0. Introduction. In the first sections of this article, I make a number of preliminary observations concerning the grammatical apparatus employed in present-day Papago to conjoin expressions belonging to the major phrasal categories—verbal, nominal, and adpositional.

While the examples cited are drawn from dialects of Papago, the facts which they illustrate hold, by and large, for dialects of Pima directly to the north. The grammatical system with which I am concerned belongs, therefore, to a linguistic tradition which might properly be labeled "Modern Upper Piman." This tradition is quite separate now from the more southerly ones commonly referred to by the term "Pima Bajo" and from other, yet more southerly, members of the Tepiman branch of Uto-Aztecan (hereinafter UA). But the languages of this group are nevertheless closely related, and many aspects of the system which I describe here can be shown to correspond, either directly or indirectly, to elements attested in other Tepiman languages. A principal focus of the last

---

1 This work has been supported in part by the National Institutes of Mental Health, grant number 5 PO1 MH13390–13. I wish to indicate my deep debt to a number of speakers of Papago who have been teachers and colleagues of mine during various periods over the past two decades. These include Albert Alvarez, Oletia Zepeda, Sam Angelo, Mareia Encinas, and Luke Preston. I am very much indebted also to people who, as schoolmates in Tucson during the 1950s, first introduced me to their rich linguistic heritage—these include John Louis, Joe Moreno, Nick Moreno, and Herman Nærcho. Morris Halle, with great care and characteristic insightfulness, went through the earlier version of this article and made detailed comments on it, suggesting many improvements and detecting many errors. I am deeply grateful to him, and any improvement which this version has over the earlier one is due largely to him. I wish also to express my appreciation of William Jacobsen for his encouragement and insightful commentary on this article and for his careful proofreading of it as well. I hope he will forgive me for continuing to use (perhaps incorrectly) the originally Algonquianist terminology of obviation in reference to the switch-reference phenomena of Tepiman. I am deeply indebted to speakers of Sierra Pima—Andrés and Leon Duarte—and to speakers of Ónavas Pima—María Córdova, Agustín Estrella, Pedro Estrella, and María Fierro. I am grateful to Stephen Hale, who took time out from a herpetological field trip to visit Ónavas and to elicit coordinate nominal expressions in the Pima of that town. None of the people mentioned in this footnote is to blame in any way for errors contained in this essay. This essay is a reduced version of an original manuscript of 109 typewritten pages; a copy of the longer version may be obtained from the author (20E–225, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass. 02139).

[IJAL vol. 49, no. 3. July 1983, pp. 599–627] © 1983 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. 0026-7071/83/4963–0055$01.00

299
sections of this article is historical; in fact, I make a number of suggestions about possible linguistic changes leading to the modern Papago state of affairs.

By way of introduction to the central theme of this essay, I cite some initial examples of the process of coordination, beginning with the coordination of nominal expressions.

The element now used to conjoin nominals in Papago is exemplified in the following sentence:\(^2\)

1. Mii\(\text{lo} \) əcw-hai\(\text{c} \) əh\(\text{a} \) ə \(\text{e} \)ə\(\text{s} \)
(\text{watermelon} \text{CONJ} \text{cantaloupe} \text{CONJ} \text{squash} \text{AUX} \text{plants} \text{USIT})

‘He plants watermelons and cantaloupes and squash’.

The conjunction, appearing as ə in (1), has a second alternative which is often heard, namely, ə\(\text{k} \). For many speakers, this simply alternates freely with ə in nominal coordination. But for many other speakers, there is some rationale behind the use of one alternative in preference to the other. Some, for example, use ə\(\text{k} \) with considerable consistency when the immediately preceding nominal conjunct ends in a full vowel, using ə Otherwise.\(^3\) Thus, for these speakers, ə is preferred in (2a) below, but ə\(\text{k} \) appears when the conjuncts are reversed, as in (2b):

2a. Hegam ə cem-hekid ə da\(\text{i} \)w Lion ə Husti.
(\text{they AUX always here arrive} :\text{PL} \text{Leon CONJ Joe})

‘Leon and Joe are always coming here’.

2b. Hegam ə cem-hekid ə da\(\text{i} \)w Husti ə\(\text{k} \) Lion.
(\text{they AUX always here arrive} :\text{PL} \text{Joe CONJ Leon})

‘Joe and Leon are always coming here’.

\(^2\) Papago examples are written in the orthography used by Albert Alvarez and the bilingual education programs with which he has worked. It is described briefly in Alvarez and Hale (1970). The system is for the most part straightforwardly phonemic, except that the letter e is used for the high back unrounded vowel /i/. The reference (OHA) following some Papago examples is Saxton and Saxton (1973). Glossing of examples is straightforward, with capitals for grammatical morphemes and lowercase for lexical items, for the most part. Where a morphologically complex Papago item is not, or cannot be, hyphenated, the glosses corresponding to its component “sememes” are joined by a colon—e.g., koi (sleep:SG:PERF). Glossing of other Tepepian and other Uto-Aztecan languages follows the same practice. Difficult-to-translate particles are often left un glossed.

\(^3\) The actual environment for the \(\text{e} \)\(\text{k} \) alternative is following a noun ending, underlyingly, in -\(\text{V}L\) ;\(\text{V} \), i.e., a long vowel or vowel sequence (VV), possibly interrupted by a laryngeal (L). This rule was discovered by Albert Alvarez and was the subject of a literacy booklet published by the Papago Language Affairs facility in 1976. The booklet, entitled Go\(\text{k} \) Ha\(\text{ve} \) \(\text{Ce} \)g\(\text{g} \) \(\text{O} \)k\(\text{h} \)\(\text{o} \)\(\text{n} \)a (book of two nouns) was designed by Alvarez to enable Papago-speaking children to discover the principle governing the \(\text{e} \) \(\text{e} \)\(\text{k} \) alternation.

This alternation will figure again in my discussion at a later point. I henceforth refer to the pair as ə, except where the longer alternant is specifically germane to the discussion.

This conjunction is also used to coordinate expressions belonging to other syntactic categories in Papago. Sentence (3) serves to exemplify the use of ə both in clausal coordination (the first instance) and in conjoining adpositional expressions (the second instance):

3. Kay hi wud a hemajikam c ɨs < ɨs) as 'ab 'e-nonhōi 'ab c 'e-taqt ɨd 'ab hab ma\(\text{x} \) g ha\(\text{i} \)c\(\text{u} \) do\(\text{k} \)am. (OHA, p. 252)
(\text{AUX} \text{hi COPULA a human CONJ AUX as there self-hands on CONJ self-feet on thus appear SUBORDAUX ART something living})

‘It was indeed a person, but about its hands and about its feet it looked like an animal’.

The first instance of ə here is functioning in concert with the particle as to render the contradictory sense corresponding to English ‘but’.

The use of ə as a generalized conjunction in Papago is evidently a recent development. It cannot be traced back to a generalized conjunction either in Tepepin or in Uto-Aztecan. Indeed, it is not necessary to go very far back in Piman linguistic history to reach a time when the expected antecedent of Papago ə is nowhere in evidence as a conjunction in the usual sense. Thus, for example, in the excellent Jesuit-period Arte de la Lengua Névome and appended Doctrina and Confesionario (Smith 1862), the coordination of nominal expressions is effected by means of the common Tepepin particle *ipi ‘also, again’ (written vpu in the Arte and continued in the modern Pima of the region as Ʌp and Ʌp, at Onavas, for example; compare Papago Ɇp, Ɇp, recalling that orthographic ə represents /i/).\(^4\) This element is placed after, not between, the items conjoined:

4a. N’api doming’ ab’ fiek’t-ab’ vpu teop’ vrha vapc?u? (Confesionario, p. 10)
(\text{Q you Sunday on holiday-on also church into enter} \text{USIT})

‘Do you go to church on Sundays and on holidays?’

