The 'Say' Auxiliary in Maricopa: Some Notes and Speculations
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Following the 'spirit of La Jolla,' my intent in this paper is simply to present some of the things I (think I) know, and especially some of those things about which I can only guess, in Maricopa syntax. Hopefully the data and discussion here will suggest --and provoke--interested comments, particularly from the Yuma side.

Two primary functions performed by Maricopa's ?i 'say' auxiliary are to signal intentionality, following main verbs, and immediacy--typically in association with progressive aspect. Thus, for the former:

(1a) ipa-c man-?i(-m) va-va-k (man-nom (a)wake/(a)rise-aux(-sub) prox-sit-tns) 'The man is trying/wants to get up'
(1b) ?-man-?i vu-vu-ak (l-arise-aux prox-sit-tns) 'I'm trying to get up'
(2a) anYis va?a {?i-m} (3pr+nom walk {aux-tns \(e::t+k\) \{aux-just+tns\}}) 'He tries to get up'
(2b) anYis ku-xavik u-v?a ?i-m (3pr+nom nom-two pl-walk aux-tns) 'The two of them try to walk'
(2c) u-v?a-a-? ?i-m (pl-walk-pl aux-m) 'They [plural] try to walk'

As indicated in examples 2a-c, a pattern alternate to that seen in (1a-b) will allow the auxiliary to stand free of the main lexical verb; in production, the auxiliary can occur more as a kind of proclitic, with a net loss of final affixes and initial person markers. Compare the following:

(3) man?c n?m-va-m ?a-man-?i-m, ?a-va-dik-sa (2pr-nom when-2-come-ds l-arise-aux-sub, l-prox-lie-assert) 'When you came, I tried to get up, but I'm just lying here'
(4) man?c n?m-va-m ?a-man ?i-va-dik-sa

In these contexts, representing the conditions under which ?i may take affixes, or be affixed, is somewhat problematic, as the following material shows. Phonetically in a sentence such as (4), the /i/ preceding the demonstrative v- sounds overloud, even (after [?]) in word-initial position. But there are difficulties in regarding this loudness as being conditioned by some 'long' glottal stop (i.e., ?-?i-va-dik-sa), which could presumably include the first person marker (here see again footnote (4)). In fact, sentences replete with added trial person markers and -m or -k tense suffixes are accepted only reluctantly; strings such as (5) or (6),

(5) anYis nYvam, manYC m-man-?a:m ... m-?i-m ... ma-va-dik-sa
(6) anYis nYvam, m-man ... ma-?i-m ma-va-dik-sa

are repeated back as

63
(7) anyis n'vam manyc m-man ?i(m) vədikga

I have even been able to gain acceptance of

(8) anyis n'vam m-man m-?i-vâ-dik-åa

but this was interpreted as '#... mə-və-dik-åa#, '... you were lying there,' and not as

(8') *anyis n'vam m-man m-?i və-dik-åa

Whatever is happening here seems to be tied up in some way with the trial person marker added to the auxiliary (as in 5, 6, 8 and 8'). For one thing, a bleeding of final suffix onto the following sequence (and this may be what occurred in sentence (4)), is a general feature of Maricopa speech, and of texts dictated at normal speed. For instance,

(9) #... n'îmkəcâ-g-k vînY-yan-di-t+k ...# (@follow along-pl -tns dem-go along-here-ind) '... they came along passing them by. . . .'

sounds like

(9') #... n'îmkəcâ-g k(\w)inyandîtk ...#

with no apparent meaning loss, or misinterpretation, on the part of native speakers. It is also quite clear that too much gapping between ?i and the preceding lexical verb (as in sentences 5 and 6) will set up an interpretation on the order of

(10) #... mə-man-k mə-və-dik-åa# '... you were lying there, awake,'

thus completely nulling out any semantic contribution from ?i.

When sentences of type (1) and (3-4) are elicited or generated as imperatives, the -?i- component separates entirely:

(11) k-man-k kə-?i-m kə-a:v-k; xot-um e-sa e-t+um (imp-arise-ss imp-aux-ss imp-hear/sense-tns; good-fut say-hortative say-always) 'Come on -- try and get up; you'll see-- it'll be fine'

But here only the initial verb marks for number (k-u-man-k, paucal; k-u-ma:n-k, plural), whereas even in highly ritualized usage,

(12) ka-diık k-u-na:k k-u-ma:v-k (imp-here+pl-ss imp-pl-sit+pl -ss imp-pl-eat+pl-tns) 'Come on, sit down, eat'

number is marked throughout the sequence. Otherwise, (11) would provide
strong grounds for granting ?i full lexical (or surface) verb status in this 'try/want' usage. For now, then, the boundary conditions around ?i will simply have to be described as 'interesting,' for which one may read, 'virtually unknown.' With this in mind, I shall continue to represent it as taking suffix positions on bare stems.

