Chapter 12

COMPLEMENT SENTENCES
AND
ADVERBIAL COMPLEMENTS
IN
VERB FINAL LANGUAGES:
SOUTHERN UTE

1. Introduction

Ute is a language with apparently free word order; “in connected discourse and conversation any word-order combinations are permissible” (Givón 1980.60). But of the six possible sequences of S, O, and V, it is SOV that is “found mostly in sentences in isolation, out of context” (Givón 1980.334). Further (Givón 1980.61):

... we have decided to cite all example sentences in this chapter in the order SUBJECT-OBJECT-VERB (the so-called SOV word-order). There are two reasons for this decision:

(i) Historical: This was probably the historically older word-order in Ute, as well as for the Uto-Aztecan [sic] language-family in general. Further, older speakers of Ute nowadays use this order more frequently than younger speakers, and we have elected to consider the speech-style of older speakers as in some way more representative of the ‘correct’ grammar of the language;

(ii) Factual: The SUBJECT-OBJECT-VERB word-order in Ute is most common when the participants in the story are introduced for the first time. Further, it is also the most common when a sentence is introduced in isolation, just by itself, without preceding context. Since all the example-sentences we cite throughout this as well as several other chapters are in isolation, out of context, the SUBJECT-OBJECT-VERB word-order sounds more natural for them.

Consider now (Givón 1980.62):

(1) mamá-ci ta'wá-ci sumáy-kyá
   [woman- man- think-ANTERIOR]
   ‘The woman remembered/thought of the man’
The semantics of syntactic complexity

In sentence (1), the S and O are followed by a suffix -č'i-č'i. By itself, this does not mark case or role distinctions, since some such suffix will normally follow “most Ute nouns” (Givón 1980.18). The common suffixes are -č'i -vi -pi -νu -μu -τu -τu

There is some correlation with noun classes so that -č'i follows animate nouns, as -vi and -pi occur “in names of animals ... or also in names of body parts” (Givón 1980.19-20). The last two, -τu and -τu, are used only with nouns that are derived from verbs (Givón 1980.18). But the -τu is also glossed aspectually (Givón 1980.88) as “nominal-habitual” to signal “an inherent quality, that is, the person is this way habitually by nature, not just by accident or incidental occurrence” (Givón 1980.88):

(2) wuʔka-τu
    [work-HABITUAL]
    ‘S/He habitually works’

And cf. (8b) below. Since vowels are devoiced finally in their citation form and also in “the subject and predicate form” (Givón 1980.24), that contrast may serve to mark a difference between S and O (Givón 1980.24). Cf. (1) above. Otherwise, in position before V, “the order is almost always SUBJECT-OBJECT” (Givón 1980.333). The EXPERIENCER ROLES (i.e., Patient and Recipient) are also undifferentiated morphologically (Givón 1980.75):

(3) mamá-ci naľá-ci pəʔqwa-τu ‘uwá-rugwá-qa
    [woman- girl- book- - her-give-ANTERIOR]
    ‘The woman gave the girl a book’

---

1 The vowel system of Ute is (Givón 1980.4):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{i} & \text{æ} & \text{u} \\
\hline
\text{e} & \text{a} & \text{o} \\
\end{array}
\]

Examples are cited in Givón’s transcription with one exception. To note devoicing of vowels, I shall use a small upper case symbol where Givón uses underlining. The cedilla is used variously; ŋ is used for the unrounded vowel paired with /u/; o is the rounded vowel paired with /æ/; and a (ňu) is a low-mid, front unrounded vowel, distinct from a (ňa), a low central vowel (unspecified for rounding).
(4) mamá-cí  ta'wá-ci  puṣári-nyá-pi máy-kyá
   [woman- man- story- - tell-ANTERIOR]
   ‘The woman told the man a story’

There is a separate postposition for the INSTRUMENTAL and COMITATIVE (Givón 1980.26):

(5) mamá-cí  wií-ci-mu  tũkũa-vi  cukũr̥a-y
   [woman- knife- -with meat- cut-IMMEDIATE]
   ‘The woman is cutting meat with a knife’

(6) mamá-cí  ta'wá-ci-wa  wūŋka-xa
   [woman- man- -with work-PAST]
   ‘The woman worked with the man’

as well as other spatial relations,

(7) mamá-cí  ta'wá'-ci-vaa-cux  paγá'y'waγy
   [woman- man- -at-toward  walking]
   ‘The woman is walking toward the man’

