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Chapter 7

Paraguayan Guaraní

Paraguayan Guaraní\(^1\) or *avañe’ê* (people’s language) is a Tupi-Guaraní language of the Tupi family spoken in Paraguay, the Argentinean provinces of Corrientes, Misiones, Formosa, Chaco and the north of Santa Fe, as well as in the southern part of the Brazilian states of Mato Grosso do Sul and Paraná (Dietrich 2002: 32). Tupi languages are spoken over an extensive area in South America, “approximately from 4° in the North to 30° in the South” (Gregores and Suárez 1967: 13). While Tupi languages keep a close resemblance to each other, similarity is notably reduced between Paraguayan Guaraní and other languages of the same family. Furthermore, *avañe’ê* is distinct from languages of the subfamily Tupi-Guaraní spoken in present Paraguay. Gregores and Suárez (1967) quote a statement from Cadogan in which he maintains that

“For a Paraguayan not used to have dealings with the Mbya [another Tupi-Guaraní language], it would be practically impossible to reach an understanding with, for example, a Mbya woman not used to contacts with Paraguayans. As to men, most of them have come into contact with Paraguayans and learnt how to express themselves, more or less, in ‘Paraguayan Guaraní’. But the differences between both languages are great and even for me it is difficult to follow a conversation between two Indians when they are speaking in their own language” (Gregores and Suárez 1967: 16)

Other languages of the Tupi-Guaraní family spoken in Paraguay are Pa‘i Tavyterã, Mbya, Chiripá, Ache, Chiripá, Tapieté and Chiriguano, the last two spoken also in Bolivia. Scholars (e.g. Dietrich 1996) have called these languages ‘ethnic Guaraní’ to distinguish them from Paraguayan Guaraní (called by some ‘Mestizo Guaraní’\(^2\)) and Classical Guaraní (also called ‘Jesuitic Guaraní’). It is generally assumed that Paraguayan Guaraní originated in one variety of ‘ethnic Guaraní’ once spoken in

---

\(^1\) I refer to ‘Paraguayan Guaraní’ as Paraguay’s national language to distinguish it from other Guaraní languages. Paraguayan Guaraní includes *Guaranîete* ‘pure Guaraní’ and *jopara* ‘mixed Guaraní.’ Both terms are not well differentiated in the literature. For some, Paraguayan Guaraní is not equivalent to *jopara*. These terms are discussed in section 7.2.

\(^2\) Dietrich (2002: 31) notes that no strict equivalence exists between ‘Guaraní criollo’ (Mestizo Guaraní) and ‘Guaraní paraguayo’ (Paraguayan Guaraní) but he does not explain the difference. His use of *Guaraní criollo* is similar to my use of *Paraguayan Guaraní*, which refers to the national language of Paraguay spoken by people of non-Indian descent in this country. The use of the adjective ‘mestizo’ makes explicit reference to the mixture characteristic of contemporary *avañe’ê*. Various glottonyms are used in the literature, and debates persist around which term is the correct one.
Paraguay at the time of the Spanish conquest, but there is no way to establish with certainty which dialect contributed to the formation of present-day Guaraní. Neither do we know how Jesuitic Guaraní is related to present-day Guaraní nor how it contributed to its present form. From an extensive investigation (Thun, *Atlas Lingüístico Guaraní-Románico – Sociología*, 2002) it is clear that variation in present Guaraní is less dialectal than sociolectal and idiolectal.

In 1992 the percentage of Guaraní monolinguals (39.30%) was considerably higher than the percentage of Spanish monolinguals (6.40%), particularly in rural areas (MEC 1999). Also, the percentage of bilinguals (49%) was less than half of the country’s population (4,152,588 in 1992). By 2002 bilinguals above five years increased to 59% (2,655,423 speakers) while Guaraní monolinguals decreased to 27% (776,092 speakers). By the same year the percentage of bilinguals from rural areas had increased to 17.62%, with a similar decrease in the percentage of Guaraní monolinguals in the same areas. Guaraní speakers including bilinguals and monolinguals above five years of age counted 3,946,904 people, according to the 2002 census.3

Other European speech communities in Paraguay include Portuguese, German and English. The majority of their members speak Spanish but only a small number speak Guaraní. On the other hand, the total population of speech communities of Tupi-Guaraní and other families amounted to 89,169 in 2002.

### Table 7.1 Speakers above 5 years by area, sex and language (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Urban Both</th>
<th>Urban Men</th>
<th>Urban Women</th>
<th>Rural Both</th>
<th>Rural Men</th>
<th>Rural Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guaraní</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,946,904</td>
<td>2,008,237</td>
<td>1,938,667</td>
<td>2,165,630</td>
<td>1,058,223</td>
<td>1,107,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,170,812</td>
<td>1,552,319</td>
<td>1,618,493</td>
<td>2,285,301</td>
<td>1,092,874</td>
<td>1,192,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td>326,496</td>
<td>177,504</td>
<td>148,992</td>
<td>205,977</td>
<td>110,161</td>
<td>95,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaraní/Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,655,423</td>
<td>1,312,980</td>
<td>1,342,443</td>
<td>1,862,561</td>
<td>901,305</td>
<td>961,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td>264,706</td>
<td>145,361</td>
<td>119,345</td>
<td>191,338</td>
<td>103,057</td>
<td>88,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaraní/Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td>196,716</td>
<td>111,513</td>
<td>85,203</td>
<td>157,830</td>
<td>87,460</td>
<td>70,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dgeec. Resultados Finales Censo Nacional de Población y Vivienda 2002

---

3 Census data must be taken with caution, however, because no census so far has measured the levels of bilingualism and the use of language in social spaces.
Table 7.1 shows two major facts. Firstly, if societal bilingualism means the use of two languages by the majority of a country’s population, Paraguay is not a bilingual country. While societal bilingualism may be attained in the near future thanks to the regular increment in the number of bilinguals over the last years, it is unlikely that Spanish and Guaraní become spoken on equal grounds in Paraguay, given the dominant position of Spanish in relation to Guaraní. Secondly, the geographical distribution of languages in urban areas (Spanish) and rural areas (Guaraní) is gradually disappearing as a result of the dissemination of bilingualism in detriment of (Guaraní) monolingualism. Still, Paraguay continues to be a unique case in the continent, but this uniqueness is founded less on the assumed bilingualism of the Paraguayan society, than on the fact that Guaraní is the only indigenous language in Latin America spoken by non-Indians as their mother tongue.

Fishman (1967) described Paraguay as a case of diglossic bilingualism, where people speak two languages but use them in different social contexts. The concept of diglossic bilingualism points out different uses but fails to recognize the existing linguistic conflict. This conflict is modeled by important sociopolitical factors. Rubin (1968) studied these factors in terms of socio-communicative contexts and variables of language choice. He was the first sociolinguist who linked language usage to political, social and economic power and described the influence of social conditions such as literacy, migration, social mobility and group cohesion on language choice. Rubin (1973 141-156) considers four major factors (‘variables’ or ‘dimensions’ in his terminology) influencing language choice in Paraguay:

a) The first factor is geographic. It distinguishes rural from urban areas. The typical space of Guaraní is the countryside while that of Spanish are the cities.

b) The second factor is the formality of the speech event. Rubin defines formality as “a limited set of expected behaviors” and informality as “the normal set of behaviors allowed within one group”. Spanish is typically associated with formal speech events (especially if one of the interlocutors is socially dominant) while Guaraní is related to informal ones. Formality is partly determined by the physical setting of the speech event and the topic of the verbal exchange. Situations that are not strictly formal may develop gradually into informal ones.

c) The third factor is the degree of intimacy. Spanish is generally associated with a lower degree of intimacy (and formality). In contrast, Guaraní is usually associated with a higher degree of intimacy. Solidarity and group identity may increase or foster intimacy. The relation between Guaraní and intimacy is not

---

4 Unfortunately we do not have a sociolinguistic survey similar to that of Quichua (cf. section 5.2.), which provides quantifiable data on the uses of Spanish and Guaraní in different socio-communicative spaces. The most comprehensive – though by now outdated – sociolinguistic study of Paraguay is that by Rubin (1968).
predetermined however, because language choice is influenced very often by the speakers’ mother tongue.

d) The fourth factor is the degree of solemnity or seriousness of the speech event. Solemn speech belongs to Spanish while humorous speech is exclusive of Guaraní. Notice that a lower level of solemnity usually corresponds to a lower level of formality and intimacy.

Also, Rubin identifies minor factors that may cause deviations from the expected speech behaviors of interlocutors. These include the pressure by educational institutions on teachers, parents and students; the linguistic proficiency and the gender of the interlocutor; and the first language of acquisition. According to Rubin, major and minor factors change as society develops over time. As formal education and bilingualism increase, speakers are freer to choose one language or the other under less sociocultural pressure. This dynamic view of bilingualism would explain the changing language usage in today’s Paraguay. Figure 7.1 shows schematically the interplay of factors determining language choice. The model assumes that higher dimensions determine lower ones. From top to bottom, language choices become specific and the sociolinguistic dimensions multiply.

