DESIDERATIVE — CAUSATIVES IN PAPAGO

Ofelia Zepeda

University of Arizona

1.   INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with the analysis of what I will term "desiderative-causative" sentences in Papago.   (1) is an example.[1]

(1)   s-ñ-ko:simc   'at.
       s-ñ-ko:ş-im-c   'at
       prefix-prefix-sleep-suffix-suffix Aux
       'I am sleepy.'

(1) contains the causative suffix c and the desiderative suffix -im (which also requires the prefix s-), hence, the term desiderative-causative. Desiderative-causative sentences have characteristics which distinguish them both from the simple desiderative sentences, as in (2), and simple causatives, as in (3).

(2)   Mali:ya 'at s-ko:sim.
       Mary   Aux s-ko:ş-im
       Mary   Aux s:sleep:DESIDERATIVE
       'Mary is sleepy' or more literally 'Mary desires to sleep.'

(3)   Mali:ya 'at ko:sc   g   'ali.
       Mary   Aux ko:ş-c   g   'ali
       Mary   Aux sleep-CAUSATIVE determiner baby
       'Mary made the child go to sleep.'

First, the subject possibilities in desiderative-causatives are exceedingly limited and distinct from those allowed in either simple desideratives or simple causatives. Second the semantic conditions which the verbs places on its associated arguments in desiderative-causative sentences must be distinguished from those in simple desideratives or simple causatives.

An examination, therefore, of the simple desiderative and the simple causative on the one hand and the desiderative-causative on the other will suggest the idiosyncracies of the latter. However, I will argue that the properties of the desiderative-causative, in regard to the subject possibilities and the conditions on arguments, is a natural consequence of the combination of the requirements imposed in the simple desiderative and the simple causative.

2.   PRELIMINARIES

We begin with a discussion of the essential properties of Papago presumed in the statement above of the two characteristics which distinguish desiderative-causatives.

2.1   Syntactic Conditions of Papago

All Papago sentences contain an Auxiliary. The Papago Aux marks, at least, person and number. The following sentences exemplify this fact.[2]

(4)   a.   Koi   'ant.
sleep Aux
'I slept.'

b.   Koi   'apt.
sleep Aux
'Your slept.'

c.   Koi   'at.
sleep Aux
'He, she, it slept.'

d.   Ko:k   'att.
sleep Aux
'We slept.'

e.   Ko:k   'amt.
sleep Aux
'You (pl) slept.'

f.   Ko:k   'at.
sleep Aux
'They slept.'

2.1.1   Subject

While not all Papago sentences obligatorily have independent arguments it is almost always possible to have some argument which agrees with the Aux in number and person. For example, all of the sentences in (4) allow an independent argument which agrees with the Aux in person and number.

(5)   a.   A:ñi 'ant   koi.
I   Aux:1st:sg sleep
'I slept.'

b.   A:pi 'apt   koi.
YOU Aux:2nd:sg sleep
'You slept.'

c.   Hegai   'at   koi.
HE,SHE,IT Aux:3rd sleep
'He, she, it slept.'

d.   A:cim 'att   ko:k.
WE   Aux:1st:pl sleep
'We slept.'

    e.   A:pim ʼamt   ko:k.
          YOU   Aux:2nd:pl sleep
          'You (pl) slept.'

    f.   Hegam ʼat   ko:k.
          THEY Aux:3rd sleep
          'They slept.'

I will term this argument which agrees with the Aux in number and person,
the <u>Subject</u>, and the number and person marking in the Aux, therefore as
<u>Subject</u> <u>Marking</u>.

2.1.2 Object

    The subject, as defined, can be easily distinguished from another
argument which I will term the <u>object</u>. Consider the following sentences.

    (6)   a.   Husi ʼo ñ-ñeid.
              Joe Aux prefix-see
              'Joe sees me.'

          b.   Husi ʼo m-ñeid.
              Joe Aux prefix-see
               'Joe sees you.'

          c.   Husi ʼo t-ñeid.
              Joe Aux prefix-see
               'Joe sees us.'

The prefixes in (6a-c) can agree with some independent argument which is,
again not obligatorily present.

    (7)   a.   Husi ʼo ʼa:ñi ñ-ñeid.
              Joe Aux I   prefix:1st:sg-see
              'Joe sees me.'

          b.   Husi ʼo a:pi m-ñeid.
              Joe Aux YOU prefix:2nd:sg-see
               'Joe sees you.'

          c.   Husi ʼo a:cim t-ñeid.
              Joe Aux WE   prefix:1st:pl-see
              'Joe sees us.'

