

The Jamul Diegueño predicate nominal construction¹

Amy Miller

In this paper I describe the predicate nominal construction found in Jamul Diegueño, a language of the Delta-California subgroup of the Yuman family spoken today by thirteen people in San Diego County, California, and discuss the historical significance of inflectional prefixes found in this construction. I begin with a summary of Pamela Munro's comparative work on predicate nominal constructions in Yuman languages.

1. The Yuman predicate nominal construction

The Yuman predicate nominal construction is a special construction used in Yuman languages to express statements of identification or class membership and is typically translated into English using the copula construction 'X is Y'. In a comparative study, Munro (1977) shows that throughout the Yuman family predicate nominal constructions have or can be described as variations on the following form (1977:446):²

(1) NP₁ NP₂-č BE

In general, the construction consists of two noun phrases followed by a form of the verb 'be'. The first noun phrase, the "(logical) subject", is optional. When it appears it takes no case marker. The second noun phrase, the "predicate noun", is obligatory. It is typically followed by the subject case marker, a reflex of Proto Yuman -č. The verb 'be' is optional in some languages, and in some languages both 'be' and the subject case marker may be omitted from the construction, which then consists solely of the juxtaposition of two unmarked nominals. 2a reproduces one example used by Munro to illustrate the basic form of the construction (1977:447) and 2b and 2c reproduce examples illustrating two possible variants (1977:449,457).³

(2)a. Mojave

John	k ^w aθ [?] ide:-č	ido-pč
John	doctor-sj	be-tense

'John is a doctor.'

b. Mojave

John k^waθ[?]ide:-č
John doctor-sj
'John is a doctor.'

c. Paipai

paxmi-ha	ksye:
man-dem	doctor

'The man is a doctor.'

On the basis of comparative data, Munro (1977:450) reconstructs the following construction for Proto Yuman:

(3) (NP₁) NP₂-č (BE)

She argues (1977:450-458;461) that the Yuman predicate nominal construction has (or once had)⁴ the complex structure reproduced in 4. The two juxtaposed noun phrases constitute a

clause, and this clause in turn functions as the subject of an existential verb 'be'.⁵ In Yuman languages, case markers always follow the last element of a noun phrase, so the subject case marker which follows the predicate noun may be analyzed as marking the grammatical function of the subject complement clause.

(4)

Munro (1977:468-474) observes that the construction has undergone or is presently undergoing various changes in the modern Yuman languages, and she argues that these changes all manifest a tendency for the complex Proto Yuman construction to be reanalyzed as monoclausal. One such change is for the logical subject to be reinterpreted as the grammatical subject of 'be'; this reinterpretation is in evidence in Yavapai, Kiliwa, Paipai, and Cocopa, where (at least some of the time) subject case marking appears on the logical subject (1977:469-470). It is also found in Mojave, where the logical subject of the construction is sometimes marked as the grammatical subject of 'be' by pronominal prefixes on this verb (1977:452,469). A second manifestation of the same tendency toward reanalysis is a change in the status of the verb 'be'. This type of change can be seen in Hualapai, Yavapai, Havasupai, and some Diegueño languages, where the verb 'be' is coalescing or has coalesced with the case marker *-č* to form a special suffix which seems to verbalize a predicate noun (1977:465-466;470-471,474). A third change attested in some languages is that the predicate noun may acquire some characteristics of a verb: for instance in Inaja Diegueño the predicate noun may take an emphatic prefix which is otherwise found only on verbs (1977:473), and in Tolkapaya Yavapai the predicate noun sometimes agrees in person with the logical subject which is marked as its grammatical subject (1977:473-474; see also Hardy 1979:271-272). Munro observes that more than one of these changes may occur in the same language.

Two distinct constructions found in Jamul Diegueño appear to derive historically from the proto Yuman predicate nominal construction. One, a copula construction, is described very briefly in section 2. The other, a predicate nominal construction, is discussed in section 3. Historical implications of the Jamul Diegueño facts are discussed in section 4.

2. The copula construction in Jamul Diegueño

The Jamul Diegueño copula construction, like the Yuman predicate nominal construction, equates a logical subject with a predicate noun. As exemplified in 5a and 5b, the copula construction consists minimally of a noun phrase followed by a form of the verb *yu* 'be'. This noun phrase, the predicate noun, appears in absolute case;⁶ it is never followed by a case marker. The logical subject of the construction is marked by a pronominal subject prefix on the verb 'be'.⁷ It may in addition be lexically realized, in which case it bears subject case marking (see note 6) and precedes the predicate noun, as in 5c and 5d.

- (5)a. *nyaap* *m-yu-pek* ...
 me.abs 2-be-if
 'If you were me ...

b. tiipay w-yu
 person 3-be
 'She is a person.'

c. nyaach a'wi yu-s
 I.sj snake be-emph
 'I am a rattlesnake.'

d. maach nyaap m-yu-pek ...
 you.sj me.abs 2-be-if
 'If you were me ...'

No copula construction is reconstructed for Proto Yuman. However, Munro's (1977) findings suggest that a copula construction is likely to be a recent development from the Proto Yuman predicate nominal construction. As reviewed in section 1, in several languages the logical subject of the predicate nominal construction is being reinterpreted as the grammatical subject of the verb 'be'. I believe that such a reinterpretation has been fully implemented in Jamul Diegueño and that the distinctive characteristics of this language's copula construction (the presence of subject case marking on the logical subject, the absence of a subject case marker following the predicate noun, and the pattern of subject prefixation on the verb 'be') result from the reinterpretation of the logical subject as the grammatical subject of the verb 'be'.⁸

3. The predicate nominal construction in Jamul Diegueño

Also found in Jamul Diegueño is a predicate nominal construction, distinct from the copula construction but descended from the same source, the Proto Yuman predicate nominal construction.⁹ The Jamul Diegueño predicate nominal construction equates a logical subject with a predicate noun. It consists minimally of a noun phrase, the predicate noun, as exemplified in 6. The predicate noun appears in absolute case (see note 6); it is never followed by a case marker. It may be followed by one of several clitics, including question markers and emphatics. In 6, a logical subject is understood.

