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Abstract:
This paper is a posthumous tribute to Prof. Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos, a linguist who contributed significantly to studies of Brazilian Indigenous Languages, especially those affiliated with the Jê family (Macro-Jê). We highlight biographical information about him, his inclination towards linguistic studies since he was a child, the beginning of his academic career, the privilege of having been a student of prominent linguists in the field of linguistic studies of indigenous languages, such as Aparecida Barbosa, Lucy Seki and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, his main scientific works and, finally, we emphasize the influence that his studies on the Kĩsêdjê language (Suyá) had in linguistic research on grammatical properties typical of Jê languages. We close the paper by emphasizing his commitment and dedication to the promotion and dissemination of research in the academic area of studies on Indigenous Languages, where his legacy remains alive for the new generations of linguists.
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INTRODUCTION

Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos, a linguist from Paraná, was present in the scenario of linguistic studies of indigenous languages in Brazil, opening space for these studies at the State University of Londrina (UEL), which, unlike the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), where the first Brazilian linguists of indigenous languages, Rosário Farâni Mansur Guérios and Aryon Dall'Igna Rodrigues, had no tradition in this knowledge field. Ludoviko, who began his linguistic studies with the Warekêna language (Arawák family), subsequently, over two and a half decades, devoted himself to the descriptive, documental and applied study of Kaingáng and Suyá (Kĩsêdjê), his studies on the latter language being the ones with the greatest impact.

Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos was born in Curitiba, on February 20, 1955. Son of Dayse Angelina Carnasciali dos Santos and Professor Doctor Geraldo Mattos Gomes dos Santos, he grew up motivated by linguistic studies, under the influence of a linguist who studied the Portuguese language and advocated Esperanto. He was married to Liana Reis dos Santos, with whom he had two daughters, Bianka Reis dos Santos Ferreira and Karolina Reis dos Santos Lucachaki.

Ludoviko studied Literature at the Pontifical Catholic University, where he also completed his master's degree. He completed his doctorate at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), where he received linguistic training and quality guidance, having been close to three important language scientists: Maria Aparecida Barbosa, Lucy Seki and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. With Barbosa he experienced lexicology, lexicography and semantics, with a special focus on terminological studies, and with Seki and Aikhenvald he entered the world of indigenous languages, taking the paths of description of the typological nature and sociolinguistics of indigenous languages in Brazil.

His teaching performance reflects his academic training in the dissertations and final papers he supervised, part of which includes lexicology (four master's dissertations) and another part focuses on indigenous languages, as well as the teaching of Portuguese to indigenous peoples and the writing of their respective native languages (a doctoral thesis and three master's dissertations, a monograph for the conclusion of an undergraduate course and three scientific initiation projects), with most of these works focused on the description of grammatical aspects of Kaingáng.

Regarding his scientific production, he primarily contemplates Kaingáng and Suyá, on which he addresses phonological, morphosyntactic and applied aspects of these languages. Suyá was the subject of a phonological study in Elimination of phonological segments in the Suyá language (Eliminação de segmentos fonológicos na língua suyá, 2002), whose results were applied in the article Report on the construction of the Suyá language orthographic system (Relato da construção do sistema ortográfico da língua Suyá, 2002), and morphosyntactic studies in the following publications: Aspects of the Suyá language system case marking of the Suyá language (Aspectos do sistema de marcação de caso da língua Suyá, 1999a), Long and short form verbs in Suyá (Verbos de forma larga y de forma corta en Suyá, 1999b) and Long form verbs and nouns in Suyá (Verbos de forma longa e nomes em Suyá, 2011). His doctoral thesis, Description of morphosyntactic aspects of the Suyá language (Kĩsêdjê), Jê family (Descrição de aspectos da morfossintáticos da língua Suyá (Kĩsêdjê), família Jê, 1997) is his most important linguistic work for linguistic studies related to the case marking system of this and other Jê languages.
Regarding Kaingáng language, he addressed language teaching within the scope of Applied Linguistics, in *Kaingang children and the difficulty in learning the number agreement system in Portuguese* (Crianças kaingang e a dificuldade em aprender o sistema de concordância de número em português, 2004) and in *Reflections on the influence of the Kaingang mother tongue in learning Portuguese as a second language* (Reflexões sobre a influência da língua materna Kaingang no aprendizado do português como segunda língua (BACCILI; SANTOS, 2007)). His other studies on Kaingáng dealt with the morphosyntax of the language: *Subject-object-verb number concordance in Kaingáng - a split ergativity system* (Concordância de número sujeito-objeto-verbo em Kaingáng - um sistema de ergatividade candida, 2003), *Notes on the Kaingang language in Paraná* (Apontamentos sobre a língua Kaingang no Paraná, 2006), and also the works published in coauthorship: *Possibility of split ergativity in the number agreement system in Kaingáng* (Possibilidade de ergatividade cindida no sistema de concordância de número em Kaingáng (ALMEIDA; SANTOS, 2003)), *Variation of the verbal form of Kaingang* (Variação da forma verbal do Kaingang (OLIVEIRA; TILLVITZ; SANTOS, 2003)) and *Formation of substantive units in the Kaingáng language: a mixed case* (Formação de unidades substantivas na língua Kaingang: um caso misto (ALMEIDA; SANTOS, 2010)).

