



---

Some Remarks on the Spelling and Formation of Taino Words

Author(s): Douglas Taylor

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Oct., 1960), pp. 345-348

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1263554>

Accessed: 07/12/2011 22:07

---

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](mailto:support@jstor.org).



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

## NOTES AND REVIEWS

### SOME REMARKS ON THE SPELLING AND FORMATION OF TAINO WORDS

DOUGLAS TAYLOR

As our oldest record of a New World language (and perhaps also because, as C. H. de Goeje suggests, a number of its words has been adopted into the languages of Europe), the meagre and scattered remains of Taino have aroused enough interest to be compiled and commented on several occasions; but they have not, so far as I know, formed the subject of any serious modern study. Admittedly there is much more important linguistic salvage to be made; but the interested scholar does not always have the means of making it; and all is grist that comes to his mill.<sup>1</sup>

A prerequisite to any such study would be the assembling of all the different spellings and glosses of what presumably was intended to represent the same Taino form; identifying the recorder and dating the record wherever possible. Only then could those familiar with the historical phonologies of Spanish, Catalan and Italian make a shrewd guess at the phonetic values intended and the phonological oppositions involved.

<sup>1</sup> In his *Nouvel examen des langues des Antilles* (JSAP XXXI.1-120; Paris, 1939), C. H. de Goeje gives a list of Taino words and phrases taken, he says, from various editions of Columbus, Las Casas, Oviedo, Martyr, Chanca and Pane. Other or fuller references to some of the sources are: Gómara, F. L. de: *Historia de las Indias* (Zaragoza, 1552-53, and Madrid, 1749), Las Casas, B. de: *Apologética historia de las Indias* (Madrid, 1909), Navarrete, F. de: *Collección de viajes . . .* (Madrid, 1865-37), Oviedo y Valdés, G. F. de: *Historia general y natural . . .* (Madrid, 1851-55); Pane, Ramón, *in* Bourne E. G.: *Columbus, Ramón Pane and the beginnings of American anthropology* (*in* Proc. Amer. Antiq. Soc. n.s. vol. 17, pp. 310-48), Scillacio, N.: *Raccolta, Travesan: Raccolta* (1501).

De Goeje says that compilations of Taino forms previous to his own were made by Gilij, Rafinesque, von Martius, Richardo (Pichardo?), Brinton, Tavera-Costa and Zayas y Alonso.

Unfortunately, de Goeje did not do this. Thus he cites only "aje, hage" for "aje, age, axe, ase, hage, haje" and possibly other spellings of the record; and sometimes 'normalizes', as in his "guaisa" for "guayça" and "daša" for "dacha" (but "machabuka" presumably as in the sources, except for the 'k'), without giving his reasons for doing so.

Letters	Total	Initial	Medial	Final
ç(a, o, u), qu	84 (1st)	30 (1st)	54 (1st)	0
n	73 (2nd)	8 (8th)	49 (2nd)	16
b	61 (3rd)	21 (3rd)	40 (4th)	0
t	51 (4th)	14 (4th)	37 (5th)	0
m	45 (5th)	25 (2nd)	16 (7th)	4
gu(a)	44 (6th)	25 (2nd)	19 (6th)	0
r	44 (6th)	0	42 (3rd)	2
h	40 (7th)	21 (3rd)	19 (6th)	0
g(e, i), j, x	29 (8th)	10 (6th)	16 (7th)	3
c, z, s-, -ss-	28 (9th)	10 (6th)	15 (8th)	3
y	23 (10th)	11 (5th)	12 (9th)	0
l	18 (11th)	2 (9th)	4 (12th)	12
d	10 (12th)	9 (7th)	1 (13th)	0
g(a, o, u)	7 (13th)	2 (9th)	5 (11th)	0
p	7 (13th)	2 (9th)	5 (11th)	0
ch	6 (14th)	0	6 (10th)	0

Lacking all but my own library facilities<sup>8</sup> the best that I could do was to restore and to supplement some of the original spellings, to list in alphabetical order some 218 words and names almost all from de Goeje's compilation, and to count the occurrences of the various letters and combinations of letters in word-initial, medial and final positions, with due regard to the divergent values of, for example, c and g before e or i on the one hand, a, o, u or a consonant on the other. Because of the frequency of such divergent spellings as: Cacibagiagua and Cazibaxagua, xagua and jagua, bixa and bija, ç (including ce, ci), z and s-, -ss- have been grouped together, as have also g(e, i), j and x; but I regard these groupings as a convenient working hypothesis only. Moreover, I am fully

aware that some later sources may employ 'j' for [h], and some early sources employ initial 'J' for [i] or [j], and that even when all possible precautions have been taken, the figures so obtained will be too low to be of much statistical value.

