

bagóburigubáiq??) *lúba búni* (“who are they who are thy parents?”) he will say to thee’. Only the first example was heard in colloquial speech, the other two coming from tales that I recorded; and the use of *búni* in place of colloquial *bú* in the last suggests that *lúba* ‘he will say’, though common in Breton’s day (see Breton 1667, pp. 54, 58), may now also be archaic. Except for its meaning, *káiq bú?* ‘who told thee?’ or ‘who says so?’ might be regarded as an aspectual verb (*ka* ‘who, what, which’ + the progressive suffix) rather than the verb stem *-iq* ‘say’ preceded by the interrogative prefix *kA-* ‘who?/what?/whose?’; and I think that in *tégi níq-bú* ‘thank you’ and *mábuiga háiq sù mútu bú* ‘everybody greets you’, *niq* and *haiq* must now be regarded as auxiliary (cf. secondary, non-aspectual *etégira* ‘to thank’ and *amábuigara* ‘to greet’), despite the possible interpretation as “thanks I-say to-thee” and “greetings they-say every person to-thee.”

NOUNS

To the class of nouns may be said to belong any word which, while not a verb as defined above, can take a personal prefix, then indicating possessor. A comparatively small number of words that we should like to call nouns—such as *áudo* ‘town’, *barána* ‘sea’, *guriara* ‘dugout canoe’, and *uátu* ‘fire’—which can take no prefix must be defined by their ability to take certain suffixes that occur only with other, prefixable nouns, as in *áudobu* ‘at the town’, *guriararugu* ‘in the dugout canoe’. Moreover, many if not all nouns have suppletive counterparts that occur only in prefixed form: *tileme* ‘her fire’, *káleme* ‘having a fire’. (Similarly in Arawak, *hikihi* ‘fire’, *báhi* ‘house’, *hámaka* ‘hammock’, and some others can take no prefix, but are replaced by other, suppletive forms which occur only in prefixed form: *dai(h)ime* ‘my fire’, *oasikoa* ‘our house’, *thokóra* ‘her hammock’.) Nouns may be (apart from inflection) simple or compound words (*niúmáru* ‘my lip(s)’, composed of *niúma* ‘my mouth’ and *áru* ‘edge, border’), or they may be derived from verbs (*aríhini* ‘my seeing; my sight’, from *ariha* ‘to see; to look’), from particles (*iúéi* ‘dirt’, from *uie* ‘dirty’; *irisini* ‘riches’, from borrowed *rísi* ‘rich’), or from other nouns (*liligua* ‘his own tail’, from *lili* ‘his tail’).

In Island-Carib and in Arawak many (perhaps most) nouns occur in two shapes, the one possessed or subordinated by a personal, attributive, or privative prefix, or (especially in Arawak) by another noun, and the other absolute or independent. In the case of plant and body parts, kinship terms, etc., the latter is rarely heard, and may not always exist. Sometimes the one and sometimes the other (rarely both) is marked as such by affixation: CAIC *liúrite* and A *liórithe* ‘his tobacco’, but CAIC *iúri* and A *ióri* ‘tobacco’; CAIC *lídiuma* and A *litíma* ‘his moustache’, but

CAIC *ídiumahá* and A *tímaha* 'moustache'; CAIC *tóho gáí* "its-extract manioc" = 'starch', but *óhoho* 'extract; concentrate'. The commonest absolutive suffix is *-hV*, in which *V* is identical with stem-final vowel, except that CAIC /ho/ = A /hi/ may occur after stem-final /a/: DIC *úihi* 'portion of meat' but *núini* 'my meat', *íthaho* 'blood' but *nítha* 'my blood', *ábuha* 'bone(s)' but *nábu* 'my bone(s)', and *suliéhe* 'shoe(s)' but *nisuliéni* 'my shoe(s)' (borrowed from Fr. *soulier*). A *íthihi* 'blood' but *líthína* 'his blood', *kathína* 'bloody; bleeding', *mathína* 'bloodless', appear to be somewhat exceptional. And notice the use of the two shapes in *hálikan íthihi?* 'which blood?' vs. *hálikan íthína?* 'whose blood?'.