The purpose of this article is to pay a posthumous tribute to Professor Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos for the pioneering spirit and originality of his academic work dedicated to the study of the indigenous languages of Brazil, especially those belonging to the Jê family (Macro-Jê). His importance for this scientific area can be seen not only in his specialized scientific production, but also as a trainer of new researchers at the State University of Londrina, where he built an academic career. Without intending to be exhaustive, this brief homage is a tribute to one of the Brazilian linguists who worked most avidly for the recognition and strengthening of research on indigenous languages in academic spaces and for a closer dialogue between researchers in the area, thus avoiding his isolation, as he exposes, in collaboration with Pontes (SANTOS; PONTES, 2002) in the presentation of the work *Jê languages – several studies* (Línguas Jê – estudos vários).

This text is structured in three parts. The first deals with the beginning of research in the area of indigenous languages, through the testimony of Professor Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, of whom Ludoviko was a student and with whom he participated in a linguistic expedition in the Uaupés region, in the northwest of the Amazon, and began his studies with the Warekêna (Arawak) language. The second part of the text highlights the main contributions of his research with the Suyá language (Kísêdjê), especially with regard to its case marking system and the nominal character of predicate nuclei that manifest an ergative-absolutive pattern, and in the influence he exerted on research within the Jê family. The third part highlights other contributions by Professor Ludoviko, including the creation of academic spaces for the promotion and dissemination of research on indigenous languages, such as the creation of the series of Macro-Jê meetings.

1. THE BEGINNING OF RESEARCH ON INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES

Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos was fortunate to have participated in two important expeditions organized by linguists to indigenous areas: the first to the Uaupés region, under the coordination of Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald; and the second to the Xingu, led by Lucy Seki. Both expeditions were carried out with the aim of documenting and describing indigenous languages in Brazil and adjacent areas (in the case of the Uaupés).

The expedition project to the Xingu proposed and led by Seki was the first major project for the study of indigenous languages funded by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), within the scope of the Scientific Research Program for Brazilian Indigenous Languages (PPCLIB),
the CNPq policy was based considered the survey of the number of languages carried out at the time by Rodrigues (1986). During Collor’s Government, CNPq interrupted special projects, but for a few years some priority was given to scholarship projects for research on indigenous languages (CABRAL, 2011, p. 2-3).

On the expedition to the Xingu, it fell to Ludoviko to deepen his study of the grammar and documentation of the Suyá language (Kişêdjê), until then the focus of phonological studies and some morphosyntactic aspects authored by Guedes (1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c, 1990d, 1991a, 1991b, 1993). Ludoviko was studying his doctorate at the Graduate Program in Linguistics at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), under the guidance of Lucy Seki, although she worked at that University as a collaborator in the project aimed at training young linguists for the documentation and description of indigenous languages, being, in fact, a professor at the Institute of Language Studies (IEL), at the State University of Campinas (Unicamp). Due to his connection with Professor Seki, Ludoviko was the only student who was not studying at Unicamp to participate in the expedition coordinated by her.

