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This paper is a historical analysis of the development of the sensory evidential suffixes and the reportative clitic in Maricopa. These two constructions clearly illustrate the evolution of evidential markers from independent verbs.

Aspect and mood in Maricopa are marked by a complex set of suffixes, auxiliary verbs and subordination constructions. The primary aspect/mood markers are the final suffixes on main verbs. The verb has pronominal prefixes which indicate the person of its subject (and object, if the verb is transitive). The structure of the typical verb can be seen in the following:

1. 'iima-k
   1-dance-asp  'I danced, am dancing'

2. 'nym-aaham-m
   2/1-hit-asp  'You hit me'

3. maa-uum
   eat-inc       'He/I will eat it'

Final suffixes are used which indicate the source of the information presented in the sentence. -(k)yuu 'sight evidential' and -(k)'a 'hearing and other sensory (non-sight) evidential' are suffixes which mark that the information expressed by the sentence is part of the first-hand knowledge of the speaker. -(k)yuu is suffixed to the main verb of a sentence in which the speaker is asserting something which he or she knows about on the basis of having directly observed the event expressed in the sentence.

4. m-ima-nyuu
   2-dance-see=ev  'You danced (I know because I saw it)'

5. ima-nyuu
   dance-see=ev    'He danced (I know because I saw it)'

6. 'iima-k'yu
   1-dance-k=see=ev  'I danced (for sure in the past)'

In (4) and (5) the suffix clearly indicates that the speaker observed the activity expressed in the sentence. In (6) in which the subject of the sentences is first person, the evidential sense is less central. When, as in (6), the subject of the verb is the speaker, the evidential reading is typically redundant (it would be uncommon for a speaker not to be present at events in which he or she is a participant) and the suffix is used to indicate that the action or state has actually occurred.
Similarly, -(k)'a is used to mark that the clause asserted by
the speaker is from the speaker's first-hand knowledge. The first-hand
knowledge is gained, in this instance, through having sensed (typically,
heard), but not having seen, the event, as in

(7) m-ashvar-'a
2-sing-hr=ev 'You sang (I know because I heard it)'

(8) ashvar-'a
sing-hr=ev 'He sang (I know because I heard it)'

(9) '-ashvar-k'a
1-sing-k=hr=ev 'I sang (for sure in the past; I heard/felt myself)'

Typically, though certainly not absolutely, -(k)'a is used on verbs of
communication of actions strongly associated with sound, as in (7)-(9)
above.

Like -(k)'yuu, -(k)'a, when used on a verb with a first person subject
has less an evidential sense than a strong assertiveness about the actual
occurrence of the action expressed by the verb. -(k)'a is less likely
to be used with a first person subject (and, in general, it is less common
than -(k)'yuu with any verb form). Possibly the most typical place this
is found is on verbs of 'saying' which are addressed to the speaker.

(10) Pam-sh 'i-m nyip ny-mhan-k ii-’a
Pam-sj say-m me 3/1-like-k say-hr=ev 'Pam told me she likes me'

Before I can account for the distribution of the sensory evidential
forms with k and those without k, more and more of the structure of the verb
must be examined. -k and -m in Maricopa are used as final suffixes on
independent verbs of declarative sentences to indicate that the clause is
realis and indicative. The speaker presents the information as fact,
not as possibility, inference, or preference, and with no hint as to its
source or any doubt of its veracity. The event or state which the verb
expresses is completed if the action is punctual, as in

(11) 'iipaa-ny-sh puy-k
man-dem-sj die-asp 'The man died, is dead'

(12) mhay-ny-sh ny-aaham-m
boy-dem-sj 3/1-hit-asp 'The boy hit me'

If the action or state is not punctual, then the verb marked with -k or -m
expresses an action or state which is either completed or on-going, as in

(13) nyaa '-ashvar-k
l 1-sing-asp 'I sang' or 'I am singing'

