Issue 4 / Часть 4

Articles / Статьи

Fernando O. de Carvalho
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; fernaoorphao@mn.ufrj.br

The Terena (Arawakan) words for 'wood' and 'tree': etymological proposals and their implications[1]

This paper discusses the etymological associations for the two terms for 'tree' found in Terena, an Arawakan language of southwestern Brazil. After noting their apparently isolated status as far as comparative equations are concerned, I propose that *tikóti* 'tree, wood' derives from a deverbal nominalization of **ti-k(o)-oʔi-*, a monovalent predicate meaning 'to bear fruit', used as an attributive modifier, or as a nominal head, and suffixed with the descriptive suffix **-ti*. The second term, *ſúwe* 'tree', is hypothesized to be a loan from Chiquitano. Nevertheless, a competing internal etymology is sketched, based on a possibly collateral etymology for the Terena noun *ſûpu* 'manioc', whose origin is established here for the first time. Implications of these proposals are discussed, in particular the hypothesis that Terena retains a frozen reflex of the third-person marker **ti-*, shared with Proto-Mojeño and Paunaka, and the need to further investigate, in a rigorous manner, the nature, extent and context for the influx of Chiquitano elements in the language.

Keywords: etymology; language contact; Arawakan languages; Terena language.

1. Introduction

Proto-Arawakan (PA),[2] as tentatively reconstructed by Payne (1991), has an etymon with the form **anda[mɨ][na]* for the meaning 'tree' (Payne 1991: 423).[3] Although said etymon is supported by a cognate set with ample distribution in the family, the members of the Bolívia-Paraná subgroup — Terena, Mojeño, Paunaka and Baure — all lack witnesses in the relevant etymology.[4] Terena is, however, even more deviant, as it parts company from this set of rather close relatives in two aspects: First, it has **two** separate nominal stems which partially overlap in their semantic ranges: *tikóti* 'tree, wood', and *ſúwe* 'tree'. In contrast, all of its close relatives seem to employ a single stem modified by contrasting classifiers for the purposes of further semantic specification.[5] Second, the two stems found in Terena are apparently isolated, in the

---

[1] I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for a number of comments, suggestions and observations on the submitted version of this text. Needless to say, any remaining shortcomings are my own responsibility.

[2] Grammatical glosses used in the paper include: 3P = third person; DES = descriptive; ATTR = attributive, and NMLZR = nominalizer.

[3] Elements between square brackets in Payne's PA etyma, as well as in many of the cognates compared, are, according to the author: "those that I assume to have morphemic status either synchronically, or at some previous stage of the language, but for which the source does not give enough information to confirm its morphemic status" (Payne 1991: 390).

[4] This group of southern Arawakan languages is usually assumed to form a clade or subgroup called 'Bolívia-Paraná'. Within this Bolívia-Paraná subgroup, Terena, Mojeño and Paunaka have been suggested to have a rather closer relationship, with Baure possibly standing as a collateral branch of this less inclusive branch, which has been tentatively labelled 'Achane'. As discussed below in section 3, we believe that one of the etymologies discussed here offers further corroboration to this internal classification.

[5] As seen below in Table 1, this property is shared with Baure, but the roots in both languages are unrelated.

sense of lacking obvious etymological associations, even within the narrower confines of the Bolívia-Paraná subgroup. The present study advances tentative etymologies for these two Terena terms, and addresses the implications of the proposed etymologies for broader issues in the history of the language and its closest relatives.

Section **2** offers a basic outline of the form and meaning of Terena *tikóti* 'tree, wood' and *ʃúwe* 'tree', stressing their opaque character with the use of comparative evidence. The descriptive and synchronic commentary on the Terena forms is mainly based on the author's own field data, complemented with observations and notes on the existing published sources on the lexicon of the language. Section **2.1** advances an internal etymology for the noun *tikóti* 'tree, wood'. Relying crucially on a "bridge form" attested in Old Mojeño, I propose that it derives from an attributive expression *ti-ko-o-ʔi-ti* meaning 'bearing/having fruit'. Section **2.2** proposes an external etymology for *ʃúwe* 'tree', one that traces it to the adoption of a loanword from Chiquitano. An alternative etymology is also proposed, however, on even more tentative grounds: *ʃúwe* 'tree' could be related to *ʃûpu* 'manioc', although only the first glimpses of a word-family tied to a hypothetical base *ʧu-* 'base; stem; trunk' can be suggested at this point. Section **3** lays out the conclusions of the paper and discusses some of the implications of the present study, notably (a) the finding that Terena seemingly shares with Mojeño and Paunaka a morphological shared innovation uniquely found in these languages, and (b) that the potential influx of Chiquitano loans in Terena is a legitimate and interesting topic for further research.

2. Terena words for 'tree'

Table 1 presents a comparison of the lexemes meaning 'tree' and 'wood' in Terena and some of its closest relatives within the Arawakan language family (see section **1**). I have also added the PA form reconstructed by Payne (1991) for these two meanings (plausibly cognate forms appear in bold).[6]

	Wordform	Meaning	Source
Terena	*tikóti*	'tree, wood'	Author field data
Terena	*ʃúwe*	'tree'	Author field data
Proto-Mojeño (PM)	***juku-ki***	'tree'	Carvalho & Rose 2018: 42
Ignaciano	***jukuki***	'árbol, palo, leña' [tree, wood, firewood]	Ott & Ott 1983: 161
Trinitario	***jkuçi***	'árbol, palo, madera' [tree, stick, wood]	Gill 1970: 5, 11
Old Mojeño	<yucuqui>	'árbol' [tree], 'palo' [wood]	Marbán 1702: 143, 298
Paunaka	***jɨkɨke***	'tree; wood; stick'	Terhart 2022: 132
Baure	*e-wokoeʔ* ***jaki-s***	'tree' 'firewood'	Danielsen 2007: 97, 468
PA	**anda[mɨ][na]*	'tree'	Payne 1991: 398, 423

Table 1. Terena, Bolívia-Paraná and Proto-Arawakan for 'tree' and 'wood'

The comparisons above match translational equivalents in Terena and some of its closest relatives and show that these comparisons raise different problems for etymologization.

---

[6] All symbols employed here have their standard IPA values, unless they stand between angled brackets. The diacritics in the Terena forms stand for different accentual phonemes of the language (see Carvalho 2021 for further details on their synchrony and diachrony).

