D. Taylor

Surinam Arawak as compared with different dialects of Island Carib

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 118 (1962), no: 3, Leiden, 362-373

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

SURINAM ARAWAK AS COMPARED WITH DIFFERENT DIALECTS OF ISLAND CARIB

Since the appearance of the first Arawak word-lists, recorded by Robert Dudley and Capt. Wyatt in the island of Trinidad on a voyage made during the years 1594—95, various Bible translations, catechisms, dictionaries and grammars of this and related languages have been written and, for the most part, published. But comparative linguistic work on members of the Arawakan family or stock (comprising more than 200 distinct languages) is still inhibited by lack of adequate transcriptions — without which, correspondences cannot be established or subgrouping carried out. Fortunately, after 365 years and despite its necessarily tentative and preliminary character, the *Rapport over een ethnologische studiereis naar Mata* by Van Renselaar and Voorhoeve seems to provide the answer to at least one question raised by comparing different dialects of Island-Carib (an Arawakan language, its name notwithstanding), one with another and with Arawak itself.

Island-Carib was first recorded toward the middle of the 17th century by Father Raymond Breton; five of whose eighteen years in the West Indies (1635—54) were spent among the Indians of Dominica (Lesser Antilles), then this island's only inhabitants. On his return to France, Breton published successively a catechism, a two-volume dictionary and a grammar of their language; which continued to be spoken in Dominica and in St. Vincent until about 1920, when it became extinct so far as the islands are concerned. But in 1797 it had been carried by some five thousand 'Black Carib' deportees from St. Vincent to Central America; where it is now spoken by thirty odd thousand of their descendants. And in 1947—48 I was able to make an ethnographic and linguistic survey of this people, which originated in the mixture of Island-Carib women with escaped Negro slaves who had taken refuge in St. Vincent.

One expects a language to change somewhat in the course of three

hundred years; but the regularity of some of the phonological changes that have taken place in that time is by no means apparent from a comparison of Breton's record with my own. Why, for example, are his *c* and *k* in "noucabo, *ma main*" and "narikiē, *je regarde*" reflected by modern /h/, while his *c* and *k* in "nócobou, *mon corps*" and "natikiē, *je pesche*" are reflected by modern /g/? And why does the *t* of his "natikiē" correspond to /d/, but that of his "nātiē, *je bois*" to /t/ of the modern Central American dialect? In default of evidence from other related languages, which the older records do not provide, one could only conclude that the apical and dorsovelar stops of early Island-Carib each split, at one time and place, into two; thus giving rise to the modern distinctions. That such a conclusion would be wrong appears, I think, from evidence provided by the present *Rapport*; and in what follows, I shall try support this opinion by comparing with Arawak (A) a few likely cognates in Goahiro (G) and, more especially, in Island-Carib (IC), of whose modern Central American dialect (C.A.) I have some first-hand knowledge.¹

An Arawak opposition of *th* ≠ *t* appears to be reflected in A *kathi* : G *kaših* : C.A. *háti* 'moon', A *dáthi* : G *taših* 'my father' and A *-dokóthi* : C.A. *áruḡuti* 'grandfather', as against A *-tíma* : G *-líma* : C.A. *-idíuma* 'beard' (this last form being a compound of *ídi* 'hair' and *-iuma* 'mouth') and A *-kotí* : G *-?uli* : C.A. *ugúdi* 'foot'. And similarly, an Arawak opposition of *kh* ≠ *k* appears to be reflected in A *-khábo* : G *-hap* : u : C.A. *úhabu* 'hand', as against A *-donká* : G *-tūka* : C.A. *arúmuga* 'sleep (v.)'. There can be no doubt concerning the C.A. oppositions of *t* ≠ *d* and *h* ≠ *g* (cf. *tíu* 'her body-hair' vs. *díu* 'snipe--sp. of bird', *-óho* 'extract, essence, starch, etc.' vs. *-ógo* 'nucleus, core, etc.'). yet such do not appear in Breton's record of the Dominican dialect, where we find: "*cāti, la lune*" and "*barbe, ítiouma*", "*oucabo, main*" and "*arónca, dormir*" (his "*tioulou, son poil*" is distinguished from "*tiou, hoche-queue, béccassine*" by a possessive suffix; but his "*eúkē*" is given the meanings of both members of my second minimal pair). Nor do these oppositions appear in the anonymous, 18th-century

