

MARKING THE BENEFICIARY IN  
MUSKOGEAN, DAKOTA, AND YUCHI

T. Dale Nicklas

Prairie Village, Kansas

Introduction

Proto-Muskogean used a morphological device for marking the beneficiary in the verb which also appears to be found in Dakota (possibly formerly in Dhegiha as well), and perhaps in Yuchi.<sup>1</sup> The device consists of a sequence of two dative markers, the first marking the person of the beneficiary, the second being a non-anaphoric third person dative. This device is unusual and arbitrary enough to instill some confidence in the conclusion that its areal distribution is not accidental. Its spread indicates contact in the more or less remote past, as its structure is generally clearer in reconstruction than in the modern languages.

Proto-Muskogean

Early Proto-Muskogean had a general set of pronominal prefixes supplemented by specialized affixes for the 1s affirmative actor and patient, and 1p actor.<sup>2</sup> Ignoring irrelevant details, the series we are concerned with appear in Table I on the following page.

The dative affixes originally consisted of the general affixes plus the increment *-mi*. The resulting combinations, which I will call the free dative, are seen in the first elements of the benefactive series in Table I. The free dative apparently survives in the Creek independent pronouns except 1s *ani*. Thus Florida Seminole 2s *ci:mi*, 3s *i:mi*, 1p *pi:mi* ~ *pi:mita:ki*, 2p *ci:mita:ki*,

---

<sup>1</sup>Caddo may also carry this trait (Wallace Chafe, comment at the conference). In Nicklas 1994 the trait was erroneously attributed to Proto-Siouan. I wish to express my appreciation for the comments of Wallace L. Chafe on Caddo and Heather K. Hardy on Alabama at the conference, and for the useful materials and comments provided me by Mary S. Linn for Yuchi and Robert L. Rankin for Dhegiha. I am responsible for all misinterpretations and other errors.

<sup>2</sup>Abbreviations are 1, 2, and 3 for first, second, and third persons and s and p for singular and plural, including dual. Thus 1s is first person singular, 3 is third person singular, dual, or plural.

Table I: Proto-Muskogean patient and dative paradigms

	General Series	Dative	Benefactive	Collapsed Benefactive
1s	a-	am-	ami im-	amim-
2s	či-	čim-	čimi im-	čimim-
3	i-	im-	imi im-	imim-
1p	pi-	pim-	pimi im-	pimim-
2p	hači-	hačim-	hačimi im-	hačimim-

3p *i:mita:ki* (Nathan 1977:57).<sup>3</sup> With an ablaut grade which accents the vowel and geminates the consonant, it survives in the independent possessive pronouns of Choctaw: 1s *ámmi*, 2s *čímmi*, 3 *ímmi*, 1p *pímmi*, 2p *hačímmi*.<sup>4</sup> Loss of the final *i* when the dative is prefixed is as yet unexplained. The benefactive was expressed by the free dative followed by a non-anaphoric third person dative prefix, as listed in Table I. Following a general rule of external sandhi common to the Muskogean languages, in normal speech the benefactive paradigm would collapse as indicated in the last column of Table I. Note that this collapse creates favorable conditions for reanalysis as a sequence of bound dative markers, with loss of the free dative forms as such.

When the final *m* of the dative prefix is followed by a consonant, it undergoes changes which vary somewhat from language to language. In Choctaw it is lost, and the preceding vowel is

<sup>3</sup>The accent and vowel length here is apparently due to an ablaut grade. Creek dialects generally have 1p *pó:mi*, most likely a reflex of the combination \**pi-* + \**ho-* 'plural' expressing the first person inclusive (Booker 1980:37 et seq.). These dialects and Hitchiti-Miccosukee, Alabama, and Chickasaw generally have *po-* where Choctaw, Apalachee, and some Florida Seminole retain *pi-*. Koasati has *ko-*. The plural suffix *-ta:ki* is a Creek innovation, possibly borrowed from Algonquian (Haas 1958:249-50).

