

THE CAUSATIVE AS A REFERENCE SWITCHING MECHANISM  
IN WESTERN POMO

Robert L. Oswalt  
California Indian Language Center

The Pomo family of northern California consists of seven distinct languages. The three most closely related of these are Kashaya, Southern, and Central Pomo—about as divergent one from another as the Romance languages Italian, Spanish, and French. Northern Pomo, somewhat more divergent—about as Romanian stands with respect to the more westerly Romance languages—forms with Kashaya, Southern, and Central the Western Pomo subgroup. The remaining three languages—Northeastern, Eastern, and Southeastern—are considerably more differentiated. The majority of the illustrative sentences will be from Kashaya; confirmatory evidence from the other three Western Pomo languages will be presented towards the end of the paper.\*

All seven Pomo languages contain Causative suffixes which point to a Proto-Pomo form something like \*-qa-, although there are a few minor unexplainable variations in the underlying forms of some of the reflexes and considerable variation in the surface forms for those languages with complex morphophonemics. For example, Southern Pomo has -ka- ~ -k- ~ -kh- ~ -k̥- ~ gemination with a neighboring stop ~ [ŋ] when combined with a preceding n or d. Kashaya has a rather simple alternation of -hqa- after a vowel with -qa- after a consonant.

The Causative in the Western Pomo languages is a very frequently occurring suffix with a wide range of functions, some of which have not, to my knowledge, been reported for other languages. One of these unusual applications, that as a reference switching mechanism, will be the end point of this paper. First, however, I want to demonstrate the use of the case system with representatives of a class of verbs that can take only one nominal adjunct. There seems to be a continuum of these verbs varying from those with which the adjunct must be in the subject case to those with which it must be in the object case. Somewhere towards the middle is šulam- 'be sick', illustrated in the sentences of group (1), with which the adjunct may be in either case. Thus both (1a) and (1b) are good sentences, but with a meaning difference: In (1a), man? 'she', in the subject case, indicates that the woman contributed, at least partly, to bringing about her sick condition. In (1b), ma·dal 'her', in the object case, indicates the woman is simply the patient and not a contributing agent.

- (1a) šulamyé· man?. 'I see she is sick.'  
be sick-visual she
- (1b) šulamyé· ma·dal. 'She is sick.'  
her
- (1c) šulamqayé· mu·kin? ma·dal. 'He caused her  
be sick-caus.-vis. he her to be sick.'

The first three sets of sentences contain a Visual evidential suffix, which indicates that the speaker sees, or recently saw, the action or state with his own eyes. It is translated 'I see...' in (1a) but will be left untranslated henceforth.

I have used the term adjunct because, in a Kashaya sentence, there need not be any nominal at all. If the pronouns were deleted from (1a) or (1b), the one who is sick would simply be less closely identified. In order to bring two nominal adjuncts into a sentence with šulam-, it is necessary to add a transitivizing suffix, such as the Causative, in (1c). Then, the one who is sick is in the object case and the causer in the subject case. The order of the words has little significance. In (1c), the positions of the subject and object could be reversed, or one of them could be before the verb. However, with an evidential suffix and deictic elements in a sentence, it is preferable that at least one deictic come after the verb.

In set (2), the verb root mo- 'run' is employed to typify verbs of motion. Such verbs almost always occur with one or more of a set of 20 or so directional suffixes, with meanings like 'up, down, in, out, etc.' Employed herein is the suffix -·d- 'along, in one direction (often hither)'—the d becomes n? word-finally and before certain consonants, including the g of the Causative. This suffix is translated in (2a) but not thereafter.

- (2a) mo·dé· man?. 'She is running along.'  
run-along-vis. she
- (2b) \*mo·dé· ma·dal.
- (2c) mon?qayé· ma·dal mu·kin?. 'He caused  
run-along-caus.-vis. her he her to run.'
- (2d) mon?qayé· mu·kin?. 'He caused (someone or some-  
thing) to run.' 'He drove.'
- (2e) mon?qayé· ma·dal. '(Someone)caused her to run.'  
'She was caused to run.'
- (2f) mon?qacé· man?. 'She ran involuntarily.'  
'She caused herself to run.'  
'She ran on purpose.'  
'She drove herself.'