4b. N’api mu mama, mu dada vpu zi-daha? (Conf., p. 13)
(\text{Q you your father, your mother also zi-love})

‘Do you love your father and mother?’

\(^4\) The date of the composition of the Arte is not actually known, nor is the identity of its author. However, Pennington develops an interesting hypothesis, quite possibly correct, about the authorship of the Arte, and he dates its composition in the 1660s, rather than the 1770s as previously assumed (Pennington 1979).
The hyphenation here is mine; I have retained the original use of spacing, even where bound morphemes are separated from the stem to which they are in fact attached (e.g., *mu*, which is the possessive and objective prefix *mi*).

So far as I am aware, nowhere in the early documents does nominal coordination involve an element which can be related to the *c* (or *kc*) of modern Papago. This Papago conjunction does, however, have a discernible source in Tepiman, and ultimately in Uto-Aztecan. I suggest in this article that the modern generalized use of *c* has arisen through reanalysis of elements, belonging originally to the verbal morphology, whose function was that of clausal subordination.

To appreciate this possibility, it is first necessary to look at the full range of facts relevant to the coordination of predicate expressions in modern Papago. Before this, however, I shall make certain elementary remarks concerning the phrase structure of Papago.

An elementary phrase structure of Papago, expressed in the notation of the X-bar theory of the categorial component (cf. Chomsky 1970 and Jackendoff 1977), includes at least the following rule schemata:

(5a) \[ \text{X}'' \to \text{Spec}_x (\text{X}'') (\text{V}''') \]

(5b) \[ \text{X}' \to [-V]'''' \text{X}' (\text{V}''') \]

(5c) \[ \text{X}' \to \ldots \text{X} \]

The category \text{Spec}_x comprises the aux (where \text{X} is V, i.e., the verb, which heads the sentence), the det (i.e., determiner, where \text{X} is N), and the class of spatial specifiers (where \text{X} is P, i.e., postposition). In the initial expansion of \text{X}''', the head (\text{X}') is defined as optional to account for cases in which the specifier is the sole constituent in a particular phrase as surface structure. At the first and second expansions, a phrase-final clause (\text{V}''') is permitted—this accounts for embedded sentences, for example, relative clauses and complements. The rule schemata \text{X}'' indicate that nonclausal complements are prenuclear in Papago. This is not always true at surface structure, however. We may assume, for present purposes, that Papago makes use of extraposition to derive alternative word orderings (cf. Hale, Jeanne, and Platero 1977, for discussion).

The sentential specifier, aux, embodies aspectual and modal elements together with elements marking the person and number of the subject. In addition, the aux may appear with one or another of the prefixes *n* (interrogative), *m* (general subordinating), or *ku* (obviative). The last-mentioned of these will figure again in the discussion of Papago phrasal coordination. A prefixed aux regularly appears in clause-initial position, while a prefixless aux is, almost without exception, placed in “second position.”

1. **The proximate conjunction.** Sentence (3) illustrates the use of the conjunction *c* in the coordination of clauses. Other examples of this element, in the same function, are given in:

(6a) *Pi:wlo 'o 'am 'ti hit hegav sa'ā c gd ḥu to:aw heg 'eda wolín.*

(Pete aux there scoop that trash conj there away put that in barrel)

‘Pete is scooping up that trash and putting it over there in that barrel’

(6b) *N-ki: o 'o'ot-ahim c hemu ahawa pi 'o'ot nant pi 'i kegc.*

(my-house aux leak-pastprog conj now then neg leak aux pi incep repair:perf)

‘My roof was leaking and now it is not leaking, because I fixed it’.

(6c) *Husi 'o cem si 'e-hascd c pi hu: g mu:n.*

(Joe aux cem si self-aggrandize conj neg eat:perf art beans)

‘Joe is trying to be somebody, and he didn’t eat the beans’.

These sentences are fairly representative of one of the uses of *c* in Papago. However, it is not always *c* which shows up when clauses are conjoined. There are special conditions on its use.

First, the above sentences have in common the fact that the first clause is in the imperfective aspect—in addition to the simple imperfective form represented in (6a) and (6c), the past progressive in *(a)him* (as in 6b) counts as an imperfective. This is one of the conditions on the use of *c* in clausal coordination. In the “canonical” use of this conjunction the immediately preceding clause is consistently imperfective.

There is a second feature which the sentences of (6) have in common and which is typical in the canonical use of Papago *c*. The clauses conjoined by this element share their subjects. I use the term “proximate” to refer to *c* in its function as a clausal conjunction, following a usage imported into Uto-Aztecan from Algonquian linguistic usage (by Grimes 1964; and adopted by others as well, e.g., Hale 1965, Voegelin and Voegelin 1975, and Jeanne 1978). Proximate coordination can be opposed to “obviative” coordination, in which the subjects of the coordinate clauses are distinct. Obviative coordination in Papago, to be exemplified later, makes use of the auxiliary prefix *ku*. The opposition involved here, to which a few Uto-Aztecanists have applied the Algonquianist term “obviation,” is better known as “switch reference” (cf. Jacobsen 1967, an excellent introduction to the topic).

Proximate coordination of an imperfective clause with a following clause of either aspect is accomplished by means of *c*, as we have seen. Where the first clause in coordination is perfective, however, a distinct form of the proximate conjunction is used. This “perfective” proximate
conjunction has the shape $k$, and it is illustrated in the sentences of (7).
This conjunction may fuse with a preceding clause-final verb, thereby
blocking certain phonological rules which would otherwise apply to a
perfective verb (in particular “truncation”; cf. Hale 1965, for a discussion
of the phonology of perfectives in Papago), and a “fused” $k$
conjunction will be written attached to its verb by means of a hyphen.

(7a) Sa ma:z mat ha'icu m-ba'â-k m-wiñwua.
    (rather seem SUBORDAUX something you-swell:PERF-CONJ you-
regurgitate:PERF)
    ‘It rather looks like something swallowed you and spit you up
    (from your rumpled appearance)’.

(7b)  Nt o'i wu:sâñ-k o ñëi g meñi.
    (AUX FUT INCEP EXIT:PERF-CONJ FUT look:PERF ART fire)
    ‘I’m going to go out and look at the fire’.

(7c)  Juddik 'ant ceg-k catwii.
    (bear AUX find:PERF-CONJ shoot:PERF)
    ‘I saw a bear and shot it’.

The V-CONJ fusion observed here is normal, when the opportunity
arises, but it is not obligatory (though dialects may differ in this respect).
This fusion has blocked truncation—had fusion not taken place, the
perfective verbs of the initial clauses of (7a)–(7c) would have appeared
as follows: (a) ba: (swallow:PERF); (b) wu:z (EXIT:PERF); (c) ce: (find:PERF).
In the sentences of (8) and (9), fusion is not applied, either because the
opportunity does not arise, or because the option is simply not taken:

(8a)  Wisilo 'ant o cem hema wu: k 'an si wipidut-ahim g ñ-wijina (kc
     'oi-a as hejel ñ-biha).
     (calf AUX FUT cem one rope:PERF CONJ there si swing-PASTPROG ART
     my-rope: CONJ so just self me-wrap:PERF)
     ‘I was going to rope a calf and was swinging my rope hard (and I
     just wrapped it around myself)’.