<sup>4</sup>Kimball (personal communication) explains the corresponding Koasati forms, which are verbs (Kimball 1991:89), as combinations of dative prefixes with the verb classifier *-li*; the assimilation \**am-li* > \**ammi-* would be regular in proto-Muskogean. The same result would flow from \**ami-li*; compare \**omi* 'to be, do' (Booker 1980:200) with Koasati *ommi-* < \**omi-li* 'to be the case that [trans]' and *onka-* < \**omi-ka* 'to be the case that [intrans]' (Kimball 1991:90, 345).

nasalized and compensatorily lengthened: \*im-pila > i: pila 'to throw to him, to send to him'.<sup>5</sup>

The probable use of the dative and benefactive concord markers in Proto-Muskogean can be inferred from the following.

In conservative Choctaw dialect the basic use of the bound dative series is to mark indirect objects other than beneficiaries: *im* a 'to give to him', *ɨ: hašaya* 'to be angry at him', *im ahoba* 'to seem to him'.<sup>6</sup> Derived uses include marking the possessor, generally alienable: *im issóbah* 'his horse'; compare *i niškin* 'his eye'. Also the person whose possession, body part, or kinsman is affected by the action ("ethical" dative), as in *issóbah* at *ɨ: kaniya tok* 'his horses ran off, the horses ran off on him', *iyyi't ɨ: lača tok* 'his feet got wet, the feet got wet on him', *iyyi ɨ: kobaffi li tok* 'I broke his foot, I broke him a foot' (at ~ 't subjective article, *tok* recent past, *li* 1s actor). Other extensions of the use of this paradigm are described in Nicklas 1974.

In some dialects the bound dative series is also used to establish concord with the beneficiary: *holisso ɨ: čompa li tok* 'I bought him a book'. This is not uncommon. In conservative dialect the benefactive series is used: *holisso imi ɨ: čompa li tok* 'I

---

<sup>5</sup>The reconstruction is based on Choctaw dialects which are conservative at this point, as will be clear from the comparative evidence which follows, so it is probably well to address objections raised by Ulrich (1986:259-60) to the account of Choctaw in Nicklas 1974. Most importantly, Ulrich describes this as my analysis of the Choctaw benefactives. In fact it is a report of my observations of the forms used by native speakers; that is, when a speaker of a conservative dialect speaks slowly enough to eliminate external sandhi effects, the collapsed forms of Table I break apart as indicated in the Benefactive column. Our object should be to explain this data rather than ignore it. Second, Ulrich objects that possessives like *ámmi* cannot be derived from free datives like *ami* by internal change because only verbs undergo internal change. But the Choctaw possessive pronouns are probably verbs in origin, as they still are in Koasati. This is further suggested by the increment \*-mi, which otherwise forms verbs (Booker 1980:200-07). Third, Ulrich objects that the intensive of *ami* would be *â:mi* rather than *ámmi*. I think the internal change required was formerly productive; it is seen in a few Choctaw forms which display the same modification, like *pila* > *pílla* 'to throw, toward (postposition)', *póllah* 'surely' (Nicklas 1974:79, 93), possibly *póttah* 'all', and perhaps a few others. If not, Kimball's etymology (footnote 4) is an alternative. Finally Ulrich claims that the final nasalization in Mrs. Wade's speech cannot arise from m, but only from n (see below). This ignores the forms used by other speakers with final m before vowels.

<sup>6</sup>Bound dative "series" rather than "prefixes" because native speakers are generally insistent that they are not affixed.

bought him a book'. Some of these dialects show the reanalysis described above: *holiŋso im i: čompa li tok* 'I bought him a book'.

The dialect described by Ulrich (1986:258-62) has apparently fused the two datives and then generalized the preconsonantal forms, with *imi:*, etc., before both consonants and vowels. There are alternate forms without nasalization, *imi*, etc.; that is, alternate forms identical to the original free dative. Whether these are survivals or result from loss of nasalization is probably a question for dialect research.

Reflexes of the Proto-Muskogean benefactive series are also found in the Alabama-Koasati group. Alabama apparently preserves the collapsed benefactive, reanalyzed as a sequence of two bound dative prefixes (Heather Hardy, comment at the conference). I have no further details on this language. Koasati uses analogous forms, but only when both a dative and a benefactive are present semantically. Kimball 1991:133 states:

"Two prefixes of position 5 can be used together if the semantics of an utterance require that both a benefactive and a dative object be expressed. However, the benefactive takes precedence over the dative, which can be expressed only by a third person prefix."