Commenting first on PA, Payne (1991) does not reconstruct an etymon meaning 'wood'. It is plausible, however, that the polysemy (vagueness?) 'tree; wood' can in fact be reconstructed at the PA level. Besides the forms in the table, which may co-lexify notions like 'wood', 'tree', 'stick' and even 'firewood', the attested reflexes of PA *anda[mɨ][na] elsewhere in the family include meanings as divergent as 'forest, jungle' and 'high in vegetation' (see Payne 1991: 423). It is plausible that, as is the case to this day in the Bolívia-Paraná languages other than Terena, further semantic specification was achieved with the use of classifiers (Payne 1991: 382–385; Dunn 2022).

The three Mojeño varieties allow for the trivial reconstruction for Proto-Mojeño (PM) of an etymon *jukuki, having as one of its reflexes the 17th-century Old Mojeño attestation <yucuqui> (Marbán 1702: 143). Prosodically-conditioned vowel loss as well as the coronalization of *k to ç in Trinitario jkuçi are treated in detail in Carvalho & Rose 2018. The PM form *jukuki is, in turn, morphologically analyzable as *juku-ki, *-ki being a form-based classifier for nouns with cylindrical and rigid forms such as branches, arms and trees (see Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 288–290; Rose 2024: 47), and *juku, the root meaning 'fire' (Carvalho & Rose 2018: 38). This root has a cognate in the Terena noun júku 'fire, firewood' (also certainly in Paunaka jɨkɨ, and, arguably, in Baure jaki). Other derivatives of PM *juku 'fire' are found, such as Ignaciano juku-pi 'candle', with the classifier -pi for cylindrical or stem-like objects (Ott & Ott 1983: 460; Rose 2024: 56).[7]

A parallel pattern of roots modified by classifiers is found in Paunaka, where jɨkɨke means 'tree; stick; wood' (Terhart 2022: 132, fn. 24). Terhart notes that it is probably derived from jɨkɨ 'fire' modified by the classifier -ke for cylindrical referents, but adds that this relation is no longer synchronically transparent to speakers (also Terhart 2022: 97, where this classifier is described as "totally lexicalized").[8] This is supported by the fact that further affixation of -ke to jɨkɨke is needed to derive nouns such as jɨkɨke-ke 'club' (Terhart 2022: 132).[9] Baure has a potential cognate for the Mojeño and Paunaka formations, jakis 'firewood', derived by the suffixation of -so, a classifier for 'stick-like' referents, and the base jaki 'fire' (Danielsen 2007: 97). For the meaning 'tree' Baure has the unrelated form e-wokoeʔ, where e- is an "unspecified possessor prefix" (Danielsen 2007: 120–121). The root -wokoeʔ, in turn, seems to have a related, compound form -wok, which appears in names for specific kinds of trees (e.g., era-wok 'plantain tree', rasa-wok 'orange tree'; Danielsen 2007: 137), and is incorporated into other verbal or "adjectival" roots, as in ʧo-wok-ʧa 'big tree' with the root ʧo- 'big' and the augmentative suffix -ʧa (Danielsen 2007: 133). The Baure form is isolated as well, but its origin will not be addressed here.

As mentioned above, Terena does retain a root júku 'fire', a clear cognate of PM *juku and Paunaka jɨkɨ, both with the same meaning (Carvalho 2018b: 426), and plausibly too of Baure jaki 'fire'. In Terena, however, the use of nominal classifiers is unattested, and the same root, júku, also means 'firewood'. Terena seems to have retained the use of classifiers only as 'verbal classifiers' or as part of a system for argument-indexing in the verb complex (including among these one-place predicates otherwise deemed 'adjectives'; see Marcus 1994; Aikhenvald 2000: 207; Passer 2016). In any case, no reflex of a derivative formation having júku 'fire' modified by classifiers (as seen in PM, Paunaka and Baure) has been found in Terena.

---

[7] Note that the PM series *juku- : Terena juku : Paunaka jɨkɨ : Baure jaki is itself isolated within Arawakan. Interestingly, Kanichana, a poorly recorded isolate of the Bolivian lowlands, has <ni-čuku> 'feu' [fire] (Créqui-Montfort & Rivet 1913).

[8] Terhart (2022: 96, fn. 23) notes that the classifier system in Paunaka is less productive than the one found in related languages like Baure.

[9] However, Paunaka (differently from Mojeño) seems to have a separate root for 'firewood': -puka (Terhart 2022: 112).

The two Terena terms in Table 1, *ʃúwe* and *tikóti*, show some overlap in their meanings: both can be applied as a reference to a given tree, or even to trees in general. However, three differences in their meanings and ranges of use are apparent. First, *ʃúwe* is most frequently used in compounds naming specific fruit-bearing trees, such as *ʃúwe kâʃu* 'cashew tree' and *ʃúwe naráŋga* 'orange tree'. In fact, Terena speakers will often translate *ʃúwe* into Brazilian Portuguese with the noun *pé* 'foot', in its metaphorical use as the head in phrases denoting the names of fruit-bearing trees (as in *pé de laranja* 'orange tree'). Second, *ʃúwe* is also used in the sense of 'stem' and 'tree trunk', and is also metaphorically extended to mean the basal ancestor of a family, or hierarchically superior member of a polity (see Almeida 2013: 48–49; this point will be relevant in section **2.2** below). In this same broad sense, the root can be used either by itself, or in compounds, as in *ʃuwé-ʃeʔéʃa* 'the oldest offspring' (Ekdahl & Butler 1969; *ʃeʔéʃa* 'child'). The third difference is that *tikóti* has a more general meaning of 'wood'. It can denote a stick, a walking staff, even wooden material in houses, and this is not possible with *ʃúwe*.

It seems clear that there is no obvious way to connect Terena *tikóti* 'tree, wood' or *ʃúwe* 'tree' either to the translational equivalents attested in its closest relatives, or to the PA etymon proposed by Payne (1991). The remainder of the paper will argue that, while *tikóti* does have a less obvious internal etymology, *ʃúwe* has an external origin as a loanword. In the latter case, however, a competing internal etymology is briefly discussed, as well as another suggestion for a possible link relating Terena *ʃúwe* 'tree' to a Baure morpheme, first suggested by Nikulin (2019).

2.1. *tikóti* 'tree, wood' – an opaque form with an internal etymology

The earliest attestation of this item is an Early Terena ('Guaná') form *<ticoti>*, recorded by Francis de Castelnau around the 1840s (see Martius 1867: 129). Karl von den Steinen documented the form *<tegati>* in 1848 and, decades later, Max Schmidt recorded *<tikotí>* (see Schmidt 1903: 574 for both attestations).[10]

As noted in section 1, the form lacks a semantically-matched internal etymology, being unrelated to other Terena lexemes and having no clear cognates in other languages of the family. I propose here that the form derives from an epithet, an attributive modifier, whose meaning was 'bearing/having fruit'. The attributive modifier in question was a derived adjective/one-place predicate which, in the process of being reanalyzed as a noun meaning 'tree' had its internal morphological structure lost, as *tikóti* is nowadays an unanalyzable root in Terena. This proposal is explored in detail in the following paragraphs.

