

Schultze Jena, Leonhard S. 1933 Indiana I - Leben, Glaube und Sprache der Quiché von Guatemala. Jena: G.Fischer.

Schultze Jena, Leonhard S. 1944 Popol Vuh - Das heilige Buch der Quiché-Indianer von Guatemala. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Tedlock, Barbara 1982 Time and the Highland Maya. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Wunderlich, Dieter 1982 "Sprache und Raum". In: Studium Linguistik 12 (1982): 1-19.

Ximénez, Francisco 1700 Arte de las tres lenguas nanchiquel, quiché y g,utuhil. Photographic reproduction of the Newberry Library manuscript, ca. (The Popol Vuh is appended)

## ON RECONSTRUCTING THE OBJECT CASE-MARKER IN UTE

T. Givón  
Linguistics Department  
University of Oregon

### Resumen

A partir del análisis de la irregularidad paradigmática observada en las marcas de caso del ute (-ci nominativo y -ci oblicuo) se propone una reconstrucción de la evolución de las mismas; se descubren vestigios de la existencia de antiguas marcas de oblicuo (acusativo y genitivo) en cuya neutralización desempeñaron un papel importante los patrones de nominalización de esta lengua. Una evidencia importante para la reconstrucción la constituyen los datos del UA y PUA.

FUNCION 8 (1988): 79-109

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Synchronic case-marking on Ute nouns
3. Traces of an oblique suffix
  - 3.1 Preamble
  - 3.2 The accusative/genitive case-marker *-y/-i*
  - 3.3 The object suffix *-ku*
  - 3.4 The oblique suffix *-a*
    - 3.4.1 Preamble
    - 3.4.2 The suffix *-a* as a genitive marker
    - 3.4.3 The suffix *-a* as an object marker
4. The hidden footprints of nominalization
  - 4.1 Interim summary
  - 4.2 Ute nominalized clauses
    - 4.2.1 Relative clauses
    - 4.2.2 Verb complements
    - 4.2.3 Adverbial clauses
  - 4.3. The possessive-reflexive and nominalization
5. Reconstructing the diachronic scenario
  - 5.1 Preamble
  - 5.2 The demise of the genitive-accusative suffix *-y*". Late phonological changes
  - 5.3 The merger of genitive and accusative *-y*
  - 5.4 The genitive-accusative suffix *-a*

## 6. Summary

## REFERENCES

## 1. Introduction

In this paper I will discuss a fairly mundane case of synchronic paradigm irregularity in Ute. Such irregularity most commonly begs for some species of diachronic reconstruction, if one is to interpret the facts with some measure of coherence. The diachronic reconstruction I propose to undertake will be largely internal. At a certain point, however, parallels between the Ute situation and other Uto-Aztecan languages can be cited, with the hope of illustrating the more general applicability of the suggested interpretation. The particular grammatical subsystem in question involves the morphology of the accusative and genitive case-marking. I will begin by outlining the most common synchronic situation, involving the case-marking of full nouns.

## 2. Synchronic case-marking on Ute nouns

The regular case-marking pattern for Ute nouns exploits a seeming morpho-phonemic alternation of the final vowel, most commonly the final vowel of the noun suffix ('absolute'). That vowel is silent for subject and predicate nouns ('nominative'); it is voiced for object and genitive nouns ('oblique'). Thus consider:

### (1)a. Subject:

mamá *-ci* paǵá'y-'wá'y  
woman-SUBJ walk -IMM  
'The woman is walking'

### b. Predicate:

'ina -'ara mamá *-ci* 'urá-'á'y  
this/SUBJ-be woman-PRED be -IMM  
'This (one) is a woman'

c. Direct object:

ta'wá-ci mamá -ci pynikyay-kyá  
 man -SUBJ woman-OBJ see -ANT  
 'The man saw the woman'

d. Indirect object:

ta'wá-ci mamá -ci -vǎǎ-cugwá-qa  
 man -SUBJ woman-OBJ-LOC-go-to-ANT  
 'The man went over to the woman'

e. Genitive:

'ica- 'ara mamá -ci káni 'urá-'ay  
 this/SUBJ-be woman-GEN house/PRED be -IMM  
 'This (one) is the woman's house'

The reason why the alternation seems morpho-phonemic is because in non-final positions, the noun's final vowel is also voiced, as in:

(2)a. wáǎ-mamá -ci -u pagáy-'way  
 two-woman-SUBJ-PL walk -IMM  
 'The two women are walking'

b. 'ica -'ara cúu -ci -n 'urá-'ay  
 this/SUBJ-be pipe-PRED-my be -IMM  
 'This (one) is my pipe'

For nouns that lack a suffix, the same alternation will show up on the last vowel on the stem. Thus consider:

(3) subject/predicate form    object/genitive form

|      |                  |      |
|------|------------------|------|
| káni | 'house'          | káni |
| kúcu | 'buffalo'        | kucú |
| púku | 'personal horse' | pukú |

The de-voicing of vowels in Ute retains clear traces of its earlier phonological predictability, displaying familiar conditioning environments such as de-stressing, accentual syncopation, and proximity to voiceless consonant or

word boundary. De-voicing is not, however, a synchronic phonological process in Ute, having receded into the partial irregularity of morpho-phonemics.<sup>1</sup>

3. Traces of an oblique suffix

3.1 Preamble

So far, one is entitled to conclude that the nominative vs. oblique contrast in Ute involves the fortuitous exploitation of an old phonologically motivated variation: that is, the morphologization of an otherwise widespread process of devoicing of unstressed vowels.

In this section I will discuss examples of three suffixes that may represent traces of earlier accusative and genitive case-markers. The neutralization of the accusative and genitive will be discussed further below.

