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NOUN STRIPPING AND LOOSE INCORPORATION IN ZUNI

Kenneth L. Miner
University of Kansas

Introduction.

Noun incorporation in American Indian languages has been discussed since the early 19th century (see Woodbury 1975a for references); Sapir 1911 constitutes the first comprehensive modern statement.

Sapir carefully distinguished noun incorporation from affixing of "elements of pronominal signification," from the presence of lexical affixes, and from the use of noun stems as verb stems (for this latter distinction see also Haas 1982); in noun incorporation, freely occurring nominal roots are optionally introduced into verbs, creating compounds of verb root plus incorporated noun (not necessarily in that linear order). Incorporated nouns are indefinite (unmodified, unmarked for number, etc.) and do not refer. (A fuller set of criteria for incorporation, based on that of Mardirussian 1975, is given in Miner 1982.) See the example from Onondaga in (1), taken from Woodbury 1975b.

(1) wa?hahnin? ne? oy?kw̃? 'he bought the tobacco'
wahyah?kw̃ahni?nu? 'he bought tobacco; he tobacco-bought'

Sapir recognized noun incorporation clearly in Iroquoian, Caddoan, Uto-Aztecan, Yana and Tanoan; marginally in Taulma and Algonquian; and not at all in Athapaskan, Salishan, Chinookan, Yokuts, Siouan or Eskimo. Since Sapir's time it has been claimed for Muskogean (Haas 1941, Hooker 1981) and Natchez (Haas 1982). Except for the loose type in Taulma, noun incorporation does not seem so far to have been claimed for languages which have been assigned to Penutian, though it may occur in a California language, Waso (Jacobsen 1980). The present study may have some implications for Penutian or Zuni-Penutian if such a relationship is valid.

Outside the Americas noun incorporation seems to occur in Chukchi, a "Paleo-Siberian" language (Comrie 1981:250-1 and references cited there) and perhaps in South Munda (21de 1976). Mardirussian 1973 extends the phenomenon to include Tongan, Fijian, Malay and the Australian language Wubalang.

In examining Mardirussian's claims regarding Oceanic languages I found that while indeed some of them do incorporate, others manifest what I call noun stripping, whereby nominal roots are rendered indefinite (modifiers, determiners, number affixes, etc. are "stipped away) and enter into
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closely-knit units with their verbs, but stop short of actually being incorporated. In Miner (forthcoming), in which I was able to exemplify stripping only in Oceanic, I suggested that noun stripping may be a historical prerequisite for noun incorporation.

In Zuni we are fortunate to find both processes, and indeed, while stripping appears to be quite prevalent, incorporation seems to be incipient.

Normally, direct objects of verbs most easily strip and incorporate, although nominals in other functions may as well; as for semantic domains, body-part terms seem most readily incorporable and kinship terms least so.

In this paper the numbers in the right-hand margins next to examples are page and line indices to BAE-AR 47 which contains Bunzel's texts (Bunzel 1932 a & b). Beneath some of these indices are indications of the type of construction being exemplified.

ND is Newman 1958; NC is Newman 1965. A glossary of abbreviations is provided as an appendix.

For reasons which will become clear, I write the wholly predictable word stress (the first syllable of a word is stressed). It is written in Bunzel's texts so I am not supplying anything; however I have not done any new fieldwork on Zuni at this writing.

Definiteness in Zuni is expressed chiefly by number inflection; I will therefore first describe this system briefly.

Noun Classes and Inflection for Number.

There are two types of Zuni substantives, which Newman calls nouns and nominal particles (NC §10.2, 12). Nominal particles behave like nouns except that they are not inflected for number (indeed are not inflected at all, which is apparently what leads Newman to term them "particles"), while nouns always are (except when they are stripped, see below). Nouns can be divided into three classes on the basis of the number suffixes they take, as shown in (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (monosyllabic roots)</td>
<td>-?i?</td>
<td>-we?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(polysyllabic roots)</td>
<td>-nne</td>
<td>-we?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-me?</td>
<td>-we?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-?e</td>
<td>-we?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distinction between nouns and nominal particles is only partly semantic. All kinship terms, names of animals, and indefinites ('someone', 'something'), as well as numerals and demonstratives, are noun particles. All body-part terms, items of clothing, and tools are nouns (NG §§12.1). Beyond this it is impossible to generalize; even the many borrowings from English and Spanish are assigned to one of the two categories, without obvious systemic

In this paper the term noun will denote inflectible (non-particle) nouns; the term nominal will refer to both categories.

There is of course a small closed set of non-nominal particles as well, including items like tón 'in vain', hápǔ 'or', etc.

Compounds and Closely-knit Constructions Involving Nominals.

I will first describe some common types of compound found in Zuni, so that stripping and incorporation will appear in proper perspective.