The same pattern must have been present in the Central American dialect; but today, apart from exceptions like *óhoho* (see above), /h/ has been lost from this suffix or transferred to prefixal position with or without retention of a vocalic suffix: *úii* '(portion of) meat' but *níi* 'my meat', *hítáó* 'blood' but *níta* 'my blood', *haráua* 'ax' but *naráuaq* 'my ax', *arónáó* 'arm; wing' but *naróna* 'my arm', *arónei* 'captain (of a boat)' but *naróne* 'my captain'. After stem-final /e/, the suffix is today *-i* rather than *-e* (a probably unique exception is *éu* 'penis' but *lẹ* 'his penis'); while after stem-final /i/, /o/, or /u/ the suffix (*-i*, *-o*, or *-u*) usually disappears in ordinary colloquial speech, though it can be "reconstituted" on formal or ceremonial occasions. Recent DIC *hálaho* 'bench (seat, chair, stool)', compared with earlier *álaho* (Breton's "álaheu") and CAIC *hálaho*, suggests that initial aspiration of such absolute nouns preceded loss of /h/ from the suffix (but cf. Arawak independent *hála* vs. subordinate *lan* with the same meaning).

Besides the dependent suffixes, CAIC *-te* and *-ni* ~ *-ne* ~ *-e* ~ $V\zeta$ (this last and commonest variant indicating nasalization of stem-final vowel), Island-Carib has a dependent suffix *-ri*, which occurs only in some (but not in all) nominal stems of Karina (Carib) ancestry; thus, *béna*, *-ebénari* 'door', *dóbu*, *-idóburi* 'stone', *dúna*, *-idúnari* 'water; river', *óma*, *-émari* 'path; road'.

With one apparent exception that need not concern us here, dependent or subordinate nominal stems of Island-Carib (forming possessed nouns or attributive and privative particles) containing one of these suffixes have referents that are regarded as alienable, while most of those that are not so marked can be called inalienable. So, compare CAIC *tégite* 'her manioc grater' with *tége* 'her shoulder' (both from *égei* [Breton's "éche"] 'grater; shoulder'), or *tufúlurie* 'her (cultivated and cut) flowers' (from borrowed *fulúri* 'flowers') with *tileue* 'its (f.) flowers', which can refer only to the plant or tree bearing them. Apparent exceptions such as *lála* 'his bench' (*hálaho* 'bench') may be due to errors in recording or to slovenly speech; for the cognate Arawak equivalent, *lilán*, shows nasalization of the stem-final vowel (written as *-Vn*).

If we assume that all nouns having alienable referents take one of the dependent suffixes in their possessed, attributive, and privative forms, but that $-V$, the commonest variant of $-ni$, may be sometimes almost imperceptible (as may the 're in Eng. *we're here*), it seems relevant to ask, What determines the choice of one rather than the other? For unlike $-ri$ (or the irregular plurals of English nouns), $-te$ and the variants of $-ni$ cannot be regarded as historical relics, since they are employed not only with inherited forms, but also with loanwords, many of which have been borrowed in fairly recent times.

Informants claim that they do not know; and the shape of the words themselves does not appear to be a determining factor: cf. Breton's *echoubára, néchoubàrate* (CAIC *isúbara, nesúbarate*) 'cutlass, my cutlass' (Sp. *espada*, or perhaps *cachiporrea*) and *acóucha, noucóuchete* (CAIC *agúsa, nagúsete*) 'needle, my needle' (Sp. *aguja*) with his *bíra, tibírani* (CAIC *bíra, tibíraq*) 'sail, its sail' (Sp. *vela*), *pántir, noupántirani* (CAIC *fanídira, nufánidiraq*) 'flag, my flag' (Sp. *bandera*), and *carta, nacartani* (CAIC *gárada, nagáradaq*) 'paper/letter/book, my paper, etc.' Examination of a considerable number of such words leads me to believe that there is, or was, a semantic distinction between $-te$ and $-ni$, with forms whose referents the possessor employs for some particular activity or occasion ('harpoon', 'hoe', 'pipe', 'tobacco', 'razor', 'soap', etc.) taking the former suffix, and others whose use does not imply any particular occasion or activity on the possessor's part (such as 'sail', 'finger ring', 'shirt', 'shoes', 'sugar') taking the latter. Admittedly, there are a few counter examples (*haráua, naráuaq* 'ax, my ax', *arásu, narásute* 'orange, my orange'), and in one or two instances either suffix is said to be permissible (*áti, nátite*, or *nátieq* 'capsicum, my capsicum'; cf. Arawak *áthi, dáthia*); but by and large this interpretation seems to fit. As cognates of these dependent or subordinating suffixes occur also in Arawak ($-the$ and $-n$) and in Guajiro ($-se$ and $-ni \sim -i$), the matter may be of some interest.

