



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>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cook, Curtis D. and Frantz, Donald G. (1978) "On Zuni "passives"," *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*: Vol. 22 , Article 2.

DOI: 10.31356/silwp.vol22.02

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers/vol22/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

ON ZUNI "PASSIVES"¹

Curtis D. Cook and Donald G. Frantz

0. Introduction and purpose
1. Definition of 'passive' in relational grammar
2. Zuni subject and object properties
 - 2.1 Pronominal form
 - 2.2. Verb agreement
 - 2.3 Word order
 - 2.4 Dependent clause markers
 - 2.5 Control of yam
 - 2.6 Object markers
3. Conclusion

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:-ʎaššik 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 obj):

- (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

1: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 absolutive (SU of intransitive, DO of a transitive), as illustrated in (12) - (14):³

(12) hon a:-te'či-ka

1: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

1: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 ergative (SU of transitive verb), as illustrated in (16) - (18):

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

1: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 same 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

*{*When the dog bit him,
 When he bit the dog,} the boy ran away.*

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

- (24) *hon a:-te'či-p, (hon) mulo:čikw(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, { he_k
 he_j } 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 not the final SU:

- (28) *hon a:-te'či-nan, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{hon} \\ \text{ho}'\text{n} \end{array} \right\}$ a:w-una-ti-na-'ka
 1:pl:subj abs.pl-arrive-sub, 1:pl: $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{subj} \\ \text{obj} \end{array} \right\}$ 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, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{he}_j \\ \text{he}_k \end{array} \right\}$ 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 poss), 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 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{his} \\ *my \end{array} \right\}$ 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 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *yam \\ \text{hom} \end{array} \right\}$ 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 ʎaššik(-'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
 { *The dog bit the boy. }
 { The boy bit the dog. }

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:-tačč-(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=absolute; 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 characterization, 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 absolute.

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 ungrammatical 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 Journal of American Linguistics 39:4.