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The use of the auxiliaries /-yu/, be, and /-wi/, do, seems almost transparent in Yuman languages. At first blush, one could believe that /-yu/ occurs only with intransitives and /-wi/ only with transitives; but this is only the most common use. The use of the suffixes for expressive purposes and for characterizing the nature of the action has hardly been explored. When the usual use of /-yu/ and /-wi/ does not occur, one should expect some meaning in addition to the basic meaning of the sentence.

kwâ ʰɔy-k-yu #
thing fog-SS-be

vú-yu #
come-be

It's foggy.

I (have)-come. I am here.

Descriptives such as the first sentence refer to a condition or state and are the most common use of /-yu/. Intransitives describing movement usually occur with /-yu/ also. If I have come, then obviously I am here, which describes a state or condition.

kísk̂a-yu #
slip-be

kísk̂a-m-yu #
slip-incho.-be

I (have) slipped.

I am slipping/starting to slip.

The first sentence with /kísk̂ayu/ describes the state or condition of having slipped. It cannot describe an imperfective that is in the process of taking place. If the action is taking place, the inchoative /-m/ occurs. In the second sentence, the slipping has begun but is not yet completed. Therefore, the condition or state of being in the process of slipping has to have the inchoative /-m/ plus /-yu/.

kwè md'-we #
thing eat-do

kwè md'-yu #
thing eat-be

I am eating.

I am eating.

These examples were explained in my April 1966 article in IJAL, but are repeated here because of the relevance. The first sentence with /-we/ states that Eating is going on right now(.), or I am in the midst of eating. /-we/ is a variant of /-wi/; but some speakers say that /-we/ is stronger than /-wi/, others make no difference apparently. The second sentence means Eating is my main activity of the moment though I have been interrupted(.), or As soon as I finish answering the door, I'm going to get back to continuing eating. But, many speakers, especially younger speakers, do not use /-yu/ with stems such as /md'/.
ná-č pà ki-yóv-a-k (?â)-pé-v-a-k-yu # I believe in God.
l-nom. person agent-make-tns.-iness. (l)-believe-def.-tns.-SS-be

hàmèr-a-č aví-a-m tàtanèh-v-a-k-we # The boys are throwing rocks at each other.
boy-def.-nom. rock-def.-abl. throw-recip.-tns.-SS-do

The first sentence with /pê/, believe, describes a condition or state and not some action; therefore, /-yu/ occurs on the verb and /pâkiyôva/ God, literally maker, i.e. creator, occurs in the inessive case since it is not the object of the verb. The second sentence above has the transitive /-we/ even though rocks is in the ablative case. The object of the verb is the reciprocal /-v/, each other, one another, which is suffixed to the verb. The sentence then is literally The boys are throwing each other with rocks(), but the correct translation is of course The boys are throwing rocks at each other.

6á wamí-yu # I hate him.
3 hate-be

6á wamí-we # I did it because I hate him.
3 hate-do

The first sentence above describes the state of hating someone, The second sentence describes why one did some action. If you saw someone breaking the window's out of someone else's car, the culprit breaking the windows could answer with the second sentence if asked why he were breaking the windows out of another person's car.

kà-v-a-yú-k ?è-?é-v-a-k múl-a ?e-spó-k-yu || How can I find out his name?
interrog.-this-def.-be-SS l-hear tns.-SS name-def. l-know-SS-be

pá-č ki-múl-v-a-č pà k-hér-a-k čiknàw-č-è-k-yu # The council appointed him
person-nom. agent-name-this-def.-nom. person agent-
tie-up-def.-iness. tell-pl.-appl.-SS-be

(to be) a policeman.

In the first sentence above, one might expect /-we/ on the verb since there is a direct object /múl/, name, which has a zero suffix, the mark of the accusative case. But, /spó/, know, come to know (i.e. learn), is a stative verb that takes /-yu/, /è/, hear, agree, is added to make the meaning learn clear. This is a case of what I call serial verbs in Hualapai.