Verbs of motion also have only one nominal adjunct but most differ from šulam- in that the adjunct must be in the subject case. Thus, Sentence (2a) is good but (2b), ostensibly parallel to (1b), is impossible. Perhaps this is because an action like 'run' is so complexly coordinated that one does not ordinarily conceive of it being done passively. Transfer of control away from the runner to someone else, or to some unnamed force, would have to be shown by introducing the Causative into the verb. When the new controlling agent is overt, it is in the subject case, as in (2c); the "doer" of the action of the verb root, the runner, is in the object case. However, neither have to be specified. In (2e), the controller is unnamed and the sentence is about as close as Kashaya comes to a passive. The meaning approaches that of (1b) in that part of the control of the action or state has passed elsewhere. The Kashaya Causative is thus a device for transferring some or all of the control and/or volition to a different agent; the doer of the act may retain some of the volition, may want to run or may not want to. The semantic domain of the Causative encompasses those of English 'make' and 'let' and more, as will be seen later.

An interesting development is the use of the Causative plus the Reflexive, the  $-c-$  in (2f), to indicate a deliberate purposeful act. Hence, in (2f), 'She caused herself to run,' is one way to say, 'She ran on purpose.' This is a more forceful statement of volition than that in (1a). The sequence Causative + Reflexive is very common (cf. (5a-b)), with a wide range of applications depending upon the associated verb root. These uses will not be explored further herein; instead the course of the article will turn to showing how the Causative suffix can be used more than once in the same verb.

- (3a)      me'e                              món'qahqaye'      ma'dal mu'kito.  
           your-father-sbj. run-along-caus.-caus.-vis. her him.  
           'Your father caused her(him) to cause him(her) to run.'
- (3b)      má'kina                              mon'qayé'              mu'kin'.
- machine run-along-caus.-vis. he  
           'He caused the machine to run.' 'He drove the car.'
- (3c)      (má'kina) mon'qáhqaye'      mu'kito man'.
- 'She caused him to drive (the car).'

In (3a), the verb form, with two instances of the Causative suffix, is grammatical and common. However, in isolation, this sentence is marginally acceptable to a native speaker because there is difficulty in interpreting it. The ambiguity arises from there being no morphological marking, or conventional fixing of the word order, to

indicate which of the two animate object pronouns is the agent of the verb root 'run' and which that of the innermost Causative. Hence the two possible readings: 'Your father caused her to cause him to run,' and 'Your father caused him to cause her to run.' However, if only one of the two objects is animate, then there is no difficulty in interpretation, because the inanimate will be assumed to be the doer of the action of the root; it would not normally be the causer of any person doing the act. To illustrate this, we can subtract one Causative and, in (3b), employ an inanimate object: má·kina 'machine, car'. The verb 'cause to run', when referring to a car, is the way to say 'drive'. The overt use of the word má·kina is no more necessary in the Kashaya sentence than is the word 'car' in the English. Hence, the earlier sentence (2d) can be interpreted as, 'He drove.'

In (3c), the verb is built up with a second Causative, and here there is no ambiguity because there is assumed to be only one animate object. This use of two Causatives is not rare and is not limited to a few cases with which the construction might be considered to be lexicalized; in fact, the Causative can occur three times in succession. Ambiguity could again arise from there being two animate objects, but the situation does come up naturally when the third Causative marks a switch in agential reference between two verbs.

In order to explain this, it will be necessary to digress for a moment. The Western Pomo languages have, in addition to a deictic system which includes pronouns and demonstratives, a system which will herein be termed agential, illustrated with Kashaya sentences in (4a-d).

- (4a) Coagential: mon<sup>?</sup>ba, ʔahqhá ʔqoʔ.  
water drink-smlf-past  
'After running, he took a drink of water.'
- (4b) Disagential: mo·dú·li, ʔahqha how.  
water give-past  
'After someone else had run, he gave (him) water.'
- (4c) Coagential: mo·dún, ʔahqhá ʔqoʔ.  
'While running, he took a drink of water.'
- (4d) Disagential: mo·dém, ʔahqhá ʔqoʔ.  
'While someone else was running, he took a drink of water.'

