelaar 2004:350–362), including information on an unusual system of inverse marking (Adelaar 2004:354). Parts of Puquina lexicon survive in Callahuaya, a secret, mixed language with a Puquina lexical base and Quechua morphology and grammatical structure, still used by traditional healers (Muysken 1994; 1997).

Mochica [omc] (which has also been called Yunga) was spoken on the Pacific coast of what is now Northern Peru, where it came under pressure from European settlers early on

and eventually became extinct in the early, 20th century. There is a certain amount of documentation of this language, e.g. Middendorf (1892), who did his own fieldwork, as well as Brüning (2004) and Hovdhaugen (2004) which are based on a more thorough analysis of older sources, which include the very early de la Carrera (1880 [1644]).

The **Andaqui [ana]** were once a numerous group in what is now Southern Colombia. They perished along with their language, of the same name, in fierce warfare against the Spaniards. Similarities with Chibchan languages (Rivet 1924) and with the neighbouring isolate Páez (see Section 3.1) have been noted (Adelaar 2004:140), but neither of these substantiate genealogical relatedness. Linguistic documentation is limited to two (rather extensive) wordlists (Anónimo 1928b; Vergara y Vergara and Delgado 1860).

Four extinct isolate languages were spoken on the slopes of the Andes: Atacame, Yurumanguí, Sechuran, and Tallán. **Atacame** or Esmeraldeño became extinct in the 19th century. The only available Atacame data was collected in 1877 by J. M. Pallares, which was reproduced and discussed in later publications (e.g., Seler 1902; Jijón y Caamaño 1945). Atacame had as an interesting grammatical feature classifying prefixes that refer to shape (example 2), a feature common in Amazonian language. By the time it was documented, the Atacame language was spoken by a population of predominantly African descent, which raises the possibility that it is an African language rather than an (adopted) Amerindian language. cursory searches for resemblances with mainly West African languages (e.g., in terms of classifying prefixes) have been carried out by various individuals, so far without interesting results.

(2) Atacame (Adelaar 2004:158; citing Jijón y Caamaño 1941:435–436)

- a *ra-tuna*
PROTRUDING.ELEMENT-mouth.area
'beard'
- b *vil-tuna*
WRAPPING-mouth.area
'lips'
- c *di-sa*
hand-1.POSSessor
'my hand'
- d *ta-di-sa*
LONG.OBJECT-hand-1.POSSessor
'my arm'
- e *ta-kel-sa*
LONG.OBJECT-bone-1.POSSessor
'my back'
- f *mu-kil-sa*
BULKY.OBJECT-bone-1.POSSessor
'my bone'

The only record of **Yurumanguí** is one wordlist from the 18th century. It was used by Rivet (1942) to propose a genealogical relation with the putative Hokan languages of North America, a proposal which has since been rejected (e.g., Constenla Umaña 1991).

The main source for the extinct isolate **Sechuran** of the coastal plain of Northern Peru is a wordlist collected in 1863 by Richard Spruce and published by von Buchwald (1919). Even less material survives of neighbouring **Tallán** (Ramos Cabredo 1950). There are occasional lexical links between Tallán and Sechuran (Adelaar 2004:398–400), but the

very limited data available is not compelling for a genealogical relationship. **Culli** was spoken in the Central Andes late into the 20th century (Adelaar 1988), surrounded by Quechua, and is documented in two wordlists, one of them published by Rivet (1949). Mutual influence of Culli with surrounding varieties of Quechua can be shown (Adelaar 2004:401–404).

4 WESTERN AMAZON

In the Western Amazon a number of Arawakan and Tupian languages are spoken, and it is the home of a number of (more or less) small families such as Jivaroan, Zaparoan, Witotoan, and Tucanoan. In this setting, there are also nine language isolates, which include three known extinct isolates. It is safe to assume that many more isolates existed but vanished without leaving traces, given the later onset of colonization in the lowlands, when compared to the Andes. Missionary sources contain long lists of ethnonyms which are never heard of in later accounts and are likely to include some isolates that disappeared without a discernible linguistic footprint.

4.1 Andoque [ano]

Andoque is spoken along the middle Caquetá River by approximately 350 speakers. It is part of one of the typical Amazonian regional cultural complex mentioned in Section 1, that of the Caquetá-Putumayo (autodenomination ‘People of the Centre’), together with the two Boran and the three Witotoan languages, as well as the Arawakan language Resígaro (Seifart et al. 2009). Intense contacts among these languages has led to diffusion of a number of grammatical features, among them extensive systems of noun classifiers, which Andoque also has (Landaburu 1979; 2000).

4.2 Cofán [con]

Cofán is spoken near the Andean foothills in Northeast Ecuador and Southern Colombia by a few thousand speakers. It is relatively well described (Borman 1962; 1976; Tobar Gutiérrez 1995; Fischer 2007). A full descriptive grammar is in preparation by Rafael Fischer and Kees Hengeveld. The Cofán are one of the tribes famous for use of hallucinogenic Yagé (or Ayuaasca).

4.3 Candoshi-Shapra [cbu]

In the Northern part of the Peruvian Amazon, Candoshi and Shapra are closely related varieties (one of them being extinct), considered here to be dialects of a single language. Correspondences with neighbouring Jivaroan languages are due to borrowing (Payne 1981). Available grammatical description of Candoshi-Shapra is limited to some specific grammatical features (Cox 1957; Anderson and Wise 1963), and there is a dictionary (Tuggy 1966). The language is still spoken by a sizeable population, and a full grammatical description is in progress by Simon Overall. A popular hypothesis is that Candoshi-Shapra will prove to be the closest relative of the large Arawakan language family after Payne (1989) uncovered some lexical correspondences that match better with reconstructed proto-Arawakan (or Maipuran Arawakan in his terminology) than with modern Arawakan languages.

4.4 Waorani [auc]

Like Candoshi-Shapra, Waorani (alternative names: Huaorani, Auca, Huao, Sabela, Auishiri) still has a considerable number of speakers (in Ecuador), possibly in addition to some uncontacted speakers in Peru. The Waorani have a history of violent resistance against outside contact (Yost 1981). After missionaries had succeeded in establishing contact, grammatical descriptions were produced, especially Peeke (1968). Noteworthy features of Waorani include an inverse pulmonic nasal /m</ and a labial inverse oral click (Pike and Saint 1962). Given the hostile relations to outsiders, the Waorani were monolingual, and the language, upon initial entrance in 1958, was reported to only have had two loanwords (Peeke 1973:4). If this assessment is correct, Waorani is the South American (if not the world) record holder of lack of borrowing.

4.5 Taushiro [trr]

Another language of Northern Peru, Taushiro, is now nearly extinct. Various proposals have been made to link it to other languages like Zaparoan, Kandoshi, and especially Omurano (Section 4.7), but none convincing. There is a basic grammatical description (Alicea 1975a; 1975b) which shows Taushiro to be a VSO language.

4.6 Urarina [ura]

Thanks to the work of Olawsky (2006), Urarina is one of the best described isolates of South America. It has about 3,000 speakers. It has the typologically rare OVS basic word order, as illustrated in example 3 (see also Olawsky 2005), which is otherwise attested in only a small number of other languages, mostly South American, and among these mostly Cariban.