It appears that one could equally well say, if both a dative and a beneficiary are present semantically, mark the beneficiary with the collapsed benefactive, and leave the dative unmarked. Presumably the benefactive is otherwise marked with the dative series.

Reflexes of the benefactive are not described for the Creek-Seminole or Hitchiti-Miccosukee subgroups, so far as I am aware.

Considering the distribution of the double dative benefactive in Muskogean, the question arises whether it is to be reconstructed for Proto-Muskogean, or to be considered an innovation in the Choctaw-Chickasaw and Alabama-Koasati subgroups. I am inclined to the former position because of the apparent age of the free dative set, indicated by reflexes in both Western Muskogean and Creek-Seminole, at opposite extremes of the Muskogean region, and because the basic forms of this set occur only in the benefactive series of the most conservative Choctaw dialects.

#### Dakota

Boas and Deloria (1939:86) describe the Dakota analogs to the Muskogean dative and benefactive under the terms "1st dative" and "2nd dative", respectively, as follows:

"The possession of the object by the subject, and the indirect objects to, on behalf of, instead of, in place of, are expressed by the prefixes *ki* and *kici*. The latter may be by origin a doubled *ki*, the second *k* being

transformed after *i* into a *c*. The form *ki-* (1st dative) implies action referring to an object belonging to a person different from the subject but without sanction or permission of the owner; for instance, 'I take his own without his permission,' in other words, an action that reflects in some way upon his interest but performed on the initiative of the subject. The form *kici-* (2d dative) expresses an action done with permission of the owner of an object, an action done on his initiative or in his place."

It appears that these datives are limited to the possessors of the direct object. The 1st dative therefore corresponds to the Muskogean ethical dative, and the 2nd dative appears to be limited to beneficiaries who own the direct object.

For present purposes it is convenient to limit the discussion to singular subjects and objects. Doing that, the order of prefixes in Dakota is ambiguously Object-Actor-*ki* (*ki*)-STEM or 1st person-2nd person-*ki* (*ki*)-STEM, except that 1s/2s is unanalyzable *c<sup>h</sup>i-*.<sup>7</sup> Thus it is the combination of object prefix with later *ki* (*ki*)- which marks the dative object. The Dakota singular paradigms appear in Table II.

Table II: Dakota objective and 1st and 2nd dative prefixes

	Objective	1st Dative	2nd Dative	2nd Dative (underlying)
1s/2s	<i>c<sup>h</sup>i-</i>	<i>c<sup>h</sup>i-cí-</i>	<i>c<sup>h</sup>í-ci-</i>	<i>c<sup>h</sup>i-kí-ki-</i>
1s/3s	<i>wa-</i>	<i>wa-kí-</i>	<i>wé-ci-</i>	<i>wa-kí-ki-</i>
2s/1s	<i>ma-ya-</i>	<i>ma-yá-ki-</i>	<i>mi-yé-ci-</i>	<i>ma-yá-ki-ki-</i>
2s/3s	<i>ya-</i>	<i>ya-kí-</i>	<i>yé-ci-</i>	<i>ya-kí-ki-</i>
3s/1s	<i>ma-</i>	<i>ma-kí-</i>	<i>mí-ci-</i>	<i>ma-kí-ki-</i>
3s/2s	<i>ni-</i>	<i>ni-cí-</i>	<i>ní-ci-</i>	<i>ni-kí-ki-</i>
3s/3s	--	<i>ki-'</i>	<i>kí-ci-</i>	<i>kí-ki-</i>

Actor: 1s *wa-*, 2s *ya-*, 3s --. Patient: 1s *ma-*, 2s *ni-*, 3s --. Surface forms from Boas and Deloria 1939:76, 87.

The internal reconstructions of the last column follow the rule stated at Boas and Deloria 1939:87 as follows: "The second datives are obviously formed by the contraction of *aki* to *e*; *iki* to *i*." The 1s *mi-* found in the 2nd dative may represent a replacement rather than a modification of the vowel of *ma-*. The internal

<sup>7</sup>Abbreviations like 1s/2s are read "first person singular actor acting on second person singular direct or dative object."

reconstructions show that structurally the Dakota 2nd dative is to the 1st dative what the Muskogean benefactive is to the Muskogean dative. That is, to form the 2nd dative, use the 1st dative followed by a non-anaphoric third person 1st dative.

