akup

Nr. 39

Hansjakob Seiler

TWO TYPES OF CAHUILLA KINSHIP EXPRESSIONS:
INHERENT AND ESTABLISHING

September 1980

Two types of Cahuilla kinship expressions: Inherent

and establishing

By Hansjakob Seiler, University of Cologne

1. In my Cahuilla Grammar (Seiler 1977:276-282)

and in a subsequent paper (Seiler 1980:229-236) I have

drawn attention to the fact that many kin terms in this

language, expecially those that have a corresponding re-

ciprocal term in the ascending direction - like niece

or nephew in relation to aunt - occur in two expressions

of quite different morphological shape. The following

remarks are intended to furnish an explanation of this

apparent duplicity.[1]

2. Let us first have a brief look at the facts. The

two expression types for a term like woman's younger

sister's child[2] are:

(1) (i) $\emptyset$ - $\emptyset$ - nési   she is her niece

$\quad\quad$ P$_2$ - P$_1$ - niece
$\quad\quad$ 3SG $\,$ 3SG

P$_1$ and P$_2$ are two different series of pronominal prefixes;

both happen to be represented by zero when the persons
are 3rd singular, but they are overtly expressed in such
forms as

(1)(ii) ʔet - ne - nési   <u>thou art my niece</u>

      P_2 - P_1 - niece
      2SG 1SG

P_1 prefixes occur both with nouns and with verbs; with
nouns they mark the possessor, with verbs the actor.
P_2 prefixes occur with nouns only, and their function
is to indicate what I (Seiler 1977:256) have called logical
or higher predication and what, in languages like English,
we would translate by using the copula 'is'; in (1) this
pronominal prefix is coreferential with the entity indi-
cated by the stem, thus <u>thou</u> and <u>niece</u> are coreferential
in <u>thou art my niece</u>. Any noun can be viewed as being
virtually construed with a prefix P_2.

    The second type is:

(2) pe - y - nési-k(a)(t)   <u>she is one who is related to her,</u>

    O - P_2 - niece-OR.REL.   <u>the niece</u>
    3SG 3SG

We have an object prefix here (3rd sing.) followed by a
P_2 subject prefix (3rd sing.), followed by the element for
<u>niece</u>, followed by a suffix -k or -kat and other variants
depending on the morphological context. The form is nominal
as is shown by the presence of P_2, and also by the fact
that the form takes object and plural suffixes. Object pre-
fixes occur both with nominal forms of this kind and with

verb forms. In the forms under consideration the object
prefixes are coreferential with the stem, hence <u>her</u> and
<u>the niece</u> are the same person, and P_2 then refers to the
other argument that is necessarily involved in the <u>niece</u>
relationship, viz. the <u>aunt</u>, more precisely: <u>mother's</u>
<u>older sister</u>. As the translation suggests, the expression
is more about the <u>aunt</u> than about the <u>niece</u>. In fact the
expression is used to refer to the <u>aunt deceased</u>, when
it is inappropriate to refer to her directly. The direct form
which is hereby avoided, but which, of course, exists for
normal use, is

(3) ∅ - hé - nes   <u>she is her aunt</u>

    P_2 - P_1 - aunt
    3SG 3SG

It is a type (1) expression. The type (2) expression
which is here under consideration establishes a relation-
ship by starting "from the other end", i.e. from the
reciprocal term and by using machinery that involves
an object prefix and a suffix -k(a)(t), which, according
to my Grammar (Seiler 1977:101) carries the function of
<u>oriented relationship</u>. It is actually a nominalizer and
a relativizer, involving a complex sentence structure,
and my translation is accordingly. Let us provisionally
call expressions of type (2) inverse, because they seem
to explicitly establish a kin relationship by starting
from the reciprocal term, while expressions of type (1),

which I shall provisionally call direct, seem to represent a kinship in a straight-forward way.

3. Both types of expression can be inflected through the different persons in a twofold way, corresponding to the two arguments involved in every kin relation. From which we may gather that, at least theoretically, the number of forms for a single kin term like niece is considerable and that it is bound to multiply with the great number of kin terms that are in the language. At this point we should like to know whether all the theoretically possible forms occur freely. For this purpose in turn we want to look at the logically possible combinations. I assume that in a kin expression like she is her niece there is one person-argument representing the possessor (her) and one person-argument representing the possessum (she) and coreferential with the stem, i.e. with the kin term itself (niece). The following table charts the logically possible combinations of person for possessor and person for possession. The meaning of the combinations can be read off by going from right to left, e.g. first line left side she is my niece. Gender and plural number are not considered here. Person is additionally symbolized by numbers to make the distance between them more salient.

