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0. Introduction. The Pai branch of the Yuman language family is known for making extensive use of an auxiliary construction that has been reconstructed for ProtoYuman by Langdon 1978. In Tolkapaya Yavapai⁴, this auxiliary construction is one of the primary syntactic devices for modifying the 'objective content' of a predication. Specifically, the auxiliary construction is used to encode such information as tense, aspect and modality. The class of auxiliaries which bears the greatest functional load in this respect is the class of existential auxiliaries: BE, DO, SAY and the cognitive auxiliary (C0G). The role of these auxiliaries is not limited, however, to sentence-level modification. The existential auxiliaries can be shown to serve an important discourse function in contributing to textual cohesion.⁵ Their basic use within the auxiliary construction itself is cohesive, since the auxiliary construction serves to mark a 'final' or 'independent' clause as opposed to a 'medial' or 'dependent' clause, thus delimiting a discourse boundary and providing a tense/aspect/modal frame for the entire discourse unit. Another such cohesive device is lexical, through the repetition of an auxiliary in tail-to-head chaining or through the substitution of an auxiliary as a proform for a lexical verb. These uses of auxiliary verbs will be briefly described below as background to an analysis of the use of auxiliaries as discourse connectives or conjunctions.

1. Auxiliaries as boundary markers: tense/aspect and modality. The use of auxiliaries in Tolkapaya to encode such information as tense/aspect, modality, and other kinds of adverbial modification has been discussed in detail elsewhere (see especially Hardy 1979). I would like to limit their discussion here to their use as terminal markers that specifically indicate the boundary of the discourse unit 'paragraph'. By 'paragraph' I am referring to a semantic/pragmatic unit of the discourse that has a single discourse TOPIC and one temporal/modal frame. In narratives, paragraphs can vary in length from one or two clauses to a lengthy series of 'medial' clauses followed by the 'final' clause that marks the end of that unit. The final clause differs from the medial clauses in that it is marked for tense/aspect/modality by some sort of terminal marking. Although there are simple terminal suffixes, terminal marking most frequently consists of one of a number of auxiliary constructions. Ubiquitous among these auxiliary constructions is the most semantically 'neutral' construction which I have called the Final Auxiliary Construction (Hardy 1979 and 1981). The Final Auxiliary Construction (FAC) marks paragraph boundaries in narratives and turns in conversations. Although nothing further will be said here about narrative style, the length of paragraphs seems to be correlated with such higher levels of discourse organization as narrative Setting, Peak, and whether or not the material is on the Event-line or is simply a comment by the narrator. An example of the FAC follows:

(1) nya-ch ma ny-chqam-k 'wu-n
I-Sj you 1/2-hit-SR 1-do-impf
'I'm hitting you.'

The FAC is constructed as follows: the final verb is suffixed with -k 'Some Referent' and followed by a behavioral auxiliary (BE, DO, SAY)⁶
that is marked for agreement with the subject of the lexical verb; the auxiliary is then suffixed with the aspexual suffixes -ny 'Perfective' or -m 'Imperfective'. The following example serves to demonstrate the markedly aspexual/modal use of auxiliaries.

(2) 'sahana bmany 'e + yiyiv-k qyat-k yu-o-k yu-ny
holy child be:nice-SR very-SR be-EVID-SR be-prf
'The holy child (Skark'amcha) was very nice, it seems.'

In this example, the lexical verb 'e yiyiv is suffixed with the same referent suffix -k that obligatorily precedes the auxiliary. A series of auxiliaries, each suffixed with -k then follows: qyat, an intensifier, is followed by the PERFECT/EVIDENTIAL construction, which consists of the auxiliary yu 'be' + o, which is then followed by the marker of a final clause, the FAC. In the text from which this example was taken, this comment of the narrator, which is marked as a separate paragraph off the Event-line, is followed by a new paragraph marked with a conjunction that specifically indicates a return to the Event-line. The auxiliary construction in general, then, consists of series of one or more verbs/auxiliaries, each of which is suffixed with the switch-reference suffix -k 'same referent' until the terminally-marked auxiliary is reached. In just this way, with or without the addition of other morphemes, most tense/aspect, modal, and adverbial modification is carried out in Tolkapaya.

