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The complexity of the Yuman personal agreement system is well known, and the analytical problems it presents have been clearly laid out (by Hinton and Langdon 1976). It is generally acknowledged that a set of prefixes marking object and subject (in that order, when relevant) may be reconstructed for Proto-Yuman, and that the subject prefixes used on intransitive verbs can appear on nouns to mark the possessor. As far as I know, only Crawford (1966) and Halpern (1946, 1947) have previously noted the existence of another sort of personal prefixation on nouns, used to indicate that the nouns in question stood in apposition to a pronoun (the Yuman 'we the people', and so forth). In this paper I will provide further examples of this rather restricted type of personal agreement, and will examine the consequences of reconstructing this system for Proto-Yuman.1

I was led to this topic by the intriguing observation that an ordinary third-person noun may sometimes trigger non-third-person agreement on a verb, as in these examples from Mojave and Tolkapaya Yavapai:2

(1) MOJAVE: Gin' of?ak-n? ̲y-3 ?-òdàqam? ̲-pał' um 'We ladies should hit him'
   women-subj 1-hit=pl-should
(2) TOLKAPAYA: wqoy-ch 'twak-k 'wa-ny-1 ̲ 'yu-ch-k-1 'yu-m
   women-subj 1-two-mm house-dem-in 1-be-pl-ss=1-be-inc

'There are two of us girls in the house'; 'We two girls are in the house'

The initial noun in each sentence clearly is the subject of the following verb or verbs (the number verb 'two' is a dependent modifier in the Tolkapaya example), as can be seen from the fact that each is marked with the subject case suffix. However, such nouns would be expected to trigger third-person subject agreement (marked in most Yuman languages (including these) with no prefix at all), rather than the first-person subject agreement marked by the glottal stop prefixed to these verbs. Semantically, there is little problem—the speaker uses the subject-marked noun and the following verb to refer to herself (and others)—but such sentences are oddities, at least, syntactically.

In most cases, in languages for which I have data, however, the speaker would not normally leave the nouns in such sentences this way, but rather would indicate by prefixes the pronominal reference each one had. Thus, the nouns at the beginning of sentences (1) and (2) would commonly appear in such languages with some sort of first-person marking, to show that they referred to the speaker (and others—in this, as elsewhere in Yuman, personal agreement is independent of number agreement). Such agreement may also be found on the verbs of subject relative clauses (to use another English example, in the 'we who are about to die' construction), which are basically derived nominals.3 I will refer to all these person-marked nouns and relative clauses generally as "personal nouns."

Halpern's description of Yuma provides the first record of such constructions. He notes the use of two "referential pronominal prefixes", first-person ?an' ̲- and second-person na:--, in such examples as
(3) YUMA: pa?i:pa: 'person', 'people'
     fa?i:pa: 'I (who am a) person', 'we people'
     ma?i:pa: 'you (who are a) person', 'you people'

(Halpern 1946: 210). As this example shows, many nouns do not inflect for plurality, and have their number determined only by context. The fa?- and ma?- prefixes also appear on Yuma relative clauses:

(4) YUMA: av?e?k'a:men'c 'all who pass by many places' (nom.)
     ma?u':va:xec 'you who will remain here' (nom.)

(Halpern 1947: 163). Both these words are subject relative clauses (i.e., the referential head noun is the subject of the relative verb) bearing the standard Yuman subject relative prefix k'- (this k'- sometimes alternates with k-; only k- is used in the languages of the Pai subgroup). The k'-VERB word is treated as a complex nominal, and the personal noun prefixes appear at the front of it, before the k-.