'(14) mhay-ny-sh ny-aashham-k 'The boy beat me up' or
boy-dem-sj 3/1-beat-asp 'The boy is beating me up'
If the action is punctual (as those in (11) and (12) are), the verb can only have a completed reading (since it is marked with a realis suffix). If, as in (13) and (14), action is durative or iterative, then it can have either a completed or on-going interpretation when marked with a realis suffix. These is a reasonable outcome of the fact that a punctual action is realis when it is accomplished. The momentaneous nature of a punctual action entails that its onset and its accomplishment are inseparable. A progressive punctual verb is unaccomplished or irrealis or iterative. In Maricopa, *puy-k* 'die' (as in (11)) and *aaahm-m* 'hit' (as in (12)) are punctual (non-iterative) verbs.

On the other hand, a durative event or state is to some extent accomplished when it is begun. Its onset and completion are separable; from its onset a certain amount of the event or state is real. Thus (13) and (14) can be interpreted as completed or on-going (as past or as present progressive). All the realis suffix implies is that some portion of the event or state has held or is holding. If any portion of a punctual action holds, all of it must hold. Compare (12) and (14); the difference between them is that the verb in (14) is marked as iterative (and, therefore, extendable over time), while in (12) the verb is only interpretable as punctual (realis, and therefore, completed). In (11) the verb is *puy-k* 'to die' (death is real only when one has died); on the other hand, the verb in (13) is *ashvar-k* 'to sing' (the moment one has sung even one note, the singing is real).

In Maricopa, the selection of -k or -m as a final main verb suffix is lexically determined based on the morpheme which immediately precedes the final suffix. This morpheme may be the verb root, as in

(15a) aaham-m hit-asp 'He hit him'

(15b) hot-k good-asp 'It is/was good'

or it can be any one of a number of non-final suffixes, as in

(16a) aaham-nt-k hit-too-asp 'He hit him again'

(16b) hot-haay-k good-yet-asp 'It is/was still good'

(17a) aaham-hot-m hit-intns-asp 'He really hit him'

(17b) hot-hot-m good-intns-asp 'It is/was very good'

In (15a) and (15b) the verb root determines which final suffix the verb takes; in (15a) the final suffix is -m, while in (15b) it is -k. In (16) and (17) the non-final suffixes determine the choice of final suffix.
There appears to be no feature or set of features, whether phonological, syntactic, or semantic, which distinguishes -m verbs (verb forms which are marked with -m as their final realis suffix) from -k verbs (verb forms which are marked with -k as their final realis suffix). Both sets of verbs include both active and stative, transitive and intransitive, basic and derived forms.6

On verbs of certain subordinate clauses of complex sentences, -k is used to signal that the verb has the same subject as the clause to which it is subordinated, as in

(18) 'ayuu nya-rav-k yoq-k
s.t. when-hurt-ss vomit-asp 'When he1 was sick, he1 threw up'

(19) kafe '-sish-k pastel '-mash-k
coffee 1-drink+du-ss pie 1-eat+du-asp 'We drank coffee and ate pie'

-m is suffixed to a subordinate verb to indicate that that verb has a different subject from that of the clause to which it is subordinate, as in

(20) 'ayuu nya-rav-m yoq-k
s.t. when-hurt-ds vomit-asp 'When he1 was sick, he1 threw up' (i ≠ j)

(21) kafe '-sish-m pastel mash-k
coffee 1-drink+du-ds pie eat+du-asp 'We drank coffee and they ate pie'

This marking of verbs of subordinate clauses as to whether they have the same subject as or a different subject from some other clause in the sentence is in keeping with what is to be expected from a switch reference system (cf. Jacobsen 1967), particularly the Yuman switch reference system (cf. Langdon and Munro, to appear; Munro 1976; Winter 1976).