Nominal + Nominal and Nominal + Verb, Giving Noun, with One Stress. In a true compound (Newman's term, I believe) of the nominal + nominal or nominal + verb type, Zuni has the unusual constraint that the first member must be of the phonological shape CV or CCV (NG §§ 4.3; 8.8, 9: 10.33). If the first member is already of this shape, as hó 'metal, coin', there is no change: hó-šonči 'fork' (šonči 'claw, fingernail', -ńne SQ). Otherwise it is abbreviated to its §C(C) sequence: iš-mōk'k'wá-'we? 'stockings, socks' (ťúk'ni 'toe', mōk'k'wá 'shoe', -ńwe? PL). This process of abbreviation is productive and applies also to borrowings; cf. mé-k'wá?íšló 'Negro' (mé- from méliká 'white American', k'wá?íšló 'black person').

In the nominal + nominal type the second member is the head; in the nominal + verb type the nominal is the head: tó-tepówaa-ńne 'wagon' (tó 'w'ood', tepówaa 'he hitched', -ńne SQ); ndé-čapí-'we? 'coffee' (né 'k'íañuy beam', čapí 'to burn', -ńwe? PL); pdé-łoːkk'á-'k'we 'hamah havaajo' (páců 'Havaajo', lókk'á 'to be greedy', -ńk'we 'people of').

The nouns arising from this type of compounding are unit nouns and like all Zuni lexical words carry a single primary stress on their first syllable: tó-tepówaa etc.

Nominal ñ Nominal, Giving Nominal, with Two Stresses. This type is not discussed by Newman but is prevalent in the texts. Two (or more, but I will keep to examples with two) nominals enter into a unit of some sort, but each retains its independent stress. (In all cases I have found, one or both members of a nominal construction is a nominal particle.)
(3) pícem ?ána
'cotton wool'

tóweus pá -nó
sacred language talk, speak

tówa yáia
corn mountain

tówa  sidlání
'corn priest'

tóákuw'zó?
yáto -nne
yesterday day

dí?ía  sidlání
bow priest

These constructions may be prefixed as units, with the prefix attaching to the first member. An excellent example is (4).

(4) ?á-cí?ísa  sidlání
PL bow priest

Note that it is the second member of each compound that is its head; see the prefix attached to the first member. Further, note that the first member in the case of (4) is a noun, the second a particle; the prefix ?á- (of which the glide drops before a consonant) can be attached to nominals only when they are nominal particles referring to persons. Thus the only explanation for ?á-íw- with pí?ísa here is that the construction as a whole is a particle because the head is a particle. ?á-cí?ísa by itself is not possible; the plural of "bow" is pí?ísa-íwí?.

Cases like (4) are rare. Much more common are cases with the head prefixed, especially when the first member is suffixed.

(5) yáia ?á-_sidání
mountain PL priest

müntain priests'
Note that the use of the possessive pronoun in the last example helps to identify the construction as a unit nominal, since the pronoun modifies the head, which is second in the construction, as also in (6).

(6) ʔán ʔáší -ya -ká pí̪nna -nne 641.152
his old age COLL INST breath SG N PRT
'his old-age breath'

A few further examples:

(7) yáño - kka táču 820.16fb
sun INST father
'sun father'

ʔóló?? -ka - va -ka wó -we? 824.16fb
summer COLL INST bird PL PRT N
'summer birds'

hó - kóm? -n ?óka 822.10
paint, clay black ST woman
'Black Paint Woman'

yó - ¿óna -kka cít(tó) 625.2
moon road INST mother
'moon mother'

tántí -ya -ká ?á •tač(ču) 635.11
be sight COLL INST PL father
'night fathers'

Note that, in all of the above examples, when the first member of this type of construction is a noun, it is not number-inflected:

pícem  'cotton'
pí?šm  'bow'
yísâ  'mountain'
kó̃kó  'house'
né-kó?ín  'black paint'
Either this, or the presence of a prefix attached to the construction as a whole, or both, mark the construction as a syntactic unit. Where the first member of the construction is a nominal particle rather than a noun, and either there is no prefix or the prefix is attached to the second member of the construction, we have no way of identifying the construction as a unit other than by analogy with the clear cases.

Number-inflected Noun # Verb, Giving Noun, with Two Stresses. In this type, the first member of the construction is the head, and it takes special "short forms" of the number suffixes. The construction as a whole then becomes a noun, and takes the regular number suffixes (which otherwise could not be attached to verbs).

The short forms of the number suffixes are:

-? if the construction as a whole is singular, e.g.,
  *hó  -?  c'ümme -nne  'a gun spring'
  metal  be strong  SG

-Ø if the construction as a whole is plural, e.g.,
  *hó  -Ø  c'ümme -wé?  'gun springs'

In some constructions the vowel of the monosyllabic head noun is simply lengthened; the construction as a whole may be singular or plural:

  *hó  tó  -mme?  'a pipe'
  be tubular  SG
  *hó  tó  -wé?  'pipes'

The above examples are all from NG i10.23.