(8b)  Mar:ñina 'atki melkwua g⼊(mo g wainomi' ab 'ab wul) k 'atki g
     m-heheliga as wesko García granad.
     (car AUX bump:PERF ART pole (SUBORDAUX ART wire there on tied)
     CONJ AUX ART your-laundry just everywhere INCEP scatter:PERF)
     ‘The car struck the pole (on which the wire clothesline was tied)
     and scattered your clothes all over’.

(9)    M 'ant o ha'ku'wañ g šudagi k 'am o šul g muñi.
     (there AUX FUT some-both:cause:PERF ART water CONJ there FUT
     throw:PL:PERF ART beans)
     ‘I’ll boil up some water and throw in some beans’.

In (8a), evidently, the option to fuse the verb and the following con-
junction was simply not taken. In (8b) and (9), fusion is blocked, since
the verb of the initial clause is not final.

2. Obviative coordination. Proximate coordination (as in 6–9 above)
is normal when the coordinate clauses share their subjects, that is, when
the subject of the second clause (normally nonverbal) is coreferential with
that of the first clause (overt or nonovert). Obviative coordination, on
the other hand, is normal when the subjects of the two clauses are
distinct in reference (whether they are overt or not). The contrast can be
observed in the following pair of sentences:

(10a)  N'âlidag 'o gegosid g gogs c ha-Tiččid g kakawai.
     (my child AUX feed ART dog CONJ them-water ART horses)
     ‘My kid feeds the dog and waters the horses’.

(10b)  N'âlidag 'o gegosid g gogs k g ň-wenag ha-Tiččid g kakawai.
     (my-child AUX feed ART dogOBJ AUX my-sibling them-water
     ART horses)
     ‘My kid feeds the dog and my brother waters the horses’.

Obviative coordination is signaled not by a conjunction, strictly speaking,
but by use of what I shall call the “obviative auxiliary” (OBJAUX) on
the noninitial clause, or clauses, of the coordination. The force of the
obviative auxiliary is to signal a switch in “topic.” Since the topic of a
sentence is quite regular, but with some exceptions, the subject, a
switch in subject will warrant use of the obviative auxiliary.5 The latter,
therefore, could quite aptly be thought of as a signal of “switch
reference.” Morphologically, the obviative auxiliary consists of the
prefix ku- followed by the remainder of the AUX (i.e., person marker,
aspect marker, mood marker, if present). Under certain conditions (e.g.,
third-person imperfective unmarked mood), the “remainder” of the AUX
will be phonologically null. The stranded $k$ appearing in (10b) is,
therefore, not to be confused with the proximate perfective conjunction
$k$, which is an utterly different element. The $k$ of (10b) is simply the
residue of ku-, following deletion of the vowel /u/ unprotected by
phonologically constituted auxiliary material in this third-person form.
A certain superficial complexity is occasioned by the additional fact
that, in modern colloquial Papago, the obviative prefix ku- normally
deletes when it is followed by phonologically nonnull auxiliary material,
as in:

5 Under certain conditions, syntactically distinct subjects may appear in clauses linked
by the proximate conjunction. In all cases of which I am aware, the syntactically distinct
subjects are, in some sense, semantically identical—e.g., the snow is melting and the
water (ñëe snow) is flowing.
(11) Husi 'o 'am ha'icu ñ-ágid ñ pi 'ap ka: heg hekaj mo s-jupij ñeok.
(Joe AUX there something me-tell OBVAUX NEG well hear that for SUBAUX S-quietly speak)
'Joe was telling me something and I didn't hear him well for the reason that he speaks so softly'.

Here, the obviative auxiliary is ñ; in its full or predeletion form, it would have appeared as kudi, which would have been an option in (11). The reduced form ñ consists solely of the first-person marker, the residue following deletion of kud.

I have chosen not to analyze the prefix kud- (or its zero alternative) as a coordinating conjunction in contemporary Papago—infused, by means of some rule of phonology, onto a following auxiliary—primarily because its use goes far beyond that of coordination. It can function as a subordinator (e.g., on obviative sentential complements of certain verbs such as ñam ke'us 'to elect, appoint to ...', ñágid 'tell to ...', where it can alternate with the general subordinator m-; and in the protasis construction to be described later), and it can initiate clauses which are syntactically independent. It can initiate a paragraph or even a discourse, and it quite commonly initiates the separate utterances of interlocutors in conversational exchanges. The following sentence serves to illustrate the use of the obviative in the complementizer function:

(12) Napt o ñ-wemt nt o ñ-wapko?
(NUUX FUT me-help:PERF OBVAUX FUT me-wash:PL PERF)
'Will you help me to do my washing?'

The obviative auxiliary here is nt, reduced from kund (in which the auxiliary is the first-person "t-form," i.e., the form used in the perfective and in the future). The following paragraph serves to illustrate the use of the obviative in its usual "topic switching" function in modern Papago:

(13) 'Am hu hebai hema med hegam gogoliwiw, ñ hema wemaj g o'odham. Kuš s-toši ñ hab kajai: "'i: yaši s-toši, ab g' ya-kukp g wipindañi, t o t-hehogi." S 'ab ahawa t ya-kukp s g ha-wahuddag ... med. . . .

(there away where one run those contraries, OBVAUX one accompany ART Papago. OBVAUX S-hot OBVAUX thus say: "Oh, very s-hot, 'ab IMPERATIVAUX INCP them-close ART windows, OBVAUX FUT US-COOL:PERF," OBVAUX 'ab thereupon INCP them-close OBVAUX ART their-sweat ... RUN . . .

'There was once one of those contraries going in a car, and a Papago was with him. And it was hot, and he (the contrary) said: "Oh, it's hot; close the windows and it will cool us." And he (the Papago) closes them and their sweat ... pours . . .'.

The narrator uses the reportative mood here (indicated by means of the mood suffix -s), except in the direct quotation. In addition, the obviative kud- is deleted in the majority of instances.

The morphological details of both proximate and obviative coordination have been briefly sketched in this and in the preceding section, and some indication of their syntax has been given as well. I turn now to the problem of integrating these constructions into the phrase structure of Papago.

3. Coordination in the Papago base. The preliminary phrase structure grammar of Papago outlined in the introduction does not obviously accommodate either of the types of coordination discussed in the preceding two sections. It does not obviously do so, but, properly conceived, the system does in fact incorporate the obviative constructions, to some extent at least. First, sentences of the type represented by (12) above are clearly accommodated by rules (5a) and (5b), which permit a dependent clause to appear finally, either at the three-bar level or at the two-bar level. Second, I think it is appropriate to view obviative coordination of the type represented in (13) as consisting simply of sentences "in sequence." In a sense, no special provision needs to be made for this, since one could, by convention, simply understand the initial sentential symbol V" as standing for any number of sentences in sequence, without special syntactic connection. The semantic connections which might be said to exist, or do in fact exist, could be supplied by some principle of logical form activated by the presence of the obviative prefix on the auxiliary. However, I suspect it will turn out that some "grouping," or hierarchical organization, of obviative sequences is desirable—for example, (A B) C, versus A (B C), versus A B C, and the like. If this is so, then it is necessary to introduce a rule for clausal sequencing. The following simple schema will do:

(14) V" -- V"*. . .