3.2 The accusative/genitive case-marker -y/-i

In a group of suffix-less nouns, all of them clearly native and all ending with the vowel /a/, one finds the suffix -y in the object or genitive case. For some nouns ending with // the suffix is -yu. Thus consider:

(4) subject/predicate form    object/genitive form

|         |               |           |
|---------|---------------|-----------|
| tocáy'a | 'prairie-dog' | tocáy'a-y |
| páa     | 'water'       | páa-y     |
| kuvúa   | 'sharp edge'  | kuvúa-y   |
| táa     | 'knee'        | táa-y     |
| piwá    | 'spouse'      | piwá-y    |

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of Ute phonology, see Givón (1980, ch. 1)

tyi 'deer'  
 pari(h) 'elk'

tyi-yy  
 pari-yy

A number of native nouns with a stem ending with /a/ show a substitution of that final /a/ with /i/ in the genitive:

| (5) | <u>noun</u>                   |      | <u>derived compound</u>  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------|--|
| a.  | tavá-ci<br>sun -NOM<br>'sun'  | ---> | tav-i- 'ini -kya-tu<br>sun-GEN-make-ANT-NOM<br>'sun-made' (name) |
| b.  | 'awá-tu<br>long-ADJ<br>'long' | ---> | 'aw -i- tavá-pu<br>long-GEN-day -NOM<br>'for a long time'        |

A number of borrowed words show a similar pattern, with the suffix being -i when following a consonant. Consider first the word 'horse', borrowed from Spanish:

|       |          |          |               |
|-------|----------|----------|---------------|
| (6)a. | kavá     | 'horse'  | (NOM)         |
| b.    | kavá-yi  | 'horse'  | (OBLIQUE)     |
| c.    | kavá-y-u | 'horses' | (either case) |

The history of the borrowing may have something to do with the distribution of the present form. Most likely, *caballo* was first analyzed as the plural form (6c), next by substraction *kavá-yi* was interpreted as the oblique form (6b), and finally *kavá* as the nominative form (6a). But mass nouns like 'bread', where no plural exists, show a similar pattern:

| (7) | <u>subject/predicate form</u> |      | <u>object/genitive form</u> |
|-----|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|
| a.  | páana 'bread'                 | ---> | páana-y                     |
| b.  | murúuna 'melon'               | ---> | murúuna-y                   |
| c.  | banáana 'banana'              | ---> | banáana-y                   |

And borrowed nouns with consonant-final stems show the predictable oblique variant -i, as in:

(8)a. ...maáy-pugay-'u dóctor-i 'uwá-y...  
 find-REM -him doctor-OBJ that-OBJ  
 'they found the doctor...'

b. ...doctor-bag-i -av yáa'wa-vaci...  
 doctor-bag-OBJ-REFL carry -BKGR  
 '...he was carrying his doctor-bag...'

c. ...'urú branch-i -vää-tux...  
 that/OBJ branch-OBJ-LOC-to  
 '...(he moved) toward the branch...'

d. ...'urú Mancos Creek-i -vää...  
 that/OBJ Mancos Creek-OBJ-LOC  
 '...over there in Mancos Creek...'

And the treatment of borrowed noun is often indicative of old (or 'underlying') native form.<sup>2</sup>

The traces of an older oblique suffix -y(i) are still manifest, as frozen relics, in the demonstratives series of Ute. Thus consider:

| (9)        | <u>subject/predicate</u> | <u>object/genitive</u> |
|------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| PROXIMATE  |                          |                        |
| inanimate  | 'i-ca                    | 'i-cá-y                |
| animate-sg | 'i-na                    | 'i-ná-y                |
| animate-pl | 'i-mu                    | 'i-mŭ                  |
| VISIBLE    |                          |                        |
| inanimate  | máru                     | ma-rŭ                  |
| animate-sg | máa                      | máa-y                  |
| animate-pl | má-mu                    | ma-mŭ                  |
| INVISIBLE  |                          |                        |
| inanimate  | 'ú-ry                    | 'urú                   |
| animate-sg | 'ú-wa                    | 'u-wá-y                |
| animate-pl | 'ú-my                    | 'u-mŭ                  |

One phonological detail recapitulates what was noted earlier above for suffix-less nouns: When-

<sup>2</sup> See Hyman (1970) for the original discussion.

ever the final stem-vowel is /a/, the oblique suffix -y seems to have survived.

A slightly more complex, but similar survival of the oblique suffix -y is found in independent pronouns:

|             | <u>subject/predicate</u> | <u>object/genitive</u> |
|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1ST PERSON  |                          |                        |
| SG          | n̥y                      | n̥yŋa-y                |
| DU-incl.    | tám̥i                    | tám̥i                  |
| PL-incl.    | táw̥i                    | táw̥i                  |
| DU/PL-excl. | n̥ym̥y                   | n̥ym̥y-y               |
| 2ND PERSON  |                          |                        |
| SG          | 'úm̥y                    | 'ym̥y-y                |
| PL          | m̥n̥i                    | m̥n̥i                  |
| 3RD-VIS.    |                          |                        |
| SG          | m̥áa-s                   | m̥áa-y-a-s             |
| PL          | m̥am̥y-s                 | m̥am̥y-a-s             |
| 3RD-INVIS.  |                          |                        |
| SG          | 'u-w̥á-s                 | 'u-w̥á-y-a-s           |
| PL          | 'u-m̥y-s                 | 'u-m̥y-a-s             |
| 'other'     | k̥ym̥á-s                 | k̥ym̥á-y-a-s           |

The suffix -y is present in almost all the oblique forms. Its absence following the vowel /i/ is phonologically predictable. The added oblique element -a will be discussed further below. The pronominal suffix -s comes from a different source and does not concern us here.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The suffix -s appears as 'conjunctive particle', with a wide and complex distribution in Ute Discourse. Its appearance with independent pronouns is, presumably, a grammaticalized off-shoot of that use. For some details, see Givón (1980, ch. 17).

