



On Pataxó and Hähähäi

Author(s): Greg Urban

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Oct., 1985), pp. 605-608

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1265361>

Accessed: 18/07/2010 22:44

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

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*.

ON PATAXÓ AND HĀHĀHĀI

Based on now permanently fragmentary data, it is nevertheless possible to isolate certain sound correspondences between the eastern Brazilian Pataxó language and its Hāhāhāi dialect. Simultaneously, these correspondences can be shown to have a bearing on the relationship of Maxakalí to Hāhāhāi (Meader 1978:8), and hence on the position of Pataxó and Maxakalí within Macro-Jê (Davis 1968; Hamp 1969).

Pataxó is known only through eighty-nine words (Wied-Neuwied 1958:510–11; cf. Loukotka 1939) collected by Prince Maximilian of Wied-Neuwied during his 1815–1817 journey up the east coast of Brazil. Wied-Neuwied probably obtained his data from inhabitants of the Rio Prado, whom he encountered in the course of his peregrinations (Wied-Neuwied 1958:214–16). These Pataxó formed part of a southern group, the dialect of which ranged some 225 kilometers from the southernmost tip of Bahia to the Rio da Santa Cruz in the north. This group was separated by a 100 kilometer stretch, then occupied by speakers of Botocudo, from the northern or Hāhāhāi dialect. It is the relationship between these two dialects that is the subject of this note.

Southern Pataxó is in all likelihood now extinct, and Hāhāhāi is virtually so. The latter dialect is known to us through (1) the unpublished 70-word list left by Colonel Antônio Medeiros de Azevedo,¹ who elicited them in 1936 from residents of P. I. Paraguaçu near the town of Itaju do Colônia, (2) a 162-word list collected in the same area in 1961 by Wilbur Pickering of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (in Meader 1978:45–50), and (3) a set of some 100 words, taped by Aracy Lopez da Silva and Urban in 1982, that were elicited from one who is purported to be the last remaining speaker of Hāhāhāi, also living at P. I. Paraguaçu.²

Of the available words, only thirty-five overlap between Pataxó proper and Hāhāhāi, and of these only twenty-six are suitable for comparison, with twenty-one appearing as probable cognates. I have endeavored to standardize the orthographies, especially in relation to the Wied-Neuwied and Azevedo lists.³ These data are given in table 1.

The vowels show no significant activity, with *P a, i, o,* and *ə* corresponding to *H a* or *ʌ, i, o,* or *u,* and *ə* or *ʌ* with minor exceptions. *e* and *ɛ* exhibit no

¹ This list was provided to me by Dr. Maria Hilda Baqueiro Paraiso, who originally invited Dr. Lopez da Silva and me to work on Hāhāhāi, and who provided us with invaluable assistance in the research.

² In addition to the sources mentioned, there is a list of forty words collected by the ethnographer Curt Nimuendajú, which was subsequently published in Loukotka (1963:32–33).

³ In the case of the Wied-Neuwied list, this involved replacing *tsch* by *č*, *y* by *i* or *ə*, *c* by *k*, and *ü* by *ə*. In the Azevedo orthography, which seems to be based on Rio de Janeiro Portuguese or some similar dialect, initial *r* and intervocalic *rr* are replaced by *h*, *t* before front vowels by *č*, *c* by *k*, *quê* by *kei*, *qui* by *ki*, and final *am* or *im* by *ã* or *ĩ*. In the Pickering list, little has been changed except for the substitution of *č* for *tš* and *γ* for *g*.