(6) xechany-ches
 girl-emph
 'It's a girl!'

A second noun phrase lexicalizing the logical subject may optionally appear, in which case it precedes the predicate noun. (Henceforth I identify the predicate noun by placing the symbol // before it.) A lexically realized logical subject appears in absolute case; it is never followed by a case marker.

(7)a. puu // kwesi'yaay-ches
 that.one witch-emph
 'He's a witch!'

b. xemaay-pu // nyaap iixaadh
 boy-dem my.abs godson
 'That boy is my godson.'

- c. peya // nyaap-ches
 this.one me.abs-emph
 'This one [in the photograph] is me.'

In the examples above, the logical subject of the predicate nominal construction had a third person referent. Let's consider examples with first and second person logical subjects:

- (8)a. // ny-kwechmaach-ches
 LS1-dancer-emph
 'I'm a dancer.'
- b. nyaap // ny-mtiipay
 me.abs LS1-Kumeyaay.Indian
 'I'm a Kumeyaay Indian.'

- (9)a. // m-kwechcheyaaw-meyu
 LS2-singer-2.Q
 'Are you a singer?'
- b. maap // m-'iipa
 you.abs LS2-man
 'You're a man.'

A first person logical subject is marked by a prefix *ny-* on the predicate noun;¹⁰ a second person logical subject by a prefix *m-*. I call these "logical subject prefixes" and gloss them 'LS1' and 'LS2' respectively. Notice that logical subject prefixes appear even when the logical subject is lexically realized, as in 8b and 9b. When no prefix appears on a predicate noun, a third person logical subject is understood (cf. 6,7).

The logical subject prefixes have alternate forms *nya-* and *maa-* which are used when the stem to which they attach is a stress-initial loan word (cf. 10.a) or a root-initial native word (cf. 10.c).¹¹ (Negative constructions like 10.c are discussed in 3.3.)

- (10)a. nyaap // nya-meer
 me.abs LS1-teacher
 'I am a teacher.'
- b. maap // maa-leep
 you.abs LS2-orphan
 'You are an orphan.'
- c. maap // uup kwechsiip maa-maw
 you.abs tobacco smoker LS2-nom.neg
 'You are a non-smoker.'

3.1. Relative clauses and complex nouns as predicate nouns

A subject relative clause may be used as a predicate noun. The verb of the relative clause must be a stative intransitive verb.

- (11) xaachaany Tsosie // tiipay kw-a'xaan
 girls Tsosie people sjrel-be.good.pl
 'The Tsosie girls are nice people (lit. people who are good).'

Logical subject prefixes attach to the nominalized verb of the relative clause.

- (12)a. // xemaay m-kw-a'xan
 boy LS2-sjrel-be.good
 'You're a good boy!'
- b. nyaap // xechany ny-kw-a'xan
 me.abs girl LS1-sjrel-be.good
 'I'm a good girl.'

An agent nominalization may also be used as a predicate noun, as exemplified in 13. (See Miller 1990 for morphological and semantic distinctions between agent nominalizations and subject relative clauses.)

- (13) puu // kwechsiich
 that.one drunkard
 'He's a drunk.'

When an agent nominalization includes a syntactically incorporated object, logical subject prefixes attach to the nominalized verb:

- (14)a. nyaap // peyon ny-kwechmaar
 me.abs peon LS1-player
 'I'm a peon player.'
- b. nyaap // vool ny-kwechniiv
 me.abs ball LS1-competitor
 'I'm a bowler.'

3.2. Negated predicate nouns

In ordinary transitive and intransitive sentences, negation is expressed by the word *xemaaw* which follows the last verb of the predication being negated.¹² A particle *may* often accompanies it, appearing at the leftmost boundary of the scope of negation. For example:

- (15) ... skan maay-m w-kull, may tekewan-k u-wiiv xemaaw
 flee high.place-to 3-climb neg turn-irr.SS 3-look.at neg
 '... he climbed up to a high place, he didn't turn and look at (the bull).'

When a predicate nominal construction expresses a negative equation, the ordinary negative construction is not used. Instead, the predicate noun contains the nominal form of the negative, *maw*, which is also found in relativized negated clauses.¹³ The particle *may* sometimes appears (cf. 17b).

- (16)a. puu // nyaap ntaat maw
 that.one my father nom.neg
 'That's not my father.'
- b. // uup kwechsiip maw
 tobacco smoker nom.neg
 'She's a non-smoker.'

When logical subject prefixes appear, they attach to the negative word *maw*:

- (17)a. nyaap // 'iipa nya-maw
 me.abs man LS1-nom.neg
 'I'm not a man.'
- b. nyaap // may uup kwechsiip nya-maw
 me.abs neg tobacco smoker LS1-nom.neg
 'I'm a non-smoker.'
- c. // a'wi maa-maw-ms
 snake LS2-nom.neg-2.emph
 'You're not a snake!'