The personal and, less frequently, the attributive and privative prefixes also occur with a small group of stems to form words having adverbial and prepositional functions together with some of the morphological characteristics of nouns; thus, *tídaq* 'in it (f.)', *tídaqie* "from within it" = 'out of it', the first showing nominal dependent $-V$ and the second the directional suffix $-giq$ (DIC $-seq$, A $-seen$, G $-hee$). These stems are $-abu$ (A *ábo, -bo*) 'with; by means of; in possession, charge, support of; etc.', $-árigi$ (A *adiki, -diki*) 'after; footsteps, tracks', $-áu$ (A *-áoa*) 'over; on; about', $-ídaq$ 'in', $-íladi$ 'like', $-uágu$ (A *-diáko*) 'upon, about', $-uária \sim -uái$ (A *oária, -oria \sim -aria*) 'from', $-ubádu$ 'opposite', $-ubára \sim -ubá$ (A *obóra, -bora*) 'for; before (loc. or temp.)', $-ugúdu$ 'for the sake of', $-úma$ (*óma, -ma*) 'together with', $-úni \sim -u$ (A *omón \sim omin, -mon \sim -min \sim -n*) 'for; to (dative); at; etc.', $-úruqu$ (A *olóko, -loko \sim -lokho-*)

'in; during; in accordance with', *-urúgabu* 'close by', *-urúma* (A *odóma*, *-doma*) 'because, on account, or by reason of'. Most of these combine with one or more of the suffixes—reflexive *-gua*, directional *-gię* 'from', and *-uni* ~ *-u* 'to; toward'—to form such derivatives as *-ábugua* 'by —self', *-unígua* ~ *-úgua* 'to/for —self', *-ábugię* 'below', *-áugię* 'above', *-úmagię* 'from (place or person)' (lit., "from with" or "since (time)"), *-úmau* 'as far as (place); until (time)', *-idau* 'into', *-idagię* 'out of', etc.

In Arawak, such forms are more numerous (I recorded some twenty-seven of them) and freer in their combinations. They may also occur, unlike those of Island Carib, in unprefixated form, and constitute a small class that I have called the postpositions (Taylor 1970b).

That such glosses as those given above are quite inadequate to explain the values of the forms will appear from the following phrases, where *-abu* has been placed in attested contexts: (1) *ábą fáłuma tábu tí* 'a coconut tree with (bearing) its fruit', (2) *abą ugúnei hábu muládunu* 'a boat with (carrying) mulattoes', (3) *búmari tábu bímenodi* 'thy wife backing up (supporting) thy mother-in-law', (4) *lídi lábu numégegu* 'his going off with (in possession of) my belongings', (5) *náueba lábu* 'I'll die of it (by its agency)', (6) *báiba lábu* 'go to the rear of it', (7) *mígira ba lábu* 'don't leave off behind (outdone by) him', (8) *legelęcuni béna lábu iráho lea* 'his locking the door behind (against) the lad', (9) *guđątina tábu náuori* 'I'm happy with (the possession of) my ax', (10) *goráua tábu tiúruгу* 'tied with (by means of) her pubic hair'. It should be noticed that personal prefixes are present in all these forms in *-abu*, whether their function be adverbial (as in 5, 6, and 7) or prepositional (as in the remainder), although they have been translated in the former case only. In Island-Carib but not in Arawak, this also occurs in regular nominal possession, as in *tebénari lubą uáguci* "its-door his-house our-father" = 'the door of our father's house', with which contrast the Arawak equivalent, *oáthináthi bá(h)isibo* "our-father house-door", a compound of *báhi* 'house' and *-sibo* 'face, front' (the Arawak house being normally open on three sides and having no door).