The nominal suffix may be omitted from the ‘object’ noun with the result that the noun combines productively with the following verb to create a stem (Givón 1980.27):

(8) (a) ta'wá-cí  kwaná-ci  paxab-ga
   [man- eagle- kill-ANTERIOR]
   The man killed the/an eagle’

(b) ta'wá-cí  kwaná-paxá-rũ
   [man- eagle-kill-HABITUAL]
   ‘The man habitually kills eagles’

(9) (a) kačũ'-ũ  mamá-cí  пуŋkǐka-na
   [Neg-he woman- see-PAST]
   ‘He didn’t see the woman’
b) kacú-’u mamá-πuníkya-na 
[Neg-he woman-see-PAST] ‘He didn’t see any woman’

The same merging occurs in the creation of compounds (Givón 1980.27):

(10) (a) nūu-ci kāni 
[Ute- house] ‘the house of a particular Ute person’

(b) nūu-gāni 
[Ute-house] ‘tipi/Ute-type house’

and in the expression of manner adverbials. Compare (5) with (11) (Givón 1980.47):

(11) wií-çukür’a-y 
[knife-cut-IMMEDIATE] ‘cutting/shredding with a knife’

(12) (a) mamá-ci pağáywa-y 
[woman walk-IMMEDIATE] ‘The woman is walking’

(b) mamá-pağáywa-y ‘S/He is walking like a woman’

The sequences in which the V is followed by S and/or O compare with those that in other languages are called ‘afterthought topics’ or ‘anti-topics’ (Givón 1980.317-18). Where a zero expression of a PARTICIPANT seems perhaps not to be precise (for whatever reason) a full noun may follow in order to resolve the vagueness (Givón 1980.318):

(13) kwaví-voró-puqa, pa-ğ-ṟi-ti-kya-tu 
[lie-go-REMOTE water-have-CAUSATIVE-ANTERIOR-κuíwaa-va ... ‘u-nága kwaví-poró-puqa, edge-at there-in lie-go-REMOTE,
Thus, the non-verb final sequences of VSO, VOS, OVS, and SVO have an explanation, and the language is more clearly a member of the SOV type.

2. Complex sentences

Givón uses the tripartite division of verbs into manipulative - modality - cognitive in his presentation of Ute sentences. Manipulative verbs like (Givón 1980.76, 165 & 172):

‘say/tell’ ‘call’
‘want-CAUSATIVE’ ‘be able-CAUSATIVE’

work as follows (Givón 1980.76, 165, 166 & 172):

(14) (a) ta’wá-ci tuá-ci sivğatu-ci mağá-vaa-ku may-kya
[man- child- goat- feed-FUTURE- say-ANTERIOR]
‘The man told the child to feed the goat’

(b) mamá-ci ta’wá-ci ‘uway máy-kya
[woman- man- him tell-ANTERIOR
wūğka-vaa-ku
work-FUTURE-]
‘The woman told the man to work/that he should work’

(15) mamá-ci ta’wá-ci wūğka-vaa-ku ʾásti’-ti-pūgá
[woman- man- work-FUTURE- want-CAUSATIVE-REMOTE]
‘The woman made the man want to work’
‘The woman motivated the man to work’

(16) mamá-ci ta’wá-ci sapīga-ti-pūgá
[woman- man- able-CAUSATIVE-REMOTE
‘áapa-ci pō’qwa-tu ʾuwa-rōgwá-vaa-ku
boy- book- him-give-FUTURE-]
‘The woman enabled the man to give a book to the boy’
To these, Givón (1980.77) adds “verbs of attempted manipulation ... which involve more gentle, less explicit ... manipulation ... when the intended result is ‘manner of action’ rather than necessarily the action itself”, e.g. (Givón 1980.77):

- ‘order’
- ‘request/ask’
- ‘allow/permit’
- ‘forbid’
- ‘do-CAUSATIVE’

Compare the following (Givón 1980.77):

(17) mamá-ci ‘áapa-ci púup’a pǒq-qaa-ni
    [woman- boy- way write-FUTURE-
     'unìti-kyà-u
do-CAUSATIVE-ANTERIOR-him]
     ‘The woman showed/trained the boy how to write’