While a student at the Graduate Program at UFSC, Ludoviko studied with several renowned linguists, including Aryon D. Rodrigues, Paulinho Vandresen, Alexandra Aikhenvald, Jean-Pierre Angenot and Lucy Seki. Alexandra Aikhenvald, in an interview given to Cabral and Miranda (01/16/2022), talks about Ludoviko’s participation in her expedition to Uaupés and in the project to train linguists to study indigenous languages at UFSC:

When I arrived in Brazil from Russia, I received a CNPq grant, then a CAPES grant, and then a CNPq grant again. It was a bit of a strange situation, because Brazil is a country of immense linguistic diversity, but, even so, there were very few universities with postgraduate programs in the richest area of Brazil, isn’t it? The field of indigenous languages. Then, together with Professor Angenot, we decided to try to solve this, establishing a program at the university where we worked at the time, Santa Catarina, in Florianópolis. Now, nowadays, the university is huge. The university is very comprehensive and there are several colleagues who are interested in different topics, and people who are interested in indigenous languages. But in the early 1990s it was different. We had several colleagues who said, “But who is interested in indigenous languages?” One of the colleagues, who didn’t even have a doctorate, even said that a comma of the Portuguese language is much more important than all the indigenous languages. But even with that kind of attitude, we managed to establish a postgraduate course with the help of Paulino Vandresen, who was very engaged, Maria Marta Furlanetto and other colleagues there. The program at the beginning was just a master’s degree and then the doctorate started too, where we taught. I taught morphology, syntax and historical linguistics, and Ludoviko was my student. It was interesting because my training at that time, I was just starting to work with indigenous languages, my training was more in the areas of Semitic, Indo-European languages, but it was very interesting to have contact with people like Ludoviko, through my great friend, the best friend I had in Brazil, Professor Lucy Seki, with Luciana Dourado and also with our own students, like Christiane Cunha de Oliveira, and Simoni Maria Benício Valadares, who just defended her thesis in New Mexico. So, it was a battle to establish a graduate program at UFSC, but we did it. I remember that in the morphology course there were about 20 people and it was very interesting, because I decided to take a somewhat different course. So we worked with an Arawak language; I did a lot of problems, a lot of material about the only Arawak language, which was more or less well described at the time, which was the Terena language, a super complex language and I remember that Ludoviko liked it a lot and the others did too, because it was a polysynthetic language, unlike the Jê languages, with a little bit of ergativity, but not much. And then, in 1991, we organized a trip that was crazy, it was like a linguistic expedition, to São Gabriel da Cachoeira, to that place that we heard had a lot, a lot of non-described languages, and we went there, a group of ten people, including Ludoviko, Cristiane, Simoni Maria Benício Valadares, Gabriela Garcia Salazar, who later worked with a Kampa language and is now in Lima, [and] continues to work, but now with Spanish. And we went there and Ludoviko met the speakers of the various languages, Baníva, Warekêna, Barê, and I think he fell in love with the Warekêna language, until he was about to change the topic of his thesis on the Tapayûna and
In the following section of this homage-article to Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos, we focus on the contribution he made to the study of morphosyntactic alignment patterns of Jê languages (Macro-Jê), which profile most of the languages of this linguistic family.

2. Ergativity in Jê Languages

Greg Urban (1985), in his classic article *Ergativity and accusativity in Shokleng (Ge)*, is the first to identify patterns of split ergativity in a Jê language, Xokléng, trying to see how these patterns match the universals related to splits of alignment proposed by Silverstein (1976) and Dixon (1979). Urban was also the first to identify aspectual conditioning as a splitting factor, splitting verb agreement and splitting between main and subordinate clauses. When considering the affinities between Kaingáng and Xokléng, Urban proposes that the former also presents alignment patterns corresponding to those of the latter. He goes even further and considers that the Krahô (Timbira) and the Xavante also present split ergativity patterns.

Approximately a decade after the classic article by Urban (1985), Santos (1997) describes patterns of split ergativity in another Jê language, Kĩsêdjê. Related to these patterns are the long and short forms of the language, about which Santos (1997, p. 68) observes that verbs in FA (long form) occur in the following situations: (i) with negation, (ii) in constructions with *mã* (future) and (iii) in the progressive aspect. On the other hand, verbs in FB (short form) are used in non-negative, non-future and non-progressive constructions (SANTOS, 1997, p. 68). Santos also notes that there are unique-form verbs found in both contexts (i) and (ii).

Verbs in FA (long form)\(^1\)

(i) with negation:

(1) \(i\)-\(ŋɡe\) 'kere

1ps-dance\hspace{1cm}\text{NEG}

“I didn’t dance” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 69).

No negation:

(2) ‘\(w\) ‘\(ŋɡe\)

1ps\hspace{1cm}\text{dance}

“I danced” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 69).

