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The Kwtsaan (Yuma) verb lyvii has cognates in many if not all other Yuman languages. For example, there is Diegueño rewii "to be like", Havasupai velwi: "to be right", Yavapai lwi: "to be correct, to be like", and so on. The basic meaning of Kwtsaan lyvii is "to be like", but it has a number of other uses which are not obviously related to the basic meaning. This paper will treat one derived form of lyvii, the one appearing in the postverbal enclitic -xa-lyvii- "to want, to feel like". First I should like to consider the process of encliticization by which lyvii came to be suffixed to a verb plus the irrealis suffix -xa, and to discuss how this process apparently differs from what is considered to be the normal historical development for enclitics. In addition I should like to consider the syntax of -xa-lyvii-, in particular with respect to negation, and to compare this with what I feel to be related phenomena in English and other languages. It will be suggested that universal pragmatic considerations concerning requests and verbs of wanting may play a role in an explanation of the facts of Kwtsaan.

It may be useful, as background to the question of the enclitization of lyvii, to consider the syntax of lyvii as a main verb, and to compare this with the use of -xa-lyvii- as an enclitic. lyvii as an independent verb behaves much like any other transitive verb in Kwtsaan. Nominal subjects are always marked with the subject marker -ts, and definite common nouns are marked with -(ny)a when they are the object of the verb; proper nouns and indefinite common nouns are usually unmarked for object case. One of the consequences of these restrictions on the occurrence of these markers is that the most common type of sentence with lyvii, that translating "It looks like an X" where X is indefinite third person, and X is indefinite and nonspecific, has no nouns with case marking:

1. iipaa lyvii-sh
   man like-EV
   'It looks like a man.'

But nouns marked for subject and object case do occur with lyvii:

2. va-ts iipaa-ny-a lyvii-sh va-kw-v-aa-ny-a
   DEM-SUBJ man-DEM-OBJ like-EV DEM-SUBR-DEM-go-DEM-OBJ
   'That looks like the man who just arrived.'

lyvii takes personal pronoun prefixes and inflects for plural subject:

3. maany-ts m-xuuvik-ly xat masiny m-lyvee-sh
   you-SUBJ you-two-in horse you-like-EV
   'The two of you are like horses.'
In general, lyvii can take only noun phrases as its complements. It is possible to predicate lyvii of actions, to say that what someone does is like something else, but the word referring to the action is either nominalized or put into a subordinate clause, with the subject of lyvii left unspecified. That is, "He sings like a frog" may be translated either as:

(4) ny-tsashvar-ny-ts xanyey lyvii-tum
    POSS-sing-DEM-SUBJ frog like-HAB
    'His singing is like a frog's.'

or as:

(5) nya-tsashvar-m, xanyey lyvii-tum
    when-sing-DS frog like-HAB
    'When he sings, it's like a frog.'

lyvii cannot appear after a verb suffixed with -k "same subject", as do, for example, the auxiliary verbs uuva- and onco-. Nor can it take sentential subjects in the sense of "(3) appears to be the case", as in "It looks like John's leaving", which is translated as:

(6) John-ts va-yem 'im v-yaa-t kw-lyvii-t
    SUBJ DEM-go intend DEM-go-t ¿-like-t

kw-lyvii- is obviously related to lyvii, but the two verbs differ syntactically in ways too interesting to go into at this point. For the present it is sufficient to note that lyvii by itself takes only nominals as complements.

The verbal enclitic -xa-lyvii-, on the other hand, appears only with verbs:

(7) mantsaan tskaw-xa-lyvii-ta
    apple eat-IRR-like-EV
    'I want to eat an apple.'

It can be suffixed to main verbs (as above) and auxiliaries:

(8) tsashvar v-oncoo-xa-lyvii-ta
    sing DEM-keep on-IRR-like-EV
    'I feel like keeping on singing.'

-xa-lyvii- can be used only when the subject of "want" is the same as the subject of the main verb. When the subject of the main verb is different, as with "John wants Mary to go", the main verb 'ar "to want" is used instead:

(9) John-ts Mary uu-yem-x-ny-a 'ar-ta
    SUBJ NR-go-IRR-DEM-OBJ want-EV
    'John wants Mary to go.'
-xa-lyvii- can never be used with noun phrases alone:

(10) mantsaan 'ar -ta
    *xa-lyvii
    'I want an apple.'

Unlike lyvii used as a main verb, -xa-lyvii- does not take pronominal prefixes and does not inflect for number:

(11) xuumar m-uu-yowv-xa-lyvii-m ?
    child you-PL-have PL-IRR-like-EV
    'Do you all wish you had a child?'