Among the **modality** verbs are (Givón 1980.71):

- ‘be able to’
- ‘plan to’
- ‘remember to’
- ‘forget to’
- ‘try to’
- ‘intend to’
- ‘want’

Examples are (Givón 1980.62, 70 & 166):

(18) ta'wá-ci ‘áapa-ci pǒq-qwa-tù ‘uwá-rugwá-vaa-ci
    [man- boy- book- him-give-FUTURE-
     sapìgya-putrá
     able-REMOTE]
    ‘The man was able to give a book to the boy’

(19) ta'wá-ci wígb-vaa-ci ‘astí’
    [man- work-FUTURE-want-IMMEDIATE]
    ‘The man wants to work’

(20) mamá-ci yùù-ruwá-pù tuwá-vaa-ci sumáy-kyà
    [woman- door- open-FUTURE-think-ANTERIOR]
    ‘The woman remembered to open the door’
Lastly, cognitive verbs like (Givón 1980.73 & 173):

‘think’ ‘believe’
‘suspect’ ‘guess’
‘hope’ ‘be afraid’
‘remember’ ‘forget’
‘doubt’ ‘be sure’

occur in the following way (Givón 1980.63, 72 & 176):

(21) mamá-ci ʻu ká-sqtí-ŋa ta'wá-ci ʻu
[woman- she Neg-sure-Neg man- he
wųŋa-pųŋá-va-ci
work-REMOTE-FUTURE-] ʻThe woman wasn’t sure if the man had worked (long before)ʼ

(22) mamá-ci sumáy-kya ta'wá-ci ʻuwáy
[woman- think-ANTERIOR man-Poss that
pći-kaa-n'ay
come-ANTERIOR-Subordinator]
ʻThe woman thought that the man came/had comeʼ

(23) mamá-ci pucúcugwa-y ta'wá-ci
[woman- know-IMMEDIATE man-Poss
pći-kaa-na'ay
arrive-ANTERIOR-Relative-Subordinator]
ʻThe woman knows that the man has arrivedʼ

The complements of both the manipulative and the modality verbs precede and follow their matrix. Cp. (14a) with (14b). And so may the complements of cognitive verbs. Compare (21) - (23) and this (Givón 1980.180):

(24) ta'wá-ci ʻuwáy wųŋa-kaa-n'ay
[man- he work-ANTERIOR-Relative-Subordinator
tųgųr'ay
well-IMMEDIATE]
ʻIt is good that the man (has) workedʼ
The three (or four) complement types accept ‘nominal’ suffixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manipulative</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-kul-</td>
<td>-ci</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and each occurs elsewhere in utterances with modals or independently (Givón 1980.121, 125, 127 & 128):

(25) ta'wá-ci ‘uwáy wůŋka-vaa-na
[man-he work-FUTURE-Relative]
‘The man must/has to work’

(26) (a) wůŋka-vaa-ci-n
[work-FUTURE-I]
‘I intend to work’

(b) tůvųci-sapá-n wůŋka-vaa-ci
[very-MOD-I work-FUTURE-]
‘I must/have to work’

(27) tůvųci-sapá’a ‘ićány ińi-vaa-ků
[work-MOD-he/she this do-FUTURE-]
‘It is necessary that s/he does this’
‘S/He must/has to do this’

All the suffixes relate their EVENTS to some deontic qualification. Of na, “this mode of obligation/necessity, is ... the strongest of the three” (Givón 1980.128). Of vaa-ci, “the suffix expresses wish/intent by the speaker (pertaining to his/her own action, but occasionally also to actions by third parties) or predictions with respect to the action of others, or imminent future action by others” (Givón 1980.121). And it is compatible with the modal tůvųci-sapá and results in “a meaning of ‘self-obligation’ or ‘self-imposed necessity’” (Givón 1980.126). Lastly, in (27) vaa-ků expresses “necessity or obligation (‘must’, ‘have to’, etc.) ... with respect to third parties (i.e., neither the speaker nor the hearer)” (Givón 1980.127). Like -vaa-ci, -vaa-ků occurs with the modal tůvųci-sapá. Cf. (27) The suffix combinations -vaa-ci and -vaa-ků also contrast in this pair (Givón 1980.258 & 268):
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(28) \[ta'wá-ci 'u kaní-naágą yůgá-půgá mamá-ci 'uway maqá-\textit{vaa-ku}'u \]
\[\text{man- he house-in enter-REMOTE woman- she feed-FUTURE- --him} \]