The limits of VP serialization tend to confirm -?i following main lexical verbs as semantically 'try to, want to.' First, mention should be made of 'like to Verb' type sentences as in,

(13) n?ya ?ə-na-k ?-mxan-t+um (1pr 1-sit-ss 1-favor-always)
   'I like sitting'
(14) n?ya ?ə-pam-əm ?-mxan-tum (. . . 1-fall-ss . . . ) 'I like falling (over, down)'
(15) man? (an?ya) ve-dik-əm ma-mxan-tum (2pr (3pr) prox-lie-ds 2-favor-always)
   'You like him lying down,' 'You like it when-(ever) he's lying down'

Also worth mentioning here is another construction, which probably involves irrealis -x(a)-:

(16) ?-⊂ma-əx-1?vi:-q (1-sleep-irr-like-emph) 'I'm sleepy'
(17) ma-⊂ma-x-1?vi:-q (2-sleep-irr-like-emph) 'Are you sleepy?,'
   'Are you going to (go to) sleep?'

For 'try(ing) to Verb,' the 'say' auxiliary is usually elicited, in either of two forms:

(18) xa?l?i?aw ta-t-poy-?i-m (cotton-tail caus-caus+die+pl-aux-tns)
   'He tries to kill bunnies'
(19) k?i?mo xa?-i(t)-sa ve?a-e-t-yu -(knee broken-advrs walk-aux-
   just-fact) 'His knee is broken but he's trying to walk any-
   way'

At present I am unable to account for the distribution of the two forms, although from the Mohave side, Pamela Munro finds that vocalic quality in such situations depends more than anything else on the suffix chosen. Example (2a) tends to confirm this analysis, since both forms were ob-

Eliciting for serialization on the order of 'he likes to try to walk,' or 'they want to try to walk,' consistently yields strings like

(20) ve?a-?i-m acpe-k (?-al?i-yu)⁵ (3-walk-aux-tns very-att
   (1-think-fact) 'I think) he really wants to walk,'

(said of the person in (19) with the broken knee); of an arthritic invalid, one could say:

   rise-aux-tns very much-att (1-think-emph) 'The old guy
   really wants to get up bad (I think)'

Apparently then, the brunt of semantic load in the English verb sequence
is taken in Maricopa as intensifying the lexical-auxiliary construction, where in an ordinary 'like to' sentence we might expect introduction of the verb mxan.

The -?i auxiliary also seems to confer immediacy, at least in association with demonstrative-locational auxiliary constructions yielding progressive or continuing aspect:

(22) xa?a=a-g n?7-yv'aw-?i (tree [=cottonwood]-nom def-stand-aux) 'There's the tree' [i.e., very close by, and visible to speaker and listener]

(23) i-pa-?a ves-k n?7-yam-?i (man-nom run-tns def-go by-aux) 'A man just ran by'

The sense of immediacy in sentence (23) contrasts neatly with the mood of total completion found in the following:

(24) n?yuko:r xat-c ves-k si-yam-yu (long past dog-nom run-tns dist-go by-fact) 'A dog ran by a long time ago (over there)'

Exact temporal specification is never, to my knowledge, super-critical in these sorts of situations, but one can arrive at a sliding scale of acceptability for the -?i, -yu and -um (simple future) suffixes through considering any co-occurring time adverbials. Thus, with an adverbial such as n?yuko:r ('long time past'), a trial string such as

(25) *n?yuko:r xat-c ves-k n?7-yam-?i

is regenerated as n?7-yam-yu#. Even with pisay, denoting 'short time ago,' while an auxiliary structure such as n?7-yam-?i# is acceptable, n?7-yam-yu# is probably preferred. So pisa, 'now,' appears to be relatively the most appropriate time word to occur with n?7yam-?i. Moreover, a sentence with ku:rim, 'soon, in a while,' obligatorily takes the -um future:

