Professor Antonio Tovar, an able Spanish linguist of Salamanca who is well known for his studies of Iberian languages, has now turned his attention to Guaraní. Another study was published in 1950 (Ensayo de Caracterización de la Lengua Guaraní. Mendoza: Annales del Instituto de Lingüística 4. 114-126) and he is now preparing a scientific grammar of Guaraní. It is good for South America, where there are so few well prepared linguists, that a scholar of Tovar’s ability applies his knowledge of general linguistics and Indo-European languages to the study of American Indian idioms.

In the article under review Tovar discusses some semantic phenomena and suggests some etymologies. He deals mainly with modern Guaraní (examples collected from Munia-gurria’s El Guaraní, Buenos Aires, 1947, and Guasch’s El Idioma Guarani, Buenos Aires, 1948), but he frequently refers to Old Guaraní (quoting Montoya’s works, first published in 1639) in order to clarify the modern forms. In this review my only aim is to comment on the examples and analyses presented by Tovar, and to show that a comparison not only with Old Guaraní but also with Old Tupí is often necessary to explain modern Guaraní forms.

Analyzing modern Guaraní piápé finger nail and pisápé toe nail (p. 43), Tovar concludes pi means not only foot but also hand. In this case he did not consult Old Guaraní, which has pwapé, finger nail and pisápé toe nail (Old

1. I use Tovar’s notation of phonemes instead of that customarily used in IJAL.
Tupí poapé ~ pwapé and pisapé) and OG pwá finger and pisá toe (OT poá ~ pwá and pisá). poá ~ pwá is evidently related to pó hand, and pisá to pí foot. Modern Guaraní piapé finger nail is certainly the result of an analogical influence of pisapé on OG pwapé. This analogical influence was made easier by the phonetic change undergone by pwá finger, which in both OG and MG became kwá (pw > kw is a normal shift in Guaraní: pweráb > kwerá to get well, to heal, pwán > kwá to pass, to run, apwá > akwá upper lip, etc.) and lost its resemblance to pwapé finger nail.

From comparison of OG and OT pwapé finger nail, pisapé toe nail with pwá finger and pisá toe, respectively, we may isolate a morpheme pé nail, which is not to be confused, as Tovar does, with Guaraní pé angled. The difference between these two morphemes is very clear in OT: nail is pé as seen in the forms cited above, while angled is pém (nominal aspect péma; cf OT itápéma = OG itápé angled stone). The loss of the last consonant and the nasalization of the preceding vowel caused Guaraní pém angled to fall together with pé nail.

tuyuyú stork is analyzed (p. 44) as a compound of tuyú clay and yú coming. Here is another case of convergence determined by phonetic change, which is cleared up by Old Tupí. OT clay is tuyúk and coming is yúr ~ úr (final consonants are normally lost in MG). A compound of these stems in OT would be *tuyúkúra, but no such compound of a subject and intransitive verb occurs in this language. On the other hand, stork in OT is tuyuyú as in Guaraní, and it is certainly unrelated to either tuyúk or yúr ~ úr.

Tovar considers aykó I am (p. 45) as the verbalization of the demonstrative kó this, to be translated as (I-it-[am]) this, and similarly considers aimé I am to be based on an alternant of the morpheme pe in. In regard to the second verb, cp. OT ain I am sitting + -bé, intensive = aimbé ~ aimé I am sitting, I am, I exist, and aykó I am + -bé, intensive = aykóbé I am, I live; aimé has no relation with the locative morpheme -pe ~ -me (called a ‘preposition’ by Tovar). The first verb, aykó I am, is simply the stem ikó ~ ekó to be preceded by the first person morheme a-.

mbohapí three is presented (p.46) as a causative of (a)hapí to burn. This lacks semantic evidence. Morphology also shows that it is not correct. Indeed the causative morpheme mbo- ~ mo- is not prefixed to a transitive verb such as (a)hapí (stem apí) but only to intransitive verbs. Comparison with OT also shows that mbohapí has nothing to do with (a)hapí. Three in OT in mosapír, corresponding to OG mbohapír; mo- (OG mo- ~ mbo-) is a prefix occurring in all OT numerals: moyepé (OG moñepé) one, (mokóy) (OG mokóy two, mosapír (OG mbohapír) three, moñerundík four. It is clear, therefore, that the stem of mosapír three is sapír (which is not found isolated) while to burn in OT is expressed by the stem apí (1st sing. asapí = OG, MG ahpí). Baptista
Caetano² has explained OG mbohapír *three* as a causative of apír *point*; this etymology is also unacceptable, for it does not justify the phoneme -h- (OT -s-); the causative of apír is mboapír *to begin* (Montoya, Tesoro 51v).

*gwasú deer* is identified (Tovar, p. 48) with gwasú *large*, but OT sīgwasú *deer* seems to indicate that the Guaraní word for *deer* may be the result of an apheresis. In Old Tupí, as in Guaraní, gwasú *large* is not properly an adjective as Tovar supposes, but an alterant of the augmentative suffix occurring after stems ending in vowels.

Tovar considers (p.49) *(t)aʔḯ (his) son* and *(t)ayʔḯ (mistakenly written (t)ai̯ḯ) (his) daughter* as metaphors derived from taʔḯy (mistakenly written taʔḯy) *seed, testicle*. There is here a metaphor, but it is not the one meant by Tovar. The Old Tupí forms taʔḯra (stem aḯr) *his son*, tayḯra (stem ayḯr) *his daughter*, and taʔña (stem aḯy) *seed, grain, testicle* clearly show that the stem of the third word cannot be confused with the stems of the other two. The metaphor I have noted is evidenced by OT taʔḯra, MG taʔḯ *his semen* = *his son*. The meaning *testicle* added to the stem aḯy (nominal aspect taʔña) *seed, grain* is due to the compound apyá-aḯy (nominal aspect tapyá-aḯña) *testicle grains*.

The examples examined above show that Old Tupí forms frequently elucidate those of Guaraní, particularly because Old Tupí is in many instances phonemically more archaic than Guaraní. Notwithstanding the criticisms made here, Tovar’s article is a very interesting contribution to the study of Guaraní etymology and semantics, and contains many good interpretations of Guaraní forms and meanings.
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