¹ Goahiro phonemes (v. Nils M. Holmer, 1949) will here be written: *a e i o u ĩ m p w n t s l r c š y k ?* (glottal catch) and *h*. Nasalization of vowels is shown by a til (*ā*); vocalic and consonantal lengthening by a colon (*a :* or *m :*). Central American Island-Carib phonemes (v. Douglas Taylor, 1955) are written: *a e i* ([i], [j]) *u* ([u], [o], [w], [w̃]) *o* ([ē], [ī]) and their nonsyllabic counterparts) *m b p f n d t s r l c* ([t̃s]) *g k* and *h*. Nasalization of vowels (usually extending over vowel sequences) is shown by a til (*ā*); accentuation or stress by the acute accent (*á*).

Arawakisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch, where we find, for example: "kátti, der Mond, ein Monat" and "ittimahü, der Bart", "úekkabbu, die Hand" and "adumkin, schlafen".

Other examples showing the correspondences of A *th* : C.A. *t* and A *k* : C.A. *g* are not hard to find²; but those showing A *t* : C.A. *d* and A *kh* : C.A. *h* are scarce in this material; and there appears to be some contradictory evidence. Thus, A *-dokota* : C.A. *arúhuda* 'show (v.)' (cf. also A *-bitá* 'burn' : C.A. *ebéda* 'kindle') and A *-deká* : C.A. *ariha* 'see' (cf. also G *-tiha* 'know') are certainly cognate; but show, besides regular A *d* : C.A. *r* and A *t* : C.A. *d*, irregular A *k* : C.A. *h*, explainable only by analogic change in one language or the other (or by a faulty transcription).³

Neither modern Goahiro nor the Central American dialect of Island-Carib has more than two liquids, *r* and *l*; and Goahiro *r* apparently corresponds both to *r* and to *l* of Arawak, while Goahiro *l* corresponds to Arawak *lh* : - A *ari* : G *ari* 'tooth', A *hiaro* : G *hi* : *e* : *r* 'woman', A *bálsi* : G *pari* : 'ashes', A *-bálha* : G *-wala* 'hair'. But there is some indication that Dominican IC had — at least in the stage recorded by Breton — oppositions analogous to A *r* ≠ *l* ≠ *lh*. Thus, A *lh* seems to be represented in IC cognates by *l* or *ll* of Breton's spelling, but by *r* of the modern C.A. dialect; whereas A *l* corresponds to IC *l* and A *r* to IC *r*, both in Breton's spelling of early Dominican and in the modern C.A. dialect of Island-Carib. So, compare: Breton's "coulialla" > C.A. *guriara* : A *kóialha* 'canoe', his "imalágali" > C.A. *marága* : A *malhaká* 'shaman's rattle', his "chimála" > C.A. *gimára* 'bow' : A *simalhá* 'arrow', his "álou-" > C.A. *háru* 'white' : A *halho* 'starch', his "ioúli" > C.A. *iúri* : G *yili* 'tobacco', his "balánna" or "balaoua"

² For example: A *thē* : G *si*- (or *s*- or *š*-) : C.A. *t* 'she; her; it; its', A *-thá* : G *-sa* : C.A. *áta* 'drink', A *ethé-hē* : G *-iša* : C.A. *h-ita-o* 'blood', A *-kéthe* : C.A. *agóto* 'grandmother', A *-dike* : G *acefe* : C.A. *arigai* 'ear', A *-kanabá* : C.A. *agāba* 'hear', A *-siká* : C.A. *íciga* 'give', A *-diaká* : C.A. *ariaga* (colloquially *erēga*) 'say'.

