



Morpheme Mergers in Island Carib

Author(s): Douglas Taylor

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Jul., 1959), pp. 190-195

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1263796>

Accessed: 11/12/2011 20:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of American Linguistics*.

rectly to the effect that the obscure first element of the cluster (Bloomfield, VFPA 6. 88) is readily re-interpreted as one of the ordinary (phonemes or) morphophonemes.

1. If *šiiʔšiiipa *duck* has root reduplication (Bloomfield, VFPA 6. 122), then the obvious morphophonemic analysis is *šiiip-šiiip-a, with the sequence *p-š represented as *ʔš.

2. If we apply a formally comparable analysis to *koʔθeewa *he fears him* and *koʔtamwa *he fears it*, we have *kop-θ-ee-w-a and *kop-t-am-w-a, with a root morpheme *kop- *fear*. This is attested in Blackfoot kóput *be afraid* (imper.), nitáikòp *I am afraid*, áikòpum *he is afraid* (Uhlenbeck *Gr.* 194).

3. Beside tr. an. *aʔleewa *he places him*, tr. in. *aʔtaawa *he places it, has it* and in. intr. *aʔteeki *when it is there, there is an.* intr. *apiwa *he is in place, he sits*, which is said to be suppletive to the first three (Bloomfield 109). But if we apply the same analysis, then instead of suppletion we obtain a full set of four primary derivatives from one root:

*ap-i-w-a	*ap-t-ee-k-i
*ap-l-ee-w-a	*ap-t-aa-w-a

4. Beside intr. an. *nenepe *I die*, *nepwa *he dies*, *nepeke *if he dies*, all three with stem *nepe-, there are tr. an. *neʔθeewa *he kills him* and tr. in. *neʔtaawa *he kills it*. Here again, if we analyze the last two on analogy of the preceding cases as *nep-θ-ee-w-a and *nep-t-aa-w-a, they can be viewed as causatives to *nep-e-. Compare *pyeewa *he comes* and *pyeθeewa *he brings him*, *pyeetaawa *he brings it*. This is not an exact parallel, however, since the derivation is secondary in the second case, whereas in the first it would rather be primary.

Even accepting as a working hypothesis that *ʔC represents *p-C in the case of the roots *šiiip-, *kop-, *ap-, *nep-, one should allow for other possibilities in other cases, e.g. *ʔt representing *k-t, not *p-t (compare *neʔtaasehkaweeha *he comes to him relieving his loneliness* and *nekotwi *one?*).

It would be interesting to see whether the analysis presented here can be applied to all or some of the present-day Algonquian languages.

MUSÉE ROYAL DU CONGO BELGE

MORPHEME MERGERS IN ISLAND CARIB

DOUGLAS TAYLOR

Morphemes, like phonemes, may split (*flour, flower; person, parson*) or fall together (as OE -ende of the present participle with -ung or -ing of the verbal noun in modern -ing); but it is not always easy to decide when the process is complete. As Nida recently pointed out (IJAL 24.280), the average speaker of English does not distinguish the *by* of *by-law* from that of *by-way*, etc.; and it is hardly surprising if for many the word *belfry* should contain *bell* and *handiwork* contain *handy*, or if an *ear* (*of corn*) be conceived as an extension of the name for the organ of hearing in the same way that the *eye* (*of a needle*) is an extension of the name for the organ of sight. We should expect such splits and mergers to be especially common in languages without a long literary tradition and an etymological spelling; but the investigator of an exotic language rarely has the means of discovering those that are already accomplished, and often tends to be arbitrary about others that are still incomplete. In what follows, I shall mention a few instances, taken from Island Carib, of homophonous morphemes that are identified by some (probably most) native speakers, but whose ancestry appears to be divergent.

