1978

On Zuni 'Passives'

Curtis D. Cook
SIL-UND

Donald G. Frantz
SIL-UND

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers

ON ZUNI "PASSIVES"[1]

Curtis D. Cook and Donald G. Frantz

0. Stout (1973) describes inflection of Zuni verbs which are made up of transitive stems plus "static" suffix -na, as exemplified in (1) and (2):

(1) a:w-akcek   a:w-utte-na-'ka

    pl-boy   abs.pl-bite-stat-pst

    The boys were bitten.

(2) a:-ƛašši k   a:w-una-ti-na-'ka

    pl-man   abs.pl-see-inch-stat-pst

    The old men were seen.

Exploring the utility of a "Chomskyan" approach to Zuni transitivity, she posits a "static transformation", which she likens to English passivization. The purpose of this paper is to investigate whether or not such clauses are 'passive' as this term is defined within the relational grammar (RG) framework.[2]

1. According to Perlmutter and Postal (1977), passivization is the advancement of a direct object (DO) to subject (SU), in a clause which "already" has a SU (in the preceding stratum). As a consequence of this advancement, the former SU is put en chomage (a special status), and the clause is intransitive (by definition, since there is no final DO). We will thus be testing the initial DO of sentences such as (1) and (2) for SU and DO properties.

2. Zuni subject and object properties

    2.1 Clear cases of first and second person pronouns as subject in both intransitive and transitive clauses have a distinctive form; contrast

the pronouns of (3) - (6) with those of (7) - (9); the latter have the
non-subject form (glossed <u>obj</u>):

(3) ho'   i:kwa:nik'-e:-'a

     1:sg:subj   work-cont-pres

I'm working.

(4) to'   a:n-uwa

     2:sg:subj   go-fut

You (sg) will go.

(5) ho'   mulo:čikw(a)   ito-ka

     1:sg:subj   cookie/cake   eat-pst

I ate the cake/cookie.

(6) to'   waccit(a)   una-'ka

     2:sg:subj   dog   see-pst

You (sg) saw the dog.

(7) waccita   hom   utte-ka

     dog   1:sg:obj   bite-pst

The dog bit me.

(8) akcek   tom   una-'ka

     boy   2:sg:obj   see-pst

The boy saw you (sg).

(9) akcek   hom   mulo:čikw(a)   uk-ka

     boy   1:sg:obj   cake

The boy gave the cake to me.

If the static clauses in question are passive, a first or second person
initial DO should have the final SU form. But as (10) and (11) show,
they do not:

(10) hom   una-ti-na-'ka

l:sg:obj   see-inch-stat-pst

I was seen.

(11) tom   utte-na-'ka

2:sg:obj   bite-stat-pst

You (sg) were bitten.

2.2 As Stout demonstrates very nicely, Zuni verbs are marked for
plurality of subject and object. The most common marker is a prefix
which has allomorphs a:w- and a:- (the latter before a consonant). This
prefix occurs on verbs with a plural <u>absolutive</u> (SU of intransitive, DO
of a transitive), as illustrated in (12) - (14):[3]

(12) hon   a:-te'či-ka

l:pl:subj   abs.pl-arrive-pst

We (3 or more) arrived.

(13) a:w-akcek   a:w-a:-ka

pl-boy   abs.pl-go-pst

Boys (3 or more) went.

(14) ho'   mulo:čikw(a-:) a:w-ito-ka

l:sg:subj   cake-pl   abs.pl-eat-pst

I ate the cakes/cookies.

(15) akcek   to'n(a')   a:w-una-ye

boy   2:pl:obj   abs.pl-see-pres

The boy sees you (pl).

There is also a suffix with several allomorphs, including -na:w and -nap,
which is triggered by a plural <u>ergative</u> (SU of transitive verb), as
illustrated in (16) - (18):

(16) hon   mulo:čikw(a-:) a:w-ito-nap-ka

l:pl:subj   cake-pl   abs.pl-eat-erg.pl-pst

We ate the cakes/cookies.

(17) a:w-akcek   tom   šem-e:-na:w-e

     pl-boy   2:sg:obj   call-cont-erg.pl-pres

The boys are calling you (sg).

(18) waccita   hom   utte-nap-ka

     dog   1:sg:obj   bite-erg.pl-pst

The dogs bit me.

Unfortunately, verb agreement provides no evidence that will help decide the passivity issue. Because it is absolutive status which is necessary for a plural nominal to trigger pluralizer a:w- ∼ a:- , we cannot tell whether *cakes* in (19) is triggering a:w- because it is final SU of a passive or because it is final DO:

(19) mulo:čikw(a-:)   a:w-ito-na-'ka

     cake-pl   abs.pl-eat-stat-pst

The cakes were eaten.