A second description of such prefixation is given by Crawford (1966) for Cocopa. The Cocopa "pronominal identity prefixes" are n'- for first person and m- for second person. In Cocopa, further, a third-person pronominal identity may be marked with n'- or (rarely) 0'-, as Crawford's examples (1966: 100) show:

(5) COCOPA: (a) apá 'man'
     apá:s 'men', 'the men', 'they who are men'
     n'apá:s 'we men'
     mapá:s 'you who are a man'
     ma?á:s 'you men'

(b) n's?ák: 'we women'; 'they who are women'
     ma?ák: 'you who are women'; 'you who are women'

(Cocopa 'man' and 'woman' are nouns which do have plural forms.) The Cocopa prefixes also sometimes occur on subject relatives, as in example (6), where the second-person prefix m- follows the criticized 0+-in it' and precedes the relative prefix k'- (Crawford 1966: 152):

(6) COCOPA: i?n'-mk'awás 'you who sit in it'

I have recorded the use of special prefixes to mark personal nouns in three other Yuman languages on which I am currently doing field work. In two of these, Mojave and Maricopa (both closely related languages of the River sub-group of Yuman), the prefixes, first-person n?- and second-person m-, are used only on the verbs of subject relative clauses, never on simple nouns:

(7) MARICOPA: (a) n'y-k'-xmok n'y-a-s ma ?-usev-k 'The three of us
     1-rel-three we-subj milk 1-drink=pl-tns drink milk'

(b) sin?e?ak n'y-a-s yav?ipay m-k-ti:v-e n'y-n'y-tpay-um
     women we-subj Apache 2-rel-sit=pl-dem po-1/3-kill=pl-fut
     'We women will kill you [sitting] Apaches'

(8) MOJAVE: (a) ?in'e:e? ãin'?e?ak n'y-k-havik-n/y n'y-n'-6čqam'-m
     us women 1-rel-two-dem po-3/1-hit=pl-tns
     'He hit us two ladies'

(b) ma?e? ãin'?e?ak m-k-havik-n'/n'y-m-čqam'-m
     you=pl women 2-rel-two-dem po-3/2-hit=pl-tns
     'He hit you two ladies'

(c) Brown n'?-k'-u:mul'n'y-č
     -ču:mpap-k e1'y?-1daw-m
     Brown 1-rel-be-named=pl-dem-subj 1-four=pl-ss in-1-be=at-tns
There are four of us Browns here; 'We four named Brown are here'.

The words on which the underlined prefixes occur are k'-relatives—in the first Maricopa example, for instance, k'-xmok in a relative on the subject of the verb 'three', 'the ones who are three'. With the ?m'-prefix, the word means 'we who are the ones who are three', 'we three', or 'the three of us'. In the third Mojave example, the k'-marked verb is u:mul' 'be named'; Brown ?m'-k'-u:mul' means 'we who are named Brown'. This example and several preceding ones show that demonstrative and case suffixes applying to the relative clause as a whole follow the relative verb, a standard Yuman occurrence.8

In the Tolikapaya dialect of Yavapai, the only member of the Pai subgroup for which I have seen this kind of data, the personal noun prefixes (simply P- (orthographic —) for first person and m- for second person) can appear on nouns, as in

(9) TOLIKAPAYA: (a) l'-muuk-ch-va pa-ny-neh-a i-k'-m
   l-Navaio-pl-dem po-3/1-kill-irr say-ss-say-inc
   'She's going to kill us Navajos'
(b) m-muuk-ch-va pa-ny-nek-a-k 'unu-u-k'-yu-m
   2-Navaio-pl-dem po-1/2-kill-irr-ss 1-aux-ss-1-be-inc
   'I'm going to kill you Navajos'
(c) m-vuy-y-ch m-hwak-k 'wa-ny-1 m-yu-ch-k-m-yu-m
   2-women-subj 2-two-ss house-dom-in 2-be-pl-ss-2-be-inc
   'There are two of you girls in the house'

Such marking is, apparently, optional, as a comparison of these examples with sentence (2) above will suggest. The same prefixes appear before the k-marked verbs of subject relative clauses:

(10) TOLIKAPAYA: (a) l'-puy-a-k l'-k-unu-u-v-che maa 'han-k-yu-m
   l-die=pl-irr-ss 1-rel-aux-dom-subj you good-ss-be-inc
   '-yii-ch-k'-yu-m 'We who are about to die salute you'
   1-think-pl-ss-1-be-inc ('We...think you're okay')
(b) maa-ch-che Phoenix m-k-yaam-ch-a-k m-k-unu-u-ch-che
   you-pl-subj Phoenix 2-rel-go-pl-irr-ss 2-rel-aux-pl-subj
   'ar-m-yaay-ee 2-glaj=2-glaj-modal
   'Those of you who are going to
   glaj should be glad'

These somewhat complex examples show that in Tolikapaya relative clauses with more than one verb, either one or all verbs may be marked with the subject relative prefix k- (for details of Tolikapaya relativization, see Kriendler 1978).