The collective' suffix -gu (322; numbers refer to the list in IJAL 22.3-4) was so called by me because it occasionally contrasts, in what seems to be its main function, with the nominal pluralizer -ië ~ iä ~ -iü ~ -nü (108), as in the case of nîbirigu *my younger siblings* and nîbrië *my younger brothers*, from nîbiri *my younger brother*. Moreover, it may, unlike the latter, occur with nouns denoting inanimate objects, as

in numégegu *my (personal) belongings*; and in at least one instance both suffixes appear to combine: nibáigu *my grandchildren as a collectivity*, from nibáia *my grandchildren*, plural of nibári *my grandchild*. In such cases, -gu almost certainly derives from a Cariban pluralizer like -kon of modern Karina. On the other hand, it seems decidedly odd that a 'collectivizer' should modify the meaning of -agóburi *decrepitude* to the extent that appears in -agóburi *parents* (v. IJAL 22.37); yet my informants could offer neither parallel nor explanation for this 'extended meaning'. Nevertheless it is plausible to suppose that -gu of this last example was once a 'suffix of respect' distinct from collective -gu, as is -ko (-ku, etc.) of Karina and of several other modern Cariban languages. The Black Carib of Central America today refer to themselves and their language as Garifuna, and to the 'family' of Carib nations as Garinagu; and there can be no doubt that the latter term, though now a primary word, has acquired a collective connotation. Yet Breton's "Callíponam" and "Callínago" of the 17th-century Dominican dialect are given as synonyms, belonging respectively to the women's speech and to that of the men; the latter having "callinágoyum *Carãibes*" as plural. Plural and collective suffixes may, as we have seen (nibáigu), combine in this language; but the apparently reversed order in "callinágoyum" is an inexplicable anomaly, unless, as I believe, we are here dealing with a different combination: that of markers of respect (honorific) and plurality.

Dominican anísiku *wit, wisdom, intelligence* (whence kanísiku *wise*, manísiku *foolish*, etc.) is an obvious derivative of the same dialect's anísi *heart, mind*—with which compare recent Vincentian aníci and modern Central American anígi with the same meanings. Its equivalent in the last of these dialects, anícigu (whence ganícigu, manícigu, etc.), though less obvious, is generally acknowledged by native speakers to contain a variant of anígi together with 'collective'

-gu. But here the latter's function differs from those previously mentioned; and is similar to that (or those) seen in derived adjectival particles like: dligu *coldish* from díli *cold*, háragu *generally hot*, or 'heaty' (informant's translation, equivalent to some extended meanings of Eng. hot, as in reference to sex, music, etc.) from hára *hot*, hísiègu *lovable* from hísiè *beloved* and méreègu *easy* from méreè *weak*.¹ Moreover, it is not unlike the apparent function(s) of Lokono (True Arawak) -ko (or -ku?) as seen in akosako *seam* from akosa *to sew, needle* (Sp. aguja), ieniko *cleverness, subtlety, wisdom* (whence kaieniko *clever*, maieniko *stupid*, etc.) from ieni-hi *song* (and perhaps formerly *tongue*, which now is ie-hi) and mariko *able* (cf. amarikota *to teach*—i.e., *cause to be able*) from mari *possible* (cf. amarita *to make, to do*). On the other hand, this latter usage of Island-Carib -gu does at least carry with it, in most cases, the collective connotation *as a whole* (v. IJAL 22.5, 13), which seems to be absent from that of the Lokono forms I have been able to find. Here again there may well have been some convergence of what once at any rate were distinct suffixes.²

Except perhaps for the first variant, the

¹ The translations of hísiègu and hísiè as *lovable* and *beloved* might give a false idea of the function of -gu in the former. Both words are adjectival particles whose lexical meaning is indifferently *liked* or *loved*; but whereas the first (with -gu) is predicative of a general quality, the latter is employed only of personal predilection; so, in verbalized forms: hísiègugíru *she is still liked/loved*, but hísiègíru nù *I still like/love her* (more lit., *she-is-still-liked/loved by-me*).