- (3) Urarina (Olawsky 2006:655)
- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| <i>nitoane-ĩ</i> | <i>hetau=te</i> | <i>katça</i> | <i>lemu-e=lu</i> | <i>lomaj</i> |
| be.like.that-PARTICIPLE HEARSAY=FOCUS | man | sink-3SG=PAST | Lomaj | |
| [ADV] | [O] | [V] | [S] | |
| 'Lomaj sank the people in that way' | | | | |

4.7 Extinct isolates of the Western Amazon

Omurano is one of the three known isolates of the Western Amazon that is extinct. Data on this language is limited to a wordlist collected by Tessmann (1930). In 2011, a few words (mostly ones already contained in the Tessmann list) were collected from a "rememberer" (O'Hagan 2011). Proposals (Kaufman 1994:63) of genealogical links with Taushiro (Section 4.5) are not convincing.

Muniche [myr], also in the Northern part of the Peruvian Amazon, is an extinct language with a number of semi-speakers in 2009 (Proyecto de Documentación del Idioma Muniche 2009). Some grammatical features have been documented in Gibson (1988; 1996) which shows Muniche to have been a suffixing genderless VSO language.

Aewa [ash], also known as A?iwa (Aíwa), Tekiráka (Tequiraca), or Vacacocha or the ambiguous Abijira (with spelling variants), was spoken in the Northern Peruvian Amazon. Wordlists of Tekiráka appear in Tessmann (1930:475–485) and Villarejo (1959). These bear no significant relations to neighbouring languages (Loukotka 1968:156;

TABLE 10.2 ITONAMA CLASSIFIERS

nota'na M, notahka F	ANIMATE + STANDING + SG [men, women, dogs, cats]
na-dīī	ANIMATE + STANDING + PL [men, women, dogs, cats]
nu-cha'u	ANIMATE + SITTING + SG [men, women, dogs, cats]
no'o-di	ANIMATE + SITTING + PL [men, women, dogs, cats]
nu'u-pu	FLAT, ROUND, HORIZONTAL + SG [banana, canoe, cut tree, big leaf, fenced lot, Chaco, village]
no'o-so, no-so-he'ke	FLAT, ROUND, HORIZONTAL + PL [banana, canoes, cut trees, large leaves, large fields, clearings, villages]
nu'u-du	OVAL, CONTAINER + SG [pot, glass, egg, coconut, basket, gourd, grain (of rice)]
no'o'-ye no-'e-he'ke	OVAL, CONTAINER + PL [pots, cups, eggs, coconuts, baskets, tutumas, grains (rice)]
no-chobo	PLANTED, STANDING + SG [tree, house]
no'o-bo	PLANTED, STANDING + PL [trees, houses]
no'o-tyo	LIQUID [water, milk]
na'a-chī na'a-chī-he'ke (PL)	LONG, WINDING, HANGING, TIED [rope, hammock, snake]
no'o-ba, no'o-ba-he'ke (PL)	LONG, WINDING [rope, hammock, snake, small blade]
no'o-lo, no'o-lo-he'ke (PL)	FLUID [stream, river, road, snake]

Source: Crevels (2002:42–43).

5.4 Kanoê [kxo]

In the Eastern Guaporé-Mamoré area, on the Brazilian side of the Guaporé River, Kanoê, Kwaza, and Aikanã are three isolates that are spoken close to each other, all by very few speakers. Kanoê (5 speakers) is comprehensively described by Bacelar (2004). When contacted, the Kanoê and the neighbouring Akuntsu (who speak a Tupi language) had both been decimated in violent encounters with encroaching colonists and farmers (Aragon 2014:1–11). Both tribes were down to a handful of people each and were more or less forced to interact in a novel way, which is said to have given rise to a Kanoê-Akuntsu pidgin (Crevels and van der Voort 2008:156). One of the features of its grammar, which it shares with other languages of the Guaporé-Mamoré region, especially the directly neighbouring ones, is semantically empty noun-formative roots (*i-* or *e-*, glossed as 'Ø-') that combine with bound roots or classifiers (as in examples 5–6).

- (5) Kanoê (Bacelar 2004:130)

i-kuta
Ø-head
'(its) head'

- (6) Kwaza (van der Voort 2004:397)

e-'kai
Ø-CLASSIFIER:leg
'(its) lower leg'

5.5 Kwaza [xwa]

Kwaza reportedly has seven remaining speakers. There is a comprehensive grammar by van der Voort (2004). Like many Amazonian languages – albeit not too many in this particular area – it has classifiers, and, related to this, it also has semantically empty elements that are used to form nouns from classifiers and from bound roots (see example 6, earlier).

5.6 Aikanã [tba]

In close contact with Kwaza, Aikanã is still spoken by about 200 speakers, but it has not been described to the same degree. A brief grammatical description is Vasconcelos (2004). Currently, further description is on-going by Hein van der Voort's team at the Museu Goeldi.

5.7 Mositén-Chimané [cas]

Mositén and Chimané are spoken in the western Bolivian lowlands along the Beni River. The varieties of Mositén and Chimané form a dialect chain and are here considered one language, though there are also arguments for distinguishing Chimané as a separate language, especially on the grounds of ethnic identification. A comprehensive description of Mositén is Sakel (2004). Sakel (2004:303) describes an unusual detransitivizing antipassive marker *-ti-* that contrasts with other antipassive markers of the language in that it is primarily used with verbs expressing violence or aggression (as in example 7).

- (7) Mositén (Sakel 2004:312; 2009:200)
- | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>me'-si-si'</i> | <i>aj</i> | <i>chhi-ti-'-in</i> |
| SO-LINKER.FEM-REDUPLICATION | yet | grab-ANTIPASSIVE-FEM.SUBJECT-PLURAL |
| <i>jib-i-ti-'-in</i> | | |
| eat-VERBAL.STEM I-ANTIPASSIVE- FEMININE.SUBJECT-PLURAL | | |
- ‘And then (the monster) grabbed her like this and ate her.’

5.8 Yuracaré [yuz]

Yuracaré is spoken by about 2,500 speakers in the eastern Beni and Cochabamba departments of Bolivia, primarily along Chapare River. A comprehensive grammar was written by van Gijn (2006). Analysis of a large Yuracaré corpus of conversational data revealed that Yuracaré has so-called *intersubjective evidential markers*, i.e., evidentials that not only express the speaker's information source but also convey the speaker's assumptions about the addressee's perspective on the information (Gipper 2011).

5.9 Chiquitano [cax]

Chiquitano is spoken by about 7,800 speakers in the central region of the Bolivian Santa Cruz department, on the limits of the Chaco area (see Section 8), and it is also well described with both missionary-era and modern descriptions (for a recent overview, see Galeote Tormo 2014). Chiquitano is one of the South American languages with male versus female registers, which is otherwise known mostly from Tupian languages (example 8).

- (8) Chiquitano (Galeote Tormo 2014:271)
- | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| MALE SPEECH | FEMALE SPEECH | |
| <i>u-mases</i> | <i>mases</i> | ‘squirrel’ |
| <i>u-pauches</i> | <i>pauches</i> | ‘pig’ |
| <i>iñuma</i> | <i>ni-xhupuxu</i> | ‘grandson’ |
| <i>yaiso</i> | <i>nakarima</i> | ‘father-in-law’ |

5.10 Extinct isolates of the Guaporé-Mamoré area

We know of three more, now-extinct, isolates that were spoken in the Guaporé-Mamoré area, two of these in the vicinity of Kwaza, Kanoê, and Aikanã (see Sections 5.4–5.6). The first of these is **Canichana**, of which only three rememberers were encountered around the year 2000. The scarce information from historical sources is summarized in Crevels (2012b). The second one, **Mure**, has been extinct for longer and is documented solely by a *pater noster*, *ave maria*, and *credo* translation found in the archive of Cardinal Mezzofanti (Teza 1868:130), where it is called Moré. There at least two languages distinguished in the missionary writings from what is present-day Bolivia with a name similar to More. One is a Chapacuran language also known as Itén which is still spoken and has relatively ample documentation (e.g., Angenot-de-Lima 2002). The other Hervás y Panduro (1800:251) calls Mure and can likely be equated with the language in Teza (1868:130). Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913) provide a morphemic interpretation of the textual data in Teza (1868:130) and file the language as Chapacuran. We find the morphemic breakdown proposed by Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913) to be essentially sound, but the idea that the language is Chapacuran is difficult to sustain. The parallels with Chapacuran are limited to a few words (which are easily interpretable as loans due to joint missionization), while the remainder is very different. The Chapacuran specialist Birchall (2013:259) reached a similar conclusion when interpreting another text in Teza (1868) which can be satisfactorily analyzed as an otherwise unattested Chapacuran language (Rocorona). No other relation for the Mure data has been suggested or is apparent.

