I. The Relationship Between Yuman 'say' and 'hear'

In Munro (1980) I suggested an etymological connection between the Proto-Yuman verbs 'say' and 'hear'. I believe that 'hear' is (historically) the "passive" (in the sense in which Langdon (1970) and others have used this term of verbal derivatives in -v/p) of 'say'. In this note I will present evidence for this relationship from a number of different levels of linguistic structure.

First let us consider the forms of 'say' and 'hear' in the modern Yuman languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>'say'</th>
<th>'hear'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiliwa (Mixco)</td>
<td>?i:</td>
<td>kwi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Diegueno (Langdon)</td>
<td>i?i:</td>
<td>i?ip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Diegueno (Langdon)</td>
<td>-i:</td>
<td>-yi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocopa (J. M. Crawford)</td>
<td>?i</td>
<td>?i?i:p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma (Halpern)</td>
<td>a?i/a?e</td>
<td>a?av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa (Gordon)</td>
<td>?i:/?e/i etc.</td>
<td>?av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojave (Munro)</td>
<td>i?i:/e?e/i/e etc.</td>
<td>?av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paipai (Joel)</td>
<td>-?i-</td>
<td>(-)?e:v-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolkapaya Yavapai (Hardy)</td>
<td>?i</td>
<td>?ev-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualapai (Redden, Yamamoto, Lieber)</td>
<td>i(?)(-)</td>
<td>ev(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai (Kozlowski)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e:v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I see no reason to suppose that Kiliwa kwi: 'hear' is related to the other words in the second column above. Aside from this, however, the cognate sets presented suggest a number of generalizations about the shape of these words in the proto-language.

The only languages which show no root-initial glottal stop in both 'say' and 'hear' are Northern Diegueno and Hualapai/Havasupai. The presence of ? in languages closely related to these, like Southern Diegueno and Yavapai, supports the notion that the omission of these root-initial ?'s was an innovation. Reconstruction of root-initial glottal stops in these words seems secure. However, it is worth noting that sporadic omission of this reconstructed ? (probably only in the verb 'say') may have been a morphologically conditioned option in Proto-Yuman. Notice, for instance, the 'say' alternants without ? in the closely related River languages Maricopa and Mojave. In Maricopa this alternation is morphologically conditioned -- if 'say' has any prefix, it must have a ?-initial root (Gordon 1980). In Mojave, however, 'say' forms both with and without ? are found after all the
personal prefixes, but the shorter forms without ? are preferred in certain morphosyntactic contexts (Munro 1976a). Other languages may also have certain forms of 'say' without the root-initial ?; for instance, in Tolkapaya Yavapai the ? in 'say' is omitted after the second-person subject prefix me (though not after the homophonous second-person object prefix!):

(1a) m-i(-k=m-i=m) (2-say(-inc)) 'You say it'
(1b) m'-i(-k=-i=m) (3/2-say(-inc)) 'He says it to you'

Along with the initial glottal stops in both roots, we may securely reconstruct a final #p in the root for 'hear'. The distribution of p's and v's in the forms above follows the regular correspondences for poststress #p (Langdon and Munro 1980).

As is usual in Yuman, the vowels are the most problematic elements in these reconstructions. In general, a reconstruction of #1: in 'say' and #1 in 'hear' seems justified. However, note the unexpected vowels in the River 'hear' forms.

My claim is that the 'hear' verbs in the table are derived from the corresponding 'say' verbs by suffixation of the -v/p "passive" suffix (Proto-Yuman #p). The length disparity between the vowells of the two verbs could be attributed either to a lengthening of the root-final vowel in 'say' or a shortening of this long vowel before the suffix in 'hear'. Given that similar stem vowel alternations have been reported in various morphophonological circumstances in the modern daughter languages (cf. e.g. Langdon 1970 on the lengthening of stem-final vowels in plural forms, and Gordon 1980 on the shortening of root-final vowels before certain suffixes) it does not seem unlikely that such alternations would be found in the proto-language.