² The anonymous, 18th-century Herrnhuter author (Schumann?) of the Grammatik der Arawakischen Sprache (in BLA VIII, Paris 1882) says that the function of -ku (written -ko by later authors) was to "intensiren oder erhöhen die Bedeutung des Wortes" to which it was suffixed. But the label 'intensifier', as applied to the Lokono examples of its use cited in this paragraph, seems hardly more apt than does my own 'collectivizer' as applied to -ku and -gu of the Island-Carib examples given in the same place. Perhaps also Lokono has two or more such homophonous suffixes.

nominal pluralizer -ie ~ -ia ~ -iu ~ -nu (108) is homophonous with the suffix (107) marking 3rd person animate plural in verbs and locators. So far as I know, Lokono has -no, -na and -ie with similar functions and distribution (except that plural forms are used only in reference to human beings; whereas in Island Carib they may be used also in reference to other animals). On the other hand, -y-amo, -amo, -am, -em, -um, -an, etc. are said to be pluralizers of modern Cariban languages, employed with "les noms, démonstratifs et interrogatifs indiquant un être humain ou un animal, ou un génie" (De Goeje, *Études linguistiques caribes* II, p. 42; and v. also Lucien Adam, *Matériaux...grammaire comparée de la famille caribe*, p. 8). In this case, a 'fusion' of Cariban with indigenous Arawakan morphemes seems to have probably taken place.

Dominican káirabu *leeward* (= *side of an island protected from the prevailing wind*; cf. Fr. basse-terre) is clearly a compound containing variants of akáira *island, country* and -ábu, a nominal stem meaning, in this case, *under*; both members being Arawakan. On the other hand, bátibu *at (the) hut(s)* from báti *hut(s)*, béiabu *at the landing-place* and máinabu *in the garden* (= *plantation, clearing*) of the same dialect are complex words containing a locative suffix -bu of Cariban ancestry. Understandably, I recorded no equivalent of the first of these words (káirabu) in Central America, whose dialect has, however, agáira *country* and the other forms cited above. In this dialect the suffix -bu also occurs in ádobu *in, at or to town* from áudo *town*, bénabu *at (the) door* from béna *door*, bórorobu *in the court-yard* from bóroro *court-yard* and probably elsewhere; but it is certainly unproductive at the present time, and apparently tends to become inseparable from forms containing it. So, while máinabu and especially béiabu are in constant everyday use, máina *garden* was obtained only by eliciting, and béia- *landing-place* was not even so admitted as a current free form. All stems with which the occur-

rence of this suffix is clearly attested are of Cariban ancestry; but it may well be that analogy between such forms as náibuga ádobu *I'm going to town* and náibuga árabu *I'm going to the bush* or, áubobugéeti sá? *is he/it (coming) from town?* and árabugéeti sá? *is he/it (coming) from the bush?*, indicates or has resulted in the native speaker's ascription of locative -bu to words like árabu *bush* (earlier *forest*), *in or to the bush*, and áriabu *night, at night*. But etymologically these words were compounds, as -úrgu *interior* + -ábu > -urúgabu *close to/by* still is, the first containing (as does also earlier árubána *tree-leaf*, with -urbána *leaf, liver, feather*) a cognate of Lokono ada *wood, stick(s), tree(s)*, and both containing -ábu *under, with* (*bearing, carrying, in possession of*), etc. (v. IJAL 22.36), whose Lokono cognate, abo *with, by*, etc., also enters into composition, as in oniabo *water*—with which compare onikain *river* and the phrase oni kia *rain*, tobanabo (-obana *leaf*) *hut, shelter*.³

A linguist who chose to describe any variety of standard spoken English without the benefit of historically known facts concerning the language would doubtless find little difficulty in distinguishing the homophonous suffixes exemplified in *bony* and *baby*; but he might get into trouble over such words as *primary, army, many* and *tardy*. And here the 'average native speaker' could not help him; though he might suggest, wrongly, that the last of these words, being clearly related to the verb *retard*, must contain some suffix. A more or less arbitrary decision may be inevitable in such cases. So,

³ Among the Black Carib of Central America, the central meaning of árabu (earlier arábu) seems to have shifted from *forest or bush* to *cultivated clearing in the forest or bush*. Similarly, the Taino word for *cultivated field*, recorded and adopted into Antillean Spanish as conuco, is clearly cognate with modern Lokono konoko *forest* and modern Goajiro unu?u *tree(s)*, and must once have had much the same meaning. If I am right in believing also áriabu (Dominican ariábu) to have been a compound, its first member may have been cognate with Goajiro aih < ali *night* and with ori- of Lokono orikahu *night*.

in the Central American dialect of Island Carib, the suffixes -ni ~ -ne ~ -e ~ -V (-NE, 211), -li ~ -le (-LE, 212) and -ri ~ -re (-RE, 213) all occur, unpredictable variants: (1) as nominalizers, and (2) as nominal suffixes having, apparently, more than one function each (v. IJAL 22.7, 8, 11, 13, 33-4). Only the first of these three is productive; and I believe that my identification of the various forms and functions symbolized as '-NE' is in accordance with native Sprachgefühl, which is, however, more or less 'neutral' as regards the other two hypothesized units (always -li and -ri except in songs and ceremonial speech, and in some primary words where these morphemes' presence can be suspected only). It will suffice here to present the case for -RE.