Finally, the **Ramanos** language was once spoken in the Moxos region in Central Bolivia. The only data on this language is a dozen or so words finally published by Palau and Saiz (1989 [1794]). The minuscule wordlist has the most important items of basic vocabulary and shows no significant resemblances to the surrounding languages so we treat it as an isolate here, although leaving it unclassified for scarcity of data would also be arguable.

6 CENTRAL AMAZON

The Central Amazon region is home to many Tupian languages, interspersed with, among others, six known isolated languages, two of which are extinct.

6.1 Guató [gta]

In Southwestern Brazil, near the Guaporé-Mamoré and the Chaco areas, Guató is down to extremely few speakers or has perhaps already lost its last fluent speaker (Postigo 2009). The language was first described by Schmidt (1905). The grammatical description by Palácio (1984) shows, among other things, that it has split ergativity.

6.2 Irántxe [irn]

Irántxe (or Mÿky) is a moribund language with about 40 speakers in the South-Central Amazon. A dictionary and grammatical description are available on this language (Monserrat and Amarante 1995; Monserrat 2000).

6.3 Pirahã [myp]

The Pirahã, now famous through the popular books and films by and about Daniel Everett, are located on the Maici River. They are the remnants of a once large group, mostly

referred to as Mura, probably consisting of various dialects, that moved through a vast territory in Central and Western Amazonia, as far Northwest as the Caquetá River. Pirahã is known for its small phoneme inventory and complex prosody, which facilitates whistled and hummed speech (Everett 1985). Pirahã appears to have extremely simple clause structure and is also claimed to lack recursion, numerals, and colour terms (Everett 2005). Thomason and Everett (2001) argued that all of Pirahã personal pronouns are borrowed from Nhengatú (Tupian).

6.4 Trumai [tɾɯmɐi]

Trumai is a language isolate within the multilingual cultural complex of the Upper Xingu, together with Arawakan and Cariban languages. There is a comprehensive reference grammar by Guirardello (1999), showing that Trumai is basically an isolating language with ergative syntax.

6.5 Extinct isolates from the Central Amazon

Matanawí was spoken on the Upper Madeira River, where Nimuendajú (1925) collected a wordlist, which is the only data available on this language, and which shows no systematic resemblance to other languages. **Mato Grosso Arára [axɣ]** also known as Arara do Rio Branco still had a few people who remembered some words in 2001. It is surrounded mostly by Tupian languages. There is only a short wordlist (Hugo 1959; Hargreaves 2007) for which the majority of entries are not Tupi cognates. Cognates for these words have so far not been uncovered in other languages or families.

7 EASTERN AMAZON

The Eastern Amazon, along the Atlantic coast of Brazil, was once dominated by languages from the Macro-Gê family. Many of them became extinct during the relatively early occupation by Europeans. Consequently, only one of the five isolates that are known from this area now has any known living speakers.

7.1 Fulniô [fun]

Fulniô, with its closely related dialect Yatê, is the only isolate that is still spoken in Northeastern Brazil. Its grammatical structure is well described by, e.g., Lapenda (1968), Meland (1968), and da Costa (1999).

7.2 Extinct isolates of the Eastern Amazon

The four known extinct isolates of the Eastern Amazon, Tuxá, Xukurú, Pankararú, and Otí, all became extinct relatively early and are all poorly documented. Only short wordlists are available for **Tuxá [tud]**, **Xukurú [xoo]**, and **Pankararú [paz]** (Meader 1978; Loukotka 1955; Lapenda 1962), but even these are of dubious quality, elicited mostly from rememberers. Meader (1978) shows that Pankararú [paz] displays Tupian lexical influence. The only information available on **Oti [oti]** is also a few wordlists, collected before the last speakers died in the early 20th century (Quadros 1892; von Ihering 1907; Borba 1908).

8 CHACO AND THE SOUTHERN CONE

There are eight known isolates in the Chaco and the Southern Cone, i.e. in a region which spans from the (Gran) Chaco, a semi-arid lowland south of the Amazon, to Tierra del Fuego, the Southern tip of South America. The languages of the Chaco (including Guaycuruan, Mascocyan, Matacoan, Zamucoan, and Tupian languages) share some structural characteristics, but Campbell (2013:287) notes that they are overall limited and concludes that the “we should not declare the existence of a Chaco linguistic area”. Only one of the isolates in the Chaco has known living speakers, as does also one isolate in Tierra del Fuego, reflecting the extinction of most indigenous languages in an area that has been colonized intensively by Europeans e.g. for cattle breeding.

8.1 Vilela [vil]

Once spoken in the Chaco, and still remembered by a few, Vilela shares some cultural vocabulary with the neighbouring extinct isolate Lule (Section 8.3) (Viegas Barros 2001), but otherwise the two are clearly distinct (Zamponi 2008:li–lv). Work is still on-going as to whether the two can be shown to be ultimately related on a very deep level. Aspects of Vilela grammar and lexicon have been described in, e.g. Balmori (1998), Lozano (2006), and Golluscio (2015).

8.2 Yámana [yag]

The Yámana language on Tierra del Fuego, also called Yaghan, has currently only one living native speaker. There are a number of grammatical descriptions, see Adelaar (2004:567–578) for a good overview. Yámana has an intriguing verb stem selection system. The object of a transitive clause and the subject of an intransitive clause determines the verb stem, i.e., in an ergative-like alignment.

8.3 Extinct languages of the Chaco and the South

Lule was spoken in the Gran Chaco, in contact with Vilela (see Section 8.1). There are a number of early descriptions which include grammatical information (Hervás y Panduro no date; Machoni de Cerdeña (1877 [1732]); Zamponi 2008 [1732]). **Guachi** was spoken in the Eastern Chaco and is poorly documented. The best case for Guachi relatedness is with Guaycurúan (Viegas Barros 2004), but the parallels are still insufficient. **Payagua** was spoken in the southern Chaco until about 1900. The best case for Payaguá relatedness is, again, with Guaycurúan and/or Guachi (Viegas Barros 2004), but again, the parallels are insufficient.

Puelche [pue] was spoken in Patagonia in central Argentina up to the early 20th century. A grammatical description, based on work carried out with the last speaker in the 1950s, is Casamiquela (1983). The parallels with Chon or Chon-Querandí (Viegas Barros 2005; 2006a; 2006b) are interesting but not conclusive. **Kunza** [kuz] (or Atacameño) was spoken in the Atacama desert in northern Chile. Its lexicon is well documented (e.g., Vilte Vilte 2004), and shows no significant resemblance to other languages. Its grammatical structure is poorly known. **Chono** was spoken on the Chilean Pacific coast and is also poorly documented, known only from short missionary translations, brought to light relatively recently (Bausani 1975). There are lexical parallels with Mapuche as well as Qawesqar (Trivero Ribera 2005:82), but the core is clearly unrelated.

