Subtiaba and MT noted above, among others, seem to indicate that Subtiaba is the more conservative language. This possibility does not necessarily contradict the proposal of Weitlaner and Weitlaner de Johnson that "Popoloca" Tlapanec (apparently NT) is more conservative than Subtiaba.[20] It does, however, indicate the urgency of more detailed internal comparison.

Regarding external relationships, in the process of working out phonological analyses for MT, I have noted a number of features similar to those of Otomanguean languages. If indeed Supanec has genetic relationships with the Hokan-Coahuiltecan languages (which must remain an open question until further comparison is done), then the Otomanguean features in Tlapanec would have one of two possible explanations: (1) Tlapanec is also genetically related to Otomanguean and is thus a bridge between it and Hokan; or (2) there is no genetic relationship with Otomanguean but there have been extensive adaptations due to areal influence.

If the latter is true, Tlapanec could become a test case for large-scale areal diffusion. However, in the words of Radin,[21] Tlapanec still awaits its definitive description.

MARK L. WEATHERS

Summer Institute of Linguistics, Mexico

THE NOMINAL PLURAL IN ARAWAK

In Arawak, the nominal plural is indicated by one of several suffixes, of which the principal are: -no (and allomorphs), -be, and -kho. One of them must be employed with all plural nouns designating persons, which are the only ones that may (but need not) take the first of these pluralizers. Grammatical ex-

pression of the plural category is optional for other countable nouns, which may, however, all be pluralized by either of the other two morphemes with seeming indifference. With the possible exception of -kho, these pluralizers are employed with no other word class than that of substantives.

Nouns designating persons usually form their plural by means of the suffix -no (in apparently free variation with -non when in word-final position, and occasionally reduced to -o), as in: lokóno *Arawaks, people* from lóko or lókoho *Arawak, person,* hiárono *women* from híaro *woman, female* (where híaro refers to a nonhuman female, it cannot be pluralized by -no), dínthinon *uncles* from dínthi *uncle (mother's brother),* hébethio *old people,* which serves as plural of both hébetho *old women* and hébethi *old man,* bíkidoliáthino *teenagers,* which serves as plural for both bíkidoliátho *(adolescent) girl* and bíkidoliáthi *(adolescent) boy,* lioínthonon *his nieces* from lioíntho *his niece* and lioínthinon *his nephews* from lioínthi *his nephew.*[1]

When this pluralizer is appended to the subordinate form of most (but not of all) kinship terms—that is, to one "possessed" by a pronominal prefix or by an immediately preceding noun or nominal word group,[2] it

---

[20] Robert Weitlaner and Irmgard Weitlaner de Johnson, "Acatlán y Huecatenango, Guerrero," *El México Antiguo* 6 (1943): 140–202, esp. p. 185.

[21] Paul Radin, "Notes on Schultze-Jena's Tlappanec," *Boletín Bibliográfico de Antropología Americana* 4 (1940): 70–74, esp. p. 74.

---

[1] The kinship terms in -oínthi and -oíntho, here translated *nephew* and *niece* respectively, refer primarily to a man's sister's son and daughter. However, according to my informants, they are also employed in reference to father's sister's son and daughter, and to mother's brother's son and daughter—that is, to all cross-cousins. This latter usage has not to my knowledge been previously reported for Arawak; and it may therefore be due to the influence of Dutch, which has *neef nephew or male cousin* and *nicht niece or female cousin.* On the other hand, a distinction between parallel and cross-cousins, inexistent in Dutch, is to be expected in a matrilineal society such as until very recently the coastal Arawak constituted; while the terms themselves, which are clearly related to the verbs aoínthin *to propagate* (v.t.) and aoínthonoan *to increase* (v.i.), are appropriate to both usages.

[2] See Douglas Taylor, "Arawak Grammatical Categories and Translation," *IJAL* 36 (1970): 199–204, esp. p. 200.

takes the form -nothi or -othi irrespective of gender, as in dadéinthióthi *my uncles* from dadéinthi *my uncle* (from independent dínthi *uncle*), bothonóthi *your daughters* from bótho *your daughter*, thisanóthi *her children* from thísa *her child*, loionóthi *his mothers* or *his parents* from lóio *his mother*. But there are other instances which resemble that of lioínthonon.