(4)

POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM			Expression Type		POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM			Expression Type
my	①	③	she	almost excl.Dir.		her	③	①	I	only Inv.
my	①	②	thou	mostly Dir.		thy	②	①	I	preferably Inv.
thy	②	③	she	preferably Dir.		her	③	②	thou	mostly Inv.
her	③	③	she	Dir. and Inv.						

From the point of view of English all these combinations seem to be parallel. However, the Cahuilla evidence shows us, that they must be distributed over two major columns - separated by a double line - and that the relationship between them is not one of parallelism but rather one of inversion. At the far right of each column the preferences for one or the other expression type are indicated. This means that the informants either rejected or accepted or volunteered an expression type for a given combination. We see from the chart that exclusive, or near-exclusive use of one vs. the other type coincides with the maximal distance between the persons (two digits). We find a scale of decreasing exclusivity or increasing tolerance for the other of the two respective types as the distance between the persons becomes smaller. When both are third, both expression types are acceptable but with a different meaning connotation and used in a different situation (see our examples (1), (2) and (3)). To complete the chart, I might now insert the she-her combination on the bottom

line of the right-hand column as well, although it is
not a logically new combination. For the sake of complete-
ness I shall exemplify the chart in (4) with a complete
set of expressions with reference to niece/nephew:

(5)

    she/my ∅   -ne   -nési   I/her   ne   -y   -nési-k
               P_2 ③ $-P_1$ ①   o ① $-P_2$ ③

    thou/my ?et   -ne   -nési   I/thy   ne   -et   -nési-k
               P_2 ② $-P_1$ ①   o ① $-P_2$ ②

                           OR:

    (*?) ?e   -n   -nési-k   (*?) hen   -?e   -nési
           o ② $-P_1$ ① P_2 ① $-P_2$ ②

    she/thy ∅   -?e   -nési   thou/her ?e   -y   -nési-k
               P_2 ③ $-P_1$ ②   o ② $-P_2$ ③

                           OR:

    (?) pe   -?et   -nési-k   (?) ?et   -∅   -nési
          o ③ $-P_2$ ② P_2 ② $-P_1$ ③

    she/her ∅   -∅   -nési   she/her pe   -y   -nési-k
               P_2 ③ $-P_1$ ③   o ③ $-P_2$ ③

The following generalization may now be derived from
our considerations thus far: The constraints in the choice
for one or the other expression type are correlated with
a scale or hierarchy of proximity with regard to the
speaker. The direct type is chosen when the person of the
possessor is nearer to the speaker than the person of the
possessum. It has to be chosen when the possessor is iden-

tical with the speaker, i.e. 1st person. The inverse
type is chosen when the person of the possessum is nearer
to the speaker than the person of the possessor. It has
to be chosen when the possessum is identical with the
speaker, i.e. 1st person. When both persons are third,
the Cahuilla has the choice of presenting either the
possessor or the possessum as being nearer to him and
of respectively "obviating", as it were, either the
possessum or the possessor.

4. This all reminds one somehow of the phenomena
of inverse inflection of verbs and of possessive con-
structions that have been found in other language fami-
lies, e.g. Algonquian.[3] There are marked differences,
however. In Algonquian verb forms the nearer referent
precedes the further referent throughout, and it is the
sole contrast between a direct vs. an indirect marker that
determines whether the nearer referent is the actor (or
possessor) and the further referent is the goal (or
possessum) or, conversely, whether the nearer referent
is the goal (possessum) and the further referent the
actor (possessor). Apart from these markers, direct vs.
indirect forms are equal, whereas the Cahuilla forms
which I provisionally called direct vs. inverse are
vastly different in shape. Moreover, the Cahuilla forms
express more than simple inversion. This will become clear
as soon as we consider the parallelism between the forms

considered thus far and certain forms of the verb
system.

