

TUPI STUDIES I

Edited by:

David Bendor-Samuel

A Publication of the
SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
of the
University of Oklahoma
Norman

1971

PREFACE

The studies which comprise this volume have arisen out of the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and, with one exception, are written by members of that Institute. The majority of the languages dealt with are spoken, and have been studied, within the borders of Brazil, but advantage has also been taken of work done by SIL members in neighboring countries. Within Brazil, SIL members have currently begun work on languages spoken by forty different tribal groups, including representatives of all the major language families. Further published studies resulting from this work will be forthcoming.

The present volume does not attempt a comprehensive description of one language, but presents briefer reports focussing on restricted aspects of a number of languages. The papers were written at different times and places, and reflect differing approaches to linguistic description. Pease and Betts' description of Parintintin phonology was finally polished at the SIL workshop in Belém, February to April, 1968. Taylor and Harrison's paper on Kaiwá is a redraft of one read to the Brazilian Anthropological Association in July of 1963. Harrison's Asurini Morphophonology was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a master of arts degree at the University of Pennsylvania in 1967.

The content of the papers is varied. 'Parintintin Phonology' provides a brief description of the sound system at all levels, with most detail on nasalization. The treatment is orthodox and handles nasalization from a phonemic point of view. 'Nasalization in Kaiwá', in contrast, deals only with nasalization, and is not closely linked to any one pattern of description either in concept or terminology. Its closest affinity is perhaps with the London school. These two treatments of a feature which is very widespread in Tupi-Guarani languages will be of considerable interest and help to other students of this family. They also provide a contrast in approach which is not without theoretical interest.

'The Morphophonology of Asurini Words' is a generative-transformational description of morphophonology. It is an excellent example of the possibilities, and limitations,

of linguistic description by means of a series of rules. The interest and attention of the reader may well be chiefly in the descriptive technique employed, at least to begin with, and the paper will repay study from this point of view alone. Those already familiar with the technique, or with willingness to master it, will also be grateful for the data provided on another feature common to a number of languages in this family.

'Cocama Clause Types', on the other hand, is a tagmemic study of one aspect of syntax. It deals with surface structure by establishing slots and fillers, and is another good example of the advantages and disadvantages of the descriptive framework chosen. Again, those familiar with the approach will be able to take ready advantage of the data, while those unfamiliar with it must give attention to this first.

It is a pleasure to be able to include in this volume the comparative paper by Miriam Lemle, who is a research student at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, and for whom SIL members have a high regard as a colleague. Her work in bringing together and interpreting the data collected by SIL workers and others is a significant contribution to the comparative field that will be of interest to all Tupinologists, and hopefully will provide a stimulus for further study.

David Bendor-Samuel