A nominalizing suffix -ri occurs with some adjectival bases, as in ubuíduri *darling, favourite* (cf. ubuíduni *goodness, prettiness, friendship or intimacy*) from buídu *good, pretty* (of Cariban ancestry), and in gaiúnari *ancestral-cult house* from gaiúna *ancestral* (which is Arawakan), an attributive denominal adjective containing the base -iúna *stem, ancestor*. In númari *my companion, my consort* (socially sanctioned, legal or extra-legal mate; Breton does not give the latter referent, which is today the more common), linguist and native speaker alike see a derivative of núma *accompanying me, together with me*, itself a noun by morphological criteria. A nominal suffix -ri also occurs with nouns of Cariban ancestry, with what may be called a 'subordinative' function, to form stems and bases of possessed nouns, attributive and privative denominal adjectives, and derivatives of these classes, like: némarí *my path* from óma *path or road*, tidúnari *its/her river* from dúna *water or river*, ka idúnari *whose river*, madúnari(tu) (*it is*) *without water*. Like all privative and attributive denominal constructions, this last word has an Arawakan prefix (privative MA-, 22); but 'subordinative' -ri, like all stems and bases with which it is found, is certainly of Cariban ancestry (cf. modern

Karina oma *path*, yemari *my path*, emari *his/her/its path*, maina emari *garden path*—i.e., *the path to the garden*).⁴

The same cannot be said of -ri in úmari *companion, consort* (with bound stem -uma- *accompanying, together with*), which shows neither possession nor any other kind of grammatical subordination so far as I can see, and whose stem is Arawakan (cf. Lokono -oma- with the same meaning). Now Island-Carib /r/ corresponds to either /r/ or /d/ of Lokono; and de Goeje tells us that Lokono -ri "forms substantives," without, unfortunately, giving any clear illustration of such formations. On the other hand, Lokono toboradi *her elder (brother), he who is before her*, from tobora *before her/it*, and tadikidi *her younger (brother), he who is after her*, from tadiki *after her/it*, contain stems that are surely cognate with Island-Carib -ubára *before (place or time)* and -árigi *after*, and would be in every way analogous to Island-Carib túmari *her companion, her consort*, from túma *together with her*, if only *companion* were qualified as *male*, and one might translate: *he who is together with her*. For the Lokono suffixes -di, -do are complex, containing -i *he (human male)* vs. -o *she or it (woman, god, beast, plant or inanimate object)*, which correspond to Island-Carib -i *he or it (masculine)* vs. -u *she or it (feminine)*. But Breton, though he lists a perfective verb: "elle est à moi nománharou" (more literally *she has become mine*), said of a female slave, gives no feminine counterpart of "nómari *mon compagnon*"; and, as we have seen, úmari now contains no reference to sex or gender except, of course, in so far as túmari may usually be translated by *her husband*, lúmari by *his wife*.

However, it is not surprising that this -ri, should it be cognate with Lokono -di, has shed any reference it may once have had to sex or gender; for the gender of an Island-Carib noun is indicated, today as three hundred years ago, only by 3rd sg. pro-

⁴For this and much other information on modern Karina I am grateful to B. J. Hoff.