9 CONCLUSION: NON-ISOLATES OF SOUTH AMERICA

To conclude we discuss evidence for genealogical relatedness of some South American languages that are often cited as isolates. The dialect survey by Croese (1985) shows that **Mapudungun [huh]** and **Huilliche [arn]** are distinct enough to be considered different languages. **Ticuna [tca]** is related to **Yurí [no isocode]**, as documented in the 19th century (Orphão de Carvalho 2009; Goulard and Montes 2013; Seifart and Echeverri 2014), and both may be related to the language spoken by the uncontacted group **Carabaya [cby]** (Seifart and Echeverri 2014). Viegas Barros (1990) analyzed lexical data from **Kawesqar [alc]** and its extinct relatives and found reason to distinguish a Southern Kawesqar and a Central Kawesqar as separate languages. Torero (2002) attributed the lexical items shared between **Cholón [cht]** and the poorly documented **Hibito [hib]** to loans, but we prefer the interpretation that the majority represent inheritance (Adelaar 2004:461–463), in which case the two form a family.

REFERENCES

- Adelaar, Willem F.H. 1988. Search for the Culli Language. *Continuity and Identity in Native America: Essays in Honor of Benedikt Hartmann*, vol. I, ed. by M. Jansen, Peter van der Loo and R. Manning, 111–131. (Indiaanse Studies). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Adelaar, Willem F.H. 2004. *The Languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alicea, Neftalí. 1975a. Análisis fonémico preliminar del idioma taushiro. *Datos Etno-Lingüísticos* 23: 1–65.
- Alicea, Neftalí. 1975b. *Análisis preliminar de la gramática del idioma Taushiro*. (Datos Etno-Lingüísticos 24). Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. www.sil.org/americas/peru/html/pubs/show_work.asp?id=3413.
- Anderson, Loretta and Mary Ruth Wise. 1963. Contrastive Features of Candoshi Clause Types. *Studies in Peruvian Indian Languages* 1: 67–102. (Summer Institute of Linguistics: Publications in Linguistics 9). The Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Angenot-de-Lima, Geralda. 2002. *Description Phonologique, Grammaticale et Lexicale du Moré, Langue Amazonienne de Bolivie et du Brésil*. Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.
- Anónimo. 1928a. Traducción de algunas voces de la lengua Guama. *Lenguas de América* 6: 382–393. (Manuscritos de La Real Biblioteca, Vol. 1, Catálogo de La Real Biblioteca). Madrid.
- Anónimo. 1928b. Vocabulario Andaqui-Español. *Lenguas de América* 6: 175–195. (Manuscritos de La Real Biblioteca, Vol. 1, Catálogo de La Real Biblioteca). Madrid.
- Aragon, Carolina Coelho. 2014. *A Grammar of Akuntsú, a Tupian Language*. Mānoa: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Arinterol, Basilio. 2000. Warao. *Manual de Lenguas Indígenas de Venezuela* (Serie Orígenes), Esteban Emilio Mosonyi and Jorge Carlos Mosonyi, 116–183. Caracas: Fundación Bigott.
- Arrieta, Anita E. 1993. Tipología morfosintáctica del timote. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica* XIX, no. 2: 99–110.
- Arrieta, Anita E. 1998. Tipología fonológica del timote. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica* XXIV, no. 1: 85–100.

- Bacelar, Laércio Nora. 2004. *Gramática da língua Kanoê*. Nijmegen, Netherlands: Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. http://webdoc.uhn.kun.nl/mono/b/bacelar_l/gramdalik.pdf.
- Balmori, Clemente Hernando. 1998. Diccionario vilela: a, b, c. *Clemente Hernando Balmori. Textos de un lingüista*, ed. by Diana Balmori, 139–252. La Coruña: Ediciós do Castro.
- Bausani, Alessandro. 1975. Nuovi materiali sulla lingua chono. *Linguistica – Folklore – Storia americana – Sociologia*, vol. 3, Ernesta Cerulli and Gilda Della Ragione, 107–116. (Atti Del XL Congresso Internazionale Degli Americanisti (Roma – Genova, 3–10 Settembre 1972)). Roma/ Génova: Roma/ Génova: Genoa: Tilgher.
- Birchall, Joshua. 2013. A look at the Rokorona language. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 66, no. 3: 257–271.
- Blench, Roger. 2012. The Role of Agriculture in Explaining the Diversity of Amerindian Languages. *The Past Ahead: Language, Culture and Identity in the Neotropics*, ed. by Christian Isendahl, 13–37. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis.
- Bolaños, Katherine. 2011. Evaluando la relación lingüística de Kakua y Puinave, dos lenguas del noroeste Amazónico, Colombia. *CILLA V*, 6 Octubre 2011.
- Borba, Telemâco. 1908. *Atualidade Indígena (Paraná, Brazil)*. Curitiba: Imprensa Paranaense.
- Borman, M.B. 1962. Cofán phonemes. *Studies in Ecuadorian Indian Languages 1*, vol. 1, ed. by Benjamin F. Elson, 45–59. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma. www.sil.org/acpub/repository/10288.pdf.
- Borman, M.B. 1976. *Vocabulario cofán: Cofán-castellano, castellano-cofán*. (Serie de Vocabularios Indígenas “Mariano Silva Y Aceves” 19). Quito: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Bowern, Claire, Hannah Haynie, Catherine Sheard, Barry Alpher, Patience Epps, Jane Hill and Patrick McConvell. 2014. Loan and Inheritance Patterns in Hunter-Gatherer Ethnobiological Nomenclature. *Journal of Ethnobiology* 34, no. 2: 195–227.
- Bowern, Claire, Patience Epps, Russell Gray, Jane Hill, Keith Hunley, Patrick McConvell and Jason Zentz. 2011. Does Lateral Transmission Obscure Inheritance in Hunter-Gatherer Languages? *PLoS ONE* 6, no. 9: 1–9.
- Brüning, Hans Heinrich. 2004. *Mochica Wörterbuch: Diccionario Mochica: Mochica-Castellano, Castellano-Mochica*. Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Escuela Profesional de Turismo y Hotelería.
- Buchwald, Otto von. 1919. Migraciones sudamericanas. *Boletín de la Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Estudios Históricos Americanos* 3: 227–236.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2012. Classification of the Indigenous Languages of South America. *The Indigenous Languages of South America: A Comprehensive Guide*, ed. by Lyle Campbell and Verónica Grondona, 59–166. (The World of Linguistics 2). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2013. Language Contact and Linguistic Change in the Chaco. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Antropológica* 5, no. 2: 259–292.
- Campbell, Lyle and William J. Poser. 2008. *Language Classification: History and Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carlin, Eithne B. and Jimmy Mans. 2014. Movement Through Time in the Southern Guianas: Deconstructing the Amerindian Kaleidoscope. *In and Out of Suriname: Language, Mobility and Identity*, ed. by Eithne B. Carlin, Isabelle Léglise, Bettina Migge and Paul B. Tjon Sie Fat, 76–100. Leiden: Brill.

