

On the Form of Negative Sentences in Kawaiisu

Author(s): Pamela Munro

Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1976), pp. 308-318

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

On the Form of Negative Sentences in Kawaiisu¹
 Pamela Munro
 University of California, Los Angeles

Simple negative sentences in Kawaiisu, a language of the Southern Numic sub-family of Uto-Aztecan, have a number of unusual characteristics which make them look remarkably like embedded clauses. In this note I will summarize the data on simple negatives in Kawaiisu, examine the morphological and syntactic similarities between such sentences and some Kawaiisu subordinate clauses, and discuss why these similarities might exist.

Kawaiisu negative sentences include the negative marker yuwaati, which always appears in first or second position in the sentence, and differ from the corresponding affirmatives in several ways. Two of the most important of these are that the logical subject of a negative sentence appears in object rather than subject form and that the verb carries the "Series II" tense endings, rather than the "Series I" endings which generally are used on the verbs of affirmative main clauses.² In addition, there are special word order restrictions on negative sentences, and conjoined subjects take an unexpected form in the negative. The following pair of sentences exemplifies some of these differences:³

- (1a) ta?nipuzi pikee-kidiina momo'o-na 'The man saw
 man see-past=SI=3anim woman-obj the woman'
 b) yuwaati ta?nipuzi-a pikee-keeneeneena momo'o-na
 neg man-obj see-past=III=3anim=3anim woman-obj
 'The man didn't see the woman'

In (1a), the subject 'man' is unmarked (nominative) and the verb has a Series I ending. In (1b), 'man' is objective (there are a number of nominal object endings, the most common of which is -a), yuwaati occurs in initial position, and the verb has a Series II ending.

The basic forms of the two series of tense endings are⁴

	Series I	Series II
present/immediate past	-di(-) [rarely -ri(-)]	-na-
past	-kidi(-)	-keena-
future	vaadi(-)	-vaana-

The Series I endings may be used alone or with following object clitics (which may change the quality of an ending's final vowel: for instance, in (1a), past -kidi plus third-person animate invisible -ina yields -kidiina). The Series II endings, however, virtually always occur with both subject and object clitics: e.g., in (1b) past -keena- is followed by two third-person animate invisible clitics: -keena- plus -ina- plus -ina- yields -keeneeneena. The pronominal clitics which mark subject and object in these forms are the same as those which may be suffixed to noun stems to show possession. (Independent noun or pronoun possessors appear in Kawaiisu

in the object form along with the possessed noun and its suffixed possessive clitic.) It should be noted that the various two-clitic combinations occur in set orders, regardless of the grammatical relations in the sentence: thus third-person visible plus first person is always -ana-ni (3anim-1), for instance, regardless of whether 'he' or 'I' is the subject.

Here is a contrastive paradigm of affirmative versus negative sentences:

(2)

ni?i abigi-di 'I'm talking'	yuwaati abigi-na-ni 'I'm not talking'
I talk-SI	neg talk-SII-1
ni?i abigi-kidi 'I talked'	yuwaati abigi-keena-ni 'I didn't talk'
ni?i abigi-vaadi 'I'm going to talk'	yuwaati abigi-vaana-ni 'I'm not going to talk'

Notice that independent pronouns are used to indicate the subject of affirmative sentences; these may be deleted, however, if the context is clear.⁵

There appear to be a few exceptions to the rule that negative sentences always take Series II endings. Most if not all of them, however, are negative sentences whose affirmative versions do not take Series I endings. There appears to be a generalization that if the predicate of a sentence is nominal (as exemplified below), it takes essentially no ending in the affirmative and only pronominal clitics in the negative.⁶

This rule holds, for instance, for predicate nominals. A nonnegative copular sentence consists simply of two unmarked nouns, but its negative counterpart is much more complicated. The predicate noun appears in unmarked (non-object) form followed by the clitic which corresponds to the subject of the sentence (which, however, since it is the subject of a negated sentence, shows up in the object form):

- (3a) ni?i pohagadi 'I'm a doctor'
I doctor
- b) nigaya yuwaati pohagadi-ni 'I'm not a doctor'
me neg doctor-1
- (4a) sumana kuhma-ni 'That's my husband'
that husband-1
- b) yuwaati sumana-ya kuhma-ana-ni 'That's not my husband'
neg that-obj husband-3anim-1 husband'

(Note that the possessive clitic follows the subject clitic in (4b).)