The crucial link in the etymologization of Terena *tikóti* is provided by the Old Mojeño form *<ticooiray>* 'árbol fructífero' [fruit-bearing tree] (Marbán 1702: 143). On the basis of our knowledge of Modern Mojeño varieties, segmentation of this Old Mojeño form is straightforward. The two final syllables belong to the nominalizing suffix *<-ray>*, attested in Ignaciano as *-raʔi*, and which indicates an 'habitual agent' (Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 674; Rose 2014: 85). The glottal stop is usually not indicated or only sporadically so in the Old Mojeño documents, a property they share with other colonial-era works on indigenous languages (see Rose 2015; Carvalho & Rose 2018). Also easily identifiable is the third person prefix *<ti->* (Rose 2015: 248–249), often found in the 'citation form' of adjectives/stative verbs, and commonly used with the nominalizer *-raʔi* (Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 674; Rose 2014: 85). The remaining stem, *<cooi>*,

---

[10] The vocalism in Taunay's (1868: 132) *<tagati>* is hard to explain. It is perhaps the result of confusion with the item *étakati* 'bamboo'. The source of the apparent confusion — either Taunay himself or his informant(s) — remains unknown. The Terena noun *étakati* is a loan from Northern Guaicuruan, as seen in Kadiwéu *etaɢadi* and Mbayá *<etagadi>*, regular reflexes of Proto-Guaicuruan **tʲaqatʲe* 'bamboo' (see Viegas Barros 2013: 233).

includes the attributive prefix <co-> that derives intransitive predicates from nouns, often meaning 'having' the noun (see e.g. Ignaciano *-iwape* 'foot', *-káiwape* 'having feet', *ti-kaiwape-ʔi* 'he/she has a foot'; Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 756; also Rose 2014: 84–85 for Trinitario). It is attached to a root <-o-> 'fruit' which is in turn modified by the classifier <-i-> for 'fruit-like' objects (see Rose 2024: 59–60). The construction means, literally, 'that which habitually bears fruit'.[11]

Setting aside for the moment the nominalizer *-raʔi*, the remaining construction, i.e. [*ti-ko*-NOUN], followed by suffixes of different kinds, and having the overall meaning '(be) thing characterized by NOUN', is amply and productively attested in the two extant varieties of Mojeño, Trinitario and Ignaciano. In said construction, the prefix *ko-* is the well-known Arawakan **ka-* attributive, paradigmatically opposed to the privative **ma-* (see Payne 1991: 377). As to its relation to the third person prefix *ti-*, Olza Zubiri et al. (2002: 874) note that 'possessive verbs' (their label to verbs derived with *ka-*, the Ignaciano reflex of Proto-Achane and Proto-Mojeño **ko-*) always take the prefix *ti-* in their third-person forms. From the Ignaciano noun *taʔi* 'fruit', analyzable as *ta-a-ʔi*, one has the derived one-place predicate *-kaʔi*, i.e. *-ka-a-ʔi*, whose meaning is 'to fructify', and *ti-ka-a-ʔi* 'it has fruits' (Ott & Ott 1983: 98, 383). In Trinitario, for instance, one finds the expression *tkojʔe* 'owner, one who possesses' (Rose 2014: 76), from *ti-ko-jeʔe*, *-jeʔe* being a noun roughly translatable as 'belongings' (Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 858). In more general terms, Mojeño intransitive verbs, including those derived with the prefixation of *ko-*, are prefixed with *ti-* to index a third-person argument (Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 477; Rose 2015: 248–249).

As for Terena, a cognate of the attributive *ko-* is found as a fully productive morpheme, while reflexes of the privative **ma-* are retained now only as fossilized parts of roots or stems (e.g., *moʃeru* 'barren, sterile (of women and animals)' < *mo-ʃe-ru; see Carvalho 2019a for details). There is, however, no synchronically transparent cognate of the prefix *ti-* noted above for the Mojeño varieties. This prefix has a rather unclear history among the Bolívia-Paraná Arawakan languages. Although Danielsen (2011: 514) reconstructs a 'non-specified third person' **ti-* for her 'proto-southern Arawakan', this is based on evidence from Mojeño and Paunaka alone. In fact, Rose (2015: 251) proposes that the prefix *ti-* for 'unspecified third person' is an innovation of Mojeño among Southern Arawakan languages, probably shared with Paunaka. She notes that its diachronic origin remains unclear,[12] and that both Mojeño and Paunaka *ti-* prefixes share a number of functional and distributional traits, including the peculiarity of being used with verbs, never with nouns (Rose 2015: 252; also Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 478).[13] What we propose here is that, just like the privative **ma-*, whose remnants can be found phonologized as segment sequences in unanalyzable roots of modern Terena, so can the 'non-specified third person' **ti-* be etymologically recovered, in the present case, as the first syllable of the noun *tikóti* 'tree'. The etymology proposed is, then:

(**1**) Etymology proposed for Terena *tikóti* 'tree, wood'
 tikóti 'wood' < **ti-* *ko-* *oʔi* *-ti* 'having or bearing fruit'
      3P- ATTR- fruit -DES

---

[11] Although *-raʔi* was described as deriving a noun denoting an 'habitual agent', it is not only semantic agents of the base verb that can become referents of the derived noun. As shown by the copious examples in Olza Zubiri et al. 2002, non-agent arguments can be targeted as well, as in *-huruka* 'to grow', *-huruka-raʔi* 'one that grows a lot, all the time'.

[12] Rose (2015: 260) tentatively suggests Mataguayan and Zamucoan as possible external sources for the origin of the *ti-* prefix that she considers an innovation in Mojeño and Paunaka.

[13] This is a relevant distributional parallel because, generally speaking, person-indexing prefixes in Arawakan languages occur both in nouns, indexing features of the 'possessor', or in verbs, indexing either the higher/controlling argument of transitive verbs, or a more active/controlling argument in a sub-class of intransitive verbs (see Payne 1991).

The proposed identification of the first and second syllables with, respectively, the erstwhile third-person marker *ti-, and the attributive prefix *ko- are formally straightforward. Moreover, it agrees with the distribution of *ti-* in Mojeño (and Paunaka, see Terhart 2022: 259–261), which is the only mark for third person in one-place predicates, a category that includes, as discussed above, verbs derived by the prefixation of the attributive suffix *ko-. Two issues that must be tackled first concern the formal residue, that is, the base noun *-oʔi 'fruit' (possibly analyzable as *-o-ʔi, see below), and the 'descriptive' suffix *-ti. Semantic issues will be briefly addressed in turn.