    The argument which agrees with the prefix in number and person I
will term the <u>Object</u> and the number and person marking which is the pre-
fix, therefore will be called <u>Object</u> <u>Marking</u>.

    Essentially, I am proposing, then, that the arguments in Papago
sentences can be divided into two — one of which, the subject, is
sanctioned by the Aux (specifically, by the number and person marking
in the Aux); and the other of which is the object, is sanctioned by
the number and person marking prefix.

2.2   Semantic Conditions

In the preceding section, I was concerned with syntactic conditions on arguments, this section takes up semantic conditions. The verb in a Papago sentence places certain semantic conditions on the various arguments which may occur. A first indication of this fact is the following pair of sentences.

(8)   a.   Ceoj 'o him.
           Boy Aux walk
           'The boy is walking.'

      b.   Hodai 'o him.
           rock Aux walk
           'The rock is walking.'

For (8b) to be a good Papago sentence, hodai must be interpreted as animate. That is, certain verbs in Papago require that the argument that is marked in Aux, i.e., the subject, must be animate. While the Aux sanctions the presence of the subject, it cannot be the source of the animacy condition in (8), since it is possible for a Papago sentence where the subject can be inanimate to have the same Aux as one where the subject must be animate.

(9)   a.   Ceoj 'o meḍ.
           boy Aux run
           'The boy is running.'

      b.   Hodai 'o s-kawk.
           rock Aux hard
           'The rock is hard.'

It is not only the case that the verb restricts what the subject can be, it also places certain semantic conditions on the object. For example, the verb neokjul 'to read', requires that the object be, at least, inanimate.

(10) Husi 'at ñeokjul g   'o'ohana.
      Joe Aux read   determiner book
      'Joe read the book.'

Animacy is not the only relevant semantic condition, but it is enough to illustrate the point at issue--that verbs place certain semantic requirements on the arguments in a sentence or, better, conditions their interpretation.

3.   DESIDERATIVES AND CAUSATIVES IN PAPAGO

Before we can look at the complex desiderative-causative construction in Papago, we must first look at the component constructions out of which it is formed: that is, the simple desiderative and the simple causative.

3.1   Simple Desideratives

The desiderative suffix -im attaches to verbs and has no effect on the number of arguments in a sentence. The following pairs are illustrative.

(11)   a.   'A:ñi 'añ   ko:ṣ.
              I   Aux:lst:sg sleep.
              'I am sleeping.'

        b.   A:ñi 'añ   s-ko:sim.
              I   Aux:lst:sg s-ko:ṣ-im
              I   Aux lst:sg s-sleep-DESIDERATIVE
              'I desire to sleep.'

(12)   a.   A:ñi 'añ   ṣonhin g   Husi.
              I   Aux:lst:sg hit   determiner Joe
              'I am hitting Joe.'

        b.   A:ñi 'añ   s-ṣonhinim   g   Husi.
              I   Aux:lst:sg s-hit-DESIDERATIVE determiner Joe
              'I desire to hit Joe.'

I should mention, in passing, that the semantic range of the verbs which allows the desiderative is essentially unrestricted.

Crucial for our purposes is a consideration of the semantic conditions which the desiderative verb places on the arguments in the sentence. In both (11b) and (12b) the arguments which agrees with the Aux and is, therefore the subject—is 'a:ñi. The subject in desiderative sentences must be animate. But, and more importantly, the subject in simple desideratives must have volition or be capable of volition. By volition, I refer to the capacity of having a will. Thus, animacy and volitionality are not coterminous. A dog is animate but lacks volitionality. In simple desiderative sentences, gogs 'dog' is a good subject, only if it can be interpreted in human terms.

(13)   Gogs 'at s-ñ-ke'im
        dog Aux s-prefix-kei-im
        dog Aux s-prefix-bite:DESIDERATIVE
        'The dog desired to bite me.'

3.2   Simple Causatives

The causative suffix in Papago attaches to verbs which do not allow the object marking prefix—that is, only to intransitive verbs.[3] And, the result of this attachment to such a verb is to allow it to take the object marking prefix—that is, it makes it transitive. The examples below show this particular point.

(14)   a.   Huan 'ɔ him
              John Aux walk
              'John is walking.'

b. Husi 'o himcud   g   Huan.
    Joe Aux him-cud   determiner John
    Joe Aux walk:CAUSATIVE determiner John
    'Joe is making, causing John to walk.'

