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0. Mojave has a well-developed system of verb suffixes which are used to express a number of "modal" concepts (necessity, obligation, possibility, conditionality, unfulfilled desire, etc.). Although some of the elements which make up this system seem to have cognates in other Yuman languages, the system itself appears to be quite exceptional: the distinctions which are expressed in Mojave sentences like those below do not appear to be made in the same way in other languages I've looked at. I hope that the presentation of this data (expanded from the discussion in my thesis, Topics in Mojave Syntax, section 1.8) will stimulate others to investigate these phenomena in other Yuman languages, so that we can work out something about comparative Yuman modality.

1. Four consonantal morphemes appear in different combinations in the various Mojave modal suffixes:

\[ p \quad \mathbf{1}^y \quad s \quad m \]

Possible sources and/or cognates for these will be discussed in section 3 below. A 2 vowel may follow any of these elements, under fairly standard Yuman 2-insertion conditions, and two other fuller vowels appear in some of the suffixes, bringing the total of the modal morphemes to six:

\[ p \quad \mathbf{1}^y \quad s \quad u \quad m \quad a^3 \]

The six elements do not all appear in each modal suffix, of course, but they always appear in the above order relative to each other. Various other elements show up in combination with the modals—these will be discussed as they come up below.

One might wonder why I have called the modal subcomponents "morphemes", since I must admit that I cannot give a precise meaning to any one of them. The ideas expressed by all of the combinations of these elements are semantically similar (all include some basic notion of "modality"), and there are patterns to be seen. (I discuss what I have figured out so far about the meanings of each element in section 4 below.) I assume, in other words, that the modal suffixes are segmentable, and that with further research we will be able to pin down more exactly the meaning of each component of them.

2. The various modal suffixes I have recorded in Mojave include the following. (The terms "root" and "epistemic" are used below to disambiguate different uses of English modals: the root use of a modal like must, for instance, expresses the speaker's wishes about an unrealized event (as in the sentence You must go now), while the epistemic use expresses the speakers conclusions (as in You must be crazy).
a. psa/pása 'have to' (root), as in
   (1) m-iyem-pása (2-go-pása) 'You have to go'

b. psum/pañum 'have to' (root), 'must' (epistemic), or 'will' (root --the "promise" sense of 'will'). The three uses are exemplified in
   (2) ?in vec ?-iyem-pañum (I 1-go-pañum) 'It's me that has to go'
   (3) makhav-c ido-pañum (Mojave-subj be-pañum) 'She must be a Mojave'
   (4) ?in vec n-ῶvu:pu:k-pañum (I 2=œbj/1=subj-care-pañum) 'I'll always take care of you'

 c. pḻu/p ḻu 'may', 'can' (root), roughly as in
   (5) modi:i ḻ m-ama:-pḻu (bread 2-eat-pḻu) 'You can have some bread'; 'Eat the bread'

d. pḻum/p ḻum 'ought to', 'should' (root) --
   (6) pið m-iyem-pañum (now 2-go-pañum) 'You'd better go now'
   (7) ?-icama:ç-pañum (1-eat=pl-pañum) 'It's time for us to eat'; 'We should eat now'

e. pñ-e 'I wish...'. The -?e of this suffix may be a variant of the "augment vowel" suffix -e/-ə, which can be preceded by a glottal stop, apparently without change in meaning, or it might be segmentable as -ʔ-e (I-say) 'I say'. The suffix -pñ-ʔ?e occurs frequently on verbs which refer to the speaker, as in (6), but also on verbs with non-first-person subjects, as in (9):
   (8) ?in vec ?-ipuy-pañ-ʔ?e (I 1-die-pañ-ʔ?e) 'I wish I were dead'
   (9) ?i:pa hova-c ipuy-pañ-ʔ?e (man that-subj die-pañ-ʔ?e) 'I wish that man were dead'

f. ḻ-ʔ ḻ-ʔ 'I wish...'; desiderative 'would that'. (The final ʔ or e is an "augment vowel", such as may follow many verb suffixes.)
   (10) man? ?ahat-c m-idu:-ḻ-ʔ (you horse-subj 2-be-ḻ-aug) 'I wish you were a horse'

In sentences (11) and (12), the 'would' clause is preceded by an 'if' clause whose verb is marked with the "irrealis" suffix -ʔ:

(11) ?-iyu:-ʔ ?-iði:-ḻ-ʔ (1-see-irreal 1-drink-ḻ-aug) 'I wish I had something to drink'; more literally, 'If I had [something], I would drink it'

('see' is idiomatically used to mean 'have' in Mojave.)
(12) Judy-c iva:-q ?-i:wa-n'c ?ahot-1'c (Judy-subj arrive-irreal 1-heart-dem-subj good-1'sug) 'If Judy were here [came], I'd be happy'

g. 1'c appears to mean (epistemic) 'could'—it only occurs with preceding idu: 'be', in the meaning 'I wonder if...', as in

(13) isma:-m idu:-1'c (sleep-diff=subj be-1'c) 'I wonder if he's sleeping'; apparently more literally, 'Could it be that he's sleeping?'

h. 1'c has been recorded only in the following sentence—its meaning is not yet clearly established.

(14) isvar-h ny'a-ar-m m-oreq-t-m isvar-1'c (sing-irreal if-want-diff=subj 2-let-emph-diff=subj sing-1'c) 'If he wants to sing, let him sing (and then he might/will sing)'

i. 1'cs 'would' (conditional), as in

(15) ?-ivil'v-k ?-idu:-q-k ?-iyer-k ?-iyem ny'-iyu:-1'cs (l-have=wings-same=subj 1-be-irreal-same=subj/dependent=future? l-fly-same=subj l-go 2=obj/l=subj-see-1'cs) 'If I had wings I'd fly out to see you'

j. pl'csa/pl'cسا also means conditional 'would'—

(16) ?-utis ?-ak'v-a:-k ?-idu:-q-k ?-ak'v-a:-pl'csa (l-gun l-carry-same=subj 1-be-irreal-same=subj/dependent=future? l-shoot-pl'cسا) 'If I had had a gun I would have shot him'

(17) marikana hova-c ?ahu:t-m idu:-q-k satumul'n-c ?ic= najuku:my-pol'csa (American that-subj good=pl-diff=subj be-irreal-dependent=future? Indian-dem-subj rich-pol'cسا) 'If white men were honest, Indians would be rich'

(15)-(17) show that irrealis -q- may be followed by a -k suffix which I once identified with the same-subject subordinator. On the basis of sentences like (17), where it is difficult to argue that 'be' and 'rich' have the same subject, however, I have decided that this -k is a dependent future (or, better, dependent unaccomplished) suffix like that found in, e.g., Diegueño.

k. p-t-1'csa/p-o-t-1'cسا still another conditional 'would', composed of p...1'csa (as in (j)) plus "emphatic" -t-. Although I originally thought the -q- which sometimes appears in this suffix was significant, I now believe that it is simply a rounded ـ. An example:

(18) mavar ?-iyu:-h modi:l'c ?-ico:-p-t-1'cسا (flour l-see-irreal bread l-make-2-emph-1'cسا) 'If I had some flour, I would make bread'
1. *suma* 'would' (habitual)/ 'always' (present habitual). This suffix and the following one are the only members of the set of Mojave modals which cooccur with tense markers (i.e., the only ones which seem to be "indicative"); they look modal in form, but, like English habitual would (When I was in the hospital they would wake me every morning at six), these suffixes have lost their real modal force.

*suma* occurs with perfective -p-c/-p-...c, as exemplified in (19)-(20):

(19) mat=kɑ:ʔelʔ?-iyem?-a:r-suma-pc (Parker 1-go 1-want-suma-tns) 'I always like to go to Parker'; 'I go to Parker all the time'

(20) ?akor modi:1Y?-ico:-p-suma-c (then bread 1-make-p-suma-c) 'I used to make bread'

The complex tense suffix -p-c splits up when it occurs with various other nonfinal suffixes: -t- 'emphatic' plus -p-c = -p-t-c, for instance. However, the variability shown in (19)-(20) is unique: we never see -t-pc, in other words. There does seem to be a difference in meaning between -suma-pc and -p-suma-c, as suggested by these examples: the first usually refers to a present habitual action, and the second to a past one. This patterning is not completely consistent throughout the whole of the data, however.