- (5) yuwaati Rochelli-ana sumana-ya 'That's not Rochelle'
neg Rochelle-3anim that-obj chelle'⁷

'Have' sentences also appear to be basically predicate nominal in character, and similarly do not take the standard endings. The affirmative 'have' construction includes the possessed noun

plus the possessive suffix -gadi, which is essentially a nominalizer (meaning something like 'possessor'--it also shows up in derived nouns like pohagadi 'doctor'--cf. Southern Paiute poa 'supernatural power'), so 'I have a dog' might be more literally translated as 'I am a dog-haver'. -gadi is not used in negative 'have' sentences (which are probably existential: 'I don't have a dog' means 'My dog doesn't exist'):

- (6a) niʔi kahni-gadi 'I have a house'
 I house-haver
 b) yuwaati kahni-ni 'I don't have a house'
 neg house-l
 (7a) niʔi kuhma-gadi 'I have a husband'; 'I'm married'
 I husband-haver
 b) yuwaati kuhma-ni 'I don't have a husband'; 'I'm not
 neg husband-l married'

Postpositional phrases are another group of nominal-like predicates which take neither Series I nor Series II endings, but which do take subject clitics in the negative:

- (8a) oovi kahni-paana 'The salt is in the house'
 salt house-in
 b) yuwaati oovi-ta kahni-paaneeka 'The salt isn't in
 neg salt-obj house-in=3inan the house'
 (9a) puguzi natiʔi-weʔe kahni-paana 'The dog and the cat
 dog cat-with house-in are in the house'
 b) puguzi-a natiʔi-weʔe yuwaati kahni-paana-ami
 dog-obj cat-with neg house-in-3pl
 'The dog and the cat aren't in the house'

The characteristics which distinguish negative from non-negative main clauses--the form of the subject noun, word order restrictions, and the use of the Series II verb endings with accompanying subject clitics--all indicate that Kawaiisu negative sentences look like embedded clauses.

It is typical, for example, for the subjects of almost all embedded clauses in Kawaiisu to appear in object form. Consider the following pairs of non-embedded and embedded clauses:

- (10a) taʔnipuzi paykwee-kidi 'The man left'
 man leave-past=SI
 b) pucuzogi-kidiika taʔnipuzi-a paykwee-neena
 know=past=SI=3inan man-obj leave-SII=3anim
 'I know that the man left'
 (11a) Cecilia churchi-vadokwee-kidi 'Cecilia went to
 Cecilia church-go=to-past=SI church'
 b) niʔi pucugi-riika Cecilia-ya churchi-vadokwee-
 I know-SI=3inan Cecilia-obj church-go=to-
 keena-ana 'I remember that Cecilia went to
 past=SII-3anim church'

- (12a) ta?nɪpuzi osorɪni-dɪ 'The man is snoring'
 man snore-SI
- b) nɪ?ɪ ku?usubɪgɪ-diika ta?nɪpuzi-a osorɪni-na-ana
 I like-SI=3inan man-obj snore-SII-3anim
 'I like men who snore'; more literally, 'I like (it
 for) a man to snore' [Note that 'like', like 'know'
 in (10b) and (11b) is marked for an inanimate (sentential) object.]

In each case, the subject of the embedded clause appears with an object ending--just as it would if it were the subject of a simple negative sentence.

Word order restrictions also make negative sentences look like affirmative main clauses. In a simple nonnegative transitive sentence, the order of subject, object, and verb is extremely free--any of these three elements may begin a sentence, and, in fact, all six possible orders of these elements have been recorded in response to elicited sentences with normal English word order. But while the order of the elements of a negative sentence following the negative yuwaatɪ appears to be moderately free, only the logical subject noun phrase of a negative sentence may come before yuwaatɪ. The order yuwaatɪ S is, I think, the source for the more complex order SUBJECT yuwaatɪ REST-OF-S; the subject-first order apparently is functionally motivated--it occurs most commonly when the grammatical role of the object-marked subject noun might not be clear because of the presence of some other object-marked (object) noun in the negated sentence. On the other hand, the subject is seldom preposed in intransitive negative sentences, in which the subject is the only object-marked noun. The fact that the subject is the only element of a negative sentence (other than yuwaatɪ) which may occur in initial position means that the word order in simple negative sentences is greatly restricted, compared to that in simple affirmative sentences. But this restriction makes negated sentences seem like embedded clauses, for elements of embedded clauses may not freely be moved out of their clauses. The fact that only the subject of a negative may be moved before yuwaatɪ, and then, apparently, mainly only to avoid potential ambiguity, suggests that the limits of a negated clause are strictly marked in the same way that those of an embedded clause are.⁹