The data we have assembled so far on personal noun marking may be summarized as follows:

I. PERSONAL NOUN PREFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cocopa</th>
<th>Yuma</th>
<th>Maricopa</th>
<th>Mojave</th>
<th>Tolikapaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>n'</td>
<td>?m'</td>
<td>n'</td>
<td>n'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>n'/?-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only Cocopa seems to have a special prefix for third-person nouns. A general point is that personal nouns are much more acceptable (or perhaps simply much more common) if they are plural, perhaps because the characteristics of a singular speaker and hearer are so well known and easily determinable that they need not be mentioned.
Although we have data here only from five of the ten Yuman languages, I do not feel uncomfortable about proposing a reconstruction of the proto-system, because the three major subgroups within Yuman are represented here—Delta-California (Cocopa), River (Yuma, Maricopa, and Mojave), and Pai (Tolalapa Yaipawai). Since personal nouns are used only in restricted syntactic contexts, I hope that field workers on other languages may discover the same thing—or relics of it, such as the Diegueño cases we will come to shortly.

I propose the following reconstructions of the Proto-Yuman personal noun prefixes: first person *ʔnʷ-, second person *m-, and third person zero. The deviations from these reconstructions occur in Cocopa, Yuma, and Tolalapa.

Although Crawford felt on Cocopa-internal evidence that it was the first-person nʷ- which was innovative, and the third-person nʸ- conservative, I think that the comparative data argues that the first-person prefix represents a predictable simplification of the reconstructed *ʔnʸ- (quite reasonably, since Cocopa has deleted a number of initial *ʔ's, including, most relevantly, the first-person subject prefix *ʔ- (modern Cocopa ʔ)). Apparently the use of a zero prefix on some third-person personal nouns represented the original situation, and the current nʸ- is an innovation, possibly on analogy with the first-person prefix.

The a vowel in the Yuma first-person ʔanʸ- is no problem. All Yuman languages insert a [ə] to break up an initial ʔ- cluster, and a is simply Halpern's representation of prestress a. The long vowel in the Yuma second-person maː- is the most serious problem for my reconstruction, since Yuma is often highly conservative about vowel length, and can provide valuable clues to the proto-situation. However, a number of cases of unexplained lengthening of prestress *a or even *a (or no proto-vowel) to aː in Yuma have been recorded, particularly in the numeral system (cf. Langdon and Munro, to appear). Mojave and Maricopa are very closely related to Yuma, and agree with Yuma in most matters of unstressed vowel length, but they both have m- for this prefix, suggesting that the Yuma long vowel may be an innovation. (I'll return to this matter again below.)

Finally, Tolalapa has lost the nʸ from the first-person prefix, so that the Tolalapa personal noun prefixes look just like the regular intransitive subject prefixes (discussed further below). The same loss of nʸ from *ʔʔnʷ occurs in Tolalapa in the complex prefix used to indicate a second person subject, first person object. This prefix is reconstructed as *ʔʔnʷm, clearly segmentable into *ʔʔnʷ 'first person object' and *m 'second person subject' (cf. Hinton and Langdon 1976), but the Tolalapa prefix is simply ʔm-

Perhaps now is the time to note that relic instances of what may reflect personal noun agreement do show up in some other languages. Langdon (1976), for instance, cites the following Diegueño irregular verb paradigm (pp. 141-142):