### 3.3 The object suffix -ku

There exists a second suffix that survives in a restricted area of the object-case paradigm, the suffix -ku. Its distribution is restricted almost entirely to the numeral and quantifier domain. Thus consider:

| (11) subject/predicate |         | object          |
|------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| sù-i-s                 | 'one'   | sù-ku-s         |
| sù-ii-ni               | 'other' | sù-ku(-nani)    |
| wá-ii-ni               | 'two'   | wá-y-ku(-nani)  |
| p̥á-ii-ni              | 'three' | p̥á-y-ku(-nani) |
| manú-ni                | 'all'   | manú-xu-t̥y     |

The association of other elements with the -ku suffix above is not always totally predictable. The object suffixal -nani seems to be an option for numerals, perhaps historically related to the adjective-deriving post-position 'like' -(na)ni. The subject suffix -ni is most likely of the same source.

An intriguing presence of the suffixal -y, in the predicable relic position following the vowel /a/, is also seen.

A suffix ku occurs in several areas of Ute grammar. Only one of those may have some bearing on the object suffix -ku. It involves the marking of complements of manipulative verbs, i.e. where no equi-subject condition obtains. To illustrate this, contrast such a complement, as in (12b), with the equi-subject complement of modality verbs in (12a), a construction marked by the complementizer suffix -ci:

- (12) a. 'áapa-ci w̥y̥ka-ci 'ásti'i-y  
 boy -SUBJ work -IRR-COMP want-IMM  
 'The boy wants to work'
- b. mamá -ci 'áapa-ci w̥y̥ka-vaa-ku 'ásti'i-y  
 woman-SUBJ boy -OBJ work -IRR-COMP want -IMM  
 'The woman wants the boy to work'

There are some precedents, however isolated, for subject and object case-marking to appear on complement clauses -- and there signal the contrast between same reference (SS) and different referent (DS).<sup>4</sup> For general pattern only, one may argue that the SS/DS contrast between (12a) and (12b) is 'coded by' the *-ci* vs. *-ku* suffixes, respectively. And thus that *-ci* may be re-constructed as a subject suffix, while *-ku* as an object suffix.

The grounds for such reconstruction in Ute are not exactly firm. The suffix *-ci* is commonly the animate noun suffix that reconstructs all the way back to Proto Uto-Aztecán. The suffix *-ku* also appears as the subordinator for many adverbial clauses (see below). True enough, these are all as a matter of course non-equisubject clauses. But *-ku* is used regardless of whether the subject of the adverbial clause is or isn't coreferential with that of the main clause (see section 4.3.2, below).

### 3.4 The oblique suffix *-a*

#### 3.4.1 Preamble

As can be seen in (10) above, the object/genitive form of some third-person independent pronouns in Ute already contains, in addition to the *-y* suffix, an added suffixal formative *-a*. In this section we will discuss frozen evidence which points to the association of the suffix *-a* with both the genitive and object cases.

<sup>4</sup> Such situations are found in the switch-reference grammar of some Australian languages (Austin, 1980, 1988). A similar -- or more restricted -- case has been reported in Yuman languages (Munro, 1980, 1983).

#### 3.4.2 The suffix *-a* as a genitive marker

Consider, for example, the partitive-genitive construction, as in:

- (13) a. 'um̩ -a -t̩  
 those-PART-NOM  
 'one of them'
- b. 'um̩-a-t̩-m̩  
 those-PART-NOM-PL  
 'some of them'
- c. máama-ci-u-a-t̩  
 women-NOM-PL-PART-NOM  
 'one of the women'
- d. num̩-y-a-t̩-m̩  
 us-OBJ-PART-NOM-PL  
 'some of us'

Next, the object form of the comparative pronouns that means, roughly, '(one) like that (one)', is also marked by the suffix *-a*:

- (14) a. 'u- rá-t̩-ni (SUBJ, SG)  
 that-be-NOM-like  
 'one like that'
- b. 'u- rá-t̩-aa-ni (OBJ, SG)  
 that-be-NOM-OBJ-like  
 'one like that'
- c. ù- rá-t̩-m̩-ni (SUBJ, PL)  
 that-be-NOM-PL-like  
 'ones like that'
- d. 'u-rá-t̩-m̩-aa-ni (OBJ, PL)  
 that-be-NOM-PL-OBJ-like  
 'ones like that'
- e. 'uwá-ra-t̩-ni (SUBJ, AN-SG)  
 him-be-NOM-like  
 'one like him'

- f. 'uwá-ra-tu-aa-ni (OBJ, AN-SG)  
him-be-NOM-OBJ-like  
'one like him'
- g. 'uwá-ra-tu-mu-ni (SUBJ, AN-PL)  
him-be-NOM-PL-like  
'ones like him'
- h. 'uwá-ra-tu-mu-aa-ni (OBJ, AN-PL)  
him-be-NOM-PL-OBJ-like  
'ones like him'

Another use of the *-a* suffix appears in the genitive augment of many body-part nouns, or with other inalienably-possessed nouns when followed by a possessive pronoun, as in:

- (15) a. *kwasi-vi* ---> *kwasi-a -'u*  
tail -NOM tail -GEN-his  
'tail' 'his tail'
- b. 'oφ -vi ---> 'oφ -a -n  
bone-NOM bone-GEN-my  
'bone' 'my bone(s)'
- c. ...'uni -aa -'u máy -pyga...  
possession-GEN-his-tell-REM  
'...(So she) told his relatives...'