\(^1\) Abbreviations: 1 = First person; 2 = Second person; 3 = Third person; \text{ASP} = Aspect; \text{FUT} = Future; \text{INST} = Instrumental; \text{NEG} = Negation; \text{NMLZ} = Nominalizer; \text{OBL} = Oblique; \text{PERS.N} = Personal name; \text{PL} = Plural; \text{POST} = Postposition; \text{PS} = Person; \text{r} = Contiguity relational prefix; \text{REL} = relational prefix; \text{SM} = Subject mark; \text{TOP} = Topic.
(ii) in constructions with mã (future):

(3) 'mẽ ra 'ŋgere mã
people SM dance FUT

(iii) in the progressive aspect:

(4) 'hɛn 'wa adgi-'ŋgere ra 'ta
ASP 1PL 1PL-dance POSP positional verb
“We are dancing” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 85).

As for splits in alignment in Suyá (Kĩsêdjê), Santos (1997, p. 159, 165) observes that a first split occurs in noun phrases. Thus, phrases whose core is a noun are combined with the particle ra (~ ta after voiceless consonants), called the subject mark, whether they are the subject of transitive or intransitive verbs, regardless of tense/aspect or negation. Only when they are topicalized, they are not marked by the particle ra, but by the topic marker na (~ n after words ending in a vowel):

(5) raŋʧi ra miʧi 'pi
anaconda SM alligator kill
“The anaconda killed the alligator” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 165).

(6) raŋʧi ra miʧi 'piri 'kere
anaconda SM alligator kill NEG
“The anaconda didn’t kill the alligator” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 165).

(7) ka'rã ra ak'nds
snake SM run away

(8) kar'o'lina ra ku'ken ra 'pa
pers.n SM wash POSP positional verb
“Karolina is washing (clothes)” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 88).

(9) 'mẽ ra 'ŋgrere mã
people SM dance FUT
“People will dance” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 165).

The other split occurs when the nominal phrase has a pronoun as its nucleus and, in this case, the split is conditioned to tense/aspect and negation, as shown in the following examples.

Negative

(10) i-'ŋgere 'kere
1ps-dance NEG
“I didn’t dance” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 69).
Affirmative
(11) ‘wa ɪɛnɾe
1ps dance
“I danced” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 69).

Negative
(12) i’ɾɛ s-a’ントo ɪɛɾe
1ps REL-cut NEG
“I didn’t cut (it)” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 78).

Affirmative
(13) ‘hɛn ‘wa hwɛŋɾo y-anto
ASP 1ps firewood REL-cut

Future
(14) i-’tɛm mɑ
1ps-go POSP
“I will go” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 90).

Present
(15) ‘wa ‘tɛ
g1ps go
“I go” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 112).

(16) ‘wa mɪ’ɾi ɪpɪ
1ps alligator kill
“I killed the alligator” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 160).

Progressive (affirmative)
(17) ‘hɛn ‘wa i-’mɛɾɛn ɪɛɾɛ
ASP 1ps 1ps-cry POSP positional verb
“I am crying” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 87).

Progressive (negative)
(18) ɪɛɾɛ mɛɾɪ nɛɾ-ɪ j-ɑkɛɾ-ɛɾɪ ɪɛɾɛ i=tɑ-m khɛɾɛ
1sg.obl game 1sg-hunt-nmlz inst 1sg=be standing-nmlz neg
“I’m not cutting up game meat.” (Tempra Suyá, personal communication).

Santos (1997) also shows that the pronominal argument of Series II also marks the subject of
descriptive sentences:

(19) a-’sɪɾɛ
2ps-small
“You are small” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 168).

(20) (’pɑ-n ɪɛɾɛ)
1ps-top 1ps 1ps-well
“I am well” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 168).
Considering the broader split in the alignment system in the Suyá language (Kĩsêdjê), which contrasts nominal vs. pronominals, Santos (1997) also describes different patterns of alignment involving the latter as follows: Series I (SI) pronouns occur as nominative forms, as illustrated by examples (21) and (22), while Series II (SII) is made up of pronouns that occur as accusative forms, as shown in examples (23) and (24).

(21) 'wa ŋɡɛ 1ps dance

(22) 'wa miʧi ’pî 1ps alligator kill
“I killed the alligator” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 160).