(11) DIEGUEÑO: (a) ʔeqʷin 'he is the same'
*ʔanʔaʔeqʷin 'I am the same'
*ʔeqʷaʔeqʷin 'you are the same'
(b) ʔeqʷaʔeqʷaʔeqʷa 'he is a rascal'
*ʔeqʷaʔeqʷaʔeqʷa 'I am a rascal'
*ʔeqʷaʔeqʷaʔeqʷa 'you are a rascal'
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The first example shows ?an\textsuperscript{V}a- and me\textsuperscript{V}a- instead of the expected first- and second-person subject markers ?- and m-; the second has ?an\textsuperscript{V}a- and ma-. True, these are on main clauses, not constituent nouns, but since the "verbs" marked could be argued to be nominal in character (they begin, for instance, with the nominal formative ?e-), it is possible that they show some left-over use of something much like the personal noun prefixes.\textsuperscript{10}

The best thing to do at this point is to try to see what other sorts of pronominal marking the personal noun prefixes we have tentatively agreed upon look like most.

First we may consider two identical sets of prefixes used (as already noted) to mark the subjects of intransitive verbs and the possessors of inalienably possessed nouns (first and second person only):\textsuperscript{11}

II. SUBJECT PREFIXES FOR INTRANSITIVE VERBS;

III. POSSESSIVE PREFIXES FOR INALIENABLELY POSSESSED NOUNS

Diegueno Cocopa Yuma Maricopa Mojave Tolkapaya Proto-Yuman

1st ?- \( \emptyset \)- ?- ?/\( \emptyset \)- ?- ?- *?-  
2nd m- m- m- m- m- m- *m-

Both of these sets reconstruct, as shown, to first-person *?- and second-person *m- (Hinton and Langdon 1976). Clearly, although semantically appropriate (since they seem to indicate a kind of subject reference), these prefixes aren't the same as those on personal nouns (except in Tolkapaya).

Next we can consider the prefixes used on alienably possessed nouns:

IV. POSSESSIVE PREFIXES FOR ALIENABLELY POSSESSED NOUNS

Diegueno Cocopa Yuma Maricopa Mojave Tolkapaya Proto-Yuman

1st \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) *?n\textsuperscript{V}y-  
2nd \( mn\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( mu\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( mn\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( mn\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( mn\textsuperscript{V}y- \) *mn\textsuperscript{V}y-

Here we do find a reconstructed *?n\textsuperscript{V}y-, but not an *m-. (The *n\textsuperscript{V}y-marker of alienable possession is clearly segmentable; this set then becomes the same as set III.\textsuperscript{12})

Finally, we can examine the set of prefixes used to indicate the object of a main clause verb (with a third-person (i.e., usually zero) subject):

V. OBJECT OF MAIN CLAUSE VERB WITH THIRD PERSON SUBJECT

Diegueno Cocopa Yuma Maricopa Mojave Tolkapaya Proto-Yuman

1st \( n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) \( ?n\textsuperscript{V}y- \) *?n\textsuperscript{V}y-  
2nd m- m- m- m- m- m- *m-

At last we have a set which seems more comparable to the personal noun prefixes, and for which we can propose the same reconstructions.\textsuperscript{13} The only problem here is Yuma (as noted, a usually conservative language), which has no ? in the first-person prefix.

However, Halpern has carefully documented a special set of Yuma object markers for use only on relative clauses—\( ?an\textsuperscript{V} y- \) to mark a first-person object of a relative clause, and \( ma- \) to mark a second-person relative clause object (1947, p. 163):

(a) \( n\textsuperscript{V} y-\) an\textsuperscript{V} \( u:\) xacme:yc 'the one who procreated us'

b) \( ma-\) \( u:\) xami-\( n\textsuperscript{V} y- \) 'the one who procreated you'
(b) n'am?an'em?en? e:vn'y a 'the one who bothers me' (voc.)
   n'amma:k e:vn'n a 'the one who bothers you' (voc.)

We now have two connections between personal noun prefixes and ob-
ject prefixes—they have similar cognate sets for which the same recon-
structions may be proposed, and they have been clearly connected in the
minds of generations of Yuma speakers, either subject to the same inno-
vations or preserving the same conservative structure.