As the pair in (14) suggest, the subject of the intransitive verb is the object of the simple causative.

The object in simple causatives need not be animate, but--and most importantly--the object must be interpreted as lacking any power or control over the action which it performs. So, for (14b) to be a good Papago sentence, Huan must be either a paraplegic with no control over his ability to walk or a small baby who has not yet learned how to walk.

Conversely, the subject in a simple causative always has absolute control over the action which the sentence describes. So, in (14b), Joe is actually moving John's legs. It doesn't follow from this requirement that the subject must be animate; the subject in simple causatives may be inanimate. So, (15) is a good Papago sentence.

(15) Ku:bs 'at ñ-i'ihokc.
      dust Aux prefix-i'ihok-c
      DUST Aux prefix-cough:CAUSATIVE
      'The dust made me cough.'

However, where the subject is inanimate, the subject must have physical contact with the object. So, for (15) to be a good sentence, ku:bs 'smoke; dust' must actually come into contact with the person who coughs. And, the action of coughing is still totally out of the control of the person who performs the action.

Let me summarize briefly the preceding discussion. A desiderative verb, i.e. a verb with the suffix -im (and the prefix s-), requires that the subject in the sentence be volitional--and, therefore, be animate. A causative verb, i.e. a verb with the suffix -c, requires that the subject in the sentence have absolute control over the action which is caused by the subject and that the object in the sentence have no control over the action which is performed.

4.   DESIDERATIVE-CAUSATIVES

The formation of the desiderative-causative is a simple morphological process: any desiderative verb which is intransitive can take the causative suffix -c, as in the following examples:

(16) a. s-ko:sim   s-ko:simc
          s-ko:s-im   s-ko:ṣ-im-c
          s-sleep:DESIDERATIVE   s-sleep:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE
          'to desire to sleep'   'something made him desire to
                                      sleep'

      b. s-himim   s-himimc
          s-him-im   s-him-im-c
          s-walk:DESIDERATIVE   s-walk:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE
          'to desire to walk,   'something made him desire to
            go, leave'   leave, go'

c. s-'i'm   s-'i'imc
    s-i-im   s-'i-im-c
    s-drink:DESIDERATIVE   s-drink:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE
    'to desire to drink'   'something made him desire to
                                    drink'

d. s-hi'am   s-hi'amc
    s-hia-im   s-hia-im-c
    s-urinate:DESIDERATIVE   s-urinate:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE
    'to desire to urinate'   'something made him desire to
                                    urinate'

e. s-hugim   s-hugimc
    s-hug-im   s-hug-im-c
    s-eat:DESIDERATIVE   s-eat:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE
    'to desire to eat'   'something made him to desire
                                    to eat (something)'

The interesting complexities of the desiderative-causative lie within the
whole desiderative-causative sentence.

The desiderative-causative meets the essence of the conditions pro-
posed above for simple desideratives and simple causatives--one argument
is volitional (has will) and one argument has complete control. But
desiderative-causatives are distinct, and essentially idiosyncratic, in
that: (1) the object of the sentence is the argument which has volition;
and (2) the subject possibilities for desiderative-causatives are ex-
ceedingly limited, limited to only a small subset of that allowed in
simple causatives.

4.1 Discussion

Consider the following desiderative-causative sentence:

(17) s-ñ-dahimc   'at 'a:ni g
      s-object-sit:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE Aux I   determiner

      gewkogdag
      tiredness

      'Tiredness made me want to sit down.'

The sentence in (17) has an object, a:ñi, and a subject, gewkogdag. The
application of these terms in either case is precisely that proposed
above, 'a:ñi agrees with the object prefix in number and person and
gewkogdag agrees with the Aux in number and person.

As in desiderative sentences, one of the arguments is volitional--
here 'a:ñi. Unlike desideratives, however, it is the object which is
volitional in desiderative-causatives. Compare, for example, the pair
of sentences in (18) below.

(18) a. S-ñ-himimc   'at.
          s-object-walk:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE Aux
          'I desire to go' or more literally 'something made me
                                              desire to go.'

b.   S-himim   'o g   Huan.
      s-walk:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE Aux determiner John
      'John desires to go.'

In both (18a) and (18b) there is one argument which is volitional
and in both the volitional argument is some animate being. The crucial
difference is that in (18a) the argument which must be volitional is
the object and in (18b) it is the subject.

As in causative sentences, one of the arguments has complete con-
trol--in (17), it is gewkogdag. Consider also the following examples.