The suffix -ba, underlined in (4a), is a portmanteau morph signaling that the action of the verb precedes that of the main verb in time and has the same agent. The suffix -u·li (-li ~ -·li ~ -V·li), in (4b), signals that the action of the verb precedes that of the main verb and has

a different agent. The suffix -un (-n ~ -Vn), in (4c), signals that the actions or states of the two verbs are simultaneous and have the same agent; -em (~ -wem), in (4d), that they are simultaneous and have different agents. I have used the terms coagential and disagential in describing Western Pomo to meet a need to designate syntactic features of these languages which show up in many forms and ways. Coagential is a subcase of coreferential and is applied here to identity of the agent of two or more verbs. As other kinds of coreference these languages also have a Reflexive suffix marking identity of the agent and patient of one verb; there is also a special pronoun that identifies the object of a subordinate verb as the same as the agent of the superordinate. Disagential applies to the overt marking of a separation in agential reference.

The examples under (4a-d) illustrate two of five pairs of suffixes. Other pairs designate conditional or future ('if' or 'when'), counter expectation ('although'), and inference ('must have'). The whole system of ten suffixes is extremely versatile and is employed in a great variety of situations. Kashaya also has noun clauses which take case suffixes typical of nouns but which also fit current definitions of headless relative clauses. However, the noun clauses are of relatively infrequent use; a half-hour story can be told without them occurring once. The agential suffixes, on the other hand, average more than one per sentence. When a relative clause might be expected, as when translating an English sentence 'The man who came to the door asked us for money,' a Kashaya will almost invariably use an agential suffix: 'Having come (-ba) to the door, the man asked us for money. If the relative word is the object of the embedded verb, a disagential suffix might be used: 'The man whom we chased away returned the next day,' would be rendered, 'Although we chased (-eti ~ -weti) him away, the man returned the next day.'

The agential systems in Western Pomo, as adumbrated so far, cannot handle all cases of verb subordination; for example, when the action of the subordinate would follow that of the superordinate. In most such instances, this is no problem, because the verb denoting the antecedent action is automatically the one subordinated. However, there are a few special situations in which this cannot be done, as with sequences expressing purpose or involving verbs of volition or emotional attitude, and then the Causative is brought into play to signal a switch in agent.

The pair (5a-b) illustrates the construction with the verb daqa 'c'- 'want', which, incidentally, exemplifies one of the special uses of the Causative + Reflexive that

was alluded to earlier, but this combination has no effect on the point to be made here. The dependent verb is in the Absolutive form and precedes the main verb. In (5a), with no Causative suffix on *mo-*, the two verbs are coagential. In (5b), the Causative signals disagency. The agent of the dependent verb, if animate and expressed, would be in the object case. However, as here, the agent need not be overt. Sentence (5b) is consequently ambiguous and could be interpreted both as 'She wants him to run,' and as 'She wants to drive.'

- (5a) *mo·du daqa·ćé· man?*. 'She wants.  
run-along-Abs. like-caus.-self-vis. she to run.'
- (5b) *mon?qá· daqa·ćé· man?*. 'She wants someone else  
to run.'
- (5c) *cohtociš.* 'I hope to go.'
- (5d) *cohtóchqaš.* 'I hope someone else goes.'
- (5e) *?ihche díbu·y.* 'Rain is falling.' 'It is raining.'
- (5f) *?ihche díbuchqaš.* 'I hope it rains.'
- (5g) *hayu ?.* 'It is a dog.'
- (5h) *hayú ?qaš.* 'I hope it is a dog.'

Sentences (5c-h) illustrate the Optative *-š ~ -Vš*, a suffix which could be deemed to embody a higher verb 'hope', complete with its agent 'I', because the suffix can be used only for the hope of the speaker. The only way to express, 'He hopes...' would be by a separate verb, namely the 'want' verb of (5a-b).