For a transitive verb stem <u>to eat</u> we have finite
verb forms of the following type:

(6) (i) pe -∅ -k^{W}á-qal   <u>he eats it</u>

      O   -P$_1$ -eat-DUR
     3SG 3SG

   (ii) ʔe -n -k^{W}á-qal   <u>I eat thee</u>

      O   -P$_1$ -eat-DUR
     2SG 1SG

Note that the P$_1$ personal prefixes, which have actor
function here, are the same as those found in the direct
kin expressions. The following forms are of a different
type:

(7) (i) pe -y -k^{W}á?-ik   <u>he is going to eat it</u>

      O   -P$_2$ -eat -OR.REL.
     3SG 3SG

   (ii) ʔe -n -k^{W}á?-ik   <u>I am going to eat thee</u>

      O   -P$_2$ -eat -OR.REL.
     2SG 1SG

These forms are nominal; they show O (object) and P$_2$
(subject) prefixes and they can take an objective case
and a plural suffix. To be still more precise, the forms
are relativized and should be translated as <u>he is one who</u>
<u>is going to eat it</u>, etc. They contain the same affix
-k(a)(t) with the same variants as found in the kin ex-
pressions. As Jacobs (1975:202 f.) has shown, it is a re-
lativizing affix. The meaning, as stated above, is that

of <u>oriented relationship</u>. The meaning of the total forms as in (7) is inceptive (Seiler 1977:92). They are usually glossed by <u>x is [one who is] going to V ....</u>. There is a very close parallelism, indeed, between these nominalized verb forms and the inverse kinship forms studied above.

As a next step in my argument I want to show that for type (6) expressions there is a systematic relation-ship between the actor in transitive verb constructions, and the possessor in possessive constructions, and also between the goal and the possessum. The link between the two systems is constituted by the very productive process of verbal abstract formation. Corresponding to (6)(i) and (ii) we find, respectively,

(8) (i) $\emptyset$ $\;$ $-\emptyset$ $\;$ $-k^{w}\acute{a}-{}^{?}a$ $\qquad$ <u>it is his eating</u> or <u>eats</u>

$\quad$ P_2 $\;$ $-P_1$ $\;$ $-eat-ABSTR$
$\quad$ 3SG $\;$ 3SG

$\quad$ (ii) ${}^{?}et-ne$ $-k^{w}\acute{a}-{}^{?}a$ $\qquad$ <u>thou art my eating</u> or <u>eats</u>

$\quad\quad$ P_2 $\;$ $-P_1$ $\;$ $-eat-ABSTR$
$\quad\quad$ 2SG $\;$ 1SG

Notice that in the transformation from the finite verb form to the verbal abstract noun the object prefix be-comes a P_2 prefix which is coreferential with the idea represented by the stem, i.e. with the possessum; thus in (8)(ii) <u>thou</u> - coming from the object <u>thee</u> - and <u>eating/ eats</u> are coreferent; and the actor of the finite form is represented by the same P_1 prefix as the possessor in the verbal abstract construction. Hence there is exact pro-

portionality between actor and goal on one side and
possessor and possessum on the other. And the expected
or natural thing both for the actor and for the possessor
is that they are nearer to the speaker (more in the focus
of his interest) than are the goal and the possessum.

    5. The question now arises as to the status of type
(7) forms. Let us first look at the full paradigm. All the
forms show the structure $O_{(object)}$ $-P_{2(subject)}$ $-V$ STEM-
-SUFFIX$_{(oriented\ relationship)}$, and they mean <u>subject is going
to V object</u> (V STEM $-k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ-$ <u>eat</u>):

(9) him/I   pe-n-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   him/we   pe-eš-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    him/thou pe-ʔ-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   him/you   pe-ʔeme-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    him/he   pe-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   him/they pe-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    them/I   me-n-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   them/we   me-eš-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

                   ⋮   ⋮

    me/thou ne-ʔ-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   me/you   ne-ʔeme-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    me/he   ne-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   me/they   ne-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    thee/I   ʔe-n-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   thee/we   ʔe-eš-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    thee/he   ʔe-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   thee/they ʔe-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    us/thou čeme-ʔ-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   us/you   čeme-ʔeme-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    us/he   čeme-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   us/they čeme-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    you/I   ʔe-n-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   you/we   ʔeme-eš-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

    you/he   ʔe-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ik   you/they ʔeme-y-$k^{W}\acute{a}ʔ$-ikt-em

The subparadigm with O=3rdPL (<u>them/I</u>, etc.) is not given
in full, the forms being like those for <u>him/I</u>, except
that me- replaces pe-.