The use of the Series II endings is another indication that the negated verbs on which they occur are more like the verbs of embedded or nominalized clauses than the verbs of nonnegative sentences marked with Series I endings. For Series II endings are characteristic of a large number of types of Kawaiisu embedded clauses--all the embedded (b) sentences in (10)-(12), for example, have verbs with Series II endings. In fact, a negative embedded clause may look very similar to a negative main clause.¹⁰

Series II endings are often associated with sentence embedding or nominalization, I believe, because the -na- which these endings contain may be identified with the reconstructable

Southern Numic nominalizer *-na-.¹¹ (The Kawaiisu Series II -na- appears as -nee- in combination with a following third-person invisible clitic (-ina- animate; -ika- inanimate)--the change of ai to ee is very common in Kawaiisu (and Numic generally).)

If the Series II -na- is a nominalizer, we would not expect Series II endings to be used on any main clauses. These endings do not often show up on nonnegative main clauses, but there are a few puzzling exceptions--for instance, they are used with certain adjectival predicates:

- (13) ^vpisaa-neena 'She's pretty'
pretty-SII=3anim
- (14) hi?i-neeka... 'It's good that...'
good-SII=3anim

Another case in which Series II endings appear on the verbs of main clauses is when those verbs are reflexive in some way. True reflexives (in my data, with either the reflexive verb prefix ni- or the independent reflexive pronoun niwayi) may apparently occur with either Series I or Series II verbs, although in my data the Series I form is more common. The same is true for sentences using the special reflexive pronoun nanosu 'by oneself; alone'. (15) shows the two possibilities for verbs with prefixed ni-:

- (15a) ni-vi~~ke~~ee-di ni?i 'I looked at myself'
refl-see-SI I
- b) ni-vi~~ke~~ee-neena 'He looked at himself'
refl-see-SII=3anim

The third case I have discovered in which Series II endings are generally used on apparent main clauses is in texts--one example is sentence (16):

- (16) niwizirikizi ^vni?itii-neena hopakidii-paana...
wild=canary make=fire-SII=3anim hole-in
'Wild Canary made a fire in a hole...'

It is hard to see why the Series II endings show up in these three cases. There is no indication that any of the Series II-marked main clauses in (13)-(16) is "embedded"¹² (consider, for instance, that the subject of (16), 'wild canary', is unmarked--i.e., in main-clause subject form). On the other hand, it is striking that so few main clauses take Series II verb endings, while so many subordinate clauses do. (No subordinate clauses appear to take the regular set of Series I endings.¹³) On the whole, the use of Series II endings on the verbs of negated main clauses is compatible with the theory that these clauses look morphologically nominalized, even though the appearance of these endings does not provide conclusive proof for the theory.

If the Series II endings do include nominalizing -na-,

two further facts about these endings and Kawaiisu negative sentences are explained. First, the reason that the -na- of the Series II ending does not show up when the sentence has a nominal predicate of some sort (cf. sentences (3)-(9)) is of course that such predicates have no need of any additional nominalization.

Also, it is clear why the subject of a Series II-marked verb is indicated by a pronominal clitic--a clitic of the same shape as those which mark objects on both Series I and Series II-marked verbs. The appearance of an extra object clitic to mark the subject of a nominalized verb is correlated with the use of the object form of an independent noun or pronoun subject of such a verb. Recall that the object case of an independent noun or pronoun may be used to express a possessor, and that possessed nouns are followed by possessive clitics of the same shape as the object clitics. It is very common, in Uto-Aztecan and cross-linguistically, for the subject of an embedded or nominalized clause to appear in possessive form.

The object-marked subject noun phrases of negative and embedded clauses in Kawaiisu are not always exactly like object-marked object noun phrases. Conjoined subject noun phrases of negative and embedded clauses are similar, but are different from conjoined object noun phrases. This similarity provides another piece of evidence that Kawaiisu negative sentences look embedded.