(26) ku:rim sin?7uk hamer ves-k vi-yam-um (soon woman bare run-tns prox-go by-fut) @'Pretty soon a naked woman will be running by'

Sentences with the spatial measure ko:rxay, 'a (little) way's off,' will take an -?i final, however. One might say while travelling,

(27) vakpal?y ko:rxay-k n?7-daw-?i (Phoenix [=va kw-pal?]/city way's off-tns def-BE-aux) 'Phoenix is still farther off yet'

It thus appears that the temporal scope appropriate for, or denoted by sentences such as (23) is rather narrow: from the recent past, up to and including the happening present. The spatial scope may be similarly restricted to an area which is 'close by,' given the evidence provided in (22) and (27). By the way, one might take sentence (27) as relating to the time one has yet to spend travelling (cf. the confusion in English between further/farther). Should ko:rxay point (also?) to temporal scope, a neat and morphologically interesting sequence of time adverbials
would emerge (n̓yuko:ʳ---pisxay---pisa---ko:rxay---ku:r̓im), extending from distant past to near future.

Two other sets of facts ought to be mentioned, which may have some bearing on the notion of 'immediacy' that I am attempting to draw here. First, the demonstrative co-occurring with an -ʔi final (in these progressive auxiliaries), is, or contains, n̓y, a morpheme which seems to denote definiteness, without necessary regard to specificity. Consider savi, 'over there,' savan̓y, '(the) one over there; ipa, 'man, person,' ipa-n̓y(a), 'a/some certain man.' In context, nominals in -n̓y(a) are usually in oblique cases.7 Compare also n̓y- 'when' clauses, the time adverbial n̓yuko:ʳ, and the conjunction n̓y̓kvar̓am [def-no(ne)-m??] 'given this, so (naught but) . . . '

Additionally, these -ʔi progressives with demonstratives other than n̓y- (or sin̓y-, vin̓y-) uniformly convert sentences containing them to questions. This applies whether or not question intonation is present. Consider the difference in impact between (28), (30'), (30''), and (29-30):

(28) pisxay vəg̓-k vin̓yə-yam-ʔi ( . . prox+def-go by-aux) 'He just ran right by,' 'He was just running by'
(29) pisxay xat-c vəg̓-k si-yəm-ʔi ( . . dist-go by-aux) 'Did a dog just zip by (over there)?', 'Was there a dog just scooting by?'
(30) anY̓ış cuqʷrer pəlY-k acpelYvi:-k və-vəʔaw-ʔi (3pr-nom word/speech many-ss much(ly)-tns prox-stand-aux) @'Doesn't he talk a lot?,' 'Isn't he being pretty gabby?'
(30') anY̓ış cuqʷrer pəlY-k 'His words are many,' 'He talks plenty'
(30'') anY̓ış cuqʷrer pəlY-t+k -ʔəl?1-øyu ( . . many-ind 1-think-fact) 'I think he talks a lot'

Now I am by no means attempting to represent the gamut of Maricopa question formation as being coverable so single-mindedly as in the above examples. (Usually present in questions are any of several WH forms having (--)kə-, along with rising interrogative intonation.) Furthermore many attempted non-future declaratives, focussing in some way on second person, have proven to be questions, despite my best efforts. We shall return below to this last point.

Secondly, in a fit of absolute desperation while attempting to elicit something (anything--just anything!) which might get at distinctions between sentences containing progressive auxiliaries such as #dem-position verb-m# versus those having #dem-position verb-ʔi#, I happened to ask the informant point-blank whether she was 'putting herself more' into either of the statements. Somewhat surprisingly, her answer was a quick 'Yes,' and unequivocal: the string with an -ʔi progressive meant for her, 'I'm saying it.' Reconstructing from my notes, her proffered scenario aptly illustrates the point. Suppose a coyote was lurking about, perhaps (out) near the chicken coop: as a watchful, keen-eyed observer, you might say to someone nearby,

(31) (k-1:yu-k) xatilwe-ŋ n̓y-vəʔaw-ʔi ((imp-see-tns) coyote-nom def-stand-aux) '(Look!) There's a coyote!,' '(Hey--) The coyote's right there!'
Upon disbelief—or, perhaps worse, inattention—on the listener's part, and being (further) perturbed, the speaker might escalate with:

\[(31')\] xatilwe-š və-v?aw-əm ?a?-iy-m (..., prox-stand-ds I-say-tns [deliberate, forceful delivery in the verb sequence]) 'Hey (I'm telling you), a coyote's right out there!'