nominal reference in another word (noun, verb, or locator). Thus, *tebéneri lúba her-door his-house (the door of his house)* indicates the feminine gender of *lúba* by *t-* in the first word, the owner's male sex by *l-* in the second, but says nothing about the masculine gender of *béna door*, *tebéneri her door*. It is true that some nouns denoting specifically male or female persons show, as final /i/ vs. /u/ or /o/, non-functional vestiges of what appears to have been a different system, partially retained in Lokono; so, compare: *eiéri man* and *hjárú woman*, *núguci(li) my father* and *núgucu(ru) my mother*, *náruguti my grandfather* and *nagóto my grandmother*, *náti my elder brother* and *nítu my elder sister*. But apart from the forms in parentheses, which occur with no nominal stems other than those meaning *father* and *mother* as cited, and with them only in ceremonial speech today, none of these words contains—or contained in Breton's time—any suffix whatever.⁵

Also as a nominalizer, *-ri* most likely has a dual descent, so to speak; for *ubuíduri darling*, etc. was probably borrowed from Karina as a possessed noun, *ibágari life* (and earlier *release, awakening*) and *igáburi conduct (behaviour), way of doing things* as verbal nouns containing a Cariban suffix homophonous if not identical with 'subordinative' *-ri*. But if de Goeje was right in believing that Island-Carib *-biri* (a homonym of *biri younger brother*, which is Cariban) *half or part (of some thing, things or beings)* is cognate with Lokono *ibili small human male*

⁵ As a nominalizing suffix, *-li* occurs in a number of nouns like: *gumúlali smoke* from *gumúla smoky* (cf. *agimulaha to smoke*), *garábali breeze or wind* from *garába turning over (inverting, reversing)*, and *ganáli foundation*, or (*kind of earthenware jar or pitcher* from *gana holding up (supporting, checking or pausing in movement)*). The unique occurrence of *-li* and *-ru* with what are now nominal stems (meaning *father* and *mother*), and the fact that these suffixes were never omitted from Dominican words like *núkusili my father*, *núkusuru my mother*, suggest that also here they were once nominalizers.

(*person*), from *ibi-small*, then Island-Carib *gaiúnari ancestral-cult house* and other similar formations on an indigenous Arawakan base may well contain what is historically the same suffix.⁶

As might be expected, some affixes of clearly Cariban ancestry, such as locative *-da in* (325), *-ha at, in* (326), *-bu at, to, in* (327), and 'subordinative' *-ri* (213), never became productive in Island Carib, and are found today only with stems that were likewise borrowed from Karina; whereas affixes belonging to the indigenous Arawakan language of these islands combine with inherited and with borrowed stems indifferently. However, I think that de Goeje was mistaken in making the unqualified statement: "On ne trouve jamais de sémantèmes d'origine iñeri unis à des morphèmes d'origine kalíña" (in *Journ. de la Soc. des Américanistes de Paris XXXI.22*). Island-Carib *tibegu her kind* clearly contains the stem *-ibe-kind (natural group, race, variety, sort)* together with *-gu* in its strictly collective function; and the latter, as we have seen, is Cariban in ancestry. What I take to be the same stem is contained in the denominal, attributive and privative adjectives, *gíbe (Dominican kibe) much, many* and *míbe not much, few*. Both usages are made of a Lokono stem *-ibe-*, as in: *t-ibe-n-ti person of her company, sect, nation*, and *k-ibe abundant*; and I therefore conclude that

⁶ These homonyms are distinguished in construction with *ua-our*, *ha-their*, *ga-having* or *ma-without* as in *hábirí their younger brother*, but *hibirí half, a part or some of (animate) them*. The latter stem enters into a compound with *ári navel* to form *aribirí umbilical cord*. My data do not show any convincing example of the merging of major morphemes; but then, what C. F. Voegelin has called 'discontinuous meanings' belong not only to homonyms like *ári navel* and *ári tooth, teeth*, *áti (woman's) elder brother* and *áti capsicum*, *-biri (man's) younger brother* and *-biri part or half of*, but also to individual morphemes like *arigai* (1) *ear*, (2) *corner (of a house)*, *égei* (1) *shoulders*, (2) *grater-board*, and *híu* (1) *thorn, prickle*, (2) *body-hair*, (3) *cassava-beer*.

Island-Carib -fegu contains an Arawakan stem together with a borrowed, Cariban suffix.