(In this last attribute -xa-lyvii- differs from all other morphemes which are used as verbal enclitics or auxiliaries in Kwtsaan, for example the negative ly'em- or -lyskii- "still":

(12) m-duu-ly-m-skii-k ?
    you-act-? you-still-EV
    'Are you still doing it (acting that way)'

(13) m-smaa-ly-m-'em m-ado-t kw-lyvii-sh
    you-sleep-? you-NEG you-act-? like-EV
    'You look as though you hadn't slept.'

Why -xa-lyvii- should be aberrant in this respect is not clear to me at this point.)

To turn to the problem of the historical development of this enclitic: lyvii used as a main verb is very old, and could probably be reconstructed for Proto-Yuman (since cognate verbs appear in all branches of the family). -xa-lyvii- as a verbal enclitic, to my knowledge, occurs only in Kwtsaan and Maricopa (see Harwell, this volume); it must, therefore, be a relatively recent development. The question is, then, by what processes did lyvii become an enclitic, and why did it do so?

To begin with, there is abundant evidence for the historical development main verb > enclitic, when at some stage there existed a surface sequence Verb # Verb which could, in some contexts, appear without intervening noun phrases. To take a very familiar example: in Spanish the modern future and conditional tenses, which must synchronically be analyzed as verb suffixes, developed historically from the construction Verb Infinitive # haber "have", so that e.g. cantar # he > cantarae "I will sing". The process of criticization or suffixation may thus be seen as a kind of resegmentation, by which a two-word sequence composed of an infinitive plus an inflected verb was reanalyzed as a single word. In Uto-Aztecan, to come closer to home, a class of adverbs now occurring in many languages as verb suffixes can be shown to occupy the same position they would have as independent verbs (see Crapo 1970 for details). Yuman languages also show evidence for this kind of development. Margaret Langdon (1974) has shown that the existential verb xu "be" is a part of the "imperfective" verb suffix in Yavapai. In some dialects it is still (partially) independent, in that it takes pronominal prefixes:
(14) \text{tt}^o \text{kwI}-1-h \ ' -no-k \ ' -yu-m \w\n\text{wash-}? \text{-IRR} \ I-\text{AUS}-\text{SS} \ I-\text{be-TNS} \w\n'I'm going to wash them.'

But in some constructions it has apparently become totally encliticized and undergoes vowel reduction:

(15) ' -hmi-k-yu-m \ ' -hmi-k-a-m \w\nI-tall-SS-\text{be-TNS} \w\n'I'm tall.'

(For details and discussion, see Chung, this volume.)

Langdon also adduces some evidence for \textit{yu} as a part of the Southern Diegueño suffix \textit{-cem}, which could also be interpreted as having imperfective meaning.

Assuming that \textit{lyvii} as an independent verb is older than \textit{-xa-lyvii-} as an enclitic, and given the amount of evidence for contiguous verbs becoming enclitics, one would like to say that the same kind of development took place in Kwtsaan. However, in the modern language a (surface) verb never occurs as a complement of \textit{lyvii}; thus there is, synchronically, no surface syntactic string 	extit{Verb-xa \# lyvii} which could be resegmented to 	extit{Verb-xa-lyvii}. However, there is evidence that at a slightly earlier stage of the language this pattern did exist. Some sentences from Abraham Halpern's field data show 	extit{Verb-xa (\#) lyvii}, with the meaning "might (or might not)"

(16) e'e-\textit{xa} \textit{lyvii-}m (BJ-11-21-38) \w\n\textit{say-IRR} like-EV \w\n'He might say it.'

It is not entirely clear from the above that the "might" construction is composed of two independent verbs, particularly in view of the fact that \textit{xa-lyvii-} appears, in a text, as a separate word:

(17) v-i:di:-t-k nyi:xat\i(a) \textit{axa-lyvii-}m ny-a'av-k (Y I-12:77) \w\n\textit{DEM-come-t-SS} fall to pieces \textit{IRR-}like-\textit{DS} \textit{DEM-feel-EV} \w\n'He felt as though he were coming to pieces.'

(The gloss is my own.)

However, there is some comparative evidence for a cognate form of \textit{lyvii} functioning as a verb auxiliary. Kendall (this volume) mentions that in Yavpe (NE Yavapai) \textit{lw}: "be correct, be like" can be used as a kind of modal auxiliary which personal pronoun prefixes:

(18) hyako k\theta ye: m-'u:-h m-li:-a \w\nwhite doctor you-see-IRR you-correct-TNS \w\n'You should see a doctor.'