Deverbal nouns in -sia, such as: dansísia *whom or what I love*, bothikísia *whom or what you found*, oadikhísia *whom or what we saw*, from kánsin *to love*, óthikin *to find* and díkhin *to see*, take pluralizing -no when and only when they refer to people, as in dansísiano(n) *(those persons) whom I love*.

Also the cardinal numbers, including fáta *how much/many*, take pluralizing -no in reference to human beings, whether they are employed substantively or as qualifying a following noun: fátano (lokóno) *how many (Arawaks)*, biámano/biánino (hiárono) *two (women)*, kabóinino (oadílino) *three (men)*, bí(b)ithino (iréino) *four (children)*; with which contrast: fáta oíoa *how many years*, bíama/bían fokoléro *two agoutis*, káboin bóde *three fishhooks*, bí(b)ithi síba *four stones*. No such distinction is found in the ordinals, which (in the absence of verbalizing suffixation) have the form of subordinate or possessed nouns such as: nakabóinthe (± -tho/-thi) *their third = the third (± feminine-neuter/masculine one) of them*, thibiánthe *her/its second/mate/partner*, libiántheoakhan (-oa *reflexive*, -khan *diminutive*) *his own little mate*. (Cf. the suffix -the or the ordinals with -the in, e.g., naiórithe *their tobacco* from ióri *tobacco*.)[3]

[3] The numeral bíithi *four*, the common reduction of bíbithi and of earlier biábíthe, which, like probably cognate Island-Carib biámburi *four*, clearly contained the word for *two;* and báthian *six*, which for some native speakers is still just a contraction of abá thimán *one crossing over* from one hand (bádakhabo *five* from abá dakhábo *one my hand*) to the other. The descriptive nature of the system may be gathered from the fact that different informants employed different, unsolicited expressions for *twelve:* bíama kotíbena *two from the foot* and bían

Another nominal suffix, -na ∼ -n, usually followed by -tho (feminine-neuter) or -thi (masculine) as gender marker, may but need not be employed with personal nouns whose subordinating prefix, noun, or nominal group is itself of plural number, as in: oáiorodántho from oáiorodátho—both meaning *our sister*, hoionátho from hóio *your-(pl.) mother* (both), nadéinthináthi from nadéinthi *their uncle* (both), thidéinthióthi thonáthobe *her uncles' daughters*. This last example is the only one I find among my data in which a subordinate noun in -na also contains a pluralizer, -be; and unfortunately, I did not ask whether -no might take the latter's place (*thonáthonon or, less likely, *thonanóthi).[4] I did try to investigate the difference between simple forms such as: oátho *our daughter*, hótho *your (pl.) daughter*, nátho *their daughter* and their alternatives in -na (oáthonátho, etc.), but had to conclude, together with my informants, that this is mainly stylistic.

What may or may not be the same morpheme occurs in the Arawaks' matrilineal clan names, such as Karoafóna *people of the K. clan* (cf. Karoafodi *man of the K. clan*,

dakhábo adiáko bían *two my hands upon two*. Numerals can only gain by losing their etymological meanings; but this is not true of some other contractions with loss of intervocalic consonant, such as áithin *to know* and -áithi *son*, from earlier ádithin and -ádithi.

[4] My negligence in this respect appears to echo that of the anonymous eighteenth-century author of the "Grammatik der Arawakischen Sprache" (in *Bibliothèque Linguistique Américaine*, vol. 8 [Paris, 1882], pp. 49–240), which I had not noticed while in the field. After listing constructions containing the nominal pluralizer -no ∼ -o and others containing the marker of plural possessor -na ∼ -n, the author comments: "Sie sollen auch sagen *wahukinatunu, huhukinatunu, nahukinatunu*" (/oaokinathono, hokinathono, naokinathono, *our, pl.-your, their younger sisters*). The uncertainty expressed by sollen (*they must* or *they should also say*) can only mean that, like myself, the writer could find no such construction among his data; and it therefore seems to me quite probable that the two suffixes in question were and are incompatible in the same word.