- Carrera, Fernando de la. 1880. *Arte de la lengua Yunga de los valles del Obispado de Trujillo*. Lima: Imprenta Liberal.
- Casamiquela, Rodolfo M. 1983. *Nociones de Gramática del Güinüna Küne: Présentation de la langue des Tehuelche Septentrionaux Australs (Patagonie Continentale)*. Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Castellví, Marcelino de. 1940. La Lengua Tinigua. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* XXXII: 93–101.
- Constenla Umaña, Adolfo. 1991. *Las lenguas del áreas intermedia. Introducción a su estudio areal*. San José: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.
- Costa, Januacele da. 1999. *Ya:thê, a última língua nativa no Nordeste do Brasil: aspectos morfofonológicos y morfo-sintáticos*. Recife: Universidade Federal de Pernambuco.
- Cox, Doris. 1957. Candoshi Verb Inflection. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 23: 129–140.
- Créqui-Montfort, Georges de and Paul Rivet. 1913. Linguistique Bolivienne: La Famille Linguistique Čapakura. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* X: 119–172.
- Crevels, Mily. 2002. *Itonama o Sihnipadara, Lengua no Clasificada de la Amazonía Boliviana*. (Estudios de Lingüística 16). Departamento de Filología Española, Lingüística General y Teoría de Literatura, Universidad de Alicante.
- Crevels, Mily. 2007. South America. *Encyclopedia of the World's Endangered Languages*, ed. by Christopher Moseley, 103–196. London and New York: Routledge.
- Crevels, Mily. 2012a. Itonama. *Ambito Andino*, vol. 2, ed. by Mily Crevels and Pieter Muysken, 233–294. (Lenguas de Bolivia). La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Crevels, Mily. 2012b. Canichana. *Amazonia*, vol. 2, Mily Crevels and Pieter Muysken, 415–449. (Lenguas de Bolivia). La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Crevels, Mily and Hein van der Voort. 2008. The Guaporé-Mamoré Region as a Linguistic Area. *From Linguistic Areas to Areal Linguistics*, ed. by Pieter Muysken, 151–179. (Studies in Language Companion Series 90). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Crevels, Mily and Pieter Muysken. 2012. Cayubaba. *Ambito Andino*, ed. by Mily Crevels and Pieter Muysken, vol. 2, 341–374. (Lenguas de Bolivia). La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Croese, Robert A. 1985. Mapuche Dialect Survey. *South American Indian Languages: Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. by Harriet E. Manelis Klein and Louisa Stark, 784–801. Austin: Texas University Press.
- Dahl, Östen, Christopher Gillam, David G. Anderson, José Iriarte and Silvia M. Copé. 2011. Linguistic Diversity Zones and Cartographic Modeling: GIS as a Method for Understanding the Prehistory of Lowland South America. *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia: Reconstructing Past Identities from Archaeology, Linguistics, and Ethnohistory*, ed. by Alf Hornborg and Jonathan D. Hill, 211–224. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Epps, Patience. In press. Amazonian Linguistic Diversity and Its Sociocultural Correlates. *Language Dispersal, Diversification, and Contact: A Global Perspective*, ed. by Mily Crevels and Pieter Muysken. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eriksen, Love. 2011. *Nature and Culture in Prehistoric Amazonia: Using G.I.S. to Reconstruct Ancient Ethnogenetic Processes from Archaeology, Linguistics, Geography, and Ethnohistory*. Lund, Sweden: Lund University.
- Everett, Daniel L. 1985. Syllable Weight, Sloppy Phonemes, and Channels in Pirahã Discourse. *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. by Mary Niepokuj, Mary van Clay, Vassiliki Nikiforidou and Deborah Feder, 408–416. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

- Everett, Daniel L. 2005. Cultural Constraints on Grammar and Cognition in Pirahã: Another Look at the Design Features of Human Language. *Current Anthropology* 46, 4: 621–634.
- Fabre, Alain. 1998. *Manual de las lenguas indígenas sudamericanas, I-II*. (LINCOM Handbooks in Linguistics 4–5). München: Lincom.
- Fischer, Rafael. 2007. Clause Linkage in Cofán (A'ingae). *Language Endangerment and Endangered Languages: Linguistic and Anthropological Studies with Special Emphasis on the Languages and Cultures of the Andean-Amazonian Border Area*, ed. by Leo W. Wetzels, 381–399. (Lenguas Indígenas de América Latina (ILLA) 5). Leiden: Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies (CNWS), Universiteit Leiden.
- Galeote Tormo, Jesús. 2014. Chiquitano (Besiro). *Oriente*, vol. 3, ed. by Pieter Muysken and Mily Crevels, 259–301. (Lenguas de Bolivia). La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Gibson, Michael. 1988. *The Muncie Language: With Partial Reference to Verb Morphology*. Reading, UK: University of Reading.
- Gibson, Michael Luke. 1996. *El Munichi: Un idioma que se extingue*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana 42). Pucallpa: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. www.sil.org/americas/peru/html/pubs/show_work.asp?id=596.
- Gijn, Erik van. 2006. *A Grammar of Yurakaré*. Nijmegen, Netherlands: Radboud Universiteit. http://webdoc.uibn.ru.nl/mono/g/gijn_e_van/gramofyu.pdf.
- Gipper, Sonja. 2011. *Evidentiality and Intersubjectivity in Yurakaré: An Interactional Account*. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen Ph.D. dissertation.
- Girón, Jesús Mario. 2008. *Una Gramática del Wänsöhöt (Puinave)*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Girón, Jesús Mario, Celestino Miraval and Moisés Miraval. 2004. *Recuperación de cantos de baile de la etnia puinave del Departamento de Guainía*. (Tradiciones orales colombianas 2). Bogotá: Universidad de Los Andes : CESO : CCELA.
- Golluscio, Lucía. 2015. Huellas de trayectorias y contactos en el sistema lingüístico: el vilela (Chaco). *Language Contact and Documentation*, ed. by Bernard Comrie and Lucía Golluscio, 77–120. Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.
- Goulard, Jean Pierre and María Emilia Rodríguez Montes. 2013. Los Yuri/Juri-Tikuna, en el complejo socio-lingüístico del noroeste amazónico. *LIAMES – Lenguas Indígenas Americanas* 13: 7–65.
- Granados, Héctor. 1998. *Lingüística indígena: la lengua waraw*. Caracas: Editorial Comisión Macuro 500 años.
- Granberry, Julian. 1993. *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Timucua Language* (3rd ed.). Tuscaloosa, AL: Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Grasserie, Raoul de la. 1894. *Langue Puquina*. (Langues Américaines). Leipzig: F. Koehler.
- Guirardello, Raquel. 1999. *A Reference Grammar of Trumai*. Houston, TX: Houston: Rice University. <http://scholarship.rice.edu/handle/1911/19387>.
- Hammarström, Harald. 2010. The status of the least documented language families in the world. *Language Documentation and Conservation* 4: 177–212.
- Hammarström, Harald. 2011. A Note on the Maco [wpc] (Piaroan) Language of the lower Ventuari, Venezuela. *Cadernos de Etnolingüística* 3: 1–11.
- Hammarström, Harald. 2014. Basic Vocabulary Comparison in South American Languages. *The Native Languages of South America: Origins, Development, Typology*, ed. by Pieter Muysken and Loretta O'Connor, 56–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammarström, Harald, Robert Forkel, Martin Haspelmath and Sebastian Bank. 2015. *Glottolog 2.5*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://glottolog.org>.