This suggests that *maw*, like the nominalized verbs in 12 and 14, is contained within the noun phrase that is the predicate noun.¹⁴

3.3. Question-marking and emphatic clitics in predicate nominal constructions

Jamul Diegueño has two sets of clitics which mark questions.¹⁵ The first set includes the forms *chu*, *chu'u*, and *chuum*, and the second set includes *meyu*, *meyu'u*, and *meyuum*.¹⁶ (Semantic differences among the forms within each set are not yet understood.) When one of these clitics is used to mark a question, it follows the last element of the verb complex of an independent clause. Ordinarily, the choice between the two sets of question markers depends on the person of the grammatical subject of the independent clause: when the subject is first or third person, a member of the first set is chosen, and when the subject is second person, a member of the second set is chosen. This may be seen in the following examples. (I gloss question markers belonging to the first set 'Q' and those belonging to the second set '2.Q'.)

- (18)a. ma'am -aa-x-chu
 where.to 1-go-irr-Q
 'Where should I go?'
- b. ma'ay m-wiww m-uuyaaw-meyu
 where.loc 2-see 2-know-2.Q
 'Where did you learn that?'
- c. xantuk tewa-chu
 be.upright be.sitting-Q
 'Is it right side up?'

When the independent clause of a question is a predicate nominal construction, the choice between the two sets of question markers depends on the person of the logical subject. If the logical subject is first or third person, a question marker from the first set is used; if the logical subject is second person, a question marker from the second set is used.¹⁷

- (19)a. yu'uu-pu // aasha-chu'u
 owl-dem bird-Q
 'Are owls birds?'
- b. maap // maa-meesr-meyu
 you.abs LS2-teacher-2.Q
 'Are you a teacher?'

A similar situation obtains with emphatics. Two of the emphatic clitics found in Jamul Diegueño are *-ches* and *-ms*. (A third, *-s*, is not relevant here.) Like question markers, emphatic clitics follow the last element of the verb complex of an independent clause. Ordinarily, the choice between *-ches* and *-ms* depends upon the person of the grammatical subject of the independent clause: *-ches* (which I gloss 'emph') is used when this subject has a first or third person referent, and *-ms* (which I gloss '2.emph') is used when the subject has a second person referent.

- (20)a. ny-chuumuch-x taaniw-ches
 3/1-kill.pl-irr be.together-emph
 'They are going to kill me.'
- b. nya-m-yaw m-nyyip-x-ms
 when-2-take 2-wear.belt-irr-2.emph
 'When you take it, wear it as a belt.'
- c. trabaxaar shemay ta'yiw-ches
 work seek 1.be.coming-emph
 'I am looking for work.'

When the independent clause is a predicate nominal construction, the choice between emphatic clitics depends on the person of the logical subject, as may be seen in 21 (see also 7a and 7c.)

- (21)a. puu // kechewaamp-ches
 that.one.abs traveller-emph
 'He's a traveller.'
- b. // aveex ny-kepshaaw-ches
 bee LS1-keeper-emph
 'I'm a beekeeper.'
- c. ... maap // m-lly'aaw-ms
 ... you.abs LS2-rabbit-2.emph
 '... you're a (cottontail) rabbit!'

The predicate nominal construction does not have a grammatical subject, and its logical subject appears to take the place of the lacking grammatical subject for the purpose of determining the choice of question marking and emphatic clitics.¹⁸

3.4. Comments

The Jamul Diegueño predicate nominal construction has a simple monoclausal structure which may be schematized as in 22. Its structure is roughly comparable with the internal structure of the embedded sentential subject of the Proto Yuman construction seen in 3 and 4.

(22) (NP) LS-NP

One characteristic which distinguishes the Jamul Diegueño predicate nominal construction from the Proto Yuman construction is the presence of prefixes marking the logical subject on the predicate noun. At first glance, the presence of these prefixes might suggest that the Jamul Diegueño construction has undergone the third type of change observed by Munro and reviewed in section 1 above, whereby the predicate noun acquires characteristics of a verb. I argue in section 4 that they have a different source.

A second distinguishing characteristic of the Jamul Diegueño predicate nominal construction is its lack of any subject case marking anywhere (remember that in the Proto Yuman construction, subject case marking follows the predicate noun), and a third peculiarity is that the Jamul Diegueño construction consistently lacks a verb 'be'.¹⁹ While several Yuman languages optionally allow omission of both the subject case marker and the verb 'be' from a predicate nominal construction, according to Munro (1977:449,457), in Jamul Diegueño these morphemes *never* appear.

While in fact the question markers and emphatics discussed in 3.4 derive historically from an auxiliary verb construction containing the verb 'be' (see Miller 1990), it must be emphasized that these clitics are widely and freely used in non-predicate nominal sentences (cf. 18,20). They cannot be regarded as copular suffixes, nor as synchronic reductions of predicate nominal 'be'.²⁰

4. Logical subject prefixes in comparative and historical perspective

4.1. Logical subject prefixes in other languages

Logical subject prefixes are found in other Yuman languages as well as in Jamul Diegueño.²¹ In Campo Diegueño, logical subject prefixes appear in at least some predicate nominal constructions. The following example is taken from Munro (1978:31), who cites Langdon (p.c.). (Interlinear glosses are my own.)

(23) Campo Diegueño
 ʔnʷa:ba // nʷə-kʷa:ko:y
 me.abs LS1-old.woman
 'I am an old woman.'

Logical subject prefixes are also found in Yuma as spoken in the 1930's. Dozens of examples may be found in Halpern's (1935ms) field notes; two appear in the exchange in 24, from the Yuma text *Xi-wa: to-ev* (Halpern 1935ms, notebook I no.6, pp. 21-22).

- (24) Yuma
 // ma-paʔi·pá·c m-adó-t-apat-m nʔ-ayú·-t-k-2a
 LS2-person-sj 2-be-assrt-also-past/pres 1/2-see-assrt-past/pres-end
 'No doubt you are human beings, as I see.'
 xá· // ʔanʔ-paʔi·pác
 yes LS1-person.pl
 'Yes, we are people.'