In the remainder of this paper I will examine some of the possible
reasons why personal noun prefixes should look like object prefixes.
First, however, I should note that I am not attempting to propose a uni-
qure reconstruction for a set of morphemes used both for personal noun
prefixes and for all verbal objects. As a simple inspection of sets I
and V shows, the sets are different, and were undoubtedly differentiated
by speakers of Proto-Yuman. The Yuma evidence suggests the possibility
of reconstructing a special set of prefixes for use on personal nouns
and for the objects of the verbs of relative clauses. We will return to
this idea again below.

Some might argue that it is merely coincidental that personal noun
prefixes should look so much like object prefixes, but this seems unlike-
ly and uninsightful. There are three other motivated explanations, which
I will examine in turn. It seems to me that, taken together, they all
suggest the pressures which determined how personal nouns would be marked.

Perhaps the least satisfactory argument hinges on the structure of
Yuman predicate nominal sentences, as exemplified by

(13) MOJAVE: ʔi:pa-n'y k'awʔide-ʃ idu:-m 'The man is a doctor'
   man-dem doctor-subj be-tns

As I have shown elsewhere (Munro 1977a), such sentences are really (at
least historically) complex—they consist of a simple NOUN NOUN predic-
tion embedded as the subject of the following existential 'be'. The per-
sonal noun phrases we are considering in this paper also have a NOUN NOUN
semantic structure—the first noun is the pronoun realized as the personal
prefix on the following noun, with which it stands in semantic apposi-
tion. Now, since the subject of a Yuman predicate nominal (like ʔi:pa-
n'y in (13)) is generally unmarked—i.e., in nominal object rather than
subject form—one might argue that the pronominal "subject" of a per-
sonal noun ought similarly to appear with object marking. I think
this argument might work from a formal standpoint, but it's not wholly
convincing.

The second argument is based on the role of the k'- relative pre-
fix (exemplified many times above), which commonly occurs on the verbs
of simple subject relative clauses like

(14) MOJAVE: ʔi:pa k'alo yaw k'-tapuy 'the man who killed the chicken'
   man chicken rel-kill

Now, subject relative clauses are not the only type encountered in Yuman.
In non-subject (or oblique) relative clauses, the k'- prefix does not
occur:

(15) MOJAVE: (a) (ʔin'y ep) k'alo yaw ?-tapuy 'the chicken I killed'
   me: chicken l-kill
   (b) (man'y) k'alo yaw m-tapuy 'the chicken you killed'
      you: chicken 2-kill
Instead, the verbs of such relative clauses are marked with normal (main clause) subject prefixes. When ?- and m-, the subject prefixes, are used on the verbs of relative clauses, then, they specifically deny that those relative clauses have first- or second-person heads (instead, the objects or some other nouns in those relative clauses must be the heads). On the other hand, when kw- is used on the verb of a relative clause, it not only shows that the subject of that clause is its head, but it also marks the fact that the subject of that clause is third person. Therefore, neither kw-, ?, - or m- is available for indicating a head which is also first or second person. Therefore, the only other available set of prefixes which can show such reference, the object prefixes, is used.

A final argument is based on the notion of position classes. A typical main-clause verb has the following structure in Yuman (ignoring suffixes, which are irrelevant here)—of course, not all slots need be filled:

```
pre-pronominal + object + subject + verb
prefixes     |      |      |      
prefix, prefix, prefix
```

(Pre-pronominal prefixes include locative/demonstrative elements like the av in Yuma (i) or the kv in Cosopa (6); plural object prefixes like Maricopa, Mojave, and Yuma mοv- or mοi (7b), (8α), (12α) or Pai pa- (9α); and uninflected pre-prefixal elements of various verbs, like the ṭar- or Tolkepaya ṭar...yay (pl.)' (10b).) The synchronic pronominal prefixes are not all readily segmentable into object plus subject morphemes, but the general feasibility of such an analysis of the prefixes is widely accepted (due probably to the efforts of Hinton and Langdon 1976). Now, it has occasionally been suggested that the kw- relative prefix fills the role (or slot) of a subject marker on the verbs of subject relative clauses, which otherwise conform to the structure above (for instance, in languages like Diegueno which have a third-person subject prefix, that prefix is replaced by kw- in subject relative clauses (Langdon 1970: 176-77)).