‘The man entered the house so that the woman would feed him’

(29) \[ta'wá-ci 'u kaní-naágą yůgá-půgá tůka-\textit{vaa-ci} \]
\[\text{man- he house-in enter-REMOTE eat-FUTURE-REMOTE} \]

‘The man entered (into) the house in order to eat’

Put in other parallel, copresent terms, the three modes (-\textit{ku}, -\textit{ci}, and -\textit{na}) describe, respectively, the AGENTIVE, aspectually initial aspect of a PROPOSITION; the Middle, aspectually imperfective aspect of a PROPOSITION; and the EXPERIENTIAL, completive aspect of a PROPOSITION. Figure 1 outlines the equivalences that underly the relations between a dependent PROPOSITION and its independent pivot PROPOSITION.

Modal:    Lesser necessity
Aspect:   Prospective
ROLE:   AGENTIVE
EVENT: Manipulative

Modal:     Greater necessity
Aspect:    Imperfective
ROLE:    Middle
EVENT:  Modality

II

Modal:    Necessity
Aspect:   Completive
ROLE:   EXPERIENTIAL
EVENT: Cognitive

III

Figure 1: Semantic correlations.

The completive aspect of the Type III complex sentence is reinforced by the presence of what Givón (1980.72) calls “a subordinating suffix -'gy’. There is elsewhere in Ute a clause suffix -'gy - y that Givón (1989.83-87) calls the “immediate tense-aspect’. Cf. (5), (11), (12), etc. Consider (Givón
1980.64, 65, 86 & 87):

(30) 'ǐn kavá pāgos'ą-y
 [this horse fat-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘This horse is fat’

(31) (a) ‘ǐc ta'wá-ci núú-ci 'ura-'ąy
 [this man Ute- be-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘This man is Ute’

(b) ‘ǐc tůká'na-pụ avátı 'urá-'ąy
 [this table- big be-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘This table is big’

(32) mamá-ci káa-y
 [woman- sing-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘The woman is singing’

(33) icáy pucúcugwa-y
 [this know-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘S/He knows this’

(34) nů'-urá kaní-náağ-tux yugá-y
 [I-be house-in-to enter-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘So I entered into the house’

(35) wíitus tůká-y
 [past eat-IMMEDIATE]
 ‘(I) have already eaten’

One organization of this diversity identifies the state associated with the content of the EVENT. And if that EVENT has some periodicity, the state is that which is the criterion of that EVENT, so that with the non-telic ‘sing’, the gloss is imperfective, and with the telic ‘enter’, it is perfective. With ‘know’, it is the condition that follows ‘finding out’. And in this view the -'ąy that is the so-called ‘subordinator’ is the same morpheme functioning to specify the stativity/resultative aspect of the propositional content formed by ‘knowing’, ‘thinking’, ‘suspecting’, ‘being sure’, etc.
Figure 1 recognizes that there exists a relation between an EVENT and a PROPOSITION which is analogous to the relation between an EVENT and a PARTICIPANT. That is, EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations, which are ROLES, may be constituted by abstracting the semantic stuff primarily from the PARTICIPANTS, thus producing a ROLE system familiar to Indo-European speakers, one that closely reflects the MOTILE — INERT potential of PARTICIPANTS. Or, conversely, the EVENT — PARTICIPANT relation may be constituted from the semantic stuff of EVENTS, and it is this that produces the CENTRAL — PERIPHERAL ROLE relations of Alabama, and like languages. Other languages will show admixtures and copresence of the two principles in different degrees. Since the phenomenon of ‘complement sentences’ is analogous in nature, we might expect the same dichotomy in how the relation is structured. Givón’s ‘binding hierarchy’ is a demonstration of the power of EVENT semantics in the formation, but it ignores the possibility that the semantics of PROPOSITIONS (as the semantics of PARTICIPANTS in the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relation) can operate to determine the nature of the ‘complement sentence’ relation. The conceptual problem is the discovery of the PROPOSITIONAL equivalent of the MOTILE — INERT scale that is operative in PARTICIPANTS. Figure 1 suggests that it is the deroulement of the content that is the equivalent (at least, in Ute), i.e.,

PROSPECT — RESULT

Referring to Figure 1, we may expect to see this semantics manifest, or played out in a language, either in the realm of Modality, Aspect, ROLES and VOICE, or EVENT. There is nothing in PROSPECT — RESULT itself which requires the presence of one or the other manifestations.