(Orthography has been standardized where possible to reflect that of Halpern's (1946,1947) publications. Segmentation of examples taken from Halpern's field notes is my own. Interlinear glosses follow Halpern (1947), with the following exceptions: the glosses 'LS1' and 'LS2' are my own, and for the sake of consistency I have substituted the case label 'subject' for Halpern's 'nominative'. Notice that in the first example in 24, the predicate noun is followed by the subject case marker and a form of the verb 'be',²² while in the second example in 24, as well as in the Campo Diegueño example in 23, the predicate noun is sentence-final.)

The prefixes *ma-* and *ʔanʔ-* in 24, as well as the prefix *nʔ-* in 23, fit the definition of logical subject prefixes: they appear on predicate nouns and they mark the person of the logical subject. It should be pointed out that the Diegueño languages belong to the Delta-California subgroup of the Yuman family, while Yuma belongs to the River subgroup.²³ The fact that logical subject prefixes are found in languages of two distinct subgroups of the Yuman family suggests that these prefixes are not an innovation in Jamul Diegueño but rather are archaic.

While logical subject prefixes were regularly used by Halpern's consultants, who were elderly in the 1930's, these prefixes seem to have fallen into disuse over the course of the past few generations. Logical subject prefixes are not found in the speech of young adult speakers recorded in the 1970's by Margaret Langdon and cited by Munro (1977:449).

It is clear that logical subject prefixes may be reconstructed for the pre-River-Delta-California languages. Before reconstructing these prefixes, however, it is necessary to point out that there is some confusion regarding the form of the Yuma second person logical subject prefix. The clearest example of what I call a logical subject prefix to be found in Halpern's published grammar has first person reference (Halpern 1947:157):

- (25) Yuma
 // ʔanʔ-ʔi·pá·cum²⁴
 LS1-man-emph
 'I am a man!'

A slightly less clear example has second person reference (Halpern 1946:207):

- (26) Yuma
 ma·-xálxál·ac

Halpern glosses this example 'You wagtail,' but the fact that the final morpheme in the construction is the subject case marker *-c* (rather than a vocative case suffix *-a*) suggests that it is in fact a predicate nominal construction literally meaning 'You are a wagtail' (instances of that variant of the predicate nominal construction lacking the verb 'be', as described in section 1, are not uncommon in Yuma). If my interpretation is correct, then the prefix *ma-* which appears in 26 is a second person logical subject prefix, which would indicate that the Yuma second person logical subject prefix has the shape *ma-* in at least some environments.

Numerous instances of the second person logical subject prefix are found in Halpern's field notes, and all are written *ma*. (Some are separated by a space from the predicate noun.) Written thus, they are ambiguous. Halpern's field notes were written before he developed the orthography which appears in his publications. While many instances of prefixes written *ma* in his field notes are standardized to *m-* in Halpern's publications, some are standardized to *ma:-* (*ma-* in Halpern's orthography). A case in point is the second person form of what Halpern calls the nominal referential pronominal prefix. This prefix is sometimes written *ma* in Halpern's field notes (the following example is taken from Halpern 1935ms, notebook III no.2, p.18):

(27) Yuma
mapi?i·pá· ...
'You people ...'

but it is standardized to *ma:-* (*ma-* in Halpern's published grammar (1947:210):

(28) Yuma
ma·pa?i·pá·
'you people'

On the basis of the evidence in 26-28, I am inclined to believe that the Yuma second person logical subject prefix was *ma:-*, but since I have not proven the case I shall continue to treat it as unsettled. The Yuma logical subject prefixes, then, are as follows:

(29) Logical subject prefixes in Yuma

1st person	2an ^y -	(where a represents the inorganic vowel schwa)
2nd person	ma:- or m-	
3rd person	Ø	

Let's compare the Jamul Diegueño logical subject prefixes:

(30) Logical subject prefixes in Jamul Diegueño

1st person	nya-	when attached to root-initial stems
	ny-	elsewhere
2nd person	maa-	when attached to root-initial stems
	m-	elsewhere
3rd person	Ø	

(Remember that in the Jamul Diegueño practical orthography, VV represents a long vowel and *ny* represents /n^y/; see note 1.)

While example 23 is sufficient to demonstrate that logical subject prefixes occur in Campo Diegueño, I do not have enough data for a complete paradigm. On the basis of the Yuma and Jamul Diegueño forms, it is possible to reconstruct the following logical subject prefixes for a stage of Yuman predating the splitting up of the River and Delta-California subgroups. I assume the vowels in the Jamul Diegueño forms to be archaic.

(31) The pre-River-Delta-California logical subject prefixes

1st person	* <i>nʷa-</i>
2nd person	* <i>ma:-</i>
3rd person	∅

4.2. The origin of the logical subject prefixes

The pre-River-Delta-California lexical pronouns had stems which may be reconstructed **nʷa:* (or **nʷa*) 'first person' and **ma:* (or **ma*) 'second person'.²⁵ These pronouns are very similar in shape to the logical subject prefixes reconstructed for pre-River-Delta-California in 31 above.

Pronoun incorporation is widely attested cross-linguistically and is recognized as a major source of pronominal prefixes. Of particular relevance here is the fact that pronoun incorporation is the source of the personal subject/object prefixes which appear on verbs in Yuman languages (Hinton and Langdon 1976:122-128). It is very likely that the logical subject prefixes of the River and Delta-California languages came about as the result of a similar process operating in the predicate nominal construction, whereby lexical pronouns denoting the logical subject were reduced and incorporated into the predicate noun.

Notice that the vowels found in the reconstructed source words are the same in quality as those in the alternative forms of the Jamul Diegueño logical subject prefixes. This, I think, supports my reconstruction of vowels in the pre-River-Delta-California logical subject prefixes in 31.