In light of the previous discussion of the semantic contribution of kw- to the relative clause, this should not seem at all unreasonable. Therefore, one might argue, when trying to mark first- or second-person reference on a nominalized verb in kw-, only the morphemes of the immediately preceding column (the column of object markers) can be available, since the subject column is already occupied.

Since a kw-VERB relative nominal can function like any other full-fledged noun, any other noun is considered to have its subject slot already filled. In other words, nouns may be considered to be inherently specified for a third-person subject (by a Φ morpheme which acts as a place-holder in the subject position).

This argument may seem stronger if we suggest that instead of having grammatical relation labels the various position classes be simply numbered. We would then have a diagram something like

```
POSITION 3  POSITION 2  POSITION 1  POSITION 0

pre-pronominal 1 = nοv y kv
prefixes 2 = m(a:) kw
3 = 0 NOUN
```

A noun is considered to occupy both columns 1 and 0. Subjects on verbs are chosen, normally, from column 1, and objects from column 2, but if
column 1 is occupied, a subject may be represented by a prefix from column 2.

I have not so far dealt with the issue of whether there would ever be any confusion because of the fact that the same prefix in front of a k-marked verb can refer, apparently, either to a subject or to an object. In other words, can m-n-k-VERB, for instance, mean both 'the one who VERBS me/us' (with the object interpretation for the position 2 prefix) and also 'I've who VERB' (with the 'subject' or personal noun interpretation)?

Apparently, the answer to this question is no. Relative clause verbs marked as personal nouns are always intransitive, as can be seen from the examples cited above.21 Copular sentences with nominal predicates are also intransitive. It seems, then, that the prefixes m- and m- refer to subjecthood (in the sense that a pronoun can be considered the subject of a following appositive noun) when used with nouns or k-marked intransitive verbs, but to objecthood (the pronoun's referent is the object of the verb used to describe the third-person head of the relative clause) when used with k-marked transitive verbs.22 The delicate balance of such a situation may be some explanation of why the personal noun construction cannot be used in relative clauses with transitive verbs (e.g., 'we who killed him' or 'we whom he killed') in any of the languages for which I have data.

All this discussion in which the formal and positional identity between personal noun markers and relative-clause object prefixes was so crucial may suggest that, after all, a single set of prefixes with just this use should be reconstructed. Once again, interpretation of the Yuma data (innovation or conservatism?) is of the greatest importance. If we do identify these two functions as reflections of a single original set of prefixes, however, we will have to account for the fact that they have diverged in the evolution of several languages. In Cocopa, for instance, a third-person personal noun prefix was innovated as n-; n- is not used, however, to mark third-person objects of either main or relative verbs in Cocopa (cf. Crawford 1966: 152-153 for one example of the use of the third-person object marker p- on a subject relative word). In Tolkapaya, the first-person personal noun prefix is ? (presumably a reduced form of the original *n-), but the first-person object prefix on both relative clause verbs and main verbs is n-. All this suggests that, although the same set of prefixes may originally have served to mark both personal noun reference and relative clause objects (with no confusion), these two different functions were eventually separated in the minds of speakers of most daughter languages, and the prefixes followed different courses of development in these two different functions.