I intend by this rule to permit the maximum projection of the V-category, that is, the sentence, to be expanded as a sequence of any number of full sentences, thereby obtaining one type of clausal coordination.

Proximate coordination is not to be accommodated in this manner, however. On the contrary, proximate coordination is a special case of a more general system of "true conjoining," extending beyond the clausal category in modern Papago. Before this true coordination can be built into the grammar, however, some details of form must be mentioned.

In the proximate coordination of a pair of clauses, the subject of the second clause is regularly missing (but see n. 5). Since the conjunction
itself encodes all necessary information concerning the identity of the subject, its inclusion in the second clause as an overt nominal would be redundant (in the canonical use of the proximate conjunction, that is). What is of interest here, however, is the fact that the auxiliary of the second clause may also be missing. In fact, the second auxiliary in proximate coordination may be overt only if it contains a mood marker—hence the following contrast:

(15a) *Ali 'at i gezi-k s-ko'okam e-ju.
   (child AUX INCEP fall:PERS-PNU s-hurtfully self-do:PERF)
   ‘The child fell down and hurt itself’.
(15b) *Ali atiki i gezi-k atiki s-ko'okam e-ju.
   (Child AUX INCEP fall:PERS-PNU AUX s-hurtfully self-do:PERF)
   ‘The child apparently fell down and apparently hurt itself’.

In (15b), the auxiliaries bear the evidential mood suffix -ki; consequently, the second auxiliary need not, and normally would not, delete.

Given the observation just made, proximate coordination of clauses in Papago has two surface syntactic forms, as depicted in:

(16a) SpecV V'' CONJ SpecV V'.
(16b) SpecV V'' CONJ V''.

And these are duplicated in the coordination of other major categories as well. Thus, for the noun phrase, one finds both:

(17a) SpecN N'' CONJ SpecN N''.
(17b) SpecN N'' CONJ N''.

And, for the adpositional category, both (18a) and (18b) are found:

(18a) SpecP P'' CONJ SpecP P''.
(18b) SpecP P'' CONJ P''.

The two forms of coordination are therefore general across the major categories of Papago, as depicted in:

(19a) SpecX X'' CONJ SpecX X''.
(19b) SpecX X'' CONJ X''.

The more complete coordinate construction, that is, with overt specifier in noninitial conjuncts, can be accommodated in our elementary grammar by means of the following additional rule of phrase structure:

(20) X'''' \rightarrow X'''' (CONJ X'''').

Since the nonfinal conjuncts here are three-bar structures, they will contain their specifiers.6

The second coordinate construction (which is, incidentally, most frequent textually) might be derived from the fuller one by means of a rule which deletes a semantically empty (or redundant) specifier when it is immediately preceded by a conjunction (CONJ). However, split nominal constructions, like that in (2) above, in which a two-bar construction (possibly coordinate, as in 2) is separated from its determiner, suggest that we must recognize a phrase structure rule which introduces conjoined two-bar structures. The necessary additional phrase structure rule is given in:

(21) X'' \rightarrow X'' (CONJ X'').*

Rules (20) and (21) introduce an element which I have glossed CONJ. At this level of abstraction, it is appropriate to think of this as a generalized conjunction. Of course, it has different shapes under different circumstances. With nonverbal conjuncts, it appears as c or kc, and the perfective proximate conjunction k must, by some (perhaps interpretive) principle, be prevented from appearing with nonverbal conjuncts in the synchronic grammar of Papago. With verbal conjuncts, on the other hand, the proximate conjunctions indicate more than mere coordination—they indicate the proximate category itself, and the choice of the particular form (cjc or cjk) is dependent upon the aspect of the preceding clause. All of this must, of course, be built into the grammar of Papago. I shall not do this here, though I foresee no particular problems in completing this portion of the grammar.

Before leaving this section, let me briefly mention and exemplify another important use of the proximate conjunction and the obliative auxiliary. This is what I call the ‘protasis construction,’ exemplified in the sentences:

(22a) Mat o sa gahi wusanning-k o cusha g tai.
   (SUBORDAUX FUT if beyond EXIT:PERS-PNU FUT extinguish:USIT ART fire)
   ‘If he passes (the exam), he'll be fighting fires’.

(22b) Mapt hascu o 'i taccud c heg o bei.
   (SUBORDAUX what FUT ever WAY:FUT:PERF conj that FUT take:PERF)
   ‘Whatever you want, you can take’.

---

6 As do many of the rules advanced here, this one overgenerates and must be limited in some way. For example, the k-form of the conjunction may not appear except after a perfective verb. I am not sure which to suggest of the many ways this constraint could be effected, since I am not sure what the theoretical issues are in this connection. For present purposes, I simply assume that cases of overgeneration by rules of phrase structure will be handled in some way or other. And I assume further that the problem here is not relevant to the issues of concern in this article, bearing in mind, of course, that this decision could be seriously in error.
(22c) Mat hascu 'i gatwi g Huan nt heg o hu.: (SUBORDAUX what ever shoot:PERF ART John OBVAUX that fut eat:PERF)

'Whatever John shot, I'll eat that'.

Without going into great detail concerning their internal structure, I
should point out that the protasis constructions have a wide range of
semantic functions—including the conditional (as in 22a), the correlative
(as in 22b and 22c), and the temporal relative (not illustrated here, but
effectively the same in form as the conditional). The protasis is evidently
a subordinate clause, its subordination normally (but not necessarily)
being marked either by the general subordinator m- (as in 22) or by the
obviative prefix ku-. What is of special interest here is the fact that the
transition between the protasis and the main clause is identical to that
observed between the first and second of two coordinate clauses.

It is quite possible that the protasis constructions are already accom-
modated within the grammar we are developing. That is to say, the
protasis and main clause in sentences of the type represented in (22)
may, from the strictly syntactic point of view, simply be coordinated
clauses—defined by rule (14) in the case of the obviative, by rules (20)
and (21) in the case of the proximate. The possibility should, however,
be kept in mind that protasis clauses are syntactically subordinate and
should be introduced as such by rules of the base. It is possible, in fact,
that they should be introduced as a preauxiliary constituent of the
sentential specifier. The following rule schema (very tentatively formu-
lated) would account for the observed patterns:

(23) SpecV → V” {OBVAUX CONJ (AUX)}

Biclausal (protasis-apodosis) constructions of the type illustrated in
(22) have close paraphrases in which the dependent clause is postposed.
In the case of semantically obviative constructions, this is already
provided for in our grammar, by virtue of rules (5a) and (5b). Thus, a
close paraphrase of (22c) is:

(24) Nt o hu: hegai mat g Huan hascu 'i gatwi (AUX FUT eat:PERF that SUBORDAUX ART John what ever shoot:PERF)

'I'll eat whatever John shot'.

In proximate (i.e., shared-subject) cases, however, the form of post-
posed conditionals, correlative, and temporal relatives is quite different,
in the prevailing usage. A special auxiliaryless construction, which I call
the "participle," is used for this. The verb in a participle construction
bears a suffix, whose form depends upon the aspect of the verb. The
most prominent of these participle suffixes (glossed -PART) are -c (after
imperfectives) and -k (after perfectives), that is, identical in shape to the
proximate conjunctions to which they are etymologically related. The
participle verbs, therefore, are identical in form to the V-CONJ fusions
mentioned earlier. However, the participles must be distinguished from
the conjunctions, since a participle verb may appear nonfinal within its
own clause (i.e., it may be followed by its complements), while a V-CONJ
fusion may never do so (a fact which follows automatically from the way
in which the fusions arise).