    These transitive nominalized verb forms show close

parallelism with such intransitive nominalized verb
forms as,

(10) hen-táxmu-ka   I am going to sing, I am one who is

    P_2 -sing -OR.REL.   going to sing
    1SG

Their relationship to intransitive finite verb forms such as

(11) ne -táxmu-qal   I sing, I am singing

    P_1 -sing -DUR
    1SG

parallels the relationship between forms (7) and (6). Mor-
phophonemic differences are being ignored here. The full

paradigm of (10) is

(12) hen-táxmu-ka   ?eš-táxmu-kat-em
    ?et-táxmu-ka   ?eme-táxmu-kat-em
      táxmu-ka   táxmu-kat-em

    In order to embrace the full range of parallelisms

a further set of forms must be considered. These are the

constructions with predicative nouns of the type x is a y:

(13) né?   hen-?áwal   I am a dog (literally: I I-dog)
    INDEP.PRON.P_2 -dog
    1SG   1SG
    ?é?   ?et-?áwal
    pé?   ?áwal
    čémem   ?eš-?á?wal-em
    ?émem   ?eme-?á?wal-em
    pé?em   ?á?wal-em

    Our problem now consists in accounting for the

parallelisms and in establishing the denominator that is

common to all the forms, including the inverse kin ex-

pressions. On the formal side, they all show P_2 subject
prefixes. In (13) these occur without the -k(a)(t) suffix,
thus we can better see what the function of P_2 is. As
shown in my grammar (Seiler 1977:261 f.) P_2 prefixes have
a key role in higher or logical predications of the type
x is a y. Cahuilla has normally no surface verb represen-
ting the ... is ... Instead, a subject element P_2 is
dissociated from the main or independent subject pronoun,
thus x x-y representing x is a y.[4] The function of P_2 is
that of a dissociated subject. As Jacobs has convincingly
shown (1975:182), Cahuilla ne? hen- exactly corresponds
to the so-called pronoun and enclitic combinations in
Luiseño, Cupeño, and Serrano. Compare the following forms
(Jacobs' analysis slightly modified):

(14) Luiseño:

    (i) noo-n kiháat   I am a child
        I -I child

    (ii) noo-n heel-ax-lut   I am going to sing
        I -I sing- ? -OR.REL.

(15) Cupeño:

    (i) nə?ə-n kiimal   I am a boy
        I   -I boy

    (ii) nə?ə-n haw -i-qat   I am going to sing
        I   -I sing-?-OR.REL.

(16) Serrano:

    (i) nɨ?ɨ-n cicint   I am a boy
        I   -I boy

    (ii) nɨ?ɨ-n caatu-ka?   I am going to sing
        I   -I sing -OR-REL.

As the parallelism shows, x is a y surfaces as x-x y,
while in Cahuilla it surfaces as x x-y. The enclitic of
the three languages corresponds to a proclitic or rather
a prefix in Cahuilla. No doubt that Cahuilla has inno-
vated here.

We further see that the parallelism ties together
both predicative expressions (x is a y) and inceptive ex-
pressions (x is going to y, (more precisely: x is one who
is going to y). Let us remind ourselves that the inceptive
expressions are complex, consisting of a matrix sentence
with a higher predicate I am one, and a relative clause
I am going to V. The dissociation is here between the
subject of the matrix sentence and the identical subject
of the relative clause, P_2 representing the latter. The
former is represented by the independent pronoun ne? I,
etc., which, as Munro (Sauvel and Munro 1979:167) aptly
observed, does not have the reinforcing value which it
shows when combined with finite verb forms. The same as
for the intransitive holds for the transitive inceptive
forms.