- Hargreaves, Inês. 2007. *Lista de palavras transcritas por Inês Hargreaves, de dois grupos ao norte do Parque Aripuanã, RO*.
- Haude, Katharina. 2006. *A Grammar of Movima*. Nijmegen University Ph.D. dissertation. http://repository.uhn.ru.nl/bitstream/2066/41395/1/41395_gramofmo.pdf.
- Haude, Katharina. 2009. Hierarchical Alignment in Movima. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75, no. 4: 513–532.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1787. *Saggio Pratico delle lingue*. (Idea dell'Universo XXI). Cesena: Gregorio Biasini all'Insengna di Pallade.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1800. *Lenguas y naciones Americanas*. (Catálogo de Las Lenguas de Las Naciones Conocidas, Y Numeracion, Division, Y Clases de Estas I). Madrid: Imprenta de la Administración del real arbitrio de beneficencia.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1971. Elementos Grammaticales de la lengua Maipure [sic!]. *Aportes Jesuíticos a la Filología Colonial Venezolana: Tomo II Documentos*, vol. 4/5, ed. by José del Rey Fajardo, 277–288. (Lenguas Indígenas de Venezuela). Caracas: Universidad Católica Andres Bello.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. no date. *Lingua Lule*.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 2004. *Mochica*. (Languages of the World/Materials 433). München: Lincom.
- Howard, Linda. 1967. Camsa Phonology. *Phonemic Systems of Colombian Languages*, ed. Viola G. Waterhouse, 73–87. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Howard, Linda. 1977. Camsa: Certain Features of Verb Inflection as Related to Paragraph Types. *Discourse Grammar: Studies in Indigenous Languages of Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador, part 2*, ed. by Robert E. Longacre and Frances Woods, 273–296. (Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 52(2)). Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington. www.sil.org/acpub/repository/15975.pdf.
- Hugo, Vitor. 1959. *Desbravadores*. São Paulo: Missão Salesiana de Humaitá.
- Ihering, Hermann von. 1907. A antropologia do estado de São Paulo. *Revista do Museu Paulista* VII: 202–257.
- Jahn, Alfredo. 1927. *Los Aborígenes del Occidente de Venezuela: Su Historia, Etnografía y Afinidades Lingüísticos*. Caracas: Lit. y Tip. del Comercio.
- Jamioy Muchavisoy, José Narciso. 1989. Morfología del verbo Kamëntsa. Santafé de Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes.
- Jamioy Muchavisoy, José Narciso. 1992. Tiempo, aspecto y modo en kamentsa. *Memorias del II Congreso del CCELA*, vol. 2, 199–207. (Memorias). Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes, CCELA.
- Jamioy Muchavisoy, José Narciso. 1999. Estructuras predicativas del kamëntsa. *Congreso de Lingüística Amerindia y Criolla. Lenguas Aborígenes de Colombia*, 251–284. (Memorias 6). Santafé de Bogotá: CCELA, UNIANDES.
- Jijón y Caamaño, Jacinto. 1941. *El Ecuador interandino y occidental antes de la conquista castellana*, vol. 2. Quito: Editorial Ecuatoriana.
- Jijón y Caamaño, Jacinto. 1945. Las lenguas del Ecuador preincáico. *Antropología prehispánica del Ecuador*, 69–94. Quito: La prensa catolica.
- Jolkesky, Marcelo. 2009. *Macro-Daha: reconstrução de um tronco lingüístico do noroeste amazônico*. Paper presented at the ROSAE - I Congresso Internacional de Lingüística Histórica, Salvador do Bahia.
- Juajibioy Chindoy, Alberto. 1962. Breve Estudio preliminar del grupo Aborigen de Sibundoy y su lengua Kamsa en el sur de Colombia. *Boletín del Instituto de Antropología [Universidad de Antioquia]* II, no. 8: 3–33.

- Jung, Ingrid. 1989. *Grammatik des Paez: Ein Abriss*. Osnabrück: Universität Osnabrück.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1990. Language History in South America: What We Know and How to Know More. *Amazonian Linguistics. Studies in Lowland South American Languages*, ed. by Doris L. Payne, 13–73. (Texas Linguistics Series). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1994. The Americas. *Atlas of the World's Languages*, ed. by Christopher Moseley and R.E. Asher, 1–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerke, Simon van de. 2000. Case Marking in the Leko Language. *Ensaio sobre linguas indígenas de las tierras bajas de Sudamérica: Contribuciones al 49o Congreso Internacional de Americanistas en Quito 1997*, vol. 1, Hein van der Voort and Simon van de Kerke, 25–37. (Lenguas Indígenas de América Latina (ILLA)). Leiden: Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies (CNWS), Universiteit Leiden.
- Kerke, Simon van de. 2002. Complex Verb Formation in Leko. *Current Studies on South American Languages*, vol. 3, ed. by Mily Crevels, Simon van de Kerke, Sérgio Meira and Hein van der Voort, 241–254. (Lenguas Indígenas de América Latina (ILLA)). Leiden: Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies (CNWS), Universiteit Leiden.
- Kerke, Simon van de. 2006. Object Cross-Reference in Leko. *What's in a Verb?*, ed. by Grażyna J. Rowicka and Eithne B. Carlin, 171–188. (LOT Occasional Series 5). Utrecht: LOT.
- Kerke, Simon van de. 2009. El Leko. *Ambito Andino*, vol. 1, Pieter Muysken and Mily Crevels, 287–332. (Lenguas de Bolivia). La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Key, Harold. 1963. *Morphology of Cayuvava*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Key, Harold. 1974. *Cayuvava texts*. (Language Data Amerindian Series 4). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Key, Harold. 1975. *Lexicon-Dictionary of Cayuvava-English*. (Language Data Amerindian Series 5). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Key, Harold H. 1967. *Morphology of Cayuvava*. (Janua Linguarum: Series Practica LIII). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor. 1913. Abschluß meiner Reise durch Nordbrasilien zum Orinoco, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der von mir besuchten Indianerstämme. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 45: 448–474.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor. 1922. Die Völkergruppierung zwischen Rio Branco, Orinoco, Rio Negro und Yapurá. *Festschrift Eduard Seler dargebracht zum 70: Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Verehrern*, ed. by W. Lehmann, 205–266. Stuttgart: Stecker und Schröder.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor. 1928a. Auake. *Sprachen*, 308–313. (Von Roroima Zum Orinoco: Ergebnisse Einer Reise in Nordbrasilien Und Venezuela in Den Jahren 1911–1913 4). Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder.
- Koch-Grünberg, Theodor. 1928b. Sapará, Purukotó, Wayumará. *Sprachen*, 257–272. (Von Roroima Zum Orinoco: Ergebnisse Einer Reise in Nordbrasilien Und Venezuela in Den Jahren 1911–1913 4). Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder.
- Landaburu, Jon. 1979. *La langue des Andoke*. 36: SELAF.
- Landaburu, Jon. 2000. La Lengua Andoque. *Lenguas indígenas de Colombia: una visión descriptiva*, ed. by María Stella González de Pérez and María Luisa Rodríguez de Montes, 275–288. Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Lapenda, Geraldo. 1968. *Estrutura da Língua Iatê: Falada pelos índios Fulniôis em Pernambuco*. Recife: Imprensa Universitaria, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco.