### Dhegiha

Of Ponca Boas (1906:334) said the following:

"The Ponca has two indirect objects, similar to those of the Dakota. Sufficient material for an exhaustive presentation of this difficult subject has not been collected. It may be sufficient to indicate the scope of these forms by what appears to be the most regular set of the indirect object, expressing the preposition 'for, on behalf of'."

The singular forms of this set, alongside the objective set, appear in Table III.\*

Table III: Ponca objective and 2nd dative

	Objective	2nd Dative
1s/2s	wi-	wi-
1s/3s	a-	e-
2s/1s	a <sup>n</sup> -ça-	i <sup>n</sup> -çe-
2s/3s	ça-	çe-
3s/1s	a <sup>n</sup> -	i <sup>n</sup> -
3s/2s	çi-	çi-
3s/3s	--	gi-

Formally, these show the same vowel changes in the 2nd dative as were seen in Dakota, but lack reflexes of the second empty \*ki. Semantically, it appears from several of Boas' examples that the Ponca 2nd dative illustrated in the table is not restricted to possessors of the direct object, but is simply the person for whom something is done. Such examples include i<sup>n</sup> çéwacka<sup>n</sup> 'thou makest an effort for me' and éka<sup>n</sup>bça 'I desire it for him'. Other examples correspond to Muskogean datives, including i<sup>n</sup>tegi 'it is difficult for me' and wéuda 'it is good for us' (objective wa-). The examples appear to show placement of the accent as in Dakota, due to coalescence with an original following \*ki-.

\*Prefixes are for actor, 1s a-, 2s ça-, 3s --; for patient, 1s a<sup>n</sup>-, 2s çi-, 3s --. Source: Boas 1906:331, 334.

Materials supplied by Robert L. Rankin suggest the possibility that Dhegiha formerly had a system like that of Dakota, which has collapsed in all languages except Kansa. In Omaha-Ponca it looks like the original 2nd dative, showing coalescence of the pronominal prefix with the first \*ki-, but with loss of the second \*ki-, is retained, serving both dative and benefactive functions. In Osage, on the other hand, it appears that the original 1st dative, with loss of \*ki-, serves both functions. However, Rankin cautions that there are more questions than answers, so this hypothesis must be considered speculative.

### Yuchi

Accounts of the pronominal inflection of the Yuchi verb can be found in Wagner 1934:324-36, 340, and Ballard 1975, 1978. Wagner relied on paradigms, making only a superficial analysis. Ballard's analysis contains important semantic observations, but on the formal side is quite complicated. A simpler analysis is possible and revealing. The following outline, based on Wagner's paradigms, is sufficient for present purposes.

There are three basic pronominal series, actor, patient, and dative. The patient consists of the actor with the increment -dze. The dative differs from the patient only in the second person. The internally reconstructed forms appear in Table IV.<sup>9</sup>

Table IV: Basic Yuchi pronominal affix series

	Actor	Patient	Dative
1s	di-	didze-	didze-
1p	no-	nodze-	nodze-
1n	'one-	'onedze-	'onedze-
2s	ne-	nedze-	s-
2p	'ane-	'anedze-	'as-

In addition, there is a prefix o- which always occurs in the dative, but which is not limited to that context. The schematic order of prefixes is Patient-Actor-Dative-o-STEM. Certain combinations have special forms. The patient and dative 1p and 1n are both we- when the subject is first or second person. This we- is identical to the third person classifier listed later, and so comes first in the prefix sequence; for example, we-di-o- 1s/1p

<sup>9</sup>Abbreviations as in earlier tables, and 1n is first person inclusive. I have followed Wagner's spelling of surface forms except that I have used o for both mid and lower mid variants.

dative, rather than \**di-nodze-o-*. The 1s actor is 'a- before the 2 dative; thus 'a-s- 1s/2s dative and 'a-'as- 1s/2p dative rather than \**di-s-* and \**di-'as-*. Surface forms differ only in minor ways. Patient 1s *didze-* is reduced to *dze-* or *tse-*, the combination 'a-'as- is reduced to 'as-, prefix vowels following nasals are nasalized, and Vne is usually contracted to V: 'anedze- > 'ądze-, for example.

