Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 14
Number 2
1989

Studies in Native American Languages V

Kansas Working Papers
in
Linguistics

edited by

Jong-seok Ok
Mubeccel Taneri

Partial funding for this journal is provided by the Graduate Student Council from the Student Activity Fee.

© Linguistics Graduate Student Association
University of Kansas, 1989

Volume 14
Number 2
1989

Studies
in
Native
American
Languages
V

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 14, No. 2, 1989

Studies in Native American Languages

COMANCHE CONSONANT MUTATION: INITIAL ASSOCIATION OR FEATURE SPREAD ?
James L. Armagost 1

THE ALSEA NOUN PHRASE
Eugene Buckley 20

LINGUISTIC BORROWING IN CHICANO LITERATURE
Eliverio Chavez 37

KOASATI COMPARATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
Geoffrey Kimball 47

UNDERLYING NASALS IN CROW, HIDATSA AND PROTO-MISSOURI RIVER (SIOUAN)
Jack Martin 57

A SPECIAL WORD IN JAMUAL DIEGUENO
Amy Miller 68

THE FOCUS ANTIPASSIVE IN K'ICHE' MAYAN
Clifton Pye 88

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF KIOWA-TANOAN
Robert Sprott 98

Cumulative Contents of Volumes 1-14 115

A SPECIAL WORD IN JAMUL DIEGUEÑO[1]

Amy Miller

Abstract: The word naynaa which occurs in the Jamul dialect of Diegueño has four functions: it is used as an emphatic, as an emphatic marker of coreference between a possessor and the subject of its clause, in the reflexive construction, and as an emphatic same-subject marking device in complex sentences. This paper describes the uses of naynaa in detail.

This is a descriptive paper concerned with the word naynaa which occurs in the Jamul dialect of Diegueño, a Yuman language spoken in the San Diego area. Naynaa has four functions: it is used as an emphatic, as an emphatic marker of coreference between a possessor and the subject of its clause, in the reflexive construction, and as an emphatic same-subject marking device in complex sentences. These uses are illustrated in (1).[2]

(1.a) naynaa k-wi
imp-do
'Do it yourself!'

(1.b) naynaa aa-pu chemlaay
language-dem 3=not=know=pl
'They don't know [how to speak] their own language'

(1.c) naynaa mat m-wiw-a
refl 2-see-Q
'Can you see yourself?'

(1.d) nya'wiw kwexpshiw w-rar naynaat w-saaw-x-it
things nom=green 3-cook 3-eat-irr-purp
'She cooked those vegetables to eat herself'

I will leave naynaa unglossed.

Naynaa has two principal forms: naynaa and naynaat. The final segment t of the latter form is discussed in section 7.2. (Until then, I shall refer to either form of the word as naynaa).

In this paper, I describe naynaa's uses in detail, beginning with its use as an emphatic in section 2. Sections 3, 4, and 5 treat its possessive, reflexive, and same-subject marking uses. (For expository convenience, I use subscripts to distinguish among these different uses). In section 6, I show that naynaa derives

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, 1989, Vol. 14, no.2, pp. 68-87.

historically from a verb, and in section 7 I consider the problem of its synchronic status. A few relevant facts about the language are given in section 1.

1. Some Facts about Jamul Diegueño

Jamul, like other dialects of Diegueño and other Yuman languages, has SOV word order. Its major word classes are noun and verb. Person of subject (and first or second person object) are marked by prefixes on the verb. Lexical pronouns[3] are not required. The case marking of nominals is optional (for discussion, see Gorbet 1976). Clauses may be connected by means of switch reference marking, and/or by various other grammatical devices (see Miller 1988). Relative clauses are head-internal (see Gorbet 1974).

2. Naynaa as Emphatic

Naynaa may function as an emphatic, "emphasizing" the subject of a clause or sentence, by which I mean that it indicates that the subject is somehow remarkable,[4] or that he acted alone, unaided, or voluntarily.[5] This can be seen in (1.a) and in the examples in (2). I will refer to *naynaa* in this use as *naynaa*$_1$.

(2.a) wa'aa-t naynaat w-tak
door-sj 3-open
'The door opened all by itself'

(2.b) naynaat akway paa
3=turn 3=arrive
'He came back of his own accord'

(2.c) naynaat Maria meshkwally-pes nyi'miit nya-meshkwally-km ...
Maria 3=bother-adv others=pl when-3=bother-irr=DS
'He always picks on Maria himself, but if other boys pick on her ...'

(2.d) skuuv naynaat w-chaw
broom 3-make
'She made her brooms herself'

naynaa$_1$ usually occurs immediately following the lexical subject, if one is present (cf. 2.a). Otherwise, it may occur sentence-intitially, as in (2.b,c), or it may follow a preposed object, as in (2.d).

The subject is the only argument which *naynaa*$_1$ can emphasize. (3.b) demonstrates that even when *naynaa*$_1$ immediately follows an object noun phrase it must be interpreted as emphasizing the subject.[6]

(3.a) naynaa kwaypaay uuniw chuuway
chief 1=speak=to
'I spoke to the chief myself (*himself)'

(3.b) kwaypaay naynaa uuniw chuuway
chief 1=speak=to
'I spoke to the chief myself (*himself)'

Notice that naynaa$_1$ follows the clitic -t, which marks subject case, in (2.a). This clitic is always the last item of the subject noun phrase; naynaa$_1$, which follows it, lies outside of the subject noun phrase.