Now, Ute appears not to integrate PROPOSITIONS by EVENT semantics (i.e., the binding hierarchy); but it uses the aspeectual parameter as the essence of unity. This also explains then why the ‘subjects’ of (22) - (23) with cognitive verbs are the least subject-like. The voicing of their noun suffixes identifies the relation to the respective EVENTS as one of possession (i.e., gerundial). That the ‘nouness’ of the -na construction exceeds the others is finally confirmed by the presence of this -na structure in the grammar of relative clauses with EXPERIENCER/Patient heads (Givón 1980.191 & 196):

(36) sivjatu-ci 'u ta'wá-ci 'uwáy páxá-na
[goat- he man-Poss he kill- ]
‘the goat that the man is killing’
(37) mamá-ci ‘u ta'wá-ci ‘uwáy pí-vwaa-cux ‘apağa-mu
[woman- she man-Poss he Pro-at-to talk- ]
‘the woman that the man is talking to’

All non-subject heads follow this type, while subjects allow these alternatives (Givón 1980.186, 187, 202 & 203):

(38) mamá-ci ‘u wúŋka-śa-tu ...
[woman- she work-ANTERIOR ...
‘the woman who worked’

(39) (a) ta'wá-ci ‘u sivą蛞-mi-tu ...
[man- he goat kill-ANTERIOR- ...
‘the man who killed the goat’
(b) ta'wá-ci ‘u sivą蛞-paą-mi-tu ...
[man- he goat-kill-HABITUAL- ...
‘the man who kills goats always’
(c) ‘u sivą蛞-paą-mi-tu (ta'wá-ci) ...
[he goat-kill-HABITUAL- (man-) ...
‘the goat-killer (man)’
(d) ‘u sivą蛞-paą-mi-ta'wá-ci ...
[he goat-kill-HABITUAL-man- ...
‘the goat-killing man’

... it seems that when the event in the relative clause is used to identify the head noun in contrast with other individuals ... [as in (39a)] who may be around but did not perform the action described in the relative clause, the order head-rel. clause is preferred in Ute ... A habitual event may even serve to identify a head noun in contrast with other individuals who are group-members but didn't perform the act in the relative clause. That is what is given in the .... relative-clause example ... [in (39b)], with the head preceding the relative clause. But a habitual act, quite typically (and much more so than a specific event that had occurred at a specific time and place) can also identify an individual as ‘that type of a person/thing’, thus becoming almost like a substitute name (epithet). Which is indeed what we have in ... [(39c)] with the relative clause preceding the head noun. In fact, in such a situation, the entire modifier may ‘incorporate’ into the head noun to create a single word ... [as in (39d)]. (Givón 1980.203)
3. **Adverbial complements**

Adverbial constructions continue the aspectual theme of integration of complex sentences in Ute. The operative affix is -kwá- ~ -ux ‘Inchoative’ (Givón 1980.107-113); for example,

(40) tųká-qa-vaani
   [eat-go-FUTURE]
   ‘(I) will (now) go and eat’
   ‘I’m going to eat now’

(41) (a) tųká-y
   [eat-IMMEDIATE]
   ‘S/He is eating’

   (b) tųká-kwá-y
   [eat-INCHOATIVE-IMMEDIATE]
   ‘S/He goes on eating for a long time’

(42) (a) tųká-rų
   [eat-HABITUAL]
   ‘S/He is an eater’

   (b) tųká-kwá-rų
   [eat-INCHOATIVE-HABITUAL]
   ‘S/He is a long-span eater’

(43) (a) wii-pųgá
   [fall-REMOTE]
   ‘S/He fell’

   (b) wii-kwá-pųgá
   [fall-INCHOATIVE-REMOTE]
   ‘S/He fell/had fallen a long time before’

(44) (a) ta-tá’A-qqá
   [Reduplication-kick-ANTERIOR]
   ‘S/He has kicked repeatedly’