(23) ’ka i-’mû 2ps 1ps-see

(24) ’pa-n ’wa a-’mû 1ps-top 1ps 2ps-see

Thus, according to Santos (1997, p. 160), “SI and SII pronouns configure a nominative-accusative system whose conditioning is restricted to non-future, non-progressive and non-negative clauses”. On the other hand, Santos (1997) describes an ergative-absolutive pattern in sentences in the future, in the progressive and in the negative, cases in which

[...] the SIII pronouns are only used to mark the agent A, being configured as ergative forms, in contrast to the SII forms, used to mark S and O. Therefore, in sentences in the future, in the progressive and in the negative a marking pattern of ergative-absolutive case (SANTOS 1997, p. 161).

The ergative-absolutive pattern manifests itself exclusively through personal pronouns that combine with the formative re (SIII), which in other northern Jê languages, such as those spoken by the Timbira peoples, corresponds to the genitive postposition re, which indicates the material with which something is done (POPJES; POPJES, 1986, p. 170).

(25) i-’re hwĩ’si ’ren mã 1ps-sm fruit pick POSP
“I will pick fruit” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 56).

(26) i’re a-ka’ken ’kere 1ps 2ps-scratch NEG
“I didn’t scratch you” (SANTOS, 1997, p. 161).

In short, although Ludovíko has not based himself on Greg Urban’s study of ergativity in Xokléng, in his analysis of Kĩsêdjê, he reiterates the existence in another Jê language of common aspects of alignment, such as aspeetual conditioning for splits, in addition to showing specificities of alignment of Kĩsêdjê, such as the split between arguments expressed by names and arguments expressed by personal pronouns. Furthermore,
he highlights the interaction between alignment patterns and the status of short vs. long, or FA and FB, respectively in their terminology, by distinguishing the syntactic contexts in which they are required.

Very interesting is the analysis by Santos (1997, p. 72) which demonstrates the use of the long forms of verbs in Suyá (Kisêdjê) in typically nominal functions and raises the possibility of interpreting them as nouns (SANTOS, 1997, p. 73), although he did not consider them as derived through nominalizing suffixes, as Costa (2003) did for the Xikrin language of Catetê. But just the fact of having considered such forms as nouns already represents a great advance in the study of Jê languages and their most notable grammatical properties.

3. Other Contributions

In addition to contributing to descriptive and applied studies in the field of indigenous languages, Ludoviko was the promoter of the first meeting on Jê languages at the State University of Londrina, on February 15th and 16th, 2001. This meeting was a milestone in events on indigenous languages in Brazil, and the works presented at this event were published in the book *Línguas Jê: Estudos outros* (Jê Languages: Other Studies), which he organized in partnership with Ismael Pontes. 16 articles were published in this work. From this event was born a series that already has eight editions held in different Brazilian Universities: Unicamp (2002), UnB (2003 and 2010), UFPR (2004), UFPE (2005), UFG (2008), UEL (2016) and UFMT (2018). This series was the inspiration for another series “Línguas e Culturas dos povos Tupi” (“Languages and Cultures of the Tupi people”), organized by the Laboratory of Indigenous Languages of the University of Brasília (LALLI/UnB), and its first edition dates from 2005.

Ludoviko was a constant presence at Macro-Jê meetings, organizing round tables, encouraging the participation of his students in these events and bringing new contributions to the studies of the languages he was researching. He was a great colleague. Ethical, human, generous and overflowed with charisma and friendliness. He was loved by everyone. Upon retiring, for health reasons, he chose to live in the countryside, but always participating in academic activities at a distance, as occurred at the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic period. For Linguistics, it remains its solid contribution to the study of indigenous languages and inspiration for new researchers who will dedicate themselves to the task of documenting, maintaining and valuing the languages spoken by the native peoples of Brazil.

Ludoviko worked as a professor at the Center for Letters and Human Sciences at the State University of Londrina, where he joined in 1981. As a manager, in addition to having exercised the role of director of that Center, he served as Pro-Rector of Graduation (PROGRAD), in the management of the Rector Nadina Moreno (2010-2014) and as Vice Rector alongside Rector Berenice Jordão (2014-2018), even holding the position of Rector for some periods.

The respect given to Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos by students, employees, colleagues at UEL and colleagues in the area of indigenous languages was great, and colleagues, in general, already expressed the absolute affection they dedicated to him by the nickname they gave him: “Ludo”.

Our tributes to the late linguist and dear colleague Ludoviko Carnasciali dos Santos, known as “Ludo”, whom his wife, Liana Reis dos Santos, describes as “… sensitive, romantic, shy, creative, intelligent, childish Piscean; someone willing to listen to you.”
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