Compare also the following C.A. words, borrowed from Karina in prehistoric times, with their models' modern forms (information kindly supplied by Berend J. Hoff). given in parentheses: *uātu* (K *waxto*) 'fire' and *átiri* (K *oxoro*) 'how much/many?', but *údu* (K *wo:to*) 'fish' and *dúna* (K *tu:na*) 'water'.

³ Seeming inconsistencies (which may, of course, be morpheme alternants), cited from both linguistic and cultural sections of the *Rapport*, include: *dakóthi* 'mijn. voet' but *-kotí* 'foot', *kolhéli* 'smoke (n.)' but *kolêdoa* 'roken', *kharemé* 'black' but *karemêro* 'zwarte patatten', and *kóiaara* 'korjaal, boot' but *kóialhaoatíkikóána* 'dissel' or, more literally, perhaps 'canoe-our-dig-instrument'.

> C.A. *barána* or *baráua* : G *pala* : 'sea'; and, on the other hand: Breton's and C.A. *lála* : A *lalan* 'his seat (bench, chair, stool)', his "láboulougou" and C.A. *lábulugu* : A *labuluku* 'the top of his head', his "balissi" > C.A. *baligi* : A *bálisi* 'ashes', his and C.A. *ári* : A *ari* 'tooth', his and C.A. *íri* : A *iri* 'name', his "inharou" > C.A. *hiáru* : A *hiaro* 'woman', his "ápara" > C.A. *áfara* : A *-fára-* 'kill'.⁴

Breton's *p* or *pf* (cf. his "poupouli ou pfoupfouli", etc.) — like *p* of the Arawak *Wörterbuch*, to which it corresponds — was clearly an aspirated labial stop in opposition to his *b* (cf. "apoúcatcha, *pondre*" vs. "aboúcatcha, *chasser*"), which was unaspirated and usually though not distinctively voiced, as is evident from occasional confusion (cf. "píani, *ta femme*" and "biráiti, *ton mari*", both beginning with the unaspirated labial stop, which here forms the prefix marking 2nd person singular). In Vincentian Island-Carib and its Central American offshoot, the aspirated labial stop passed, as in Arawak, to *f*; and there is evidence that the Central American dialect of about a hundred years ago had only one labial and one dorsovelar stop, both of which were usually but non-distinctively voiced until — doubtless under the influence of bilingualism and borrowing — voicing at last became distinctive and two new oppositions were acquired, *p* ≠ *b* and *k* ≠ *g*.

It is strange that the only aspirated consonants to be recognized as such by Breton were *h* and *nh* (cf. his: "nácou, mes yeux; bácou, tes yeux; lácou, ses yeux (à lui); tácou, ses yeux (à elle); ouácou, nos yeux; hácou, vos yeux; nhácou, leurs yeux"), both attested also for recent Dominican, but merged — together with earlier *kh* — as *h* of the Central American dialect (the Vincentian data give no indication as to what corresponded in that dialect to Dominican *nh*). It would be still stranger for a language to have such oppositions as *ph* ≠ *p* and *nh* ≠ *n*, but only one apical and one dorsovelar stop (in medial positions, Breton wrote both *c* or *k* and *g*; but it is clear that these symbols represent voiceless and voiced variants of either dorsovelar stop: cf. "inoúcouira" as well as "inoúgoura" > C.A. *inúgura* 'yonder she goes', and "áglica" > C.A. *áhoroha* 'to grate'). And now, thanks largely to the present *Rapport*, a comparison of cognates in Arawak and the different Island-Carib dialects allows us to posit, with a reasonable degree of confidence, three additional oppositions for the dialect de-

⁴ It is clear (from evidence which need not be cited here) that Breton's intervocalic *-nh-*, as in his *inharou* 'woman', indicates nasalization of the preceding vowel, and nothing else. It should not be confused with the aspirated nasal *nh-*, as in his *nhácou* 'their eyes'.

scribed by Breton: *th* ≠ *t*, *kh* ≠ *k* and *lh* ≠ *l*.