In (5c), without the Causative, the hoper and the doer of the action must be the same. If they are not, as in (5d), the Causative must be used to signal the switch. Now, in all the pairs of set (5), there is certainly volition in the higher agent, but there is very little control. To the extent that an expressed desire, wish, or hope can influence the doer to run or to leave, there is a remnant of control in (5b) and (5d). However, in (5f) and (5h) that remnant is virtually nonexistent. In some earlier time there may have been a belief that the expression of a wish or hope could somehow contribute to bringing about a natural act or state, but most Kashaya speakers would not expect that by uttering (5f) or (5h) there would be any effect on the reality of whether it will rain or of what species an animal is. ((5h) might be said if someone saw or heard an animal in the brush and expressed the hope that it be a dog rather than something dangerous, like a bear.)

In the above examples, there is some volition in the Causative agent. However, even that would seem to

be absent in a striking development in Northern Pomo (unknown to me in the other Western Pomo languages). To explain this it will be necessary to digress again to the agential system described earlier. As presented in (4a-d), it operates within sentence boundaries. However, these languages are sufficiently committed to the system to have developed devices for extending it across those boundaries.

In Kashaya, a story may be begun as in (6a). The second sentence can be tightly linked to the first by beginning in one of two ways: The main verb of the first sentence may be repeated, as in (6b), with one of the five pairs of subordinating agential suffixes; or, more commonly, a "utility" verb men 'thus + śi- 'do' may be employed, as in (6c-d), to carry the suffix.

- (6a) mulido            mu 'aca' cila            mo'du.  
       that-be-quot. that man awhile run-along-past  
       'It is said that man was running awhile.'
- (6b) mon'ba, 'ahqhá 'qo'.  
       'After running, he took a drink of water.'
- (6c) men'siba, 'ahqhá 'qo'.  
       'After doing so, he took a drink of water.'
- (6d) men'si·li, 'ahqha how.  
       'After he had done so, someone else gave him water'

In (6b), a repeat of (4a), and in (6c), the -ba signals that its verb, and thus the verb of the preceding sentence (6a), are coagential with the following superordinate verb. In (6d), men'si·li is coagential with the main verb of the preceding sentence but disagential with its superordinate verb and it thus signals a switch in agent between the two sentences.

In Northern Pomo, nan is employed in the situation of (6c), where Kashaya has men'siba. nan consists of the common verb na- 'be, do' + -n '-ing', a suffix apparently cognate to Kashaya -n ~ -Vn 'while', of (4c), but with a much wider range of use. Northern Pomo apparently does not have a unitary disagential suffix corresponding to the -li ~ -·li ~ -V·li of Western Pomo. Instead, for the situation in (6d), it uses nakan, wherein -ka- is most reasonably identified as its common Causative suffix -ka-. Although, analytically, nakan could be said to mean 'causing to be (or do)', in function it simply marks disagency between two sentences. Any historically earlier element of meaning including 'transfer of control or volition' has been lost; in this particular function the action in the antecedent sentence and that in

the succeeding, the one beginning with nakan, may be totally unconnected in causality.

Examples parallel to the Kashaya sentences (5a-b) will now be presented in the other Western Pomo languages.

(7) Southern Pomo. Causative -ka-.

ham'u 'yowa m'u ho'liw hud'akay.  
that be-vis. he leave-abs. like-caus.-self-abs.  
'He wanted to leave.'

ham'u 'yowa m'u 'to ho'likaw hud'akay.  
me leave-caus.-abs.  
'He wanted me to leave.'

(8) Central Pomo, Boya dialect. Causative -ka-.

mul béy yow da'da.  
he off go-abs. wants  
'He wants to leave.'

to' mul béy yo'kaw da'da.  
me he off go-caus.-abs. wants  
'He wants me to leave.'

(9) Northern Pomo. Causative -ka-.

mú' 'a' duhú da'di.  
there I off-go want  
'I want to go there.'

mo'wal 'a' duhúka da'di.  
him I off-go-caus. want  
'I want him to leave.'

Several of the wide variety of functions of the Causative in Western Pomo have now been set forth. Early examples dealt with uses fairly typical of Causatives—the transfer of control over an action (and a piece of volition) from the actual doer to a new agent. Later examples demonstrated that the Western Pomo Causative has an additional function in which the concepts of control and volition hardly seem applicable, a function in which it simply signals a switch in agent and thus helps fill in holes in an unusual and elegant referential system.