Insofar as the semantic value of *-abu* is concerned, it may be agreed that most instances of its use contain the notion of underlying position, of support, or of both. And since the bones constitute the underlying support or essential substructure of the body, it seems plausible to suggest that the homophony of *-abu* 'supporting, underlying' and *-abu* 'bones' need not be coincidental (cf. also A *ábo* 'supporting, etc.', *ábon* 'under', and *-abóna* 'bones'). It may also be mentioned that CAIC *uáladi* (from *-iladi*) may sometimes be translated 'our like' and at others 'like us' and that Breton translated his *árici* (CAIC *-árici*, A *adiki*, G *aciki*) by 'reste, trace' as well as by 'après'.

Island-Carib words formed from these stems by means of the attributive and privative prefixes, CAIC *gA-* and *mA-*, are not plentiful, though *gáma* (from *-úma*) 'being with; having', *máma* 'without', and the aorist verb *máunitu* 'it is useless, without purpose' (from *-uni*) are common enough (cf. A *mamintho* ~ *máontho*, as in *máontho iónro bósín* 'it's useless for you to go there'). A *abókoton* 'to seize, to lay hold on' is a causative verb derived from the same language's *ábo*; and recent DIC *mábukhu* 'groundless (without valid reason); lacking in resourcefulness' probably contains its *-ábu*.

Some of these stems have reduced forms that must be regarded as suffixal: *-da* as in *ómada* 'in the road', *-rugu* as in *ganálirugu* 'in the canari (earthenware pot)', *-u* as in *lidáu* 'into it' (cf. *lidagié* 'out of it'). In *turúgabu* (*leskuéla*) 'close by it (the school)' (*túrugu* + *-ábu*), *tégeuagu* 'on her shoulder' (*tége* 'her shoulder' + *uágu*), and *tugúdina* 'her heel' (*tugúdi* 'her foot' + *-úna* 'stem'; cf. A *dadináina* 'my shoulder', from *dadína* 'my arm'), we may see either derivation or composition, although recent DIC *káirabu* 'leeward side (of an island)' (*akáira* 'island' + *-abu*) and A *-obánabo* 'temporary shelter' (*-bana* 'leaves' + *abo*) are best regarded as compounds. On the other hand, CAIC *árabu* 'woodland' (**ara* 'tree' + *-ábu*) and *áriabu* 'night' (**ari* 'darkness' + *-abu*) reverted to simple forms when their first members became obsolete. It is possible, however, that some native speakers have come to regard these two words, mistakenly, as containing the locative suffix *-bu* 'at; to; in' (of Carib ancestry), by analogy with others like *áudobu* 'at/to town', *béiabu* 'at the landing place', *bórorobu* 'in the courtyard', and *máinabu* 'in the manioc field', which do contain it, since *árabu* and *áriabu*, though unanalyzable at the present time, may also be employed in a locative sense, as 'to the bush' and 'at night'.

A few nouns appear to be anomalous in one way or another; I shall mention only three: *anágni*, *-anága* 'back (anat.)', *fúieni*, *-ufúie* 'wrist', and *ilógoni*, *-ilógo* 'domesticated or semidomesticated animal' (preposed to the name of any animal whose ownership is to be expressed, as in *lilógo áuli* 'his dog' and *tilógo gabáiu* 'her horse'). The suffix *-ni* (or one of its variants) is, as we have seen, common both as a nominalizer (*irísini* 'riches; wealth', from borrowed *rísi* 'rich') and as a marker of dependence in alienable nominal stems (*nubáduni* 'my stick', from borrowed *bádu* [Fr. *báton*] 'stick'); and it is therefore hard to believe that the same morpheme could also have such a different function as that of marking the absolute noun. Moreover, while it would appear regular for names of body parts and products to require no dependent suffix (as inalienable), Breton's "(n)anágni" and "(n)iliguini" contain *-ni* in both dependent and absolute forms (*fúieni*, containing a loan from Fr. *poignet*, presumably had not yet been borrowed in his time). And this suffix, though now