TABLE I
PROBABLE COGNATE FORMS

	Wied-Neuwied 1815-1816	Azevedo 1936	Pickering 1961	Urban 1982
1 'arrow'	<i>pohoi</i>	<i>po'hoi</i>	<i>'bohoi b'ʔo'hoi</i>	<i>po'hoi</i>
2 'ax'	<i>kaxə</i>		<i>ʌʔʌ</i>	
3 'bed'	<i>mip(čap)</i>	<i>mi'(nā)</i>	<i>'mim(nʌ)</i>	
4 'bow'	<i>poitaŋ</i>	<i>po'kei</i>	<i>b'ʔo'k'ʔi</i>	
5 'blood'	<i>enghem</i>		<i>ʔheb</i>	
6 'canoe'	<i>mibkoi</i>		<i>'Mmimp'ʔoi</i>	
7 'corn'	<i>pasčon</i>	<i>bahu'čau</i>	<i>b'ʔahobčab</i>	
8 'die'	<i>(nok)čon</i>		<i>ʌčʉ(kú)</i>	
9 'earth'	<i>aham</i>	<i>ha'm(iko)</i>	<i>'hahām</i>	
10 'eye'	<i>aŋgwa</i>	<i>a'wa</i>		<i>a'wa</i>
11 'fish'	<i>maham</i>	<i>ma'hāmi</i>		<i>mā'hām</i>
12 'head'	<i>atpatoi</i>	<i>amako'(hai)</i>	<i>ʌmbʌ'koi</i>	<i>ām̄bʌ'ko(hai)</i>
13 'knife'	<i>amanai</i>		<i>ʔmāgʔi</i>	<i>hām̄ā'ŋgāi</i>
14 'liver'	<i>aktiopkanai</i>		<i>č'ʌmʌŋgāi</i>	<i>čamʌŋgai</i>
15 'manioc'	<i>kohom</i>	<i>ohei</i>	<i>u'hūi</i>	<i>u'hui</i>
16 'mother'	<i>atən</i>	<i>akei</i>	<i>čŋk'ʔai</i>	<i>e'kai</i>
17 'neck'	<i>mai</i>		<i>(ʔ'č'i)pai</i>	<i>(ač'i)pāi</i>
18 'paca'	<i>čapa</i>		<i>'tapa</i>	
19 'sister'	<i>ehe</i>	<i>apu^a</i>	<i>āhūi^a</i>	
20 'tapir'	<i>amaxə</i>	<i>hamahei</i>	<i>hʌmʌhʔi</i>	<i>hām̄hāi</i>
21 'thigh'	<i>ča(kepke)ton</i>	<i>a'čeko</i>		<i>a'čeko</i>

^aMeans 'brother'.

detectable patterning. Of the consonants, P *h* and *w* correspond to H *h* and *w*, while P *x* occurs as H *h* or *ɣ*. The major activity occurs in the consonants, and this may be displayed as in table 2.

The interesting regularities concern the alveolar and velar consonants. Alveolar stops and nasals in Pataxó become velar stops and nasals in Hāhāhāi, and the velar stops and nasals in Pataxó disappear in Hāhāhāi. These regularities enable us to account, for example, for the *atpatoi* : *ʌmbʌ'koi* relationship, in which, indeed, it is possible that the initial *t* first became *k* and then disappeared. It should be noted also that the alveolar nasal in final position disappears. We may wonder whether this happens correspondingly with the oral stop. Alas, however, the data are insufficiently rich.

What is especially intriguing is that the relationship of Pataxó to Hāhāhāi corresponds to that of Maxakalí to Hāhāhāi. Popovich (in Meader 1978:9), comparing Pickering's Hāhāhāi data with his Maxakalí material, concludes that the Maxakalí-Pataxó correspondences include *t* : *k* and *p* : *b*, which are identical to the Pataxó-Hāhāhāi correspondences revealed above. Of course, the Pataxó

TABLE 2
CONSONANT CORRESPONDENCES

Pataxó	Hãhãhãi	
<i>p</i>	<i>p</i> or <i>b</i>	1, 4, 7, 10, 15, 16
	<i>m</i>	3, 14? (final position)
<i>t</i>	<i>k</i>	4, 12, 16, 21?
<i>č</i>	<i>č</i>	7, 8?, 21?
	<i>t</i>	18
<i>k</i>	∅	2, 6, 8?, 14, 15, 21?
<i>m</i>	<i>m</i>	3, 6, 9, 11, 13, 20
	<i>p</i>	17
	<i>b</i>	5
	∅	15
<i>n</i>	<i>ŋg</i>	13, 14
	∅	7?, 8?, 16, 21? (final position)
<i>ŋg</i>	∅	4, 5, 10

data are from an earlier period, 1815–1817, so that actual chronology reinforces what we know must have been the direction of historical change.