It has been the purpose of this note to show that any research carried out by qualified persons, even as a side line to their main investigation, may yield results that are valuable to those working in allied fields; so this is not the place to discuss all the problems of Island-Carib phonology. But before I can make clear what I now conceive to have been the evolution of the Island-Carib consonantal system and its relationship to that of modern Arawak, I must mention a couple of developments that have nothing to do with sound change in the ordinary meaning of that term. Dominican Island-Carib had only one sibilant, /s/, that was usually hissing in the recent stage of that dialect, but more often hushing in Breton's day. In his own words: "La consonnante *s* se prononce quelquefois comme le sygma des Grecs ou le ç François, qui a une virgule sous soy, comme *sanyánti*, je ne puis, mais plus souvent comme *ch*, *chanyánti*". But in recent Vincentian and its Central American offshoot, we find both hissing /s/ and a hushing affricate, /c/ ([tʃ]; but often reduced to [ʃ] when immediately preceded by an accented vowel). So, Breton's *ch* in "chába nitibouri, *tond, rase-moy*" (nitibouri 'my hair') corresponds to /s/ of the Central American dialect; whereas his *ch* in "chába noucounni, *estoupe les fentes de mon canot, ... calfate-le*" (noucounni 'my canoe') corresponds to its /c/.

Moreover, in Central America (though not in St. Vincent), *c^h* ^e was largely but not entirely replaced some hundred years ago by *g^h* ^e or by *c^u* ^o; so that we now find C.A. *ígira* (< *ícira*) 'leave (v.)', *íciga* 'give', *sísira* 'shaman's rattle', *anígi* (< *anící*) 'heart; mind', *anícugu* (< *anícigu*) 'wisdom', *sígai* 'porpoise', *ígiri* (< *íciri*) 'nose', *igíbu* (< *icíbu*) 'face' and *núguci(li)* 'my father', corresponding to Dominican *ísira*, *ísika*, *sísira*, *anísí*, *anísiku*, *síkai*, *ísiri*, *isíbu* and *núkusi*.

It is probably impossible at the present time to reconstruct the process which led — presumably before the deportation of 1797 — to the splitting of earlier /s/. But there is evidence that the partial replacement of *c^h* ^e was still in a state of flux as recently as 1872, when, for example, *-giba-* was recorded for what is now *-ciba-* 'wash (clothes)'; and this suggests that the replacements resulted from a sort of 'hyper-correction'. If palatalization of *g* before *i* or *e* led to its confusion with *c* in these positions, many anomalous morpheme alternants must have been acquired: the attributive prefix *g(a)-*, as in *gála-* 'having contents' (cf. *mála-* 'empty'), would have occurred as **c-* in **cibe* = *gibe-* 'much/many' (cf. *mibe-* 'little/few'), and such a verb as *áiga* 'eat' would

have given **áicini* = *áigini* 'eating'. On the other hand, the widespread replacement of *c^{i, e}* by *g^{i, e}*, which I believe to have begun as analogical regularization, has led to extremely few such anomalies (*anicugu* 'wisdom', containing a variant of *anigi* 'heart; mind', is exceptional in this respect).