3. Naynaa in Possessive Constructions

3.1. Possessive Constructions. Possessed nouns take prefixes indicating the person of their possessor:

1st person	Ø	
2nd person	m-	
3rd person	kw-	for most kinship terms
	Ø	elsewhere

In addition, many (usually alienably) possessed nouns are marked with the prefix ny-, which follows the personal prefix.

In a fully specified possessive construction, a noun or lexical pronoun naming the possessor precedes the possessed noun. If a lexical pronoun, it appears in non-subject form; if a noun, it is unmarked for case.

(4.a) ... Evelyn ny-armewil uutak-x tapaa-t ...
Evelyn pos-car 3=caus=open-irr 3=loc=aux-SS
'... he was trying to break into Evelyn's car ...'

(4.b) mat peya-t nyaap ny-wa llyewii
place this-sj my pos-house 3=resemble
'This place reminds me of home (lit. resembles my house)'

When the identity of the possessor is understood, the possessor need not be lexicalized:

(5) ny-wa taa=aama
pos-house 3=send
'They sent him home (lit. to his house)'

When the possessor of one argument of a clause is coreferential with another argument of that clause, the referent is lexicalized at most once. This can be seen in (6), where the possessor of wa is (under this interpretation) coreferential with the lexically realized subject llye'aaw.

(6) ... llye'aaw-pu-t ny-wa-pu akway paa-pes ...
rabbit-dem-sj pos-house-dem 3=turn 3=arrive-adv
'... the rabbit came back home (lit. to his house), but ...'

Possessive constructions which are not fully specified, such as those in (5) and (6) are ambiguous: in appropriate contexts, these examples could be interpreted as 'She sent him to her/my/another's house' and '... the rabbit came back to my/another's house'.

For future reference, note that the fully specified possessive construction constitutes a syntactic constituent: no word or phrase may intervene between the possessed noun and the lexical noun or pronoun functioning syntactically as possessor, and the entire construction may be shifted in certain pragmatic circumstances, for instance in the "afterthought" construction:

(7) kuutuch-pu nye'-iny raw Maria kw-ntachany-pu-t
acorn=flour-dem 3/1-give hab Maria 3-o=sister-dem-sj
'She used to give me acorn flour, Maria's sister [that is]'

3.2. Possessive Constructions with Naynaa. Naynaa may appear in a possessive construction when the possessor corefers with the subject of the clause. (I will refer to naynaa in possessive constructions as naynaa$_2$.) Its appearance makes this coreference explicit and emphatic. The sentences in (8), unlike those in (5,6) above, are unambiguous.

(8.a) naynaa ny-armewil taanawa tewaa
pos-car 3=caus=run 3=loc=aux
'He's driving his own (*other's) car [for once]'

(8.b) iipa-pu-t naynaa ny-wa allymar
man-dem-sj pos-house 3=caus=burn
'That man set fire to his own (*other's) house'

(8.c) naynaa ny-wa taa=aama
pos-house 3=send
'She sent him to her own (*his/*other's) house'

Two facts suggest that the sequence of naynaa$_2$ plus possessed noun comprises a syntactic constituent. First, the entire construction may be shifted in certain pragmatic circumstances, as in (9), a permutation of (8.b).

(9) naynaa ny-wa iipa-pu-t allymar
pos-house man-dem-sj 3=caus=burn
'That man set fire to his own house!'

Second, the subject-coreferential possessive interpretation is possible only when naynaa is adjacent to the possessed noun. Otherwise, the possessor of the noun need not be interpreted as coreferential with the subject, and *naynaa* is interpreted as the emphatic *naynaa*$_1$. This is exemplified by the contrast between (10.a) (where *naynaa* is adjacent to the possessed noun *nywa* and where the possessor of *nywa* is interpreted as coreferential with the subject) and (10.b) (where *naynaa* is not adjacent to *nywa* and where this interpretation is not necessary).

(10.a) Maria Tom naynaa ny-wa taa=aama
Maria Tom pos-house 3=send
'Maria sent Tom to her own house'

(10.b) Maria naynaa Tom ny-wa taa=aama
Maria Tom pos-house 3=send
'Maria herself sent Tom to (his/her/another's) house'

4. Reflexive/Reciprocal Constructions

4.1. Reflexives in Related Dialects and Languages.

In other dialects of Diegueño, and in the Yuman languages most closely related to it (the California-Delta and River subfamilies), reflexivization and reciprocal action are marked by the proclitic *mat*. An example from the Mesa Grande dialect of Diegueño (Couro and Langdon 1975:183) is given in (11).

(11) 'ehaa-lly mat '-wuuw
water-in refl 1-see
'I saw myself in the water'

4.2. Reflexives in Jamul Diegueño.

In Jamul, too, *mat* marks reflexive and reciprocal reference. Examples are given in (12).

(12.a) xatt mat aanin
dog refl 3=shake
'The dog shook himself'

(12.b) mat sxwan
refl 1=scratch
'I scratched myself'

(12.c) mat tetekyuut
refl 3=greet=pl
'They greeted one another'

(12.d) Maria Tom mat mespi
Maria Tom refl 3=dislike
'Maria and Tom don't get along, dislike each other'

Often, *naynaa* appears in reflexive constructions, where it immediately precedes *mat*, as in (13).