-m verbs do not participate in the switch reference system. None of these verbs can be marked with -k 'same subject'. These verbs are always marked with -m when the same subject or the different subject suffix might be expected, as in

(22) Bonnie-sh 'ayuu nya-maa-m onyor chaa-k
Bonnie-sj s.t. when-eat-m book read-asp 'Bonnie1 reads while she1/j eats'

Thus in (22) even though the verb of the dependent clause is marked with -m, the subjects of the two clauses can be interpreted as being the same or as being different. The verb must be marked with -m in switch-referencing contexts, regardless of what the subjects of the clauses are.7

In Maricopa the sensory evidential suffixes and the perfective suffixes each have two forms, one with a k and one without a k:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>with k</th>
<th>without k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sensory evidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sight</td>
<td>-k'yuu</td>
<td>-'yuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>-k'a</td>
<td>-'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>-ksh</td>
<td>-sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td>-ksha</td>
<td>-sha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As exemplified in (6) and (9) the sensory evidential suffixes with \( \text{-}k \) (k-forms) (and the perfective suffixes with \( \text{k} \)) are used when the subject of the verb is first person. In fact the constraint is stronger than this; aside from having a first person subject, the verb must also be a \(-k\) verb (that is, a verb form which takes \(-k\) as its final reals suffix and which participates in switch reference) if it is to be marked with \(-k\text{'yuu}\) or \(-k\text{'a}\). In the cases below (23 and 24) the sentences contain m-verbs and therefore cannot be marked with \(-k\text{'yuu}\) or \(-k\text{'a}\), regardless of what the subject of the verb is.

(23a) \(-kyaa-'yuu\)
1-shoot-see=ev
'I shot him'

(23b) \(m-kyaa-'yuu\)
2-shoot-see=ev
'You shot him'

(23c) \(kyaa-'yuu\)
shoot-see=ev
'He shot him'

(24a) \(-mii-'a\)
1-cry-hr=ev
'I cried'

(24b) \(m-mii-'a\)
2-cry-hr=ev
'You cried'

(24c) \(mii-'a\)
cry-hr=ev
'He cried'

This association of \(-k\text{'yuu}\) and \(-k\text{'a}\) with \(-k\)-verbs suggests that the \(k\) in the suffixes is segmentable and related either to the switch-reference marking \(-k\) or the aspect/mood marking \(-k\). Since the presence of \(k\) is conditioned not only by the kind of verb (\(-k\)-verb or \(-m\)-verb), but also by what the subject of the verb is, it seems likely that the \(k\) found in the sensory evidential suffixes is related to the switch reference system which is also sensitive to the subject of the verb. Thus, in (25) which has a \(-k\)-verb with a first person subject,

(25) nyaa 'ayuu 'rav-k-'yuu
I s.t. 1-hurt-ss-see=ev
'I was sick'

the \(k\) in \(-k\text{'yuu}\) can tentatively be identified as the same subject suffix. In (26) which has the same verb, but a third person subject, the \(k\) is not present.

(26) Päm-sh 'ayuu rav-'yuu
Päm-sj s.t. hurt-see=ev
'Pam was sick'

In (27) and (28), which both contain \(-m\)-verbs, it does not matter what the subject is; as in the switch reference cases, these verbs cannot be marked with \(k\).

(27) nyaa 'wii-'yuu
I 1-do-see=ev
'I did it'

(28) Päm-sh wii-'yuu
Päm-sj do-see=ev
'Pam did it'
Further support for the hypothesis that the \( k \) in this construction is the same subject suffix comes from the remainder of the sight evidential suffix. The sight evidential suffix itself consists of \( yuu \) which is transparently related to the verb \( yuu-k \) 'to see' with the first person prefix \( ' \); this is compatible with the semantics since this affix means that the event took place within the sight of the speaker. In other words, the sight evidential includes the morphemes for 'I see'.

In complex sentences which have a sensory verb as their main verb and a clausal object, the verb of the complement clause is marked with a switch reference suffix, either same subject \(-k\) or different subject \(-m\). In the following examples, this complex construction is shown with the sensory verb \( yuu-k \) 'see' with complement clauses which have the same subject (as in (29a)) and different subjects (as in (29b-c)).