There is no word 'and' in Kawaiisu, so a comitative construction is used to express conjunction. A conjoined subject noun phrase has the first noun in the unmarked (subject) form, with the second noun followed by the postposition -we?e (sometimes -waa?e) 'with'.¹⁴

- (17) ta?nipuzi momo?o-waa?e pi?ee-kidi-mi-ni
 man woman-with see-past=SI-pl-1
 'The man and the woman saw me'
 (18) pahna po?o-waa?e kahni-paana 'The bread and the wa-
 bread water-with house-in ter are in the house'

When the conjoined noun phrase serves as the object of the sentence, the first noun is marked as an object, and the second is followed by the object form of the postposition 'with', -waako:¹⁵

- (19) ni?i ta?nipuzi-a pi?ee-kidiina momo?o-waako
 I man-obj see-past=SI=3anim woman-with=obj
 'I saw the man and the woman'
 (20) ni?i ka?a-kidi pahna-ya po?o-waako 'I ate bread
 I eat-past=SI bread-obj water-with=obj and water'

When a conjoined noun phrase (first noun plus second noun and suffixed 'with') serves as the subject of a negated sentence, there is a strong preference for having the second noun marked with the subject rather than the object form of 'with' (even though the first noun appears in object form, as is usual for the subjects of negative sentences):

- (21) *yuwaat̄i suʔuru kahni-paaneeka pahna-ya poʔo-weʔe*
 neg that house-in=3inan bread-obj water-with
 [...*poʔo-waako] 'The bread and the water are
 *water-with=obj not in the house'
- (22) *taʔnipuzi-a momoʔo-weʔe* [...(*/?)momoʔo-waako]
 man-obj woman-with=subj woman-with=obj
yuwaat̄i p̄ikee-keena-am̄i-ni 'The man and the woman
 neg see-past=SII-3pl-1 didn't see me'

This tendency is shared by conjoined noun phrases which serve as the subjects of nonnegative embedded clauses:

- (23) *hiʔi-neeka kahni-paaneeniina-am̄i taʔnipuzi-a*
 good-SII=3inan house-in-3pl man-obj
 momoʔo-weʔe [...*momoʔo-waako] 'It's good that the
 woman-with *woamm-with=obj man and the woman
 are in the house'
- (24) *sumara kahni taʔnipuzi-a momoʔo-weʔe* [...*momoʔo-
 that house man-obj woman-with=subj *woman-
 waako] *pu-vaana-am̄i* 'That is the house that the man
 with=obj rel-in-3pl and the woman are in'; lit. 'That
 house is the one in which the man and the woman are'

Therefore, the subjects of negative and embedded sentences in Kawaiisu, although superficially similar to object noun phrases, systematically differ from object noun phrases in the same way.

Supposing we accept the claim that negative sentences are quite similar in many ways to embedded clauses, or the stronger claim that negative sentences "are" (somehow) embedded clauses. What does this mean?

One possible reason for a sentence to show up in embedded or nominalized form as part of a "simple" sentence is that it is actually the complement of some "higher" verb. The only candidate for this higher verb in Kawaiisu negative sentences--the only part of these sentences which is not part of the nominalized sentences in question--is the negative *yuwaat̄i*. However, *yuwaat̄i* is invariable, and thus doesn't inflect like a normal Kawaiisu verb. If it was a verb, we would expect it to show up at least some of the time in final position in the sentence (the position in which Kawaiisu verbs are probably generated, and certainly a frequent position for the verb of a declarative sentence), which it does not. Therefore, *yuwaat̄i* is probably not a verb, and Kawaiisu negative sentences probably do not have a structure in which the negated sentence is the complement of a higher verb.

A second case where a nominalized sentence might show up in an apparently simple main clause would be as part of an N N predicate nominal construction (like (3a) and (4a) above).¹⁷ There is evidence that the Kawaiisu *yuwaat̄i* S negative construction might be analyzable as a string of two noun phrases. The negated sentence, as I have shown, is morphologically a nominalization. The invariable negative *yuwaat̄i* can also be analyzed as a nominal:

the ending -t̄i- is a common Numic participial suffix which is often used as a nominalizer (e.g., on some adjectives and color terms in Kawaiisu).¹⁸