(13.a) naynaa mat wiw
refl 1=see
'I can see myself!'

(13.b) naynaa mat axway
refl 3=kill
'He killed himself'

(13.c) Tom naynaa mat chuuway
refl 3=talk=to
'Tom was talking to himself'

Naynaa does not often appear in reciprocal constructions.

The reflexive constructions in which naynaa regularly appears can be characterized as those naming actions not typically performed on or directed toward oneself. (Acts of seeing are normally directed toward things other than oneself, for instance, and the things one typically kills are game animals.) While naynaa may be omitted from these constructions, versions in which it appears are preferred to versions in which it does not. On the other hand, in reflexive constructions naming actions which are commonly performed on or directed toward oneself (e.g. those exemplified in (12.a,b)), naynaa tends not to appear.[7]

Apparently, then, that when naynaa appears in reflexive constructions it signals that coreference between the subject and object is remarkable. I will call naynaa thus used naynaa$_3$.

A number of verbs which are marked with the clitic mat cannot be considered true reflexives[8] synchronically. Some of these verbs do not occur independently of mat as transitive verbs; examples are mat kiisik 'feel uneasy' and mat uunaap 'play'. Others do occur independently of mat as transitive verbs, but with a difference in meaning. Consider the verb mat chaaxaaya 'be stuck up'. While chaaxaaya is a transitive verb, it means 'brag about'. Furthermore, chaaxaaya has a reflexive form naynaa mat chaaxaaya 'brag about oneself' which differs in both form and meaning from mat chaaxaaya 'be stuck up'. Similarly, mat pshaw 'be careful' differs slightly in meaning from the reflexive form naynaa mat pshaw 'take care of oneself', as does mat nyexiimir 'get hurt' from naynaa mat nyexiimir 'hurt oneself'. In these cases, verbs marked with mat are middle verbs, while verbs marked with naynaa mat are true reflexives.

To sum up, reciprocal reference in Jamul is marked by the clitic mat. Reflexivization is marked by the clitic mat when the fact that the subject acts upon himself is not remarkable. When reflexivity is seen as remarkable, naynaa$_3$ immediately precedes mat. Mat is also used to mark middle verbs, and the cooccurrence of naynaa$_3$ with mat distinguishes the true reflexive forms of certain verbs from their middle forms. I suspect that the use of naynaa$_3$ will eventually grammaticalize with the result that *naynaa mat* will be the new marker of true reflexivization in Jamul.

5. *Naynaa in Complex Sentences*

5.1. Complex Sentences in Jamul. A detailed discussion of complex sentences can be found in Miller (1988); only relevant details are given here. Jamul has, in addition to nominalization and relativization, a variety of clause linking devices. The most versatile and most widely used of these is the switch reference system, a system of morphosyntactic devices which indicate whether the subject of one clause is "the same as" or "different from"[9] the subject of another, usually adjacent, clause. Jamul has two same-subject suffixes, which appear optionally (the degree to which they are likely to appear can be stated in phonological terms; see Miller 1988): *-t* links clauses in realis constructions and *-k* links clauses in irrealis constructions. Jamul's different-subject suffixes, which appear obligatorily, are *-chm* and *-m*,[10] which link clauses in realis constructions, and *-km*, which links clauses in irrealis constructions. A variety of other clause-linking devices are found as well, including grammatical words and morphemes which mark purpose clauses, reason clauses, adversative clauses, clauses naming temporally sequenced events ('then' clauses), 'when/if' clauses, and counterfactual conditional clauses. Switch reference marking may appear with all clause-linking devices that are non-suffixal. It does not appear in nominalized complement clauses nor in relative clauses.

5.2. Complex Sentences with Naynaa. Naynaa has a special function in complex sentences (where I will call it *naynaa*$_4$): it indicates that the subject of one clause corefers with the subject of a another clause in the same sentence.[11] The sentences in (14) exemplify this; in (14.a), the subject of 'fall' must be interpreted as 'Tom', and (14.b) is grammatical only if the subject of 'pregnant' is interpreted as 'Juan'.

(14.a) Tom kw-meyuy llewak nya-w-chaw naynaat w-nall
Tom 3-relative 3=punch when-3-perf 3-fall
'Tom socked his brother and then (Tom/*brother/*other) fell down'

(14.b) Juan-t Maria nya-w-wiw naynaa w-tuuy tewa
Juan-sj Maria when-3-see 3-pregnant 3=loc=aux
'When Juan met Maria, (Juan/*Maria/*other) was pregnant'

Naynaa$_4$ is used only in certain pragmatic circumstances. It has an emphatic function: it not only indicates coreference of subjects across clauses but also connotes that this coreference is remarkable. When the speaker does not wish to connote that the coreference of subjects across clauses is remarkable, *naynaa*$_4$ does not appear; compare the sentences in (15) with those in (14).

(15.a) Tom kw-meyuy llewak nya-w-chaw skan-t w-aam
Tom 3-relative 3=punch when-3-perf 3=flee-SS 3-go=away
'Tom punched his brother and then ran off'

(15.b) Sally nya-paa w-tuuy tewa
Sally when-3=arrive 3-pregnant 3=loc=aux
'When Sally came here, she was pregnant'

Naynaa$_4$ may be used in all types of complex sentences. 'When' clause constructions were seen in (14). (16-21) below exemplify the use of naynaa$_4$ in constructions involving adversative clauses, reason clauses, 'then'-clauses, purpose clauses, counterfactual conditionals, and simple switch reference constructions. Examples of naynaa$_4$ in relative clauses and nominalized complement constructions will be seen below in (23) and (25).