(19)   S-ñ-'i'imc   'at g   tonamdag.
        s-object-drink:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE Aux determiner thirst
        'Thirst made me desire to drink.'

(20)   S-ñ-hugimc   'at g   bihugimdag.
        s-object-eat:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE Aux determiner hunger
        'Hunger made me desire to eat.'

In all three of these sentences, the fact that the argument which is the
subject or the causer is also in complete control may not be as obvious
as in the simple causative. Compare, for example, the simple causa-
tive in (14b). However, in (17), (19), and (20) the "causer" is an in-
ternal state. The individual experiencing the desire to sit down or
the desire to drink or the desire to eat is powerless against it; thus,
the "causer" in all three sentences--the subject argument--has complete
control.

In regard, then, to the notion of complete control and its associa-
tion specifically with the subject argument, desiderative-causatives and
simple causatives are essentially identical. The differences between
the two, and the special character of the desiderative-causative, become
clear upon a closer examination of desiderative-causatives: the subject
in desiderative-causative sentences is subject to stringent requirements.
These requirements are such that, in most desiderative-causative sen-
tences, it is impossible for a subject to be present.

The subject of (17), (19), and (20) is a -dag word, that is, a
word which contains the suffix -dag. Dag is a suffix which attaches to
some verb and makes it a noun; (21) below gives some examples.

(21)   verb   +dag   =

        cipkan 'is/was working'   cipkandag 'work, job
        'oi 'is/was following   'oidag 'fields'
        'i: 'drank'   'i'idag 'drunkeness
        ma:si 'born, dawn'   ma:sidag 'birthday'
        ceggia 'is/was fighting'   ceggiadag 'war, a fight'
        him 'is/was walking'   himdag 'way of life, culture'
        gia, 'to take by hand,   gi'adag 'handle'
              handle

wi:pia 'to leave'	wi:piadag 'remains'
mehĭ 'to set on fire'	mehidag 'charred remains'

The category of -dag words is larger than that pattern represented in (21) would suggest. The suffix -dag also attaches to nouns. (22) below gives a small sample of nouns + dag.

(22)   Noun   +dag   =

nowĭ 'hand'	nowidag 'sleeve'
kahio 'leg'	kahiodag 'pantleg'
ki: 'house'	ki:dag 'housing'
'i:wagĭ 'greens'	'i:wagidag 'vegetation leaves'
ba:şo 'chest'	ba:şodag 'apron'
waili 'a dance'	wailidag 'dance'
si:l 'saddle'	si:ldag 'the saddle of something'
'uşab 'sap'	'uşabdag 'the sap of something'

The difference between the set in (21) and that in (22) is clear: the former are the Papago equivalent of English abstract nouns; the latter are less easy to characterize, but definitely are not abstract nouns. We have already seen that the subject in (17), (19) and (20) is a -dag word. We can now be more precise. The subject of a desiderative-causative must be a -dag word, specifically a verb + -dag word--i.e. the Papago equivalent of an abstract noun.

However, not any -dag word can occur as the subject in a desiderative causative sentence. (23) is a desiderative-causative sentence with a -dag word as a subject, but the sentence is not good Papago.

(23)   *S-n-'i'imc   'at g   cipkandag
                                                              cipkan-dag
           s-object-drink:DESIDERATIVE:CAUSATIVE Aux determiner work
           'Work made me desire to drink.'

Only a small subset of the -dag words is possible as the subject in a desiderative-causative sentence. These are ones which refer to some internal state or emotion. (24) contains an exhaustive list.

(24)   Verb   +dag   =

tonam 'to be thirsty'	tonamdag 'thirst'
bihugim 'to be hungry'	bihugimdag 'hunger'
gewkog 'to be tired'	gewkogdag 'tiredness'
mumku 'to be sick'	mumkudag 'sickness'

The subjects in (17), (19), and (20) are all included on this list; verb + dag word which do not refer to some internal state or emotion-- cf. the list in (22)--may not be subjects in desiderative-causative sentences.

Finally, even if the subject is chosen from the list in (24), a desiderative-causative sentence could still be unacceptable. The subject must have a direct relationship to the emotion or internal state being experienced. In (17), (19), and (20), the subjects are so related: gewkogdag 'tiredness' has a direct relationship to the desire to sit down; bihugimdag 'hunger' has a direct connection to the desire to eat; and tonamdag 'thirst' has a direct connection to the desire to drink. However, (25) even though it contains an abstract noun having to do with some internal state, in fact, even though we know that bihugimdag is a possible subject in some desiderative-causative sentence--is not a good sentence. Bihugimdag 'hunger' is not directly related to the desire to drink.