**Figure 7.1 Dimensions ordered by language choice**

Based on Rubin (1968)
Rubin referred explicitly to the sociopolitical conflict of the Paraguayan society as a factor unbalancing the status of bilingualism. Many of his readers have downplayed the sociopolitical conflict by assuming wrongly that Paraguay is a model of stable bilingualism. Quite the opposite, the sociolinguistic situation in Paraguay is not stable but changing. Moreover, the complementary distribution of Guaraní and Spanish shows that Paraguay is typically diglossic even though bilingualism is becoming the rule. Rubin noticed that language shift was in progress already in the sixties. Interestingly, the shift did not favor one language over the other but fostered bilingual proficiency and the mixing of both languages (Rubin 1973: 126f). But what is the limit of Paraguayan bilingualism? If the use of one language remains mutually exclusive of the other, full bilingualism can be attained, other things being equal. Considering that no society is completely bilingual, Rubin suggests that societal bilingualism in Paraguay can be approached but never accomplished.

The idea of an unfinished bilingualism is shared by Melià (1973), for whom “real bilinguals (to be specific, coordinate bilinguals) are unviable in Paraguay, as it is not possible to master both languages, Spanish and Guaraní, with equal, or nearly equal, proficiency, not because of structural deficiencies of Guaraní but because of its specific developments” (Melià 1973: 26; my translation). These developments result from the coexistence of languages over a long period of time and eventually converge in the emergence of a third language genetically different from Spanish and Guaraní. The new language will grow out of a complex process of language mixing. This process was surmised by Rubin as the following quote shows:

“Este aumento en la habilidad bilingüe se refleja en el pueblo debido a un alto grado de ‘codeswitching’. Frecuentemente, cuando se les preguntaba a los informantes qué idioma usaban en situaciones específicas contestaban ‘dzopará’ [jopará] (mezcla) refiriéndose tanto al cambio de un idioma a otro entre frases como también a la mezcla más íntima dentro de las frases mismas. Las observaciones de los informantes revelan que un gran porcentaje de las conversaciones informales consiste en un equilibrio entre los idiomas que se utilizan en un mismo discurso. El cambio a un aumento en la habilidad bilingüe produce también un alto grado de ‘codeswitching’ Aunque no tengo datos históricos que documenten esto, se dice que hace veinte años, la gente hablaba más el Guaraní” [This increase in bilingualism is reflected on a high degree of ‘codeswitching’. When asked about what language they use in specific situations, informants usually answered ‘dzopará’ (mixture) in reference not only to the switch of languages from one phrase to another but also to the mixing within

---
5 For Melià (1973) the situation in Paraguay is neither bilingualism nor diglossic bilingualism (in Fishman’s sense) but diglossia. For Melià, only this term unmask the true dimension of Paraguay’s linguistic conflict. In a similar way, von Gleich (1993) insists that nobody in Paraguay is bilingual, and Paraguayan bilingualism is more mythical than real.
phrases themselves. My informants’ remarks show that a large percentage of informal conversations correspond to a balance between languages mixed in the same discourse.] (Rubin 1973: 127; my translation).

Melià’s third language has a proper name. It is called *jopara* ‘mixed Guaraní’, and it is viewed as the opposite of *guaraníete* ‘pure Guaraní’. The specific characteristics of both varieties are discussed in section 7.2 in the context of linguistic variation in Paraguay. While *jopara* is typically associated with urban settings, *guaraníete* is identified with the countryside. A clear-cut geographical division cannot be assumed however, since higher levels of mixture are naturally expected as rural speakers become bilingual (cf. supra). For many *jopara* is equivalent to colloquial Guaraní while *guaraníete* is used only in literary works and textbooks. The current bilingual programs promote *jopara* as the language of schooling. Over the last decades many efforts have been made to ‘cleanse’ Guaraní *jopara* by producing prescriptive grammars and dictionaries that fill lexical gaps through neologisms and other equally fruitless strategies. The debate about which language should be used in education continues today.

The distance between *jopara* and *guaraníete* is increasing day by day. According to Granda, “if the gap between actual language use and language reference models continues or increases, it might give rise not only to an unwanted collective complex of linguistic inferiority but also to an increasingly dangerous state of double internal diglossia” (1981: 134; my translation).

### 7.1. The history of Guaraní in Paraguay

Juan Díaz de Solís (1516) and Alejo García (1524) explored the territory of Paraguay with the purpose of finding an easier route to the Inca Empire. By 1525 the news of a silver booty seized by García in the eastern slopes of the Andes encouraged Sebastián Gaboto to lead an exploration party along the Paraná and Paraguay rivers. A few years later Sebastián de Mendoza set up a large expedition to the estuary of Rio de la Plata, where he founded the city of Buenos Aires in 1536. Sent by Mendoza to rescue the exploration party of Juan de Ayolas and Domingo Martínez de Irala in the Chaco, Juan de Salazar and Gonzalo de Mendoza founded the outpost of Asunción on the eastern banks of the Paraguay River in 1537. Only Irala and his party survived to the bellicose Indians of the Chaco and were forced to return to Asunción. There he met a strong resistance from Cario Indians (Guaraní), whose leader Lambaré was defeated in the outskirts of Asunción one year later.

The Guaraní-speaking groups inhabiting the territory of present Paraguay at the moment of the Spanish invasion were “the Carios, whose territory was limited by the Paraguay, Tebicuary and Jejuí rivers, on the one hand, and the highlands of
Ybyturuzú; the Tapé, who inhabited the highlands of the same name on the Grande del Sur river; the Chandules or Islander Guaraníes; the Itatines in northeastern Paraguay; the Chiriguanos in the eastern slopes of the Andes; and the Guarayos in Santa Cruz de la Sierra [Bolivia]” (Corvalán 1992: 2; my translation). The Spaniards realized very early that the linguistic homogeneity of the Spaniards could help their colonization enterprise. The contact was different in each case, not only because the Guaraní groups were many but also because the methods and goals of the conquerors changed according to the situation (Melià 1988: 18). While the Carios were contacted by military parties in the late 1530s (cf. supra), the Tapes were contacted by Jesuit missionaries in 1628. These opposite situations suggest that there were two different conquests. Each conquest had its own agents, its own place and time, but above all, its own methods.

The first Conquest of Guaraní

Few years after their defeat by Irala, the Carios entered into marriage alliances with the Spaniards. Indian women were given to the conquerors as domestic workforce and became mothers to a large numbers of mixed-blood children whom they cared for and raised alone. For some authors, this explains the spreading of Guaraní among the mestizo population of Paraguay unlike the events in other Spanish colonies where mestizos did not maintain the Indian language but assimilated linguistically to the dominant Spanish society. While miscegenation was decisive for the configuration of the linguistic situation in Paraguay, ethnic mixing did not encourage an equal use of Spanish and Guaraní. The assumption that miscegenation allowed bilingualism is deeply rooted in historiography and veils the sociopolitical domination of colonial Paraguay, where both languages coexisted but were used in mutually exclusive settings (cf. Melià 1988: 216).

Before the Spanish conquest the Carios and other Guaraní groups lived in settlements scattered over a vast area of land that covered present Paraguay, the southernmost part of Brazil and the north of Argentina. According to Clastres (1974: 79f) Guaraní territory covered an area of about 500,000 square kilometers. A conservative estimate of the Guaraní population at the time of the Spanish conquest gives an approximate of 200,000 people (Melià 1988: 239). Still, the scattered

6 Cario, Tovatí and Guarambaré Indians were the first Guaraní to be contacted by the Spaniards and were eventually absorbed in the mixing process. Tapé, Itaí and Paranaguá Indians had their first contact with Europeans only through Jesuit missionaries. Mbya Indians, in contrast, had only occasional contact with Europeans and preserved their culture and language to a great extent without Spanish influence well into the twentieth century (cf. Trinidad Sanabria 2002; Melià 1988).

7 The idea of the different conquests is inspired in the work of Melià (1988) about the four different types of ‘reductions’ to which Guaraní was subject during the last four hundred or so years (cf. infra).
settlement pattern of Guaraní peoples prevented the Spaniards from using their workforce at a large scale as they did in the Andes.

In Asuncion, the major settlement in Guaraní territory, Spaniards were easily outnumbered by Indians. This situation prevailed into the first half of the sixteenth century, even after the decimation of the Guaraní by epidemic outbreaks. In 1617 the number of Indians in Asuncion was 28,200 vis-à-vis 350 Spanish colonists (Necker 1975: 145). With such a demographic unbalance, intermarriage became the best strategy for Spaniards to create long-lasting bonds that encourage pacific coexistence. Spaniards used to marry several Indian women, and polygamy became a common practice in the district. As a result, miscegenation spread rapidly along with the Indian language, which was transmitted from the Indian mothers to their mestizo offspring. Mestizos became more numerous over the years but were eventually absorbed into the Spanish enclaves of the area. The easy incorporation of mestizos to the colonial society was facilitated in part by the absence of a strong caste system, which left space for interracial and intercultural practices. This does not mean however that Mestizos were not discriminated. They were indeed, but unlike Indians, Mestizos could mask their descent and became more ‘Spanish-like’ in a process of socio-psychological “whitening” (Maeder 1975: 82).