Nor can the ergative plural suffix help us, for the static construction in question is used only when the initial ergative is completely unspecified. Obviously, this rules out the possibility that the initial ergative will ever be plural in these sentences; consequently, even as non-passives these verbs will never take the ergative plural suffix.

    2.3 The unmarked word order in Zuni is SOV, as has been amply illustrated in examples (3) - (18). Here again we get no help in deciding our question of passivization, for an initial DO will occur before the verb whether it is a final SU or final DO.[4]

    2.4 Among the clause subordinators of Zuni, there are at least two which involve subject coreferentiality constraints. -n ∼ -nam requires that the dependent clause which it marks have the <u>same</u> SU as the main clause, as illustrated in (20) - (23):[5]

(20) hon   a:-te'či-nan,   hon   mulo:čikw(a-:)   a:w-ito-nap-ka

     1:pl:subj abs.pl-arrive-sub, 1:pl:subj cake-pl abs.pl-eat-erg.pl-pst

When we arrived, we ate the cakes.

(21) *hon   a:-te'či-nan,   a:w-akcek   ho'n   a:w-una-p-ka

     1:pl:subj abs.pl-arrive-sub, pl-boy   1:pl:obj
                                                    abs.pl-see-erg.pl-pst

When we arrived, the boys saw us.

(22)   waccita   utte-nan,   yutula-'ka

        dog   bite-sub,   run=away-pst

When the dog_j bit him_k, he_j ran away.

(23)   waccita   utte-nan,   akcek   yutula-'ka

        dog   bite-sub,   boy   run=away-pst

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{*When the dog bit him,} \\ \text{When he bit the dog,} \end{array} \right\}$ *the boy ran away.*

-p ~ -ap requires that the dependent clause to which it is attached have a SU <u>different</u> from that of the main clause, as illustrated in (24) - (27):

(24)   *hon   a:-te'či-p,   (hon) mulo:čikwi(a-:)   a:w-itoi-nap-ka

        1:pl:subj   abs.pl-arrive-sub, 1:pl:subj   cake-pl   abs.pl-eat-
                                                                    erg.pl-pst

When we arrived, we ate the cakes.

(25)   hon   a:-te'či-p,   a:w-akcek   ho'n   a:w-una-p-ka

        1:pl:subj abs.pl-arrive-sub, pl-boy   1:pl:obj abs.pl-see-erg.pl-
                                                                     pst

When we arrived, the boys saw us.

(26)   waccita   utt-ap,   yutula-'ka

        dog   bite-sub,   run=away-pst

When the dog_j bit him_k, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} he_k \\ *he_j \end{array} \right\}$ *ran away.*

(27)   waccita   utt-ap,   akcek   yutula-'ka

        dog   bite-sub,   boy   run=away-pst

When the dog bit him, the boy ran away.

If Zuni static clauses are passive, then we would expect these coreferentiality constraints to be sensitive to coreferentiality with the initial DO of the putative passives. But as we see in (28) - (31), we get just the results we would expect if the initial DO is <u>not</u> the final SU:

(28) *hon   a:-te'či-nan, $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{hon} \\ \text{ho'n} \end{Bmatrix}$ a:w-una-ti-na-'ka

    1:pl:subj   abs.pl-arrive-sub,   1:pl: $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{subj} \\ \text{obj} \end{Bmatrix}$ abs.pl-see-inch-
                                                                                          stat-pst

When we arrived, we were seen.

(29) *utte-nak-nan,   yutula-'ka

    bite-stat-sub,   run=away-pst

When he$_j$ was bitten, $\begin{Bmatrix} he_j \\ he_k \end{Bmatrix}$ *ran away.*

(30) hon   a:-te'či-p,   ho'n   a:w-una-ti-na-'ka

    1:pl:subj   abs.pl-arrive-sub,   1:pl:obj   abs.pl-see-inch-stat-pst

When we arrived, we were seen.

(31) utte-nak-'ap   yutula-'ka

    bite-stat-sub   run=away-pst

When he was bitten, he ran away.

    2.5 As Cook and Frantz (to appear) demonstrate, a possessor coreferential with the SU of the governing verb is realized by anaphoric element yam (glossed <u>poss</u>), illustrated by (32) and (33):

(32) yam   ho'   ačiyann-akka   apc'i-ka

    poss   1:sg:subj   knife-instr   cut-pst

I cut it with my knife.