Now let us consider the semantic consequences of such a claim about morphology. Suppose we assume a situation which a speaker might describe in the following way:

(2) A says "Kamaduu" (Mojave 'hello') to B

One possible "passive" of (2) would be

(3) B is said "Kamaduu" to (by A)

And a sensible consequence of (3) is

(4) B hears "Kamaduu"

Thus, it does seem that 'hear' is in a sense a passive of 'say'. One objection to this, however, might be this: since 'hear' can take an object, how can it be a passive? Actually, 'hear' can take two types of objects (in English at least), a quotation, as in (4), or some source of sound, corresponding to the speaker A in (2). The quotation "object" (see part II below) is no problem, since 'say' sentences like (2) also start out with two objects, a quotation and an indirect object (like B in (2)). When the indirect object is passivized upon, the
quotation remains behind in the syntactic object position — just like the "old" object in an English sentence like

(5) Mary was given the book (by her grandmother).

Analogically, if the phrase was given in this sentence was reinterpreted as a nonpassive basic verb, the book would be taken as an object. Why the subject of 'say' should occur as an object in a 'hear' sentence, however, is more of a problem, since Yuman passive constructions typically do not allow even the oblique expression of an agent. However, I think that 'hear' is much less perfectly transitive a verb in the Yuman languages I know than it is in English. Consider the following examples from Mojave:

(6a) hatshoq-ny 'a'av-k (dog-dem 1-hear-tns)
'I heard the dog'
(6b) hatshoq-ny-ch uwh-m 'a'av-k (dog-dem-su bark-ds 1-hear-tns)
'I heard the dog bark'

Mojave speakers have told me that (6b) is a better way to express the idea in (6a). At least in Mojave, 'hear' prefers not to take an animate (noise-making) object, but prefers to have that object expressed in an associated switch-reference-marked clause.

At this point let's return to the question of the a's in the River words for 'hear'. In most of the Yuman languages, 'hear' is formed by the suffixation of -v/p directly to the normal 'say' verb. In River, however, 'hear' is the "passive" of 'say to', a verb first noted (for Maricopa) by Lynn Gordon. While 'say' can take a marked indirect object in most languages, as (1b) above shows, River sentences with marked (non-third-person) indirect objects often show a replacement of the normal 'say' stem listed in the table above with the 'say to' stem (Maricopa 'aa, Mojave a'aa), as in these Mojave examples:

(7a) 'inyep 'ny-i1i-m (me 3/1-say-tns)
'He said it to me'
(7b) 'inyep 'ny-a1aa-m (me 3/1-say-to-tns)
'He said it to me' (better?)

(In Maricopa, according to Gordon (1980), the requirement that 'aa replace 'say' when an indirect object is marked on the verb seems to be stronger than in Mojave.) Notice incidentally the meaning of a non-third person associated with a 'say' verb showing no indirect object agreement:

(8) 'inyep i1i-m (me say-tns)
'He said it about me'

I have not seen this 'say to' verb reported for Yuma (the third language of the River branch) or for any other Yuman language. Perhaps it was an innovation in River, where qualitative ablaut frequently marks various sorts of derivational processes (Langdon 1976).
case, where this verb was available it makes sense that it would have been used as the source for the passive whose history is suggested in (2)-(4) above, since the presence of the indirect object in the original 'say' sentence is crucial.

Another point concerning the final consonant in 'hear' has to do with a common rule by which stem-final v's are deleted before labials in such languages as Mojave (Munro 1976a) and Maricopa (Gordon 1980). One of the best examples of this process in Mojave is the verb 'hear', which, along with other verbs, seems to show compensatory lengthening when this deletion occurs, as in

(9) '-a'aa-mpotch (1-hear-neg+perf) 'I didn't hear it'

Gordon (1980) has noted that in Maricopa the only stem-final v's which delete in this environment are those of -v passives and the verb 'hear', and the same seems to be true in Mojave. If all these verbs belonged to the same group (e.g. -v passives), this generalization would be neater. The "compensatory lengthening" referred to above might involve simply a reversion to the original shape of the verb before suffixation of the "passive" ending.

There is one more similarity between 'say' and 'hear' which may support the historical connection being proposed. As is well-known among Yumanists (and noted in part in most grammars and many shorter papers), 'say' is an extremely common auxiliary verb in Yuman, both in various idiosyncratic constructions, or patterning with the "existential" (Munro 1976b) or "behavioral" (Langdon 1976) auxiliaries 'be' and 'do'. 'Say' sometimes conveys the idea of 'manifest' (I believe this gloss is due to Kendall and Shaterian), while 'hear' may be used to mean something like 'experience' -- again two notions which are sort of opposites, or passives of each other. In this 'experience' sense 'hear' appears in such auxiliary constructions as the periphrastic expression of 'never' in Mojave:

(10) hayiko-ly '-iyem-k 'a'aa-mot-m (white=man-in 1-go-ss 1-hear-neg-tns) 'I never go to town'

Thus it seems reasonable to suppose not only that the Yuman verbs for 'say' and 'hear' are related, but also that 'hear' is a historically a v-passive derived from some 'say' verb.