(16) llye'aaw-pu w-saaw-x tuuyaw-pes naynaat ch'am
rabbit-dem 3-eat-irr 3=loc=aux-adv 3=goof
'He had been all ready to eat the rabbit, but then he (himself/*other) goofed'

(17) shuuyaw map xemaaw kenaat naynaat wi
1=wait=for 1=want neg because 1=do
'I didn't want to wait for her, so I did it myself (*so another did it him/herself)'

(18) xekwall kavaay llyaawacha nyapuum naynaat llyewa
child horse 3=caus=mount then 3=mount
'He put the child up on the horse and then (he/*other) climbed up [behind him]'

(19) nya'wiw kwexepshiw w-rar naynaat w-saaw-x-it
things nom=green 3-cook 3-eat-irr-purp
'She cooked these vegetables to eat herself (*for another to eat)'

(20) xenu xemaaw-pek naynaa w-aa-x-m tuuyaw
3=sick neg-if 3-go-irr-DS 3=happen
'If he hadn't been sick, he (*other) would have gone himself'

(21) Maria gayeet w-pap-t naynaat w-saaw
Maria cookies 3-bake-SS 3-eat
'Maria made cookies and ate them herself (*another ate them)'

Each of the sentences above except (17) contains two clauses, and the subject of the second clause must be interpreted as coreferential with the subject of the first clause. (17) contains three clauses; the subject of its third clause must be interpreted as coreferential with the subject of the second. In (16,17,18,20,21), naynaa$_4$ appears in an independent clause and indicates coreference with the subject of a preceding dependent clause; in (19), it appears in a dependent clause and indicates coreference with the subject of a preceding independent clause.

5.3. Clause Affiliation. For future reference, I shall demonstrate that *naynaa*$_4$ belongs syntactically to the clause which contain the closest verb on its right and that it may be surrounded by material from this clause. This is most easily seen in relative clauses.

Diegueño relative clauses are head-internal; for discussion, see Gorbet (1974). In the Jamul dialect, the head of the relative clause may be topicalized by being shifted to the leftmost boundary of the relative clause. This is exemplified in (22.b); compare (22.a) where the head has not been topicalized. (Relative clauses are set off with brackets.)

(22.a) [Maria leech chshaak]-pu mamwi-a
Maria milk 3=bring-dem 2=do=what-Q
'What did you do with the milk Maria brought home?'

(22.b) [leech Maria chshaak]-pu mamwi-a
milk Maria 3=bring-dem 2=do=what-Q
'What did you do with the milk Maria brought home?'

Naynaa$_4$ may appear in a relative clause, indicting that the subject of the relative clause is coreferential with that of the clause in which it is embedded, as in (23). The head of the relative clause may be topicalized, in which case it precedes *naynaa*$_4$, as shown in (23.b).

(23.a) [naynaat paap afrir-pu] nemuxay
potatoes 3=fry-dem 3=like
'He likes potatoes that he (*other) fries himself'

(23.b) [paap naynaat afrir-pu] nemuxay
potatoes 3=fry-dem 3=like
'He likes potatoes that he (*other) fries himself'

Notice also that the linear position of *naynaa*$_4$ in (23.a,b) appears to parallel that of the relative clause's lexical subject in (22.a,b). In other types of complex sentences, too, *naynaa*$_4$ appears to occupy the syntagmatic slot in its clause which a lexical subject, if present, would occupy: compare (16) above with (24).

(24) llye'aaw-pu w-saaw-x tuuyaw-pes xattpa-pu-t paa-t nar
rabbit-dem 3-eat-irr 3=loc=aux-adv coyote-dem-sj 3=arrive-SS 3=steal
'He had been all ready to eat the rabbit, but Coyote arrived and took it from him'

Similar comparisons can be made with the remaining types of complex sentences; examples are available on request.

5.4. Coreference with the Subject of a Following Clause. Although it typically occurs in a non-initial clause and indicates coreference between the subject of its own clause and that of the preceding clause, in certain circumstances *naynaa*$_4$ may appear initially in a complex sentence. An example of this has already been seen in (23.a); another is presented in (25). The subject of *naynaa*$_4$'s clause must corefer with the subject of *uuyaaw* in (25).

(25) naynaak[12] w-tuum-x-pu uuyaaw xemaaw
3-pay-irr-dem 3=know neg
'She didn't know that she (*other) had to pay for it herself'

Sentence-initial *naynaa* indicates coreference across clauses only when it occurs in a nominalized relative or in a nominalized complement clause explicitly marked such by the demonstrative clitic *-pu*. When *naynaa* occurs initially in a complex sentence and the clause in which it occurs is not a nominalized relative or complement clause, *naynaa* is interpreted not as *naynaa*$_4$ which encodes coreference across clauses but as the emphatic *naynaa*$_1$. This can be seen in (26); another example is (2.c).