Participial constructions are exemplified in:

(25) 'a arm o koi, xa taccu-d-c. (here AUX FUT sleep:PERF, if WANT-FUT:IMPERF-PART)

'You can sleep here, if you want'.

(25b) Pt o s-ko'okam 'e-ju.: xa 'i ges-y-k. (AUX FUT s-hurtfully self-do:PERF, if INCEP fall:PERF-PART)

'You'll hurt yourself if you fall'.

(25c) Iduum 'ad cem s-mu'amk 'eda wud 'ali-k-c. (bear AUX cem s-kill:DESIDERATIVE then COPULA child-INCREMEN-

- PART)

'He used to want to kill a bear when he was a child'.

Since participials necessarily lack a specifier, I assume that they are
introduced as two-bar structures, in clause-final position, and their
subjects, necessarily nonverbal, are interpreted by means of a special
control rule which binds them to the subject of the main verb—that is to
say, participials are evidently structures of obligatory control.

Although many details of Papago grammar have not been touched
upon in this discussion, and although none has been given a full
 treatment, we have enough background now to turn to a consideration
of the historical developments which might have given rise to the
modern Papago system of conjunctions.

4. Possible UA antecedents. The obviative prefix of Papago may be
derived from the Uto-Aztecan subordinating suffix *-ku ~ -ko. This
element is continued in a number of attested Uto-Aztecan languages,
some examples of which are listed here: Numic -ku (e.g., Miller 1975:95),
Hopi -q ( / -qo/; Jeanne 1978:chap. 3), Huichol -ku (Grimes 1964:65),
Mayo -k ~ -ko (Collard and Collard 1963:207-11), Tubar -ko (Lionnet
1978:44). The Mayo and Tubar identifications may be incorrect. Gen-
ernally, however, an element of this form is widespread in the family and
is characteristically obviative where encountered. The vocalism of the
ending is reconstructed as variable. Numic quite consistently shows /u/
like its fellow connective -ti- mentioned above, may likewise reflect an early UA system of proximate subordination. Within Numic, the Southern Ute participial ending -/ka/ (written -ga; Ute Language Program 1979:86) closely approximates the Tepiman *-ka in form and function. And Hopi -qua, a likely candidate, is primarily a nominalizing element (Jeanne 1978:chap. 4 and Voegelin and Voegelin 1975) and is not now exclusively proximate.

5. The syntax of UA subordinate constructions. The subordinators cited in the preceding section serve a number of functions in the modern languages, including a type of subordination closely similar to that termed "protasis" in my earlier discussion of Papago. I believe that this function is well enough attested in the UA daughter languages to be reconstructed for the family as a whole. Thus, I assume that the following structural profile—perhaps defined by a rule introducing the subordinate clause in "specifier position"—should be attributed to Proto-Uto-Aztecan:

\[
\frac{\text{protsis}}{\text{main clause}}\frac{\text{remainder}}{\ldots \text{V-Sub}}_{\text{V}}^m \quad \frac{\text{\ldots V}}{\text{V}}_{\text{v}-\text{t}}
\]

Here, the notation \( V^m \) stands for the maximum projection of the sentential (i.e., verbal) category, and \( V\text{-Sub} \) symbolizes the verb-plus-subordinator word which heads the protasis clause. And \( V^m\text{-v} \) symbolizes the portion of the main clause which follows the specifier position (i.e., it is the maximum-minus-one level of structure).

The following Huichol sentences (taken from Grimes 1964:65) illustrate this protasis construction, outside Tepiman:

\[ (27a) \] kuyélíká-\( i \) pinélicu\( z é \i\).  
(walk:along-PROX:CONCUR he:SAW:me)  
'As he (A) was walking along, he (A) saw me'.

\[ (27b) \] ni\( a \)-\( ka \) pinélicu\( z é \i\).  
(arrive-PROX:ANTECED he:SAW:me)  
'After he (A) arrived, he (A) saw me'.

\[ (27c) \] ni\( a \)-\( ku \) pinélicu\( z é \i\).  
(arrive-OBJ:ANTECED he:SAW:me)  
'After he (A) arrived, he (B) saw me'.

I turn now to the developments within the Tepiman branch.

6. The obviative. If the Papago obviative prefix ku- and the cognate ku- ~ ko- found in other Tepiman languages are indeed related to the Uto-Aztecan obviative subordinating suffix *-ku ~ -ko, then a radical
reanalysis of this element occurred quite early in the prehistory of the Tepiman branch. In Tepiman, where the putative continuation of the UA obliative ending is found, it is consistently a prefix to the auxiliary of the second clause in sequence, not a suffix to the verb of the first clause. And just as in Papago, the *ku- ~ ko- of other Tepiman languages can initiate clauses which are not in sequence, that is, it can initiate a paragraph or even a discourse.

Mason (1916) refers to the Tepecano reflex of this element as a proclitic and says that it "is a little more forcible than *n- [another auxiliary prefix, glossed 'relative' by Mason]. It sometimes introduces subordinate clauses, being translated by 'that', but frequently begins a new sentence, particularly when a new thought is introduced or a break in continuity is made" (Mason 1916:337). The examples which appear in Mason's work show that it is prefixed to elements similar to those which, in Papago, are said to comprise the auxiliary. While its semantic force is similar to that of the Papago *ku-, in that it often indicates a "break in continuity," it is not so consistently obliative. The same is true of *ku- in Southern Tepehuán, Tepecano's closest extant relative (Willett 1980).

In Névome, this element (written *co by the grammarian of the Arte, and glossed *ko in examples below) regularly precedes person markers which, in Papago, have been assigned to the auxiliary. The compiler of the grammar wrote a space between *co and the person marker; the latter, under appropriate conditions, is followed by *t (cf. Papago *ti in the t-form of the auxiliary), also set off by a space. The function of *co in Névome includes subordination, particularly of "subjunctive clauses" in *na (cf. Smith 1862:21; this form is not now used in Papago but is continued in other modern Tepiman languages), and coordination. An example of the latter use is the following:

(28) Taso [sic taco] hakida ay si-m' himi tani an't' igui, co'p' ta pima ay s' himi mu. (Smith 1862:26)
(yesterday at: this time hither si-you go order: PERF first: singular ta igui, ko second: singular ta NEG hither si go DESERATIVE)

'Yesterday at this time I ordered you to come here, but you didn't want to come'.

Although I cannot, of course, be sure what the state of affairs in the synchronic grammar of Névome would have been, I do not think that it would be a mistake to regard the sequence *co'p'ta in (28) as a t-form auxiliary complex containing the prefix *ko-, the Névome cognate of Papago *ku-, just as the equivalent modern Onavas Pima form *ko-p-t most assuredly is. As in Tepecano, however, this element is not consistently obliative, as the following example attests:

(29) Dodaki Padre divia-na, co hunu ni maca-na. (Smith 1862:22)
(OPTATIVE priest come-SUBJUNCTIVE, KO CORN me give-SUBJUNCTIVE)

'Would that the priest would come to give me corn'.

In my material on the modern Pima of Onavas and of the Sierra, all instances of *ko- (with one possible exception from Onavas) conform to the obliative use. The *ko- is prefixed to the other elements regarded as belonging to the auxiliary, as in Papago:

(30) Onavas

(30a) *ig ni'i kon 'am yook.
(that sing OBVAUX I cry)

'He sings and I cry'.