As noted in Carvalho (2017a: 52), Terena *háʔi* 'fruit' is of unclear origin. Though formally similar to PM *-o-ʔi 'fruit', there is no explanation for the Terena glottal fricative *h-* (which corresponds to PM *h; see Carvalho 2018b), even though the mismatch in vowel quality could be explained away as related to diffusional changes and dialect borrowing involving *a* and *o*, common in both Mojeño and Terena (see Carvalho 2023). That is, the etymological proposal sketched in (1) includes *-oʔi as the **expected** Terena form for 'fruit', one that is, as indicated by the asterisk, hence, unattested. The proposal of this form is rather conservative, as one could entertain the possibility of a bi-morphemic structure, *-o-ʔi instead. In this, case, the two elements could have been retained in the form of two attested Terena classifiers: *-ʔo* 'animal/person/body' and another, *-ʔi*, for 'non-specific form' (see Ekdahl & Butler 1979: 168). Whatever the origin of modern Terena *háʔi* 'fruit', once it replaced the stem *-oʔi (or *-o-ʔi) 'fruit', the relation between *ti-ko-oʔi-ti and the noun for 'fruit' became less transparent, perhaps prompting both the semantic shift 'fruit-bearing tree' > 'tree', and the loss of the syllable *-ʔi-, which is apparently an isolated development.

The last formal residue concerns the suffix *-ti in the etymon in (1), which is still retained in modern Terena *tikóti* ′tree, wood', as the final syllable of this synchronically unanalyzable root. Labeled a 'state' suffix in Ekdahl & Grimes (1964) and a 'descriptive' in Ekdahl & Butler (1979: 100), it is commonly found with stative one-place predicates, or 'adjectival verbs' as Ekdahl & Grimes (1964) put it, but it also occurs with active intransitive verbs deriving an argument nominalization (e.g., *-jôno* 'to go', *jonó-ti* 'one who goes'). The proposed etymology, and the comparisons with the Mojeño formations instantiating the [*ti-ko*-NOUN] construction, can be strengthened by noting that Mojeño *-raʔi* and Terena *-ti* are found in parallel formations that share some old root morphemes. Thus, Old Mojeño <ticosarai> 'hazer frío' [to be cold] (Marbán 1702: 449) matches Terena *kásati* 'to be cold'. Although reflexes of PM *-sa- (or, better yet, *-(a)sa-, in view of the Terena parallel below) is not attested anywhere as an independent root/stem meaning 'cold', its reconstruction is plausible, and there is even the possibility of comparing the two formations on a morpheme-by-morpheme basis:

(2) Old Mojeño   *ti-*   *ko-*   *sa*   *-raʔi*
     Terena   Ø-   k-   asa   -ti
                   3-   ATTR-   cold   -NMLZR

The comparison above underscores not only the functional parallelism of Mojeño *-raʔi* and *-ti*, but another important factor: the match between a Ø-marked third person in Terena and *ti-* in Old Mojeño. Terena has Ø-marking for third person (see e.g., Ekdahl & Grimes 1964; Carvalho 2017a; 2021), both in the indexing of verb arguments, and in the indexing of possessors in nouns. In fact, this can be tied to a more general process of diachronic erosion of prefixal elements in the history of the language, as noted above for privative *ma-, but which also applies to the person-indexing prefixes (see Carvalho 2017a, 2019a, 2021). It is, thus, unsurprising that *ti- has ended up either entirely lost, as in (2), or fossilized into roots, as in *tikóti* 'tree, wood' (1).

Note, finally, that the semantic development proposed here in (1) can be summarized in the chain: 'fruit-bearing tree' > 'tree' > 'tree, wood'. The first transition is hypothetically facilitated by the loss of the inherited stem for 'fruit', as discussed above, while a comparison with the closest relatives of Terena, in particular their use of nominal form-based classifiers, suggests that the polysemy/vagueness of *tikóti* 'tree, wood' is likely a consequence of the loss of the loss of these grammatical elements in Terena.

The most important implication of the etymology presented in this section is that, if correct, it shows that Terena once had a third-person marker *ti-*, a cognate of formally identical prefixes found in Mojeño and in Paunaka. Since the prefix in question has been argued to be a shared innovation linking Mojeño and Paunaka, its past presence in Terena brings these three languages even closer to one another, further reinforcing the view that these languages might in fact constitute a monophyletic subgroup within the broader Bolívia-Paraná branch of the Arawakan family (see Carvalho forthc.).

2.2. *ʃúwe* 'tree' and the issue of loans from Chiquitano

Terena *ʃúwe* 'tree' is less well-attested than its partial synonym *tikóti*. This is partially due to simpler and more superficial sources on the language, like short vocabulary lists, where *tikóti*, not *ʃúwe*, usually appears as the translation for Sp. *árbol* or Pt. *árvore*. None of the 19th century sources on the language mentioned in the preceding section record *ʃúwe*, which is unsurprising given the fact that bilingual Terena-Portuguese speakers, when asked the translation of Pt. *árvore* in their language, will almost always answer with *tikóti*. Even more extensive dictionaries of the language, such as Silva 2013, fail to record it. Be that as it may, the etymology advanced here is the following: *ʃúwe* is a loan from Chiquitano, the candidate source form being attested as *soés* 'árbol, madera' [tree, wood] in the Ignaciano variety (Ciucci & Tomichá 2018: 9), ['sǫɛs] in the Migueleño variety (Nikulin 2021). Aside from this hypothesis, a competing, internal etymology will be advanced as well at the end of the present section.

The etymology proposed here is not among those advanced by Jolkesky (2016: 374) as Arawakan-Chiquitano parallels, suggestive of some kind of historical relation involving speakers of these languages. In Terena, the best candidate for a wordform of Chiquitano origin is *tamúku* 'dog', already noted in Jolkesky (2016: 373–374). Other parallels noted by Jolkesky (2016) are less trivial, such as Terena *nêwoe* 'cotton', compared to Chiquitano *naβoʂ* 'cotton', and Terena *apákana* 'liver', supposedly comparable to Chiquitano *pakaa* 'liver'.[14] All of these would require further argumentation to stand as convincing contact etymologies, but no detailed discussion of these proposals is presented by the author.[15]

Chiquitano (also known as 'Bésiro') was employed as a vehicular 'common language' (*lengua general*) for both religious and secular activities in the context of multi-ethnic settle-

---

[14] The form for 'cotton' in Jolkesky (2016) seems to come from the Bésiro variety of Chiquitano (see e.g., Sans 2013: 20), since a different form, *purubí-ʃ*, is attested in the Ignaciano variety (Ciucci & Tomichá 2018: 9). The form he cites for 'liver', however, seems to be an error: the root for 'liver' is *pakã?ã* in both the Ignaciano and Migueleño varieties (Ciucci & Tomichá 2018: 14).