Now, the combination of P_2+STEM+-k(a)(t) results
in the inceptive meaning of these intransitive forms,
and so does the combination O+P_2+STEM+-k(a)(t) of the
transitive forms. How does this happen? -k(a)(t), we
said, has the function of an oriented relationship. This
means that a relationship is being established by showing
that it has a point of departure and a goal toward which

the relationship extends. In intransitive inceptive ex-
pressions the point of departure is the dissociated sub-
ject, and the goal is the idea portrayed by the verb
stem. Thus in

(17) né? hen-táxmu-ka   <u>I am going to sing</u>
     I   I -sing -OR.REL.

the relationship extends from <u>I</u> (P_2) to <u>sing</u>. It is a
relationship established, in contradistinction to a re-
lationship (the subject relation) which is presented as
being inherently given with the verb stem and which is
expressed by the finite verb form as in

(18) = (11)

     ne-táxmu-qal   <u>I sing, am singing</u>
     I -sing -DUR

-k(a)(t) is not the only suffix signaling oriented re-
lationship, -wet, -iš and others show this function as
well (plus some additional features, such as habitual).
In transitive inceptive expressions the point of departure
is the dissociated subject, and the goal is the complex
idea portrayed by the verb stem plus the object. Thus in

(19) (cf. (7)(ii))

     né? ?e   -n-k^{W}á?-ik   <u>I am going to eat thee</u>
     I   thee -I-eat -OR.REL.

the relationship extends from <u>I</u> (P_2=-n-) to the complex
O...STEM (?e...k^{W}a?-). It is again a relationship estab-
lished, in contradistinction to an inherent relationship
where it is taken for granted that both the subject and

- 15 -

the object inherently belong to the transitive verb
stem. We conclude that establishing a relationship
subject/verb itr. or subject/verb tr. - instead of pre-
senting this relationship as inherent - produces the
meaning of inceptivity.

And now, how does this all relate to those kinship
expressions which we have provisionally termed as inverse?
They are establishing also, and they contrast with the
so-called direct ones, which are inherent. We might now
abandon our provisional terminology regarding kin ex-
pressions and replace them by the more appropriate terms
of inherent vs. establishing. We remember that a kin
term posits two arguments, one of them being coreferent
with the kin term itself. In the inherent kin expressions
the possessor appears as inherently given. In the estab-
lishing kin expressions the possessor appears as a dis-
sociated subject, and it is the starting point of the
relationship, while the possessum appears as its goal,
and thus we understand, why the argument which is core-
ferent with the kin term itself surfaces as an object
prefix.

Compare the interaction between the entities of
possessum (italics) and possessor (bold face), nearer
and further, and the prefixes P_1, P_2, and O in the
following chart:

(20) POSSESSUM   further P_2 in $\underline{P_2}\text{-}P_1\text{-niece}$ relational

               nearer   O in $\underline{O}\text{-}P_2\text{-niece}$ establishing

    POSSESSOR nearer P_1 in $P_2\text{-}\underline{\underline{P_1}}\text{-niece}$ relational

               further P_2 in $O\text{-}\underline{\underline{P_2}}\text{-niece}$ establishing

Notice that P_2 always represents the subject that is
further removed. The establishing kin expression is
chosen in that less expected, less natural case where
the possessum is the nearer, and the possessor is the
further referent. The inherent kin expression is chosen,
when the situation is reversed. But the distinction
between the two situations, as has been shown above and
as the terms indicate, amounts to more than a mere re-
versal.

It may be added that the same inherent/establishing
distinction as described for kin terms holds for body
organ and for implement terms (further details in Seiler
1977:283 f.).

I suspect that at least the Cupan languages, but
probably also other related languages (Serrano) show
the inherent/establishing distinction for kin terms,
body organ and implement terms, although I have not come
across yet conclusive data in the relevant literature. I
hope that my synoptic treatment of kin expressions and
inceptive and similar verb forms will not only help to
understand the former but that it will also help to solve
the question of why an important portion of the verb

system, such as the inceptive, habitual, completed ex-
pressions, appears in nominalized and relativized form
- a question raised but left unanswered in my grammar
(Seiler 1977:274). Inceptive and similar functions are
achieved by the device of establishing a relationship,
which, in turn, is achieved by embedding into a matrix
sentence of higher predication (x is a y). The pro-
cedure has nothing exotic - if we compare it, e.g.,
with the expanded form in English (I am going to sing).