In addition there are seven third person proclitics which classify animate third persons first as non-Yuchi (*we-*) or Yuchi. Within the Yuchi class the primary division is between male speaker (*hq- ~ hę-*) and female speaker. The latter classifies referents primarily as in an ascending generation (*i-*) or otherwise (*o-*). However, both male and female speakers use *e-* for a female relative of an ascending generation and *se-* for a female relative otherwise. Finally, female speakers use *s'e-* for a male relative of the same or descending generation. Note that *we-*, *hq- ~ hę-*, *i-*, and *o-* are used in both singular and plural, while *e-*, *se-*, and *s'e-* are limited to the singular. These proclitics can mark either subject or object, or both. If two third person proclitics occur, the order is Object-Subject. Inanimate third persons are generally unmarked.

The third person proclitics would appear to be relatively new based on their position. There is an older third person prefix *hi-* which Wagner (1934:340) calls "impersonal", meaning inanimate. The following are among his examples.

'yqspa hiháhe	'pecans where-they-are'
ric'ó hi'yadá	'Tic'o they-were-called'
k'alat'élé' 'yapí'ó rihíhadj'nháde	'other-things wagon that-had-been-in'

Wagner lists a second "impersonal" prefix *ho-*. While he found the difference in meaning between this pair unclear, *ho-* is formally clearly *hi-o-*, the loss of *i* being regular. His examples include the following:

hocuk'qla'ε	'it was tied to'
rot'ohá nodetahá hodjuhá	'the-sand our-feet it-burned'
tsóti ho'ága	'medicine its-day'
gowádo'ε hó'yuhε	'the-grave its-house'

Note that the third and fourth examples illustrate alienable possession, which Yuchi, like Muskogean, generally expresses with dative prefixes.

The following remarks concentrate on the older prefixes, largely ignoring the newer classifiers. As in Dakota the dative is expressed through the combination of the patient series with a word level prefix, in this case *o-*. Unlike Dakota, the patient prefix precedes the actor, while the dative prefix generally follows it,

schematically Patient-Actor-Dative-o-STEM. In addition, o- sometimes accompanies the patient paradigm. The o- patient and the dative paradigms, singulars only, appear in Table V.<sup>10</sup>

Table V: Yuchi o- patient and dative paradigms

	o- Patient		Dative		
	Surface	Underlying	Surface	Underlying	
1s/2s	<i>nędzedo-</i>	<i>nedze-di-o-</i>	'aso-	'a-	s-o-
1s/3s	-do-	-di-o-	-do-	-d-	o-
2s/1s	tseyo-	didze- <i>y-o-</i>	netso-	ne-didze-o-	
2s/3s	-yo-	- <i>y-o-</i>	-yo-	-ne-	hi-o-
3s/1s	-dzio-	-didze-hi-o-	-tso-	-didze-o-	
3s/2s	- <i>nędzio-</i>	-nedze-hi-o-	-so-	-s-o-	

Both Wagner and Ballard considered io forms like 3s/1s *dzio-* to belong to a different pronominal series from o forms like 3s/1s *tso-*; and because the prefixes of Table IV can mark the subject of intransitive verbs, both active and stative, and the possessor of nouns, some stems requiring o- or *hi-o-*, Wagner had an irreducible seven series for verb and noun combined, and Ballard required the same. This plethora of pronominal series stems from the failure to recognize that o- is a constituent of the word, not of the preceding prefix. Further, their analyses require the ad hoc mixing of various series to get full paradigms when two participants are to be marked.

Once the status of o- is understood one can do with the forms of Table IV and a few other principles. Forms like 3s/1s *tso-* occur when o- is present. Forms with io arise like 3s/1s *dzio-*, that is, when *hi-* is also present. The sequence of changes is *didze-hi-o-* > *dzehio-* > *dzeho-* > *dzio-*; compare 1p/3 *-no-hi-o-* > *-noho-* > *-no-* > *nq-*, not \**nio-*. Likewise 3s/3s *se-hi-o-* > *sio-*, but 3s/3s *hq-hi-o-* > *hq-*, not \**hjo-*. With 2s *ne-hi-o-*, we may have intermediate *neho-* > *nio-* > *io-* = *yo-*, but there is a suggestion elsewhere in the language of y- 2 actor.