The suffix *-a* is also used in the formation of alienable possession expressions, following the formative 'uni-possession'. It is also used in the formation of existential expressions, which are patterned after inalienable possession, with the location being the grammatical 'possessor'. Thus compare:

- (16)a. *kani -gyā -tu* (inalienable)  
house-have-NOM/HAB  
'a home-owner'  
'(She/he) has a home'

- b. 'i -vāa-tu 'avá'na-tu kani -aa -ġa -tu  
here-LOC-SUBJ many -OBJ house-GEN-have -NOM/HAB  
(locative)

'Here there are many houses'  
'This place has many houses'

- c. 'avá'na-tu kani -'uni-aa -ġa -tu  
many -OBJ-house/OBJ-POS -GEN-have-NOM/HAB  
(alienable)

'(She/he) owns many money'

- d. *pukù -gwa -tu* (inalienable)  
horse-have-NOM/HAB  
'(She/he) has a (personal) horse'

- e. 'u -vāa-tu 'avá'na-tu-mu puku -aa -ġa  
there-LOC-SUBJ many-NOM-PL/OBJ horse-GEN-have  
-tu  
-NOM/HAB (locative)

'That place has horses'  
'There are many horses there'

- f. 'ava'na-tu-mu kavá -'uni-aa -ġa -tu (alienable)  
many-NOM-PL/OBJ horse -POS-GEN-have-NOM/HAB  
'(She/he) owns many horses'

- g. \*panáqa-ry -gyā -tu (\*inalienable)  
money -ADJ/OBJ-have-NOM/HAB

- h. panáqa-ry -'uni-aa -ġa -tu  
money -ADJ/OBJ-POSS-GEN-have-NOM/HAB  
'a rich person'  
'(She/he) has money'

Finally, the following examples, taken from traditional Ute stories told by tribal elders,<sup>5</sup> also show the use of *-a* as a genitive marker:

<sup>5</sup> See Givón (1985).

(17)a. ...nũ -'ura pũni-ti -pãã-ni -mũ  
 I/SUBJ-be see -CAUS-IRR-FUT-you  
 '...I will indeed show you

'umũ pũa-u -aa -mũ  
 those/OBJ kin-PL-GEN-your  
 your relatives...'

b. ...manũ-xu-ty tũvũ-pũ -aa 'uni-'ni-kya-tũ-mũ  
 do-INT-PL-NOM-PL/GEN all-OBJ-NOM/OBJ earth-NOM-GEN  
 '...he spoke the languages of all the peoples'

'apãã-na-y 'apãã-pũga...  
 speak-REL-OBJ speak-REM  
 who lived on earth...'

### 3.4.3 The suffix -a as an object marker

There is textual evidence, again derived from traditional Ute narratives told by tribal elders,<sup>6</sup> for the use of the suffix -a as an object marker as well. In example (18) below, the suffix -a is added to the post-positional relative pronoun pũ-, before the instrumental preposition. In direct elicitation with younger speakers, that -a was not present. Thus consider:

(18) a. ...nũ 'umũ-y- rugwã-paa-ni  
 I/SUBJ you -OBJ-give -IRR-FUT  
 '...I will give you'

'urũ pũ -aa -m 'uni-vãã-na-ãy...  
 that/OBJ REL-OBJ-with  
 what to do it with ...'

In example (19) below, -a as an object marker is used twice: Once following the nominal suffix -pũ and again before a (locative) post-position, the other following the causative -ti in a nominal construction meaning 'baseball' (literally

<sup>6</sup> The following passages were all taken from Ute traditional narrative (see Givón, ed., 1985).

'cause-to-hit') and again preceding the locative post-position:

(19) ...mãry -'ura tũvũ -pũ -aa -va  
 that/SUBJ-BE ground-NOM-OBJ-LOC  
 'It's at this ground

pũ -paay-'ura mamã -xwa- nhká -mi  
 REL-LOC -be woman-step-dance/PL-HAB  
 that they used to do the Beardance,

kwipã-ti -aa -vaa-'urũ...  
 hit -CAUS-OBJ-LOC-that/OBJ  
 at the baseball park...'

It is not always easy to distinguish between the genitive and object use of -a, specially when the oblique suffix -y is also present, as in:

(20) ...xurã 'uwãs 'u tukũ -a -y piwã -y  
 then he that/SUBJ cougar-GEN-OBJ spouse-OBJ  
 'then finally he ran away with

cũká-xwa-u -pũga pinã-xwã  
 lead-go -INCEP-REM later-go  
 Cougar's wife...'

## 4. The hidden footprints of nominalization

### 4.1 Interim summary

Of the three oblique suffixes discussed above, -ku is clearly limited to the accusative, and even there in a rather restricted domain (quantifiers). The suffix -a is a bit less restricted; still, the bulk of its distribution in the grammar involves the genitive paradigm. It is most conspicuously in the suffix -y/-i, found in the pronominal system as well as in suffixless ('defective') nouns, that we find almost a complete neutralization of the accusative and genitive case. Further, this neutralization closely parallels the synchronic neutralization



of the accusative and genitive case-marking in regular nouns (see section 2, above).

The neutralization of either the subject/agent or the object/patient case with the genitive tends to arise from one coherent source -- sentence nominalization.<sup>7</sup> In the following section I will discuss some of the nominalization patterns in Ute, setting up the background for an attempt to explain the accusative-genitive neutralization.

## 4.2 Ute nominalized clauses

### 4.2.1 Relative clauses

In Ute, as in many Uto-Aztecan languages, almost all subordinate clauses are historically nominalized. Subject relative clauses use nominal morphology, with the suffix *-tu* and the plural maker *-m̥y*, much like agentive nominals. Thus consider:

- (21) a. *qáa -p̥yga*  
sing-REM  
'(She/he) sang'
- b. *qáa -mi -tu*  
sing-HAB-NOM  
'singer'  
'(She/he) sings'  
'the one who sings'
- c. *qáa -qa -mi -tu -m̥y*  
sing-PL-JAB-NOM-PL  
'singers'  
'They sing'  
'The ones who sing'
- d. *qáa -p̥yga -tu*  
sing-REM-NOM  
'The one who sang'

<sup>7</sup> For the syntax of nominalized clauses, see Comrie and Thompson (1985) or Givón (1989, ch. 1).