In the second sentence above, one might expect the verb to have /-we/ also, but it has /-yu/ since there is no direct object. That there is an understood object is clear from the applicative suffix /-è/, to, for, on behalf of, /hér/, stop, arrest, put in jail, literally means tie up, from the old practice of tying up a trouble maker or prisoner, since there were no jails to hold prisoners in aboriginal times. /pâkherâk/, policeman, person who ties up (someone), is in the inessive case since it is not the direct object. The sentence literally is The council designated/appointed (him) to policeman. Since there is no direct object, but a noun in an oblique case (the equivalent of an English prepositional phrase), the verb has /-yu/ as an intransitive.
hamāŋ və kɔ̀-v-yú-č-a (?i)-sí-č-a-k-yú || What shall we call/name the baby?
small=child this interrog.-this-be-tns.
(1)-call-pl.-tns.-SS-be

In this sentence, there are both a direct object and an objective complement; yet /sí/, call, name, has /-yu/. It is fairly easy to see how having a name could be a state or condition; but, apparently, giving a name, or, naming, is also a stative.

vi-yú wòk-sí r-mày-v-a hamāŋ-qèç òí-v-č-yú # This milk is for the baby to drink.
intense-this dear-call subord.-milk-this-def.
small=child-small drink-this-distrib.-be

If the sentence were The baby drinks/is drinking the milk(.), there would have to be a nominative case ending on baby, i.e. /hāmāŋqèçac/. The /ç/ on /qèç/ is part of the stem. And, there would be a /-we/ suffix on the verb. So, it would seem clear that this is a case of a middle or ergative verb. This is further indicated since milk precedes baby.

Douglas lowé-a-k-yú # Douglas is married.
Douglas wife-tns.-SS-be

Douglas Sadie lowé-k-we # Douglas married Sadie.
Douglas Sadie wife-SS-do Douglas is married to Sadie.

The first sentence above is clearly a stative. The second sentence above is a transitive, but such a sentence is often used to describe the state of being married to someone. This leads the writer to think that stative vs. transitive-active is not a Hualapai category. (Of course, translations into English can be very deceptive.)

hát nà-hât-à-v-č vi-kók pós tòtkawí-č-v-a-taóp-miüc-k-we # My dog never chase
dog 1-dog/pet-def.-this-nom. intense-not cat chase-pl.-
this-tns.-not-always-SS-do cats.

hát nà-hât-à-v-č vi-kók pós tòtkawí-č-v-a-taóp-miüc-k-yú # My dog never chase
cats.

The second sentence above describes the nature or characteristics of the dog. The first sentence is a claim or statement. Probably the best way to indicate the meaning difference is to put overstress or emphatics stress on never in the first sentence. Thus, the meaning is I claim that....., I state that....., or I affirm that.....

kwè-ká-v mi-wí-ŋ mì-yú || What is it that you're doing?
thing-interrog-this 2-do-SS 2-be

kwè-ká-v mi-wí-hi-k mì-wí || Just what is it that you are doing?!
thing-interrog.-this 2-do-irreal./fut.-SS 2-do

In this pair of sentences, /wí/ and /yú/ are full verbs with primary stresses on the stem. The first sentence with /yú/ is an equational sentence, which is a stative. The second sentence is an expressive, emotional state, as well as a question. Thus, it would seem that statives can be made expressive by using /wí/ in place of /yú/ and by adding the irrealis-future marker.
pú-č tóh-v-a sawáł-k-yu #  He gambles all the time at cards.
man-nom. card(s)-this-def. like-intensely-S5-be

/tóhva/, cards, would seem an obvious direct object, and the writer so regards it. Nevertheless, the verb has the /-yu/ suffix. It is easy to see how this is a stative. A better translation would be He is obsessed with gambling at cards. This reflects the stative meaning of the sentence. Thus, it becomes clearer that the difference between /-yu/ and /-wi/ is not just transitive vs. intransitive, but stative or intense vs. active or temporary. Intense would mean long-term, as well as its usual meaning of very much.

há há-č əpá-k-yu #  The water has/is frozen.
water that-nom. freeze-stative-S5-be

há há-č əpá-m-k-yu #  The water is freezing/starting to freeze.
water that-nom. freeze-inchoa.-S5-be

The first sentence is clearly stative, and it is marked by the stative suffix /-č/. The second sentence is also a stative. A clearer translation would be The water is in the state of freezing. Compare this with the sentence above about starting to slip/be slippin. Though in general Hualapai verbs do not mark perfective vs. imperfective, Hualapai can mark imperfective by using the inchoative suffix /-m/.

The writer has wondered a long time whether the stative /-č/ suffix and the applicative /-m/ suffix are the same. Perhaps the stative suffix given above is some sort of middle or reflexive suffix, e.g. The water is freezing itself. (Consider the way reflexives and intransitives are marked in Romance languages.)

nú-č ni-kwáty hvát-a ni-kwáty-we #  I am wearing a red shirt. I have a red shirt on.
1-nom. subord.-shirt red-def. subord.-wear/put-on-do

This sentence can mean either I am wearing a red shirt(,), or I have put on a red shirt. Since the sentence is marked with /-we/, one might think that this is just a transitive sentence and that the translation is just faulty. But, this is the usual way to say I am wearing clothing, or I am putting on clothing. It seems clear here that this is a transitive in Hualapai and that the problem with put on is just a translation problem.