*suma* may also be followed by -c, which is rare as a "tense" marker on non-*suma* sentences; here it seems to mean about the same as -pc:

(21) ?-tavaʔenʔ-k?-isma-suma-c (1-curl-same=subj 1-sleep-suma-tns) 'I always sleep curled up'

The next sentence, (22), shows *suma* combined with negative -m=p-ot-c, which includes the complex tense marker -p-c, and thus behaves analogously to -p-suma-c above, with -suma- appearing before the final -c of the suffix:

(22) ?-isvar-m=p-ot=suma-c (1-sing-neg/suma) 'I never sing'

m. -sɑma-p=t=c 'like' (-p=t=c is the tense/emphatic suffix discussed in connection with sentences (19) and (20) above):

(23) ?-nakut-sɑma-p=t=c (1-call=father-sɑma-tns/emph) 'He's acting as my father'; 'I'm acting as if he were my father'; 'I always call him Dad'

(24) kwaʔide:-sɑma-p=t=c (doctor-sɑma-tns/emph) 'He's acting like a doctor'

3. Identifying the modal morphemes.

3.1 p. This morpheme is mysterious in all its occurrences
in Mojave. It is probably of demonstrative origin, but it has a number of cognates which have something to do with objects or object status. In Mojave, p marks the object case of one word, the pronoun 'me' ?in"ep ('I' is ?in"ec). A -p suffix also appears in the perfective construction, either in its full form with the existential auxiliary 'be', 'do', or 'say', as in

(25) ?-tapuy-p(-k) ?-a?wi:-c (1-kill-p(-same=subj) 1-do-c) 'I killed him'; 'I have killed him'

or in a reduced form in which the auxiliary is deleted:

(26) ?-tapuy-p-c 'I killed him'; 'I have killed him' (= (25))

I have analyzed this -p- as a sentential object marker, primarily on the basis of the evidence of sentences like

(27) ?in"ec kwelo?ow tapuy-p ?-iyu:-c (I chicken kill-p 1-see-c) 'I saw him kill the chicken'

in which the -p suffix follows the lower object clause kwelo?ow tapuy '(he) kill (the) chicken'. (The different-subject marker -m may optionally follow -p in this sentence, just as -k (same-subject) may optionally occur in (25).) The reason I suspect that the modal p is the same as this "object" p is that variants of some p modal sentences show alternations very parallel to those shown in the examples above. For instance, consider

(28) kwalo?ide:-p-k idu:-sum (doctor verb-p-same=subj be-sum)

'He must be a doctor'

The alternation between -p AUX-sum, as in (28), and -psum, as in (3), is exactly comparable to the alternation between -p AUX-c and -pc shown in (25)-(26).

3.2 lY. I identify this morpheme with the locative case marker (Proto-Yuman *lY, Mojave lY), following the work of Langdon (e.g., 1970) and Gorbet (1973), who have shown that it has modal or "unrealized" connotations as a Diegueno complementizer. Another similar use of the morpheme is its appearance as part of the negative in Yuma and Maricopa (see Munro 1973), where the lY may be shown historically to have originated as an unrealized marking on the negated clause.

3.3 s. This morpheme is totally mysterious to me. There are no related s's in Mojave, and I have not discovered any very likely cognates elsewhere (from *s, presumably, s in Northern Pai, s in the other Yuman languages). Various indicative (assertive?) verb suffixes in, e.g., Yuma and Maricopa have the shape -s and are possible candidates for cognates, since, as the discussion in section 4 below will reveal, s modal suffixes are characterized by a certain amount of semantic "strength".

3.4 m. This morpheme is also difficult to identify, although not
for a lack of reconstructable *m's! It does not seem profitable to relate this modal m to the comitative or directional *-m case markers or, probably, to the switch-reference marker; a possibility is the m of the negative (which I believe to have a non-negative origin historically; see Munro 1973), but I see no semantic justification for this. A better thing to consider, perhaps, is a strange m which appears in Mojave as a suffix on auxiliary verbs in some (affirmative) questions in which they appear, as in (29a-c):

(29a) maki iman-k idu:-m (where come=from=same=subj be=m)
   b) maki iman-k idu:-m-a
   c) maki iman-k idu:-m-e
   d) maki iman-k idu:
   e) maki iman-k idu:-a
   f) maki iman-k idu:-e
   g) maki iman
   h) maki iman-a
   i) maki iman-e

All these sentences mean 'Where did he come from?' As (29) demonstrates, the verb of a WH question in Mojave may optionally be followed by same-subject -k plus the appropriate existential auxiliary ('do', 'say', or 'be', as here); when the auxiliary is present, the m in question may optionally follow it. Any of these forms—the bare verb, the verb-plus-k-plus-auxiliary, or the verb-plus-k-plus-auxiliary-plus-m—may optionally be followed by one of the 'augment vowels' a and e. The m suffix in (29a-c) is thus a question marker of a very restricted sort, which just possibly might be identified with the modal m. (Note that the m of (29a-c) cannot be the same as the Mojave 'tense' suffix -m (i.e., the different-subject marker—see Munro 1974), for two reasons—questions, both yes-no and WH, are marked by the absence of a tense marker (consider (29d-i); and, more importantly, "tense" -m may otherwise never be followed by augment -a or -e.)