[15] Terena *nêwoe* 'cotton' has a weakly suppletive allomorph used in possessive constructions, *-ánewa*, and a proper etymology of the term would demand an account of this allomorphy pattern. Terena *apákana* 'liver', on the other hand, while lacking a lexicostatistical cognate in Proto-Mojeño *-upono* 'liver' (Carvalho & Rose 2018: 35), could be compared to the series of Old Mojeño *to-poko* 'leaf' (Marbán 1702: 574) and Ignaciano *ta-paka-hi* 'leaf' (Ott & Ott 1983: 568). Note that 'liver' and 'leaf' are derivationally or etymologically related in many Arawakan languages (Payne 1991: 410). The correspondences between Terena *a* and Old Mojeño *o* add another layer of issues to be tackled.

ments established by Jesuit missionaries, starting in the second half of the 17th century, in the region known as 'Chiquitanía', close to Santa Cruz de la Sierra, today in the eastern lowlands of Bolivia. Starting in the year 1691, a number of such 'Missions' were active in the region (see e.g., Arnt 2005, 2007; Arruda 2011; Galeote Tormo 2014: 260).[16] It is not surprising, then, that loanwords with a Chiquitano origin are frequently attested in languages of the region, with the impact on Paunaka, of the Bolívia-Paraná branch of Arawakan, being particularly strong (see Terhart 2022: 15, 49, 57–59, 140–141).[17] Even the other, northernmost members of this subgroup, such as the Mojeño varieties, have traces of probable Chiquitano loans, as attested in Ignaciano *pakure*, Trinitario *pokre* and Chiquitano *pokure-*, all meaning 'canoe, boat',[18] or Mojeño *taku* 'mortar', Chiquitano *taku-* 'mortar' (see, e.g., Jolkesky 2016: 373–374).[19]

Two factors, one linguistic and the other geographic, suggest, however, that the transmission of *ʃúwe* 'tree' from its Chiquitano source form, if it did take place, was more indirect. As anticipated above, the proposed candidate source form is the Chiquitano noun meaning 'tree, wood', variously transcribed as *soése* (Sans 2013: 39), *soés* (Ciucci & Tomichá 2018: 9), *soesɨ* ['sǫɛs] (Nikulin 2021: 30). The form can be segmented into a base or root *soé-*, and a suffix, sometimes glossed an 'absolute' (Adam & Henry 1880: 8; Galeote Tormo 2014: 300-31) or 'general case' (Sans 2013: 20), which occurs in complementary distribution with plural (*-ka*) and diminutive (*-ma*) suffixes, and which plays a role in the paradigmatic opposition between third-person possessors and other possessors (including first-person and second-person indices and noun phrases; Sans 2013: 20-23).[20] As the suffix in question is often reduced to a single consonant due to vowel apocope (Sans 2013: 20; Nikulin 2021: 27–29), it is likely that the source form was in fact close to *soés*. The formal disparity between the presumed source *soés* and Terena *ʃúwe* can be accounted for by noting that Terena allows for open syllables only, thus leading to the deletion of final *-s.* Here, however, an interesting alternative is suggested by the work of Nikulin (2019): in the extinct "Piñoco" variety of Chiquitano, which Nikulin identifies as the main source for Chiquitano substrate words in eastern Bolivian Spanish, the source form would have been **soe*, since this variety lacked the suffix *-s* altogether. As to the medial position, note that medial *-w-* could naturally arise as a transitional, labial gliding element between *o* and the next, non-labial vowel.[21] The most important issue here concerns the adaptation of initial *s-* as *ʃ-* in Terena.

---

[16] Despite having a common language, the Missions of Chiquitos differed from similar endeavours in regions in South America, such as the Guarani Missions in the province of Tapes (nowadays in Southern Brazil), in that it included "neighbourhoods" for different ethnic groups, which offered a certain prospect for autonomy and the maintenance of diversity among the ethnically and linguistically diverse groups (Arnt 2007: 188).

[17] It is not the case, of course, that all of these loans originate in the ethnic contacts of the 17th and 18th centuries. The Paunaka have been shifting to Chiquitano until recently (before shifting to Spanish; Terhart 2022: 12), and there is a long tradition of the language being considered, on a regional level, superior to other indigenous languages (Terhart 2022: 37).

[18] According to Andrey Nikulin (p.c.), this form for 'canoe', *pokure*, is attested only in the colonial Chiquitano sources. Although this limited distribution could suggest the possibility of diffusion in the direction Arawakan → Chiquitano, the item is also unanalyzable and etymologically isolated on the Arawakan side of the comparison.

[19] Rose (2015: 258–259) suggests that the system of speaker-gender indexicality present in Mojeño third person pronouns could have originated in contact with Chiquitano, which has a similar system.

[20] The suffixes *-ka* and *-ma* of the Bésɨro variety have cognates *-kaa* and *-maʔa*, respectively, in the Migueleño variety of Chiquitano (see Nikulin 2019: 12).

[21] The second development, in particular, has countless parallels in the historical phonology of Terena. One case is that of the loss of **ɾ*, which, when lost between **e* and a following non-front vowel, yields a transitional glide, e.g., **-peɾo* 'domestic animal' > *-pêjo* (see Carvalho 2018b).

As shown by Carvalho (2017a; 2017b), the fricative segments of modern Terena, such as ʃ, reflect a recent shift of original affricates, which implies that *fúwe* must have come from *ʧúwe*. The change in question took place approximately on the border of the 19th and 20th centuries, and was preceded by a debuccalization change that yielded the diachronic developments *s, *ʃ > h (see Carvalho 2017a for details). Early loans with a fricative like *s* appear in modern Terena with *h* as the relevant reflex segment, as evidenced by a number of Portuguese and Spanish loans (e.g., *sapato* 'shoe' > *hapátu*; see Carvalho 2017a: 522). Thus, as far as the initial consonant goes, rather than *fúwe*, an adaptation of Chiquitano would instead appear as **húwe* in the modern language.