The initial demographic situation in Paraguay had a strong impact on the languages involved. Not only Guaraní spread all over Paraguay but its linguistic structure experienced noticeable changes as a result of usage in contexts different from those of pre-contact times. At the same time, Spanish continued to be used in all official transactions and was associated with the ruling elites. Still, Crown officials protested that Guaraní was displacing Spanish in the area to the point that even the few unmixed descendants of Spaniards who remained in Paraguay preferred to speak the native language with each other instead of speaking Spanish. The use of Guaraní by culturally indigenous mestizos who were part of the colonial society and by Spaniards who learned the language from their close contact with the overwhelming number of Mestizos and Indians required a series of adaptive strategies from the indigenous language which eventually shaped present Guaraní.

The second Conquest of Guaraní

The Guaraní peoples who remained outside Spanish influence were the object of evangelization enterprises, first by Franciscan and later by Jesuit missionaries. While Franciscan missions developed at the heart of the colonial matrix, Jesuitic missions (1610-1768) attained a higher degree of autonomy and self-support without parallel in Hispanic America. Reducciones or missions were villages formed by people from different ethnic groups under the rule of the Jesuits. Entry was prohibited to everyone except missionaries. This policy prevented any type of mixing with the Spanish population and saved Indians from the numerous epidemic
outbreaks that assailed towns and cities. In 1760, eight years before the Jesuits were expelled from the Spanish colonies, the number of Guaraní Indians had increased to 104,184 in the seven reducciones that existed in Paraguay, while the population of Spaniards and Mestizos in urban centers counted 39,739 citizens (Maeder 1975: 81). A remarkable characteristic of reducciones was the considerable degree of independence granted to Indians for their own cultural and economic ways. The Guaraní language was one of the most cherished cultural traditions which flourished in the space of reducciones. No other language was used in the missions for oral and written communication in daily life, both by Indians and Jesuits. The latter made their best efforts to standardize the language by providing it with a phonological spelling, grammars, dictionaries and all kind of materials for religious indoctrination. Melià (1988: 249) calls this process reducción ‘reduction’. He offers a detailed description of the standardization the Jesuits made of the language so that it can express all the concepts considered useful for the everyday and religious life of Indians. The effects of standardization in the structure of the language are discussed in the next section. For the time being suffice it to say that the Guaraní ‘created’ by the Jesuits sought to erase the dialectal differences present in reducciones. Arguably, a process of dialect leveling took place during the one hundred and fifty years of Jesuitic missionary administration and resulted in the creation of a Guaraní koine (Lustig 1996: 23).

After the missions were dissolved by the Crown under suspicion of creating an autonomous regime independent from Spain, their Indians either fled to the wilderness or integrated into the colonial society. Only a very small number of them remained in the surroundings of the former missions. They organized themselves in communities with a relative autonomy and fewer contacts with the outside world, thus surviving until 1848 (cf. infra) when a pro-Spanish nationalist regime ordered their dissolution (Plà 1970: 17).

---

8 A total of 29 reducciones were scattered in Paraguay (7), northern Argentina (15) and southern Brazil (7).
9 Melià identifies four ‘reductions’ of Guaraní since the Spanish Conquest: the Hispanic reduction; the Jesuit reduction; the National-Indigenous reduction after the Independence from Spain and the formation of the Paraguayan state; and the anthropological reduction by academic researchers (Melià 1988: 260).
The differences between the Guaraní spoken by Indians in the reducciones and the Guaraní spoken by Mestizos and Spaniards in the urban centers were numerous, but most of them consist in changes induced in the language by contact with Spanish. The mutual influence between Jesuitic Guaraní and urban Guaraní remains unknown to date (Dietrich 1995: 204). From the present configuration of Paraguayan Guaraní it is obvious that the contribution of the Jesuitic Guaraní spoken by Indians from former reducciones who came to live in the towns became dissolved over the years until their eventual assimilation in the colonial society. Melià (1988) expresses this view in the following terms:

“Con la migración de los indios misioneros fuera de sus reducciones, movimiento que se irá prolongando durante el siglo XIX, y la mayor interferencia de la población criolla en aquellos mismos pueblos, es muy probable que la distancia dialectal entre ambas formas de la lengua Guaraní haya disminuido, pero en el sentido de una mayor criollización. Los factores que mantenían al Guaraní como “variedad alta” con escritura y literatura y con su relativa autonomía dentro de la reducción desaparecen, mientras se acentúan los factores que actuaban dentro del colonialismo criollo”. [With the migration of the Indians out of the reducciones – a process that extended well into the nineteenth century – and the increasing presence of the Mestizo population in the same town, it is very likely that the dialectal distance
between both varieties of the Guaraní language diminished, but in the direction of an increasing creolization. The factors disappeared that made Guaraní the “higher variety”, i.e the variety with a writing system and literature tradition but also with relative autonomy inside the reducciones; at the same time, the factors playing a role in mestizo colonialism became important] (Melià 1988: 243; my translation).

Guaraní after the Independence

When Paraguay declared its independence from Spain in 1811, it was an isolated district of the Viceroyalty of Rio de la Plata, with minor economic and political relevance for the Crown. Guaraní was then spoken all over Paraguay by people of Indian and Spanish descent. But the new establishment did not create an auspicious context for the use of Guaraní in education and administration. The diglossic character of the colonial society remained unchanged. After their independence from Spain, Paraguayans continued to show ambivalent attitudes towards Guaraní: one the one hand, Guaraní is seen as the greatest symbol of Paraguayan identity; on the other, Guaraní is associated with backwardness and primitivism. This ambivalence explains why political leaders often took contradictory stands and made divergent decisions about the use of Guaraní.

The dictator Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia ruled the country during 26 years, from 1814 to his death in 1840. Apart from isolating Paraguay from the rest of the world and promoting an autarchic system based on economic self-support and agrarian communalism, Francia gave a new impetus to the old educational establishment by opening schools across the country and ordering that education be provided only in Spanish. Contradictorily, Francia himself used Guaraní for all administrative and political issues and considered it a distinctive trait of Paraguayan identity. Francia’s successor, Carlos Antonio Lopez, a European-grown progressist, was a blatant detractor of Guaraní. In 1848 Lopez launched a campaign for the replacement of Guaraní family names with Spanish names. About the same year he ordered the dissolution of the few Indian communities that remained from the former Jesuit missions. However, this measure indirectly strengthened the use of Guaraní, because many Indians who were Guaraní monolinguals became incorporated to the mainstream Paraguayan society (Zajícová 2002: 4). The effects of such incorporation have not received yet any special attention from historians and linguists.

With Lopez’ death in 1862, his son Francisco Solano Lopez became president of Paraguay and had to face a bloody war with Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. While the aftermath of the war was incommensurable in demographic and economic terms, it strengthened Guaraní as a Paraguayan symbol. Guaraní was used in the battlefield and the trenches as a secret code or in folk songs, many of which became part of Paraguayan oral tradition. Francisco López realized the agglutinating
potential of Guaraní and organized during the war a Congress of Spelling (Congreso de Grafía) which set the first rules for the orthography of Paraguayan Guaraní. The first literary works written in Paraguayan Guaraní date from this time. Journals like *Cabichu’í* and *Cacique Lambaré* reported the events of war and mocked the warlike skills of the enemy.

Six years of war left a decimated nation at the mercy of the winning powers. And the winners did not have any interest in promoting Guaraní. A puppet regime was appointed on 15 August 1869 during a mass celebrated at the Cathedral by the General Vicar of the Argentinean Army, who preached about “the need to regenerate the Paraguayan people in order to promote their development” and the need to expel Guaraní from Paraguay for being “a dreadful creation of ignorance and backwardness” (García Mellid 1988: 34). Shortly afterwards, on the 7th of March 1870, the Minister of the Interior Cirilo Antonio Rivarola decreed on behalf of the provisional government that “schoolteachers and pupils are explicitly prohibited to use Guaraní in the classrooms, the only language of which shall be Spanish” (Zajícová 2002: 5). A few years later the Argentinean political writer and activist Domingo F. Sarmiento embarked on an educational reform for Paraguay following his ideological tenant of a new American civilization, in which “languages of wild men” had no place (Trinidad Sanabria 2002). For the next fifty years a linguistic policy that favored Spanish monolingualism at the cost of Guaraní prevailed in education and administration. War tested the agglutinating power of Guaraní once more in the 1930s. The Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia (1932-1935) motivated the recognition of Guaraní at all spheres of administration. Politicians, military and religious leaders usually gave their speeches and harangues in Guaraní while poets used to compose popular songs in the language.