Stripped and Loosely Incorporated Nominal # Verb, with Two Stresses.

Now that we have looked at other types of compounding in Zuni, we have a vantage point from which to examine our main topic.

Stripping. In noun stripping, a noun is bereft of a number suffix, as in the case of the compounds discussed in the section beginning at the bottom of p. , and appears to enter into the same type of compound structure with the verb as does the first member of the nominal # nominal compounds exemplified in that section. That is, both stresses are retained.

Nominal particles may also appear in this same type of construction, but since they never take the definitizing number suffixes it makes little
sense to speak of them as stripped.

Stripped Objects. Examples in (8).

(8) tālikina ?ā-teyaʔaʔu prayer stick PL give CAUS 'give prayer-sticks to a plurality'
629.8fb; cf. 742.6;
706.31
?
žona ?ēiata -na road pass upon ST 'on (her) road passing'
629.9; cf. 632.7; 630.10fb
čă tēkataš -na child neglect ST 'neglecting (your) children'
676.1, 23, etc.

Stripped Subjects. Of this I have only a single example:

(9) yāto kwāyi -p(pa) sun emerge SUB-DE 'the sun rose'
604.33; cf. 577.632

Incorporation.

Stripping is fairly common in Zuni. Incorporation, as both Newman (MG §15.3) and Bunsel (1934, §36) explicitly point out, is more rare. (Note that in this respect the two phenomena parallel the two sub-types of nominal ≠ nominal compounds discussed in the section beginning at the bottom of p. 9.) In the first place, a prefix must be present in order for the difference to be discernible. Newman's example of an incorporated object is (10).

(10) ?i- kih(e) ?āś -ka RECTP ceremonial bro. make PA 'they made e. o. ceremonial brothers'

Note, in (10), the reciprocal prefix ?i·γ- (the glide of which drops before a consonant) which, although a verbal prefix, is here attached to a nominal, this particular nominal being by chance a nominal particle. The only explanation for the prefix with the nominal is that the nominal is incorporated. However, the two members of the construction retain their separate stresses, which is why I refer to "loose" incorporation.

Newman gives (11) as "an optional variant" of (10).

(11) kih(e) ?i·γ-āś-ka
Here the reciprocal prefix is attached to the verb and the nominal is merely stripped rather than incorporated (or would be said to be stripped, if it were a noun rather than a nominal particle).

For a noun in such a construction, involving the same prefix, see (12).

(12) ?i·w- one ? såle -na·w -appə 648.9; cf. RECIP road pass upon PL SUB-DS 652.7, 658.11f
    'passing e. o. on e. o.'s road'

A further example from Newman, with a different prefix:

(13) ?i- we -təku -ka REFL fur of small animal wear around neck PA
    'he wore the fur pieces around his neck'

Finally, (14):

(14) ?i·w-soi yámi -čəo -num 640.115
    PL hand, arm break in half REP PET

Example (14) was translated by Bunzel 'their arm will break' but yámi is a transitive verb, so ?äsí (the glottal stop of which drops after a glide) can only be its object.

Newman's example of an incorporated subject is:

(15) ?i·w-soi ?i·w-siλu -kə REFL hand, arm PL move about PA
    'they felt about with their hands'

The notion of transitivity in Zum is difficult to communicate without repeating much of Newman's discussion of it. The plural prefix ?i·w- pluralizes only nominals in the absolute (non-ergative) function, i.e., pluralizes the subject of an intransitive verb or the object of a transitive verb. The verb ?iλu is an intransitive verb, so ?äsí in (15) can only be its subject.

Another example, from Bunzel:

(16) ?i·w-one yá· -tu PL road finish PERH
    'may (our) roads be fulfilled'

Here, yá· 'finish' is an intransitive verb.
Conclusions.

In Miner (forthcoming) I suggested that noun stripping may be an early stage in the development of noun incorporation. The similarity between the non-referring and indefinite status of stripped and of incorporated substantives is striking. To help confirm or disconfirm their relatedness I sought a language having both phenomena.

Zuni is such a language. It seems to me that there are two indications that stripping is historically prior to incorporation in Zuni: (a) stripping is much more common, and (b) such incorporation as there is tends to be of a loose sort (as in Tukels): the numbers of the relevant constructions retain their separate stresses and by that criterion are separate words, yet the constructions can be (though it occurs relatively rarely) prefixed as wholes.

APPENDIX: glossary of abbreviations

CAUS  causative
COLL  collective
FUT  future
INST  instrumental
PA  past
PERM  permissive
PL  plural
PRT  nominal particle
RECI  reciprocal
REFL  reflexive
REP  repetitive
SG  singular
ST  static
STA  stative
SUB-JS  subordinator-different subject
SUB-SS  subordinator-same subject
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