Note that here also \textit{l(w)i:} occurs after the irrealis marker.

So there is some justification for setting up 	extit{Verb-xa \# lyvii} as a construction in some earlier stage of the language. We have even seen that at an earlier date in Kwtsaan this construction, or something like it, existed with the meaning "might", which, as a kind of dubitive
future, seems to be a logical translation for the combination Irrealis plus "be like". What remains to be explained is why this construction should come to mean "want" for the speakers of Kwtsaan today.

I should like to attempt an explanation of this problem, but first I will present some additional facts about the syntax of -xa-lyvii- which may shed some light on the exact nature of the problem to be solved.

1) When -xa-lyvii- is negated, the irrealis marker -x(a)- remains, while lyvii appears to drop; compare:

(19) mantsaan tskaw-xa-lyvii-ta
     apple      eat-IRR-like-EV
     'I want to eat an apple.'

and

(20) mantsaan tskaw-x-ly'em-ta
     apple      eat-IRR-NEG-EV
     'I don't want to eat an apple.'

lyvii drops only when it appears as part of this enclitic; lyvii as a main verb can occur with the negative:

(21) kew-ny-ny-ts    tsiyer    lyvii-tum
     cloud-DEM-DEM-SUBJ bird     like-HAB
     'That cloud looks like a bird.'

(22) kwe-ny-ny-ts    tsiyer    lyvii-ly'em-tum
     cloud-DEM-DEM-SUBJ bird     like-NEG-HAB
     'That cloud doesn't look like a bird.'

One might think that there is some surface constraint against two verbal enclitics (or two enclitics with ly) occurring on the same verb, but this is disproved by the following example:

(23) tsiimats-ny-ts nya'im-p-m, 'tsashvar-xa-lyvii-lyangi-ta
     dance-DEM-SUBJ end-?DS I-sing-IRR-like-still-EV
     'The party's over, but I still feel like singing.'

Moreover, both -xa-lyvii- and -ly'em- can apparently appear together in some cases:

(24) xuumar  '-yuu-xa-lyvii-ly'em-ta
     child I-see-IRR-like-NEG-EV
     'I don't want to have a child.'

This construction is highly marked, and the difference in meaning between (24) above and

(25) xuumar  '-yuu-x-ly'em-ta
     child I-see-IRR-NEG-EV
     'I don't want to have a child.'
is difficult to define precisely, except that (24) implies a stronger negation. As a first approximation to the meaning, I would relate this difference to the one in English between not like and dislike. I don't like apples could mean either that apples are not something the speaker particularly likes, or that they are something he specifically does not like; I dislike apples can have only the latter meaning. Similarly, in (25) the speaker is merely denying a desire to have a child, while in (24) she is asserting her lack of desire to have one.

2) -xa-lyvii- appears consistently only with first- and second-person subjects. With human third-person subjects it appears to be optional. That is, a sentence like "John wants to run" can be conveyed either by:

(26) John-ts avesh-xa-lyvii-k 'e-ta
    SUBJ run-IRR-like-SS say-EV

or by:

(27) John-ts avesh 'e-ta
    SUBJ run say-EV

where 'eta is a quotative marker. In Kwtsaan a sentence like

(28) *John-ts avesh-xa-lyvii-ta

is ungrammatical, since all verbs of internal state (thinking or feeling) with third-person subjects must also refer to the subject's report of his state. In Kwtsaan you cannot say simply that someone feels a certain way, you must also say that he said he did. At any rate, not only is the quotative marker 'eta necessary with verbs of wanting having third-person subjects, it appears to be sufficient in itself to convey the notion of wanting. That is, (27) seems to function in the same way as (26), although the former is more clearly a real quotation.

3) -xa-lyvii- is ungrammatical with third-person subjects which are incapable of speech. That is, creatures such as dogs, horses, and babies are generally considered volitional beings, but they cannot express their desires by saying so; in Kwtsaan "want" sentences with these subjects do not take -xa-lyvii- but rather a different kind of construction which means "seems to say":

(29) xat tsoqtsaq-ny-ts avesh 'e-t kw-lyvii-sh
dog-DEM-SUBJ run say-t ?-like-EV
'The dog wants to run.'

(30) xumar-ny-ts ts-maa-w 'e-t kw-lyvii-sh
    child-DEM-SUBJ OBJ-eat-DES say-t ?-like-EV
'The baby wants to eat.'