Most of the liberal, revolutionary and dictatorial administrations of the twentieth century did nothing for the promotion of Guaraní. Winds of change came with the nationalization of the language on the 15th of August 1967, when the Constitution granted Guaraní the status of a ‘national language’. The new status did not have any practical consequence however. Only with the fall of Stroessner’s dictatorship in 1989 and the passing of a new Constitution in 1992, Guaraní obtained its official status on a par with Spanish. The Ministry of Education began to implement a bilingual education program in which every child must be taught in his/her own mother tongue. But the implementation of bilingual programs did not escape controversy: some people consider that bilingual programs perpetuate the same structures of oppression on Guaraní by giving too much space to Spanish borrowings; others consider that Guaraní and Spanish are related by their common history, so that it is inevitable that Guaraní carries all kinds of traces from Spanish, just like Paraguayan Spanish carries numerous traces from Guaraní.

Because Paraguayan Guaraní was used only in oral form until recently, the greatest challenge faced by language policy makers in Paraguay is the design of a
large-scale adaptation of the language to the contents of modern education. This adaptation, which Melià calls ‘the national-indigenous reduction of Guarani’ (Melià 1988: 260), includes the following tasks: the construction of a specialized Guarani lexicon for social and physical sciences; a new description of Guarani according to its own categories; the normativization of Guarani for its use in public spaces; the promotion of literature and the preparation of teaching materials in Guarani; and the training of teachers in the implementation of bilingual education programs (Pereira Jacquet 2003). Of these goals the creation of a modern lexicon has absorbed the efforts of linguists and teachers during the last decade. Every year dictionaries appear to bridge the lexical gap between Guarani and Spanish. Some of these dictionaries have been criticized by linguists on account of the flawed and arbitrary mechanisms used to create a mare magnum of neologisms that Guarani speakers never use in daily communication (De Guaraniá 1998; Melià 1998; Trinidad Sanabria 2002.). The writing of good descriptive grammars to facilitate the teaching of Guarani according to its own linguistic categories has been completely neglected so far. In the new millennium language planning has become the arena of political disputes. Far from solved, controversies about education models proliferate. In a recent article about the ideologies behind the debate of Guarani in bilingual education programs, Mortimer (2006) summarizes in very clear terms what seems to be the actual motivation of the dispute:

“More than being over the kind of Guarani being used in schools, the current struggle seems to be over the degree to which the language is incorporated into the curriculum and the degree to which this incorporation might represent an additional academic challenge for students who have traditionally spoken the language of greater access and power—that is to say, the degree to which the incorporation of Guarani into school challenges the advantages Spanish speaking students have traditionally enjoyed. The formal incorporation of both languages into public education undoubtedly represents improvement in access for Guarani dominant children to both literacy and knowledge” (Mortimer 2006: 68).

The core of the controversies about the use of Guarani in education seems therefore the confrontation of views about linguistic mixture. Underlying this confrontation are long-established relations of power between different sectors of a culturally and racially mixed society like the Paraguayan.

7.2. Language variation and language mixing in Paraguay

Paraguay is described as more homogeneous in linguistic terms than any other country in the Americas. The basis for this statement is the allegedly stable
bilingualism of Paraguay and the high degree of racial mixture at all levels of the Paraguayan society. While homogeneity is certainly prominent in Paraguay, the fact is that Paraguayan bilingualism is neither stable nor societal, but changing and diglossic.

The homogeneity of Paraguayan Guaraní is based on a narrow dialectal variation. Guaraní dialectal differences are visible between the variety spoken in Paraguay and the one spoken by Paraguayan immigrants in the Argentinean Province of Corrientes. The Guaraní of Corrientes is not simply “an extension of Paraguayan Guaraní but an independent variety of Guaraní which has evolved since the late 1800s” (Dietrich 2002: 34f; my translation). Two opposite tendencies are observed in Corrientes Guaraní: one is the archaic realization of certain sounds (e.g. the first person pronoun che is realized as [če] in Corrientes but as [še] in Paraguay); the other is the loss of several distinctive features of phonology (e.g. nasalization) and the lexicon (e.g. kinship terms). Gregores and Suárez (1968) report that their informants were aware of the differences between their (Paraguayan) dialects of Guaraní and the dialect spoken in Northeast Argentina, “but that they [the differences] were never so great as to impair communication in any serious way” (Gregores and Suárez 1968: 16). These authors notice that linguistic borders do not match political borders between Paraguay and Argentina. The same applies to the dialects of Guaraní spoken by Paraguayan immigrants in Brazil, even if, in this case, the contact language is Portuguese instead of Spanish. The findings of Atlas Lingüístico Guaraní-Románico (2002) point in the same direction.

Variation in Paraguayan Guaraní is more visible, in a diatopic perspective, between urban and rural varieties. However, the gap between both varieties is being gradually bridged by an increasing bilingualism in rural areas (cf. 5.3). In principle, the urban-rural split is correlated to differences in social class, economic position, education and age. Therefore, variation in Paraguayan Guaraní is sociolectal rather than dialectal. In other words, Paraguayan Guaraní is diastratically heterogeneous, but dialectally homogeneous.

In the literature rural Guaraní is associated with Guaraníete ‘true Guaraní’ while urban Guaraní is sometimes identified with jopara ‘mixed Guaraní’. However, there is no exact correspondence between these varieties and their assigned areas. It is perfectly possible to find jopara in rural areas – in fact some of our rural informants spoke more jopara than Guaraníete. Still, the degree and range of mixture is visibly lower in the countryside. Guaraníete has been also identified with academic Guaraní, i.e. the language created by scholars through a systematic ‘cleansing’ of the Spanish lexicon (Mortimer 2006: 2). Academic Guaraní is used only by a small number of educated Paraguayans in formal settings (Lustig 1996: 20; Rodríguez-Alcalá 2002: 79). The other side of the coin is jopara, i.e. the colloquial variety of Guaraní spoken by most Paraguayans. Jopara carries numerous lexical and grammatical imprints from Spanish. In general, there is no consensus
about which variety is referred to by one term or the other. Let us see some definitions of Guaraníete and jopara in the literature.

Dietrich equates Guaraníete with the ‘educated standard variety’ of Guaraní (Sp. norma culta) as opposed to jopara, the mixed language “characterized by many lexical and syntactic influences from Spanish” (2002: 40). In similar terms, Lustig (2000: 2) associates Guaraníete with a Guaraní purged of Spanish items. Neither Dietrich nor Lustig are specific about whether Guaraníete is equivalent to Paraguayan Guaraní or not. Still, the assumption is implicit in both authors that Guaraníete is one form of Paraguayan Guaraní. The definitions of jopara in the literature are more numerous. Lustig provides a definition of jopara as “a mixed language from Spanish and Guaraní in which most of the Paraguayans communicate in their daily life” (Lustig 1996: 1; my emphasis), but he adds that jopara is better described as a ‘mixture of languages’ rather than a ‘mixed language’, since it is not a language in strict terms, because it has no rules. A similar view is held by Dietrich (1993: 18) who considers jopara a non-stabilized mixed language on its way either to normativization or replacement by Spanish. In terms of use and distribution Lustig defines jopara as “a diastratic and diasituational variety of Paraguayan Guaraní which occupies an intermediate position in a continuum of different degrees of Hispanicization or Guaranítization, from ethnic Guaraní through pure academic Guaraní to Paraguayan Spanish and Standard Spanish” (Lustig 1996: 3; my translation). That is, jopara is the variety in which Paraguayan Guaraní is realized in daily communication. A rather different definition of jopara appears in an official document on the Paraguayan educative reform prepared by the Paraguayan Ministry of Education (MEC). This document defines jopara first as the lexical borrowing which is not integrated into Guaraní phonology and morphosyntax, and by extension as the variety which uses non-integrated forms. Jopara is the opposite of jehe’a, i.e. the lexical borrowing which, by virtue of its integration to the structure of the language, is part and parcel of the Guaraní lexicon and follows its orthographic rules (MEC 2004). A further distinction is made according to the possible types of jopara: the use of unincorporated single words (lexical jopara); the mixing of Spanish and Guaraní within one syntactic unit (syntactic jopara); and the use of Spanish and Guaraní in alternated form within one text (discursive jopara). Both jopara and jehe’a are different from Paraguayan Guaraní, the language used by most Paraguayans in daily communication.

In sum, there are several definitions of Guaraníete and jopara, some subtler than others but all used more or less interchangeably. The list of terms referring to either variety can be long, as noticed by Mortimer (2006: 59), who found as many as twenty-six terms for Guaraníete and no fewer than twenty-three for jopara. Add to the list two terms associated to jopara which are increasingly used in specialized and non-specialized circles: one term is guarañol, a hybrid from Guaraní and español, coined by Melià (1988: 247); the other is castení, a hybrid from castellano and
Guaraní. While both terms refer to language mixing, they are not interchangeable and mean two different types of mixture. Castení refers to the jopara whose matrix language is Spanish; guarañol refers to the jopara whose matrix language is Guaraní. In the following I provide a characterization of jopara guarañol and the place it occupies in the continuum discussed in section 5.1.3.