2. Substitution. Auxiliaries can be substituted as proforms for lexical verbs and their use as such is particularly common in texts. It is often the case that the final auxiliary of one paragraph will be repeated as the initial dependent clause of the next paragraph. In fact, this tail-to-head linking probably provides the source for the auxiliary 'phrasees' that synchronically function as conjunctions. The next example is from the story 'White Dove':

(3) pa='ich=h=wa-v-ch pa-hwan-k chov-k qyat-k chavv-k
enemy-Sj pl.obj.-attack-SR fight-SR very-SR fight=Pl-SR
cat-k ha-k hunuw-i.
very-SR Dem-Loc IncomAux-Absol
'The enemy attacked them and fought fiercely, they all fought and kept on.'
Ha-k hunuw-t-me 'ich=wa-che vthri-ka qa + 'wil 'i-ch-i
Dem-Loc IncomAux=Tem-DR enemy-Sj be:scared-SR run:away Punct=Pl-Absol
'This went on until the enemy got scared and ran away.'

The final auxiliary phrase of the first line in (3), hak hunuw, is repeated as a dependent clause with the temporal pivot -t and suffixed with the 'different referent' suffix -me. We will see later that the form Aux + (t) + same/different referent characterizes initial conjunctions as well. Here we will conclude this section by noting that the substitution of an auxiliary for the lexical verb enforces cohesion (since it cannot be interpreted without reference to some other part of the discourse) and the repetition of clauses manifested in this tail-to-head chain serves to mark dramatic peaks and heighten the dramatic tension.

3. Switch-reference. A slight digression is in order at this point before we turn to the discourse-connective uses of auxiliaries. We have noted the use of switch-reference markers at various points in conjunction with the auxiliary construction. The switch-reference system clearly plays an important role in the syntax of Tolkapaya, particularly with respect to the discourse. As it is usually described, switch-reference is a sentence-internal device for signaling whether or not the central PARTICIPANT of some (dependent) verb has the same or different referent from some other (referencing) verb. As noted earlier, in examples 1-3 it can be observed that the verb preceding the auxiliary verb will always take -k 'same referent' since an auxiliary will always have the same central
referent as the lexical verb in the same clause. Example 4 below shows a series of two distinct clauses with the same referent, where the first verb is suffixed with -k; the first verb in example 5 is suffixed with -m since its referent is different from that of the final verb.

(4) nya-ch 'swar-k 'ima-k 'yu-ny
   I-Sj 1-sing-SR 1-dance-SR 1-be-prf
   'I sang and danced.'

(5) m-svar-m ny-ev-k 'yu-m
   2-sing-DR 1/2-hear-SR 1-be-impf
   'I heard you sing.'

It is not surprising that such a reference device is also pressed into service to facilitate cohesion between clauses and paragraphs in a text. Switch-reference marking in Tolkapaya, in fact, cannot be fully understood without observing the circumstances under which the grammatical sentence-internal operation of switch-reference is superseded by the discourse (see Hardy 1982). The switch-reference system has a cohesive function independent from that of the auxiliaries, but the two overlap in the form of auxiliary phrases used as conjunctions, as described below in section 4.

The unmarked reference markers -k/-m alternate with the vocally-augmented suffixes -ka/-me under specific pragmatic conditions. The alternative marking possibilities allow speakers to indicate whether the EVENTS manifested by the two reference-related clauses are viewed as separate EVENTS or as two aspects of one complex EVENT. The presence of a vocally increment indicates that the speaker views the EVENTS expressed by the two clauses as separate and the reference-marked clause as the backgrounding clause. For example, in 6 below, we see that the temporal setting described in the first clause is viewed as a distinct EVENT (or situation) that provides a background for the main assertion that there were people camped out together.

(6) 'kurtha chur-a nyoom-t-me 'paach-ch va-k tkav-k wayo-k
   long ago 2-year-Abs go:by-Tem-DR people-Sj Dem-Loc gather-SR dwell-SR
   i-ch-k 'i-m
   say-P1-SR say-impf
   'It was long ago, many years gone by, and there were people camped out together, they say.' (White Dove)

By contrast, the two verbs tkav 'be gathered together' and wayo 'live at a place' describe aspects of the same situation and are suffixed with -k alone, no vocalic increment. Not surprisingly, sentential auxiliaries, which always follow the main verb in a sentence, never have switch-reference suffixes with vocalic increments and neither do the main verbs which precede them, as can be seen in the foregrounded clause in 6. We will see that the choice of switch-reference marking is relevant to the interpretation of conjunctive auxiliary phrases as well.