Twenty-eight of the words in this count have initial vowel (19 a, 5 i, 2 e and 2 o). Medial occurrences of the above-listed letters are intervocalic except for the following nine clusters, each of which was found only once: lb, rb, re(a), cr, dr, nr, nh, st, ct. It should be noted that m and n in word-final are written in several instances for the same word (e.g.: cibucam, cibucan); and may therefore represent an undifferentiated velar nasal, or even vowel nasalization. A suffix -el, said to mean *son of* accounts for 8 of the 12 occurrences of final l.

If we look only at the totals, we are first struck by the 'eminence' of k-sounds, and by the apparently considerable break in frequency of occurrence between h and g(e, i), etc. Both Lokono and Island Carib have an attributive prefix ka- and a verbalizing suffix -ka; and there is reason to suspect the presence of similar affixes in Taino. So, for example, the second element of T buti-caco *blue-eyed* apparently contains cognates of this prefix and of Island-Carib áku (Lokono akusi) *eye(s)*; while T ahiacauo *let us tell* probably contains a cognate of the suffix. And there is some suggestion that Taino may have had only one sibilant (or as-sibilant?) phoneme, such as, for example, the spelling "ase" (Alonso Enríquez de Guzmán, 1534), as well as "axe, hage", etc., for what looks like a cognate of Goajiro haši and Lokono haliti or halite *sweet-potato*. In this word, and in that meaning *capsicum* ("axi, aji"), x or j of the written Taino form corresponds to /t/ of Lokono (hati) and of Island Carib (áti), to /š/ of Goajiro (haši); but elsewhere both x, j (or ge, gi) and ç, z (or s-, -ss-) of the Taino record (cf. Caci-bagiagua and Cazibaxagua, both representing the same name of a grotto) correspond to /s/ of Lokono and /s/ of Island Carib (the

latter phoneme usually but non-distinctively hushing in the early dialect of Dominica, and hence written 'ch' by Breton). So: Taino "bixa, bija" and Island-Carib "bíchet" *anatto* (*Bixa orellana* L), T "hibiz" and IC "hébichet" *sifter*, T "xagua, jagua" and IC "chaoua" *genipa*, T "xagueye, jagueye" *natural cistern* and IC "chaouai" *rocky coast, cave, grotto*, T "cemí, zemí" and IC "chemín, cemín" *God or spirit*, T "ciba" and Lokono /siba/ (cf. IC "ichíbani" *rock used as anchor*) *stone*. Should Taino have had only one sibilant, like Lokono and early Island Carib, this phoneme would appear to have had a frequency of occurrence intermediate between those of b and t; leaving a still greater gap between h and y.

Most striking when we look at the distribution is the absence from initial position of r, which ranks high medially, and the quasi-absence of medial d, found only in the cluster dr in the name of a mythical being, Giadruuaua. Moreover, while medial r of Taino apparently corresponds to medial d of Lokono (and to r of Island Carib), as in "guarocoel": L uaduku(n)ti (IC uárukuti) *our grandfather* and "buren": L budali (IC búrelet) *cassava griddle*, initial d of Taino corresponds to initial d of Lokono at least in "dacha" (or "daca"): L dakia *I*. Should the Taino sounds written d and r have belonged to one and the same phoneme, this would take its place, with a more normal distribution, between b (or the sibilant, should there be only one) and t. But whether these Taino sounds were or were not in opposition, their known distribution and correspondence indicate a stage of development intermediate in this respect between that of Lokono and that of Island Carib (whose r corresponds either to d or to r of Lokono in both medial and initial positions).