Within the broader spectrum of Macro-Jê, Hamp (1969) has sought parallels in the development of Karajá and Maxakalí from Proto-Jê. Some of these are to be found within the more recent history of the Maxakalian group itself. In particular, Hamp shows that Proto-Jê velar stops and nasals are lost in Karajá. This is something that, as we have seen, occurs as well in the development of the Northern Pataxó or Hãhãhãi dialect. Similarly, Proto-Jê *c* is stably reflected as *c* in Maxakalí and as *č* in Karajá, a stability that is found as well in the relationship between Pataxó and its innovating Hãhãhãi dialect. Furthermore, Karajá has shown instability in the alveolar region, replacing PJê *t* and *n* in all cases. A similar instability is found in Hãhãhãi, where, however, the alveolars have gone to velars, a development for which there is no evidence in Karajá.

It is to be lamented that no further data are forthcoming on Pataxó and Hãhãhãi, whose alveolars and velars have had such a stormy history. Nevertheless, we can take some solace in the confirmation that this analysis of fragmentary data receives on two planes. On the plane of internal evidence, the stops and nasals undergo parallel processes in relation to both the alveolar to velar transformation and the loss of velars. On the broad, sweeping plane of comparative evidence, we have the repetition of turbulence in alveolars and velars in the differentiation of Karajá from Proto-Jê. Regrettably, when it comes to many of

the eastern Brazilian languages, this is the only kind of confirmation for which we can hope.

GREG URBAN, *University of Texas, Austin*

REFERENCES

- DAVIS, IRVINE. 1968. Some Macro-Jê relationships. *IJAL* 34:42–47.
- HAMP, ERIC P. 1969. On Maxakali, Karaja, and Macro-Jê. *IJAL* 35:268–70.
- LOUKOTKA, ČESTMIR. 1939. A língua dos Patachos. *Revista do Arquivo Municipal* 55:5–15.
- _____. 1963. Documents et vocabulaires inédits de langues et de dialectes Sud-Américains. *Journal, Société des Américanistes de Paris* 52:7–60.
- MEADER, ROBERT E. 1978. *Índios do Nordeste: Levantamento Sobre os Remanescentes Tribais do Nordeste Brasileiro*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- WIED-NEUWIED, MAXIMILIAN PRINZ ZU. 1958. *Viagem ao Brasil nos Anos de 1815 a 1817*. Bibliotheca Pedagogica Brasileira, Ser. 5a, Vol. 1. São Paulo: Editora Nacional. [Portuguese edition/translation of *Reise nach Brasilien in den Jahren 1815 bis 1817*. Frankfurt: H. L. Brönnner, 1820–1821.]

FROM COMPARATIVE METHOD TO PHYLUM LINGUISTICS AND BACK AGAIN

One cannot say that the traditional comparative method (wherewith Indo-European was confirmed in the century before this) is in some way entirely opposed to phylum linguistics. However, if “phylum linguistics” is a cover term for work on remote relationships—more distant than those established by the comparative method—then phylum linguistics differs radically in approach from comparative method linguistics. The lack of extensive detailed information on many, if not most, of the languages of the Americas has forced the proposers of distant relationships to base their proposals on similarities—in large part typological rather than lexical. No one has appreciated this more clearly than Eric Hamp (1979:1002–3), who says, “It is worth noting that now that Na-Dene is perceived to require no reconstructed tones the motivation for a relation to Sino-Tibetan has largely vanished; we might just as well look to Nivkh (Gilyak)” and “Indeed much of the ultimate success in this pursuit will come from the sort of serendipitous reflexion that rests on chancing to notice the right things while observing the general caveats of sound procedure” (1979:1005).

Sapir’s intense familiarity with and brilliant insight into what was known about North American Indian languages at the time enabled him to hypothesize genetic relations among large groups of these languages on the basis of their sharing features such as canonical shape of stems, types of morphophonemic change, semantic functions of affixes, as case, ergativity vs. transitivity, etc., as