A classification of Guaraní varieties is represented in Figure 7.2 below. The Guaraní branch of the Tupi family distinguishes three sub-branches: ethnic Guaraní, spoken by indigenous peoples of Paraguay; Classical Guaraní, developed in the Jesuitic missions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and Paraguayan Guaraní, the language spoken by Paraguayan Mestizos. Paraguayan Guaraní is further divided into Guaraníete (standard Guaraní used in written form and formal speech) and jopara (colloquial Guaraní). Paraguayan Guaraní received two contributions: from Classical Guaraní when the Jesuitic missions were dissolved and their Indians came to live in the towns; and from ethnic Guaraní, through the ongoing migration of members of Guaraní ethnic groups to the cities. Finally, jopara distinguishes two varieties according to the matrix language involved: Spanish-based jopara or guarañol and Guaraní-based jopara or castení.11

---

10 Notice that Classical Guaraní is different from Guaraníete, even if both resemble each other in several ways, mainly in the minimum influence of Spanish in their respective systems.

11 Strictly speaking, though, castení should not belong to Guaraní, because its matrix language is Spanish.
Borrowing and language mixing

Nobody knows exactly when Spanish borrowing in Guaraní started. From other colonial settings in the Americas we assume that it was in the early years of colonization. In fact, Spanish borrowings in Amerindian languages are as old as the Spanish presence in the continent. For example, many aboriginal languages preserve Spanish words long disappeared from modern Spanish or words which are pronounced as in old Spanish: e.g. *parlana* ‘to speak’ in Quichua, from old Spanish *parlar* ‘to speak’; *obexa* ‘sheep’ [obešá] in Guaraní, pronounced [obexa] in modern Spanish; *domi* ‘money’ in Otomí, from *tomín*, a type of Spanish currency in the sixteenth century. These words and many others are conspicuous evidence of early contacts with Spanish. In the communicative setting of Spanish colonization, lexical borrowing was a common practice. Of course, the wide gap between borrowing and mixing proper has been bridged only by few languages.

Mixing as defined here is the massive entry of foreign elements in a language which ends by changing its original configuration. Some authors call this process ‘relexification’ (e.g. Muysken 1981): a term from Creole linguistics to describe the massive lexical replacement occurred in certain non-Creole languages. Two well-known cases of mixing in Amerindian languages come from Nahuatl (Hill and Hill 1977, 1986) and Media Lengua (Muysken 1979, 1985, 1997; Gómez Rendón 2005, 2008b). I propose to include jopara as another case of language mixing for a number of reasons to be explained later in this section. The few linguistic studies of mixing in jopara are Domínguez (1982), Armatto de Welti (1982), Lustig (1996) and Gómez Rendón (forthcoming/a).

Language mixing in diachronic perspective

The social and cultural conquest of Guaraní peoples and their language had two different settings, as explained in the previous section. One took place in the colonial urban centers founded by the Spaniards since 1537 and involved intense miscegenation (*mestizaje*) in cultural and racial terms. The other took place in the Jesuitic missions and involved the isolation of indigenous people from the colonial society, which enabled them to preserve a great part of their former life style and their own language. Neither setting was harmless however. Spanish settlers and missionaries, each in their own ways, undertook the ‘reduction’ of Guaraní peoples. This reduction was far more systematic in the case of the Jesuitic missions. The Spanish settlers did not make any effort to provide the indigenous language with an orthographic system of graphemes and rules while the Jesuits did so. In the urban centers Guaraní was spoken alongside Spanish while in the missions it was the only language for communication. Guaraní experienced an intense contact with Spanish in colonial towns by a steady increase in the number of bilinguals among Mestizos
and Spaniards. Still, the linguistic processes undergone by Guaraní in both settings resemble each other very closely. They involved the Hispanicization of the lexicon and certain grammatical categories of the indigenous language.

In the lexicon the process involved three strategies: the borrowing of Spanish lexical and grammatical items; the use of native Guaraní words with Spanish meanings; and the formation of new words on the basis of Spanish semantic structures.

From early religious works and the proceedings of indigenous councils it is possible to trace the use of Spanish borrowings back to the late sixteenth century. In the first Guaraní catechism written by Fray Luis de Bolaños (1583), besides religious names (e.g. Jesus, Maria) and formulae (e.g. amen) we find a few Spanish words including padre ‘father’, gracia ‘grace’ and cruz ‘cross’. In a 1753 document, written by the president of the Indian council Nicolás Ñeengyrú to the governor of Buenos Aires, we find Spanish borrowings of administrative character (e.g. rey ‘king’, cabildo ‘council’, Corregidor ‘royal representative’) but also a few words from basic vocabulary (e.g. señor ‘sir’, nombre ‘name’). If Spanish was present in the written language of monolingual clergymen and mission Indians, it is not unrealistic to assume its presence in the oral language of bilingual Mestizos and Spaniards in towns. A series of official documents written in Guaraní by Mestizo leaders of the Independence wars show an abundance of lexical and grammatical borrowings from Spanish (cf. Romero 1992).

The mechanisms of semantic calquing and word formation had far-reaching consequences for the development of the language. They consisted in the mapping of Spanish semantic units onto native forms and in the creation of neologisms based on Spanish word-formation rules. Both practices were familiar in the colonial period, especially among the Jesuits. Like in other areas of the Spanish Empire, the missionaries used native words to express religious concepts. In this case the advantage was that missionaries find no resistance from religious officials, who criticized vehemently the use of native languages for religious indoctrination in the case of Quechua, for example (Mannheim: 1991: 65). The word tupã is illustrative in this respect. Originally, Tupã was one of the highest Tupi-Guaraní divinities. Jesuits used this word to mean ‘God’. The same word served to create neologisms such as Tupã-sy ‘God-mother’ for the Virgin Mary, or Tupã-o ‘God-house’ for the church. Later on Tupã was replaced by ņande-jára, literally ‘Our Lord.’

In the grammar, Guaraní lost several grammatical categories. According to Zajícová (2002: 3), because it was women, not (Spanish) men, who transmitted Guaraní to their offspring, the language lost certain gender-based categories. One of them was the use of the affirmative adverb, which had originally two forms, ta in men’s speech and he in women’s speech. Nowadays we find only the second form in Paraguayan Guaraní while the other is preserved in ethnic varieties. Similar changes affected the kinship system. Pre-contact Guaraní used a gender- and age-
based categorization of kinship, according to which the speaker’s sex and age determined the use of the reference term. Thus, a woman addressed her brother as *kyvy* regardless of age while a man called his brother *ryke’y* (if he was older than his brother) or *ryyy* (if he was younger). Similar distinctions were made by sisters and brothers when referring to older or younger siblings. Of this fine-grained classificatory system only a few terms remain while most have been replaced by Spanish kinship terms which do not make similar distinctions (Dietrich 2002: 33f).12

These glimpses into the contact-induced changes that occurred in Paraguayan Guaraní give us an idea of how different the language is from pre-contact Guaraní – or from ethnic Guaraní for that matter. The study of language mixing in Paraguay is largely limited by the absence of written documents or primary sources that show the evolution of mixing through the aforementioned strategies. Fragmentary evidence comes from a few testimonial narratives of Crown administrators and visitors during the colonial period. The following is one of the earliest references to language mixing in Paraguay.

> “Todo el vulgo, aun las mujeres de rango, niños y niñas, hablan el Guaraní como su lengua natal, aunque los más hablen bastante bien el español. A decir verdad, mezclan ambas lenguas y no entienden bien ninguna...Así nació una tercera o sea la que usan hoy en día” [all people, even elite women, boys and girls, speak Guaraní as their mother tongue, even though most of them speak Spanish as well. Actually, they mix both languages and do not understand either properly...In this way a third language emerged, which is the one they use nowadays] (Dobrizhoffer 1783, quoted in Melià 1974: 59).

The first written documents in *jopara* date from the War of the Triple Alliance. As mentioned above, the Guaraní language became then an agglutinating symbol of Paraguayan identity. Two journals written in *jopara* under the name of *Cacique Lambare* and *Cabichú*i appeared between 1867 and 1868. These early pieces of Paraguayan folk literature have been analyzed by Lustig (2002). *Cacique Lambare* and *Cabichú*i were Guaraní monolingual publications for soldiers on the front. Considering this readership, the editors used colloquial Guaraní only. The following excerpt is taken from *Cabichú*i (quoted in Lustig 2002: 4).

---

12 For a similar development in Ecuadorian Quichua, see Gómez Rendón 2007a.
Extract from *Cabichu’i* (jopara literature from the late nineteenth century)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paraguayan Guaraní (jopara)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toikove 21 de octubre tres de noviembre ndive mburuvicha ha’e soldados umi ára javeve. Taimarã’e’y entero ikatu haguá ogosa ñande Karai Guasu ome’êva condecoración eta. Enterove por parejo jafelicita chupekuéra, ñande <em>Mariscal</em> remime’ê jarohory hendivekuéra, Toikove ñane Retã ñande <em>Mariscal</em> ndive, ha’e umi Mburuvicha eta oascende ramo va’ekue.</td>
<td>On the 21st of October and the 3rd of November our officials and soldiers shall celebrate. Everybody shall be party in honor of the many decorations gained by our Great General. Each and all of us shall congratulate them, and with them we shall show our joy as a gift for our General. That our Land may live and so live our General and the promoted officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text contains sixteen different Spanish items among numerals, nouns, verbs and adverbs. Spanish items are adapted to the morphosyntactic structure of Guaraní. Interestingly, the editors of this journal state explicitly that they are using ‘pure’ Guaraní. Lustig quotes another text in *jopara* from the Chaco War against Bolivia, composed by a famous Paraguayan folk singer, in which its author boasts his use of ‘pure Guaraní’ but uses a large number of Spanish borrowings or code switches. The entire *jopara* literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries takes as its point of departure the events of war and depicts Guaraní as the symbol of the nation, regardless of any concern about mixture.