Karoafódo *woman of the K. clan*), and in words denoting origin or provenance such as Beribísi-khonána (-kondi, -khondo) *people (man, woman) belonging to or coming from Berbice*. But here the pluralizing function of -na is clear; whereas in the cases of lisanóthi oionátho *his children's mother* and naionátho *their mother*, it seems to be redundant.

Another pluralizer, -be, seems to have evolved as such since the eighteenth century and to be related to the stem (h)ebe: *full, ripe, old* (of age). Unlike plurals in -no, those in -be may refer to inanimate objects (ádabe *trees* from áda *tree, wood*), to animals (anoánabe *vultures* from anoána *vulture*, hasírobe *water-dogs* from hasíro *water-dog, otter*), or to people. And although hiárobo *females or women*, oadílibe *males or men*, thisábe *its young* or *her children* are ambiguous out of context, they are always distinguished in pronominal reference by, respectively, third-person singular feminine-neuter and third-person plural human, as in thóraa hiárobe *those* (lit. "*that*") *females*, but náraa hiárobe *those* ("*human*") *women*.

However, even when both refer to persons, plurals in -be are not always interchangeable with those in -no. So, for example, oadílibe amóridan lókoho *men are deceitful creatures*, but oadílino ósa kánro *the men went to bathe*. The first said by an old lady recalling the misfortunes of her youth refers to *men* in general, the second, though lacking a determinant, refers to *the men* (*of the household*). The use of independent or absolute lókoho (*kind of*) *person* should also be noticed; though here translated by a plural, it is morphologically singular.

I have found no example of pluralizing -be in qualifying adjectives (such as sa *good, well, dear*); but it is common in such words as biámbe *two* and ibírobe *little ones* where these have substantival function.

What seems to be a third nominal pluralizer, -kho, was infrequently employed by my informants; and my examples of its use suffice only to suggest that it may refer to a "set" or collectivity rather than to a plurality of persons or things: ibírokho *little ones* (in reference to twin infants and said to be "the

same as ibírobe"), téetekho and (borrowed) mámakho, both *mammas* (in reference to the speaker's own mother and mother's elder sister), dásakho (abo daosábo) (*I'm going with*—or better *I'm taking*) *my children* (said to be "the same as dasanóthi"), dánikho *my personal belongings* from dáni *my thing, mine*. But what then can we say of -kho in áithinkho *knowledge* from áithin *to know, knowing*, and iénikho *cleverness* from iénihi *song*, unless this should be a different morpheme? And compare with related Dominican Island-Carib anísiku *wit, wisdom* from ánisi *heart, mind*, by addition of the suffix -ku, which elsewhere functions as a collectivizer: nisániku *my family* (*children and grandchildren*) from nidáni *my son* or *my daughter*.

Something must be said here about subordinate or possessed nouns, which, whether morphologically marked as such or not, follow immediately upon the prefix, noun, or nominal word group to which they are subordinate, as in: dása óio *my child's mother*, dasanóthio oionátho *my children's mother*, anoána óio lan *the vulture mother's bench*. This juxtaposition has led some writers to see compounds rather than nominal word groups in constructions like hiárono lan *women's benches* and oadílino lan *men's benches*. Now lan ~ lania- is the subordinate form corresponding to independent hála *bench* (just as iórithe is the subordinate form corresponding to independent ióri *tobacco*); and as such it is subject to both inflectional and derivational affixation: dalán *my bench*, bolán *your bench*, thilaniáoakhan *her own little bench*. Independent dínthi *uncle* is replaced by subordinate dáinthi or déinthi, as in dadéinthi *my uncle*, deréitho déinthi *my wife's uncle*, etc. And in the same way, independent báhi *house* is replaced by subordinate (and suppletive) síkoa, as in thisíkoa *her house* and thidéinthi síkoa *her uncle's house*, etc.