(33) yam   ačiyann-akka   hom   apc'i-ka

    poss   knife-instr   1:sg:obj   cut-pst

He cut me with $\begin{Bmatrix} his \\ *my \end{Bmatrix}$ *knife.*

If the initial DO of static clauses is final SU, then it should control yam. But speakers reject sentences such as (34) if they contain yam:

(34) hom   apc'i-na-'ka $\begin{Bmatrix} *\text{yam} \\ \text{hom} \end{Bmatrix}$ ačiyann-akka

    1:sg:obj   cut-stat-pst   1:sg:poss   knife-instr

I was cut with my knife.

2.6 As illustrated in (36) - (40), the markers -ya' and -ona' can be used to help indicate "first object"[6] status, especially if the unmarked SOV word order is violated, as in (38):

(36) akcek   ƛašši̱k(-'on)   una-'ka

boy   man-obj   see-pst

The boy saw the old man.

(37) ho'   luk-ya'   una-ka'

1:sg:subj   this-obj   see-pst

I saw this.

(38) a:w-akcek-'ona   waccit(a)   a:w-utte-nap-ka

pl-boy-obj   dog   abs.pl-bite-erg.pl-pst

The dogs bit the boys.

(39) ho'   akcek-'ona   mulo:čikw(a)   uk-ka

1:sg:subj   boy-obj   cake   give-pst

I gave the cake to the boy.

As (40) and (41) show, these suffixes cannot be attached to what are clearly final SU's:

*(40) a:w-akcek-'ona   a:-te'či-ka

pl-boy-obj   abs.pl-arrive-pst

The boys arrived.

(41) akcek   waccita-ya'   utte-ka

boy   dog-obj   bite-pst

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{*}\textit{The dog bit the boy.} \\ \textit{The boy bit the dog.} \end{array} \right\}$$

Applying this test to the initial DO's of statics, we find that they behave as final DO's:

(42) akcek-'on   utte-na-'ka

boy-obj   bite-stat-pst

The boy was bitten.

(43) a:-tač̌č̌-(on)   a:w-una-ti-na-'ka

    pl-father-obj   abs.pl-see-inch-stat-pst

The fathers were seen.

3. A number of subject and object properties are discussed above.
Of these, those which potentially serve as a test of whether or not Zuni
clauses such as (1) and (2) are passive as defined within RG, indicate
that such sentences are not passive; i.e., the evidence overwhelmingly
supports an analysis in which the initial DO of such clauses is also
final DO.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Newman (1965) for description of Zuni morphology (though we
differ in a few minor details). Cook is primarily responsible for the
data and its analysis, while Frantz takes major responsibility for the
discussion. Abbreviations used in this paper include: abs=absolutive;
cont=continuative aspect; DO=direct object; erg=ergative; fut=future;
inch=inchoative; obj=objective case; pl=plural; poss=possessive; pres=
present; pst=past; RG=relational grammar; sg=singular; stat=static;
sub=subordinator; SU=subject; subj=subjective case; 1=first person;
2=second person; 3=third person.

[2] This is not a critique of Stout's analysis, for her description
utilized a framework in which passivization can have no universal charac-
terization, as Keenan (1975) and Perlmutter and Postal (1977) show.

[3] There are verbs which instead of a:w- or a:-, take a prefix t-~ te-,
and others which have a suppletive stem with a plural absolutive.

[4] Stout (1973) described her static transformation as a rule moving an
object to the front, but this was necessary only because she assumed
phrase structure rules which generated an English-like linear order of
constituents. With the phrase structure rules she posited, she would
have needed a transformation to place objects before the verb even in the
ordinary transitive cases.

[5] As has become common practice, an asterisk marks either: an ungramma-
tical sentence; an interpretation that a given sentence cannot have; or a
form, the presence of which would make a sentence ungrammatical.

[6] Here we are using Stout's term so as to avoid committing ourselves on
the final status of initial IO's in sentences such as (39). We plan to
deal with these in Cook and Frantz (in preparation).

REFERENCES

Cook, C. and D. Frantz. To appear. "Zuni yam."

..... In preparation. "Relational grammar looks at Zuni transitivity."

Keenan, E. 1975. "Some universals of passive in relational grammar." Papers from the Eleventh Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Newman, S. 1965. Zuni Grammar. University of New Mexico Publications in Anthropology, No. 14.

Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal. 1977. "Toward a universal characterization of passivization." Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Stout, C. 1973. "Problems of a Chomskyan analysis of Zuni transitivity." International Jornal of American Linguistics 39:4.