Ballard (1978:103) understood that what he called the *dzio-* paradigm "represents a combination of the *dze* paradigm with a particle *ho-*." But there is no way to predict the presence of this *ho-*, as opposed to o- or nothing, unless it is understood that *ho-*

<sup>10</sup>Forms in bold italics are apparently analogical from the other series. Initial hyphens show where third person proclitics would appear. Source of surface forms: Wagner 1934.

is *hi-o-*. Then *hi-* can be predicted on the assumption that it is an old third person marker, actor, patient, and dative, retained in transitive paradigms only when it immediately preceded *o-*; that is, in *o-* patient paradigms with third person actor and dative paradigms with third person dative. The only exceptions are the analogical forms in boldface in Table V.

All the foregoing is meant to further establish the earlier existence of third person dative *ho-*. If we accept that, then on areal grounds we have some expectation that Yuchi would use, or formerly used, the combination *oho-* in combination with dative pronominals to mark the beneficiary. On this point, Wagner (1934:340) goes on to say, "With the following verbs *ho-* occurs as the direct impersonal object following the indirect object. As a rule, however, the direct object precedes the indirect object ..." This *ho-* can in fact equally well be described as a non-anaphoric third person dative prefix following a dative prefix to express beneficiary. Wagner's six verbs, four of which require a beneficiary, are as follows (double dative in boldface):

asohot'á	I let it go for you	asohohó	I took it from you
asohókasa	I crush it for you	dohokiłá	I escape from it
asohóła	I wove it for you	asohó'ę	I spread it out for you

Wagner's language suggests that only these six verbs have the *oho-* forms. This may be the case; a recent initial attempt by Mary S. Linn (personal communication) to elicit *oho-* forms in other verbs returned only *o-* datives, including cases in which the patient was the body part or possession of the beneficiary; examples include *hę-datci hę-do-di-dję* 'I washed his face for him', *di-datci hę-dzo-di-dję* 'he washed my face for me', *k'asoso hę-do-wadji-dję* 'I bought a book for him', *k'asoso hę-dzo-wadji-dję* 'he bought a book for me', (*datci* 'face', *di* 'to wash', *k'asoso* 'book', *wadji* 'to buy', *-dję* past tense). In the absence of an alternative explanation, it appears that these six verbs represent survivals of a former productive benefactive paradigm, formally analogous to the Muskogean benefactive and Dakota 2nd dative, which has been lost in favor of the simple dative.

## REFERENCES

- Ballard, W. L. 1975. Aspects of Yuchi morphonology. In James M. Crawford, ed., *Studies in Southeastern Indian Languages*. Athens: University of Georgia Press. Pp. 163-188.
- . 1978. More on Yuchi pronouns. *IJAL* 44:103-12.
- Boas, Franz. 1906. Notes on the Ponka grammar. *Fifteenth International Conference of Americanists* 2:317-37.
- Boas, Franz, and Ella Deloria. 1939. *Dakota Grammar*. *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, Volume XXIII, Second Memoir.

- Booker, Karen M. 1980. Comparative Muskogean: Aspects of Proto-Muskogean Verb Morphology. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Kansas. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Haas, Mary R. 1958. A new linguistic relationship in North America: Algonkian and the Gulf languages. *SWJA* 14:231-64.
- Kimball, Geoffrey. 1991. *Koasati Grammar*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Nathan, Michele. 1977. Grammatical Description of the Florida Seminole Dialect of Creek. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tulane University. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Nicklas, T. Dale. 1974. *The Elements of Choctaw*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- 1994. Linguistic Provinces of the Southeast at the time of Columbus. In Patricia B. Kwachka, ed., *Perspectives on the Southeast: Linguistics, Archaeology, and Ethno-history*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Ulrich, Charles Howard. 1986. *Choctaw Morphophonology*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Wagner, Günter. 1934. Yuchi. In Franz Boas, ed., *Handbook of American Indian Languages* 3:293-384. New York: Columbia University Press.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).