4.3. The origin of the personal noun prefixes

For the benefit of non-Yumanists, I shall begin this section with a brief review of the Yuman personal noun construction. As described and analyzed by Munro (1978), the Yuman personal noun construction is a special construction in which a personal prefix appears on a nominal (a simple noun and/or a relative clause). This prefix marks the person of the referent of the nominal on which it appears. Munro finds instances of the personal noun construction in five languages representing the three major branches of the Yuman family: Maricopa, Mojave, and Yuma of the River subgroup, Cocopa of the Delta-California subgroup, and Tolkapaya Yavapai of the Pai subgroup. She concludes that the construction was present in Proto Yuman, and reconstructs a set of personal noun prefixes (Munro 1978:25).

A few of the examples of personal nouns cited by Munro are reproduced below. (The original source of the Yuma data is Halpern (1946:210), who refers to the prefixes in question as nominal referential pronominal prefixes.)

(32) Yuma

<i>ʔanʷ-paʔi-pá·</i>	'I (who am a) person', 'we people'
<i>ma-paʔi-pá·</i>	'you (who are a) person', 'you people'
<i>paʔi-pá·</i>	'person', 'people'

In Mojave and Maricopa, according to Munro (1978:23), personal noun prefixes are found only on relative clauses and not on simple nouns. The following examples from Mojave (taken from Munro (1978:23), demonstrate the use of personal nouns in sentences. (Personal noun prefixes are glossed 'PN1' and 'PN2').

(33)a. Mojave

ʔinʔe:č	θinʔəčʔak	nʔ-k-havik-nʔ	nʔ-nʔ-čəčqamč-m
us	women	PN1-rel-two-dem	pl.obj-3/1-hit.pl-tns

'He hit us two ladies.'

b. Mojave

ma:č	θinʔəčʔak	m-kʷ-havik-nʔ	nʔ-m-čəčqamč-m
you.pl	women	PN2-rel-two-dem	pl.obj-3/2-hit.pl-tns

'He hit you two ladies'

In Jamul Diegueño, I have found what appear to be personal noun constructions:

(34)a. *nya-meers-pe-ch* *nya'ru* *kw-allyaw* *maar* *xemaaw*
 PN1-teacher-dem-sj money sjrel-be.much earn.pl neg
 'We teachers don't earn much money'

b. *m-kw-xewak-pe-ch* *k-naak*
 PN2-sjrel-be.two-dem-sj imp-sit.pl
 'You two sit down!'

However, many -- if not all -- of the apparent personal nouns in this language are synchronically analyzable as relativized predicate nominal constructions. For example, *nya-meers* 'we teachers' can be analyzed as a relative clause literally meaning 'we who are teachers' derived from the predicate nominal construction (*nya'wap*) // *nya-meers* ((we.abs) LS1-teacher) 'We are teachers', and the sentence in 34a can be analyzed as in 34a', where the relativized predicate nominal construction is contained within square brackets:

(34)a'. [// *nya-meers*]-pe-ch *nya'ru* *kw-allyaw* *maar* *xemaaw*
 [LS1-teacher]-dem-sj money sjrel-be.much earn.pl neg
 'We who are teachers don't earn much money'

The prefixes which appear on the predicate nouns of relativized predicate nominal constructions have the forms *nya-* 'first person' and *maa-* 'second person' before unprefixated native words and stress-initial loan words; they have the forms *ny-* and *m-* elsewhere. They are thus identical with the logical subject prefixes that appear on the predicate nouns of non-relativized predicate nominal constructions.

Because of gaps in my data I cannot ascertain that all apparent personal nouns may be analyzed as synchronic relativizations of predicate nominal constructions. (For instance, because I have not elicited a predicate nominal construction meaning 'you are ones who are two', I cannot be certain that *m-kwexewak* 'you two' in 34b can be analyzed as a synchronic relative clause derived from such a predicate nominal construction.) I hope that future research will enable me to settle this matter.²⁶

In Yuma as spoken in the 1930's, as well as in contemporary Jamul Diegueño, instances of what Munro (1978) calls the personal noun construction may be analyzed as relativized predicate nominal constructions. For instance, the examples in 32, *ʔanʔ-paʔi:pá* 'we (who are) people' and *ma-paʔi:pá* 'you (who are) people', may be analyzed as relative clauses derived from the predicate nominal constructions *ʔanʔ-paʔi:pá* and *ma-paʔi:pá* 'you are people' in 24.

Notice that the personal prefixes which appear in relativized predicate nominal constructions in Yuma (those which Munro (1978) called the Yuma "personal noun prefixes") have shapes *ʔanʔ-* 'first person' and *ma:-* 'second person'. In light of this fact, it is especially attractive to

resolve the uncertainty regarding the shape of the second person logical subject prefix (see 4.1) in favor of the shape *ma:-*.²⁷

The fact that personal noun constructions are also found in the River languages Mojave and Maricopa and in the D-C language Cocopa suggests that logical subject prefixes were used at one time in these languages. Munro (1977:473-474) observes that personal prefixes (which I would call logical subject prefixes) appear "occasionally" on predicate nouns in modern Mojave²⁸ as well as Yuma. Whether they are used in modern Maricopa and Cocopa remains to be determined.