The consonantal patterns and correspondences of the three Island-Carib dialects and of modern Surinam Arawak may, then, be tentatively shown as follows (aspirated consonants are written as digraphs, *Ch*; others are shown by symbols representing their commonest allophones):

Dominican IC. Vincentian IC. Cent. Am. IC. Surinam Arawak

m	n	—	m	n	—	m	n	—	m	n	—
	nh			— (?)							
b			b	d	g	b	d	— g	b	d	—
	t	k			c		p	t c k	p	t	k
ph	th	kh	—	th	kh				—	th	kh
—	s	h	f	s	h	f	s	h	f	s	h
	r, l			r, l			r, l			r, l	
	lh									lh	

Dom.	m	b	b	ph	n	nh	t	th	r	r	lh	l	s	s	s	k	k	kh	h
Vin.	m	b	b	f	n	—	d	th	r	r	r	l	s	c	c	g	g	kh	h
C.A.	m	b	p	f	n	h	d	t	r	r	r	l	s	c	g	g	k	h	h
Ara.	m	b	p	f	n	n	t	th	d	r	lh	l	s	s	s	k	k	kh	h

II

In the final paragraph of this *Rapport*, its authors wisely renounce any attempt to give a linguistic interpretation of the Arawak kinship terms without a better understanding of the language's morpho-phonematic structure than we yet have. But "fools rush in where angels fear to tread"; and in what follows, I shall venture some preliminary remarks and suggestions concerning possible analyses of several terms.

Seventeen of them end in *-thi*, and have male referents; fourteen end in *-to*, and have female referents; and of these thirty-one terms, eight in *-thi* have otherwise identical counterparts in *-to*. Very few of the

terms appear to be elementary; but we are prevented from concluding that *-thi* and *-to* are always suffixal by such a pair as *dáthi* 'my Fa, FaBr' and *dáto* 'my Da, BrDa, WiBrDa, HuBrDa, HuSiDa'. Of the remaining eight terms in this list, five refer to females (*dâio*, *dátio*, *dakêthê*, *damêkêthê* and *dakêrê*), and three to members of either sex: *daséro* 'my child's spouse's parent', *iôio* and *bêbe* 'elder sibling (particularly but not exclusively of opposite sex)'.

But though most of the terms seem to have 'motivated', complex or compound stems, their analysis — with a couple of exceptions — offers considerable difficulty; partly because, perhaps, we are so used to identify reference with meaning. Thus, while we are quite ready to recognize *dathirêto* 'my FaBrWi' (101 & 103) and *dinthirêto* 'my MoBrWi' (109 & 111) as compounds of, respectively, *dáthi* 'my Fa, FaBr' and *dínthi* 'my MoBr' with *-rêto* 'wife', we are baffled by the seeming incompatibility of the referents that we should like to recognize in *damadokorêthi* 'my WiFa' (77) or 'my HuFa' (81): *-dokóthi* 'grandfather' or *-rêthi* 'husband', or both, together with an unidentified element *-m-* or *-ma-* (cf. *-ma* 'with', which, like Latin *con-*, is sometimes completive).

This difficulty is lessened (though not removed) if we analyse *-dokóthi* into *-doko-* 'show, teach' (as in *adokota* 'to show') and *-thi* 'father', *-rêthi* into *-rê-* 'child' (as in *irêno* 'children', with nominal pluralizer *-no*. Cf. also Island-Carib *iráithi* 'husband', *iráho* 'child') and *-thi* 'father'; being careful to remember that such glosses are but tentative approximations. Should this be correct, Arawak *dadokóthi* would then mean something like 'my-show-father' (taking Eng. *show* in the sense of Dut. *wijzen*), *derêthi* 'my-child-father' and *damadokorêthi* — if we ignore the obscure element *-m(a)* — 'my-show-child-father'.

Arawak *dakêrê* 'my HuMo' (83) and Island-Carib *nágoro* (C.A. *nágoro*) 'my SoWi' are almost certainly cognate, except for the prefixes (the only personal affixes for which Arawak and Island-Carib do not have cognate equivalents are those of 1st singular). Both stems appear to be identical with those of respectively Arawak and Island-Carib verbs for 'to bind'; so that the kinship terms' meaning, as distinct from their reference, seems to be something like 'my ally' in both languages.