A few problems remain. One difficult one concerns the order of pronominal referent and appositive noun, which I have continually assumed to be PRONOUN NOUN (as with English 'we the people' or 'we women' in Mojave (Sa-b)) at some underlying level. In Maricopa, however, as shown in examples like (7a-b), a pronoun may follow an appositional noun or relative clause. I believe this situation is exceptional, but I do not yet understand the reasons for it.23

Another puzzle (less of a real problem) has to do with the relationship, in Yuman and perhaps also cross-linguistically, between what I have called personal nouns and vocatives. The following pair of sentences is interesting:
(16) TOLKAPAYA: (a) m-vquy-a  pa-ny-’u-k-’yu-m  ’I see you’
    2-women-den po-1/2-see-ss-1-be-inc  woman’
(b) vquy-ee  pa-ny-’u-k-’yu-m  ’Women, I see you’
    women-voc po-1/2-see-ss-1-be-inc

The verb of each sentence is the same; the first word of sentence (a) is
marked as a second-person personal noun, while ’women’ in sentence (b) is
marked with an -ee suffix which frequently appears on vocative nouns.
Vocatives in Tolkapaya (and also Mojave, I can report) never have a se-
cond-person prefix—cf. also the Yuma examples in (12b). A full compara-
tive survey of Yuman vocatives, and of the exact differences between sen-
tences like (a) and sentences like (b), is definitely needed.
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Abbreviations used in these and the following sentences include subj
(subject case marker), pl (pl), 1 (first person), 2 (second person), rel
(subject relative prefix), dom (demonstrative), ss (same subject subor-
dinator), da (different subject subordinator), inc (incomplete), tens
(tense), po (plural object), fut (future), irr (irrealis), voc (vocative),
nom (nominative). / separates subject from object in complex prefixes,
and = is used to separate parts of a complex gloss. I apologize for the
inadequate gloss ’aux’ (auxiliary) used for the Tolkapaya auxiliary verb
unu.

Citations are presented in the orthography of the original sources,
but underlinings are mine. Mojave and Maricopa data is cited in rough
phonemic form, normalized from my notes; Tolkapaya data is cited in the
orthography developed by the UCLA Tolkapaya group (to whom I wave grate-
fully in passing).

3. Subject plurality is indicated by various changes in the verb
   stem; object plurality is sometimes indicated similarly, or may be shown
   in some languages by a special agreement prefix which precedes the person
   agreement prefixes on the verb stem.

4. This may be a somewhat controversial oversimplification.

5. The initial av- in (4a) is a prefix of demonstrative origin which
   always precedes the person-markers on the verb. The fact that the person-
   al noun prefixes are no exception to this rule shows that the [kʷ-VERB]
   string should probably not be viewed as just another (accidentally com-
   plex) noun.

6. Crawford notes that ’man’ is the only noun in which third-person
   identity is marked by Ø. It would seem, however, that this does reflect
   the reconstructable system.

7. My Maricopa data is from Pollyanna Heath (thank you!), whose ac-
   quaintance I owe to the kindness of Henry O. Harwell.

8. I return below to the peculiar order of the kʷ-marked verb and
'we' in Maricopa (9a)--note that the same order is followed with the appositional noun in (7b).  

9. The analogical process followed may have been something like this: in the personal noun process *?n?y, the *? was known by speakers of pre-Cocopa to mark first-person, so *?n?y was interpreted (and then segmented) as a personal noun marker. This *?n?y was then combined with the third-person prefix, *∅, to form a pre-Cocopa third-person personal noun prefix *?n?- which survives as n?-y. The other developments in the first-person prefixes referred to in the text (personal noun prefix *?n?- becoming modern n?- and ordinary subject *?- becoming ∅-), both by loss of initial *?-), followed this development of the third-person personal noun prefix.

10. Margaret Langdon suggested at the Workshop that the a's at the end of these prefixes provide support for the conservatism of the a: in the Yuma prefix ma:-, but I believe it is true that these a's are predictable from Langdon’s synchronic Diegueño rules (Langdon 1970: 71, rule [a]), and I think Langdon would agree with me. Of course, this regularity does not at all eliminate the possibility that these a's might conceivably reflect historical *a's.

11. Halpern (1942) first noted the relationship of the subject/possessor conflation to the fact that many inalienable possession relationships are expressed by verbs of which the possessor is the subject (i.e., 'he is my father' is expressed as 'I call him father', in what we might take to be a reversal of grammatical roles). See also Munro (1977:b), pp. 57, 59, where I refer also to work by Margaret Langdon (this volume). 