II. -k on the Quotation Complements of 'say' 6

Yumanists have long been puzzled by the fact (noted first by Sandra Chung for Tolkapaya Yayapai -- cf. also Kendall 1975) that quotation complements of the verb 'say' (and, in some languages, of verbs derived from 'say', like 'think') do not show normal switch-reference marking. In this note, I will suggest a new explanation for the puzzling use of -k on complements of 'say' in these languages.

Consider a sentence like the Mojave example
(11) m-isay-k 'i-il'i-m (2-fat-? 1-say-tns)
'I say you're fat' OR 'I say, "You're fat"

The use of -k on the apparently subordinate verb isay 'fat' in
(11) contrasts with the well-known same-subject marking function of -k
in a sentence like

(12) m-isay-k m-suupaw-m (2-fat-ss 2-know-tns)
'you know you're fat'

Here, the subjects of both clauses are the same, so same-subject
-k appropriately appears on the first (subordinate) verb. But the
subjects of the two clauses in (11) are different, so there is no
reason to expect the use of -k. Another explanation might be that the
quotation in (11) is syntactically direct, since the normal way to say
simply 'You're fat' in Mojave is m-isay-k -- thus, one might argue, the
use of -k on the first verb in (11) mimics the use of -k on the
 corresponding independent clause.

There seem to be two cross-linguistic problems with this
 suggestion. First, in Tolkapaya Yavapai -k may freely occur on 'say'
complements, but no independent clauses are ever marked with -k (Hardy
1979):

(13) m-'ev-k 'i-k='i=m (2-hear-? say-inc) 'He says you heard it'
(14) m-'ev-i / m-'ev-k=m=yu=m / #m-'ev-k (2-hear-inc)
'You heard it'

Secondly, in Maricopa there are two classes of verbs -- -k verbs,
which are subject to normal switch-reference marking and take -k as
their neutral aspect marker, and -m verbs, which do not participate in
the switch-reference system (remaining marked with -m even in a
same-subject environment) and take -m as their neutral aspect marker
(Gordon 1980). Even Maricopa -m verbs, however, can take a -k suffix
in a 'say' complement:

(15) m-maa-k/m 'i-i-m (2-eat-?/asp say-asp) 'He says you ate it'
(16) m-maa-m / #m-maa-k (2-eat-asp) 'You ate it'

Note that either the "direct quotation"7-m or the special 'say'
complement-marking -k we are discussing here is appropriate for
Maricopa -m verbs in a quotation complement like (15). This prompts
Gordon (1980) to note that in the Maricopa equivalent of a sentence
like Mojave (11), (17), where -k appears on a -k verb complement, the
-k must be subject to two analyses, either as "direct" aspectual marker
or as complement-marker:

(17) m-shaay-k 'i-i-m (2-fat-?/asp say-asp) 'He says you're fat'
(16) m-shaay-k 'You're fat'

It is indeed hard to explain why the same-subject -k of the
switch-reference system would occur in the environments exemplified above, and the Maricopa data suggests strongly that the 'say' complement -k cannot be the same-subject marking -k, even with an intricate extension of the description of the use of same-subject -k or a suspension of the rules for its use, as earlier investigators (Kendall 1975, Munro 1976b) have suggested. If, though, the -k on 'say' complements is not same-subject -k, what is it?