It is most likely that the stem of Arawak *daorítêthi* 'my (man speaking) DaHu' (78) contains that of *dathithi* (or *datithi*?) 'my (woman speaking) DaHu' (80), and that both have a morpheme in common with *dátio* 'my SoWi' (82 & 84); these last two terms being differentiated by final *-thi* (cf. 1) and *-io* (cf. 5) respectively. Almost certainly cognate

with the foregoing are Island-Carib *itithi* '(woman's) Da Hu' and *itĩũ* 'HuMo' or '(woman's) DaHu'. Of *itĩũ* ("itignon") Breton says: "la bru appelle ainsi sa belle-mère, & la belle-mère son gendre"; and elsewhere he tells us that a woman called her HuMo and HuFa alike *netĩũ* ("néteignon") 'my progenitor'. Whether IC *iti-* and *ete-* are or are not variants of the same morpheme, it seems clear that neither *(n)itĩũ* nor *(n)etĩũ* specifies the sex of the referent; and both appear to have a bound morpheme in common with IC *niráníũ* 'my (man sp.) BrWi' or 'my (woman sp.) SiHu', which probably may be analysed as meaning 'my child's parent'. Moreover, while Arawak *dãio* and *dátio* refer only to females, the plural *daionothi* refers to 'my parents'; and in the *Arawakisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. "*úju*, Mutter", we find: "*beju uju*, ein grosser Hirsch; *hime uju*, ein sehr grosser Fisch" and "*újuhu*, die Vielheite". If this last word (cf. *iohón* 'many' in the present *Rapport's* word-list) is related to the kinship term, the latter's meaning may well be close to that of 'multiplier' or, as Breton glosses IC *etĩũ*, 'progéniteur'.

Arawak *datéboathi* 'my FaSiHu' (105 & 107) or 'my MoSiHu' (113 & 115), *daiaboáto* 'my MoSi' (31 & 33) and *dasáboato* 'my (woman sp.) SiDa' (34) appear to contain, as first elements of their stems, allomorphs of *-thi* 'Fa, FaBr', *-io* 'Mo, FaSi' and *-sa* 'child' respectively, combined with a morpheme that we may write *-Aboa-*: *A* being manifested as replacement of a preceding /i/ by /e/, or of a preceding /o/ by /a/. Cf. also (from other records): *daitheboathi* 'my step-son' and *databoato* 'my step-daughter', which presumably contain *dáithi* 'my son, etc.' and *dáto* 'my daughter, etc.'. There seems to be some instability in these terms' reference; for the first of those cited above has been glossed elsewhere as 'my step-father' or 'my FaBr', the second as 'my step-mother', 'my FaSi' or 'my uncle's wife'. But assuming that there is or was some justification for the gloss 'step-' (that *datéboathi* referred to a man who was or might one day be married to my mother, *daiaboáto* to a woman who was or might one day be married to my father), the present terminological distinction between MoSi and FaSi may well reflect a former prevalence of the sororate and/or of sororal polygyny.

The terms *dínthi* 'my MoBr' (27 & 29) and *da(w)ônthi*, *-to* 'my (man sp.) SiSo' (28), 'my (man sp.) SiDa' (30) have an *air de famille* which appears more strongly in their earlier forms, as recorded in the *A.-D. Wörterbuch*: *(d)adaúnti*, and *däuhinti*, *-tu*. And in the same place we find "*ueintu*, Schwester (einer Mannsperson): *daiuntu*, *biuntu*,

plural *üinati*" and "*addaüina*, ein Stumpfen"; this last form being a compound of *áda* 'tree, wood' with "*uéinna*" (= /oina/?) 'stem, proximal end', and, I would suggest, the original shape of the stem of *dínthi* 'my MoBr' or 'my stock-father'. If I should be right, these terms for MoBr, a man's Si, SiDa and SiSo provide linguistic confirmation of matrilineal descent.