- Lapenda, Geraldo Calábria. 1962. O dialecto Xucuru. *Doxa (Revista Oficial do Departamento de Cultura do Diretório Acadêmico da Faculdade de Filosofia de Pernambuco da Universidade do Recife)*. X, no. 10: 11–23.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2015. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Eighteenth edition*. Dallas, TX: SIL International. www.ethnologue.com (13 June 2013).
- Loukotka, Čestmír. 1968. *Classification of South American Indian Languages*, ed. Johannes Wilbert. Los Angeles: Latin American Center, University of California.
- Loukotka, Čestmír. 1949. La Langue Taruma. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* XXXVIII: 53–82.
- Loukotka, Čestmír. 1955. Les langues non-Tupí du Brésil du Nord-Est. *Anais do XXXI Congresso Internacional de Americanistas 31, São Paulo, 1954*, vol. II, ed. by Herbert Baldus, 1029–1054. São Paulo: Anhembi.
- Lozano, Elena. 2006. *Textos Vilelas (con notas gramaticales y etnográficas)*, ed. by Lucía A. Golluscio. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Lingüística, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Luzena, Gerónimo Josef de. no date. *Traducion de la lengua española á la otomaca, taparita y yarura*.
- Machoni de Cerdeña, Antonio. 1877 [1732]. *Arte y vocabulario de la lengua lule o tonocoté*. Buenos Aires: Coni.
- Maciel, Iraguacema. 1991. *Alguns aspectos fonológicos e morfológicos da língua Maku*. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília.
- Mattallana, Baltasar de and Cesareo de Armellada. 1943. Exploración del Paragua. *Boletín de la Sociedad Venezolana de ciencias naturales* VIII, no. 53: 61–110.
- Meador, Robert E. 1978. *Índios do Nordeste: Levantamento Sobre Os Remanescentes Tribais do Nordeste Brasileiro*. (Série Lingüística 8). Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Meland, D. 1968. *Fulniô Grammar*. (Arquivo Lingüístico 26). Brasília: Brasília: ILV.
- Michael, Lev and Christine Beier. 2012. *Phonological sketch and classification of Aʔiwa [ISO 639: ash]*.
- Middendorf, E.W. 1892. *Das Muchik oder die Chimu-Sprache mit einer einleitung über die culturvölker, die gleichzeitig mit den Inkas und Aimaraàs in Südamerika lebten und einem Anhang über die Chibcha-Sprache*. (Die Einheimischen Sprachen Perus). Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 1965. Fonología Makú. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Série Antropologia* 25: 1–17.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 1966. Esboço sintático de um corpus da língua Makú. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Série Antropologia* 32: 1–38.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 1978. Maku, Sape and Uruak Languages: Current Status and Basic Lexicon. *Anthropological Linguistics* XX, no. 3: 133–140.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 1980. Languages of the Orinoco-Amazon Basin: Current Status. *Antropológica* 53: 95–162.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 1983. Lenguas de la Región Orinoco Amazonas: Estado Actual. *América Indígena* 43: 703–784.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 1985. Languages of the Orinoco-Amazon Region: Current Status. *South American Indian Languages: Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. by Harriet E. Manelis Klein and Louisa Stark, 17–139. Austin: Texas University Press.
- Migliazza, Ernesto C. 2008. *Maku*. Paper presented at the 4th Conference on Endangered Languages and Cultures of Native America, University of Utah.

- Monserrat, Ruth Maria Fonini. 2000. *A língua do povo M̃ky*. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.
- Monserrat, Ruth Maria Fonini and Elizabeth R. Amarante. 1995. *Dicionário M̃ky-Português*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Sepee/SR-5/UFRJ.
- Mosonyi, Esteban Emilio. 1966. *Morfología del verbo Yaruro*. Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- Mosonyi, Esteban Emilio and Jorge Ramón García. 2000. Yaruro (Pumé). *Manual de Lenguas Indígenas de Venezuela*, ed. by Esteban Emilio Mosonyi and Jorge Carlos Mosonyi, 544–593. (Serie Origenes). Caracas: Fundación Bigott.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1994. Callahuaya. *Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining*, Peter Bakker and Maarten Mous, 207–211. (Studies of Language and Language Use 13). Amsterdam: Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1997. Callahuaya. *Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective*, Sarah Grey Thomason, 427–447. (Creole Language Library 17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nettle, Daniel. 1999. Linguistic Diversity of the Americas can be reconciled with a recent colonization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 96: 3325–3329.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1990. Linguistic Diversity and the First Settlement of the New World. *Language* 66, no. 3: 475–521. doi:10.2307/414609.
- Nimuendajú, Curt. 1925. As Tribus do Alto Madeira. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* XVII: 137–172.
- O'Hagan, Zachary J. 2011. Informe de campo del idioma omurano.
- Obrigón Muñoz, Hugo and Jorge Díaz Pozo. 1989. *Morfología Yarura*. Maracay: Instituto Universitario Pedagógico Experimental de Maracay.
- Olawsky, Knut. 2005. Urarina – Evidence for OVS Constituent Order. *Leiden Papers in Linguistics* 2(2): 43–68.
- Olawsky, Knut. 2006. *A Grammar of Urarina*. (Mouton Grammar Library 37). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Oramas, Luis. 1916. *Materiales para el estudio de los dialectos Ayamán, Gayón, Jirajara, Ajagua*. Caracas: Litografía del Comercio.
- Oré, Luis Jerónimo de. 1607. *Rituale seu Manuale Peruanum*. Napels.
- Orphão de Carvalho, Fernando. 2009. On the Genetic Kinship of the Languages Tikúna and Yuri. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Antropológica* 1, no. 2: 247–268.
- Palácio, Adair P. 1984. *Guató: a língua dos índios canoeiros do rio Paraguai*. Campinas: São Paulo: Universidade Estadual de Campinas. <http://libdigi.unicamp.br/document/?code=vtls000051737>.
- Palau, Mercedes and Blanca Saiz. 1989. *Moxos: Descripciones exactas e historia fiel de los indios, animales y plantas de la provincia de Moxos en el virreinato del Perú por Lázaro de Ribera, 1786–1794*. Madrid: El Viso.
- Payne, David L. 1981. Bosquejo fonológico del Proto-Shuar-Candoshi: evidencias para una relación genética. *Revista del Museo Nacional* 45: 323–377.
- Payne, David L. 1989. On proposing deep genetic relationships in Amazonian languages: The case of Candoshi and Maipuran Arawakan languages. Society for the Study of Indigenous Languages of the Americas.
- Peeke, Catherine. 1973. *Preliminary Grammar of Auca*. (Summer Institute of Linguistics: Publications in Linguistics 39). The Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Peeke, M. Catherine. 1968. *Preliminary grammar of Auca (Ecuador)*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

- Perozo, Laura, Ana Liz Flores, Abel Perozo and Mercedes Aguinagalde. 2008. Esenario histórico y sociocultural del alto Paragua, Estado Bolívar, Venezuela. *Evaluación rápida de la biodiversidad de los ecosistemas acuáticos de la cuenca alta del río Paragua, estado Bolívar*, ed. by Josefa Celsa Señaris, Carlos A. Lasso and Ana Liz Flores, 169–180. (Boletín RAP de Evaluación 49). Arlington, VA: Conservation International.
- Pike, Kenneth L. and Rachel Saint. 1962. Auca phonemics. *Studies in Ecuadorian Indian Languages*, vol. 1, ed. by Benjamin Elson, 2–30. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Postigo, Adriana Viana. 2009. Alguns apontamentos bibliográficos sobre a língua guató (Macro-Jê). *LIAMES* 9: 99–106.
- Proyecto de Documentación del Idioma Muniče. 2009. *Una Breve Descripción del Idioma Muniče*. Cabeceras Aid Project.
- Quadros, Francisco R. Ewerton. 1892. Memoria sobre os trabalhos de exploração e observação efetuada pela secção da comissão militar encarregada da linha telegráfica de Uberaba a Cuiabá, de fevereiro a junho de 1889. *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* 55, no. 1: 233–260.
- Quatra, Miguel Marcello. 2008a. *Estructura básica del verbo jodì*. Caracas: Ediciones IVIC.
- Quatra, Miguel Marcello. 2008b. *Bajkewa jkwikidëwa-jya jodì ine – Dodo ine. Diccionario básico Castellano – Jodì*. Caracas: Ediciones IVIC.
- Querales, Ramón. 2008. *El Ayamán (Ensayo de reconstrucción de un idioma indígena venezolano)*. Barquisimeto: Concejo Municipal de Iribarren.
- Ramos Cabredo, Josefina. 1950. Ensayo de un vocabulario de la lengua Tallán o Tallanca. *Cuadernos de Estudio del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas* 3, no. 8. 11–55.
- Rivet, Paul. 1924. La Langue Andakí. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* XVI: 99–110.
- Rivet, Paul. 1942. Un dialecte Hoka Colombien: Le Yurumangí. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 34: 1–59.
- Rivet, Paul. 1949. Les langues de l'ancien diocèse de Trujillo. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris* 38: 1–51.
- Rivet, Paul and Constant Tastevin. 1920. Affinités du Makú et du Puináve. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* XII: 69–82.
- Rivière, Peter G. 1966. Some ethnographic problems of Southern Guyana. *Folk* 8–9: 301–312.
- Rojas Curieux, Tulio Enrique. 1998. *La lengua Paez*. Bogotá: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Romero-Figeroa, Andrés. 1985. OSV as the basic order in Warao. *Lingua* 66(2–3). 115–134. doi:10.1016/S0024–3841(85)90281–90285.
- Romero-Figeroa, Andrés. 1997. *A Reference Grammar of Warao*. (LINCOM Studies in Native American Linguistics 6). München: Lincom.
- Rosenblat, Angel. 1936. Los Otomacos y Taparitas de los llanos de Venezuela. Estudio etnográfico y lingüístico. *Tierra Firme* 1, no. 4: 227–377.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2004. *A Grammar of Mosestén*. (Mouton Grammar Library 33). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2009. Mosestén and Chimane (Tsimane'). *Ambito Andino*, vol. 1, ed. by Mily Crevels and Pieter Muysken, 333–375. (Lenguas de Bolivia). La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Schmidt, Max. 1905. *Indianerstudien in Zentralbrasilien: Erlebnisse und ethnologische Ergebnisse einer Reise in den Jahren 1900 bis 1901*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