(29a) 'iima-k 'yuu-k
1-dance-se 1-see-asp 'I saw myself dance' (cf. (6))

(29b) m-iima-m 'yuu-k
2-dance-ds 1-see-asp 'I saw you dance' (cf. (4))

(29c) iima-m 'yuu-k
dance-ds 1-see-asp 'I saw him dance' (cf. (5))

If one compares (29a-c) to the parallel evidential-marked verbs in (6), (4) and (5), it is clear that the \(-k\) in the evidential form is associated with \(-k\) 'same subject' in the complex sentence, while \( \emptyset \) in the evidential form is associated with \(-m\) 'different subject' in the complex sentence). Similarly, with verbs which do not participate in switch reference, \(-m\) on the complement clause of the complex sentence is parallel to \( \emptyset \) in the evidential marked forms. Compare (23a-c) with (30a-c):

(30a) 'kyaa-m 'yuu-k
1-shoot-\( m \) 1-see-asp 'I saw myself shoot him'

(30b) m-kyaa-m 'yuu-k
2-shoot-\( m \) 1-shoot-asp 'I saw you shoot him'

(30c) kyaa-m 'yuu-k
shoot-\( m \) 1-see-asp 'I saw him shoot him'

Thus, \( yuu-k \) 'see' is a verb which takes switch-reference marked complements. Complements of \( yuu 'I see' \) which themselves have first person subjects are obligatorily marked with \(-k\) (if the verb of the complement is a \(-k\)-verb). This supports the identification of the \( k \) in the sight evidential suffix with the same subject \(-k\).

A parallel relationship can be traced for \(-k'\( a \) and \( a \) with respect to the verb \( av-k \) 'to hear, sense'. The distribution of the form with \( k \) and that without \( k \) is the same as described above for \(-k'yuu \) and \(-yuu\). Like \( yuu-k \) 'to see', \( av-k \) 'to hear' is a verb which takes a switch-reference marked object complement. \( av-k \) is somewhat more distant phonologically from its affixal counterpart \( a \) than the first person verb of 'seeing' is
from the sight evidential. There is no explicit first person 'I-' prefix on the hearing evidential. This seems a very slight change given the general process for eliminating first person 'I-' on consonant-initial verb stems in Maricopa. The loss of y is not particularly difficult to account for; many y's in final position are lost in many contexts.

The evidential forms, unlike their complex counterparts, do not have as their main assertion that the speaker saw or heard something; instead, the main assertion is that made by the verb to which the evidential is affixed. The evidential marking sets the event in time and space with regard to the speaker.

The main semantic force of these affixes which speakers are immediately conscious of is that the clauses which contain evidentials assert something which truly happened in the past. (An evidential is not used on a verb to express an action or state which is presently going in within the sight or hearing of the speaker—that would presumably also be in the sight or hearing of the person the speaker is addressing). More than this, of course, these affixes reflect the actual sensory source of the information. These affixes have a kind of hierarchy for use—if an event is both seen and heard (probably the most commonplace situation), then the sight evidential is used; the hearing evidential is only used when the event is witnessed but not seen—the direct perceptual source of the information can be hearing, feeling or otherwise sensing (but not seeing).