Admittedly, all this does not prove that these and similar constructions are nominal word groups rather than compounds (only a detailed study of stress and juncture, for which I am not prepared, could do that); but unless we are ready to admit an almost

unlimited number of nominal compounds, it does make it likely. And while a kinship term like dámadokoréithi *my wife's father, my husband's father*, which seems to contain réithi *husband*, cannot be written otherwise because the meaning of its first component is obscure,[5] I see no advantage to be gained by making compounds of dínthi réitho *uncle's wife*, dáthi réitho *my father's*—or *my father's brother's*—*wife*, any more than of daoíntho réithi *my niece's husband*. On purely semantic grounds a case might be made for treating háko réithi *pestle* (háko *mortar*) as a compound, which unlike its analogous Island-Carib equivalent it is not by linguistic criteria: note IC hána *mortar* + iuéra *penis*→ áneuera *pestle*, showing loss of h-, and -a + i- → -e-.

Thirty-one of the thirty-eight different kinship terms listed by Van Renselaar and Voorhoeve[6] end in -thi or in -tho, the former designating males, the latter females; and fourteen of these differ formally and semantically by this feature alone. But as we have seen, this is not true in the case of all plurals in -no; thus daokianóthi is the plural of both daokíthi *my younger brother* and daokítho *my younger sister*, and oathonóthi *our daughters* is the plural of oátho or oathonátho *our daughter* (with *oathonáthono(n) still unattested). Moreover, -thi and -tho sometimes distinguish species rather than sex, as in kakithi(non) *human being(s)* and

kakitho(be) (*nonhuman*) *creature(s)*, both derived from the verb kákin *to live*.

Any word in -thi or -tho may be pluralized where its function is substantival, but not where this is adjectival or predicative.[7] So, thoiothínon *mature people* serves as the plural of both thóiothi *grown* (*mature*) *man* and thóiotho *grown* (*mature*) *woman* where no noun follows; but thóiothi oadíli and thóiotho híaro, with the same meanings and which include the nouns oadíli *man* and híaro *woman*, can only be pluralized as thóiothi lokóno, in which male singular thóiothi qualifies plural lokóno *people*. And similarly in the case of thóiothi dasábe *my children* (*of either sex*) *are grown up*, where thóiothi is predicative. Adjectival and predicative functions cannot always be distinguished in default of further context; thus, sátho khotón may mean *good food* or *the food was good*, sáthi thisanóthi *her dear children* or *her children are well*.[8]

<div align="right">Douglas Taylor</div>

Windward Islands, Dominica

<div align="center">A NOTE ON UTO-AZTECAN
CONSONANT GRADATION</div>

It is well known that certain Uto-Aztecan languages display a regular process of medial consonant lenition, resulting in strong/weak alternations such as p/v, t/r, etc., depending on a morphological trait of the preceding element. These alternations are largely retained as a productive synchronic process in the Numic languages, but outside this subfamily the allophonic variation has become phonemic in character, yielding voiced obstruent phonemes in various daughters. While consonant gradation has

---

[5] But ómadokoréithi *wife's or husband's father* also seems to contain the stem of dókothi *grandfather*, just as omíkithi *wife's mother* seems to contain that of akíthi *grandmother*, and both contain prefixed forms of the postposition óma *together with*. So that if -rei- of ómadokoréithi signifies *child*, as it does in iréino *children* (without a singular), and final -thi is here just a marker of male sex for the whole term, then this word becomes clear as *child's cograndfather*, omíkithi as *cograndmother*. And similarly, iréithi *husband* can be explained as *child-father* (cf. íthi *father*), and iréio *wife* (synonymous with iréitho) as *child-mother* (cf. óio *mother*).

[6] H. C. Van Renselaar and J. Voorhoeve, "Rapport over een studiereis naar Mata," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 118 (1962): 328-61.

[7] See Taylor, p. 203.

[8] Whatever may be their earlier history, the substantive (i)sa *child* and the adjective (i)sa *good, well, dear* are today different though homophonous lexemes and do not enter into the same combinations or contexts.