As far as we can tell based on historical attestation, there is no reason to suppose that the initial segment in Chiquitano *soé-* 'tree, wood' has ever been anything other than a fricative (see e.g., Adam & Henry 1880: 91, <Çoe-z> 'palo, árbol, abrigo'). If this is the case, the facts at our disposal about the diachrony of affricates and fricatives in Terena would call for an intermediate point in the chain from *soé-s* to *fúwe*. One possibility is that Chiquitano *s-* shifted to an affricate as part of the adaptation process in a third (and so far unindentified language), adopted into Terena, and then changed to a fricative again.

I make the tentative proposal that Chiquitano loans would have entered Terena not via the Jesuit settlements of the Chiquitanía, but through the intermediation of Zamucoan-speaking groups. Well to the south of the Chiquitanía, already in the region known as the northern Chaco (and much closer to the historical location of the Terena; Carvalho 2019b), Jesuit missionaries founded the Mission of San Ignacio de Zamucos, which had an ephemereal existence, lasting from 1723 to 1745 (see Arnt 2005, 2007 for a historical study). Although Chiquitano was not the common or vehicular language in San Ignacio de Zamucos, the Jesuits working in San Ignacio were regularly accompanied by 'Chiquitos' (that is, Chiquitano speakers) in the quality of assistants and ranchers (Arnt 2007: 189).[22] Indeed, the presence of Chiquitano in this southern outpost is demonstrated by the fact that, in a report on the conditions in the northern Chaco dated to 1733, the Terena appear identified as 'Terenacas' (Arnt 2005: 170), with the characteristic Chiquitano plural suffix *-ka* added to the ethnonym *terena*.

San Ignacio de Zamucos was built with the intent to make transportation and communications easier between Asunción (Paraguay) and Santa Cruz de la Sierra, in the Chiquitanía (Arnt 2005, 2007: 188). Since the routes through the Paraguay River were considered too dangerous at the time, it was necessary to find an alternative route through the Pilcomayo River, and, for achieving this goal, inclusion of the Terena under the purview of the Jesuits was necessary. There is ample historical documentation showing that attempts were made in the mid-18th century to 'pacify' the Terena, including the exchange of 'diplomatic envoys' between them and San Ignacio de Zamucos (Arnt 2005: 177, 180–181; 2007: 179, 188). This sets a reasonably plausible socio-historical setting for the transmission of loanwords.

The best candidate for the role of bridge between the Terena and the Jesuit Missions is Ayoreo, or a variety thereof. Differently from Chamacoco (the other extant Zamucoan language), Ayoreo speakers are known to have been affected by the Jesuit activities in San Ignacio de Zamucos (see Ciucci 2016: 31). The hypothesis would then have an Ayoreo-like Zamucoan lect acting as an intermediate in the transfer of Chiquitano *sóe-s* to Terena, which could, in principle, account for the otherwise surprising adaptation of a fricative as an affricate. Note that Ayoreo, just like Terena, also features the noun *tamoko* for 'dog', which is usually assumed

---

[22] The Zamuco were introduced to missionary activity, and the Jesuits in particular, by the 'Chiquitos', that is, speakers of one or more varieties of Chiquitano (Arnt 2007: 187).

to be a loan from Chiquitano.[23] Two immediate obstacles for this hypothesis are: (a) the lack, to the best of my knowledge, of attestation for Chiquitano *sóe-s* 'tree, wood' being adopted by some Zamucoan language, and (b) the fact that Ayoreo has the coronal fricative *s* among its contrasting segments (Bertinetto 2014: 376). This second objection would imply that, in principle, there would be no reason for the fricative → affricate shift to occur. As it stands, then, the hypothesis would require a variety of Ayoreo that is different from the attested ones, and the matter clearly deserves further scrutiny. All in all, despite the difficulties, and even if the Zamucoan intermediation is ultimately rejected, in our view, the formal and semantic parallel between Chiquitano *sóe-s* 'tree, wood' and Terena *fúwe* 'tree' make the hypothesis of a historical association worthy of consideration.

An interesting, and, possibly, competing etymology is advanced in Nikulin (2019). In what is close to a reversal of the current proposal, Nikulin suggests that Proto-Chiquitano **soé-sɨ* 'tree' is an Arawakan loan, and cites Baure *-foe* 'tree trunk' (also given as *-fe*; see Danielsen 2007: 446), Mojeño *-hue-ku* 'woods' and Terena *-hôi* 'woods' as a cognate series on the Arawakan side (Nikulin 2019: 10). Although the Terena and Mojeño comparisons are clear cognates, treatment of the Baure comparandum requires a better understanding of the correspondences than is currently available. In the end, it is possible that both Nikulin's and the present author's contact etymologies are correct: it might be the case that Proto-Chiquitano **soé-sɨ* 'tree' is a loan originating in some Arawakan source form that had a cognate in Terena *hôi* 'woods', and that, later, Terena borrowed a reflex of **soé-sɨ* 'tree' as *fúwe* 'tree'.

Before closing the discussion of *fúwe* 'tree', I would like to briefly comment on a competing, internal etymology that can be proposed for the term, one that depends on first establishing another, possibly collateral etymology. Carvalho (2019b: 355–356) presents the view that Terena *fûpu* 'manioc' lacks cognates in the remaining Arawakan languages and, most strikingly, in its closest relatives, such as Mojeño and Paunaka (which is true as far as semantically-matched or lexicostatistical cognates are concerned). Nonetheless, the form can in fact be related to Old Mojeño <taChupu> 'el tronco que queda del árbol cortado' [the trunk that remains after a tree is cut] (Marbán 1702: 457), where *ta-* is just a third-person non-human prefix (see Rose 2015).[24] With the Trinitario cognate *ta-ʧupu* 'tree trunk', *manko-ʧpu* 'mango tree trunk' (Rose 2024: 37–38), an etymon **ʧupu* 'trunk, tree stump' can be trivially reconstructed for Proto-Mojeño (no cognate has been found in the main lexical source on Ignaciano – Ott & Ott 1983). Now, since manioc is planted by inserting into the ground the stems or stalks cut off from mature plants, a semantic shift from 'trunk, tree stump' (with the meaning retained in PM **ʧupu*), to 'manioc' (the meaning of Terena *fûpu*), is in no sense forced. If the meaning 'trunk, tree stump' is assumed as basic for **ʧupu*, a connection to *fúwe* (recalling that Pre-Terena would have an initial affricate: **ʧuwe*), which, as noted in section 2 also includes 'base' or 'stem' in its sense, becomes tempting. If further forms are brought into comparison, such as Trinitario *ʧumo* 'toco para asiento' [wood stump for sitting] (Gill 1993: 10),[25] or Terena *fú-na-* 'strong', an association between **ʧu-* and notions like 'base, stem, foundation, trunk' suggests itself. Much more work will be needed, however, before the structure of this putative word-

---

[23] Ciucci (2014: 32) deems *tamoko* in Ayoreo to be a "recent loanword" from Chiquitano. The 'recent' qualifier seems to stem from the absence of this term from Chamacoco and, notably, from Old Zamuco, which is assumed to be rather closely related to Ayoreo. My impression is that these are less than compelling reasons to believe that the loan is chronologically recent.