The historical record suggests that *jopara* has been spoken in Paraguay at least since the seventeenth century, and since then it has been strongly associated with ethnic (Paraguayan) identity. Speaking *jopara* always implied loyalty to this identity. Only recently *jopara* has been negatively associated with impurity. Clearly, certain changes in the linguistic ideology of the Paraguayan society occurred in the second half of the twentieth century. The attacks on *jopara* became harder since the early seventies, some years after the declaration of Guaraní as a national language, and have reached their peak in the last decade, after the promotion of Guaraní to the status of official language and the implementation of the Paraguayan Educative Reform. Ironically, the new status of Guaraní has encouraged the underestimation of colloquial Guaraní. While there are many influencing factors to be consider, those of ideology and politics are among the most crucial, as explained by Mortimer (2006: 68).

But what type of mixture is *jopara*? As explained above, *jopara* includes two varieties ways: one takes Spanish as its morphosyntactic matrix (section 5.1.3.1); the other takes Guaraní as the matrix. The first variety was discussed in section 5.1.3.1. Here I discuss the variety of *jopara* based on Guaraní morphosyntax. Part of the following discussion was presented elsewhere (Gómez Rendón, forthcoming/a).
Assuming that language mixing is determined by a combination of the lexicon and the grammar of the languages in contact, four different combinations of Spanish and Guaraní are possible. This is shown in Figure 7.3 below.

First, any combination of lexicon and grammar from two dialectal varieties of one language produces another dialectal variety of the same language, one that is typologically similar to the dialects which contributed to its emergence. Because *jopara* is not a mixture of dialects but one of different languages, the mixtures which combine lexicons and grammars of either Guaraní (G) or Spanish (Sp) are not considered *jopara*.

**Figure 7.3 Combinatory possibilities of Spanish-Guaraní language mixing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEXICON</th>
<th>GRAMMAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>J_G (GUARAÑOL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are left thus with two possible *jopara* mixtures: one (J_Sp) whose matrix language is Spanish and (most of) its lexicon Guaraní; and another (J_G) whose matrix language is Guaraní and (most of) its lexicon Spanish. I have proposed to call the first variety *casteni* and the second *guarañol*. The first variety (J_Sp) is not reported in the literature because linguists and sociolinguists refer to *jopara* only as ‘Hispanicized Guaraní’. However, this variety (J_Sp) exists indeed in the form of Guaraniticized Spanish, as discussed in section 5.1.3.1. Casteni speakers usually live in the cities, particularly in Asunción; their socioeconomic status is low and their education level is usually elementary. For the second type of mixture (J_G) the evidence is abundant. It includes part of the corpus collected for this investigation. The text corresponds to a speaker of Ciudad del Este. Spanish loanwords are italicized and switches appear in square brackets.
Example from Jopara

Given the strong presence of code switching, one major question is in what proportion code-switching and borrowing occur in this variety of jopara. From the statistical analysis of texts (Gómez Rendón, forthcoming/a) I have shown that code-switching tends to be more frequent than borrowing (1.37 to 1) and inter-sentential switches more numerous than intra-sentential ones. A detailed analysis of the morphosyntactic matrix allows to conclude that: 1) Guaraní is the matrix language of this variety of jopara because it provides most of the system morphemes; 2) word order is Guaraní and Spanish, even though syntactic calquing from the latter is prolific; 3) constituent order in the noun phrase is Guaraní, even though jopara is less complex, both morphologically and syntactically, than traditional Guaraní (cf. infra).

The next question is whether this variety is still Guaraní in typological terms. To answer this question, we need first to describe the typological features of traditional varieties of Guaraní and compare them to those of innovative varieties such as jopara. This is done in the next section.

7.3. Paraguayan Guaraní: a typological characterization

The following typological description is based on traditional Guaraní as spoken in rural areas. Notice that rural Guaraní is not necessarily equivalent to Guaraníete or ‘pure Guaraní’. Rural Guaraní is a variety used in daily communication and characterized by a lesser influence from Spanish; Guaraníete refers to a standardized
variety purged of Spanish elements. The typology of traditional Guarani\textsuperscript{13} will be
compared with that of jopara Guarani. The term ‘Paraguayan Guarani’ is a cover
term for traditional Guarani and jopara Guarani.

Paraguayan Guarani is one of several Guarani languages of the Tupi Guarani
family (cf. Figure 7.2). The Guarani branch extends over several countries, including
Bolivia, Paraguay and Argentina. The Tupi-Guarani family covers a wider area,
thereby representing the largest language family in South America in geographical
distribution (cf. Dietrich 1990). Guarani is spoken also in the northeast of Argentina
and the south of Brazil by Paraguayan immigrants.

The phonological inventory of traditional Guarani includes twenty-six sounds:
fourteen consonants (/p/, /t/, /k/, /s/, /š/, /h/, /m/, /n/, /r/, /γ/, /v/, /y/, /l/, /ɾ/, /ɬ/, /ɹ/, /ʃ/); twelve
vowels among oral and nasal (/a/, /ã/, /e/, /i/, /i/, /o/, /õ/, /u/, /u/). This
inventory differs from the one presented by Gregores and Suárez (1968) in two
respects. On the one hand, it does not include the lateral /ɭ/, the voiceless labiovelar
stop /k\textsuperscript{w}/, the voiced labiovelar nasal /w/, or the voiced fricative labiovelar velar /γ-
\textsuperscript{w}/. Lateral /ɭ/ shows a low frequency and occurs mostly in Spanish and other
borrowings. Segments /k\textsuperscript{w}/, /h\textsuperscript{w}/ and /γ\textsuperscript{w}/ are allophonic realizations of the non-
labiovelar phonemes /k/, /h/ and /γ/ before and after vowels and after /ɭ/. On the
other hand, the inventory includes nasals as distinct phonemes and not as allophones
of oral vowels (Gregores and Suárez 1968: 82f).

In addition to the aforementioned sounds, the phonological inventory of jopara
Guarani includes six sounds /ɬ/, /ʃ/, /l/ and /ɹ/. With the exception of /ɭ/ and
/ʃ/, which may come from another indigenous language (cf. Gregores and Suárez
1967: 89), the occurrence of these phonemes is limited mostly to Spanish loanwords.
On occasion these sounds appear in native items, especially in the speech of younger
bilinguals. Segments /ɬ/, /ʃ/ show the same primary articulation as native
phonemes /p, š, r/ but differ from them in their secondary articulation. Laterals /ɭ/ and
/ʃ/ have no native counterparts in the place and manner of articulation and thus
may be considered exclusive of jopara Guarani. A significant degree of free
variation is found across jopara idiolects between /ɬ/-/ʃ/ and /ɭ/-/ɭ/. The vowel
inventory of jopara Guarani has remained virtually untouched by Spanish, except
for the tendency observed in bilingual children and young adults to either relax the
high central vowel /ɨ/ to produce [I], or pronounce it like the fricative velar [γ].
Because this phenomenon is limited to urban lects, it is possible to state that the six-
vowel set of traditional Guarani is preserved in the vast majority of jopara speakers.

Nasal harmony and spreading nasalization are two salient features of the
suprasegmental phonology of traditional Guarani. Both features show the effects

\textsuperscript{13} Traditional Guarani not only has fewer Spanish loanwords but the existing ones are
assimilated to its phonological system. Jopara has many more Spanish loanwords, most of
which are unassimilated.
from contact in *jopara* varieties. Bilingual children and young adults do not (fully) nasalize affixes attached to nasal roots (e.g. reciprocal *jajo* instead of *ñaño*). Regressive and progressive nasalization does not occur either in the speech of all *jopara* speakers (e.g. *mitângüera* ‘children’ is sometimes realized as [mita’ngwera] instead of [mitã’gwera]).

Stress in traditional Guaraní typically falls on the last syllable. Loanwords are assimilated to this pattern, i.e. “with stress in the last syllable, no matter in which syllable the stress originally fell” (Gregores and Suárez 1967: 91). Here *jopara* Guaraní makes a difference once again, because the majority of loans occurs unassimilated and preserves primary stress in the same syllable as in the source language. An example is Spanish /késo/ ‘cheese’, which occurs assimilated as [kesú] in traditional Guaraní but unassimilated as [késo] in *jopara* Guaraní. A thorough description of assimilation of Spanish loan words in Guaraní is presented in section 10.1.2.