- Seifart, Frank and Juan Alvaro Echeverri. 2014. Evidence for the Identification of Carabayo, the Language of an Uncontacted People of the Colombian Amazon, as Belonging to the Tikuna-Yurí Linguistic Family. *PLoS One* 9, no. 4e: 94814.
- Seifart, Frank, Doris Fagua, Jürg Gasché and Juan Alvaro Echeverri (eds.). 2009. *A Multimedia Documentation of the Languages of the People of the Center. Online Publication of Transcribed and Translated Bora, Ocaína, Nonuya, Resígaro, and Witoto Audio and Video Recordings with Linguistic and Ethnographic Annotations and Descriptions*. Nijmegen: The Language Archive. <https://hdl.handle.net/1839/00-0000-0000-001C-7D64-2@view>.
- Seler, Eduard. 1902. Die Sprache der Indianer von Esmeraldas. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur amerikanischen Sprach- und Alterthumskunde*, vol. I, 49–64. Berlin: A. Asher.
- Slocum, Marianna C. 1986. *Gramática Páez*. Loma Linda: Editorial Townsend. www.sil.org/americas/colombia/pubs/abstract.asp?id=20108.
- Sturtevant, William C. 2005. History of Research on the Native Languages of the Southeast. *Native Languages of the Southeastern United States* (Studies in the anthropology of North American Indians), ed. by Heather Kay Hardy and Janine Scancarrelli, 8–65. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Tadmor, Uri, Martin Haspelmath and Bradley Taylor. 2010. Borrowability and the notion of basic vocabulary. *Diachronica* 27, no. 2: 226–246. doi:10.1075/dia.27.2.04tad.
- Tessmann, Günter. 1930. *Die Indianer Nordost-Perus: grundlegende Forschungen für eine systematische Kulturkunde*. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter.
- Teza, Emile. 1868. Saggi Inediti di lingue Americane. *Annali delle Università Toscane (parte prima): Scienze Neologiche* X. 117–143.
- Thomason, Sarah G. and Daniel L. Everett. 2001. Pronoun borrowing. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 27: 301–315.
- Tobar Gutiérrez, María Elena. 1995. *Modo, aspecto y tiempo en Cofán*. Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes.
- Tobar Ortiz, Nubia. 2000. La Lengua Tinigua: Anotaciones fonológicas y morfológicas. *Lenguas indígenas de Colombia: una visión descriptiva*, ed. by María Stella González de Pérez and María Luisa Rodríguez de Montes, 669–679. Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Torero, Alfredo. 2002. *Idiomas de los Andes: lingüística e historia*. Lima: IFEA, Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos : Editorial Horizonte.
- Trivero Ribera, Alberto. 2005. *Los primeros pobladores de Chiloé*. (Working Paper Series 25). Uppsala: Ñuke Mapuförlaget.
- Tuggy, John C. 1966. *Vocabulario candoshi de Loreto*. (Serie Lingüística Peruana 2). Yarinacocha: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. www.sil.org/americas/peru/html/pubs/show_work.asp?id=2444.
- Vaquero, Antonio. 1965. *Idioma Warao: Morfología, Sintaxis, Literatura*. (Estudios Venezolanos Indígenas). Caracas: Editorial Sucre.
- Vasconcelos, Ione P. 2004. *Aspectos da fonologia e morfologia da língua Aikanã*. Maceió: Universidade Federal de Alagoas.
- Vergara y Vergara, Jose Maria and Evaristo Delgado. 1860. The Indians of Andaqui, New Grenada. *Bulletin American Ethnological Society* I: 53–72.
- Viegas Barros, José Pedro. 1990. Dialectología Qawasqar. *Amerindia* 15: 43–73.
- Viegas Barros, José Pedro. 2005. *Voces en el viento: Raíces lingüísticas de la Patagonia*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Mondragon.
- Viegas Barros, José Pedro. 2001. Evidencias de la relación genética lule-vilela. *LIAMES* 1: 107–126.

- Viegas Barros, José Pedro. 2004. *Guaicurú no, macro-Guaicurú sí: Una hipótesis sobre la clasificación de la lengua Guachí (Mato Grosso do Sul, Brasil)*. Buenos Aires: CONICET – Instituto de Lingüística, Universidad de Buenos Aires. Manuscript.
- Viegas Barros, José Pedro. 2006a. Reconstruyendo la morfosintaxis del proto-Chon. Paper presented at the “Avances en Lingüística Histórico-Comparativa Aborigen Sudamericana” en el 52º Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Sevilla, 17–21 de julio de 2006.
- Viegas Barros, José Pedro. 2006b. Proto-Chon Cultural Reconstructions from the Vocabulary. Paper presented at the Historical Linguistics and Hunter-Gatherer Populations in Global Perspective, Workshop at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig 10–12/08/2006.
- Vilera Díaz, Diana. 1985. *Introducción morfológica de la lengua Hödi*. Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- Vilera Díaz, Diana. 1987. Introducción a morphosintaxis de la lengua Hoti: el lexema nominal. *Boletín de lingüística* 6: 79–99.
- Villarejo, Avencio. 1959. Idiomas y dialectos antiguos y actuales. *La selva y el hombre*, 171–180. Lima: Editorial Ausonia.
- Vilte Vilte, Julio. 2004. *Diccionario Kunza-Español: Español-Kunza*. Codelco Chile.
- Voort, Hein van der. 2004. *A Grammar of Kwaza*. (Mouton Grammar Library 29). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yost, James A. 1981. Twenty Years of Contact: The Mechanisms of Change in Wao (“Auca”) Culture. *Cultural Transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador*, ed. by Norman E. Whitten Jr., 677–704. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Zamponi, Raoul. 2002. Notes on Betoï Verb Morphology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 68, no. 2: 216–241.
- Zamponi, Raoul. 2003. *Betoï*. (Languages of the World/Materials 428). München: Lincom.
- Zamponi, Raoul. 2008. Sulla fonologia e la rappresentazione ortografica del lule. *Arte y vocabulario de la lengua Lule y Tonocoté*, ed. by Antonio Maccioni, xxi–lviii. Cagliari: Centro di Studi Filologici Sardi.