- e. *qáa -qa -p̥yga -tu -m̥y*  
sing-PL-REM -NOM-PL  
'The ones who sang'

Object relative clauses are marked by the nominalizing suffix *-na*. Their subject appears in the oblique -- historically genitive -- form. Thus consider:

- (22)a. *ta'wá -ci 'u sivãtu -ci 'uwa -y pãxá -qa*  
man-SUBJ that/SUBJ goat -OBJ that-OBJ kill-ANT  
'The man killed the goat'

- b. *sivãtu -ci 'u ta'wá -ci 'uwa -y pãxá -qa*  
goat-SUBJ that/SUBJ man-GEN he-GEN kill-ANT

*-na*  
-REL/NOM

'The goat that the man killed'

In indirect-object relativization, also marked by the object relative suffix *-na*, the nominal character of the construction is further underscored by the frequent presence of (some form of) the object suffix *-y*. Thus consider:

- (23)a. ...*n̥y -úra p̥ni -ti -p̥ã -ni -m̥y*  
' I/SUBJ-be see -CAUS-IRR-FUT-you  
'I indeed will show you

*p̥upa -am̥y -'uru wii -kya -paa -na -y*  
manner-they-that/OBJ dance-PL -IRR-REL/NOM-OBJ  
the way they will do the Sundance..'

- b. ...*p̥upa -ax wac̥ -ka -na -y*  
manner-it put -ANT/PASS-REL/NOM-OBJ  
'nobody knows'

*kac̥ -ux p̥uc̥uc̥gwa -wa...*  
NEG -it know -NEG  
they way it was done...'

- c. ...."kacù-ux pùupa 'urá-na -y!"  
 NEG -it manner be -REL/NOM-OBJ  
 'and who's going to say:  
 'áa -ax-'ura máy-vag-ni?...  
 WH/SUBJ-it -be say-IRR-FUT  
 "that's not the way (it should be done)!"?...'
- d. ...manù-xu-tu tpuvù -pu -aa 'uni-'ni-kya  
 all-OBJ-NOM/OBJ earth-NOM-GEN do-INT-PL  
 'he spoke the languages of all the peoples  
 -tù-my 'apága-na -y apága-puga...  
 -NOM-PL/GEN speak-REL/NOM-OBJ speak-REM  
 of the earth...'

#### 4.2.2 Verb complements

In sentential complements of cognition-utterance verbs, three morphological traits hint at a nominalized source. First, such complements are marked by either the nominal/relative suffix *-na* or another noun suffix, *-pu*. Second, either one of these two nominal suffixes may be followed by the suffix *-ay*, most likely a reflex of the object/genitive suffix *-y*, perhaps in combination with *-a*. Even when that object suffix is absent, as in (24b), below, the nominal suffix itself appears in its voiced --oblique-- form. These facts again suggest that the entire complement is treated as a nominal object. Finally, the nominalized origin of the complements is further underscored by oblique/genitive case-marking of the subject of the complement clause. Thus consider:

- (24)a. *mamá -ci 'u pucúcugwa-ga*  
 woman-SUBJ that/SUBJ know -ANT  
 'the woman knew (anterior)  
 'áapa-ci 'uwá-y picù -kaa-na -'ay  
 boy -GEN that-GEN arrive-ANT-NOM-OBJ  
 that the boy had arrived'.

- b. *mamá -ci 'u pucúcugwa-puga*  
 woman-SUBJ that/SUBJ know -REM  
 'The woman knew (remote-past)  
 'áapa-ci 'uwá-y picù -pu  
 boy -GEN that-GEN arrive-NOM/OBJ  
 that the boy had arrived (long before)'
- c. *mamá -ci 'u máy-kya-ni*  
 woman-SUBJ that/SUBJ say-ANT-like  
 'The woman thought (anterior)  
 'áapa-ci 'uwá-y náaga picù -pu -'ay  
 boy -GEN that-GEN maybe arrive-NOM-OBJ  
 that maybe the boy had arrived'
- d. *mamá -ci 'u ka- pucúcugwa-wa*  
 woman-SUBJ that-SUBJ NEG-know -NEG  
 'The woman doesn't know  
 'áapa-ci 'uwa-y picù- vwaa-na -'ay  
 boy -GEN that-GEN arrive-IRR-NOM-OBJ  
 if the boy will arrive'
- e. *mamá -ci 'u ka -suti'i-na*  
 woman-SUBJ that/SUBJ NEG-sure -ANT/NEG  
 'The woman is not sure  
 'áapa-ci 'uwá-y picù -pu -'ay  
 boy -GEN that-GEN arrive-NOM-OBJ  
 whether tje boy has arrived'

Complement of modality and manipulative verbs, while containing the irrealis suffix *-vaa*, also require the complementizer suffixes *-ci* (for equi-subject modality verbs) or *-ku* (for non-equi-subject manipulation verbs). Thus recall:

- (12)a. 'áapa-ci wùyka-va-ci 'ásti'i  
 boy-NOM work-IRR-COMP want/IMM  
 'The boy wants to work'  
 b. *mamá -ci 'áapa-ci wùyka-vaa-ku 'ásti'i*  
 woman-NOM boy -OBJ work -IRR-COMP want/IMM  
 'the woman wants the boy to work'

Of these two complementizer suffixes, *-ci* is homophonous with the animate suffix *-ci*. The etimological origin of *-ku* is yet to be determined.