In conclusion, I present under (10) a succession of Kashaya verbs with an increasing number of occurrences of the Causative suffix; none of the constructions are highly unusual. The verbs are complete sentences in themselves; however, the more complex forms would normally appear in some context that would clarify the relationship of each suffix to some potential actor.

- (10a) mo·duš. 'I hope to run.'  
 (10b) monʔqaš. 'I hope someone else runs.'  
 'I hope to drive.'  
 (10c) monʔqáhqaš. 'I hope someone else lets a  
 third person run.'  
 'I hope someone else drives.'  
 (10d) monʔqáhqaqaš. 'I hope someone else lets a  
 third person drive.'

\* \* \* \* \*

#### NOTES

\*The data on which this paper is based were collected in the course of extended fieldwork among the Western Pomo supported by the National Science Foundation, grants GS-711 and GS-1463. Statements on the degree of interrelationship of these languages are based primarily on the percent of shared cognates in a basic 100-word list (Oswalt 1964). Comparative morphology supports the subgrouping to the extent stated herein (Oswalt 1976). More information on the verbal affixes is in Oswalt (1976).

\* \* \* \* \*

#### REFERENCES

- Oswalt, Robert L. 1964. "The Internal Relationships of the Pomo Family of Languages," Actas y Memorias, XXXV Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Mexico, 1962, Part 2, 413-421 + 5 pp. of data.
- 
1976. "Comparative Verb Morphology of Pomo," in Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver, eds., Hokan Studies (The Hague, Mouton) pp. 13-28.

## A Glimpse of the Pre-Washo Pronominal System

William H. Jacobsen, Jr.  
University of Nevada, Reno

O. The Washo language of east central California and western Nevada is one of the Hokan group of languages, located primarily in California, which has been a major concern to Professors Haas and Beeler.<sup>1</sup> This is an extremely disparate group of languages, with at least 13 quite distinct branches as usually construed, exhibiting pronominal systems of considerable typological diversity. Under these circumstances, as a preliminary to any attempt to attain some conception of the Proto-Hokan pronominal system, the systems of the separate branches need to be traced back as far as possible by comparative and internal reconstruction. Indeed, we now have sophisticated studies for the two branches most amenable to comparative reconstruction, by McLendon (1976) for Pomo and by Hinton and Langdon (1976) for Yuman. This I now attempt to do for Washo, a language exhibiting little dialectal diversity. This study rests in part on previous, only partly published, contributions, especially one some years ago of internal reconstruction in Washo (Jacobsen 1960a, 1960b). This concentrated primarily on phonology, although using the pronominal prefixes as key portions of evidence. Now I want to focus on the somewhat different older morphological pattern of pronouns that can be perceived, with attention to some recent suggestions about the relationship of affixal ordering to word order.

1. Table 1 lists the Washo pronominal prefixes, which occur on nouns to express their possessor and on verbs to express their subject and object.<sup>2</sup> These distinguish three persons, in addition to imperative subject, reflexive object, subjective and impersonal possessor, and absolutive. With a third person possessor or subject, a distinction is shown as to whether or not this possessor or the object is expressed by the preceding word.<sup>3</sup>

Almost all of these prefixes have different shapes depending on whether a vowel or a consonant follows, which are shown in the first two columns. In the first column  $\bar{t}$  and  $\bar{k}$  are glottalized or ejective stops; M is voiceless. The  $\bar{e}$  is a "vowel-coloring" morphophoneme which has the effect of changing a following  $i(\cdot)$  to  $e(\cdot)$ . The variant forms in the second column with  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{e}$  respond to regular rules of vowel harmony. (A variant with  $\bar{e}$  exists also for the imperative-plus-reflexive in the first column.) In other descriptive writings I have used the  $\bar{e}$  as a cover symbol for this alternating vowel, which has the effect of producing just one shape for morphemes such as the imperative prefix  $\bar{g}$ .<sup>4</sup> But it seems wise to avoid this abstraction in the present context for the sake of direct presentation of the data.<sup>5</sup> Variant forms separated by commas represent dialectal variations. The right-hand column presents the reconstructed forms that will be developed as we proceed.