Though this paper has not solved all the problems with the differences between the /-yu/ and /-wi/ verbal auxiliary suffixes, it would seem that the main difference is that /-yu/ is intransitive and middle, and /-we/ is transitive and active. Stative verbs most often take /-yu/; but perfective actives with a continued or present result, though they have the /-we/ suffix, may give a present perfect result, e.g. I (have) married Sadie(,), therefore, I am married to Sadie(,), or I (have) put on a red shirt(,), therefore, I am wearing a red shirt. Also, statives or intransitives can be made to refer to a particular time, especially the present, by adding the inchoative suffix /-m/ to form imperfectives, which perhaps should best be considered change of state, though an accurate translation may be just an imperfective, especially in the present. For expressive use, statives may take /-we/ instead of /-yu/, as in I did it because I hate him.

In addition, certain Hualapai verbs require their "noun objects" to be in some oblique case, usually the inessive, and these verbs then have /-yu/ even though the translation has an object. (This of course is not unlike Indo-European languages requiring certain cases or certain prepositions after certain verbs.) Likewise, verbs that take /-we/ with an object may take /-yu/ for expressive uses, as in My main activity at this time is eating, though I have been interrupted(,), or As soon as I finish answering the door, I'm going to get back to continuing eating.
Though the discussion above accounts for most of the uses of the differences in /-yu/ and /-wi/, there is one usage in which both refer to emotional states.

?i-simé-(k)-yu # I miss him. I've lost him.
1-miss/loose-(SS)-be

?i-simé-(k)-we # I miss him. I've lost him.
1-miss/loose-(SS)-do

The first sentence above means He's dead and gone, and I'll never see him again. The second sentence means He's just gone temporarily, and I expect to see him again. Some speakers have this difference only for missing or losing people; others also use this difference for inanimate objects. Some younger speakers do not have this distinction at all; and of those younger people who make this distinction, many use it only for people. If the /-k/ occurs, it seems to be more intense.

This causes the writer to suggest that /-yu/ means long-term imperfective, and /-we/ means perfective, short-term, and short-term imperfective, which is just another way of describing /-yu/ as stative and /-we/ as active.

There is another distinction between /-yu/ and /-we/, which just doesn't seem to fit into the system at all.

hmú-n-a-č  čó-v-ik-yu # The children are fighting.
child-def.-nom. right-recip.-SS-be

hmú-n-a-č  čó-v-ik-we # The children are fighting.

The first sentence means Two or three children are fighting(.), but the second means Several children are fighting. Perhaps this is just another intensive use of /-we/, i.e. the more people, the more intense the fighting.
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PREFACE

In 1981 the Hokan-Yuman Languages Workshop began meeting jointly with the Penutian Languages Conference. In 1982 the Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference began meeting with specialists from other disciplines, anthropologists, archeologists, geographers, and others. Because of the very diverse nature of such a group, various specialists desired to publish their papers in a variety of places in order for specialists in their disciplines to have ready access to them. This meant that there were no proceedings for the 1983, 1984, and 1985 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conferences. Papers from linguists who gave papers at these three meetings have been assembled in this volume.

The papers are presented in the order in which they were read at the meetings except the Callaghan paper on patridominace and Proto-Utian, which was discussed at length at the 1984 meeting, though it was not formally presented.

The 1983 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference met at the University of California, San Diego, June 16–18, 1983. We greatly acknowledge all the work done by Margaret Langdon and others in the Department of Linguistics at UCI, which made the meeting so enjoyable and useful.

The 1984 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference met at the University of California, Berkeley, June 22–24, 1984, and was held in honor of Abraham Halpern. Our thanks go to Leanne Hinton and others in the Department of Linguistics at UCB for all they did to make the meeting enjoyable and productive.

The 1985 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference met at the University of California, San Diego, June 19–21, 1985. We are again indebted to Margaret Langdon and the Department of Linguistics at UCI for all the work they did in hosting another pleasant and useful meeting.

The 1986 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference will be held at the University of California, Santa Cruz, June 23–27, 1986, as part of the Mary Haas Festival Conference.

Only a very few copies of the proceedings of earlier meetings are still available from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901. We are endeavoring to have the ERIC Clearing House on Languages and Linguistics offer these publications in some demand form.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, May 1986
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