12. Jack Kriender has observed to me that the n?- possessive prefix is rare in Tolkapaye; this question merits further study.

13. Hinton and Langdon were unaware of the Maricopa and Mojave data I cite here when they first proposed their reconstructions (in 1970), so they did not reconstruct *?n?-y, but rather simply *?n?-y, for the first-person object prefix. However, they do propose a *?n?- prefix for an earlier stage of Yuman, and I believe that the Mojave and Maricopa data here would convince them that this reconstruction is correct for Proto-Yuman.

14. Apparently this apposition can be either restrictive or nonrestrictive.

15. For Mojave, at least, one can argue that certain pronouns are, in fact, marked as objects, rather than simply unmarked for subject. The clearest case is the first-person singular tin’eč (subject)/tin’ep (object). 'I am a doctor' is tin’ep k’wa9piide:– i’di:–m (me doctor-subj bein). The origin of the -p on 'me' is somewhat obscure, but there are arguments that it has other uses as an object marker (cf. Munro 1976, chapter 2).

16. A somewhat disturbing fact is that although both personal nouns and copular sentences with pronoun subjects may be argued to have a [PRO-NOUN NOUN] structure, copular sentences do not normally show the same pattern of agreement marking on the predicate noun as that found on personal nouns (cf. fn. 15). Margaret Langdon has recently given me an example of a sentence with just this sort of marking, however, from the Campo dialect of Diegueño: ?g’ya:ba n’yé k’wa9ko:ya (me n’old=woman) 'I am an old woman'. This sentence has the expected object pronoun generally used for the subjects of predicate nominals (fn. 15) plus a predicate noun marked with the object/personal noun prefix n’y-a. It seems very likely that the "irregular verb paradigms" cited in (11) are Mesa
Grande Diegueño remnants of the same sort of thing.

17. The subjects of Yuman relative clauses, whether heads or not, are normally not marked with the subject case suffix (I believe this observation is originally due to Corbett (1973 and elsewhere)). This follows a general principle by which the subjects of many nominalized sentences are not subject-marked, among them (I have argued) the subjects of predicate nominal sentences (Munro 1977a). This fact might connect up somehow with the issue at hand, but I'm not sure.

18. Instead, in many relative clauses in many languages (among them Mojave; cf. Munro 1976, chapter 3), the verb is marked with one or more nominalizing morphemes. These are generally optional, and are omitted here for clarity.

19. There is another kind of relative clause with a third-person subject, of course—this example parallels (15a-b): k'alojaw tapuy (chicken kill) 'the chicken he killed'. Here, a verb marked with $\emptyset$ shows that (a) the subject of the relative clause is third-person, and (b) the head of the relative clause is not the subject.

20. Impressive logical arguments could be brought to support this idea (I won't try to do them justice here, but cf., as one example, Bach 1968), since non-proper nouns have frequently been analyzed as elliptical predications (The one that is a cat is on the thing that is a mat, and so on).

21. One might offer (8c), where the verb is 'be named', as a weak counterexample, but I don't believe that anyone could seriously formulate an argument that Brown is an object in this sentence. This is, however, the most transitive example of a personal relative that I can find.

22. Stephen Anderson has praised my restraint in passing up the opportunity to breathe the word "ergative" here. I don't know that it would help.

23. What this reminds me of is another strange pronoun-noun order problem in Yuman. In most Yuman languages, demonstratives follow the noun (e.g. Mojave ?i:pa hovan' (man that) 'that man'). In the Pai subgroup, however, independent demonstratives precede the noun (e.g. Tolka-paya yv a kthar-va (this dog-dem) 'this dog'—cf. Glover 1977). I am not aware of any convincing explanation for either this or the Maricopa problem. (Non-Yumanists may need a reminder here that there can be no very direct connection, since Maricopa is not Pai, and in Maricopa, therefore, independent demonstratives follow nouns.)
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