(26) naynaat chaw-x tapaa-chm w-xwak
1=fix-irr 1=loc=aux-DS 3-break
'I tried to fix it myself and it broke'

5.5. Coreference with the Subject of a Non-Adjacent Clause. *Naynaa*$_4$ is sometimes used to indicate that the subject of its clause corefers with that of a non-adjacent preceding clause.[13] This can be seen in (27).

(27) Maria tamaal w-chaw-pu may nemuxay xemaaw-pes naynaat nemuxay
Maria tamales 3-make-dem neg 1=like neg-advers 3=like
'I don't like Maria's tamales but she likes them' (lit. 'Although I don't like the tamales Maria makes, she likes them')

All examples of this phenomenon which I have been able to elicit involve the adversative construction. I suspect that the peculiar semantics of this construction are responsible for the construal of *naynaa*$_4$ with the subject of the non-adjacent clause. In (27), for instance, the adversative clause ('Although I don't like the tamales Maria makes') has a meaning contradictory to the meaning of the clause in which *naynaa*$_4$ occurs; thus if the subject of the latter were construed with that of the former the sentence would not make sense. Further investigation is needed to determine whether similar interpretations are possible in constructions where coreference with the adjacent clause is not ruled out pragmatically.

5.6. Coreference with Possessors. *Naynaa*$_4$ may be used in complex sentences to indicate coreference between the subject of one clause and the possessor of the subject of another clause in the same sentence. Consider the example in (28). *Naynaa* appears in the second clause of this sentence and indicates that the possessor of the subject of its clause is coreferential with the (third person plural) subject of the preceding clause.

(28) nyexay-pu nyaam uuiit yu xemaay leep-pu
soup-dem really 3=give=pl aux boy orphan-dem
'Soup was all they ever gave him, the orphan boy,

naynaa ny-xaakwaall cha'saw kwa'xaan w-saw-pes
their=emph pos-children food nom=good 3-eat=pl-adv
although their own children ate good food'

In the examples in (29), the subject of *naynaa*$_4$'s clause may be interpreted as coreferential with the possessor of the subject of the preceding clause.

(29.a) Linda ny-famiil Kaamp-lly nyewaayk-pes naynaat chepa-t ...
Linda pos-family Campo-in 3=live-adv 3=exit-SS
'Linda's family lives in Campo, but she (herself) left and ...'

(29.b) Maria kw-nsuum nya-xnu naynaat pshaw
Maria 3-y=brother when-3=sick 3=care=for
'When Maria's brother was sick, she took care of him (herself)'

(29.c) (nyaap) ntachany w-aam-pes naynaat maaw
(my) 1=o=sister 3-go=away-adv 1=not=do
'My older sister left, but I (myself) didn't'

Sentences like those in (29) may also have another reading, in which the subject of *naynaa*'s clause is coreferential with the (entire) subject of the preceding clause, if such a reading is pragmatically and grammatically possible. For instance, (29.b) may also be interpreted as 'When Maria's brother was sick, he took care of (someone) himself'. Notice, though, that a similar reading of (29.c) is impossible for grammatical (not to mention pragmatic) reasons: The verb of *naynaa*$_4$'s clause appears in an unambiguous first person form. The subject of the clause which precedes it is third person; thus the only interpretation possible of the sentence is that in which *naynaa*$_4$ is construed as coreferential with the first person possessor of the subject of the first clause.

5.7. Same-Subject Naynaa vs. the Same-Subject Suffixes.

Although *naynaa*$_4$ functions as a marker of subject coreference, it differs in subtle ways from the same-subject switch reference suffixes. First, switch reference suffixes are not used in conjunction with suffixal clause-linking devices nor in relative clauses nor in nominalized clauses; *naynaa*$_4$, on the other hand, is used in these places (cf. 16,20,23,25). Second, switch reference suffixes appear only on dependent clauses; *naynaa*$_4$, on the other hand, may appear in a non-initial clause regardless of the dependency relations between this clause and the relevant preceding clause. Third, *naynaa*$_4$ may indicate coreference between the subject of one clause and the possessor of the subject of another (cf. 5.6); switch reference suffixes may do no such thing.

Less subtle differences are these: First, *naynaa*$_4$ has an emphatic function, while the same-subject switch reference suffixes do not. Second, the appearance of same-subject switch reference suffixes is phonologically governed -- they tend to disappear in certain phonological environments. The appearance of *naynaa*$_4$, on the other hand, is pragmatically governed, and when it is used, it is a salient, stress-bearing word.

5.8. A Note on Naynaa$_4$ *and Logophoric Elements.* "Logophoric" elements have received much attention in recent literature (Clements 1975, Hyman and Comrie 1981, Maling 1984, O'Connor 1986, Sells 1987). These are special grammatical morphemes (often pronouns) which appear in clausal complements[14] of verbs of saying, thinking, and feeling and which indicate coreference between an argument in the complement clause and an argument in the higher clause. An example from Ewe (Clements 1975) appears in (30); the logophoric pronoun is glossed 'LOG'.

(30) Kofi be ye-dzo
Kofi say LOG-leave
'Kofi says that he (Kofi/*other) left'

If an ordinary pronoun, rather than the logophoric pronoun, is used in this context, it is interpreted as disjoint in reference from the relevant argument of the higher clause. This can be seen in (31) (likewise from Clements 1975), where the ordinary pronoun is glossed 'PN'.