The above examples should make it clear that -xa-lyvii- is in some way connected with the speech situation. It is used only in those sentences referring to a positive desire and/or request. It is obligatory only with first- and second-person subjects, which are the only persons
directly involved in speech acts. And it is ungrammatical with precisely those third-person subjects which can never perform speech acts. But what does this connection have to do with the use of \textit{lyvii} in a desiderative construction?

In order to answer that question it will be necessary to broach the subject of the social or pragmatic function of "want" sentences in Kwtsaan. But before doing so I should like to present what I feel are related phenomena in better-known languages, particularly English. Many if not all Indo-European languages have "polite" forms to express the notion of wanting, which, in non-negated sentences, are synonymous or nearly so with the word meaning "want", but which are not synonymous with "want" in the negated versions of the sentences. For example, in English a sentence like I'd like to go swimming means much the same thing as I want to go swimming. That is, despite the conditional in the first sentence and the indicative in the other, the two sentences refer to the speaker's present desire to go swimming. On the other hand, the negated versions of these sentences, I wouldn't like to go swimming and I don't want to go swimming, do not mean the same thing (in their most common acceptations); only the second refers to the speaker's present feelings, while the first refers to the way he would feel in the event that an unspecified situation should arise. In other words, in the non-negated sentences the conditional is interpreted as though it were indicative, while in the negated sentence it remains a conditional. In other European languages either the conditional or the past subjunctive mood is used as a polite form with the verb meaning "to want"; it is most commonly interpreted as present-tense in non-negated sentences, but in negated sentences it retains its "basic" or original meaning.

I believe it is possible to explain the differences between the non-negated and the negated sentences with would like and its equivalents by reference to the social function of desiderative sentences. I want \textit{x} is usually interpreted as a request (or demand, depending on the situation); at any rate, saying this places some obligation on the hearer to satisfy the speaker's desire. Thus, in a situation where the speaker either does not want his addressee to satisfy his desire, or does not want to appear as if he did, he must refer to his desire in a more indirect manner. In English and most other Indo-European languages the conditional or subjunctive mood is used to accomplish this indirectness. Saying I would like \textit{x} is a way of suggesting that one does not, at present, want \textit{x} (but might do so later). Susan Steele (1975) calls this function "disassociative", because, when used in a request form, it has the effect of abstracting the speaker from his request. In the case of the Indo-European forms, the abstraction is either on the temporal or the aspectual level; past-tense forms assert that the action is over and done with, while subjunctives and unrealis forms (as in Uto-Aztecan) assert that the action is, in some sense, not real or non-existent.

The reason that the negated versions of these forms do not have the same meaning should be obvious. I don't want \textit{x} could never be interpreted as a request, or as a demand, or as anything other than an expression of the speaker's emotions (under normal circumstances); therefore, I wouldn't like \textit{x} need not be used as a polite form, and has only its original meaning.
In Kwtsaan the situation is more complicated. It is true that, as in many other Yuman languages, the irrealis marker -x- is associated with verbs of wanting, but, to my knowledge, it cannot be used alone with unambiguously desiderative meaning. There are certain constructions in Kwtsaan where the irrealis is the only desiderative marker, e.g.

(31) nyaa ka-lyvii-m Mary uu-yuu-x-ny-a 'shamdii-ta
hour WH-like-DS NR-see-IRR-DEM-OBJ I-don't know-EV
'I don't know what time I want to meet Mary.'

but this kind of construction appears to be possible only with nominalized verb forms, and is never unambiguously desiderative (i.e., (31) can also mean "I don't know what time I will meet Mary").

In the -xa-lyvii- enclitic it is the conjunction of xa and lyvii which means "want", but only lyvii drops when "want" is negated. In this respect lyvii appears to function in the same way that the conditional in English and subjunctives in other languages function in conjunction with verbs of wanting. The question is, therefore, what does lyvii have in common with tense/aspect markers which allows them to accomplish this "dissociative" function? I would suggest that the relevant semantic feature of these morphemes is the fact that they all have negative presuppositions. The use of a conditional or subjunctive marker in a sentence requires a presupposition that the action or state predicated in the sentence has not taken place (or does not exist). In order to say John would go to Boston (but he hasn't got a car) one must know, or presuppose, that John has not gone to Boston. Using lyvii also requires a negative presupposition, but of a slightly different sort. In order to say x is like y, one must presuppose that x is not the same as y. Consider the absurdity of saying George Washington is like George Washington, or even George Wash- is like the first president of the United States. What unites these two kinds of negative presuppositions is a kind of metaphor: lyvii, requiring the presupposition x is not (equal to) y, is used as though it had the presupposition x does not exist required by the use of conditionals and subjunctives. It is not at all uncommon for expressions of equality to be treated as expressions of existence; the English copula, for example, has both meanings. What is unusual is that, in this case, the expressions of equality and of existence are not a part of the overt, or asserted, semantic structure of the morphemes in question, but rather of the presuppositions which they require. However, there is some evidence for the same phenomenon in English with like, which in some senses has a kind of non-factive element to its meaning: for example, you could not say You like to hit that tree just now if the car had already crashed. Certainly much more work is necessary before this hypothesis can be accepted; at present it is not even clear what kinds of data can be used as evidence.