Munro (1978) found the personal noun construction in one language belonging to neither the River nor the Delta-California subgroups, namely Tolkapaya Yavapai, a member of the Pai subgroup. The presence of a personal noun construction in a Pai language raises the questions of whether the presence of logical subject prefixes might once have been more widespread than proposed in 4.1 and thus whether they should be reconstructed for Proto Yuman. I hesitate to do so. The personal noun prefixes found in Tolkapaya Yavapai diverge from those found in the River and Delta-California languages: the first person prefix is *ʔ-* in Tolkapaya Yavapai (Munro 1978:24), while in River and Delta-California languages it is *nʔ-*, *nʔa-*, and *ʔanʔ-*. Considered as a set, the Tolkapaya Yavapai personal noun prefixes bear a stronger resemblance to that language's personal subject prefixes (see Hardy 1979:15) than to River and Delta-California logical subject and personal noun prefixes. It is thus quite possible that personal nouns in Tolkapaya Yavapai come from a different source than do those in River and California-Delta languages. I leave the investigation of this possibility to further research.

5. Summary

In this paper, I have described the Jamul Diegueño predicate nominal construction, setting the description against the background of previous work on Yuman predicate nominal constructions. I have also described a copula construction found in Jamul Diegueño.

I have shown that the inflectional prefixes which mark person of logical subject on the predicate noun in Jamul Diegueño are also found in Yuma as it was spoken in the 1930's. On the basis of this evidence, I reconstructed logical subject for a stage of Yuman predating the split into the River and Delta-California subgroups.

Finally, I have argued that the in languages of these two subgroups, the "personal noun" constructions described in the literature can be accounted for, diachronically if not synchronically, as relative clauses formed from prefixed predicate nominal constructions.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Margaret Langdon for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Jamul Diegueño data are from my consultant, the late Mrs. Gennie Walker of San Diego, and from the speech of her mother, Mrs. Isabel Thing, as preserved in a tape recording made by Margaret Langdon in the 1960's.

The following abbreviations are used in interlinear glosses: abs, absolute; advrs, adverbative; asrt, assertive; dem, demonstrative; des, desiderative; DS, different subject; emph, emphatic; end, end of sentence; imp, imperative; irr, irrealis; loc, locative; LS, logical subject; neg, negative; nom, nominal form; pl, plural; Q, question; sjrel, subject relative; sj, subject; SS, same subject; 1, first person subject; 2, second person subject; 3, third person subject; #/#, person of subject/person of object. A period is used to separate the parts of the gloss of a given morpheme. Morpheme boundaries are indicated by a dash. A predicate noun is preceded by the symbol //.

Data from Jamul Diegueño are presented in a practical orthography adapted from that of Couro and Hutcheson (1973). The symbols ', *ch*, *dh*, *kw*, *ll*, *lly*, *ly*, *ny*, *sh*, *xw* represent the phonemes / ʔ, č, d, kʷ, l, lʲ, lʲ, nʲ, š, xʷ /. VV represents a long vowel, and *e* represents the inorganic vowel schwa. I omit schwa at morpheme boundaries that are marked by a dash. Data from other languages are presented in the orthography of their cited sources, with the exception that vowel length in Yuma is indicated here by a colon rather than a raised dot.

2. The verb 'be' may be followed by what Munro (1977:446) calls final tense/aspect/evidential markers, and she includes these in her schematizations of the Yuman predicate nominal construction. I have omitted them here for the sake of simplicity.

3. The original sources of these data are Munro's Mojave field notes and Judith Joel's Paipai field notes.

4. Munro (1977:450) states that the tree diagram which I have reproduced in 4 represents the structure of the sentence which I have reproduced in 2a. However, she later states that the same diagram reflects "the structure of predicate nominal sentences at some pre-Proto-Yuman stage", and that "there are many syntactic traces of this structure which remain in the grammars of the synchronic languages" (1977:468).

5. Munro argues that the verb 'be' is an existential auxiliary verb. I agree that it is an existential verb, but because it is preceded not by a main verb but by a sentential subject I do not consider it an auxiliary verb.

6. Case marking appears obligatorily on demonstratives and on nouns marked as definite with the demonstrative clitic *-pu*; it appears optionally on other nouns. Subject case is marked with the clitic *-ch*. Objects, as well as lexically realized possessors, appear in what I follow Halpern (1946:210) in calling "absolute case", which is unmarked. Lexical pronouns have special subject and absolute forms which are used obligatorily. Their subject forms are *nyaach* 'I', *maach* 'you (subject)', *nya'wach* 'we', and *menya'wach* 'you all', and their absolute forms are *nyaap* 'me, my', *maap* 'you (obj), your', *nya'wap* 'us, our', and *menya'wap* 'you all (obj), your (pl)'. Other cases are marked with overt case markers not relevant to the present paper.

The lack of case marking in 5a and 5b cannot be the accidental result of case-marking optionality, since lexical pronouns, which obligatorily take subject forms or absolute forms depending on their grammatical function, always appear in absolute case when serving as predicate noun (cf. 7c).

7. The prefixes which mark person of subject on intransitive verbs, and on transitive verbs with third person objects, are:

1st person	'-	before vowel-initial monosyllabic stems
	∅	elsewhere
2nd person	m-	
imperative	k-	
3rd person	w-	before most monomorphemic monosyllabic stems
	∅	elsewhere

Person of subject and first or second person object are marked on transitive verbs by means of the following prefixes:

	OBJECT	1	2
	SUBJECT		
1		--	ny-
2		meny-	-- m-
imp		nyek...'-	--
3		ny...'-	m-

The 3/1- prefix is a discontinuous morpheme consisting of an element *ny-* which is prefixed to the

verb stem and a glottal stop which is inserted into the prefix structure of the verb stem immediately before the root. Likewise the imp/1- prefix is a discontinuous morpheme consisting of an element nyek- which is prefixed to the stem and a glottal stop which is inserted immediately before the root.

8. Margaret Langdon (personal communication) has suggested that contact with English may have influenced this development.