Should this fail to spur the listener on, the speaker (now completely exasperated) would rage forth with,

\[(31'')\] (kaxa?maya!) xatilwe-š vo-v?aw-əm ?a?-iy-m, alə-m-a:v-m-ṭk m-va-k m-du:-m (,'@Damn it all!')... neg-2-hear/sense-neg-just+tns 2-sit-tns 2-BE-tns [forceful delivery in the second person portion] ')' (Hell!) There's a coyote right there—and here you (go and) dummy-up!'

Granting my questionable field methods, and the dangers inherent as well in 'folk-analysis,' this whole sequence merits serious consideration as regards 'immediacy,' and simultaneously, authentication or verifiability as in, say, the performative analysis of J. R. Ross. For one thing, it is most difficult in Maricopa—at least under usual conditions—to get sequences 'added-on' like the #m-du:-m# in (31''). Here the informant has given one voluntarily, and one must really ask how this can be.

At this point I shall offer a rather speculative amalgam of the two sets of facts outlined above. Let us assume that these (progressive) auxiliary constructions relate in some essential way to the nature of the sentence information content overall—specifically, the manner by which such information has been obtained or can be verified (a suggestion ultimately from Ronald Langacker, via Pamela Munro's thesis). Therewith, a tinge of 'immediacy' could be linked to 'SAY,' at some (relatively deep?) propositional level. Apparently that level is not wholly inaccessible though, judging from the informant analysis reported above. In fact, one of the things that the speaker seems to be doing (in 31'-31'') is to convert the final -?i auxiliary to a surface verb, taking person markers and final affixes—in a situation increasingly reeking of flagrant authentication.

And, unless (otherwise) marked, the feature 'definiteness,' carried by the demonstrative (-)nY- in auxiliary structure, attaches to ego.\(^9\) In other words, the onus of verifiability typically falls to the lot of the speaker, at least where immediacy is involved. This still seems to be the force of (31''), even as the listener comes under a good deal of heat.

Where immediacy is involved, but specification is made for some particular place (away from the speaker??), the burden of proof shifts from ego to other, typically the one spoken to. Herein lies my own reading of why it is that progressive auxiliaries in -?i, but with si-, va-, or di- demonstratives ('(over)there,' 'proximate, here,' '(over) here, this way') invariably yield questions. Thus a string such as

\[(32)\] poš-ịg veš-k vi-yam-?i 'Is there a cat running by?'
gets interpreted as ' [You say] there's a cat running by' (try this on for size in English, with or without interrogative intonation).
I shall go farther to offer this as a partial explanation regarding the difficulty, at least in Maricopa, of getting straightforward, non-future, non-imperative sentences involving (just) second person. As indicated above, I often get questions: by the analysis offered here, too much responsibility for authentication attaches to second person (or to the informant??) to permit any other interpretation. Obviously, all of these issues bear further investigation.

Summing up to this point, we have seen ?i in essentially two different usages, the first closely associated with main sentence verbs and conferring intentionality, being semantically 'try to, want to.' In its second usage, as the final element in progressive constructions, the notion of 'immediacy' seems apt. Can these uses be seen in a more unified format? Perhaps so if we construe 'intentionality' as relating to a continuity of attempts (real or imaginary), extending through a time frame which closely circumscribes the speaker's observation and/or utterance.

There is some ancillary sociolinguistic information (mainly in my head and hardly codified) which may provide another bridge between these two usages. In normal Maricopa interchanges, /-?iyM/ and /-?em/ tags are frequent, and seem to convey meanings on the order of 'I mean (it), '(Better) Do it' or 'I mean now.' In any case, these are certainly akin to the senses picked up on by linguistic outsiders (e.g., non-Maricopa spouses, children adopted in from other tribes, and itinerant anthropologists), presenting an interesting blurring of the distinctions operating between intention, imperativity and immediacy. In terms of temporal designation, we would seem to be squarely in the fuzzy area between pisa ' (right) now' and ku:rim 'soon, in a while.'

FOOTNOTES

1. I remain indebted to Polly Heath of Los Angeles for much of the data here, for her hospitality, and for her sustaining interest in her own language. Sipporah and Stanley Janis of Laveen, Arizona, have both contributed more than might ever be described toward my understanding of Maricopa. Likewise felt are the influences of Nick Sunn, Paul Bread and Jasper Donahue, who also have been patient. Gene and Bonnie Clayton have, on various occasions, provided unstintingly of themselves and their home.