[24] <Chupu> also means 'thumb' (Marbán 1702: 457).

[25] An anonymous reviewer notes the curious parallel with Chiquitano *-tɨmo* 'seat', 1SG *i-tʃɨmo* (from the verb 'to sit'), the latter form in particular comparable to Trinitario *ʧumo* 'wood stump for sitting' (see Nikulin 2019, 2021 on progressive palatalization in Chiquitano). This looks, *prima facie* at least, like a chance resemblance.

family is ascertained, if at all, but these comparisons are advanced here as a possible path for an internal etymology for Terena *ʃúwe* 'tree'.

3. Conclusions and implications

This paper has put forth etymologies for two terms meaning 'tree' (one of them also 'wood') attested in Terena, a southwestern Arawakan language of Brazil. After describing the etymological problems they pose, three etymological proposals were discussed. For *tikóti* 'tree, wood', an origin in the formation **ti-ko-o-ʔi-ti*, roughly meaning 'bearing/having fruit', was proposed. The formal aspects of the etymon and its diachronic development into *tikóti*, as well as the semantic developments, were discussed in detail. For *ʃúwe* 'tree', two etymologies were proposed, with different degrees of elaboration. An external or contact etymology, invoking Chiquitano *sóe-s* 'tree, wood' as the ultimate source form, was presented. A specific set of formal issues arising from the match *sóe-s* : *ʃúwe* suggested a more convoluted history, one involving not a direct loan but the intermediation of Ayoreo, or a close variety thereof, a Zamucoan language. A plausible socio-historical background for the transmission was offered, but there are still some issues that must be addressed before the hypothesis is made more compelling. In fact, an alternative, internal etymology for *ʃúwe* 'tree' was offered as well, one that depends on the further elucidation of a putative word-family sharing a root **ʧu-*, to which the rough meaning 'base, foundation, stem, trunk' could be assigned.

Moreover, the etymology of *tikóti* 'tree, wood', in our view the best supported of those presented here, carries an important implication for the historical linguistics of Terena and its closest relatives. As it is currently agreed that the third-person marker *ti-* is a secondary development in Mojeño and Paunaka, accepting its previous existence in Terena suggests that its emergence might constitute a shared morphological innovation linking these three languages. As to the proposed parallel between Chiquitano *sóe-s* 'tree, wood' and Terena *ʃúwe* 'tree', it offers another contribution to a burgeoning series of studies focusing on a detailed investigation of the history of contacts involving southern Arawakan languages and other regional languages of the Chiquitanía and the Boreal Chaco. It is well-known that Terena (or, more generally, the language of the Guaná-Chané; Carvalho 2016) has a set of loanwords resulting from contact with Northern Guaicuruan languages (Carvalho 2018a), and with Guarani (Carvalho 2017c), and an encompassing and rigorous approach to language contact with Chiquitano varieties has been presented in Nikulin (2019). These and other investigations are setting standards for a more rigorous investigation of contact etymologies, beyond the bird's eye view or scouting phase of overviews like Jolkesky (2016).

References

Adam, Lucien, Victor Henry. 1880. *Arte y Vocabulario de la Lengua Chiquita con algunos textos traducidos y explicados compuestos sobre manuscritos inéditos del XVIII siglo.* Paris: Librairie-Éditeur J. Maisonneuve. (Reprinted 1968, Nendeln / Liechtenstein: Kraus).

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2000. *Classifiers*. Oxford University Press.

Almeida, Carolina P. de. 2013. *Os troncos, suas raízes e sementes*. M.A. Thesis. Universidade de Brasília (UnB).

Arnt, Fúlvio V. 2005. *San Ignacio de los Zamucos: Índios e Jesuítas no coração do deserto Sul-Americano, Século XVIII. M.A. Thesis*. São Leopoldo, Brazil: Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos.

Arnt, Fúlvio V. 2007. A redução dos Zamuco no contexto colonial do século XVIII. *História UNISINOS* 11(2): 185–191.

Arruda, Ariane A. C. de. 2011. *Condicionantes étnicos nas Missões de Chiquitos: alianças e conflitos na Chiquitanía e no Pantanal (1609–1691).* M.A. Thesis. Porto Alegre, Brazil: Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande Sul.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco. 2014. Ayoreo. In: Pieter Muysken, Mily Crevels (eds.). *Lenguas de Bolivia: Oriente*: 369–413. La Paz: Plural Editores.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2016. Terena, Guaná, Chané and Kinikinau are one and the same language: Setting the record straight on Southern Arawakan linguistic diversity. *Línguas Indígenas Americanas (LIAMES)* 16 (1): 39–57.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2017a. Fricative debuccalization and primary split in Terena (Arawak) historical phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 83(3): 509–537.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2017b. Philological evidence for phonemic affricates and diachronic debuccalization in early Terena (Arawakan). *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi* 12(1): 157–171.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2017c. Tupi-Guarani loanwords in Southern Arawak: Taking contact etymologies seriously. *Revista Linguística* 13(3): 1–34.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2018a. Arawakan-Guaicuruan language contact in the South American Chaco. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 84 (2): 243–263.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2018b. The historical phonology of Paunaka (Arawakan). *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi* 13(2): 405–428.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2019a. Demorphologization of the Arawakan privative *ma-* in Terena. *Línguas Indígenas Americanas (LIAMES)* 19: 1–18.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2019b. Etymology meets ethnohistory: Linguistic evidence for the prehistoric origin of the Guaná-Chané in the northwestern Chaco. *Anthropological Linguistics* 61 (3): 341–363.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2021. On the diachronic origins of the Terena tonal accent. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 119(3): 315–329.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. 2023. Payne's rule and the late **o > a* shift in Mojeño Ignaciano: A response to Ramirez and França (2019) – or, how (not) to do historical linguistics. *Línguas Indígenas Americanas (LIAMES)* 23: 1–36.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de. Forthc. Derived allomorphy as a diachronic shared innovation in Terena and Mojeño nominalization. *Folia Linguistica*.

