Articles

NOUN STRIPPING AND LOOSE INCORPORATION IN ZUNI

Kenneth L. Miner
University of Kansas

Introduction.

Noun incorporation in American Indian languages has been dis-
cussed 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 or-
der). 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?hahninú? ne? oyέ?kwa? 'he bought the tobacco'

    wa?hayε?kwahní·nu? 'he bought tobacco; he tobacco-bought'

Sapir recognized noun incorporation clearly in Iroquoian, Caddoan,
Uto-Aztecan, Yanan and Tanoan; marginally in Takelma and Algonquian; and
not at all in Athapaskan, Salishan, Chinookan, Yokuts, Siouan of Eskimo.
Since Sapir's time it has been claimed for Muskogean (Haas 1941, Booker
1981) and Natchez (Haas 1982). Except for the loose type in Takelma 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, Washo (Jacobsen 1980). The present study may have some impli-
cations 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 (Zide 1976). Mardirussian 1975 extends the
phenomenon to include Tongan, Fijian, Malagasy and the Australian language
Gunbalang.

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 nominals are rendered indefinite (modifiers,
determiners, number affixes, etc. are "stipped" away) and enter into

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; NG 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 (NG §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).

		SG	PL
(2)			
1. (monosyllabic roots)		-?|e?	-we?
(polysyllabic roots)		-nne	-·we?
2.		-mme?	-we?
3.		-?e	-·we?

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 system.

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 tén 'in vain', hápiš '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 hé 'metal, coin', there is no change: hé-šonči-nne 'fork' (šónči 'claw, fingernail', -nne SG). Otherwise it is abbreviated to its #C(C)V sequence: tú-mokʷkʷʔa-·weʔ 'stockings, socks' (túkni 'toe', mókʷkʷʔa 'shoe', -·weʔ PL). This process of abbreviation is productive and applies also to borrowings; cf. mé-kʷʔiššo 'Negro' (me- from mélika 'white American', kʷʔiššo 'black person').

In the nominal + nominal type the second member is the head; in the nominal + verb type the nominal is the head: tá-tepowa-nne 'wagon' (tá 'wood', tépowa 'be hitched', -nne SG); nó-čapi-·weʔ 'coffee' (nó 'kidney bean', čápi 'to burn', -·weʔ PL); pá-lokkʔa-·kʷe 'Ramah Navajo' (páču 'Navajo', lókkʔa 'to be greay', -·kʷe '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: tátepowanne etc.

Nominal # 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 this construction is a nominal particle.)

(3) pícem ?óka   822.4
     cotton woman   N # PRT
     'Cotton Woman'

     téwusu   pé   -na   825.6
     sacred language   talk, speak ST   PRT # N
     'prayer-words'

     tówa   yála   605.1
     corn   mountain   PRT # N
     'Corn Mountain'

     tówa   šíwani   636.8
     corn   priest   PRT # PRT
     'corn priest'

     téššukʷ?a?   yáto   -nne   639.49
     yesterday   day   SG   PRT # N
     'yesterday'

     pí?ɬa   šíwani
     bow   priest   N # PRT
     'bow priest'

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

(4) ?á·-pi?ɬa   šíwani   706.25,
     PL bow   priest   724.6fb,
     'bow priests'   831.10

Note that it is the second member of each compound that is its head; see
here 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 ?a·w- (of which the glide drops before a consonant) can be at-
tached to nominals only when they are nominal particles referring to per-
sons. Thus the only explanation for ?a·w- with pí?ɬa here is that
the construction as a whole is a particle because the head is a particle.
?á·-pi?ɬa by itself is not possible; the plural of 'bow' is pí?ɬa·we?.

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

(5) yála   ?á·-šiwani   647.2
     mountain   PL priest   N # PRT
     'mountain priests'

```
téhɬi      -ya     -ka    ʔaˑ-šiwani        622.16
be night   COLL    INST   PL  priest        PRT # PRT
'night priests'

yám        kʔákʷ(e)   ʔaˑ-mossi            639.66
one's one  house      PL   leader          N # PRT
'his house-chiefs'
```

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    ɬášši   -ya    -ka    pínna   -nne   641.152
      his    old age COLL   INST   breath  SG     PRT # N
      'his old-age breath'
```

A few further examples:

```
(7)   yáto - kka      táččhu                      820.10fb
      sun    INST      father                      PRT # PRT
      'sun father'

      ʔóloʔʔika - ya      -ka    wó    -weʔ        821.4fb
      summer     COLL     INST   bird  PL          PRT # N
      'summer birds'

      héˑ          -kʷʔi   -n    ʔóka             822.10
      paint, clay  black   ST    woman            N # PRT
      'Black Paint Woman'

      yá    -ʔona   -kka    cít(ta)                624.2
      moon  road    INST    nother                 PRT # PRT
      'moon mother'

      téhɬi     -ya    -ka    ʔáˑ-tač(čhu)         635.11
      be night  COLL   INST   PL   father          PRT # PRT
      '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?ɬa                     'bow'

yála                      'mountain'

kʔákʷe                    'house'

héˑkʷʔin                  '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.,

hé	-?	c'úmme	-nne	
metal		be strong	SG	'a gun spring'

- Ø if the construction as a whole is plural, e.g.,

hé	-Ø	c'úmme	-·we?	'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:

hé·	tó	-mme?	
	be tubular	SG	'a pipe'

hé·	tó	-we?	'pipes'

The above examples are all from NG §10.23.