4. Auxiliary phrases as conjunctions. Conjunctive auxiliary phrases are composed of an (uninflected) existential auxiliary followed optionally by a temporal suffix and (with one exception) by a switch-reference suffix.

(7) Existential Auxiliary + (TEM) + SR/DR + Vocalic Increment

yu 'be' (wi 'do', li 'say', yi 'COG')+(t 'pivot') +k/m +a/e

Tolkapaya narrative conjunctions fall, roughly, into the four logically basic conjunctive types that Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify for English: additive, adversative, temporal, and causal.

4.1 Additive conjunctions. Additive conjunctions are morphologically simplest and are used to link paragraphs or, more typically, to make additional comments about some situation without advancing the Event-line. For this reason, additive conjunctions are found more frequently in
contemporary, first-person narratives ('general' narrative) than in legends ('story' narrative), since a first-person experiencer might reasonably be expected to offer embellishing comments on first-hand experiences. Example 8 below is taken from an account of the speaker's first trip on an airplane.

(8i) chkpìt-k ham-k ham-k 'kwì cha-h-m 'lamch-k vyaar + i-k peek:out-SR look:away-SR look-SR cloud top-Dem-Loc l-go:around-SR fly-SR 'wi cha-h 'lamch-m yu-ch-k ;
mountain top-Dem l-go:around:DR be-Hab-SR
'I peeked out and looked off in the distance as I was passing over clouds and flying over mountain tops!

ii. yu-ka marmar 'i-h 'um-t-te' "Abilene cha-v-m 'amch-k yu-m"
CONJ while Punct-Irr Neg-Tem-SR A.top-Dem-Loc go:around-SR be-impf 'i-ee-k hukwa-k 'i-n
say-too-SR feel/hear-SR say-impf
'And it wasn't long before I heard someone say "We're passing over Abilene."

iii. yu-me "Ft. Worth cha-h 'amch-k yu-me ;
CONJ Ft. Worth top-Dem l-go:around-SR be-DR
w-tvlwìv-ka naal-a-k hunu-ì-yu-m"
2-be:ready-SR descend-Irr-SR IncomAux-SR be-impf
'And "we're passing over Ft. Worth; it's time to land." (Airplane Trip)

Additive conjuctions are often used to mark shifts between narrative and dialogue and between speaker turns within a dialogue, as can be seen in the above example.

4.2 Adversative conjuctions. The function of adversative conjuctions derives in a quite natural way from the use of their modal auxiliary in indicating counterexpectancy. Adversative conjuctions serve a specifically contrastive function in the discourse. Before examining the conjuction itself, it may be useful to describe the use of yit(e) as a modal auxiliary. The form and function of the modal auxiliary yit(e) has been described in detail elsewhere (Hardy and Gordon 1980), where it was noted that yite functions as a contrastive at the sentence level. Specifically, yite is a modal auxiliary that marks an assertion as contrasting with certain expectations—either those established by the immediate discourse context or those based on the context of experience. The semantics are illustrated quite clearly in the following example.

(9) ny-'wa-v-ì qech yit(e) 'e + 'yì-i-k 'yu-m
Poss-l-house-Dem-Sj small ContExp * 1-like-SR 1-be-impf
'My house is small, but I like it.'

In a similar way, conjuctions based on the auxiliary yit(e) appear often at a 'crisis' point in a narrative, introducing a new, unexpected turn of events, often an episodic peak. In this case, such conjuctions are used externally (in Halliday and Hasan's 1976 sense); that is, they mark a relationship between predicated EVENTS in the story line itself. One such example is from the story 'White Dove' in which the climax is the killing of White Dove's husband by the enemy. The conjuction yitka introduces the pre-peak episode when the enemy suddenly attacks the hunting party.

(10) i. (...'they were killing deer and hunting other animals and butchering them (and this went on) for some time.)

ii. Yitka 'sit-k 'i-ka "pa=ichn=wa-w-ì yuw-ch-k yu-m."
CONJ be:one-SR say-SR enemy-Dem-Sj come-P1-SR be-impf
'And then suddenly one man said, "The enemy is coming!"'