The main syllabic pattern of traditional Guaraní is CV, although CVC syllables are not infrequent. Onsets and codas consist are always monophonemic (Gregores and Suárez 1968: 61). There is no restriction in onsets. Codas may be only /m/, /n/ or /ŋ/. Spanish loanwords with consonant clusters in onsets are assimilated by adding a syllable with the same vowel as in the original syllable. One of the earliest Spanish loanwords assimilated along this pattern is *cruz* ‘cross’, pronounced as *kurusu* in traditional Guaraní. Because Spanish loanwords in *jopara* Guaraní usually occur unassimilated, there are no restrictions for onsets and codas. Accordingly, one finds clusters formed by a plosive and a flap (e.g. /tr/, /pr/) and sibilants in coda position – especially in plural words borrowed as frozen expressions (e.g. *kosa-s̱kuéra* ‘things’).

Morphologically, traditional Guaraní is defined as agglutinative and polysynthetic. It has prefixes, suffixes and circumfixes. Consider the affirmative sentence in (1) and its negative counterpart in (2):

1) \[ ne-mo-memby-jevý-ta \]
\[ \text{3subj2obj-CAUS-have.son-again-FUT} \]
‘He will make you have a son again’

2) \[ no-ne-mo-memby-jevý-ta-i \]
\[ \text{NEG-3subj2obj-CAUS-have.son-again-FUT} \]
‘He will not make you have a son again’

(Lustig 1996: 19)

Both prefixes (*ne-, mo-*) and suffixes (*-jevý, -ta*) are added to the root *memby* ‘son’ in (1). The circumfix *no-i* indicates negation in (2). A larger number of affixes may
be attached to the root. Interestingly, example (1) comes from a jopara speaker (Lustig 1996). Jopara preserves the morphosyntactic structure of Guaraní, despite the plethora of Spanish lexical borrowings. Still, there is an increasing tendency in this variety to depart from traditional polysynthesis towards a higher degree of analyticity. Consider the answer given by a jopara speaker to the question whether knowing a second language is good for monolinguals:

3) a. chéve guarâ nda-i-perhudisial-r-i,
   1.OBJ for NEG-3.PRS-detrimental-EUPH-NEG
b. re-mombarete-ve-hina pene arandu
   2S-strengthen-MORE-PROG 2.POSS knowledge
c. a-medida-que la ňe’ê rei-kuaa
   inasmuch.as DEM speak 2S-know
   ‘For me it is not bad, because you strengthen your knowledge to the extent you know the language’

The example contains three Spanish borrowings: the adjective perhudisial ‘detrimental’; the complex conjunction a medida que; and the article la. Let us focus on the linking strategies in (3). Although clause (b) is semantically dependent on (a), the causal relation made explicit in the English translation through the conjunction ‘because’ is only implicit in (3) in so far as both clauses are linked by simple juxtaposition. On the other hand, (c) is linked to (b) by Spanish a medida que ‘to the extent that’, thereby indicating a ‘fulfilled condition’ and subordinating (c) to (b). While both linking mechanisms coexist in jopara, traditional Guaraní shows a strong preference for the use of parataxis and postpositions – instead of connectives. This makes jopara somewhat less synthetic than traditional Guaraní. Compared to an equivalent construction in traditional Guaraní, clause (c) is a syntactic calque from Spanish. In (c) the verb head kuaa ‘to know’ has two arguments, the second-person subject expressed by the prefix rei- and the object la ňe’ê ‘the language’. The construction is fully grammatical in jopara and yet syntactically different from (4), in which noun incorporation has taken place, thus leaving one explicit argument:

4) Re- ňe’ê-kuaa
   2S-speak-know
   ‘you know how to speak (it)’

In fact, the increasing replacement of noun incorporation with phrasal constructions is a strong evidence of the greater degree of analyticity in jopara. In general, incorporated constructions are more frequent in traditional Guaraní. Compare examples (5a-b).
   1S-wash-FUT my-mouth 1S-REFL-mouth-wash-FUT
   ‘I will wash my mouth’       ‘I will wash my mouth’

As it seems, polysynthesis is not the rule in jopara. It may be hypothesized that Spanish connectives influence decisively the degree of synthesis, but further analysis is required. Loan connectives are discussed in Chapter 11.

Pre-contact Guaraní did not make gender distinctions in nouns while number marking was optional. Traditional and mixed varieties of Paraguayan Guaraní still lack gender marking in nouns, but jopara Guaraní tends to mark number with more frequency. Also, pre-contact Guaraní did not have articles to express definiteness, but traditional Guaraní and jopara Guaraní use Spanish articles la for singular and lo\(^\text{14}\) for plural (Gregores and Suarez 1967: 144). Spanish articles are used somewhat differently in Paraguayan Guaraní. In (6) la precedes the possessive adjective, which is ungrammatical in Spanish:

6) ij-apyte-pe-kuéra o-u la che tio
   3.POSS-middle-LOC-PL 3S-come DEM 1.POSS uncle
   ha o-henoi la iñ-eriano-kuéra
   and 3-call DEM 3.POSS-sibling-pl
   ‘My uncle came with them and then called his brothers and sisters’

Articles in Paraguayan Guaraní perform a demonstrative (deictic) function (Lustig 1996: 10). They are used to mark definiteness, reference and cohesion in discourse. The use of Spanish articles in Paraguayan Guaraní is described in Chapter 11.

The order of constituents in the Guaraní noun phrase is head-modifier in attributive constructions and modifier-head in possessive constructions. Traditional Guaraní has basically two ways of expressing possession: the juxtaposition of nouns in the order possessor-possessed as in (7); and the composite postposition -pegua attached to possessor noun as in (8).

7) umi organización dirihente-kuéra ndive ro-ñe’ê
   some organization leader-PL with 1PLEXC-speak
   ‘we speak with some leaders of the organization’

8) mbyja ára-pegua o-mombe’u Ñandejara i-pu’a-aka-ha
   star sky-ABL 3-tell Our.Lord 3-be.powerful-REL
   ‘The stars from the sky tell the power of God’

\(^{14}\) The form lo comes from the masculine plural article los after the elision of the sibilant.
The juxtaposed construction in (7) is similar in meaning to the possessor-ablative construction in (8). Ablative constructions are often used as fixed expressions and show relatively low frequency (cf. Guasch 1997: 62). Neither plus human nor minus alienable are determining factors in possession marking. Alternatively, *jopara* uses the Spanish preposition *de* between possessed and possessor. Consider the following example:

9) *Oj-há-pe guive o-je-gueraha preso padre-de-familia*

3.be.REL-LOC FROM 3-PASS-take imprisoned parent-of-family

‘Since then, parents of families were imprisoned’

Jopara constructions with *de* are restricted to Spanish loanwords. This suggests that they should be analyzed rather as phrasal borrowings (cf. Chapter 10). Other Spanish prepositions are not borrowed into *jopara*, and the language remains postpositional.

While the word order of traditional Guaraní is SOV, there is a tendency in Paraguayan Guaraní to SVO due to Spanish influence (Gregores and Suarez 1967: 182). Still, word order in Paraguayan Guaraní remains relatively free. Personal pronouns are dropped with frequency. If explicit, they serve emphatic and contrastive purposes. On the other hand, Paraguayan Guaraní is an active-stative language in which case marking is based on active-inactive distinctions (Velázquez-Castillo 2002).

The foregoing discussion shows that *jopara* resembles traditional Guaraní in features such as affixation and word order, but it differs in others like clause linking, articles and connectors.

The System of Parts of Speech in Paraguayan Guaraní

Paraguayan Guaraní is a flexible type-2 language in Hengeveld’s classification. Accordingly, it has only two lexical classes: verbs and non-verbs. The class of verbs is clearly identified by the existence of two morphological paradigms (*areal* verbs and *aireal* verbs) as shown in the following examples.

10) a. (Che) a-guata
    1S 1S-go
    ‘I walk’

   b. (Nde) re-mba’apo
    2S 2S-work
    ‘You work’

11) a. (Che) ait-pota
    1S 1S-want
    ‘I want’

   b. (Nde) rei-pota
    2S 2S-want
    ‘You want’
Non-verbs occupy any of the following syntactic positions without further measures: head of referential phrase, modifier of referential phrase, and modifier of predicate phrase. The following examples illustrate the syntactic flexibility of non-verbs:

12) a. Ko karai tuja  
    DEM man old  
    ‘This old man’

   b. Che tuva tuja  
    1S father old  
    ‘The oldness of my father’

13) a. Che ro-hayhu asy  
    1S 2.OBJ-love intense  
    ‘I love you passionately’

   b. Nde rayhu asy  
    2S love intense  
    ‘Your passionate love’

The same lexeme, tuja, modifies a referential phrase in (12a) and heads a referential phrase in (12b). Likewise, asy modifies a predicate phrase in (13a) and a referential phrase in (13b). Another feature typical of Paraguayan Guarani is the capacity of most lexemes to be used predicatively. This feature is most visible in the case of quality-attributive verbs (Gregores and Suárez 1967: 138), which may be used as heads of predicate and referential phrases, as shown in (14a-b):

14) a. a-vy’á ne-recha-rehe  
    1S-happiness 2S-see-by  
    ‘My happiness of seeing you’

   b. a-vy’á ne-recha-vo  
    1S-happiness 2S-see-when  
    ‘I am happy to see you’