DOMINICA, BRITISH WEST INDIES

A POSSIBLE ARAWAK-CARIB BLEND

DOUGLAS TAYLOR

The 'semantic peculiarity' of the nominal stem -isię *attraction exerted by (some being or thing on another's inclination)*, employed in expressions of love, liking or—with the privative prefix—dislike, has been described in section 3.1 of my outline of the modern Central American dialect of Island Carib (IJAL 22.5, 6). Here I wish to consider its ancestry, which may have its own peculiar interest.

Corresponding to attributive denominal hísię *attractive* of this dialect is what Raymond Breton, describing the Dominican dialect of circa 1650, wrote: "kinchim" (kínchim lahámouca hóne *il voudrait être aimé de vous*), "kinchin" (kínchin-lákia bóne *qu'il te soit cher*, kinchínti lóne *il l'aime*) or "kinchen" (lika kinchen náne *ce que je chéris*), and usually translated by *aimé* or *cher*. This form—and privative "minchínti lóne *il ne l'aime pas*" (equivalent to: msięti lú of the C. A. dialect)—he ascribes to the 'women's speech'. Elsewhere he lists: ícheem *ce que j'aime*, nícheem bouca *ce que j'aimais*, lichíém-kia nóne *c'est que je l'aime* (more literally, *his-attraction it-is for-me*) and kinchínti nóne *je l'aime bien* (more lit., *il-est-aimé de-moi*); the last two entries both ending with the reference: "*voyez chétina*". Turning to the latter we find: "chétina, [or] chetímain ní, *j'aime*," "ouécou-cheti,...*un homme qui aime le vin*,..." (cf. C. A. uógu *cassava beer*), and elsewhere, "amon chéti *il en aime une autre*". Evidently Breton regarded all these forms as related; yet there appear to be three distinct bases, perhaps phonologically: -isi or -ise, -iseę or -isię and se- respectively, whose differences remain unexplained. The first two, whatever their

status in Breton's day, were later merged as -iseę (or -isen) in recent Dominican and Vincentian, and as -ísię (with stable stress) in the Central American dialect. The third would seem to be lost, unless it should be identified with the suffix -se in C. A. garíhase(ti) (*it is*) *worth seeing*, based on aríha *to see*, or be contained in nominal -isebe *agreeableness*, whence C. A. hésebe(ti) (*it is*) *agreeable, pleasant, likeable (of a place)* and Breton's kechébeti *il est bien privé, familier, il se plaît*, which he ascribes to the 'women's speech'.¹

Comparable with Breton's Island-Carib "kinchin" and "minchin" are Lokono "kanissin *lieben*" and "mansin *nicht lieben, hassen*" of the late eighteenth century, anonymous Herrnhuter vocabulary,² containing, as base, an(i)si, a word defined only as entering into "schöne Redensarten, z. B. jurán ansi *verlangen*, júra dánísi *ich verlange*, júra bánísi, etc.," but which C. H. de Goeje³ (whose informant glossed this word by *vitality*) believed to be cognate with Island-Carib "ánichi *coeur, âme*. Ce mot mis avec le verbe dénote envie, volonté, désir, comme: chinhacaécoua clec báníchi *tu as bien envie de rire*."⁴ The Island-Carib and Lokono words alike contain attributive ka- or privative ma-, common to both languages; and these prefixes, though they often change another

¹ See pp. 138, 283, 323, 330 of Raymond Breton's Dictionnaire caraïbe-français (éd. fac-simile Jules Platzmann, Leipzig 1892); pp. 14, 296 & 314 of his Dictionnaire français-caraïbe (éd. fac-simile Jules Platzmann, Leipzig 1900); and pp. 19, 38, 61-2 of his Grammaire caraïbe (nlle. éd. Lucien Adam & Ch. Leclerc. BLA III; Paris 1877).

² Arawakisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch; in BLA VIII (pp. 69-165); Paris 1882. The author is thought to have been either Schulz or Schumann.

³ See p. 121 of this author's The Arawak Language of Guiana (Amsterdam 1928); and pp. 95 & 103 of his Nouvel examen des langues des Antilles; in JSAP n.s. 31 (pp. 1-120); Paris 1939. A cognate, Goajiro *aĩ life, heart, soul*, is also used to express love or wish.

⁴ Breton's Dictionnaire caraïbe-français; s. v. "ánichi".