(31) Kofi be e-dzo
Kofi say PN-leave
'Kofi says that he (other/*Kofi) left'

According to Clements (1975:141), the logophoric pronoun refers back to that argument of the higher clause "whose speech, thoughts, feelings, or general state of consciousness are ... reported" in the embedded clause. Details of the syntax and use of logophoric elements differ slightly across the languages which have them, but Clements's characterization seems to hold cross-linguistically.

Naynaa$_4$ and logophoric elements are similar in that both indicate coreference across clauses. However, they differ in important ways. While logophoric pronouns are used in a limited set of syntactic and semantic circumstances, *naynaa*$_4$ is used freely. It is not restricted to complement clauses; we have seen that it may occur in a wide variety of complex sentence types and that is is found in independent clauses as well dependent clauses. More importantly, as the examples in (14) and (16-21) demonstrate, *naynaa*$_4$ is not restricted to contexts involving the reporting of speech, thoughts, feelings, or general states of consciousness. For these reasons, I do not consider *naynaa*$_4$ a logophoric element.

6. Diachronic Source of Naynaa

naynaa derives historically from a verb,[15] as is evident from the fact that it occasionally appears bearing residual verbal morphology. For example, *naynaa* sometimes appears with a prefix *m-*, the residue of the second person subject prefix,[16] when associated with a second person subject. (This happens only rarely; *naynaa* is not usually inflected for person of subject.) An example is given in (32).

(32) m-naynaa k-wiw
2- imp-see
'See for yourself'

Furthermore, *naynaa* sometimes appears with a final segment *k* in irrealis constructions. (This too is rare.) One example appears below and another in (25) above. The shape and position of this segment, along with the fact that all of its occurrences take place in irrealis contexts, strongly suggest that it is the residue of the irrealis same-subject suffix *-k*.

(33) Jose naynaak w-rar-x w-i
Jose 3-cook-irr 3-say
'Jose said he would cook it himself'

The hypothesis that *naynaa* was once a verb suggests a diachronic source for the *t* which often appears as its final segment: this *t* must once have been the realis same-subject suffix *-t*, alternating with the irrealis same-subject suffix *-k* in irrealis contexts.

Thus it is clear that *naynaa* derives historically from a verb which occurred as a dependent clause in a same-subject switch reference construction.

7. The Synchronic Status of Naynaa

7.1. Naynaa.

Naynaa cannot be considered a verb synchronically. First, it does not normally inflect for person of subject. Second, its final segment *t* no longer productively alternates with *-k* in irrealis contexts (cf. 19,20; more examples available on request) and thus cannot be considered the realis same-subject suffix.

Synchronically, *naynaa*$_1$ can be considered simply an emphatic.[17] *Naynaa*$_3$, as suggested in 4.2, may be in the process of grammaticalizing as part of a new reflexive marker *naynaa mat*. The synchronic status of *naynaa*$_2$ and *naynaa*$_4$ will be discussed in section 7.3.

7.2. The Final Segment t. The final segment t which often appears on naynaa derives historically from the realis same-subject suffix but cannot be analyzed as this suffix synchronically. In this section I consider the question of what the synchronic status of the final segment t might be.

While alternation between naynaa and naynaat is not completely systematic, its distribution follows clear tendencies. The t-final form rarely appears in reflexive and emphatic possessive constructions. In simple emphatic and emphatic same-subject-marking constructions, however, the t-final form appears roughly 80% of the time.[18]

A brief summary of subject case marking is now in order. Jamul has a subject case marking clitic -t, which appears obligatorily on demonstratives and optionally elsewhere.[19] Lexical pronouns have distinct subject and non-subject forms[20]; their subject forms end in t (which is segmentable historically if not synchronically as the subject case marker).

Moyne (1971:159) has observed that in case-marking languages, ordinary emphatics (which have functions are roughly equivalent to that of naynaa$_1$) may bear nominative case marking; he cites Arabic and Hungarian as cases in point. This leads me to suspect that the final t which appears on naynaa$_1$ might be being reanalyzed as the subject case marker -t (or as the final t associated with the subject forms of lexical pronouns).

7.3. More Speculation. Possessive naynaa$_2$ and same-subject marking naynaa$_4$ behave syntactically like noun phrases. In particular, naynaa$_2$, like lexically realized nominal possessors, must appear immediately adjacent to the possessed noun, and together with the possessed noun it forms a syntactic constituent which may be postposed (cf. section 3).[21] Naynaa$_4$, as seen in 5.3, occupies the syntagmatic slot which a lexically realized subject would occupy if present -- even in clauses with permuted constituent order. Furthermore, both naynaa$_2$ and naynaa$_4$ have anaphoric functions: the former indicates coreference with a clausemate subject, and the latter indicates coreference with the subject of another clause.

Perhaps, then, naynaa$_2$ and naynaa$_4$ have been reanalyzed as special possessive and same-subject marking pronouns.[22]

A synchronic analysis of naynaa's final t as the subject case marker would nicely complement an analysis of naynaa$_{2,4}$ as special possessive and same-subject marking pronouns. If naynaa$_2$ were analyzed as a possessive pronoun, one would expect it to lack a subject case marker (as do other lexical pronouns in the fully specified possessive construction; cf. 3.1). If naynaa$_4$ were analyzed as a special subject pronoun, one would of course expect it to appear with the subject case marker (or with the final t associated with the subject forms of pronouns). The distribution of t-final and vowel-final forms of naynaa reported in 7.2 conforms closely, if not perfectly, to these expectations. (The discrepancies may reflect that the reanalysis of naynaa's final t is not yet complete.)