Adversatives (and perhaps the other conjuctions as well) are often used internally as well; that is, the conjuctions are internal to the speech act itself. For instance, adversatives are used in the same way as English anyway for the purposes of returning to the Event-line after a digression.
Example 11 below demonstrates this internal usage of *yite* taken from a version of the Creation Story where the speaker is telling about the folk hero Skark'amcha and digresses to describe a past event about how his mother was killed after having given birth to him. To get back to the main point, Skark'amcha, the speaker introduces the paragraph with the conjunction *yite*, which has the effect of saying, for instance, in English 'Well anyway, the boy was called Skarak'amcha.' It is probably significant that in the internal usage of the adversative conjunction, the auxiliary phrase does not take switch-reference marking. The switch-reference markers track discourse *TOPIC* and/or simultaneity vs. sequence of the *EVENTS* that are being related.

(11) i. (... 'First Woman had a girl child and she too bore a child, a boy; after some time the eagles got the (boy's) mother and killed her and the grandmother was very sad and thus it happened.')

ii. *Yite* hman-v-a Skark'amcha si-ka...

CONJ child-Dem-Abs Skark'amcha name-SR

Well anyway, this child was called Skark'amcha... (Creation Story I)

4.3 Temporal conjunctions. Although the switch-reference markers help to keep track of the relative ordering of *EVENTS* related by conjunctions, it is possible to make a distinction somewhat finer than simultaneous vs. sequential by using the temporal Pivot morpheme *-t* suffixed to the auxiliary to indicate that the *EVENTS* are overlapping. The temporal pivot marked conjunction usually relates an *EVENT* that functions as a Setting to some central *EVENT* in the paragraph; as Setting, it of course overlaps in time with the central *EVENT*. Example 12 is illustrative.

(12) i. ('It was long ago, many years gone by, and there were people camped out together, they say.') (see example 6)

ii. *Yutne* mayor-ch 'i-ka "...".

CONJ chief-Sj say-SR

And then one day the chief said "...". (White Dove)

The conjunction *yu* marks what Halliday and Hasan call 'conclusions'. It is used in Tolkapaya to mark the last in a series of *EVENTS* or as in 13 below, the last in a series of interchanges among speakers in a reported dialogue.

(13) i. ('...White Dove said, "Where is my husband?" And then the man said, "He was killed. They killed him. He's dead. He got killed."')

ii. *Yum-pe* K=winymasav-ch 'i-mii-k mo-lo '+yiiv-h 'um-ah

CONJ Kwinymsava-Sj 1-cry-SR * 1-mourn-Irr Neg-Irr

' -unu-k ' -yu-m

1-InfomAux-SR 1-be-Impf

'Finally, White Dove said, "I'm not going to cry or mourn."' (White Dove)

The suffix *-pe* in *yumpe* is the demonstrative suffix identified in Glover 1979 as singling out one particular member of a set. In other words, it is used when a *DOMAIN* is in consciousness and a certain *PARTICULAR* within that *DOMAIN* is being identified. It also occurs on the few conjunctions that are based on demonstrative roots rather than auxiliary verbs.

4.4 *Causal conjunctions*. Specifically causal conjunctions are somewhat more difficult to identify uniquely. It is probably the case that many of the uses of the additive conjunctions could be interpreted as causal. The formal overlap between a causal relationship holding between clauses as opposed to simple temporal sequencing allows for alternative interpretations of a single complex sentence as well. (For further discussion, see Hardy and Gordon 1980 and Hardy 1982.) One auxiliary phrase that clearly functions as a causal conjunction is *ka-v-yu-h-* which is used to introduce a reason clause. Example 14 shows how *kavyuha* refers back to a known
proposition to express the notion 'for that reason' or 'therefore'.

(14) i. (..'The chief said," Our women have no clothes and our children have no shoes. Maybe we should go hunting.',')

ii. "Ka-v-yu-h-a 'ich=-nyay-k 'yaam-ch-a-k '-unuu -k

Interr-Dem-be-Dem-Abs s.t.-1/3-hunt-SR l-go-Pl-Irr-SR l-IncomAux-SR

'yu-m " 'i-ch-k;

l-be-impf say-Pl-SR

' "Therefore, we will go hunting," they said." (White Dove)

It may well be that this particular example is functioning as an internal conjunction to the speech act and is not actually part of the quotation at all, since the conjunction does not have a switch-reference marker. That is, example 14 may well mean 'Therefore, the men said, "We will go hunting."'