2. Pamela Munro's generous comments, coming mainly from the Mohave standpoint, have consistently proved helpful in getting my ideas in shape, but nothing that I say here should be held against her. Susan Norwood and Don Crook have already inspired me to count my morphemes one by one: I hope they will find some of the data here useful.

3. Symbols used here which may cause confusion are as follows: c = ɣ; q = ʃ; d = ɖ; -nom for nominative case; nom- for nominalizer; sub for subordinate; att for attributive; + between features which cannot (quite) be separated morphologically (one use being for vocalic ablaut);
@ for 'approximate gloss.' At times I have written /i/ for what I assumed was 'really' [o] adjacent to morpheme boundaries, assimilated toward /i/ near, say, /$/. The sound in question may simply be what others might write as short /i/. As a general caution, readers should ever be wary of my representations of vocalic length.

4. Other data indicates that the person marker should occur immediately before the locational auxiliary, at least after the demonstrative vin-.

5. Cf. Halpern ("Yuma VI": 158), *a:ly?i/e 'to think, prefer, believe.'

6. As with the sequence in (31-31"), a gem like this is illustrative of Polly Heath's beautiful insight.

7. From the standpoint of Altaic linguistics, at least, this is exactly what one would expect. Some necessary goal for verbal action seems apposite; see also footnote (9) below.

8. I am equally disposed to regard -m here as a present/past marker (which would work out alright for the locational auxiliary *y?aw, 'stand, be located'), (thereby) putting ?a?iym into a following sentence, loosely conjoined syntactically, but sharing the same deep propositional structure with the sequence preceding. Similar arguments would apply to the first and second person strings in (31")

9. Again from a (wildly) comparative point of view, personal pronouns in Mandarin obligatorily take spatial demonstratives whenever they are involved as the goals of motion verbs (e.g., lái wo-je+r (come 1pr-here+def) 'Come here;' chyo ta-ne+r (go 3pr-there+def) 'Go to him.'). I mention this only as an example of something that happens in language when categories like spatial reference or specification, definiteness and person designation get thrown together.
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PREFACE

The study and analysis of Yuman languages in the last decade have drawn many researchers into a field where previously there had been only a half-dozen active workers. Much of the credit for encouraging the study of these languages must go to Margaret Langdon. Her efforts in finding funding for the Yuman Archives and two conferences on Hokan and Yuman languages have spurred many researchers to put forth determined efforts to describe these languages while speakers who really control these languages are still available for consultation. These conferences have been especially fruitful in permitting face-to-face study and discussion of mutual problems, and many insights into the analysis of Yuman languages have resulted from these discussions. All of us in the study of Hokan and Yuman languages are especially grateful to her for all she has done for the study of these languages.

Unfortunately, everyone who presented a paper at the First Yuman Languages Workshop was not able to prepare a final version for inclusion in this volume before it went to press. All the papers in this volume were presented in an earlier version at the Yuman workshop except the one by Yamamoto, who was unable to attend the workshop.

The papers are presented according to the groups of languages presented at the Yuman workshop. Since there were some last minute changes in the program, I must plead faulty memory if I inadvertently placed some papers in an order different from that of the workshop presentation.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, March 1976
INTRODUCTION

The papers in this volume represent revised versions of presentations made at the First Workshop on Yuman Languages held on the campus of the University of California, San Diego, June 17-21, 1975. The specific aim of the Workshop was to allow for close interaction between all linguists interested in the structure of Yuman languages and exchange of data. The focus was on the area of syntax, where the least amount of published information had previously been available, with emphasis more on the discussion of interesting problems than on theoretical agreement. New data were presented for all Yuman languages still spoken. The decision to make the results of the Workshop more generally available was unanimously supported by the participants. This volume then is offered in the hope that the syntactic patterns illustrated and described will be interest not only to other Hokanists but to students of syntax in general.

Thanks are due to James Redden for arranging the publication of this volume and assuming responsibility for all editorial details, and to the National Science Foundation for including support for consultants in Grant GSO-7418043 (Yuman Languages of the Southwest—Margaret Langdon, Principal Investigator).

Margaret Langdon
La Jolla, January 1976.
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