The form of sentential subjects reflects, at least for fully finite realis sentences, a similar nominalized morphology. Thus consider:

- (25) *ta'wá-ci 'uwá-y wúyka-xa -na -'ay tɔvúci-'ay*  
 man -GEN that-GEN work -ANT-NOM-OBJ well -IMM  
 'That the man worked is good'  
 'It's good that the man worked'

#### 4.2.3 Adverbial clauses

Time adverbial clauses translated as either 'if' or 'when' are marked by a reflex of subordinating suffix *-ku*, as in complements of manipulative verbs (see (12) above). In addition, the telltale sign of nominalization -- genitive-marked subject -- is also present. Thus consider:

- (26)a. *ta'wá-ci 'uwá-y kani -naaǵa yuga -xu*  
 man -GEN that-GEN house-in enter-SUBORD  
 'When the man entered the house,

*mamá -ci 'u paǵa-kwa-puga*  
 woman-SUBJ that/SUBJ go -go -REM  
 the woman took off'

- b. *ta'wá-ci 'uwá-y kani -naaǵa yuga -xu*  
 man -GEN that-GEN house-in enter-SUBORD  
 'If the man enters the house,

*mamá -ci 'u paǵa-kwa-vǵa-ni*  
 woman-SUBJ that-SUBJ go -go -IRR-FUT  
 the woman will take off'

The same is true for 'after' time clauses, where the anterior aspect is used, followed by *-ku*. Such anterior adverbial clauses may also be interpreted as 'because' clauses. Thus consider:

- (27)a. *ta'wá-ci 'uwá-y wúyka-makú -kway-ku*  
 man -GEN that-GEN work -finish-ANT -SUBORD  
 'After the man (had) finished working,  
 'Because the man (had) finished working,

*mamá -ci 'u paǵa-kwa-puga*  
 woman-SUBJ that-SUBJ go -go -REM  
 the woman took off (remote)'

- b. *ta'wá-ci 'uwá-y wúyka-maku-kway-ku*  
 man-GEN that-GEN work-finish-ANT-SUBORD  
 'After the man will finish working,  
 'Because the man will finish working,

*mamá -ci 'u paǵa-kwa-vaa-ni*  
 woman-SUBJ that-SUBJ go -go -IRR-FUT  
 the woman will take off'

The anterior-marked adverbial clause in (27a,b) can assume, in addition to 'after' and 'because', also the value of a counter-fact-conditional clause. The marking of the main clause by a special morphemic combination, together with a modal adverbial in the subordinate this counter-fact interpretation. Thus consider:

- (28) *naaǵa-su-ni ta'wá-ci 'uwá-y picu -kay-ku*  
 maybe-MOD man -GEN that-GEN arrive-ANT-SUBORD  
 'If the man had arrived (but he didn't)

*mamá -ci 'u maǵa-qa -ty -'u*  
 woman-SUBJ that feed-ANT-NOM-hic  
 the woman would have fed him'  
 (lit.: '...the woman would have been the one who would have fed him'.)

Purpose clauses adopt the morphology of verb complements, depending on whether the purpose clause is equi-subject or not (see (12), above). Thus contrast:

(29)a. ta'wá-ci kani -naaga yugá -puga tuká-vaa-ci  
 man -SUBJ house-in enter-REM eat-IRR-SUBORD  
 'The man entered the house (remote) in order to eat'

b. ta'wáy-ci kani -naaga yugá -puga  
 man -SUBJ house-in enter-REM  
 'The man entered the house (remote)

mamá -ci 'uwá-y maga-vaa-ku -'u  
 woman-GEN that-GEN feed-IRR-SUBORD-him  
 so that the woman may feed him'

The non-equi-subject in the purpose clause in (29b) conforms to our expectations of a nominalized origin of this clause by displaying the genitive case-marking.

Finally, subjectless participial-adverbial clauses are also marked with the subordinating -ku suffix. Thus consider:

(30)a. ta'wá-ci 'u, wúyuka-xu, mamá -ci 'uwá-y  
 man-SUBJ that-SUBJ work -SUBORD woman-GEN that-GEN

punikya-puga  
 see -REM

'The man, working, saw the woman'

b. ta'wá-ci 'u mamá -ci 'uwá-y wúyuka  
 man -SUBJ that-SUBJ woman-GEN that-GEN work

-xu punikya-puga  
 -SUBORD see -REM

'The man saw the woman working'

#### 4.3. The possessive-reflexive and nominalization

There is a possessive-reflexive morpheme in Ute, whose normative use in simple clauses is defined as 'the subject possesses the object'. To illustrate this simple use, consider:

(31)a. mamá -ci tuá -ci punikya-puga  
 woman-SUBJ child-GEN see -REM  
 'the woman saw the child'

b. mamá -ci tuá -ci -'u punikya-puga  
 woman-SUBJ child-GEN-3s see -REM  
 'The woman saw his/her child' (not her own)

c. máama-ci tuá -ci -av punikya-puga  
 woman-SUBJ child-GEN-REFL see -REM  
 'The woman saw her own child'

A pervasive use of -av to mark relative, adverbial or complement clauses underscores their nominal character. The grammar treats them as possessed objects, with nominal that is coreferent to -av thus related as subject, for the purpose of precipitating the use of the possessive-reflexive. The examples below are all taken from traditional narrative told by Ute elders.

(32)a. ...'úru-'uru kwiy'a-xa-puga, wa'á-py-m  
 CONJ fence-PL-REM cedar-INSTR  
 '...so they made a corral, of cedar branches,

pù -paa-y -av -'uru máy-kya-na...  
 REL-LOC-OBJ-REFL-that say-ANT-REL  
 the way he had said...'