The oblique non-quotation object in a Mojave sentence like (8) above can also be explicitly case-marked, as in

(8') 'inyep-k i'ii-m (me-obl say-tns) 'He said it about me'

The Mojave case-marker -k is sometimes used to mark involved but not particularly affected participants, as in (8'). It seems clear that 'me' is not an indirect object of 'say' (in that case, we would certainly expect a first-person object prefix on the verb, and the translation would be different), but it does not really appear to be a direct object either. When no indirect object is present, a non-third-person direct object should always trigger verbal agreement in Mojave (Munro 1976a). The status of 'me' in (8') seems clearly to be "oblique", comparable to that of the inanimate noun marked with -k in a sentence like

(19) 'amat-k 'chanaly-k (ground-obl 1-drop-tns)
'I dropped it on the ground'

Although the exact semantics of the reconstructable Proto-Yuman case marker *-k is still unclear, some oblique relational meaning like those used in present-day Mojave is doubtless appropriate. It seems likely to me that the use of -k to mark the topic of conversation in (8') was grammaticized during the evolution of Proto-(Northern?)-Yuman and extended to the surprising use of -k on full complement clauses seen in the Mojave, Maricopa, and Tolkapaya examples above. Gordon (1980) suggests an additional piece of Maricopa data in support of this analysis. She notes that while most -m verbs may appear with -k in 'say' complements like (16), imperatives of -m verbs may not be marked with -k:

(20) k-maa-m/*k 'ii-m (imp-eat-asp/*?=obl say-asp)
'He said to eat it' / 'He said, "Eat it"'

As Gordon points out, the failure of "speech act morphology" like the imperative prefix k- to occur in a -k-marked 'say' complement is consistent with the general (cross-linguistic) reluctance of such syntactic apparatus to occur in any embedded or nominalized clause -- and by the analysis presented here, the case-marker -k is an explicit marker of the nominal, non-main-clause status of the quotation complements it marks.

Thus, in these Yuman languages at least the quotation complement of 'say' is marked not like a direct object (the syntactic role assigned to complements of 'say' in some traditional analyses of
various languages) but rather explicitly as an oblique. This finding is consistent with data from a variety of unrelated languages which show in different ways that 'say' must often be analyzed as intransitive — thus, 'say' may often take an indirect object but not a direct object (cf. Munro to appear).

Footnotes

1. This paper owes a lot to Lynn Gordon, both for the suggestive analyses of Maricopa she presents in her dissertation, Gordon (1980), which have greatly clarified and inspired my own thinking on many matters, and for uncounted helpful conversations. I'm also grateful to Charles Ulrich and Allen Munro for listening to various of these ideas at times.

I must also thank my teachers, Nellie Brown (Mojave), Molly Fasthorse (Tolkeapaya Yavapai), and Pollyanna Heath (Maricopa), who provided all the sentential data herein (although, of course, my understanding of the Tolkeapaya and Maricopa facts draws heavily upon the work of Hardy 1979 and Gordon 1980).

2. Most of the data here comes from 100 wordlists kindly provided by the Yumanists noted for a comparative lexical project conducted by Robert Oswalt and myself reported on at an earlier meeting of this group. The data from Gordon and Hardy, however, was provided later. Hyphens in the table indicate my omission of "tense" and other suffixes and of demonstrative prefixes.

Tom and Carol Nevers provided the following additional Cocopa forms: i 'I say' and ee?qeeq 'I hear'.

3. I believe this observation to be the somewhat collective observation of Heather Hardy, Lynn Gordon, Bonnie Glover, and myself, but it probably also appears somewhere in Hardy (1979).

This Tolkeapaya data, like all remaining data in this paper, is presented in practical orthography.

4. In all Yuman languages verbs agree with an indirect object even if a direct object is present.

5. Consider also the English I'd never hear of going to town.

6. Most of the arguments in this sections appear in abbreviated form in Munro (to appear).

7. I use the term "direct quotation" here quite injudiciously. I believe that the principal consequence of the direct/indirect quotation distinction is in pronominial usage — if the use of pronouns is "transparent" (i.e. assigned according to the speaker's real-world knowledge and orientation), the quotation is "indirect" (e.g. He said (that) I should go), but if the use of pronouns is "opaque" (assigned according to the knowledge and orientation of the subject of 'say'), the quotation is "direct" (e.g. He said, "You should go"). This variation in the use of pronouns seems to be the only consistent test for direct-indirect quotation cross-linguistically. However, in English grammar the distinction is more often taken to refer to the (possible) appearance of the complementizer that and the use of quotation marks, and that is the sense in which I use the term loosely.
8. Margaret Langdon (personal communications) has justified the reconstruction of the Yuman case markers.

9. Incidentally, imperative k- may occur on switch-reference marked clauses in Maricopa (for instance, when one imperative is linked to another by switch-reference), as Gordon (1980) has noted.

10. I am not sure how many other Yuman languages besides those noted here use a -k suffix to mark quotation complements. This would be interesting to learn.
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