5. Conclusion. Although the syntax and semantics of auxiliaries used as conjunctions differs in several ways from auxiliaries used to modify the main predication of a sentence, the two are related. Within the sentence, auxiliaries always follow the main predication and are inflected to agree with the main verb subject in person; conjunctive auxiliaries initiate a sentence (or paragraph) and are never inflected. The choice of switch-reference suffix depends either on discourse TOPIC or on the temporal relationship between the EVENTS in question, rather than on grammatical subject. Therefore, the distribution of -k/-m and the vocalic increments cannot be accounted for by looking at sentence-level grammatical relations alone, but must take the discourse context into account. That this should be so is not surprising, given that conjunctions are discourse-level elements and that switch-reference itself is a discourse device.

When switch-reference is the only means of connecting series of clauses and very lengthy strings appear, unpunctuated by any terminal marking, the traditional European concept of 'sentence' must be called into question. In fact, what appears to be delimited by terminally-marked independent clauses is paragraph boundary, a unit of the discourse. Given that one of the more frequent narrative forms involves this kind of 'chaining', often with repetition of clauses across paragraphs in the tail-to-head construction, such a device would seem to facilitate the repeated or substituted use of auxiliaries as pro-verbs. Eventually such phrases would be reinterpreted as conjunctions, independent from the paragraphs that preceded them as far as their form is concerned.

The overlap in the cohesive use of the switch-reference system, substitution and repetition of auxiliaries, and auxiliaries used in conjunctive phrases shows that Halliday and Hasan's five types of cohesive devices (reference, ellipsis, substitution, lexical, and conjunction) are even less neatly discrete categories in Tolkapaya than they are in English, but are rather part of a complexly integrated system for ensuring cohesion.
Notes

1 Tolkapaya Yavapai or Western Yavapai belongs to the Pai subgroup of the Yuman language family. Grateful thanks goes to Molly Fasthorse, as always, for her many hours of hard work helping me go over textual material. Thanks to Pam Munro and Lynn Gordon for their comments on this and related matters. Special thanks to Philip Davis for the many hours helping me puzzle out the texts.

Examples are written in the UCLA practical orthography developed for Yavapai. Abbreviations used here in glossing morphemes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absol</td>
<td>Absolutive form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>Locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContExp</td>
<td>Contrary to Expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>Negative Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Plural subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss</td>
<td>Possessive prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punct</td>
<td>Punctual Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sj</td>
<td>Subject case: suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Same Referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tem</td>
<td>Temporal suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>1st part of a separable verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 See Langacker 1975.

3 Textual cohesion refers to relations of meaning existing within a text, defining it as a text, such that the interpretation of one element in the discourse is dependent on another (see Halliday and Hasan 1976: 4).

4 These are terms used by Longacre (1972) and others to refer to typologically very similar constructions in New Guinean languages.

5 The use of the term 'behavioral' to refer to the class of verbs BE, DO, SAY follows Langdon 1978 (originally proposed by Halpern) as a substitute for the earlier term 'existential'. The choice of BE, DO, or SAY is determined by the semantics of the lexical verb in the following way: DO is selected for active, transitive verbs, SAY is used with verbs of communication or other vocal behavior, and BE is used with stative, intransitive verbs. BE is the semantically more 'neutral' member of this class and can be substituted in most cases for the other two behavioral verbs.

6 See Longacre 1972 for discussion of this construction as applied to New Guinean languages.


8 These types of the narrative are distinguished by Deibler for the New Guinean language Gahuku (in Longacre 1972).

9 This variant of the vocalically-incremented switch-reference suffix -k is found occasionally in texts. The -e appears to indicate another instance of the same type of EVENT, in much the same way that -e on verb roots indicates 'too, also, again'.

10 It is probably more often than not the case that simultaneously-occurring EVENTS have the same PARTICIPANTS if not the same discourse
TOPIC; sequential EVENTS will probably tend to have different TOPICS.

For further discussion of this morpheme see Hardy and Gordon 1980.

For a discussion of this problem with respect to typologically similar SOV switch-referencing languages in New Guinea, see Longacre 1972. For instance, 'it is only necessary to note that in a language exclusively of this structure—where only one clause can be given distinctive treatment, and all other clauses must be reduced to a different grammatical mold—it is very unlikely that this in any way parallels the subordinate-coordinate distinction in Indo-European languages. It is then very probable that the surface distinction medial-final is something different in kind than the subordinate-coordinate distinction found in an Indo-European language. In regard to the third assumption that such a chain is necessarily a sentence,...suffice it to say here that such an assumption is quite arbitrary and may prove to be a source of confusion in the analysis of certain languages.' (Longacre 1972: 3).
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