(lit.: '...the way of his own saying...')

b. ...'umú-a -tugwa supáy-puga 'urú,  
 them-OBJ-go leave-REM that/OBJ  
 '...he left it up to them,

púupa -'uru 'uni-kya-na -av  
 manner-that/OBJ do -PL -REL-REFL  
 (to imitate) the way the had done it...'  
 (lit.: '...the way of their own doing...')

c. ...puni-ti -pugay-'u 'urú m'ó-av 'uru  
 see -CAUS-REM -3s that/OBJ hand-REFL that/OBJ  
 ...and he showed them his hand

pú -m -'uru tapága-xa -pua-na -av -'uru  
 REL-LOC-that nail -ANT/PASS-REM-REL-REFL-that  
 where he had been nailed (to the cross)...'  
 (lit.: '...the place of his being nailed...')

d. ...'urú 'uwáyas 'uni-kya-na -av pynikya-puga  
 that/OBJ his do -ANT-REL-REFL see-ANT-REM

'...he saw what he had done...'  
 (lit.: '...he saw that of his own doing...')

e. ...kukwá-pi 'urú ma -mágu'na-ta -xa -na -av  
 firewood-OBJ that/OBJ RED-gather-PASS-ANT-REL-REFL  
 '...he lighted the firewood

na'á-ti -puga...  
 burn-CAUS-REM  
 that he had gathered...'  
 (lit.: ' the firewood of his own gathering...')

f. ...'urú púpa -av máy-puga-na-y 'uw-ayás 'urú...  
 that/OBJ manner-REFL say-REM -REL-OBJ his that/OBJ  
 '...the way he had predicted...'  
 (lit.: '...the way of his saying...')

In sum, then, the use of the reflexive-possessive -av referring to the subject of the main verb, underscores the nominalized character of such subordinate clauses in Ute.

## 5. Reconstructing the diachronic scenario

### 5.1. Preamble

In this section I will suggest a step-by-step reconstruction of the history of the Ute case-markers. I will start from the most recent -- and easiest to reconstruct -- changes, those that are shared by the So. Numic group. I will then proceed to the presumably earlier, thus harder to reconstruct, changes. At appropriate points, comparative Uto-Aztecan evidence will be considered.

### 5.1 The demise of the genitive-accusative suffix -y: Late phonological changes

It is fairly clear that the case-marker shared by both the accusative and genitive in Ute in the fairly recent past was -y. (or -i or -yi; the three forms are low-level phonological variants). Frozen forms on demonstratives (cf. (9)) and independent pronouns (cf. (10)) point overwhelmingly in this direction, as do the forms of suffix-less native nouns (cf. (4), (5)) and borrowed nouns (cf. (7), (8)). The sequence of relatively late phonological change by which the nominative vs. oblique distinction was transformed into a final vowel voicing contrast, respectively, is easy to reconstruct. The most common Ute noun suffixes -- the animate -ci, the animate -pi/-vi and the body-part -pi/-vi -- all end with the vowel /i/, to which the reconstructed suffix most easily assimilates. Synchronic phonological rules routinely delete /i/ or /y/ following /i/, and often also following the high-back-unrounded vowel /u/. This may account for loss of the suffix before the other noun suffixes -- -pu/-vu and -tu/-ru. Finally, the 'shielding' of the final vowel of the nominative form from de-voicing by following suffixes is synchronically well attested (cf. (2)). The last sequence of the history of the accusative-genitive suffix -y is easily reconstructible as the following temporally-ordered phonological processes:

- (33)a. De-voicing of final unstressed vowels  
 (SUBJ/PRED final vowels are lost)  
 (?the suffix -yi becomes -y)  
 b. Loss of the suffix -y before /i/ and /y/

## 5.2 The merger of genitive and accusative -y

Langacker (1977, pp. 82-83) suggests that the suffix *-a* is the older genitive and accusative marker in Uto-Aztecan, and *-yi* a younger one, attested only in the Northern sub-family. Dakin (1985) reports the traces of a *-yi* genitive suffix in Nahuatl and Mayo as well, which suggests that it was innovated prior to the NUA-SUA split, and perhaps lost in most members of the Southern branch. Either interpretation is compatible with the Ute evidence.

Merger of the accusative and genitive case-marking is not limited to Ute or So. Nomic, but rather is attested elsewhere in UA. It has occurred, for example, in Yaqui, with the suffix *-ta*, as in (Jelinek and Escalante, 1986):

(34)a. *aapo kari -ta viča*  
I/SUBJ house-OBJ see  
'I see the house'

b. *Peo -ta kari*  
Peter-GEN house  
'Peter's house'

Still the question of whether *-yi* spread from genitive to accusative or vice-versa remains. Dakin (1985) suggests the suffix *-yi/-ya* was originally a genitive marker. And Langacker (1977, p. 83) suggests that *-yi* started as the third-person-singular possessor pronoun in \*PUA and later extended its scope, presumably first toward a general genitive case-marker.

The generalization of the third-person singular genitive pronoun toward a general genitive marker is widely attested, as in e.g. English<sup>8</sup> or various Creoles.<sup>9</sup> But the extension from gen-

<sup>8</sup> See Janda (1978).

<sup>9</sup> See Givón (1984, ch. 6).

itive to accusative -- however widely attested in UA or elsewhere -- requires justification.

The simplest explanation for a genitive-to-accusative (or, for that matter, genitive-to-nominative) change is that it must have occurred through reinterpretation of nominalized clauses. Genitive marking of both subject and object arguments is widely attested in nominalization, constituting in fact one of the most reliable, universal syntactic correlates of nominalized clauses.<sup>10</sup> Thus consider:

- (35) a. John's knowledge of the answer surprised her  
b. Her success was astounding  
c. The killing of horses is prohibited

In order to extend a genitive in nominalized clauses toward the accusative (or nominative) in finite clauses, one must assume that nominalized clause became reanalyzed -- liberated -- into finite clauses.