(30b) G 'ali k gogs giv' him ko kui-him.
(ART child ART:OBJ dog strike-PRES OBVAUX HOWL-PRES)

'The child is striking the dog and it (the dog) is howling'.

(31) Sierra (recorded at Yecora)

(31a) *An tkpa:n-im kop 'ap itiy-im.
(I work-PRES OBVAUX you play-PRES)

'I am working and you are playing'.

(31b) *An hink sik mi ko in'hadin' hink tux 'ip mi.
(I one:OBJ deer KILL: PERF OBVAUX my brother one:OBJ rabbit also KILL: PERF)

'I killed a deer, and my brother killed a rabbit as well'.

It should be pointed out that the auxiliary in these languages, so far as I am aware, "surfaces" only when prefixed. This fact can be observed in the initial clauses of (30) and (31), where no element corresponding to the Papago auxiliary appears. I assume that this suppression of auxiliaries in main or "unattached" clauses is a recent development, not a continuation of the original Tepiman state of affairs.

If we assume that Uto-Aztecan languages generally shared a protasis construction of the type depicted in (26), then it is quite possible that the ancestor of the Tepiman languages also shared that construction. If we assume, further, that an auxiliary element was present at this pre-Tepiman stage as well, and that it directly followed the protasis clause, then there would have been at that stage of the protolanguage a structural "profile" of the following form:

(32) protasis main clause remainder

( ( . . ) V -k u ) V a u ( ( . . ) V ) V a s -
(In which ku symbolizes the obviative subordinator *-ku ~ -ko.) This places the obviative subordinator of the protasis directly before and adjacent to the auxiliary (aux) of the main clause. It is quite possible that this construction is sufficiently ambiguous, structurally, to permit a reanalysis, by the pre-Tepiman learning generations, according to which the subordinator is dissociated from its erstwhile host verb and fused onto the auxiliary of the main clause remainder, resulting in the following surface structure:

(33)  

\[
\text{"protasis"} \quad \text{"main clause remainder"} \\
(V \ldots V_{\text{m-l}}) \quad \text{ku-aux} \quad (V \ldots V_{\text{v-l}})
\]

The likelihood of this reanalysis is not diminished by semantic considerations, since, if the testimony of modern languages like Hopi (as well as that of the Tepiman languages themselves) can be entered in evidence here, the protasis clause is not always subordinate semantically (i.e., not always a "backgrounding" or "conditional" clause), and, in fact, it is very often semantically coordinate to the remainder, and in some cases may arguably be semantically more prominent than the remainder. While the protasis may originally have been consistently subordinate semantically, I suggest that it did not remain so. At the pre-Tepiman stage of interest here, I suggest that the protasis was often semantically coordinate, possibly even superordinate, and that the reanalysis depicted in (33) did in fact take place—encouraged not only by the "ambiguity" of the ancestral structural profile, but also by the more perfect syntactic-semantic alignment which reanalysis achieves. If this reanalysis did in fact take place, and the structure of (33) came to be used for clausal coordination (with the "remainder" now perhaps V\text{m-l}, not V\text{m-1}), then it is expected that it would also come to be used for proximate and obviative coordination alike (as it evidently did in Névome and Tepecano).

While I cannot say that I am absolutely confident of the correctness of the scenario just presented, it does have the virtue of explaining the fact that the Tepiman auxiliary prefix ku- ~ ko- is identical (up to and including the variable vocalism) with the Uto-Aztecan obviative subordinator *-ku ~ -ko. The suggested reanalysis, however, if real, took place in pre-Tepiman times, evidently, since it appears that the ku- ~ ko- auxiliary prefix must be reconstructed for the branch as a whole. We are, therefore, at some temporal remove from it and can only see its final result, itself somewhat obscured by subsequent changes in individual daughter languages. The situation is to some extent more favorable in the case of the proximate counterpart, however, since here the protasis construction evidently persisted well into the Tepiman era and is still observable in Papago, as we have seen.

7. The proximate. At the time the Arte was composed, Névome evidently continued the U/A endings *-it and *-ka only in the protasis, or subordinating, construction. That is to say, it represents a state of affairs which must have obtained in earlier stages of Papago, prior to the putative reanalysis leading to the new "conjunction" status of modern (*-ke and (*-jk). Some reanalysis may, however, have taken place in Névome, in a direction not followed by the Papago represented in the examples so far cited in this essay. The putative Névome reanalysis had to do not with the structural nature of the endings but rather with their proximate function. While *-it (written tu in the Arte) is consistently proximate in Névome, its aspectual opposite *-ka (written ca) had extended its use to embrace the obviative function as well as the proximate. (I am assuming that this was the direction of change, and not the reverse; but this could be mistaken, particularly in view of the obviative function of apparent continuations of Uto-Aztecan *-ka in certain Northern Uto-Aztecan languages.) In addition, Névome possessed certain suffixes which cannot clearly be related to modern Papago elements. Examples of the proximate endings with which we are concerned follow.

-tu (proximate):

(34a) Ohan-tu pim' hucudoi an' t' io munnu. (Arte, p. 31) (write-prox neg who 1st:sg ta fut address:perf)

'While writing I will speak to no one'.

(34b) Oumurh-tu an' t' igui gui. (Arte, p. 31) (room-prox 1st:sg ta igui fall:perf)

'While walking around I fell'.

-ca (proximate, obviative):

(34c) Cabaio gus'-ca t' igui ni-maisa. (Vocab., p. 17) (horse fall:perf-prox ta igui me-cover:perf)

'The horse, falling, pinned me underneath'.

(34d) Mu divia-ca mu-gaga t' igui sicoa. (Arte, p. 30) (you:obj arrive:perf-obj your-field ta igui hoo:perf)

'After you arrived, he hoed your field'.

This last example illustrates a regular Névome principle according to which an overt subject in the protasis is marked for objective case; this continues a feature of Proto-Uto-Aztecan grammar. The operation of this principle is not visible in 34a and 34c, since case is not overt on nouns, only on determiners and pronouns.)

Onavas Pima (possibly a descendant of Névome, if not, a close relative thereof) is similar to Papago in its continuation of *-it and *-ka.
generalized to all occurrences. That such a reanalysis could have occurred is made plausible by the additional observation that the *-p3 of Sierra Pima is also extended to nominal coordination (i.e., just as it apparently is in Papago). Examples of proximate coordination by *-p3 are given in (37)—word boundaries and transcription of epenthetic i are rendered as in my original field notes:

(37a) G kii 'a·nanak-kad ka·k·k·i (k) a·vupi·kad niit.


'He hears with his ears and sees with his eyes'.

(37b) Gogis· ko'ok iti· kui·him.

(dog sick PROX howl:PRES)

'The dog is sick and howling'.

While the modern Piman languages briefly surveyed here have developed in somewhat different ways, neither the difference among them nor their remove from the state of affairs represented by Névéome is very great. It is not at all unreasonable to suggest that at a time not very long ago, perhaps not much earlier than the writing of the Arte in which Névéome was reported, the proximate endings were involved in a single uniform syntactic construction directly descended from the protasis construction attributed to Uto-Aztecan (i.e., the structure of 26 above). Although the obviative version of the structure had almost certainly been reanalyzed, the proximate construction depicted in (38) persisted in Piman and was probably still in full use through, and quite possibly for some time after, the Jesuit sojourn in the Pimería:

(38) \[ \text{protasis} \quad \text{main clause remainder} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\ldots V \{ \begin{array}{c}
-\text{ti} \\
-\text{ka} \\
\end{array} \} \gamma_{\text{prot}} \\
\end{array}
\]

This structure, I contend, is the one which antecedent the protasis and participial constructions of modern Papago and which constitutes the source of the modern system of conjunctions found in that language.