I have suggested (in Munro 1974b) that Northern Uto-Aztecan negatives may all derive (historically) from an [N N]_S structure in which the first N is a nominalized negative and the second is a nominalization of the negated sentence; such sentences would translate literally as emphatic negations something like 'Untrue is the fact/claim that S'. The Kawaiisu data does lend support to the reconstruction of such a structure; the problem, however, is that Kawaiisu yuwaat̄i is not cognate with other Northern Uto-Aztecan negatives, which reconstruct as something like *ka-y-t̄i.¹⁹ So although Kawaiisu may retain the archaic negative construction virtually unchanged, the lexical negative yuwaat̄i seems to be a Kawaiisu innovation. It appears to have originated as a -t̄i- participle meaning roughly 'being not', with yu- from *ȳi 'be' and -waa- apparently cognate to the Southern Numic negative verb suffixes Southern Paiute -ŋwaʔai- and Chemehuevi -waʔay- (-waʔ in final position).²⁰ These suffixes follow verbs negated by a preceding first or second-position negative from *ka-y-t̄i, as in this example from Chemehuevi:²¹

(25) kacu-ʔuŋwa-n kiʔi-wa? 'He/it didn't bite me'
neg₁-3anim-1 bite-neg₂

Apparently the negative force of Kawaiisu yuwaat̄i comes from the presence of this element -waa-, even though the cognate forms like the -waʔ in (25) do not by themselves carry negation.

Hopefully more work on the synchronic grammar of Kawaiisu will help reveal why Kawaiisu negatives have the form they do, and how this typologically unusual structure evolved.

Footnotes

1. This paper is based on fieldwork done in Tehachapi, California, with Mrs. Lida Girado and the late Mrs. Bertha Goings, who provided most of the data, and with Mr. Andy Greene, who offered some useful confirmation. I am grateful to all of these people, and to Professor Maurice Zigmund, who generously introduced me to Kawaiisu and to his consultants, and who helped me with some of the examples in this paper (including the etymology of pohagad̄i 'doctor', below). I would also like to thank Wick Miller, for giving me copies of his notes on Kawaiisu and of the analyzed text "Wild Canary and Coyote", which I quote below, and Talmy Givón and Edith Moravcsik, who made helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

2. I do not know whether the terms "Series I" and "Series II" are due to Miller or to Zigmund; I learned them from Miller's notes. My discussion of verbal morphology here is based on Miller.

3. Kawaiisu sentences are presented roughly as transcribed, except that when the quality of a final vowel that was deleted in speech is known, it has been reinstated here. Since many

Kawaiisu morphemes change their shape when in the environment of certain other morphemes, I have not fully segmented all the words in the examples. -'s correspond one-to-one between the Kawaiisu and the gloss underneath it. Separate components of the gloss are separated by ='s. The abbreviations used in the glosses in this paper are SI = Series I verb; SII = Series II verb; 1 = first-person subject, object, or possessor; 3 = third-person subject, object, or possessor; anim = animate; fut = future; inan = inanimate; neg = negative; obj = object; pl = plural; refl = reflexive; subj = subject. I have not indicated third-person visible/invisible distinctions in the glosses, primarily to save space.

4. I have omitted the remote past endings -pidi(-) and -pi- from this table because they are so seldom used in speech.

Note: the plural clitic -m̄(-) may follow Series I-marked verbs with plural subjects.

5. Independent object pronouns sometimes show up in negative sentences (e.g. (3b), (4b), and (5) below), possibly for emphasis.

6. The full Series II ending plus clitic sequence is also shortened in a few other cases, somewhat sporadically, apparently by deletion of inanimate object clitics.

7. Consonant-final English names like Rochelle appear to end in -i in the (underlying) form in which they are used in Kawaiisu sentences.

8. Another way in which postpositional phrases behave like nominals in Kawaiisu is that some of them are distinguished for subject and object case. See the discussion of conjoined subjects and objects below.

9. The position of yuwaat̄ is of course not surprising from the point of view of comparative Uto-Aztecan--the negative, like modals and various other elements, is one of a class of first- or second-position morphemes in many if not most Uto-Aztecan languages (for some discussion, see Steele 1973). In other Uto-Aztecan languages with which I am familiar, however, virtually any item of the sentence may be preposed before the negative (possibly with some change in focus or emphasis), which is definitely not the case in Kawaiisu.