In similar terms, a predicative reading of tuja in (12a) is “to be old”. The predicative use of nouns, adjectives and manner adverbs is illustrated in the following examples:

15) a. Pe kyse puku  
    DEM knife red  
    ‘That red knife’

   b. Che che-kyse  
    1S 1S.POSS-knife  
    ‘I have a knife’

16) a. A-jahe’o pochy-rehe  
    1S-cry angry-by  
    ‘I cry from anger’

   b. Che che-pochy  
    1S 1S-anger  
    ‘I am angry’

17) a. o-mbohovai mbarete  
    3-react strongly  
    ‘He reacts strongly’

   b. o-mo-mbarete  
    3-CAUS-strongly  
    ‘He strengthens [it]’

Despite the extensive predicative use of most lexemes, the existence of a clear-cut lexical class of ‘pure’ verbs identified on the basis of their morphology (cf. Nordhoff 2004) prevents a classification of Paraguayan Guarani as a type-1 language.
The examples given in support of my classification of Paraguayan Guaraní as a type-2 flexible language come from traditional Guaraní. Neither loanwords from Spanish nor syntactic calquing occur in these examples. The question is whether this classification is valid also for jopara. To answer this question I analyze examples from colloquial Guaraní collected in the field. The assumption to be confirmed is that jopara Guaraní maintains the same distribution of parts of speech as traditional Guaraní. In the following examples Spanish borrowings appear underlined.

18) o-ñe’e la Guaraní-me
   3-speak ART Guaraní-LOC
   si ha’ekuéra oi-pota la kampesino vóto
   if 3.PL 3-want ART peasant vote
   ‘They speak in Guaraní if they want to get the peasant vote’

19) porque pe nde mitã-ramoguare rei-ramo-guare
    because DEM 2S child-WHEN.PST 2S.be-WHEN.NMLZ.PST
    nde servicio-marina-pé entero re-gueruka cheve,
    2S navy-LOC all 2S-send 1S.ACC
    ‘Because you sent me your photos since your childhood till you entered the navy’

20) o-ñe’e atravesado la Guaraní
    3-speak crossed ART Guaraní
    ‘They speak Guaraní in a confusing manner’

From a flexible language which makes no distinction between nouns, adjectives and adverbs, it is expected that (1) Spanish nouns may be used as adjectives, (2) adjectives as nouns, and (3) adjectives and nouns as adverbs. The first hypothesis is met by (18), where the Spanish noun campesino ‘peasant’ modifies the noun head voto ‘vote’. The fact that campesino can be used also as adjective in Spanish contributes to a similar use in jopara. The second prediction is confirmed by (19), where the Spanish adjective entero ‘entire’ is used as a noun, with the meaning of ‘everything’. Finally, the prediction about the behavior of adjectives as adverbs is confirmed by (20), where the Spanish adjective atravesado ‘crossed, mixed up’ modifies the Guaraní verb ñe’e ‘speak’. Notice that these examples do not involve a process of derivation. But jopara shows also the extended predicative use of most lexemes, as illustrated by the following examples.

21) nda-che-tiempo-i la a-japo haçuá otra-cosá
    NEG-1S-time-NEG PRO 1S-do for other-thing
    ‘I don’t have time to do other things’
Examples (21) and (22) include the Spanish noun *tiempo* ‘time’ and the adjective *conocido* ‘known’. Both lexemes carry verbal morphology: the verbal prefix *che*- (first-person singular) attached to the loanword *tiempo* in (21) makes the verb ‘to have time’; the pronominal prefix *i*- (third-person) in (22) promotes the loan adjective *conocido* to the category of verb. Notice that the prefixes in (21) and (22) are not derivational but inflectional morphemes. Finally, example (23) shows the prepositional phrase *de provecho* ‘of use’ used as a predicate with the meaning of ‘to be useful’. The bulk of the evidence attests *jopara* as a flexible language. This flexibility does not imply however that Spanish loanwords are always used in non-prototypical functions. Examples of borrowed lexemes used in their original lexical classes are numerous. Thus, Spanish verbs are always used as heads of predicate phrases (24) and manner adverbs always used as modifiers of predicate phrases (25).

Certainly, not all lexemes are equally likely to be used as verbs. This means that a semantic constraint operates for native elements of open classes too. Notwithstanding this restriction, the fact that Spanish loanwords may be used also in non-prototypical positions confirms that *jopara* maintains the system of parts of speech of traditional Guaraní.
7.4. **Borrowing hypotheses for Paraguayan Guaraní**

The language-specific hypotheses presented in this section are tested in Chapters 10 and 11 on the Guaraní corpus collected in Paraguay. The hypotheses involve predictions about frequencies, types and functions of Spanish borrowings in the corpus. They are based on the hierarchies discussed in section 4.3 concerning a) the principle of functional explanation; b) the principle of system compatibility; c) the scales of borrowability; and d) the theory of parts of speech. The numbers correspond to those in section 4.3.

**Predictions from the Principle of Functional Explanation**

**H.1** Paraguayan Guaraní will borrow Spanish discourse elements easier than non-discourse elements.

**H.1.1** Paraguayan Guaraní will borrow Spanish discourse elements such as topic and focus markers but evidentials and connectors.

**Predictions from the principle of system compatibility**

**H.2** Paraguayan Guaraní (agglutinative) will borrow from Spanish (fusional) free words and roots, but less likely clitics (e.g. pronominal proclitics) and bound morphemes (e.g. plural markers, gender markers, etc.)

**Predictions from the scales of borrowability**

**H.3** Paraguayan Guaraní will borrow Spanish lexical elements easier than grammatical ones.

**H.3.1** Paraguayan Guaraní will borrow items from open lexical classes (e.g. nouns) easier than items from half-open (e.g. prepositions) and closed classes (e.g. articles).

**H.3.2** Paraguayan Guaraní will borrow Spanish lexical items in the following order of frequency: nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Adpositions (i.e. prepositions) will be borrowed, if at all, less easily because Paraguayan Guaraní (postpositional) does not have a syntactic slot for them. In contrast, articles may be borrowed to the extent that a syntactic slot for them is available in Guaraní. In turn, pronoun borrowing will be disfavored by the pro-drop character of Spanish will disfavor the borrowing of Spanish pronouns. Conjunct borrowing is not expected, other things being equal.

**Predictions from the theory of parts of speech**

**H.4** The typological distance between Spanish (source language) and Paraguayan Guaraní (recipient language) is bridged in the borrowing process following the hierarchy of parts of speech: head of predicate phrase > head of referential phrase > modifier of referential phrase > modifier of predicate phrase.

**H.4.1** Accordingly, Spanish forms that function as heads of phrases (i.e. verbs and nouns) will be borrowed easier than forms that function as modifiers (i.e.
adjectives and adverbs). Also, Spanish forms that function as heads of predicate phrases (i.e. verbs) will be the most easily borrowed lexical class; forms that function as modifiers of predicate phrases (i.e. manner adverbs) will be the hardest class to be borrowed. While H.4.1 contrasts with H.3.2 above, both hypotheses will be tested.

H.4.2 If Paraguayan Guaraní borrows items from one lexical class, it borrows items from previous lexical classes in the hierarchy. Accordingly, if Paraguayan Guaraní borrows modifiers of referential phrases (Spanish adjectives), it will borrow heads of referential and predicate phrases too (Spanish nouns and verbs) but not necessarily modifiers of predicate phrases (Spanish manner adverbs).

H.4.3 As a flexible language, Paraguayan Guaraní will borrow more easily lexemes from the lexical class immediately following the last differentiated lexical class in its parts-of-speech system. Therefore, Paraguayan will borrow nouns more easily, because nouns are the lexical class that follows the last differentiated class (verbs) in its system.

H.5 The syntactic distribution of borrowed lexemes in Paraguayan Guaraní will follow the same distribution of native lexical classes (functional adaptation hypothesis). Accordingly, if Paraguayan Guaraní borrows Spanish adjectives, it will use them as heads of referential phrases but also as modifiers of referential and predicate phrases, which corresponds to the distribution of native Guaraní non-verbs. In addition, all Spanish borrowings might be used alternatively as predicates given the same use of lexical classes in Paraguayan Guaraní. Therefore, Spanish borrowing will thus not modify the system of parts of speech in Guaraní.

H.6 The distribution of borrowed lexemes will follow the same distribution of their lexical classes in Spanish (functional specialization hypothesis). Accordingly, if Paraguayan Guaraní borrows Spanish adjectives and adverbs, it will use them only in their original positions of modifiers of referential and predicate phrases but not interchangeably as if they formed one lexical class. The functional specialization of Spanish borrowings will thus result in a gradual differentiation of the parts-of-speech system of Paraguayan Guaraní. While H5 and H6 make opposite predictions, both hypotheses will be tested.

H.7 No predictions can be made from the lexicalization hypothesis because it applies only to rigid languages and Paraguayan Guaraní is flexible (cf. supra).

The foregoing hypotheses will be tested systematically on the Guaraní corpus in the light of linguistic and nonlinguistic factors influencing the borrowing process (Chapters 10 and 11).