---

2 “... ‘remote’/’anterior’ use ... pertains only to verbs which are instantaneous, that is have no duration” (Givón 1980.110).
The ‘inchoative’ embodies the same array of PERIPHERAL properties as -m- in Bella Coola: ‘translocative’, ‘event’, ‘becoming’. And furthermore, that PERIPHERALITY is extended to PROPOSITIONS — as in Alabama -n — to specify surrounding, backdrop, PERIPHERAL, ‘adverbial’ relations (Givón 1980.247 & 256):

(47)  
\[
\text{ta'wá-ci \ 'uwáy kaní-naağa yugá-ux,}
\]
\[
\text{[man-Poss he-Poss house-in enter-INCHOATIVE}
\]
\[
\text{maná-ci \ 'u págá-kwá-vaa-ni}
\]
\[
\text{woman- she walk-go-FUTURE]}
\]
\‘When the man enters the house, the woman will (then) leave’
\‘If the man enters the house, the woman will (then) leave’

---

3 “... the use of -kwa- imparts it [a reduplicated, iterative, PWD] verb the continuative/progressive meaning, like it would any other verb” (Givón 1980.111).

4 “... ‘sudden action’ meaning ... At least with some non-durative ... the inchoative aspect contributes the sense of sudden action” (Givón 1980.112).

5 “The inchoative aspect here converts a state into an event, i.e., something with a beginning point” (Givón 1980.113).
(48) ta'wá-ci ʻuwáy muráacu-paa-kwa,
    [man-Poss he-Poss drunk-FUTURE-INCHOATIVE
     mamá-ci ʻu supáy-kwa-vaa-ní'-u
     woman- she leave-go-FUTURE-him]
    ‘Since the man will be/get drunk, the woman will leave him’

Further aspectual specification may make the arrangement more precise,
as -púa- ‘Future’ in (48) and -şay- ‘Anterior’ in (49); but the basic relation is
unchanged (Givón 1980.254):

(49) ta'wá-ci ʻuwáy kaní-naağá yugá-şay-kwa,
    [man-Poss he-Poss house-in enter-ANTERIOR-INCHOATIVE
     mamá-ci ʻu págá-kwa-pugá
     woman- she walk-go-REMOTE]
    ‘Because the man entered the house, the woman left’

Or the combinations invoke relations noted for -vaa-ci- and -vaa-ku above to
express ‘purpose’.

To the above kwa constructions expressing ‘if’, ‘when’, ‘since’, and
‘because’, we may add the ‘counterfactual’ (Givón 1980.257):

(50) náaga-sú-ni ta'wá-ci ʻuwáy píců-kay-kwa
    [maybe-CON man-Poss he come-ANTERIOR-INCHOATIVE
     mamá-ci ʻu mağá-vaa-qá-tú'-u
     woman- she feed-FUTURE-ANTERIOR-him]
    ‘If the man had come, the woman would have fed him’

and the ‘concessive’ (Givón 1980.260):

(51) ta'wá-ci ʻuwáy píců-kay-kwa-sapa,
    [man- he come-ANTERIOR-INCHOATIVE-Mod
     mamá-ci ʻu págá-kwa-pugá
     woman- she walk-go-REMOTE]
    ‘Even though the man did/had come, the woman left’

The primary difference between the ‘because of’ of (49) and the ‘concessive’
of (51) is the presence of the ‘modal’ sapa (Givón 1980.126). The kwa
constructions encompass the range from the IRREALIS extreme of ‘counter-
factuality’ to the REALIS of ‘because’ and ‘even though’:
IRREALIS — counterfactual — conditional — when — since — because — REALIS
if if even though

and the pivot of such clauses may select a PARTICULAR as in (Givón 1980.263):

(52) ta'wá-ci ́u máa-á-á-á-u ́úų wúká-xá-ux
[man- he woman- -Pl they work-Pl-INCHOATIVE
pənìkyaá-y-ka
see-ANTERIOR]
‘The man saw the women working/at work’

(53) ta'wá-ci ́u, wúká-u-x, máa-á-á-á-u ́úų
[man- he work-INCHOATIVE woman- she
pənìkyaá-y-ka
see-ANTERIOR]
‘The man, working/at work, saw the woman’

Here, the clauses seem to stand as asides, and the pauses which set them off support this.