10. Many embedded negative clauses (which I will not discuss further here) do not include yuwaat̄, but are negated either with some "privative" verb suffix (the most common, I think, is -pi?ena) or with the clause-initial embedded negative morpheme kedu, which derives from the general Northern Uto-Aztecan negative *ka-y-t̄ mentioned in the last section of this paper.

11. The remote past Series II ending -p̄i- (see footnote 4) probably derives from *-p̄i-, another nominalizer and participial.

12. The explanation for why Series II endings occur on some simple main clauses in Kawaiisu, if it is true that these endings contain nominalizing -na-, may be related to a development in the Southern Numic language Chemehuevi, in which a construction using a na-marked verb is now employed to express a perfective (see Munro 1974a). The use of the perfective would be completely understandable in texts, and it is possible that the extension of such a

construction to some (stative?) adjective and reflexive constructions is not unreasonable.

13. Except for complements of 'say', which act like main clauses in other ways as well (see Munro to appear).

14. Wick Miller's notes on Kawaiisu show some examples of a more complicated comitative construction in which the postposition is attached to a pronominal copy of one of the two conjoined nouns. I have not elicited this construction in speech.

15. The use of an "object form" of certain postpositions in particular syntactic environments was first noted by Sapir (1930) for Southern Paiute, another Southern Numic language.

16. Note that the grammatical number of the "conjoined noun phrase" in the comitative construction seems to be somewhat variable, but probably is generally plural (thus giving some justification to the label "conjoined noun phrase"). The subject clitic corresponding to the conjoined noun phrase is plural in every case I have recorded except (21); semantically plural inanimate noun phrases often seem to be grammatically singular. However, note that the object clitic corresponding to the conjoined (animate) object in (19) is singular. It is probably significant that in this case the order of the two "conjoined" nouns is discontinuous.

17. Conceivably, of course, an $N_1 N_2$ sentence translated as ' N_1 is N_2 might be analyzed as having a (deleted) copular verb BE.

18. This argument gets complicated. Participles in $-t\dot{i}$ often develop into verbal aspectual and "tense" markers (like the $-d\dot{i}$ in the Kawaiisu Series I verb endings), so it's hard to characterize a $-t\dot{i}$ form as uniquely nominal or verbal. On the other hand, while $-d\dot{i}/-r\dot{i}$ forms do seem to be fairly verby in Kawaiisu, $-t\dot{i}$ forms do not.

19. Or perhaps $*ka-y-ta$. Ronald Langacker has suggested to me that the actual source may be $*ka-y\dot{i}-ta$.

20. I am grateful to Ronald Langacker for a helpful discussion of the etymology of $y\dot{u}waat\dot{i}$. There are other negative verb suffixes throughout Uto-Aztecan which may reconstruct to $*wa$ or a leniting $*ma$.

Interestingly, Southern Paiute $-n^w a?ai-$ and Chemehuevi $-wa?ai-$ have exactly the same shape as the subject form of the postposition 'with' (cf. Kawaiisu $-we?e$, discussed above) in those languages.

Maurice Zigmund has pointed out to me a probably related Kawaiisu noun suffix, $-aat\dot{i}$, whose use is exemplified in these pairs of words:

<u>hiwa</u>	'parent'	<u>hiwaat\dot{i}</u>	'orphan'
<u>pia</u>	'mother'	<u>piaat\dot{i}</u>	'motherless'

References

- Miller, Wick R. n.d. [1974] Kawaiisu field notes.
 Munro, Pamela. 1974a. Imperatives, Passives, and Perfectives in Chemehuevi. Ms. (Presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Mexico City, November 1974.)
 ----- 1974b. On the Morphology of Shoshonean Negatives. Ms.

- Munro, Pamela. To appear. Chemehuevi 'Say' and the Uto-Aztecan Quotative Pattern. In the proceedings of the 1974 Great Basin Anthropological Conference (Donald Tuohy, ed.), Nevada State Museum, Carson City, Nevada.
- Sapir, Edward. 1930. Southern Paiute, a Shoshonean Language. American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Proceedings 65, 1: 1-296.
- Steele, Susan M. 1973. The Positional Tendencies of Modal Elements and Their Theoretical Implications. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- Williams, Emma, and Elsie Williams Garcia. n.d. [Recorded 1930's by Maurice Zigmund.] Wild Canary and Coyote. Ms. text, ed. by Wick R. Miller in 1974.