Evidential marking may seem odd on first person verbs, since, of course, any event one is a participant in, one is present at. However, we have already seen that it is possible to assert (without difficulty) that 'I' saw or otherwise sensed 'myself' do something (cf. (29a) and (30a)). The natural inference of these evidentials is that something truly happened in the past. With a first person subject, that aspect of the meaning is central (the form of the witnessing is less important as is the assumption of direct observation since they are part of the natural and predictable state of affairs). When the subject is first person, the use of -k'yuu, in particular, marks the assertion as more emphatically true and sets the event unambiguously in the past. Neutral realis marking as in (1-2, 15a-17b) does not imply that the action/state expressed by the verb is in the past. Compare (30a) and (30b):

(30a) nyaa 'ayuu 'rav-k
I s.t. 1-hurt-asp 'I am/was sick'

(30b) nyaa 'ayuu 'rav-k='yuu
I s.t. 1-hurt-ss=1=see 'I was sick' (same as (25))

The verb marked with an evidential suffix can be negative—one can witness something not happening, as in

(31) waly-marsh-ma-='yuu
neg-win+du-neg-l=see 'I was sick'

The evidential itself cannot be negated, since the evidential sense is presupposed not asserted. To assert that one did not witness something, an independent
main verb must be used, as in

(32) marsh-m waly-’-yuu-ma-k
      win+du-ds neg-1-see-neg-aspi  'I didn’t see them win'

The source of these evidential suffixes suggests a parallel source for
-(k)sh 'perfective' and -(k)shn 'emphatic perfective' which demonstrate the
same distributional pattern of k and Ø as the evidential suffixes do. It
was this pattern of distribution of k and Ø which led to the identification
of k in the evidential suffixes as the same subject -k (historically, at
least). It seems likely that in the perfective suffixes as well k is
historically the same subject suffix. This leaves morphemes which cannot be
related to any independent verb. The perfective affixes, if they are related
to independent verbs, are so reduced that no identification is possible.
Note that as well as sharing the distribution of form with the evidentials,
the perfectives also share the semantic feature of basically past time
reference. Whatever the original verb was in the perfective constructions
(or verbs were), all that is historically reconstructable of them now is that
they must have had first person subjects (like the sensory verbs in the
evidentials) to account for where the k’s are found in the perfectives
(only on -k-verbs with first person subjects).

An interesting outcome of this grammaticization is that it gives
Maricopa a set of verbal forms in which first person subject is, in effect,
marked by the shape of the suffix, rather than a pronominal prefix or in
addition to a pronominal prefix. In four different, though related, aspect/
modes, the presence of the k in the suffix identifies the verb as having
a first person subject (though, of course, the absence of k does not
suffice to mark the verb as not having a first person subject if the verb
is an -m-verb). This process of marking first person subject with the presence
of k in the evidential/perfective suffixes is happening concurrently with
the loss of - as a first person prefix.

Another grammaticized evidential construction is also derived from
a complex sentence. The reportative construction in Maricopa consists of
a form of the verb 'ii-m 'say', which is invariant and cliticized to the
verb which precedes it; the hearing evidential suffix is attached to the
verb 'say'. This form just like the sensory evidentials discussed above
is used exclusively on independent clauses. The construction is used to
indicate that the speaker is not vouching for the truth of the utterance,
instead he or she is merely repeating something that has been said to him
or her.

(33) Bonnie-sh chuy-k-'ish-a
       Bonnie-sj marry-k-say+sh-hr=ev 'They said, I hearttell) Bonnie got married'

The identification of 'ish (alternatively, ish) as a form of the
verb 'say' is not based on the phonological similarities between these two
forms alone, since this verb has many forms and this form, 'ish, resembles
a number of other morphemes (’ish 'unspecified object', sh plural/dual suffix,
sh aspect/mood suffix, etc.). Morphosyntactic evidence exists which indicates
that this construction contains the verb 'say' in it at some level.