As noted in section 4 above, this is the case synchronically with subordinate clauses in Ute. They conform to pattern (34a,b) above. But the Uto-Aztecan merger pattern -- both the older one with *-a* and the later one with *-yi* -- extended the genitive marking only to the accusative. Such a shift conforms to pattern (34c). One must conclude that the nominalization involved must have been a subjectless nominalization -- i.e. applying to the verb-phrase alone.

Nominalized verb phrases are typically obtained in verb complements of modality and manipulation verbs (see (12) above). English is fairly typical of this general tendency, as in:

- (36) a. he finished eating the egg  
b. he finished the eating of the egg  
c. He is (\*at) running<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See Comrie and Thompson (1985); Givón (1989, ch. 1).

<sup>11</sup> The current English progressive is a reduced form of a preposition-phrase complement, originally of the form 'He

Modality verbs, such as 'want', 'have', 'start', 'finish', 'come', 'go', and 'be'/'stay'/'stand'/'sit' are the most common universal course of grammaticalized tense-aspect markers.<sup>12</sup> There is no reason to assume that the Ute -- and Uto-Aztecans -- tense-aspect markers did not arise through this very same universal channel. Many current Ute tense-aspect are transparently derived from such a source. For example, the anterior-perfect *-ka* is derived from 'have'-*ga*, as in the participial suffix *-ga*.<sup>13</sup> The habitual *-tu/ry* suffix is itself still a derived nominal suffix. The habitual *-mi* is transparently derived from 'go' (*\*-mia*). The remote *-puga* is a transparent contraction of the nominal suffix *-pu* followed by 'have' *-ga*.<sup>14</sup> The most common correlates associated with a genitive-to-accusative extension are thus well attested in Ute. These facts taken together, while not proving that nominalization and tense-aspect innovation were the driving mechanism behind the genitive-to-accusative shift, they are fully compatible with such an interpretation.

### 5.3 The genitive-accusative suffix *-a*

Langacker (1977, pp. 82-83) suggests that *-a* is an older genitive-accusative suffix in \*PUA. Its much more limited, frozen-relic distribution in Ute, in either the genitive or accusative function, certainly supports such an interpretation. The few attested cases *-ya* or *-ay* sequences in

is at working'. Traces of this form are still heard in non-standard American dialects, cf. 'I am a-coming'. The very same development is currently taking place in colloquial German.

<sup>12</sup> See discussion in Givón (1979, ch. 5; 1982; 1984, ch. 6).

<sup>13</sup> See Givón (1988).

<sup>14</sup> See Givón (1988).

Ute may represent combinations, perhaps on the various lines shown elsewhere in UA.<sup>15</sup> Dakin's (1985) suggestion of a reconstructible *-ya* genitive suffix in \*PAU should probably be reinterpreted as such a combination. But once again, in order to explain the genitive-accusative overlap, one must assume the very same nominalization cum tense-aspect innovation pathway.

### 6. Summary

The intersection of internal Ute evidence and comparative Uto-Aztecans evidence suggests the following diachronic sequence of events:

- (i) Both the suffix *-a* and the suffix *-y(i)* started as genitive suffixes;
- (ii) Two independent cycles of genitive-to-accusative extension took place in UA,

- (a) an early one with the suffix *-a* before the NUA-SUA split; and
- (b) a later one with the suffix *-y(i)*, either confined to NUA after the split, or somehow widely eradicated from SUA after the split

(iii) The genitive-to-accusative extension must have been driven, in both instances, by verb/phrase nominalization, most likely during the renovation of the tense-aspect morphology via the grammaticalization of modality verbs.

(iv) Within Ute (and So. Numic), the shift from the *-y(i)* vs. zero oblique vs. nominative contrast, to a voiced vs. unvoiced final vowel contrast, respectively, reflects a relatively recent phonologically motivated change.

<sup>15</sup> Langacker (1977, p. 82) suggests that the Yaqui *-ta* is a combination of the nominal *-ti* plus *-a*; and that the Mono *-na* is again a combination of some nasal element with *-a*.

## REFERENCES

- Austin, P. 1980 "Switch reference in Australian languages". In P. Munro ed. *Studies of Switch-Reference*. UCLA Working Papers in Syntax, 8.
- Austin, P. 1988 "UCLA Colloquium paper" (pending).
- Comrie, B. and S. Thompson. 1895 "Lexical nominalizations". In T. Shopen ed. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dakin, K. 1985 "Yi/ya, a Uto-Aztecan possessive suffix? Friends of Uto-Aztecan Conference, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ms.
- Givón, T. 1979 *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, T. 1980 *Ute Reference Grammar*. Ignacio, Colorado: Ute Press.
- Givón, T. 1982 "Tense-aspect-modality: The Creole prototype and beyond". In P. Hopper ed. *Tense and Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*, TSL 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1984 *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, Vol. I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1988 "Tale of two passives: Internal reconstruction in Ute". In M. Shibatani ed. *Passive and Voicing*, TSL 16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1989 *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, Vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. ed. 1985 "Ute Traditional Narratives". Ignacio, Colorado: Ute Press.
- Hyman, L. 1970 "The role of borrowing in the justification of phonological grammars". *Studies in African Linguistics* 1/1.
- Janda, R. 1978 "A case of liberation from morphology to syntax: the fate of the English genitive marker -(e)s". UCLA. Ms.
- Jelinek, E. and F. Escalante. 1986 "Verbless possessive sentences in Yaqui". Paper presented at Mary Hass Festival, University of California, Santa Cruz. Ms.
- Langacker, R. 1977 *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar*, vol. 1: *An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas, Arlington, 56.
- Munro, P. 1980 "On the syntactic status of switch-reference clauses: The special case of Mojave comitatives". In P. Munro ed. *UCLA Papers in Syntax*, 8. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Munro, P. 1983 "Where 'same' is not 'not different'". In J. Haiman and P. Munro eds. *Switch reference and Universal Grammar*, TSL 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.