Such alternative spellings as "guamechyna" and "guamiquina", "dacha" and "daca" suggest that 'ch', which was not found in initial position, was a variant of k before a high front vowel; so that "dacha" may have been phonologically identical with its cog-

nate Lokono equivalent, *dakia*. And if so, the "garrucha" or *spear-thrower* of the Taino may have been phonologically \**kadukia*, and possibly related to Lokono *kaduk-un* "in Schoos, oder auf den Armen haben".

Only two reliable cognates of Lokono forms containing *r* appear in my Taino list: *mahiz maize* and *mahite toothless*; and here Taino *h* corresponds to *r* of Lokono and of Island Carib alike: *márisi maize* and *ári tooth, teeth* of both the latter languages. T *mahite* contains moreover cognates of privative *ma-* and subordinative *-te*; both affixes that are common to Lokono, Island Carib and Goajiro. But then, in T "ahiacauo guarocoel" *let us tell our grandfather*, *h* of the first word and *r* of the second apparently both correspond to *d* of Lokono (*adiaka speak, tell, say*; *uadukunti our grandfather*) and to *r* of Island Carib (*aríaka speak, tell, say*; *uárukuti our grandfather*).<sup>2</sup>

It would appear from my count that Taino *m* is, proportionately, about three times as frequent in initial as in medial position, and that the reverse is true of Taino *n*. Moreover, all 25 occurrences of initial *m* are followed by the low vowel, *a*; and since *ma-* is a private prefix, we might expect it to be represented here more than once. So, a comparison with Lokono and Island Carib makes it likely that Taino "manicato", said to have been uttered by a Haitian bride after having been successfully "probado" by the male guests at the wedding, meant *she is forbearing, patient*, or, possibly, *it does no harm*, and Taino *Matinico*

<sup>2</sup> Taino "bagua" and Lokono *bara*, meaning *sea*, certainly seem to be cognate; but when they are compared to other cognate equivalents, such as Island-Carib *baláua* (also *balána*) *sea*, it is seen that each of the former languages omits one and a different syllable of the latter word, so that we cannot speak of a correspondence here to Lokono *r*. In Taino: "ocama guaxeri guariquen caona yari" (Zayas, p. 470), said to have been "usada por una India de Haiti para decir a su principal o encomendero que mirase una veta o piedra de oro", T *caona* is certainly cognate with IC *káuana gold*, T *yari* with IC *íari* or *íari ornament, jewel (beads or necklace)*; but this last word appears to have no cognate in Lokono.

(the name of the mythical island of women, identified by some with Martinique) *the fatherless*, the latter containing, like the words "tayno" and Lokono, -no *plural human*. And it would seem that Taino, like Lokono, had several other common suffixes containing *n*.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, the sequence "gua"—which I take to represent [ɣa] in at least some of its occurrences—is proportionately more than twice as frequent in initial position as elsewhere; and since, in the form meaning *our grandfather* (see above), it appears to form a prefix cognate with Lokono and Island-Carib *ua-* (Goajiro *wa-*) *we, our, us*, it seems highly probable that it had the same function also in Taino "guatiao", which is glossed, indifferently with "datiao", as *amigo, compañero*. Comparison of the latter with T "dacha" *I* and with such a Lokono possessed noun as *dadukuti my grandfather* leads to the conclusion that T *datiao* means *my friend* and contains, together with a stem cognate with Island-Carib *-tjau*, as in *uatjau our friend*, a prefix cognate with Lokono *da-* and Goajiro *ta-* *I, my, me*. Since most Arawakan languages have instead a prefix *nV-* with this function, the forms in an apical stop must be an innovation that Taino shares only, so far as I know, with Lokono, Goajiro and Paraujano.