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.

<u>Stripped Objects</u>.   Examples in (8).

(8)   télikina   ?á·-4eya-?u   629.8fb; cf.
         prayer stick   PL   give CAUS   742.6;
         'give prayer-sticks to a plurality'   706.31

         ?óna   ?élate   -na   629.9; cf.
         road   pass upon   ST   632.7; 630.10fb
         'on (her) road passing'

         čá   téka4aš   -na   676.1, 23, etc.
         child   neglect   ST
         'neglecting (your) children'

<u>Stripped Subjects</u>.   Of this I have only a single example:

(9)   yáto   kʷáyi   -p(pa)   604.33; cf.
         sun   emerge   SUB-DS   577.632
         'the sun rose'

<u>Incorporation</u>.

      Stripping is fairly common in Zuni. Incorporation, as both Newman
(NG §15.3) and Bunzel (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.   .) 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)   ?í·-   kih(e)   ?áš   -ka
         RECIP   ceremonial bro.   make   PA
         'they made e. o. ceremonial brothers'

      Note, in (10), the reciprocal prefix ?i·y- (the glide of which
drops before a consonant) which, although a verbal prefix, is here at-
tached 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 re-
tain their separate stresses, which is why I refer to "loose" incorporation.

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

(11)   kíh(e) ?í·y-aš-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) ʔí·y-   ona   ʔélate   -na·w -appa   648.9; cf.
     RECIP   road   pass upon   PL   SUB-DS 652.7, 658.11fb
     'passing e. o. on e. o.'s road'

A further example from Newman, with a different prefix:

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

Finally, (14):

(14) ʔá·w-asi   yámi   -ččo   -nna   640.115
     PL   hand, arm   break in half REP   FUT

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

Newman's example of an incorporated subject is:

(15) ʔá·w-asi   ʔá·w-allu   -kka
     PL   hand, arm   PL   move about   PA
     'they felt about with their hands'

The notion of transitivity in Zuni is difficult to communicate without repeating much of Newman's discussion of it. The plural prefix ʔa·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 ʔállu is an intransitive verb, so ʔási in (15) can only be its subject.

Another example, from Bunzel:

(16) ʔá·w-ona   yá·   -tu   625.43; cf.
     PL   road finish   PERM   623.50
     '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 Takelma): the members 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
RECIP	reciprocal
REFL	reflexive
REP	repetitive
SG	singular
ST	static
STA	stative
SUB-DS	subordinator-different subject
SUB-SS	subordinator-same subject

REFERENCES

Booker, Karen. 1981. Incorporation in Muskogean. Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics 6.55-69.

Bunzel, Ruth L. 1932a. Zuni Origin Myths (Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology 47.545-609).

Bunzel, Ruth L. 1932b. Zuni Ritual Poetry (Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology 47.611-835).

--------------- 1934. Zuni. (In Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 3, Franz Boas, ed. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 383-515).

Chambers, J. K. 1978. Dakota accent. In Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye, eds., Linguistic Studies of Native Canada, pp. 3-18. Vancouver: Universtiy of British Columbia Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981. The Languages of the Soviet Union. Cambridge University Press.

Haas, Mary R. 1941. Noun incorporation in the Muskogean languages. Language 17.311-315.

------------- 1982. Noun incorporation in Natchez. Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics 7.1-4.

Jacobsen, William H., Jr. 1980. Washo bipartite verb stems. In Kathryn Klar, Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver, eds., American Indian and Indo-European Studies: Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 6). Mouton. Pp. 85-99.

Mardirussian, Galust. 1975. Noun incorporation in universal grammar. Papers of the Eleventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 383-389.

Miner, Kenneth L. 1981. Algonquian medials as incorporated nominals: the evidence and some implications. Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Society, Los Angeles, November.

----------------- 1982. A note on noun incorporation. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics 7:3.36-37.

----------------- forthcoming. Object stripping in some Oceanic Languages. Papers of the 17th Annual Mid-America Linguistics Conference.

Newman, Stanley. 1958. Zuni Dictionary (Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics, publication 6).

---------------- 1965. Zuni Grammar (University of New Mexico Publications in Anthropology 14). University of New Mexico Press.

Sapir, Edward. 1911. The problem of noun incorporation in American languages. American Anthropologist 13.250-282.

Woodbury, Hanni. 1975a. Onondaga noun incorporation: some notes on the inter-dependence of syntax and semantics. International Journal of American Linguistics 41.10-20.

---------------- 1975b. Noun Incorporation in Onondaga. Yale University PhD Dissertation.

Zide, Arlene R. K. 1976. Nominal combining forms in Sora and Gorum. In Philip N. Jenner, Lawrence C. Thompson, and Stanley Starosta, eds., Austroasiatic Studies, Part II (=Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 13). University Press of Hawaii.