Carvalho, Fernando O. de, Françoise Rose. 2018. Comparative Reconstruction of Proto-Mojeño and the Diversification of Mojeño Dialects. *LIAMES: Línguas Indígenas Americanas* 18(1): 3–44.

Ciucci, Luca. 2014. Tracce di contatto tra la famiglia Zamuco (ayoreo, chamacoco) e altre lingue del Chaco: prime prospezioni. *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica* 13: 1–52.

Ciucci, Luca. 2016. *Inflectional Morphology in the Zamucoan Languages*. Asunción: CEADUC, Biblioteca Paraguaya de Antropología.

Ciucci, Luca, José Macoñó Tomichá. 2018. *Diccionario básico del Chiquitano del Municipio de San Ignacio de Velasco*. Santa Cruz de la Sierra: Industria Maderera San Luis S. R. L., Museo de Historia.

Créqui-Montfort, Georges de, Paul Rivet. 1913. Linguistique Bolivienne: La Langue Kaničana. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* XVIII: 354–377.

Danielsen, Swintha. 2007. *Baure: An Arawak Language of Bolivia. (Indigenous Languages of Latin America, 6.)* Leiden: Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies (CNWS), Universiteit Leiden.

Danielsen, Swintha. 2011. The personal paradigms in Baure and other Southern Arawakan languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77(4): 495–520.

Dunn, Saskia. 2022. *The shape of Arawakan classifiers: An internal source for the Arawakan classifier system(s). M.A. Thesis*. Leiden University.

Ekdahl, Elizabeth Muriel, Nancy Evelyn Butler. 1969. *Terêna dictionary*. Brasilia: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Ekdahl, Elizabeth Muriel, Nancy Evelyn Butler. 1979. *Aprenda Terêna*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Ekdahl, Elizabeth Muriel, Joseph E. Grimes. 1964. Terena verb inflection. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 30: 261–268.

Galeote Tormo, Jesús. 2014. Chiquitano (Besɨro). In: Pieter Muysken, Mily Crevels (eds.). *Lenguas de Bolivia: Oriente*: 259–301. La Paz: Plural Editores.

Gill, Wayne. 1970. *Diccionario Trinitario-Castellano y Castellano-Trinitario*. San Lorenzo de Mojos: Misión Evangélica Nuevas Tribus.

Jolkesky, Marcelo. 2016. *Estudo arqueo-ecolinguístico das terras tropicais sul-americanas*. Doctoral Dissertation. Universidade de Brasília (UnB).

Marbán, Pedro. 1702. *Arte de la lengua Moxa, con su vocabulario y catecismo*. Lima: Impr. Real de Joseph de Contreras.

Marcus, Inge H. E. 1994. Classifiers in Terena. *Estudos Linguísticos / Anais dos Seminários do GEL* 23(2): 912–919.

Martius, Carl Friedrich Phillip von. 1867. *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal Brasiliens, II: Zur Sprachenkunde*. Erlangen: Druck von Junge.

Nikulin, Andrey. 2019. Contacto de lenguas en la Chiquitanía. *Revista Brasileira de Línguas Indígenas* 2(2): 5–30.

Nikulin, Andrey. 2021. Fonología segmental del Chiquitano Migueleño. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi* 16(2): 1–34.

Olza Zubiri, Jesús, Conchita Nuni de Chapi, Juan Tube. 2002. *Gramática moja ignaciana (morfosintaxis).* San Cristóbal / Caracas: Universidad Católica del Táchira / UCAB.

Ott, Willis, Rebecca B. Ott. 1983. *Diccionario ignaciano y castellano, con apuntes gramaticales*. Cochabamba: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Passer, Matthias. 2016. (What) Do verb classifiers classify? *Lingua* 174: 16–44.

Payne, David L. 1991. A Classification of Maipuran (Arawakan) Languages Based on Shared Lexical Retentions. In: Desmond C. Derbyshire, Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*: 255–500. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rose, Françoise. 2014. Mojeño Trinitario. In: Pieter Muysken, Mily Crevels (eds.). *Lenguas de Bolivia: Oriente*: 59–97. La Paz: Plural Editores.

Rose, Françoise. 2015. Innovative complexity in the pronominal paradigm of Mojeño: A result of contact? In: Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev, Nino Amiridze (eds.). *Borrowed morphology*: 241–267. Berlin: De Gruyter / Mouton.

Rose, Françoise. 2024. *Mojeño Trinitario Classifiers: A multilocus and multifunctional system. Cadernos de Etnolinguística, Série Monografias 7*. Available online at: cnrs.hal.science/DDL/hal-04684656v1.

Sans, Pierric. 2013. *Elementos de la gramática del Bésɨro*. Bolivia: San Antonio de Lomerio.

Schmidt, Max. 1903. Guaná. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 35(4): 324–336, 560–604.

Silva, Denise. 2013. *Estudo lexicográfico da língua Terena: Proposta de um dicionário bilíngue terena-português. Dissertation*. Araraquara: Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho".

Taunay, Alfredo. 1868. *Scenas de Viagem: Exploração entre os Rios Taquary e Aquidauana no Districto de Miranda*. Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Americana.

Terhart, Lena. 2022. *A grammar of Paunaka. Dissertation*. Europa-Universität Flensburg.

Viegas Barros, Pedro. 2013. *Proto-Guaicurú*. München: LINCOM Europa.

Фернанду де Карвальью. Слова 'дерево', 'дрова' в языке терена аравакской семьи: этимологический анализ и возможные импликации

В статье обсуждаются возможные этимологические связи двух слов со значением 'дерево', обнаруживаемых в терена, одном из языков аравакской семьи, расположенном в юго-западной части Бразилии. Учитывая отсутствие для них очевидных параллелей в других аравакских языках, для слова *tikóti* 'дерево, дрова' предлагается анализ его как именного производного от одновалентного глагола **ti-k(o)-oʔi-* со значением 'плодоносить', образованного с помощью дескриптивного суффикса **-ti*. Относительно второго термина, *ʃúwe* 'дерево', можно предположить, что это заимствование из языка чикитано, хотя возможна и альтернативная этимология, связывающая его происхождение с терена существительным *ʃûʋi* 'маниок', происхождение которого раскрывается в данной работе впервые. Также обсуждаются некоторые следствия предложенных этимологизаций, в частности, возможность того, что в терена сохраняется застывший рефлекс показателя 3-го л. **ti-* (общая изоглосса с пра-мохеньо и паунака). Делается вывод о необходимости тщательных дальнейших исследований относительно масштаба, природы и социолингвистических характеристик элементов, заимствованных в терена из чикитано.

Ключевые слова: этимология; языковые контакты; аравакские языки; терена язык.