There are some other m's in other languages which have some association with questions (one might also consider the m question/indefinite prefix, which appears, for example, in Mojave maki in (29)—see Mixco 1975). But all in all it is difficult to say much about this morpheme.

3.5 Vowels. All I can really say about the j, a, and u which appear in modals is that they too are mysterious. It is tempting to conjure that they are reduced higher verbs of some sort, since some linguists would like us to believe that all modals originate synchronically as full main verbs; the u particularly invites identification with Proto-Yuman *yu 'be' (which, however, is du in Mojave, remember). One thing which is characteristic of Yuman verbs which shows up in the modal suffixes is ablaut, as in

(30) ?-ie?yc-paysa (1-bury=pl-paysa) 'We've got to bury him'

which should be compared to (1) above or to
(31) \(?-ic\?ay-p\?sa (1-bury-p\?sa) 'I've got to bury him'

psum/p\?sum, the modal suffix described in section 2b above, also has an ablauted variant, p\?sum. On the basis of examples like (30)-(31), which show a number contrast, I originally concluded that the \(\?y\) of (30) appeared because of plural ablaut, but I have discovered since that this is not always the case (Judith Crawford first suggested to me that it might not be). Whatever the meaning of the \(\?\) to \?y change, however, it certainly makes the vowel look like a possible remnant of some extremely archaic verb. At this stage, however, it's difficult to say anything about this or the other modal vowels.

4. What the modal elements mean, individually and in combination.

Sections 2 a-d above show that \(p\) plus either \(1\?y\) or \(s\) plus either \(u\) or \(a\) plus, optionally, \(m\)--schematically

\[ \begin{align*}
\ p + & \ [ \ 1\?y \ ] \\
\ s & \ + \ [ \ u \ ] \\
\ a & \ + \ ( \ m \ )
\end{align*} \]

--refer to some event which is possible and which is desired, somehow, by the speaker. The choice of \(u\) versus \(a\) appears not to be highly significant, as far as I can tell. If \(s\) appears instead of \(1\?y\), however, the event is a matter of necessity or strong obligation (consider \(p\?sa 'have to' and \ p\?sum 'must'). If \(1\?y\) appears, the reference is to permission or weak obligation (\(pl\?y\?u 'may'; should'; \ pl\?y\?um 'should'). It seems from a comparison of \(p\?sa/p\?sum\) and \(pl\?y\?u/pl\?y\?um\) that the presence of \(m\) intensifies or strengthens the force of the rest of the semantic combination which precedes it.

The element \(1\?y\) alone, or with a preceding \(p\) (as in \(pl\?y\?e\) and \(1\?y\?a/1\?y\?e 'would that!'') has a desiderative meaning which extends to use as a sort of conditional (note the similarity in English between 'would' and 'would that'). The optimal conditional pattern includes an \(s\) as well, as schematized in

\[ \begin{align*}
\ ( \ p \ ) + \ & \ 1\?y \\
\ s + & \ + \ ( \ a \ )
\end{align*} \]

\(s\) does not cooccur with \(1\?y\) in the first pattern shown above, but appears to mean something "stronger" than \(1\?y\). It seems that the appearance of \(s\) in the second pattern again shows a strengthening, if we may say that conditional 'would' is somehow stronger than desiderative 'would that'. (Examples of this pattern are \(1\?y\?a\), \(pl\?y\?a\), and \(p-t-1\?y\?a\).

Finally, the sequence
\[ \begin{align*}
\ s + \ & \ ( \ u \ ) + \ m + \ a + \ \text{TENSE}
\end{align*} \]

appears in suma, the modal of habituality, and \(s\) ma 'like'. The semantic connection between habitualness and comparison seems to be some element of repetition. Unfortunately this use of the \(s\) and \(m\) modal morphemes does not fit in too neatly with the rest of the discussion
above.