6. One last set of facts of Cahuilla needs to be
appended: For a considerable number - about 30% - of
Cahuilla kin expressions we find that reciprocal terms
are almost identical in shape, except that the expression
referring to the descending generation is longer by a
consonant, or a vowel, or a consonant plus vowel. In
comparison with this longer form, which has stress on
the first syllable of the stem, stress is shifted onto
the prefix in the ascendent monosyllabic forms. The
stress shift may serve the purpose of differentiation
(Seiler: forthcoming). With the P_1 prefix in the first
person we find the following forms:

(21) né-nes   m o sis   né-kum   f o br

    ne-nési   wm's y sis ch   ne-kúmu   mn's y br ch

    né-qa   f f   né-su$^{?}$ m m

    ne-qála   mn's s ch   ne-súla   wm's d ch

    né-k^{w}a   m's f   né-qex   gf's sis

    ne-k^{w}ála   mn's d ch   ne-qéxe   wm's br's gch

Cupeño and Luiseño seem to show similar pairs, although
the "increments" marking the descendent generation are
different.[5] Kawaiisu is another related language for which
such a situation has been reported. Given the descendent
term, the corresponding ascendent can be derived from it
by a simple set of rules such as: Delete final -la where
it occurs, or else delete final vowel. It remains to be
seen in the more closely and the more distantly related
languages whether the existence of two types of kin ex-
pression and the near-identity of reciprocal kin terms
condition each other. I have no doubt that there is a
close connection between the two phenomena.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This is a revised version of a paper read at the Eighth Uto-Aztecan Working Conference held at Albuquerque, N.M., June 22-23, 1980. It is incorporated in the akup series because it inaugurates research work on a new dimension within our UNITYP project: The dimension which we call Inherence vs. Ascription (Inhärenz vs. Zuschreibung). The earlier paper (Seiler 1980: 229-236) is identical with akup 27 (1977): Both represent an earlier stage in the explanation of this problem.

[2]This refers to a boy (nephew) or a girl (niece), as the case may be. For brevity's sake I use niece as a gloss in my translations.

[3]See, e.g. the description of the situation in Potowatomi by Hockett (1966:59-73).

[4]I presume that the abstract entity AUX introduced in such instances by S. Steele (1975) serves, among others, the purpose of representing this state of affairs.

[5]R. Langacker (forthcoming) has proposed that the increment -ma in Luiseño represents the diminutive.

REFERENCES

Hockett, Charles F. 1966. What Algonquian is really like.
   IJAL 32.59-73.

Jacobs, Roderick A. 1975. Syntactic Change. A Cupan (Uto-
   Aztecan) Case Study. University of California Publications
   in Linguistics 79. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: UC Press.

Langacker, Ronald. Forthcoming. The integration of grammar
   and grammatical change. Symposium on Uto-Aztecan Historical
   Linguistics. Albuquerque, N.M., June 24-26, 1980.

Sauvel, Katherine Siva, and Pamela Munro. 1979. Chem'ivillu'
   (Let's Speak Cahuilla). Preliminary version.

Seiler, Hansjakob. 1977. Cahuilla Grammar. Morongo Indian
   Reservation, Banning (Ca.): Malki Museum Press

Seiler, Hansjakob. 1980. Two systems of Cahuilla kinship
   expressions: labeling and descriptive. American Indian and
   Indoeuropean Studies. Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler,
   ed. by Kathryn Klar, Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver
   (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 16), 229-236.
   The Hague-Paris-New York: Mouton Publishers.

Seiler, Hansjakob. Forthcoming. Discussion of Pamela Munro's
   paper 'Phonological vignettes in Uto-Aztecan', Symposium on
   Uto-Aztecan Historical Linguistics. Albuquerque, N.M.,
   June 24-26, 1980.

Steele, Susan. 1975. The Auxiliary in Uto-Aztecan: Comparison
   and Reconstruction. Mimeo. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University.

In der Reihe akup erscheinen die Arbeiten des Kölner
Universalienprojekts (DFG-Projekt, Leitung Prof. Dr.
Hansjakob Seiler). Die Nummern 1-15 sind erschienen
als Linguistic Workshop I-III (LW I, LW II, LW III),
München: Fink 1973-75.