Admittedly, none of the above attempts at analysis throws any light on the former marriage pattern of the Arawak; and the present absence of terminological discrimination between parallel and cross-cousins (both classed together with siblings) seems to be incompatible with the practice of any form of cross-cousin marriage. However, as Fred Eggan has recently remarked (*Current Anthropology* for February 1962, p. 98): "kinship terminologies are quite sensitive indicators of social and cultural change... But by that very fact there are not likely to be many survivals to indicate the earlier types". Nevertheless, indications that the kinship terminology of Arawak has changed somewhat in historical times are not lacking. Such are, for example: the apparent instability of reference mentioned above, contractions like *dínthi* and *dáithi* from earlier *dadaointhi* and *dádithi* which presumably have destroyed any 'motivation' these terms may once have had, and simplifications extending a term's reference as in the case of *dáithi* 'my HuSiSo' (110) for earlier *daithikithi* (Walter Roth, *An Introductory Study of the Arts, Crafts and Customs of the Guiana Indians*, section 878). In the same place Roth tells us that a man called his MoBrWi *daiohoto*, a term which apparently has been replaced by *dinthirêto* (109 & 111). According to Nancy P. Hickerson (in *IJAL* 19: 3, p. 182), *daoribithi* (93, 94, 96 & 97) and *daoribiato* (95, 98, 99 & 100), now referring to 'my (man or woman sp.) SiHu, WiBr or HuBr' and to 'my (man or woman sp.) BrWi, WiSi or HuSi' respectively, were restricted to the relationships between siblings-in-law of the same sex; the stems *-ronai-* and *-ranomal-* being employed by men and women respectively with reference to siblings-in-law of the opposite sex. It may be that this last is a case of different usage rather than of change (cf. Dutch *zwager*, *zwagerin* vs. *schoonbroeder*, *schoonzuster*); but it should be noted that the only other terms in this list which contain *-ori-* (78 & 119—22) refer to relationships between people of like sex (a man's DaHu, WiSiHu and HuBrWi).

According to Roth, the Arawak had earlier and closer relations with the Europeans than any other Guianese tribe; and it is understandable if abandonment of cross-cousin marriage was followed by disuse and

loss of the terms designating marriageable cross-cousins. On the other hand, the multiplicity of Arawak terms recorded and glossed as 'brother' and 'sister' (not all of which are listed in the present *Rapport*) suggests that one or more of them may once have been restricted in reference to marriageable cross-cousins; so, perhaps, C. H. de Goeje's *dayéna* 'my sister', which he qualifies as "rather archaic" (*The Arawak Language of Guiana*, p. 196; Amsterdam, 1928), may have referred to 'my MoBrDa'.

A somewhat similar case is that of the Island-Carib; among whom, though line of descent is unattested, patrilineal cross-cousin marriage, with matrilocal residence except as regards their chiefs, was clearly favoured. So, according to Raymond Breton (*Dictionnaire caraïbe-français*, p. 268):

"Si tost qu'une fille est née, elle est destinée pour un cousin maternel, lors qu'ils ont tous deux l'âge & que le temps destiné est échu, le garçon va au lieu où demeure sa femme pretendue (apres néanmoins que les parens y ont consenty) & si la fille va trouver son mary capitaine, ou fils de capitaine (comme il arrive quelque-fois)..."

Yet even here, terms for only some of the cross-cousin relationships are given; and these are no longer in use as such. So Breton (loc. cit., p. 11):

"Les cousins germains que nous appellons fils des freres du Pere, se nomment freres, & ces freres du Pere sont aussi appelez Peres; & les enfans de ses freres ne contractent point d'alliance par ensemble, mais bien avec les enfans des soeurs de leurs Peres, que s'il ny avoit point de filles, ils s'appelleroient, *Iapátaganum*.

Nigaton, c'est ainsi que les cousines appellent leurs cousins maternels lors que leurs soeurs ne se marient pas avec eux: & les cousins en tel cas les appellent *nionelle átonum*.