In this paper I have tried to show that the syntax of the enclitic -xa-lyvii- can only be explained by reference to pragmatic considerations which have their correlates in many other languages, if, indeed, they are not universal. A number of details about the use of lyvii in this construction have not yet, however, been fully explained. For example, there is the problem of the failure of -xa-lyvii- to take pronoun prefixes, in distinction to every other enclitic form in the language. It may be that this difference implies a greater formal difference than that which I have been
assuming in this paper. There is also the problem of the sentences without any overt desiderative marker which are still translated with "want". Is it that there is a suffix which occasionally appears as \( \emptyset \) (alternating with \(-w\)), or is it that the absence of any suffix indicating that the action has been performed is interpreted as meaning that the action is yet to be performed, which in turn is used occasionally to mean that the subject wants to perform the action?

At a deeper level there are a number of questions which this brief treatment has ignored completely. For example, what is the relationship between \( lyvi \) and the "optative" suffix -ly('a), as in

\[
(32) xnumar '-yu-lY
\]

child \( \text{I-see-OPT} \)

'I'd like to have a child.'

and, further, what do these have to do with the uses of \( ly \) (and cognate morphemes) in desiderative constructions in other Yuman languages, e.g. some dialects of Diegueño and Cocopa? And lastly, will the answers to these questions bear any relation to the reason why, in the history of English, the verb meaning "to be like" also came to mean "to enjoy"?

I hope that some of the pragmatic considerations presented in this paper will suggest new ways of looking at these and other problems in this area, and perhaps lead to a better understanding of the semantic structures of Yuman languages.

Notes

1. Both Christine Emerson and Cynthia Wilson (of California State University, San Diego) deserve credit for a large part of this paper. Their ideas and analyses, as well as their judgments on Kwtsaan sentences, appear here in places too numerous and varied to list specifically. I should like to thank Margaret Langdon for her help with several drafts of this paper, and Don Crook for his ideas and support during the writing of it.

The orthography used here for Kwtsaan is the practical orthography used in the field methods class at UCSD in 1975, so that, for example, \( sh \rightarrow s \), and so on. The other languages cited are written in the orthography used by the source. Most of the abbreviations used in the morpheme glosses are self-explanatory, except for EV, which I am using as a cover term for anything that can go at the end of a main verb (and thus is equivalent to TNS).

Research was financed by NSF Grant G30C-7418043.

2. This distinction is reminiscent of the one found by Langacker (1975) for not Adjective versus un-Adjective; the first he calls "simple negation", the second "reversal". He proposes that the difference in meaning between the two lies in the difference between the scope relationships in their semantic representations; "simple negation" is represented as NOT(BE(ADV)), while "reversal" is represented as BE(NOT(ADV)). It should be possible to set up the same kind of distinction for not like and dislike: NOT(DO(LIKE))
as opposed to \text{DO(NOT(LIKE))} and possibly for the Kwtsaan construction as well: \text{-x-ly'em-} would be equivalent to \text{NOT(DO(WANT))}, while \text{-xa-lyvii-ly'em-} would correspond to \text{DO(NOT(WANT))}, except that I am not sure how these scope relationships interact with the performative level.

3. This constraint is similar to one in Japanese, where it is not possible to say \text{hoshii da} "want" of third persons; instead, \text{hoshii garu}, which is usually translated as "shows signs of wanting", is used.

4. The \text{-w} which is suffixed to \text{ts-maa-} "eat" is problematic in several ways. It clearly has a kind of desiderative meaning whenever it occurs, but its distribution seems to be restricted to verbs which end in a vowel. Why it does not occur on consonant-final verbs is a problem which remains to be solved.

5. I wish to thank Patrick Murray for suggesting this line of enquiry.
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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 Hakanists 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 GS0C-7418043 (Yuman Languages of the Southwest--Margaret Langdon, Principal Investigator).

Margaret Langdon
La Jolla, January 1976.
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