From what I have just presented, the meanings of 1\(\text{y}\) and s, and to some extent m, are beginning to be clarified. m may be more than a modal force intensifier, since it also appears to mark non-conditionality, or rather to appear only in non-conditional environments. It isn't easy, however, to say much about the contribution of p or the vowels to the meanings of these suffixes.

Any further comments on this system, or my analysis of it, will be welcome.

Notes.

1. I've discussed the Mojave modal system with a number of people; I'd like to thank Brent DeChene, Margaret Langdon, Allen Munro, and Susan Steele especially. My analysis is obviously still tentative. I'm also grateful, as always, to my Mojave teachers, particularly Nellie Brown and the late Robert S. Martin. This research was supported by NSF grant SOC74-18043; the Academic Senate of the University of California, Los Angeles; the Department of Linguistics of the University of California, San Diego; and the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

2. Yavapai is one of the few languages whose modal system has been examined in some detail (in Martha B. Kendall's paper presented at this workshop).

3. Judith Crawford records the modal u at least some of the time as 0—I admit I hear it that way occasionally, but u seems more common, and the variation does not appear to be significant.

4. The abbreviations used in this paper are 1 = first person, 2 = second person, subj = subject, pl = plural, irreal = irrealis, dem = demonstrative, aug = augment, diff = different, emph = emphatic, tns = tense, obj = object. I have tried to make morpheme-by-morpheme parenthesized glosses correspond exactly with the Mojave cited. 's boundaries are used to separate parts of the text or gloss in either language which are known to be segmentable but which are not glossed separately in the text: e.g., p=t=c is a combination tense/emphatic suffix.

Since most of this paper is typed single-spaced, I have omitted the v's on my c's (phonetically [\(\text{x}\)]).

5. This sentence, and (10) below, follow the normal pan-Yuman predicate nominal (copular) structure: SUBJECT [here deleted] PREDICATE-c BE.

6. Sound correspondences should have a postvocalic demonstrative *p/v* going to y in Mojave, like the normal Mojave 'near' demonstrative suffix \(-y\). That's just one of the problems with this morpheme.

7. This word is phonetically [...hido:asum].
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PREFACE

The study and analysis of Yuman languages in the last decade have drawn many researchers into a field where previously there had been only a half-dozen active workers. Much of the credit for encouraging the study of these languages must go to Margaret Langdon. Her efforts in finding funding for the Yuman Archives and two conferences on Hokan and Yuman languages have spurred many researchers to put forth determined efforts to describe these languages while speakers who really control these languages are still available for consultation. These conferences have been especially fruitful in permitting face-to-face study and discussion of mutual problems, and many insights into the analysis of Yuman languages have resulted from these discussions. All of us in the study of Hokan and Yuman languages are especially grateful to her for all she has done for the study of these languages.

Unfortunately, everyone who presented a paper at the First Yuman Languages Workshop was not able to prepare a final version for inclusion in this volume before it went to press. All the papers in this volume were presented in an earlier version at the Yuman workshop except the one by Yamamoto, who was unable to attend the workshop.

The papers are presented according to the groups of languages presented at the Yuman workshop. Since there were some last minute changes in the program, I must plead faulty memory if I inadvertently placed some papers in an order different from that of the workshop presentation.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, March 1976
INTRODUCTION

The papers in this volume represent revised versions of presentations made at the First Workshop on Yuman Languages held on the campus of the University of California, San Diego, June 17-21, 1975. The specific aim of the Workshop was to allow for close interaction between all linguists interested in the structure of Yuman languages and exchange of data. The focus was on the area of syntax, where the least amount of published information had previously been available, with emphasis more on the discussion of interesting problems than on theoretical agreement. New data were presented for all Yuman languages still spoken. The decision to make the results of the Workshop more generally available was unanimously supported by the participants. This volume then is offered in the hope that the syntactic patterns illustrated and described will be interest not only to other Hokanists but to students of syntax in general.

Thanks are due to James Redden for arranging the publication of this volume and assuming responsibility for all editorial details, and to the National Science Foundation for including support for consultants in Grant GSO-C-7418043 (Yuman Languages of the Southwest--Margaret Langdon, Principal Investigator).

Margaret Langdon
La Jolla, January 1976.
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