'ii-m 'say', like the evidential verbs described above, is a verb
which takes an object complement clause. Unlike the sensory verbs, however,
'say' takes a complement whose verb is not marked with switch reference suffixes.
Instead, verbs of complements of 'ii-m 'say' (if they are realis) are marked with the neutral realis suffixes -k or -m or with -k (which does not indicate same subject or ordinary aspect marking). Clearly, the -k does not indicate same subject in

(34) Bonnie-sh chuy-k uu'ish-k
    Bonnie-sj marry-k say+pl-aspect 'They said Bonnie got married'

since 'they', the subject of the 'say' verb, 'Bonnie', the subject of the complement clause, are not the same. Further evidence that this is not the same subject -k as noted above is that -m verbs (which never are marked with the same subject marker -k or the neutral aspect marker -k) can be marked with this -k, as in

(35) Pam-sh Bonnie tpuy-k uu'ish-k
    Pam-sj Bonnie kill-k say+pl-aspect 'They said that Pam killed Bonnie'

-m verbs in such complement clauses can also be marked with -m, as in

(36) Pam-sh Bonnie tpuy-m uu'ish-k
    Pam-sj Bonnie kill-m say+pl-aspect 'They said that Pam killed Bonnie'

-k verbs in such complement clauses can never be marked with -m (whether as different subject marker or as aspect marker). Compare (34) and

(37) *Bonnie-sh chuy-m uu'ish-k
    Bonnie-sj marry-m say+pl-aspect

(This is the only construction which shows variation between -m and -k which does not also demonstrate clear differences in syntactic organization or in which there is not great indeterminacy as to the subjects of the verbs involved.)

This variation between -k and -m is found on the verb followed by a reportative clitic. Compare the final suffixes on the lexical verbs in (38a) and (38b). They show parallel structure to (35) and (36) above, which are complex sentences with full-fledged 'say' verbs as the main verbs of the sentence.

(38a) Pam-sh Bonnie tpuy-k 'ish-a
    Pam-sj Bonnie kill-k say+sh-hr=ev 'Pam killed Bonnie (I hear tell)

(38b) Pam-sh Bonnie tpuy-m 'ish-a
    Pam-sj Bonnie kill-m say+sh-hr=ev 'Pam killed Bonnie (I hear tell)'

Both the sensory evidential suffixes and the hearsay construction are still quite transparent in their internal structure and both are clearly derived historically from complex sources. In both cases an original main verb has been reduced to suffixes or clitics. Both constructions demonstrate parallel development from complex sentences containing two clauses to simple sentences in which the main verb/clause has been reduced to being part of the verbal complex (of the earlier complement clause). Both constructions illustrate the use of productive systematic morphology which has to some extent become fixed, producing a new form which does not participate in the general syntactic or morphological system. This grammatical fixing of these constructions
Has produced simple sentence from complex sentences; simultaneously it has complicated the grammar by introducing new morphosyntactic categories.

Footnotes

1 Maricopa is a Yuman language of the River branch, most closely related to Mojave and Yuma. The data and analysis presented in this paper comes from Gordon 1980a. The data is presented in practical orthography: VV = V; ch = ç; sh = ±; d = Ø; ny = n; ky = k; ly = l; ' = ?; h = x; kw = k. The abbreviations used in this paper are: 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; 1/2 = first person subject/second person object, etc; asp = neutral realis aspect; dem = demonstrative; du = dual; de = different subject suffix; hr=ev = non-sight sensory evidential; neg = negative; intns = intensifier; pl = plural; see = ev = sight evidential; sj = subject; ss = same subject suffix; s.t. = something (unspecified argument); inc = incomplete.

I am grateful to my Maricopa teachers Pollyanna Heath and Jasper Donahue, for their patience and skill. Most of the data included in this paper is from Ms. Heath. I have discussed these data at different times with Pamela Munro, Margaret Langdon, Sandra Thompson, Bonnie Clover, and Heather Hardy and I would like to thank them for their interest and suggestions.

2 Aspect and mood are primarily marked by final suffixes on the verb of an independent clause. More complex moods and aspects are expressed using auxiliary constructions and complex sentences. Inferential constructions include the enclitic shaa and several main and auxiliary verb constructions. The enclitic shaa indicates that the sentence to which it is affixed is the belief, inference or expectation of the speaker. It cliticized to the final verb of the main clause of a sentence which is marked with either realis -k or -m or incomplete -uum (cf. Gordon 1980).