Perhaps this as much as can legitimately be gathered from my very incomplete survey of the spelling of Taino forms in the various sources in which they were recorded. But I

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Taino "atabaene nequen" *sati (wife who agreed to be buried alive with dead husband)*, 'Burenquen' *Puerto Rico*, 'guariquen' *earring (?)*, 'henequen' *'hemp' (so-called; an Agave or a Bromelia from which thread and cord were made)*, *Duiheyniquen* or *Duyheyniquem*, a river name (compare *Luinikan river, creek*, containing *uini water* together with a diminutive *-kan*). If the first of these forms should be related to IC *taba-go down (of sun, moon, etc.)* and *enéneri wife*, it should be differently spaced: *ataba-eneken*. The name for *Puerto Rico* appears to contain *buren cassava griddle*. If *guariquen* is related to IC *arikai* and *L adike ear(s)*, it probably contains *ua- we, our, us* and a suffix (?) *-n*.

am convinced that a more thorough-going study of this sort would be rewarding. For instance, it might be possible to confirm or to disprove the nondistinctive character of 'x' ('j', 'gi', 'ge') and 'ç' (z, s-, -ss-) and (or) of 'd' and 'r'; or to discover the environments in which Taino 'n' corresponds, if it does, to /l/ of Lokono and (or) of Island Carib, as appears to be the case in the words for *cassava griddle* (see above), in T "guanabana" and Island Carib ualápána *soursop*, and elsewhere (cf. T "aon" and IC áuli *dog*, T "hyen" and IC íhali, L keheli *manioc juice*, T mani and IC máli *peanut*, T "canima", "caniba" or "canibal" and IC kalipuna, L kalipi-di/-du/-na *Carib*).

And if the word "tayno" meant "bueno" (Navarrete) or "nobilis" (Travesan), did the equally common recording "nitayno" mean *his nobles* (in reference to the cacique), and contain a prefix cognate with Goajiro nV- *he, his, him*, which latter is equivalent to—if not cognate with—IV- of Lokono and of Island Carib? One would also like to find a meaning for Taino "naboria", said to designate the lowest caste or class; and if Lokono -budia, glossed by de Goeje as "*a small remnant*", may be translated *remainder, rest*, it seems not unlikely that this Taino word should contain a cognate of the Lokono stem together with a prefix cognate with Lokono and Goajiro na-*they, their, them*, and have meant: *the rest of them*.

DOMINICA, BRITISH WEST INDIES

#### A NOTE ON TANAINA SUBGROUPS<sup>1</sup>

H. A. GLEASON, JR.

In IJAL 26: 120-122, Herbert J. Landar discusses the subgrouping of Tanaina on the basis of a lexicostatistical treatment of Osgood's data. The article is particularly useful in that the data is available, and Landar's interpretation of it is clearly stated. It provides an opportunity to subject the same material to other lexicostatistical

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

treatments,<sup>2</sup> and to compare the results. It should be borne in mind that the following calculations are made from Landar's cognation table, and do not, therefore, raise any question about his identification of cognates. The only point under discussion is the relationship between the results of one method of counting and another.

If a count of counterindications is made, the following tabulation results:

Bay					
3	Kenai				
19	20	Tyonek			
41	39	31	Susitna		
41	40	31	3	Upper Inlet	
13	14	12	31	30	Iliamna

The meaning of these figures is that if Bay and Kenai are taken to be immediately related, 3 items in the corpus will require special explanation (borrowing or parallel innovation), whereas if Bay and Susitna are so taken, 41 will require special explanation. There are two clear minima, Bay-Kenai 3 and Susitna-Upper Inlet 3. These may be taken to indicate that these two pairs should be considered as immediately related. Tyonek-Iliamna 12 is also a minimum, but a most precarious one compared with Bay-Iliamna 13. It is doubtful that a difference of this magnitude is significant, so it should be disregarded.

The characteristic vocabulary index<sup>3</sup> confirms these conclusions strongly:

Bay					
20.3	Kenai				
9.6	8.7	Tyonek			
2.4	3.9	7.5	Susitna		
2.5	3.1	6.5	31.4	Upper Inlet	
7.2	6.8	11.2	2.8	3.3	Iliamna

<sup>2</sup> Gleason, H. A., Jr. 1959. Counting and calculating for historical reconstruction. AL 1, no. 2, 22-32. See also Gleason, H. A., Jr. Genetic relationship among languages (to be published by the American Mathematical Society in the proceedings of the 1960 symposium on Language Structure and its Mathematical Aspects).

<sup>3</sup> I would like to reiterate that this term is unsatisfactory and is here continued in use only in default of a better.