The kwa clauses contrast with a second range of adverbial clauses, the “‘true’ participial adverbial/subordinate clauses” (Givón 1980.265) marked by -ga-. The independent and dependent clauses linked by -ga- must share the same subject and semantically, the NARRATED EVENTS of the two PROPOSITIONS are simultaneous, which “in some sense makes the two actions/events ‘belong together’, ‘be intertwined’ or ‘be performed at the same place’” (Givón 1980.265, 267 & 268):

(54) ta'wá-ci ́u káa-á wúká-púgá
[man- he sing-Participle work-REMOTE]
‘The man worked singing’

(55) wúká-á-sapa, ta'wá-ci ́u tágá-pú-á-á ́úų
[wóork-Participle-Mod man- he poor-Diminutive-
'urá-á-y
be-IMMEDIATE]
‘In spite of working, the man is poor’
(56) ta'wá-ci 'u ká-wúŋka-ğa-way-sapɔ,  
[man- he Neg-work-Participle-Neg-Mod  
pagú'-ųá-mi  
fish-trap-HABITUAL]  
‘The man, instead of fishing, traps fish’

In contrast with the background, remote PERIPHERALITY of kwa clause relations, ga specifies a relation between its clauses that is closer and more CENTRAL. And in contrast with its absence, ga creates a relation at some remove. This is confirmed by the use of ga to express an “intermediate purpose clause” (Givón 1980.266):

(57) Durán-go-uwaa-cawí-kwa-y siv́átu-ci wʊnány-kwa-ğa,  
[Durango-at-to-go-IMMEDIATE goat- sell-go-Participle  
túká-nar’ł-paa-ci  
eat-buy-FUTURE- ]  
‘He is going to Durango to sell a goat, in order to buy food’

4. Conclusion

The behavior of adverbs is diverse in several ways. First, elements denoting some adverbial meaning may appear within simple sentences, and PROPOSITIONAL complexity may not be present. Or adverbial content may be expressed complexly. Because of this, it is not apparent that the two manifestations have any necessary relation. But there is some indication that behind this diversity there lies a pattern. Their connection may be detected by placing the candidates for adverbial interpretation in relation to the semantic space constructed from the consideration of relative clauses; but this will be successful only when that space is amplified by the addition of the semantics of CENTRAL — PERIPHERAL. That semantics may be detected internally, within a simple PROPOSITION, as well as externally in the composition of complex PROPOSITIONS. An example of the former, i.e., the organization of adverbials as PERIPHERAL within a PROPOSITION, comes from Japanese. The use of the postposition ni in Japanese, which is otherwise the mark of PERIPHERAL semantic status, i.e., demoted subjects in Passives, directional, and recipients, also is used to express the content of adverbs (De Wolf 1988.155 and Kuno 1973.70 & 109):
(58) (a) Ano hito wa honyou *ni* tasukaru wa
[that person really helpful Emph-Fem]
‘He’s so helpful!’

(b) Taroo ga sensei *ni* sikar-are-ta
[Taroo teacher by scold-Pass-Pst]
‘Taroo was scolded by the teacher’

(c) Amerika *ni* iki-ta-i
[America to go-want-Prs]
‘I want to go to America’

Mandarin provides an example of a language of the other sort, in which the adverbial connection **between** PROPOSITIONS is built from the semantics of CENTRAL — PERIPHERAL. In simple sentences, the adverbial form appears to show the syntax of ‘nominalization’. Consider these sentences (Example [59c] is from Ma 1985.39.):

(59) (a) Tā shuōhuà
[s/he speak]
‘S/He is speaking’

(b) Wǒ bu liáojiē laōshì shuō de
[I Neg understand teacher speak DE]
‘I don’t understand what the teacher said’

(c) Tā gaōxìng de shuō
[s/he happy DE speak]
‘S/He speaks happily’

As the semantics of PERIPHERALITY associated with adverbials is compacted within the semantics of a PROPOSITION, the more it may appear to lose the DIVERSITY which it might otherwise have, and the more it will seem to acquire the semantics of UNITY. We have discovered that accommodation before in the semantics of ‘complementation’ as a PROPOSITION came to occupy a position within another PROPOSITION. In Figure 2, ‘complementation’ is represented as Path A, which leads to a condition in which the item holds a CENTRAL relation to the EVENT ... which entails a more ROLE-like status. The alternative Path B is one which also leads to a position
within the PROPOSITION, and also to a condition which shows the form of semantic UNITY, but one which bears a relation PERIPHERAL to the PROPOSITION. Compare the condition represented by (59c) with (60):