Ceux cy en cas qu'ils se doivent prendre en mariage, les appellent *Niouélieri*: & celles la eux, *Nikéliiri*." ⁵

⁵ Note that these two terms referred to "la promise de mon frère" and to "le promis de ma soeur" respectively; the betrothed themselves referring to one another as "*niánicani*, ma fiancée" and "*niráiticaní*, mon fiancé", which are derivatives of *niani* 'my Wi' and *niráithi* 'my Hu'. With this derivative suffix compare that of Breton's *niráheucayem* 'my spouse's child (by another marriage)' from *niráheu* 'my child (So or Da)'. In the modern C.A. dialect of IC, *niráohāiā* (from *niráo* 'my child') may have the same meaning, or it may be used, optionally, to distinguish BrCh (in the case of men) or SiCh (in that of women) from own offspring. Similarly, this suffix, *-hāiā* < *-khāiā*, is occasionally though rarely employed to distinguish FaBr from Fa, *núguci* (*hāiā*), MoSi from Mo, *núgucu* (*hāiā*), etc. Yet the only unambiguous way of asking 'who is your mother (genetrix)?' is to employ *ágai* (Breton's *ákay*) 'container', and say: *ka bágaiā*?

No terms are given for the relationships between FaSiSo and MoBrDa, or between FaSiDa and MoBrDa; and it is not altogether certain that "iapátaganum" was employed reciprocally, since it appears to contain a contraction of the term for FaSi in composition with that for So (in relation to the mother only).

At the present time, among the Black Caribs of Central America (descendants of deportees from St. Vincent), parallel cousins are still classed together with siblings, paternal uncles and maternal aunts together with parents. But while the terms for MoBr and FaSi are extremely common, being also employed to address even complete strangers of the appropriate generation with regard to the speaker, terms for the cross-cousin relationships are no longer current, and are now hardly known to the younger generation. More usually, today, young men of the same age-group will address one another by name, by nickname, or as *bra* (possibly borrowed from Miskito), irrespective of any known kinship; while they will address young women as *nítu* 'my Si', and be addressed by them as *náti* 'my Br', terms which show a slightly greater degree of formality.

However, I was told that (*n*)*ibámu*, usually referring to '(my) SiHu, man sp.' or to '(my) WiBr', might also be employed for the relationships between male cross-cousins, *gūiá* (Sp. *cuñada*) and *gūiáu* (Sp. *cuñado*) for those between male and female cross-cousins. And older informants recalled that the latter, borrowed terms had replaced earlier (and now obsolete) *niuóririri* (cf. Breton's *niouélleri*) and *nógoriri* (cf. Breton's *nikêliri*) respectively.

The term *nígate* (Breton's *nígateou*) is still in common use; but now refers to 'my (woman sp.) BrWi' or to 'my HuSi' — relationships for which Breton gave no term. Unless and until the origin and significance of *-igate* can be found, this change of reference remains inexplicable.

DOUGLAS C. TAYLOR

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. Arawakisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch.
Grammatik der Arawakischen Sprache. Both in Tome VIII of the Bibliothèque linguistique américaine; pp. 69-165 and 166-240. Paris, 1882.
- Breton, Raymond. Dictionnaire carraïbe-françois (Auxerre, 1665). Dictionnaire françois-caraiïbe (Auxerre, 1666). Editions fac-simile Jules Platzmann. Leipzig, 1892 and 1900.
Grammaire caraiïbe (Auxerre, 1667). Nouvelle édition L. Adam & Ch. Leclerc. Paris, 1877.
- Holmer, Nils M. Goajiro (Arawak) I: Phonology, II: Nouns and associated morphemes, III: Verbs and associated morphemes, IV: Texts. International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. 15 (1949), pp. 45-56, 110-20, 145-57 and 232-35.
- Taylor, Douglas. Phonemes of the Hopkins (British Honduras) dialect of Island-Carib. Island-Carib II, III & IV. Both in International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. 21 (1955), pp. 45-56, Vol. 22, pp. 1-44 and 138-50, Vol. 24, pp. 36-60.
The Black Carib of British Honduras. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 17. New York, 1951.