The suggestions made here and in 7.2 are highly speculative and might be taken as a hypothesis to investigate in further research.

8. Closing Remarks

I have described naynaa's four uses and their syntactic characteristics. Syntactically, the four uses of naynaa differ from one another considerably; in terms of their functions, however, they remain quite similar to one another.

All uses of naynaa have an emphatic function. $Naynaa_1$ "emphasizes" a subject in that it indicates that the subject is somehow remarkable (see note 4) or that he acted alone, unaided, or voluntarily. Possessive $naynaa_2$ encodes emphatic coreference between a possessor and the subject of its clause: that is, it connotes that this coreference is remarkable. Same-subject-marking $naynaa_4$ encodes emphatic coreference between the subject of one clause and the subject of another. Finally, in its typical use in reflexive constructions $naynaa_3$ is emphatic: it indicates that coreference between subject and object is remarkable. (If, as other facts discussed in section 4 suggest, $naynaa_3$ is eventually grammaticalized as part of a new reflexive marker naynaa mat, this emphatic function will be lost.)

In three of its uses, naynaa has an anaphoric function: it indicates coreference with a subject. Possessive $naynaa_2$ and reflexive $naynaa_3$ indicate coreference with a clausemate subject, while same-subject-marking $naynaa_4$ indicates coreference between the subject of the clause in which it occurs and the subject of another clause in the same sentence. Furthermore, while $naynaa_1$ is not anaphoric, is nonetheless bound to the subject of its clause in the sense that the subject is the only element of the clause which it can be interpreted as "emphasizing".

NOTES

1. This is a revised version of a paper (originally titled "A special pronoun in Jamul") read at the Haas Festival Conference, University of California, Santa Cruz, in June 1986. I would like to thank Bill Robboy, Peggy Speas, Sandra Thompson, and especially

Margaret Langdon for helpful comments on intermediate versions. My consultant is Mrs. Gennie Walker of San Diego, whose patience and generosity I deeply appreciate.

2. The following abbreviations are used in interlinear glosses: adv, adversative; aug, augment; dem, demonstrative; DS, realis different subject; hab, habitual; imp, imperative; irr, irrealis; irr=DS, irrealis different subject; irr=SS, irrealis same subject; loc=aux, locational auxiliary; nom, nominalizer; neg, negative; perf, perfective auxiliary; pl, plural; pos, alienably possessed; purp, purposive; Q, question; refl, reflexive; sj, subject; SS, realis same subject; 1, first person subject or first person possessor; 2, second person subject or possessor; 3, third person subject or possessor; #/#, person of subject/person of object (note: third person objects are not indexed by pronominal prefixes). The symbol = is used to separate the parts of the gloss of a morpheme. Morpheme boundaries are indicated by a dash.

Data are presented in a practical orthography adapted from that of Couro and Hutcheson (1973). The symbols ' ch, kw, ll, lly, ly, ny, sh, xw represent /?, č, k^{w}, ɬ, ɬ^{y}, l^{y}, n^{y}, š, x^{w}/, and VV represents a long vowel. e represents the inorganic vowel schwa. The symbol = is used to separate adjacent like vowels. I omit schwa at morpheme boundaries.

3. In this paper, I will use the term "lexical pronoun" to refer both to lexical pronouns and to those lexical demonstratives which may be used for textual (as well as spatial) deixis and which fulfill the function of third person pronouns.

4. More precisely, the fact that the subject's referent fulfills whatever semantic role is associated with the subject of the relevant verb is seen as remarkable by the speaker.

5. Similar interpretations of emphatics are found in other languages; see Moyne (1971) and Edmundson and Plank (1978).

6. (3.a) is preferred to (3.b). (3.b) was judged grammatical (with the meaning 'I spoke to the chief myself/*himself') by my consultant, but she did not produce it herself.

7. Faltz (1985:242-3) notes that the distribution of the emphatic self in Middle English reflexive constructions follows a similar pattern.

8. I consider true reflexives to be forms of ordinary transitive verbs which happen to have objects coreferential with their subjects.

9. Langdon and Munro (1979) point out that "same" need not always mean "strictly coreferential"; switch reference constructions involving weather verbs and cases in which the subjects of two

clauses overlap in reference constitute cases in point. Precise terms like "coreferential" are thus not accurate, and for this reason Langdon and Munro's deliberately imprecise terms "same as" and "different from" are used here.

10. This analysis of the different-subject suffix *-m* is tentative.

11. Edmundson and Plank (1978:388-92) observe that in English, a similar effect sometimes obtains when the subject of a non-initial clause is emphasized with *himself*.

12. The final segment *k* which appears here will be discussed in section 7.

13. Similar phenomena have been observed in studies of switch reference marking in other languages (see for example Gordon 1981, Oswalt 1981).

14. Sells (1987) points out that in some languages (he cites Mundang), logophoric pronouns are also found in relative clauses modifying objects of verbs of this class.

15. Incidentally, the Yuman language Mojave has a verb *i:we:* which means 'do oneself', according to Munro (1976:47). Here is one of her examples:

k-i:we:-k	k-a?wi:-m
imp-do=oneself-SS	imp-do-tns
'Do it yourself!'	