(60)  Tā hěn gāoxìng
       [s/he very happy]
       ‘S/He is happy’

But there is a third alternative in which the adverbial content retains its PROPOSITIONAL identity, i.e., maintains DIVERSITY. In Figure 2, this is Path C, which is also present in Mandarin and which also implicates the semantics of PERIPHERALITY. In Japanese, we saw that PERIPHERALITY may be associated with the semantics of ‘adverb’ in the use of the postposition ni; and

Figure 2: Variation in complexity.

in Mandarin, we see that because the ‘adverb’ lies within a PROPOSITION, it may also appear to be ‘complementized’ (or more aptly ‘adverbialized’). Here, that outcome is the ‘nominalization’ of PROPOSITIONAL content by the use of de. But when the ‘adverbial’ content is more ‘verbal’, and the relation of the ‘adverbial’ content is more DIVERSE, i.e., more PROPOSITION-like, the less will it seem to be ‘nominalized’ and the more sentential it will be. Compare these sentences (Ma 1985.38-39):
(61) (a)  Tā zài zhēng yǎn  
[s/he ZAI open eye]  
‘S/He is opening his/her eyes’

(b)  Tā zài zhēng zhe yǎn  
[s/he ZAI open ZHE eye]  
‘S/He has his/her eyes open’

(c)  Tā zhēng zhe yǎn shùijiào  
[s/he open ZHE eye sleep]  
‘S/He is sleeping with his/her eyes open’

(62)  Tā xiào zhe shuò  
[s/he smile ZHE speak]  
‘S/He speaks with a smile’

The adverbial function is present in (61c) and in (62). The more ‘active’, and therefore PROPOSITIONAL, content of ‘open [eye]’ and ‘smile’ is encoded adverbially using zhe, which is elsewhere an aspectual marker within simple PROPOSITIONS (Ma 1985.30-31):

(63)  Tā zài ménkòu zhàn zhe  
[s/he ZAI door stand ZHE]  
‘S/He is standing at the door’

(64)  Qián zài yínhángli cún zhe  
[money in bank save ZHE]  
‘The money is deposited in the bank’

Huang and Davis (1989) have argued that the semantics of the aspect signalled by zhe may, independently of its adverbial usage in (61a) and (62), best be thought of as <NON-INTERRUPTED & PERIPHERAL> within an aspectual system which includes le, zài, and guò. This again associates the notion of ‘adverb’ with the semantics of PERIPHERAL. Ute echoes the Mandarin in adapting the semantics of aspect to the expression of PERIPHERAL, which in this context again covers the content of ‘adverbial’. Alabama solves the expression of ‘adverbial’ content, using its -t, -k, and -n affixes, which also relate PROPOSITIONS in terms of CENTRAL — PERIPHERAL. But unlike Mandarin and Ute, Alabama does not achieve this by
using varieties of aspectual meaning.

Like relative clauses, the category of adverbial clauses has \textbf{no universal syntactic} expression. \textbf{Nor} do adverbial clauses have a \textbf{universal content}, and it may be difficult to answer the question of whether a given form is ‘adverbial’ or not, just as it may be difficult to identify relative clauses in all cases. But these \textbf{goals} are, perhaps, the \textbf{wrong} ones. A more productive attitude may be to attempt to understand how any given expression and its semantics is to be understood relative to other forms and their meanings. In the same way that ‘relative clause’ was a grammatical epiphenomenon and in the same way that the semantic content of relative clause was distributed across a semantic space, the universal grammar of ‘adverbial clause’ is an accidental product of the interaction of semantics which are going to be present in language in any case, but which are not devoted to configuring what we perceive as ‘adverbial’. The \textbf{organization of Figure 3} may provide a basis for
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understanding complexity without forcing us to accept issues that are, for the most part, the legacy of a way of thinking about language which requires the
application of categories, such as adverb, relative clause, etc. Within each language, the organization of the universal resources of Figure 3 will fix the frame within which the content of complexity will find its place.