9. Differences in meaning and use between the copula construction and the predicate nominal construction are not yet understood. While pairs such as

- a. nyech'ak-pe-ch metiipay w-yu
woman-dem-sj Indian 3-be
'That woman is playing Indian, pretending to be an Indian.'
- b. nyech'ak-pumetiipay
woman-dem Indian
'That woman is an Indian.'

clearly contrast semantically, this contrast is not exhibited by all (nor even many) copula-predicate nominal pairs.

I have noticed a strong tendency for equations which hold true in the past or future but not in the present to be expressed as copula constructions rather than as predicate nominal constructions.

My small corpus of copula and predicate nominal constructions taken from texts has not greatly illuminated their meaning and use. Most examples come from my consultant's translation into her language of the English version of a story found in Langacker (1982), in which a rabbit attempts to talk his way out of being eaten by a coyote. He tells the coyote that he is really a rattlesnake, not a rabbit; the coyote considers the possibility and then argues that the rabbit is lying, he is really a rabbit. My consultant used 4 copula constructions and 3 predicate nominal constructions in translating this story, as well as as one lovely hybrid: *maach m-lly'aaw m-yu-pes ...* (you.sj LS2-rabbit 2-be-advrs) 'You are a rabbit, but ...'. The only pattern that I have been able to identify is that only copula constructions (and the hybrid) seem to be used in dependent clauses, while both copula and predicate nominal constructions are used in independent clauses. I hope that additional textual data will make it possible to identify other patterns.

10. This prefix has an allomorph zero, which is used only when the predicate noun begins with the phoneme /ny/. (It should be noted that sequences of palatalized nasals, separated by the inorganic vowel schwa, are permitted elsewhere in the language; cf. *nyenye'matt* 'he helped me'.)

11. I have not yet been able to find out whether *leep* 'orphan' is a native word or a loan word.

12. Copula constructions are negated in this manner too: e.g. *may a'wi m-yu xemaaw* (neg snake 2-be neg) 'You're not a snake.'

13. While some relative clauses (those derived from stative intransitive verbs) may be used as predicate nouns, I have no examples of these in predicate nominals expressing negative equations. This may reflect a gap in my data.

14. Here are examples of the use of the nominal form of the negative in relative clauses:

- (a) [mechyuy metewiill wiiw maw]-pu aayip-chm wiiw
[relatives old.folks see nom.neg]-dem arrive.pl-DSsee
'My elderly relatives whom I don't [regularly] see came, and I saw them.'
(derived from *mechyuy metewiill wiiw xemaaw* (relatives old.folks see neg) 'I don't [regularly] see my relatives.')

(b) [nyech'ak kw-cheyaw maw]-pu peya k-iny
 [woman sjrel-sing nom.neg]-dem this imp-give
 'Give this to the woman who isn't singing.'
 (derived from *nyech'ak-pe-ch cheyaw xemaaw* (woman-dem-sj sing neg) 'The woman isn't singing.')

15. A third question-marking clitic, *-aa* (or *-a*), is not relevant to the present discussion.

16. The second set of question words are actually inflected forms of a cliticized auxiliary verb 'be', which has alternate forms *yu*, *yu'u*, and *yuum*. See Miller 1990 for discussion.

17. Questioned predicate nominal constructions with first person logical subjects ('Am I an X?') are somewhat unnatural, and I have not elicited any.

18. Of the two nominals that may occur in the predicate nominal construction, the predicate noun is the less subject-like by virtue of having predicational force, and thus the logical subject is by default the more subject-like. I think that this is why the choice of emphatics and question markers falls to the logical subject. I do not conclude from the facts adduced in 3.4 that the logical subject is in the process of being reinterpreted as the grammatical subject of the construction, nor have I found any other evidence to support such a conclusion.

19. Predicate nominal sentences into which 'be' is inserted are rejected by my consultant in favor of either copula constructions or predicate nominal sentences lacking 'be'.

20. Furthermore, I do not identify the 'be' of this archaic auxiliary construction with the 'be' of the Yuman predicate nominal construction. We saw in section 1 that the Yuman predicate nominal construction consists of a sentential subject (composed of two juxtaposed noun phrases) and 'be'. Given the lack of any other verb which might take this sentential subject as its argument, predicate nominal 'be' must be a main verb.

21. Munro (1977:473) observed that in one isolated Mojave example, the predicate noun bears a second person prefix *m-*. While she regards the prefix in this example as an innovation manifesting the tendency for predicate nouns to acquire the characteristics of verbs in some cases, the facts presented in this paper suggest that it may be archaic.

22. For discussion of person marking on 'be', see Munro (1976:278-282 and 1977:452,453, 469-70).

23. See Langdon (1978:93-94) and references cited therein regarding the classification of the Yuman languages.

24. The suffix *-cum* looks as if it might have resulted from the merging of the subject case marker *-c* with the verb *adú-m* 'be'. If this is its etymology, however, the fact that this suffix may be used with ordinary (non-predicate-nominal) sentences, as seen in Halpern (1947:157), is puzzling.

25. Here are the stems of the lexical pronouns in the modern River and Delta-California languages (for some of the Diegueño (Delta-California) languages, data is not available). For the sake of consistency, I have substituted Halpern's term 'absolute' for the term 'object' used by some other Yumanists to refer to the same form.