1. Seiler, H. 1973, "Das Universalienkonzept", LW I, 6-19.
2. Lehmann, C. 1973, "Wortstellung in Fragesätzen", LW I, 20-53.
3. Ibañez, R. 1973, "Programmatische Skizze: Intonation
   und Frage", LW I, 54-61.
4. Brettschneider, G. 1973, "'Sexus' im Baskischen: Die
   sprachliche Umsetzung einer kognitiven Kategorie",
   LW I, 62-72.
5. Stephany, U. 1973, "Zur Rolle der Wiederholung in der
   sprachlichen Kommunikation zwischen Kind und Erwachsenen",
   LW I, 73-98.
6. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance: Instru-
   mental, Comitative and Collective (With special reference
   to German)", LW II, 2-55.
7. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance in
   Uto-Aztecan", LW II, 56-68.
8. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Prinzipien für 'Universal 14'",
   LW II, 69-97.
9. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Isomorphismus im sprachlichen
   Zeichen", LW II, 98-123.
10. Seiler, H. 1975, "Die Prinzipien der deskriptiven und
    der etikettierenden Benennung", LW III, 2-57.
11. van den Boom, H. 1975, "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und
    Grammatik am Beispiel des neuinterpretierten λ-Ope-
    rators", LW III, 58-92.
12. Untermann, J. 1975, "Etymologie und Wortgeschichte",
    LW III, 93-116.
13. Lehmann, C. 1975, "Strategien für Relativsätze",
    LW III, 117-156.
14. Ultan, R. 1975, "Infixes and their origins"
    LW III, 157-205.

15. Stephany, U. 1975. "Linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the interpretation of children's early utterances", LW III: 206-233.
16. Ultan, R. 1975. "Descriptivity grading of Finnish body-part terms"
17. Lehmann, C. 1975. "Determination, Bezugsnomen und Pronomen im Relativsatz"
18. Seiler, H. 1975. "Language Universals and Interlinguistic Variation"
19. Holenstein, E. 1975. "Semiotische Philosophie?"
20. Seiler, H. 1976. "Introductory Notes to a Grammar of Cahuilla" (To appear in Linguistic Studies offered to Joseph Greenberg on the occasion of his 60th birthday)
21. Ultan, R. 1976. "Descriptivity in the Domain of Body-Part Terms"
22. Boom, H. van den. 1976. "Bedeutungsexplikation und materiale Implikation"
23. Seiler, H. 1977(a). "The Cologne Project on Language Universals: Questions, Objectives, and Prospects" Seiler, H. 1977(b). "Determination: A Functional Dimension for Interlanguage Comparison" (final version of Seiler, H. 1976 "Determination ...", published as akup 23, 1976).
    (To appear in: Papers from the Gummersbach Conference on Language Universals. The Hague: Mouton)
24. Moshinsky, J. 1976. "Measuring Nominal Descriptivity"
25. Seiler, H. (ed.) 1976. "Materials for the DFG International Research Conference on Language Universals"
26. Walter, H. 1976. "Das Problem der Deskriptivität am Beispiel deutscher Verbalderivation"
27. Seiler, H. 1977. "Two Systems of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Labeling and Descriptive" (To appear in the Festschrift for Madison S. Beeler)
28. Holenstein, E. 1977. "Motive der Universalienforschung"
29. Virkkunen, P. 1977. "Zum Ausdruck der notivischen Bestimmtheit im Finnischen. Mit einer Schlußbemerkung zum typologischen Vergleich des Französischen und des Finnischen von Wolfgang Raible".

30. Kölver, Ulrike. 1977. "Nominalization and Lexicalization in Modern Newari".

31. van den Boom, Holger. 1978. "Paradigmenwechsel als Notationswechsel: Saussure - Chomsky".

32. Holenstein, Elmar. 1978. "Von der Hintergehbarkeit der Sprache (und der Erlanger Schule)".

33. Ramat, Paolo. 1978. "Y a-t-il une typologie profonde? (quelques considérations théoriques (et pratiques)".

34. Kölver, Ulrike. 1979. "Syntaktische Untersuchung von Numeralklassifikatoren im Zentralthai".

35. Holenstein, Elmar. 1979. "Zur Begrifflichkeit der Universalienforschung in der Linguistik und Anthropologie".

36. Lehmann, Christian. 1979. "Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium seiner Grammatik".

37. Serzisko, Fritz. 1980. "Sprachen mit Zahlklassifikatoren: Analyse und Vergleich."

38. Barron, Roger. 1980. "Das Phänomen klassifikatorischer Verben in nordamerikanischen Indianersprachen: Ein typologischer Versuch".