Other inferential constructions use the sensory verbs yuu 'see' and 'av 'hear, sense' to indicate the perceptual source of the information on which the speaker bases his or her inference. Another set of inferential construction uses the existential verbs duu 'be!', wii 'do', and 'ii 'say'. These verbs are used to express how the event on which the speaker's inference is based is manifested.

3 The first person subject (intransitive and transitive with a third person object) prefix 'l- is obligatory for most speakers only with vowel initial and glide initial stems. With consonant initial stems, 'l- is obligatory; thus, the unmarked form is ambiguous between third person subject and first person subject.

4 The -k on the verb of the complement is discussed later in the paper. The verb 'l-m 'say' varies greatly in form—the vowel can be long or short; under certain circumstances the vowel can be lowered and shortened; the initial 'l- is optional when no prefix precedes it (all this is discussed in detail in Gordon 1980). This accounts for the difference in form between the two instances of 'say' in this example.

5 Note that in (15b) the verb hot 'good' is a -k verb, while in (17) the suffix -hot- (which is transparently derived from the independent verb) takes -m as its final aspect marker.
6 This is clearly not a phonologically based distribution, since it is possible to find pairs of homophonous stems which differ only in the assignment of final realis marker. Such pairs include:

chaa-m 'put'  chaa-k 'read, count'
shmaa-m 'sleep'  shmaa-k 'dream'
waa-m 'do to someone'  waa-k 'drive'
chem-m 'put'  chem-k 'make a mistake'

Other possible criteria for the assignment of -k or -m also fail—
even verbs which are derived from nouns (using the same morphology) may fall into different classes, e.g.,
hay-m 'damp' (from ha 'water')  mathay-k 'windy' (from matha 'wind')

7 Switch reference suffixes are used on verbs in all kinds of dependent clauses—complement clauses, adverbial clauses (temporal, causal, etc.), and certain modifying clauses. Switch reference marking is never used together with case marking.

8 The v usually lost is the medio-passive suffix. As pointed out by Munro (1980, to appear), it seems that 'hear' in the Yuman languages is the medio-passive form of 'say'; in Maricopa, the transitive form of 'say' is 'aa-m' and the medio-passive form 'a(a)v would be identical the av 'hear, sense'.
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Unfortunately, everyone who presented a paper at the 1980 Hokan Languages Workshop was not able to prepare a final version for inclusion in this volume. All papers in this volume except two were presented in an earlier version at the 1980 workshop. The papers are arranged in the order they appeared on the program.

The paper by Birgitte Bendixen was presented at the 1979 Hokan Languages Workshop. The camera-ready manuscript for her article arrived at the editor's office more than three months before the publication deadline. The editor is so used to having to call up contributors and begging them to get their manuscripts in that he totally forgot Dr. Bendixen's paper was in his files and left it out of the 1979 volume. The editor humbly apologizes for this oversight. The second paper by Pamela Munro was discussed in part at the 1980 workshop, and the editor asked her to include it in this volume.

The participants of the 1980 Hokan Languages Workshop gratefully acknowledge all the work done by Leanne Hinton and several of her students, which made the workshop run so smoothly and enjoyably. We also wish to thank the College of Letters and Sciences at the University of California, Berkeley, for a grant to help defray the costs of holding the workshop.

Copies of the 1977, 1978, and 1979 workshop proceedings are still available from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901. The volumes for the 1975 and 1976 workshops, which appeared in the SIU-C series, University Museum Studies, are now out of print, but copies may be obtained in microfiche or hardbound volumes from ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3250 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, DC 20007.

The 1981 Hokan Languages Workshop will meet jointly with the Penutian Language Conference at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California, June 29 to July 2, 1981. The proceedings of the 1981 workshop will appear in Occasional Papers On Linguistics in early 1982. For the first time, the papers of the Penutian Language Conference will be published in the same volume as the Hokan papers. Copies may be ordered from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, June 1981
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