16. The forms of the personal subject prefixes which appear on intransitive verbs (and on transitive verbs with third person objects) are:

First person	'-	before monosyllabic vowel-initial stems
	0	elsewhere
Second person	m-	
Third person	w-	before most monosyllabic monomorphemic stems
	0	elsewhere

It should be noted that the forms which one would expect to appear on a consonant-initial, bisyllabic verb are identical in shape to the corresponding possessive prefixes.

17. Emphatics, also known as intensifiers, have received little attention in the literature (exceptions include Moyne 1971, Moravcsik 1972, Edmundson and Plank 1978), and they are not well understood. In a study of intensifier (i.e. emphatic) constructions in 60 languages, Moravcsik (1972) adopts the following working definition: intensifier constructions are phrases consisting of a

noun or pronoun followed by another word, the whole phrase being the translation equivalent of the phrase *I myself* in the sentence *I myself haven't seen it* (the intensifier itself is the word following the noun or pronoun in the former). Emphatic *naynaa*$_1$ fits this definition - but other uses of *naynaa* do not.

I assume that emphatics can be considered a class which need not be subsumed under any major word class.

18. These statistics are based on elicited data as well as on data from texts. If only text data were considered, the two forms could be said to be in complementary distribution, the vowel-final form appearing in emphatic possessive and reflexive contexts and the *t*- final form appearing in simple emphatic and emphatic same-subject constructions. However, the number of occurrences of *naynaa* in texts is rather small.

19. See Gorbet (1976) for discussion.

20. Jamul's lexical pronouns have subject and non-subject forms:

	SUBJECT FORMS		NONSUBJECT FORMS	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
First person	nyaat	nya'wat	nyaap	nya'wap
Second person	maat	menya'wat	maap	menya'wap

There are no third person lexical pronouns; demonstratives are used instead. In this paper I have used the term "lexical pronouns" to include demonstratives as well as lexical pronouns; cf. note 3.

21. One syntactic difference between *naynaa*$_2$ and possessively-used nouns and pronouns must be noted. As observed in 3.1, a possessor cannot be lexically realized if it corefers with a lexically realized argument in the same clause. *Naynaa*$_2$, on the other hand, may appear when the subject with which it corefers is lexically realized (cf. 8.b; 10.a). I believe that this reflects a functional difference between *naynaa*$_2$ and possessively-used lexical pronouns (the former are used to indicate contrastive reference, while *naynaa* is used to indicate emphatic coreference) rather than a syntactic difference between them.

22. Moravcsik (1972) has pointed out that, cross-linguistically, words which function as emphatics (which she calls intensifiers) are sometimes used as pronouns as well.

REFERENCES

Clements, George. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: its role in discourse. Journal of West African languages 10.2:141-177.

Couro, Ted and Christina Hutcheson. 1973. A dictionary of Mesa Grande Diegueño. Banning: Malki Museum Press.

Couro, Ted and Margaret Langdon. 1975. Let's talk 'Iipay Aa. Banning: Malki Museum Press.

Edmundson, Jerold A. and Frans Plank. 1978. Great expectations: an intensive self analysis. Linguistics and philosophy 2.373-413.

Faltz, Leonard. 1985. Reflexivization: a study in universal syntax. New York: Garland Publishing.

Gorbet, Larry. 1974. Relativization and complementation in Diegueño: noun phrases as nouns. University of California, San Diego dissertation.

Gorbet, Larry. 1976. Diegueño case marking: conditions of optionality. Proceedings of the first Yuman languages workshop, ed. James E. Redden. University Museum Studies 7. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University. pp. 10-17.

Gordon, Lynn. 1981. Switch reference, clause order, and interclausal relations in Maricopa. in Haiman and Munro, eds. pp. 83-104.

Haiman, John and Pamela Munro, eds. 1981. Switch reference and universal grammar. Typological studies in language 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyman, Larry and Bernard Comrie. 1981. Logophoric reference in Gokana. Journal of African languages and linguistics 3.1:19-37.

Langdon, Margaret. 1970. A grammar of Diegueño: the Mesa Grande dialect. University of California publications in linguistics 66.

Langdon, Margaret and Pamela Munro. 1979. Subject and (switch) reference in Yuman. Folia linguistica 13:321-344.

Maling, Joan. 1984. Non-clause-bounded reflexives in modern Icelandic. Linguistics and philosophy 7.3:211-241.

Miller, Amy. 1988. Complex sentences in Jamul Diegueño. ms.

Moravcsik, Edith A. 1972. Some cross-linguistic generalizations about intensifier constructions. Papers from the eighth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. pp. 271-277.

Moyne, J.L. 1971. Reflexive and emphatic. Language 47.1:141-163.

Munro, Pamela. 1976. Mojave syntax. New York: Garland Publishing.

O'Connor, Mary Catherine. 1986. Two kinds of anaphora in Northern Pomo: are they logophoric? Papers from the 1983, 1984, and 1985 Hokan-Penutian language conferences, ed. James E. Redden. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University. pp. 59-69.

Oswalt, Robert L. 1981. Interclausal reference in Kashaya. in Haiman and Munro, eds. pp. 267-290.

Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. Linguistic inquiry 18.3:445-479.