8. Papago. In the canonical Névéome instantiation of (38) (i.e., as described in the Arte) the complex sentence as a whole had only one instance of the so-called auxiliary (assuming this to be a genuine construct in Névéome), and this auxiliary appeared in the main clause remainder, not in the protasis. In order to get from the structure depicted in (38) to the type of structure which exists in modern Papago,

\[ ^{3} \text{In Tepeccano and Southern Tepehuan, the modern descendants of *-hi and *-ka have apparently become finite inflections (see the longer version of this article for examples).} \]
where the auxiliary appears regularly in the first clause, and only secondarily in the second, we must somehow contrive to get the auxiliary forward in (38) at some pre-Papago stage. The data of Névome, taken in their totality, including not only the grammar, but the Confesionario as well, offer some suggestions in this regard. While the auxiliary associated with the main clause may normally have followed the dependent clause, it often preceded it, particularly in the interrogative form (initiated, as in Papago, by the prefix n(a)-), perhaps to embrace the dependent clause within the scope of the polar question operator. Thus, in the Confesionario, one finds examples conforming to the pattern represented by:

(39) N' ap' ta pim' hicudoi hiboina-ca muha?
    (Q 2:sg ta NEG who bewitch:PERF-PROX kill:PERF)
    'Have you ever, bewitching someone, killed him?'
    (I.e. 'Have you ever killed anyone by bewitching him?')

The string n' ap' ta here is the exact equivalent of the Papago qaux complex napt. If the Confesionario data are trustworthy, and if they can be taken to illustrate a general syntactic possibility in the language of the period, then it is evident that Névome—and presumably its sister Piman languages as well, including the ancestor of Papago—permitted a protasis subordinate clause to appear in post-aux position within the matrix clause. Thus, in addition to the profile depicted in (38) above, Piman of the Névome era also had the following:

(40) (aux (...) v {i \{ti\}} \{ka\} \{m\} \{m\} \{m\} \\

This probably persisted as an alternative construction as long as Piman was predominantly verb-final, as Névome was. But as free word order developed, resulting ultimately in the system described earlier for Papago, it is extremely likely that the dependent clause in this sort of construction was attracted to the right margin of the sentence—this is observationally a much-favored (or unmarked) arrangement in so-called scrambling languages. The end point of this latter development is the participial construction of modern Papago.

But this is not the only thing that happened to (40), evidently. That profile is susceptible to reanalysis. In an extraordinarily large percentage of actual instances, the auxiliary will be as appropriate to the verb of the dependent clause as to that of the matrix—this will always be the case where the two clauses agree in aspect. Thus, for example, the Névome sentence (39) is virtually identical in its profile to the modern Papago sentence:

(39') Napt pi hedai hiwihoin-k mua?
    (qaux NEG who bewitch:PERF-PROX kill:PERF)

'Have you not (ever) bewitched anyone and (thereby) killed him/her?'

And the meaning, I suspect, is essentially the same. But in the Papago sentence, the auxiliary is not exclusively associated with the main clause—it is most likely associated jointly with the coordinate predicates (i.e., it is specifier to the coordinated two-bar structures following it). In the Névome of (39), I imagine that the auxiliary is properly construed only with the final (and main) verb, while the suffixed predicate hiboinac-a is subordinate syntactically (whatever the facts may have been semantically).

Given the fact that the protasis clause is often semantically coordinate to the matrix, a reanalysis assigning the auxiliary to the embedded clause (in a structure like 40) would not be at all surprising. This alone would give the following profile:

(41) (aux (... ) v {i \{ti\} \{ka\} \{m\} \{m\} \\

This is essentially the proximate protasis construction of modern Papago and, very probably, the immediate precursor to the coordinate structures of that language as well.

The next step in the indicated direction is a reanalysis which, so to speak, formalizes the semantic coordination as a genuine coordinate structure in syntax by "promoting" the erstwhile suffixes to the status of coordinate conjunction, introducing them as such by means of a coordinate structure schema within the phrase structure component of the grammar. Since the second predicate in (41) lacks the auxiliary (i.e., the sentential specifier), it would appear, from the structure profile itself, that it is the core of the sentence (i.e., the two-bar structure) that enters into the coordination and that the auxiliary serves, umbrella fashion, for both predicates. I suggest that this two-bar coordination was, in fact, the first to enter the language:

(42) aux (... ) v\nu conj (... ) v\nu.

Notice that this corresponds precisely to the coordination depicted in (16b), repeated here for convenience:

(16b) Spec v V'\nu conj V''

The coordinate subpart of this would be defined by the phrase structure rule given in (21) and repeated here:

(21) X'\nu \rightarrow X'\nu (conj X')\nu*

The reanalysis being suggested here, in fact, amounts to the introduction of this rule into the language ancestral to modern Papago.

Once this rule was introduced, it was generalized (probably at once) to all categories. Its generalization follows in part from the nature of
phrase structure (as conceived within the X-bar theory) and in part from the nature of true coordinate structures.

The change would follow from the theory of phrase structure, since that theory places the highest value on generalizations across categories. Thus, assuming, as seems reasonable, that there is a universal rule of coordination, having roughly the form indicated below (setting aside details concerning the surface positioning of the conjunction):

\[ X' \rightarrow X'' \text{ (CONJ } X''') \ast \]

and assuming that this is universal not in its instantiation but in its universal availability for potential instantiation, as soon as Papago acquired the rule:

\[ V''' \rightarrow V'' \text{ (CONJ } V''') \ast \]

it is likely that it generalized to the other major categories, giving the form presented in (21).

The particular way in which the coordination rule entered Papago—that is, via reanalysis of a subordinating structure which presented the learning generations with a profile containing only one instance of the sentential specifier AUX (as depicted in 42)—evidently led first to a grammar in which coordination was at the two-bar level of structure, rather than at the maximal projection of phrasal categories. It is likely, however, that coordination at the maximal level is most natural (cf. the suggestion to this effect in George 1980). If so, it is to be expected that rule (21) would soon be joined by the more usual coordination at the maximal projection—as expressed in rule (20), repeated here for convenience:

\[ X''' \rightarrow X''' \text{ (CONJ } X''') \ast \]

If a development such as the one just outlined is at all reasonable, then we must address a question which quite naturally suggests itself regarding the Uto-Aztecan obviative element *-ku ~ -ko, which did not reanalyze as a coordinating conjunction in the sense of CONJ in (20) and (21). Why, for example, didn’t reanalysis of the obviative protasis construction give rise to structures defined by (20), with *-ku ~ -ko representing the CONJ element? I suggest that the reason this theoretically possible reanalysis did not take place has to do precisely with the fact that *-ku ~ -ko was obviative and therefore, in the common ancestral Tepiman stage, would regularly have been followed by the auxiliary of the main clause, as in the profile given in (32), repeated here:

\[ \ldots \text{protasis} \quad \text{main clause remainder} \]

\[ \text{V-ko}\_{y-1} \quad \text{AUX} \quad \ldots \text{V}\_{y-1} \]

Although, to be sure, it is not necessarily the case that this construction would reanalyze in any particular way, it was subject, so to speak, to the “ambiguity” according to which the *-ku ~ -ko element was, ahistorically, associated morphologically with the following AUX rather than with the preceding V. I find it easy to imagine that this is what happened in fact—the early or pre-Tepiman *-ku ~ -ko was reanalyzed as a prefix ku- ~ ko- on the following auxiliary and came eventually, and quite naturally, to function as a clause introducer, much like the other auxiliary prefixes found in Tepiman synchronically. This reanalysis deprived *-ku ~ -ko of the opportunity of undergoing the alternative reanalysis as a coordinating conjunction in Tepiman. I should emphasize, however, that I offer this suggestion with some reticence, since I have no detailed knowledge at all which would permit me to state with certainty that the Tepiman auxiliary is in fact a continuation of the Uto-Aztecan obviative suffix.