(25)   *S-n-i'imc   'at g   bihugimdag
       s-object-drink:desiderative:causative Aux determiner HUNGER
       'Hunger made me desire to drink.'

I have discussed three requirements which the subject of a desiderative-causative must meet: (1) it must be a verb + dag word, an abstract noun; (2) it must be a particular type of abstract noun, specifically, one referring to an internal state or emotion; (3) it must have a direct relationship to the desire being experienced. These three requirements clearly restrict the possible choices for the subject in any desiderative-causative sentence.   In fact, the norm for most desiderative-causatives sentences is that there is no lexical item which meets the requirements; the standard desiderative-causative, thus, obligatorily lacks a subject. The following illustrate this fact.

(26)   S-ñ-ko:simc   'at.
         s-object-sleep:desiderative:causative Aux
         'I am sleepy.' or literally, 'Something made me desire to sleep.'

         S-ñ-himimc   'at.
         s-object-walk:desiderative:causative Aux
         'I want to leave, go.' or 'Something made me desire to leave.'

         S-ñ-şoşakimc   'at.
         s-object-cry:desiderative:causative Aux
         'I feel like crying.' or 'Something made me desire to cry.'

         S-ñ-hi'amc   'at.
         s-object-urinate:desiderative:causative Aux
         'I feel like urinating.'

         S-ñ-wihosimc   'at.
         s-object-vomit:Desiderative:causative Aux
         'I feel like throwing up.' or 'Something makes me feel like
                                               throwing up.'

         S-ñ-biscimc   'at.
         s-object-sneeze:desiderative:causative Aux
         'I feel like sneezing.' or 'Something makes me feel like
                                               sneezing.'

         S-ñ-je:ñimc   'at.
         s-object-smoke:desiderative:causative Aux
         'I feel like smoking.' or 'Something makes me feel like smoking.'

In summary, desiderative-causatives have one argument which must be volitional and another which must have complete control. However, (1) the former is associated not with the subject, but with the object and (2) the requirements for the latter are such that they effectively preclude the presence of a subject in the vast majority of desiderative-causative sentences.

4.2   Explanation

We have considered the crucial characteristics of simple desideratives, simple causatives, and desiderative-causatives. It appears that the latter, while it is morphologically the sum of the former, is otherwise distinct. I suggested at the beginning of this paper that this appearance is deceiving; we are ready, then, to consider this suggestion.

The requirements of the desiderative-causative--i.e. that one argument must be volitional and another must have absolute control-- virtually repeat requirements of the simple desiderative and the simple causative. The difference is simply that in the desiderative-causative there is a shift in the arguments which satisfy these requirements. In the desiderative it is the subject which is obligatorily volitional; in the desiderative-causative, it is the object. In the causative the subject must have absolute control, but the possibilities which this allows are far greater than the absolute control required in the desiderative-causative.

The explanation of the latter is relatively straightforward. Although the subject possibilities are different from those in simple causatives, the important point is that the same requirements pertain in either case. To desire to do something is a volitional internal state which can be controlled only by some non-volitional and physiologically related internal state. That is, a desire cannot be caused-- at least under any consistent interpretation of cause--by some external force.

Given that the "desire" is within the scope of the "causation", the fact that the object is volitional also presents relatively little difficulty. The crucial point is not that the object is the volitional argument, but that there exists a volitional argument to fulfill the requirement of the desiderative. Since the subject must have absolute control, and is not experiencing the desire, the object is the only argument available.

5.   CONCLUSION

After having discussed at some length the syntactic and semantic properties of a Papago desiderative and causative and the properties of a Papago desiderative-causative it ought to be clear why it is not possible to get the following sentences in Papago.

(27)   John made me feel like crying.

    *S-ñ-sosakimc   'at g   Huan.
     s-object-sosa-im-c   Aux determiner John
     s-object-cry:desiderative:causative Aux determiner John
     'John made me feel like crying.'

(28)   John made me feel like leaving.

    *S-ñ-himimc   'at g   Huan.
     s-object-him-im-c   Aux determiner John
     s-object-walk:desiderative:causative Aux determiner John
     'John made me feel like leaving.'

(29)   The movie made me feel sleepy.

    *S-ñ-ko:simc   'at g   wepegi.
     s-object-ko:s-im-c   Aux determiner movie
     s-object-sleep:desiderative:causative Aux determiner movie
     'The movie made me feel sleepy.'