River languages

Mojave (Munro 1976:37-38)

1st person subject	(sg) ʔinʔeč	(pl) ʔinʔe:čvəč
1st person absolute	(sg) ʔinʔep	(pl) ʔinʔe:čvə, ʔinʔe:č
2nd person subject	(sg) manʔč	(pl) ma:čvəč
2nd person absolute	(sg) manʔ	(pl) ma:čvə, ma:c

Maricopa (Gordon 1986:54)

1st person subject	'nyaash, 'nyaa
1st person absolute	'nyip
2nd person subject	mansh
2nd person absolute	many

Yuma (Halpern 1946:211)

1st person subject	(sg) ʔanʔá·c	(pl) ʔanʔécac
1st person absolute	(sg) ʔanʔép, ʔanʔá·p	(pl) ʔanʔé
2nd person subject	(sg) má·nʔc	(pl) mácac
2nd person absolute	(sg) ma:nʔ	(pl) --

Delta-California languages

Cocopa (Crawford 1966:108)

1st person subject	nʔá·c
1st person absolute	nʔá·p
2nd person subject	mapúc
2nd person absolute	mapúnʔ

Mesa Grande Diegueño (Langdon 1970:145)

1st person	(sg) ʔanʔa·	(pl) ʔanʔawup
2nd person	(sg) ma·	(pl) manʔawup

Jamul Diegueño

1st person subject	(sg) nyaach	(pl) nya'wach
1st person absolute	(sg) nyaap	(pl) nya'wap
2nd person subject	(sg) maach	(pl) menya'wach
2nd person absolute	(sg) maap	(pl) menya'wap

The fact that there is considerable variation in the forms of plural pronouns in the languages which have them suggest that these plural forms are independent developments in individual languages (and thus that the pre-River-Delta-California pronouns were not differentiated with respect to number). Cocopa is the only language to have third person pronouns (which are not listed above); this can be considered an idiosyncratic development in this language.

A stem *ʔnʔa-* (or *ʔnʔa:-*) is found in the first person forms of all River languages and in Mesa Grande Diegueño. The presence of a final suffix *-p* on the first person absolute form in all languages except Mesa Grande indicate that the stem-plus-suffix combination **ʔnʔa-p* (or **ʔnʔa:-p*) may be reconstructable as the absolute form of the first person pronoun. A stem-plus-suffix combination **ʔnʔa-č/*ʔnʔa:-č* may be reconstructed for the first person subject form.

For second person forms, the stem **ma-* (or **ma:-*) may be reconstructed.

Because the logical subject of the Proto Yuman predicate nominal construction appeared in what I call absolute case (see section 1 and note 6), it is the absolute form of these pronouns that should be compared with the pre-River-Delta-California logical subject prefixes in 31. (It is not surprising that the demonstrative suffix **-p* has been lost from the first absolute person form during the incorporation process, since incorporation often involves reduction of the incorporated form.)

26. I would be surprised if it turned out that some prefixed nominals could be analyzed only as personal nouns (and not as relativized predicate nominal constructions). It seems to me that as long as logical subject prefixes are present in the predicate nominal construction prefixes, relativized predicate nominal constructions would remain transparently related to the predicate

nominal constructions that are their sources.

27. It should be noted that in Yuma, according to Halpern (1947:163), subject/object prefixes which appear on (unrelativized) transitive verbs are replaced by a special "objective series of pronominal prefixes" when the same verbs appear prefixed with *kʷ*- 'definite' in relative clauses. The singular forms of these objective pronominal prefixes are identical with the prefixes which appear on relativized predicate nominal constructions: *ʔanʷ*- 'first person', *ma*- 'second person' and zero 'third person'.

28. In section 1, I mentioned that personal prefixes sometimes appear on the predicate noun in the Tolkapaya Yavapai predicate nominal construction. These prefixes should not be confused with logical subject prefixes. They are clearly instances of the prefixes which normally mark person of subject on verbs (see Hardy 1979:271), and they evidence that the Tolkapaya Yavapai predicate nominal construction is in the process of developing into a copula construction similar to that found in Jamul Diegueño.

29. See note 21.

References

- Couro, Ted and Christina Hutcheson. 1973. *Dictionary of Mesa Grande Diegueño*. Banning: Malki Museum Press.
- Crawford, James M. 1966. The Cocopa language. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Gordon, Lynn. 1986. *Maricopa morphology and syntax*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Linguistics 108.
- Halpern, A. M. 1935ms. Field notes on file in the Yuman Archives, University of California, San Diego.
- Halpern, A.M. 1946. Yuma III: Grammatical processes and the noun. *International journal of American linguistics* 12.4:204-212.
- Halpern, A. M. 1947. Yuma VI: Miscellaneous morphemes. *International journal of American linguistics* 13.3:147-166.
- Hardy, Heather K. 1979. Tolkapaya syntax: aspect, modality, and adverbial modification in a Yavapai dialect. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hinton, Leanne and Margaret Langdon. 1976. Object-subject pronominal prefixes in La Huerta Diegueño. In Langdon, Margaret and Shirley Silver, eds. *Hokan Studies: Papers from the First Conference on Hokan Languages*. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 108. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 113-128.
- Langacker, Ronald, ed. 1982. *Uto-Aztecan grammatical sketches*. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Langdon, Margaret. 1970. *A grammar of Diegueño: the Mesa Grande dialect*. Berkeley: University of California publications in linguistics 66.
- Langdon, Margaret. 1978. Auxiliary verb constructions in Yuman. *Journal of California and Great Basin anthropology papers in linguistics*. pp. 93-130.
- Miller, Amy. 1990. A grammar of Jamul Diegueño. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- Munro, Pamela. 1976. *Mojave syntax*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Munro, Pamela. 1977. From existential to copula: the history of Yuman 'be'. In Li, Charles N., ed. *Mechanisms of syntactic change*. Austin: University of Texas Press. pp. 445-490.
- Munro, Pamela. 1978. Yuman personal nouns. In Redden, James E., ed. *Proceedings of the 1977 Hokan-Yuman languages workshop*. Occasional papers on linguistics 2. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University. pp. 22-32.