lacking in CAIC *nanága* 'my back', reappears in the compound *nanáganabù* 'my backbone' (with *-ábu* 'bone' or with *-ábu* 'support'?). I suspect that *-ni* is or was nominalizing in all three cases cited; for in one place Breton glosses *anágni* as "le principal, le capital," which suggests that it may be a deadjectival noun meaning 'main', and his "iliguini" is variously glossed as "animal qu'on nourrit; nourrisson; petit fils," which suggests that it contained a verbal stem meaning 'suckle' (Island-Carib and Arawak women often suckle young animals that they wish to raise as pets). As for *fúieni*, the nominalization may well be analogic; for the inherited word that was replaced by the borrowing of Fr. *poignet*, "eleouchagoni," itself contains *-ni* and is a verbal noun denoting 'that which bends or twists' (cf. now the etymology of Eng. *wrist*).

Some but not all nouns referring to animate beings take a pluralizing suffix which occurs in the same variants as does the personal suffix of third plural: cf. Breton's *cáintium ouacánum*: CAIC *gáitiu uáganiu* 'our enemies are angry' (*ágani* 'enemy'). So also, *iráhoqia* 'children', from *iráho* 'child'; *hjár(u)iu* 'women', from *hjárú* 'woman'; *eiériu* 'men', from *eiéri* 'man'; *nidúheiu* 'my kinsmen', from *nidúhe* 'my kinsman/kinswoman'; *nítunu* 'my sisters', from *nítu* 'my sister'; *nibirie* 'my younger brothers', from *nibiri* 'my younger brother'. This last example contrasts with *nibirigu* 'my younger siblings (of either sex)', whose suffix *-gu* may be appended to many nouns with animate or inanimate referents which cannot take the regular pluralizing suffix; so, *numáda(gu)* 'my friend(s)' and *numége(gu)* 'my personal belonging(s)'. But plural pronominal reference is made only to such nouns as denote animate beings: *óroua iráhoqia hára* 'those three children', but *óroua guríara túra* 'those three canoes' (lit., "three canoe that"), *numádagu hára* 'those friends of mine', but *numégegu líra* 'those (lit., "that") belongings of mine'.

On the other hand, a noun's grammatical gender is marked only by third singular pronominal reference to it, as masculine or feminine, in another word; and here there is no distinction between animate and inanimate. So, in *uáiriti tebénari lúbq uáguci* 'the door of our father's house is big', the masculine gender of *béna* 'door' is marked by the *-i* suffix of the aorist verb *uáiriti* 'it is big', the feminine gender of *-úbq* 'house' is marked by the *t-* prefix of *tebénari* 'its door', and the male sex of *-úguci* 'father' by the *l-* prefix of *lúbq* 'his house'. (From a comparison of such pairs as *núguci* 'my father' vs. *núgucu* 'my mother', *náti* 'my brother' vs. *nítu* 'my sister', and *eiéri* 'man' vs. *hjárú* 'woman', it might seem that some nouns contained, etymologically, the mark of their own gender or of the referent's sex; but if so, such vestiges are today non-functional.)

Perhaps the most unusual feature of Island-Carib is the attribution of gender, which in very many cases depends upon the sex of the speaker.

All nouns having abstract referents (such as those meaning 'dance', 'night', 'jealousy', and all verbal nouns) are treated as masculine by the women and as feminine by the men; and this also applies to such impersonal reference as is indicated by the 'it' of Eng. *it is late, it is raining, it is good to see you*, etc. Yet both sexes agree on the gender of nouns having concrete, visible, or tangible referents. And since some nouns, such as *háti* 'moon; month', may have both concrete and abstract referents, such may also have two genders. So, *háti* 'moon' is masculine for both sexes, while *háti* 'month' is feminine for the men, but masculine for the women. (In their concrete senses, *uéiu* 'sun; day' and *háti* 'moon; month' are masculine, it is said, because these heavenly bodies once were men, whereas, since *uarúguma* 'star(s)' is feminine and may have plural pronominal reference, the stars once were women.)