    In all of the above everything is consistent with the requirements of the desiderative. That is, the argument experiencing the 'desire' is a volitional being; this is true in both the English and the Papago sentences. However, where the English form is grammatical with 'John' or 'movie' as the subject or causer the Papago sentences are ungrammatical. Recall the requirements which were placed on the possible subject of a desiderative-causative, i.e. a -dag noun, referring to some internal state or emotion, and an internal state which directly related to the 'emotional state' experienced. None of the subjects in (27) through (29) meet these requirements.

    The interesting question, then—and that with which I will conclude—is: Is the difference between English and Papago in this regard a cultural one or a linguistic one? That is, is it the case that a speaker of English and a speaker of Papago view the possibility of "causing" a desire in different terms? Or, is it the case that in English it is possible to allow a noun like movie or John to refer to entities of varying degrees of abstractness while in Papago nouns like wepegi and Huan have more obviously fixed referents? What implications would either result have for linguistic theory?

FOOTNOTES

[1]The orthography used in this paper is that created by Albert Alvarez and Kenneth Hale. Symbols unique to Papago include the following: /d/ retroflexed apico-alveolar, e.g. med 'running'; /ş/ retroflexed fricative, e.g. 'eş 'chin'. Vowel length in Papago is marked by a colon (:) after the vowel, e.g. /e:/ me: 'ran'. Extra-short vowels are marked by a ˇ above the vowel, e.g. /ɨ̆/ 'uwɨ̆ 'woman'.

    In the Papago example sentences, prefixes are hyphenated at morpheme boundaries; this is standard Papago orthographic practice—e.g. s-ñ-ko:simc. Suffixes, on the other hand, are not marked in the orthography; for example, ko:simc includes two suffixes -im and -c. Where necessary for exposition, the presence of suffixes is indicated by writing them with a preceding hyphen, e.g. s-ñ-ko:s-im-c.

[2]In Table A below is the complete set of Papago <u>Independent Pro-</u>
<u>nouns</u>. In Tables B and C are the Imperfective and Perfective <u>Auxiliaries</u>
respectively. Finally, in Table D is the set of <u>Object Markers</u>. The
Independent Pronouns can function as either subject or object. When one
of them is subject, the Aux agrees in number and person; when one of
them is object, the Object Marker agrees in number and person.

A. Pronouns			B. Auxiliaries (Imperfective)		
	Sing.	Pl.		Sing.	Pl.
1st.	ʼa:ñi (I,me)	ʼa:cim (we)	1st.	ʼañ	ʼac
2nd.	ʼa:pi (you)	ʼa:pim (you pl.)	2nd.	ʼap	ʼam
3rd	hegai (he,she,it)	hegam (they)	3rd.	ʼo	ʼo

C. Auxiliaries (Perfective)			D. Object Markers		
	Sing.	Pl.		Sing.	Pl.
1st.	ʼant	ʼatt	1st.	ñ-	t-
2nd.	ʼapt	ʼamt	2nd.	m-	ʼem-
3rd.	ʼat	ʼat	3rd.	∅	ha-

[3]The <u>s-</u> prefix attaches to the verb simultaneously with the desid-
erative suffix -<u>im</u>. The <u>s-</u> in the Papago examples is not labeled and
is simply given as <u>s-</u> since it is not totally clear what it should be
called. This <u>s-</u> normally marks 'attributes or characteristics' of
certain things, i.e. <u>s-padma</u> 'lazy'; <u>s-da:pk</u> 'slippery'. It is tradi-
tionally associated with what we call stative verbs or adjectives in
Papago, i.e. <u>s-kawk</u> 'hard', <u>s-mu'uk</u> 'sharp'. This prefix also appears
in conjunction with other suffixes other then -<u>im</u>, for example the suffix
-<u>dag</u>; <u>s-cipkan-dag</u> 'to be a good worker.'

[4]The causative suffix has both an imperfective and a perfective
form. Both the imperfective form -<u>cud</u> and the perfective form -<u>c</u> attach
to imperfective verbs. For example: <u>himcud</u> 'is/was causing to walk',
<u>ko:ṣcud</u> 'is/was causing to sleep'; <u>himc</u> 'caused to walk; <u>ko:ṣc</u> 'caused
to sleep.'

[5]This is an exhaustive list for this particular speaker of Papago.
It may be possible for other speaker of Papago to have 'abstract nouns'
which are possible subjects for desiderative-causative sentences.