Assuming it is correct that only the Uto-Aztecan proximate suffixes had the opportunity to reanalyze in the way they evidently have in Papago, a number of questions remain concerning the details of their reanalysis as coordinate conjunctions. I concern myself with only two of these remaining questions, to wit: (1) Why did (-k), and not (-k), come to be the conjunction for nonverbal categories? (2) How did the alternant *k arise?

The answer to the first question is to be found in the morphophonological observation made earlier concerning the interaction between a perfective verb and the perfective-associated (-k). Recall that the proximate conjunction may, and normally does, fuse onto the verb of the preceding clause where that is verb-final—harking back, no doubt, to its earlier suffixal status. Recall further that a perfective verb, when suffixed, fails to undergo the truncation process so characteristic of perfective forms in Tepiman (especially Papago). Since truncation is blocked by the proximate element -k, as with any other suffix, the surface forms of Papago sentences in which a perfective verb immediately precedes the proximate conjunction will regularly provide “audible” evidence of the suffixal nature of the conjunction. By contrast, the imperfective-associated element (-k) will not so regularly reveal its suffixal status, since its attachment to a preceding verb does not block a prominent morphophonological process.

We can assume with great certainty that the superficial formal state of affairs just described was essentially the same in the pre-Papago era when the pressures for reanalysis were making themselves felt. It seems quite reasonable to propose that (-k) (< *-k) underwent reanalysis before (-k) (< *ka) did, the latter resisting reanalysis for a time by virtue of its all too evident suffixal status. If (-k) became a conjunction (i.e., CONJ in
20 and 21) before (-k) did, then it would be the former, rather than the latter, which would spread to nonverbal categories, assuming as I have here that generalization of the coordination rule would follow smartly on the heels of the initial reanalysis.

Given this scenario, it would not be surprising to find a language representing the suggested intermediate stage in its synchronic grammar—that is to say, a language in which -k (\(< -*ka\)) is clearly suffixal and in which the imperfective-associated counterpart has become the generalized coordinate conjunction. Sierra Pima may be such a language. It is certain, at least, that -k is consistently suffixal; it is never separated from the verb of the preceding clausal conjunct, and it consistently blocks the morphophonological processes which otherwise affect perfective verbs in that language. The situation with Sierra (-j)j\(j\)j\(j\)\(j\) (\(< -*th\)) is somewhat unclear. I have suggested earlier that it has been reanalyzed—to account for the palatalization. But it is not clear, in the case of verbal coordination, that it can be separated from the verb of the preceding clausal conjunct. My own notes are quite ambiguous on this matter in terms of my transcription of forms, and crucial test cases (e.g., with the verb nonfinal in the first of a pair of conjoined clauses) are simply missing from my data. However, there is positive evidence that this element has become a generalized coordinating conjunction in Sierra Pima, since it is used in nominal coordination, as illustrated in the following sentence: 8

(43) Huan \(t\)\(i\)gVenit \(s\i\)\(i\)mu\(i\)m\(a\)k.

(John CONJ ART Benito very much speak)

'John and Benito talk a lot'.

The genesis of the Papago alternant \(kc\) is, I think, also illuminated by a consideration of the phenomenon of fusion discussed earlier in connection with the proximate conjunction. The imperfective-associated

---

8 The Ónavas Pima cognate -t evidently has not reanalyzed in this way, remaining firmly suffixal to verbs. Stephen Hale (personal communication) has given me the following Ónavas Pima form, elicited by him to obtain conjoined nominals in subject position:

'Aligur k \(k\)\(i\)l vim \(m\)\(i\)k.

(youth ART:OM man with speak)

'The youth and the (older) man speak'. (Lit., 'The youth speaks with the (older) man'.)

This clearly involves the use of a postpositional construction, based in the comitative postposition \(vim\) (cf. the Papago adposition \(w\)\(e\)\(m\)). This comitative construction may well function generally to express ideas for which the conjoined nominal construction would be used in Papago. More investigations must be made, however, since the above sentence is open to other interpretations with respect to its position within the total body of possible evidence on coordination of Ónavas Pima.

9 Sierra Pima evidently has an alternant \(kJ)j\(j\)j\(j\)\(j\) (beside \(f)j\(j\)j\(j\)\(j\), for its own autonomous conjunction. I do not control the details, however, since I have only heard (overheard) this

---

element (-k) may, it was noted, fuse onto a preceding clause-final verb; in its participial function, of course, it is necessarily fused onto the verb and, there, it represents a direct continuation of the original proximate suffix of Uto-Aztecan. When this element attaches to a stative predicator terminating in the segmental skeleton V(L)V, an increment -k appears immediately preceding it, as exemplified in:

(44) 'Ali 'o wou\(i\)-k\(e\) soak.

(child AUX there lie-INCREMENT-CONJ cry)

'The child is lying there and crying'.

I suggest that this is the source of the \(kc\) alternant. The logic of reanalysis is quite straightforward. Consider, for example, the fused form wou\(i\)-k\(e\) in the sentence just cited. Since the verb in the first verbal conjunct (i.e., wou\(i\)) would lack the -k increment if not suffixed, 10 the surface forms of the relevant stative sentences give the impression that the increment is dependent upon the suffix. It would not be surprising, therefore, if the increment were in fact associated with the proximate suffix itself by the learning generations faced with the actual surface forms. The proximate ending would, accordingly, appear to have two alternants, -k and -kc, either or both of which could assume the role of CONJ when the reanalysis under consideration here took place.

From the observed synchronic facts of Papago, it is evident that both alternants did indeed come to represent the new category CONJ. The original phonological correlation is only marginally evident now, in the speech of those who, in nominal coordination for instance, distribute \(kc\) and \(c\) in accordance with the phonological shape of the nominal preceding the conjunction—that is, \(kc\) after \(...\) V(L)V, and \(c\) otherwise.
There is some evidence that the alternation between $c$ and $kc$ has assumed a new rationale in the synchronic grammar of Papago. I cannot yet speak with confidence on this matter, but it appears that the longer alternant is sometimes used to signal the circumstance in which an immediately preceding potential conjunct is not to be taken as coordinate with the constituent following the conjunct. If I am correct in this, the longer alternant ($kc$) will be used to signal the fact that the string A CONJ B is to be bracketed as . . . A] CONJ B . . . . That is to say, the longer alternant appears where a major syntactic break intervenes between the potential conjunct A and the following conjunct. By contrast, use of the shorter form $c$ in an otherwise identical string would imply direct coordination of A and B.

This is all extremely tentative, but the issue deserves detailed study and may well prove to be of great importance in the investigation of discourse structure in Papago. It is almost certainly relevant to the study of uses of the conjunctions which go beyond what I have referred to as their "canonical" proximate coordinating function.
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