So much for the effects of mythology on grammar. But for the rest, the attribution of grammatical gender seems to follow a logic that one might vainly seek in the most ancient Indo-European languages. Feminine are nouns referring to all kinds of containers: houses and vehicles of all sorts, cloth and clothing, beds, hammocks, boxes, jars, pans, guns, pistols, eggs, etc. Among the articles of clothing, whose names have almost all been borrowed, only *bunídi* 'hat' (Sp. *bonete*) is masculine. Feminine also are the mainly borrowed names of cutting instruments, such as those meaning 'ax', 'hoe', 'knife', 'razor', 'scissors', though the names of piercing instruments, like *agúsa* 'needle' (Sp. *aguja*), *arúfu* 'harpoon' (Sp. *arpón*, Fr. *harpon*), are masculine.

On the other hand, nouns referring to parts and products of the body are for the most part masculine. Out of a list of eighty-seven such items, I find only fifteen that are feminine: these include the words meaning 'belly', 'bladder', 'intestines', 'heart', 'liver', 'lungs', 'nostrils', 'throat', 'tongue', 'vein (or artery)', 'womb'. *Lé* 'his penis' is feminine, while *tógo* 'her vulva' is masculine.

The names of most cultivated plants and their fruits are feminine, notable exceptions being *áti* 'capsicum', *íáiaua* 'pineapple', and borrowed *rí* 'rice', which are masculine. The name of any animal whose sex is known may, in theory, be either masculine or feminine; but usually the words meaning 'bird', 'fish', 'manatee', 'shark', 'snake', and 'turtle' are treated as feminine, irrespective of the animal's sex. Borrowed *aréba* 'cassava bread' (K *are:pa*) and *bínu* 'rum (or other spirituous liquor)' (Sp. *vin*) are masculine, while borrowed *feí* 'bread' (Fr. *pain*) and *diuéí* 'wine' (Fr. *du vin*) are feminine.

Other seemingly arbitrary attributions of gender, while not rare, are comparatively few; and apart from nouns whose referents belong to one of the semantic categories outlined above in which the feminine gender predominates, the great majority of those having sexless concrete referents

appear to be masculine at the present time. This is very different from Arawak, in which one of the two genders is restricted (in principle at least) to male human referents who are Amerindians, the other applying to everybody and everything else.

LOCATORS OR DEMONSTRATIVES

Under this label I have grouped together what probably should be regarded as two (or perhaps three) small, closed classes of primary words, each containing a bound stem, which may be simple or complex, and one primary suffix (to which, in some cases, a secondary suffix may be added). All these words contain reference to position (in space or time) or to person; but as most of them refer to both, it is not practicable to separate them on these lines. The stems and suffixes are shown in Table 5. Only those listed for convenience after 4 in the table clearly constitute a set apart. After stem-final /a/, parenthetic (u) = \emptyset (zero) and parenthetic (V) = /o/; after stem-final /u/, both (u) and (V) = /u/; and after stem-final /i/, (u) = \emptyset and (V) = /i/. Except when followed by secondary -*u*, where *H* = /h/, -*Ha* loses its aspirate and may undergo crasis with the preceding vowel.

TABLE 5. Locators in Island-Carib

Stems	Primary suffixes						Secondary suffixes		
	-g(u)ia	-Ha	-ra	-g(V)ta	-g(V)ra	-te	-u	-gię	-i
1. <i>ia-</i>	+								
2a. <i>nu-, ua-; bu-, hu-</i>	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	
2b. <i>li-, tu-, ha-</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+			
3. <i>N- + personal suffix</i>		+	+	+	+	+			+
4. <i>hagá-, higá-, áhą-, káta-</i>				personal suffix					

The first stem, *ia-* is a "pure" locator, in contradistinction to the others, which are personal or "mixed." So, *iágia* 'it is here' (emphatic), *iáa* 'here', *iáhaų* 'hither', *iágię* 'hence', *iára* 'there', *iágota* 'over there', *iágóra* 'away yonder', *iáraų* 'thither', *iáragię* 'thence', etc.

The second set consists of personal pronominal stems which, unlike the corresponding prefixes, contain stable vowels. Despite the fact that only those of third person take strictly locative suffixes, it is clear that all belong to the same subclass. So, *nugúia* 'it is I; as for me' and *bugúia*